Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2002) 11, 487–499. © 2002 Cambridge University Press
DOI: 10.1017/S096354830200528X Printed in the United Kingdom

The Minesweeper Game: Percolation and Complexity

ELCHANAN MOSSEL

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
Giv'at Ram, Jerusalem 91904, Israel
and
Microsoft Research, 1 Microsoft Way,
Redmond, WA 98052, USA
(e-mail: mossel@math.huji.ac.il)

Received 29 July 2000; revised 15 March 2002

We study a model motivated by the minesweeper game. In this model one starts with the percolation of mines on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and then tries to find an infinite path of mine-free sites. At every recovery of a free site, the player is given some information on the sites adjacent to the current site. We compare the parameter values for which there exists a strategy such that the process survives to the critical parameter of ordinary percolation. We then derive improved bounds for these values for the same process, when the player has some complexity restrictions in computing his moves. Finally, we discuss some monotonicity issues which arise naturally for this model.

1. Introduction

1.1. The finite game

The minesweeper is a popular computer game. The game is played on a finite square grid $G_N = \{1,\ldots,N\} \times \{1,\ldots,N\}$. Let $M \subset G_N$ be the set of *mines*; an element $v \in M$ is called a *mine*; an element in $v \in G_N \setminus M$ is called a *free site*. The set M is unknown to the player, and the aim of the game is to find this set M. At every step, the player is allowed to guess whether a certain site $v \in G_N$, which currently has unknown status, is a free site. If $v \in M$ (*i.e.*, the site is a mine) then the player loses. Otherwise, the player is given the number of sites adjacent to this site which are occupied by mines: $|\{v' \in G_N : d_\infty(v,v') = 1, v' \in M\}|$, and then plays a new move.

We remark that in the original game, the player is also initially given the number of mines $|M|$. Since we are interested in infinite variants of this game, we simplify the model and ignore this extra information.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.2. The infinite game

In this paper we consider an infinite variant of this game. Throughout this paper, when we refer to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ as a graph, we endow the graph $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with the l_∞ neighbouring structure

$$(\mathbb{Z}^d, \{(v,u) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ such that } d_\infty(v,u) = 1\}).$$

We recall that *site percolation* with parameter p on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is the random subgraph ω of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ which satisfies $\mathbf{P}[v \in \omega] = p$, independently for all sites $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. For such $\omega \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we say that v is *open* (this is the standard term), or *free* (this is the term corresponding to the minesweeper game) if $v \in \omega$; otherwise, we say that v is *closed*, or v is a *mine*. We note that the set of mines $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \omega$ may be obtained as the set of open vertices in $1 - p$ percolation.

The set ω is unknown to the player, and at every step the player is required to find some new site $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ which is a free site. If $v \notin \omega$ the player loses. Otherwise, he is given the number: $|\{v' \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d_\infty(v,v') = 1 \text{ and } v' \notin \omega\}|$ and then plays a new step.

If $0 < p < 1$ and the player is required to find the set of all mines $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \omega$, then he will almost surely die. This follows from the fact that if $0 < p < 1$, then a.s. there are infinitely many sites which have only mine neighbours. A more realistic aim for the player is to play an infinite sequence of steps. This leads to the following definitions.

Definition.

(1) A *game-configuration* is a triplet (ω, μ, I) where ω is the set of free sites, $\mu \subset \omega$ is the finite subset of free sites which are known to the player and $I : \mu \to \{0, \ldots, 3^d - 1\}$ is the function that satisfies

$$I(v) = |\{v' : d_\infty(v',v) = 1 \text{ and } v' \notin \omega\}|. \tag{1.1}$$

That is, I is the information known to the player.

(2) We call S a *strategy* if S is a function from all pairs (μ, I) as above to sites in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ which satisfies $S(\mu, I) \notin \mu$ (*i.e.*, S always picks a new site).

(3) The *game determined by* S, denoted by $\mathcal{G}(S)$, is a sequence of game configurations

$$\mathcal{G}(S) = (c_n)_n = ((\omega, \mu_n, I_n))_n,$$

which is defined in the following way: ω is chosen according to p-percolation. We define μ_n and I_n recursively. We start by defining $\mu_0 = \emptyset$ and let I_0 be the empty function. Now we continue recursively:

- if $S(\mu_n, I_n) \notin \omega$ the sequence is determined to be $(c_0, \ldots, c_n)$;
- if $S(\mu_n, I_n) \in \omega$ we set $\mu_{n+1} = \mu_n \cup \{S(\mu_n, I_n)\}$, let I_{n+1} satisfy (1.1) and continue recursively.

