

Strategic equivalence among hat puzzles of various protocols with many colors

Masaru Kada Souji Shizuma

September 17, 2019

Abstract

We discuss “puzzles of prisoners and hats” with infinitely many prisoners and more than two hat colors. Assuming that the set of hat colors is equipped with a commutative group structure, we prove strategic equivalence among puzzles of several protocols with countably many prisoners.

1 Introduction

The famous mathematical puzzles known as “puzzles of prisoners and hats” or “hat guessing games” are originally suggested by Gardner [1], and have been studied in connection with combinatorics and set theory. Set-theoretic studies before 2013 of hat puzzles are summarized by Hardin and Taylor [3].

In the present paper we adopt the formalization of hat puzzles in the Hardin–Taylor book [3]. We call the players *agents* instead of “prisoners” and the set of agents is often denoted by A . The set of hat colors is often denoted by K . We call a function f from A to K a *coloring*. A *visibility graph* is a directed graph V on the set A of vertices without loops, that is, $V \subseteq A \times A \setminus \{\langle x, x \rangle : x \in A\}$. By a directed edge $\langle a, b \rangle \in V$ we intend to mean that the agent a can see (the hat worn by) the agent b . For an agent $a \in A$, we write $V(a) = \{x \in A : \langle a, x \rangle \in V\}$. A visibility graph V is *complete* if $V = A \times A \setminus \{\langle x, x \rangle : x \in A\}$ (and hence $V(a) = A \setminus \{a\}$ for all $a \in A$). In some cases, declarations by the agents are not simultaneous, and

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 03E05; Secondary 03E20, 03E25.
Keywords: hat guessing game, hat puzzle, additive group, axiom of choice.

some agent a can hear some of other agents' declarations before declaring his own guess. We write $H(a)$ to denote the set of agents who declare their guesses before the agent a does.

Basically, a *strategy* for an agent $a \in A$ is a function G_a from $V(a) \dot{\cup} H(a) K$ to K , where $X \dot{\cup} Y$ means the union when we regard X and Y as their disjoint copies. This reflects the manner of each agent a , who guesses the color of his own hat from the colors of hats worn by agents in his vision $V(a)$ and the declarations of agents in his audition $H(a)$. We call a collection $P = \{\langle a, G_a \rangle : a \in A\}$ of all pairs of an agent and his strategy a *predictor*.

During the studies of hat puzzles, various protocols of guessing are suggested. Here we introduce several protocols and related results.

First, we consider a hat puzzle with complete visibility, where all agents declare their guesses at once. In other words, $V(a) = A \setminus \{a\}$ and $H(a) = \emptyset$ for all $a \in A$. Using the axiom of choice, in the case of $|K| = 2$, Lenstra proved a significant result (see [3, Theorem 3.3.1] for a proof).

Theorem 1.1 (Lenstra). *Consider a hat puzzle with an arbitrary set A of agents, the set $K = \{0, 1\}$ of colors, complete visibility and simultaneous declaration. Then there is a predictor under which all agents guess correctly or all agents guess incorrectly.*

Second, we consider a hat puzzle with the set A of agents and complete visibility, where a designated agent s declares first and then others do at once. We will call the agent s the *signaler*, and his declaration a *signal*. Note that $V(s) = A \setminus \{s\}$ and $H(s) = \emptyset$, and for all $a \in A \setminus \{s\}$, $V(a) = A \setminus \{a\}$ and $H(a) = \{s\}$. Hardin and Taylor showed, under $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$, that there is a *signaling predictor* if and only if there is a *Lenstra predictor* (See [3, Theorem 3.3.2]).

Theorem 1.2 ($\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$). *With an arbitrary set A of agents and the set $K = \{0, 1\}$ of hat colors, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *The visibility graph V is complete, and in the puzzle of one-in-advance protocol, there is a predictor under which all agents but the signaler guess correctly.*
- (2) *In the puzzle of simultaneous declaration, there is a predictor under which all agents guess correctly or all agents guess incorrectly.*

Third, we consider the following setting: The set A of agents is well-ordered by the relation $<_A$, and the visibility graph V is *one-way forward-complete*, that is, $V = \{\langle x, y \rangle \in A \times A : x <_A y\}$ (and hence $V(a) = \{x \in A : a <_A x\}$). The agents declare their guesses one by one along the order $<_A$.

