

# Misère Quotients for Impartial Games

PREPRINT

Thane E. Plambeck  
2341 Tasso St.  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Aaron N. Siegel  
Institute for Advanced Study  
1 Einstein Drive  
Princeton, NJ 08540

December 24, 2018

*Dedicated to Richard K. Guy on the occasion of his 90<sup>th</sup> birthday, 30 September 2006.*

## Abstract

*The G-values of various games*, by R. K. Guy and C. A. B. Smith, introduced a broad class of impartial games and gave complete normal-play solutions for many of them. In this paper, we announce misère-play solutions to many of the games considered by Guy and Smith. They are described in terms of *misère quotients*—commutative monoids that encode the additive structure of specific misère-play games. Our solutions were obtained through a combination of theoretical advances and new algorithms for calculating misère quotients. We also introduce a structure theory for misère quotients and pose many open problems.

## 1 Introduction

In 1935, T. R. Dawson, the prolific composer of fairy chess problems, invented a little game now known as *Dawson's Chess* [9]. The game is played on a  $3 \times n$  chessboard, with equal facing rows of black and white pawns. The  $3 \times 14$  starting position is shown in Figure 1. The pieces move and capture as ordinary chess pawns, and captures, if available, are mandatory. The mandatory-capture rule ensures that each pawn will advance at most one rank before being captured or blocked by an opposing pawn. Thus the players will eventually run out of moves, and whoever makes the last move *loses*.

Dawson invested considerable effort in finding a perfect strategy (on arbitrarily large boards), but he was hampered by his unfortunate choice of winning condition. Had he asserted, instead, that whoever makes the last move *wins*, it's likely he would have solved the game. Instead, the problem has remained open for over 70 years.




Figure 1: The starting position in  $3 \times 14$  Dawson's Chess.

This is no accident: combinatorial games with *misère play*—in which the last player to move loses—tend to be vastly more complicated than their normal-play (last-player-winning) counterparts. Many authors have attempted to solve Dawson's Chess, and a variety of related misère-play games, only to be met with fierce resistance.

In this paper, we present strategies for several dozen previously-unsolved misère-play games. The solutions were obtained using a combination of new theoretical advances and powerful computational techniques. These advances also shed light on the question of just *why* misère play is so much harder than normal play. Although Dawson's Chess remains open, we have pushed the analysis further than ever before; and there is significant hope that our techniques can be improved to obtain a full solution.

## Impartial Combinatorial Games

A combinatorial game is *impartial* if both players have exactly the same moves available at all times.<sup>1</sup> A complete theory of *normal-play* impartial games was convincingly developed in the 1930s, independently by R. P. Sprague and P. M. Grundy [28] [29]. They showed that every position in every impartial game is equivalent (in normal play) to a single-heap position in the game Nim.

In the 1956 issue of the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, there appeared two papers, back-to-back, that highlighted the sharp differences between normal and misère play. The first was a seminal article by Richard K. Guy and Cedric A. B. Smith, *The G-Values of Various Games* [17], in which the authors introduced a broad class of impartial games known as *octal games*. Guy and Smith applied the Sprague–Grundy theory to obtain complete normal-play solutions to dozens of such games, including Dawson's Chess.<sup>2</sup> Their analysis was such an enormous success that it left little to be discovered about normal-play octal games.

The second article was by Grundy and Smith [15], and concerned impartial games with misère play. In contrast to the Guy–Smith paper, it has a somewhat dispiriting introduction:

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Dawson's Chess appears to distinguish between Black and White, the reader might wish to verify that this is illusory: the mandatory-capture rule guarantees that their moves are, in fact, equivalent.

<sup>2</sup>In fact, Guy credits Dawson's Chess as a motivating influence: “It may be of historical interest to note that Dawson showed the problem to me around 1947. Fortunately, I forgot that Dawson proposed it as a losing game, was able to analyze the normal-play version and rediscover the Sprague–Grundy theory.” [16]

Various authors have discussed the ‘disjunctive compound’ of games with the last player winning (Grundy [14]; Guy and Smith [17]; Smith [27]). We attempt here to analyse the disjunctive compound with the last player losing, though unfortunately with less complete success . . . .

At the source of the “less complete success” was the apparent lack of a natural analogue of the Sprague–Grundy theory in *misère* play—in particular, the almost negligible canonical simplification of most *misère*-play impartial game trees. Grundy and Smith speculated that improvements might be lurking, but their efforts to produce additional simplification rules were unsuccessful. Finally, in 1976 Conway proved through an intricate argument [6, Theorem 77] that no such improvements exist. Thirty years later, he offered the following remarks.

The result I am most proud of in *misère* impartial combinatorial games is that the Grundy and Smith reduction rules are in fact the only ones available in general in the global semigroup of all *misère* games . . . . Grundy quite specifically did not believe that this would be the case. [7]

Conway’s result shows that the complications observed by Grundy and Smith are intrinsic. Yet for many *misère* games, including many octal games, there is a path forward. The Grundy–Smith equivalence can be localized to the set of all positions that arise in the play of a particular game. This associates to every game  $\Gamma$  a certain commutative monoid  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the *misère quotient* of  $\Gamma$ . Together with a small amount of additional information, one can recover from  $\mathcal{Q}$  a perfect winning strategy for  $\Gamma$ . The monoid  $\mathcal{Q}$  therefore serves as a *local* *misère* analogue of the Sprague–Grundy theory.

The main ideas behind the quotient construction are described in [19] [20], and we’ll review them in the next section; but they only set the stage for the goals of this paper:

1. To record what’s been discovered about the *misère* play of particular games, in the spirit of Guy and Smith;
2. To develop a structure theory for *misère* quotients;
3. To describe algorithms useful for investigating *misère* games; and
4. To identify new problems and areas of interest in the structure of *misère* play.

Henceforth, we will assume that the reader is familiar with the classical Sprague–Grundy theory. To a lesser extent, we will also assume familiarity with the canonical theory of *misère* games. See *Winning Ways* [4] for an outstanding introduction to both topics.

Section 2 of this paper is an informal exposition of the *misère* quotient construction. Section 3 summarizes the solutions to various octal games, obtained using the techniques of this paper. In Sections 4 and 5, we formalize the *misère* quotient construction and develop a rudimentary structure theory. Section 6 gives some interesting counterexamples, and Section 7 dives a bit more deeply

into the general structure of misère quotients. Finally, in Section 8, we introduce an intriguing conjecture that has sweeping implications for the relationship between normal and misère play.

Two appendices provide a few more details. Appendix A includes complete solutions to most of the games showcased in Section 3. Included are two correctness proofs for quotients that we have not been able to verify algorithmically. In Appendix B, we describe the algorithms used to compute and verify misère quotients.

## 2 Misère Quotients

Let  $G$  be an impartial game. We denote by  $o^+(G)$  the normal-play outcome of  $G$ . Thus  $o^+(G) = \mathcal{P}$  if second player (the *previous* player) can force a win, assuming normal play; otherwise,  $o^+(G) = \mathcal{N}$ , indicating that first player (the *next* player) can force a win. Likewise, we denote by  $o^-(G)$  the misère-play outcome of  $G$ . We say that  $G$  is a *normal  $\mathcal{P}$ -position* if  $o^+(G) = \mathcal{P}$ , etc.

Now let  $G$  and  $H$  be impartial games. We define

$$G =^+ H \text{ iff } o^+(G + X) = o^+(H + X), \text{ for every impartial game } X.$$

$$G =^- H \text{ iff } o^-(G + X) = o^-(H + X), \text{ for every impartial game } X.$$

It is customary to write simply  $G = H$  instead of  $G =^- H$  when we are firmly in the context of misère games.

A major goal of combinatorial game theory is to understand the structure of the equivalence classes of games modulo equality. As mentioned in the introduction, Sprague and Grundy completed this program convincingly for normal play.

**Fact 2.1** (Sprague–Grundy Theorem). *Let  $G$  be any impartial game. Then for some Nim-heap  $*n$ , we have  $G =^+ *n$ .*

The Sprague–Grundy Theorem yields a remarkably simple structure for the normal-play equivalence classes of impartial games. In misère play, however, the situation is vastly more complex. For example, consider just those impartial games born by day 6. In normal play, there are precisely seven of them, up to equivalence:  $0, *, *2, \dots, *6$ . By contrast, Conway has shown that in misère play there are more than  $2^{4171779}$ .

The solution to this problem is to localize the definition of equality. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be some fixed set of games, closed under addition, and suppose that whenever  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ , then every option of  $G$  is also in  $\mathcal{A}$ . (Typically,  $\mathcal{A}$  will be the set of all positions that arise in some fixed game  $\Gamma$ , such as Dawson’s Chess.) Then define, for all  $G, H \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$G \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} H \text{ iff } o^-(G + X) = o^-(H + X), \text{ for every } X \in \mathcal{A}.$$

It is easily seen that  $\equiv_{\mathcal{A}}$  is an equivalence relation. It is furthermore a congruence: if  $G \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} H$  and  $K \in \mathcal{A}$ , then since  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under sums, we have

$G + K \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} H + K$ . Consequently, addition modulo  $\equiv_{\mathcal{A}}$  defines a monoid  $\mathcal{Q}$ :

$$\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{A} / \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} .$$

Moreover, if  $G \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} H$ , then necessarily  $o^-(G) = o^-(H)$  (taking  $X = 0$  in the definition of equivalence). Therefore each  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$  has a well-defined outcome, and we can put

$$\mathcal{P} = \{[G]_{\equiv_{\mathcal{A}}} : G \in \mathcal{A}, o^-(G) = \mathcal{P}\}.$$

The structure  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is the *misère quotient* of  $\mathcal{A}$ , and we denote it by  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ . We will refer to  $\mathcal{P}$  as the  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion of  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ .

As we will see, the misère quotient of  $\mathcal{A}$  is often finite, even when  $\mathcal{A}$  is infinite. In such cases, our reduction makes the theory tractable, as follows. Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  be the quotient map, defined by  $\Phi(G) = [G]_{\equiv_{\mathcal{A}}}$ . Suppose we can identify a set of generators  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{A}$ , together with the images  $\Phi(H) \in \mathcal{Q}$  of each generator  $H \in \mathcal{H}$ . (For example,  $\mathcal{A}$  might be the set of all Dawson’s Chess positions, and  $\mathcal{H}$  the set of Dawson’s Chess positions consisting of a single contiguous row of pawns.) Given a position  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ , we can write  $X$  as a sum of generators,  $X = H_1 + H_2 + \dots + H_k$ , and compute the images  $x_1 = \Phi(H_1)$ ,  $x_2 = \Phi(H_2)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $x_k = \Phi(H_k)$ . Then we simply check whether

$$x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdot \dots \cdot x_k \in \mathcal{P},$$

and this determines  $o^-(X)$ . The problem of finding the outcome of the (possibly quite complicated) sum  $X$  is therefore reduced to a small number of operations on the finite multiplication table  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

In this paper, we are principally concerned with *octal games*, in which the positions are sums of heaps of tokens. If  $\Gamma$  is an octal game, we will usually denote by  $H_n$  a  $\Gamma$ -heap of size  $n$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of all positions of  $\Gamma$  (the “heap algebra”) and by  $\mathcal{H}$  the set of single-heap positions. When convenient, we will regard  $\mathcal{A}$  as a free commutative monoid on the countable generating set  $\mathcal{H}$ . Finally, it will be useful to write  $\mathcal{H}_n = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_n = \langle \mathcal{H}_n \rangle$ .

To present the solution to  $\Gamma$ , it suffices to specify three things: the monoid  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion  $\mathcal{P}$ , and the quotient map  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  (sometimes called the *pretending function* of  $\mathcal{A}$ ). Since  $\Phi$  is a monoid homomorphism, we need only specify the values  $\Phi(H_n)$  for each  $n$ . We can use this information to reconstruct perfect play for  $\Gamma$ , as described above.

We will shortly present a catalogue of such solutions to various octal games. These solutions were obtained with the help of *MisereSolver* [25], our software for computing misère quotients, which is described in detail in Appendix B. The one missing ingredient is the Guy–Smith–Plambeck *Periodicity Theorem*, which enables one to compute  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$  in terms of some finite partial quotient  $\mathcal{Q}_n = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}_n)$ . For the record, we state the theorem here.

**Fact 2.2** (Periodicity Theorem [17] [19]). *Let  $\Gamma$  be an octal game, let  $d$  be the index of its last non-zero code digit, and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the free commutative monoid*

on the set of heaps  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, H_3, \dots\}$ . Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be the misère quotient of  $\mathcal{A}$ , with pretending function  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ . Suppose that

$$\Phi(H_{n+p}) = \Phi(H_n), \text{ for all } n \text{ such that } n_0 \leq n < 2n_0 + p + d.$$

Then

$$\Phi(H_{n+p}) = \Phi(H_n) \text{ for all } n \geq n_0.$$

Therefore, if we compute a partial quotient  $\mathcal{Q}_{n_0+2p+d}$  that satisfies the hypotheses of the Periodicity Theorem, we can extrapolate that  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{n_0+2p+d}$ , yielding a complete solution for  $\Gamma$ .

### Example: Misère Guiles

*Guiles* is the octal game **0.15**. It was previously unsolved (despite non-trivial effort), but *MisereSolver* can nonetheless dispense a complete solution in under one second. A presentation for the misère quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is shown in Figure 2, together with the single-heap values of the quotient map  $\Phi$ . The monoid  $\mathcal{Q}$  has 42 elements; 12 of these are in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0+	$a$	$a$	1	$a$	$a$	$b$	$b$	$a$	$b$	$b$
10+	$a$	$a$	1	$c$	$c$	$b$	$b$	$d$	$b$	$e$
20+	$c$	$c$	$f$	$c$	$c$	$b$	$g$	$d$	$h$	$i$
30+	$ab^2$	$abg$	$f$	$abg$	$abe$	$b^3$	$h$	$d$	$h$	$h$
40+	$ab^2$	$abe$	$f^2$	$abg$	$abg$	$b^3$	$h$	$d$	$h$	$h$
50+	$ab^2$	$abg$	$f^2$	$abg$	$abg$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$d$	$b^3$	$b^3$
60+	$ab^2$	$abg$	$f^2$	$abg$	$abg$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$d$	$b^3$	$b^3$
70+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$f^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$d$	$b^3$	$b^3$
80+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$f^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	...				

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{0.15}) \cong \langle a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i \mid & a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2, bc = ab^3, c^2 = b^2, \\ & b^2d = d, cd = ad, d^3 = ad^2, b^2e = b^3, de = bd, be^2 = ace, \\ & ce^2 = abe, e^4 = e^2, bf = b^3, df = d, ef = ace, cf^2 = cf, \\ & f^3 = f^2, b^2g = b^3, cg = ab^3, dg = bd, eg = be, fg = b^3, \\ & g^2 = bg, bh = bg, ch = ab^3, dh = bd, eh = bg, fh = b^3, \\ & gh = bg, h^2 = b^2, bi = bg, ci = ab^3, di = bd, ei = be, \\ & fi = b^3, gi = bg, hi = b^2, i^2 = b^2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{a, b^2, bd, d^2, ae, ae^2, ae^3, af, af^2, ag, ah, ai\}$$

Figure 2: The misère quotient and pretending function of Guiles (**0.15**).

### 3 The $\Phi$ -Values of Various Games

We summarize extensive computations obtained using *MisereSolver* [25], an extension to the *CGSuite* computer algebra system [24]. The algorithms that drive *MisereSolver* are described in Appendix B.

Many of the games presented here were previously unsolved. Several others had been solved using other methods, but the misère quotient techniques yield cleaner solutions with much less effort. We have noted in the text each case in which we are aware of a prior solution.

A set  $\mathcal{A}$  of games is *closed* if it is closed under addition, and whenever  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $G'$  is an option of  $G$ , then also  $G' \in \mathcal{A}$ . In the previous section, we defined the misère quotient  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  of a closed set of games  $\mathcal{A}$ . When  $\mathcal{A}$  is not closed, we will write  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  to mean  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{cl}(\mathcal{A}))$ , where  $\text{cl}(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the smallest closed set containing  $\mathcal{A}$ . When  $G$  is a single game, we will simply write  $\mathcal{Q}(G)$  to mean  $\mathcal{Q}(\text{cl}(\{G\}))$ .

Finally, when  $\Gamma$  is a particular heap game, we will write  $\mathcal{Q}(\Gamma)$  to mean  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the set of all positions that occur in  $\Gamma$ .

#### 3.1 General comments

**Many details omitted.** Throughout this paper one can find many complete descriptions of misère quotients, presented using generators and relations. For the most part, these represent relatively simple examples. The most complicated quotients we've computed involve thousands of elements, and to write out their minimal presentations would require several largely unenlightening pages. Such presentations are available on our website [21], and they're easily reproducible with *MisereSolver* [25], so we've omitted them for most quotients with more than 50 elements.

