

Pure Monte Carlo Counterfactual Regret Minimization

Qi Ju

Huazhong University of Science and
Technology
Wuhan, China
juqi@hust.edu.cn

Ting Feng

Huazhong University of Science and
Technology
Wuhan, China
fengting@hust.edu.cn

Falin Hei

Huazhong University of Science and
Technology
Wuhan, China
heifalin@hust.edu.cn

Zhemei Fang

Huazhong University of Science and
Technology
Wuhan, China
zmfang2018@hust.edu.cn

Yunfeng Luo

Huazhong University of Science and
Technology
Wuhan, China
yfluo@hust.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Counterfactual Regret Minimization (CFR) and its variants are the best algorithms so far for solving large-scale incomplete information games. However, we believe that there are two problems with CFR: First, matrix multiplication is required in CFR iteration, and the time complexity of one iteration is too high; Secondly, the game characteristics in the real world are different. Just using one CFR algorithm will not be perfectly suitable for all game problems.

For these two problems, this paper proposes a new algorithm called Pure CFR (PCFR) based on CFR. PCFR can be seen as a combination of CFR and Fictitious Play (FP), inheriting the concept of counterfactual regret (value) from CFR, and using the best response strategy instead of the regret matching strategy for the next iteration. This algorithm has three advantages. First, PCFR can be combined with any CFR variant. The resulting Pure MCCFR (PMCCFR) can significantly reduce the time and space complexity of one iteration. Secondly, our experiments show that the convergence speed of the PMCCFR is 2~3 times that of the MCCFR. Finally, there is a type of game that is very suitable for PCFR, we call this type of game clear-game, which is characterized by a high proportion of dominated strategies. Experiments show that in clear-game, the convergence rate of PMCCFR is two orders of magnitude higher than that of MCCFR.

KEYWORDS

Nash Equilibrium, Counterfactual Regret Minimization, Fictitious Play, Dominated Strategy

ACM Reference Format:

Qi Ju, Ting Feng, Falin Hei, Zhemei Fang, and Yunfeng Luo. 2024. Pure Monte Carlo Counterfactual Regret Minimization.

1 INTRODUCTION

Game theory is the study of mathematical models of strategic interactions among rational players, and its core is to find a Nash equilibrium (NE) in which no player can improve by deviating from the equilibrium. While the complete information games have been well addressed by the new artificial intelligence algorithms [29], the extensive-form games with incomplete information, commonly appearing in the areas of video game design, electricity market, and advertising auction, still face significant challenges. In a complete

information game, we can decompose the game into sub-games, and use the backward induction algorithm to solve the equilibrium. However, in incomplete information game, the hidden information for each player prevents the direct use of sub-game payoff in backward induction algorithm, which largely increases the time and space complexity of solving the equilibrium.

The Counterfactual Regret Minimization (CFR) algorithm [35] improved from Regret Matching (RM) [15] is the basic method for solving incomplete information extensive-form games. However, CFR has to traverse the entire game tree in one iteration. Under the current hardware limitations, CFR can only be used to solve heads-up limit Texas hold'em poker with 10^{14} information sets. Many popular games are much larger than heads-up limit Texas hold'em poker, such as no-limit Texas hold'em has 10^{162} information sets [20, 25], DouDizhu has 10^{83} information sets [31, 32], and Mahjong has 10^{121} information sets [24], so it is unrealistic to traverse all information sets in one iteration. In order to overcome the problem that the vanilla CFR rely on game tree traversal, Monte Calo CFR (MCCFR) [22] partially updates the game tree through the sampling method to avoid traversing the entire game tree, and existing experiments show that the convergence rate of MCCFR is similar to that of CFR. So MCCFR is the preferred algorithm for solving large-scale practical problems. In addition to MCCFR, pruning is also a simple and efficient method to reduce the space complexity of the algorithm. The simplest pruning method is to directly skip the sub-game tree with probability of 0. This pruning alone may avoid 96% of invalid game tree traversal [22].

Fictitious Play (FP) is another type of methods for solving NE, which can be traced back to Brown's article in 1951 [4, 5]. In *The Theory of Learning in Game* [14] summarized the previous research and defined the form of FP canonically. Generalized weakened fictitious play (GWFP) process [23] strictly proved that in the presence of certain disturbances and errors, GWFP will eventually converge to NE like FP. Hendon et al. [17] extended FP to extensive-form games. Full-width extensive-form fictitious play (XFP) algorithm [16], basis on GWFP, enables FP to converge faster in extensive-form games. However, compared with RM, the FP algorithm lags behind in the number of papers and engineering implementation.

In the field of deep reinforcement learning, it is a common research insight to select/combine different algorithms for different problems [18]. However, few studies have explored this issue in game learning. In fact, in addition to the two basic algorithms of

RM and FP, there are many other algorithms and variants such as Double Oracle [2], Online Mirror Descent [3, 27], Hedge [10], CFR+ [30], etc. These algorithms have achieved very impressive results in some specific games. But how these algorithms are combined and why they have such different convergence properties and lead to different game results remains a mystery.

Our work can be seen as a combination of CFR and FP, We call this algorithm Pure CFR. From the perspective of CFR, our work adopts the Best Response (BR) strategy instead of the RM strategy as the strategy for the next iteration. From the perspective of FP, we introduce the concept of counterfactual regret (value) into calculation of BR strategy, which greatly facilitates the use of FP algorithm in extensive-form games. Finally, Pure MCCFR (PMCCFR), which combines MCCFR and Pure CFR, converges 2~3 times faster than MCCFR in our experiments under the same training time, and in clear-games (class of game that more than 90% of the strategies in the game are dominated strategies), the convergence rate can be increased by two orders of magnitude compared with MCCFR under the same training time. Our experimental code can be found at <https://github.com/Zealoter/PCFR>.

2 NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Game Theory

2.1.1 Normal-Form Games. Normal-form game is the most basic Game Theory model. $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, i, \dots\}$ denotes the set of players. Player i has a finite action set \mathcal{A}^i . The strategy σ^i of player i is defined as the $|\mathcal{A}^i|$ -dimensions probability distributions over \mathcal{A}^i ($|\cdot|$ represents the number of elements in the set), where $\sigma^i(a')$ represents the probability of player i choosing action a' , i.e. $0 \leq \sigma^i(a') \leq 1$ and $\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{A}^i} \sigma^i(a') = 1$. Define Σ^i as the strategy set of player i , where $\sigma^i \in \Sigma^i$. If strategy σ^i only chooses a specific action a' (e.g. $\sigma^i(a') = 1$), then strategy σ^i is called a pure strategy, we use a_p^i to represent the pure strategy $\sigma^i(a^i) = 1$. Strategies other than pure strategies are mixed strategies. $\Sigma_p^i = (a_{p1}^i, a_{p2}^i, \dots)$ denotes the set of pure strategy. A strategy profile $\sigma = \times_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sigma^i$ is a collection of strategies for all players, $\sigma^{-i} = (\sigma^1, \dots, \sigma^{i-1}, \sigma^{i+1}, \dots)$ refers to all strategies in σ except player i . $\Sigma = \times_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \Sigma^i$ denotes the set of strategy profile, $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Define $u^i : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the bounded payoff function. We write $u^i(a_p^i, \sigma^{-i})$ (respectively $u^i(\sigma^i, \sigma^{-i})$) for the expected payoff to Player i if they select pure strategy a_p^i (respectively strategy σ^i) and all other players play the strategy profile σ^{-i} .

2.1.2 Extensive-Form Games. Extensive form game is generally represented as game trees and consist of the following elements:

- $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, i, \dots\}$ represents a collection of players.
- The nodes s in the game tree represent possible states in the game, and these nodes constitute a set of states $s \in \mathcal{S}$. The leaf nodes of the game tree $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ are also called terminal states.
- For each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, its subsequent edges define the set of actions $A(s)$ that the player or chance can take. $P : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \cup \{c\}$ is the player function determines who takes an action in a given state. If $P(s) = c$ then chance determines the action taken in state s .

