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#### Abstract

Regular games form a well-established class of games for analysis and synthesis of reactive systems. They include coloured Muller games, McNaughton games, Muller games, Rabin games, and Streett games. These games are played on directed graphs $\mathcal{G}$ where Player 0 and Player 1 play by generating an infinite path $\rho$ through the graph. The winner is determined by specifications put on the set $X$ of vertices in $\rho$ that occur infinitely often. These games are determined, enabling the partitioning of $\mathcal{G}$ into two sets $W_{0}$ and $W_{1}$ of winning positions for Player 0 and Player 1, respectively. Numerous algorithms exist that decide specific instances of regular games, e.g., Muller games, by computing $W_{0}$ and $W_{1}$. In this paper we aim to find general principles for designing uniform algorithms that decide all regular games. For this we utilise various recursive and dynamic programming algorithms that leverage standard notions such as subgames and traps. Importantly, we show that our techniques improve or match the performances of existing algorithms for many instances of regular games.
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1. Introduction. In the area of verification of reactive systems, studying games played on finite graphs is a key research topic [12]. The recent work [11] serves as an excellent reference for the state-of-the-art in this area. Interest in these games arises from their role in modeling and verifying reactive systems as games on graphs. Coloured Muller games, Rabin games, Streett games, Muller games, and McNaughton games constitute well-established classes of games for verification. These games are played on finite bipartite graphs $\mathcal{G}$ between Player 0 (the controller) and Player 1 (the adversary, e.g., the environment). Player 0 and Player 1 play the game by producing an infinite path $\rho$ in $\mathcal{G}$. Then the winner of this play is determined by conditions put on $\operatorname{Inf}(\rho)$ the set of all vertices in the path that appear infinitely often. Studying the algorithmic content of determinacy results for these games is at the core of the area.

Next we provide some basic definitions used in the study of regular games. After that we discuss known algorithms and compare them with our findings.
1.1. Arenas, regular games, subarenas, and traps. All games that we listed above are played in arenas:

Definition 1.1. An arena $\mathcal{A}$ is a bipartite directed graph $\left(V_{0}, V_{1}, E\right)$, where 1. $V_{0} \cap V_{1}=\emptyset$, and $V=V_{0} \cup V_{1}$ is the set of nodes, also called positions.
2. $E \subseteq V_{0} \times V_{1} \cup V_{1} \times V_{0}$ is the edge set where each node has an outgoing edge.
3. $V_{0}$ and $V_{1}$ are sets of positions for Player 0 and Player 1, respectively.

Players play the game in a given arena $\mathcal{A}$ by taking turns and moving a token along the edges of the arena. Initially, the token is placed on a node $v_{0} \in V$. If $v_{0} \in V_{0}$, then Player 0 moves first. If $v_{0} \in V_{1}$, then Player 1 moves first. In each round of play, if the token is positioned on a Player $\sigma$ 's position $v$, then Player $\sigma$ chooses $u \in E(v)$, moves the token to $u$ along the edge $(v, u)$, and the play continues on to the next round. Note that condition 2 on the arena guarantees that the players can always make a move at any round of the play.

[^0]Definition 1.2. A play, in a given arena $\mathcal{A}$, starting at $v_{0}$, is an infinite sequence $\rho=v_{0}, v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots$ such that $v_{i+1} \in E\left(v_{i}\right)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Given a play $\rho=v_{0}, v_{1}, \ldots$, the set $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho)=\left\{v \in V \mid \exists^{\omega} i\left(v_{i}=v\right)\right\}$ is called the infinity set of $\rho$. The winner of this play is determined by a condition put on $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho)$. We list several of these conditions that are well-established in the area.

Definition 1.3. The following games played on a given arena $\mathcal{A}=\left(V_{0}, V_{1}, E\right)$ will be called regular games:

1. A coloured Muller game is $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, c,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)$, where $c: V \rightarrow C$ is a mapping from $V$ into the set $C$ of colors, $\mathcal{F}_{0} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1}=2^{C}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{0} \cap \mathcal{F}_{1}=\emptyset$. The sets $\mathcal{F}_{0}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{1}$ are called winning conditions. Player $\sigma$ wins the play $\rho$ if $c(\operatorname{lnf}(\rho)) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$, where $\sigma=0,1$.
2. A McNaughton game is the tuple $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, W,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)$, where $W \subseteq V$, $\mathcal{F}_{0} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1}=2^{W}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{0} \cap \mathcal{F}_{1}=\emptyset$. Player $\sigma$ wins the play $\rho$ if $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho) \cap W \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$.
3. A Muller game is the tuple $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)$, where $\mathcal{F}_{0} \cup \mathcal{F}_{1}=2^{V}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{0} \cap \mathcal{F}_{1}=\emptyset$. Player $\sigma$ wins the play $\rho$ if $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$.
4. A Rabin game is the tuple $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(U_{1}, V_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(U_{k}, V_{k}\right)\right)$, where $U_{i}, V_{i} \subseteq V$, $\left(U_{i}, V_{i}\right)$ is a winning pair, and $k \geq 0$ is the index. Player 0 wins the play $\rho$ if there is a pair $\left(U_{i}, V_{i}\right)$ such that $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho) \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset$ and $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho) \cap V_{i}=\emptyset$. Else, Player 1 wins.
5. A Streett game is the tuple $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(U_{1}, V_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(U_{k}, V_{k}\right)\right)$, where $U_{i}$, $V_{i}$ are as in Rabin game. Player 0 wins the play $\rho$ if for all $i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$ if $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho) \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset$ then $\operatorname{Inf}(\rho) \cap V_{i} \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise, Player 1 wins.
6. $A$ KL game is the tuple $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(u_{1}, S_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(u_{t}, S_{t}\right)\right)$, where $u_{i} \in V, S_{i} \subseteq$ $V$, $\left(u_{i}, S_{i}\right)$ is a winning pair, and the index $t \geq 0$ is an integer. Player 0 wins the play $\rho$ if there is a pair $\left(u_{i}, S_{i}\right)$ such that $u_{i} \in \operatorname{lnf}(\rho)$ and $\operatorname{lnf}(\rho) \subseteq S_{i}$. Else, Player 1 wins.
Note that the first three games are symmetric. Rabin games can be considered as dual to Streett games. The first five winning conditions are well-established conditions. The last condition is new. The motivation behind this new winning condition lies in the transformation of Rabin and Streett games into Muller games via the KL winning condition. In a precise sense, as will be seen in Section 4.5 via Lemma 4.12, the KL condition serves as a compressed Rabin winning condition. The games that we defined have natural parameters:

Definition 1.4. The sequence $|C|, k,|W|, t$ is the list of parameters for colored Muller games, Rabin and Streett games, McNaughton games, and KL games, respectively.

Since the parameters $|W|$ and $|C|$ range in the interval $[0,|V|]$, we can call them small parameters. The parameters $k$ and $t$ range in $\left[0,4^{|V|}\right]$ and $\left[0,2^{|V|} \cdot|V|\right]$, respectively. Hence, we call them (potentially) large parameters.

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an arena. A pseudo-arena of $\mathcal{A}$ determined by $X$ is the tuple $\mathcal{A}(X)=\left(X_{0}, X_{1}, E_{X}\right)$ where $X_{0}=V_{0} \cap X, X_{1}=V_{1} \cap X, E_{X}=E \cap(X \times X)$. If this pseudo-arena is an arena, then we call it the subarena determined by $X$.

The opponent of Player $\sigma$, where $\sigma \in\{0,1\}$, is denoted by Player $\bar{\sigma}$. Traps are subarenas in games where one of the players has no choice but stay:

Definition 1.6 ( $\sigma$-trap). A subarena $\mathcal{A}(X)$ is a $\sigma$-trap for Player $\sigma$ if each of the following two conditions are satisfied: (1) For all $x \in X_{\bar{\sigma}}$ there is a $y \in X_{\sigma}$ such that $(x, y) \in E$. (2) For all $x \in X_{\sigma}$ it is the case that $E(x) \subseteq X$.

If $\mathcal{A}(X)$ is a $\sigma$-trap, then Player $\bar{\sigma}$ can stay in $\mathcal{A}(X)$ forever if the player wishes to do so.

Let $T$ be a subset of the arena $\mathcal{A}=\left(V_{0}, V_{1}, E\right)$. The attractor of Player $\sigma$ to the set $T \subseteq V$, denoted $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}(T, \mathcal{A})$, is the set of positions from where Player $\sigma$ can force the plays into $T$. The attractor $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}(T, \mathcal{A})$ is computed as follows:

$$
\begin{gathered}
W_{0}=T, \quad W_{i+1}=W_{i} \cup\left\{u \in V_{\sigma} \mid E(u) \cap W_{i} \neq \emptyset\right\} \cup\left\{u \in V_{\bar{\sigma}} \mid E(u) \subseteq W_{i}\right\}, \\
\text { and then set } \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}(T, \mathcal{A})=\bigcup_{i \geq 0} W_{i} .
\end{gathered}
$$

The set $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}(T, \mathcal{A})$ can be computed in $O(|E|)$. We call $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}$ the attractor operator. Note that the set $V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}(T, \mathcal{A})$, the complement of the $\sigma$-attractor of $T$, is a $\sigma$-trap for all $T$. This set is the emptyset if and only if $V=\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}(T, \mathcal{A})$.

