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Abstract
Determining the complexity of perfect information trick taking card games is a long standing open problem. This question is worth addressing not only because of the popularity of these games among human players, e.g., DOUBLE DUMMY BRIDGE, but also because of its practical importance as a building block in state-of-the-art playing engines for CONTRACT BRIDGE, SKAT, HEARTS, and SPADES.

We define a general class of perfect information two-player trick taking card games dealing with arbitrary numbers of hands, suits, and suit lengths. We investigate the complexity of determining the winner in various fragments of this game class.

Our main result is a proof of PSPACE-completeness for a fragment with bounded number of hands, through a reduction from Generalized Geography. Combining our results with Wästlund’s tractability results gives further insight in the complexity landscape of trick taking card games.

1 Introduction
Determining the complexity class of games is a popular research topic [Hearn, 2006], even more so when the problem has been open for some time and the game is actually of interest to players and researchers. For instance, the game of AMAZONS was proved PSPACE-complete by three different research groups almost simultaneously [Furtak et al., 2005; Hearn, 2006]. In this paper, we investigate the complexity of trick taking card games. The class of trick taking card games encompasses a large number of popular card games such as CONTRACT BRIDGE, HEARTS, SKAT, SPADES, TAROT, and WHIST.¹

The rules of the quintessential trick taking card game are fairly simple. A set of players is partitioned into teams and arranged around a table. Each player is dealt a given number of cards \( n \) called hand, each card being identified by a suit and a rank. The game consists in \( n \) tricks in which every player plays a card. The first player to play in a given trick is called lead, and the other players proceed in the order defined by the seating. The single constraint is that players should follow the lead suit if possible. At the end of a trick, whoever put the highest ranked card in the lead suit wins the trick and leads the next trick. When there are no cards remaining, after \( n \) tricks, we count the number of tricks each team won to determine the winner.²

Assuming that all hands are visible to everybody, is there a strategy for the team of the first player to ensure winning at least \( k \) tricks?

Despite the demonstrated interest of the general population in trick taking card games and the significant body of artificial intelligence research on various trick taking card games [Buro et al., 2009; Ginsberg, 2001; Frank and Basin, 1998; Kupferschmid and Helmert, 2006; Luštrek et al., 2003], most of the corresponding complexity problems remain open. This stands in stark contrast with other popular games such as CHESS or GO, the complexity of which was established early [Fraenkel and Lichtenstein, 1981; Lichtenstein and Sipser, 1980; Robson, 1983].

There are indeed very few published hardness results for card games. We only know of a recent paper addressing UNO [Demaine et al., 2010], a card game not belonging to the category of trick taking card games, and Frank and Basin [2001]’s result on the best defense model. They show that given an imperfect information game tree and an integer \( w \), and assuming the opponent has perfect information, determining whether one has a pure strategy winning in at least \( w \) worlds is NP-complete.

As for tractability, after a few heuristics were proposed [Kahn et al., 1987], Wästlund’s performed an in-depth combinatorial study on fragments of perfect information two-hands WHIST proving that some important fragments of trick taking card games are polynomial [Wästlund, 2005a,b].

Note that contrary to the hypotheses needed for Frank and Basin [2001]’s NP-completeness result, this paper assumes perfect information and a compact input, namely the hands and an integer \( k \). There are several reasons for focusing on perfect information. First, it provides a lower bound to the imperfect information case when compact input is ass-

¹A detailed description of these games and many other can be found on http://www.pagat.com/class/trick.html.

²There are more elaborate point-based variants where tricks might have different values, possibly negative, based on cards comprising them. We focus on the special case where each card has the same positive value.
Lemma 1. The winner of a trick is the index corresponding to the card with highest rank among those having the required suit. The position resulting from a trick with cards \( C = \{c_2, \ldots, c_{s-1}\} \) played in a position \( p \) can be obtained by removing the selected cards from the hands and setting the new lead to the winner of the trick.