**Partial quotients and infinite quotients.** In Section 2, we defined the  $n^{\text{th}}$  *partial quotient*  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma)$ , obtained by requiring all heaps to have size at most  $n$ . It appears that many octal games have some infinite partial quotients. Currently, *MisereSolver* is limited to computations on finite misère quotients; when  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma)$  is infinite, the software goes into an infinite loop at heap size  $n$ , analyzing successively larger finite approximations to  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ .

Unfortunately, it is often difficult to prove by hand that a quotient is infinite. This means that in most cases, we can only speculate whether a quotient is truly infinite, or whether we just haven't run *MisereSolver* for long enough. (However, see Section 6 for a proof that  $\mathcal{Q}_5(\mathbf{0.31011})$  is infinite.)

Figure 5 gives the largest known partial quotient for every unsolved two-digit octal game. In each case, we are reasonably sure that the *next* partial quotient is infinite, but a solution to the following problem would give us more confidence.

**Open Problem.** *Specify an algorithm to determine whether a given quotient  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  is infinite.*

A classical theorem of Rédei [13] [22] implies that every finitely generated commutative monoid is finitely presented. Since each partial quotient  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma)$  is necessarily finitely generated, there is hope that our techniques can be extended to obtain solutions for many octal games with infinite partial quotients.

**Open Problem.** *Specify an algorithm to compute a presentation for the (possibly infinite) quotient  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ , whenever  $\mathcal{A}$  is finitely generated.*

**Algebraic periodicity.** According to the Periodicity Theorem (Fact 2.2), the full misère quotient  $\mathcal{Q}(\Gamma)$  can sometimes be obtained from a finite number of partial quotients. In order to apply the Periodicity Theorem, the partial quotients must “stabilize” after a certain point, so that  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma) = \mathcal{Q}(\Gamma)$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ .

Many misère games show another, more intriguing type of limiting behavior. Such games have progressively larger partial quotients that exhibit a strong algebraic regularity. When this regularity continues indefinitely, the full quotient can be deduced from a finite number of partial quotients; but unlike in the “stable” case, the full quotient is infinite, whereas every partial quotient is finite. We’ve christened this behavior “algebraic periodicity,” but we can’t give a precise definition because we don’t fully understand how to describe it in general. See Appendix A for complete solutions to two examples, **0.26** and **4.7**.

Algebraic periodicity is a rich area for further study. Many other games show this type of behavior, including **0.54**, **0.145**, **0.157**, **0.175**, **0.355**, **0.357**, **0.516**, **0.724**, and **0.734**. We suspect that a general method for identifying and generalizing algebraic-periodic behavior—if one can be found—would quickly dispense solutions to many of them.

**Open Problem.** *Give a precise definition of algebraic periodicity (that includes at least some of the cases listed above), and prove an analogue of the Periodicity Theorem for algebraic periodic games.*

### 3.2 The Tame Quotients

In a sense, the simplest misère quotients are those that arise in Nim. Put  $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{Q}(0)$ , and for each  $n \geq 1$  define

$$\mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{Q}(*2^{n-1}).$$

Finally, put

$$\mathcal{T}_\infty = \mathcal{Q}(0, *, *2, *3, \dots),$$

the quotient of misère Nim.

The quotients  $\mathcal{T}_n$  are extremely common, and they correlate with an important property of misère games known as *tameness*. Roughly speaking, an impartial game is said to be *tame* if its misère-play strategy can be described in terms of the misère-play strategy of Nim. There are several ways to formalize the definition; Conway [6] uses a modification of Grundy values called *G\*-values*. The same symbols are called *genus symbols* in *Winning Ways* [4].

We will not review the details of genus symbols and their relation to misère quotients in this paper (for a discussion, see [19] [20]). Instead, we simply define a set of games  $\mathcal{A}$  to be *tame* if its misère quotient is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{T}_n$  for some  $n$ . Otherwise, we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is *wild*. When  $\mathcal{A}$  is tame, its misère-play strategy can easily be inferred from its normal-play strategy [4] [6].

It is worthwhile to write down explicit presentations for the  $\mathcal{T}_n$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_1 &\cong \langle a \mid a^2 = 1 \rangle \\ \mathcal{T}_2 &\cong \langle a, b \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b \rangle \\ \mathcal{T}_n &\cong \langle a, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1} \mid a^2 = 1, b_1^3 = b_1, b_2^3 = b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}^3 = b_{n-1}, \\ &\quad b_1^2 = b_2^2 = b_3^2 = \dots = b_{n-1}^2 \rangle \\ \mathcal{T}_\infty &\cong \langle a, b_1, b_2, \dots \mid a^2 = 1, b_1^3 = b_1, b_2^3 = b_2, \dots, \\ &\quad b_1^2 = b_2^2 = b_3^2 = \dots \rangle\end{aligned}$$

Now  $\mathcal{T}_1 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$  (as a monoid). For  $n \geq 2$ , the structure of  $\mathcal{T}_n$  is best described as follows. Note that  $b_1^2 = b_2^2 = \dots = b_{n-1}^2$ ; let  $z$  be this value. Then every  $x \in \mathcal{T}_n$  satisfies  $zx = x$ , *except* for  $x = 1, a$ . If we let

$$\mathcal{K}_n = \{x \in \mathcal{T}_n : zx = x\},$$

then  $\mathcal{K}_n$  is a group with identity  $z$ , and we have  $\mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{K}_n \cup \{1, a\}$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{K}_n \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ , with generators  $za, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}$ . The remaining two elements  $\{1, a\}$  form a separate copy of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . Therefore  $|\mathcal{T}_n| = 2^n + 2$ .

Likewise, we can define  $\mathcal{K}_\infty$  in the same way, and we have

$$\mathcal{K}_\infty \cong \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}_2,$$

and  $\mathcal{T}_\infty = \mathcal{K}_\infty \cup \{1, a\}$ .

Readers familiar with Conway's genus theory will recognize 1 and  $a$  as the *fickle units*, and  $z$  and  $az$  as the *firm units*.

$\mathcal{T}_2$ , in particular, is extremely common; for example, it is the quotient of **0.23**, **0.31** ("Stalking") and **0.52**.

### 3.3 The Smallest Wild Quotient

The smallest wild misère quotient is an eight-element monoid that we denote by  $\mathcal{R}_8$ :

$$\mathcal{R}_8 = \langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, bc = ab, c^2 = b^2 \rangle; \quad \mathcal{P} = \{a, b^2\}.$$

In Section 5 of this paper, we will prove that  $\mathcal{T}_0$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  are the only quotients smaller than  $\mathcal{R}_8$ . It is also possible to show that  $\mathcal{R}_8$  is the *unique* misère quotient of order 8 (up to isomorphism), though this is more difficult; see [26].

Many octal games have misère quotient  $\mathcal{R}_8$ , including **0.75** (Section 3.4), **0.512**, and **4.56**.

### 3.4 Wild Octal Games with Known Solutions

We now summarize the wild two- and three-digit octal games whose misère-play solutions are known. The results are tabulated in Figure 3. Each row of the table shows a game code (or a schema of equivalent codes), together with the period, preperiod, and quotient order of the misère solution. We have also include an appropriate attribution in each case where we are aware of a prior solution.

Comments and historical notes on some individual games follow.

**Guiles.** The game **0.15** is named *Guiles* in honor of Richard Guy (the name is short for “Guy’s Kayles”). Its misère quotient was discussed in Section 2; it has 42 elements, with a  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion of size 12. See Figure 2, and also [20].

**Kayles.** William L. Sibert tells the interesting story of his discovery of the complete analysis of misère Kayles (**0.77**) in [23]. In [8], Sibert’s original solution is reformulated and simplified considerably. The misère quotient of Kayles, a monoid with 40 elements, is discussed at length in [19, Section 11.5] and [20]. For completeness, we reproduce the solution here in Figure 19. Other octals with misère quotient isomorphic to Kayles include **0.074-0.077** and **0.440-0.443** (duplicate Kayles), as well as **0.044** and **0.046** (triplicate Kayles).

**Allemand’s Games.** Allemand gives solutions for the wild octals **0.26**, **0.53**, **0.72**, **0.75** and **4.7** in terms of his *generalized genus theory* [1] [2]. **0.53** and **0.72** have quotients of orders 16 and 24, respectively; see Figure 16.  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{0.75}) \cong \mathcal{R}_8$ ; see Figure 7. **0.26** and **4.7** are *algebraic periodic* in the vague sense described above; see Figures 20 and 21 for their presentations, and Appendix A for correctness proofs.

Allemand’s solution to **0.26** is slightly flawed<sup>3</sup>; we give a corrected analysis in Appendix A. His solution to **0.54** is also incorrect, but this appears somewhat more difficult to repair. See Section 3.5 for further discussion of **0.54**.

**4.7** has several duplicates and triplicates; these are listed in Figure 3. In addition, the games **0.516** and **0.574** appear to have the same misère quotient as **4.7**, but we do not include solutions here.

**Flanigan’s Games.** Complete analyses of misère **0.34** and **0.71** are due to Jim Flanigan [4]. The game **0.34** has period eight (in both normal and misère play) and quotient order 12; see Figure 14. Although the normal-play Grundy sequence of **0.71** has period two, its misère pretending function has period six.  $|\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{0.71})| = 36$ ; see Figure 16.

**Lemon Drops.** The game **0.56** is called *Lemon Drops* in *Winning Ways* [4]. It’s tame, so the normal-play period of 144 [12] remains the same in misère play.

**0.123.** This game is studied exhaustively in [19]. Its misère quotient has order 20; see Figure 15.

**0.241.** The normal-play period of **0.241** is 2, while its misère-play period is 10. **0.71**, discussed above, exhibits similar behavior. If the Normal Kernel

---

<sup>3</sup>For example,  $H_{13} + H_{17} + H_{31}$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, but is misidentified in [1] as an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position.

Code	pd	ppd	$ \mathcal{Q} $	Comments	Solved By
<b>0.15</b>	10	66	42	Guiles, §3.4	
<b>0.260̄</b>		†	∞		Allemang [2]
<b>0.340̄</b>	8	7	12	§3.4; $\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{S}_{12}$	Flanigan [4]
<b>0.440̄</b>	24	143	40	Duplicate <b>0.77</b>	Sibert [8]
<b>0.530̄</b>	9	21	16	§3.4	Allemang [2]
<b>0.570̄</b>		†	∞	Duplicate <b>4.7</b>	Allemang [2]
<b>0.710̄</b>	6	3	36	§3.4	Flanigan [4]
<b>0.720̄</b>	4	16	24	§3.4	Allemang [2]
<b>0.750̄</b>	2	8	8	§3.4; $\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{R}_8$	Allemang [2]
<b>0.770̄</b>	12	71	40	Kayles, §3.4	Sibert [8]
<b>4.40̄</b>	12	71	40	Cousins of <b>0.77</b>	Sibert [8]
<b>4.70̄</b>		†	∞	Knots, §3.4	Allemang [2]
<b>0.044̄</b>	24	142	40	Duplicate <b>0.77</b>	Sibert [8]
<b>0.074̄</b>	24	142	40	Duplicate <b>0.77</b>	Sibert [8]
<b>0.115</b>	14	92	42	$\frac{7}{5}$ -plicate <b>0.15</b>	
<b>0.123</b>	5	5	20		Plambeck [19]
<b>0.144</b>	10	12	30		
<b>0.152</b>	48	25	34		
<b>0.153</b>	14	32	16		
<b>0.157</b>		†	∞	Triplicate <b>4.7</b>	Allemang [2]
<b>0.241̄</b>	10	4	36	Cousins of <b>0.317</b>	
<b>0.315̄</b>	10	4	36		
<b>0.351</b>	8	4	22		Plambeck [18]
<b>0.512̄</b>	6	16	8	$\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{R}_8$	
<b>0.644</b>	442	3255	172		
<b>0.712̄</b>	6	3	14	$\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{R}_{14}$	
<b>0.716̄</b>	2	22	14	$\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{R}_{14}$	
<b>4.56̄</b>	4	11	8	$\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{R}_8$	
<b>4.74̄</b>	2	8	8	$\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathcal{R}_8$	

$\dot{d}$  means “ $d$  or  $d + 1$ ”;  $\ddot{d}$  means “ $d$  or  $d + 2$ ”;  $\bar{d}$  means “ $d, d + 1, d + 2$  or  $d + 3$ ”

† Algebraic periodic; see Section 3.4 and Appendix A.

Figure 3: Wild two- and three-digit octal games with known misère quotients.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
0+	1	$a$	$a$	$b$	$b$	$ab$	$c$	$c$	$d$	$e$	$f$	$g$
12+	$h$	$b$	$i$	$ab^2$	$j$	$k$	$l$	$m$	$n$	$o$	$p$	$q$
24+	$r$	$abo$	$anq$	$b^3$	$s$	$t$	$abm$	$cq^2$	$u$	$cjk$	$v$	$w$
36+	$x$	$b^3$	$y$	$agt$	$z$	$b^2i$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$b^3$	$\gamma$	$\delta$	$b^4c$
48+	$bco$	$ab\zeta$	$\varepsilon$	$b^3$	$\zeta$	$ab^3c$	$grx$	$\eta$	$ab\zeta$	$ab\zeta$	$b^3$	$ab^3c$
60+	$\theta$	$b^3$	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$cf\theta$	$b^4c$	$ab^3c$	$ab^3c$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$ab^4$	$b^4c$
72+	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$ab^3c$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$ab^3c$	$b^4c$	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$ab^4$	$b^3$	$ab^3c$
84+	$ab^3c$	$b^3$	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$ab^4$	$b^4c$	$ab^3c$	$ab^3c$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$ab^4$	$b^4c$
96+	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$ab^3c$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$ab^3c$	$b^4c$	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$ab^4$	$b^3$	$ab^3c$
108+	$ab^3c$	$b^3$	$b^4c$	$ab^4$	$ab^4$	$\dots$						

Figure 4: The pretending function of **0.4107** has eventual period 24, despite many initial irregularities.

Hypothesis is true (Section 8), then the normal period of any periodic octal game always divides its misère period.

**0.644.** This game has misère period 442 and preperiod 3255, the same as in normal play. This is the largest known misère period for a wild octal game.  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{0.644})$  has order 172. The misère quotient “grows” for the last time at heap 333—that is,  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{333}$ , while  $\mathcal{Q} \neq \mathcal{Q}_{332}$ . Intriguingly, the (normal) Grundy function also attains its maximum  $\mathcal{G}$ -value of 64 at heap 333. This behavior is somewhat explained by the Normal Kernel Hypothesis (Section 8).

**0.4107.** A great variety of misère quotients can be found among the four-digit octals; we include here just one particularly striking example. **0.4107** has period 24, preperiod 66, and quotient order 506. Its quotient has a minimal set of 34 generators

$$\{a, b, c, \dots, x, y, z, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon, \zeta, \eta, \theta\}.$$

The pretending function is shown in Figure 4. There are many irregular values among the smaller heaps, until finally a pattern abruptly emerges at heap size 66. (See [21] for the full quotient presentation.)

The sudden emergence of periodic behavior, after so much irregularity, is rather extraordinary. One wonders how many other solutions lurk just beyond the reach of our computational resources.

### 3.5 Unsolved Two- and Three-Digit Octals

We now briefly discuss some of the most important unsolved octal games. Figure 5 lists the normal-play period of each unsolved two-digit octal. Also listed is the largest  $n$  for which the partial quotient  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  is known, together with the order  $|\mathcal{Q}_n|$ .

We suspect that every unsolved two-digit octal has an infinite misère quotient. **0.54** is likely to be algebraic periodic; in the remaining cases, we suspect that the listed value of  $n$  represents the last finite partial quotient. Validating or refuting these suspicions will require more sophisticated techniques (or

Code	N pd	$n$	$ Q_n $	Comments
<b>0.04</b>	—	44	864	Treblecross, §3.5
<b>0.06</b>	—	15	48	
<b>0.07</b>	34	33	638	Dawson’s Kayles, §3.5
<b>0.14</b>	—	20	96	
<b>0.16</b>	149459	17	434	
<b>0.35</b>	6	35	3182	
<b>0.36</b>	—	20	304	§3.5
<b>0.37</b>	—	15	304	§3.5
<b>0.40</b>	34	34	638	Cousins of <b>0.07</b>
<b>0.45</b>	20	26	550	
<b>0.54</b>	7	†		§3.5
<b>0.60</b>	—	16	304	Officers [4]
<b>0.64</b>	—	13	346	
<b>0.74</b>	—	14	74	
<b>0.76</b>	—	11	34	

$\dot{d}$  means “ $d$  or  $d + 1$ ”;  $\ddot{d}$  means “ $d$  or  $d + 2$ ”;  $\bar{d}$  means “ $d$ ,  $d + 1$ ,  $d + 2$  or  $d + 3$ ”

† **0.54** appears to be algebraic periodic.

Figure 5: Unsolved two-digit octal games.

extremely diligent effort).

The unsolved three-digit octals are too numerous to list in a table of this form; they are summarized compactly in Figure 13, and on our website [21] in more detail. Some specific comments follow.