A strategy for Player $\sigma$ is a function that receives as input initial segments of plays $v_{0}, v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}$ where $v_{k} \in V_{\sigma}$ and outputs some $v_{k+1}$ such that $v_{k+1} \in E\left(v_{k}\right)$. An important class of strategies are finite state strategies. R. McNaughton in [19] proved that the winner in McNaughton games has a finite state winning strategy. W. Zielonka proves that the winners of regular games have finite state winning strategies [23]. S. Dziembowski, M. Jurdzinski, and I. Walukiewicz in [6] investigate the memory needed for the winners of coloured Muller games. They show that the memory $|V|$ ! is a sharp bound for finite state winning strategies.

In the study of games, the focus is placed on solving them. Solving a given regular game entails two key objectives. First, one aims to devise an algorithm that, when provided with a regular game $\mathcal{G}$, partitions the set $V$ into two sets $W i n_{0}$ and $W i n_{1}$ such that $v \in W i n_{\sigma}$ if and only if Player $\sigma$ wins the game starting at $v$, where $\sigma \in\{0,1\}$. This is called the decision problem where one wants to find out the winner of the game. Second, one would like to design an algorithm that, given a regular game, extracts a winning strategy for the victorious player. This is known as the synthesis problem.

Traditionally, research on regular games specifically selects an instance of regular games, e.g., Muller games, Rabin games or Streett games, and studies the decision and synthesis problems for these instances. This paper however, instead of focusing on instances of regular games, aims at finding uniform algorithms and general principles for deciding all regular games. Importantly, we show that our techniques based on general principles improve or match the performances of existing decision algorithms for many instances of regular games.
1.2. Our contributions in light of known algorithms. We provide two types of algorithms for deciding regular games. The first type are recursion based, and the second type are dynamic programming based. Recursive algorithms have been exploited in the area significantly. To the best of our knowledge, dynamic programming techniques have not been much used in the area. We utilise these techniques and improve known algorithms for deciding all regular games defined above.

The performances of algorithms for regular games $\mathcal{G}$ can be measured in two ways in terms of input sizes. One is when the input sizes are defined as $|V|+|E|$. The other is when the games $\mathcal{G}$ are presented explicitely that consists of listing $V, E$, and the corresponding winning conditions. In these explicit representations the sizes of Muller, McNaughton, and coloured Muller games are bounded by $|V|+|E|+2^{|V|} \cdot|V|$. The sizes of Rabin and Streett games are bounded by $|V|+|E|+4^{|V|} \cdot|V|$. The sizes of the KL games are bounded by $|V|+|E|+2^{|V|} \cdot|V|^{2}$. We use the notation $|\mathcal{G}|$ for these representations of games $\mathcal{G}$. These two ways of representing inputs, together with the small parameters $|C|$ and $|W|$ and potentially large parameters $k$ and $t$, should be taken into account in our discussion below.

1: Coloured Muller games. The folklore algorithms that decide coloured Muller games use induction on cardinality of the color set $C$ [11]. These algorithms are recursive and run in time $O\left(|C||E|(|C||V|)^{|C|-1}\right)$ and space $O(|\mathcal{G}|+|C||V|)$. Using the breakthrough quasi-polynomial time algorithm for parity games, C. Calude, S. Jain, B. Khoussainov, W. Li, and F. Stephan improve all the known algorithms for coloured Muller games with the running time $O\left(|C|^{5|C|} \cdot|V|^{5}\right)$ and space $O\left((|C|!|V|)^{O(1)}\right)$ [2]. Björklund et al. in [1] showed that under the ETH it is impossible to decide coloured Muller games in time $O\left(2^{o(|C|)} \cdot|V|^{a}\right)$ for any $a>0$. C. Calude, S. Jain, B. Khoussainov, W. Li, and F. Stephan in [2] improved this by showing that under the ETH it is impossible to decide coloured Muller games in $2^{o(|C| \cdot \log (|C|))}$ Poly $(|V|)$. Their proof, however, implies that this impossibility result holds when $|C| \leq \sqrt{|V|}$. The table below now compares these results with our algorithms.

| Best known (running time, space) | Our algorithm (s) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\left(O\left(\|C\|^{5\|C\|} \cdot\|V\|^{5}\right), O\left((\|C\|!\|V\|)^{O(1)}\right)\right)$ | $\left(O\left(2^{\|V\|}\|C\|\|E\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+2^{\|V\|}\|V\|\right)\right)$ |
| $[2]$ | Theorem 4.1(DP) |
| $\left(O\left(\|C\|\|E\|(\|C\|\|V\|)^{\|C\|-1}\right), O(\|\mathcal{G}\|+\|C\|\|V\|)\right)$ | $\left(O\left(2^{\|V\|}\|V\|\|E\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+2^{\|V\|}\right)\right)$ |
| folklore, e.g., see[11] | Theorem 4.5 (DP) |
|  | $\left(O\left(\|C\|!\binom{\|V\|}{\|C\|}\|V\|\|E\|\right), O(\|\mathcal{G}\|+\|C\|\|V\|)\right)$ |
| Theorem 3.2 (recursion) |  |

The algorithms from Theorems 4.1 and 4.5 are dynamic programming (DP) algorithms. One can verify that if $|V| / \log \log (n) \leq|C|$, for instance $|V| / a<C$ where $a>1$, then:

1. Running times of both of these algorithms are better than $O\left(|C|^{5|C|} \cdot|V|^{5}\right)$,
2. Moreover, when the value of $|C|$ are in the range of $|V| / \log \log (n) \leq|C|$, then these running times are in $2^{o(|C| \cdot \log (|C|))} \operatorname{Poly}(|V|)$. This refines and strengthens the impossibility result that under the ETH no algorithm exists that decides coloured Muller games in $2^{o(|C| \cdot \log (|C|))} \operatorname{Poly}(|V|)$ [2].
3. The spaces of both of these algorithms are also better than $O\left((|C|!|V|)^{O(1)}\right)$.
4. All of the previously known algorithms have superexponential running times. Our algorithms run in exponential time.
For small parameters such as $|C| \leq \log (|V|)$, the algorithms from [2] and [11] outperform our algorithms. Note, however, that the condition $|V| / \log \log (n) \leq|C|$, as stated in our second observation above, is reasonable and practically feasible. For instance, our algorithms are better for any value of $|C|$ with $C \geq|V| / a$, where $a>1$. Also, the running times of our algorithms are exponential thus matching the bound of the impossibility result of Björklund et al. mentioned above.

Our recursive algorithm from Theorem 3.2 is a recast of standard recursive algorithms. However, as shown in the table, our careful running time analysis implies that our recursive algorithms has a better running time and it matches the space bounds of the previously known recursive algorithms.

2: Rabin and Streett games. E. A. Emerson and C. S. Jutla show that the problem of deciding Rabin games is NP complete [7, 9]. Hence, deciding Streett games is co-NP complete. Horn's algorithm for deciding Rabin games has the running time $O\left(k!|V|^{2 k}\right)[13]$. N. Piterman and A. Pnuelli show that Rabin and Streett games can be decided in time $O\left(|E||V|^{k+1} k k!\right)$ and space $O(n k)$ [22]. The work of N. Piterman and A. Pnuelli remained state-of-the-art for Rabin games until the quasi-polynomial breakthrough for parity games by C. Calude, S. Jain, B. Khoussainov, W. Li, and F.

