



HAL
open science

Grabbing olives on linear pizzas and pissaladières

Jean-Claude Bermond, Michel Cosnard, Frédéric Havet

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Claude Bermond, Michel Cosnard, Frédéric Havet. Grabbing olives on linear pizzas and pissaladières. 2022. hal-03623938

HAL Id: hal-03623938

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03623938v1>

Preprint submitted on 26 Apr 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Grabbing olives on linear pizzas and pissaladières

Jean-Claude Bermond¹, Michel Cosnard¹, and Frédéric Havet¹

¹ Université Côte d’Azur, Coati, I3S, CNRS, INRIA, Sophia Antipolis, France

April 26, 2022

Abstract

In this paper we revisit the problem entitled SHARING A PIZZA stated by P. Winkler by considering a new puzzle called SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE. The game is played by two polite coatis Alice and Bob who share a pissaladière (a $p \times q$ grid) which is divided into rectangular slices. Alice starts in a corner and then the coatis alternate removing a remaining slice adjacent to at most two other slices. On some slices there are precious olives of Nice and the aim of each coati is to grab the maximum number of olives. We first study the particular case of $1 \times n$ grid (i.e. a path) where the game is a graph grabbing game known as SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA. In that case each player can take only an end vertex of the remaining path. These problems are particular cases of a new class of games called d -degenerate games played on a graph with non negative weights assigned to the vertices with the rule that coatis alternatively take a vertex of degree at most d .

Our main results are the following. We give optimal strategies for paths (linear pizzas) with no two adjacent weighty vertices. We also give a recurrence formula to compute the gains which depend only on the parity of n and of the respective parities of weighty vertices with a complexity in $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ where h denotes the number of parity changes in the weighty vertices. When the weights are only $\{0, 1\}$ we reduce the computation of the average number of olives collected by each player to a word counting problem. We solve SHARING PISSALADIÈRE with $\{0, 1\}$ weights, when there is one olive or 2 olives. In that case Alice (resp. Bob) grabs almost all the olives if the number of vertices of the grid $n = p \times q$ is odd (resp. even). We prove that for a $2 \times q$ grid with a fixed number k of olives Bob grabs at least $\lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$ olives and almost always grabs all the k olives.

1 Introduction

One of our motivations for this article came from the problem entitled SHARING A PIZZA stated by P. Winkler in the new edition of his famous book *Mathematical Puzzles* [14]. We copy here the statement. *Alice and Bob are preparing to share a circular pizza, divided by radial cuts into some arbitrary number of slices of various sizes. They will be using the “polite pizza protocol”: Alice picks any slice to start; thereafter, starting with Bob, they alternate taking slices but always from one side or the other of the gap. Thus after the first slice, there are just two choices at each turn until the last slice is taken (by Bob if the number of slices is even, otherwise by Alice). Is it possible for the pizza to have been cut in such a way that Bob has the advantage—in other words, so that with best play, Bob gets more than half the pizza?*

In the solution page 286, P. Winkler wrote: *If the number of slices is even (as with most pizzas), one can apply the solution of the puzzle Coins in a Row (see problem in Chapter 7 [14] but also the first problem of the book in 2004 [12]). Alice can always get at least half the pizza. Indeed Alice can just number the slices 1, 2, etc. starting clockwise (say) from the cut, and play so as to take all the even-numbered slices or all the odd, whichever is better for her. The argument fails if the number of slices is odd. But the odd case sounds even better for Alice since then she ends up with more slices. How can we get a handle on the odd case?*

P. Winkler indicates that this puzzle was already devised by D. E. Brown in 1996, and has attracted a lot of attention, in part because of his conjecture [13] that Alice could always get at least $4/9$ of the pizza. Indeed he gave the surprising example of a 15-slice circular pizza with slice-sizes 0, 1, and 2 of which nothing can stop Bob from acquiring $5/9$. The conjecture has been proved independently by two groups [2, 6].

At this stage, P. Winkler rose an interesting question *Can a slice be of size zero?* and answered: *Mathematically, no problem; gastronomically, think of a slice of size ϵ .* In fact, in the figure of his book, he put pepperoni to




Figure 1: Two examples of pizzas where Bob can always get 5 of the 9 olives.

indicate the slice sizes and he wrote *No matter how she plays, Alice can never get more than 4 of the 9 pepperoni chunks against a smart, hungry Bob*. We give here again the example with olives (instead of pepperoni). In both pizzas of Figure 1, there are 9 olives (placed in the same positions). The pizza on the left has 15 slices, three of them having two olives. The pizza on the right has 21 slices with at most one olive on each of them. It is obtained from the left pizza by splitting the slices with two olives into three parts, two with one olive and the middle one with none. One can check that on both pizzas Bob can always grab 5 olives.

Another interesting question is : “ What is the right shape for a pizza ? ” Many people might answer round (circular). But according to Wikipedia¹ the traditional Sicilian pizza is typically rectangular, unlike the Neapolitan pizza which is circular. The roman “Pizza al taglio” (pizza by the slice) is baked in large rectangular trays, and generally divided in rectangular slices. Note also that the largest pizza² ever baked is a linear pizza of length 1,853.88 meters.

Of higher importance to the authors is “pissaladière”. This marvelous dish is originally a specialty of the French city of Nice (under the name “pissaladeria”) and of Liguria (under the name “piscialandrea”). The classical pissaladière is presented as a rectangular grid where the slices are small rectangles (see Figure 2). Its traditional topping consists of caramelised (almost pureed) onions, anchovies and delicious small black olives of Nice, of which coatis are fond.




Figure 2: Two coatis trying to (politely) grab as many olives as possible on a pissaladière.

The original aim of our research was to tackle a new puzzle similar to Winkler’s one that we call SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE. The game is now played on a pissaladière, which is a rectangle, divided into rectangular slices by horizontal and vertical lines (knife cuts). Olives are a precious ingredient and so there are only a small number k of olives; therefore many slices have no olives and some slices have one or more olives. The game is played by

¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sicilian_pizza

²<https://www.this-is-italy.com/world-biggest-pizza/>

two coatis named Alice and Bob (see Figure 2). They both want to eat as many olives as possible, but they are civilized. The politeness imposes them to alternately pick a slice which is adjacent to at most two other slices. Hence, in the first move Alice can only pick one of the four corners of the pizza, and in the second move Bob can only pick one of the three remaining corners or one of the two slices adjacent to the corner removed by Alice. On Figure 2 you can see that the malicious Bob is content (and Alice disappointed). Indeed, with the disposal of the olives, Bob will grab all the 4 olives.

One particular interesting case is the $1 \times n$ grid or path of order n . In this case, the coati politeness imposes a stronger rule than the above, because otherwise any slice can be picked and the coati would rush to slices with olives. With the stronger rule, a coati can only pick one of the two slices at the ends of the (remaining) path. We will refer to this puzzle as SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA. Note that this problem appears in SHARING A PIZZA after the first move. Indeed, when Alice has picked the first slice, it remains a linear pizza. Therefore to solve an instance of SHARING A PIZZA, it suffices to solve n instances of SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA. This problem is equivalent to the puzzle COINS IN A ROW described in Winkler’s books [12, 14] as follows: *On a table is a row of 50 coins, of various denominations. Alix picks a coin from one of the ends and puts it in her pocket; then Bert chooses a coin from one of the (remaining) ends, and the alternation continues until Bert pockets the last coin. Prove that Alix can play so as to guarantee at least as much money as Bert.* The main difference with SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA is that Alice is now Alix and Bob is now Bert. We note that P. Winkler mentioned the following in his book : *In fact, for Alix to play optimally, she needs to analyze all the possible situations that may later arise. This can be done by a technique called “dynamic programming”.* More precisely, for an instance on the path of order n , $O(n^2)$ situations have to be considered, corresponding to the $O(n^2)$ subpaths, so the optimal strategies may be found in $O(n^2)$ time.

Various questions can be asked for these puzzles.

- (Q1) What is the minimum number of olives each coati can grab in function of the size of the pizza or pissaladière? This is the question asked by Winkler for the circular pizza.
- (Q2) For a given setting of k olives, can we give optimal strategies for the two coatis ? In particular can we compute the number of olives each coati will grab (when they both play optimally) in a time polynomial in k (the number of olives) and independent of the size of the pizza ?
- (Q3) What is the average number of olives grabbed by each coati if the k olives are uniformly distributed ?
- (Q4) What is the probability that a given coati (Alice or Bob) wins, that is grab at least half the olives ?

Before reviewing known results and describing our contribution, let us formally define the puzzles or games.

2 Statement of the problem and results

2.1 Graph-grabbing games

The three puzzles described above are particular cases of scoring games played on graphs (for scoring games, see for example the survey [7]). In particular, SHARING A PIZZA and SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA belongs to the class of *graph-grabbing* or *graph-sharing* games [3, 8, 9, 10]. The name “graph-grabbing” game comes from M. Rosenfeld [10], who proposed the game for trees and called it “gold grabbing game”. In such games, two players Alice and Bob share a **connected graph with non-negative weights assigned to the vertices**. In this mathematical setting, the weights are real numbers, but in practical life the weights represent the number of olives on a slice and so are integers. The information is complete in the sense that both players know exactly the weights; in particular they know which slices have a zero weight (no olive). They alternately take the vertices one by one and collect their weights. The first turn is Alice’s. There are some differences according to the rule taken to grab a vertex. In [3, 9] the authors consider two rules: the first one consists in removing a non cut vertex (i.e. the subgraph induced by the remaining vertices is connected during the whole game). The authors called this rule (R) (for “Remaining part connected”). The second rule, called (T) (for “Taken part connected”), imposes that the subgraph induced by the taken vertices is connected during the whole game. Hence SHARING A PIZZA is a graph-grabbing game on a cycle with any of the two rules (or both) because for a cycle (R) and (T) are identical; SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA

is a graph-grabbing game on a path with rule (R). More generally, playing a graph-grabbing game on a tree with rule (R) imposes each player to take a leaf. For such games, Seacrest and Seacrest [11] showed that if a tree has an even number of vertices, Alice has a winning strategy (i.e. a strategy to obtain at least half of the total weight), thus answering a conjecture of Micek and Walczak [8]. They also conjectured that the same statement holds for every weighted connected bipartite graph with even order. Egawa et al. [4] proved that the conjecture holds for some particular bipartite graphs called $K_{m,n}$ -trees. As noted in [8], any odd tree on at least three vertices can be weighted so that Alice gets nothing (it suffices to put the whole weight at one non-leaf vertex). Eoh and Choi [5] gave general classes of graphs for which Alice has a winning strategy with rule (R) when the weights are 0 or 1. Cibulka et al. [3] showed, when playing with any of rules (T) and (R) or both, then for every $\epsilon > 0$ and for every $k \geq 1$, there is a k -connected graph G for which Bob has a strategy to obtain $(1 - \epsilon)$ of the total weight of the vertices. This contrasts with the original pizza game played on a cycle. They also show that the problem of deciding whether Alice has a winning strategy is PSPACE-complete if condition (R) or both conditions (T) and (R) are required. Micek and Walczak [9] showed the importance of parity in graph-grabbing games. For example, they proved that, with rule (T) on a tree with an odd number of vertices, Alice has a strategy to get at least 1/4 of the weight .

2.2 d -degenerate games

Note that playing with rules (R) or (T) on a pissaladière (i.e. a (rectangular) grid) with at least two rows and two columns is everything but polite. Most of the time, the set of vertices that a player can remove is not very restricted; on her first move, Alice can always remove the vertex she wants. Therefore we introduce the d -degenerate rule (D_d) yielding the d -**degenerate game**.

(D_d) : At each move, a player can only pick a d -**removable** vertex which is a vertex of degree at most d in the remaining graph.

Of course, with such a rule, all the vertices can be removed only if at each step there is a removable vertex. This is the case if and only if the graph is d -degenerate. Recall that a graph is d -**degenerate** if each of its subgraphs has a vertex of degree at most d . A graph G is d -degenerate if and only if it has a d -**degenerate ordering** that is an ordering (v_1, \dots, v_n) of its vertices such that v_i has degree at most d in $G\langle\{v_i, \dots, v_n\}\rangle$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Note that we could play the d -degenerate game on a graph which is not d -degenerate. Then the two coatis share a fraction of the graph until there is no d -removable vertex. But we shall not consider it in this paper, and shall only play the d -degenerate game on d -degenerate graphs.

The 1-degenerate connected graphs are the trees. In a tree, a 1-removable vertex is a leaf. Therefore, on trees, the 1-degenerate game is equivalent to the graph-grabbing game with rule (R). In particular, the 1-degenerate game on path is exactly SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA. Grids are a nice examples of 2-degenerate graphs and the 2-degenerate game on grids is exactly SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE.

2.3 Our results

When we started our study, our aim was to obtain results on SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE, which corresponds to the 2-degenerate game on a grid. We were interested in the case of integer-valued weight function, which corresponds to the case where an olive cannot be cut and is on a unique slice, and especially $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function, which corresponds to the case where there is at most one olive per slice. But we realized that questions (Q2) to (Q4) were not answered in the literature for SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA. Consequently, we first study this problem.

Consider the path with n vertices $P_n = (1, 2, \dots, n)$ together with a weight function $w : V(P_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. A **weighty** vertex is a vertex whose weight is nonzero. In that case question (Q1) is easily answered when n is even as noted by Winkler. Alice can use the even-odd strategy in which she removes either all the even vertices or all the odd ones, thus grabbing at least half of the weight (olives). However, the even-odd strategy is not necessarily optimal. For example, consider a path with $n = 12$ vertices and weights $w(2) = 1, w(5) = 2, w(7) = 3, w(10) = 4$ and all the other weights equal to zero. Playing the even-odd strategy Alice collects 5 olives, while we can show that she can get 6 olives (see Example in Subsection 3.1).