In the example in Figure 1, the lead is to 1. A possible trick would be \((s_3,A), (s_1,Q), (s_1,J), (s_4,Q)\); note that only hand \( h_4 \) can follow suit, and that 1 is the winner so remains lead.

Definition 4. A team mapping \( \sigma \) is a map from \([1 \ldots n]\) to \(\{A,B\}\) where \( n \) is the number of hands, \( A \) is the existential player, and \( B \) is the universal player. A (perfect information, plain) trick-taking game is pair consisting of a position and a team mapping \( \sigma \).

For simplicity of notation, team mappings will be written as words over the alphabet \(\{A,B\}\). For instance, 1 \(\mapsto\) \(A\), 2 \(\mapsto\) \(B\), 3 \(\mapsto\) \(A\), 4 \(\mapsto\) \(B\) is written \(ABAB\).

Definition 5. A trick is won by team \( A \) if its winner is mapped to \( A \) with \( \sigma \). The value of a game is the maximum number of tricks that team \( A \) can win against team \( B \).

The value of the game presented in Figure 1 is 3 as team \( A \) can ensure making all remaining tricks with the following strategy known as squeeze. Start with \((s_3,A)\) from \( h_1 \) and play \((s_1,J)\) from \( h_3 \), then start the second trick in the suit where \( h_2 \) elected to play.

2.2 Decision problem and fragments

The most natural decision problem associated to trick-taking games is to compute whether the value of a game is larger or equal to a given value \( \nu \). Put another way, is it possible for some team to ensure capturing more than \( \nu \) tricks? We will see in Section 3 that the general problem is \(\text{PSPACE}\)-hard, but there are several dimensions along which one can constrain the problem. This should allow to better understand where the complexity comes from.

Team mappings only allow team mappings belonging to a language \(\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{A,B\}^*\), typically \(\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 = \{(AB)^j\}\) or \(\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_2 = \{A\}^*\).

Number of suits the total number of distinct suits \( s \) is bounded by a number \( s = S \), or unbounded \( s = \omega \).

Length of suits the maximal number of ranks over all suits \( l \) is bounded by a number \( l = L \), or unbounded \( l = \omega \).

Symmetry for each suit, each hand needs to have the same number of cards pertaining to that suit.

The fragments of problems respecting such constraints are denoted by \( B(\mathcal{L}, s, l) \) when symmetry is not assumed. If symmetry is assumed, then we denote the class by \( B^S(\mathcal{L}, s, l) \). The largest class, that is, the set of all problems without any restriction is \(B(\omega,\omega,\omega)\).

Example 1. The class of double-dummy Bridge problems is exactly \( B(\mathcal{L}_2, 2, 13) \).

Proposition 1. \( B(\omega,\omega,\omega) \) is in \(\text{PSPACE}\).

Proof. The game ends after a polynomial number of moves. It is possible to perform a minimax search of all possible move sequences using polynomial space to determine the maximal number of tricks team \( A \) can achieve.
2.3 Generalized Geography

Generalized Geography (GG) is a zero-sum two-player game over a directed graph with one vertex token. The players take turn moving the token towards an adjacent vertex and thereby removing the origin vertex. The player who cannot play anymore loses. An example of a GG instance on a bipartite graph is given in Figure 2.

Deciding the winner of a GG instance is PSPACE-complete [Schaef er, 1978], and GG was used to prove PSPACE-hardness for numerous games including GO [Lichtenstein and Sipser, 1980], OTHELLO [Iwata and Kasai, 1994], AMAZONS [Furtak et al., 2005], UNO [Demaine et al., 2010]. Lichtenstein and Sipser have shown that GG remains PSPACE-hard even if the graph is assumed to be bipartite [1980].

3 Unbounded number of hands

We present a polynomial reduction $\phi$ from bipartite GG on graphs of degree 3 to $B(\ldots, 2)$.

