

# How strong can the Parrondo effect be? II

S. N. Ethier\* and Jiyeon Lee†

## Abstract

Parrondo's coin-tossing games comprise two games,  $A$  and  $B$ . The result of game  $A$  is determined by the toss of a fair coin. The result of game  $B$  is determined by the toss of a  $p_0$ -coin if capital is a multiple of  $r$ , and by the toss of a  $p_1$ -coin otherwise. In either game, the player wins one unit with heads and loses one unit with tails. Game  $B$  is fair if  $(1 - p_0)(1 - p_1)^{r-1} = p_0 p_1^{r-1}$ . In a previous paper we showed that, if the parameters of game  $B$ , namely  $r$ ,  $p_0$ , and  $p_1$ , are allowed to be arbitrary, subject to the fairness constraint, and if the two (fair) games  $A$  and  $B$  are played in an arbitrary periodic sequence, then the rate of profit can not only be positive (the so-called Parrondo effect), but also be arbitrarily close to 1 (i.e., 100%). Here we prove the same conclusion for a random sequence of the two games instead of a periodic one, that is, at each turn game  $A$  is played with probability  $\gamma$  and game  $B$  is played otherwise, where  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$  is arbitrary.

*Keywords:* Parrondo games; rate of profit; strong law of large numbers; stationary distribution; random walk on the  $n$ -cycle

2010 MSC: Primary 60J10; secondary 60F15

## 1 Introduction

The flashing Brownian ratchet of Ajdari and Prost (1992) is a stochastic model in statistical physics that is also of interest to biologists in connection with so-called molecular motors. In 1996 J. M. R. Parrondo proposed a toy model of the flashing Brownian ratchet involving two coin-tossing games. Both of the games,  $A$  and  $B$ , are individually fair or losing, whereas the random mixture (toss a fair coin to determine whether game  $A$  or game  $B$  is played) is winning, as are periodic sequences of the games, such as  $AABB AABB AABB \dots$ .

Harmer and Abbott (1999) described the games explicitly. For simplicity, we omit the bias parameter, so that both games are fair. Let us define a  $p$ -coin to be a coin with probability  $p$  of heads. In Parrondo's original games, game

---

\*Department of Mathematics, University of Utah, 155 S. 1400 E., Salt Lake City, UT 84112.

†Department of Statistics, Yeungnam University, 280 Daehak-Ro, Gyeongsan, Gyeongbuk 38541, South Korea.

Game  $A$  uses a fair coin, while game  $B$  uses two biased coins, a  $p_0$ -coin if capital is a multiple of 3 and a  $p_1$ -coin otherwise, where

$$p_0 = \frac{1}{10} \quad \text{and} \quad p_1 = \frac{3}{4}. \quad (1)$$

The player wins one unit with heads and loses one unit with tails. Both games are fair, but the random mixture, denoted by  $\frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{2}B$ , has long-term cumulative profit per game played (hereafter, rate of profit)

$$\mu(\frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{2}B) = \frac{18}{709} \approx 0.0253879, \quad (2)$$

and the pattern  $AABB$ , repeated ad infinitum, has rate of profit

$$\mu(AABB) = \frac{4}{163} \approx 0.0245399. \quad (3)$$

Dinis (2008) found that the pattern  $ABABB$  (or any cyclic permutation of it) has the highest rate of profit, namely

$$\mu(ABABB) = \frac{3613392}{47747645} \approx 0.0756769. \quad (4)$$

How large can these rates of profit be if we vary the parameters of the games, subject to a fairness constraint?