- In a game, players may only know that they are in a certain type of states, but they cannot determine which specific state s they are in. Define the information set $I \in \mathcal{I}^i$ to represent the set of states that the player i cannot distinguish.
- Define a payoff function that $R : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{N}|}$ maps the end point state to a vector whose components correspond to the payoff for each player.
- The behavioral strategy $\sigma^i(I) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}(I)|}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}^i$ of extensive games is defined independently on each information set.

2.1.3 Nash Equilibrium. The best response (BR) strategy of player i to their opponents' strategies σ^{-i} is

$$b^i(\sigma^{-i}) = \max_{a_p^i \in \Sigma_p^i} u^i(a_p^i, \sigma^{-i}), \quad (1)$$

although a mixed strategy may also become a BR strategy, it is much easier to find a pure BR strategy than a mixed BR strategy in engineering implementation, so the BR strategies discussed in this article are all pure BR strategies. If there are multiple BR strategies at the same time, one of them will be returned randomly. Define the exploitability ϵ^i of player i in strategy profile σ as:

$$\epsilon^i = u^i(b^i(\sigma^{-i}), \sigma^{-i}) - u^i(\sigma), \quad (2)$$

and total exploitability as $\epsilon = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \epsilon^i$. A Nash equilibrium is a strategy profile σ such that $\epsilon = 0$.

2.1.4 Dominated Strategy. In game theory, strategic dominance occurs when one action (or strategy) is better than another action (or strategy) for one player, no matter how that player's opponents may play. For example, in the famous "Prisoner's Dilemma", no matter how the opponent decides, the payoff of **testifies** is always higher than **staying silent**. In Prisoner's Dilemma, staying silent is a dominated strategy. Formally, for player i , if there is a pure strategy $a_p^{i*} \in \Sigma_p^i$ and a strategy $\sigma^{i*} \in \Sigma^i$ satisfies:

$$u^i(a_p^{i*}, \sigma^{-i}) \leq u^i(\sigma^{i*}, \sigma^{-i}), \forall \sigma^{-i} \in \Sigma^{-i}, \quad (3)$$

pure strategy a_p^{i*} is a dominated strategy of player i . Any rational player will definitely not choose strategy $\sigma(a^{i*}) > 0$, so we can eliminate action a^{i*} from action set \mathcal{A}^i without changing the NE of the game [26].

We believe that the proportion of dominated strategies is an important feature of the game, which directly determines the convergence rate of different algorithms. Based on experience, if the proportion of dominated strategies in the game exceeds 90%, we call it a **clear-game**; if the proportion of dominated strategies in the game is less than 10%, we call it a **tangled-game**.

2.2 Normal-Form Game Solving Algorithm

2.2.1 Regret Matching(RM). Let σ_t^i be the strategy used by player i on round t . The average overall regret of player i 's action a^i at time T is:

$$\bar{R}_T^i(a^i) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u^i(a^i, \sigma_t^{-i}) - u^i(\sigma_t). \quad (4)$$

The new strategy is produced by:

$$\sigma_{T+1}^i(a^i) = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{R}_T^{i,+}(a)}{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^i} \bar{R}_T^{i,+}(a)} & \text{if } \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}^i} \bar{R}_T^{i,+}(a) > 0 \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}^i|} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Where $\bar{R}_T^{i,+}(a) = \max(\bar{R}_T^i(a), 0)$. Since the probability of taking action $\sigma_{T+1}^i(a)$ is proportional to the regret value $\bar{R}_T^{i,+}(a)$ of this action, so this algorithm is called the regret matching algorithm. The convergence rate of RM is $\bar{R}_T^i \leq \frac{L\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}^i|}}{\sqrt{T}}$, where $L = \max_{\sigma \in \Sigma, i \in \mathcal{N}} u^i(\sigma) - \min_{\sigma \in \Sigma, i \in \mathcal{N}} u^i(\sigma)$. Let $\bar{\sigma}_T^i$ be the average strategy of player i :

$$\bar{\sigma}_T^i(a) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^i(a)}{T}. \quad (6)$$

In a two-player zero-sum game, if $\bar{R}_T^i \leq \epsilon^i$ for both players $i \in \mathcal{N}$, then $\bar{\sigma}_T$ is a $\frac{(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2)}{2}$ -equilibrium.

2.2.2 Fictitious Play(FP). FP assuming all players start with random strategy profile $\sigma_{t=1}$ (t donates the number of iterations), the strategy profile is updated following the iterative function:

$$\sigma_{t+1} = (1 - \alpha_t) \sigma_t + \alpha_t b(\sigma_t), \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha_t = \frac{1}{t+1}$. The convergence rate of FP in a two-player zero-sum game may be $O(\sqrt{T})$ [12]. As far as we know, in the case of multi-player, the convergence rate of FP has not been well studied. To speed up iteration, define the average overall Q-value of player i 's action a^i at time T as:

$$\bar{Q}_T^i(a^i) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u^i(a^i, \sigma_t^{-i}). \quad (8)$$

If u^i is an affine function (e.g. payoff function in two-player zero-sum game), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_T^i(a^i) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T u(a^i, b(\sigma_t^i)) = u\left(a^i, \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T b(\sigma_t^i)\right) \\ &= u(a^i, \sigma_t^{-i}) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

at this time, the action corresponding to the maximum value in $\bar{Q}_T^i(a^i)$ is the pure BR for average strategy σ_t^{-i} .

2.3 Extensive-Form Game Solving Algorithm

2.3.1 Counterfactual Regret Minimization(CFR). Define counterfactual value $u(I, \sigma)$ to be the expected value given that information set I is reached and all players play using strategy σ except that player i plays to reach I . Finally, for all $a \in A^i(I)$, define $\sigma_{I \rightarrow a}$ to be a strategy profile identical to σ except that player i always chooses action a when in information set I . The immediate counterfactual regret is:

$$R_{T,\text{imm}}^i(I, a) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I) \left(u^i(I, \sigma_t|_{I \rightarrow a}) - u^i(I, \sigma_t) \right), \quad (10)$$

where $\pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I)$ is the probability of information set I occurring if all players (including chance, except i) choose actions according to σ_t .

Let $\bar{R}_{T,\text{imm}}^{i,+}(I, a) = \max(\bar{R}_{T,\text{imm}}^i(I, a), 0)$, the strategy at time $T+1$ is:

$$\sigma_{T+1}^i(I, a) = \begin{cases} \frac{R_{T,\text{imm}}^{i,+}(I, a)}{\sum_{a \in A^i(I)} R_{T,\text{imm}}^{i,+}(I, a)} & \text{if } R_{T,\text{imm}}^{i,+}(I) \neq \mathbf{0} \\ \frac{1}{|A^i(I)|} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

The average strategy $\bar{\sigma}_T^i$ for an information set I on iteration T is:

$$\bar{\sigma}_T^i(I) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \pi_{\sigma_t}^i(I) \sigma_t^i(I)}{\sum_{t=1}^T \pi_{\sigma_t}^i(I)}. \quad (12)$$

Eventually, $\bar{\sigma}_T$ will converge to NE with $T \rightarrow \infty$.

2.3.2 Monte Carlo Counterfactual Regret Minimization(MCCFR) and Naive Pruning. There are many forms of sampling MCCFR, but the most common is external sampling MCCFR (ES-MCCFR) [6] because of its simplicity and powerful performance. In ES-MCCFR, some players are designated as traversers and others are samplers during an iteration. Traversers follow the CFR algorithm to update the regret and the average strategy of the experienced information set. On the rest of the sampler's nodes and the chance node, only one action is explored (sampled according to the player's strategy for that iteration on the information set), and the regret and the average strategy are not updated.