An instance of GG on a bipartite graph is given by $(G = (V_A \cup V_B, E_{AB} \cup E_{BA}), v_1)$ where $v_1 \in V_A$ denotes the initial location of the token. Let $m = m_{AB} + m_{BA} = |E_{AB}| + |E_{BA}|$ the number of edges and $n = n_A + n_B = |V_A| + |V_B|$ the number of vertices. We construct an instance of $B(\ldots, 2)$ using $m + n(m + 1)$ suits, and $2n$ rounds with $m + 1$ cards each as follows.

Each vertex $v \in V_A$ (resp. $v \in V_B$) is encoded by a hand $h_v$ owned by team A (resp. B). We add $n$ additional dummy hands, hand $h_{A,i}$ up to hand $h_{A,n_B}$ for team A and $h_{B,i}$ up to hand $h_{B,n_B}$ for team B.

Each edge $(s, t) \in E_{AB}$ (resp. $E_{BA}$) is encoded by a suit $s_{i,j}$ of length 2, for instance $\{AK\}$. The cards in suit $s_{i,j}$ are dealt such that hand $h_v$ receives $K$, hand $h_s$ receives $A$. We add $n(m + 1)$ additional dummy suits $s_{A,i,j}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n_B\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, m + 1\}$ and $s_{B,i,j}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n_A\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, m + 1\}$.

For all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n_B\}$ (resp. $n_A$), hand $h_{A,i}$ (resp. $h_{B,i}$) receives A in all suits $s_{A,j,k}$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, m + 1\}$, while hand $h_{i}$ (resp. $h_{n_B,i}$) receives K in all suits $s_{A,j,k}$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, m - \deg(v_i)\}$. Recall that $1 \leq \deg(v_i) \leq 3$ and note that the suits $s_{A,j,k}$ with $m-2 \leq j$ might only feature A (with no K).

The goal of team A is to make at least $m_{BA} + 1$ tricks. Intuitively, for team A (resp. B) playing in a suit $s_{B,j}$ (resp. $s_{A,j}$) makes them lose all the remaining tricks (provided, of course, that hand $h_{B,i}$ (resp. $h_{A,i}$) has not discarded its corresponding A) so it cannot be good. The interesting and difficult part of this bridge game would only occur in playing accurately the suits $s_{i,j,k}$ between hands $h_i$ for $i, s, t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, that is the non dummy suits and the non dummy hands. Remark that this part simulates GG on the instance $(G, v_1)$.

**Lemma 1.** Player 1 has a winning strategy in $(G, v_1)$, then team A can make $m_{BA} + 1$ tricks in $\phi(G, v_1)$.

**Proof.** Let $\psi$ be the winning strategy of player 1, mapping a path $v_1 \ldots v_{i+1}$ ending in $V_B$ to a vertex $v' \in V_B$. We define the following winning strategy for team A in $\phi(G, v_1)$. When in a hand $h_{A,i}$ for some $i$, cash all the remaining A (all the remaining tricks). When in a hand $h_{i}$ for some $i$, cash all A (they are in suits $s_{i,j}$). Then $\psi$ tells you which of the K in a non dummy suit (suits of the form $s_{i,j}$) to play. Keeping track of which hands have taken the lead so far (without counting several times a hand which cashes some A) $h_{B,i} \rightarrow h_{B,i+1} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow h_{B,i}$, play the K in $s_{i,t}$ where $\psi(v_i, v_{k_1}, v_{k_2}, \ldots, v_{k_{i+1}})$ is the $t$-ieth vertex.

As for discarding, hands $h_{i}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n_A\}$ can throw away any of the dummy K in suits $s_{i,j}$, in any order. Hands $h_{A,i}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n_B\}$ have to be more careful. They can start by discarding the A in suits $s_{A,m - \deg(v_i) + 1}$ up to $s_{A,m + 1}$. Then, they can discard in the same suit hand $h_{n_A + i}$ has discarded its K at some previous trick. Indeed, hand $h_{n_A + i}$ does not discard at most $\deg(v_i)$ times in the part of the game in non dummy hands.