Note that, for each $a \in A$, $H(a) = \{x \in A : x <_A a\}$. Geschke, Lubarsky and Rahn [2] studied such a protocol of hat puzzles with $A = \omega$ and $K = \{0, 1\}$, and obtained the following result.

Throughout the present paper, for a function φ with domain D , $d \in D$ and any value v , $\varphi[d|v]$ abbreviates the function $(\varphi \upharpoonright (D \setminus \{d\})) \cup \{\langle d, v \rangle\}$.

Definition 1.3. A function p from ${}^\omega 2$ to 2 is called a *parity function* if for any $f \in {}^\omega 2$ and $n \in \omega$, $p(f[n|0]) = 1 - p(f[n|1])$ holds.

Theorem 1.4 (ZF). *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *In the puzzle with the set $A = \omega$ of agents, the set $K = \{0, 1\}$ of colors, one-way forward-complete visibility and one-by-one declaration, there is a predictor ensuring all agents but the agent 0 guess correctly.*
- (2) *There is a parity function.*

It is not so hard to obtain a parity function under ZFC. Geschke, Lubarsky and Rahn pointed out that a parity function may not exist under $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$ [2, Theorem 10]. Theorem 1.4 tells us that the existence of such a predictor can be regarded as a weak choice principle (see [2, Section 4] for details).

Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 are all stated in the context of hat puzzles with two hat colors. In the following sections, we will integrate these theorems and generalize them to puzzles with more than two colors, assuming that the set K of colors is equipped with a structure of a commutative group. In particular, by letting K be the cyclic group of order 2 (that is, $K = \mathbb{Z}_2 = (\{0, 1\}, +)$), we obtain the original theorems as corollaries of our theorem.

2 Main result

Throughout this section, we consider hat puzzles with the set K of hat colors equipped with additive group operation $+$, and the set ω of agents. We vary visibility graphs and guessing protocols.

All the argument in this section can be done under $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$.

Definition 2.1. We consider a hat puzzle with complete visibility, where all agents declare their guesses at once. In this puzzle we describe a strategy G_a for each agent $a \in \omega$ by a function from ${}^\omega K$ to K such that the value $G_a(f)$ does not depend on the value of f at a . A predictor P in such a puzzle is called *biased* if, for every coloring $f \in {}^\omega K$ there is $k \in K$ such that $P_n(f) = f(n) + k$ holds for all $n \in \omega$.

Lenstra's theorem (Theorem 1.1) tells us that, in such a hat puzzle with $K = \{0, 1\}$, there is a predictor under which everyone's guess is correct or everyone's guess is incorrect. We call such a predictor a *Lenstra predictor*. Note that, when $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$, a predictor P is a biased predictor if and only if P is a Lenstra predictor. So we may regard a biased predictor as a generalization of a Lenstra predictor to the case when $|K| > 2$.

Definition 2.2. We consider a hat puzzle with complete visibility, where a designated signaler $s \in \omega$ declares first and then others do at once. We describe a strategy G_a for each agent $a \in \omega$ in such a puzzle in the following way: G_s is a function from ${}^\omega K$ to K such that $G_s(f)$ does not depend on the value of f at s , and for $a \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$, G_a is a function from ${}^\omega K \times K$ to K such that $G_a(f, k)$ does not depend on the value of f at a (the second argument k is intended to receive a signal). A predictor $P = \{\langle n, G_n \rangle : n \in \omega\}$ in such a puzzle is called *signal-biased* if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) For every coloring $f \in {}^\omega K$, $P_n(f, P_s(f)) = f(n)$ holds for every $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$ (everyone but the signaler guesses correctly).
- (2) For every coloring $f \in {}^\omega K$ and any two colors $k, l \in K$,

$$P_n(f, k) - P_n(f, l) = l - k$$

holds for every $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$.

In the case of $K = \{0, 1\}$, a predictor which satisfies the first clause in the above definition is called a *signaling* predictor [3, Theorem 3.3.2]. It is obvious that, when $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$, a signal-biased predictor is a signaling predictor.