Pruning is a common optimization method in all tree search algorithms. The Alpha-Beta algorithm in the complete information extensive game is a pruned version for Min-Max algorithm. This method is also the key algorithm for Deep Blue's success [19]. Naive pruning algorithm is the simplest pruning algorithm in CFR. In naive pruning, if all the players have no probability of reaching the current state s ($\forall i, \pi_{\sigma_t}^i(s) = 0$), the entire subtree at that state s can be pruned for the current iteration without affecting the regret calculation. Existing research experiments have shown that only using the naive pruning algorithm can save more than 96% of the calculation time in some games [22].

2.3.3 Extensive-Form Fictitious Play(XFP). Theoretically, any extensive-form game can be transformed into a normal-form game. Therefore, FP can also be migrated to extensive-form games. Let σ_1 be an initial strategy profile. The extensive-form fictitious play process

$$\sigma_{t+1}^i(I) = \sigma_t^i(I) + \frac{\alpha_{t+1} \pi_{\sigma_t}^i(I) (b^i(\sigma_t^{-i})(I) - \sigma_t^i(I))}{(1 - \alpha_{t+1}) \pi_{\sigma_t}^i(I) + \alpha_{t+1} \pi_{b^i(\sigma_t^{-i})}^i(I)} \quad (13)$$

for all players $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and all their information states $I \in I^i$. However, XFP did not consider how to find BR strategies efficiently in extensive-form games.

3 MOTIVATION OF PCFR

We believe that previous game solving algorithms have ignored two important issues:

- Many game convergence analyzes are based on the number of iterations T , but this obviously ignores the time/space complexity required in an iteration of the algorithm. For example, Hedge converges faster than CFR when the number of iterations is the same, but the time required for Hedge to calculate an iteration is much longer than that of CFR, so training generally uses the CFR algorithm instead of Hedge.

- To the best of our knowledge, no research has discussed the adaptability between game solving algorithms and game characteristics. A general algorithm (such as CFR+, OMD) obviously cannot perfectly solve all game problems, so we hope to find the most suitable solution algorithm for games with different characteristics.

3.1 Complexity of RM and FP in One Iteration

Previous experiments have shown that the convergence rate of FP is similar to that of RM under the same training time. The iterative calculation of RM is complex but the convergence rate is faster, while the iterative calculation of FP is simple but the convergence rate is slow. In the case of N player, the RM algorithm obtains the regret value $R^i(a_x, \sigma^{-i})$ through the strategy and payoff function (matrix multiplication). Therefore, RM requires searching the entire game, and the time/space complexity is $O(|\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathcal{N}|})$. However, in the FP process, since the player will only play a pure strategy, FP does not need to calculate the matrix multiplication of the strategy and the payoff function. Regardless of the number of players in the game, the time/space complexity of calculating an FP iteration is $O(|\mathcal{A}|)$.

In large-scale game problems (especially multi-player games), it is unrealistic to use RM/CFR to search the entire game space. The current solution is to introduce sampling and pruning into RM/CFR, but this will cause complexity in engineering implementation and bring huge variance. The previous XFP algorithm did not inherit the characteristics of simple calculation of FP in strategic games (XFP still needs to traverse all information sets), so we believe it is necessary to design a new FP algorithm in extensive-form games.

3.2 The Relationship between Convergence Speed and Algorithm in Different Games

A common phenomenon in real-world games is that only a very small number of strategies in the action space of the game are non-dominated strategies. For example, in the openings of chess and Go, both top AI and human experts will only choose from several common openings. DeepMind believes that game strategy is like a spinning tops [11], only a small subset of strategies in the strategy space can be regarded as non-dominated strategies. MCCFR mentions that the pruning ratio reaches 96% in some games, and Pluribus supplementary materials [9] also mention that about 50% of the information sets will not pass through at all during training (strategies that are not played are almost certainly dominated strategies, and there are still many dominated strategies among the traversed information set). These facts all prove that the proportion of dominated strategies in real-world games is high, and according to the definition in 2.1.4, most real-world games can be called clear games.

In training, RM and its variants do not perform well in the clear game, which we believe is due to RM wasting too much time exploring dominated strategies. For example, in the rock-paper-scissors (RPS) game, a Leaky Rock (LR) action is added for player 1. Set the payoff of action LR to be 0.1 less than that of action R (action LR is a

dominated strategy and no rational person will choose this action):

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{add action LR}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -0.1 & -1.1 & 0.9 \end{bmatrix} \quad (14)$$

Assuming that player 1 starts with an average strategy and player2 takes scissors in the first round, player 1's profit is $u^1 = 0.225$. The regret value is $R^1(R) = 1 - 0.225 = 0.775$, $R^1(S) = 0 - 0.225 = -0.225$, $R^1(P) = -1 - 0.225 = -1.225$, $R^1(LR) = 0.9 - 0.225 = 0.675$. According to the RM algorithm, the probability of selecting Rock in the next round of iterative game is: $\sigma^1(R) \approx 0.534$. The probability of choosing action LR is: $\sigma^1(LR) \approx 0.466$. In this case, although action LR is a dominated strategy, RM will still have nearly half the probability of choosing this action (it can be considered that nearly half of the computing resources are wasted at this time). But in FP, the action LR can never be selected.

It is easy to prove through toy experiments that the convergence speed of FP in the normal-form clear-game is much faster than that of RM. Therefore, we believe that if the BR strategy is also used in extensive-form clear-game, its convergence speed will be faster than CFR.

4 PURE CFR ALGORITHM THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

4.1 PCFR Implementation

We propose a new algorithm called Pure CFR (PCFR), and the theoretical convergence of the PCFR is proved in A.1. First, it is no longer necessary to calculate the immediate counterfactual regret, just define the immediate counterfactual Q-value:

$$Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i(I, a) = Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^i(I, a) + \pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I)u^i(I, \sigma_t|I \rightarrow a). \quad (15)$$

The difference between $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i$ and $\bar{R}_{t,\text{imm}}^i$ is that $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i$ does not need to subtract average payoff $u^i(I, \sigma_t)$, because it has no effect on finding the maximum value of $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i$, and it will save a lot of computing time.

Second, the strategy in the next iteration is a BR strategy rather than RM strategy:

$$\sigma_{t+1}^i = \max_{a \in \Sigma_p^i(I)} Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i(I, a). \quad (16)$$

Since max will only take the action with the largest counterfactual Q-value, the strategy obtained in each iteration is a pure strategy. This is why we named this algorithm Pure CFR. In addition, the time complexity of calculating the BR strategy is obviously lower than that of calculating the RM strategy.

Finally, since the update σ_{t+1}^i is a pure strategy, $\pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I)$ is either 0 or 1. This means that the probability of triggering naive pruning is greatly increased. It can be seen from the equation 10 that if $\pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I) = 0$, it is unnecessary to enter the sub-game tree to calculate $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i(I, a)$. Similarly, it can be seen from the equation 12 that if $\pi_{\sigma_t}^i(I) = 0$ it is unnecessary to update the average strategy $\bar{\sigma}_t^i(I)$. These pruning greatly improve the efficiency of the algorithm. The pseudocode of the PCFR algorithm can be found in Appendix B.1.

4.2 Pure CFR Algorithm Theoretical Analysis

4.2.1 *Time Complexity of CFR and PCFR in an Information Set.* The advantages of solving the BR strategy on an information set are reflected in three points:

- (1) There is no need to subtract $u^i(I, \sigma_t)$ when calculating the counterfactual Q-value $Q_{T, \text{imm}}^i(I)$;
- (2) $Q_{T, \text{imm}}^i(I)$ does not need to be compared with 0, nor does it need to calculate the proportion of the regret value of each action to the total regret value. It just needs to find the maximum of $Q_{T, \text{imm}}^i(I, a)$;
- (3) Since the next strategy is a pure strategy, updating the average strategy only requires $O(1)$.

