

# Synthesis of Robust Optimal Real-Time Systems

**Benjamin Monmege** ✉ 

Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, LIS, Marseille, France

**Julie Parreaux** ✉

University of Warsaw, Poland

**Pierre-Alain Reynier** ✉

Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, LIS, Marseille, France

---

## Abstract

---

Weighted Timed Games (WTGs for short) are widely used to describe real-time controller synthesis problems, but they rely on an unrealistic perfect measure of time elapse. In order to produce strategies tolerant to timing imprecisions, we consider a notion of robustness, expressed as a parametric semantics, first introduced for timed automata. WTGs are two-player zero-sum games played in a weighted timed automaton in which one of the players, that we call Min, wants to reach a target location while minimising the cumulated weight. The opponent player, in addition to controlling some of the locations, can perturb delays chosen by Min. The robust value problem asks, given some threshold, whether there exists a positive perturbation and a strategy for Min ensuring to reach the target, with an accumulated weight below the threshold, whatever the opponent does.

We provide in this article the first decidability result for this robust value problem. More precisely, we show that we can compute the robust value function, in a parametric way, for the class of divergent WTGs (this class has been introduced previously to obtain decidability of the (classical) value problem in WTGs without bounding the number of clocks). To this end, we show that the robust value is the fixpoint of some operators, as is classically done for value iteration algorithms. We then combine in a very careful way two representations: piecewise affine functions introduced in [1] to analyse WTGs, and shrunk Difference Bound Matrices (shrunk DBMs for short) considered in [29] to analyse robustness in timed automata. The crux of our result consists in showing that using this representation, the operator of value iteration can be computed for infinitesimally small perturbations. Last, we also study qualitative decision problems and close an open problem on robust reachability, showing it is EXPTIME-complete for general WTGs.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Software and its engineering → Formal software verification; Theory of computation → Algorithmic game theory

**Keywords and phrases** Weighted timed games, Algorithmic game theory, Robustness

## 1 Introduction

The design and synthesis of real-time systems have long been paramount challenges, given the critical need for dependable and efficient systems in a variety of applications. In particular, the pursuit of robustness and reliability in these systems has led researchers to explore innovative methods and formalisms to address the complexities inherent in real-time environments. In this work, we focus on game-based models, and more precisely on the game extension of timed automata [2], a.k.a. timed games, which provide an elegant framework for capturing the interplay between system components, environment dynamics, and strategic decision-making. More precisely, in this model, locations of a timed automaton are split amongst the two players, which play in turn in the infinite-state space of the automaton.

Regarding robustness, prior studies have primarily focused on areas such as fault tolerance, adaptive control, and formal methods. In this work, we follow a series of works based on game theory. The objective is to fill the gap between mathematical models such as timed automata, often used for model-checking purposes, and implementation constraints, in which clocks only have finite precision, and actions are not instantaneous. To that end, a parametric

semantics has been considered in [28], which consists in allowing the delays to be perturbed by some limited amount. The uncertainty of the system, i.e. the perturbation of the delays, is modelled by an adversarial environment. Two kinds of problems can then be considered: first, the analysis may be done for a fixed perturbation bound (we call it a *fixed-perturbation robustness problem*); second, in order to abstract the precise settings of the implementation, and as the exact value of the perturbation bound may be unknown, one can try to determine whether there exists a perturbation bound under which the system is reliable (we call it an *existential robustness problem*). By monotonicity of the semantics w.r.t. the perturbation bound, if one manages to prove the reliability against some perturbation bound, then it still holds for smaller perturbations. Initially introduced for model-checking purposes [32, 10], this approach has been lifted to automatic synthesis, yielding the so-called *conservative semantics*, studied for instance in [30, 27, 20]. In these works, a player named Controller aims at satisfying a liveness objective while its opponent may perturb the delays.

In the present work, we aim to go beyond qualitative objectives, and tackle quantitative aspects. In real-time systems and critical applications, quantitative aspects such as resource utilization and performance metrics hold important significance. This has led to the model of *weighted timed games* (WTG for short), which has been widely studied during the last two decades. When considering a reachability objective, Controller (a.k.a. player Min) aims at reaching a set of target locations while minimizing the accumulated weight. One is then interested in the *value problem*, which consists in deciding, given some threshold, whether a strategy for Min exists to reach some target location while keeping the accumulated cost below this threshold. While this problem is undecidable in general [13, 6, 15], several subclasses have been identified that allow one to regain decidability. Amongst recent works, we can cite the class of divergent WTGs [21] which generalize to arbitrary costs the class of strictly non-Zeno costs introduced in [7], or the class of one-clock WTGs [26].

The core objective of this research is to explore the synthesis of real-time systems that not only meet timing constraints but also optimize performance with respect to specified weight objectives and are robust against timing imprecisions. To that end, we aim to study the setting of timed games extended with both robustness issues and quantitative aspects. We focus on the conservative semantics and on reachability objectives. In this setting, under a fixed perturbation, the player Min aims at reaching a set of target locations while minimizing the accumulated weight, and resisting delay perturbations. This leads to a notion of *robust value under a fixed perturbation*: this is simply the best value Min can achieve. The associated fixed perturbation robust value problem aims at comparing this value with a given threshold. When turning to the existential robustness decision problem, one considers the notion of *robust value*, defined as the limit of robust values for arbitrarily small perturbation values. We prove that this limit exists, and study the associated decision problem, which we simply call *robust value problem*, and which can be defined as follows: given a threshold, determine whether there exists a positive perturbation, and a winning strategy for Min ensuring that the accumulated weight until the target is below the threshold.

This problem is highly challenging as it combines difficulties coming from the introduction of weights, with those due to the analysis of an existential problem for the parametric semantics of robustness. Unsurprisingly, it has been shown to be undecidable [31]. To highlight the challenges we face, already in the qualitative setting (w/o weights), the setting of two-player has not been addressed yet for the conservative semantics, hence the existential robust reachability problem was left open in [31]. Indeed, in [20, 30], only the one-player case is handled (a partial extension is considered in [27]) and the existential robustness reachability problem for the two-player setting has only been solved for the excessive semantics (an

alternative to the conservative semantics) in [12]. Regarding the quantitative setting, very few works have addressed robustness issues. The fixed-perturbation robust value problem is shown to be decidable for one-clock weighted timed games in [22], with non-negative weights only, and for the excessive semantics. In [11], the authors consider the one-player case and prove that the robust value problem is PSPACE-complete.

Our contributions are as follows: first, regarding the qualitative setting, we close the case of existential robust reachability in two-player timed games for the conservative semantics, and show that this problem is EXPTIME-complete. To do so, we introduce a construction which allows us to reduce the problem to the excessive semantics solved in [12]. As a corollary, we deduce an upper bound on the length of paths to the target.

Then, we turn to the quantitative setting and show that for the class of divergent WTGs (one of the largest classes of WTGs for which the decidability of the value problem is known), the robust value problem is decidable. We proceed as follows:

1. We characterize the robust value for a fixed perturbation as the fixpoint of some operator.
2. We show that for acyclic WTGs, this fixpoint can be obtained as a finite iteration of this operator, which we decompose using four simpler operators.
3. We introduce a symbolic parametric approach for the computation of this operator, for arbitrarily small values of the perturbation. This requires carefully combining the representation of value functions using piecewise affine functions introduced in [1] with the notion of shrunk DBMs, used in [29] to analyse robustness issues in timed automata. This yields the decidability of the robust value problem for the class of acyclic WTGs.
4. By combining this with the upper bound deduced from the qualitative analysis, we show the decidability of the robust value problem for the whole class of divergent WTGs.


In Section 2, we introduce WTGs, under the prism of robustness. We describe in Section 3 the robustness problems we consider, present our contributions for qualitative ones, and state that we can solve the quantitative one for acyclic WTGs. Sections 4 and 5 detail how to prove this result, following steps 1.-3. described above. Last, Section 6 extends this positive result to the class of divergent WTGs. Omitted proofs can be found in the Appendix.

## 2 Robustness in weighted timed games

We let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a finite set of variables called clocks. A valuation is a mapping  $\nu: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . For a valuation  $\nu$ , a delay  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and a subset  $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  of clocks, we define the valuation  $\nu + t$  as  $(\nu + t)(x) = \nu(x) + t$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and the valuation  $\nu[Y := 0]$  as  $(\nu[Y := 0])(x) = 0$  if  $x \in Y$ , and  $(\nu[Y := 0])(x) = \nu(x)$  otherwise. A (non-diagonal) guard on clocks of  $\mathcal{X}$  is a conjunction of atomic constraints of the form  $x \bowtie c$ , where  $\bowtie \in \{\leq, <, =, >, \geq\}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ . A valuation  $\nu: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  satisfies an atomic constraint  $x \bowtie c$  if  $\nu(x) \bowtie c$ . The satisfaction relation is extended to all guards  $g$  naturally, and denoted by  $\nu \models g$ . We let  $\text{Guards}(\mathcal{X})$  denote the set of guards over  $\mathcal{X}$ .

► **Definition 1.** A weighted timed game (WTG) is a tuple  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  where  $L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T$  are finite disjoint subsets of Min locations, Max locations, and target locations, respectively (we let  $L = L_{\text{Min}} \uplus L_{\text{Max}} \uplus L_T$ ),  $\mathcal{X}$  is a finite set of clocks,  $\Delta \subseteq L \times \text{Guards}(\mathcal{X}) \times 2^{\mathcal{X}} \times L$  is a finite set of transitions, and  $\text{wt}: \Delta \uplus L \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is the weight function.

The usual semantics, called *exact semantics*, of a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined in terms of a game played on an infinite transition system whose vertices are configurations of the WTG denoted by  $\text{Conf} = \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}} \uplus \text{Conf}_{\text{Max}} \uplus \text{Conf}_T$ . A configuration is a pair  $(\ell, \nu)$  with a location and a valuation of the clocks. A configuration is final (resp. belongs to Min, or Max), and belongs



■ **Figure 1** An acyclic WTG with two clocks.

to  $\text{Conf}_T$  (resp. to  $\text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$ , or  $\text{Conf}_{\text{Max}}$ ) if its location is a target location of  $L_T$  (resp. of  $L_{\text{Min}}$ , or  $L_{\text{Max}}$ ). The alphabet of the transition system is given by  $\Delta \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ : a pair  $(\delta, t)$  encodes the delay  $t$  that a player wants to spend in the current location, before firing transition  $\delta$ . An example of WTG is depicted in Figure 1.

In this article, we consider an alternative semantics to model the robustness, traditionally called the *conservative semantics*. It is defined in a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$  according to a fixed parameter  $p > 0$ . This semantics allows Max to slightly perturb the delays chosen by Min with an amplitude bounded by  $p$ . From the modelling perspective, the perturbations model the small errors of physical systems on the real value of clocks. Conservative means that the delays proposed by Min must remain feasible after applying all possible perturbations. In particular, the conservative semantics does not add new edges with respect to the exact one.

► **Definition 2.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  be a WTG. For  $p \geq 0$ , we let  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p = \langle S, E, \text{wt} \rangle$  with  $S = S_{\text{Min}} \uplus S_{\text{Max}} \uplus S_T$  the set of states with  $S_{\text{Min}} = \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$ ,  $S_T = \text{Conf}_T$  and  $S_{\text{Max}} = \text{Conf}_{\text{Max}} \cup (\text{Conf}_{\text{Min}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Delta)$ ;  $E = E_{\text{Min}} \uplus E_{\text{Max}} \uplus E_{\text{rob}}$  the set of edges with

$$E_{\text{Max}} = \{((\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell', \nu')) \mid \ell \in L_{\text{Max}}, \nu + t \models g \text{ and } \nu' = (\nu + t)[Y := 0]\}$$

$$E_{\text{Min}} = \{((\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t)) \mid \ell \in L_{\text{Min}}, \nu + t \models g \text{ and } \nu + t + 2p \models g\}$$

$$E_{\text{rob}} = \{((\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} (\ell', \nu')) \mid \varepsilon \in [0, 2p] \text{ and } \nu' = (\nu + t + \varepsilon)[Y := 0]\}$$

where  $\delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta$ ; and  $\text{wt}: S \cup E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  the weight function such that for all states  $s \in S$  with  $s = (\ell, \nu)$  or  $s = (\ell, \nu, \delta, t)$ ,  $\text{wt}(s) = \text{wt}(\ell)$ , and all edges  $e \in E$ ,  $\text{wt}(e) = \text{wt}(\delta)$  if  $e = (s \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s')$  with  $s \in \text{Conf}$ , or  $\text{wt}(e) = 0$  otherwise.

When  $p = 0$ , the infinite transition system  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^0$  describes the exact semantics of the game, the usual semantics where each step of the player Min is cut into the true step, followed by a useless edge  $(\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, 0} (\ell', \nu')$  where Max has no choice. When  $p > 0$ , the infinite transition system  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  describes the conservative semantics of the game: states  $(\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Delta$  where Max must choose the perturbation in the interval  $[0, 2p]$  are called *perturbed states*.

Let  $s$  be a state of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ , we denote by  $E(s)$  the set of possible outgoing edges of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $s$ . We extend this notation to locations to denote the set of outgoing transitions in  $\mathcal{G}$ . A state (resp. location)  $s$  is a *deadlock* when  $E(s) = \emptyset$ . We note that the conservative semantics may introduce deadlock in configurations of Min (even if an outgoing edge exists in the exact semantics). Thus, unlike in the literature [1, 21], we allow state *and* location deadlocks.

A *finite play* of  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t. the conservative semantics with parameter  $p$  is a sequence of edges in the transition system  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  starting in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ . We denote by  $|\rho|$  the number of edges of  $\rho$ , and by  $\text{last}(\rho)$  its last state. The concatenation of two finite plays  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ ,

such that  $\rho_1$  ends in the same state as  $\rho_2$  starts, is denoted by  $\rho_1\rho_2$ . Moreover, for modelling reasons, we only consider finite plays (starting and) ending in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since a finite play is always defined regarding a parameter  $p$  for the conservative semantics, we denote by  $\text{FPlays}^p$  this set of finite plays. Moreover, we denote by  $\text{FPlays}_{\text{Min}}^p$  (resp.  $\text{FPlays}_{\text{Max}}^p$ ) the subset of these finite plays ending in a state of Min (resp. Max). A *maximal play* is then a maximal sequence of consecutive edges: it is either a finite play reaching a deadlock (not necessary in  $L_T$ ), or an infinite sequence such that all its prefixes are finite plays.

The objective of Min is to reach a target configuration, while minimising the cumulated weight up to the target. Hence, we associate to every finite play  $\rho = s_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0, t_0} s_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1, t_1} \dots s_k$  (some edges are in  $E_{\text{rob}}$ , others are not) its cumulated weight, taking into account both discrete and continuous costs:  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} [t_i \times \text{wt}(s_i) + \text{wt}(\delta_i)]$ . Then, the weight of a maximal play  $\rho$ , denoted by  $\text{wt}(\rho)$ , is defined by  $+\infty$  if  $\rho$  does not reach  $L_T$  (because it is infinite or reaches another deadlock), and  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho)$  if it ends in  $(\ell, \nu)$  with  $\ell \in L_T$ .