Game  $A$  is always the same fair-coin-tossing game. With  $r \geq 3$  an integer, game  $B$  is a mod  $r$  capital-dependent game that uses two biased coins, a  $p_0$ -coin ( $p_0 < \frac{1}{2}$ ) if capital is a multiple of  $r$ , and a  $p_1$ -coin ( $p_1 > \frac{1}{2}$ ) otherwise. The probabilities  $p_0$  and  $p_1$  must be such that game  $B$  is fair, requiring the constraint

$$(1 - p_0)(1 - p_1)^{r-1} = p_0 p_1^{r-1},$$

or equivalently,

$$p_0 = \frac{\rho^{r-1}}{1 + \rho^{r-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad p_1 = \frac{1}{1 + \rho} \quad (5)$$

for some  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . The special case of  $r = 3$  and  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  gives (1).

The games are played randomly or periodically. Specifically, we consider the random mixture  $\gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B$  (game  $A$  is played with probability  $\gamma$  and game  $B$  is played otherwise) as well as the pattern  $\Gamma(A, B)$ , repeated ad infinitum. We denote the rate of profit by

$$\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) \quad \text{or} \quad \mu(r, \rho, \Gamma(A, B)),$$

so that the rates of profit in (2)–(4) in this notation become  $\mu(3, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{2}B)$ ,  $\mu(3, \frac{1}{3}, AABB)$ , and  $\mu(3, \frac{1}{3}, ABABB)$ .

How large can  $\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$  and  $\mu(r, \rho, \Gamma(A, B))$  be? The answer, at least in the second case, is that it can be arbitrarily close to 1 (i.e., 100%):

**Theorem 1** (Ethier and Lee (2019)).

$$\sup_{r \geq 3, \rho \in (0,1), \Gamma(A,B) \text{ arbitrary}} \mu(r, \rho, \Gamma(A, B)) = 1.$$

In the first case the question was left open, and it is the aim of this paper to resolve that issue. It turns out that the conclusion is the same:

**Theorem 2.**

$$\sup_{r \geq 3, \rho \in (0,1), \gamma \in (0,1)} \mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) = 1.$$

This will be seen to be a consequence of Corollary 5 below.

We can compute  $\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$  and  $\mu(r, \rho, \Gamma(A, B))$  for  $r \geq 3$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ , and patterns  $\Gamma(A, B)$ . Indeed, the method of Ethier and Lee (2009) applies if  $r$  is odd, and generalizations of it apply if  $r$  is even; see Section 2 for details in the random mixture case and Ethier and Lee (2019) in the periodic pattern case. For example,

$$\mu(3, \rho, \tfrac{1}{2}A + \tfrac{1}{2}B) = \frac{9(1 - \rho)^3(1 + \rho)}{2(35 + 70\rho + 78\rho^2 + 70\rho^3 + 35\rho^4)} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\mu(3, \rho, AAB B) = \frac{3(1 - \rho)^3(1 + \rho)}{8(3 + 6\rho + 7\rho^2 + 6\rho^3 + 3\rho^4)}. \quad (7)$$

These and other examples suggest that typically  $\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$  and  $\mu(r, \rho, \Gamma(A, B))$  are decreasing in  $\rho$  (for fixed  $r$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\Gamma(A, B)$ ), hence maximized at  $\rho = 0$ . We excluded the case  $\rho = 0$  in (5), but now we want to include it. We find from (6) and (7) that

$$\mu(3, 0, \tfrac{1}{2}A + \tfrac{1}{2}B) = \frac{9}{70} \approx 0.128571 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(3, 0, AAB B) = \frac{1}{8} = 0.125,$$

which are substantial increases over  $\mu(3, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{2}B)$  and  $\mu(3, \frac{1}{3}, AAB B)$  (see (2) and (3)). We can do slightly better by choosing  $\gamma$  optimally:

$$\mu(3, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) = \frac{3\gamma(1 - \gamma)(2 - \gamma)}{(2 + \gamma)(4 - \gamma)},$$

so  $\max_{\gamma} \mu(3, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) \approx 0.133369$ , achieved at  $\gamma \approx 0.407641$ . Similarly, we can do considerably better by choosing the optimal pattern  $ABAB B$ :

$$\mu(3, 0, ABAB B) = \frac{9}{25} = 0.36. \quad (8)$$

Thus, we take  $\rho = 0$  in what follows.

