

Memory depth of finite state machine strategies for the iterated prisoner's dilemma

T.J. Gaffney^{*1}, Marc Harper¹, and Vincent A. Knight²

¹Google Inc., Mountain View, CA, United States of America

²Cardiff University, School of Mathematics, Cardiff, United Kingdom

April 8, 2024

Abstract

We develop an efficient algorithm to determine the memory-depth of finite state machines and apply the algorithm to a collection of iterated prisoner's dilemma strategies. The calculation agrees with the memory-depth of other representations of common strategies such as Tit-For-Tat, Tit-For-2-Tats, etc. which are typically represented by lookup tables. Our algorithm allows the complexity of finite state machine based strategies to be characterized on the same footing as memory- n strategies.

1 Introduction

The Prisoner's dilemma is a classic game-theoretic model of competitive interactions. As a one shot-game it has a non-cooperative Nash equilibrium, however with repeated play cooperative strategies can be effective. The Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma (IPD) has been studied extensively in tournaments, population games, and via systematic searches for effective strategies to the repeated game. Though strategies can be arbitrarily complex, Robert Axelrod and collaborators showed that simple strategies such as Tit-for-Tat (TFT) could defeat many more-complicated strategies [5] in tournament settings.

Subsequent research has investigated the effect of complexity on the performance of strategies [3]. In many cases memory-depth, defined by the amount of rounds of history used to decide the next action, has served as a proxy for complexity [3]. A strategy requiring n rounds of the history is called a memory- n strategy. TFT is a memory-one strategy depending only on the opponent's previous action, as are many recently defined strategies such as zero-determinant strategies [12]. It has been shown, in some contexts, that longer-memory strategies are more evolutionary stable [11]. More generally, strategies with long memories have been observed to outperform shorter-memory strategies [2, 8, 10] in various contexts.

Researchers have also evolved or otherwise trained strategies to compete in various IPD contexts [4, 7]. Such processes can produce strategies of substantially varying complexity. Generally these processes require an encoding of a subset of the space of all strategies into a representation that can breed and mutate. Two such representations are lookup tables and finite state machine (FSM) [3]. Lookup tables have a fixed memory-depth and one can easily restrict a population to individuals of fixed depth with an evolutionary algorithm. [9] showed that longer such strategies (up to four states) performed better in a pool with shorter strategies.

In contrast, the transitions of a finite state machine may vary with simple variations, and the memory-depth is not simply the number of states, though some authors have used the number of states as a measure of complexity. The literature has not previously defined memory-depth of FSM strategies, perhaps due to the non-triviality of the calculation. Ashlock et al [4] showed that fewer-state strategies tend to appear in evolved populations. Nevertheless, the memory-depth of a finite state machine is often infinite, requiring the entirety of the history of play.

Since strategies may be represented or implemented in many ways, a representation agnostic definition of complexity such as memory-depth is preferable to a parameter-based definition such as the number of states of a finite state machine. This paper defines an efficient algorithm to calculate the memory-depth of a FSM strategy, allowing a comparability of complexity to strategies represented in other ways.

Table 1: Payoffs Matrix for Prisoner’s Dilemma

	Cooperate	Defect
Cooperate	(3, 3)	(0, 5)
Defect	(5, 0)	(1, 1)

2 Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma, Memory Depth, and Finite State Machines

The Prisoner’s Dilemma is a simple game where each player chooses to cooperate or defect. The two players choose their move at the same time, and receive the cooresponding payoff shown in Table 1. The IPD has two players play each other repeatedly. Players form strategies to decide when to cooperate and when to defect, taking into account what happened in previous turns.

A *strategy* is any set of rules for how to play the prisoner’s dilemma; for example a simple (but effective) strategy, called Tit-For-Tat (TFT), acts by copying the opponent’s previous move. A strategy may use any general rule to respond to past turns. For example, the Go-By-Majority strategy is a strategy that cooperates if the opponent has cooperated at least half the time. The *memory-depth* of a strategy is the smallest amount of recent history that a strategy needs to know in order to choose the next move. For example, TFT only needs to know what the opponent did last turn to make a decision; a variant Tit-For-Two-Tats (TF2T) defects only after two opponent defects, and therefore has a memory-depth of two. Generally speaking, we say a strategy has memory-depth n if n is the smallest number for which the strategy would work the same if it only had knowledge of the previous n moves (including its own previous n moves). Some strategies need their entire history; we say that these strategies have infinite memory-depth. For example, the Go-By-Majority strategy needs to know the entire play history at any point in order to know what to do next. We say that such a strategy has infinite memory-depth.