A strategy for Min (resp. Max) is a mapping from finite plays ending in a state of Min (resp. Max) to a decision in  $(\delta, t)$  labelling an edge of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from the last state of the play. Since plays could reach a deadlock state of Min, we consider strategies of Min to be partial mappings. For instance, in the WTG depicted in Figure 1 and a perturbation  $p$ , a strategy for Min in all plays ending in  $(\ell_2, \nu)$  can be defined only when  $\nu(x_2) \leq 2 - 2p$  since, otherwise, there are no outgoing edges in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from this state. Symmetrically, we ask for Max to always propose a move if we are not in a deadlock state. More formally, a strategy for Min, denoted  $\chi$ , is a (possibly partial) mapping  $\chi: \text{FPlays}_{\text{Min}}^p \rightarrow E$  such that  $\chi(\rho) \in E(\text{last}(\rho))$ . A strategy for Max, denoted  $\zeta$ , is a (possibly partial) mapping  $\zeta: \text{FPlays}_{\text{Max}}^p \rightarrow E$  such that for all  $\rho$ , if  $E(\text{last}(\rho)) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\zeta(\rho)$  is defined, and in this case belongs to  $E(\text{last}(\rho))$ . The set of strategies of Min (resp. Max) with the perturbation  $p$  is denoted by  $\text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  (resp.  $\text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$ ).

A play or finite play  $\rho = s_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0, t_0} s_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1, t_1} \dots$  conforms to a strategy  $\chi$  of Min (resp. Max) if for all  $k$  such that  $s_k$  belongs to Min (resp. Max), we have that  $(\delta_k, t_k) = \chi(s_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0, t_0} \dots s_k)$ . For all strategies  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$  of players Min and Max, respectively, and for all configurations  $(\ell_0, \nu_0)$ , we let  $\text{Play}((\ell_0, \nu_0), \chi, \zeta)$  be the outcome of  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$ , defined as the unique maximal play conforming to  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$  and starting in  $(\ell_0, \nu_0)$ .

The semantics  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  is monotonic with respect to the perturbation  $p$  in the sense that Min has more strategies when  $p$  decreases, while Max can obtain, against a fixed strategy of Min, a smaller weight when  $p$  decreases. Formally, we have:

► **Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG, and  $p > p' \geq 0$  be two perturbations. Then*

1.  $\text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p \subseteq \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p'}$ ;
2. for all  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$ ,  $\sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \geq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta))$ .


### 3 Deciding the robustness in weighted timed games

We aim to study what Min can guarantee, qualitatively and then quantitatively, in the conservative semantics of weighted timed games whatever Max does.

**Qualitative robustness problems.** Formally, given a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$  and a perturbation  $p$ , we say a strategy  $\chi$  of Min is *winning* in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$  if for all strategies  $\zeta$  of Max,  $\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)$  is a finite play ending in a location of  $L_T$ .

There are two possible questions, whether the perturbation  $p$  is fixed, or if we should consider it to be infinitesimally small:

- *fixed-perturbation robust reachability problem:* given a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$ , a configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$  and a perturbation  $p > 0$ , decide whether Min has a winning strategy  $\chi$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ ;



■ **Figure 2** Gadget used to encode the conservative semantics into the excessive one. Each transition  $\delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell')$  with  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$  is replaced by the gadget. Symbols  $w, w_0, w_1$  denote weights from  $\mathcal{G}$ . The new location  $\ell^\delta$  of Max uses a fresh clock  $x^e$  to test the guard after the perturbation (as in the conservative semantics). The new location  $\ominus$  is a deadlock (thus winning for Max).

- *existential robust reachability problem*: given a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$  and a configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$ , decide whether there exists  $p > 0$  such that Min has a winning strategy  $\chi$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . Notice that by Lemma 3, if Min has a winning strategy  $\chi$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ , then he has one in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^{p'}$  for all  $p' \leq p$ .

When the perturbation  $p$  is fixed, we can encode in a WTG the conservative semantics described in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ , by adding new locations for Max to choose a perturbation, and by modifying the guards that will now use the perturbation  $p$ . Solving the fixed-perturbation robust reachability problem then amounts to solving a reachability problem in the modified WTG<sup>1</sup> which can be performed in EXPTIME [3] (here weights are useless). Since the reachability problem in timed games is already EXPTIME-complete [23], we obtain:

- **Proposition 4.** *The fixed-perturbation robust reachability problem is EXPTIME-complete.*

We now turn our attention to the existential robust reachability problem. This problem was left open for the conservative semantics (see [31], Table 1.2 page 17), while it has been solved in [12] for an alternative semantics of robustness, known as the *excessive semantics*. Intuitively, while the conservative semantics requires that the delay, after perturbation, satisfies the guard, the excessive semantics only requires that the delay, *without perturbation*, satisfies the guard. We present a reduction from the conservative semantics to the excessive one, allowing us to solve the existential robust reachability problem for the conservative semantics. Intuitively, the construction (depicted on Figure 2) adds a new location (for Max) for each transitions of Min to test the delay chosen by Min after the perturbation:

- **Proposition 5.** *The existential robust reachability problem is EXPTIME-complete.*

**Quantitative fixed-perturbation robustness problem.** We are also interested in the minimal weight that Min can guarantee while reaching the target whatever Max does: to do that we define *robust values*. First, we define the *fixed-perturbation robust value*: for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  (and not for all states of the semantics), we let  $\overline{\text{val}}^p(\ell, \nu) = \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta))$ .

Since a fixed-perturbation conservative semantics defines a *quantitative reachability game*<sup>2</sup>, where configurations of Max also contain the robust states, we obtain that the fixed-

<sup>1</sup> By transforming the WTG, its guards use rational instead of natural numbers (due to  $p$ ). To fit the classical definition of WTG, we can apply a scaling factor (i.e.  $1/p$ ) to all constants appearing in this WTG. We note that this operation preserves the set of winning strategies for the reachability objective (here weights are irrelevant) by applying the scaling operations on strategies too.

<sup>2</sup> A quantitative reachability game introduced in [14] is an abstract model to formally define the semantics of quantitative (infinite) games.

perturbation robust value is determined, by applying [16, Theorem 2.2], i.e. that  $\overline{\text{rVal}}^p(\ell, \nu) = \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta))$ . We therefore denote  $\text{rVal}^p$  this value.

► **Remark 6.** In [11, 12, 22], the set of possible perturbations for Max is  $[-p, p]$ . For technical reasons, we use a (equivalent) perturbation with a shift of the delay proposed by Min by  $p$ .

When  $p = 0$ ,  $\text{rVal}^0$  defines the (*exact*) value that is used to study the value problem in WTGs. By Lemma 3, we can deduce that the fixed-perturbation robust value is monotonic with respect to the perturbation  $p$  and is always an upper-bound for the (exact) value.

► **Lemma 7.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG, and  $p > p' \geq 0$  be two perturbations. Then, for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$ ,  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) \geq \text{rVal}^{p'}(\ell, \nu)$ .*

As in the qualitative case, when the perturbation  $p$  is fixed, we can encode in polynomial time in a WTG the conservative semantics described in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . Unfortunately, the value of WTGs is not always computable since the associated decision problems (in particular the *value problem* that requires to decide if the value of a given configuration is below a given threshold) are undecidable [13, 5, 15]. However, in subclasses of WTGs where the value function can be computed, like acyclic WTGs (where every path in the graph of the WTGs is acyclic, decidable in 2-EXPTIME [17]) or divergent WTGs (that we recall in Section 6, in 3-EXPTIME [7, 18]), the fixed-perturbation robust value is also computable (if the modified game falls in the subclass). In particular, we obtain:

► **Proposition 8.** *We can compute the fixed-perturbation robust value of a WTG that is acyclic (in 2-EXPTIME) or divergent (in 3-EXPTIME), for all possible initial configurations.*

On top of computing the robust values, the previous works also allow one to synthesize almost-optimal (*i.e.* arbitrarily close from the value) strategies for both players.

**Quantitative robustness problem.** Now, we consider the existential version of this problem by considering an infinitesimal perturbation. We thus want to know what Min can guarantee as a value if Max plays infinitesimally small perturbations. To define properly the problem, we introduce a new value: given a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$ , the *robust value* is defined, for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , by  $\overline{\text{rVal}}(\ell, \nu) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0, p > 0} \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ . This value is defined as a limit of functions (the fixed-perturbation robust values), which can be proved to always exist as the limit of a non-increasing sequence of functions (see Lemma 7). The decision problem associated to this robust value is: given a WTG  $\mathcal{G}$ , an initial configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$ , and a threshold  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ , decide if  $\overline{\text{rVal}}(\ell, \nu) \leq \lambda$ . We call it the *robust value problem*.

Unsurprisingly, this problem is undecidable [11, Theorem 4]. We will thus consider some restrictions over WTGs. In particular, we consider classes of WTGs where the (non robust) value problem is known as decidable for the exact semantics: acyclic WTGs [1], and divergent WTGs [7, 18]. Our first main contribution concerns the acyclic case:

► **Theorem 9.** *The robust value problem is decidable over the subclass of acyclic WTGs.*

The next two sections sketch the proof of this theorem via an adaptation of the value iteration algorithm [1] used to compute the value function in (non-robust) acyclic WTGs: it consists in computing iteratively the best thing that both players can guarantee in a bounded number of steps, that increases step by step. It is best described by a mapping  $\mathcal{F}$  that explains how a value function gets modified by allowing one more step for the players to play. The adaptation we propose consists in taking the robustness into account by using shrunk DBM techniques introduced in [29]: instead of inequalities on the difference of two clock values of the form  $x - y \leq c$  involving rational constants  $c$ , the constants  $c$  will now

be of the form  $a - bp$ , with  $a$  a rational and  $b$  a positive integer,  $p$  being an infinitesimal perturbation. This will allow us to compute a description of the fixed-perturbation values for all initial configurations, for all perturbations  $p$  smaller than an upperbound that we will compute. The robust value will then be obtained by taking the limit of this parametric representation of the fixed-perturbation values when  $p$  tends to 0. Our algorithm will also compute an upperbound on the biggest allowed perturbation  $p$ . As in previous works, once the value is computed, we can also synthesize almost-optimal strategies.

Section 4 will describe the mapping  $\mathcal{F}_p$ , with a known perturbation  $p$ : the iteration of this operator will be shown to converge towards the fixed-perturbation value  $\text{rVal}^p$ . The robust value functions will be shown to always be piecewise affine functions with polytope pieces. Section 5 describes the parametric representation of these functions, where the perturbation is no longer fixed but is a formal parameter  $\mathbf{p}$ . We then explain how the mapping  $\mathcal{F}_p$  can be computed for all small enough values of  $p$  at once, allowing us to conclude.

#### 4 Operator $\mathcal{F}_p$ to compute the fixed-perturbation value

The first step of the proof is the definition of the new operator adapted from the operator  $\mathcal{F}$  of [1]. We thus fix a perturbation  $p > 0$ , and we define an operator  $\mathcal{F}_p$  taking as input a mapping  $X: L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$ , computing a mapping  $\mathcal{F}_p(X): L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$  defined for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$  by  $\mathcal{F}_p(X)(\ell, \nu)$  equal to

$$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \ell \in L_T \\ +\infty & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}} \text{ and } E(\ell, \nu) = \emptyset \text{ (if Max reaches a deadlock, he wins)} \\ \sup_{(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell', \nu') \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p} [t \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) + X(\ell', \nu')] & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}} \text{ and } E(\ell, \nu) \neq \emptyset \\ \inf_{(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p} \sup_{(\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} (\ell, \nu') \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p} [(t + \varepsilon) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) + X(\ell', \nu')] & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Min}} \end{cases}$$

In the following, we let  $\mathbb{V}^0$  be the mapping  $L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$  defined by  $\mathbb{V}^0(\ell, \nu) = 0$  if  $\ell \in L_T$  and  $\mathbb{V}^0(\ell, \nu) = +\infty$  otherwise. By adapting the proof of the non-robust setting, we show:

► **Lemma 10.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an acyclic WTG,  $p > 0$ ,  $D$  is the depth of  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e. the length of a longest path in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then,  $\text{rVal}^p$  is a fixpoint of  $\mathcal{F}_p$ , and  $\text{rVal}^p = \mathcal{F}_p^D(\mathbb{V}^0)$ .*

We can thus compute the fixed-perturbation robust value of an acyclic WTG by repeatedly computing  $\mathcal{F}_p$ . We will see in the next section that this computation can be made for all small enough  $p$  by using a parametric representation of the mappings. It will be easier to split the computation of  $\mathcal{F}_p$  in several steps (as done in the non robust case [1, 21]). Each of the four operators takes as input a mapping  $V: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$  (where the location  $\ell$  has been fixed, with respect to mappings  $L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$ ), and computes a mapping of the same type.

- The operator  $\text{Unreset}_Y$ , with  $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  a subset of clocks, is such that for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$ ,  $\text{Unreset}_Y(V)(\nu) = V(\nu[Y := 0])$ .
- The operator  $\text{Guard}_{\delta}$ , with  $\delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell')$  a transition of  $\Delta$ , is such that for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$ , if  $\nu \models g$ , then  $\text{Guard}_{\delta}(V)(\nu) = V(\nu)$ ; otherwise,  $\text{Guard}_{\delta}(V)(\nu)$  is equal to  $-\infty$  if  $\ell \in L_{\text{Max}}$ , and  $+\infty$  if  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$ .
- The operator  $\text{Pre}_{\ell}$ , with  $\ell \in L$ , is such that for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$ ,  $\text{Pre}_{\ell}(V)(\nu)$  is equal to  $\sup_{t \geq 0} [t \text{wt}(\ell) + V(\nu + t)]$  if  $\ell \in L_{\text{Max}}$ , and  $\inf_{t \geq 0} [t \text{wt}(\ell) + V(\nu + t)]$  if  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$ .
- The operator  $\text{Perturb}_{\ell}^p$ , with perturbation  $p > 0$  and  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$ , is such that for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$ ,  $\text{Perturb}_{\ell}^p(V)(\nu) = \sup_{\varepsilon \in [0, 2p]} [\varepsilon \text{wt}(\ell) + V(\nu + \varepsilon)]$ .



Though the situation is not symmetrical for Min and Max in  $\mathcal{F}_p$ , in particular for the choice of delay  $t$ , the definition of  $\text{Pre}_\ell$  does not differentiate the two players with respect to their choice of delay. However, the correctness of the decomposition comes from the combination of this operator with  $\text{Guard}_\delta$  (that clearly penalises Min if he chooses a delay such that the translated valuation does not satisfy the guard) and  $\text{Perturb}_\ell^p$  that allows Max to select a legal perturbation not satisfying the guard, leading to a value  $+\infty$  afterwards.

For a mapping  $\mathbb{V}: L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$  and a location  $\ell$ , we can extract the submapping for the location  $\ell$ , that we denote by  $\mathbb{V}_\ell: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ , defined for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$  by  $\mathbb{V}_\ell(\nu) = \mathbb{V}(\ell, \nu)$ . Mappings  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$  can be compared, by using a pointwise comparison: in particular the maximum or minimum of two such mappings is defined pointwisely. The previous operators indeed allow us to split the computation of  $\mathcal{F}_p$  (see the proof in Appendix G). We also rely on the classical notion of *regions*, as introduced in the seminal work on timed automata [2]. Indeed, for a given location  $\ell$ , the set of deadlock valuations  $\nu$  where  $E(\ell, \nu) = \emptyset$  is a union of regions that we denote  $R_\ell$  in the following, and that can easily be computed.