Suppose there are x actions $\mathcal{A}(I) = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_x\}$ in the information set I , and the counterfactual payoff $u(I, a)$ of each action is known, then:

The calculations required for PCFR in one information set are:

- (1) Add the counterfactual payoff $u^i(I, \sigma_t | I \rightarrow a)$ to the counterfactual Q-value $Q_{T, \text{imm}}^i(I, a)$, this step requires x additions;
- (2) Find the maximum value of $Q_{T, \text{imm}}^i(I)$ (get BR strategy), this step requires x comparisons;
- (3) Update the BR strategy to the average strategy, this step requires 1 addition;

A total of $2x + 1$ additions.

The calculations required for CFR in one information set are:

- (1) Get average counterfactual payoff $u^i(I)$ from $u^i(I, \sigma_t | I \rightarrow a)$ and strategy $\sigma_t(I)$, this step needs x multiplications and $x - 1$ additions;
- (2) Get regret value $R_{\text{imm}}(I, a)$, this step needs x additions;
- (3) Multiply the regret value $R_{\text{imm}}(I, a)$ by $\pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I)$ and add it to the average regret value $\bar{R}_T(I, a)$, this step needs x additions and x multiplications;
- (4) Compared Regret value with 0, this step needs x comparisons;
- (5) Add up the positive regret values, this step needs $x - 1$ additions;
- (6) Get regret matching strategy, this step x multiplications;
- (7) Update the RM strategy to the average strategy, this step needs x additions;

A total of $6x - 2$ additions and $3x$ multiplications.

It can be seen that in one information set, PCFR only takes $2/9$ of the time of CFR.

4.2.2 *Number of nodes touched in one iteration.* Let the game tree have no chance nodes, each node has g actions, the game tree has h levels. When $g = 3, h = 4$, the game tree is shown in the Figure 1. The node $s_{\text{all}} = (s_r, s_g, s_b, s_y)$ of the entire game tree is divided into four types.

- The probability of all players reaching this node is 1 (red node s_r);
- The probability of all players reaching this node is 0 (green node s_g), and these nodes can be pruned;

- The probability of the current player reaching this node is 1, and the probability of other players is 0 (blue node s_b);
- The probability that the current player reaches this node is 0, and the probability of other players is 1 (yellow node s_y);

Green nodes and subsequent sub-game trees do not need to be touched. Let $s_{\text{pass}} = (s_r, s_b, s_y)$ as the node that needs to be touched, It can be seen from the Figure 1 that there is only one red node at each level, the yellow and green nodes will only be after the blue node, and the blue node will be generated by the red node and the yellow node. Define $F_h(s_x)$ as the number of s_x type nodes in layer $1 \sim h$. The iteration equations of various nodes in each lever h can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} F_h(s_r) &= 1 \\ F_h(s_g) &= gF_{h-1}(s_g) + (g-1)F_{h-1}(s_b) \\ F_h(s_b) &= (g-1)F_{h-1}(s_r) + gF_{h-1}(s_y) \\ F_h(s_y) &= F_{h-1}(s_b) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

the general term formula for blue node s_b in the h layer is:

$$\begin{aligned} F_h(s_b) &= (g-1)F_{h-1}(s_r) + gF_{h-1}(s_y) \\ &= (g-1)1 + gF_{h-2}(s_b) \\ &= (g-1) + g((g-1) + gF_{h-4}(s_b)) \\ &= \dots \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

after simplification:

$$F_{h \geq 2}(s_b) = (g-1) \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor (h-2)/2 \rfloor} g^i. \quad (19)$$

The number of nodes that need to be touched s_{pass} in the h level game tree is:

$$\begin{aligned} F_h(s_{\text{pass}}) &= F_h(s_r) + F_h(s_b) + F_h(s_y) \\ &= 1 + F_h(s_b) + F_{h-1}(s_b) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$F_{h \geq 3}(s_{\text{pass}}) = 1 + (g-1) \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor (h-2)/2 \rfloor} g^i + (g-1) \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor (h-3)/2 \rfloor} g^i. \quad (21)$$

The number of node s_{all} of the entire h level game tree is:

$$F_h(s_{\text{all}}) = \sum_{i=0}^h g^i = \frac{1-g^{h+1}}{1-g}. \quad (22)$$

In a two-player game, it can be approximately considered that $F_h(s_{\text{all}}) \propto \sqrt{F_h(s_{\text{pass}})}$, so PCFR only needs to touch $O(\sqrt{|S|})$ nodes in one iteration. Extending the results to multi-player games, PCFR only needs to touch $O(\sqrt[h]{|S|})$ nodes.

4.3 PCFR Combined with CFR Variants

Because our algorithm meets Blackwell approachability, the CFR variants, such as MCCFR, CFR+, and different average weighting schemes [8] etc. are all applicable to the proposed PCFR (called PCFR-variants). However, the theoretical convergence rate of the PCFR-variants can only be calculated in the worse cases. Thus, we use a series of experiments to explore the convergence rate of different PCFR-variants. According to the experiment results in Appendix C, the vanilla-weighted PMCCFR (i.e. MCCFR + PCFR)




Figure 1: Game tree when each node has $g = 3$ actions and $h = 4$ levels. The number $(\pi^1(s), \pi^2(s))$ in each node represents the probability of player1 and player2 reaching this node respectively.

converges the fastest. The pseudocode of the PMCCFR algorithm can be found in Appendix B.2.

5 EXPERIMENTS EVALUATION

5.1 Description of the Game

We have adopted random game tree, Kuhn-extension poker, Leduc-extension poker, princess and monster [22] to compare the abilities of different algorithms. These games are widely used to compare the convergence rate of different algorithms. In the random game tree, we carefully designed the clear-game and the tangled-game to show the impact of game characteristics on the convergence rate of different algorithms. The Kuhn-extension poker is based on the vanilla Kuhn poker [21], increasing the number of cards to x (vanilla Kuhn poker has 3 cards); increasing the bet action types to y (only 1 in vanilla Kuhn poker); increasing the number of raising times to z times (vanilla Kuhn poker has only 1 time); The improvement of Leduc-extension is similar to the improvement of Kuhn-extension based on Leduc poker [28]. These improvements allow us to change the scale of the game very easily. Princess and monster is a classic pursuit problem. For a detailed description of these games, and more experimental results, see Appendix D.

5.2 Experimental Settings

The CPU used in our experiment is AMD 3990WX, and the memory is 128GB. We run a set of experiments to compare PMCCFR with CFR, ES-MCCFR, and CFR+.

In order to reflect the fluctuation range of different algorithms, all algorithms use random distribution as the initial strategy. The strategies of all players are updated simultaneously during the iteration. The weight settings of the comparative experiments are consistent with previous classic papers [6, 22]. ES-MCCFR and CFR both adopt square weights, the time weights of CFR+ are set to liner, while PCFR and PMCCFR adopt vanilla weights. In the engineering implementation, if the probability of reaching a certain node during iteration is less than 10^{-20} , it will be directly pruned. In MCCFR, if $R_t^{i,\max} = 0$, we directly set the strategy of the next stage to a randomly pure strategy.

In Appendix E, we compare time, number of iterations, and nodes touched as an indicator. Finally, we use nodes touched and time as an indicator.

5.3 Experimental Results

5.3.1 Convergence. As shown in the Figure 2, when the number of nodes touched is used as an indicator, the convergence rate of the PMCCFR is slightly better than that of ES-MCCFR. However, when touch the same number of nodes, the computation time of PMCCFR is only 2/9 of MCCFR (the reason is mentioned in Section 4.2.1). Therefore, considering the time of game simulation, PMCCFR saves 1/2~2/3 time compared to ES-MCCFR when achieving the same exploitability in these games.