(4) For a strategy S define

$$\theta_S(p) = \mathbf{P}_p[|\mathcal{G}(S)| = \infty],$$

where $\mathbf{P}_p$ is the Bernoulli measure on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ for which a site is free with probability p. Define

$$\theta(p) = \sup_S \theta_S(p).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus, $\theta_S(p)$ is the probability of winning the game playing S, and $\theta(p)$ is the probability of winning the game playing an 'optimal' strategy.

(5) Finally, we define

$$W(d) = \{p \in [0,1] : \theta(p) > 0\}.$$

$W(d)$ is the set of all probabilities for which the game can be won.

Proposition 1.1. *Set*

$$Y = \#\{n : S_n(\mu_n, I_n) \notin \partial\mu_n\},$$

where ∂A *is defined as* $\{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d_\infty(v, A) = 1\}$. *Then, for all* S, *we have*

$$\mathbf{P}[Y \geqslant n+1] \leqslant p^n.$$

Proof. For all $v \notin \partial\mu_n$ and all I_n that satisfy (1.1), $\mathbf{P}[v \in \omega | I_n] = p$. □

Proposition 1.1 implies that a.s. during the game the player only plays inside a finite number of clusters (connected components of ω). It is therefore natural to compare the set $W(d)$ to the set of parameters p for which an infinite cluster exists.

Our first result bounds the values of p for which we can win the game. We denote by $p_c(d)$ the critical value for percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ (with the l_∞ neighbouring structure). Thus, for $p > p_c(d)$, with probability 1 there exists an infinite path of free sites. For $p < p_c(d)$ such a path does not exist a.s. Using the enhancement results of Aizenman and Grimmett (see [2]) we prove the following.

Theorem 1.2. *For all* $d \geqslant 2$, *there exists an* $\epsilon = \epsilon(d) > 0$ *such that*

$$[1-\epsilon, 1] \subset W(d) \subset [p_c(d) + \epsilon, 1].$$

Thus, when the density of mines is small, the player may get out of the mine-field. On the other hand, there is an interval of densities for which there exists an infinite path that is free of mines, yet the player is doomed to die.

Another natural question is: What are the connections between the complexity of the strategies used and the sets of winning probabilities? In the following definition we give a formulation of complexity in this context.

Definition. Let (ω, μ, I) be a game configuration. We call $v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ a *trivially free* site for the configuration, if $v \in \omega \setminus \mu$ and there exists $u \in \mu$ that satisfies $d_\infty(v,u) = 1$ and $I(u) = 0$.

We call a strategy T a *trivial strategy* if the following holds.

(1) For a game configuration (ω, μ, I) that has a trivially free site, $T(\mu, I)$ is a trivially free site.

(2) For (ω, μ, I) for which there exists no trivially free site, we have $T(\mu, I) \notin \partial\mu$. (In other words, when there are no trivially free sites, T chooses a site on which it has no information whatsoever.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

As part of Theorem 1.2, we prove the following.

Proposition 1.3. *For all $d \geqslant 2$, there exists an $\bar{\epsilon}(d) > 0$ such that, if T is a trivial strategy, then*

$$(1 - \bar{\epsilon}(d), 1] \subset \{p : \theta_T(p) > 0\} \subset [1 - \bar{\epsilon}(d), 1].$$

This result says that even the lowest complexity algorithms suffice for low mine density. Rephrasing Proposition 1.3 in terms of the original game, we get that there exists $\bar{\epsilon}(d) > 0$ such that, for $p \in (1-\bar{\epsilon}(d), 1]$, we may reconstruct an infinite path with positive probability on the 'first click'. On the other hand, we prove that, by using more complex strategies, we may win in higher mine densities.

Theorem 1.4. *For all $d \geqslant 2$, there exists an $\epsilon(d) > \bar{\epsilon}(d)$ such that*

$$(1 - \epsilon(d), 1] \subset W(d).$$

The proof of this theorem again uses the method of enhancements. However, some additional work is needed. In particular, we devise some hand-tailored combinatorial designs in order to prove some strict inequalities. We believe that there is a hierarchy of results generalizing Theorem 1.4 by saying that, given more information during the game, the set of winning probabilities strictly increases. See Conjecture 3.3 for the exact formulation.