Stephan [2]. They gave a FPT algorithm for Rabin games on $k$ colors by converting it to a parity game and using the quasi-polynomial algorithm. A Rabin game with $n$ vertices, $m$ edges and $k$ colors, can be reduced to a parity game with $N=n k^{2} k$ ! vertices, $M=n k^{2} k!m$ edges and $K=2 k+1$ colors [8] (We will use these values of $N, M$, and $K$ below). By combining the reduction from Rabin to parity games and the state-of-the-art algorithms for parity games [4, 5, 10, 16] in a "space-efficient" manner, see for instance Jurdziński and Lazić [16], one can solve Rabin games in time $O\left(\max \left\{M N^{2.38}, 2^{O(K \log K)}\right\}\right)$, but in exponential space. On substitution of the values of $M$ and $N$, the algorithm of Jurdziński and Lazić would take time at least proportional to $m\left(n k^{2} k!\right)^{3.38}$. However, observe that the parity game obtained from a Rabin game is such that the number of vertices $N$ is much larger than the number of colors $K$. This results in $K \in o(\log (N))$. For cases where the number of vertices of the resulting parity game is much larger than the number of priorities, say the number of colors $(2 k+1)$ is $o(\log (N))$, Jurdziński and Lazić also give an analysis of their algorithm that would solve Rabin games in time $O\left(n m k!^{2+o(1)}\right)$. Closely matching this are the run times in the work of Fearnley et al. [10] who provides, among other bounds, a quasi-bi-linear bound of $O\left(M N \mathfrak{a}(N)^{\log \log N}\right)$, where $\mathfrak{a}$ is the inverse-Ackermann function. In either case above, this best-known algorithm has at least a $(k!)^{2+o(1)}$ dependence in its run time, and takes the space proportional to $\left(n k^{2} k!\right) \log \left(n k^{2} k!\right)$; this has a $k!$ dependence again. R. Majumdar et al. in [18] recently provided an algorithm that decides Rabin games in $\tilde{O}\left(|E \| V|(k!)^{1+o(1)}\right)$ time and $O(|V| k \log k \log |V|)$ space. This breaks through the $2+o(1)$ barrier. A. Casares et al. have shown in [3] that under the ETH it is impossible to decide Rabin games in $2^{o(k \log k)} \operatorname{Poly}(|V|)$. Just like for coloured Muller games, this impossibility result holds true when $k \leq \sqrt{|V|}$. The next table compares these results with our findings.

| Best known (running time, space) | Our algorithm (s) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\left(O\left(\|E\|\|V\|^{k+1} k k!\right), O(\|\mathcal{G}\|+k\|V\|)\right)$ | $\left(O\left(\left(k\|V\|+2^{\|V\|}\|E\|\right)\|V\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+2^{\|V\|}\|V\|\right)\right)$ |
| $[22]$ | Theorem 4.14(DP) |
| $\left(\tilde{O}\left(\|E\|\|V\|(k!)^{1+o(1)}\right), O(\|\mathcal{G}\|+k\|V\| \log k \log \|V\|)\right)$ | $\left(O(\|V\|!\|V\|(\|E\|+k\|V\|)), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+\|V\|^{2}\right)\right)$ |
| $[18]$ | Theorem 3.4 (recursion) |

We single out four key parts of both of our algorithms:

1. In terms of time, both our dynamic and recursive algorithms outperform the known algorithms when the parameter $k$ ranges in $\left[|V|, 4^{|V|}\right]$. In particular, when $k$ is polynomial on $|V|$ (which is a practical consideration), then our algorithms have better running times.
2. Just as for coloured Muller games we refine the impossibility result of A. Casares et al. under the assumption of the ETH [3]. Namely, when the parameter $k \geq|V| \log |V|$, both of our algorithms run in $2^{o(k \log k)} \operatorname{Poly}(|V|)$. We consider the condition $k \geq|V| \log |V|$ as reasonable and practically feasible.
3. Our DP algorithm from Theorem 4.14 is the first exponential time algorithm that decides Rabin games. The previously known algorithms run in superexponential times.
4. When $k$ falls into the range $\left[|V|, 4^{|V|}\right]$, then the recursive algorithm from Theorem 3.4 performs the best in terms of space against other algorithms.
When the values of $k$ fall within the range $\left[2^{|V|}, 4^{|V|}\right]$, our dynamic algorithm from Theorem 4.14 outperforms other algorithms both in terms of space and time.

If Player 0 wins Rabin games, then the player has a memoryless winning strategy [9]. Hence, one might suggest the following way of finding the winner. Enumerate all
memoryless strategies and select the winning one. Even when the arena is a sparse graph, e.g., positions have a fixed bounded out-degree, this process does not lead to exponential running time as the opponent might have a winning strategy with a large memory.
3: Muller games. Nerode, Remmel, and Yakhnis were the first who designed a competitive algorithm that decides Muller games [21]. The running time of their algorithm is $O(|V|!\cdot|V||E|)$. W. Zielonka [23] examines Muller games through Zielonka trees. The size of Zielonka tree is $O\left(2^{|V|}\right)$ in the worst case. S. Dziembowski, M. Jurdzinski, and I. Walukiewicz in [6] show that deciding Muller games with Zielonka trees as part of the input is in NP $\cap$ co-NP. D. Neider, R. Rabinovich, and M. Zimmermann reduce Muller games to safety games with $O\left((|V|!)^{3}\right)$ vertices; safety games can be solved in linear time [20]. F. Horn in [14] provides the first polynomial time decision algorithm for explicitly given Muller games with running time $O(|V|$. $\left.\left|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right| \cdot\left(|V|+\left|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right|\right)^{2}\right)$. F. Horn's correctness proof has a non-trivial flaw. B. Khoussainov, Z. Liang, and M. Xiao in [17] provide a correct proof of Horn's algorithm through new methods and improve the running time to $O\left(\left|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right| \cdot\left(|V|+\left|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right|\right) \cdot\left|V_{0}\right| \log \left|V_{0}\right|\right)$. All the known algorithms that we listed above are either recursive algorithms or reductions to other known classes of games. Our algorithm is a dynamic programming algorithm, and to the best of our knowledge, the first dynamic algorithm that solves Muller games. The table below compares the best of these results for Muller games, in terms of time and space, with our algorithm from this paper:

| Best known (running time, space) | Our algorithm |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\left(O\left(\left\|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right\| \cdot\left(\|V\|+\left\|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right\|\right) \cdot\left\|V_{0}\right\| \log \left\|V_{0}\right\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+\left\|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right\|\left(\|V\|+\left\|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right\|\right)\right)\right)$ | $\left(O\left(2^{\|V\|}\|V\|\|E\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+2^{\|V\|}\right)\right)$ |
| $[17]$ | Theorem 4.6 (DP) |

One can see that the algorithm from [17], in terms of running time and space, is better than our algorithm when $\left|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right| \leq \sqrt{2^{|V|}}$. However, our algorithm becomes competitive (or better) than the algorithm in [17] when $\left|\mathcal{F}_{0}\right|>\sqrt{2^{|V|}}$. Also, note that by running our algorithm and the algorithm in [17] in parallel, we get the best performing polynomial time algorithm that solves explicitly given Muller games.
4: McNaughton games. R. McNaughton [19] provided the first algorithm that decides McNaughton games in time $O\left(a^{|W|} \cdot|W|!\cdot|V|^{3}\right)$, for a constant $a>1$. Nerode, Remmel, and Yakhnis in [21] improved the bound to $O(|W|!|W||E|)$. A. Dawar and P. Hunter proved that deciding McNaughton games is a PSPACE-complete problem [15]. The table below compares our algorithms with currently the best algorithm that runs in time $O(|W|!|W||E|)$ :

| Best known (running time, space) | Our algorithm (s) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(O(\|W\|\|E\|\|W\|!), O(\|\mathcal{G}\|+\operatorname{Poly}(\|V\|)))$ | $\left(O\left(2^{\|V\|}\|W\|\|E\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+2^{\|V\|}\|V\|\right)\right)$ |
| $[21]$ | Theorem 4.7 (DP) |
|  | $\left(O\left(2^{\|V\|}\|V\|\|E\|\right), O\left(\|\mathcal{G}\|+2^{\|V\|}\right)\right)$ |
|  | Theorem 4.7 (DP) |

It is not too hard to see that when the value of the parameter $|W|$ exceeds $|V| / \log \log (n)$, then our algorithm has asymptotically better running time. In particular, when $|W|$ is greater than any constant fraction of $|V|$, that is, $|W| \geq|V| / a$ where $a>1$, then our algorithm outperforms the bound in [21].

In addition to all of the above, we make the following three comments: (1) Running any of the previously known algorithms for any of the instances of regular games in parallel with any of our appropriately chosen algorithms yields an improved run-
ning upper bound; (2) Exponential (on $|V|$ ) bounds are unavoidable due to the ETH considerations (as we explained above). In fact, the sizes of the games $\mathcal{G}$ can be exponential on $|V| ;(3)$ Even though our algorithms provide competitive running times, their possible limitations are in the use of large spaces and the lack of clear dependence on the parameters. However, when the inputs have exponential size, then our algorithms require linear space on the sizes of the inputs.
2. The notion of full win and characterization of winning regions. In this section we develop a few concepts and techniques used throughout the paper. We first define the notion of full win. This will be used in designing dynamic programming algorithms for deciding regular games. Then we provide Lemma 2.2 that characterizes winning regions. This lemma is used for designing recursive algorithms for solving regular games. The last result of this section is Lemma 2.4. We call the lemma trichotomy lemma as it characterises three cases: (1) Player 0 fully wins the game, (2) Player 1 fully wins the game, and (3) none of the players fully wins the game. This lemma will be the basis of our dynamic algorithms.

Definition 2.1. If $\operatorname{Win}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G})=V$, then player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$. Else, the player does not fully win $\mathcal{G}$. If $\operatorname{Win}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}) \neq V$ and $\operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\mathcal{G}) \neq V$, then no player fully wins $\mathcal{G}$.