**Treblecross.** **0.04** is a cousin of Treblecross, the game of “one-dimensional Tic-Tac-Toe” [4].

**Dawson’s Kayles.** Guy and Smith [17] first observed that Dawson’s Chess is equivalent to the octal game **0.137**. It is a cousin of the two-digit octal **0.07**, which is commonly known as *Dawson’s Kayles*.

Guy and Smith showed that normal-play Dawson’s Kayles (and therefore Dawson’s Chess as well) has a period 34 Grundy sequence. Unpublished work by Ferguson [10], based on Conway’s genus theory, analyzed misère play of **0.07** to heap size 24. Using *MisereSolver*, we can extend the analysis to heap size 33: the partial quotient  $Q_{33}(\mathbf{0.07})$  has order 638, with a  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion of size 109. The full presentation is too messy to justify its inclusion here, but it can be found online [21] or reproduced with *MisereSolver*.

The games **0.400** (in the schema notation of Figure 5) are all equivalent to Dawson’s Kayles.

**0.36 and 0.37.** The largest known partial quotients of **0.36** and **0.37** are isomorphic:  $Q_{20}(\mathbf{0.36}) \cong Q_{15}(\mathbf{0.37})$ . However, their pretending functions are somewhat different. To what extent does this similarity continue?

**0.54.** Allemang [2] gives an incorrect solution to the game **0.54**. It appears to be algebraic-periodic, with an infinite misère quotient. However, its quotient seems to be more complicated than those of **0.26** and **4.7**; better techniques for identifying algebraic periodicity are needed. The three-digit octal game **0.145** exhibits similar (but not identical) behavior.

**0.316.**  $|\mathcal{Q}_{23}(\mathbf{0.316})| = 8704$ . This is the largest known finite partial quotient of an unsolved octal game.

**0.414.** The partial quotients  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\mathbf{0.4\ddot{1}\dot{4}})$  grow surprisingly slowly as  $n$  increases. For this reason, *MisereSolver* can quickly compute many corresponding  $\Phi$ -values. Other wild games with similar behavior include **0.644**, **0.764**, **0.776**, and **4.44**. Among these, only **0.644** has been solved. Since none of the others have known *normal*-play solutions [11], it seems unlikely that their misère-play solutions are forthcoming.

Nonetheless, it is interesting to study this type of behavior. Slow-growing partial quotients seem to be tied to small  $\mathcal{P}$ -portions. For example, we have  $|\mathcal{Q}_{18}(\mathbf{0.414})| = 16$ , with a  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion of size 3. By heap 5447 the quotient has grown quite a bit:  $|\mathcal{Q}_{5447}(\mathbf{0.414})| = 1032$ . However, the  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion of  $\mathcal{Q}_{5447}$  still has size 3. Likewise,  $|\mathcal{Q}_{2860}(\mathbf{0.776})| = 528$ , but there are only 5  $\mathcal{P}$ -position types, the same as at heap 10.

Tame games, of course, exhibit the clearest form of this behavior: the  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion of  $\mathcal{T}_n$  has exactly two elements, for all  $n \geq 2$ . Games with stable  $\mathcal{P}$ -portions can therefore be regarded as “almost tame” in some sense.

**Open Problem.** *Explain and quantify this type of “almost tameness.” Is there a deeper principle at work?*

### 3.6 Quaternary Games

A *quaternary game* is an octal game whose code digits are restricted to **0**, **1**, **2** and **3**. Thus heaps may never be split, and the only available moves are to remove some number of tokens from a heap. Despite these severe rules restrictions, many quaternary games exhibit interesting and surprisingly intricate misère quotients.

There are twenty-one wild four-digit quaternaries. Of these, seventeen have known solutions; these are summarized in Figure 6. Only **0.3102**, **0.3122**, **0.3123**, and **0.3312** remain unsolved. The first author has offered a reward of \$200 for the solution to **0.3102**, and \$25 each for the others. It appears likely that their misère quotients are infinite, so the solutions might be quite difficult to obtain. Figure 6 lists their largest known partial quotients.

**0.(3310)<sup>n</sup>.** Suppose misère Nim is played with two restrictions:

- $4k$  beans may not be removed from any heap;
- $4k + 3$  beans may be removed only if it is the whole heap.

In standard notation, this game would be

$$\mathbf{0.(3310)^\infty} = \mathbf{0.3310331033103310\dots}$$

Code	pd	ppd	$ \mathcal{Q} $	Code	pd	ppd	$ \mathcal{Q} $	Comments
<b>0.0122</b>	7	8	20	<b>0.2012</b>	5	4	20	
<b>0.1023</b>	7	6	20	<b>0.3101</b>	2	5	14	
<b>0.1032</b>	7	8	20	<b>0.3102</b>	—	—	—	$ \mathcal{Q}_{11}  = 74$
<b>0.1033</b>	7	7	20	<b>0.3103</b>	5	3	20	
<b>0.1231</b>	5	5	20	<b>0.3112</b>	5	6	20	
<b>0.1232</b>	6	6	46	<b>0.3122</b>	—	—	—	$ \mathcal{Q}_6  = 52$
<b>0.1321</b>	5	6	20	<b>0.3123</b>	—	—	—	$ \mathcal{Q}_{11}  = 328$
<b>0.1323</b>	6	7	46	<b>0.3131</b>	2	7	12	
<b>0.1331</b>	5	5	20	<b>0.3312</b>	—	—	—	$ \mathcal{Q}_{13}  = 264$

Figure 6: The twenty-one wild four-digit quaternary games.

Does its misère quotient have order 226? The following approximations seem to suggest that it does:

$\Gamma$	$ \mathcal{Q} $	pd
<b>0.3310</b>	6	3
<b>0.33103310</b>	202	7
<b>0.331033103310</b>	226	11
<b>0.3310331033103310</b>	226	15
<b>0.33103310331033103310</b>	226	19

**Question.** Does  $\mathcal{Q}(0.(3310)^\infty) = \mathcal{Q}(0.(3310)^n)$  for all  $n \geq 3$ ? Can we say anything interesting in general about games with infinite octal codes?

### 3.7 Games Born by Day 4

The quotients  $\mathcal{Q}(G)$ , for a single misère game  $G$ , are fundamental (but in some cases still quite intricate). Figure 7 summarizes all quotients obtained this way, to birthday four. Each quotient is listed together with its order, monoid presentation, and  $\mathcal{P}$ -portion.

The canonical forms of the twenty-two misère impartial games  $G$  of birthday at most four were introduced by Conway [6], and are duplicated here in Figure 8. They are shown together with their misère quotients.

In Figure 8 (and throughout the rest of this paper) we use a slightly modified form of Conway's notation for misère canonical forms. The notation  $*n$ , where  $n$  is a single-digit number, represents (as always) a Nim-heap of size  $n$ . If  $G$ ,  $H$ ,  $K$  are misère canonical forms, stripped of their preceding  $*$ 's, then  $*GHK$  is the game whose options are to  $*G$ ,  $*H$  and  $*K$ . Parentheses are used to denote sub-options:  $*(GH)K$  has options to  $*GH$  and  $*K$ .  $*G_+$  denotes the game whose only option is to  $*G$ .

For example,  $*2_+320$  has four options: 0,  $*2$ ,  $*3$ , and the game  $*2_+$  whose only option is to  $*2$ .

There are exactly 4171780 games born by day five [6]. They yield a bewildering variety of misère quotients, including infinite quotients; finite quotients

	$ \mathcal{Q} $	$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{P}$
$\mathcal{T}_0$	1	$\langle   \rangle$	$\emptyset$
$\mathcal{T}_1$	2	$\langle a \mid a^2 = 1 \rangle$	$\{a\}$
$\mathcal{T}_2$	6	$\langle a, b \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b \rangle$	$\{a, b^2\}$
$\mathcal{R}_8$	8	$\langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, bc = ab, c^2 = b^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2\}$
$\mathcal{T}_3$	10	$\langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, c^3 = c, c^2 = b^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2\}$
$\mathcal{S}_{12}$	12	$\langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2, b^2c = b^3, c^2 = 1 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, ac\}$
$\mathcal{S}'_{12}$	12	$\langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, c^2 = 1 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, ac\}$
$\mathcal{R}_{14}$	14	$\langle a, b, c \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, b^2c = c, c^3 = ac^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, bc, c^2\}$

Figure 7: The eight misère quotients born by day 4.

0	*	*2 *3 <sub>+</sub> *2 <sub>+</sub> 2	*3 *32 *2 <sub>+</sub> 210 *2 <sub>+</sub> 32	*2 <sub>+</sub> *2 <sub>++</sub> *2 <sub>+</sub> 3	*2 <sub>+</sub> 320	*4 *2 <sub>+</sub> 3210	*2 <sub>+</sub> 1 *2 <sub>+</sub> 21 *2 <sub>+</sub> 31	*2 <sub>+</sub> 321	*2 <sub>+</sub> 0 *2 <sub>+</sub> 20 *2 <sub>+</sub> 30
$\mathcal{T}_0$	$\mathcal{T}_1$	$\mathcal{T}_2$		$\mathcal{R}_8$	$\mathcal{T}_3$	$\mathcal{S}_{12}$	$\mathcal{S}'_{12}$	$\mathcal{R}_{14}$	

Figure 8: The 22 misère games born by day 4, grouped by quotient isomorphism type.

with more than 1500 elements (and probably larger ones as well); and counterexamples to several reasonable-sounding statements about the general structure of misère quotients. Some examples may be found in Sections 6 and 8 of this paper. It is conceivable that a complete survey of games born by day five might eventually be conducted.

## 4 Bipartite Monoids

In this section we present a general algebraic framework and a formal construction of the misère quotient.

**Definition 4.1.** A bipartite monoid is a pair  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ , where  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a monoid and  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{Q}$  is an identified subset of  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

For example, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of impartial games, closed under addition. Let  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  be the set of normal-play  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is a bipartite monoid. If instead we take  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the set of misère-play  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions, we get a different bipartite monoid.

We will be largely concerned with quotients of bipartite monoids. The discussion can be framed categorically, as follows.

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ ,  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  be bipartite monoids. A homomorphism  $f : (\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  is a monoid homomorphism  $\mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}'$  such that

$$x \in \mathcal{P} \iff f(x) \in \mathcal{P}'$$

for all  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ .

Then  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  is a quotient of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  if and only if there exists a surjective homomorphism  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be a bipartite monoid. Two elements  $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$  are indistinguishable if, for all  $z \in \mathcal{Q}$ , we have

$$xz \in \mathcal{P} \iff yz \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Our motivation for this definition comes from the game-theoretic interpretation. For example, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of all impartial games, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  consist of all normal  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions. Then  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$  are indistinguishable if and only if  $X + Z$  and  $Y + Z$  have the same outcomes, for all  $Z$ . Thus indistinguishability coincides with Grundy equivalence.

**Definition 4.4.** A bipartite monoid  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is reduced if its elements are pairwise distinguishable. We write r.b.m. as shorthand for reduced bipartite monoid.

Every bipartite monoid  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  has a quotient that is reduced, and there is a simple procedure for constructing this r.b.m. Fix  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ , and define, for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$x \rho y \iff x \text{ and } y \text{ are indistinguishable.}$$

Now  $\rho$  is a congruence: it is an equivalence relation, and if  $v \rho w$  and  $x \rho y$ , then  $vx \rho wy$ . Thus the equivalence classes mod  $\rho$  form a monoid  $\mathcal{Q}'$ . Moreover, if  $x \rho y$ , then  $x \in \mathcal{P} \iff y \in \mathcal{P}$  (taking  $z = 1$  in the definition of indistinguishability). Therefore, the set  $\mathcal{P}' = \{[x]_\rho : x \in \mathcal{P}\}$  is well-defined, and it is easily seen that  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  is a quotient of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ . Finally,  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  must be reduced: if  $[x]_\rho$  and  $[y]_\rho$  are indistinguishable in  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$ , then  $x$  and  $y$  are indistinguishable in  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ , whereupon  $[x]_\rho = [y]_\rho$ .

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be a bipartite monoid. The reduction of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is the r.b.m.  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  defined by  $\mathcal{Q}' = \mathcal{Q}/\rho$ ,  $\mathcal{P}' = \{[x]_\rho : x \in \mathcal{P}\}$ .

**Example.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of impartial games, closed under addition, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of normal-play  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be the reduction of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ .

- If the Grundy values in  $\mathcal{A}$  are bounded, say  $\{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ , then by the Sprague–Grundy Theorem  $\mathcal{Q} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ .
- If the Grundy values in  $\mathcal{A}$  are unbounded, then

$$\mathcal{Q} \cong \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

In either case,  $\mathcal{P} = \{0\}$ , and if  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  is the quotient map, then  $\Phi(X)$  is the Grundy value of  $X$  (in binary).

**Example.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of all impartial games, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of all misère  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions. Then  $X \rho Y$  if and only if  $X = Y$  in misère play (if and only if  $X$  and  $Y$  have the same misère canonical form).

**Definition 4.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of impartial games, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of all misère  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then the misère quotient of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the reduction  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . We refer to the quotient map  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  as the pretending function of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We now show that the reduction of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is the *unique* reduced quotient of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ , up to isomorphism.

**Proposition 4.7.** Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  and  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$  be bipartite monoids, with reductions  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  and  $(\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{R}')$ , respectively. Suppose that  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$  is a quotient of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ , i.e., there exists a surjective homomorphism  $f : (\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ . Then in fact, there is an isomorphism  $i : (\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}') \cong (\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{R}')$  making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{Q} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{Q}' \\ f \downarrow & & \parallel i \\ \mathcal{S} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{S}' \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is a surjective homomorphism of bipartite monoids, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [x] = [y] & \text{ iff } xz \in \mathcal{P} \Leftrightarrow yz \in \mathcal{P} \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{Q} \\ & \text{ iff } f(xz) \in \mathcal{R} \Leftrightarrow f(yz) \in \mathcal{R} \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{Q} \\ & \text{ iff } f(x)w \in \mathcal{R} \Leftrightarrow f(y)w \in \mathcal{R} \text{ for all } w \in \mathcal{S} \\ & \text{ iff } [f(x)] = [f(y)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can define  $i : \mathcal{Q}' \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'$  by  $i([x]) = [f(x)]$ , and the conclusions are apparent.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.8.** A r.b.m. has no proper quotients (in the category of bipartite monoids).

## 5 The Structure of Misère Quotients

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of games, and let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of misère  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions in  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the previous section, we defined the *misère quotient* of  $\mathcal{A}$  to be the unique reduced quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  of  $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . We now investigate the general structure of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ .

Some aspects of the theory can be generalized to sets that are closed under addition, but are not option-closed. However, virtually all sets of games that are

interesting to us will be option-closed. For example, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is the set of positions that arise in some specified heap game  $\Gamma$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  is necessarily closed, since all options are to sums of smaller heaps. Thus there is not much harm in taking closure to be a basic assumption. Furthermore, giving up closure would require us to loosen the theory considerably.

Notice, for example, that closure implies that  $0 \in \mathcal{A}$ . Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{A}$  is non-trivial, then it must contain a game of birthday exactly 1. The only such game is  $*$ , so necessarily  $*$   $\in \mathcal{A}$ . This gives our first proposition:

**Proposition 5.1.** *Every non-trivial misère quotient contains an element satisfying  $a^2 = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $a = \Phi(*)$ . Since  $* + * = 0$ , we have  $* + * \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} 0$ ; therefore  $a^2 = 1$ .  $\square$

Now we rattle off some elementary facts about  $\Phi$ -values:

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  be a non-trivial misère quotient and fix  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Then there is some  $y \in \mathcal{Q}$  with  $xy \in \mathcal{P}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix some  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $x = \Phi(G)$ , and consider  $G + G$ . If  $\Phi(G + G) \in \mathcal{P}$ , then we can simply take  $y = x$ . If  $\Phi(G + G) \notin \mathcal{P}$ , then  $G + G$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. So there is some  $G'$  with  $G + G'$  a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. But then  $\Phi(G + G') \in \mathcal{P}$ , so we can take  $y = \Phi(G')$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.3.** *If  $G'$  is an option of  $G$ , then  $\Phi(G') \neq \Phi(G)$ .*

*Proof.* By proposition 5.2, there is some  $y \in \mathcal{Q}$  with  $\Phi(G)y \in \mathcal{P}$ . Fix  $H$  with  $\Phi(H) = y$ , so that  $G + H$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. Then necessarily  $G' + H$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, so  $\Phi(G')y \notin \mathcal{P}$ , and  $y$  distinguishes  $G$  and  $G'$ .  $\square$

We now establish some interesting results regarding the order of a misère quotient  $\mathcal{Q}$ . We first show that, except for the trivial quotient  $\mathcal{Q} = \{1\}$ , every misère quotient has even order.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a non-trivial closed set of games. Then for every  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ ,*

$$G \not\equiv_{\mathcal{A}} G + *.$$

*Proof.* This is obvious if  $G = 0$  (since  $0$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position while  $*$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position), so assume otherwise. There are two cases.

