

Monotonous betting strategies in warped casinos



by Nan Fang

Joint work with [George Barmpalias](#) and [Andy Lewis-Pye](#)

July 2018, Paris



A roulette system (strategy) has two components:

- ▶ the **outcome** where we bet
- ▶ the **amount** we bet

Many well-known strategies are single-sided:

- ▶ Martingale
- ▶ Grand Martingale
- ▶ D'Alembert
- ▶ Reverse D'Alembert
- ▶ Oscars Grind
- ▶ Laboucher or Cancellation System
- ▶ The Paroli

www.smartgaming.com/Articles/gambling_tips_top_10_roulette_systems.html

Martingale strategy and D' Alembert system

Coup Nr.	Pieces in use	Total loss in pieces
1	1	1
2	2	3
3	4	7
4	8	15
5	16	31
6	32	63
7	64	127
8	128	255
9	256	511
10	512	1023

Coup	Use	Loss	Profit	Total
1	1	1		-1
2	2	2		-3
3	3	3		-6
4	4	4		-10
5	5		5	-5
6	4		4	-1
7	3		3	+2
8	2		2	+4
9	1		1	+5

- ▶ provide certain **desired profit** x, with extremely **high probability**
- ▶ they work in (and in fact require) **fair casinos**.

What's the catch?

Fairness means that on average, the expectation of profit is 0.

The only way to get profit x with very high probability, is that with very small probability you lose a large amount, compared to x .

Other realistic considerations are:

- ▶ With high probability, you need to have access to considerable funds, for a considerable profit
- ▶ Upper limits set by the casino may block an aggressive strategy
- ▶ Slight advantages of the casino, such as the existence of 0 in the roulette

How about biased casinos?

We ought to be able to do better in warped casinos.

Suppose that the frequency of 0s is $> 3/4$, infinitely often.

Then the following single-sided strategy guarantees you unbounded wealth:

- at each stage bet half of your capital on 0.

More generally:

If the relative frequency of 0s is $> q > 1/2$ infinitely often then the following single-sided strategy guarantees you unbounded wealth:

At each stage bet $(2q - 1)$ times your current capital, on 0.

Modelling betting strategies

A **stage in a game** is determined by the series of previous outcomes.

A **strategy** is a function that maps any finite sequences of outcomes to the amount the player bets at that particular stage.

If $M(\sigma)$ is the capital at σ and we bet b on 0, then $b \leq M(\sigma)$ and

$$M(\sigma * 0) = M(\sigma) + b \quad \text{and} \quad M(\sigma * 1) = M(\sigma) - b \quad \text{so}$$

$$M(\sigma) = \frac{M(\sigma * 0) + M(\sigma * 1)}{2}.$$

Conversely given M we can define the bet: $b_M(\sigma * i) = M(\sigma * i) - M(\sigma)$.

If I consider M_s , the capital at stage s , as a random variable in a fair game, then (M_s) is a martingale, relative to the outcome process (I_s) :

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{s+1} \mid I_s) = M_s$$

Hence the probability that $M_s > 100 \cdot M_0$ at some stage s is $< 1/100$.

Success of strategies

The **standard success** measure is the condition:

$$\limsup_n M(X \upharpoonright_n) = \infty$$

while a **savings method** shows that this is equivalent to

$$\lim_n M(X \upharpoonright_n) = \infty$$

Exponential success means that:

$$\limsup_n \frac{M(X \upharpoonright_n)}{\alpha^n} = \infty \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 1.$$

Realistic considerations:

- ▶ infinitely divisible currency
- ▶ time to success
- ▶ computational restrictions
- ▶ inflation

Biased Casinos

When can we say that a casino is biased?

In general, when there is a strategy that succeeds on its outcomes.

It is reasonable to assume that strategies are **programmable**.

In general, we restrict the strategies in a **countable collection** of functions.

Having a sequence (N_i) of strategies with $\sum_i N_i(\lambda) < \infty$, consider the:

Mixture strategy: $\sigma \mapsto \sum_i N_i(\sigma)$ which is a

- ▶ composition of many strategies
- ▶ each using its own capital pool
- ▶ and betting independently of each other.

Question

Can we always succeed in a biased casino with a single-sided strategy?