► **Lemma 11.** *For all  $\mathbb{V}: L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$ ,  $\ell \in L$ , and  $p > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V})(\ell)$  equals*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \nu \mapsto 0 & \text{if } \ell \in L_T \\ \left( \nu \mapsto \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } \nu \in R_\ell \\ \max_{\delta=(\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta} [\text{wt}(\delta) + \text{Pre}_\ell(\text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})))] & \text{if } \nu \notin R_\ell \end{cases} \right) & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}} \\ \min_{\delta=(\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta} [\text{wt}(\delta) + \text{Pre}_\ell(\text{Perturb}_\ell^p(\text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})))] & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Min}} \end{array} \right.$$


## 5 Encoding parametric piecewise affine functions

We now explain how to encode the mappings that the operators defined in the previous section take as input, to compute  $\mathcal{F}_p$  for all perturbation bounds  $p > 0$  at once. We adapt the formalism used in [1, 21] to incorporate the perturbation  $p$ . This formalism relies on the remark that  $\mathbb{V}^0$  is a piecewise affine function, and that if  $\mathbb{V}$  is piecewise affine, so is  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V})$ : thus we only have to manipulate such piecewise affine functions.

To model the robustness, that depends on the perturbation bound  $p$ , and maintain a parametric description of all the value functions for infinitesimally small values of  $p$ , we consider piecewise affine functions that depend on a formal parameter  $\mathbf{p}$  describing the perturbation. The pieces over which the function is affine, that we call cells in the following, are polytopes described by a conjunction of affine equalities and inequalities involving  $\mathbf{p}$ . Some of our computations will only hold for small enough values of the parameter  $\mathbf{p}$  and we will thus also maintain an upperbound for this parameter.

► **Definition 12.** *We call parametric affine expression an expression  $E$  of the form  $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x x + \beta + \gamma \mathbf{p}$  with  $\alpha_x \in \mathbb{Q}$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\beta \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ , and  $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$ . The semantics of such an expression is given for a particular perturbation  $p$  as a mapping  $\llbracket E \rrbracket_p: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\infty$  defined for all  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$  by  $\llbracket E \rrbracket_p(\nu) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x \nu(x) + \beta + \gamma p$ .*

A partition of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$  into cells is described by a set  $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$  of parametric affine expressions. Every expression can be turned into an equation or inequation by comparing it to 0 with the symbol  $=$ ,  $<$  or  $>$ . The partition of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}}$  is obtained by considering all the combinations of equations and inequations for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ : such a combination is described by a tuple  $(\bowtie_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  of symbols in  $\{=, <, >\}$ . For a given perturbation  $p$ , we let  $\llbracket \mathcal{E}, (\bowtie_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m} \rrbracket_p$  be the set of valuations  $\nu$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\llbracket E_i \rrbracket_p \bowtie_i 0$ .



■ **Figure 3** On the left, we depict the partition defined from  $\mathcal{E} = \{x_2 - 2p, 2x_1 + x_2 - 2 + p, 2x_1 - x_2 + 1/2\}$ , for a small enough value of  $p$ . On the right, we depict the atomic partition induced by  $\mathcal{E}$ , and draw in red the added parametric affine expressions.

We call *cell* every such combination such that for  $p$  that tends to 0, while being positive, the set  $\llbracket \mathcal{E}, (\bowtie_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m} \rrbracket_p$  is non empty. We let  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$  be the set of cells of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Notice that it can be decided (in at most exponential time) if a combination  $(\bowtie_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  is a cell, by encoding the semantics in the first order theory of the reals, and deciding if there exists an upperbound  $\eta > 0$  such that for all  $0 < p \leq \eta$ ,  $\llbracket \mathcal{E}, (\bowtie_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m} \rrbracket_p$  is non empty. Moreover, we can compute the biggest such upperbound  $\eta$  if it exists. The upperbound of the partition  $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$  is then defined as the minimum such upperbound over all cells (there are at most  $3^m$  cells), and denoted by  $\eta(\mathcal{E})$  in the following. On the left of Figure 3, we depict the partition of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$  defined from  $\mathcal{E} = \{x_2 - 2p, 2x_1 + x_2 - 2 + p, 2x_1 - x_2 + 1/2\}$ , with a fixed value of the perturbation. In blue, we color the cell defined by  $(>, <, >)$ . We note that this cell is non-empty when  $p \leq 1/2$ . By considering other cells, we obtain that  $\eta(\mathcal{E}) = 1/2$ .

In the following, we may need to record a smaller upperbound than  $\eta(\mathcal{E})$ , in order to keep the tightest constraint seen so far in the computation. We thus call *parametric partition* a pair  $\langle \mathcal{E}, \eta \rangle$  given by a set of equations and a perturbation  $\eta > 0$  that is at most  $\eta(\mathcal{E})$ .

For a cell  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$ , an expression  $E$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  is said to be on the *border* of  $c$  if the removal of  $E$  from the set  $\mathcal{E}$  of expressions forbids one to obtain the set of valuations  $\llbracket c \rrbracket_p$  with the resulting cells for all small enough values of  $p > 0$ : more precisely, we require that no cell  $c' \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E} \setminus \{E\})$  is such that for some  $p \leq \eta(\mathcal{E})$ ,  $\llbracket c \rrbracket_p = \llbracket c' \rrbracket_p$ . Because of the definition of  $\eta(\mathcal{E})$ , this definition does not depend on the actual value of  $p$  that we consider (and we could thus replace "for some" by "for all" above). On the left of Figure 3, all expressions are on the border for the blue cell, but only two of them are on the border of the orange cell.

The proofs that follow (in particular time delaying that requires to move along diagonal lines) requires to adapt the notion of *atomicity* of a parametric partition, originally introduced in the non-robust setting [1, 21]. A parametric affine expression  $E = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x x + \beta + \gamma p$  is said to be *diagonal* if  $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x = 0$ : indeed, for all  $p > 0$ ,  $\llbracket E \rrbracket_p(\nu) = \llbracket E \rrbracket_p(\nu + t)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . A parametric partition is said to be *atomic* if for all cells  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$ , there are at most two non-diagonal parametric affine expressions on the border of  $c$ : intuitively, one border is reachable from every valuation by letting time elapse, and the other border is such that by letting time elapse from it we can reach all valuations of the cell. An atomic partition decomposes the space into tubes whose borders are only diagonal, each tube being then sliced by using only non-diagonal expressions. In particular, each cell  $c$  of an atomic partition has a finite set of cells that it can reach by time elapsing (and dually a set of cells that can reach  $c$  by time elapsing), and this set does not depend on the value of the parameter  $p$ , nor the starting valuation in  $\llbracket c \rrbracket_p$ . On the right of Figure 3, we depict the atomic partition associated with the same set of expressions used on the left. The diagonal expressions are depicted in red. We note that the cell colored in blue on the left is split into five cells that are non-empty

when  $p \leq 3/7$ . We can describe the new parametric partition as  $(\{x_2 - 2\mathbf{p}, 2x_1 + x_2 - 2 + \mathbf{p}, 2x_1 - x_2 + 1/2, x_1 - x_2 - 1 + 7\mathbf{p}/2, x_1 - x_2 + 2\mathbf{p}, x_1 - x_2 + 1/2, x_1 - x_2 + 7/8 - \mathbf{p}/4\}, 3/7)$ . As we will see below, a parametric partition can always be made atomic, by adding some diagonal parametric affine expressions.

A *parametric value function* (PVF for short) is a tuple  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  where  $\langle \mathcal{E}, \eta \rangle$  is a partition and, for all cells  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$ ,  $f_c$  is a parametric affine expression. For a perturbation  $0 < p \leq \eta$ , the semantics  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p$  of this tuple is a mapping  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$  defined for all valuations  $\nu$  by  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p(\nu) = \llbracket f_c \rrbracket_p(\nu)$  where  $c$  is the unique cell such that  $\nu \in \llbracket c \rrbracket_p$ . A PVF is said to be *atomic* if its parametric partition is atomic. As announced above, we can always refine a PVF so that it becomes atomic.

► **Lemma 13.** *If  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  is a PVF, we can compute an atomic PVF  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  such that  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p = \llbracket F' \rrbracket_p$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

To conclude the proof of Theorem 9, we need to compute one application of  $\mathcal{F}_p$  over a mapping  $X: L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$  that is stored by a PVF for each location. Moreover, our computations must be done for all small enough values of  $p$  simultaneously.

► **Proposition 14.** *Let  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  be a PVF. We can compute a PVF  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  with  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p = \mathcal{F}_p(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

**Sketch of the proof.** By using Lemma 11, it suffices to perform the proof independently for the four operators, as well as maximum or minimum operations. Proofs from [1, 21] can be adapted for the maximum/minimum operations as well as the operators  $\text{Guard}_{\delta}$  and  $\text{Unreset}_{\gamma}$  that exist also in the non-robust setting. In the case of  $\text{Max}$ , the two cases depend only on the regions and we thus only apply the various operators for starting valuations not in  $R_{\ell}$ .

For the operator  $\text{Pre}_{\ell}$  (and similarly  $\text{Perturb}_{\ell}^p$ ), the adaptation is more subtle. The key ingredient, for instance to compute it over an atomic partition for a location  $\ell$  of  $\text{Max}$ , is to transform the computation of  $(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)(\nu) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [t \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket F \rrbracket_p(\nu + t)]$  involving a supremum (for a fixed valuation  $\nu$ , and a fixed perturbation  $p \leq \eta$ ), by using a maximum over a finite set of interesting delays. First, we remark that for every delay  $t > 0$ , the valuation  $\nu + t$  belongs to the open diagonal half-line from  $\nu$ , which crosses some of the semantics  $\llbracket c' \rrbracket_p$  for certain cells  $c'$ . Moreover, this finite (since there are anyway only a finite number of cells in the partition) subset of crossing cells neither depends on the choice of  $\nu$  in a given starting cell  $c$ , nor on the perturbation  $p$  as long as it is at most  $\eta$  (by atomicity of the partition). Since the function  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p$  is affine in each cell, the above supremum over the possible delays is obtained for a value  $t$  that is either 0, or tending to  $+\infty$ , or on one of the two non-diagonal borders of the previous crossing cells, and we thus only have to consider those borders (that do not depend on the choice of  $\nu$  in a given starting cell  $c$ , nor on the perturbation  $p$ ). ◀

## 6 Divergent weighted timed games

From our algorithm to solve acyclic WTGs, we naturally want to extend the computation of the robust value to other classes of WTGs by using an unfolding of the WTG. In particular, we consider the natural extension of *divergent WTGs* (like in [18, 21]) that define a large class of decidable WTGs for the exact semantics, with no limitations on the number of clocks.

As usual in related work [1, 7, 8, 21], we now assume that all clocks are *bounded* by a constant  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , i.e. every transition of the WTG is equipped with a guard  $g$  such that  $\nu \models g$  implies  $\nu(x) \leq M$  for all clocks  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . We denote by  $W_{\text{loc}}$  (resp.  $W_{\text{tr}}$ ,  $W_{\text{e}}$ ) the maximal weight in absolute values of locations (resp. of transitions, edges) of  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e.  $W_{\text{loc}} = \max_{\ell \in L} |\text{wt}(\ell)|$  (resp.  $W_{\text{tr}} = \max_{\delta \in \Delta} |\text{wt}(\delta)|$ ,  $W_{\text{e}} = MW_{\text{loc}} + W_{\text{tr}}$ ).

We use the exact semantics to define the divergence property by relying once again on the regions [2]. We let  $\text{Reg}(\mathcal{X}, M)$  be the set of regions when clocks are bounded by  $M$ . A game  $\mathcal{G}$  (w.r.t. the exact semantics) can be populated with the region information as described formally in [21]: we obtain the *region game*  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})$ . We call *region path* a finite or infinite sequence of transitions in this game, and we denote by  $\pi$  such paths. A play  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  can be projected on a region path  $\pi$ : we say that  $\rho$  *follows* the region path  $\pi$ . It is important to notice that, even if  $\pi$  is a *cycle* (i.e. starts and ends in the same location of the region game), there may exist plays following it in  $\mathcal{G}$  that are not cycles, due to the fact that regions are sets of valuations.

Divergent WTGs are obtained by enforcing a semantical property of divergence (originally called *strictly non-Zeno cost* when only dealing with non-negative weights [7]): it asks that every play (w.r.t. the exact semantics) following a cyclic region path has weight far from 0. Formally, a cyclic region path  $\pi$  of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})$  is said to be a positive (resp. negative) if every finite play  $\rho$  following  $\pi$  satisfies  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho) \geq 1$  (resp.  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho) \leq -1$ ).

► **Definition 15.** *A WTG is divergent if every cyclic region path is positive or negative.*

Finally, with loss of generality, we only consider divergent WTGs containing no configurations with a value equal to  $-\infty$ . Intuitively, guaranteeing a value  $-\infty$  resembles a Büchi condition for Min, since this means that Max cannot avoid the iteration of negative cycles with his delays. In the robust settings, testing Büchi condition for automata is already non-trivial [20], thus we remove this behaviour in our games in this article. Since the value is a lower bound of the robust value (by Lemma 7), we obtain that all locations have a robust value distinct from  $-\infty$ . Moreover, testing if such a location exists in a divergent WTG can be done in EXPTIME [21]. Our second contribution is to extend the symbolic algorithm used in the case of acyclic WTGs to compute the robust value in this subclass of divergent WTGs.

► **Theorem 16.** *The robust value problem is decidable over the subclass of divergent WTGs without configurations of value  $-\infty$ .*

**Sketch of the proof.** We compute the robust value by using an adaptation of the algorithm of [21] used to compute the (exact) value function in divergent WTGs. In particular, its termination is guaranteed by the use of an equivalent definition of divergent WTG requiring that for all strongly connected components (SCC)  $S$  of the graph of the region game, either every cyclic region path  $\pi$  inside  $S$  is positive (we say that the SCC is positive) or every cyclic region path  $\pi$  inside  $S$  is negative (we say that the SCC is negative).

We adapt this argument in the case of the computation of the robust value of a divergent WTG (without configurations with a value equal to  $-\infty$ ). In particular, we observe that if a cyclic region path is positive (resp. negative) w.r.t. the exact semantics, then it is also positive (resp. negative) w.r.t. the conservative semantics, as the latter only filters some plays. Thus, the finite convergence of the value iteration algorithm (defined by  $\mathcal{F}_p$  as for acyclic WTG, i.e. initialised by the function  $\mathbb{V}^0$  defined such that  $\mathbb{V}^0(\ell) = 0$  for all target locations, and  $\mathbb{V}^0(\ell) = +\infty$  otherwise) is guaranteed by its finite convergence in finite time in each positive (resp. negative) SCC. Intuitively, in a positive (resp. negative) SCC, the interest of Min (resp. Max) is to quickly reach a target location of  $\mathcal{G}$  to minimise the number of positive (resp. negative) cyclic region paths followed along the play that allow us to upperbound the number of iterations needed to obtain the robust value of all locations. Thus, the number of iterations needed to compute the robust value in a divergent WTG is defined by the sum of the number of iterations for each SCC along the longest path of the SCC decomposition. ◀

On top of computing the value, the modified algorithm allows one to synthesize almost-optimal strategies (we can adapt recent works [25] showing that those strategies can be taken among switching strategies for Min and memoryless strategies for Max).

## 7 Conclusion

This article allows one to compute (finite) robust values of weighted timed games in classes of games (acyclic and divergent) where the non-robust values are indeed computable.