Unfortunately, we do not know whether the set $W(d)$ is connected. In Section 4 we discuss some examples which are related to this monotonicity problem.

It seems that the minesweeper game introduces many interesting problems in diverse fields. Some of these problems are considered in this paper. For different perspectives, see [1] and [6].

2. Comparison to percolation

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Let S be a trivial strategy, and assume that $\theta_S(p) > 0$. Call a game configuration $c = (\omega, \mu, I)$ *critical* if there exists no site which is trivially free for c. If c is critical then, since S is trivial, it follows that $\mathbf{P}[S(\mu, I) \in \omega] = p$. Thus, if $\mathscr{G}(S) = (c_n)$, then the probability that more than t of the c_n are critical is bounded by p^t. It follows that, given $|\mathscr{G}(S)| = \infty$, there is a.s. only a finite number of critical c_n. Let A be the event that the percolation cluster contains an infinite connected subgraph of vertices v, such that all vertices at l_∞ distance 1 from v are also in the percolation cluster. From the argument above it follows that $\theta_S(p) > 0$ implies $\mathbf{P}_p(A) > 0$.

On the other hand, suppose that $\mathbf{P}_p(A) > 0$ and let S be a trivial strategy. It is then easy to see that $\theta_S(p) > 0$.

We achieved that $\theta_S(p) > 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{P}_p(A) > 0$. In other words, writing $\bar{W}(d) = \{p : \theta_S(p) > 0\}$, we obtain

$$\{p : \mathbf{P}_p(A) > 0\} = \bar{W}(d).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since A is an increasing event, there exists an $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(d) \geqslant 0$ such that

$$(1 - \epsilon_0, 1] \subset \{p : \mathbf{P}_p(A) > 0\} \subset [1 - \epsilon_0, 1].$$

In order to conclude this, we show that $\epsilon_0 > 0$.

Divide $\mathbb{Z}^d$ into cubes of side length 3 centred at $3\mathbb{Z}^d$. Declare such a cube to be *open* if it contains no mines. Now, consider the percolation process on the cubes with the l_1 neighbourhood structure. This is a Bernoulli percolation with parameter p^{3^d}. Therefore, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that this percolation process survives for all $p \in [1 - \epsilon, 1]$. Note that the event A occurs whenever there is an infinite cluster of open cubes (see Figure 1). It follows that $\epsilon_0 \geqslant \epsilon > 0$ as needed. □




Figure 1 Sketch of Proposition 1.3

In order to prove that $W(d) \subset [p_c(d) + \epsilon, 1]$, we use the method of strict inequalities developed by Aizenman and Grimmett [2], after Menshikov [7]. We follow some of their notation below.

A boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^d} \to \{0,1\}$ is called *local* if there exists a finite set τ such that, whenever $\omega_1 \cap \tau = \omega_2 \cap \tau$, $f(\omega_1) = f(\omega_2)$. For a local function f we define $f_v(\omega)$ by

$$f_v(\omega) = \begin{cases} \{v\} & \text{if} \quad f(\omega - v) = 1, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\omega - v$ is the translation of ω by $-v$. Define the *diminishment* procedure D_f, which corresponds to the local function f, to be the function which maps the configuration ω to the configuration $\tilde{\omega}$ defined by

$$\tilde{\omega} = \omega \setminus \bigcup_{v \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f_v(\omega).$$

A diminishment procedure is called *essential* if there exists a configuration ω which contains a doubly infinite path, but $\tilde{\omega}$ does not contain such a path. We need the following theorem in order to prove that $W(d) \subset [p_c(d) + \epsilon, 1]$.