Some strategies are most-easily described by how they respond to a few previous moves. One example is the Fortress-3 strategy, shown in Figure 2. (When a strategy is defined with a table of previous n moves, like this, we call the table a *lookup representation*.) This strategy defects unless the previous three opponent moves are defects. The memory depth is therefore 3.¹ With a lookup representation, it is easy to see what the memory-depth is, but not all strategies are represented as lookups. The definition of memory-depth is independent of strategy representation. In this paper we explore memory-depth of strategies represented as an FSM (defined below).

Table 2: Lookup table Fortress-3


Previous Three Opponent Moves	Strategy’s Next Move
C, C, C	D
C, C, D	D
C, D, C	D
C, D, D	D
D, C, C	D
D, C, D	D
D, D, C	D
D, D, D	C

An FSM is specified by $(S, \Sigma, \Gamma, s_0, \delta, \omega)$, where S is the set of states, Σ is a set of input symbols, Γ is a set of output symbols, s_0 is an initial state, $\delta : S \times \Sigma \rightarrow S$ is a state-transition function, and $\omega : S \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is an output function. It starts in state s_0 , and (when in state s) responds to an input, $\sigma \in \Sigma$, by outputting $\omega(s, \sigma)$, and transitioning to state $\delta(s, \sigma)$.² We further say that two states, s_i and s_j , have the same *response sets* if $\omega(s_i, \sigma) = \omega(s_j, \sigma)$, for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, that is, if the mapping from input action to output action is the same for the two

¹This strategy only uses the opponent’s previous three moves, but in general a memory-depth 3 strategy could also use information about its own previous three moves.

²Notation from Soucha [13]

Figure 1: Finite state machine for Fortress-3



states.

Some strategies are naturally described as a FSM. For example, the Fortress-3 strategy described above can be described by the FSM in Figure 1. State 1 represents a state where the last opponent move was a defect, state 2 represents a state where the last opponent move was a cooperation, state 3 represents a state where the last two opponent moves were cooperations, and state 4 represents a state where three or more of the opponent's most recent moves are cooperations.³ Using this as an example, we can see that each state has two outgoing edges, one for each possible opponent action: In state 3 the outgoing edges are C/C going to state 4 and D/D going to state 1. This means that in state 3, the strategy responds to a cooperation by cooperating and switching to state 4, and to a defection with a defection and a switch to state 1. Similarly, in state 1 the outgoing edges are C/D going to state 2 and D/D returning to state 1. The strategy responds to a cooperation by defecting and switching to state 4, and to a defection by defecting and staying in state 1.

There is not an obvious way to read memory-depth from a strategy represented as an FSM. Generally there is no close connection between number of states and memory-depth; the number of states is dependent on the representation, while memory-depth exists for any strategy independent of representation. Memory-depth is the amount of history required to decide the next move. For FSMs the next move is given immediately by the current state, which may suggest that the next move can be determined immediately. However the current state is an internal variable, based on the history. Just as GoByMajority updates an internal variable tracking portion of time opponent cooperated, a FSM updates an internal variable tracking state.⁴ And like with GoByMajority's internal state, it may take all the history to reconstruct an FSM's internal state (as demonstrated in 5, below). This paper describes a way to calculate the memory-depth for any strategy that can be represented by a FSM.

Though our algorithm is general, we apply it here to strategies for the IPD. The FSMs define the strategies: the inputs are the opponent's previous action and the outputs are the strategy's reaction. The only possible moves are Cooperate (C) and Defect (D) so $\Sigma = \Gamma = \{C, D\}$. A machine may have any finite number of states.

