



Fig. 1. Averaged capital per player as a function of the number of players obtained using analytical expressions for the evolution of the probability distribution. The paradox exists only for $N = 3$ and $N = 6$.


Fig. 2 Numerically obtained averaged capital per player per turn of the games as a function of the number of players ($10 \leq N < 1000$). Capital is averaged over 1000 turns and over 1000 runs of the games. The paradox does not occur for any value of N .


Fig. 3. Averaged capital per player as a function of the number of players obtained using analytical expressions for the evolution of the probability distribution. The paradox exists for all values of N , except for $N = 4$ and then only in case game $A + B$ is played.

Fig. 4. Numerically obtained averaged capital per player per turn of the games as a function of the number of players ($10 \leq N < 1000$). Capital is averaged over 1000 turns and over 1000 runs. The paradox occurs for all N .









Synchronous Cooperative Parrondo's Games

Zoran Mihailović¹ and Milan Rajković²

Vinča Institute of Nuclear Sciences,

P.O. Box 522, 11001 Belgrade, Serbia

¹chesare@vin.bg.ac.yu, ²milanr@vin.bg.ac.yu

March 22, 2022

Abstract

Inspired by asynchronous cooperative Parrondo's games we introduce two new types of games in which all players simultaneously play game A or game B or a combination of these two games. These two types of games differ in the way a combination of games A and B is played. In the first type of synchronous games, all players simultaneously play the same game (either A or B), while in the second type players simultaneously play the game of their choice, i.e. A or B. We show that for these games, as in the case of asynchronous games, occurrence of the paradox depends on the number of players. An analytical result and an algorithm are derived for the probability distribution of these games.

Recently, new types of Parrondo's games have been introduced [1], termed cooperative Parrondo's games that incorporate the feedback through spatial neighbor dependence. These games are based on the state of player's nearest neighbors where the state refers to a player either being a winner or a loser in the previous game. Each of N players, arranged in a circle, owns a capital $C_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, which evolves by combination of two games. Game A is the same as in the classical setup [2],[3],[4], namely the probability of winning and losing is $p^{(A)}$ and $1 - p^{(A)}$ respectively. Game B depends on the state of neighbors to the left and to the right of the player, i.e. whether they have won or lost in the previous game. Games A and B, when played individually may be losing or fair, while any kind of periodic or random alternation of games A and B turns out to be winning. In

[1], the evolution of probabilities in games B and C was studied using mean field type equations while in [5], referred to as paper 1, we have modeled the games as discrete-time Markov chains and we have derived the analytic form of the exact probability evolution equations. Inspired by these games, we introduce here two new types of cooperative games in which all players play simultaneously either game A or game B or any combination of these two games and we name these games “one dimensional synchronous cooperative games” in order to make distinction between the standard cooperative games which we termed “one dimensional asynchronous games”. Essentially the difference from the asynchronous case is that at each turn of the game all players play simultaneously, again depending on the state of their neighbors, which in turn is the result of the previous game’s outcome. Moreover, a combination of games A and B may be played in two distinctive ways. First, players may simultaneously play game A or game B in any predetermined or random order. We denote this game as $A + B$. Alternatively, each player may at each turn of the game chose randomly whether to play game A or game B , and we denote this game as $A * B$. In both cases the paradoxical result that games $A + B$ or $A * B$ may be winning while each game individually, A or B , may be losing, occurs and it depends on the number of players. Interestingly, for the set of probabilities introduced in [1], the paradox appears only for $N = 3$ and $N = 6$. We also introduce a set of probabilities for which a counterintuitive (paradoxical) result appears irrespective of the number of players with the exception of $N = 4$ and then only for the game of type I ($A + B$). As in the case of asynchronous games we derive the probability transition matrix for games B , $A + B$ and $A * B$.

As in the case of asynchronous games, the analysis is performed via discrete time Markov chains (DTMCs) and we first derive the probability transition matrix for game B . Probabilities of winning in game B depend on the current state of left and right neighbors, denoted as a pair $h_k = (s_k - 1 \ s_k + 1)$, and with player at position k are given by $p_0^{(B)}$ when $(s_k - 1 \ s_k + 1) = (00)$, $p_1^{(B)}$ when $(s_k - 1 \ s_k + 1) = (01)$, $p_2^{(B)}$ when $(s_k - 1 \ s_k + 1) = (10)$ and $p_3^{(B)}$ when $(s_k - 1 \ s_k + 1) = (11)$.