From a hand $h_{i}$, team B cannot play towards a non dummy hand $h_{i}$ of team A which has already taken the lead, since by construction, $h_{i}$ has cashed all the A in non dummy suits, and in particular the one in $s_{i,j}$, so the K owns by team B has gone. Team B, had therefore two losing options: follow an actual GG game simulation where he will eventually lose, or
play in a dummy suit and lose all the remaining tricks. All in all, team B cannot cash more than its number of A in non-dummy suits which is equal to \(m_{AB}\). So, team A will make at least the complement \(m_{BA}+1\).

The same result also applies to team B. Therefore team A has a winning strategy in \(\phi(G, v_1)\) if and only if the first player has a winning strategy in the instance \((G, v_1)\) of GG. The reduction is thus complete, leading to \(\text{PSPACE}\)-hardness.

**Theorem 1.** \(B(\omega, \omega, 2)\) is \(\text{PSPACE}\)-complete.

### 4 Bound number of hands

The *trick balance* in an intermediate position is the number of tricks made by team A so far minus the number of tricks made by team B so far.

The basic idea of this reduction is that we have a termination gadget that allows both team to end the game by splitting the remaining tricks evenly. However, using the termination gadget comes with a small cost. So each team tries to achieve a sufficiently high trick balance before terminating the game.

The termination gadget involves two suits \(s_A\) and \(s_B\) and four hands \(h_3\) through \(h_6\) that do not otherwise influence the game.

Besides the termination gadget, we have two hands, one per team, and one suit \(s_v\) for each vertex \(v\) of the GG instance. A team, say A, can threaten to increase the trick balance in their favour by playing in the attacking gadget of a suit \(s_v\).

This can only be defended by having the opponent team, say B, counter-attacking in a suit \(s_{v'}\). B can choose \(s_{v'}\), but for the defense to be successful, \(v'\) needs to be a neighbour of \(v\) in GG. After this exchange is performed, team B has priority to attack but can only attack in suit \(s_{v'}\)’s attacking gadget. The same process goes on until the defending team cannot find an appropriate counter-attacking suit. At that moment, the attacking team manages to increase the trick balance enough to safely terminate the game in their favour. We see that picking the counter-attacking suits emulates a game of GG on \(G\).

Let \(G = ((V = V_A \cup V_B, E), (v_0))\), a directed bipartite graph and one of its vertex \(v_0\), be an instance of GG. Let \(n = n_A + n_B\) the number of vertices, and \(N(v)\) denote the set of neighbors of a vertex \(v\). We construct in polynomial time an equivalent instance of \(B(L_3, \omega, \omega)\) using 6 hands and \(s = n + 2\) suits. In the instance we create, the seating order does not have any influence so we will represent gadgets and positions simply by listing the cards in each hand in a table. In the following, we will use \(\omega\) to represent a large number, for instance we can set \(\omega = 8n\). We will also use \(t\) to represent the total number of tricks to be made.³ Team A wins if they make strictly more than \(t/2 + \sqrt{t}/4\) tricks.

#### 4.1 Presentation of the gadgets

Unless the gadgets are not symmetrical, we only describe one team’s version of the gadgets. Assume an arbitrary ordering on the vertices in \(V_A\) and in \(V_B\), that is \(V_A = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n_A}\}\) and \(V_B = \{v_1', v_2', \ldots, v_{n_B}'\}\).