3 Modified PDS Algorithm


There is a body of research that explores the following question: what is the shortest sequence of input actions for which the output actions can distinguish which state the machine is in? Such a sequence is called *distinguishing sequence*. There have been many answers to this question, which are reviewed in Soucha [13]. Our memory-depth question differs in a few ways: Firstly our memory question looks backwards instead of forwards. Secondly we only want to be able to distinguish between states with different response sets, not to distinguish all states. Thirdly we seek not the shortest distinguishing sequence, rather we must find a depth for which all sequences of that depth are distinguishing. This is equivalent to finding the longest *non-distinguishing sequence*, and adding one.

Despite these differences, one of the approaches in the existing literature can be easily adapted, though inefficiently. The Preset Distinguishing Sequence (PDS) algorithm [13] [6] builds all sequences of possible future moves,

³This could also be presented as a three-state FSM, since states 3 and 4 behave the same.

⁴ Generally determining the current state is sufficient but not necessary to decide the next move, because multiple states may have the same result set; in that case we don't need to determine which of those states the strategy is in. The existing literature sometimes requires "minimal" machines, which precludes such pairs of states, but this is too restrictive for our purposes.

Figure 2: Reverse distinguishing tree for Fortress-3



stopping when it finds the shortest distinguishing sequence. As a modified approach, we could instead build backwards, calling a sequence distinguishing when all the terminal states have the same response set, continuing until the longest non-distinguishing sequence has been found.

The algorithm involves building a *reverse distinguishing tree*, which is a predecessor tree. Formally, the algorithm has the following steps:

1. Make a root node for a tree, containing a *path* for each state $s \in S$. A path is just an object with a *terminal* and a *current* state, written as (s_t, s_c) . We initially set both terminal and current states to s .
2. For each leaf in the tree (initially just the root), if all the terminal states in the leaf have the same response set, then we mark that leaf as "resolved."
3. For each non-resolved leaf, walk backward from current states, while keeping track of terminal states. That is, for each non-resolved leaf, P , build child nodes, $\{C_\sigma\}$ in the following way: For each path, (s_t, s_c) in P , and each transition $\delta(s_c, \sigma) = s_t$, put a path (s_t, s_c) .
4. Repeat steps 2 and 3 until all leaves are resolved. The height of the tree (in the number of nodes) is the memory-depth.

To see how the algorithm works with an example, we will continue with our Fortress-3 strategy from above: The only state that can follow C/C is 4. The only state that can follow D/D is 1. However a C/D could indicate either a transition from 1 to 2 or from 2 to 3. At this point, state 1 (terminal state 2) can only have D/D feed into it, and state 2 (terminal state 3) can only have C/D feed into it. We build the reverse distinguishing tree in Figure 2; in drawing the graph, we only write the terminal states for the paths of a leaf.

When all the leaves are resolved (as in Figure 2) the algorithm halts. We can then determine the memory-depth. For this example, at the bottom-most leaf, in order to distinguish between response sets, we need the input actions. This is the opponent's action from three turns ago. Therefore the memory-depth is three. Generally, the memory-depth cannot be inferred by the height of the tree alone, because the output action is the strategy's own action two turns ago. Hence it matters how the bottom layer is distinguished. To handle this we shift the nodes so that an edge is on the same level of memory as shown in Figure 3.

With this setup it will always be the case that the height of the fully resolved tree (or rather height minus one since we're counting edges) is the memory-depth of the strategy. (The * is used to specify that opponent action in the most recent turn won't affect the state the strategy is on.)

We will find it convenient later to rewrite this so that actions are matched with the state, as we do in Figure 4. We call a state along with the incoming/outgoing actions a *memit* (or memory unit). With this representation we write current states instead of terminal states. It's less clear from the representation that the nodes with $D1_D, D2_D, D3_D, D4_D$ are resolved, but they are in this case because they all represent paths with the same terminal node. A useful property of this representation is that the same children follow from a fixed parent, regardless of the position in the graph. This repeated calculation is the motivation for the more efficient algorithm of the next section.