The Convergence rate in 14-Card 1-Action 1-Len Leduc shows that although MCCFR will surpass CFR+ when the passing nodes is used as an indicator, CFR+ will surpass MCCFR when time is used as an indicator. This is because MCCFR calculates the RM strategy every time it passes through a node, while CFR+ only calculates the RM strategy once after passing through all nodes in an information set. Therefore, when passing through the same number of nodes, the time of MCCFR calculate RM strategy will definitely exceed CFR+, which also reflects the necessity of taking time as an indicator.

5.3.2 Comparison of Time Required in One Iteration. CFR+ needs to traverse the entire game tree for each iteration, which makes it extremely difficult to use the CFR+ algorithm in large-scale games. Correspondingly, if a small number of nodes are touched in one iteration, it can not only allow the algorithm to run on lower hardware configurations, but also does not need to consider issues such as memory allocation and recycling, which will bring great convenience to engineering implementation.

As shown in the Table 1, in the early iterations of training, CFR+/CFR needs to traverse about half of the nodes of the entire game tree, while the PMCCFR traverses very few nodes. In the 3-Card 20-Action 7-Len Kuhn with 4.97 million nodes, PMCCFR will only pass 855 nodes at one iteration. In this game, the ES-MCCFR will pass through 5528.12 nodes, but the full traversal algorithm PCFR will only pass through 5413.04 nodes. This means that as long as the training time is sufficient, PMCCFR can be directly applied




Figure 2: Convergence rate in Leduc-extension, princess and monster, Kuhn-extension. The graph in the first row takes the number of passing nodes as an indicator, and the graph in the second row takes the running time of the algorithm as an indicator. The training timing of all experiments is fixed at 1000s. Each experiment has an average of 30 rounds, and the light range is the 90% confidence interval.

Game name	Game tree's node	Travesal or MC	Algorithm	Average number of nodes touched per iteration	The proportion of nodes touched per iteration (%)
5 Card 5 Bet Action 1 Len Leduc	245336	Traversal	CFR+	131615.8	53.647
			CFR	110428.3	45.011
			PCFR	11027.4	4.494
		MC	PMCCFR	110.4	0.045
			MCCFR	221.3	0.09
3 Card 20 Bet Action 7 Len Kuhn	4967263	Traversal	CFR+	2774844.0	55.862
			CFR	2198996.4	44.269
			PCFR	5413.0	0.108
		MC	PMCCFR	855.8	0.017
			MCCFR	5528.1	0.111

Table 1: The number of nodes that different algorithms touched through in first five iterations of different games (averaged over 30 random samples)




Figure 3: Convergence rate in Random Game Tree. The graph in the first row takes the number of passing nodes as an indicator, and the graph in the second row takes the running time of the algorithm as an indicator. The training timing of all experiments is fixed at 10s. Each experiment has an average of 30 rounds, and the light range is the 90% confidence interval.

to the solution to large-scale game problems without any memory recycling. In addition, previous experience has shown that algorithms that pass fewer nodes in one iteration often converge faster in training large-scale games, which also explains why PMCCFR is slightly faster than MCCFR when measuring convergence rate by the number of nodes passed.

5.3.3 Convergence Rate of PCFR in Clear-Game. In the random game tree, each player will first randomly get a private feature card (the private feature cards of other players are not known). Each player has two kinds of private feature cards. After that, Player 1 and Player 2 alternately make $d = 6$ rounds of decisions. These decisions were all public (called public feature). All information sets have $g = 4$ actions. The entire game tree has 21845 nodes. The payoff of the tangled-game will be randomly generated using Gaussian distribution based on the public decision-making and private feature. The clear game randomly sets 5% of the public feature to non-dominated based on the tangled-game. The corresponding payoff of this public information is increased by 3 (no matter what

type of private attribute card the opponent has). In this experiment, both PCFR and MCCFR use constant weights $w_t = 1$. The results of the experiment are shown in Figure 3. In the tangled-game, the convergence speed of MCCFR is slightly better than that of PMCCFR. In the clear-game, both PMCCFR and MCCFR achieved faster convergence speeds, but PMCCFR is obviously more suitable for this kind of game. The convergence speed is two orders of magnitude ahead of MCCFR. It was also mentioned in Section 3.2 that real-world games are often clear-game, so we believe that PMCCFR can be used as a "prior" method. For an unstudied game, you can first use PMCCFR for early training to explore the characteristics

of the game in order to find the most suitable training algorithm for the game.

In the clear game, the number of nodes that PMCCFR passes through at the same time does not reach twice that of MCCFR. This is because the probability of MCCFR triggering pruning will also greatly increase under this setting, offsetting part of the disadvantage of calculation speed.

6 CONCLUSION

This paper proposes a novel method for solving incomplete information zero-sum games—Pure CFR. We first demonstrate that PCFR still has the same convergence properties and a similar convergence rate as the vanilla CFR, and can be freely combined with previous CFR variants. Due to adopting the BR strategy instead of the RM strategy, PMCCFR achieved a rate increase of 2 ~ 3 times compared to vanilla MCCFR in the experiment. At the same time, we found that PCFR is very suitable for clear-games with a high proportion dominated strategies. This method can achieve an improvement of two orders of magnitude in clear-games.