Theorem 2.1. (Aizenman, Grimmett) *Consider the following two-stage procedure. Perform site percolation with parameter p, and on the resulting configuration perform some essential diminishment D. Then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for all $p < p_c(d) + \epsilon$, the set of resulting sites does not contain an infinite cluster a.s.* □

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lemma 2.2. *For all $d \geqslant 2$ there exists an $\epsilon = \epsilon(d) > 0$ such that*

$$W(d) \subset [p_c(d) + \epsilon, 1].$$

Proof. Look at the percolation of free sites with density p. Consider the diminishment procedure, which sets the site v closed whenever it observes the configuration $\sigma + v$ on $\prod_{i=1}^{d}[v_i - 5, v_i + 5]$ in which the free sites are exactly $\{u : u_1 = v_1, u_2 = v_2 \ldots, u_{d-1} = v_{d-1}\}$ (see Figure 2: σ is the configuration on $[-5, 5]^d$ that has as free sites $-5e_d, \ldots, 5e_d$). This is an essential diminishment. Therefore, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that, whenever $p < p_c(d) + \epsilon$, the diminished configuration $\tilde{\omega}$ does not contain an infinite cluster of free sites, with probability 1.




Figure 2 The diminishment procedure

We claim that $W(d) \subset [p_c(d) + \epsilon, 1]$. Suppose that $p \in W(d)$, and let S be a strategy with $\theta_S(p) > 0$. Let $\mathcal{G}(S)$ be the game determined by S, and let v^n satisfy $v^n \in \mu_{n+1} \setminus \mu_n$. By Proposition 1.1, a.s. for all but finite number of ns, $v^n \in \partial\mu_n$.

Similarly, suppose that $v = v^n$ and the configuration in $\prod_{i=1}^{d}[v_i - 5, v_i + 5]$ is $\sigma + v$. Note that

$$\mathbf{P}[v^n \in \omega \text{ and } v^n + e_1 \notin \omega | I_n] = \mathbf{P}[v^n \notin \omega \text{ and } v^n + e_1 \in \omega | I_n].$$

Therefore, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}[v^n \in \omega | I_n] \leqslant 1 - \delta$. It now follows that a.s. the sequence v^n contains only finitely many elements v such that $\sigma + v$ is the configuration of $\prod_{i=1}^{d}[v_i - 5, v_i + 5]$.

Since $\theta_S(p) > 0$, we see that the diminished percolation survives with positive probability. Therefore $p \geqslant p_c(d) + \epsilon$ as needed. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. This follows from Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 1.3. □

3. Simple and complex strategies

In this section we prove Theorem 1.4 for $d = 2$, the proof for general d being similar. The first step is to translate the problem to one that does not involve strategies, but only the structure of the percolation cluster.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Definition. Call a site v *wide free* if v is a free site and all sites w with $d_\infty(v,w) \leqslant 1$, are free sites. Call a site v *almost wide free* if it is a wide free site, or if it has a single mine neighbour $w = (w_1, w_2)$, and the configuration of mines and free sites in $[w_1 - 6, w_1 + 6] \times [w_2 - 4, w_2 + 4]$ is an exact copy of Figure 3, where the sites labelled by o are mines, and sites which are not labelled, or labelled by V, are free sites (*i.e.*, the sites in Figure 3 that are labelled by V are not wide free but are almost wide free). Note that every wide free site is an almost wide free site.




Figure 3 Definition of almost wide free sites

Given ω, let ω_T be defined as follows:

- if there exists a site v such that $d_\infty(0,v) < 5$ and v is a mine, set $\omega_T = \emptyset$;
- otherwise, ω_T is the connected component of wide free sites for which $0 \in \omega_T$.

We let $A_T = \{\omega : |\omega_T| = \infty\}$.

Given ω, let ω_A be defined in the following way:

(1) if there exists a site v such that $d_\infty(0,v) < 5$ and v is a mine, set $\omega_A = \emptyset$;
(2) otherwise, ω_A is the connected component of almost wide free sites which contains 0.

We let $A_A = \{\omega : |\omega_A| = \infty\}$.

The proof of Proposition 1.3 implies that, if S is a trivial strategy, then the set of probabilities, $\bar{W}(d)$, for which the game can be won using S, does not depend on S, and satisfies $\bar{W}(d) = \{p : \mathbf{P}_p(A_T) > 0\}$. In particular, $\bar{W}(d)$ is an interval. We will show that $W(d)$ contains an interval that is longer than $\bar{W}(d)$, by showing that $\{p : \mathbf{P}_p[A_A] > 0\}$ contains such an interval, and the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1.

$$\{p : \mathbf{P}_p[A_A] > 0\} \subset W(d). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Let S be the following strategy.