³\(t\)'s exact value can be computed and is polynomial in the input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>Suit</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(h_1)</td>
<td>(s_A)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_2)</td>
<td>(s_B)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_3)</td>
<td>(s_A)</td>
<td>2t+1 — 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_4)</td>
<td>(s_A)</td>
<td>2t — 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_5)</td>
<td>(s_B)</td>
<td>2t+1 — 2t-3(\omega+1) — 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_6)</td>
<td>(s_B)</td>
<td>2t-3(\omega+1) — 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 4: The termination gadget.](image)

The suit \(s_A\) has length \(2t+1\) and is possessed only by hands \(h_1, h_3\) and \(h_4\). Hand \(h_1\) only has the smallest card in the suit, hand \(h_3\) has all the other cards of the suit with an odd rank and hand \(h_4\) has all the cards of that suit with an even rank. Thus, hands \(h_3\) and \(h_1\) have only cards in the suit \(s_A\). The suit \(s_B\) is owned only by hands \(h_2, h_5\) and \(h_6\). It is defined similarly except \(h_5\) has \(3\omega\) top cards to cash in that suit, then the cards are interleaved.

The following two lemmas allow us to focus on hands \(h_1\) and \(h_2\) in the remaining of this reduction.

**Lemma 2.** If \(h_1\) leads and the trick balance is \(\omega\), then team A can ensure winning the game.

**Proof.** Team A can play in the suit \(s_A\) then the rest of the game will hold between hands \(h_3\) and \(h_4\). It is easy to see that team A wins half (rounded up) of the remaining tricks.

**Lemma 3.** If \(h_2\) leads and the trick balance is \(-2\omega\), then team B can ensure winning the game.

The \(e|w\)-block. An \(e|w\)-block in a suit \(s\) for team A is the possibility for team A to cash \(w\) tricks by playing \(e\) times in the suit. In other words, hand \(h_2\) has the \(e\) top cards and \(h_1\) has the \(e+w\) following top cards. \(e\) stands for *establish* and \(w\) for *winners*. Figure 5 provides an example of a \(3|4\)-block.

We can concatenate several \(e|w\)-blocks for the same team in the same suit. For instance, Figure 6 shows how blocks are concatenated and provides a more concise notation.

Given a vertex \(v \in V\), a concatenation of \(e|w\) blocks with various values for \(e\) allows to encode the index of \(v\) in an attacking gadget. It also allows to encode which vertex \(v'\), \(v\) is adjacent to in a counter-attacking gadget via their indices. If \(v \in V_B\) (resp. \(V_A\)), the (counter-)attacking gadgets will be for team A (resp. B) and we say that the corresponding suit
is a defensive suit for team B (resp. A). The $|w|$-blocks we
need in the following have $e$ an integer in $[1, \ldots, 6]$, and $w$ a
fraction of $\omega$.

The counter-attacking and attacking gadgets. Consider
two words over $\{0, 1\}$ for each suit $s_v$ with $v \in V_4$. The
attacking word for suit $s_v$ is a such that $a(0) = 1$, $a(n_A + 1) = 0$,
and for each $j \neq i$, $j \in [1, n_A]$, $a(j) = 0$ and
$a(i) = 1$. The counter-attacking word for suit $s_v$ is $c$ such
that $c(0) = 1$, $c(n_B + 1) = 1$, and for each $j \in [1, n_B]$, if
$v_i \in N(v)$ then $c(j) = 1$ else $c(j) = 0$.

The gadgets can be built by looking at adjacent letters in
these words. If these letters are 11 or 00, put a $2|\omega$-block. If
they are 10, put a $3|\omega$-block, and if they are 01, put $1|\omega$. We
therefore define for each suit $s_v$, a counter-attacking gadget $C(v)$
and an attacking gadget $A(v)$. The words and gadgets for the
GG instance in Figure 2 are given in Figure 7.

Let $v \in V_A$ and $v' \in V_B$. Observe that the sum of the $e$
parts of the $A(v')$ gadgets is equal to $2(n_A + 1)$ and that of
the $C(v')$ gadgets is $2(n_A + 1)$. Similarly, the sum of the
$w$ parts is $\omega(n_A + 1)$. The same holds for $A(v')$ and $C(v')$,
replacing $n_B$ with $n_A$.

In the next two lemmas, we assume optimal play from both
teams subject to leading from a single suit.