We now provide two lemmas that characterize winning regions in coloured Muller games. Later we algorithmically implement the lemmas and analyse them. We start with the first lemma. The statement of the lemma and its equivalent forms have been known and used in various forms [19] [11]. Later we will utilise the lemma in our recursive algorithms through their detailed exposition and analysis.

Lemma 2.2. Let $\sigma \in\{0,1\}$ such that $c(V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$. Then we have the following:

1. If for all $c^{\prime} \in c(V), \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)=V$ or Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}(V \backslash$ $\left.\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$, then Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$.
2. Otherwise, let $c^{\prime}$ be a color in $C$ such that $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right) \neq V$ and Player $\sigma$ doesn't fully win $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$. Then we have $\operatorname{Win}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G})=$ $\operatorname{Win}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash X))$, where $X=\operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right.$.

Proof. For the first part of the lemma, assume that for all $c^{\prime} \in c(V), V=$ $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)$ or Player $\sigma$ fully wins the game $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$. We construct the following winning strategy for Player $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{G}$. Let $c(V)=\left\{c_{0}, \ldots, c_{k-1}\right\}$ and $i$ initially be 0 .

- If the token is in $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c_{i}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)$, then Player $\sigma$ forces the token to a vertex in $c^{-1}\left(c_{i}\right)$ and once the token arrives at the vertex, sets $i=i+1 \bmod k$.
- Otherwise, Player $\sigma$ uses a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c_{i}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$.

Consider any play consistent with the strategy described. If there is an $i$ such that the token finally stays in $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c_{i}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right.$ ), then Player $\sigma$ wins the game. Otherwise, we have $c(\operatorname{lnf}(\rho))=c(V)$. Since $c(V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$, Player $\sigma$ wins. This implies that Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$.

For the second part, let $c^{\prime} \in C$ such that $\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right) \neq V$ and Player $\sigma$ doesn't fully win $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$. Let $V^{\prime}=\operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)\right)$. Consider $X=\operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(V^{\prime}, \mathcal{A}\right)$ as defined in the statement of the lemma. Note that $\mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)$ is a $\sigma$-trap in $\mathcal{A}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right.$ ); furthermore, $\mathcal{A}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$ is a $\sigma$-trap in $\mathcal{A}$. This implies that $\mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)$ is a $\sigma$-trap in $\mathcal{A}$. Now we want to construct a winning strategy for Player $\bar{\sigma}$ in the arena $\mathcal{A}$ when the token is placed on $v \in$ $X \cup \operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash X))$. The winning strategy for Player $\bar{\sigma}$ in this case is the following:

- If $v \in X$, Player $\bar{\sigma}$ wins by forcing the token into $V^{\prime}$ and following the winning
strategy in $\sigma$-trap $\mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)$.
- If $v \in \operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash X))$, Player $\bar{\sigma}$ follows a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}\left(\operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash\right.$ $X)$ )) until Player $\sigma$ moves the token into $X$.
Note that $\mathcal{A}\left(\right.$ Win $_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash X))$ ) is a $\bar{\sigma}$-trap in $\mathcal{A}(V \backslash X)$ and $\mathcal{A}(V \backslash X)$ is a $\bar{\sigma}$-trap in $\mathcal{A}$. Hence, the set $\mathcal{A}\left(\operatorname{Win}_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash X))\right)$ is a $\bar{\sigma}$-trap in $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, $W_{i n_{\sigma}}(\mathcal{G})=$ Win $_{\sigma}(\mathcal{G}(V \backslash X))$.
As an immediate corollary we get the following lemma for Player $\sigma$.
Lemma 2.3. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a coloured Muller game and let $\sigma \in\{0,1\}$ be such that $c(V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$. Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$ If and only if for all $c^{\prime} \in c(V), \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)=$ $V$ or Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$.

Now we provide the next lemma that we call Trichotomy lemma. We will use this lemma in our dynamic programming based algorithms.

Lemma 2.4 (Trichotomy Lemma). Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a coloured Muller game and let $\sigma \in\{0,1\}$ be such that $c(V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$. Then we have the following two cases:

1. If for all $c^{\prime} \in c(V), \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)=V$ or Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}(V \backslash$ $\left.\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\right)\right)$, then Player $\sigma$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$.
2. Otherwise, if for all $v \in V, \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\{v\}, \mathcal{A})=V$ or Player $\bar{\sigma}$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}(V \backslash$ $\left.\operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\{v\}, \mathcal{A})\right)$, then Player $\bar{\sigma}$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$.
3. Otherwise, none of the players fully wins.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, Part 1 is proved. For the remaining parts of the lemma, we are under the assumption that Player $\sigma$ doesn't fully win $\mathcal{G}$. For the second part, if Player $\bar{\sigma}$ fully wins $\mathcal{G}$, then for any $v \in V, \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\{v\}, \mathcal{A})=V$ or Player $\bar{\sigma}$ fully wins the game in $\bar{\sigma}$ - $\operatorname{trap} \mathcal{A}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\{v\}, \mathcal{A})\right)$. Otherwise, for all $v \in \operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\mathcal{G})$, $\operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\{v\}, \mathcal{A}) \neq V$ and Player $\bar{\sigma}$ doesn't fully win $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}(\{v\}, \mathcal{A})\right)$.

Note that Part 2 of the lemma assumes that Player $\sigma$ for which $c(V) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$ does not fully win the game. With this assumption, the second part characterizes the condition when Player $\bar{\sigma}$ fully wins the game; without this assumption, Part 2 does not hold true.
3. Recursive algorithms for deciding regular games. Our goal is to provide recursive algorithms that solve regular games. To do so we utilise Lemma 2.2. Naturally, we first start with a generic recursive algorithm that decides coloured Muller games, see Figure 1. Lemma 2.2 guarantees correctness of the algorithm. Initially, the algorithm memorizes $\mathcal{G}$ globally. Then the function $\operatorname{SolveCMG}\left(V^{\prime}\right)$ is called. The algorithm returns $\left(\operatorname{Win}_{0}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right.$, $\left.\operatorname{Win}_{1}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)$.

```
Global Storage: A coloured Muller game \(\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, c,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)\)
Function: SolveCMG( \(V^{\prime}\) )
Input: A vertex set \(V^{\prime}\) with \(\mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\) is an arena
Output: \(\left(\operatorname{Win}_{0}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right), \operatorname{Win}_{1}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)\)
Let \(\sigma \in\{0,1\}\) such that \(c\left(V^{\prime}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}\);
for \(c^{\prime} \in c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\) do
    \(\left(W_{0}^{\prime}, W_{1}^{\prime}\right) \leftarrow \operatorname{SolveCMG}\left(V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)\)
    if \(W_{\sigma}^{\prime} \neq V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\) then
            \(X^{\sigma} \leftarrow \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(W_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\prime}, \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right) ;\)
            \(\left(W_{0}^{\prime \prime}, W_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \leftarrow \operatorname{SolveCMG}\left(V^{\prime} \backslash X\right)\);
            \(W_{\sigma} \leftarrow W_{\sigma}^{\prime \prime}, W_{\bar{\sigma}} \leftarrow V^{\prime} \backslash W_{\sigma} ;\)
            return \(\left(\stackrel{\sigma}{W}_{0}, W_{1}\right)\)
    end
end
\(W_{\sigma} \leftarrow V^{\prime}, W_{\bar{\sigma}} \leftarrow \emptyset ;\)
return \(\left(W_{0}, W_{1}\right)\)
```

FIG. 1. The recursive algorithm for coloured Muller games

A standard analysis of this algorithm produces running time $O\left(|C|^{|C|} \cdot|V|^{|V|}\right)$, see [11]. Our analysis below improves this by showing that the multiplicative factors $|C|^{|C|}$ and $|V|^{|V|}$ in this estimate can be replaced with $|C|$ ! and $\binom{|V|}{|C|}$, respectively.

Lemma 3.1. During the call of Solve $C M G(V)$, the function SolveCMG is recursively called at most $|C|!\left(\begin{array}{l}\left.\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}V \mid \\ |C|\end{array}\right.\right)|V| \text { times. }\end{array}\right.$

Proof. If $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|=0$, then no SolveCMG function is recursively called. Because
 non-empty sets $V^{\prime \prime} \subseteq V^{\prime}$ and $\sigma \in\{0,1\}, \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(V^{\prime \prime}, \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)=V^{\prime}$; hence, SolveCMG is recursively called $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|$ times. If $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|=1$ then SolveCMG is recursively called for $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|$ times.