(1) At the first step, try to recover 0.
(2) If there exists a trivially free site, then recover it.
(3) When a site v is recovered together with all but one neighbours of v, and it is given that v has a single mine neighbour, then 'mark' this neighbour as a mine.
(4) If v has a single mine neighbour, and a neighbour u of v is marked as a mine, recover all other neighbours of v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

We claim that, when A_A holds, $\mathcal{G}(S)$ is infinite. This implies (3.1). Assume that A_A holds. Therefore, there exists an infinite self-avoiding path of almost wide free sites: $\varphi = (0 = v^0, v^1, v^2, \dots)$. We will show by induction that S can recover all these sites (and some more).

Since 0 is a free site, $0 = v^0$ is recovered. Suppose that S recovered $v^0, \dots, v^n$. If v^n is a wide free site, then v^{n+1}, as a neighbour of v^n, is a trivially free site. Therefore S recovers v^{n+1}.

A more interesting case is when v^n is a site such as one of the Vs in Figure 3. Let (x_0, y_0) be the location of the mine adjacent to v^n.

Since φ is connected, and by the assumption that all v with $d(v, 0) < 5$ are free sites, it follows that there exists $k < n$ such that $v^k = (x_0 - 5, y_0)$, or there exists $k < n$ such that $v^k = (x_0 + 5, y_0)$. Assume without loss of generality that $v^k = (x_0 - 5, y_0)$.

Given v^k, S can easily recover all the sites in $[x_0 - 5, x_0 - 1] \times [y_0 - 1, y_0 + 1]$ (as trivially free sites). Now it may recover $(x_0 - 2, y_0 - 2)$ as a trivially free site, and then similarly all the remaining sites in $[x_0 - 2, x_0 + 2] \times [y_0 - 3, y_0 - 1]$.

Note that now the site $(x_0 - 1, y_0 - 1)$ and all its neighbours but one are recovered. Moreover, $(x_0 - 1, y_0 - 1)$ has a single mine neighbour. We therefore mark (using rule (3) of S) (x_0, y_0) as a mine. After marking (x_0, y_0) as a mine, it is easy to recover (using rule (4)) all the neighbours of (x_0, y_0) and their neighbours. One of these sites must be v^{n+1}. □

The next step of the proof is to introduce a new parameter s. Consider Bernoulli percolation with parameter s which is independent of the p-percolation of free sites. We now consider sites which are either

- wide free, or
- almost wide free, with a single mine neighbour, which is open in the s-percolation.

We call such sites *good* sites. Given ω, let ω' be defined as follows:

(1) if there exists a site v such that $d(0, v) < 5$ and v is a mine, set $\omega' = \emptyset$;
(2) otherwise, ω' is the connected component of good sites which contains 0.

Define

$$A = \{\omega : |\omega'| = \infty\}, \qquad \theta(p, s) = \mathbf{P}_{p,s}[A].$$

It follows from the definition that $\theta(p, 0) = \mathbf{P}_p[A_T]$ and $\theta(p, 1) = \mathbf{P}_p[A_A]$.

Next, we approximate $\theta(p, s)$ by functions on finite volume spaces. For $v = (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ let

$$B_v(k) = [x - k, x + k] \times [y - k, y + k],$$

and define

$$A^N = \{\omega : \omega' \cap \partial B_0(N) \neq \emptyset\}, \qquad \theta^N(p, s) = \mathbf{P}_{p,s}[A^N].$$

It is clear that, for all (p, s),

$$\theta(p, s) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \theta^N(p, s).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

The core of the proof is the following comparison of the effect of the p- and s-percolation on the probability of the event A^N.

Lemma 3.2. *There exists N_0 and a continuous positive function $g(p,s)$ on the square $(0,1)\times(0,1)$ such that, for all $N \geqslant N_0$,*

$$\frac{\partial\theta^N(p,s)}{\partial p} \leqslant g(p,s)\frac{\partial\theta^N(p,s)}{\partial s}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 1.3, it follows that there exist $0 < q_0 < q_1 < 1$ and $0 < \bar{\epsilon} < 1$ such that

$$[q_1,1] \subset (1-\bar{\epsilon},1] \subset \bar{W}(d) \subset [1-\bar{\epsilon},1] \subset [q_0,1],$$

and

$$[q_1,1] \subset W(d) \subset [q_0,1],$$

where $\bar{W}(d)$ is the set of winning probabilities using a trivial strategy. Let $\alpha > 0$ be such that $[q_0, q_1+\alpha] \subset (0,1)$. Let $g(p,s)$ be the continuous function that exists by Lemma 3.2, and