*Case 1:*  $G + G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. Then  $G + G + *$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, since it has a move to  $G + G$ . So  $o^-(G + G) \neq o^-(G + * + G)$ .

*Case 2:*  $G + G$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. Then  $G + G'$  must be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position for some option  $G'$  of  $G$ . So  $G + G' + *$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, since it has a move to  $G + G'$ . So  $o^-(G + G') \neq o^-(G + * + G')$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a misère quotient. If  $\mathcal{Q}$  is finite and non-trivial, then  $|\mathcal{Q}|$  is even.*

*Proof.* Write  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  for some closed set of games  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  be the associated pretending function. Put  $a = \Phi(*)$ , and define  $f : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  by  $f(x) = ax$ . Since  $* + * = 0$ , we have  $f(f(x)) = x$ , for all  $x$ . By Theorem 5.4,  $f(x) \neq x$ , for all  $x$ . Therefore  $f$  induces a perfect pairing of elements of  $\mathcal{Q}$ .  $\square$

Next we show that there is no misère quotient of order 4, and that the quotients of orders 1, 2 and 6 are unique (up to isomorphism).

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of games, let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ , and let  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  be a closed subset. Then there is a submonoid  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\mathcal{Q}$  such that*

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}) \text{ is the reduction of } (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{R}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  be the quotient map and put  $\mathcal{R} = \{\Phi(X) : X \in \mathcal{B}\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed,  $\mathcal{R}$  is a submonoid of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Furthermore, the restriction

$$\Phi \upharpoonright \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$$

is a surjective homomorphism of bipartite monoids. Therefore the reduction of  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{R})$  is also a quotient of  $\mathcal{B}$ . By uniqueness (Proposition 4.7), it must be the misère quotient of  $\mathcal{B}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a non-empty closed set of games. Then either:*

- (i) *Every  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  satisfies either  $G = 0$  or  $G = *$ ; or*
- (ii) *There exists a  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $G = *2$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose (i) fails. Then there is some  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $G \neq 0, *$ . Choose such  $G$  with minimal birthday. Then every  $G'$  satisfies either  $G' = 0$  or  $G' = *$ . Thus either  $G = \{0\}$ ,  $G = \{*\}$ , or  $G = \{0, *\}$ . But the first two possibilities imply  $G = *$  and  $G = 0$ , respectively; by assumption on  $G$ , neither is true, so  $G = \{0, *\} = *2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a non-empty closed set of games. Then either:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{T}_0$ ; or
- (ii)  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{T}_1$ ; or
- (iii) *There exists a closed subset  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}) \cong \mathcal{T}_2$ .*

*Proof. Case 1:* Every  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  satisfies either  $G = 0$  or  $G = *$ . If  $\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$ , then  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{T}_0$ , by definition. Otherwise,  $\mathcal{A}$  must contain a game of birthday exactly 1;  $*$  is the only such game, so  $* \in \mathcal{A}$ . By assumption on  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{Q}(0, *) = \mathcal{T}_1$ .

*Case 2:* Otherwise, by Lemma 5.7, there is some  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $G = *2$ . Choose such  $G$  with minimal birthday and let  $\mathcal{B} = \text{cl}(\{G\})$ . Let  $\mathcal{C} = \text{cl}(\{0, *, *2\})$ . We know that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{T}_2$ ; let  $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_2$  be the quotient map.

Now every  $X \in \mathcal{B}$  is canonically equal to some  $t(X) \in \mathcal{C}$ . Define  $\Psi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_2$  by  $\Psi(X) = \Phi(t(X))$ . Now  $(\mathcal{T}_2, \Psi)$  must be correct for  $\mathcal{B}$ , since canonical equality is always outcome-preserving. Since  $\mathcal{T}_2$  is reduced, this shows that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{T}_2$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.9.** *There is no misère quotient of order 4, and exactly one each of orders 1, 2 and 6 (up to isomorphism).*

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  be a misère quotient. Consider each possibility in Theorem 5.8. In case (i),  $|\mathcal{Q}| = 1$ . In case (ii),  $|\mathcal{Q}| = 2$ . Finally, in case (iii), there is some  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}) \cong \mathcal{T}_2$ . By Lemma 5.6, there is some  $\mathcal{R} < \mathcal{Q}$  whose reduction is  $\mathcal{T}_2$ . Therefore

$$6 = |\mathcal{T}_2| \leq |\mathcal{R}| \leq |\mathcal{Q}|.$$

Furthermore, if  $|\mathcal{Q}| = 6$ , then  $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2 \cong \mathcal{R}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

In fact, there is also just one quotient of order 8, but this fact is rather harder to establish. See [26] for a proof.

## 6 Further Examples

All of the misère quotients discussed in previous sections share some important features: for example, they are all finite. In this section, we give several counterexamples to show that these features do not extend to all misère quotients.

### Elements with Unusual Periods

If  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a monoid and  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ , then the *period* of  $x$  is the least  $k \geq 1$  such that  $x^{n+k} = x^n$ , for some  $n$ . If no such  $k$  exists, then we say that  $x$  has period  $\infty$ . Note that if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is finite, then  $x$  must have finite period.

In normal play, every position  $G$  satisfies the equation  $G+G = 0$ . Therefore, in a normal quotient, every element has period at most two. On the basis of the examples in Section 3, it is tempting to assert that this is true for misère quotients as well, and in fact the authors believed this for a long time. However, there do exist finite misère quotients with larger-period elements, though they are exceedingly rare.

A striking example is given by  $G = *(2_+210)(2_+30)3_+21$ . It can be described as a coin-sliding game with heaps of tokens placed on the vertices of the tree shown in Figure 9. In this game, the players take turns sliding a single coin “down” the tree along a single edge. The game ends when all coins have reached leaf nodes of  $G$ , and whoever makes the last move loses.

$\mathcal{Q}(G)$  is a misère quotient of 200 elements; it has the following presentation:

$$\mathcal{Q}(G) \cong \langle a, b, c, d, e \mid a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2, b^2c^2 = c^2, c^3 = abc^2, \\ c^2d = ac^2, d^2 = c^2, c^2e^2 = c^2, e^6 = 1 \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{a, b^2, abc, ab^3c, c^2, bd, b^3d, ae, ab^2de, cde, b^3cde, ae^2, b^2e^2, abce^2, ab^3ce^2, \\ bde^2, ae^3, bde^3, b^3de^3, ae^4, b^2e^4, abce^4, ab^3ce^4, ab^2de^4, bcde^4, b^3cde^4, ae^5\}$$

The most striking feature of this quotient is the generator  $e$  of period 6. In particular,  $e^2$  has period 3, an odd number.




Figure 9: Ready for a game of misère coin-sliding on  $G = *(2_+210)(2_+30)3_+21$ .

There also exist quotients with period-4 elements. For example, let  $H = *(2_+1)(2_+0)4310$ . Then  $\mathcal{Q}(H)$  is a quotient of order 120 containing an element of period 4. It is the smallest known quotient containing an element with period larger than 2.

**Open Problem.** *Exhibit a misère quotient containing an element of period 8 (or any finite period other than 1, 2, 3, 4, or 6).*

**Question.** *Are there any restrictions on the possible periods of misère quotient elements?*

**Question.** *What is the smallest quotient containing an element of period  $> 2$ ?*

### The Sad Affair of $*(2_+0)0$

We now show that  $\mathcal{Q}(*(2_+0)0)$  is infinite. It can be verified computationally that all games with smaller game trees have finite quotients, so in some sense  $*(2_+0)0$  is the *simplest* game that yields an infinite quotient. This fact makes it worthy of significant attention.

$*(2_+0)0$  arises in various quaternary games; for example, it is the canonical form of an **0.31011**-heap of size 5. It can also be represented as the coin-sliding game shown in Figure 10. Stacks of coins are arranged on the boxes to form a starting position. On her turn, a player may slide one coin one space in the direction of an arrow. This might cause the coin to drop off the board, whereupon it is removed from the game. It is easily seen that a single coin on the rightmost box has canonical form  $*(2_+0)0$ .

For the remainder of this section, write

$$A = *; \quad B = *2; \quad C = *2_+; \quad D = *2_+0; \quad E = *(2_+0)0;$$




Figure 10: A simple coin-sliding game with an infinite misère quotient.

and put  $\mathcal{A} = \text{cl}(E)$ . Then each game in  $\mathcal{A}$  has the form

$$iA + jB + kC + lD + mE,$$

for some quintuple of integers  $(i, j, k, l, m)$ . (These correspond to the number of coins on each successive box in Figure 10, left-to-right.)

When  $k \geq 3$ , the  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions admit a simple description:  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff both  $i + l$  and  $j + m$  are even. When  $k \leq 2$ , however, the  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions are highly erratic. The outcomes for  $l < 14$  and  $m < 20$  are summarized in Figure 11. Each of the twelve grids represents the outcomes for a particular triple  $(i, j, k)$ . Within each grid, there is a black dot at (row  $m$ , column  $l$ ) iff  $G = iA + jB + kC + lD + mE$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. The outcomes for  $l \geq 14$  and  $m \geq 20$  can be obtained through the following simple recurrence:

Let  $G = iA + jB + kC + lD + mE$ , with  $l \geq 4$  or  $m \geq 12$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} o^-(G + 2D + 2E) &= o^-(G); \\ o^-(G + 2D) &= o^-(G) \quad \text{if } m < 3; \\ o^-(G + 2E) &= o^-(G) \quad \text{if } l < 3. \end{aligned} \tag{†}$$

Figure 11 illustrates some striking features about this game. Most prominent is the diagonal of  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions in the  $(0, 0, 0)$  diagram, along the line  $m = l + 7$ . It is, in fact, this diagonal (and its echo in several other cases) that makes the quotient infinite. In addition, there are many strange anomalies, such as the  $\mathcal{P}$ -position at  $(i, j, k, l, m) = (1, 1, 2, 0, 3)$ . Such anomalies are difficult to explain as anything other than combinatorial chaos. It is remarkable that such a simple game gives rise to so much complexity.

We now prove the correctness of Figure 11 (and of the asserted outcomes when  $k, l, m$  are large). For each  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ , denote by  $o^*(G)$  the *asserted* outcome of  $G$ ; as always,  $o^-(G)$  denotes the *true* outcome of  $G$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $G = iA + jB + kC + lD + mE$ .*

(a) *If  $j \geq 2$ , then  $o^*(G + 2B) = o^*(G)$ .*

(b) *If  $k \geq 3$ , then  $o^*(G + C) = o^*(G)$ .*

*Proof.* (a) is by inspection of Figure 11; (b) is automatic from the description of  $o^*$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 6.2.**  $o^-(G) = o^*(G)$  for all  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $o^*(0) = \mathcal{N}$ . Thus it suffices to show the following, for each  $G \neq 0$ :

$$o^*(G) = \mathcal{P} \iff \text{No option } G' \text{ satisfies } o^*(G') = \mathcal{P}. \tag{‡}$$

Suppose instead (for contradiction) that (‡) fails for some  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ . Choose  $G = iA + jB + kC + lD + mE$  to be a counterexample with minimal birthday. Since  $A + A = 0$  (canonically), we know that  $i = 0$  or  $1$ .




Figure 11: Schematic of the  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions for  $\text{cl}(* (2+0)0)$  with  $k \leq 2$ .

Now (‡) can be verified computationally when  $j < 5$ ,  $k < 5$ ,  $l < 7$ , and  $m < 15$ . Therefore we may safely assume that at least one of these inequalities fails. There are five cases.

*Case 1:*  $j \geq 5$ . Then fix  $H$  with  $G = H + 2B$ . Since  $j - 2 \geq 2$ , Lemma 6.1(a) gives  $o^*(G) = o^*(H)$ . Furthermore, every option  $G'$  of  $G$  can be written as  $G' = H' + 2B$ . Since  $j - 2 \geq 3$ , we can write  $H' = j'B + X$ , for  $j' \geq 2$ . Thus Lemma 6.1(a) gives  $o^*(H' + 2B) = o^*(H')$ . Therefore

$$\{o^*(G') : G' \in \text{opts}(G)\} = \{o^*(H') : H' \in \text{opts}(H)\}.$$

It follows that (‡) fails for  $H$  as well, contradicting minimality of  $G$ .

The remaining cases are all very similar.

*Case 2:*  $k \geq 5$ . Then fix  $H$  with  $G = H + C$ . Since  $k - 1 \geq 4$ , Lemma 6.1(b) gives  $o^*(G) = o^*(H)$ , but also  $\{o^*(G') : G' \in \text{opts}(G)\} = \{o^*(H') : H' \in \text{opts}(H)\}$ , contradicting minimality of  $G$ .

*Case 3:*  $l \geq 7$  but  $m < 3$ . Then fix  $H$  with  $G = H + 2D$ . Since  $l - 2 \geq 5$ , the recurrence (†) gives  $o^*(G) = o^*(H)$ , etc., as in previous cases.

*Case 4:*  $m \geq 15$  but  $l < 3$ . Then fix  $H$  with  $G = H + 2E$ , and proceed as in Case 3.

*Case 5:*  $l \geq 7$  or  $m \geq 15$ , and  $l, m \geq 3$ . Then fix  $H$  with  $G = H + 2D + 2E$ , and proceed as in Case 3.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.3.**  $\mathcal{Q}(E)$  is infinite.

*Proof.* If  $l \geq 3$  is odd, then  $lD + mE$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff  $m = l + 7$ . Thus the games  $(2n + 3) \cdot D$  are pairwise distinguishable.  $\square$

## 7 Transition Algebras and the Mex Function

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of games with quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ , and let  $G$  be a game with  $\text{opts}(G) \subset \mathcal{A}$ . Consider the set  $\Phi''G \subset \mathcal{Q}$  defined by

$$\Phi''G = \{\Phi(G') : G' \text{ is an option of } G\}.$$

What can we say about the extension  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$ ? In normal play, we know that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  if and only if  $\Phi''G$  excludes at least one Grundy value in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Furthermore, in that case we necessarily have  $\Phi(G) = \text{mex}(\Phi''G)$ .

In this section we investigate analogous questions in misère play: Given just  $\Phi''G$ , can we determine whether  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ ? If so, can we determine  $\Phi(G)$ , again given just  $\Phi''G$ ?

The answer to both of these questions is yes, but we need more information than is contained in the quotient  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ . The primary goal of this section is to introduce an intermediate structure  $T = T(\mathcal{A})$ —the *transition algebra* of  $\mathcal{A}$ —that carries exactly the right information to answer these questions. As we will see, there exists a partial function  $F : \text{Pow}(\mathcal{Q}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ , depending only on  $T$ , such that whenever  $\text{opts}(G) \subset \mathcal{A}$ :

- (i)  $F(\Phi''G)$  is defined iff  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ ; and
- (ii) When  $F(\Phi''G)$  is defined, then  $\Phi(G) = F(\Phi''G)$ .

We call  $F$  the *mex function* for  $T$ .

Transition algebras appear to be necessary: there exist sets of games  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , with  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B})$ , whose mex functions are nonisomorphic. Further,  $T$  is finite whenever  $\mathcal{Q}$  is finite, so transition algebras indeed provide a useful simplification (as compared to working directly with  $\mathcal{A}$ ). They have several other applications as well: in attacking the *classification problem*<sup>4</sup> [26], and in the design of algorithms for computing misère quotients (Appendix B).

For the rest of this section, fix a closed set of games  $\mathcal{A}$  with misère quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  and pretending function  $\Phi : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . We begin with an auxiliary definition.

**Definition 7.1.** *Let  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Then the meximal set of  $x$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  is given by*

$$\mathcal{M}_x = \{y \in \mathcal{Q} : \text{there is no } z \in \mathcal{Q} \text{ such that both } xz, yz \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

**Example.** *Let  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{T}_2 = \langle a, b \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b \rangle$ , let  $\mathcal{P} = \{a, b^2\}$ , and let  $x = b^2$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}_x = \{b, ab, ab^2\}$ . Let  $G = *2 + *2$  and  $H = *2 + *2 + * + *$ . We have  $\Phi(G) = \Phi(H) = x$  (and in fact,  $G = H$  canonically). However,  $\Phi''G = \{b, ab\} \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_x$ , while  $\Phi''H = \{a, ab, ab^2\} = \mathcal{M}_x$ .*

Meximal sets are motivated by the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  and put  $x = \Phi(G)$ . Then  $\Phi''G \subset \mathcal{M}_x$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose (for contradiction) that there is some  $y \in \Phi''G$  with  $y \notin \mathcal{M}_x$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{M}_x$ , there must be some  $z$  such that both  $xz, yz \in \mathcal{P}$ . Fix  $G' \in \text{opts}(G)$  and  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\Phi(G') = y$  and  $\Phi(X) = z$ . Then  $G + X$  and  $G' + X$  are both  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions, a contradiction.  $\square$

We will soon show a converse: if  $\Phi''G = \mathcal{M}_x$ , then necessarily  $\Phi(G) = x$ . First we introduce the transition algebra of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 7.3.** *The transition algebra of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the set of pairs*

$$T(\mathcal{A}) = \{(\Phi(G), \Phi''G) : G \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

*We define the map  $\Psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow T(\mathcal{A})$  by  $\Psi(G) = (\Phi(G), \Phi''G)$ .*

**Remark.** *Since  $T \subset \mathcal{Q} \times \text{Pow}(\mathcal{Q})$ , we have that  $|T| \leq |\mathcal{Q}| \cdot 2^{|\mathcal{Q}|}$ . In particular, if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is finite, then so is  $T$ .*

The image  $\Psi(G)$  of a game  $G$  identifies not just the pretension  $\Phi(G)$ , but also the pretensions of all options of  $G$ . Thus  $\Psi(G)$  determines all possible *transitions* from  $G$  to its options, as projected down to the misère quotient. The following lemma shows that  $T$  has a commutative monoid structure with identity  $(1, \emptyset)$ .