In the future research, we will verify the feasibility of the method on a larger scale and combine it with other CFR variants, such as Alternate Update, Discount CFR [8], Lazy CFR [34], Greedy RM [33], predictive version [13], deep networks [7], etc. In addition, finding the most suitable algorithm for games with different characteristics is also a very interesting direction.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jacob Abernethy, Peter Bartlett, and Elad Hazan. 2011. Blackwell Approachability and No-Regret Learning are Equivalent.
- [2] Lukáš Adam, Rostislav Horčík, Tomáš Kasl, and Tomáš Kroupa. 2021. Double oracle algorithm for computing equilibria in continuous games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 5070–5077.
- [3] Yu Bai, Chi Jin, Song Mei, and Tiancheng Yu. 2022. Near-optimal learning of extensive-form games with imperfect information. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 1337–1382.
- [4] Ulrich Berger. 2007. Brown’s original fictitious play. *Journal of Economic Theory* 135, 1 (2007), 572–578.
- [5] G. W. Brown. 1951. Iterative solution of games by fictitious play. *activity analysis of production and allocation* (1951).
- [6] Noam Brown. 2020. Equilibrium finding for large adversarial imperfect-information games. *PhD thesis* (2020).
- [7] Noam Brown, Adam Lerer, Sam Gross, and Tuomas Sandholm. 2019. Deep counterfactual regret minimization. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 793–802.
- [8] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. 2019. Solving Imperfect-Information Games via Discounted Regret Minimization. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 33 (2019), 1829–1836.
- [9] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. 2019. Superhuman AI for multiplayer poker. *Science* 365, 6456 (2019), eaay2400.
- [10] Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi, Yishay Mansour, and Gilles Stoltz. 2007. Improved second-order bounds for prediction with expert advice. *Machine Learning* 66 (2007), 321–352.
- [11] Wojciech M Czarnecki, Gauthier Gidel, Brendan Tracey, Karl Tuyls, Shayegan Omidshafiei, David Balduzzi, and Max Jaderberg. 2020. Real world games look like spinning tops. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 17443–17454.
- [12] Constantinos Daskalakis and Qinxuan Pan. 2014. A counter-example to Karlin’s strong conjecture for fictitious play. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 11–20.
- [13] Gabriele Farina, Christian Kroer, and Tuomas Sandholm. 2021. Faster game solving via predictive blackwell approachability: Connecting regret matching and mirror descent. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 5363–5371.
- [14] Drew Fudenberg and David K. Levine. 1998. *The Theory of Learning in Games*. MIT Press Books 1 (1998).
- [15] Sergiu Hart and Andreu Mas-Colell. 2000. A simple adaptive procedure leading to correlated equilibrium. *Econometrica* 68, 5 (2000), 1127–1150.
- [16] Johannes Heinrich, Marc Lanctot, and David Silver. 2015. Fictitious Self-Play in Extensive-Form Games. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- [17] Ebbe Hendon, Hans Jørgen Jacobsen, and Birgitte Sloth. 1996. Fictitious play in extensive form games. *Games and Economic Behavior* 15, 2 (1996), 177–202.
- [18] Matteo Hessel, Joseph Modayil, Hado Van Hasselt, Tom Schaul, Georg Ostrovski, Will Dabney, Dan Horgan, Bilal Piot, Mohammad Azar, and David Silver. 2018. Rainbow: Combining improvements in deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [19] Hoane Feng Hsiung Hsu. 2002. Deep Blue. *Artificial Intelligence* (2002).
- [20] Michael Johanson. 2013. Measuring the Size of Large No-Limit Poker Games. *Computer Science* (2013).
- [21] H. W. Kuhn. 1950. Simplified two-person poker. *Contributions to the Theory of Games* (1950).
- [22] Marc Lanctot, Kevin Waugh, Martin Zinkevich, and Michael H. Bowling. 2010. Monte Carlo Sampling for Regret Minimization in Extensive Games. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 22.
- [23] David S. Leslie and E. J. Collins. 2006. Generalised weakened fictitious play. *Games and Economic Behavior* 56, 2 (2006), 285–298.
- [24] Junjie Li, Sotetsu Koyamada, Qiwei Ye, Guoqing Liu, and Hsiao Wuen Hon. 2020. Suphx: Mastering Mahjong with Deep Reinforcement Learning. (2020).
- [25] Matej Moravik, Martin Schmid, Neil Burch, Viliam Lis, and Michael Bowling. 2017. DeepStack: Expert-Level Artificial Intelligence in No-Limit Poker. *Science* 356, 6337 (2017), 508.
- [26] Larry Samuelson. 1992. Dominated strategies and common knowledge. *Games and Economic Behavior* 4, 2 (1992), 284–313. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0899-8256\(92\)90020-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0899-8256(92)90020-5)
- [27] Shai Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2012. Online learning and online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 4, 2 (2012), 107–194.
- [28] Jiefu Shi and Michael L. Littman. 2002. Abstraction Methods for Game Theoretic Poker. In *International Conference on Computers and Games*.
- [29] David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dharmasharan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, Timothy Lillicrap, Karen Simonyan, and Demis Hassabis. 2018. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and Go through self-play. *Science* 362, 6419 (2018), 1140–1144.
- [30] Oskari Tammelin. 2014. Solving Large Imperfect Information Games Using CFR+. *Eprint Arxiv* (2014).
- [31] Daochen Zha, Kwei Herng Lai, Yuanpu Cao, Songyi Huang, Ruzhe Wei, Junyu Guo, and Xia Hu. 2019. RLCard: A Toolkit for Reinforcement Learning in Card Games. (2019).
- [32] Daochen Zha, Jingru Xie, Wenye Ma, Sheng Zhang, and Ji Liu. 2021. DouZero: Mastering DouDizhu with Self-Play Deep Reinforcement Learning.
- [33] Hugh Zhang, Adam Lerer, and Noam Brown. 2022. Equilibrium Finding in Normal-Form Games Via Greedy Regret Minimization. (2022).
- [34] Yichi Zhou, Tongzheng Ren, Jialian Li, Dong Yan, and Jun Zhu. 2018. Lazy-CFR: fast and near optimal regret minimization for extensive games with imperfect information. (2018).
- [35] M. Zinkevich, M. Johanson, M. Bowling, and C. Piccione. 2007. Regret minimization in games with incomplete information. *Oldbooks.nips.cc* 20 (2007), 1729–1736.

A CONVERGENCE OF PCFR

A.1 Blackwell Approachability Game

Definition A.1. A Blackwell approachability game in normal-form two-player games can be described as a tuple (Σ, u, S^1, S^2) , where Σ is a strategy profile, u is the payoff function, and $S^i = \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}^{|\mathcal{A}^i|}$ is a closed convex target cone. The Player i 's regret vector of the strategy profile σ is $R^i(\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}^i|}$, for each component $R^i(\sigma)(a_x) = u^i(a_x, \sigma^{-i}) - u^i(\sigma)$, $a_x \in \mathcal{A}^i$ the average regret vector for players i to take actions at T time a is \bar{R}_T^i

$$\bar{R}_T^i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T R^i(\sigma_t) \quad (23)$$

At each time t , the two players interact in this order:

- Player 1 chooses a strategy $\sigma_t^1 \in \Sigma^1$;
- Player 2 chooses an action $\sigma_t^2 \in \Sigma^2$, which can depend adversarially on all the σ^t output so far;
- Player 1 gets the vector value payoff $R^1(\sigma_t) \in \mathbb{R}^{l^1}$.

The goal of Player 1 is to select actions $\sigma_1^1, \sigma_2^1, \dots \in \Sigma^1$ such that no matter what actions $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots \in \Sigma^2$ played by Player 2, the average payoff vector converges to the target set S^1 .

$$\min_{\hat{s} \in S^1} \|\hat{s} - R_T^1\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty \quad (24)$$

Before explaining how to choose the action σ_t to ensure this goal achieve, we first need to define the forceable half-space:

Definition A.2. Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ as half-space, that is, for some $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{H} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{a}^\top x \leq b\}$. In Blackwell approachability games, the halfspace \mathcal{H} is said to be forceable if there exists a strategy $\sigma^{i*} \in \Sigma^i$ of Player i that guarantees that the regret vector $R^i(\sigma)$ is in \mathcal{H} no matter the strategy played by Player $-i$, such that

$$R^i(\sigma^{i*}, \hat{\sigma}^{-i}) \in \mathcal{H} \quad \forall \hat{\sigma}^{-i} \in \Sigma^{-i} \quad (25)$$

And σ^{i*} is forcing action for \mathcal{H} .

Blackwell's approachability theorem states the following.

THEOREM A.3. Goal 24 can be attained if and only if every half-space $\mathcal{H}_t \supseteq S$ is forceable.

The relationship between Blackwell approachability and no-regret learning is:

THEOREM A.4. Any strategy (algorithm) that achieves Blackwell approachability can be converted into an algorithm that achieves no-regret, and vice versa [1]

Let $\bar{\sigma}_T^i$ be the average strategy of player i :

$$\bar{\sigma}_T^i(a) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \sigma_t^i(a)}{T} \quad (26)$$

In a two-player zero-sum game, the exploitability of the average strategy $\bar{\sigma}_T^i$ at time T of player i is $\epsilon_T^i = \max_{a' \in \mathcal{A}^i} \bar{R}_T^i(a')$ [6]. Obviously, the regret value is always greater than the exploitability:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_T = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \epsilon_T^i \leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{\hat{s} \in S^i} \|\hat{s} - R_T^i\|_2 = 0 \quad (27)$$

So, if the algorithm achieves Blackwell approachability, the average strategy $\bar{\sigma}_T^i$ will converge to equilibrium with $T \rightarrow \infty$. The rate




Figure 4: The difference between RM and FP (PCFR in normal-form game) in a two-dimensional plane

of convergence is $\epsilon_T^i \leq \bar{R}_T^i \leq L\sqrt{|\mathcal{A}|}/\sqrt{T}$, where $L = \max_{\sigma \in \Sigma, i \in \mathcal{N}} u^i(\sigma) - \min_{\sigma \in \Sigma, i \in \mathcal{N}} u^i(\sigma)$ represents the payoff interval of the game.