Assume that $\left|V^{\prime}\right|>2,\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|>1$, and for all $V^{\prime \prime}$ with $\left|V^{\prime \prime}\right|<\left|V^{\prime}\right|$, during the call of SolveCMG $\left(V^{\prime \prime}\right)$, the function SolveCMG is recursively called at most $\left|c\left(V^{\prime \prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime \prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime \prime}\right)\right|}\left|V^{\prime \prime}\right|$ times. For each $c^{\prime} \in c\left(V^{\prime}\right)$, the set $V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)$ has at most $\left|V^{\prime}\right|-1$ vertices and $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|-1$ colours. For $c^{\prime} \in c\left(V^{\prime}\right)$ with

$$
\operatorname{Win}_{\sigma}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)\right) \neq V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

we have $W_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\prime}=\operatorname{Win}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)\right)$. Let $X=\operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(W_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\prime}, \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Since $\left|W_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\prime}\right| \geq 2$, the set $V^{\prime} \backslash X$ contains at most $\left|V^{\prime}\right|-2$ vertices and $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|$ colours. By hypothesis, during the call of SolveCMG $\left(V^{\prime}\right)$, the function SolveCMG is recursively called at most

$$
\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|+1+\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|\left(\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|-1\right)!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|-1}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|-1}\left(\left|V^{\prime}\right|-1\right)+\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|-2}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left(\left|V^{\prime}\right|-2\right)
$$

times. This value is bounded from above by

$$
\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|+1+\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left(\left|V^{\prime}\right|-1\right)
$$

Now there are 2 cases:

1. $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|=2$ : Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left|V^{\prime}\right|-\left(\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|+1+\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left(\left|V^{\prime}\right|-1\right)\right) \\
= & \left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}-\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|-1 \geq 2!\binom{3}{2}-3=3
\end{aligned}
$$

2. $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|>2$ : Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left|V^{\prime}\right|-\left(\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|+1+\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left(\left|V^{\prime}\right|-1\right)\right) \\
= & \left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}-\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|-1 \geq\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!-\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|-1>0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, during the call of SolveCMG $\left(V^{\prime}\right)$, the function SolveCMG is recursively called at most $\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|!\binom{\left|V^{\prime}\right|}{\left|c\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right|}\left|V^{\prime}\right|$ times. By hypothesis, the proof is done.

Theorem 3.2. There is an algorithm that, given coloured Muller game $\mathcal{G}$ com-


Proof. Consider the algorithm in Figure 1. Apply $\operatorname{SolveCMG}(V)$ to compute $W_{i n_{0}}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\operatorname{Win}_{1}(\mathcal{G})$. The recursive depth of the algorithm is at most $|C|$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is
memorized globally. In each iteration, only $O(|V|)$ space is applied to memorize the vertex set. Therefore, the algorithm takes $O(|\mathcal{G}|+|C||V|)$ space. By Lemma 3.1, the function SolveCMG is recursively called for at most $|C|!\left(\begin{array}{l}\left.\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}|V| \\ |C|\end{array}\right.\right)|V| \text { times. We need to }\end{array}\right.$ estimate the running time in two parts of the algorithm:

- Part 1: The running time within the loop"for $c^{\prime} \in c\left(V^{\prime}\right)$ do". In each enumeration of the color $c^{\prime}$, there is a corresponding recursive call on SolveCMG. Every time when we have $W_{\sigma}^{\prime} \neq V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)$, there is also a corresponding recursive call on SolveCMG. Since the function SolveCMG is recursively called for at most $|C|!\binom{|V|}{|C|}|V|$ times, this part takes $O\left(|C|!\left(\begin{array}{l}\left.\left.\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}V \mid \\ |C|\end{array}\right.\right)|V||E|\right)\end{array}\right.\right.$ time.
- Part 2: The running time outside the loop"for $c^{\prime} \in c\left(V^{\prime}\right) d o$ ". As SolveCMG is recursively called for at most $|C|!\left(\begin{array}{l}\left.\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}|C| \\ |C|\end{array}\right.\right)|V| \text { times, the running time bound }\end{array}\right.$ for this part of the algorithm is also $O\left(\left(|C|!\left(\begin{array}{l}\left.\left.\left.\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}V \mid \\ |C|\end{array}\right.\right)|V|+1\right)|V|\right) \text {. } \text {. } 10 .\end{array}\right.\right.\right.$
Therefore, the algorithm takes $O\left(|C|!\binom{|V|}{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ time. Note that the correctness of the algorithm is provided by Lemma 2.2.
3.1. Application to Rabin and Streett games. Since Muller games are coloured Muller games in which each vertex has its own color, there is also a recursive algorithm for computing winning regions of Muller games. In this case, Lemma 3.1 shows that the function SolveCMG is recursively called at most $|V|!|V|$ times. Hence, Theorem 3.2 implies the next lemma:

Lemma 3.3. There is a recurisve algorithm that, given Muller game $\mathcal{G}$ computes Win $_{0}(\mathcal{G})$ and $W_{i n}^{1}(\mathcal{G})$ in time $O(|V|!|V||E|)$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+|V|^{2}\right)$.

Through this lemma, by transforming Rabin conditions into Muller conditions, we can also provide a recursive algorithm for deciding Rabin games. The algorithm is presented in Figure 2.

```
Global Storage: A Rabin game \(\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(U_{1}, V_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(U_{k}, V_{k}\right)\right)\)
Function: SolveRG( \(V^{\prime}\) )
Input: A vertex set \(V^{\prime}\) with \(\mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\) is an arena
Output: \(\left(\operatorname{Win}_{0}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right), \operatorname{Win}_{1}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)\)
If for all \(i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}\) we have \(V \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset \Longrightarrow V \cap V_{i} \neq \emptyset\) then \(\sigma=1\), otherwise \(\sigma=0\).
for \(v \in V^{\prime}\) do
    \(\left(W_{0}^{\prime}, W_{1}^{\prime}\right) \leftarrow \operatorname{SolveRG}\left(V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(\{v\}, \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\right)\)
    if \(W_{\sigma}^{\prime} \neq V^{\prime} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(\{v\}, \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right)\) then
        \(X \leftarrow \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(W_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\prime}, \mathcal{A}\left(V^{\prime}\right)\right) ;\)
        \(\left(W_{0}^{\prime \prime}, W_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right) \leftarrow\) SolveRG \(\left(V^{\prime} \backslash X\right)\);
        \(W_{\sigma} \leftarrow W_{\sigma}^{\prime \prime}, W_{\bar{\sigma}} \leftarrow V^{\prime} \backslash W_{\sigma} ;\)
        return \(\left(W_{0}, W_{1}\right)\)
    end
end
\(W_{\sigma} \leftarrow V^{\prime}, W_{\bar{\sigma}} \leftarrow \emptyset ;\)
return \(\left(W_{0}, W_{1}\right)\)
```

Fig. 2. The recursive algorithm for Rabin games

Theorem 3.4. We have the following:

1. There exists an algorithm that, given Rabin or Streett game $\mathcal{G}$, computes $W_{i n}(\mathcal{G})$ and $W_{i n}(\mathcal{G})$ in time $O(|V|!|V|(|E|+k|V|))$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+|V|^{2}\right)$.
2. There exists an algorithm that, given $K L$ game $\mathcal{G}$ computes $W_{i n}(\mathcal{G})$ and $W_{i n}(\mathcal{G})$ in time $O(|V|!|V|(|E|+t|V|))$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+|V|^{2}\right)$.
Proof. Consider the algorithm above for Rabin games. We apply SolveRG( $V$ ) to compute $\operatorname{Win}_{0}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\operatorname{Win}_{1}(\mathcal{G})$. Compared with the recursive algorithm of Muller games, the algorithm only changes the computing of $\sigma$. Therefore, the function

SolveRG is recursively called at most $|V|!|V|$ times. Also each computation of $\sigma$ takes $O(|k||V|)$ time. By Lemma 3.3, the algorithm takes time $O(|V|!|V|(|E|+k|V|))$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+|V|^{2}\right)$. For Streett games and KL games, similar arguments are applied.
4. Dynamic programming algorithms for deciding regular games. In this section, we provide dynamic programming algorithms for all regular games. First, in Section 4.1 we provide a dynamic version of the recursive algorithm in Figure 3. Then in Sections 4.2-4.5, the next set of all dynamic algorithms for solving the regular games will utilize Lemma 2.4.

Let $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, c,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)$ be a coloured Muller game where $V=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$. We need to code subsets of $V$ as binary strings. Therefore, we assign a $n$-bit binary number $i$ to each non-empty pseudo-arena $\mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)$ in $\mathcal{G}$ so that $S_{i}=\left\{v_{j} \mid\right.$ the $j$ th bit of $i$ is 1$\}$. We will use this notation for all our algorithms in this section.
4.1. Algorithm 1 for Coloured Muller Games. Consider the algorithm in Figure 3. This is a dynamic programming version of the recursive algorithm in Figure 1. The algorithm, given a coloured Muller game $\mathcal{G}$ as input, returns the collections $W_{i n}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\operatorname{Win}_{1}(\mathcal{G})$. The correctness of the algorithm is guaranteed by Lemma 2.2. Thus, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. There is an algorithm that solves coloured Muller game in time $O\left(2^{|V|}|C||E|\right)$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$.