<sup>4</sup>That is, the problem of determining the number of nonisomorphic quotients of order  $n$ .

**Lemma 7.4.** *If  $(x, \mathcal{E}), (y, \mathcal{F}) \in T$ , then so is  $(xy, y\mathcal{E} \cup x\mathcal{F})$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\Psi(G) = (x, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\Psi(H) = (y, \mathcal{F})$ , then  $\Psi(G+H) = (xy, y\mathcal{E} \cup x\mathcal{F})$ .  $\square$

The projection map  $T \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  given by  $(x, \mathcal{E}) \mapsto x$  is a monoid homomorphism, and this makes  $T$  into a bipartite monoid with reduction  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Further, it is trivially verified that  $\Psi$  is a homomorphism of bipartite monoids, and therefore (by Proposition 4.7) the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & T(\mathcal{A}) \\ & \searrow \Phi & \downarrow \\ & & \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) \end{array}$$

Transition algebras have several important uses. The first is given by the following lemma, which establishes the existence of the mex function  $F$  and shows that it depends only on  $T$ .

**Theorem 7.5** (Generalized Mex Rule). *Let  $T = T(\mathcal{A})$  and let  $G \neq 0$  be a game with  $\text{opts}(G) \subset \mathcal{A}$ . The following are equivalent, for  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ .*

- (a)  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\Phi(G) = x$ .
- (b) *The following two conditions are satisfied:*
  - (i)  $\Phi''G \subset \mathcal{M}_x$ ; and
  - (ii) *For each  $(y, \mathcal{E}) \in T$  and each  $n \geq 0$  such that  $x^{n+1}y \notin \mathcal{P}$ , we have either:  $x^{n+1}y' \in \mathcal{P}$  for some  $y' \in \mathcal{E}$ ; or else  $x^n x'y \in \mathcal{P}$  for some  $x' \in \Phi''G$ .*

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): (i) is just Lemma 7.2. For (ii), fix  $(y, \mathcal{E}) \in T$  and  $n \geq 0$ , and suppose  $x^{n+1}y \notin \mathcal{P}$ . Fix  $Y \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\Psi(Y) = (y, \mathcal{E})$ . Then  $(n+1) \cdot G + Y$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, so either  $(n+1) \cdot G + Y'$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, or else  $n \cdot G + G' + Y$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. But these imply, in turn, that  $x^{n+1}\Phi(Y') \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $x^n\Phi(G')y \in \mathcal{P}$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): Fix  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\Phi(H) = x$ , and write  $\mathcal{B} = \text{cl}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$ . We will show that

$$o^-(G + X) = o^-(H + X), \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (\dagger)$$

This implies that  $G \equiv_{\mathcal{B}} H$ , so that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\Phi(G) = x$ .

Assume (for contradiction) that  $(\dagger)$  fails, and fix  $K \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $o^-(G + K) \neq o^-(H + K)$ . Since  $\mathcal{B} = \text{cl}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$ , we can write  $K = n \cdot G + Y$ , for some  $n \geq 0$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ . Choose such  $K$  with  $n$  minimal; and having done so, choose  $K$  to minimize the birthday of  $Y$ . In particular, this implies that no option of  $K$  witnesses the failure of  $(\dagger)$ . We now have two cases.

*Case 1:*  $G + K$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, but  $H + K$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. Now  $G + K'$  cannot be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, for any option  $K'$  of  $K$ : for then minimality of  $K$  would imply that  $H + K'$  is also a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, contradicting the assumption

on  $H + K$ . Therefore  $n = 0$  (so that  $K \in \mathcal{A}$ ), and  $G' + K$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position for some option  $G'$  of  $G$ . We conclude that

$$\Phi(H)\Phi(K) = x\Phi(K) \in \mathcal{P} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(G')\Phi(K) \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Thus  $\Phi(G') \notin \mathcal{M}_x$ , contradicting condition (b)(i).

*Case 2:*  $G + K$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, but  $H + K$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. Observe that, by (repeated application of) the minimality of  $n$ , we have

$$o^-(n \cdot G + X) = o^-(n \cdot H + X), \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (\ddagger)$$

Now  $H + n \cdot G + Y = H + K$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position and  $H + Y \in \mathcal{A}$ , so by  $(\ddagger)$  we have that  $H + n \cdot H + Y$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. Put  $(y, \mathcal{E}) = \Psi(Y)$ . By assumption,  $\Phi(H + n \cdot H + Y) = x^{n+1}y \notin \mathcal{P}$ . To complete the proof, we show that this contradicts condition (b)(ii).

First, if  $y' \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $y' = \Phi(Y')$  for some option  $Y'$  of  $Y$ . But since  $G + K$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, we know that  $G + n \cdot G + Y'$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. By minimality of  $K$ , this implies  $H + n \cdot G + Y'$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, and by  $(\ddagger)$ ,  $H + n \cdot H + Y'$  is also an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. Therefore  $x^{n+1}y' \notin \mathcal{P}$ . So  $y'$  cannot fulfill condition (b)(ii).

Finally, suppose  $x' \in \Phi''G$ , and write  $x' = \Phi(G')$ . Then  $G' + n \cdot G + Y$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. But  $G' + Y \in \mathcal{A}$ , so by  $(\ddagger)$  we know that  $G' + n \cdot H + Y$  is also an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position. Therefore  $x^n x' y \notin \mathcal{P}$ , so  $x'$  cannot fulfill condition (b)(ii). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.6** (Mex Interpolation Principle). *Let  $G$  be a game with  $\text{opts}(G) \subset \mathcal{A}$ , and suppose that*

$$\Phi''H \subset \Phi''G \subset \mathcal{M}_x,$$

*for some  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  ( $H \neq 0$ ) with  $\Phi(H) = x$ . Then  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\Phi(G) = x$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $G$  satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) in the Generalized Mex Rule. (i) is assumed. Now condition (ii) must hold for  $H$  (again by the Generalized Mex Rule); since  $\Phi''H \subset \Phi''G$ , it must hold for  $G$  as well.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.7.** *Let  $G$  be a game with  $\text{opts}(G) \subset \mathcal{A}$  and  $\Phi''G = \mathcal{M}_x$ . Then necessarily  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\Phi(G) = x$ .*

*Proof.* There is some  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\Phi(H) = x$ . By Lemma 7.2, we have  $\Phi''H \subset \mathcal{M}_x$ . Now the corollary follows from the Interpolation Principle.  $\square$

The Interpolation Principle yields substantial information about the mex function  $F$  for  $T$ . For a fixed  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ , consider the collection

$$\Xi = F^{-1}(x) = \{\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{Q} : F(\mathcal{E}) = x\},$$

ordered by inclusion. By the Interpolation Principle, we know that  $\mathcal{M}_x \in \Xi$ , and by Lemma 7.2 it serves as an absolute upper bound for  $\Xi$ . Now let  $\Lambda$  be




Figure 12: Schematic of the mex function for  $T(*2)$ . Each of the six elements of  $\mathcal{T}_2$  is shown together with its meximal set and antichain of lower bounds.

the antichain of minimal elements of  $\Xi$ . Again by the Interpolation Principle,  $\Xi$  is completely determined by  $\Lambda$  and  $\mathcal{M}_x$ : indeed,

$$\Xi = \{\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{M}_x, \text{ for some } \mathcal{L} \in \Lambda\}.$$

Therefore  $\Xi$  has the structure of an upward-closed subset of the complete Boolean lattice on  $\mathcal{M}_x$ . As an example, Figure 12 illustrates the structure of  $\Xi$  for each of the six elements  $x \in \mathcal{T}_2 = \mathcal{Q}(*2)$ .

It is a remarkable fact that the upper bound  $\mathcal{M}_x$  depends only on  $\mathcal{Q}$ . By contrast, the set  $\Lambda$  of lower bounds might depend on the fine structure of  $T$ .

We conclude with a note of caution. The Generalized Mex Rule asserts only that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ . It need *not* be the case that  $T(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) = T(\mathcal{A})$ . Furthermore, the mex function  $F^+$  for  $T(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$  need not be the same as the mex function  $F$  for  $T(\mathcal{A})$ : it is possible that  $\text{dom}(F^+) \subsetneq \text{dom}(F)$ . However, we *can* conclude that  $F = F^+$  in the special case of interpolation:

**Proposition 7.8** (Mex Interpolation Principle, Strong Form). *Let  $G$  be a game with  $\text{opts}(G) \subset \mathcal{A}$ , and suppose that*

$$\Phi''H \subset \Phi''G \subset \mathcal{M}_x,$$

*for some  $H \in \mathcal{A}$  ( $H \neq 0$ ) with  $\Phi(H) = x$ . Let  $F$  and  $F^+$  be the mex functions for  $T(\mathcal{A})$  and  $T(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$ , respectively. Then  $F = F^+$ .*

*Proof.* We must show that, for each  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{Q}$  and  $w \in \mathcal{Q}$ ,

$$F(\mathcal{D}) = w \quad \text{iff} \quad F^+(\mathcal{D}) = w.$$

Now by the Generalized Mex Rule,  $F(\mathcal{D}) = w$  iff  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{M}_w$  and

For each  $(y, \mathcal{E}) \in T(\mathcal{A})$  and each  $n \geq 0$  such that  $w^{n+1}y \notin \mathcal{P}$ , either:  $w^{n+1}y' \in \mathcal{P}$  for some  $y' \in \mathcal{E}$ ; or else  $w^n w'y \in \mathcal{P}$  for some  $w' \in \mathcal{D}$ . (†)

Likewise,  $F^+(\mathcal{D}) = w$  iff  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{M}_w$  and

For each  $(y, \mathcal{E}) \in T(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$  and each  $n \geq 0$  such that  $w^{n+1}y \notin \mathcal{P}$ ,  $(\ddagger)$   
either:  $w^{n+1}y' \in \mathcal{P}$  for some  $y' \in \mathcal{E}$ ; or else  $w^n w' y \in \mathcal{P}$  for some  $w' \in \mathcal{D}$ .

Now  $T(\mathcal{A}) \subset T(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$ , so  $(\ddagger) \Rightarrow (\dagger)$ . To prove that  $(\dagger) \Rightarrow (\ddagger)$ , it suffices to show the following: whenever  $(y, \mathcal{E}) \in T(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$ , then there is some  $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{E}$  with  $(y, \mathcal{E}') \in T(\mathcal{A})$ . But this is a simple consequence of the assumptions on  $G$ : for any  $Y \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $n \geq 0$ , we have  $\Phi(Y + n \cdot H) = \Phi(Y + n \cdot G)$ , and furthermore  $\Phi''(Y + n \cdot H) \subset \Phi''(Y + n \cdot G)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, note that if  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}) \neq \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ , then the content of  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\})$  *cannot* be determined on the basis of  $\Phi''G$  alone: it is sensitive to the most minute structural details of  $\mathcal{A} \cup \{G\}$ .

## 8 The Normal Kernel Hypothesis

The strategy for misère Nim has been known since Bouton [5], and it is usually formulated as follows:

Play normal Nim until your move would leave a position consisting entirely of heaps of size 1. Then play to leave an odd number of heaps of size 1.

In this section we introduce a suitable generalization of this strategy to arbitrary games  $\Gamma$ . The generalization rests upon a sweeping assertion that we call the *Normal Kernel Hypothesis*. Though NKH is unproven—and quite possibly false—it holds for all the quotients discussed in this paper, and many thousands of others as well. Thus the generalized strategy is quite important for practical purposes, and even if NKH is false, its wide applicability cries out for a deeper explanation.

Before stating NKH, we must recall some basic results from commutative semigroup theory. Proofs of these results can be found in a standard reference such as Grillet [13].

Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a monoid and fix  $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$ . We say that  $x$  *divides*  $y$ , and write  $x|y$ , if  $xz = y$  for some  $z \in \mathcal{Q}$ .  $x$  and  $y$  are *mutually divisible* if  $x|y$  and  $y|x$ . It is easy to see that mutual divisibility is a congruence, and the congruence class of  $x$  is called the *mutual divisibility class* of  $x$ .

An *idempotent* is an element  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $x^2 = x$ . If  $x$  is an idempotent, then its mutual divisibility class  $\mathcal{G}$  is a *subgroup* of  $\mathcal{Q}$  with identity  $x$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{G}$  is maximal among *subgroups* of  $\mathcal{Q}$  (ordered by inclusion).

If  $\mathcal{Q}$  is finite, then we can enumerate its idempotents  $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k$ . The mutual divisibility class  $\mathcal{K}$  of their product  $z = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_k$  is called the *kernel* of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Multiplication by  $z$  defines a surjective homomorphism  $\mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ , and any surjective homomorphism from  $\mathcal{Q}$  onto a group  $\mathcal{G}$  factors through this map. Thus  $\mathcal{K}$  is the group obtained by adjoining formal inverses to  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

**The Normal Kernel Hypothesis (NKH).** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of games with finite misère quotient, let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the kernel of  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ , and let  $z$  be the identity of  $\mathcal{K}$  (i.e., the product of all idempotents in  $\mathcal{Q}$ ). Then for all  $G, H \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have*

$$z\Phi(G) = z\Phi(H) \iff G \text{ and } H \text{ have the same normal-play Grundy value.}$$

NKH asserts that there is a one-to-one correspondence between elements of  $\mathcal{K}$  and normal-play Grundy values of games in  $\mathcal{A}$ .  $G$ -values can therefore be recovered from  $\Phi$ -values, and it follows that misère play is “at least as hard” as normal play. There are also deep consequences for the structure of  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

**Lemma 8.1.** *Assume NKH. Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  be a finite misère quotient with kernel  $\mathcal{K}$ , and let  $z$  be the identity of  $\mathcal{K}$ .*

- (a) *If  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$  is an idempotent and  $\Phi(G) = x$ , then  $G$  has Grundy value 0.*
- (b)  *$\mathcal{K} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^n$ , for some  $n$ .*
- (c) *Suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  is the set of positions in some heap game  $\Gamma$ . If  $\Gamma$  is misère-play periodic, then it is normal-play periodic, and its normal period divides its misère period.*

*Proof.* (a)  $G + G$  necessarily has Grundy value 0. But  $\Phi(G + G) = x^2 = x$ , so

$$z\Phi(G) = zx = z\Phi(G + G),$$

whence by NKH  $G$  has Grundy value 0.

(b) Let  $x \in \mathcal{K}$  and fix any  $G$  with  $\Phi(G) = x$ . Then  $G + G$  has Grundy value 0, so by NKH  $z\Phi(0) = z\Phi(G + G)$ . Therefore  $z = zx^2 = x^2$ . Since  $x$  was arbitrary, this shows that every element of  $\mathcal{K}$  has order 2.

(c) Suppose that  $\Gamma$  is misère-play periodic. Then for some  $n_0, p$ , we have  $\Phi(H_{n+p}) = \Phi(H_n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . Therefore  $z\Phi(H_{n+p}) = z\Phi(H_n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . By NKH,  $H_{n+p}$  and  $H_n$  have the same Grundy value, for all  $n \geq n_0$ , and the conclusion follows.  $\square$

NKH also has significant strategic consequences. Let  $G$  be any game with  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{K}$ , and suppose every option  $G'$  also satisfies  $\Phi(G') \in \mathcal{K}$ . Then the winning move(s) in  $G$  can be determined just by looking at Grundy values.

This idea can be applied as follows. Suppose we are playing some large sum of heaps  $G$ . If  $G$  contains many heaps (or combinations of heaps) with images in  $\mathcal{K}$ , then we can be confident that  $\Phi(G)$  will remain in  $\mathcal{K}$  for quite some time. So long as it remains there, we need only consider the Grundy values of each heap. Only when a move takes us out of the kernel is it necessary to pay closer attention.

Thus if NKH holds, and if we also have  $z \in \mathcal{P}$  (so that normal and misère  $\mathcal{P}$ -positions coincide on  $\mathcal{K}$ ), then the basic strategy for misère Nim has an elegant generalization:

Play normal  $\Gamma$  until your move would leave a position outside of  $\mathcal{K}$ .  
Then pay attention to the fine structure of the misère quotient.