Therefore our aim in Section 3 is to describe optimal strategies on paths. We first consider 0-**ordinary** weight functions in which the end-vertices have weight zero and there are no two adjacent weighty vertices. In Subsection 3.1, we describe some strategies called Σ_0 and show that they are optimal (Theorem 3). It allows us to give

a recursive formula to compute the gain of both players and to show that the weights collected by each player depend only on the parity of n and on the respective parities of the weighty vertices and not on the precise value of n nor of the values of the weights of the vertices. So, for 0-ordinary weight functions, one can compute the optimal gain in time $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ where k is the number of weighty vertices. We then show that in fact, the complexity is in $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ where h denotes the number of parity changes in the weighty vertices (Proposition 7). In Subsection 3.3, we extend strategy Σ_0 to weight functions where the end-vertices may be weighty but two weighty vertices are still not adjacent. Then in Subsection 3.4, we revisit SHARING A PIZZA in the case where there is no adjacent weighty vertices: we show that Alice has an optimal strategy whose first move consist in grabbing a weighty vertex, and derive that the optimal gain can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(kh^2)$ (Proposition 10).

If we have consecutive weighty vertices, the situation is more complex as there are examples where a player has no interest in taking a weighty end-vertex. Consider the path on four vertices with $0 < w(1) < w(2)$ and $w(3) = w(4) = 0$. If at the first move Alice removes the weighty end-vertex 1, then she will gain only $w(1)$. But if she removes vertex 4, then whatever Bob plays she will grab vertex 2 and gains the weight $w(2)$.

In Section 4, we show that for a d -degenerate game with $\{0, 1\}$ weight function, there is an optimal play where a coati grabs immediately an olive if possible (Lemma 12). This lemma applied for linear pizza enables us to delete two consecutive vertices of weight 1 giving one olive to each player (Proposition 18). Hence, for linear pizzas with a $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function we completely answer question (Q2). Furthermore, in that case we show how to relate the computation of the gain of each player to counting on binary words. That allows us to give a way to compute asymptotically the average number of olives grabbed by each player (Corollary 21) and to answer questions (Q3) and (Q4) when the number k of olives is small. See Table 1.

In Section 5, we deal with our original problem SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE. We first consider the simple case where there is a single olive on the pissaladière: we prove that Alice collects the olive if and only if the pissaladière has an odd number of slices or if the olive is on a corner of the pissaladière. This allows us to completely answer questions (Q1) to (Q4) in this case (Corollary 35.) Then, we consider the game with k olives on a pissaladière with two rows of slices. We show that Alice might collect no olive and almost always does so when the number of columns goes to infinity (Corollary 37). In contrast, Bob can always collect $\lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$ olives (best possible) (Corollary 39) and almost always collects all the olives (Proposition 40). Finally, we consider the case where there are two olives on different slices of the pissaladière. This case is more complex, and we do not answer (Q2). However we prove that if the number of slices is odd (resp. even), then Alice (resp. Bob) almost always grab the two olives (Theorem 42).

3 Sharing a linear pizza

In this section, we are given the path $P_n = (1, 2, \dots, n)$ of order n with a non-negative weight function w on the vertices. The weight of vertex i is denoted by $w(i)$. If the $w(i)$ are integers, we can consider vertices as slices of a linear pizza, the weight representing the number of olives on each slice.

We denote by $O = O(w)$ the set of k vertices $\{i_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ which have a nonzero weight $w(i_j)$ called **weighty vertices** (slices with olives in the integral model). The other vertices have weight zero (no olive). The set O is **ordinary** if it contains no two adjacent vertices, that is if $|O \cap \{i, i+1\}| \leq 1$ for all $i \in [1, n-1]$. A set which is not ordinary is called **rare**. It is **s -ordinary** ($s = 0, 1, 2$) if it is ordinary and $|O \cap \{1, n\}| = s$. So s is the number of weighty end-vertices. The weight function w is **ordinary** (resp. **rare**, **s -ordinary**) if the set O is ordinary (resp. rare, s -ordinary).

Ordinary weight functions are useful because we can design for them optimal strategies to determine the final weight collected by each player and compute recursively this number in polynomial time (quadratic in k and not depending of n). Indeed after removing a weighty vertex, the remaining set of weighty vertices is still ordinary. Ordinary sets are important especially in the case of $\{0, 1\}$ -weight functions (or more generally integer-valued weight functions) because the proportion of ordinary sets over all possible sets O of k olives tends to 1 when n tends to $+\infty$, as proved in Lemma 19. **In this section, we consider only ordinary weight functions.**

3.1 Optimal strategy for 0-ordinary weight functions

Strategies Σ_0 : At a given stage an end-vertex of the remaining path can be of three types: (1) “weighty” ; (2)

“critical” if it has weight zero and is adjacent to a weighty vertex; (3) “safe” if it has weight zero and is not adjacent to a weighty vertex. In strategy Σ_0 , at any move if a player X can remove a weighty vertex, then X will do so and will gain the weight of this vertex. Otherwise, if the end-vertices have weight zero, two cases can appear. Either one end-vertex is safe and the player will remove it. Otherwise the two end-vertices are critical; the player is stacked and obliged to let in the next move the other player grab a weighty vertex; but the player can choose to remove the critical vertex which ensures the maximum gain at the end of the game. Then we apply recursively the strategy on the path P_n with a new weight function where the weight of the removed vertex is now 0 and so with a smaller set of weighty vertices.

At the beginning of the game, if the weight function is 0-ordinary, the end-vertices have weight 0 (that is $i_1 > 1$ and $i_k < n$). The set of safe vertices is $S = \{1 \leq i \leq i_1 - 2\} \cup \{i_k + 2 \leq i \leq n\}$. So, during the first $|S|$ moves, the strategy Σ_0 consists for each player to remove a safe vertex (the order in which the safe vertices are chosen has no importance). Then, at move $|S| + 1$, one player, denoted by \bar{X} , is obliged to take one of the two critical vertices ($i_1 - 1$ or $i_k + 1$). Then at move $|S| + 2$ the other player, denoted by X , will take the neighbour x of this vertex which is either i_1 or i_k . X is either Alice or Bob according the parity of $|S|$ which itself depends only on the parity of n and of the respective parities of i_1 and i_k . More precisely

- $X = A$ when $|S|$ is odd, that is when either $\{n$ is even and i_1 and i_k have the same parity}, or $\{n$ is odd and i_1 and i_k have different parity };
- $X = B$ when $|S|$ is even, that is when either $\{n$ is odd and i_1 and i_k have the same parity}, or $\{n$ is even and i_1 and i_k have different parity }

Then we apply strategy Σ_0 on P_n with the weight of x reduced to zero. More precisely, let us denote for every $1 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq n$, by $w[\alpha, \beta]$ the weight function defined by $w[\alpha, \beta](i) = w(i)$ if $\alpha \leq i \leq \beta$, and $w[\alpha, \beta](i) = 0$ otherwise. We apply strategy Σ_0 on P_n with the new weight function $w[i_2, i_k]$ if $x = i_1$ and $w[i_1, i_{k-1}]$ if $x = i_k$. Note that the first $|S| + 2$ moves already done corresponds to successive removal of safe vertices in the strategy Σ_0 on P_n with this new weight function.

Example: Let us apply strategy Σ_0 on the example of the introduction: a path with $n = 12$ vertices and 4 weighty vertices $w(2) = 1, w(5) = 2, w(7) = 3, w(10) = 4$. At the first move vertex 12 is safe (and 1 is critical) and so Alice will remove 12. Then at the second move there are two critical vertices 1 and 11. Bob can choose which vertex he will remove and one can verify that the best choice is to remove 1. Then Alice grabs the weighty vertex 2. Then Bob removes the safe vertex 3. Now at move 5 Alice is stacked as there are two critical vertices 4 and 11. But she has the choice. If she does the greedy choice of removing the vertex 4 with the largest weight one can verify that she will grab at the end only 5 olives. But, if at move 5 Alice chooses the apparently bad vertex 11, Bob will be happy to grab at move 6 the 4 olives of vertex 10. At move 7 Alice removes the safe vertex 9. Then, whatever Bob does, Alice will grab at moves 9 and 11 the weighty vertices 5, 7. In summary Alice will get the olives of vertices 2, 5, 7 that is 6 olives as announced in the introduction.

The strategy Σ_0 is partly greedy in the sense that the player X who takes the first vertex x in O is uniquely determined. However, the other player \bar{X} can choose the vertex which maximizes his/her final gain or equivalently minimizes the gain of X . But, as seen in the example, this choice is not greedy.

The total weight collected by a player X with strategy Σ_0 on P_n with weight function w is denoted by $\sigma_0^X(n; w)$. The following lemma follows immediately from the definition. It gives a recursive formula to compute the gain of the players and shows that the weight collected by each player depends only on the parity of n and on the respective parities of the i_j and not on the precise value of n nor of the values of the i_j .

Lemma 1. *Let P_n be a path with n vertices and w a 0-ordinary weight function with set $O = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ of weighty vertices. Assume that the two players play according to strategy Σ_0 . Let $X = A$ if either $\{n$ is even and i_1 and i_k have the same parity}, or $\{n$ is odd and i_1 and i_k have different parity };* otherwise $X = B$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_0^X(n; w) &= \min \left\{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), w(i_k) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \right\}, \\ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w) &= W - \sigma_0^X(n; w) = \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Our aim is now to prove that the strategies Σ_0 are optimal. To do so, we first prove that the strategies Σ_0 have the following property which is easy to prove for optimal strategies.

Lemma 2. Let P_n be a path with n vertices and w a 0-ordinary weight function. Then, for any player X ,

$$\sigma_0^X(n; w) \geq \max \{ \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on k , the result being trivial when $k = 1$. Suppose that the lemma is true until $k - 1$. Consider a game on P_n with the set of weighty vertices O of size k . By Lemma 1, two cases can appear for the player X .

- (i) Either $\sigma_0^X(n; w) = \max \{ \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \}$, or
- (ii) $\sigma_0^X(n; w) = \min \{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), w(i_k) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \}$.

In case (i), there is nothing to prove. Assume now that we are in case (ii). W.l.o.g. we may also assume that $w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]) \leq w(i_k) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$. Then $\sigma_0^X(n; w) = w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$. So it remains to prove the following claim.

Claim 2.1. $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \leq w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$.

Proof of claim. By Lemma 1, $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$ is either $\min \{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]), w_{k-1} + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-2}]) \}$, or $\max \{ \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]), \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-2}]) \}$.

Assume $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \min \{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]), w_{k-1} + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-2}]) \}$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]) \leq \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$. So, $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \leq w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]) \leq w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$ proving the claim.

Assume $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}])$. By the induction hypothesis $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]) \leq \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$, so $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \leq \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]) < w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$ proving the claim.

Henceforth, it remains to deal with the case where $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-2}])$.

By Lemma 1, $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-2}])$ is either $\min \{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-2}]), w(i_{k-2}) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-3}]) \}$, or $\max \{ \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-2}]), \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-3}]) \}$. As above, if it is either $\min \{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-2}]), w(i_{k-2}) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-3}]) \}$ or $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_{k-2}])$, we get the result using the induction hypothesis. Henceforth, we have to deal with the case where $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-2}]) = \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-3}])$.

And so on, by induction on $h = 1, \dots, k-2$, either we get the result for some h , or we have $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1-h}])$ for every h . In particular, for $h = k-1$, we get $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_1]) \leq w(i_1)$. So the claim holds. \diamond

The claim finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Theorem 3. Strategies Σ_0 are optimal on P_n with 0-ordinary weight functions.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the number k of weighty vertices. Suppose that the strategies Σ_0 are optimal for 0-ordinary weight functions having up to $k-1$ weighty vertices. Let us consider the game on P_n with a 0-ordinary weight function w with a set O of k weighty vertices.

By Lemma 1, with strategy Σ_0 , the gain of X is $\sigma_0^X(n; w) = \min \{ w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), w(i_k) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \}$, and the gain of \bar{X} is $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w) = \max \{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \}$.

Consider an optimal strategy played by the two players. Let c be the first critical vertex removed by a player, and let x be its weighty neighbour. Either $c = i_1 - 1$ and $x = i_1$, or $c = i_k + 1$ and $x = i_k$.

Suppose for a contradiction that c is removed by X . In the following move, \bar{X} can remove x . Let $w' = w[i_2, i_k]$ if $x = i_1$ and $w' = w[i_1, i_{k-1}]$ if $x = i_k$. The vertices removed so far (including c and x) are safe for w' . Therefore it can be seen as the beginning of a strategy Σ_0 for w' which is optimal for w' by the induction hypothesis. Thus the gain of X using this strategy for w is at most its optimal gain for w' that is $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$ if $x = i_k$ and $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k])$ if $x = i_1$. In both cases, by Lemma 2, this gain is smaller than $\sigma_0^X(n; w)$, a contradiction.

Therefore c is removed by \bar{X} . In the following move X can remove x . Let $w' = w[i_2, i_k]$ if $x = i_1$ and $w' = w[i_1, i_{k-1}]$ if $x = i_k$. The vertices removed so far (including c and x) are safe for w' . Therefore it can be seen as the beginning of a strategy Σ_0 for w' which is optimal for w' by the induction hypothesis. Thus the gain of \bar{X} using this strategy for w is at most its optimal gain for w' which is $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$ if $x = i_k$ and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k])$ if $x = i_1$. In both cases, it is no greater than $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w)$, and it is strictly smaller if removing c does not maximize \bar{X} 's gain.

So \bar{X} has no interest of playing differently from strategy Σ_0 and can remove safe vertices until it is forced to pick a critical vertex. Moreover, when he does so, he must remove a critical vertex that maximizes its gain (as in strategy Σ_0). On his side, X must also remove safe vertices as long as \bar{X} does because it cannot remove a critical vertex by the above paragraph. Therefore the strategy Σ_0 is optimal. \square

As the strategy Σ_0 are optimal, they satisfy certain properties like the following one.

Proposition 4. *Let w be a 0-ordinary weight function on P_n with set of weighty vertices $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$. Let (I_1, I_2) be a partition of O , and for $j = 1, 2$, let w_j be the weight function defined by $w_j(x) = w(x)$ if $x \in I_j$ and $w_j(x) = 0$ otherwise. Then*

$$\sigma_0^A(n; w) \leq \sigma_0^A(n; w_1) + \sigma_0^A(n; w_2).$$

In particular, $\sigma_0^A(n; w) \leq w(i_1) + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_2, i_k])$.

Proof. Consider an optimal strategy for A on P_n with w .

This strategy may also be seen as a strategy for A on P_n with w_j (for any $j = 1, 2$). The gain of A on w_j is then at most $\sigma_0^A(n; w_j)$.

But the gain of A with w is the sum of the gain of the weighty vertices with w_1 and the gain of the weighty vertices with w_2 . Thus the optimal gain of A with w is at most the sum of its optimal gain with w_1 and its optimal gain for w_2 .