Theorem 1 was shown to follow from the next theorem.

**Theorem 3** (Ethier and Lee (2019)). *Let  $r \geq 3$  be an odd integer and  $s$  be a positive integer. Then*

$$\mu(r, 0, (AB)^s B^{r-2}) = \frac{r}{2s + r - 2} \frac{2^s - 1}{2^s + 1},$$

*regardless of initial capital.*

*Let  $r \geq 4$  be an even integer and  $s$  be a positive integer. Then*

$$\mu(r, 0, (AB)^s B^{r-2}) = \begin{cases} \frac{r}{2s + r - 2} \sum_{k=0}^s \left\lceil \frac{2k}{r} \right\rceil \binom{s}{k} \frac{1}{2^s} & \text{if initial capital is even,} \\ 0 & \text{if initial capital is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The special case  $(r, s) = (3, 2)$  of this theorem is consistent with (8).

Theorem 2 will be seen to follow from the next two results, the proofs of which are deferred to Section 4.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $r \geq 3$  be an integer and  $0 < \gamma < 1$ . Then*

$$\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) = \frac{r\gamma(1 - \gamma)(2 - \gamma)[(2 - \gamma)^{r-2} - \gamma^{r-2}]}{2[(2 - \gamma)^r - \gamma^r] + r\gamma(2 - \gamma)[(2 - \gamma)^{r-2} - \gamma^{r-2}]},$$

*regardless of initial capital.*

**Corollary 5.** *For each integer  $r \geq 3$ , define  $\gamma_r := 2/\sqrt{r}$ . Then*

$$1 - \mu(r, 0, \gamma_r A + (1 - \gamma_r)B) \sim 2\gamma_r \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty,$$

*regardless of initial capital.*

Table 1 illustrates these results.

Table 1: The rate of profit  $\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$ .

$r$	$\arg \max_{\gamma} \mu$	$1 - \max_{\gamma} \mu$	$\gamma_r := 2/\sqrt{r}$	$1 - \mu$ at $\gamma = \gamma_r$
10	0.366017	0.665064	0.632456	0.743544
100	0.165296	0.316931	0.200000	0.322034
1000	0.0594276	0.117089	0.0632456	0.117307
10000	0.0196059	0.0390196	0.0200000	0.0390273
100000	0.00628474	0.0125497	0.00632456	0.0125500
1000000	0.00199601	0.00399002	0.00200000	0.00399003

For the purpose of comparison, let us state a corollary to Theorem 3 that is analogous to Corollary 5.

**Corollary 6.** For each integer  $r \geq 3$ , define  $s_r := \lfloor \log_2 r \rfloor - 1$ . Then

$$1 - \mu(r, 0, (AB)^{s_r} B^{r-2}) \sim \frac{2s_r}{r} \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty,$$

assuming initial capital is even if  $r$  is even,

Table 2 illustrates Theorem 3 and Corollary 6.

Table 2: The rate of profit  $\mu(r, 0, (AB)^s B^{r-2})$ , assuming initial capital is even.

$r$	$\arg \max_s \mu$	$1 - \max_s \mu$	$s_r := \lfloor \log_2 r \rfloor - 1$
10	2, 3	0.375000	2
100	5	0.103009	5
1000	8	0.0176590	8
10000	12	0.00243878	12
100000	15	0.000310431	15
1000000	18	0.0000378134	18

Ethier and Lee (2019) remarked that the rates of profit of periodic sequences tend to be larger than those of random sequences. Corollaries 5 and 6 yield a precise formulation of this conclusion.

## 2 SLLN for random sequences of games

Ethier and Lee (2009) proved a strong law of large numbers (SLLN) and a central limit theorem for random sequences of Parrondo games. It is only the SLLN that is needed here.