The difference, of course, is that for misère Nim this “fine structure” is painfully simple, while for arbitrary  $\Gamma$  it can be quite complicated indeed.

A note of caution: it is *not* always the case that  $z \in \mathcal{P}$ . Counterexamples are rare, however; the smallest known quotient where  $z \notin \mathcal{P}$  is

$$(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(*_{(2+31)}(2+2)2+3),$$

which has order 420. NKH still holds for  $\mathcal{Q}$ , so that  $\mathcal{K} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Now, however, we have  $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P} = \{az\}$  (where  $a = \Phi(*)$ ), corresponding to Grundy value 1. Thus Grundy values still carry sufficient information to play optimally inside  $\mathcal{K}$ ; but now the winning moves are to positions of Grundy value 1, rather than Grundy value 0 (as in normal play).

**Open Problem.** *Exhibit a misère quotient in which  $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P}$  contains an element of Grundy value  $\geq 2$  (or show that none exists).*

We now prove NKH in certain special circumstances. These circumstances are broad enough to encompass all known misère quotients, including the anomaly just discussed.

**Proposition 8.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  be a finite misère quotient and let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the kernel of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Then  $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P}$  is nonempty.*

*Proof.* Let  $z$  be the identity of  $\mathcal{K}$ . If  $z \in \mathcal{P}$ , then we are done. Otherwise, fix  $G$  with  $\Phi(G) = z$ . Then  $\Phi(G + G) = z^2 = z$ . Now  $G + G$  is an  $\mathcal{N}$ -position, so some option  $G + G'$  must be a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. But

$$\Phi(G + G') = z\Phi(G') \in \mathcal{K}. \quad \square$$

Our “special circumstances” require that  $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P}$  contain *exactly one* element.

**Definition 8.3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be a finite r.b.m. and let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the kernel of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . We say that  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is regular if  $|\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P}| = 1$ .*

**Definition 8.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of games with finite misère quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  and pretending function  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ . We say that  $\Phi$  is faithful if, whenever  $\Phi(G) = \Phi(H)$ , then  $G$  and  $H$  have the same Grundy value.*

It is not hard to see that faithfulness depends only on the transition algebra  $T(\mathcal{A})$ , so it is a slightly more robust property than appears at first glance.

**Theorem 8.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of games with finite misère quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  and pretending function  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ . Suppose that  $\Phi$  is faithful and  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is regular. Then NKH holds for  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

*Proof.* For the forward direction, suppose  $z\Phi(G) = z\Phi(H)$ . Fix  $Z \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\Phi(Z) = z$ . Then  $\Phi(G + Z) = \Phi(H + Z)$ . Since  $\Phi$  is faithful, we know that  $G + Z$  and  $H + Z$  have the same Grundy value. Therefore so do  $G$  and  $H$ .

To complete the proof, we must show that if  $G, H \in \mathcal{A}$  have the same Grundy value, then  $z\Phi(G) = z\Phi(H)$ .

First of all, since  $\mathcal{Q}$  is regular, we know that  $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P}$  contains a unique element  $y$ . Fix  $Y$  with  $\Phi(Y) = y$  and let  $r$  be the Grundy value of  $Y$ . Suppose  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  is any game of Grundy value  $r$ ; we will show that  $z\Phi(G) = y$ .

Fix  $Z \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\Phi(Z) = z$ , and put  $X = G + Z + Z$ . Since  $z$  is an idempotent, we have  $\Phi(X) = z\Phi(G)$ . Furthermore, every option of  $X$  has the form  $G' + Z + Z$  or  $G + Z' + Z$ , so  $\Phi''X \subset \mathcal{K}$ . But since  $X$  has Grundy value  $r$ , none of its options can have Grundy value  $r$ , so  $y \notin \Phi''X$ . Since  $y$  is the unique element of  $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathcal{P}$ , we infer that  $(\Phi''X) \cap \mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ , whence  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position. Thus  $\Phi(X) = z\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$ , and by uniqueness of  $y$  we conclude that  $z\Phi(G) = y$ .

Now fix any  $G, H \in \mathcal{A}$  and suppose  $G$  and  $H$  have the same Grundy value. Then  $G + G + Y$  and  $G + H + Y$  both have Grundy value  $r$ , so by the above argument,  $z\Phi(G + G + Y) = z\Phi(G + H + Y) = y$ . Put  $x = \Phi(G + Y)$ ; then

$$z\Phi(G + G + Y) = zx\Phi(G) \quad \text{and} \quad z\Phi(G + H + Y) = zx\Phi(H).$$

Since  $\mathcal{K}$  is a group, there is some  $x'$  with  $xx' = z$ , and it follows that  $z\Phi(G) = z\Phi(H)$ , as needed.  $\square$

We conclude with an interesting proposed generalization of Proposition 8.2. Consider an arbitrary maximal subgroup  $\mathcal{G} < \mathcal{Q}$ . Examples with  $|\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{P}| \geq 2$  are commonplace (when  $\mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{K}$ ). However, it is unknown whether  $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{P}$  can be empty.

**Question.** *Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be a finite misère quotient and let  $\mathcal{G}$  be any maximal subgroup of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Must  $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{P}$  be nonempty?*

## A Solutions in Detail

In this section we give detailed solutions to many of the games discussed in Section 3.

Figure 13 summarizes the status of every octal game with at most three code digits. For each game  $\Gamma$ , the chart indicates whether  $\Gamma$  is tame or wild, and whether its normal- and/or misère-play solution is known.

Figures 14 and 16 present complete solutions to wild two- and three-digit octal games with relatively simple misère quotients and pretending functions. Figure 15 does the same for wild four-digit quaternaries. Finally, Figures 17, 18 and 19 present the solutions to **0.115**, **0.152** and **0.77**, respectively. The solution to **0.644** is omitted due to space constraints; see [21].

### Algebraic Periodic Games: 0.26 and 4.7

Algebraic periodicity was discussed at the beginning of Section 3. We now give two examples. Both **0.26** and **4.7** have infinite (and non-finitely generated) misère quotients. Furthermore, all of their *partial* quotients are finite. Full presentations are shown in Figures 20 and 21, respectively.

$d_1 d_2$	$d_3$							$d_1 d_2$	$d_3$								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		7	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
.00	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-	.44	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	-	-	-	-
.01	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	*	.45	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
.02	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-	.46	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	-	-	-	-
.03	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-	.47	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
.04	-	-	-	*	⊖	*	⊖	*	.50	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕
.05	⊕	*	⊕	*	*	*	-	*	.51	⊕	⊕	⊖	⊕	⊕	*	*	*
.06	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.52	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	*	*	*
.07	*	*	*	*	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	.53	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	*	*	*
.10	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	⊕	*	⊕	.54	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
.11	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	⊖	*	*	.55	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	*	*
.12	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊖	*	-	-	*	.56	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-
.13	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	-	-	*	.57	⊖	⊖	⊕	⊕	*	*	*	*
.14	-	*	-	-	⊖	*	-	⊕	.60	-	-	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-
.15	⊖	⊕	⊖	⊖	*	⊕	⊕	⊖	.61	-	-	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-
.16	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	.62	-	-	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-
.17	*	*	-	*	-	*	*	*	.63	-	-	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-
.20	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-	.64	-	-	-	-	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖
.21	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-	.65	-	-	-	-	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖
.22	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	*	*	.66	-	-	-	-	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖
.23	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	*	*	.67	-	-	-	-	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖
.24	⊕	⊖	⊕	⊖	-	-	-	-	.70	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕
.25	⊕	⊖	⊕	⊖	-	-	-	-	.71	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	*	*	⊖	⊖
.26	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	.72	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖
.27	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	.73	⊕	⊕	*	*	*	*	*	*
.30	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	.74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.31	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	⊖	*	⊖	.75	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	*	*	*	*
.32	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	-	*	*	.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.33	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	-	*	*	*	.77	⊖	⊖	⊕	⊕	-	-	-	-
.34	⊖	⊖	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	*	*
.35	*	⊖	⊕	⊕	-	*	*	*	4.1	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	*	*
.36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.2	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	*	*	*
.37	-	-	⊕	⊕	-	*	*	-	4.3	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕
.40	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	4.4	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	-	-	-	-
.41	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	4.5	⊕	⊕	*	*	⊕	⊕	⊖	⊖
.42	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	4.6	⊖	⊖	⊖	⊖	-	-	-	-
.43	*	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	4.7	⊖	⊖	⊕	⊕	⊖	⊖	*	*

- ⊕ Tame; solution is known in both normal and misère play.
  - ⊖ Wild; solution is known in both normal and misère play. See Figure 3 for details.
  - Wild; solution is unknown in either normal or misère play. For details on two-digit octals, see Figure 5; for three-digit octals, see [21].
  - \*
- Wild; solution is known in normal play, but not in misère play. These are the most promising candidates for further research.

Figure 13: Summary of 3-digit octal games.

Code	$\mathcal{Q}$	p	$\Phi$
<b>0.34</b>	$\mathcal{S}_{12}$	8	$a 1 a b 1 a 1 a b a c a b 1 a c 1 a b a c a b 1 a c \dots$
<b>0.750</b>	$\mathcal{R}_8$	2	$a b a b c b c b a b^2 b a b^2 b a b^2 \dots$
<b>0.512</b>	$\mathcal{R}_8$	6	$a a a b b b a b^2 c b b b a b^2 b^2 c b b b a b^2 b^2 a b^2 b b b a b^2 b^2 a b^2 \dots$
<b>0.712</b>	$\mathcal{R}_{14}$	6	$a b a 1 c 1 a a c a 1 c 1 a a c \dots$
<b>0.716</b>	$\mathcal{R}_{14}$	2	$a b a 1 c 1 c a c a a c c a c c a c c a c a c^2 a c c c^2 c c^2 a c^2 c^2 a c^2 c^2 a c^2 \dots$
<b>4.56</b>	$\mathcal{R}_8$	4	$a a b b a c b b c c b b a b^2 a b^2 b b a b^2 a b^2 \dots$
<b>4.74</b>	$\mathcal{R}_8$	2	$a b a b c b c b a b^2 b a b^2 b a b^2 \dots$
<b>0.3101</b>	$\mathcal{R}_{14}$	2	$a b c^2 c c^2 a c^2 c^2 a c^2 c^2 a c^2 \dots$
<b>0.3131</b>	$\mathcal{S}_{12}$	2	$a b a b b^2 c b^2 a b^2 b^2 a b^2 b^2 a b^2 \dots$

Figure 14: Pretending functions for octal games with misère quotients isomorphic to  $\mathcal{R}_8$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_{12}$  or  $\mathcal{R}_{14}$  (cf. Figure 7).

35

Code	p	$\Phi$	$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{P}$
<b>0.1230</b>	5	$a 1 b b a d^2 1 c d a d^2 1 c d \dots$	$\langle a, b, c, d \mid a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2,$ $b^2 c = b^3, c^2 = 1, b^2 d = d,$ $cd = bd, d^3 = ad^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, ac,$ $bd, d^2\}$
<b>0.1023</b>	7	$a 1 1 b b a a d^2 1 1 c d a a d^2 1 1 c d \dots$		
<b>0.1032</b>	7	$a 1 a 1 b b b a d^2 d^2 1 c a d^2 d a d^2 d^2 1 c a d^2 d \dots$		
<b>0.1033</b>	7	$a 1 a b b b 1 d^2 d^2 a d a d^2 c 1 d^2 d^2 a d a d^2 c \dots$		
<b>0.1331</b>	5	$a a b b 1 d^2 a d c 1 d^2 a d c \dots$		
<b>0.3103</b>	5	$a b d^2 d 1 a c d^2 d 1 a c \dots$		
<b>0.3112</b>	5	$a b a 1 b d^2 c a 1 d d^2 c a 1 d \dots$	$\langle a, b, c, d \mid a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2,$ $b^2 c = b^3, bc^3 = bc, c^4 = c^2,$ $bcd = b^2 d, b^3 d^2 = bd^2,$ $cd^2 = bd^2, b^2 d^3 = d^3, d^5 = ad^4 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, ac, ac^2,$ $ac^3, bd, ab^3 d,$ $cd, ad^2, b^2 d^2,$ $abd^3, d^4\}$
<b>0.1232</b>	6	$a 1 b b a b a b^2 1 c b d a b^2 1 c b d \dots$		
<b>0.1323</b>	6	$a a 1 b b a b a b^2 1 c b d a b^2 1 c b d \dots$		

Figure 15: Pretending functions and quotient presentations for some wild quaternary games.

Code	$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\Phi$
<b>0.530</b>	$\langle a, b, c, d, e \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, b^2c = c, c^2 = b^2, bd = ab, cd = ac, d^2 = b^2, be = ab, ce = ac, e^2 = b^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, e\}$	$\begin{array}{ccccccc} a & a & b & b & a & b^2 & b & b & c \\ b^2 & d & b & b & e & ab^2 & b & b & c \\ ab^2 & ade & b & b & ab^2 & ab^2 & b & b & c \\ ab^2 & ab^2 & b & b & ab^2 & ab^2 & b & b & c \\ ab^2 & ab^2 & \dots & & & & & & \end{array}$
<b>0.710</b>	$\langle a, b, c, d \mid a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2, b^2c = c, c^4 = ac^3, c^3d = c^3, d^2 = 1 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, bc, c^2, ac^3, ad, b^3d, cd, bc^2d\}$	$\begin{array}{cccc} a & b & a & 1 & c & 1 \\ a & d & a & 1 & c & 1 \\ a & d & \dots & & & \end{array}$
<b>0.720</b>	$\langle a, b, c, d, e, f \mid a^2 = 1, b^4 = b^2, b^2c = ab^2, c^2 = b^2, b^2d = b^3, cd = ab^3, d^2 = b^2, b^2e = ab^3, bce = bd, de = abd, e^2 = b^2, bf = bd, cf = ab^3, df = b^2, ef = ab^2, f^2 = b^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, ad, be, af\}$	$\begin{array}{ccccccc} a & 1 & b & ab \\ a & 1 & b & ab \\ c & b^2 & abc & ab^3 \\ c & b^2 & d & e \\ abd & b^2 & f & e \\ abd & b^2 & f & \dots \end{array}$
<b>0.144</b>	$\langle a, b, c, d, e \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, b^2c = c, c^4 = c^2, bd = ab, cd = ac, d^2 = b^2, c^2e = c^3, de = ab^2e, e^2 = c^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, c^2, ae, abce\}$	$\begin{array}{cccccccc} a & 1 & 1 & a & b & b & b & b & c & c \\ a & ab^2 & ab^2 & d & b & b & b & b & c^3 & e \\ ab^2 & ab^2 & ab^2 & d & b & b & b & b & c^3 & e \\ ab^2 & \dots & & & & & & & & \end{array}$
<b>0.241</b>	$\cong \mathcal{Q}(0.71)$		$\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & a & b & a & 1 & a & 1 & c & 1 & a \\ 1 & a & d & a & 1 & a & 1 & c & 1 & a \\ 1 & a & d & \dots & & & & & & \end{array}$
<b>0.351</b>	$\langle a, b, c, d \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, b^2c = c, c^3 = ac^2, b^2d = d, c^2d = ac^2, d^2 = b^2 \rangle$	$\{a, b^2, bc, c^2, d, bcd\}$	$\begin{array}{cccc} a & b & a & b & b^2 & c & b^2 & b \\ d & b & d & b & b^2 & c & b^2 & b \\ d & b & d & \dots & & & & \end{array}$

Figure 16: Quotient presentations and pretending functions for **0.53**, **0.71**, **0.72**, **0.144**, **0.241**, and **0.351**.

$Q(\mathbf{0.115}) \cong Q(\mathbf{0.15})$  (cf. Figure 2)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
0+	$a$	$a$	$a$	1	$a$	$a$	$a$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$a$	$b$	$b$	$b$
14+	$a$	$a$	$a$	1	$c$	$c$	$c$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$d$	$b$	$b$	$e$
28+	$c$	$c$	$c$	$f$	$c$	$c$	$c$	$b$	$b$	$g$	$d$	$h$	$h$	$i$
42+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$abg$	$f$	$abg$	$abg$	$abe$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$h$	$d$	$h$	$h$	$h$
56+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$abe$	$f^2$	$abg$	$abg$	$abg$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$h$	$d$	$h$	$h$	$h$
70+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$abg$	$f^2$	$abg$	$abg$	$abg$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$d$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$b^3$
84+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$abg$	$f^2$	$abg$	$abg$	$abg$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$d$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$b^3$
98+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$f^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$d$	$b^3$	$b^3$	$b^3$
112+	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$f^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	$ab^2$	...						