Proposition 2.3. *When $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$, a signaling predictor is a signal-biased predictor.*

Proof. Let $s \in \omega$ be the designated signaler and $P = \{\langle n, G_n \rangle : n \in \omega\}$ be a signaling predictor. It suffices to show that, for every $f \in {}^\omega 2$ and every $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$, $G_n(f, 0) \neq G_n(f, 1)$ holds.

Suppose not, and choose $f \in {}^\omega 2$ and $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$ so that $G_n(f, 0) = G_n(f, 1) = i$. Let $f_0 = f[n|0]$ and $f_1 = f[n|1]$. Since the value of G_n does not depend on $f(n)$, we have

$$G_n(f_0, 0) = G_n(f_1, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad G_n(f_0, 1) = G_n(f_1, 1).$$

Since either f_0 or f_1 is identical to f , we have

$$G_n(f_0, 0) = G_n(f_1, 0) = i = G_n(f_0, 1) = G_n(f_1, 1)$$

This means that, whichever the value $f(n)$ is, and whichever the signal is, the strategy G_n suggests the same guess. In other words, G_n has no way to switch the guess when the color of the hat worn by the agent n is switched. This contradicts the assumption that P is a signaling predictor, which says that for *any* coloring f the predictor P tells the agent n the correct guess. \square

Definition 2.4. For an additive group $(K, +)$, a function p from ${}^\omega K$ to K is called a *K-parity function* if for any $f \in {}^\omega K$, $n \in \omega$ and $k, l \in K$, $p(f[n|k]) - p(f[n|l]) = l - k$ holds.

A parity function, which we defined in Definition 1.3, is nothing other than a \mathbb{Z}_2 -parity function.

Definition 2.5. We consider a hat puzzle with one-way forward-complete visibility, where agents declare their guesses one-by-one along the ordering on ω . In such a puzzle, we describe a strategy G_a of the agent a by a function from ${}^\omega K$ to K such that $G_a(f)$ does not depend on the value of f at a , since $V(a) \cap H(a) = \emptyset$ and $V(a) \cup H(a) = \omega \setminus \{a\}$ for each agent $a \in \omega$. A predictor P in such a puzzle is called *starter-biased* if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) For every coloring $f \in {}^\omega K$, $P_n(f[0|P_0(f)]) = f(n)$ holds for every $n \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$ (everyone but the agent 0 guesses correctly).
- (2) For every coloring $f \in {}^\omega K$ and any two colors $k, l \in K$,

$$P_n(f[0|k]) - P_n(f[0|l]) = l - k$$

holds for every $n \in \omega \setminus \{0\}$.

Theorem 2.6. For hat puzzles with the set ω of agents and a set K of hat colors equipped with an additive group operation $+$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) There is a biased predictor in the puzzle with complete visibility and at-once declaration.
- (2) There is a signal-biased predictor in the puzzle with complete visibility and one-in-advance declaration.
- (3) There is a starter-biased predictor in the puzzle with one-way forward-complete visibility and one-by-one declaration.
- (4) There is a *K-parity function*.

Proof. (1) \rightarrow (2): Suppose that $P^b = \{\langle n, G_n^b \rangle : n \in \omega\}$ is a biased predictor. We shall construct a signal-biased predictor $P^{sb} = \{\langle n, G_n^{sb} \rangle : n \in \omega\}$. Let $s \in \omega$ be the designated signaler. For each coloring $f \in {}^\omega K$, we set $G_s^{sb}(f) = G_s^b(f)$, and for $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$ and $x \in K$, $G_n^{sb}(f, x) = G_n^b(f) - (x - f(s))$. Now we verify that this works. It is easy to see that P^{sb} satisfies the second clause of the definition of a signal-biased predictor. Now fix $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$ and we will show that the agent n guesses correctly. Since P^b is a biased predictor, we have

$$G_n^b(f) - f(n) = G_s^b(f) - f(s),$$

and by the definition of G_n^{sb} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n^{sb}(f, G_s^{sb}(f)) &= G_n^b(f) - (G_s^b(f) - f(s)) \\ &= G_n^b(f) - (G_n^b(f) - f(n)) \\ &= f(n). \end{aligned}$$