$$m = \max_{[q_0,q_1+\alpha]\times[1/4,3/4]} \{g(p,s), 1/\alpha\}.$$

Note that, if $p \in [q_0,q_1]$, then $[p, p+\frac{1}{2m}] \subset [q_0, q_1+\alpha]$. By Lemma 3.2 we obtain, for $p \in [q_0,q_1]$ and $N \geqslant N_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^N\left(p,\frac{3}{4}\right) - \theta^N\left(p+\frac{1}{2m},\frac{1}{4}\right) &= \int_0^{1/2} \frac{d\theta^N}{dt}\left(p+\frac{1}{2m}-\frac{t}{m},\frac{1}{4}+t\right)dt \\ &= \int_0^{1/2}\left(\frac{\partial\theta^N}{\partial s} - \frac{1}{m}\frac{\partial\theta^N}{\partial p}\right)\left(p+\frac{1}{2m}-\frac{t}{m},\frac{1}{4}+t\right)dt \\ &\geqslant 0.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\theta^N(p,s)$ is a monotone function of s. Therefore, when $p \in [q_0,q_1]$ and $N \geqslant N_0$,

$$\theta^N(p,1) \geqslant \theta^N\left(p,\frac{3}{4}\right) \geqslant \theta^N\left(p+\frac{1}{2m},\frac{1}{4}\right) \geqslant \theta^N\left(p+\frac{1}{2m},0\right).$$

Taking the limit $N \to \infty$, we see that, when $p \in [q_0,q_1]$, $\theta(p,1) \geqslant \theta(p+\frac{1}{2m},0)$. This implies that $(1-\epsilon,1] \subset \{p : \mathbf{P}_p[A_A] > 0\} \subset W(d)$, where $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2m} > \bar{\epsilon}$ as needed (note that the assumption $W(d) \subset [q_0,1]$ implies in particular that $1-\bar{\epsilon}-1/2m \geqslant q_0$). □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let γ be a configuration inside the square $B_0(N)$ and v a site. Let γ^{p+} (γ^{p-}) be γ where the site v, and this site only, is updated to be a free site (a mine). Call a site v *p-pivotal* for the configuration γ, if $\gamma^{p+} \in A^N$ and $\gamma^{p-} \notin A^N$. Define an *s-pivotal* site similarly. By Russo's formula (see, *e.g.*, [5]),

$$\frac{\partial\theta^N(p,s)}{\partial p} \leqslant \mathbf{E}_{p,s}|\{v : v \text{ is } p\text{-pivotal for } A^N\}|$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

and

$$\frac{\partial \theta^N(p,s)}{\partial s} = \mathbf{E}_{p,s}|\{v : v \text{ is } s\text{-pivotal for } A^N\}|.$$

The proof will follow once we show that there exists a positive continuous function $g(p,s)$ such that:

$$\mathbf{E}_{p,s}|\{v : v \text{ is } p\text{-pivotal for } A^N\}| \leqslant g(p,s)\mathbf{E}_{p,s}|\{v : v \text{ is } s\text{-pivotal for } A^N\}|. \tag{3.2}$$

Let v be p-pivotal for a configuration γ. We will show that it is possible to change the configuration (of both the p-percolation and the s-percolation) inside the box $B_v(20)$, in order to obtain that one of the vertices in the box is s-pivotal. This implies (3.2). We assume below that $B_v(20) \subset B_N(0)$ and $d(v,0) \geqslant 10$. The cases where $v \notin B_{N-20}$ or $d(v,0) < 10$ are treated in a similar way.

Since v is p pivotal, it follows that $\gamma^{p-} \notin A^N$ and $\gamma^{p+} \in A^N$. Assume first that we may either set open all the s-percolation values of γ^{p-} in $B_v(20)$ in order to obtain a configuration $\gamma^{p-s+} \in A^N$, or set closed all the s-percolation values of γ^{p+} in $B_v(20)$ in order to obtain a configuration $\gamma^{p+s-} \notin A^N$. Clearly, in either case, by changing a subset of these s-values, we may obtain $\tilde{\gamma}$ such that for $\tilde{\gamma}$ there exists a $u \in B_v(20)$ that is s-pivotal for A^N. Since $\tilde{\gamma}$ was obtained from γ, by changing the configuration inside $B_v(20)$, the lemma follows.