**Theorem 7** (Ethier and Lee (2009)). *Let  $\mathbf{P}$  be the transition matrix for a Markov chain in a finite state space  $\Sigma$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{P}$  is irreducible and aperiodic, and let the row vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  be the unique stationary distribution of  $\mathbf{P}$ . Given a real-valued function  $w$  on  $\Sigma \times \Sigma$ , define the payoff matrix  $\mathbf{W} := (w(i, j))_{i, j \in \Sigma}$ , and put*

$$\mu := \boldsymbol{\pi} \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1},$$

*where  $\dot{\mathbf{P}} := \mathbf{P} \circ \mathbf{W}$  (the Hadamard, or entrywise, product), and  $\mathbf{1}$  denotes a column vector of 1s with entries indexed by  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  be a Markov chain in  $\Sigma$  with transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ , and let the initial distribution be arbitrary. For each  $n \geq 1$ , define  $\xi_n := w(X_{n-1}, X_n)$  and  $S_n := \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_n$ . Then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} S_n = \mu$  a.s.*

We wish to apply Theorem 7 with

$$\Sigma = \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$$

( $r$  is the modulo number in game  $B$ ),  $\mathbf{P} := \gamma \mathbf{P}_A + (1 - \gamma) \mathbf{P}_B$ , where the  $r \times r$  transition matrices  $\mathbf{P}_A$  and  $\mathbf{P}_B$  are given by

$$\mathbf{P}_A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}_B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & p_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & q_0 \\ q_1 & 0 & p_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q_1 & 0 & p_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & q_1 & 0 & p_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & q_1 & 0 & p_1 \\ p_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & q_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $p_0$  and  $p_1$  as in (5) and  $q_0 := 1 - p_0$  and  $q_1 := 1 - p_1$ , and the  $r \times r$  payoff matrix  $\mathbf{W}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  is irreducible and aperiodic if  $r$  is odd, in which case the theorem applies directly. But if  $r$  is even, then  $\mathbf{P}$  is irreducible and periodic with period 2. In that case we need the following extension of Theorem 7.

**Theorem 8.** *Theorem 7 holds with “is irreducible and aperiodic” replaced by “is irreducible and periodic with period 2”.*

We remark that an alternative proof of a strong law of large numbers for Parrondo games could be based on the renewal theorem; see Pyke (2003).

*Proof.* The irreducibility and aperiodicity in Theorem 7 ensures that the Markov chain, with initial distribution equal to the unique stationary distribution, is a stationary strong mixing sequence (Bradley (2005), Theorem 3.1). Here we must deduce this property in a different way.

The assumption that  $\mathbf{P} = (P_{ij})_{i,j \in \Sigma}$  is irreducible with period 2 implies that  $\Sigma$  is the disjoint union of  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ , and transitions under  $\mathbf{P}$  take  $\Sigma_1$  to  $\Sigma_2$

and  $\Sigma_2$  to  $\Sigma_1$ . This tells us that  $\mathbf{P}^2$  is reducible with two recurrent classes,  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ , and no transient states. Let the row vectors  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1 = (\pi_1(i))_{i \in \Sigma}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2 = (\pi_2(j))_{j \in \Sigma}$  be the unique stationary distributions of  $\mathbf{P}^2$  concentrated on  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ , respectively. Then  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1 \mathbf{P} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_2$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2 \mathbf{P} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_1$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\pi} := \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_1 + \boldsymbol{\pi}_2)$  is the unique stationary distribution of  $\mathbf{P}$ .