Figure 17: Pretending function for  $\mathbf{0.115}$ .

$$Q(\mathbf{0.152}) \cong \langle a, b, c, d, e \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, bc^2 = b, c^3 = c, bd = b, c^2d = d, d^2 = b^2, b^2e = e, c^2e = e, de = e, e^3 = ce^2 \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{a, b^2, c^2, acd, abce, e^2\}$$

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
0+	$a$	$a$	1	$b$	$b$	$b$	1	$a$	$b^2$	$c$	$ab$	$b$
12+	$ab$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$a$	$ab$	$b$	$b$	$ce^2$	$d$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$e$
24+	$b$	$b$	$ab$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$ab^2$	$ab$	$b$	$ab$	$ce^2$	$b^2$	$ab^2$
36+	$b^2$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$b^2$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$ce^2$	$ab$	$b$	$ab$	$ce^2$
48+	$b^2$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$b$	$b$	$b$	$b^2$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$ce^2$	$ab$	$b$
60+	$ab$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$ab^2$	$ab$	$b$	$b$	$ce^2$	$b^2$	$ab^2$	$b^2$	$ce^2$
72+	$b$	$b$	$ab$	$ab^2$	...							

Figure 18: Quotient presentation and pretending function for  $\mathbf{0.152}$ .

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{0.77}) \cong \langle a, b, c, d, e, f, g \mid a^2 = 1, b^3 = b, bc^2 = b, c^3 = c, bd = bc, \\ cd = b^2, d^3 = d, be = bc, ce = b^2, e^2 = de, \\ bf = ab, cf = ab^2c, d^2f = f, f^2 = b^2, b^2g = g, \\ c^2g = g, dg = cg, eg = cg, fg = ag, g^2 = b^2 \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{a, b^2, ac, ac^2, d, ad^2, e, ade, adf\}$$

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
0+	$a$	$b$	$ab$	$a$	$c$	$ab$	$b$	$ab^2$	$d$	$b$	$bc$	$e$
12+	$ab^2$	$b$	$abc$	$ab^2$	$d^2e$	$ab$	$b$	$ade$	$b^2c$	$bc$	$abc$	$b^2c$
24+	$f$	$b$	$g$	$ab^2c$	$b^2c$	$abc$	$b$	$ab^2$	$g$	$bc$	$abc$	$b^2c$
36+	$ab^2$	$b$	$ab$	$ab^2$	$b^2c$	$abc$	$b$	$ab^2$	$g$	$b$	$abc$	$b^2c$
48+	$ab^2$	$b$	$g$	$ab^2$	$b^2c$	$abc$	$b$	$ab^2$	$b^2c$	$b$	$abc$	$b^2c$
60+	$ab^2$	$b$	$g$	$ab^2$	$b^2c$	$abc$	$b$	$ab^2$	$g$	$bc$	$abc$	$b^2c$
72+	$ab^2$	$b$	$g$	$ab^2$	$b^2c$	$abc$	$b$	$ab^2$	$g$	$b$	$abc$	$b^2c$
84+	$ab^2$	$b$	$g$	$ab^2$	$b^2c$	$abc$	$b$	$ab^2$	$g$	$b$	$\dots$	

Figure 19: Quotient presentation and pretending function for **0.77**.

$$\mathcal{Q} \cong \langle a, b, c_n \mid a^2 = 1, b^{n+1}c_n = b^{2n+3}, \\ (c_m c_n = b^{m+2}c_n)_{m \leq n} \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{a, (b^{2m})_{m \geq 1}, (b^m c_n)_{m \leq n \text{ and } m+n \text{ odd}}\}$$

	1	2	3	4
0+	1	$a$	$b$	$ab$
4+	1	$a$	$b$	$ab$
8+	$c_0$	$ac_0$	$c_1$	$ab^3$
12+	$c_2$	$abc_1$	$c_3$	$abc_2$
16+	$c_4$	$abc_3$	$c_5$	$abc_4$
20+	$c_6$	$abc_5$	$\dots$	

Figure 20: Quotient presentation and pretending function for **0.26**.

$$\mathcal{Q} \cong \langle a, b, c, d_n \mid a^2 = 1, bc = ab^3, c^2 = b^4, \\ b^{n+1}d_n = a^{n+1}b^{2n+5}, cd_n = ab^2d_n, \\ d_m d_n = a^{m+1}b^{m+4}d_n \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{a, (b^{2m})_{m \geq 1}, (b^m d_n)_{m \text{ odd}, n \text{ even}, m < n}, \\ (ab^m d_n)_{m \text{ even}, n \text{ odd}, m < n}\}$$

	1	2
0+	$a$	$b$
2+	$a$	$b$
4+	$c$	$b^3$
6+	$d_0$	$d_1$
8+	$d_2$	$d_3$
10+	$d_4$	$d_5$
12+	$d_6$	$\dots$

Figure 21: Quotient presentation and pretending function for **4.7**.

Since we do not have any computational methods for verifying algebraic periodicity, we must resort to manual proofs of Figures 20 and 21. In each case, the proof proceeds in two stages. We first show that the given presentation is *correct*, in the sense that  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$ . Then we show that the given presentation is *reduced* (as a bipartite monoid).

### Figure 20 Is Correct for 0.26

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of **0.26** positions, regarded as a free commutative monoid on the heap alphabet  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, H_3, \dots\}$ . Define homomorphisms  $t, w : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  as follows:

$$t(H_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \in \{1, 2\}; \\ 1 & \text{if } k \in \{3, 4\}; \\ \lfloor \frac{k-5}{2} \rfloor & \text{if } k \geq 5. \end{cases} \quad w(H_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \leq 8; \\ 1 & \text{if } k \in \{9, 10\}; \\ (k-7)/2 & \text{if } k \geq 11 \text{ is odd}; \\ (k-12)/2 & \text{if } k \geq 11 \text{ is even}. \end{cases}$$

Let  $g(G)$  denote the ordinary Grundy value of  $G$ . It is easily checked that  $g(H_k)$  is equal to the mod-4 parity of  $k-1$ .

**Fact A.1** (Allemang [1]). *Let  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  and write  $G = X + H$ , where  $H = H_k$  is the largest single heap appearing in  $G$ . Then  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i)  $t(G) = 0$  and  $g(G) = 1$ ;
- (ii)  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) \leq t(X)$ , and  $g(G) = 0$ ; or
- (iii)  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) \geq t(X) + 2$ , and  $g(G) = 2$ .

Fact A.1 corrects some slight errors in Allemang's definition of  $t$ . This would be a good reason to include a proof here; but the only proof we know is a tedious and unenlightening combinatorial slog, and anyway it is our hope that algorithmic verification methods will emerge in the near future. We therefore choose to take the easy way out, and leave its proof as an exercise.

**Theorem A.2.** *Figure 20 is correct for 0.26.*

*Proof.* Let  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ . We must show that  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$ . We first make two preliminary observations, which are easily proved by inspecting the definitions of  $g$ ,  $t$ , and  $\Phi$ :

$$\text{If } k \leq k', \text{ then } \Phi(H_k)\Phi(H_{k'}) = a^{g(H_k)}b^{t(H_k)}\Phi(H_{k'}). \quad (\dagger)$$

$$\text{If } w(H) \leq m, \text{ then } b^m\Phi(H) = a^{g(H)}b^{m+t(H)}. \quad (\ddagger)$$

Now fix  $G$ , and write  $G = X + H$  where  $H = H_k$  is the largest heap appearing in  $G$ . By repeated application of  $(\dagger)$ , we have  $\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}b^{t(X)}\Phi(H)$ . There are five cases.

*Case 1:*  $t(G) = 0$ . Then  $\Phi(G) = a^{g(G)}$  and the conclusion is evident.

*case 2:*  $t(G) \neq 0$  and  $w(H) \leq t(X)$ . Then by (‡) we have

$$\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}b^{t(X)}\Phi(H) = a^{g(X)}a^{g(H)}b^{t(X)+t(H)} = a^{g(G)}b^{t(G)}.$$

So  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$  iff  $g(G)$  and  $t(G)$  are both even. But  $t(G)$  is even iff  $g(G) \in \{0, 1\}$ , so it follows that

$$\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P} \text{ iff } g(G) = 0.$$

This agrees with the characterization in Fact A.1.

*Case 3:*  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) > t(X)$ , and  $k \in \{9, 10\}$ . Then  $w(H) = 1$ , so  $t(X) = 0$ , and we have  $\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}\Phi(H)$ . Since  $\Phi(H_9) = c_0$  and  $\Phi(H_{10}) = ac_0$ , this necessarily implies  $\Phi(G) \notin \mathcal{P}$ , which agrees with Fact A.1.

*Case 4:*  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) > t(X)$ , and  $k \geq 11$  is odd. Then  $\Phi(H) = c_{w(H)-1}$  and we have

$$\Phi(G) = a^{g(G)}b^{t(X)}c_{w(H)-1}.$$

Thus  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$  precisely when  $g(G)$  and  $t(X) + w(H)$  are both even. But  $t(X) + w(H)$  is even iff  $t(G)$  is odd, so this agrees with Fact A.1.

*Case 5:*  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) > t(X)$ , and  $k \geq 11$  is even. Then  $\Phi(H) = abc_{w(H)}$  and so

$$\Phi(G) = a^{g(G)}b^{t(X)+1}c_{w(H)}.$$

Thus  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$  precisely when  $g(G)$  and  $t(X) + w(H)$  are both even, and the conclusion is just as in Case 4.  $\square$

This shows that  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  is a homomorphism of bipartite monoids. The following theorem completes the picture.

**Theorem A.3.** *The bipartite monoid  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  given in Figure 20 is reduced.*

*Proof.* For convenience, write  $c_\infty = 1$ . Then every  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$  may be written uniquely as  $a^i b^m c_n$ , where  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , and  $m \leq n$ . We will prove that, if  $(i, m, n) \neq (i', m', n')$ , then  $x = a^i b^m c_n$  and  $x' = a^{i'} b^{m'} c_{n'}$  are distinguishable.

First suppose  $i \neq i'$ , so without loss of generality  $i = 0$  and  $i' = 1$ . Fix an integer  $M > \max\{n, n'\}$  such that  $m+n+M$  is even. Then  $xb^M = b^{m+n+2+M} \in \mathcal{P}$ , while  $x'b^M = ab^{m'+n'+2+M} \notin \mathcal{P}$ .

Now assume  $i = i'$ . It suffices to assume  $i = 0$ , since if  $x$  and  $x'$  are distinguished by  $z$ , then  $ax$  and  $ax'$  are distinguished by  $az$ . We may also assume, without loss of generality, that  $n - m \leq n' - m'$ . There are several cases.

*Case 1:*  $m + n \not\equiv m' + n' \pmod{2}$ . Then let  $M > \max\{n, n'\}$  be such that  $m + n + M$  is even. As before,  $(b^m c_n)b^M = b^{m+n+2+M}$ , while  $(b^{m'} c_{n'})b^M = b^{m'+n'+2+M}$ . Since  $m + n + 2 + M$  is even and  $m' + n' + 2 + M$  is odd, we are done.

*Case 2:*  $m+n \equiv m'+n' \pmod{2}$  and  $n-m < n'-m'$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $n-m < n'-m'$ . Then  $xb^{n-m+1} = b^{n+1}c_n = b^{2n+3} \notin \mathcal{P}$ , while  $x'b^{n-m+1} = b^{m'+n-m+1}c_{n'}$ . But  $m'+n-m+1 < m'+n'-m'+1 = n'+1$ , and

$$m'+n-m+1+n' \equiv (m'+n')+(n-m)+1 \equiv (m'+n')+(m+n)+1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2},$$

so this is in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

*Case 3:*  $n-m = n'-m'$ . Then we may assume that  $n < n'$ . Let  $M > \max\{n, n'\}$  and put  $N = m' + n' + 2 + M$ . Then  $x'b^M c_N = b^{m'+n'+2+M} c_N \notin \mathcal{P}$ . However,

$$xb^M c_N = b^{m+n+2+M} c_N = b^{m+n+4+M+N}.$$

Since  $m+n \equiv m'+n' \pmod{2}$ , this exponent is even. Hence  $xb^M c_N \in \mathcal{P}$ .  $\square$

### Figure 21 Is Correct for 4.7

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of 4.7 positions, regarded as a free commutative monoid on the heap alphabet  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, H_3, \dots\}$ . Define homomorphisms  $t, w : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  as follows:

$$t(H_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k = 1; \\ 1 & \text{if } k = 2; \\ k-3 & \text{if } k \geq 3. \end{cases} \quad w(H_k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \leq 4; \\ 1 & \text{if } k = 5; \\ k-6 & \text{if } k \geq 6. \end{cases}$$

Let  $g(G)$  denote the ordinary Grundy value of  $G$ . It is easily checked that  $g(H_k) = 2$  if  $k$  is even, 1 if  $k$  is odd.

**Fact A.4** (Allemang [1]). *Let  $G \in \mathcal{A}$  and write  $G = X + H$ , where  $H = H_k$  is the largest single heap appearing in  $G$ . Then  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff one of the following conditions holds:*

- (i)  $t(G) = 0$  and  $g(G) = 1$ ;
- (ii)  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) \leq t(X)$ , and  $g(G) = 0$ ; or
- (iii)  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) \geq t(X) + 2$ , and  $g(G) = 3$ .

**Theorem A.5.** *Figure 21 is correct for 4.7.*

*Proof.* Fix  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ . We must show that  $G$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position iff  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$ . As in the case of 0.26, the following observations are easily checked:

$$\text{If } k \leq k', \text{ then } \Phi(H_k)\Phi(H_{k'}) = a^{g(H_k)}b^{t(H_k)}\Phi(H_{k'}). \quad (\dagger)$$

$$\text{If } w(H) \leq m, \text{ then } b^m\Phi(H) = a^{g(H)}b^{m+t(H)}. \quad (\ddagger)$$

Now fix  $G$ , and write  $G = X + H$  where  $H = H_k$  is the largest heap appearing in  $G$ . By repeated application of  $(\dagger)$ , we have  $\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}b^{t(X)}\Phi(H)$ . There are four cases.

*Case 1:*  $t(G) = 0$ . Then  $\Phi(G) = a^{g(G)}$  and the conclusion is evident.

*Case 2:*  $t(G) \neq 0$  and  $w(H) \leq t(X)$ . Then by  $(\ddagger)$  we have

$$\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}b^{t(X)}\Phi(H) = a^{g(X)}a^{g(H)}b^{t(X)+t(H)} = a^{g(G)}b^{t(G)}.$$

So  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$  iff  $g(G)$  and  $t(G)$  are both even. But  $t(G)$  is even iff  $g(G) \in \{0, 1\}$ , so this agrees with the characterization in Fact A.4.

*Case 3:*  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) > t(X)$ , and  $k \in \{5, 6\}$ . Then  $w(H) = 1$ , so  $t(X) = 0$ , and we have  $\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}\Phi(H)$ . Since  $\Phi(H_5) = c$  and  $\Phi(H_6) = b^3$ , this necessarily implies  $\Phi(G) \notin \mathcal{P}$ , which agrees with Fact A.4.

*Case 4:*  $t(G) \neq 0$ ,  $w(H) > t(X)$ , and  $k \geq 7$ . Then  $\Phi(H) = d_{w(H)-1}$ , so

$$\Phi(G) = a^{g(X)}b^{t(X)}d_{w(H)-1}.$$

Now if  $w(H)$  is odd, then  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$  iff  $g(X)$  is even and  $t(X)$  is odd. But  $w(H) \equiv g(H) \pmod{2}$ , and  $w(H) \not\equiv t(H) \pmod{2}$ , so this means  $g(G)$  and  $t(G)$  are both *odd*. Since  $t(G)$  is odd iff  $g(G) \in \{2, 3\}$ , this agrees with the characterization in Fact A.4.

Likewise, if  $w(H)$  is even, then  $\Phi(G) \in \mathcal{P}$  iff  $g(X)$  is odd and  $t(X)$  is even. Once again, this means that  $g(G)$  and  $t(G)$  are both odd. This exhausts all cases and completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem A.6.** *The bipartite monoid  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  given in Figure 21 is reduced.*

The proof of Theorem A.6 is much like Theorem A.3.

## B Algorithms

In this appendix we describe *MisereSolver*'s algorithm for calculating misère quotients. Throughout this section, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an arbitrary finitely-generated closed set of games, treated as a free commutative monoid on generators  $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n\}$ . Denote by  $<_{\text{lex}}$  the lexicographic ordering on  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\left(\sum k_i H_i\right) <_{\text{lex}} \left(\sum \ell_i H_i\right) \text{ iff } k_i < \ell_i \text{ for the largest } i \text{ such that } k_i \neq \ell_i.$$

Notice that if  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $X'$  is an option of  $X$ , then  $X' <_{\text{lex}} X$ .

The basic idea is to produce a sequence of increasingly accurate approximations to the misère quotient  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$ . If  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  is indeed finite, then the sequence is guaranteed to converge to it.

At each stage of the iteration, we are given a promising r.b.m.  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  (the ‘‘candidate quotient’’), together with a homomorphism  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  (represented as a mapping  $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ ). If  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  is the correct quotient of  $\mathcal{A}$ , with pretending function  $\Phi$ , then we are done. If not, then there is some  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $X \neq 0$ , such that either:

- (i)  $\Phi(X) \in \mathcal{P}$ , but also  $\Phi(X') \in \mathcal{P}$  for some option  $X'$ ; or

(ii)  $\Phi(X) \notin \mathcal{P}$ , but there is no option  $X'$  with  $\Phi(X') \in \mathcal{P}$ .