Since w is 0-ordinary, so are w_1 and w_2 . Thus, by Theorem 3, the optimal gains of A with w , w_1 , or w_2 is obtained applying the strategy Σ_0 . Hence $\sigma_0^A(n; w) \leq \sigma_0^A(n; w_1) + \sigma_0^A(n; w_2)$. \square

3.2 Complexity of computing $\sigma_0^X(n; w)$

In this section, we will show that the computational complexity of computing the optimal gains of Alice and Bob for the linear pizza with a 0-ordinary weight function is in $O(h^2)$ where h is the number of changes of parities in the weighty vertices. First let us show that the complexity is in $O(k^2)$

Proposition 5. *Let P_n be a path with n vertices and w a 0-ordinary weight function with set $O = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ of weighty vertices. Then $\sigma_0^X(n; w)$ and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w)$ can be computed in $O(k^2)$ arithmetic operations.*

Proof. By Lemma 1, we have $\sigma_0^X(n; w) = \min \{w(i_1) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), w(i_k) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])\}$ and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w) = \max \{\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_2, i_k]), \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])\}$. They can both be computed from $\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_j, i_{k-t+j}])$ and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_j, i_{k-t+j}])$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$ and $t = 1, \dots, k$, where

$$\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_j, i_{k-t+j}]) = \min \{w(i_{k-t+j}) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_{j+1}, i_{k-t+j}]), w(i_k) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_j, i_{k-t+j-1}])\}$$

$$\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_j, i_{k-t+j}]) = \max \{\sigma_0^X(n; w[i_{j+1}, i_{k-t+j}]), \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_j, i_{k-t+j-1}])\}$$

Hence there are $O(k^2)$ values to be computed, each of them taking a constant time. \square

In fact, one can often compute $\sigma_0^X(n; w)$ and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w)$ faster than stated in Proposition 5. Indeed analyzing strategy σ_0 , we can prove that the players collect weighty vertices by blocks and not one by one. A **(parity) block** of olives in a 0-ordinary set of weighty vertices $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ is a maximum set of successive weighty vertices having the same parity. In symbols, it is a set $\{i_{j_1}, \dots, i_{j_2}\}$ such that $i_j \equiv i_{j_1} \pmod{2}$ for all $j_1 \leq j \leq j_2$, $i_{j_1-1} \not\equiv i_{j_1} \pmod{2}$ and $i_{j_2+1} \not\equiv i_{j_1} \pmod{2}$. Note that if all the weighty vertices have the same parity then we can compute the gains in one step. Indeed, as shown by P. Winkler, if n is even (resp. odd) Alice (resp. Bob) collects all the weighty vertices with the total weight as gain. So we deal only with the case of $h \geq 2$ parity blocks. The following lemma shows that that X collects either the rightmost block of olives or the leftmost one.

Lemma 6. *Let w be a 0-ordinary weight function on P_n with set of weighty vertices $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$. Let $\{i_1, \dots, i_\alpha\}$ be its leftmost parity block of O and let $\{i_\beta, \dots, i_k\}$ be its rightmost parity block.*

Let $X = A$ if either $\{n \text{ is even and } i_1 \text{ and } i_k \text{ have the same parity}\}$, or $\{n \text{ is odd and } i_1 \text{ and } i_k \text{ have different parity}\}$; otherwise $X = B$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w) &= \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta+1}]) \right\}, \text{ and so} \\ \sigma_0^X(n; w) &= \min \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha} w(i_j) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k]), \sum_{j=\beta}^k w(i_j) + \sigma_0^X(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}]) \right\}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, we have

$$\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w) = \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \right\} \quad (1)$$

By induction, $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k]) \geq \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k])$, and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \geq \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}])$. Therefore,

$$\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w) \geq \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}]) \right\}.$$

Let us now prove the opposite inequality by induction on k , the result holding by (1) when $k = 2$. By the induction hypothesis $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k]) = \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_{\beta-1}]) \right\}$. By Lemma 2, $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_{\beta-1}]) \leq \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}])$. Therefore

$$\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_2, i_k]) \leq \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}]) \right\}$$

Similarly by induction: $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) = \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_{k-1}]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}]) \right\}$. By Lemma 2, $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_{k-1}]) \leq \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k])$. Therefore

$$\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}]) \leq \max \left\{ \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_{\alpha+1}, i_k]), \sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w[i_1, i_{\beta-1}]) \right\}$$

Hence by (1), this gives the result. \square

Using the same method as for proving Proposition 5, but using Lemma 6 instead of Lemma 1, we can prove the following.

Proposition 7. *Let P_n be a path with n vertices and w a 0-ordinary weight function. Then $\sigma_0^X(n; w)$ and $\sigma_0^{\bar{X}}(n; w)$ can be computed in $O(h^2)$ arithmetic operations where h is the number of parity blocks of the set of weighty vertices (or equivalently the number of parity changes of the weighty vertices plus 1).*

3.3 Optimal strategies for 1- and 2-ordinary weight functions

Based on strategies Σ_0 for 0-ordinary weight functions, we now define the strategies Σ_1 and Σ_2 for 1-ordinary and 2-ordinary, respectively, weight functions.

Strategies Σ_1 : If the players have to play on the path P_n with a 1-ordinary weight function w , then the players do the following: At the first move A removes the weighty end-vertex; then the players play according to strategy Σ_0 on P_n with weight function $w' = w[1, n-1] = w[i_1, i_{k-1}]$ if the removed vertex was n , or $w' = w[2, n] = w[i_2, i_k]$ if the removed vertex was 1.

Strategies Σ_2 : If the players have to play on the path P_n with a 2-ordinary weight function w , then the players do the following: At the first move, A removes the end-vertex with the largest weight and at the second move B removes the other end-vertex. Then the players play according to strategy Σ_0 on P_n with weight function $w' = w[2, n-1] = w[i_2, i_{k-1}]$.

Note that for both strategies Σ_1 and Σ_2 , it is possible to finish playing according to Strategy Σ_0 on P_n with weight function w' , because w' is a 0-ordinary weight function and the vertices removed before applying strategy Σ_0 are safe for w' .

The total weight collected by a player X with strategy Σ_i on P_n with an i -ordinary weight function w is denoted by $\sigma_i^X(n; w)$.

The following lemma follows immediately from the definition.

Lemma 8. *Let P_n be a path with n vertices and w a weight function with set $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ of weighty vertices.*

- *Assume w is 1-ordinary and the two players play according to strategy Σ_1 .
If $i_1 = 1$, then $\sigma_1^A(n; w) = w(i_1) + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_2, i_k])$ and $\sigma_1^B(n; w) = \sigma_0^B(n; w[i_2, i_k])$.
If $i_k = n$, then $\sigma_1^A(n; w) = w(i_k) + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$ and $\sigma_1^B(n; w) = \sigma_0^B(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$.*
- *Assume w is 2-ordinary and the two players play according to strategy Σ_2 . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_2^A(n; w) &= \max\{w(i_1), w(i_k)\} + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]) \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma_2^B(n; w) &= \min\{w(i_1), w(i_k)\} + \sigma_0^B(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]) .\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 9. (i) *Strategies Σ_1 are optimal on P_n with 1-ordinary weight functions.*

(ii) *Strategies Σ_2 are optimal on P_n with 2-ordinary weight functions.*

Proof. (i) Assume w is a 1-ordinary weight function with set $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ of weighty vertices. W.l.o.g. assume that $i_k = n$ and $i_1 > 1$. By Lemma 8, $\sigma_1^A(n; w) = w(i_k) + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$.

Suppose that A does not play according to strategy Σ_1 , that is A removes 1. We distinguish two cases depending on whether $i_1 = 2$ (that is 1 is critical) or not.

- $i_1 > 2$. Then B can remove 1 and get $w(i_1)$. We are then left with a 0-ordinary weight function. By Lemma 3, the strategies Σ_0 are then optimal so the gain of A is at most $\sigma_0^A(n; w[i_1, i_{k-1}])$ which is less than $\sigma_1^A(n; w)$.
- $i_1 = 2$. Then B is left with two weighty end-vertices, namely 2 and n . B can take the one with maximum weight $\max\{w(i_1), w(i_k)\}$. By Lemma 3, the strategies Σ_0 are then optimal, so, by Lemma 1, the gain of A is at most $\min\{w(i_1), w(i_k)\} + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}])$ which is no greater than $\sigma_1^A(n; w)$ by Lemma 2.

(ii) Assume w is a 2-ordinary weight function with set $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ of weighty vertices. Necessarily, $i_1 = 1$ and $i_k = n$. Player A is obliged to remove a weighty vertex. Then Player B has to play on a path with $n - 1$ vertices with a 1-ordinary weight function. By (i), the optimal strategy for B is Σ_1 which consists in removing the other end-vertex, and for the next moves the strategy Σ_0 is optimal on the path $(2, \dots, n - 1)$. The gain for B is at least $\min\{w(i_1), w(i_k)\} + \sigma_0^B(n; w[i_2, i_{k-1}]) = \sigma_2^B(n; w)$. Moreover this bound is attained only if A removes a vertex among $\{1, n\}$ with maximum weight. Therefore the strategy Σ_2 is optimal. \square

3.4 Back on Circular pizza

In this subsection, we are given the cycle $C_n = (1, 2, \dots, n, 1)$ of order n with a non-negative weight function w on the vertices. As for paths, the weight function is **ordinary** if there are no adjacent weighty vertices.

Proposition 10. *Let C_n be a cycle with n vertices and w a 0-ordinary weight function with k weighty vertices.*

Alice has an optimal strategy whose first move consists in removing a weighty vertex. So the weight collected by Alice and Bob if they both play optimally can be computed in $O(kh^2)$ arithmetic operations where h is the number of parity blocks.

Proof. Let O be the set of weighty vertices. Suppose Alice removes a vertex a not in O . Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a = 1$.

Assume first that $a = 1$ has a neighbour in O . By symmetry, we may assume that $n \in O$. Every strategy starting with the removal of 1 or n may be seen as a strategy on the path P_n (with weight function w) obtained from C by removing the edge $\{n, 1\}$. Note that w is 1-ordinary. By Theorem 9 (i), an optimal strategy on P_n is

Σ_1 whose first move consists in removing n . Therefore if there is an optimal strategy starting with the removal of 1, there is also an optimal strategy starting with the removal of n (which belongs to O).

Assume now that 1 has no neighbour in O . Let $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ with $i_1 < \dots < i_k$. Every strategy starting with the removal of 1 can be seen as a strategy on P_n . Therefore, by Theorem 3, and Lemma 1, the gain of Alice is at most $\sigma_0^A(n; w)$. But Alice could also apply the strategy Σ_1 on the path obtained from P by removing the edge $\{i_1 - 1, i_1\}$. Doing so, she first removes the vertex i_1 , which is in O , and her gain is $w(i_1) + \sigma_0^A(n; w[i_2, i_k])$, which is at least $\sigma_0^A(n; w)$ by Proposition 4. Therefore, if there is an optimal strategy starting with the removal of 1, there is also an optimal strategy starting with the removal of i_1 (which belongs to O computing the optimal gains of Alice and Bob can be done by computing the k gains that correspond to the k path pizza problems where vertex 1 is a weighty vertex. Finally computing the optimal gains of Alice and Bob can be done by computing the k gains that correspond to the k path pizza problems where a weighty vertex is removed by Alice. \square

4 d -degenerate games with a $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function

We prove some results for d -degenerate game played on a d -degenerate graph for some fixed integer d when w is a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued function. We show how we can use them to answer Questions (Q1), Q(2), Q(3) for linear pizzas with a $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function. The weight function w is then completely determined by the set $O = \{v \mid w(v) = 1\}$. This set is then called the **olive set** and its elements the **olives**. Let G be a graph on n vertices and an olive set $O \subseteq V(G)$. Coatis Alice and Bob are denoted by their initials A and B respectively. A **play** σ is a sequence of legal moves made alternately by A and B . This is a d -degenerate ordering of G . An **optimal play** is a sequence of moves made alternately by A and B when they play optimally. For $X \in \{A, B\}$, we denote by $\text{col}_d^X(G, O)$ the number of olives that X collects in an optimal play. Note that $\text{col}_d^A(G, O) + \text{col}_d^B(G, O) = |O|$. For any integer $k \in [n]$, we say that a coati **secures** s olives among k on G if he/she collects at least s olives for any set of k olives.

Lemma 11. *Let d be a positive integer, G be a d -degenerate graph, and $X \in \{A, B\}$ a coati. For any $k < |V(G)|$, we have*

$$(i) \quad \text{sec}_d^X(G, k) \leq \text{sec}_d^X(G, k+1) \leq \text{sec}_d^X(G, k) + 1, \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \quad \overline{\text{col}}_d^X(G, k) \leq \overline{\text{col}}_d^X(G, k+1) \leq \overline{\text{col}}_d^X(G, k) + 1.$$

Proof. Let O be a set of $k+1$ olives.

Let $o \in O$ be an olive. Playing his strategy for $O \setminus \{o\}$, the coati X collects $\text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\})$ olives. So $\text{col}_d^X(G, O) \geq \text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\})$.

Moreover, $\text{col}_d^X(G, O) = k+1 - \text{col}_d^{\overline{X}}(G, O) \leq k+1 - \text{col}_d^{\overline{X}}(G, O \setminus \{o\}) = \text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\}) + 1$. Hence

$$\text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\}) \leq \text{col}_d^X(G, O) \leq \text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\}) + 1. \quad (2)$$

This equation directly implies (i).

It also implies the following:

$$\frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{o \in O} \text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\}) \leq \text{col}_d^X(G, O) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{o \in O} \text{col}_d^X(G, O \setminus \{o\})$$

which directly implies (ii). \square

Question (Q1) consists in determining $\text{sec}_d^A(G, k)$ (resp. $\text{sec}_d^B(G, k)$) the maximum number of olives Alice (resp. Bob) secures.

Question (Q3) asks for the average number of olives $\overline{\text{col}}_d^X(G, k)$ coati X collects in the d -degenerate game over all possible k olive sets of G .

Finally, Question (Q4) asks for $\text{win}_d^A(G, k)$ (resp. $\text{win}_d^B(G, k)$) which is the probability that Alice (resp. Bob) wins, that is collects at least half the olives.

