

The Square-root Game

David Blackwell

University of California
Department of Statistics
367 Evans Hall # 3860
Berkeley, California 94720-3860
U. S. A.
e-mail:david.bl@stat.berkeley.edu

Abstract

In this work I give an elementary proof of the following : “The absolute $1/2$ moment of the beta $(1/4, 1/4)$ distribution about t is independent of t for $0 < t < 1$.

Keywords : beta distribution, two person game, Richardson extrapolation.

Theorem 1 *The absolute $1/2$ moment of the beta $(1/4, 1/4)$ distribution about t is independent of t for $0 < t < 1$:*

$$\int_0^1 p(x)(|x - t|^{(1/2)}) dx,$$

where

$$p(x) = [x(1 - x)]^{(-3/4)},$$

is independent of t for $0 < t < 1$.

More generally, for any a with $0 < a < 1$, the absolute $a - th$ moment of the beta $((1 - a)/2, (1 - a)/2)$ distribution about t is independent of t for $0 < t < 1$.

This note, which I am pleased to write in honor of my old friend Tom Ferguson, is about the process that led to the Theorem.

Quite a few years ago, shortly after Tom Ferguson got his first PC, I asked him about the Square-root Game :

Square-root Game

Players I and II simultaneously choose numbers x and y in the unit interval. Then II pays I the amount $|x - y|^{(1/2)}$.

Later that day, Tom told me that the value of the game is .59907, to 5 places. I asked him how he got such accuracy, since he could solve games only up to 30×30 on his machine. He said that he'd used Richardson extrapolation (which I'd never heard of). He told me a bit about Richardson extrapolation, and we turned to other rhings.

Then, in my Fall 1994 game theory class I assigned, as a homework problem, to solve the Square-root Game to 3 places. Several students succeeded, but one group of four students, working together, claimed to have solved the game to 15 places. According to them, if either player used the beta $(1/4, 1/4)$ strategy, then Player I's expected income, as calculated by Mathematica, was constant to 15 places, no matter what the other Player did. They could not prove that a beta $(1/4, 1/4)$ strategy gave a constant income, and neither could I.

Later I asked Jim Pitman about the more general case as stated in the Theorem, and he gave a not-quite-elementary proof. Later he found a generalization to higher dimensions in Landkof [1972]. Finally I found an elementary proof, given below.

The method the four students used to get their solution is simple and instructive.

1. They solved a discrete version, restricting each Player to the 21 choices $0, .05, \dots, .95, 1$. The good strategy for each player was a U -shaped distribution, symmetric about $1/2$.
2. They calculated the variance of this distribution, and found the beta distribution symmetric about $1/2$ with the same variance. It was beta $(.2613, .2613)$.
3. They guessed that .2613 was trying to be .25, so tried beta $(1/4, 1/4)$ as a strategy.

Here is the proof of the Theorem. Fix $a, 0 < a < 1$, and put

$$f(t) = \int_0^1 p(x)(|x - t|^a) dx$$

where $p(x) = [x(1 - x)]^{-(a+1)/2}$.

We must show that f is constant on $0 < t < 1$. Its derivative is

$$f'(t) = a \int_0^t [(t-x)^{(a-1)}]p(x) dx - a \int_t^1 [(x-t)^{(a-1)}]p(x) dx$$

With the change of variable $u = 1 - x$ in the second integral, we get

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= a \left[\int_0^t [(t-x)^{(a-1)}]p(x) dx - \int_0^{1-t} [(1-t-u)^{(a-1)}]p(u) du \right] \\ &= a(F(t) - F(1-t)), \text{ where} \\ F(t) &= \int_0^t [(t-x)^{(a-1)}]p(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

So we must show that $F(1-t) = F(t)$. To evaluate F , make the linear fractional change of variable $z = (t-x)/(t-tx) : x = t(1-z)/(1-tz)$ (see Carr, [1970], Formula 2342). We get

$$F(t) = [t(1-t)]^{((a-1)/2)} \int_0^1 [(1-z)^{-(a+1)/2}] [z^{(a-1)}] dz$$

So $F(1-t) = F(t)$, proving the Theorem.

So the value of the Square-root game is I's expected income when he chooses x according to beta $(1/4, 1/4)$ and II chooses $y = 0$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(1/2)/\Gamma(1/4)\Gamma(1/4) \int_0^1 (x^{(1/2)})([x(1-x)]^{(-3/4)}) dx &= \Gamma(1/2)\Gamma(3/4)\Gamma(1/4) \\ &= .599070117367796.... \end{aligned}$$

So Tom's first five places were correct.

Acknowledgement

I thank the referee for his kind remarks.

References

- [1] CARR, G. S. (1970). Formulas and Theorems of Pure Mathematics. Chelsea.
- [2] LANDKOF, N. S. (1972). Foundations of Modern Potential Theory. Springer-Verlag. N. S.