(2) \rightarrow (1): Suppose that $P^{sb} = \{\langle n, G_n^{sb} \rangle : n \in \omega\}$ is a signal-biased predictor where s is the signaler. We shall construct a biased predictor $P^b = \{\langle n, G_n^b \rangle : n \in \omega\}$. For each $f \in {}^\omega K$, let $G_s^b(f) = G_s^{sb}(f)$ and for $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$, $G_n^b(f) = G_n^{sb}(f, f(s))$. It suffices to show that $G_n^b(f) - f(n) = G_s^b(f) - f(s)$ for every $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$. Since P^{sb} is a signal-biased predictor, we have

$$G_n^{sb}(f, f(s)) - G_n^{sb}(f, G_s^{sb}(f)) = G_s^{sb}(f) - f(s).$$

By the assumption, $G_n^{sb}(f, G_s^{sb}(f)) = f(n)$ holds. By the definition of G_n^b for $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n^b(f) - f(n) &= G_n^{sb}(f, f(s)) - f(n) \\ &= G_n^{sb}(f, G_s^{sb}(f)) + G_s^{sb}(f) - f(s) - f(n) \\ &= G_s^{sb}(f) - f(s). \end{aligned}$$

(2) \rightarrow (4): Suppose that $P^{sb} = \{\langle n, G_n^{sb} \rangle : n \in \omega\}$ is a signal-biased predictor where s is the signaler. We define $p : {}^\omega K \rightarrow K$ by letting

$$p(f) = G_s^{sb}(f) - f(s)$$

for each $f \in {}^\omega K$. We check that p is a K -parity function. Since $G_s^{sb}(f)$ does not depend on $f(s)$, we have $p(f[s|k]) - p(f[s|l]) = l - k$. For $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$, by the definition of p , we have

$$p(f[n|k]) - p(f[n|l]) = G_s^{sb}(f[n|k]) - G_s^{sb}(f[n|l]).$$

Now, under the predictor P^{sb} , every agent $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$ guesses correctly for any coloring f . Therefore,

$$G_n^{\text{sb}}(f[n|k], G_s^{\text{sb}}(f[n|k])) = k \quad \text{and} \quad G_n^{\text{sb}}(f[n|l], G_s^{\text{sb}}(f[n|l])) = l.$$

Since P^{sb} is signal-biased and the value of f at n does not affect the value of G_n^{sb} , we have

$$l - k = G_s^{\text{sb}}(f[n|k]) - G_s^{\text{sb}}(f[n|l]) = p(f[n|k]) - p(f[n|l]).$$

(4) \rightarrow (2): Suppose that $p : {}^\omega K \rightarrow K$ is a K -parity function. We define a predictor $P = \{\langle n, G_n \rangle\}$ for a one-in-advance protocol with the designated signaller $s \in \omega$. For each $f \in {}^\omega K$, let $G_s(f) = p(f)$, and for $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$ and $k \in K$ define $G_n(f, k)$ as

$$G_n(f, k) = i \iff p(f[n|i]) = k.$$

Note that, by the definition of a parity function, P is well-defined and satisfies the second clause of the definition of a signal-biased predictor. We will show that $G_n(f, G_s(f)) = f(n)$ for each $n \in \omega \setminus \{s\}$. Let $k = G_s(f) = p(f)$. Since $f[n|f(n)] = f$ trivially holds, we have $p(f[n|f(n)]) = k$, and by the definition of G_n we have $G_n(f, k) = f(n)$.

(3) \rightarrow (4): Suppose that, in a puzzle of one-by-one protocol with the set $\{t\} \cup \omega$ of agents, where t is the starter (that is, the $<$ -least agent), $P = \{\langle n, G_n \rangle : n \in \{t\} \cup \omega\}$ is a starter-biased predictor. We define a function p from ${}^\omega K$ to K by letting $p(f) = G_t(f)$ for each $f \in {}^\omega K$. To see that p is a K -parity function, fix $n \in \omega$ and $k, l \in K$. By the definition of G_t , we have $p(f[n|k]) = G_t(f[n|k])$ and $p(f[n|l]) = G_t(f[n|l])$. Since the strategy G_n makes a correct guess and the value of G_n does not depend on the value at n of the function in the argument, we have

$$G_n(\{\langle t, p(f[n|k]) \rangle\} \cup f) = k \quad \text{and} \quad G_n(\{\langle t, p(f[n|l]) \rangle\} \cup f) = l.$$

Since P is a starter-biased predictor, $p(f[n|k]) - p(f[n|l]) = l - k$ holds.