As future works, we would like to carefully explore the exact complexity of our algorithms. Intuitively, each operator used to describe  $\mathcal{F}_p$  can be computed in exponential time with respect to the set of cells and the size of  $\eta$ . By [21], the number of cells exponentially grows at each application of  $\mathcal{F}_p$  (so it is doubly exponential for the whole computation) and the constants in affine expressions polynomially grow, in the non-robust setting. We hope that such upperbounds remain in the robust setting. This would imply that, for divergent WTGs, our algorithm requires a triply-exponential time, since the unfolding is exponential in the size of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

As future works, we also suggest to extend the setting to incorporate divergent WTGs that contains location with a value equal to  $-\infty$ . However, fixing it for all divergent WTGs seems to be difficult since, intuitively, the condition to guarantee  $-\infty$  looks like a Büchi condition where Max can avoid the iteration of cycles with his delays. Moreover, we would to study almost-divergent weighted timed games (studied in [19, 21]), a class of games undecidable, but with approximable value functions. We wonder if the robust values could also be approximated by similar techniques. Another direction of research would be to consider the fragment of one-clock weighted timed games, another class of games where the value function is known to be computable (for a long time in the non-negative case [9], very recently in the general case [26]). The difficulty here would be that encoding the conservative semantics in an exact semantics, even with fixed-perturbation, requires the addition of a clock, thus exiting the decidable fragment. The question thus becomes a possible adaptation of techniques used previously to solve non robust one-clock WTGs to incorporate directly the robustness.

---

## References

- 1 Rajeev Alur, Mikhail Bernadsky, and P. Madhusudan. Optimal reachability for weighted timed games. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'04)*, volume 3142 of *LNCS*, pages 122–133. Springer, 2004.
- 2 Rajeev Alur and David L. Dill. A theory of timed automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 126(2):183–235, 1994.
- 3 Eugene Asarin and Oded Maler. As soon as possible: Time optimal control for timed automata. In *Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, volume 1569 of *LNCS*, pages 19–30. Springer, 1999.
- 4 Giovanni Bacci, Patricia Bouyer, Uli Fahrenberg, Kim G. Larsen, Nicolas Markey, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Optimal and robust controller synthesis using energy timed automata with uncertainty. In *Formal Aspects Comput.*, 2021.
- 5 Patricia Bouyer, Thomas Brihaye, Véronique Bruyère, and Jean-François Raskin. On the Optimal Reachability Problem of Weighted Timed Automata. In *Formal Methods in System Design*, 2007.
- 6 Patricia Bouyer, Thomas Brihaye, and Nicolas Markey. Improved Undecidability Results on Weighted Timed Automata. In *Information Processing Letters*, 2006.

- 7 Patricia Bouyer, Franck Cassez, Emmanuel Fleury, and Kim G. Larsen. Optimal strategies in priced timed game automata. In *FSTTCS 2004: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 148–160, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 8 Patricia Bouyer, Samy Jaziri, and Nicolas Markey. On the value problem in weighted timed games. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR'15)*, volume 42 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, pages 311–324. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.
- 9 Patricia Bouyer, Kim G. Larsen, Nicolas Markey, and Jacob Illum Rasmussen. Almost optimal strategies in one clock priced timed games. In *FSTTCS 2006: Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 345–356, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 10 Patricia Bouyer, Nicolas Markey, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Robust Model-Checking of Linear-Time Properties in Timed Automata. In *LATIN 2006: Theoretical Informatics, 7th Latin American Symposium*, Valdivia, Chile, March 20–24, volume 3887 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 238–249, 2006.
- 11 Patricia Bouyer, Nicolas Markey, and Ocan Sankur. Robust Weighted Timed Automata and Games. In *Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems - 11th International Conference, FORMATS 2013*, volume 8053 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 31–46, 2013.
- 12 Patricia Bouyer, Nicolas Markey, and Ocan Sankur. Robust reachability in timed automata and games: A game-based approach. In *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 2015.
- 13 Thomas Brihaye, Véronique Bruyère, and Jean-François Raskin. On optimal timed strategies. In *Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems*, pages 49–64, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 14 Thomas Brihaye, Gilles Geeraerts, Axel Haddad, Engel Lefaucheux, and Benjamin Monmege. Simple priced timed games are not that simple. In *Proceedings of the 35th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS'15)*, volume 45 of *LIPICs*, pages 278–292. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.
- 15 Thomas Brihaye, Gilles Geeraerts, Shankara Narayanan Krishna, Lakshmi Manasa, Benjamin Monmege, and Ashutosh Trivedi. Adding Negative Prices to Priced Timed Games. In *CONCUR 2014 - Concurrency Theory - 25th International Conference*, volume 8704 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* pages 560–575, 2014.
- 16 Thomas Brihaye, Gilles Geeraerts, Axel Haddad, Engel Lefaucheux, and Benjamin Monmege. One-clock priced timed games with negative weights. Research Report 2009.03074, arXiv, 2021.
- 17 Damien Busatto-Gaston. *Symbolic controller synthesis for timed systems: robustness and optimality*. PhD thesis, Aix-Marseille Université, 2019.
- 18 Damien Busatto-Gaston, Benjamin Monmege, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Optimal reachability in divergent weighted timed games. In *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 20th International Conference, FOSSACS 2017, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2017*, pages 162–178, 2017.
- 19 Damien Busatto-Gaston, Benjamin Monmege, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Symbolic Approximation of Weighted Timed Games. In *38th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2018*, 2018.
- 20 Damien Busatto-Gaston, Benjamin Monmege, Pierre-Alain Reynier, and Ocan Sankur. Robust Controller Synthesis in Timed Büchi Automata: A Symbolic Approach. In *Computer Aided Verification - 31st International Conference, CAV 2019*, volume 11561 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* pages 572–590, 2019.
- 21 Damien Busatto-Gaston, Benjamin Monmege, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Optimal controller synthesis for timed systems. In *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 2023.

- 22 Shibashis Guha, Shankara Narayanan Krishna, Lakshmi Manasa, and Ashutosh Trivedi. Revisiting Robustness in Priced Timed Games. In *35th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundation of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2015*, 2015.
- 23 Marcin Jurdziński and Ashutosh Trivedi. Reachability-time games on timed automata. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP'07)*, volume 4596 of *LNCS*, pages 838–849. Springer, 2007.
- 24 Kim G. Larsen, Axel Legay, Louis-Marie Traonouez, and Andrzej Wasowski. Robust synthesis for real-time systems. In *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 2014.
- 25 Benjamin Monmege, Julie Parreaux, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Playing Stochastically in Weighted Timed Games to Emulate Memory. In *48th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2021)*, volume 198 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 137:1–137:17, 2021.
- 26 Benjamin Monmege, Julie Parreaux, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Decidability of One-Clock Weighted Timed Games with Arbitrary Weights. In *33rd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2022*, volume 243 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 15:1–15:22, 2022.
- 27 Youssouf Oualhadj, Pierre-Alain Reynier, and Ocan Sankur. Probabilistic Robust Timed Games. In *CONCUR 2014 - Concurrency Theory - 25th International Conference*, volume 8704 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 203–217, 2014.
- 28 Anuj Puri. Dynamical Properties of Timed Automata. In *Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault-Tolerant Systems, 5th International Symposium, FTRTFT'98*, volume 1486 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 210–227, 1998.
- 29 Ocan Sankur, Patricia Bouyer, and Nicolas Markey. Shrinking Timed Automata. In *IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2011)*, volume 13 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 90–1027, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2011.
- 30 Ocan Sankur, Patricia Bouyer, Nicolas Markey, and Pierre-Alain Reynier. Robust Controller Synthesis in Timed Automata. In *CONCUR 2013 - Concurrency Theory - 24th International Conference*, 2013.
- 31 Ocan Sankur. *Robustness in timed automata : analysis, synthesis, implementation. (Robustesse dans les automates temporisés : analyse, synthèse, implémentation)*. PhD thesis, École normale supérieure de Cachan, Paris, France, 2013.
- 32 Martin De Wulf, Laurent Doyen, Nicolas Markey, and Jean-François Raskin. Robustness and Implementability of Timed Automata. In *Formal Techniques, Modelling and Analysis of Timed and Fault-Tolerant Systems, Joint International Conferences on Formal Modelling and Analysis of Timed Systems, FORMATS 2004 and Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault-Tolerant Systems, FTRTFT 2004*, volume 3253 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 118–133, 2013.

### A Proof of Lemma 3

► **Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG, and  $p > p' \geq 0$  be two perturbations. Then*

1.  $\text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p \subseteq \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p'}$ ;
2. for all  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$ ,  $\sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \geq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta))$ .

**Proof.** 1. Let  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  be a strategy of Min in  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p'}$  be a finite play in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$ . Otherwise,  $\rho \notin \text{FPlays}^p$ , and  $\chi(\rho)$  is not defined. Now, by definition of the strategy, we have  $\chi(\rho) = (\delta, t)$  such that  $(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  where  $\text{last}(\rho) = (\ell, \nu)$ , i.e.  $\nu + t \models g$  and  $\nu + t + 2p \models g$  where  $g$  is the guard of  $\delta$ . Since valuations that satisfies a guard defined an interval, we conclude that  $\nu + t \models g$  and  $\nu + t + 2p' \models g$  by  $\nu + t \leq \nu + t + 2p' < \nu + t + 2p$ . Thus,  $(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^{p'}$ , i.e.  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p'}$ .

2. The proof consists in proving the following claim:

$$\forall \zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'} \exists \zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p, \text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta) = \text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta') \quad (\star)$$

Indeed, we can conclude since, for all  $\zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}$ , we have

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \geq \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) = \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta')).$$

Now, by letting  $\zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}$ , we prove  $(\star)$  by defining  $\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$  as an extension of  $\zeta'$ , i.e. for all finite play  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\text{Max}}^p$ , we fix

$$\zeta(\rho) = \begin{cases} \zeta'(\rho) & \text{if } \rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}; \\ e & \text{where } e \in E(\text{last}(\rho)), \text{ otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

where  $E(\text{last}(\rho))$  is the set of edges of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $\text{last}(\rho)$ . In particular, we conclude by induction on the length of the play induced by  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$ . The property is trivial when  $\rho = (\ell, \nu)$ . Otherwise, we fix  $\rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s \in \text{FPlays}^p$  be the play conforming to  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$  of length  $i$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ , and  $\rho' = \rho'_1 \xrightarrow{\delta', t'} s \in \text{FPlays}^{p'}$  be the play conforming to  $\chi$  and  $\zeta'$  of length  $i$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$  (we note that such a play exists since  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p'}$ , by the previous property). Thus, by the hypothesis of induction,  $\rho_1 = \rho'_1$ , thus we need to prove that  $(\delta, t) = (\delta', t')$ . In particular, if  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$ , then the property holds since we apply the same strategy in both cases. Otherwise, since  $\rho_1 = \rho'_1 \in \text{FPlays}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}$ , we conclude by definition of  $\zeta$ . ◀


### B Proof of Proposition 5

► **Proposition 5.** *The existential robust reachability problem is EXPTIME-complete.*

Before to provide the proof of this proposition, we first formally recall the definition of the excessive semantics, where we reuse the sets  $S_{\text{Min}}$ ,  $S_{\text{Max}}$ ,  $S_T$ ,  $E_{\text{Max}}$ ,  $E_{\text{rob}}$  and  $\text{wt}$  of Definition 2:

► **Definition 17.** *Let  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  be a WTG. The excessive semantics of  $\mathcal{G}$  of perturbation  $p > 0$  is the transition system  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p = \langle S, E, \text{wt} \rangle$  only differing from  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  by the set  $E'_{\text{Min}} = \left\{ \left( (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \right) \mid \ell \in L_{\text{Min}}, \nu + t \models g \right\}$  where  $\delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta$ .*





■ **Figure 4** Gadget used to define  $\mathcal{G}^e$  from  $\mathcal{G}$ . We detail how a transition  $\delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell')$  starting in a location belonging to Min is transformed. Symbols  $w, w_0, w_1$  denote weights from  $\mathcal{G}$ . The new location  $\ell^\delta$  of Max is urgent and tests the guard after the perturbation (as in the conservative semantics).

As explain before, the proof consists on a reduction from the conservative semantics to the excessive one. Intuitively, the conservative semantics imposes that the guards on transitions of Min are tested after applying the perturbation. The reduction exploits this idea: all transitions of Min in  $\mathcal{G}$  will be modified by adding a new *urgent location*<sup>3</sup> of Max (to forbid modification of the delay) dedicated to check the delay chosen by Min (after perturbation). This gadget is depicted on Figure 4. If Min plays a decision that is not robust w.r.t. the conservative semantics (that is possible since we ask for a robust decision w.r.t. the excessive one), then Max wins by reaching  $\ominus$ . Otherwise, Min chooses a robust decision w.r.t. the conservative semantics and Max must apply the original transition. Formally,

▶ **Proposition 18.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG. We can build in polynomial time a WTG  $\mathcal{G}^e$  such that for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$ , and all perturbation  $p > 0$ , Min has a winning strategy from  $(\ell, \nu)$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  iff she has a winning strategy from  $(\ell, \nu)$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$ .*

Using this reduction, we can solve the existential robust reachability problem (for the conservative semantics), and obtain the following result that directly imply Proposition 5:

▶ **Proposition 19.** *The existential robust reachability problem is EXPTIME-complete.*

*In addition, if the problem has a positive answer, then there exists a bound  $A$  exponential in the size of the WTG such that for every small enough perturbation  $p > 0$ , Min has a winning strategy in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  ensuring to reach the target within at most  $A$  steps.*

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG. The EXPTIME membership directly follows from Proposition 18 and [12] that shows the decidability of the existential robust reachability problem for the excessive semantics in exponential time. To prove the EXPTIME hardness, we apply the reduction from the halting problem of linear-bounded alternating Turing machines from [27].

Regarding the second statement of the Proposition, [12] also shows that if the existential robust reachability problem for a WTG  $\mathcal{G}'$  under excessive semantics admits a positive answer, then there exists some positive parameter and a strategy for Min which ensures to reach the target within at most  $A$  steps, where  $A$  is exponential in the size of  $\mathcal{G}'$ . For details, see the

<sup>3</sup> An urgent location is a location where time elapsing is not allowed. We can model it with a new clock that is reset before entering the urgent location and will be equal to 0 in all guards of its outgoing transitions. In particular, we use the urgent locations in this reduction to simplify its proof of correctness. Indeed, with urgent locations,  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G}^e$  have the same number of clocks, i.e. valuations in both games are the same dimension.

proof of Proposition 4.1 of [12]. To conclude, we observe that the proof of Proposition 18 shows, given some perturbation  $p$  and some bound  $A$ , that if Min has a winning strategy ensuring to reach the target within at most  $A$  steps in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$ , then so does she in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . ◀

In the rest of this Appendix, we give the proof of Proposition 18. In particular, we provide the formal construction of the game  $\mathcal{G}^e$  from a game  $\mathcal{G}$ . To do it, we need to slightly modify the definition of a WTG by allowing *urgent locations* under the excessive semantics. Formally, a *WTG with urgent locations* is a tuple  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, L_u, \mathcal{X}, \Delta^e, \text{wt}^e \rangle$  where  $\langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  is a WTG and  $L_u \subseteq L$  is a set of urgent locations. The usage of urgent location modifies the set of edges of the semantics of the WTG.