The following lemma shows that there is an optimal play where a coati grabs immediately an olive if possible. We denote by $R_d(G, O)$ the set of **removable olives** in the d -degenerate game on G , that are the vertices of O that have degree at most d in G .

Lemma 12. *Let G be a d -degenerate graph and let O be a set of olives. If $R_d(G, O) = r > 0$, then for any order o_1, o_2, \dots, o_r of the r vertices of $R_d(G, O)$, there is an optimal play starting with o_1, o_2, \dots, o_r*

Proof. We prove the result by induction on the number of vertices of G , the result holding trivially if G has one vertex. We note that to prove the lemma it suffices to prove that there is an optimal play starting with o_1 . Indeed, by induction hypothesis there exist an optimal play in $(G, O) - \{o_1\}$ starting with o_2, \dots, o_r as these vertices are vertices of $O - o_1$ removable.

Let σ be an optimal play for (G, O) and suppose that σ starts with the vertex v_1 . If $v_1 = o_1$ there is nothing to prove. We distinguish two cases.

- $v_1 \in O$. So, let $v_1 = o_j$, with $2 \leq j \leq r$. By the induction hypothesis applied to $(G, O) - \{o_j\}$, there is an optimal play in $(G, O) - \{o_j\}$ starting with o_1 . So we have an optimal play in (G, O) $o_j, o_1, v_3, \dots, v_n$. But the play $\sigma' = (o_1, o_j, v_3, \dots, v_n)$ is also optimal as A and B get the same number of olives (the only difference is that now A grabs o_1 instead of o_j). Note that the proof will not be valid if the weighty vertices have different weights.
- $v_1 \notin O$. By the induction hypothesis, we have an optimal play in $(G, O) - \{v_1\}$ starting with o_1, o_2, \dots, o_r and so in (G, O) an optimal play $(v_1, o_1, \dots, o_r, v_{r+1}, v_{r+2}, \dots, v_n)$. The gain of A is therefore $\text{col}^A((G, O) - \lfloor r/2 \rfloor + G(A))$ where $G(A)$ is the gain of A in the optimal play $(v_{r+1}, v_{r+2}, \dots, v_n)$ in $(G, O) - \{v_1, o_1, \dots, o_r\}$ with A playing first (resp. second) if r is odd (resp. even).

Now consider the play where A plays first o_1 . By the induction hypothesis there is an optimal play in $(G, O) - \{o_1\}$ starting with o_2, \dots, o_r .

If $r \geq 2$, A can remove in move 3 the vertex v_1 and then A will gain $G(A)$ in the play in $(G, O) - \{o_1, v_1, o_2, o_3, \dots, o_r\}$ (with B starting). So we have a play $\sigma' = (o_1, o_2, v_1, o_3, \dots, o_r, v_{r+1}, v_{r+2}, \dots, v_n)$ where A gains $\lfloor r/2 \rfloor + G(A)$ which is the optimum and so σ' is an optimal play satisfying the lemma.

If $r = 1$ the gain of A is now 1 plus the gain $H(A)$ in an optimal play on $(G, O) - \{o_1\}$ with B playing first. To compute the gain $H(A)$ we will use the trick of computing the gain if we add an olive in v_1 . By Equation (2) $H(A) \geq H'(A) - 1$ where $H'(A)$ is the gain of A if we add an olive in v_1 that is in the game $(G, O \cup \{v_1\}) - \{o_1\}$ with B playing first. By induction hypothesis there is in this game an optimal play where B starts with v_1 and then consisting of the optimal play (v_2, \dots, v_n) and so the gain of A is exactly $H'(A) = G(A)$. Therefore $H(A) \geq G(A) - 1$. In summary there is a play σ' starting with o_1 , where A gains at least $G(A)$; that is exactly the value of an optimal play and so σ' is also an optimal play. □

The set of **reachable olives** $R_d^+(G, O)$ is the set of olives that can be removed without removing a non-olive vertex. Precisely, it is recursively defined as follows: if (G, O) has no removable olive, then $R^+(G, O) = \emptyset$; if (G, O) has a removable olive o , then $R_d^+(G, O) = \{o\} \cup R_d^+(G, O \setminus \{o\})$. Note that this set is well-defined as it does not depend on the order in which we remove the olives because a removable vertex remains removable when another vertex is removed. Lemma 11 and an immediate induction yield the following corollary.

Corollary 13. *Let G be a d -degenerate graph on n vertices. For every O , there is an optimal play of the d -degenerate game starting with the elements of $R_d^+(G, O)$. Hence $\text{col}_d^A(G, O) \geq \lfloor |R_d^+(G, O)|/2 \rfloor$ and $\text{col}_d^B(G, k) \geq \lfloor |R_d^+(G, O)|/2 \rfloor$.*

Corollary 14. *Let G be a d -degenerate graph on n vertices. For every $k \in [n]$, we have $\text{sec}_d^A(G, k) \leq \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and $\text{sec}_d^B(G, k) \leq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$.*

Proof. Let (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) be a d -degenerate ordering of G . Let $O = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$. Then $R_d^+(G, O) = O$. Hence by Corollary 13, $\text{col}_d^A(G, O) = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and $\text{col}_d^B(G, k) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$. The result follows. □

Corollary 14 is tight in the sense that there are d -degenerate graphs such that $\text{sec}_d^A(G, k) = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and $\text{sec}_d^B(G, k) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$. This is in particular the case for the graphs with maximum degree d .

Proposition 15. Let G be a graph with maximum degree at most d . For any $k \in [V(G)]$, we have $\overline{\text{col}}_d^A(G, k) = \text{sec}_d^A(G, k) = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and $\overline{\text{col}}_d^B(G, k) = \text{sec}_d^B(G, k) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$. Hence $\text{win}_d^A(G, k) = 1$, $\text{win}_d^B(G, k) = 1$ if k is even, and $\text{win}_d^B(G, k) = 0$ if k is odd.

Proof. We have $R_d^+(G, O) = O$ for all olive set O . So, by Corollary 13, $\text{col}_d^A(G, O) \geq \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and $\text{col}_d^B(G, O) \geq \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ for all set O of k olives. Thus $\text{col}_d^A(G, O) = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ and $\text{col}_d^B(G, O) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$ for all set O of k olives. The result follows. \square

Question 16. What are the d -degenerate graphs such that $\text{sec}_d^A(G, k) = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ (resp. $\text{sec}_d^B(G, k) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$)? Can we recognize them in polynomial time? More generally, can we compute $\text{sec}_d^A(G, k)$ and $\text{sec}_d^B(G, k)$ in polynomial time?

Question 17. What are the d -degenerate graphs such that $\text{win}_d^A(G, k) = 1$ (resp. $\text{win}_d^A(G, k) \geq 1/2$, $\text{win}_d^B(G, k) = 0$, $\text{win}_d^B(G, k) = 1$)? Can we recognize them in polynomial time? More generally, can we compute $\text{win}_d^A(G, k)$ and $\text{win}_d^B(G, k)$ in polynomial time?

4.1 Sharing a linear pizza with a $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function

The olive set $O = \{v \mid w(v) = 1\}$ is **rare** or α -**ordinary** for some $\alpha \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ if it corresponds to a rare or α -ordinary weight function. Lemma 12 implies the following proposition.

Proposition 18. Suppose that O contains two adjacent olives $\{i_j, i_j + 1\}$. Let $P'_{n-2} = P_n \setminus \{i_j, i_j + 1\}$ and $O' = O \setminus \{i_j, i_j + 1\}$. Then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, O) = 1 + \text{col}_1^A(P'_{n-2}, O')$ and $\text{col}_1^B(P_n, O) = 1 + \text{col}_1^B(P'_{n-2}, O')$.

Proof. Note that by Lemma 12, when a player takes one of the olives $\{i_j, i_j + 1\}$, the next player has an optimal strategy where (s)he takes the other olive. Let Π_0 be such an optimal play on (P_n, O) ; to Π_0 we associate the play Π'_0 on (P'_{n-2}, O') by deleting in Π_0 the two consecutive moves $i_j, i_j + 1$. In the play Π'_0 , A collects $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, O) - 1$ olives (and B $\text{col}_1^B(P_n, O) - 1$ olives).

Conversely consider an optimal play Π'_1 on (P'_{n-2}, O') . To Π'_1 we associate a play Π_1 on (P_n, O) as follows. Let $\Pi'_1 = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-2})$ and let v_h be the first move such that $v_h \in \{i_j - 1, i_j + 2\}$. The first h moves of Π_1 will be the same as Π'_1 that is (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_h) . Let X be the player who picks up v_h ; then, by Lemma 12, there is an optimal strategy in Π_1 where the other player picks one of the olives $\{i_j, i_j + 1\}$, exactly v_j (resp. $v_j + 1$) if $v_h = v_j - 1$ (resp. $v_h = v_j + 2$). Then again by Lemma 12 there is an optimal strategy where X picks up the other olive in $\{i_j, i_j + 1\}$. Then the last $n - 2 - h$ moves are the same as in Π_1 . The number of olives collected by A in Π_1 is $1 + \text{col}_1^A(P'_{n-2}, O')$.

We claim that Π_1 is optimal. Indeed suppose there exists an optimal play Π_{opt} where A collects strictly more olives than in Π_1 and consider the play Π'_{opt} on (P'_{n-2}, O') associated to Π_{opt} as defined above. In Π'_{opt} , A will collect one olive less than in Π_{opt} that is strictly more olives than in Π'_1 contradicting the optimality of Π'_1 . Therefore, $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, O) = 1 + \text{col}_1^A(P'_{n-2}, O')$. \square

This proposition enables us to deal with adjacent olives and so to answer Question (Q2) for linear pizza with a $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function. If there are h pairs of adjacent olives, we give h olives to each player and delete the corresponding vertices. We are left with a path of size $n - 2h$ and with an ordinary set of olives. Then we apply strategy Σ to compute the remaining gains of A and B .

A $\{0, 1\}$ -weight function is completely determined by its olive set $O = \{v \mid w(v) = 1\}$. A set of olives is **rare** or α -**ordinary** for some $\alpha \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ if it corresponds to a rare or α -ordinary weight function. It turns out that among the $\binom{n}{k}$ sets of k olives on P_n , the 0-ordinary sets prevail. Let $\text{ord}_0(n, k)$ be the number of 0-ordinary sets of k olives on P_n .

Lemma 19. Let k be a fixed integer.

$$\text{ord}_0(n, k) = \binom{n-k-1}{k} = \frac{n^k}{k!} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \right). \quad (3)$$

Proof. We shall use the following well-known equality: $\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n^k}{k!} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)$ (\star) .

Let $O = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ be a 0-ordinary set of k olives. $P_n - O$ is the disjoint union of the $k + 1$ non-empty subpaths $P[1, i_1 - 1], P[i_1 + 1, i_2 - 1], \dots, P[i_k + 1, n]$. Therefore, there is a bijection between the 0-ordinary sets and the $(k + 1)$ -uples (p_1, \dots, p_{k+1}) of positive integers such that $\sum_{j \in [k+1]} p_j = n - k$. This number is exactly the number of ways to allocate $n - 2k - 1$ elements into $k + 1$ boxes, which is $\binom{n-k-1}{k}$. Now (\star) yields the second equality of (3). \square

This lemma implies that to obtain asymptotic formulas on $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k)$, (and so $\overline{\text{col}}_1^B(P_n, k) = k - \overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k)$), $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, k)$, $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, k)$, for k fixed, we can only consider 0-ordinary sets. Recall that, when n is even, $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, k) = 1$ by Winkler's result. When playing on a 0-ordinary set on an odd path, in her first move Alice necessarily removes a non-olive vertex, leaving to Bob an even path on which he can win. Thus Lemma 19 implies that $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, k) = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$. If k is odd, the two coatis cannot win simultaneously, so $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, k) = 0$ if n is even, and $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, k) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ if n is odd. But when k is even, Alice and Bob can both collect half the vertices and thus win simultaneously. It is then interesting to know the probability of such a draw. If n is even, it is exactly $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, k)$, and when n is odd it is asymptotically equivalent to $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, k)$.

Let $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ be a set of k olives. For any $j \in [k]$, let $\gamma_j = 1$ if i_j is odd, and $\gamma_j = 0$ otherwise. The **parity word** of O is $W_O = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_k$. As observed earlier, if O_1 and O_2 are two 0-ordinary sets of P_n with same parity word, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, O_1) = \text{col}_1^A(P_n, O_2)$. Therefore, for any parity word W , we can define $\text{col}_1^X(P_n, W)$ as $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, O)$ for any 0-ordinary set O such that $W = W_O$. Moreover, as we shall now prove in Lemma 20, there is asymptotically roughly the same number of 0-ordinary sets associated to each word of length k .

For any word $W \in \{0, 1\}^k$, let $\text{ord}_0(n, W)$ be the number of 0-ordinary sets O of P_n such that $W_O = W$.

Lemma 20. *Let k be a fixed integer. Then*

$$\text{ord}_0(n, W) = \frac{n^k}{k! 2^k} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) = \frac{\text{ord}_0(n, k)}{2^k} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \text{ for all word } W \in \{0, 1\}^k. \quad (4)$$

Proof. Let W be a word in $W \in \{0, 1\}^k$.

Consider a 0-ordinary set $O = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ with parity word W . Let $i_0 = 0$ and $i_{k+1} = n + 1$. For all $j \in [n + 1]$, let $S_j = \{i_j - 1\}$ and $\ell_j = i_j - 2$ if i_{j-1} and i_j have the same parity, and let $S_j = \{i_j - 2, i_j - 1\}$ and $\ell_j = i_j - 3$ otherwise. The vertices of each S_j are non-olive vertices, and $P_n - (O \cup \bigcup_{j \in [k+1]} S_j)$ is the disjoint union of the $k + 1$ paths $Q_j = P_n[i_{j-1} + 1, \ell_j]$ on an even (possibly 0) number of vertices. Note that $P_n - (O \cup \bigcup_{j \in [k+1]} S_j)$ has $n - (k + 1) - h$ vertices where $h = \{j \in [k + 1] \mid \gamma_{j-1} \neq \gamma_j\}$ is the number of parity changes. (Note that h only depends on W .) Setting $q_j = |V(Q_j)|$ for all $j \in [k + 1]$, we have $\sum_{j \in [k+1]} q_j = n - k - h - 1$.

Therefore, there is a bijection between the 0-ordinary sets O such that $W_O = W$ and the $(k + 1)$ -uples (q_1, \dots, q_{k+1}) of even non-negative integers such that $\sum_{j \in [k+1]} q_j = n - k - h - 1$. This number is exactly the number of ways to allocate $(n - k - h - 1)/2$ elements into $k + 1$ boxes, which is $\binom{\frac{n-k-h-1}{2}}{k}$. Hence, using (\star) and (3), we get (4). \square

Lemmas 19 and 20 directly imply the following.

Corollary 21. *Let k be a fixed integer. For any $X \in \{A, B\}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{col}}_1^X(P_n, k) &= \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{W \in \{0, 1\}^k} \text{col}_1^X(P_n, W) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right); \\ \text{win}_1^X(P_n, k) &= \frac{1}{2^k} \left| \left\{ W \in \{0, 1\}^k \mid \text{col}_1^X(P_n, W) \geq \frac{k}{2} \right\} \right| \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 21, to compute the asymptotic value of $\overline{\text{col}}_1^X(P_n, k)$ and $\text{win}_1^X(P_n, k)$, it suffices to compute the value $\text{col}_1^X(P_n, W)$ for the 2^k words of $\{0, 1\}^k$. This can be done using the recursive formulas of Lemma 1.

Let W be a word in $\{0, 1\}^k$. We denote by $k_0(W)$ or simply k_0 the number of 0 in W and by $k_1(W)$ or simply k_1 the number of 1 in W . Note that $k_0(W)$ (resp. $k_1(W)$) is the number of even (resp. odd) olives in every 0-ordinary set with parity word W .

Proposition 22. *Let W be a word in $\{0, 1\}^2$.*

If $\max\{k_0, k_1\} = 2$, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 2$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 0$ if n is odd. Otherwise $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 1$.

Corollary 23. $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, 2) = \begin{cases} 3/2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 1/2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$

Moreover, if n is even then $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, 2) = 1/2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$, and if n is odd then $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, 2) = 1/2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$.

Proposition 24. *Let W be a word in $\{0, 1\}^3$.*

If $\max\{k_0, k_1\} = 3$, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 3$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 0$ if n is odd. Otherwise $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 2$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 1$ if n is odd.

Corollary 25. $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, 3) = \begin{cases} 9/4 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 3/4 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$

Proposition 26. *Let W be a word in $\{0, 1\}^4$.*

- *If $\max\{k_0, k_1\} = 4$, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 4$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 0$ if n is odd.*
- *If $\max\{k_0, k_1\} = 3$ or $W \in \{0110, 1001\}$, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 3$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 1$ if n is odd.*
- *Otherwise $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 2$.*

Said otherwise, if n is even then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, O) = \max\{k_0, k_1\}$, and if n is odd then $\text{col}_1^B(P_n, O) = \max\{k_0, k_1\}$ except when $W = 0110$ or $W = 1001$.

Corollary 27. $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, 4) = \begin{cases} 23/8 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 9/8 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$

Moreover, if n is even then $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, 4) = 1/4 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$, and if n is odd then $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, 4) = 1/4 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$.

Proposition 28. *Let W be a word in $\{0, 1\}^5$.*

If n is even, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = \max\{k_0, k_1\}$ except when $W = 01110$ or $W = 10001$ in which case $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 4$.

If n is odd, then $\text{col}_1^B(P_n, W) = \max\{k_0, k_1\}$ except when $W = 01110$ or $W = 10001$ in which case $\text{col}_1^B(P_n, W) = 4$.

Corollary 29. $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, 5) = \begin{cases} 7/2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 3/2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$

Proposition 30. *Let W be a word of $\{0, 1\}^6$.*

- *If $W \in \{001110, 010110, 011010, 011100, 110001, 101001, 100101, 100011\}$, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 4$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 2$ if n is odd.*
- *If $W \in \{011110, 100001\}$, then $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 5$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = 1$ if n is odd.*
- *Otherwise $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = \max\{k_0, k_1\}$ if n is even and $\text{col}_1^A(P_n, W) = \min\{k_0, k_1\}$ if n is odd.*

Corollary 31. $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, 6) = \begin{cases} 131/32 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 61/32 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$

Moreover, if n is even then $\text{win}_1^B(P_n, 6) = 3/16 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$, and if n is odd then $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, 6) = 3/16 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$.

For any integer k , let

$$C_k = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \text{ even}} \overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k) = k - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k) = k - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \text{ odd}} \overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k),$$

and for any even integer k let

$$D_k = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{win}_1^A(P_n, k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \text{ odd}} \text{win}_1^A(P_n, k) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{win}_1^B(P_n, k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, n \text{ even}} \text{win}_1^B(P_n, k).$$

Table 1 summarizes the obtained values when $k \leq 6$ and suggests the Conjecture 32.

Conjecture 32. $\frac{C_k}{k} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$ and $D_{2p} \rightarrow 0$ when $p \rightarrow \infty$.

	k	1	2	3	4	5	6
$\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k)$	n even	1	$3/2 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$9/4 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$23/8 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$7/2 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$131/32 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$
	n odd	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$1/2 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$3/4 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$9/8 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$3/2 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$61/32 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$
$\text{win}_1^A(P_n, k)$	n even	1	1	1	1	1	1
	n odd	$2/n$	$1/2 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$1/4 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$	$3/16 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n})$

Table 1: Asymptotic value of $\overline{\text{col}}_1^A(P_n, k)$ and $\text{win}_1^A(P_n, k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq 6$

5 Sharing a pissaladière

In this section, we study SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE, the 2-degenerate game on rectangular grids $G_{p \times q}$ with p rows and q columns. We always consider $p \leq q$ and $p > 1$. Indeed if $p = 1$ the grid is reduced to a path considered in the preceding sections with the stronger rule of picking only vertices of degree 1. Vertices are denoted (a, b) where a is the index of the row and b the index of the column. A vertex of $G_{p \times q}$ is a **corner vertex** if it is in $\{(1, 1), (p, 1), (1, q), (p, q)\}$. Otherwise it is a **central vertex**.

At a given stage in the game, a vertex is **critical** if it is removable and its removal leaves an olive removable. This happens when the olive has three remaining neighbours, in which case its removable neighbours are critical. A vertex is **safe** if it is removable, not an olive and not critical.

The strategy for a coati is to take a safe vertex and when possible to force the other coati to take a critical vertex.

5.1 One olive

We first consider the case where the pissaladière contains only one olive. Here again parity is important. Alice will collect the olive if pq is odd or if it is in a corner and Bob will collect a central olive if pq is even. The following lemma is more general since it deals with grid subgraphs and will be useful for the case of two olives.

Lemma 33. *Let $O = \{o\}$ be a set of one olive in a subgraph H of the grid (not necessarily connected) on $n(H)$ vertices. Then $\text{col}_2^A(H, O) = 1$ if and only if $n(H)$ is odd or $d_H(o) \leq 2$.*

Proof. If $d_H(o) \leq 2$, then Alice collects the olive at her first move. Henceforth, we may assume $d_H(o) \geq 3$.

Assume $n(H)$ is odd. Alice's strategy is the following. She removes a safe vertex until Bob removes a critical vertex. Then the olive becomes removable and Alice grabs it. Let us prove that Alice can always take a safe vertex. Assume that it is Alice's turn to play and no critical vertex has been removed. Since $n(H)$ is odd, the remaining graph has an odd number of vertices and contains at least o and three of its neighbours and hence it has at least 5 vertices. Therefore, at least one of the vertices is neither critical nor o . By symmetry, we may assume that there is such a vertex $x = (a', b')$ in the northwest part from $o = (a, b)$ that is a vertex with $a' \leq a$ and $b' \leq b$. Moreover, we may consider x such that there is no vertex in the northwest part from it. Then x is removable, and thus safe concluding the proof. If $n(H)$ is even, Bob can play the same strategy as Alice's above, and so collects the olive. \square

A particular case of the previous lemma is when the subgraph is the grid itself.

Proposition 34. *Let o be the single olive in $G_{p \times q}$. Then $\text{col}_2^A(G_{p \times q}, o) = 1$ if and only if pq is odd or o is a corner.*

With Proposition 34 we can immediately answer question (Q1) to (Q4) when there is a single olive on the pissaladière. Note that for any $X \in \{A, B\}$, $\text{win}_2^X(G_{p \times q}, 1) = \overline{\text{col}}_2^X(G_{p \times q}, 1)$

Corollary 35. *If pq is odd, then $\text{sec}_2^A(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 1$, $\text{sec}_2^B(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 0$, $\overline{\text{col}}_2^A(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 1$, $\overline{\text{col}}_2^B(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 0$. If pq is even, then $\text{sec}_2^A(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 0$, $\text{sec}_2^B(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 0$, $\overline{\text{col}}_2^A(G_{p \times q}, 1) = \frac{4}{pq}$ and $\overline{\text{col}}_2^B(G_{p \times q}, 1) = 1 - \frac{4}{pq}$.*

5.2 Pissaladière of height 2

In this subsection, we consider SHARING A PISSALADIÈRE when the pissaladière has two rows. The two coatis plays the 2-degenerate game on the grid $G_{2 \times q}$. We shall prove that : $\text{sec}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k) = 0$ (Corollary 37) and $\text{sec}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) = \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$ (Corollary 39) and that $\overline{\text{col}}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k)$ tends to 0 when $q \rightarrow \infty$ and k is fixed (Proposition 40).

Let O be a set of olives in $G_{2 \times q}$. An **olive component** of O in G is a component of $G_{2 \times q} \langle O \rangle$. The set of olive components of size ≥ 2 will be denoted $C'(O)$. An olive in a component of size 1 is said to be **lonesome**; said otherwise an olive is lonesome if none of its neighbours is in O . Two lonesome olives are **related** if they have two common neighbours. The **lonesome graph** is the graph whose vertices are the lonesome olives and in which there is an edge between two lonesome olives if and only if they are related. A **wave** is a connected component in the lonesome graph. We denote by $\mathcal{W}(O)$ the set of waves. If there is a lonesome corner olive in O which is in an odd wave, then we set $\epsilon(O) = 1$, otherwise we set $\epsilon(O) = 0$.

Lemma 36. *Let O be a set of olives in $G_{2 \times q}$. Then*

$$\text{col}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, O) \geq \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}(O)} \left\lceil \frac{|W|}{2} \right\rceil - \epsilon(O) + \sum_{C \in C'(O)} \left\lfloor \frac{|C|}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. Let v be a vertex. We denote by $L(v)$ (resp. $R(v)$) the set of vertices that are left (resp. right) to v and not adjacent to v :

$$L(a, b) = \{(a', b') \mid b' < b\} \setminus \{(a, b-1)\} \quad \text{and} \quad R(a, b) = \{(a', b') \mid b' > b\} \setminus \{(a, b+1)\}.$$

Note that if v is a central vertex then $L(v)$ and $R(v)$ are both odd.

Bob's strategy is the following.

1. If an olive is removable, then Bob collects it.
2. If there is no removable olive, then Bob takes a removable vertex not adjacent to a remaining lonesome olive (as we will see such a vertex always exists).

Let us show that when there is no removable olive, Bob has always the possibility to take a removable vertex not adjacent to a lonesome olive and so 2. can be applied. That is clear if there is no lonesome olive. If a lonesome olive remains, then it is a central one. Let o_ℓ be the leftmost (that is the one with smallest second coordinate) remaining

lonesome olive and o_r the rightmost (that is the one with largest second coordinate) remaining lonesome olive. Observe that all removable vertices are in $L(o_\ell) \cup R(o_r)$ which cardinal is even. Then Bob removes a vertex in this set. Doing so Alice will not be able to collect a lonesome olive in her next move. The only way for Alice to collect a lonesome central olive is to remove a vertex adjacent to two related lonesome olives, to let Bob collect one of them by 1., and to collect the other. However Alice may collect a lonesome olive in a corner on her first move. Therefore Bob collects at least $\sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}(O)} \lceil |W|/2 \rceil - \epsilon(O)$ lonesome olives.

Moreover, for any olive component C of size greater than 1, Bob collects at least $\lfloor |C|/2 \rfloor$ olives in C . Indeed each time Alice collects an olive in the component if there is a remaining olive Bob also collects another one. \square

Corollary 37. *If $q \geq 2k + 1$, then $\text{sec}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $O = \{(1, b) \mid 2 \leq b \leq 2k + 1 \text{ and } b \text{ even}\}$. Then O is made of k lonesome central olives which are not related to each other. Hence, by Lemma 36, $\text{col}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, O) \geq |\mathcal{C}^1(O)| = |\mathcal{C}(O)| = k$. Thus $\text{col}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, O) = k - \text{col}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, O) = 0$. \square

Corollary 38. *$\text{sec}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) \geq \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$ for all k .*

Proof. Let O be a set of k olives and let p be the number of lonesome olives. By Lemma 36, $\text{col}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) \geq \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2$, with $\Sigma_1 = \sum_{W \in \mathcal{W}(O)} \lceil |W|/2 \rceil - \epsilon(O)$ and $\Sigma_2 = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}'(O)} \lfloor |C|/2 \rfloor$. If the size s of a component of $\mathcal{C}'(O)$ is even then $\lfloor s/2 \rfloor = s/2 \geq s/3$. If it is odd, since $s \geq 3$, $\lfloor s/2 \rfloor \geq s/3$. So, $\Sigma_2 \geq \lceil (k-p)/3 \rceil$.

If $p \leq 1$ the results holds. If $p = 2$, then, either there is a wave of order 2 and $\epsilon(O) = 0$, or there are two waves of order 1 and $\epsilon(O) = 1$. In both cases, we have $\Sigma_1 = 1$ and so $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 \geq \lceil \frac{k-2}{3} \rceil + 1 \geq \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$. If $p \geq 3$, $\Sigma_1 \geq \lceil p/2 \rceil - 1$. So $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 \geq \lceil \frac{k-p}{3} \rceil + \lceil p/2 \rceil - 1 \geq \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$. In all cases $\text{col}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) \geq \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$ proving the corollary. \square

Corollary 39. *If $q \geq k + 1$, then $\text{sec}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) = \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$.*

Proof. By Corollary 38, it suffices to prove $\text{sec}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) \leq \lceil \frac{k-1}{3} \rceil$. Since sec_2^B is non-decreasing it suffices to prove this statement when $k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, say $k = 3h + 1$ for some integer h .

Let $O_i = \{(1, 3i), (2, 3i), (2, 3i + 1)\}$ for all $i \in [h]$, and let $O = \{(1, 1)\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^h O_i$.

Set $L_i = \{(a, b) \mid b < 3i - 1\}$ and $R_i = \{(a, b) \mid b > 3i + 2\} \cup \{(1, 3i + 2)\}$.

Let us describe an optimal strategy for Alice. She first removes the olive $(1, 1)$. Then at each move she does the following. If it is possible to collect an O_i , then she collects the first olive. By lemma 12 Bob takes the second olive, then Alice takes the third.

Otherwise let ℓ (resp. r) be the smallest (resp. largest) integer i such that O_i has not been removed. Then Alice removes a vertex of $L_\ell \cup R_r$. This is always possible because all removed vertices are in this set and this set has an odd number of vertices. Doing so Bob will not be able to collect an olive at his next move. (In particular, it will not collect the first olive of any O_i).

Applying this strategy Alice collects the first and third olives of all O_i . Therefore Alice collects two olives per O_i . Since she also collects the olive $(1, 1)$ in her first move, she collects $2h + 1$ olives. Consequently Bob collects $h = \frac{k-1}{3}$ olives. \square

Proposition 40. *Let be fixed positive integer k .*

$\overline{\text{col}}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k) = \mathcal{O}(1/q)$ and $\overline{\text{col}}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) = k + \mathcal{O}(1/q)$;

$\text{win}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k) = \mathcal{O}(1/q)$, and $\text{win}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/q)$.

Proof. We distinguish two kinds of olive sets: *ordinary sets* in which the k olives are central lonesome and not related, and the ones that are not ordinary that we call *rare sets*. For an ordinary set O , by Lemma 36, $\text{col}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, O) = k$ and so $\text{col}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, O) = 0$.

There are $\binom{2q}{k} = \frac{2^k q^k}{k!} + \mathcal{O}(q^{k-1})$ possible k -sets of olives on $G_{2 \times q}$.

An olive set is rare if it contains either a corner, or two adjacent olives, or two related olives. The number of k -sets containing a corner is at most $4 \times \binom{2q-1}{k-1} = \mathcal{O}(q^{k-1})$. There are $\binom{2q-2}{k-2} = \mathcal{O}(q^{k-2})$ k -sets containing a given pair of adjacent vertices, and the number of pair of adjacent vertices is $3q - 2$. Thus, there are $\mathcal{O}(q^{k-1})$

k -sets containing two adjacent vertices. Similarly, there are $\mathcal{O}(q^{k-1})$ k -sets containing two related vertices. Hence number of rare sets is $\mathcal{O}(q^{k-1})$.

Consequently, $\overline{\text{col}}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k) \leq \frac{1}{\binom{2q}{k}} \cdot k \cdot \mathcal{O}(q^{k-1}) = \mathcal{O}(1/q)$, and so $\overline{\text{col}}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) = k + \mathcal{O}(1/q)$. Similarly, $\text{win}_2^A(G_{2 \times q}, k) = \mathcal{O}(1/q)$, and $\text{win}_2^B(G_{2 \times q}, k) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/q)$. \square

5.3 Two olives on a pissaladière

In this subsection, the coatis are given a pissaladière $G_{p \times q}$ with two olives thrown uniformly at random on two different slices. Our aim is to estimate the number of olives that Alice (or Bob) will collect when playing the 2-degenerate game. Unsurprisingly, the parity of the number $n = p \times q$ of slices plays an important role. Therefore, we define **Content** (C) to be Alice (resp. Bob) and **Defeated** (D) to be Bob (resp. Alice) if n is odd (resp. even).

The following lemma shows that Content always collects at least one olive.

Lemma 41. *For any set of two olives O , Content collects at least one olive*

Proof. Let O be a set of two olives.

If O contains two corners, then Content can remove one of them on its first move, so $\text{col}_2^C(G_{p \times q}, O) \geq 1$.

Assume now that one of the two, say o_1 , is not a corner. Playing its optimal strategy for $\{o_1\}$, Content collects at least $\text{col}_2^C(G_{p \times q}, \{o_1\})$ olives. Thus $\text{col}_2^C(G_{p \times q}, O) \geq \text{col}_2^C(G_{p \times q}, \{o_1\}) = 1$, by Lemma 33. \square

We shall prove that Content almost always grabs the two olives.

Theorem 42. $\overline{\text{col}}_2^C(G_{p \times q}, 2) = 2 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$.

For the proof we will use the following notation. A vertex $v = (a, b)$ has (at most) four neighbours: its **north neighbour** $\mathbb{N}(v) = (a - 1, b)$, its **south neighbour** $\mathbb{S}(v) = (a + 1, b)$, its **west neighbour** $\mathbb{W}(v) = (a, b - 1)$ and its **east neighbour** $\mathbb{E}(v) = (a, b + 1)$.

The (open) **neighbourhood** of a vertex v , denoted by $N_G(v)$, in a graph G is the set of vertices adjacent to it. The **closed neighbourhood** of a vertex v is $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. When the graph G is clear from the context, we often drop the superscript and use $N(v)$ and $N[v]$ instead of $N_G(v)$ and $N_G[v]$ respectively.

Let $S = V \setminus (N[o_1] \cup N[o_2])$. Let S^* be the set of vertices of S that can be removed without removing any vertex of $N[o_1] \cup N[o_2]$.

For a matching (set of independent edges) M , we denote by $V(M)$ the set the vertices incident to edges of this matching, and for every vertex v in $V(M)$ we denote by $M(v)$ the vertex matched to v by M (that is such that $\{v, M(v)\} \in M$).

At a given stage in the game, a vertex is **critical** if it is removable and its removal leaves an olive removable. This happens when the olive has three remaining neighbours, in which case its removable neighbours are critical. A vertex is **safe** if it is removable, not a olive and not critical. A non-olive vertex which is not removable is called **locked**. Observe that a locked vertex may become removable and thus either critical or safe. A removable vertex which is one of the four neighbours of an olive goes from safe to critical when another neighbour of the olive is removed. It might go from critical to safe when its neighbouring olive is removed. Note there always exists a safe vertex in S^* unless all vertices of S^* have been removed.

Let $O = \{o_1, o_2\}$ be a set of two olives in $G_{p \times q}$. We set $o_1 = (a_1, b_1)$ and $o_2 = (a_2, b_2)$ and **we always assume that o_1 is smaller than o_2 in the lexicographical order, that is either $a_1 < a_2$, or $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 < b_2$** . In other words, either o_1 is north of o_2 or o_1 and o_2 are in the same latitude (row) and o_1 is west of o_2 .

For each $i \in [2]$, we abbreviate $\mathbb{N}(o_i)$, $\mathbb{S}(o_i)$, $\mathbb{W}(o_i)$, $\mathbb{E}(o_i)$ in, respectively, \mathbb{N}_i , \mathbb{S}_i , \mathbb{W}_i , \mathbb{E}_i . Furthermore, for every $\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{W}, \mathbb{E}\}$, we also abbreviate $\mathbb{X}(\mathbb{Y}_i)$ into $\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}_i$, and so on.

We now split the sets of two olives in two categories: rare and ordinary. A set of two olives is **rare** if it is of one of the following six types:

- Type 1: At least one olive is a corner.
- Type 2: The two olives are adjacent : $o_2 \in \{\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{E}_1\}$.

- Type 3: The two olives are related if they have exactly two neighbours in common : $o_2 \in \{\text{SW}_1, \text{SE}_1\}$.
- Type 4: The two olives are at distance 4 and on a same diagonal : $o_2 \in \{\text{SSWW}_1, \text{SSEE}_1\}$.
- Type 5: Either q is odd and the two olives are on a same row along the two opposite sides : $o_1 = (a, 1)$ and $o_2 = (a, q)$ with $1 < a < p$. Or p is odd and the two olives are on a same column along the two opposite sides : $o_1 = (1, b)$ and $o_2 = (p, b)$ with $1 < b < q$.
- Type 6: The two olives have a unique common neighbour : $o_2 \in \{\text{SS}_1, \text{EE}_1\}$.

The sets that are not rare are called **ordinary**.

5.3.1 Ordinary sets of two olives

Among the $\binom{n}{2}$ sets of two olives, the ordinary sets asymptotically prevail. Let $\text{ord} = \text{ord}(G_{p \times q})$ be the number of ordinary sets of two olives.

Lemma 43. $\text{ord} = \binom{n}{2} + \mathcal{O}(n)$.

Proof. One easily sees that there are at most $4n$ sets of Type 1, at most $2n$ sets of Type t , for $2 \leq t \leq 4$, at most $p + q < n$ sets of Type 5, and at most $2n$ sets of Type 6. Hence, in total, there are at most $13n$ rare sets. Thus $\binom{n}{2} - 13n \leq \text{ord} \leq \binom{n}{2}$. \square

The proofs of Theorem 42 in the odd and even cases are identical, but with the role of Alice and Bob interchanged. We shall now prove the following theorem stating that, whatever the parity of n is, Content grabs the two olives (and Defeated no olive). Together with Lemma 43, it directly implies Theorem 42.

Theorem 44. *Let O be an ordinary set of two olives in $G_{p \times q}$. Then Content collects the two olives.*

The strategy for Content is to take a safe vertex and when possible to force Defeated to take a critical vertex.

The proof of this theorem is in two parts; in one we prove that Content grabs the first olive, and in the other we prove that Content grabs the second olive. As it is the easiest, we begin with this later part.

Lemma 45. *Let O be a set of two olives at distance at least 3 in $G_{p \times q}$. Then Content collects the second olive.*

Proof. Let X be the coati that collected the first olive and \bar{X} its opponent. By Lemma 12, we may assume that X collected this olive as soon as possible, and so right after \bar{X} removed a critical vertex adjacent to it. Hence, after the removal of the first olive, we are left with a subgraph H of the grid in which the second olive is not removable (for otherwise it would have been possible to remove it earlier since the two olives have no common neighbours). If X is Defeated (resp. Content), then H has an odd (resp. even) number of vertices, and so by Lemma 33 with Content (resp. Defeated) in the role of Alice, Content collects the second olive. \square

Let us now show that Content collects the first olive.

Lemma 46. *Let O be an ordinary set of two olives in $G_{p \times q}$. Then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof. Set $V = V(G_{p \times q})$ and $O = (o_1, o_2)$ with $o_1 = (a_1, b_1)$ and $o_2 = (a_2, b_2)$. Recall that we may assume, as stated above, that $a_1 < a_2$, or $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 < b_2$.

Since O is not of Type 1, it contains no corner. Therefore a coati collects the first olive if and only its opponent is the first to remove a critical vertex. Therefore the strategy of both coatis is to force its opponent to be the first to remove a critical vertex. Therefore we may assume that **both coatis remove a safe vertex until it is impossible. Let R be the set of vertices removed until a coati is blocked, that is there is no more safe vertex to remove. We shall prove that $|R| \equiv pq \pmod{2}$, which implies that Content collects the first olive.** Recall that as long as there remains at least one vertex of S^* in the graph, one of them is safe and the coatis are not blocked. So $S^* \subseteq R$.

In the figures, we put the two olives and their neighbours in general position. Note that if o_1 (resp. o_2) has degree 3 – that is on the border –, then one of $\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{S}_1$ (resp. $\mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{E}_2, \mathbb{S}_2$) does not exist and the three neighbours of o_1 (resp. o_2) are critical. Recall that there is no olive in a corner (otherwise it will be a rare set of Type 1). We indicate with a $*$ the vertices which are in S^* . We put nothing for vertices locked at the beginning and recall that

they might at some stage become removable and thus either critical and safe. That depends of the strategies of Content and makes some proofs involved.

By symmetry, we can suppose furthermore that $b_2 \geq b_1$ and that $a_2 - a_1 \leq b_2 - b_1$. We distinguish various cases. We consider them in decreasing order of the possible values of $a_2 - a_1$ and for each value of $a_2 - a_1$ in decreasing order of the values of $b_2 - b_1$.

Claim 46.1. *If $a_2 - a_1 \geq 3$ (and so $b_2 - b_1 \geq 3$), then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. One can check that $S^* = S$. (See Figures 3.) If one olive has four neighbours R contains also a neighbour of this olive. Thus $|R| = pq - 8$, and so Content collects the first olive. \diamond

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	N ₁	*	*	*	*	*
*	W ₁	o ₁	E ₁	*	*	*	*
*	*	S ₁	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	N ₂	*	*
*	*	*	*	W ₂	o ₂	E ₂	*
*	*	*	*	*	S ₂	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 3: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 3$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 3$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

Claim 46.2. *If $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 \geq 4$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. The proof is identical to Claim 46.1 as again $S^* = S$. (See Figures 4.) \diamond

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	N ₁	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	W ₁	o ₁	E ₁	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	S ₁	*	*	*	N ₂	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	W ₂	o ₂	E ₂	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	S ₂	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 4: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 4$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

Claim 46.3. *If $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 3$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. One can check that $S^* = S \setminus \{SE_1, NW_2\}$. (See Figure 5).

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	N ₁	*	*	*	*	*
*	W ₁	o ₁	E ₁	*	*	*	*
*	*	S ₁			N ₂	*	*
*	*	*	*	W ₂	o ₂	E ₂	*
*	*	*	*	*	S ₂	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 5: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 3$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

We distinguish two cases:

Assume first that either $\{o_1$ is of degree 3 or R contains \mathbb{W}_1 or $\mathbb{N}_1\}$ and either $\{o_2$ is of degree 3 or R contains \mathbb{E}_2 or $\mathbb{S}_2\}$. Then $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1$ and $\mathbb{N}\mathbb{W}_2$ remain locked, that is do not belong to R . Thus $|R| = pq - 10$, and so Content collects the first olive.

Otherwise R contains a vertex in $\{\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{W}_2\}$. Then R contains necessarily $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1$ and $\mathbb{N}\mathbb{W}_2$. Thus $|R| = pq - 8$, and so Content collects the first olive. \diamond

Note that we cannot have $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 2$, for otherwise O would be of Type 4.

Claim 46.4. *If $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 \geq 4$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. The proof is similar to that of Claim 46.3.

Set $d = b_2 - b_1$. We have $d \geq 4$. Let L be the set of vertices in row a_1 between \mathbb{E}_1 and \mathbb{N}_2 plus those of row $a_2 = a_1 + 1$ between \mathbb{S}_1 and \mathbb{W}_2 , that is $L = \{(a_1, b) \mid b_1 + 1 < b < b_2\} \cup \{(a_1 + 1, b) \mid b_1 < b < b_2 - 1\}$. Note that $|L| = 2(d - 2)$. One can check that $S^* = S \setminus L$. (See Figure 6).

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{N}_1	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	\mathbb{W}_1	o_1	\mathbb{E}_1			\mathbb{N}_2	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{S}_1			\mathbb{W}_2	o_2	\mathbb{E}_2	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	\mathbb{S}_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 6: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 4$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

We distinguish two cases:

Assume first that $\{o_1$ is of degree 3 or R contains \mathbb{W}_1 or $\mathbb{N}_1\}$ and $\{o_2$ is of degree 3 or R contains \mathbb{E}_2 or $\mathbb{S}_2\}$. Then all vertices of L remain locked, that is do not belong to R . Thus $|R| = pq - 2d - 6$, and so Content collects the first olive.

Otherwise R contains a vertex in $\{\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{W}_2\}$. Then R contains necessarily all vertices of L . Thus $|R| = pq - 8$, and so Content collects the first olive. \diamond

Claim 46.5. *If $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 3$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. The proof is similar to that of Claim 46.3 but more involved. One can check that $S^* = S \setminus \{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{N}\mathbb{W}_2\}$ (see Figure 7). If either o_1 is of degree 3 or R contains \mathbb{W}_1 or \mathbb{N}_1 and either $\{o_2$ is of degree 3 or R contains \mathbb{E}_2 or $\mathbb{S}_2\}$, then $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1$ and $\mathbb{N}\mathbb{W}_2$ remain locked. Thus $|R| = pq - 10 \equiv pq \pmod{2}$, and so Content collects the first olive.

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{N}_1	*	*	*	*	*
*	\mathbb{W}_1	o_1	\mathbb{E}_1		\mathbb{N}_2	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{S}_1		\mathbb{W}_2	o_2	\mathbb{E}_2	*
*	*	*	*	*	\mathbb{S}_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 7: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 3$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

So the Content's strategy will be to prevent Defeated to take \mathbb{S}_1 or \mathbb{N}_2 (note that \mathbb{E}_1 or \mathbb{W}_2 can be removable only if \mathbb{S}_1 or \mathbb{N}_2 has been first removed). Let M be the matching $\{(a_1, j), (a_1 + 1, j)\}$, and let $T^* = S^* \setminus V(M)$.

Content applies the following procedure till one vertex of $\{\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{N}_1\}$ and one vertex of $\{\mathbb{E}_2, \mathbb{S}_2\}$ have been removed. Recall that none of the coatis removes a critical vertex for otherwise its opponent would remove the first olive in the next move.

(R) If Defeated just removed a vertex in $V(M)$, then Content removes the vertex to which it is matched by M . Otherwise, it removes a safe vertex in T^* .

Let us prove that this strategy is valid, i.e. that the rule can be applied. Assume Defeated removed a vertex v in $V(M)$, then $M(v)$ has not been removed earlier. Furthermore, if v is removable, one of its neighbours $w \in \{\mathbb{W}(v), \mathbb{E}(v)\}$ has been removed before and so $M(w)$ has been removed and therefore $M(v)$ becomes removable and Content can remove it. Note also that $|T^*| = pq - 2q - 2 \equiv pq \pmod{2}$ and so each time Defeated removes a vertex in T^* it remains at least one removable vertex in T^* and the second part of Rule (R) can be applied.

Suppose that at least one of the vertices in $\{\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{N}_2\}$ is removed during the procedure. By symmetry, we may assume that \mathbb{S}_1 is the first removed. Before it is removed, one of the two vertices $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{W}_1$ or $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1$ has been removed (because o_1 is not removed since the procedure did not stop). It cannot be $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1$ as \mathbb{E}_1 and \mathbb{W}_2 have not been removed. So it is $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{W}_1$. But this vertex is matched with \mathbb{W}_1 which should have been removed before and then \mathbb{S}_1 was critical, which contradicts the fact that it is removed.

Thus, applying the above procedure, one vertex in $\{\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{N}_1\}$ and one vertex in $\{\mathbb{E}_2, \mathbb{S}_2\}$ are removed. Hence, as noted at the beginning Content collects the first olive. \diamond

Claim 46.6. *If $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 2$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. The proof is identical to that of Claim 46.1 as $S^* = S$ (See Figure 8). \diamond

*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{N}_1	*	*	*	*
*	\mathbb{W}_1	o_1	\mathbb{E}_1	\mathbb{N}_2	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{S}_1	\mathbb{W}_2	o_2	\mathbb{E}_2	*
*	*	*	*	\mathbb{S}_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 8: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 2$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

Note that we cannot have $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 1$, for otherwise O would be of Type 3.

Claim 46.7. *If $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_2 - b_1 \geq 3$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof of claim. Set $d = b_2 - b_1$. We have $d \geq 3$. Moreover, since O is not of Type 5, $d \leq q - 2$.

If $a_1 > 1$, let $L_{\mathbb{N}} = \{(a_1 - 1, b) \mid b_1 < b < b_2\}$, in which case $|L_{\mathbb{N}}| = d - 1$ and if $a_1 = 1$, $L_{\mathbb{N}} = \emptyset$. If $a_1 < q$, let $L_{\mathbb{S}} = \{(a_1 + 1, b) \mid b_1 < b < b_2\}$, in which case $|L_{\mathbb{S}}| = d - 1$ and if $a_1 = q$, $L_{\mathbb{S}} = \emptyset$. Let $L_{\text{eq}} = \{(a_1, b) \mid b_1 + 1 < b < b_2 - 1\}$; then $|L_{\text{eq}}| = d - 3$. Let $L = L_{\mathbb{N}} \cup L_{\text{eq}} \cup L_{\mathbb{S}}$. One can check that $S^* = S \setminus L$. (See Figure 9).

*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{N}_1				\mathbb{N}_2	*	*
*	\mathbb{W}_1	o_1	\mathbb{E}_1		\mathbb{W}_2	o_2	\mathbb{E}_2	*
*	*	\mathbb{S}_1				\mathbb{S}_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 9: Two olives with $a_2 = a_1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 4$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

If $a_1 = 1$ or $a_1 = q$, then $b_1 \neq 1$ and $b_q \neq q$ because O is not of Type 1. The two olives have only three neighbours, so $R = S^*$ and $|R| = pq - 2d - 4 \equiv pq \pmod{2}$. Thus Content collects the first olive. In what follows we suppose that $1 < a_1 < q$ and so $|L| = 3d - 5$.

Observe the following facts:

- If \mathbb{N}_1 or \mathbb{N}_2 is in R , then $L_{\mathbb{N}} \subset R$. Otherwise $L_{\mathbb{N}} \cap R = \emptyset$.
- If \mathbb{S}_1 or \mathbb{S}_2 is in R , then $L_{\mathbb{S}} \subset R$. Otherwise $L_{\mathbb{S}} \cap R = \emptyset$.
- $R \cap \{\mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{W}_2\} = \emptyset$.
- If $\{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{S}_2\} \subset R$ or $\{\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{N}_2\} \subset R$, then $L_{\text{eq}} \subseteq R$. Otherwise $L_{\text{eq}} \cap R = \emptyset$.

If R contains at least one vertex in $\{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2\}$, then $|R| \equiv pq \pmod{2}$ so Content collects the first olive. Indeed suppose for example that R contains \mathbb{N}_1 , then either it contains \mathbb{S}_2 and $|R| = pq - 8$, otherwise $|R| = pq - 2d - 4$ (using the above facts). If $R \cap \{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2\} = \emptyset$, then all the vertices of $L_{\mathbb{N}} \cup L_{\text{eq}} \cup L_{\mathbb{S}}$ remain locked. Thus $|R| = pq - 3d - 3$.

If d is odd then $|R| \equiv pq \pmod{2}$ in both cases, so Content collects the first olive.

If d is even, Content has to be careful by removing safe vertices so that $R \cap \{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2\} \neq \emptyset$. Since O is not of Type 5, then either $b_1 > 1$ or $b_2 < q$. By symmetry, we may assume $b_1 > 1$. we now describe a strategy for Content such that R does not contain \mathbb{W}_1 .

Let M be the matching $\{(i, b_1 - 1), (i, b_1)\}$. Observe that M matches \mathbb{W}_1 with o_1 , NW_1 with \mathbb{N}_1 , and SW_1 with \mathbb{S}_1 . Content applies the following procedure until either s/he collects an olive, or a vertex in $\{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_2\}$ is removed.

- (R) If Defeated just removed a vertex in $V(M)$, then Content removes the vertex to which it is matched by M . Otherwise, Content removes a safe vertex not in $V(M)$.

Let us prove that this strategy is valid, i.e. that rule (R) can be applied. Assume Defeated removed a vertex v in $V(M)$, then $M(v)$ has not been removed earlier. Furthermore, if v is, then one of its neighbours w in $\{\mathbb{N}(v), \mathbb{S}(v)\}$ has been removed before and so $M(w)$ has been removed and therefore $M(v)$ becomes removable and Content can remove it. Note also that $R \setminus V(M) = V(G) \setminus \{V(M) \cup L \cup \{\mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{W}_2, \mathbb{N}_2, o_2, \mathbb{S}_2\}\}$ (\mathbb{N}_2 and \mathbb{S}_2 cannot have been removed otherwise the procedure stopped). Therefore, $|R \setminus V(M)| = pq - 2p - 3d - 10 \equiv pq \pmod{2}$ (as d is even) and so when Content plays it remains at least one removable vertex in $R \setminus V(M)$ and the second part of Rule (R) can be applied.

Finally, suppose for a contradiction that \mathbb{W}_1 is removed during the procedure. Before being removed one of the two vertices NW_1 or SW_1 has been removed (because o_1 is not removed since the procedure did not stop). But those vertices are matched with \mathbb{N}_1 and \mathbb{S}_1 respectively. Thus, by Rule (R), one of \mathbb{N}_1 and \mathbb{S}_1 has been removed before and the procedure stopped, a contradiction.

Thus, applying the above procedure, one vertex in $\{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{S}_2\}$ is removed. Hence, as noted before $|R| \equiv pq \pmod{2}$ and Content collects the first olive. \diamond

Since O is not of Type 6 nor of Type 2, we cannot have $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_2 - b_1 \in \{1, 2\}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 46. \square

5.3.2 Rare sets of two olives

For sake of completeness, in this subsection, we show what happens for rare sets of two olives. For all types except Type 6, we are able to determine how many olives each coati grabs. In most cases (Type 2,3,4,5) they each grab one olive.

Proposition 47. *Let O be a rare set of 2 olives in $G_{p \times q}$.*

- *Type 1 : Alice grabs the first olive (which is in a corner). If pq is even or if the second olive is adjacent to the first one or is in a corner then Bob grabs the second olive. Otherwise Alice grabs the second olive.*
- *Types 2,3,4, 5 : Alice and Bob grab one olive each.*

Proof. We divide the proof in five cases according the type of the rare sets.

Claim 47.1. *Assume O is of Type 1. Alice grabs the first olive (which is in a corner). If pq is even or if the second olive is adjacent to the first one or is in a corner then Bob grabs the second olive. Otherwise Alice grabs the second olive.*

Proof of claim. In her first move Alice collects an olive in the corner by Lemma 12. We are then left with a play with one olive, Bob as first player and a subgraph H of size $pq - 1$. By Lemma 33, Bob collects the second olive if and only if either pq is even or the second olive is removable in H that is o_2 is in a corner or adjacent to the first olive. \diamond

Claim 47.2. *If O is of Type 2, then each coati collects one olive.*

Proof of claim. By Lemma 41, it suffices to prove that Defeated collects at least (and so exactly) one olive.

Defeated's strategy is to apply the following rules in order.

(R1) If an olive is removable, then Defeated removes it.

(R2) If a safe vertex is removable, then Defeated removes it. Otherwise Defeated removes any (critical) vertex.

Consider the first critical vertex which is removed. If Content removes it, then Defeated removes the first olive in the next move. If Defeated removes it, then there is no more safe vertices. In particular, the two olives have exactly three neighbours. Thus if Content removes an olive, then the second one becomes removable, (and if he does not, then Defeated can remove the first olive). \diamond

Claim 47.3. *If O is of Type 3, then each coati collects one olive.*

Proof of claim. By Lemma 41, it suffices to prove that Defeated collects at least (and so exactly) one olive.

Without loss of generality, we have $a_2 = a_1 + 1$ and $b_2 = b_1 + 1$. See Figure 10.

*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	N_1	*	*	*
*	W_1	o_1	$E_1 = N_2$	*	*
*	*	$S_1 = W_2$	o_2	E_2	*
*	*	*	S_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 10: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 1$.

(R1) If an olive is removable, then Defeated removes it.

(R2) If a safe vertex is removable, then Defeated removes it. Otherwise Defeated removes $E_1 = N_2$ or $S_1 = W_2$.

Consider the first critical vertex which is removed. If Content removes it, then Defeated removes the first olive in the next move. If Defeated removes it, then there is no more safe vertices. In particular, the two olives have exactly three neighbours. So one of $E_1 = N_2$, $S_1 = W_2$ has not been removed, and Defeated removes it. Doing so, both olives become removable. Thus Defeated can remove one of them in his next move. \diamond

Claim 47.4. *If O is of Type 4, then each coati collects one olive.*

Proof of claim. By Lemma 45, Content takes the second olive. We will now show that Defeated has a strategy to take the first one.

As in Lemma 46, the strategy of both coatis is to force its opponent to be the first to remove a critical vertex. Thus, we let R be the set of vertices removed until a coati is blocked, that is there is no more safe vertex to remove. Defeated must make sure that $|R| \equiv pq + 1 \pmod{2}$ in order to collect the first olive. ,

Without loss of generality, we may assume $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 2$. One can check that $S^* = S \setminus \{SE_1 = NW_2\}$. See Figure 11.