We consider two Markov chains, one in  $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$  and the other in  $\Sigma_2 \times \Sigma_1$ , both denoted by  $\{(X_0, X_1), (X_2, X_3), (X_4, X_5), \dots\}$ . The transition probabilities are of the form  $P^*((i, j), (k, l)) := P_{jk}P_{kl}$  in both cases. To ensure that the Markov chains are irreducible, we change the state spaces to  $S_1 := \{(i, j) \in \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2 : P_{ij} > 0\}$  and  $S_2 := \{(j, k) \in \Sigma_2 \times \Sigma_1 : P_{jk} > 0\}$ . The unique stationary distributions are  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1^*$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2^*$  given by

$$\pi_1^*(i, j) = \pi_1(i)P_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_2^*(j, k) = \pi_2(j)P_{jk}.$$

To check stationarity, we confirm that for each  $(k, l) \in S_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i, j) \in S_1} \pi_1^*(i, j) P^*((i, j), (k, l)) &= \sum_{j \in \Sigma_2} \sum_{i \in \Sigma_1} \pi_1(i) P_{ij} P_{jk} P_{kl} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \Sigma_2} \pi_2(j) P_{jk} P_{kl} = \pi_1(k) P_{kl} = \pi_1^*(k, l). \end{aligned}$$

An analogous calculation applies to  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_2^*$ .

We claim that  $\mathbf{P}^*$  is irreducible and aperiodic on  $S_1$  as well as on  $S_2$ . It suffices to show that all entries of  $(\mathbf{P}^*)^n$  are positive on  $S_1 \times S_1$  and on  $S_2 \times S_2$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . Indeed, given  $(i_0, j_0), (i_n, j_n) \in S_1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{P}^*)_{(i_0, j_0)(i_n, j_n)}^n \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), \dots, (i_{n-1}, j_{n-1}) \in S_1} P^*((i_0, j_0), (i_1, j_1)) P^*((i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)) \cdots \\ &\quad \cdots P^*((i_{n-1}, j_{n-1}), (i_n, j_n)) \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), \dots, (i_{n-1}, j_{n-1}) \in S_1} P_{j_0 i_1} P_{i_1 j_1} P_{j_1 i_2} P_{i_2 j_2} \cdots P_{j_{n-1} i_n} P_{i_n j_n} \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \in \Sigma_1} P_{j_0 i_1} (\mathbf{P})_{i_1 i_n}^{2(n-1)} P_{i_n j_n} > 0 \end{aligned}$$

since all entries of  $\mathbf{P}^{2(n-1)}$  are positive on  $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_1$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . A similar argument applies to  $S_2$ .

Now we compute mean profit at stationarity. Starting from  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1^*$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\boldsymbol{\pi}_1^*}[w(X_0, X_1) + w(X_1, X_2)] \\ &= \sum_{(i, j) \in S_1} \sum_{(k, l) \in S_1} \pi_1^*(i, j) P^*((i, j), (k, l)) [w(i, j) + w(j, k)] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \Sigma_1} \sum_{j \in \Sigma_2} \sum_{k \in \Sigma_1} \pi_1(i) P_{ij} P_{jk} [w(i, j) + w(j, k)] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i,j \in \Sigma} \pi_1(i) P_{ij} w(i,j) + \sum_{j,k \in \Sigma} \pi_2(j) P_{jk} w(j,k) \\
&= \pi_1 \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1} + \pi_2 \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1} \\
&= 2\pi \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1},
\end{aligned}$$

and the same result holds starting from  $\pi_2^*$ .

We conclude that, starting with initial distribution  $\pi_1^*$ ,  $(X_0, X_1), (X_2, X_3), (X_4, X_5), \dots$  is a stationary strong mixing sequence with a geometric rate, hence the same is true of  $w(X_0, X_1) + w(X_1, X_2), w(X_2, X_3) + w(X_3, X_4), \dots$

As in Ethier and Lee (2009), the SLLN applies and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (2n)^{-1} S_{2n} = \frac{1}{2} 2\pi \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1} = \pi \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1} \text{ a.s.}$$

The same is true starting with initial distribution  $\pi_2^*$ , and the coupling argument used by Ethier and Lee (2009) to permit an arbitrary initial state extends to this setting as well.  $\square$