► **Definition 20.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, L_u, \mathcal{X}, \Delta^e, \text{wt}^e \rangle$  be a WTG with urgent locations. For  $p \geq 0$ , we define a transition system  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p = \langle S, E, \text{wt} \rangle$  only differing from the excessive semantics of  $\langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  by the set  $E$  defined such that, when  $\ell \in L_u$ , then for all valuations  $\nu$ ,  $(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell', \nu') \in E(\ell, \nu)$  if and only if  $t = 0$ .

Now, we have equipped to lead to the following definition of  $\mathcal{G}^e$ :

► **Definition 21.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  be a WTG and  $\Delta_{\text{Min}} = \{\delta \mid \delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta \text{ with } \ell \in L_{\text{Min}}\}$ . We let  $\mathcal{G}^e = \langle L_{\text{Min}}^e, L_{\text{Max}}^e, L_T, L_u^e, \mathcal{X}, \Delta^e, \text{wt}^e \rangle$  be a WTG with urgent locations where:  $L_{\text{Min}}^e = L_{\text{Min}} \cup \{\odot\}$ ,  $L_{\text{Max}}^e = L_{\text{Max}} \cup \{\ell^\delta \mid \delta \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}\}$ ,  $L_u^e = \{\ell^\delta \mid \delta \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}\}$ , and  $\Delta^e = \Delta_{\text{Min}}^e \uplus \Delta_{\text{Max}}^e \uplus \Delta_{\text{cons}_p}^e \uplus \{(\odot, \text{true}, \emptyset, \odot)\}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{Max}}^e &= \{(\ell, g, Y, \ell') \mid (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta \text{ with } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}}\} \\ \Delta_{\text{Min}}^e &= \{(\ell, \text{true}, \emptyset, \ell^\delta) \mid \delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}\} \\ \Delta_{\text{rob}}^e &= \{(\ell^\delta, g, Y, \ell') \mid \delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}\} \cup \{(\ell^\delta, \neg g, \emptyset, \odot) \mid \delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\neg g$  is the complement<sup>4</sup> of  $g$ , and  $\text{wt}^e : L^e \cup \Delta^e \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the weight function defined for all locations  $\ell \in L^e$  and for all transitions  $\delta = (\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta^e$  by  $\text{wt}^e(\ell) = \text{wt}(\ell)$  if  $\ell \in L$ , and 0 otherwise, and by:

$$\text{wt}^e(\delta) = \begin{cases} \text{wt}(\delta) & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}} \\ \text{wt}(\delta') & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Min}} \text{ and } \ell' = \ell^{\delta'} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This construction can be done in polynomial time. We now turn to its correction. Consider a perturbation  $p > 0$  and a configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$ . We have to prove that the following properties are equivalent:

1. Min has a winning strategy in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ ;
2. Min has a winning strategy in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ .

In this proof, we will consider two different semantics, the conservative and the excessive one. We naturally extend all notions of plays and strategies introduced for the conservative semantics to the excessive one. In particular, we denote by  $\text{FPlays}^{\text{excess}_p}$  the set of plays and  $\text{Strat}^{\text{excess}_p}$  the set of strategies w.r.t. the excessive semantics. Recall that we denote by  $\text{FPlays}^p$  the set of plays and  $\text{Strat}^p$  the set of strategies w.r.t. the conservative semantics.

<sup>4</sup> Formally, the complement of a guard is not a guard, as a guard is a conjunction of atomic constraints. However, it can be represented as a disjunction of guards, which can be dealt with using multiple transitions.

We will also say that a decision (i.e. a transition) is robust for  $\text{cons}_p$  (resp.  $\text{excess}_p$ ) if it is well-defined in the corresponding semantics. The following property directly follows from the definition of the conservative and excessive semantics, as the last one is more restrictive than the former one.

► **Lemma 22.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG and a robust decision  $(\delta, t)$  for  $\text{cons}_p$  with  $p > 0$ , from a configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$ . Then,  $(\delta, t)$  is robust for the  $\text{excess}_p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ .*

**First implication: a winning strategy in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  implies a winning strategy in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$**

To prove this implication, we consider  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  be a winning strategy for Min in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ , and we define  $\chi^e \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{excess}_p}$  be a strategy for Min in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$ . In particular, we prove that  $\chi^e$  is winning. To define this strategy, we use the (partial) function  $\text{proj}: \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p} \rightarrow \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$  on finite plays in  $\text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p}$  starting from  $(\ell, \nu)$  and ending in a state of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . In particular,  $\text{proj}$  is defined on finite plays that do not reach the location  $\ominus$ . By construction of  $\mathcal{G}^e$ , except configurations around  $\ell^\delta$ , edges along  $\rho$  are ones of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ : all decisions applied in  $\rho$  are robust for  $\text{cons}_p$ , or feasible for Max. Thus, the projection function consists in removing the configurations around  $\ell^\delta$ . Formally, for all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p}$  starting in  $(\ell, \nu)$  and ending in a state of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p = \langle S, E \rangle$ , we inductively define:

$$\text{proj}(\rho) = \begin{cases} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu); \\ \text{proj}(\rho_1) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s & \text{if } \rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s \text{ with } \text{last}(\rho_1) \in S; \\ \text{proj}(\rho_1) \xrightarrow{\delta, p} (\ell', \nu') & \text{if } \rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta', p} (\ell^\delta, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, 0} (\ell', \nu'). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, by definition of  $\text{proj}$ , we remark that  $\text{proj}$  fulfils the following property:

► **Lemma 23.** *Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p}$  be a finite play ending in a state of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . Then,  $\text{proj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$  and  $\text{last}(\rho) = \text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho))$ .*

Now, we have tools to define  $\chi^e$ : for all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p}$  starting in  $(\ell, \nu)$  and ending in a configuration of Min, we let

$$\chi^e(\rho) = (\delta', t) \quad \text{if } \chi(\text{proj}(\rho)) = (\delta, t).$$

We note that this strategy chooses robust decisions for  $\text{excess}_p$  since guards in transitions starting in a location of Min in  $\mathcal{G}^e$  are equal to true. Moreover, since the definition of  $\chi^e$  relies on  $\text{proj}$ , it is no surprise that:

► **Lemma 24.** *Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p}$  conforming to  $\chi^e$ . Then,*

1.  $\rho$  can not reach  $\ominus$ ;
2. if  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is defined (i.e.  $\text{last}(\rho) \in S$ ), then  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$ .

**Proof.** We reason by induction on the length of finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}_p}$  conforming to starting in  $(\ell, \nu)$ . If  $\rho = (\ell, \nu)$  then  $\text{proj}(\rho) = (\ell, \nu)$ , and both properties trivially hold. Otherwise, we suppose that  $\rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$  and we prove both properties.

1. By contradiction, we suppose that  $s = (\ominus, \nu)$  for a valuation  $\nu$ . In particular, by definition of  $\mathcal{G}^e$ ,  $\text{last}(\rho_1) = (\ell_1^\delta, \nu')$  such that  $\delta = (\ell_1, g, Y, \ell_1') \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}$  and  $\nu' \not\models g$ . Now, since  $\rho$  start a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we can write  $\rho_1 = \rho_2 \xrightarrow{\delta', t_1} (\ell, \nu, \delta', t_1) \xrightarrow{\delta', \varepsilon} (\ell_1^\delta, \nu')$  where  $\text{last}(\rho_2) = (\ell_2, \nu_2) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}^{\mathcal{G}}$  (by definition of  $\mathcal{G}^e$ ). Moreover, as  $\rho_1$  is conforming to  $\chi^e$  and does not reach  $\ominus$ , we know that  $\chi^e(\rho_2) = (\delta', t_1)$ , i.e.  $\chi(\text{proj}(\rho_2)) = (\delta, t_1)$ . Since  $\chi$  is a strategy for Min in  $\mathcal{G}$  (under the conservative semantics), then for all perturbations  $\varepsilon \in [0, 2p]$ ,  $\nu_2 + t + \varepsilon \models g$ , i.e.  $\nu' \models g$ . Thus, we obtain a contradiction.

2. We distinguish two cases according the last state of  $\rho_1$ . First, if  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \in S$ , then  $\text{proj}(\rho_1)$  is defined. Since  $\text{proj}(\rho_1)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  (by the hypothesis of induction) and  $\text{last}(\rho_1) = \text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho_1))$  (by Lemma 23, we conclude that  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  when  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \notin \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}^{\mathcal{G}}$ . In particular, we suppose that  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}^{\mathcal{G}}$ , and  $\text{proj}(\rho) = \text{proj}(\rho_1) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$ . We note that by definition of  $\chi^e$ , the decision chosen by the strategy  $\chi$  for  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is  $(\delta, t)$ . Thus,  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$ .  
 Otherwise, we suppose that  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \notin S$  and by the previous property, we know that  $\text{last}(\rho_1) = (\ell_1^\delta, \nu')$  such that  $\delta = (\ell_1, g, Y, \ell_1') \in \Delta_{\text{Min}}$ . Now, since  $\rho$  start a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we can write  $\rho_1 = \rho_2 \xrightarrow{\delta', \varepsilon} (\ell_1^\delta, \nu')$  where  $\text{last}(\rho_2) \in S \setminus \text{Conf}^{\mathcal{G}}$  (by definition of  $\mathcal{G}^e$ ). To conclude, we note that  $\text{proj}(\rho) = \text{proj}(\rho_2) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} s$  with  $\text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho_2))$  be a state of Max (in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ ). Thus,  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  since  $\text{proj}(\rho_2)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  by hypothesis of induction.  $\blacktriangleleft$

By contradiction, we suppose that  $\chi^e$  is not a winning strategy. In particular, we suppose that there exists a maximal play  $\rho$  conforming to  $\chi^e$  that does not reach a target location. Moreover, by Lemma 24.1, we know that  $\rho$  can neither reached  $\odot$  nor ends in an urgent location of Max (they do not introduce new deadlock). In particular, if  $\rho$  is a finite play, its ends in a state of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . Thus, by Lemma 23, we deduce that  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  does not reach a target location (we note that if  $\rho$  is infinite,  $\text{proj}$  is defined on all its finite prefix ending in a state of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ ). Since  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  (by Lemma 24.2), we deduce that  $\chi$  is not winning. Thus, we obtain a contradiction.

### Second implication: a winning strategy in $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$ implies a winning strategy in $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$

Conversely, consider a (given) winning strategy  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{\text{excess}^p}$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G}^e \rrbracket_{\text{excess}}^p$ . We define a strategy  $\chi^c \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  for Min in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  which is winning. To do it, we define a function that encodes plays in  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t. conservative semantics into plays in  $\mathcal{G}^e$  w.r.t. excessive semantics. Since the interval of possible perturbations is the same in both semantics, all robust decisions for the conservative semantics in  $\mathcal{G}$  are robust decisions for the excessive semantics in  $\mathcal{G}^e$  where all guards from a location of Min contain no constraints. Formally, we define, by induction on the length of finite plays,  $\text{inj} : \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p \rightarrow \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}^p}$  such that for all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$ , we let

$$\text{inj}(\rho) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } \rho = s; \\ \text{inj}(\rho_1) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s & \text{if } \rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s \text{ with } \text{last}(\rho_1) \in \text{Conf}^{\mathcal{G}}; \\ \text{inj}(\rho_1) \xrightarrow{\delta', p} (\ell^\delta, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, 0} s & \text{if } \rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta, p} s \text{ with } \text{last}(\rho_1) = (\ell, \nu, \delta, t). \end{cases}$$

By definition of  $\text{inj}$ , we remark that  $\text{inj}$  fulfils the following property:

► **Lemma 25.** *Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$  be a finite play ending in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then,  $\text{inj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}^e}^{\text{excess}^p}$  and  $\text{last}(\rho) = \text{last}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ .*

Now, we have tools to define  $\chi^c$ : for all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$ , we let

$$\chi^c(\rho) = (\delta, t) \quad \text{if } \chi(\text{inj}(\rho)) = (\delta', t)$$

such that  $\delta' = (\text{last}(\rho), \text{true}, \emptyset, \ell^\delta)$  and  $(\delta, t)$  is a robust decision for the conservative semantics from  $\text{last}(\rho)$ . We note, by definition, that this strategy chooses a robust decision for the conservative semantics. Moreover, since the definition of  $\chi^c$  relies on  $\text{inj}$ , we can show:

► **Lemma 26.** *Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$  conforming to  $\chi^c$ . Then,  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$ .*

**Proof.** We reason by induction on the length of finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}_{\mathcal{G}}^p$ . If  $\rho = s$  then  $\text{inj}(\rho) = s$ , and the property trivially holds. Otherwise, we suppose that  $\rho = \rho_1 \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$ . Since  $\text{proj}(\rho_1)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  (by the hypothesis of induction) and  $\text{last}(\rho_1) = \text{last}(\text{inj}(\rho_1))$  (by Lemma 25), we conclude that  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  when  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \notin \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}^{\mathcal{G}}$ . In particular, we suppose that  $\text{last}(\rho_1) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}^{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $\text{inj}(\rho) = \text{inj}(\rho_1) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$ . To conclude, we remark that  $(\delta, t)$  is robust for the conservative semantics in  $\mathcal{G}$  since  $\chi$  is supposed to win. Otherwise, Max can choose a perturbation such that  $\odot$  was reached, which contradicts that  $\chi$  is winning. ◀

By contradiction, we suppose that  $\chi^c$  is not a winning strategy. In particular, we suppose that there exists a maximal play  $\rho$  conforming to  $\chi^c$  that does not reach a target location. By Lemma 25, we deduce that  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  does not reach a target location. Since  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$  (by Lemma 26), we deduce that  $\chi$  is not winning. Thus, we obtain a contradiction which conclude the proof of Proposition 18.

## C Conservative semantics is equivalent to the “classical” conservative semantics

In the literature, the conservative semantics is defined such that Max can choose a perturbation in  $[-p, p]$  instead in  $[0, 2p]$  in our case. Even if this semantics change a little the possible choices of Min, we prove that their robust values are always equal. Formally, we define the “classical” conservative semantics, given in [11, 12, 22] by:

► **Definition 27.** *Let  $\mathcal{G} = \langle L_{\text{Min}}, L_{\text{Max}}, L_T, \mathcal{X}, \Delta, \text{wt} \rangle$  be a WTG. The “classical” conservative semantics of  $\mathcal{G}$  of perturbation  $p > 0$  is a transition system  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_{\text{cons}}^p = \langle S, E, \text{wt} \rangle$  only differing from  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  by the sets*

$$E_{\text{Min}} = \left\{ \left( (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \mid \ell \in L_{\text{Min}}, t \geq p, \nu + t - p \models g \text{ and } \nu + t + p \models g \right) \right\}$$

$$E_{\text{rob}} = \left\{ \left( (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} (\ell', \nu') \mid \varepsilon \in [-p, p] \text{ and } \nu' = (\nu + t + \varepsilon)[Y := 0] \right) \right\}$$

where  $\delta \in \Delta$ .

We note that with respect to this new conservative semantics, all delays  $t$  chosen by Min must satisfy  $t \geq p$ , since, otherwise, Max can produce a negative delay. Moreover, we note that  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_{\text{cons}}^p$  correspond to a shift by  $p$  of delays used in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . In particular, by applying the definition of both semantics, we obtain the following lemma:

► **Lemma 28.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG,  $p > 0$  be a perturbation. Then,  $(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  is an edge of the conservative semantics if, and only if,  $(\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t+p} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t+p) \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_{\text{cons}}^p$  is an edge of the “classical” conservative semantics.*

We naturally extend all notions of plays and strategies in this context. In particular, we denote by  $\text{FPlays}^{p, \text{cons}}$  the set of plays and  $\text{Strat}^{p, \text{cons}}$  the set of strategies w.r.t. the “classical” conservative semantics. Moreover, we defined a new robust value (that is also determined by [16, Theorem 1]):

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) = \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p, \text{cons}}} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p, \text{cons}}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)),$$

Now, we prove that

► **Proposition 29.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG and  $p > 0$  be a perturbation. Then, for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$ , we have  $rVal^p(\ell, \nu) = rVal_{\text{cons}}^p(\ell, \nu)$ .*

Given an initial configuration  $(\ell, \nu)$ , we reason by double inequalities.