Can any successful strategy be replaced with a single-sided strategy?

For the programmable strategies the answer is yes.

For the mixtures of programmable strategies, the answer is no.

In fact, there exists a casino where:

- ▶ a programmable mixture strategy succeeds exponentially fast
- ▶ but no single-sided programmable mixture succeeds at all.

Idea behind positive answer

A winning strategy must do well at least in one of the red or black bets.

Every martingale is the product of a 0-sided martingale and a 1-sided martingale.

Also the component martingales are computable in the original martingale.

0-Strategy:

- ▶ bet on 0s as before but with modified amounts, and on 1s cancel the bets.
- ▶ On the next 0 bet as before, but proportionally relative to the ratio N/M on the previous 0-bet.
- ▶ So, scale according to the ratio of the N and M capitals at that point.

Negative answer for mixtures

An elaborate construction of a casino which is:

- ▶ **immune to** (generalized) single-sided mixture strategies
- ▶ **rigged by** a mixture strategy which is successful exponentially fast.

Find more details of the argument in our paper.

Single-sided martingales

A (super)martingale M is

- ▶ 0-sided if $M(\sigma * 0) \geq M(\sigma * 1)$ for all σ ;
- ▶ 1-sided if $M(\sigma * 1) \geq M(\sigma * 0)$ for all σ .

We say that M is single-sided if it is either 0-sided or 1-sided.

Observations

- ▶ There exists an optimal 0-sided (1-sided) left-c.e. supermartingale.
- ▶ For any 0-sided martingale M there is a 0-sided martingale N such that for all sequences X $\limsup_n M(X \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ iff $\lim_n N(X \upharpoonright n) = \infty$.

Single-sided martingales

Lemma

Every martingale M is the product of a 0-sided martingale N and a 1-sided martingale T . Moreover N , T are computable from M .

Corollary

Given a computable martingale M , there exist a 0-sided martingale N and a 1-sided martingale T such that for each X with $\limsup_n M(X \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ we have $\limsup_n N(X \upharpoonright n) = \infty$ or $\limsup_n T(X \upharpoonright n) = \infty$.

Single-sided martingales

Theorem

There exists a real of effective Hausdorff dimension $1/2$ such that no single-sided left-c.e. martingale succeeds on it.

Recall that the effective Hausdorff dimension of a real X is defined by

$$\dim(X) = \lim_n \frac{K(X \upharpoonright n)}{n}$$

and all Martin-Löf random real has Hausdorff dimension 1.

proof idea

Lemma (Hoeffding's inequality)

Given a prediction function f , $1/2 < q < 1$ and n , the number of strings in 2^n with number of correct predictions more than qn is at most $r_q^{-n} \cdot 2^n$, where $r_q > 1$ is a constant depends only on q .

Lemma

For each $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exists $m_0 > 0$ such that for all $m \geq m_0$ the number of strings in 2^m with the number of 0s (and hence, 1s) in $[(1 - \epsilon)m/2, (1 + \epsilon)m/2]$ is at least $(1 - \epsilon)2^m$.

Kastergales

A kastergale is a pair (f, N_f) where $f: 2^{<\omega} \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ is a partial computable function and N_f is a left-c.e. supermartingale with monotone approximation $N_f[s]$ and the property that:

- ▶ $f(\sigma)[s] \uparrow \Rightarrow N(\sigma * 0)[s] = N(\sigma * 1)[s]$;
- ▶ $f(\sigma)[s] \downarrow \Rightarrow N(\sigma * f(\sigma))[s] = N(\sigma * (1 - f(\sigma)))[s]$.

Theorem

There exists a real of effective Hausdorff dimension $1/2$ such that no kastergale succeeds on it.

Related literature

- ▶ Ron Peretz
Effective martingales with restricted wagers
Information and Computation 245 (2015) 152–164
- ▶ Gilad Bavly and Ron Peretz
How to gamble against all odds
Games and Economic Behavior 94 (2015) 157–168
- ▶ Adam Chalcraft, Randall Dougherty, Chris Freiling, Jason Teutsch
How to build a probability-free casino
Information and Computation 211 (2012) 160–164
- ▶ Jason Teutsch
A savings paradox for integer-valued gambling strategies
Int J Game Theory (2014) 43:145–151