We say that such an  $X$  is a *failure* of the candidate  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ . Now suppose that  $X$  is the *lexicographically least* failure of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ . Then, by a straightforward induction,  $\Phi$  correctly predicts the outcomes of all proper followers of  $X$ . Therefore we know the outcome of  $X$ : it is necessarily the opposite of that predicted by  $\Phi$ . Using this information, we produce a new candidate  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}', \Phi')$ , for which  $X$  is *not* a failure. The construction will guarantee that no lexicographically smaller failures are introduced. The least failures of successive candidate quotients are therefore strictly lexicographically increasing.

There are two main components of this algorithm.

- *Verification*: Given a candidate  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ , the verification engine determines whether it is the correct quotient of  $\mathcal{A}$ , and efficiently identifies the least failure when it is not.
- *Recalibration*: Given a candidate  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ , together with the least failure  $X$ , the recalibration engine constructs the next candidate  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}', \Phi')$ .

When *MisereSolver* begins, it starts with an initial round of recalibration. For the initial candidate, we use the misère quotient of  $\langle H_1, \dots, H_{n-1} \rangle$  (computed recursively), taking  $X = H_n$  to be the least failure.

We are reasonably certain that *MisereSolver* uses the “book” algorithm for verification: it is both elegant and fast. (In particular, we have improved substantially on the algorithms described in [19].) However, our recalibration algorithm feels very crude: *MisereSolver* sometimes chooses very poor candidates; often they are considerably larger than the true quotient. An improved recalibrator might dramatically extend *MisereSolver*’s scope.

## Verification

Given a r.b.m.  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  and a monoid homomorphism  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ , we wish to determine:

- The  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\Phi(X) \in \mathcal{P}$  but  $\Phi(X') \in \mathcal{P}$  for some option  $X'$ ;
- The  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\Phi(X) \notin \mathcal{P}$  but  $\Phi(X') \notin \mathcal{P}$  for all options  $X'$ .

As observed in [19], (b) is far more difficult computationally. This is due to the presence of the universal quantifier: in searching for *some* option in (a), we can essentially treat each generator as an independent entity; but to iterate over *all* options in (b), we must consider the totality of generators involved in  $X$ .

For (a), we use the essential strategy outlined in [19]. The basis is the following theorem:

**Fact B.1** ( *$\mathcal{P}$ -Verification Theorem [19, Section 9.1.3]*). *Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be a r.b.m. and fix a homomorphism  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (i) There is a game  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  and an option  $X'$  such that  $\Phi(X), \Phi(X') \in \mathcal{P}$ .
- (ii) There is a generator  $H \in \mathcal{H}$ , an option  $H'$ , and an element  $x \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $x\Phi(H), x\Phi(H') \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Therefore, to resolve (a), we can iterate over all pairs  $(H, x) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{Q}$ , testing condition (ii) in Fact B.1. For each such pair satisfying (ii), let  $X$  be the  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least game with  $\Phi(X) = x$ ; then  $H + X$  is a candidate for the  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least failure. This yields at most  $|\mathcal{H}| \cdot |\mathcal{Q}|$  candidates, over which we simply minimize.

Our technique for (b) uses the following central idea.

**Definition B.2.** Let  $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ , and suppose that  $X <_{\text{lex}} Y$ ,  $\Phi(X) = \Phi(Y)$ , and  $\Phi''X \subset \Phi''Y$ . Then we say that  $Y$  is subsumed by  $X$ .

Now if  $Y$  is subsumed by  $X$ , then  $Y$  cannot be the  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least failure of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ , because if  $Y$  satisfies (b), then so does  $X$ . Moreover,  $Y + Z$  cannot be the  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least failure, for any  $Z \in \mathcal{A}$ : once again, if  $Y + Z$  satisfies (b), then so does  $X + Z$ ; and necessarily  $X + Z <_{\text{lex}} Y + Z$ . Therefore, we can completely disregard any element of  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $Y$  as a subword.

We may therefore traverse the set  $\mathcal{A}$  in lexicographic order, pruning whenever we reach an  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  that we know to be subsumed. Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  is finite and there are at most  $|\mathcal{Q}| \cdot 2^{|\mathcal{Q}|}$  possibilities for  $(\Phi(X), \Phi''X)$ , this traversal is guaranteed to terminate (even though  $\mathcal{A}$  is infinite). The full procedure is summarized as Algorithm 1.

## Recalibration

Given an r.b.m.  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$ , a map  $\Phi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ , and a lexicographically least failure  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  (as certified by Verification), we must construct a new triple  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}', \Phi')$  whose least failure  $Y$  is guaranteed to satisfy  $Y >_{\text{lex}} X$ . The construction must further guarantee that if  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A})$  is finite, and if  $(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{P}_1, \Phi_1), (\mathcal{Q}_2, \mathcal{P}_2, \Phi_2), \dots$  is a sequence of successive recalibrations, then  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{A}) = (\mathcal{Q}_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$  for sufficiently large  $n$ .

What follows is an informal description of *MisereSolver*'s recalibration procedure. The essential idea is to “free” all generators involved in the failure  $X$ , mapping them to suitable monoids of the form  $\langle t \mid t^{n+k} = t^n \rangle$ . This gives an expanded monoid, in which the true outcome of  $X$  may be “marked” without affecting the indicated outcome of any  $Y <_{\text{lex}} X$ . The expanded monoid is then immediately collapsed back down to a r.b.m. This ensures that we can recalibrate as many times as necessary while keeping the candidate quotients reasonably small.

Given a candidate  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$  with  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least failure  $X$ :

1. Let  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, \dots, J_m\} \subset \mathcal{H}$  be the set of generators appearing in  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}^-$  be the submonoid of  $\mathcal{Q}$  generated by  $\{\Phi(H) : H \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{J}\}$ . For each  $i$

---

```

1:  $T \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: return LEXLEASTNFAILURE( $n, 0$ )

3: procedure LEXLEASTNFAILURE( $d, X$ )
4:   if  $d = 0$  then                                ▷ Done recursing; check this value of  $X$ 
5:     if  $X = 0$  then
6:       return NULL                                  ▷ 0 must be special-cased in misère play
7:     end if
8:      $x \leftarrow \Phi(X); \mathcal{E} \leftarrow \Phi''X$ 
9:     if  $x \in \mathcal{P}$  then
10:      return NULL                                  ▷ We are seeking  $\mathcal{N}$ -failures only
11:    else
12:      if  $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{E} = \emptyset$  then
13:        return  $X$                                   ▷ We've found the lex-least failure
14:      else
15:         $T \leftarrow T \cup \{(x, \mathcal{E})\}$            ▷ Add a transition record for  $(x, \mathcal{E})$ 
16:        return NULL                                ▷ Keep searching
17:      end if
18:    end if
19:  else                                              ▷ Continue recursing from depth  $d$ 
20:    loop
21:       $Y \leftarrow \text{LEXLEASTNFAILURE}(d - 1, X)$ 
22:      if  $Y \neq \text{NULL}$  then
23:        return  $Y$                                   ▷ Found the answer; return it
24:      end if
25:       $X \leftarrow X + H_d$                             ▷ Add a heap  $H_d$  to  $X$ 
26:       $x \leftarrow \Phi(X); \mathcal{E} \leftarrow \Phi''X$ 
27:      if there exists  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E}$  with  $(x, \mathcal{D}) \in T$  then
28:        return NULL                                ▷  $X$  is subsumed; return immediately
29:      end if
30:    end loop
31:  end if
32: end procedure

```

---

Algorithm 1:  $\mathcal{N}$ -Verification Algorithm.

( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ), let  $\mathcal{R}_i = \langle t \mid t^{n+k} = t^n \rangle$ , for some carefully chosen  $k, n$ .<sup>5</sup> Now put

$$\mathcal{Q}^* = \mathcal{Q}^- \times \mathcal{R}_1 \times \mathcal{R}_2 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{R}_m.$$

2. Define  $\Phi^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}^*$  as follows. For each  $i$ , put  $\Phi^*(J_i) =$  the generator of  $\mathcal{R}_i$ . For  $H \notin \mathcal{J}$ , put  $\Phi^*(H) = (\Phi(H), 1, 1, \dots, 1)$ .
3. Define  $\mathcal{P}^* \subset \mathcal{Q}^*$  as follows. First put  $1 \notin \mathcal{P}^*$ . Then for each  $x \in \mathcal{Q}^*$ , let  $X$  be the  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least element of  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $\Phi^*(X) = x$ . Since  $X' <_{\text{lex}} X$  for each option  $X'$  of  $X$ , we may assume that we have already defined whether each  $\Phi^*(X') \in \mathcal{P}^*$ . So define

$$x \in \mathcal{P}^* \iff \Phi^*(X') \notin \mathcal{P}^* \text{ for each option } X'.$$

Essentially, we are guessing whether each such  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{P}$ -position, under the assumption that  $\Phi^*$  is correct on all its options.

4. This gives a bipartite monoid  $(\mathcal{Q}^*, \mathcal{P}^*)$ . Compute its reduction  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}')$  and let  $\Phi'$  be the factor map.

There is a great deal of inefficiency in this process: much more of the monoid is “freed” than is needed to enforce the correct outcome of  $X$ . Nonetheless, it works quite well for our purposes, and it satisfies the following two crucial theorems, which we state without proof.

**Theorem B.3** (Recalibration Theorem). *Let  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  be a r.b.m. and  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$  a homomorphism with  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least failure  $X$ . Let  $(\mathcal{Q}', \mathcal{P}', \Phi')$  be the recalibration of  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$  by  $X$  and let  $Y$  be the lex-least failure of  $\Phi'$ . Then  $X <_{\text{lex}} Y$ .*

**Theorem B.4** (Termination Theorem). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a closed set of games with finite misère quotient  $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P})$  and pretending function  $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ . Let*

$$(\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{P}_1, \Phi_1), (\mathcal{Q}_2, \mathcal{P}_2, \Phi_2), \dots$$

*be a sequence of candidate quotients for  $\mathcal{A}$ , with each  $(\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}, \mathcal{P}_{n+1}, \Phi_{n+1})$  computed by recalibrating on the  $<_{\text{lex}}$ -least failure of  $(\mathcal{Q}_n, \mathcal{P}_n, \Phi_n)$ . Then for all sufficiently large  $n$ , we have  $(\mathcal{Q}_n, \mathcal{P}_n, \Phi_n) = (\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{P}, \Phi)$ .*

In the raw form described here, Recalibration can be extremely slow. If the least failure  $X$  involves many generators, the expanded monoid  $\mathcal{Q}^*$  is often quite large. Fortunately, a tremendous shortcut is available: in step 1, rather than expand along the entire set  $\mathcal{J}$ , we can first try to expand along some proper subset  $\mathcal{J}' \subsetneq \mathcal{J}$ . This almost always succeeds—in many cases, when  $\mathcal{J}'$  is a singleton.

---

<sup>5</sup>*MisereSolver*'s method of choosing such  $k, n$  is currently rather crude and is not worth an extended discussion. The important thing is that  $k$  and  $n$  must be large enough to arrive eventually at the correct presentation, but small enough to keep the computations tractable. There is much room for improvement here.

## Optimizations for Heap Games

*MisereSolver*'s chief application is to calculate misère quotients of heap games. When  $\Gamma$  is an octal game, it is likely that  $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma)$  for many values of  $n$ . In such cases *MisereSolver* uses significant optimizations to compute the next pretension  $\Phi(H_{n+1})$ .

First, whenever a new partial quotient  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma)$  is computed, *MisereSolver* also computes the meximal sets  $\mathcal{M}_x$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ . It also computes the antichain of lower bounds of the transition algebra  $T_n$ . (See Section 7 for discussion.) The algorithm used to compute this antichain is virtually identical to Algorithm 1.

Then, before computing  $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}(\Gamma)$ , *MisereSolver* first calculates the set  $\mathcal{E} = \Phi''H_{n+1}$ . If there exists an  $x \in \mathcal{Q}_n$  and a lower bound  $(x, \mathcal{D}) \in T_n$  such that  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{M}_x$ , then by the Mex Interpolation Principle (Corollary 7.6) it follows that  $\Phi(H_{n+1}) = x$ . This check is extremely fast. Furthermore, by Proposition 7.8, it is not necessary to update the information about  $T_n$ . Thus *MisereSolver* can run quickly through a large number of interpolated heaps.

If no such lower bound  $(x, \mathcal{D})$  exists, it might still be the case that  $\mathcal{Q}_{n+1}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{Q}_n(\Gamma)$ . To test this, *MisereSolver* tries every  $x$  with  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{M}_x$ . For each such  $x$ , the software assigns  $\Phi(H_{n+1}) = x$  and runs Algorithm 1. If the algorithm returns NULL for some value of  $x$ , then we are done. (However, we must recompute the antichain of lower bounds of  $T_{n+1}$ .) If it fails on every  $x$ , then *MisereSolver* proceeds with the full recalibration/verification procedure described above.

## References

- [1] D. T. Allemang. Machine computation with finite games. Master's thesis, Trinity College, Cambridge, 1984.  
<http://www.plambeck.org/oldhtml/mathematics/games/misere/allemang/>.
- [2] D. T. Allemang. Generalized genus sequences for misère octal games. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 30(4):539–556, 2002.
- [3] D. T. Allemang. Solving misère games quickly without search. Unpublished research, 2002.
- [4] E. R. Berlekamp, J. H. Conway, and R. K. Guy. *Winning Ways for Your Mathematical Plays*. A. K. Peters, Ltd., Natick, MA, second edition, 2001.
- [5] C. L. Bouton. Nim, a game with a complete mathematical theory. *Ann. of Math.*, 3(2):35–39, 1902.
- [6] J. H. Conway. *On Numbers and Games*. A. K. Peters, Ltd., Natick, MA, second edition, 2001.
- [7] J. H. Conway. Personal communication, April 2006.
- [8] J. H. Conway and W. L. Sibert. Mathematical Kayles. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 20(3):237–246, 1992.

- [9] T. R. Dawson. Caissa's wild roses, 1935. In *Five Classics of Fairy Chess*. Dover Publications, Inc., 1973.
- [10] T. S. Ferguson. A note on Dawson's Chess. Unpublished, <http://www.math.ucla.edu/~tom/papers/unpublished/DawsonChess.pdf>.
- [11] A. Flammenkamp. Sprague-Grundy values of octal games. <http://wwwhomes.uni-bielefeld.de/achim/octal.html>.
- [12] A. Gangolli and T. E. Plambeck. A note on periodicity in some octal games. *Internat. J. Game Theory*, 18(3):311–320, 1989.
- [13] P. A. Grillet. *Commutative Semigroups*. Number 2 in Advances in Mathematics. Springer, 2001.
- [14] P. M. Grundy. Mathematics and games. *Eureka*, 2:6–8, 1939.
- [15] P. M. Grundy and C. A. B. Smith. Disjunctive games with the last player losing. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 52:527–533, 1956.
- [16] R. K. Guy, August 2006. Personal communication.
- [17] R. K. Guy and C. A. B. Smith. The  $G$ -values of various games. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 52:514–526, 1956.
- [18] T. E. Plambeck. Misere games (web pages devoted to problems, computer software, and theoretical results). <http://www.plambeck.org/oldhtml/mathematics/games/misere/>.
- [19] T. E. Plambeck. Taming the wild in impartial combinatorial games. *INTEGERS: The Electr. J. Combin. Number Thy.*, 5(#G05), 2005.
- [20] T. E. Plambeck. Advances in losing. In M. Albert and R. J. Nowakowski, editors, *Games of No Chance 3*, MSRI Publications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, forthcoming. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.CO/0603027>.
- [21] T. E. Plambeck and A. N. Siegel. Misère Games on the Web. <http://www.miseregames.org/>.
- [22] L. Rédei. *The Theory of Finitely Generated Commutative Semigroups*. Pergamon, 1965.
- [23] W. L. Sibert. The game of misère Kayles: The “safe number” vs. “unsafe number” theory. Unpublished manuscript, October 1989.
- [24] A. N. Siegel. Combinatorial Game Suite. <http://www.cgsuite.org/>.
- [25] A. N. Siegel. *MisereSolver*. <http://www.cgsuite.org/>.
- [26] A. N. Siegel. On the classification of misère quotients. In preparation.

- [27] C. A. B. Smith. Compound two-person deterministic games. Unpublished manuscript.
- [28] R. P. Sprague. Über mathematische Kampfspiele. *Tôhoku Math. J.*, 41:438–444, 1935–36.
- [29] R. P. Sprague. Über zwei Abarten von Nim. *Tôhoku Math. J.*, 43:351–359, 1937.
- [30] R. P. Sprague. Bemerkungen über eine spezielle Abelsche Gruppe. *Math. Z.*, 51:82–84, 1947.