A.2 Fictitious Play achieves Blackwell Approachability

We first prove that FP achieves Blackwell approachability in a two-player zero-sum game. Define $\bar{R}_t^{i, \max}$ be the maximum portion of vector $\bar{R}_t^{i, +}$. If $\bar{R}_t^{i, \max} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we find the point $\psi_t = \bar{R}_t^i - \bar{R}_t^{i, \max}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}^i|}$ and let $\frac{\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t}{\|\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t\|}$ be the normal vector, then we can determine half-space by $\frac{\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t}{\|\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t\|}$ and ψ_t :

$$\mathcal{H}_t^P = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{l^{-i}} : (\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t)^\top z \leq (\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t)^\top \psi_t \right\} \quad (28)$$

Because $\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t = \bar{R}_t^{i, \max}$, $(\bar{R}_t^i - \psi_t)^\top \psi_t = 0$, therefore:

$$\mathcal{H}_t^P = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{l^{-i}} : \left\langle \bar{R}_t^{i, \max}, z \right\rangle \leq 0 \right\} \quad (29)$$

For any point $s' \in S^i$ there is $\left\langle \bar{R}_t^{i, \max}, s' \right\rangle \leq 0$. Then we need to prove that a forcing action for \mathcal{H}_t^P indeed exists. According to Definition 2, we need to find a $\sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \in \Sigma^i$ that achieves $R^i(\sigma_{t+1}^{i*}, \hat{\sigma}_{t+1}^{-i}) \in \mathcal{H}_{t+1}^{i, P}$ for any $\hat{\sigma}_{t+1}^{-i} \in \Sigma^{-i}$. For simplicity, let $\ell = [u^i(a_1, \sigma^{-i}), \dots]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}^i|}$, we rewrite the regret vector as $R^i(\sigma_{t+1}^{i*}, \hat{\sigma}_{t+1}^{-i}) = \ell - \langle \ell, \sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \rangle \mathbf{1}$,

we are looking for a $\sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \in \Sigma^i$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& R^i \left(\sigma_{t+1}^{i*}, \delta_{t+1}^{-i} \right) \in \mathcal{H}_t^P \\
& \iff \left\langle \bar{R}_t^{i,\max}, \ell - \langle \ell, \sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \rangle \mathbf{1} \right\rangle \leq 0 \\
& \iff \left\langle \bar{R}_t^{i,\max}, \ell \right\rangle - \langle \ell, \sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \rangle \left\langle \bar{R}_t^{i,\max}, \mathbf{1} \right\rangle \leq 0 \\
& \iff \left\langle \bar{R}_t^{i,\max}, \ell \right\rangle - \langle \ell, \sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \rangle \left\| \bar{R}_t^{i,\max} \right\|_1 \leq 0 \quad (30) \\
& \iff \left\langle \ell, \frac{\bar{R}_t^{i,\max}}{\left\| \bar{R}_t^{i,\max} \right\|_1} \right\rangle - \langle \ell, \sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \rangle \leq 0 \\
& \iff \left\langle \ell, \frac{[\bar{R}_t^i]^{\max}}{\left\| [\bar{R}_t^i]^{\max} \right\|_1} - \sigma_{t+1}^{i*} \right\rangle \leq 0
\end{aligned}$$

We obtain the strategy $\sigma_{t+1}^{i*} = \frac{\bar{R}_t^{i,\max}}{\left\| \bar{R}_t^{i,\max} \right\|_1}$ that guarantees \mathcal{H}_{t+1}^P to be forceable half space. And the action with the highest regret value is actually the BR strategy [6], so FP achieves Blackwell approachability. Figure 4 shows the difference in forceable half spaces for BR and RM strategies in the two-dimensional plane. According to A.4, BR strategy is also a regret minimizer in normal-form game. Therefore, replacing the RM strategy with the BR strategy in CFR does not affect the convergence of the algorithm.

B PSEUDOCODE

B.1 PCFR

The pseudocode 1 here does not join the rest of the variants, nor does it consider cases other than two-player zero-sum.

B.2 PMCCFR

Since PMCCFR will directly sample actions on opportunity nodes, the efficiency of the PMCCFR algorithm will be higher than PCFR. The pseudocode of PMCCFR is shown in pseudocode 2.

C COMPARISON BETWEEN VARIANTS OF PCFR

C.1 PCFR variants

We combined PCFR with RM+ and MC variants to obtain: PCFR, PCFR+, PMCCFR, and PMCCFR+ four combinations.

As shown in Figure 5, it can be seen that the results of PMCCFR and PMCCFR+ are always better than those of PCFR and PCFR+, but the performance of PMCCFR and PMCCFR+ is different in diverse problems. Finally, we adopted a more conservative PMCCFR method.

C.2 Weighted Averaging Schemes for PCFR

Different weights of PCFR will also have a significant impact on the results. The weight w_t is introduced into $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i(I)$:

$$Q_{t,\text{imm}}^i(I) = \begin{cases} Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^i(I) + w_t u^i(I, \sigma_t) & \text{if } \pi_{\sigma_t}^{-i}(I) = 1 \\ Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^i(I) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Common w_t values are $w_t = 1$, $w_t = \log t$, $w_t = t$, $w_t = t^2$. The Figures 6 show the experimental results with different weights.

Algorithm 1 PCFR(s, π, π^c)

```

1: if  $\pi^1 = \pi^2 = 0$  or  $\pi^c = 0$  then
2:   return  $[0, 0]$ 
3: end if
4: if  $s \in \mathcal{Z}$  then
5:   return  $[u^1(s)\pi^2\pi^c, u^2(s)\pi^1\pi^c]$ 
6: end if
7: Define  $I$  as the information set to which  $s$  belongs
8:  $r = [0, 0]$ 
9: if  $P(s) = c$  then
10:  for  $a \in \mathcal{A}(s)$  do
11:     $r' = \text{PCFR}(s + a, \pi, \pi^c \sigma^c(s)(a))$ 
12:     $r = r + r'(p_s)$ 
13:  end for
14:  return  $r$ 
15: else
16:  if  $P(s) = p_1$  then
17:     $\pi_s, \pi_o = \pi^1, \pi^2$ 
18:     $p_s, p_o = p_1, p_2$ 
19:  else
20:     $\pi_s, \pi_o = \pi^2, \pi^1$ 
21:     $p_s, p_o = p_2, p_1$ 
22:  end if
23:  if  $\pi_o = 0$  then
24:     $r' = \text{PCFR}(s + \sigma_t(I), \pi, \pi^c)$ 
25:     $r(p_o) = r'(p_o)$ 
26:     $\bar{\sigma}_t^{p_s}(I) = ((t-1)\bar{\sigma}_{t-1}^{p_s}(I) + \sigma_t^{p_s}(I))/t$ 
27:  else if  $\pi_s = 0$  then
28:    for  $a \in \mathcal{A}(I)$  do
29:       $r' = \text{PCFR}(s + a, \pi, \pi^c)$ 
30:       $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) = Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) + r'(p_s)$ 
31:      if  $a = \sigma^{p_s}(I)$  then
32:         $r(p_o) = r'(p_o)$ 
33:      end if
34:    end for
35:     $\sigma_{t+1}^{p_s}(I) = \max_{a \in \Sigma_p^i(I)} Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
36:  else
37:    for  $a \in \mathcal{A}(I)$  do
38:       $\pi^{p_s} = \sigma_t^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
39:       $r' = \text{PCFR}(s + a, \pi, \pi^c)$ 
40:       $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) = Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) + r'(p_s)$ 
41:       $r(p_o) = r(p_o) + r'(p_o)$ 
42:       $r(p_s) = r(p_s) + r'(p_s)\sigma_t^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
43:    end for
44:     $\bar{\sigma}_t^{p_s}(I) = ((t-1)\bar{\sigma}_{t-1}^{p_s}(I) + \sigma_t^{p_s}(I))/t$ 
45:     $\sigma_{t+1}^{p_s}(I) = \max_{a \in \Sigma_p^i(I)} Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
46:  end if
47: end if
48: return  $r$ 

```

In the comparison of four common w_t , convergence is faster when $w_t = 1$.