**First inequality:**  $rVal_{\text{cons}}^p(\ell, \nu) \geq rVal^p(\ell, \nu)$ .

By considering a strategy  $\chi' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p, \text{cons}}$  for Min, we exhibit a strategy  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  at least as good as  $\chi'$ , i.e. such that

$$\sup_{\zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p, \text{cons}}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi', \zeta')) \geq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)).$$

The definition of  $\chi$  is induced by a function between plays  $\text{FPlays}^p$  to  $\text{FPlays}^{p, \text{cons}}$  such that this function preserves the weight of plays. Intuitively, this function implements the property on robust decision given by Lemma 28. Formally, we define the function  $\text{proj}: \text{FPlays}^p \rightarrow \text{FPlays}^{p, \text{cons}}$  by induction on the length of plays such that for all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$ , we have

$$\text{proj}(\rho) = \begin{cases} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu); \\ \text{proj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu) \text{ and } \text{last}(\rho') \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Max}}; \\ \text{proj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t+p} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t+p) & \text{if } \rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t); \\ \text{proj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon-p} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} (\ell, \nu) \text{ and } \text{last}(\rho') \notin \text{Conf}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,  $\text{proj}$  fulfils the following property:

► **Lemma 30.** *For all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$ , we have:*

1.  $\text{proj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}^{p, \text{cons}}$  and  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$  if and only if  $\text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho)) \in \text{Conf}$ . Moreover, when  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$  we have  $\text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho)) = \text{last}(\rho)$ ;
2. if  $\rho$  ends in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho))$ .

**Proof.** 1. By definition of  $\text{proj}$ .

2. We reason by induction on the length of a  $\rho$  where  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$ . If  $\rho = (\ell, \nu)$ , then the property trivially holds. Otherwise, we let  $\rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$ . Thus, we conclude by distinguishing cases according to  $\text{last}(\rho')$ . First, we remark that  $\text{last}(\rho') \notin \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$ . Otherwise, that will contradict  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$ .

Now, we suppose that  $\text{last}(\rho') = (\ell, \nu) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Max}}$ , and we have  $\text{proj}(\rho) = \text{proj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$ . In particular, by hypothesis of induction applied on  $\rho'$  that ends in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we have  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho')) = \text{wt}(\rho')$ . Moreover, since  $\text{last}(\rho') = (\ell, \nu) = \text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho'))$  (by item (1)), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho)) &= \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho')) + t \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) \\ &= \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho') + t \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we suppose that  $\text{last}(\rho') = (\ell, \nu, \delta, t') \notin \text{Conf}$ , and we have  $\text{proj}(\rho) = \text{proj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t-p} s$  such that

$$\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho)) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho')) + (t-p) \text{wt}(\ell, \nu, \delta, t') + 0 = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho')) + (t-p) \text{wt}(\ell). \quad (1)$$

Since  $\text{last}(\rho') \notin \text{Conf}$ , we can not apply the hypothesis of induction on  $\rho'$ . However, we can rewrite  $\rho' = \rho'' \xrightarrow{\delta, t'} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t')$  where  $\text{last}(\rho'') = (\ell, \nu) \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$  (since  $\rho'$  begins by a configuration). In particular,  $\text{proj}(\rho') = \text{proj}(\rho'') \xrightarrow{\delta, t'+p} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t'+p)$ , and we obtain that

$$\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho')) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\rho'')) + (t'+p) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho'') + (t'+p) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta)$$

since  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\text{proj}(\rho'')) = \text{wt}(\rho'')$  (by hypothesis of induction applied on  $\rho''$ ) and  $\text{last}(\rho'') = (\ell, \nu) = \text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho''))$  (by item (1)). By combining the previous equation with (1), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}_\Sigma(\text{proj}(\rho)) &= \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho'') + (t' + p) \text{wt}(\ell) + (t - p) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) \\ &= \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho'') + (t' + t) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) = \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Now, we define  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  such that for all  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$

$$\chi(\rho) = (\delta, t - p) \quad \text{if } \chi'(\text{proj}(\rho)) = (\delta, t).$$

By Lemma 28, we note that this choice induced an edge of  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . Moreover, since the definition of  $\chi$  relies on  $\text{proj}$ , it is no surprise that:

► **Lemma 31.** *Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$  be a play conforming to  $\chi$ . Then,  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi'$ .*

**Proof.** We reason by induction on the length of  $\rho$ . If  $\rho = (\ell, \nu)$  then  $\text{proj}(\rho) = (\ell, \nu)$ , and the property trivially holds. Otherwise, we can write  $\rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$  such that  $\text{proj}(\rho')$  is conforming to  $\chi'$  by the hypothesis of induction. In particular, if  $\text{last}(\rho') \notin \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$  then  $\text{last}(\text{proj}(\rho')) \notin \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$  (by Lemma 30-(1)) and  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi'$ .

Now, we suppose that  $\text{last}(\rho') \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$ , and  $\text{proj}(\rho) = \text{proj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t+p} s$ . Since  $\rho$  is conforming to  $\chi$ , then  $\chi(\rho') = (\delta, t)$ . We conclude by definition of  $\chi$ , since  $\chi'(\text{proj}(\rho')) = (\delta, t + p)$ . ◀

We consider a finite play  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$  ending a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$  and conforming to  $\chi$ . We prove that the play  $\text{proj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}^p$  conforming to  $\chi'$  (by Lemma 31) satisfies  $\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{wt}(\text{proj}(\rho))$ . Indeed, if  $\rho$  reaches a target location, then  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  reaches the same target location by applying Lemma 30-(1). In particular, by Lemma 30-(2), we conclude that  $\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{wt}(\text{proj}(\rho))$ . Otherwise,  $\rho$  does not reach a target location and  $\text{wt}(\rho) = +\infty$ . By using Lemma 30-(2), we conclude that  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  does not reach a target location. Otherwise,  $\rho$  would reach the same last configuration (since it ends in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ ), i.e.  $\text{wt}(\text{proj}(\rho)) = +\infty$ .

Finally, we have shown that for all maximal plays  $\rho$  conforming to  $\chi$ , we can define a play  $\text{proj}(\rho)$  conforming to  $\chi'$  (by Lemma 31) such that  $\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{wt}(\text{proj}(\rho))$ . In particular, we do not prove that there does not exist infinite maximal play conforming to  $\chi$ , but if such a play exists, it also exists an infinite maximal play conforming to  $\chi'$ . Indeed, we prove that for all finite plays conforming to  $\chi$ , there exists a finite play with a weight at least equal to the finite play conforming to  $\chi'$  such that the last configuration of two plays is equal. In particular, if all maximal plays conforming to  $\chi$  are finite, we obtain the inequality over values of  $\chi$  and  $\chi'$ . Now, if there exists an infinite maximal play conforming to  $\chi$ , then all its prefixes do not reach the target. In particular, we can define an infinite play conforming to  $\chi'$  that does not reach the target (since for each prefix, both plays end in the same configuration) and the inequality holds. Thus, we obtain that

$$\sup_{\zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p, \text{cons}}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi', \zeta')) \geq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \geq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu).$$

Since, this inequality holds for all  $\chi'$ , we obtain the claimed inequality.

**Second inequality:**  $\text{rVal}_{\text{cons}}^p(\ell, \nu) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ .

Conversely, by considering a strategy  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  for Min, we exhibit a strategy  $\chi' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p, \text{cons}}$  at least as good as  $\chi$ , i.e.

$$\sup_{\zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p, \text{cons}}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi', \zeta')) \leq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)).$$

In particular, we use the function  $\text{inj}: \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}} \rightarrow \text{FPlays}^p$  defined by induction on the length of plays such that for all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$ , we have

$$\text{inj}(\rho) = \begin{cases} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu) \\ \text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu) \text{ and } \text{last}(\rho') \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Max}} \\ \text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t-p} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t-p) & \text{if } \rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \\ \text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon+p} s & \text{if } \rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} s \text{ and } \text{last}(\rho') \notin \text{Conf} \end{cases}$$

Moreover,  $\text{inj}$  satisfies the properties:

► **Lemma 32.** *For all finite plays  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$ , we have:*

1.  $\text{inj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}^p$  and  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$  if and only if  $\text{last}(\text{inj}(\rho)) \in \text{Conf}$ . Moreover, when  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$  we have  $\text{last}(\text{inj}(\rho)) = \text{last}(\rho)$ ;
2.  $\text{inj}$  is the inverse of  $\text{proj}$ ;
3. if  $\rho$  ends in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e.  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$ , then  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ .

**Proof.** 1. By definition of  $\text{proj}$ .

2. Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$ , we prove that  $\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho)) = \rho$  by induction on the length of  $\rho$ . If  $\rho = (\ell, \nu)$ , then  $\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho)) = (\ell, \nu)$ . Otherwise, we rewrite by  $\rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$  such that  $\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho')) = \rho'$  by the hypothesis of induction. We conclude by distinguishing cases according to  $\text{last}(\rho')$ . If  $\text{last}(\rho') \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Max}}$ , then

$$\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho)) = \text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s) = \text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho')) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s.$$

If  $\text{last}(\rho') \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$ , then

$$\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho)) = \text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t-p} s) = \text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho')) \xrightarrow{\delta, t-p+p} s = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s.$$

Finally, if  $\text{last}(\rho') \notin \text{Conf}$ , we have

$$\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho)) = \text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t+p} s) = \text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho')) \xrightarrow{\delta, t+p-p} s = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s.$$

Conversely, via an analogous proof, we obtain that for all  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$  we have  $\text{inj}(\text{proj}(\rho)) = \rho$  by induction on the length of  $\rho$ .

3. Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$ , we have  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{proj}(\text{inj}(\rho))) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{inj}(\rho))$  by Lemma 30-(2). We conclude that  $\text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\rho) = \text{wt}_{\Sigma}(\text{inj}(\rho))$  by item (2). ◀

Now, we define  $\chi' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p,\text{cons}}$  such that for all  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$

$$\chi'(\rho) = (\delta, t+p) \quad \text{if } \chi(\text{inj}(\rho)) = (\delta, t).$$

By Lemma 28, we note that this choice induced an edge of  $[[\mathcal{G}]]_{\text{cons}}^p$ . Moreover, since the definition of  $\chi$  relies on  $\text{inj}$ , it is no surprise that:

► **Lemma 33.** *Let  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$  be a play conforming to  $\chi'$ . Then,  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  is conforming to  $\chi$ .*

**Proof.** We reason by induction on the length of  $\rho$  and as in Lemma 31, the interesting case is when  $\rho = \rho' \xrightarrow{\delta, t} s$  where  $\text{last}(\rho') \in \text{Conf}_{\text{Min}}$  and  $\text{inj}(\rho')$  is conforming to  $\chi$  by the hypothesis of induction. In this case,  $\text{inj}(\rho) = \text{inj}(\rho') \xrightarrow{\delta, t-p} s$ . Since  $\rho$  is conforming to  $\chi'$ , then we have  $\chi'(\rho) = (\delta, t)$ . We conclude by definition of  $\chi'$ , since  $\chi(\text{inj}(\rho')) = (\delta, t-p)$ . ◀



We consider a finite play  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^{p,\text{cons}}$  ending a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$  and conforming to  $\chi'$ . We prove that the play  $\text{inj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}^p$  conforming to  $\chi$  (by Lemma 33) satisfies  $\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{wt}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ . Indeed, if  $\rho$  reaches a target location, then  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  reaches the same target location by applying Lemma 32-(1). In particular, by Lemma 32-(3), we conclude that  $\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{wt}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ . Otherwise,  $\rho$  does not reach a target location and  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  too by Lemma 32-(1). Thus,  $\text{wt}(\rho) = +\infty = \text{wt}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ .

Finally, we have shown that for all plays  $\rho$  conforming to  $\chi$ , we can define a play  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  conforming to  $\chi'$  (by Lemma 33) such that  $\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{wt}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ . In particular, we conclude since the following inequality holds for all  $\chi'$ ,

$$\text{rVal}_{\text{cons}}^p(\ell, \nu) \leq \sup_{\zeta' \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p,\text{cons}}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi', \zeta')) \leq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)).$$

## D Proof of Lemma 7

► **Lemma 7.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG, and  $p > p' \geq 0$  be two perturbations. Then, for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$ ,  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) \geq \text{rVal}^{p'}(\ell, \nu)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  be a strategy for Min such that

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \geq \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta))$$

(by Lemma 3-(2)). We conclude, by applying the infimum over strategies in  $\text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p \subseteq \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p'}$  (by Lemma 3-(1)) for Min:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) &= \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \\ &\geq \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{p'}} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^{p'}} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) = \text{rVal}^{p'}(\ell, \nu). \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

## E Example of computation of robust value functions

We consider the acyclic WTG depicted in Figure 1 with two clocks  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2\}$  and we compute the fixed-perturbation robust value function w.r.t. the conservative semantics with a parameter  $p > 0$ , for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ . All cells used throughout this computation are depicted in Figure 5 (we note that the cells are depicted for a fixed  $p$ , otherwise another dimension is needed).

**The fixed-perturbation robust value function in  $\ell_1$**  Intuitively by the positivity of the weight in  $\ell_1$ , Min wants to play with the minimal delay, i.e.  $0$ , whereas Max wants to maximise its perturbation, i.e.  $2p$ . Thus, we have

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_1, \nu) = \inf_t \sup_{\varepsilon \in [0, 2p]} [(t + \varepsilon) \times 1] = 2p.$$

**The fixed-perturbation robust value function in  $\ell_2$**  Again, since the weight of  $\ell_2$  is positive, Min wants to minimise the time spent in this location whereas Max wants to maximise the perturbation, i.e.  $2p$ . In particular, from the guard, we remark that if  $\nu(x_2) \geq 1$ , Min can directly leave the location and the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to  $1 + (0 + 2p) \times 1 + 2p = 1 + 4p$ ; otherwise, if  $\nu(x_2) < 1$ , Min must wait until the

valuation of  $x_2$  is equal to 1 and the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to  $1 + (1 - \nu(x_2) + 2p) \times 1 + 2p = 2 + 4p - \nu(x_2)$ . To summarize, for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ , we have

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_2, \nu) = \begin{cases} 2 + 4p - \nu(x_2) & \text{if } \nu(x_2) < 1; \\ 1 + 4p & \text{if } 1 \leq \nu(x_2) \leq 2 - 2p; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**The fixed-perturbation robust value function in  $\ell_3$**  Since the conservative semantics do not perturb the decisions of Max,  $\ell_2$  can be reached only on the projection of the brown cell on the affine equation  $x_1 = 0$  and the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_3, \nu) = \sup_{\substack{t \\ 1 < \nu(x_1) + t < 2 \\ \nu(x_2) + t < 1}} \text{rVal}^p(\ell_2, \nu') - 2 \quad \text{where } \nu'(x_1) = 0 \text{ and } \nu'(x_2) = \nu(x_2) + t.$$

Moreover, Max wants to play a delay such that the valuation of  $x_1$  is close enough to 1 when the transition is applied. In particular, we distinguish two cases according to the valuation of  $x_1$ .