Since the memory-depth of FSMs are often infinite, there is no guarantee of convergence. We look at a simple example: Consider a strategy (shown in Figure 5) that in state 1 will cooperate (regardless of opponent action), and in state 2 will respond in kind to either a cooperate or a defect, and with every opponent cooperation the

Figure 3: Shifted reverse distinguishing tree for Fortress-3




Figure 4: Memit reverse distinguishing tree for Fortress-3





Figure 5: FSM graph of infinite strategy



strategy switches states. An arbitrarily long chain of C/C could occur without us knowing the state, and therefore we wouldn't know how to respond to a defect. If we trace our algorithm, we would find a never-ending branch of C/C and so this algorithm doesn't have a good way to detect infinite-memory strategies. However in the next section, we see that finite-memory strategies will converge after at most S^2 steps.

The Modified PDS algorithm, though intuitive, is slow as the number of branches can grow exponentially. Moreover since we have to run the algorithm many times before we can conclude that a strategy has infinite memory, it is impractical. The following algorithm addresses both these points.

4 Memit Pair Algorithm

A better approach is to look at pairs of memits. If there is a sequence that is not distinguishable, then there will be a sequence of memit pairs that will be indistinguishable at every step. So we look instead for such a sequence of pairs. To do this, we build a graph where the nodes are all memit pairs that are not distinguishable by their actions. An edge between a pair of memits (A, B) to another pair of memits (C, D) exists if there's a transition from A to C and a from B to D (or $A \rightarrow D, B \rightarrow C$.) Then we find the longest path in this graph.

The algorithm works as follows.

1. Make a *memit graph*, where the nodes are all possible memits, represented as triples: (incoming player action, state, outgoing opponent action). Make an edge from memit (a, X, b) to (c, Y, d) if the response to an opponent action b when in state X is to respond c and move to state Y . Said mathematically, $\omega(X, b) = c, \delta(X, b) = Y$.
2. Make a *memit pair graph*, where the nodes are all pair of memits (a, X, b) and (c, Y, d) for which the states are different ($X \neq Y$), but the actions are the same ($a = c, b = d$). Label this (a, X, Y, b) and count this the same as (a, Y, X, b) , making only one node for both. Make an edge from memit-pair (a, X, Y, b) to memit-pair (c, Z, W, d) , if there are edges (in the memit graph) $(a, X, b) \rightarrow (c, Z, d)$ and $(a, Y, b) \rightarrow (c, W, d)$. [Or if there are edges $(a, X, b) \rightarrow (c, W, d)$ and $(a, Y, b) \rightarrow (c, Z, d)$.]
3. For each node in the memit pair graph for which the states in the memit pair have distinct response sets, find the longest path ending on that node. If there is a path ending at that memit pair which has a cycle, then count as infinite.
4. The number of nodes in the longest of these paths plus one is the memory-depth.

As an example, consider a run of the algorithm on the Fortress-3 strategy from above. We first draw the full memit graph in Figure 6, and the graph of memit pairs in Figure 7. We see that there is a path, for example, from the memit pair $(D, 1, 2, C)$ to $(D, 2, 3, D)$ because in the memit graph $(D, 1, C)$ maps to $(D, 2, D)$ and $(D, 2, C)$ maps to $(D, 3, D)$.

To see how this would work for the infinite-memory case, we will repeat this calculation for the two-state strategy of Figure 5. The memit graph is shown in Figure 8 and the memit-pair graph is shown in Figure 9. What makes this memory infinite is the loop between $c1c$ and $c2c$, which forms a self-loop on this memit pair.

It is important for this example that state 1 and state 2 have different response sets, which is required in step 3 of the algorithm. To demonstrate why, we consider TFT written with two states, shown in Figure 10. TFT responds in kind to the opponent's previous move; it has memory-depth one and is usually represented with just one state. However when we write it as two states, it yields the memit-pair graph in Figure 11, which has loops, which seems to imply an infinite memory. This can be explained by the fact that states 1 and 2 have the same response set, and therefore there is no path ending in a node with a pair of states having different response sets.⁵

⁵Because there are no such paths, this must be handled specially, as described in step 4 below.