### 3 Stationary distribution of the random walk on the $n$ -cycle

We will need to find the stationary distribution of the general random walk on the  $n$ -cycle ( $n$  points arranged in a circle and labeled  $0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ ) with transition matrix

$$\mathbf{P} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & p_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & q_0 \\ q_1 & 0 & p_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & q_2 & 0 & p_2 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & q_{n-3} & 0 & p_{n-3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & q_{n-2} & 0 & p_{n-2} \\ p_{n-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & q_{n-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where  $p_i \in (0, 1)$  and  $q_i := 1 - p_i$ . It is possible that a formula has appeared in the literature, but we were unable to find it. We could derive a more general result with little additional effort by replacing the diagonal of  $\mathbf{P}$  by  $(r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{n-1})$ , where  $p_i > 0$ ,  $q_i > 0$ ,  $r_i \geq 0$ , and  $p_i + q_i + r_i = 1$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ ). But to minimize complications, we treat only the case of (9).

The transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  is irreducible and its unique stationary distribution  $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1})$  satisfies  $\pi = \pi \mathbf{P}$  or

$$\pi_i = \pi_{i-1} p_{i-1} + \pi_{i+1} q_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1,$$

where  $\pi_n := \pi_0$  and  $q_n := q_0$ , or

$$\pi_{i-1} p_{i-1} - \pi_i q_i = \pi_i p_i - \pi_{i+1} q_{i+1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

Thus,  $\pi_{i-1}p_{i-1} - \pi_i q_i = C$ , a constant, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , where  $\pi_n := \pi_0$  and  $q_n := q_0$ ; alternatively,

$$\pi_i = -\frac{C}{q_i} + \frac{p_{i-1}}{q_i} \pi_{i-1}. \quad (10)$$

This is of the form  $x_i = a_i + b_i x_{i-1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ , the solution of which is

$$x_i = \sum_{j=1}^i a_j \left( \prod_{k=j+1}^i b_k \right) + \left( \prod_{j=1}^i b_j \right) x_0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where empty products are 1. Applying this to (10), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_i &= -C \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{q_j} \left( \prod_{k=j+1}^i \frac{p_{k-1}}{q_k} \right) + \left( \prod_{j=1}^i \frac{p_{j-1}}{q_j} \right) \pi_0 \\ &= -C \frac{1}{q_i} \left[ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( \prod_{k=j}^{i-1} \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right) \right] + \frac{q_0}{q_i} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{p_j}{q_j} \right) \pi_0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $C$  can be determined in terms of  $\pi_0$  from the  $i = n$  case (since  $\pi_n := \pi_0$  and  $q_n := q_0$ ). It is given by

$$C = q_0 \left[ \left( \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{p_j}{q_j} \right) - 1 \right] \left[ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left( \prod_{k=j}^{n-1} \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right) \right]^{-1} \pi_0.$$

Defining  $\Pi_0 := 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_i &:= -\frac{q_0}{q_i} \left[ \left( \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{p_j}{q_j} \right) - 1 \right] \left[ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left( \prod_{k=j}^{n-1} \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right) \right]^{-1} \left[ 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( \prod_{k=j}^{i-1} \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{q_0}{q_i} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{p_j}{q_j} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , we find that  $\pi_i = \Pi_i \pi_0$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ , and the following lemma is immediate.

**Lemma 9.** *The unique stationary distribution  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{n-1})$  of the transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$  of (9) is given by*

$$\pi_i = \frac{\Pi_i}{\Pi_0 + \Pi_1 + \dots + \Pi_{n-1}}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1,$$

where  $\Pi_0 := 1$  and  $\Pi_i$  is defined by (11) for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ .

**Example 1.** As a check of the formula, consider the case in which  $p_0 = p_1 = \dots = p_{n-1} = p \in (0, 1)$  and  $q_0 = q_1 = \dots = q_{n-1} = q := 1 - p$ . Here the transition matrix is doubly stochastic, so the unique stationary distribution is discrete uniform on  $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Indeed, algebraic simplification shows that  $\Pi_0 = \Pi_1 = \dots = \Pi_{n-1} = 1$ .