**Lemma 4.** Assume the initial trick balance is 0, team B
starts, team A only leads cards from $A(v')$, and team B only
leads cards from $C(v')$. The trick balance remains $\leq -\omega$. If
$v' \in N(v)$, it remains $\leq 1$, else it reaches $\omega + 1$.

**Proof.** It is optimal to play blocks from the highest to the lowest
ranked when in lead, and to take any trick offered when not in lead. Let $i$ the index of $v$. Observe that team A needs to
$2j + 1$ tempi to establish the $j$th block if $j \neq i$, and $2i$ tempi
for the $i$th block. Team B needs $2j$ tempi to establish the $j$th block if $v' \in N(v_j)$, and $2j + 1$ tempi otherwise.

**Lemma 5.** Assume the initial trick balance is $-3\omega/2$, team A
starts, team A only leads cards from $C(v)$, and team B only
leads cards from $A(v')$. The trick balance remains $\leq -|\omega|$. If
$v' \in N(v)$, it remains $\geq -3\omega/2 - 1$, else it reaches $-3\omega/2$.

When team A attacks in the suit $s_v$ and team B does not
play in an admissible counter-attacking suit, team A establishes $\omega$
tricks before her (Lemma 4) and wins by termination (Lemma 2).
Conversely, if team A does not play in a neighbouring suit when
team B attacks, team A loses (Lemma 3, 5). Thus, Lemmas 4 and 5
give the graph structure to the suits.

Combining the attacking and counter-attacking gadgets. We
now need to complete the picture so that the assumptions of
Lemmas 4 and 5 are met.

In each suit $s_v$ of hand $h_1$ (resp. $h_2$) but the one corre-
spending to the starting vertex $v_0$, we start by the counter-
attacking gadget $C(v)$ surrounded by the fixed sequences $5|\omega
1|3\omega/2$ and $2|\omega$ (resp. $4|\omega/2 3|2\omega$ and $2|2\omega$) and call it first
part of the suit. We then add to each suit, including $s_v$, the
attacking gadget $A(v)$ surrounded by the fixed sequences $4|\omega
3|3\omega/2 1|3\omega/2$ and $1|\omega$ (resp. $6|\omega 1|3\omega/2$ and $1|3\omega/2$) and
call it second part of the suit. Figure 8 displays the combination
resulting from the GG instance in Figure 2.

These fixed starting sequences ensure that once a team
leads in suit $s_v$, they will continue leading only in $s_v$
until the suit is emptied. They also ensure, that while one team
chooses the attacking suit first, the opponent actually starts
leading in the counter-attacking gadget.

The ending sequences, on the other hand, ensure that after
the attacking suit $s_v$ and the first part of the counter-attacking
suit $s_v'$ have been emptied, the situation corresponds to the
reduction from the GG instance with the edges adjacent to $v$
removed and $v'$ as a starting vertex.

**Lemma 6.** A trick balance of $\omega$ cannot be achieved by leading
in defensive suits.

**Ensuring the players simulate GG.** Let $P$ a position re-
sulting from one constructed from a GG instance. Assume
there exists a suit $s_v$ (and $v$ the corresponding vertex in the
original GG instance), such that for any suit $s$ different from
$s_A$, $s_B$, and $s_v$, $s$ is dealt among hands $h_1$ and $h_2$ so as to
form a first part and a second part in $h_1$ or in $h_2$. If $s_v$
forms only a second part in $h_2$ (resp. $h_1$), $h_2$ (resp. $h_1$) is on
the lead, and the trick balance is $1/2$ (resp. 0), then we say that $P$
is $A$-clean (resp. $B$-clean) and $s_v$ is the current starting suit.
Lemma 7. Let $P$ an $B$-clean position with starting suit $s_v$, and a suit $s_v'$, such that $v' \in N(v)$. Assume team A can ensure winning with optimal play from $P$. If team B only leads from suit $s_v$ and team A only leads from $s_v$ until $s_v$ is empty, then we reach a $A$-clean position $P'$ with $s_v'$ as the starting suit. Moreover, team A can ensure winning with optimal play from $P'$.