Figure 6: Memit graph of Fortress-3 strategy




Figure 7: Memit-pair graph of Fortress-3 strategy




Figure 8: Memit graph of infinite memory strategy




Figure 9: Memit-pair graph of infinte memory strategy




Figure 10: FSM graph of two-state TFT





Figure 11: Memit-pair graph of two-state TFT



5 Algorithm Pseudocode

In this section, we show the implementation of the algorithm in pseudocode. The algorithm is implemented and tested in full in the Axelrod library for Python [1] (version 4.7.0 at the time of writing).⁶

We break down the algorithm into five steps:

1. Reduce graph to reachable states from the initial state, deleting unreachable nodes, and edges to or from them.
2. Build memit graph, as described above.
3. Build memit-pair graph, as described above.
4. If there are no tied memits, then manually check if the memory-depth is 0 (all actions are the same) or 1 (otherwise).⁷
5. Otherwise, for each memit-pair node, for which the memits have a different response set, find the longest path (in the memit-pair graph) ending at that node. If there is a loop in the path, then we say that the memory-depth is infinite. The memory-depth is the length (in nodes) of the longest such path plus one.

Step 4 is self-explanatory, and steps 1 and 5 are well-known graph calculations, so these are omitted here. Algorithms for steps 2 and 3 are shown below. For these algorithms, we will call memits (*in_action*, *state*, *out_action*). For algorithm 2, we say that two memits are equal if their *in_action* and *out_action* are the same, and the states are different.

Algorithm 1: Build memit graph, per step 2.

Input: FSM given as list of graph transitions, (*current_state*, *opponents_last_action*, *next_state*, *response*).

Output: MemitGraph

```

1 Initialize incoming_actions, a map from states to incoming actions
2 foreach Transition in FSM do
3   | Add response action to incoming_actions with key next_state
4 end
5 foreach Transition in FSM do
6   | foreach in_action in incoming_actions[current_state] do
7     | foreach out_action in Defect and Cooperate do
8       |   Set start_node to (in_action, current_state, opponents_last_action)
9       |   Set end_node to (response, next_state, out_action)
10      |   Add an edge from start_node to end_node to Memit Graph
11      | end
12   | end
13 end

```

The runtime of the first two steps in the algorithm is linear in the S , number of states of the FSM. Building the memit-pair graph involves looping through all pairs of memits, which will take $O(S^2)$ time. The resulting memit-pair graph will have $O(S^2)$ vertices, and $O(S^2)$ edges, since each vertex can only have at most two edges leaving it. Step 5 loops through every vertex, and for each vertex finds the longest path using a search that will, at most, reach every vertex. The total runtime of this step is $O(S^4)$, which is the longest step.

As we trace a path in Step 5 of the above algorithm, we can see the work that would have to be done in the Modified PDS algorithm of the previous section. A path of length n on the memit-pair represents a unresolved complete tree with depth n .⁸ In the worst case scenario, the modified PDS algorithm would need a tree of size $O(2^{S^2})$ to resolve a pair of states.

⁶ In the algorithm, we formally reverse the graph, but here we just describe the algorithm as looking backwards.

⁷ This is a special case, since, as we see below, we add one to the length of the longest path to get the memory-depth. So there's no way that the general algorithm can detect a memory-0 strategy.

⁸ We can see now that if the Modified PDS algorithm does not converge after a depth of S^2 , then it must be an infinite-memory strategy.

Algorithm 2: Build memit-pair graph, per step 3.

Input: MemitGraph, given as adjacency lists, $\{successors[memit]\}$

Output: MemitPairGraph

```

1 foreach  $x \in \text{Memit}s, y \in \text{Memit}s : x = y$  do
2   | Add  $(x, y)$  to the memit-pair graph
3   foreach  $sx \in successors[x], sy \in successors[y] : sx = sy$  do
4   |   | Add an edge from  $(x, y)$  to  $(sx, sy)$ 
5   end
6 end

```

6 Data Analysis

The Axelrod library currently has 17 strategies to the IPD that are represented as FSMs, from various literature sources and in some cases trained by evolutionary algorithms. We list these in Table 3 along with the number of states used to build the FSM and the memory-depth. We see that the strategies naturally described by a FSM are often infinite memory-depth.