**Example 2.** Consider next the case in which  $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_{n-1} = p \in (0, 1)$  and  $q_1 = q_2 = \dots = q_{n-1} = q := 1 - p$ . Of course  $p_0$  and  $q_0 := 1 - p_0$  may differ from  $p$  and  $q$ . Then  $\Pi_0 := 1$  and

$$\Pi_i = - \left[ \frac{(p_0/q)(p/q)^{n-1} - q_0/q}{(p/q)^n - 1} \right] ((p/q)^i - 1) + (p_0/q)(p/q)^{i-1} \quad (12)$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Pi_i &= 1 - \left[ \frac{(p_0/q)(p/q)^{n-1} - q_0/q}{(p/q)^n - 1} \right] \left[ \frac{(p/q)((p/q)^{n-1} - 1)}{p/q - 1} - (n-1) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{(p_0/q)((p/q)^{n-1} - 1)}{p/q - 1} \\ &= 1 - \frac{p_0 - q_0}{p - q} + n \frac{p_0 p^{n-1} - q_0 q^{n-1}}{p^n - q^n}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the last step involves some algebra and we have implicitly assumed that  $p \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . In particular,  $\pi_0$  is the reciprocal of (13). This result is useful in evaluating  $\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$ ; see Section 4.

**Example 3.** Consider finally the special case of Example 2 in which  $p_0 = q$  and  $q_0 = p$ . The (12) becomes

$$\Pi_i = - \left[ \frac{(p/q)((p/q)^{n-2} - 1)}{(p/q)^n - 1} \right] ((p/q)^i - 1) + (p/q)^{i-1}$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ , and (13) becomes

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Pi_i = 2 + npq \frac{p^{n-2} - q^{n-2}}{p^n - q^n}. \quad (14)$$

We have again implicitly assumed that  $p \neq \frac{1}{2}$ , and again  $\pi_0$  is the reciprocal of (14). This result is useful in evaluating  $\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$ ; see Section 4.

## 4 Evaluation of rate of profit

Recall that mean profit has the form  $\mu = \pi \dot{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{1}$ , which we apply to  $\mathbf{P} := \gamma \mathbf{P}_A + (1 - \gamma) \mathbf{P}_B$ .

To find  $\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$ , it suffices to note that  $\mathbf{P}$  has the form (9) under the assumptions of Example 2 with  $n := r$ ,

$$p := \frac{\gamma}{2} + (1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{1 + \rho}, \quad \text{and} \quad p_0 := \frac{\gamma}{2} + (1 - \gamma) \frac{\rho^{r-1}}{1 + \rho^{r-1}}, \quad (15)$$

where  $0 < \rho < 1$ . Thus,

$$\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) = \pi_0(p_0 - q_0) + (1 - \pi_0)(p - q), \quad (16)$$

with  $\pi_0$  being the reciprocal of (13).

To find  $\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$ , it suffices to note that  $\mathbf{P}$  has the form (9) under the assumptions of Example 2 with  $n := r$ ,

$$p := \frac{\gamma}{2} + (1 - \gamma)1 = 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad p_0 := \frac{\gamma}{2} + (1 - \gamma)0 = \frac{\gamma}{2} = 1 - p = q.$$

We are therefore in the setting of Example 3, and

$$\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) = \pi_0(q - p) + (1 - \pi_0)(p - q) = (p - q)(1 - 2\pi_0), \quad (17)$$

with  $\pi_0$  being the reciprocal of (14).