If this assumption does not hold, then $\gamma^{p+s-} \in A^N$ and $\gamma^{p-s+} \notin A^N$. Since $\gamma^{p+s-} \in A^N$, there exists a self-avoiding path of good sites (in the configuration γ^{p+s-}) $\varphi = (0, v^1, v^2, \ldots, v^k = v, \ldots, v^n)$, such that $v^n \in \partial B_0(N)$.

By the definition of γ^{p+s-}, it follows that, for all i, if $d_\infty(v^i, v) \leqslant 19$, then v^i is a wide free site. Let

$$i = \min\{\ell < k : d_\infty(v^\ell, v) = 18\}, \qquad j = \max\{\ell > k : d_\infty(v^\ell, v) = 18\}.$$

Note that all the neighbours of v^i and v^j are free sites. Also note that it cannot be the case that v^i and v^j are neighbours, as this will imply that $\gamma^{p-s+} \in A^N$. We need to consider several cases, where we analyse in detail the case illustrated in Figure 4. Here v^i and v^j belong to the same face of $B_v(18)$, and both v^i and v^j are at distance least 5 from the corners of $B_v(20)$. Since $\gamma^{p-s+} \notin A^N$, it follows that $d_\infty(v_i, v_j) \geqslant 4$. We let v' be the neighbour of v^i such that v^i and v' differ in exactly one coordinate, and $d_\infty(v', v) = 17$. Let v'' be a neighbour of v^j defined similarly.

Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be obtained from γ^{p+s-} in the following way.

- For all w with $d_\infty(v,w) \geqslant 18$, $\tilde{\gamma}$ has the same p- and s-percolation values as γ^{p+s-}.
- For all w with $d_\infty(v,w) \leqslant 18$, w is closed in the s-percolation.
- If $d_\infty(w,v) = 17$, then w is a mine unless $d_\infty(w,v') \leqslant 1$, or $d_\infty(w,v'') \leqslant 1$, in which case w is a free site.
- v' and v'' are connected by a path of almost wide free sites inside the box $B_{17}(v)$, in such a way that v is the only mine adjacent to the path, and it is s-pivotal for the existence of the path. (Instead of giving a long, explicit construction, we refer the reader to Figure 4.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

We claim that $\tilde{\gamma}$ has v as s-pivotal site. Let $\tilde{\gamma}^{s-} = \tilde{\gamma}$ (so that v is closed in the s-percolation), and $\tilde{\gamma}^{s+}$ be $\tilde{\gamma}$ where the site v, and this site only, is updated to be open for the s-percolation.

For $\tilde{\gamma}^{s+}$, the concatenation of $(v_0, \ldots, v^i, v')$, the path of good sites inside $B_{17}(v)$ connecting v' to v'' and $(v'', v^j, \ldots, v^n)$ is a self-avoiding path of good sites connecting v^0 to $\partial B_N(0)$. Thus $\tilde{\gamma}^{s+} \in A^N$.

On the other hand, for $\tilde{\gamma}^{s-}$, the set of good sites w with $d_\infty(v, w) \geqslant 17$ is a subset of the set of good sites with $d_\infty(v, w) \geqslant 17$ for the configuration γ^{p+s-}. Since v is p-pivotal for γ^{p+s-}, it follows that for $\tilde{\gamma}$ there exists no path of good sites connecting 0 and $\partial B_N(0)$ that is disjoint from $B_{17}(0)$. For $\tilde{\gamma}^-$, there is no path of good sites connecting u and w with $d_\infty(u, v) = d_\infty(w, v) = 17$. Thus $\tilde{\gamma}^{s-} \notin A^N$. It follows that v is s-pivotal for $\tilde{\gamma}$ as needed.

It is easy to obtain similar constructions when v^i and v^j do not belong to the same face, or if either v^i or v^j is close to a corner. □




Figure 4 Making v pivotal

We suspect that, in some sense, a player who has access to better strategies should have a strictly larger set of winning probabilities. A *range n strategy* is a strategy which decides to recover a site v depending only on the information at distance at most n from v. Let $W_n(d)$ be the set of probabilities for which the game can be won using range n strategies. A general conjecture in the same spirit as Theorem 1.4 is as follows.

Conjecture 3.3. *There exists a k such that for all n, there exists an $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ such that*

$$(W_n(d) + (-\epsilon, \epsilon)) \cap [0, 1] \subset W_{n+k}(d).$$

4. Monotonicity and open problems

It may seem reasonable that, the more free sites we have, the larger the probability of winning the game. There are two natural interpretations of this conjecture.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Interpretation 1. If we can win the game for mine density $1-p$ for some graph G, we can also win it for density $1-p$ for any graph $\tilde{G}$ that has G as a subgraph.

Interpretation 2. If we can win the game for a certain mine density $1-p$, we can also win it for any other mine density $1-\tilde{p}$ for $\tilde{p} > p$. That is, the set of winning probabilities is an interval $[p, 1]$ or $(p, 1]$.

We start with a motivation for how adding mines may increase the success probability. Look at Figure 5. Note that, by looking at the data we are given, we cannot decide between the 3 configurations on the left of the figure. Therefore, given these data, we cannot even find one free vertex. On the other hand, by adding the 2 mines (on the right of the figure), the situation is clear and there are 3 surely free vertices.




Figure 5 Adding mines may help

We now give an example in which our first interpretation of monotonicity does not hold, while the second one does.

Example 1. Consider the minesweeper game on the rooted $(d+1)$-regular tree T_d. It is clear that we can win the game with positive probability if and only if there exists with positive probability an infinite sub-tree of vertices that are all free of mines, and in which all the vertices have either no children or d children.

Thus we are dealing with a branching process (see, *e.g.*, [3]) in which the probability that any vertex survives is p^d. Therefore there is a positive probability of winning the game if and only if

$$dp^d > 1.$$

Therefore, the set of winning probabilities for the $(d+1)$-regular tree, denoted by $W(d)$, is the interval $((1/d)^{1/d}, 1]$. Note that $\{T_d\}_{d=3,\infty}$ is an increasing family of graphs, but $\{W(d)\}_{d=3,\infty}$ is decreasing and has as intersection the set $\{1\}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the second example we give a variant of the game for which the first interpretation of monotonicity does not hold.

Example 2. This is a variation on the last example. Suppose that, instead of the number of adjacent vertices occupied by mines, we are given the following information. For every vertex we are given one bit of information. This bit is on if and only if there are no mines in the leftmost l children and there is at least one mine in $d-l$ other children. Again, this is reduced to a branching process. But here the expected number of children is

$$lp^l(1-p^{d-l}).$$

For every value of l, when d is large, the set $W(d)$ is some open interval (p_1, p_2).

For another example of nonmonotonic behaviour in percolation-related models, we refer the reader to [4].

We conclude with one open problem and one conjecture.

Conjecture. *On $\mathbb{Z}^d$ the minesweeper game is monotone in p, i.e., the set of winning probabilities is an interval $[p(d), 1]$ or $(p(d), 1]$.*

Problem. *What can be said about the set $W(d)$ for $\mathbb{Z}^d$ as $d \to \infty$?*

Acknowledgement

I thank Itai Benjamini for interesting discussions. Thanks to Olle Häggström and the anonymous referee for many helpful remarks.

References

[1] Adamatzky, A. (1997) How cellular automaton plays Minesweeper. *Appl. Math. Comput.* **85** 127–137.
[2] Aizenman, M. and Grimmett, G. R. (1991) Strict monotonicity in percolation and ferromagnetic models. *J. Statist. Phys.* **63** 817–835.
[3] Atherya, K. B. and Ney, P. E. (1972) *Branching Processes*, Springer.
[4] Brightwell, G. R., Häggström, O. and Winkler P. (1999) Nonmonotonic behavior in hard-core and Windom–Rowlison models. *J. Statist. Phys.* **94** 415–435.
[5] Grimmett, G. R. (1997) Percolation and disordered systems. In *Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics* (Saint-Flour, 1996), Vol. 1665 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer, pp. 153–300.
[6] Kaye, R. (2000). Minesweeper is NP-complete. *Math. Intelligencer* **22** 9–15.
[7] Menshikov, M. V. (1987) Quantitative estimates and rigorous inequalities for critical points of a graph and its subgraphs. *Theory. Prob. Appl.* **32** 544–547.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S096354830200528X Published online by Cambridge University Press