Table 3: Memory-depths and number of states for Axelrod FSM strategies

<u>Strategy Name</u>	<u>States</u>	<u>Memory Depth</u>
Fortress 3	3	2
Fortress 4	4	3
Predator	9	∞
Pun1	2	∞
Raider	4	∞
Ripoff	3	3
Usually Cooperates	2	∞
Usually Defects	2	∞
Solution B1	3	2
Solution B5	6	∞
Thumper	2	∞
Evolved FSM 4	4	∞
Evolved FSM 16	16	∞
Evolved FSM 16 Noise 05	16	∞
TF1	16	∞
TF2	16	∞
TF3	16	∞

7 Discussion

We have defined an efficient algorithm for computing the memory-depth of finite state machine strategies that can be used to understand the complexity of such strategies on equal footing with strategies otherwise implemented or represented. We applied the algorithm to a set of finite state machine strategies in the Axelrod library, which includes over 200 strategies and all of the 63 strategies in Axelrod’s second tournament as of library version 4.6.0., some of which were evolved for various environments (see table 6). As most of these finite state machine strategies are infinite, and these strategies are among the best performers in the Axelrod library, our algorithm demonstrates that longer memory strategies can in fact outperform simpler strategies such as TFT (also included in the library). There may, however, be similarly high performing strategies of smaller memory-depth. Evolutionary processes can easily change a finite memory strategy into a longer or infinite one. Given the algorithm presented in this paper, future strategy development could restrict the space of FSM strategies to those of a maximum memory-depth.

References

- [1] The Axelrod project developers , *Axelrod: 4.7.0*, April 2016.
- [2] Christoph Adami and Arend Hintze, *Evolutionary instability of zero-determinant strategies demonstrates that winning is not everything*, Nature communications **4** (2013), 2193.
- [3] Daniel Ashlock and Eun-Youn Kim, *The impact of varying resources available to iterated prisoner’s dilemma agents*, 2013 IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computational Intelligence (FOCI), IEEE, apr 2013.
- [4] W. Ashlock and D. Ashlock, *Changes in prisoner’s dilemma strategies over evolutionary time with different population sizes*, 2006 IEEE International Conference on Evolutionary Computation, IEEE, 2006.
- [5] Robert Axelrod and William D Hamilton, *The evolution of cooperation*, science **211** (1981), no. 4489, 1390–1396.
- [6] R.G. Deshmukh and G.N. Hawat, *An algorithm to determine shortest length distinguishing, homing, and synchronizing sequences for sequential machines*, Conference Record Southcon, IEEE, 1994.
- [7] Marc Harper, Vincent Knight, Martin Jones, Georgios Koutsovoulos, Nikoleta E. Glynatsi, and Owen Campbell, *Reinforcement learning produces dominant strategies for the iterated prisoner’s dilemma*, PLOS ONE **12** (2017), no. 12, e0188046.
- [8] Vincent Knight, Marc Harper, Nikoleta E. Glynatsi, and Owen Campbell, *Evolution reinforces cooperation with the emergence of self-recognition mechanisms: An empirical study of strategies in the moran process for the iterated prisoner’s dilemma*, PLOS ONE **13** (2018), no. 10, e0204981.
- [9] Mikaela Leas, Emily Dolson, Riley Annis, Joshua Nahum, Laura Grabowski, and Charles Ofria, *The prisoners dilemma, memory, and the early evolution of intelligence*, Proceedings of the Artificial Life Conference 2016, MIT Press, 2016.
- [10] Christopher Lee, Marc Harper, and Dashiell Fryer, *The art of war: Beyond memory-one strategies in population games*, PloS one **10** (2015), no. 3, e0120625.
- [11] Jiawei Li and Graham Kendall, *The effect of memory size on the evolutionary stability of strategies in iterated prisoner’s dilemma*, IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation **18** (2014), no. 6, 819–826.
- [12] W. H. Press and F. J. Dyson, *Iterated prisoner’s dilemma contains strategies that dominate any evolutionary opponent*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **109** (2012), no. 26, 10409–10413.
- [13] Michal Soucha, *Finite state machine state identification sequences*, Bachelor’s thesis, Czech Technical University in Prague, 2014.