*Proof of Theorem 4.* From (17) and (14) with  $n = r$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) &= (p - q)(1 - 2\pi_0) \\ &= (p - q) \left( 1 - \frac{2(p^r - q^r)}{2(p^r - q^r) + rpq(p^{r-2} - q^{r-2})} \right) \\ &= \frac{rpq(p - q)(p^{r-2} - q^{r-2})}{2(p^r - q^r) + rpq(p^{r-2} - q^{r-2})}, \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows by substituting  $1 - \gamma/2$  and  $\gamma/2$  for  $p$  and  $q$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 5.* We want to show that  $\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$  can be close to 1 by choosing  $p := 1 - \gamma/2$  close to 1 and  $\pi_0$  close to 0, which requires  $r$  large. So we consider a sequence  $p \rightarrow 1$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0 &= \frac{p^r - q^r}{2(p^r - q^r) + rpq(p^{r-2} - q^{r-2})} \\ &\sim \frac{p^r}{2p^r + rqp^{r-1}} \\ &= \frac{p}{2p + rq}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us specify that  $p = 1 - 1/\sqrt{r}$  (equivalently,  $\gamma = 2/\sqrt{r}$ ). Then, by (17),

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B) &= 1 - (p - q)(1 - 2\pi_0) \\ &\sim 1 - (1 - 2/\sqrt{r}) \left( 1 - \frac{2(1 - 1/\sqrt{r})}{2(1 - 1/\sqrt{r}) + \sqrt{r}} \right) \\ &\sim \frac{4}{\sqrt{r}}, \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 6.* For even  $r \geq 4$  and positive integers  $s \leq r/2$ , Theorem 3 implies that

$$1 - \mu(r, 0, (AB)^s B^{r-2})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \left(1 - \frac{2(s-1)}{r+2(s-1)}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^s}\right) \\
&= \frac{2s}{r+2(s-1)} - \frac{2}{r+2(s-1)} + \frac{1}{2^s} - \frac{2(s-1)}{r+2(s-1)} \cdot \frac{1}{2^s},
\end{aligned}$$

if initial capital is even. With  $s$  replaced by  $s_r := \lfloor \log_2 r \rfloor - 1$ , the first term is asymptotic to  $2s_r/r$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  and the remaining terms are  $O(1/r)$ .

For odd  $r \geq 3$ , the argument is essentially the same.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* It is enough to show that  $\mu(r, \rho, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$  is continuous at  $\rho = 0$  for fixed  $r$  and  $\gamma$ . In fact, there is a complicated but explicit formula, given by (16), using (13) and (15), showing that it is a rational function of  $\rho$ . Therefore, we need only show that it does not have a pole at  $\rho = 0$ . In fact, Theorem 4 shows that  $\mu(r, 0, \gamma A + (1 - \gamma)B)$  is the ratio of two positive numbers, and this is sufficient.  $\square$

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Derek Abbott for raising the question addressed here. SNE was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (429675). JL was supported by the Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education (NRF-2018R1D1A1B07042307).

## References

- Ajdari, A. and Prost, J. (1992). Drift induced by a spatially periodic potential of low symmetry: Pulsed dielectrophoresis. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Série 2* **315**, 1635–1639.
- Bradley, R. C. (2005). Basic properties of strong mixing conditions. A survey and some open questions. *Probab. Surveys* **2** 107–144.
- Dinis, L. (2008). Optimal sequence for Parrondo games. *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 021124.
- Ethier, S. N. and Lee, J. (2009). Limit theorems for Parrondo’s paradox. *Electronic J. Probab.* **14** (62), 1827–1862.
- Ethier, S. N. and Lee, J. (2019). How strong can the Parrondo effect be? *J. Appl. Probab.* **56** (4), 1198–1216.
- Harmer, G. P. and Abbott, D. (1999). Parrondo’s paradox. *Statist. Sci.* **14** (2), 206–213.
- Pyke, R. (2003). On random walks and diffusions related to Parrondo’s games. In *Mathematical Statistics and Applications: Festschrift for Constance Van Eeden*, ed. M. Moore, S. Froda, and C. Léger. IMS Lecture Notes–Monograph Series **42**, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Beachwood, OH, pp. 185–216.