Proof. As $P$ is an $B$-clean position, the trick balance is 0 and the lead is on $h_1$. Suppose team A plays in a suit $s_u$ with $u \neq v$ and $u \in V_A$, before having established and cashed the $\omega$ tricks of the $6|\omega$-block of the color $s_u$ (first block of the second part of that color). After 6 tempi, team B has had time to cash the $\frac{5\omega}{2}$ tricks of the two first block $5|\omega$ and $1|\frac{3\omega}{2}$ of the color $s_v'$, while team A has at most cash the $\frac{\omega}{2}$ winners of the first block $4|\frac{\omega}{2}$ of $s_u$. Consequently, the balance trick takes a value smaller than $-2\omega$ and team B wins accordingly to Lemma 3. In particular, team A cannot ensure winning. Thus, team A has to use the 6 first tempi to play in $s_v$. At this point, team B threatens to enter in $C(v')$ while team A cannot yet enter $A(v')$. That forces team A to play again in $v$. Then, team B enters $C(v')$ immediately followed by team A cashing $\frac{5\omega}{2}$ tricks (the trick balance is now 0) and entering $A(v')$. According to Lemma 4, team A has to play solely in $A(v)$ until emptying this gadget.

In the end, the balance is $-\omega$, the lead is in $h_2$ and the only remaining cards in $h_1$ in the color $s_u$ are $\frac{3\omega}{2}$ winners. So the trick balance is virtually $\frac{\omega}{2}$ and we reach a $A$-clean position winning for team A.

Lemma 8. Let $P$ a $A$-clean position with starting suit $s_v'$. Assume team A can ensure winning with optimal play from $P$. Then there exists a suit $s_v$ such that $v \in N(v')$ and such that if team B only leads from suit $s_v'$ and team A only leads from $s_v$ until $s_v$ is empty, then we reach a $B$-clean position $P'$ with $s_v$ as the starting suit. Moreover, team A can ensure winning with optimal play from $P'$.

Lemma 9. Let $G$ be an $GG$ instance, and consider the corresponding $B(L_3, \omega)$ instance $B$. If team A can win in $B$, then the second player in $G$ does not have a winning strategy.

Proof. Let $\sigma$ a strategy for the second player in $G$ and let us show that $\sigma$ is not winning. Assume team $B$ plays according to $\sigma$ in the $B$ instance. Team $A$ can answer by keeping simulating $GG$ and still ensure winning (Lemma 7 and 8), thereby generating a strategy in $GG$. Since there are only finitely many suits to be emptied, we will reach an $B$-clean position with starting suit $s_v$, and without any suit $s_v'$ such that $v' \in N(v)$. This shows that the corresponding $GG$ situation is lost and that $\sigma$ is not a winning strategy.

Lemma 10. Let $G$ be an $GG$ instance, and consider the corresponding $B(L_3, \omega)$ instance $B$. If team B can win in $B$, then the first player in $G$ does not have a winning strategy.

Proof. Similar proof with the dual to Lemmas 7 and 8.

These two propositions lead us to our main result.

Theorem 2. The $B(L_3, \omega)$ fragment is PSPACE-hard.
Finding a PSPACE-hardness proof necessitating only 2 hands is very appealing. Another interesting problem is to find a hardness proof with a bounded number of suits. These two new open problems along with Wästlund’s tractability perspective in Figure 9 which displays the complexity landscape for noteworthy fragments of $B(L, s, l)$.

Many actual trick taking card games also feature a trump suit and potentially different values for tricks based on which cards were involved. Such a setting can be seen as a direct generalization of ours, but remains bounded. Therefore our PSPACE-completeness results carry over to point-based trick taking card games involving trumps.
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