Figure 5: Convergence rate of PCFR variants in different games




Figure 6: Convergence rate of different weighted average schemes for PCFR

D EXPERIMENT SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

D.1 Description of the game

D.1.1 *Kuhn-extension/Leduc-extension poker*. We have made improvements to Kuhn and Leduc Poker:

- (1) The original Leduc and Kuhn poker types are 3 cards, and in the improved game the types are $x \geq 3$ cards;
- (2) The original Leduc and Kuhn can only raise one fixed chip, but in the improved game it is allowed to raise $y \geq 1$ chips of various sizes. The Bet Action raise size here adopts an equal proportional sequence in multiples of 2. For example, when the blind bet is 1 and $y = 4$, the allowed raise action is [1, 2, 4, 8];

- (3) The original Leduc and Kuhn can only raise once in a round. After one player raises, the rest of the players can only choose to call or fold, and cannot raise a larger bet. In the improved game, it can be raised up to z times.

D.1.2 *Princess and Monster*. Princess and monster (PAM) is a game in which two players chase and escape in a dungeon with obstacles (a 4-connected grid diagram of $m \times n$). The game rule is:

- The two players are monster and princess, and each player knows the structure of the dungeon and which rooms can be accessed.
- They can only exist in one particular dungeon at a time, and they all know the number of their current dungeon (grid).

Algorithm 2 PMCCFR(s, π)

```
1: if  $\pi^1 = \pi^2 = 0$  then
2:   return  $[0, 0]$ 
3: end if
4: if  $s \in \mathcal{Z}$  then
5:   return  $[u^1(s)\pi^2, u^2(s)\pi^1]$ 
6: end if
7: Define  $I$  as the information set to which  $s$  belongs
8:  $r = [0, 0]$ 
9: if  $P(s) = c$  then
10:   $a \sim \sigma^c(s)$ 
11:   $r = \text{PMCCFR}(s + a, \pi)$ 
12:  return  $r$ 
13: else
14:  if  $P(s) = p_1$  then
15:     $\pi_s, \pi_o = \pi^1, \pi^2$ 
16:     $p_s, p_o = p_1, p_2$ 
17:  else
18:     $\pi_s, \pi_o = \pi^2, \pi^1$ 
19:     $p_s, p_o = p_2, p_1$ 
20:  end if
21:  if  $\pi_o = 0$  then
22:     $r' = \text{PMCCFR}(s + \sigma_t(I), \pi)$ 
23:     $r(p_o) = r'(p_o)$ 
24:     $\bar{\sigma}_t^{p_s}(I) = ((t-1)\bar{\sigma}_{t-1}^{p_s}(I) + \sigma_t^{p_s}(I))/t$ 
25:  else if  $\pi_s = 0$  then
26:    for  $a \in \mathcal{A}(I)$  do
27:       $r' = \text{PMCCFR}(s + a, \pi)$ 
28:       $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) = Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) + r'(p_s)$ 
29:      if  $a = \sigma^{p_s}(I)$  then
30:         $r(p_o) = r'(p_o)$ 
31:      end if
32:    end for
33:     $\sigma_{t+1}^{p_s}(I) = \max_{a_p \in \Sigma_p(I)} Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
34:  else
35:    for  $a \in \mathcal{A}(I)$  do
36:       $\pi^{p_s} = \sigma_t^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
37:       $r' = \text{PMCCFR}(s + a, \pi)$ 
38:       $Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) = Q_{t-1,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a) + r'(p_s)$ 
39:       $r(p_o) = r(p_o) + r'(p_o)$ 
40:       $r(p_s) = r(p_s) + r'(p_s)\sigma_t^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
41:    end for
42:     $\bar{\sigma}_t^{p_s}(I) = ((t-1)\bar{\sigma}_{t-1}^{p_s}(I) + \sigma_t^{p_s}(I))/t$ 
43:     $\sigma_{t+1}^{p_s}(I) = \arg \max_{a_p \in \Sigma_p(I)} Q_{t,\text{imm}}^{p_s}(I, a)$ 
44:  end if
45: end if
46: return  $r$ 
```

- The monster's goal is to find and capture the princess as soon as possible.
- The princess's goal is to escape the monster as much as possible.

The actions they can choose are:

- In the initial stage, monster and princess can choose any birth room to start the game;
- In the following process, monster and princess can choose to move one space per step in four directions, up, down, left and right, or stay in place. When moving, they cannot exceed the dungeon boundary or enter impassable rooms.

Result of the game:

- At the same time, if the monster and princess appear in the same dungeon, the game ends. The princess survives the n round and gets n utilities, and the corresponding monster gets $-n$ utilities.
- If the monster does not capture the princess within a certain number of steps (such as N move), the game ends directly. The princess earns N utilities and the monster earns $-N$ utilities.




Figure 7: The structure of the dungeon.

As shown in Figure 7, we set the dungeon to a 3×3 grid, with inaccessible rooms in the upper left and right corners.

D.2 The Rest of the Experimental Results

We measured the number of information sets and the number of nodes in different games in Table 2, and there are rest of the experimental results in Figure 8.

E THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TIME, NODES TOUCHED AND ITERATIONS AS INDICATOR

In previous papers, many convergence analyses were performed based on the number of iterations T , which is obviously unfair to the sampling CFR/PCFR algorithm. For sampling algorithms, many studies have used the number of nodes to analyze the convergence of the algorithm, but these studies have ignored the inconsistent calculation time of different nodes and the inconsistent number of information sets that have passed through the same node. The cost of an iteration in CFR/PCFR is divided into two parts: the game tree traversal cost and the RM/BR strategy cost calculated on the information set:

- On each information set: It is necessary to calculate the RM/BR strategy and update the average strategy for the passed information set. These costs have been detailed in Section 4.2.1.




Figure 8: Convergence rate in Leduc-extension, Kuhn-extension, Here Action and Len are both 1.

Game name	Information set	Number of nodes
RPS	2	13
3 C 1 P 1 L Kuhn	12	55
15 C 1 P 1 L Kuhn	60	1891
50 C 1 P 1 L Kuhn	200	22051
3 C 3 P 3 L Kuhn	48	271
7 C 3 P 3 L Kuhn	112	1891
7 C 5 P 3 L Kuhn	364	6427
15 C 5 P 3 L Kuhn	780	32131
15 C 7 P 3 L Kuhn	1920	80011
3 C Leduc	288	1945
7 C Leduc	1512	25985
15 C Leduc	6480	255601
25 C Leduc	18900	1180001
3 C 3 P Leduc	1680	12529
7 C 3 P Leduc	9016	172313
15 C 3 P Leduc	41160	1712521
3 C 5 P Leduc	6399	49384
7 C 5 P Leduc	34587	685280
15 C 5 P Leduc	158355	6831856
4 round PAM	224	68815
5 round PAM	794	715655
6 round PAM	2804	7447021

Table 2: Information sets and node number record for different games

- On the player node, the counterfactual utility needs to be obtained on this type of node $u^i(s, \sigma_t|_{I \rightarrow a})$ and multiplied by the strategy return.
- On opportunity nodes, in this type of node need to get virtual utility $u^i(I, \sigma_t|_{I \rightarrow a})$ and multiplied by opportunity node probability.
- On the end point node, it is necessary to solve the final income according to the node on this type of node.

When passing through the same number of nodes, different algorithms do not pass through the same number of information sets. For example, when using the CFR algorithm to train vanilla Kuhn poker (assuming no pruning), one iteration passes through 55 nodes (24 player nodes, 1 random node, 30 leaf nodes), and calculate regret matching strategies on 12 information sets, at this time, the ratio of information set calculation and node calculation is 12:55. While using MCCFR the calculation passes through 10 nodes (4 player nodes, 1 random node, 5 leaf nodes), and calculate regret matching strategies on 4 information sets, the ratio of information set calculation and node calculation is 4:10. And the computing time is different at different decision, opportunity, and end point nodes. Therefore, measuring the performance of the algorithm by the number of nodes passed does not objectively reflect the ability of the algorithm.

- There are three types of nodes on each game tree node, all of which need to get the counterfactual utility of each player. The difference is: