

# MISÈRE PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES is PSPACE-complete, even on Planar Graphs

Kyle Burke<sup>✉1</sup>, Caroline Cashman<sup>✉2</sup>, Alfie Davies<sup>✉3</sup>,  
Kanae Yoshiwatari<sup>✉4</sup>, and Francesca Yu<sup>✉5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Florida Southern College, Lakeland, USA

<sup>2</sup> College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, USA

<sup>3</sup> Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada

<sup>4</sup> Kyoto University, Japan

<sup>5</sup> University of California, Berkeley, USA

## Abstract

We show that MISÈRE PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES is PSPACE-complete on planar graphs via a reduction from BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC. Furthermore, we show how to embed our gadgets onto the square and triangular grids. In order to clearly explain these results, we get into the details of BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC and find three PSPACE-complete variants of that as well.

## 1 Introduction

Combinatorial Games are two-player games with no randomness and no hidden information where the players (left and right) alternate turns according to the rules until the game ends. A *position* is a game state, and the positions that the left and right players can move to are the left and right *options*. For many rulesets, the default *normal play* convention is used: when the set of options a player has from the current position is empty, that player loses the game. Under *misère play*, when a player has no options available, they win instead. A combinatorial game ruleset is *impartial* if the two players have the same options from every position. Otherwise, the game is strictly *partizan*. [2], [1], [9].

ARC KAYLES is an impartial combinatorial game played on a simple undirected graph. Each turn a player chooses one of the edges on the graph,

$(u, v)$ , then removes both vertices  $u$  and  $v$  as well as all edges incident to either. It is played with the normal play convention.

PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES is a partizan game just like ARC KAYLES, except that all edges in the graph are coloured Blue or Red. On their turn, the left player can only pick a blue edge and the right player can only pick a red edge, though edges of both colours adjacent to those are deleted.

MISÈRE PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES is the same as PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES, except that it is played with the misère play convention. Thus the winner of a game is the first player to start their turn with no edges of their colour. We provide a playable version of MISÈRE PARCK at <https://kyleburke.info/DB/combGames/miserePartizanArcKayles.html>.

Computational Complexity provides one means to assess how fun a game is. For games like UNDIRECTED GEOGRAPHY where the winning strategy can be determined in polynomial time [3], there is no meaningful competition if one or both players know how to choose a winning option. If there are polynomial options from any position, then by using the process to determine winnability a player can select a winning move if one exists in polynomial time.

Instead, evidence that there may not be an efficient algorithm to solve a game adds to the intensity of the competition as players use uncertain heuristics to make their moves. GENERALIZED CHESS, for example, is EXPTIME-complete, so no polynomial-time algorithm exists to determine the winnability from any position. Many loop-free games have been shown to be PSPACE-complete, meaning that unless  $P = PSPACE$ , no polynomial time algorithm exists for them either [6], e.g. HEX [7], AMAZONS [5], and GEOGRAPHY [8]. The intractability of these games increases their replayability as players hone their imperfect strategies. Unlike many other scientific fields, showing that a ruleset is computationally hard is beneficial and can help explain (or even promote) its popularity.

The computational complexity of PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES is of significant interest because it is a general version of the game DOMINEERING, for which the complexity remains unsolved despite multiple attempts<sup>1</sup>.

In sections 2 and 3, we prove that MISÈRE PARCK is PSPACE-complete. First, in section 2, we provide an overview of the reduction, including a description of the ruleset PosCNF and a thorough discussion of B2CL and some variants, which we reduce directly from. (This includes an explanation of why we cannot reduce from PosCNF directly.) In Section 3, we describe

---

<sup>1</sup>Finding DOMINEERING to be PSPACE-complete would prove the same for PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES, but not the other way around.

the individual gadgets for the reduction to complete the proof of hardness. We provide gadgets for both square and triangular grids, showing that the game is PSPACE-complete in both more-specific cases.

## 2 Reduction Overview

The reduction we present to show MISÈRE PARCK is PSPACE-complete is from POSITIVECNF (PosCNF) via BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC (B2CL). Much of the terminology stems from the PosCNF part, but the detour through B2CL provides us with the benefit of planarity. This is a common path for proving game complexity. We include this section to help explain this for readers not used to these constructions.

### 2.1 PositiveCNF

POSITIVECNF (PosCNF) is a boolean-formula game with players named True and False. The position consists of a conjunctive normal form (CNF) boolean formula without negations (“positive”) and the current state of the variables, with each being either *true*, *false*, or *unassigned*. On their turn, a player chooses one of the unassigned variables and assigns their value to it. After all variables have been assigned, the winner is the player whose identity is what the formula evaluates to. Since the formula is positive, it would never benefit a player to assign their opponent’s value to a variable.

Aside from the positive nature of the formula, there are some important distinctions between the Quantified Boolean Formula (game) and PosCNF:

- PosCNF is not known to be hard on only 3-CNF formulas, so some of the clauses may be much longer in order for it to be computationally hard.
- The order of variables is not decided ahead of time. The difficulty of each turn is not in picking the value to assign, but in choosing which of the unassigned variables to claim.

### 2.2 Bounded Two-Player Constraint Logic

BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC (B2CL) is a game where each turn consists of flipping an edge in a directed graph. The position consists of a digraph of coloured (Blue, Red) arcs that each have weight 1 or 2. Each edge can only be flipped once, so in a given position, some edges might have already been flipped. One blue arc and one red arc are each indicated as the

goals for that player. Each vertex must have a total in-weight of at least 2. A turn consists of picking an arc of your colour and flipping it without violating the in-weight condition. If a player flips their goal arc, then the game ends and they are declared the winner. If a player is ever unable to move, then the game ends in a draw.

B2CL is defined and shown to be PSPACE-hard in [5]. Note: we use a different description of the game. In the original work, the edges are coloured White and Black to identify the two players (Blue and Red for us) and colours are instead used to identify the weight of the edges. (Red for 1 and blue for 2.) In our diagrams of B2CL, we use extra arrowheads to indicate the edge weights, and just color the edges by their player.

The reduction is from POSCNF and includes clever tricks so that the only required vertices to show hardness are encodings of And, Or, Fanout, Choice, and Variable gadgets; all other vertices can be transformed into combinations of those five. The reduced graphs are designed so that one of the goal edges will be triggered before either player can't move, avoiding the issue of draws. Additionally, a crossover gadget can be built from those five so that the planar version of B2CL is also PSPACE-hard.




Figure 1: B2CL Gadgets.

Since B2CL isn't a boolean formula game, the gadgets are described using the terms Active and Inactive in place of True and False, respectively. In these POSCNF-based games, the difficult decisions for the players are still in the order they choose the variables. After that, Blue spends their moves appropriately propagating the active and inactive signals through the all-blue (And, Or, Fanout, and Choice) vertices to see whether they can flip their goal edge.

As with POSCNF, it never hurts Blue to have an Active output from one vertex gadget instead of an Inactive with all else being the same.

[5] hints that instead of using their goal edges, “it is normal to define the loser as the first player unable to move.” We spell that out here, both for Normal Play and an intermediate game where the players take on roles similar to those in Maker-Breaker games<sup>2</sup>.

**Definition 2.1** (BUILDER-BLOCKER BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC). *BUILDER-BLOCKER BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC (BBB2CL)* is the same game as *B2CL*, except that there is no Red goal edge. If Blue flips the(ir) goal edge, the game ends and they win. If the goal edge has not been flipped and the current player can’t make a move, then instead the game ends with Red as the winner.

**Definition 2.2** (NORMAL-PLAY BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC). *NORMAL-PLAY BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC (NPB2CL)* is the same game as *BBB2CL*, except that there is no Blue goal edge. When a player is unable to flip an edge, the game ends with the other player as the winner.

We next show that these are both PSPACE-complete. Our reductions will piggyback off of the reduction from [5] with slight modifications. An example of that reduction from POSCNF is included in Figure 2.

There are four main parts to the construction:

- The bottom row of variable gadgets.
- The all-blue circuit-like gadgetry leading from the variables to (and including) the goal.
- The  $k$  extra plays for Red.  $k$  should be chosen so that it is at least as large as the number of plays Blue has in the circuitry.
- The Red goal edge, adjacent to a final Blue edge that Blue will have to flip if they are unable to flip their goal edge, handing the win to Red.

Together, this assures that Blue wins exactly when they can choose variables to satisfy the original positive CNF formula.

B2CL is used extensively to show PSPACE-hardness in combinatorial games for three main reasons:

---

<sup>2</sup>This will not be an actual Maker-Breaker game, as those have additional requirements, e.g. coming from a positional game.




Figure 2: Translated from Figure 6.1 of [5], a B2CL position equivalent to the PosCNF game on  $(w \vee x \vee y) \wedge (w \vee z) \wedge (x \vee z)$ . For space reasons (as in the source figure) it does not contain all simplifications to only the five basis vertices and does not employ the crossover gadgets. We do, however, include the extra  $k$  hidden red plays described.

1. There are only five basis vertices that are needed to include instead of every possible Constraint Logic vertex.
2. Those five gadgets can be abstracted into their named meaning; often the actual rules for constraint logic (e.g. edge flipping) are (safely) overlooked.
3. The crossover gadget can be built from the other five basis vertices, delivering planarity automatically.

We continue by showing the necessary parts so that BBB2CL and NPB2CL can also be used for the same purposes.

**Lemma 2.3.** *BUILDER-BLOCKER BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC is PSPACE-complete.*

*Proof.* We use the same construction from [5] (example in Figure 2) except that the connected component with the Red goal is missing and we double the number of extra red plays ( $2k$  instead of  $k$ ). Since Red has so many moves, the game will not end due to them running out of plays. Red will play on as many variables as possible, then just make their moves waiting to see whether Blue is able to activate the goal. If Blue can, then they will win. Otherwise, they will run out of moves and thus the game will end in Red's favour.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.** *PSPACE-hard instances of BBB2CL can be constructed from only the same five basis vertices as in B2CL.*

*Proof.* Our reduction is the same except that we remove one component and add  $k$  more copies of a vertex that already existed in the original reduction.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** *NORMAL-PLAY BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC is PSPACE-complete.*

*Proof.* We use the same construction as in lemma 2.3, except that instead of a single goal edge for Blue, this is the start of a Blue chain of length  $2k$ . Now, if Blue is able to flip what was the goal edge, they can now earn  $2k$  extra moves, enough to continue playing after Red uses what remains of their  $2k$  moves.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** *PSPACE-hard instances of NPB2CL can be constructed from only the same five basis vertices as in B2CL.*

*Proof.* Our reduction is the same as for BBB2CL, except that we've added a long chain for Blue after what was their goal edge. That chain can be created from connected Or gadgets, as we demonstrate in Figure 3.  $\square$

This second result means that future results can build off of this without showing a separate goal gadget.

Since the main topic of this paper is a misère game, we include a misère version of B2CL and prove the analogous results about that.

**Definition 2.7** (MISÈRE PLAY BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC). *MISÈRE PLAY BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC (MPB2CL)* is the same game as NPB2CL, except that when a player is unable to flip an edge on their turn, they win the game.

**Lemma 2.8.** *MISÈRE PLAY BOUNDED TWO-PLAYER CONSTRAINT LOGIC is PSPACE-complete.*




Figure 3: Modification of the Blue goal from the reduction to reach NPB2CL. On the left side is the goal part of the original B2CL and BBB2CL reductions. On the right side is the modification using additional Or gadgets that gives Blue  $2k$  additional moves.

*Proof.* We use the same construction as in lemma 2.5, except that instead of the  $2k$  long chain for Blue at the end of the circuitry, those chain edges are now Red. We provide a separate chain of  $2k$  moves for Blue. The following prescribed order of the game is best for both players.

Since this is misère, both players are looking to finish up their moves as quickly as possible. The first player who can't move will win.

Both players will first select all variables. This is because Blue wants to open up the new  $2k$  long chain for Red at the end of their circuitry section. Red has the opposite goal, so they will also want to play on the variables first. Afterwards, Blue will move through the circuitry to finish that before Red completes their original batch of  $2k$  moves. If Blue is able to activate the end of the circuit, then Red has an additional  $2k$  moves. Red had  $k$  left from their original  $2k$ . Red's total of  $3k$  is greater than Blue's  $2k$ , so Blue will run out before Red and will win. If Blue is not able to activate the end of the circuit, then Blue will still have  $2k$  moves plus whatever remains in the circuitry and Red will win by finishing their original  $2k$  moves first.  $\square$




Figure 4: New basis vertices needed for the reduction: Blue-to-Red (left) and Red-Or (right).



**Corollary 2.9.** *PSPACE-hard instances of MPB2CL can be constructed from the five basis vertices as in B2CL plus two additional vertices: Blue-to-Red and Red-Or, as shown in Figure 4.*

*Proof.* Our reduction is the same as for *NPB2CL*, except for two changes that necessitate the new vertices: (1) the blue weight-2 edge that, if flipped, allows a red weight-2 edge to be flipped, and (2) a red version of the Or vertex. These two form the new tail that trails from where the original Blue goal edge stood.  $\square$




Figure 5: Modification of the Blue goal from the reduction to reach MPB2CL. On the left side is the goal part of the original B2CL and BBB2CL reductions. On the right side is the modification using additional gadgets that gives Red  $2k$  moves if Blue would have met the goal originally.

Although the use of these two additional vertices disappointingly forces future reductions to include two extra gadgets, these gadgets are hopefully relatively easy to concoct. The Blue-to-Red vertex is very similar to the Variable vertex and the Red-Or is literally the same thing as Or, but with Red edges instead of Blue.

### 3 General Graph Reduction Details

Here, we show the gadgets used in game reduction. We reduce from standard B2CL, so we need to prove the following items:

- There exist gadgets that act like each of the Variable, And, Or, Split, and Choice vertices.
- We need a Goal gadget that Blue wins with if they can activate it while the rest of the construction remains consistent.

- The gadgets need to use a common interface between them that appropriately propagate active and inactive signals.
- Red has some way to make their  $k$  extra moves while Blue is making moves on the circuitry.

We consider the game on general graphs, as well as when restricted to the Cartesian grid and triangular grid. For those stricter results, we will have some additional requirements:

- The gadgets must “snap” onto the grid structures, meaning the graphs only include a subset of those grids in each case.
- We need additional wire gadgets to connect the interfaces between gadgets.

First, in Figure 6 we show the gadget (input/output) interface, on both the triangular and Cartesian grids. The I stands for Inactive; the A stands for Active.



Figure 6: INPUT/OUTPUT interface for Cartesian and Triangular grids

Of the four vertices in the interface gadget, the top and middle-bottom will never be incident to any other edges and I and A will never be connected to any red edges. Thus, it never benefits Blue to choose the top edge over I or A, as choosing either the I or A edge instead may remove more blue edges and will not remove any extra red edges. If Blue plays on the A edge of any interface, that will correlate to an active signal between those gadgets; if they play on the I edge, this simulates an inactive signal.

In B2CL, Blue never prefers inactive connections, so we design the gadgets so that Blue will choose to play on A edges (instead of I) any time it will not cost them an additional move. The red edge below is included so Red has their own move to make while Blue plays on the gadget.

In Figure 7 we show the singular goal gadget, which will Blue to win the game if they are able to activate its input and not make any extra moves on any gadgets.




Figure 7: Goal gadget. If the input is activated, then Blue doesn't need to spend an extra turn to take the extra edge,  $G$ .




Figure 8: VARIABLE gadget on Cartesian grids. The triangular grid version is the same, but with the vertical edge in the output gadget bent to either the left or right. If Red goes first, their best move is to play on edge  $c$ . If Blue goes first, they should choose to play on  $d$ . In addition to all these edges, each pair of Variable gadgets is accompanied by a single Red edge, different from the one pictured.

We show the beginning variables in the Cartesian and triangular grids in Figure 8. Identical logic follows in showing that both are positive formulas.

In the Variable gadget:

- If Red goes first, they should choose to play on edge  $c$ . This is because it leaves  $a$  as a completely independent play that Blue has to make later. Since Red will play on  $c$  in half of these gadgets, these singleton Blue edges will exactly balance out the added Red edges. Additionally, edge  $e$  will remain, so Blue will have to continue on the gadget by playing  $f$  instead of  $g$ . Playing on  $b$  is not as good for Red because Blue will (have to) play on  $e$  and  $g$ . Although that includes the extra move, it also means they get to activate the output.
- If Blue goes first, they should choose to play on edge  $d$ . This allows them to activate the output by choosing  $g$  in a future turn. For the separated path  $ab$ , both players want to avoid this component and play to force the other player to move there instead. There will be enough other Blue moves that these will constitute the last of Red's turns. If

Blue played on  $e$  instead of  $d$ , then Red could take the  $c$  pieces instead, forcing Blue to take more turns on the  $a$  edges.

If we have wires of even and odd length, then we can always arrange them to connect our gadgets on both of the grids that we're targeting, as we can include them until the variables align. We get these wires in Figures 9 (even) and 10 (odd).




Figure 9: Wire of Even Length.




Figure 10: Wire of Odd Length.

The argument is identical for the even and odd cases. With Active input,  $a$  is cleared so Blue selects  $d$  which then allows them to select  $g$  as the output. With Inactive input, Blue must clear  $a$ , so they first select  $b$ . Then, they must still clear  $e$ , so they select  $f$ , leading to an Inactive output.

### 3.1 General Graph Gadgets

We now outline the reduction gadgets used on a general graph. First, consider the AND gadget in Figure 11. In this gadget, Blue can only activate the output gadget if both input gadgets are active without playing additional moves.

1. If the input is  $(A, A)$ , then both edge  $a$  and  $b$  vanish, leaving only edges  $c, d, e$ . Blue then takes  $d$ , giving an active output;
2. If the input is  $(I, A)$ , then the edges  $b, c, d, e$  remain. Blue then would take  $c$ , giving an inactive output;




Figure 11: AND gadget. The output (Out) can be activated only if both inputs (In 1 and In 2) are active.

3. If the input is  $(A, I)$ , the output is inactive due to similar reasoning as in Case 2;
4. If the input is  $(I, I)$ , then edges  $a, b, c, d, e$  will remain, in which case Blue can take them all by claiming edge  $c$ , giving an inactive output.

Next, consider the OR gadget in Figure 12, with two inputs and one output. The output can be activated if either of the two inputs is active, but if both are inactive then the output must also be inactive. Blue will make an extra move on the gadget outside of the three interfaces, so an additional red edge is included.

1. If the input is  $(A, A)$ , edges  $a, b$  and  $c$  vanish. Blue should take  $e$  in order to clear  $d$ . They then select  $g$ , giving an active output;
2. If the input is  $(I, A)$ ,  $a$  and  $c$  vanish. Blue would then select  $d$ , which clears  $b$  and  $e$ . They then select  $g$ , resulting in an active output;
3. If the input is  $(A, I)$ , the output is active due to similar reasoning in Case 2;
4. If the input is  $(I, I)$ , then edges  $a, b$ , and  $c$  remain. Blue would then select  $b$  or  $c$ , which clears  $a, b, c$ , and  $d$ . In order to clear  $e$ , Blue must choose  $f$ , resulting in an inactive output.

Following this, we consider the FANOUT gadget in Figure 13:




Figure 12: OR gadget.




Figure 13: FANOUT gadget.

1. If the input is  $A$ , then both edge  $a$  and  $b$  vanish, allowing Blue to take both  $d$  and  $f$ , resulting in two active outputs;
2. If the input is  $I$ , then the edges  $a$  and  $b$  remain, forcing Blue to select  $c$  and  $e$ , leading to an inactive output for both branches.

To conclude our analysis of the general case, we consider the CHOICE gadget in Figure 14.

1. If the input is  $A$ , then both edge  $a$  and  $b$  vanish. Blue still needs to remove edge  $c$ , so they select inactive as one output, and active as the other;




Figure 14: CHOICE gadget.

2. If the input is  $I$ , then the edges  $a$  and  $b$  remain, forcing Blue to take an inactive output for both branches.

**Theorem 3.1.** *MISÈRE PARCK is PSPACE-complete.*

*Proof.* By the reduction from B2CL with the gadgets described above, MISÈRE PARCK is PSPACE-hard. MISÈRE PARCK is also in PSPACE because the game tree's height is bounded by the number of edges and each position has at most that many options. Thus, MISÈRE PARCK is PSPACE-complete.  $\square$

Some of the gadgets from above need to be modified slightly in order to fit on either the triangular or Cartesian grids. We describe these gadgets in the appendix in Section A.

## 4 Future Directions

This work is the first result the authors know of that uses Constraint Logic show that misère combinatorial games are PSPACE-hard. Naturally, this begs the question of whether this approach can be used for other misère games as well. Additionally, although we did not use the misère version of Constraint Logic we devised (MPB2CL) in our reduction, it's also possible that that new ruleset could be used for future hardness results as well. That would be even more useful if the number of basis vertices needed for hardness could be decreased.

**Open problem 4.1.** Is there a set of basis vertices with fewer than seven elements that MPB2CL is PSPACE-complete on, even for planar graphs?

Of course, the big questions that motivated this are still unsolved. Recent advances in the normal-play version of PARCK have shown that the game is computationally intractable, specifically NP-hard [4]. It remains unknown whether the game is PSPACE-complete.

**Open problem 4.2.** What is the computational complexity of PARTIZAN ARC KAYLES? What is its complexity on planar graphs?

This, in turn, was motivated by two other games that have unknown complexity, despite plenty of interest from combinatorial game researchers.

**Open problem 4.3.** What is the computational complexity of ARC KAYLES?

**Open problem 4.4.** What is the computational complexity of DOMINEERING?

Although our work does not appear to yield a new path to proving any of these three, we hope it will ignite more interest in these long-standing problems.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the organizers of the Integers Conference 2025, held in Athens, Georgia, for bringing them together and facilitating this research. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP24KJ1232.

## References

- [1] M. H. Albert, R. J. Nowakowski, and D. Wolfe. *Lessons in Play: An Introduction to Combinatorial Game Theory*. A. K. Peters, Wellesley, Massachusetts, 2007.
- [2] Elwyn R. Berlekamp, John H. Conway, and Richard K. Guy. *Winning Ways for your Mathematical Plays*, volume 1. A K Peters, Wellesley, Massachusetts, 2001.
- [3] Aviezri S. Fraenkel, Edward R. Scheinerman, and Daniel Ullman. Undirected edge geography. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 112(2):371–381, 1993.



- [4] Tesshu Hanaka, Hironori Kiya, Michael Lampis, Hirotaka Ono, and Kanae Yoshiwatari. Faster winner determination algorithms for (colored) arc kayles. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 156:103716, 2026. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000025000984>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2025.103716>.
- [5] Robert A. Hearn and Erik D. Demaine. *Games, puzzles and computation*. A K Peters, 2009.
- [6] C. H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1994.
- [7] S. Reisch. Hex ist PSPACE-vollständig. *Acta Inf.*, 15:167–191, 1981.
- [8] Thomas J. Schaefer. On the complexity of some two-person perfect-information games. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 16(2):185–225, 1978.
- [9] A.N. Siegel. *Combinatorial Game Theory*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2013. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=VUVrAAAAQBAJ>.

## A Specific Gadgets for Cartesian and Triangular Grids

In this section, we provide specific gadgets for Cartesian and Triangular grids when those need to differ from the versions shown previously.

### A.1 Cartesian grid gadgets

Note first that the AND and FANOUT gadgets can be redrawn in the Cartesian grid with no fundamental edits, thus the logic from the general case follows here. We show them in Figures 15 and 16 respectively.

Since our gadgets for our OR and CHOICE can not be immediately redrawn in the Cartesian grid, we give new gadgets for the Cartesian grid below. First consider the OR gadget in Figure 17.

1. If the input is  $(A, A)$ , then edges  $a, b, e, f$  are cleared upon input. Because Blue needs to clear  $c$ , Blue has to take edge  $c$  or  $d$ , in which case they would prefer  $d$  in an optimal strategy. Upon taking  $d$ , edges




Figure 15: AND gadget for Cartesian grids.




Figure 16: FANOUT gadget for Cartesian grids.




Figure 17: OR gadget for Cartesian grids.