Game B

Let the initial state of the ensemble of players be $i = (i_1, \dots, i_N)$ and the final $f = (f_1, \dots, f_N)$. Since at each moment of time all players play simultaneously and therefore change each individual state, the probability of transition is

$$T_{fi}^{(B)} = \prod_{k=1}^N w(i_k, f_k), \quad (1)$$

where probabilities w depend on whether state f_k is 1 (winning) or 0 (losing), and upon the probability of winning, i.e.

$$w(i_k, f_k) = \begin{cases} 1 - p_{\eta_k}^{(B)}, & f_k = 0 \\ p_{\eta_k}^{(B)}, & f_k = 1 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and where $\eta_k = (s_k - 1, s_k + 1) = (i_k - 1, i_k + 1)$ denotes an ordered pair of k -th player's neighbors in the initial state. Writing $r_i = 1 - p_i$ where $i = 0, 1, 2$ or 3 , the probability transition matrix $\mathcal{T}^{(B)}$ for $N = 3$ is

$$\mathcal{T}^{(B)} = \begin{pmatrix} r_0 r_0 r_0 & r_2 r_1 r_0 & r_1 r_0 r_2 & r_3 r_1 r_2 & r_0 r_2 r_1 & r_2 r_3 r_1 & r_1 r_2 r_3 & r_3 r_3 r_3 \\ r_0 r_0 p_0 & r_2 r_1 p_0 & r_1 r_0 p_2 & r_3 r_1 p_2 & r_0 r_2 p_1 & r_2 r_3 p_1 & r_1 r_2 p_3 & r_3 r_3 p_3 \\ r_0 p_0 r_0 & r_2 p_1 r_0 & r_1 p_0 r_2 & r_3 p_1 r_2 & r_0 p_2 r_1 & r_2 p_3 r_1 & r_1 p_2 r_3 & r_3 p_3 r_3 \\ r_0 p_0 p_0 & r_2 p_1 p_0 & r_1 p_0 p_2 & r_3 p_1 p_2 & r_0 p_2 p_1 & r_2 p_3 p_1 & r_1 p_2 p_3 & r_3 p_3 p_3 \\ p_0 r_0 r_0 & p_2 r_1 r_0 & p_1 r_0 r_2 & p_3 r_1 r_2 & p_0 r_2 r_1 & p_2 r_3 r_1 & p_1 r_2 r_3 & p_3 r_3 r_3 \\ p_0 r_0 p_0 & p_2 r_1 p_0 & p_1 r_0 p_2 & p_3 r_1 p_2 & p_0 r_2 p_1 & p_2 r_3 p_1 & p_1 r_2 p_3 & p_3 r_3 p_3 \\ p_0 p_0 r_0 & p_2 p_1 r_0 & p_1 p_0 r_2 & p_3 p_1 r_2 & p_0 p_2 r_1 & p_2 p_3 r_1 & p_1 p_2 r_3 & p_3 p_3 r_3 \\ p_0 p_0 p_0 & p_2 p_1 p_0 & p_1 p_0 p_2 & p_3 p_1 p_2 & p_0 p_2 p_1 & p_2 p_3 p_1 & p_1 p_2 p_3 & p_3 p_3 p_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

It may be immediately noticed that this matrix has no zero entries while for the asynchronous game B it is sparse, i.e. most of its entries are zero.

Game A+B (Type I)

The ensemble of players collectively chooses to play either game A or game B so that the probability transition matrix is

$$\mathcal{T}^{(A+B)} = \gamma \mathcal{T}^{(A)} + (1 - \gamma) \mathcal{T}^{(B)}, \quad (4)$$

and γ represents the relative probability of playing game A , where we assume the value of one half. Matrix $\mathcal{T}^{(A)}$ has a very simple structure in the unbiased case ($p^{(A)} = 1/2$) when all entries are equal to $1/8$. In order to illustrate the above expression we calculate the probability of transition from state $i = (001)$ to state $f = (011)$. The transition $i \rightarrow f$ occurs when all players play either game A or game B , hence two possibilities are

$$(001) \rightarrow (011) \begin{cases} (1 - p^{(A)})p^{(A)}p^{(A)} & \text{all players play game } A \text{ i.e. } (AAA) \\ (1 - p_2)p_1p_0 & \text{all players play game } B \text{ i.e. } (BBB) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the probability of transition from state (001) to (011) is

$$T_{fi}^{(A+B)} = w(001 \rightarrow 011) = \gamma[(1 - p^{(A)})p^{(A)}p^{(A)}] + (1 - \gamma)[(1 - p_2)p_1p_0]. \quad (6)$$

Similarly, each entry in the probability transition matrix $\mathcal{T}^{(A+B)}$ may be written as the sum according to expression 4.

Game A*B (Type II)

In this game each player randomly plays either game A or game B , thus individually contributing “noise” to the ensemble. In order to shed more light on the transition process we calculate the transition probability from state $i = (001)$ to state $f = (011)$. There are $2^N = 8$ possible ways in which three player state may change from i to f :

$$(001) \rightarrow (011) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (1 - p^{(A)})p^{(A)}p^{(A)} & (\text{AAA}) \\ (1 - p^{(A)})p^{(A)}p_0 & (\text{AAB}) \\ (1 - p^{(A)})p_1p^{(A)} & (\text{ABA}) \\ (1 - p^{(A)})p_1p_0 & (\text{ABB}) \\ (1 - p_2)p^{(A)}p^{(A)} & (\text{BAA}) \\ (1 - p_2)p^{(A)}p_0 & (\text{BAB}) \\ (1 - p_2)p_1p^{(A)} & (\text{BBA}) \\ (1 - p_2)p_1p_0 & (\text{BBB}) \end{array} \right. \quad (7)$$