Let M be the matching $M_W \cup M_N \cup M_E \cup M_S$ where $M_W = \{(a_1, j), (a_1 + 1, j)\}, 1 \leq j \leq b_1 - 1$, $M_N = \{(i, b_1), (i, b_1 + 1)\}, 1 \leq i \leq a_1 - 1$, $M_E = \{(a_2, j), (a_2 + 1, j)\}, b_2 + 1 \leq j \leq q$, $M_S = \{(i, b_2 - 1), (i, b_2)\}, a_2 + 1 \leq i \leq p$.

*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{N}_1	*	*	*	*
*	\mathbb{W}_1	o_1	\mathbb{E}_1	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{S}_1		\mathbb{N}_2	*	*
*	*	*	\mathbb{W}_2	o_2	\mathbb{E}_2	*
*	*	*	*	\mathbb{S}_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 11: Two olives with $a_2 - a_1 = 2$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 2$.

Defeated applies the following rule until a vertex of $N[o_1] \cup N[o_2]$ is removed. Note that if o_1 or o_2 has degree 3 in $G_{p \times q}$ (it is on the border), then such a vertex is already removed.

(R1) If Content just removed a vertex in $V(M)$, then Defeated removes the vertex to which it is matched by M . Otherwise, Defeated removes a safe vertex in $S^* \setminus V(M)$.

Let us prove that this strategy is valid, i.e. that the above rule can be applied.

Assume Content removed a vertex v in $V(M)$, then $M(v)$ has not been removed earlier. Furthermore if v is removable one of its neighbour w has been removed before and so $M(w)$ has been removed and therefore $M(v)$ becomes removable and Defeated can remove $M(v)$.

Assume Content did not remove a vertex in $V(M)$, then since $|S^* \setminus V(M)| = pq - 2|M| - 7 \equiv pq - 1$. If pq is odd (resp. even) then Content is A (resp. B) and the number of vertices of $S^* \setminus V(M)$ already removed after the move of Content is odd (resp. even). Therefore, there is an odd number of vertices of $S^* \setminus V(M)$ that have not been removed yet. Hence Defeated can remove a vertex in $S^* \setminus V(M)$.

Let us show now that the first vertex of $N[o_1] \cup N[o_2]$ which is removed is none of $\{\mathbb{S}_1, \mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{W}_2\}$. Indeed suppose for a contradiction that it is one of them, w.l.o.g. we may assume it is \mathbb{S}_1 . As neither o_1 has been removed nor $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1$ (which is locked), $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{W}_1$ has been removed and so by rule (R2) \mathbb{W}_1 has been removed and the procedure would have stopped.

Thus R contains a vertex in $\{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{S}_2, \mathbb{E}_2\}$. Therefore $\mathbb{N}\mathbb{E}_1$ remains locked, and so $|R| = pq - 9$ and Defeated collect the first olive. \diamond

Claim 47.5. *If O is of Type 5, then each coati collects one olive.*

Proof of claim. By symmetry, we may assume that q is odd and $o_1 = (a, 1)$, $o_2 = (a, q)$ for some $1 < a < p$.

By Lemma 45, Content takes the second olive. We will now show that Defeated has a strategy to take the first one.

Again the strategy of both coatis is to force its opponent to be the first to remove a critical vertex. Note that as o_1 and o_2 have degree 3 in the grid, the set R of vertices removed until there is no more safe vertex to remove is S^* . But $|S^*| = pq - 3q \equiv pq - 1$ since q is odd. Hence Defeated collects the first olive. \diamond

\square

Rare sets of Type 6 The case of rare sets of Type 6 is more complicated. In a very particular case, one can show that each coati collects one olive (Proposition 48). We believe that in all other cases, Content collects the two olives. However, we are only able to prove it in some cases. Such a case is given in Proposition 49.

Proposition 48. *If pq is odd and the two olives have the center of the grid $G_{p \times q}$ as unique common neighbour, that is either $\mathbb{E}_1 = \mathbb{W}_2 = \left(\frac{p+1}{2}, \frac{q+1}{2}\right)$ or $\mathbb{S}_1 = \mathbb{N}_2 = \left(\frac{p+1}{2}, \frac{q+1}{2}\right)$, then each coati collects one olive.*

Proof. If O is of Type 6, then pq is odd. Thus Content is Alice and Bob is Defeated. By Lemma 41, Alice collects at least one olive, so it suffices to prove that Bob also collects at least one olive.

Note that since pq is odd, the grid has a center $\left(\frac{p+1}{2}, \frac{1+1}{2}\right)$, and the two olives are symmetric to each other with respect to the center. The strategy of Bob is then the following. He plays symmetrically to Alice (that if Alice

removes (a, b) , then he removes $(p + 1 - a, q + 1 - b)$. Doing so when Alice removes o_1 (resp. o_2), then Bob removes o_2 (resp. o_1) in the next move. \square

Proposition 49. *Let $O = \{o_1, o_2\}$ be a set of two olives on the grid $G_{p \times q}$. If $o_1 = (a_1, b_1)$ and $o_2 = (a_2, b_2)$ with $a_1 = a_2$, $b_2 - b_1 = 2$, and $b_1 + 1 \leq \frac{q-3}{2}$, then Content collects the first olive.*

Proof. One can check that $S^* = S \setminus \{\mathbb{N}\mathbb{E}_1, \mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_1\}$ (see Figure 12).

*	*	*	*	*	*	*
*	*	\mathbb{N}_1		\mathbb{N}_2	*	*
*	\mathbb{W}_1	o_1	$\mathbb{E}_1 = \mathbb{W}_2$	o_2	\mathbb{E}_2	*
*	*	\mathbb{S}_1		\mathbb{S}_2	*	*
*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Figure 12: Two olives with $a_2 = a_1$ and $b_2 - b_1 = 2$. Vertices in S^* are marked with $*$.

If $a_1 = 1$, then both o_1 and o_2 have degree 3, so $R = S^*$. Thus $|R| = |S^*| = pq - 8 \equiv pq \pmod{2}$, and so Content collects the first olive. Henceforth we may assume that $a_1 > 1$.

If $R \not\supseteq \{\{\mathbb{N}_1, \mathbb{S}_2\}, \{\mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_1\}, \{\mathbb{W}_1, \mathbb{E}_2\}\}$.

then $|R| = pq - 8$, and so Content collects the first olive. Thus Content must apply a strategy to make sure that it occurs.

Let Z_1 be the subgrid with corners $(1, 1)$ and \mathbb{N}_1 , Z'_1 the subgrid with corners $(1, 1)$ and \mathbb{N}_2 , Z_2 the subgrid with corners \mathbb{N}_2 and $(1, q)$, Y_1 the subgrid with corners $(p, 1)$ and \mathbb{S}_1 , Y_2 the subgrid with corners \mathbb{S}_2 and (p, q) , Y'_2 the subgrid with corners \mathbb{S}_1 and (p, q) , and C the subgrid with corners \mathbb{N}_1 and $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_2$. Let M be the matching $\{(i, b_2), (i, b_2 + 1) \mid i \in [p]\}$.

In a first step, Content applies the following rules until a vertex x in $N(o_1) \cup N(o_2)$ is removed. Note that if $a_1 = 1$, then \mathbb{W}_1 does not exist. Therefore, Content does not perform this first step and directly applies the second step for $x = \mathbb{W}_1$.

(R0) If Defeated removed a vertex v in M , then Content removes $M(v)$. Otherwise Content removes a removable vertex in Z_1 .

This rule can always be applied. Let x be the first vertex in $N(o_1) \cup N(o_2)$ that is removed. Observe that $x \notin \{\mathbb{N}_2, \mathbb{S}_2, \mathbb{E}_2\}$. Indeed to remove a vertex in this set, all the vertices of $Z_2 \setminus V(M)$ or of $Y_2 \setminus V(M)$. But the vertices of such sets are removed by Defeater since Content applies Rule (R0). Moreover, after Defeater removes a vertex in those sets, Content removes a vertex in Z_1 . But $|Z_1| < \min\{|Z_2 \setminus V(M)|, |Y_2 \setminus V(M)|\}$. Therefore \mathbb{N}_1 should have been removed before all vertices of $Z_2 \setminus V(M)$ or of $Y_2 \setminus V(M)$ are removed, a contradiction.

• Case 1: $x = \mathbb{W}_1$.

In this case, Content applies the following rule until a neighbour of o_2 is removed.

(R $_{\mathbb{W}_1}$) If Defeated removed a vertex v in M , then Content removes $M(v)$. Otherwise Content removes a removable vertex in $V \setminus (C \cup V(M))$.

This strategy is valid since $|C \cup V(M)|$ is even. Doing so the first neighbour of o_2 that will be removed will be \mathbb{N}_2 or \mathbb{S}_2 .

• Case 2: $x = \mathbb{N}_1$.

In this case, Content applies the following rule until a neighbour of o_2 is removed.

(R $_{\mathbb{N}_1}$) Content removes a vertex of Z'_1 .

Let us prove that the first neighbour of o_2 which is removed is not \mathbb{S}_2 . Suppose for a contradiction that \mathbb{S}_2 has been removed before \mathbb{E}_2 and \mathbb{N}_2 . Then \mathbb{E}_2 has not been removed, so all the vertices of $Y_2 \setminus \{\mathbb{S}_2\}$ have been removed earlier. But, as Content followed Rule (R0) until \mathbb{N}_1 is removed and Rule (R $_{\mathbb{N}_1}$) afterwards, each vertex of $(Y_2 \setminus V(M)) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_2\}$ has been removed by Defeated and right after Content removed a vertex of $Z'_1 \setminus \mathbb{N}_1$. But since $a_1 \leq \frac{p+1}{2}$ and $b_2 = b_1 + 2 \leq \frac{q-1}{2}$, we have $(Y_2 \setminus V(M)) \cup \{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{E}_2\} = |Y_2| - 2(p - a_1) + 1 = (p - a_1)(q - b_2 - 1) + 1 \geq (a_1 - 1)b_2 - 1 = |Z'_1| - 1$, a contradiction.

Case 3: $x = \mathbb{S}_1$.

Since $|Z_1| \leq |Y_1|$ and Content applies Rule (R0), this case can only happen if $|Z_1| = |Y_1|$ and Defeated is Alice. This implies that $a_1 = \frac{p+1}{2}$, and pq is even. Moreover, Alice must have only removed vertices of Y_1 because otherwise she would have removed a vertex in either $V \setminus (M \cup Y_1)$, and Bob would have removed \mathbb{N}_1 before she removes \mathbb{S}_1 .

Thus Bob applies the following rule until a neighbour of o_2 is removed.

(R $_{\mathbb{S}_1}$) Bob removes a vertex of Y_2 .

Let us prove that the first neighbour of o_2 which is removed is not \mathbb{N}_2 .

Suppose for a contradiction that \mathbb{N}_2 has been removed before \mathbb{E}_2 and \mathbb{N}_2 . Then \mathbb{E}_2 has not been removed, so all the vertices of Z_2 have been removed earlier in the second step. Moreover, as Bob followed Rule (R $_{\mathbb{S}_1}$), the vertices of Z_2 have been removed by Alice. But $|Y_2| = |Z_2|$ (because $a_1 = \frac{p+1}{2}$), and Bob was the first to play in the second step, and thus has already removed \mathbb{S}_2 , a contradiction.

□

6 Conclusion

In this paper we studied some particular cases of graph-grabbing games. We made an extensive analysis of SHARING A LINEAR PIZZA, including optimal strategies and complexity results. However there are still many open problems : study the case of adjacent weighty vertices for general weights and prove the conjecture that for $\{0, 1\}$ weights each player grabs asymptotically half of the olives.

We also introduced d -generate games for which we obtained preliminary results and performed a more extensive study for the grids case that we called Pissaladière. We prove that for 2 olives A (resp. B) almost grabs the 2 olives if the size is odd (resp. even). We conjecture that the same result holds for k olives. Finally, many problems remain open for other d -generate games.

Conjecture 50. If n is odd $\overline{\text{col}}_2^A(G_{p \times q}, k) = k + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$. If n is even $\overline{\text{col}}_2^B(G_{p \times q}, 2) = k + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$

References

- [1] J.-C. Bermond, M. Cosnard, and F. Havet. Grabbing olives on linear pizzas and pissaladières. Working paper, Mar. 2022.
- [2] J. Cibulka, J. Kyncl, V. Mészáros, R. Stolar, and P. Valtr. Solution of Peter Winkler’s pizza problem. In J. Fiala, J. Kratochvíl, and M. Miller, editors, *International Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms - IWOCA*, volume 5874 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 356–367. Springer, 2009.
- [3] J. Cibulka, J. Kyncl, V. Mészáros, R. Stolar, and P. Valtr. Graph sharing games: Complexity and connectivity. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 494:49–62, 2013.
- [4] Y. Egawa, H. Enomoto, and N. Matsumoto. The graph grabbing game on $K_{m,n}$ -trees. *Discrete Mathematics*, 341(6):1555–1560, 2018.
- [5] S. Eoh and J. Choi. The graph grabbing game on 0,1-weighted graphs. *Results in Applied Mathematics*, 3:100028, 2019.
- [6] K. Knauer, P. Micek, and T. Ueckerdt. How to eat 4/9 of a pizza. *Discrete Mathematics*, 311(16):1635–1645, 2011.

- [7] U. Larsson, R. J. Nowakowski, and C. P. dos Santos. *Games of No Chance 5*, volume 70 of *MSRI Publications*, chapter 3 Scoring games: the state of the play, pages 89–111. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [8] P. Micek and B. Walczak. A graph-grabbing game. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 20(4):623–629, 2011.
- [9] P. Micek and B. Walczak. Parity in graph sharing games. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(10):1788–1795, 2012.
- [10] M. Rosenfeld. A gold grabbing game, [http : //garden.irmacs.sfu.ca/category/rosenfeld](http://garden.irmacs.sfu.ca/category/rosenfeld), 2009.
- [11] D. E. Seacrest and T. Seacrest. Grabbing the gold. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(10):1804–1806, 2012.
- [12] P. Winkler. *Mathematical Puzzles: a connoisseur's collection*. CRC Press, 2004.
- [13] P. Winkler. Problem posed at Building Bridges, a conference in honour of 60th birthday of L. Lovász, Budapest, 2008.
- [14] P. Winkler. *Mathematical Puzzles*. A K Peters CRC Press, 2020.