$c, d, i, h$  are cleared, leaving edges  $g, j, l, k$ . Then Blue would need to take  $g$  and  $k$ , rendering an active output;

2. If the input is  $(A, I)$ , then edges  $a, b$  are cleared upon input. Because Blue needs to clear  $c$ , Blue has to take either  $c$  or  $d$ , in which case they would prefer  $d$  in an optimal strategy. Upon taking  $d$ , the edges  $c, d, h, i$  are cleared, leaving the edges  $e, f, g, j, k, l$ . Then by claiming  $f$  and  $k$ , Blue clears them all, rendering an active output;
3. If the input is  $(I, A)$ , the output is active due to similar reasoning in Case 2;
4. If the input is  $(I, I)$ , then none of the labeled edges are cleared upon input. Because Blue has to clear edge  $a$ , Blue has to take either  $a$  or

$b$ , in which case they would prefer  $b$  in an optimal strategy, clearing  $a, b, c, d$ . Similarly, Blue would claim edge  $f$  in an optimal strategy, clearing  $e, f, g, h$ . At this point, only  $i, j, k, l$  remains and Blue would take  $j$  to clear them all, rendering an inactive output.

To conclude our gadget analysis for the game in the Cartesian grid, we show the CHOICE gadget in 18.




Figure 18: CHOICE gadget for Cartesian grids.

1. If the input is  $A$ , it clears  $a, b$  and  $d$ . Blue must then choose  $f$  or  $g$  to remove  $i$ . Suppose they choose  $f$ , thereby clearing  $c$  and  $h$ . They must then select  $m$  in order to clear  $k$ , and following this they can choose  $q$  on the top row, leading to an active output on top. On the bottom row, they still must clear  $e$  so they select  $j$  which then forces them to select  $I$  in order to clear  $n$ . Symmetrical logic follows if they choose  $g$ ;
2. If the input is  $I$ , Blue should choose  $d$  which clears  $a, b, f, g$  and  $i$ . Note that the top and bottom rows are symmetric. Blue must choose  $h$  and  $j$  in order to clear, respectively,  $c$  and  $e$ . This forces them to choose  $o$  to clear  $m$  and  $p$  to clear  $n$ , leading to an inactive output in both rows.

## A.2 Triangular grid gadgets

Again, our gadgets for AND and FANOUT gadgets can be redrawn in the Cartesian grid with no fundamental edits as shown in Figures 19 and 20. Thus, the logic from the general case follows.

Then, we give an alternate OR gadget for the triangular grid in Figure 21.




Figure 19: AND gadget for triangular grids.




Figure 20: FANOUT gadget for triangular grids.




Figure 21: OR gadget for triangular grids.

1. If the input is  $(A, A)$ , then edges  $a$  and  $b$  vanish. Blue should take  $d$  or  $e$  to clear  $c, d, e$  and  $f$ . Then, they can select  $A$ , giving an active output;
2. If the input is  $(I, A)$ , this clears  $b$  but not  $a$ . Blue should then optimally select  $e$  in order to clear  $a$ , which also clears  $c, d$  and  $f$ , leading to an active output on the next turn;
3. If the input is  $(A, I)$ , this clears  $a$  but not  $b$ . Blue clears  $b$  by selecting  $d$ , which also clears  $c, e$  and  $f$ , leading to an active output on the next turn;
4. If the input is  $(I, I)$ , then Blue would optimally select  $c$  to clear  $a$  and  $b$ . This leaves  $f$ , so Blue must choose the inactive output.

Lastly, we describe a CHOICE gadget for triangular grids in Figure 22.

1. If the input is  $A$ , then edges  $a$  and  $b$  vanish. Blue would then choose to take  $c$  or  $d$ . If they choose  $c$ , edges  $c, d, e$  vanish while edge  $f$  remains, leading to an active output in the upper branch and an inactive output





Figure 22: CHOICE gadget for triangular grids.



in the lower branch; the case when they choose  $d$  similarly leads to an inactive output in the upper branch and an active one in the lower branch;

2. If the input is  $I$ , the edge  $a$  remains, which urges  $B$  to select  $b$ . Then edges  $c$  and  $d$  are cleared, leaving edges  $e$  and  $f$ , which leads to active outputs in both branches.

### A.3 Line Graph Planarity

The line graphs of all of our gadgets turn out to be planar. In particular, the planarity of the line graph of CHOICE gadget for Cartesian grids can be witnessed as shown in Figure A.3.