(4) \rightarrow (3): Suppose that $p : {}^\omega K \rightarrow K$ is a K -parity function. We work in a puzzle of one-by-one protocol with the set $\{t\} \cup \omega$ of agents, where t is the starter (that is, the $<$ -least agent). We define a predictor $P = \{\langle n, G_n \rangle : n \in \{t\} \cup \omega\}$. For each $f \in {}^\omega K$, let $G_t(f) = p(f)$, and for each $n \in \omega$ define $G_n(\{\langle t, k \rangle\} \cup f)$ by

$$G_n(\{\langle t, k \rangle\} \cup f) = i \iff p(f[n|i]) = k.$$

By the definition of G_n and the property of p , P is well-defined and satisfies the second clause of the definition of a starter-biased predictor. We will show,

by induction on n , $G_n(\{\langle t, p(f) \rangle\} \cup f) = f(n)$ holds for every $n \in \omega$. Fix $n \in \omega$ and assume that every agent before n except for t guesses correctly. Then the agent n will declare $i = G_n(\{\langle t, p(f) \rangle\} \cup f)$. By the definition of G_n , we have $p(f[n|i]) = p(f)$, and by the property of p , $i = f(n)$ holds. \square

3 Conclusion

Here we check the existence of a K -parity function under ZFC.

Proposition 3.1. *For any additive group $(K, +)$, there is a K -parity function.*

Proof. Define an equivalence relation $=^*$ on ${}^\omega K$ as follows:

$$f =^* g \text{ if and only if } \{n \in \omega : f(n) \neq g(n)\} \text{ is finite.}$$

Fix a complete system $A \subseteq {}^\omega K$ of representatives of the relation $=^*$. Define a function φ from ${}^\omega K$ to K as follows: For $f \in {}^\omega K$, let \tilde{f} be the unique member of A with $f =^* \tilde{f}$, and define $\varphi(f)$ by

$$\varphi(f) = \sum_{n \in \omega} (\tilde{f}(n) - f(n)).$$

It is easy to see that φ is well-defined and is a K -parity function. \square

Note that, as we mentioned in Section 1, a \mathbb{Z}_2 -parity function may not exist under $\text{ZF} + \text{DC}$. So we regard any of the condition listed in Theorem 2.6 as an identical weak choice principle.

In the case of $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$, Theorem 2.6 leads the following result, which extends both Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.4.

Corollary 3.2. *For hat puzzles with the set ω of agents and the set $K = \{0, 1\}$ of hat colors, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *There is a Lenstra predictor in the puzzle with complete visibility and simultaneous declaration.*
- (2) *There is a signaling predictor in the puzzle with complete visibility and one-in-advance declaration.*
- (3) *In the puzzle with one-way forward-complete visibility and one-by-one declaration along the order on ω , there is a predictor under which everyone but the agent 0 guesses correctly.*
- (4) *There is a parity function.*

References

- [1] M. Gardner. *The 2nd Scientific American Book of Mathematical Puzzles and Diversions*. Simon and Schuster, 1959.
- [2] S. Geschke, R. Lubarsky, and M. Rahn. Choice and the hat game. In *Infinitary combinatorics in set theory and its applications*, number 1949 in RIMS Kokyuroku, pages 34–44. Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, 2015.
- [3] C. S. Hardin and A. D. Taylor. *The Mathematics of Coordinated Inference*. Springer, 2010.

MASARU KADA

Graduate School of Science, Osaka Prefecture University
1-1 Gakuen-cho, Naka-ku, Sakai Osaka 599-8531 JAPAN
kada@mi.s.osakafu-u.ac.jp

SOUJI SHIZUMA

Graduate School of Science, Osaka Prefecture University
1-1 Gakuen-cho, Naka-ku, Sakai Osaka 599-8531 JAPAN
dd305001@edu.osakafu-u.ac.jp