Sequences in the second column represent players' choices for each possible transition. The probability of transition is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_{fi}^{(A+B)} &= w(001 \rightarrow 011) = \frac{1}{8}[(1 - p^{(A)})p^{(A)}p^{(A)} + (1 - p^{(A)})p^{(A)}p_0 + \\ &\quad (1 - p^{(A)})p_1p^{(A)} + (1 - p^{(A)})p_1p_0 + (1 - p_2)p^{(A)}p^{(A)} + \\ &\quad (1 - p_2)p^{(A)}p_0 + (1 - p_2)p_1p^{(A)} + (1 - p_2)p_1p_0 \\ &= [1 - (\frac{p^{(A)} + p_2}{2})](\frac{p^{(A)} + p_1}{2})(\frac{p^{(A)} + p_0}{2}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Comparing this expression with the corresponding matrix entry for game B , it may be deduced (and verified by computing probabilities for all transitions) that the corresponding entries in the probability transition matrix for game $A*B$ may be obtained by replacing each p_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, 3$) in $\mathcal{T}^{(A+B)}$ with

$$\frac{1}{2} (p^{(A)} + p_i) .$$

The equilibrium (stationary) state occurs when the probability distribution remains invariant under the action of \mathcal{T} , that is, $|\pi(t+1)\rangle = \mathcal{T} |\pi(t)\rangle = |\pi\rangle$, and this probability distribution is determined by solving $(\mathbf{1} - \mathcal{T})\pi = 0$. For game A ,

for which there is a probability p for a player to win (alternatively $(1-p)$ to lose), the stationary distribution is easily obtained by setting $p_0 = p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = p$ in (3) or alternatively by associating to each ensemble state, corresponding probabilities for each player:

$$\pi^{(A)} = [(1-p)^3, (1-p)^2p, (1-p)^2p, (1-p)p^2, (1-p)^2p, (1-p)p^2, (1-p)p^2, p^3]^T \quad (9)$$

For game B the stationary distribution may be obtained analytically using the probability distribution matrix (3), however the expression is too long to be presented here. Instead we give the numerical values for the stationary distributions assuming Torral's values, $p_0 = 1$, $p_1 = p_2 = 0.16$, $p_3 = 0.7$:

$$\pi_1^{(B)} = [.0570.1906.1906.0849.1906.0849.0849.1161]^T \quad (10)$$

$$\pi_1^{(A+B)} = [.0972.1495.1495.1033.1495.1033.1033.1444]^T \quad (11)$$

$$\pi_1^{(A*B)} = [.1184.1297.1297.1194.1297.1194.1194.1341]^T \quad (12)$$

Interestingly, comparison of expressions 10 and 12 shows that the stationary probability for the occurrence of state (000) increases considerably for game $A * B$, implying that “noise” from game A has the largest effect on this state when the games are alternating individually. For the probability values of set II ($p_0 = 0.05$, $p_1 = p_2 = 0.6$, $p_3 = 0.8$) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_2^{(B)} &= [.3163.0761.0761.0936.0761.0936.0936.1742]^T \\ \pi_2^{(A+B)} &= [.1632.1069.1069.1196.1069.1196.1196.1573]^T \\ \pi_2^{(A*B)} &= [.1355.1171.1171.1229.1171.1229.1229.1442]^T \end{aligned}$$

We now present analytical and numerical results of the model. First we consider probability values of set I, namely ($p_0 = 1, p_1 = p_2 = 0.16, p_3 = 0.7$) and $p^{(A)} = 0.499$. For this set the paradox exists only for $N = 3$ and 6 (irrespective whether $A + B$ or $A * B$ game is played) as presented in Fig. 1. Results presented in this figure were obtained using analytical expression for the evolution of probability distribution. Moreover, numerical simulations show (Fig.2), that paradox does not occur for any other number of players up to 1000. For set II the paradox exists for all N except for $N = 4$, and then only if game $A + B$ is played. In all other cases the paradox exists as may be noticed in Figs 3 and 4.

In conclusion, one dimensional synchronous games, introduced here and based on Parrondo's cooperative games exhibit paradoxical outcome characteristic of classical Parrondo's games, namely that alternation of two losing games produces a net gain. The novel feature of these games is that all players play simultaneously either game A or game B , as well as a random mixture of these two games which may be realized in two different ways. Since winning results from the interaction between different players, these paradoxical results may be of far-reaching consequences for games of economic, social and biological importance.

Acknowledgement

This work is financed by Ministry of Science and Technology of Serbia, under the project OI 1986.

References

- [1] [1]R. Toral, Fluct. Noise Lett. 1 (2001) L7.
- [2] G. P. Harmer, D. Abbott, P. G. Taylor and J. M. R. Parrondo, Chaos 11 (2001) 705.
- [3] [3]G. P. Harmer and D. Abbott, Stat. Sci. 14 (1999) 206; Nature (London) 402 (1999) 864.
- [4] G. P. Harmer and D. Abbott, Fluct. Noise Lett. 2 (2002) R71-R107.
- [5] [5]Z. Mihailović and M. Rajković, Fluct. Noise Lett. (2003)