Proof. We use the Algorithm 1 in Figure 3. Note that we apply the binary trees to maintain $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma} \mathrm{s}, W_{0}$ and $W_{1}$. For each $S_{i}$, the algorithm takes $O(|C||E|)$ time to compute $W_{0}\left(S_{i}\right)$ and $W_{1}\left(S_{i}\right)$. Therefore, this algorithm runs in $O\left(2^{|V|}|C||E|\right)$ time. Since $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma} \mathrm{s}, W_{0}$ and $W_{1}$ are encoded by binary trees, the algorithm takes $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$ space.

```
Input: A coloured Muller game \(\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, c,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)\)
Output: \(\operatorname{Win}_{0}(\mathcal{G}), \operatorname{Win}_{1}(\mathcal{G})\)
\(W_{0} \leftarrow \emptyset, W_{1} \leftarrow \emptyset\);
for \(i=1\) to \(2^{n}-1\) do
    \(S_{i} \leftarrow\left\{v_{j} \mid\right.\) the \(j\) th bit of \(i\) is 1\(\} ;\)
    if \(\mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\) is not an arena then
        break;
    end
    Let \(\sigma \in\{0,1\}\) such that \(c\left(S_{i}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}\);
    \(i s \_w i n=t r u e ;\)
    for \(c^{\prime} \in c\left(S_{i}\right)\) do
            if \(\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right) \neq S_{i}\) and
            \(W_{\sigma}\left(S_{i} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right)\right) \neq S_{i} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right)\) then
                is_win =false;
                \(X \leftarrow \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(W_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\mathcal{G}\left(S_{i} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right)\right)\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right) ;\)
                \(W_{\sigma}\left(S_{i}\right) \leftarrow W_{\sigma}\left(S_{i} \backslash X\right), W_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(S_{i}\right) \leftarrow S_{i} \backslash W_{\sigma}\left(S_{i}\right) ;\)
                break;
            end
    end
    if \(i s_{-}\)win \(=\)true then
        \(W_{\sigma}\left(S_{i}\right) \leftarrow S_{i}, W_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(S_{i}\right) \leftarrow \emptyset ;\)
    end
end
return \(W_{0}(V)\) and \(W_{1}(V)\)
```

Fig. 3. Algorithm 1 for coloured Muller games
4.2. Algorithm 2 for Coloured Muller Games. In this section, we utilise the concept of full win for the players, see Definition 2.1. The new dynamic algorithm, Algorithm 2, is presented in Figure 4. The algorithm takes coloured Muller game
$\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, c,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)$ as input. Lemma 2.4 guarantees correctness of the algorithm. During the running process, this dynamic algorithm partitions all subgames $\mathcal{G}\left(S_{i}\right)$ into the following three collections of subsets of $V$ :

- $P_{0}=\left\{S_{i} \mid i \in\left[1,2^{n}-1\right]\right.$ and Player 0 fully wins $\left.\mathcal{G}\left(S_{i}\right)\right\}$,
- $P_{1}=\left\{S_{i} \mid i \in\left[1,2^{n}-1\right]\right.$ and Player 1 fully wins $\left.\mathcal{G}\left(S_{i}\right)\right\}$, and
- $Q=\left\{S_{i} \mid i \in\left[1,2^{n}-1\right]\right.$ and no player fully wins $\left.\mathcal{G}\left(S_{i}\right)\right\}$.

Now we provide analysis of Algorithm 2 presented in Figure 4.

```
Input: A coloured Muller game \(\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A}, c,\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)\)
Output: The partitioned sets \(P_{0}, P_{1}\) and \(Q\).
\(P_{0} \leftarrow \emptyset, P_{1} \leftarrow \emptyset, Q \leftarrow \emptyset ;\)
for \(i=1\) to \(2^{n}-1\) do
    \(S_{i} \leftarrow\left\{v_{j} \mid\right.\) the \(j\) th bit of \(i\) is 1\(\} ;\)
        if \(\mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\) is not an arena then
            break;
        end
        Let \(\sigma \in\{0,1\}\) such that \(c\left(S_{i}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}\);
        AllAttr \({ }_{0}=\) true, AllAttr \({ }_{1}=\) true;
        for \(c^{\prime} \in c\left(S_{i}\right)\) do
            if \(\operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right) \neq S_{i}\) and \(S_{i} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\sigma}\left(c^{-1}\left(c^{\prime}\right), \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right) \notin P_{\sigma}\) then
                AllAttr \({ }_{\sigma}=\) false;
                break
            end
        end
        if All Attr \(_{\sigma}=\) true then
            \(P_{\sigma} \leftarrow P_{\sigma} \cup\left\{S_{i}\right\} ;\)
        else
            for \(v \in S_{i}\) do
                if \(\operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\{v\}, \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right) \neq S_{i}\) and \(S_{i} \backslash \operatorname{Attr}_{\bar{\sigma}}\left(\{v\}, \mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)\right) \notin P_{\bar{\sigma}}\) then
                        AllAttr \({ }_{\bar{\sigma}}=\) false;
                        break
            end
            if All \(^{\text {Attr }_{\bar{\sigma}}}=\) true then
                    \(P_{\bar{\sigma}} \leftarrow P_{\bar{\sigma}} \cup\left\{S_{i}\right\} ;\)
            else
            \(Q \leftarrow Q \cup\left\{S_{i}\right\} ;\)
        end
        end
end
return \(P_{0}, P_{1}\) and \(Q\)
```

Fig. 4. Algorithm 2 for partitioning subgames of a coloured Muller game

Lemma 4.2. Algorithm 2 computes $P_{0}, P_{1}$ and $Q$ for a coloured Muller game in $O\left(2^{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$ space.

Proof. We use the Algorithm 2 in Figure 4. Note that we apply the binary trees to maintain $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma} \mathrm{s}, P_{0}, P_{1}$ and $Q$. For each $S_{i}$, the algorithm takes $O(|V||E|)$ time to determine the set to add $S_{i}$. Therefore, this algorithm runs in $O\left(2^{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ time. Since $P_{0}, P_{1}$ and $Q$ are encoded by binary trees, the algorithm takes $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$ space.

Lemma 4.3. Let $\mathcal{A}(X)$ and $\mathcal{A}(Y)$ be 1-traps. If Player 0 fully wins $\mathcal{G}(X)$ and $\mathcal{G}(Y)$ then Player 0 fully wins $\mathcal{G}(X \cup Y)$.

Proof. We construct a winning strategy for Player 0 in $\mathcal{G}(X \cup Y)$ as follows. If the token is in $\operatorname{Attr}_{0}(X, \mathcal{A}(X \cup Y))$, Player 0 forces the token into $X$ and once the token arrives at $X$, Player 0 follows the winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}(X)$. Otherwise, Player 0 follows the winning strategy in $\mathcal{G}(Y)$.

Lemma 4.4. If for all $S_{i} \in P_{0}$, the arena $\mathcal{A}\left(S_{i}\right)$ isn't 1-trap in $\mathcal{G}$, then $W_{i n}(\mathcal{G})=$ $\emptyset$ and $\operatorname{Win}_{1}(\mathcal{G})=V$. Otherwise, let $\mathcal{A}\left(S_{\max }\right)$ be the maximal 1-trap in $\mathcal{G}$ so that $S_{\text {max }} \in P_{0}$. Then $\operatorname{Win}_{0}(\mathcal{G})=S_{\text {max }}$ and $\operatorname{Win}_{1}(\mathcal{G})=V \backslash S_{\text {max }}$.

Proof. For the first part of the lemma, assume that $\operatorname{Win}_{0}(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$. Now note that $\mathcal{A}\left(\operatorname{Win}_{0}(\mathcal{G})\right)$ is 1-trap such that Player 0 fully wins $\mathcal{G}\left(\operatorname{Win}_{0}(\mathcal{G})\right)$. This contradicts with the assumption of the first part. For the second part, consider all 1-traps $\mathcal{A}(X)$ with $X \in P_{0}$. Player 0 fully wins the games $\mathcal{G}(X)$ in each of these 1-traps by definition of $P_{0}$. By Lemma 4.3, Player 0 fully wins the union of these 1-traps. Clearly, this union is $S_{\max } \in P_{0}$. Consider $V \backslash S_{\max }$. This set determines a 0-trap. Suppose Player 1 does not win $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash S_{\max }\right)$ fully. Then there exists a 1-trap $\mathcal{A}(Y)$ in game $\mathcal{G}\left(V \backslash S_{\max }\right)$ such that Player 0 fully wins $\mathcal{G}(Y)$. For every Player 1 position in $y \in Y$ and outgoing edge $(y, x)$ we have either $x \in Y$ or $x \in S_{\max }$. This implies $\mathcal{A}\left(S_{\max } \cup Y\right)$ is 1-trap such that Player 0 fully wins $\mathcal{G}\left(S_{\max } \cup Y\right)$. So, $S_{\max } \cup Y$ must be in $P_{0}$. This contradicts with the choice of $S_{\max }$.

By Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, we have proved the following theorem.
THEOREM 4.5. There exists an algorithm that decides the coloured Muller games $\mathcal{G}$ in time $O\left(2^{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$.
4.3. Applications to Muller and McNaughton games. It is not too hard to see that for Muller games and McNaughton games, we can easily recast the algorithms presented in Sections 4.1 and 4.2. Indeed, the transformation of Muller games to coloured Muller games is obvious. Hence, by applying Theorem 4.5 to Muller games we get the following result:

Theorem 4.6. There exists an algorithm that decides Muller game $\mathcal{G}$ in time $O\left(2^{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$.

The transformation of McNaughton games into coloured Muller games is also easy. Each position $v$ in $W$ gets its own color, and all positions outside of $W$ get the same new colour. Hence, we can apply both Theorems 4.1 and 4.5 to McNaughton games:

Theorem 4.7. Each of the following is true:

1. There exists an algorithm that decides McNaughton games $\mathcal{G}$ in $O\left(2^{|V|}|W||E|\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$ space.
2. There exists an algorithm that decides McNaughton games $\mathcal{G}$ in $O\left(2^{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$ space.
4.4. Enumeration Lemma. This is an auxiliary section that will provide us with an enumeration technique. This technique will then be used in designing an algorithm to decide Rabin and Streett games by transforming these games into Muller games in a more efficient manner.

Let $n$ be a natural number and $\mathcal{S}=\left\{b_{1}, \ldots, b_{t}\right\}$ be a set of $n$-bit binary integers, where $n$ is the size of the vertex set $V=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ of the arena. Each $b_{i}$ represents the characteristic function of the set $V_{i} \subseteq V: b_{i}(v)=1$ iff $v \in V_{i}$. We want to efficiently enumerate the collection $2^{V_{1}} \cup \ldots \cup 2^{V_{t}}$. Note that

$$
2^{V_{1}} \cup \ldots \cup 2^{V_{t}}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid \exists b \in \mathcal{S}(x \& b=x)\right\}
$$

where $x$ is the binary integer of length at most $n$, and the operation $\&$ is the bitwise and operation. Later we will use our enumeration of the collection

$$
\mathcal{X}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid \exists b \in \mathcal{S}(x \& b=x)\right\}
$$

to transform the KL condition into Muller condition.

Note that the brute-force algorithm that enumerates the collection $\mathcal{X}=2^{S_{1}} \cup$ $\ldots \cup 2^{S_{t}}$ runs in time $O\left(2^{n} \cdot t\right)$. In our enumeration we want to remove the dependence on $t$ as $t$ can be exponential on $n$. This is done in the next lemma:

Lemma 4.8 (Enumeration Lemma). Given the set $\mathcal{S}=\left\{b_{1}, \ldots, b_{t}\right\}$ of $n$-bit binary integers, we can enumerate the collection $\mathcal{X}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid \exists b \in \mathcal{S}(x \& b=\right.$ $x)\}$ in time $O\left(2^{n} n\right)$ and space $O\left(2^{n}\right)$.

Proof. We apply the function Enumerate $(\mathcal{S}, n)$ shown in Figure 5. Also we apply the binary trees to maintain sets of $n$-bit binary integers such as $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}$.

```
Function: Enumerate \((\mathcal{S}, n)\).
Input: \(\mathcal{S}\) and \(n\) where \(\mathcal{S}\) is a set of \(n\)-bit binary integers.
Output: \(\mathcal{X}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid \exists b \in \mathcal{S}(x \& b=x)\right\}\).
if \(\mathcal{S}=\emptyset\) then
        return \(\emptyset\)
end
if \(n=0\) then
        return \(\{0\}\)
end
\(\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime} \leftarrow \emptyset\)
for \(b \in \mathcal{S}\) do
        if \(b \bmod 2=0\) then
            \(\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime} \cup\left\{\frac{b}{2}\right\}\)
        else
            \(\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime} \cup\left\{\frac{b-1}{\frac{b}{2}}\right\}\)
\(S_{1}^{\prime} \leftarrow S_{1}^{\prime} \cup\left\{\frac{b-1}{2}\right\}\)
            \(\mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime} \cup\left\{\frac{b-1}{2}\right\}\)
        end
end
\(\mathcal{X}_{0}^{\prime} \leftarrow\) Enumerate \(\left(\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime}, n-1\right), \mathcal{X}_{1}^{\prime} \leftarrow \operatorname{Enumerate}\left(\mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime}, n-1\right), \mathcal{X} \leftarrow \emptyset\)
for \(x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{X}_{0}^{\prime}\) do
        \(\mathcal{X} \leftarrow \mathcal{X} \cup\left\{2 x^{\prime}\right\}\)
end
for \(x^{\prime} \in \mathcal{X}_{1}^{\prime}\) do
        \(\mathcal{X} \leftarrow \mathcal{X} \cup\left\{2 x^{\prime}+1\right\}\)
end
return \(\mathcal{X}\)
```

Fig. 5. Algorithm for Enumerate $(\mathcal{S}, n)$

Let $\left(\mathcal{S}_{1}, n_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\mathcal{S}_{k}, n_{k}\right)$ be the sequence of all inputs recursively computed during the execution of Enumerate $(\mathcal{S}, n)$ where $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{k}$ are in non-decreasing order. In the following, we want to show that for each $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)$, Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid\right.$ $\left.\exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$. Not hard to see that $n_{1}=0$ or $\mathcal{S}_{1}=\emptyset$ as otherwise there is a recursion on computing an input with smaller $n$. If $\mathcal{S}_{1}=\emptyset$ then Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{1}, n_{1}\right)=$ $\emptyset=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{1}}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{1}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$, otherwise $n_{1}=0$ and Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{1}, n_{1}\right)=$ $\{0\}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{1}}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{1}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$. Then we consider Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)$ with $i>1$ and assume for all $i^{\prime}<i$, Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i^{\prime}}, n_{i^{\prime}}\right)=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i^{\prime}}}\right) \mid \exists \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i^{\prime}}}(x \& b=\right.$ $x)\}$.

- $\mathcal{S}_{i}=\emptyset$ or $n_{i}=0$ : If $\mathcal{S}_{i}=\emptyset$ then $\operatorname{Enumerate}\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)=\emptyset=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid\right.$ $\left.\exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$, otherwise $n_{i}=0$ and Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)=\{0\}=\{x \in$ $\left.\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$.
- Otherwise: Let $\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime}=\left\{\left.\left\lfloor\frac{b}{2}\right\rfloor \right\rvert\, b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime}=\left\{\left.\frac{b-1}{2} \right\rvert\, b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}\right.$ and $b \bmod 2=$ $1\}$. Then by hypothesis, Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime}, n_{i}-1\right)=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}-1}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime}}(x \& b\right.$ $=x)\}$ and Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime}, n_{i}-1\right)=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}-1}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$. Therefore Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)=\left\{2 x \mid x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}-1}\right)\right.$ and $\left.\exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime}}(x \& b=x)\right\} \cup$ $\left\{2 x+1 \mid x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}-1}\right)\right.$ and $\left.\exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime}}(x \& b=x)\right\}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid x \bmod 2=\right.$ 0 and $\left.\exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=x)\right\} \cup\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid x \bmod 2=1\right.$ and $\exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=$ $x)\}=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$.

Therefore, Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n_{i}}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$. By hypothesis, we show that Enumerate $(\mathcal{S}, n)=\left\{x \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid \exists_{b \in \mathcal{S}}(x \& b=x)\right\}$.

Then we measure the complexity of running Enumerate $(\mathcal{S}, n)$. We partition $\left\{\mathcal{S}_{1}, n_{1}\right\} \ldots\left\{\mathcal{S}_{k}, n_{k}\right\}$ into $P\left(n^{\prime}\right)=\left\{\mathcal{S}_{i} \mid i \in[1, k]\right.$ and $\left.n_{i}=n^{\prime}\right\}$ for $n^{\prime} \in[0, n]$. Then for each $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)$ with $n_{i}>0$, it calls Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}^{\prime}, n^{\prime}\right)$ with $n^{\prime}=n_{i}-1$ at most 2 times. Therefore, for each $n^{\prime} \in[0, n],\left|P\left(n^{\prime}\right)\right| \leq 2^{n-n^{\prime}}$. For each $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right), \mathcal{S}_{i}$ is maintained by a binary tree rooted by $r_{i}$ where the subtrees of $r_{i}$ are $\mathcal{S}_{i, 0}=\left\{\left.\frac{b}{2} \right\rvert\, b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}\right.$ and $b$ $\bmod 2=0\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{i, 1}=\left\{\left.\frac{b-1}{2} \right\rvert\, b \in \mathcal{S}_{i}\right.$ and $\left.b \bmod 2=1\right\}$. Then for each $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)$, $\mathcal{S}_{0}^{\prime}=\mathcal{S}_{i, 0} \cup \mathcal{S}_{i, 1}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{1}^{\prime}=\mathcal{S}_{i, 1}$ are computed in $O\left(2^{n_{i}}\right)$ time through the union of binary trees. Similarly, for each $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right), \mathcal{X}$ is computed in $O\left(2^{n_{i}}\right)$ time. Hence, the time complexity of each iteration Enumerate $\left(\mathcal{S}_{i}, n_{i}\right)$ is bounded by $O\left(2^{n_{i}}\right)$. Since $\sum_{n^{\prime} \in[0, n]} \sum_{\mathcal{S}^{\prime} \in P\left(n^{\prime}\right)} 2^{n^{\prime}}=\sum_{n^{\prime} \in[0, n]} 2^{n-n^{\prime}} \cdot 2^{n^{\prime}}=2^{n} \cdot n$, the time complexity of the algorithm is bounded by $O\left(2^{n} \cdot n\right)$. Since the maximum recursion depth of the algorithm is $n$ and for the recursion at level $i, O\left(2^{i}\right)$ space is applied, the algorithm takes $O\left(2^{n}\right)$ space.
4.5. Applications to Rabin and Streett games. We can naturally transform Rabin games, Streett games, and KL games into Muller games, and then apply our dynamic algorithms from Section 4.3 to thus obtained Muller games. These transformations are the following:

- For Rabin games and $X \subseteq V$, if for $i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$ we have $X \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset \Longrightarrow$ $X \cap V_{i} \neq \emptyset$ then $X \in \mathcal{F}_{1}$, otherwise $X \in \mathcal{F}_{0}$.
- For Streett games and $X \subseteq V$, if there is an $i \in\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $X \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset$ and $X \cap V_{i}=\emptyset$, then $X \in \mathcal{F}_{1}$, otherwise $X \in \mathcal{F}_{0}$.
- For KL games and $X \subseteq V$, if for $i \in\{1, \ldots, t\}$ we have $u_{i} \in X \Longrightarrow X \nsubseteq S_{i}$ then $X \in \mathcal{F}_{1}$, otherwise $X \in \mathcal{F}_{0}$.
In these transformations one needs to be careful with the parameters $k$ and $t$ for Rabin and Streett games and KL games, respectively. They add additional running time costs, especially $k$ and $t$ can have exponential values in $|V|$. For instance, the direct translation of Rabin games to Muller games requires, for each pair ( $U_{i}, V_{i}$ ) in the Rabin winning condition, to build the collection of sets $X$ such that $X \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset$ and $X \cap V_{i}=\emptyset$. The collection of all these sets $X$ form the Muller condition set $\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)$. As the index $k$ is $O\left(2^{2|V|}\right)$, the direct transformation above is expensive. Our goal now is to carefully analyse the transformations of Rabin games to Muller games.

We start with transforming KL games to Muller games. Let $\mathcal{G}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(u_{1}, S_{1}\right)\right.$, $\ldots,\left(u_{t}, S_{t}\right)$ ) be a KL game. Define Muller game $\mathcal{G}^{\prime}$, where $\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)$ are given as follows:
$X \in \mathcal{F}_{0}$ if for some pair $\left(u_{i}, S_{i}\right)$ we have $u_{i} \in X$ and $X \subseteq S_{i}$, otherwise $X \in \mathcal{F}_{1}$
Lemma 4.9. The transformation from $K L$ games $\mathcal{G}$ to Muller games $\mathcal{G}^{\prime}$ takes $O\left(2^{|V|}|V|^{2}\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$ space.

Proof. We apply the binary encoding so that for $i \in[1, t], u_{i} \in[0, n)$ and $S_{i} \in$ $\left[0,2^{n}\right)$. In the following, we apply binary trees to maintain sets of binary integers. We transform $\mathcal{G}$ into Muller game $\mathcal{G}^{\prime}=\left(\mathcal{A},\left(\mathcal{F}_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{1}\right)\right)$ where we also apply the binary encoding so that $\mathcal{F}_{0}=\left\{X \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid\right.$ there exists an $i \in[1, t]$ so that the $u_{i}$-th bit of $X$ is 1 and $\left.X \& S_{i}=X\right\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{1}=\left\{0,1, \ldots, 2^{n}-1\right\} \backslash \mathcal{F}_{0}$. Then let $\mathcal{S}_{i}=\left\{S_{j} \mid\right.$ $j \in[1, t]$ and $\left.u_{j}=i\right\}$ for $i \in[0, n)$. By Lemma 4.8, for each $i \in[0, n)$, we compute $\left\{X \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid \exists_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{i}} X \& S=X\right\}$ in time $O\left(2^{n} \cdot n\right)$ and space $O\left(2^{n}\right)$, and
then compute $\left\{X \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid\right.$ the $i$-th bit of $X$ is 1 and $\left.\exists_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{i}} X \& S=X\right\}$ in time $O\left(2^{n}\right)$ by traversing the binary trees, checking and deleting subtrees at depth $i$. Since $\bigcup_{i \in[0, n)}\left\{X \in\left[0,2^{n}\right) \mid\right.$ the $i$-th bit of $X$ is 1 and $\left.\exists_{S \in \mathcal{S}_{i}} X \& S=X\right\}=\mathcal{F}_{0}$, we reuse $O\left(2^{n}\right)$ space for each $i \in[0, n)$ and use another $O\left(2^{n}\right)$ space to record the prefix union results. Since $\mathcal{F}_{1}$ is computed from $\mathcal{F}_{0}$ in time $O\left(2^{|V|}\right)$ by computing the complement of the tree, this is a transformation from KL games to Muller games and the transformation takes $O\left(2^{|V|}|V|^{2}\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$ space.

As an immediate corollary we get the following complexity-theoretic result for KL games.

Theorem 4.10. There exists an algorithm that, given a $K L$ game $\mathcal{G}$, decides $\mathcal{G}$ in $O\left(2^{|V|}|V||E|\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}\right)$ space.

Now we transform Rabin games $\mathcal{G}$ to Muller games. As we mentioned above, the direct translation to Muller games is costly. Our goal is to avoid this cost through KL games. The following lemma is easy:

Lemma 4.11. Let $X \subseteq V$ and let $\left(U_{i}, V_{i}\right)$ be a winning pair in Rabin game $\mathcal{G}$. Set $Y_{i}=U_{i} \backslash V_{i}$ and $Z_{i}=V \backslash V_{i}$. Then $X \cap U_{i} \neq \emptyset$ and $X \cap V_{i}=\emptyset$ if and only if $X \cap Y_{i} \neq \emptyset$ and $X \subseteq Z_{i}$.

Thus, we can replace the winning condition $\left(U_{1}, V_{1}\right), \ldots\left(U_{k}, V_{k}\right)$ in Rabin games to the equivalent winning condition $\left(Y_{1}, Z_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(Y_{k}, Z_{k}\right)$. We still have Rabin winning condition but we use this new winning condition $\left(Y_{1}, Z_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(Y_{k}, Z_{k}\right)$ to build the desired KL game:

Lemma 4.12. The transformation from Rabin games $\mathcal{G}$ to $K L$ games takes time $O\left(k|V|^{2}\right)$ and space $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$.

Proof. Enumerate all pairs $\left(U_{i}, V_{i}\right)$, compute $Y_{i}=U_{i} \backslash V_{i}, Z_{i}=V \backslash V_{i}$ and add all pairs ( $u_{j}, S_{j}$ ) with $u_{j} \in Y_{i}$ and $S_{j}=Z_{i}$ into KL conditions. By applying binary trees, the transformation takes $O\left(k|V|^{2}\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$ space. This preserves the winning sets $W_{0}$ and $W_{1}$.

Thus, the transformed KL games can be viewed as a compressed version of Rabin games.

Corollary 4.13. The transformation from Rabin games $\mathcal{G}$ to Muller games $\mathcal{G}^{\prime}$ takes $O\left(\left(k+2^{|V|}\right)|V|^{2}\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$ space.

Note that deciding Rabin games is equivalent to deciding Streett games. Thus, combining the arguments above, we get the following complexity-theoretic result:

Theorem 4.14. There exist algorithms that decide Rabin and Streett games $\mathcal{G}$ in $O\left(\left(k|V|+2^{|V|}|E|\right)|V|\right)$ time and $O\left(|\mathcal{G}|+2^{|V|}|V|\right)$ space.
5. Conclusion. The algorithms presented in this work give rise to numerous questions that warrant further exploration. For instance, we know that explicitly given Muller games can be decided in polynomial time. Yet, we do not know if there are polynomial time algorithms that decide explicitly given McNaughton games. Another intriguing line of research is to investigate if there are exponential time algorithms that decide coloured Muller games when the parameter $|C|$ ranges in the interval $[\sqrt{|V|},|V| / a]$, where $a>1$. It could also be very interesting to replace the factor $2^{|V|}$ with $2^{|W|}$ in the running time that decides McNaughton games. If so, this implies that the ETH is not applicable to McNaughton games as opposed to coloured Muller games (and Rabin games). These all may uncover new insights and lead to even more
efficient algorithms.
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