- We suppose that  $1 < \nu(x_1)$ , and Max can directly leave the location to obtain the weight  $2 + 4p - \nu(x_2)$  in  $\ell_2$ . In particular, when  $\nu(x_2) < 1$ , we deduce that the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to  $4p - \nu(x_2)$ .
- Otherwise, we suppose that  $\nu(x_1) \leq 1$  and Max wants to play the delay is  $1 - \nu(x_1)$ . We note that this decision is feasible only when  $\nu(x_2) < \nu(x_1)$ . In this case, the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to  $-2 + 2 + 4p - (\nu(x_2) + 1 - \nu(x_1)) = 4p + \nu(x_1) - \nu(x_2) - 1$ .

Thus, for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ , we conclude that


$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_3, \nu) = \begin{cases} 4p + \nu(x_1) - \nu(x_2) - 1 & \text{if } \nu(x_1) \leq 1 \text{ and } \nu(x_2) < \nu(x_1); \\ 4p - \nu(x_2) & \text{if } 1 < \nu(x_1) < 2 \text{ and } \nu(x_2) < 1; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**The fixed-perturbation robust value function in  $\ell_4$**  By negativity of the weight of  $\ell_4$ , Max wants to minimise the perturbation, whereas Min wants to maximise the time spent in  $\ell_4$ , i.e. Min waits until a valuation equal to  $2 - 2p$  (since the guard must be satisfied for all perturbations, Min can not wait longer). Again, we distinguish two cases according to the order over valuations of  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ .

- We suppose that  $\nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) \leq 2 - 2p$  and  $2 - 2p - \nu(x_1)$  is a robust delay for Min. Moreover, since Max does not perturb the delay chosen by Min, the fixed-perturbation robust value is equal to  $-(2 - 2p - \nu(x_1))$ .
- We suppose that  $\nu(x_1) < \nu(x_2) \leq 2 - 2p$  and, symmetrically,  $2 - 2p - \nu(x_2)$  is a robust delay for Min when  $\nu(x_2) + 2p - 1 \leq x_1 \leq \nu(x_2)$ . Moreover, since Max does not perturb the delay chosen by Min, the fixed-perturbation robust value is equal to  $-(2 - 2p - \nu(x_2))$ .

Thus, for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ , we have

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_4, \nu) = \begin{cases} -(2 - 2p - \nu(x_1)) & \text{if } \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) < 2 - 2p; \\ -(2 - 2p - \nu(x_2)) & \text{if } \nu(x_2) + 2p - 1 \leq \nu(x_1) < \nu(x_2) < 2 - 2p; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$



■ **Figure 5** Cells for the fixed-perturbation robust value functions computed for all locations of the acyclic WTG depicted in Figure 1 when  $p = \frac{1}{18}$ .

We note that  $\nu(x_2) + 2p - 1 \leq 2$  (i.e. the green cell is not empty) if and only if  $p \leq 1/2$ . For the rest of the computation, we suppose that the upper bound over  $p$  is  $\eta = 1/2$ .

**The fixed-perturbation robust value function in  $\ell_0$**  Finally, we compute the fixed-perturbation robust value function of  $\ell_0$  by remarking that

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = \min \left( \text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_3, \nu), \text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_4, \nu) \right)$$

where  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_3, \nu)$  (resp.  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_4, \nu)$ ) denotes the robust value from  $(\ell_0, \nu)$  when Min chooses to go to the location  $\ell_3$  (resp.  $\ell_4$ ) from  $\ell_0$ . To conclude, we distinguish two cases according to the choice of transition by Min.

*We suppose that Min chooses to go to  $\ell_4$ .* Since the clock  $x_1$  is reset by the transition between  $\ell_0$  and  $\ell_4$  only the green cell on its border  $x_1 = 0$  can be reached to obtain a finite value function, i.e.  $\ell_4$  is reached when  $\nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 2p$ . Now, since the weight of  $\ell_0$  is positive and the fixed-perturbation robust value function increases when the valuation of  $x_2$  increases, Max wants to maximise its perturbation, i.e.  $2p$ , whereas Min wants to minimise its delay, i.e. directly leave if  $\nu(x_1) \geq 1$ , or wait until 1 for the valuation of  $x_1$ .

- We suppose that  $1 < \nu(x_1) < 2 - 2p$  and Min plays the delay **0** when  $\nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 4p$ . Moreover, the obtained weight is  $1 \times 2p + 1 - (2 - 2p - (\nu(x_2) + 2p)) = \nu(x_2) + 6p - 1$ .
- We suppose that  $0 \leq \nu(x_1) \leq 1$  and Min plays the minimal delay  **$1 - \nu(x_1)$**  when  $\nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p$ . In particular, the obtained weight is  $1 \times (1 - \nu(x_1) + 2p) + 1 - (2 - 2p - (\nu(x_2) + 1 + 2p - \nu(x_1))) = 1 + \nu(x_2) + 6p - 2\nu(x_1)$ .

Thus, for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ , we have

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_4, \nu) = \begin{cases} \nu(x_2) + 1 + 6p - 2\nu(x_1) & \text{if } x_1 \leq 1 \text{ and } \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p; \\ \nu(x_2) - 1 + 6p & \text{if } 1 < \nu(x_1) < 2 - 2p \text{ and } \nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 4p; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*We suppose that Min chooses to go to  $\ell_3$ .* According to the guard between  $\ell_0$  and  $\ell_3$ , we know that  $\ell_3$  is reached with the green cell, i.e. in  $\ell_3$  (after the perturbation), the valuations

of clocks are such that  $\nu(x_1) \leq 2$  and  $\nu(x_2) \leq 1$ . Again, Min wants to minimise its delay and Max perturbs with  $2p$ . Thus, from the guard, we consider two cases according to the valuation of  $x_1$ .

- We suppose that  $1 \leq \nu(x_1) \leq 2 - 2p$  and Min plays with the delay  $0$  when  $\nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 2p$ . In particular, the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to  $1 \times 2p + 4p - (\nu(x_2) + 2p) = 4p - \nu(x_2)$ .
- We suppose that  $\nu(x_1) < 1$  and Min plays with the delay  $1 - \nu(x_1)$  when  $x_2 \leq \nu(x_1) - 2p$ . Moreover, the fixed-perturbation robust value function is equal to  $1 \times (1 - \nu(x_1) + 2p) + 4p - (\nu(x_2) + 1 + 2p - \nu(x_1)) = 4p - \nu(x_2)$ .

Thus, for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ , we have

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_3, \nu) = \begin{cases} 4p - \nu(x_2) & \text{if } \nu(x_1) \leq 2 - 2p \text{ and } \nu(x_2) \leq \min(\nu(x_1) - 2p, 1 - 2p); \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Computation of the minimum.* To conclude, we take the minimum between these two robust values functions: we look for the minimum according to valuations of clocks.

- We suppose that  $\nu(x_1) \leq 1$  and  $\nu(x_1) - 4p \leq \nu(x_2) < \nu(x_1) - 2p$ . In this case, only  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_3, \nu)$  is finite. Thus, we deduce that  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = 4p - \nu(x_2)$ .
- We suppose that  $1 \leq \nu(x_1) \leq 2 - 2p$  and  $1 - 4p < \nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 2p$ . Again, only  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_3, \nu)$  is finite, i.e.  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = 4p - \nu(x_2)$ .
- We suppose that  $\nu(x_1) = 2 - 2p$  and  $\nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 2p$  and  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = 4p - \nu(x_2)$  by choosing  $\ell_3$ .
- We suppose that  $\nu(x_1) \leq 1$  and  $\nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p$ . In this case, both fixed-perturbation robust value functions are finite. Thus, we want to decide when  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_4, \nu) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell_0 \rightarrow \ell_3, \nu)$ , i.e. when  $\nu(x_2) + 1 - 6p - 2\nu(x_1) \leq 4p - \nu(x_2)$ . As this inequality holds when  $\nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) + 5p - 1/2$ , we fix  $\eta = 1/18$  to guarantee that the cell defined by  $\nu(x_1) + 5p - 1/2 \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p$  is not empty. Thus, in this case, we obtain that

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = \begin{cases} \nu(x_2) + 1 + 6p - 2\nu(x_1) & \text{if } \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) + 5p - \frac{1}{2}; \\ 4p - \nu(x_2) & \text{if } \nu(x_1) + 5p - \frac{1}{2} \leq \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- We suppose that  $1 < \nu(x_1) < 2 - 2p$  and  $\nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p$ . In this case both fixed-perturbation robust value functions are finite and we want to decide when  $\nu(x_2) - 1 + 6p \leq 4p - \nu(x_2)$ . Since this inequality holds when  $\nu(x_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} - p$  that is possible when  $p = 1/2$ . In particular,  $\eta$  remains  $1/18$ . Thus, in this case, we obtain that

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = \begin{cases} \nu(x_2) - 1 + 6p & \text{if } \nu(x_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} - p; \\ 4p - \nu(x_2) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} - p < \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 4p; \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, for all valuations in  $[0, 2]^2$ , we have

$$\text{rVal}^p(\ell_0, \nu) = \begin{cases} \nu(x_2) - 1 + 6p & \text{if } \begin{cases} \nu(x_1) \leq 1 \text{ and } \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 5p - \frac{1}{2}; \\ 1 < \nu(x_1) < 2 - 2p \text{ and } \nu(x_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} - p; \end{cases} \\ 4p - \nu(x_2) & \text{if } \begin{cases} \nu(x_1) \leq 1 \text{ and } \nu(x_1) - 5p - \frac{1}{2} < \nu(x_2) \leq \nu(x_1) - 2p; \\ 1 < \nu(x_1) < 2 - 2p \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} - p < \nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 2p; \\ \nu(x_1) = 2 - 2p \text{ and } \nu(x_2) \leq 1 - 2p; \end{cases} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

## F Proof of Lemma 10

To prove this result, we introduce the fixed-perturbation robust value at horizon  $i$ , i.e. the fixed-perturbation robust value computed only on plays on length at most  $i$ . Formally, given two robust strategies  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  and  $\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$ , we define  $\text{Play}^i((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)$  be the maximal play conforming to  $\chi$  and  $\zeta$  with a length at most<sup>5</sup>  $i$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ . In particular, we denote by  $\text{rVal}_i^p$  the *fixed-perturbation robust value at horizon  $i$* , defined by

$$\text{rVal}_i^p(\ell, \nu) = \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}^i((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)).$$

► **Lemma 10.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an acyclic WTG,  $p > 0$ ,  $D$  is the depth of  $\mathcal{G}$ , i.e. the length of a longest path in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then,  $\text{rVal}^p$  is a fixpoint of  $\mathcal{F}_p$ , and  $\text{rVal}^p = \mathcal{F}_p^D(\mathbb{V}^0)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\ell, \nu)$  be a configuration. By grouping all infimum/supremum together in  $(\mathcal{F}_p)^i(\mathbb{V})(\ell, \nu)$ , it can be rewritten as

$$\inf_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq i \\ s_k \in S_{\text{Min}}}} (f_k : ((\delta_0, t_0), \dots, (\delta_{k-1}, t_{k-1})) \mapsto (\delta_k, t_k)) \sup_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq i \\ s_k \in S_{\text{Max}}}} (f_k : ((\delta_0, t_0), \dots, (\delta_{k-1}, t_{k-1})) \mapsto (\delta_k, t_k)) \text{wt}(\rho)$$

where  $\rho$  is the finite play  $s_0 \xrightarrow{(\delta_0, t_0)=f_0} s_1 \xrightarrow{(\delta_1, t_1)=f_1(\delta_0, t_0)} \dots \xrightarrow{(\delta_i, t_i)=f_i((\delta_0, t_0), \dots, (\delta_{i-1}, t_{i-1}))} s_i$  such that  $\text{wt}(\rho)$  is finite if and only if  $\rho$  reaches a target location within  $i$  steps. Since the operator  $\mathcal{F}_p$  only used robust decisions for  $p$  for both players, we notice that the mapping  $f_k$ , chosen by the player owning state  $s_k$ , describes the robust decision for  $p$  for the  $k$ -th step as a function of the previously chosen (robust) decisions. In particular, for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$ , we have

$$\text{rVal}_i^p(\ell, \nu) = (\mathcal{F}_p)^i(\mathbb{V})(\ell, \nu). \quad (2)$$

Finally, to conclude the proof, we remark that the hypothesis of acyclicity of  $\mathcal{G}$  guarantees that  $\text{rVal}^p = \text{rVal}_D^p$  where  $D$  is the length of the longest path in  $\mathcal{G}$  (that is finite since  $\mathcal{G}$  is acyclic). In particular, by (2), we have  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) = \mathcal{F}_p^D(\mathbb{V}_0)(\ell, \nu)$ . To conclude, we note that  $\mathcal{F}_p(\text{rVal}^p)(\ell, \nu) = \mathcal{F}_p^{D+1}(\mathbb{V}_0)(\ell, \nu) = \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ . ◀

## G Proof of Lemma 11

► **Lemma 11.** *For all  $\mathbb{V}: L \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\infty}$ ,  $\ell \in L$ , and  $p > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V})(\ell)$  equals*

$$\begin{cases} \nu \mapsto 0 & \text{if } \ell \in L_T \\ \left( \nu \mapsto \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } \nu \in R_\ell \\ \max_{\delta=(\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta} [\text{wt}(\delta) + \text{Pre}_\ell(\text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})))] & \text{if } \nu \notin R_\ell \end{cases} \right) & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}} \\ \min_{\delta=(\ell, g, Y, \ell') \in \Delta} [\text{wt}(\delta) + \text{Pre}_\ell(\text{Perturb}_\ell^p(\text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})))] & \text{if } \ell \in L_{\text{Min}} \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** The case for  $\ell \in L_T$  is direct from the definition of  $\mathcal{F}_p$ .

<sup>5</sup> If the play reaches a deadlock within  $j$  steps ( $j < i$ ), we consider that it is an outcome of both strategies within  $i$  steps.

Now, we suppose that  $\ell \in L_{\text{Max}}$  and we distinguish two cases. If  $\nu \in R_\ell$ , i.e.  $E(\ell, \nu) = \emptyset$ , by definition,  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu) = +\infty$ . Now, we suppose that  $\nu \notin R_\ell$ , i.e.  $E(\ell, \nu) \neq \emptyset$ , and by decomposing the supremum, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu) &= \max_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} (\text{wt}(\delta) + \sup_{(\ell,\nu) \xrightarrow{\delta,t} (\ell',\nu')} [t \text{wt}(\ell) + \mathbb{V}_{\ell'}(\nu')]) \\ &= \max_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} (\text{wt}(\delta) + \sup_{(\ell,\nu) \xrightarrow{\delta,t} (\ell',\nu')} [t \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})(\nu + t)]) \end{aligned}$$

since  $\nu' = (\nu + t)[Y := 0]$ . When we fix a transition, choosing a robust decision (to define an edge in the semantic) is equivalent to choosing  $t$  to be a delay such that  $(\nu + t) \models g$ . In particular, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu) &= \max_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} (\text{wt}(\delta) + \sup_t [t \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'}))(\nu + t)]) \\ &= \max_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} (\text{wt}(\delta) + \text{Pre}_\ell(\text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})))(\nu)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we suppose that  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$  and we distinguish two cases. If  $\nu \in R_\ell$ , i.e.  $E(\ell, \nu) = \emptyset$ , by definition,  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu) = +\infty$ , which is consistent with the definition of an infimum/minimum over an empty set. Now, we suppose that  $\nu \notin R_\ell$ . In particular, by decomposing the infimum, we obtain that  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu)$  is equal to

$$\min_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} (\text{wt}(\delta) + \inf_{(\ell,\nu) \xrightarrow{\delta,t} (\ell,\nu,t,\delta)} \sup_{\substack{\varepsilon \in [0,2p] \\ (\ell,\nu,t,\delta) \xrightarrow{\delta,\varepsilon} (\ell,\nu')}} [(t+p) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})(\nu + t + \varepsilon)])$$

since  $\nu' = (\nu + t + \varepsilon)[Y := 0]$ . Then, like in the case of Max, the operator  $\text{Pre}_\ell$  does not distinguish decisions that are robust and those that are not. In particular, this operator does not compute, a priori, the set of safe delays (i.e. the delays such that the guard is satisfied for all perturbations). Now, to guarantee that the chosen delay by  $\text{Pre}_\ell$  induces an edge in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_p$ , we use the combination between operators  $\text{Perturb}_\ell^p$  and  $\text{Guard}_\delta$ . Indeed, if the operator  $\text{Pre}_\ell$  chooses a delay such that  $(\delta, t)$  is a non-robust decision, then there exists  $\varepsilon \in [0, 2p]$  such that  $\text{Guard}_\delta(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})(\nu + t + \varepsilon) = +\infty$ . In particular, the computation of the following supremum  $\sup_{\varepsilon \leq 2p} \text{Guard}_\delta(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'})(\nu + t + \varepsilon)$  guarantee that  $\text{Pre}_\ell$  (and more precisely its infimum) compute a delay that induces a robust decision when it is possible. Thus, we rewrite the infimum and the supremum over all edges in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket_p$  of  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu)$  by a constraint on the delay and the perturbations that we consider before applying the filter defined by the guard, i.e.  $\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu)$  is equal to

$$\min_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} (\text{wt}(\delta) + \inf_t (t \text{wt}(\ell) + \sup_{\varepsilon \leq 2p} [\varepsilon \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'}))(\nu + t + \varepsilon)])).$$

Finally, we conclude by definition of operators  $\text{Pre}_\ell$  and  $\text{Perturb}_\ell^p$ :

$$\mathcal{F}_p(\mathbb{V}_\ell)(\nu) = \min_{\delta=(\ell,g,Y,\ell')} [\text{wt}(\delta) + \text{Pre}_\ell(\text{Perturb}_\ell^p(\text{Guard}_\delta(\text{Unreset}_Y(\mathbb{V}_{\ell'}))))(\nu)]. \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

## H Proof of Lemma 13

► **Lemma 13.** *If  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  is a PVF, we can compute an atomic PVF  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  such that  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p = \llbracket F' \rrbracket_p$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

**Proof.** To define the atomic parametric piecewise affine function  $F'$ , we add diagonal inequalities defined from each intersection between two (non-diagonal) affine expressions.

Formally, we consider two (non-diagonal) affine expressions  $E : \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} a_x x + b + c\mathbf{p}$  and  $E' : \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} a'_x x + b' + c'\mathbf{p}$ . By letting  $A = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} a_x$  and  $A' = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} a'_x$ . We fix the diagonal intersection of  $E$  and  $E'$  (denoted by  $E \cap_d E'$ ), i.e. the hyperplane that contains the intersection of hyperplanes defined by equations  $E = 0$  and  $E' = 0$ , by

$$E \cap_d E' = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (Aa'_x - A'a_x)x + (Ab' - A'b) + (Ac' - A'c)\mathbf{p}.$$

On the right of Figure 3, the diagonal intersection of equations of  $\mathcal{E}$  are depicted in red.

Finally, we define  $F'$  by letting  $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E} \cup \{E \cap_d E' \mid E, E' \in \mathcal{E}\}$ ,  $\eta' = \min(\eta(\mathcal{E}'), \eta)$  and  $(f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')}$  by the restriction of  $(f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})}$  (we note that since  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$ , a cell of  $\mathcal{E}'$  is always contained in a cell of  $\mathcal{E}$ ). To conclude, we show that  $F'$  is atomic as in the non-robust case (see [21, Lemma 7.7]). ◀

## I Proof of Proposition 14

In this section, we detailed the proof of Proposition 14 by given the computation of each operator:

► **Proposition 14.** *Let  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  be a PVF. We can compute a PVF  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  with  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p = \mathcal{F}_p(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

We start by considering the minimum (resp. the maximum) of two parametric value functions  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . To do so, we consider their parametric partitions  $\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \eta_1 \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{E}_2, \eta_2 \rangle$ , and build their *intersection*  $\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \eta_1 \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{E}_2, \eta_2 \rangle$  that is a parametric partition  $\langle \mathcal{E}, \eta \rangle$  obtained by considering the union of all the expressions as well as an upperbound  $\eta = \min(\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta(\mathcal{E}))$ : therefore, each cell  $c$  of the intersection is such that there exist a cell  $c_1$  of  $\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \eta_1 \rangle$  and a  $c_2$  of  $\langle \mathcal{E}_2, \eta_2 \rangle$  such that for all  $p \leq \eta$ ,  $\llbracket c \rrbracket_p = \llbracket c_1 \rrbracket_p \cap \llbracket c_2 \rrbracket_p$ .

► **Lemma 34.** *Let  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, \eta_i, (f_{i,c})_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_i)} \rangle_{1 \leq i \leq k}$  be a set of parametric value functions. Then, there exists a parametric value function  $\langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  such that  $\eta \leq \min_i \eta_i$ , and  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p = \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \llbracket F_i \rrbracket_p$  (respectively,  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \llbracket F_i \rrbracket_p$ ) for all  $p \leq \eta$ .*

**Proof.** We provide the proof only in the case  $k = 2$  and for the minimum operation, since we can deduce the general one by induction. We thus consider the intersection  $\langle \mathcal{E}', \eta' \rangle$  of the two partitions  $\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \eta_1 \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{E}_2, \eta_2 \rangle$ . For a cell  $c$  of this partition, we know that it is obtained by the intersection of two cells  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  of the two original partitions. We consider the parametric affine expressions

$$f_{1,c_1} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x x + \beta + \gamma\mathbf{p} \quad \text{and} \quad f_{2,c_2} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha'_x x + \beta' + \gamma'\mathbf{p}$$

We need to refine the cell  $c$  to take into account the minimum of the two functions. To do so, we consider the equation describing the equality of the two functions: it is of the form  $E = 0$  with  $E = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\alpha'_x - \alpha_x)x + (\beta' - \beta) + (\gamma' - \gamma)\mathbf{p}$ , and we thus add the expression  $E$  in the partition, if this one goes through the cell  $c$ . In this case, this gives rise to two new cells over which  $f_{1,c_1}$  and  $f_{2,c_2}$  are respectively the minima: we can decide this by a careful examination of the parametric affine expressions. ◀

Thanks to that, we are able to adapt the proofs from [1, 21] for the operators  $\text{Guard}_\delta$ ,  $\text{Unreset}_\gamma$  and  $\text{Pre}_\ell$ , that exist also in the non-robust setting.

► **Lemma 35.** *Let  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  be a parametric value function. For all transitions  $\delta \in \Delta$ , we can compute a parametric value function  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  such that  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p = \text{Guard}_\delta(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

**Proof.** We let  $\langle \mathcal{E}', \eta' \rangle$  be the intersection of the partition  $\langle \mathcal{E}, \eta \rangle$  and the partition obtained by considering the set of affine expressions that compose the guard of the transition (with all coefficients in front of  $\mathbf{p}$  being 0, and thus an upperbound as big as we want). For each cell of the obtained partition, either all the valuations in its semantics entirely fulfil the guard (for all values of  $p \leq \eta$ ), or entirely do not fulfil it. Thus, for each cell  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')$ , either we let  $f'_c$  be equal to the mapping  $f_{\bar{c}}$  with  $\bar{c}$  the unique cell of  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$  that contains  $c$ , or we let  $f'_c = \pm\infty$  otherwise, according to which player the initial location of  $\delta$  belongs to. ◀

► **Lemma 36.** *Let  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  be a parametric value function. For all  $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , we can compute a parametric value function  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  such that  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p = \text{Unreset}_Y(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

**Proof.** Given a parametric affine expression  $E$  of the form  $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x x + \beta + \gamma \mathbf{p}$ , we let  $\text{Unreset}_Y(E)$  be the parametric affine expression  $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus Y} \alpha_x x + \beta + \gamma \mathbf{p}$  (where we have replaced by 0 every coefficient  $\alpha_x$  with  $x \in Y$ ). In particular, we obtain that  $\llbracket E \rrbracket_p(\nu[Y := 0]) = \llbracket \text{Unreset}_Y(E) \rrbracket_p(\nu)$ . We thus let  $\mathcal{E}'$  be the set of expressions  $\text{Unreset}_Y(E)$  for all  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ . For all cells  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')$ , let  $\bar{c}$  be the cell of  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})$  that contains the part of the cell  $c$  where all clocks of  $Y$  are equal to 0. Then, we let  $f'_c = \text{Unreset}_Y(f_{\bar{c}})$ , so that for all  $p \leq \min(\eta, \eta')$ , and all valuations  $\nu \in \llbracket c \rrbracket_p$ , we have  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p(\nu) = \llbracket f'_c \rrbracket_p(\nu) = \llbracket \text{Unreset}_Y(f_{\bar{c}}) \rrbracket_p(\nu) = \llbracket f_{\bar{c}} \rrbracket_p(\nu[Y := 0]) = \text{Unreset}_Y(\llbracket f_{\bar{c}} \rrbracket_p(\nu)) = \text{Unreset}_Y(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p(\nu))$ . ◀

► **Lemma 37.** *Let  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  be a parametric value function. For all locations  $\ell$ , we can compute a parametric value function  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  such that  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p = \text{Pre}_\ell(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

**Proof.** By Lemma 13, we can suppose that the partition we start with is atomic. Suppose now that  $\ell \in L_{\text{Max}}$  (the case for  $\text{Min}$  is symmetrical by replacing the supremum with an infimum), and consider a valuation  $\nu$ , as well as a fixed perturbation  $p \leq \eta$ . Then,

$$\text{Pre}_\ell(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)(\nu) = \sup_{t \geq 0} [t \text{ wt}(\ell) + \llbracket F \rrbracket_p(\nu + t)].$$

For every delay  $t > 0$ , the valuation  $\nu + t$  belongs to the open diagonal half-line from  $\nu$ , which crosses some of the semantics  $\llbracket c' \rrbracket_p$  for  $c'$  some cells of the parametric partition (this subset of cells is finite since there are anyway only a finite number of cells in the partition). Since the partition is atomic, this subset of cells neither depends on the choice of  $\nu$  in a given starting cell  $c$ , nor on the perturbation  $p$  as long as it is at most  $\eta$ . For a starting cell  $c$ , we thus let  $D_c$  be the set of cells that intersect the open diagonal half-lines starting from  $c$ .<sup>6</sup>

Since the function  $\llbracket F \rrbracket_p$  is affine in each cell, the above supremum over the possible delays is obtained for a value  $t$  that is either 0, or tending to  $+\infty$ , or on one of the two non-diagonal borders of a cell that intersect the open diagonal half-line from  $\nu$  (indeed diagonal borders either completely contain this half-line or do not intersect it), and we thus only have to consider those borders. Once again because the partition is atomic (and  $\eta$  is small enough), the set of those borders do not depend on the choice of  $\nu$  in a given starting cell  $c$ , nor on the perturbation  $p$  as long as it is at most  $\eta$ . For a starting cell  $c$  and a cell  $c' \in D_c$ , we thus

<sup>6</sup> This is a subset of what we intuitively called a *tube* in Section 5.



let  $B_{c,c'}$  be the non-diagonal borders of  $c'$  that intersect the diagonal half-lines from  $c$ : if  $c = c'$ , this consists of one of the non diagonal borders of  $c'$ , otherwise of both non diagonal borders of  $c'$ .

Consider again a valuation  $\nu$ , as well as a fixed perturbation  $p$ , and let  $c$  be the cell that contains  $\nu$  when the perturbation is  $p$ . For  $c' \in D_c$ , and  $B \in B_{c,c'}$ , there exists a unique  $t_{\nu,B,p} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $\nu + t_{\nu,B,p}$  lies on the border  $B$ : if  $B = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x x + \beta + \gamma \mathbf{p}$  with  $A = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x \neq 0$  (since  $B$  is non-diagonal), then  $t_{\nu,B,p} = -\frac{1}{A} (\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha_x \nu(x) + \beta + \gamma p)$ . The supremum in the definition  $\text{Pre}_\ell(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)(\nu)$  can thus be rewritten as

$$\max \begin{cases} \llbracket f_c \rrbracket_p(\nu) \\ \max_{c' \in D_c} \max_{B \in B_{c,c'}} [t_{\nu,B,p} \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket f_{c'} \rrbracket_p(\nu + t_{\nu,B,p})] \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (t \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket F \rrbracket_p(\nu + t)) \end{cases}$$

where the first term of the external maximum corresponds to the delay 0, the second term corresponds to a jump arbitrarily close to the border  $B$ , and the last term corresponds to a delay tending to  $+\infty$ .

The various finite maxima in this formula can be computed by using Lemma 34. The limit when  $t$  tends to  $+\infty$  can be computed by using the parametric affine expression  $f_{c'}$  in the furthest cell  $c'$  in the  $D_c$ . It only remains to explain how to compute the value  $t_{\nu,B,p} \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket f_{c'} \rrbracket_p(\nu + t_{\nu,B,p})$ , in a way that does not depend on  $\nu$  and  $p$ . Suppose that  $f_{c'} = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha'_x x + \beta' + \gamma' \mathbf{p}$ , with  $A' = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha'_x$ . By using the value of  $t_{\nu,B,p}$  computed above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\nu,B,p} \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket f_{c'} \rrbracket_p(\nu + t_{\nu,B,p}) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \alpha'_x \nu(x) + (A' + \text{wt}(\ell)) t_{\nu,B,p} + \beta' + \gamma' p \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left( \alpha'_x - \frac{A' + \text{wt}(\ell)}{A} \alpha_x \right) \nu(x) + \beta' - \frac{A' + \text{wt}(\ell)}{A} \beta + \left( \gamma' - \frac{A' + \text{wt}(\ell)}{A} \gamma \right) p \end{aligned}$$

This term can be encoded by the following parametric expression, allowing us to conclude:

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \underbrace{\left( \alpha'_x - \frac{A' + \text{wt}(\ell)}{A} \alpha_x \right)}_{\in \mathbb{Q}} x + \underbrace{\beta' - \frac{A' + \text{wt}(\ell)}{A} \beta}_{\in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}} + \underbrace{\left( \gamma' - \frac{A' + \text{wt}(\ell)}{A} \gamma \right)}_{\in \mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{p} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

Finally, we need to compute  $\text{Perturb}_\ell^p$  for a location  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$ . We obtain this by a subtle adaptation of the operator  $\text{Pre}_\ell$ , taking into account the parametric representation of the perturbation  $p$ .

► **Lemma 38.** *Let  $F = \langle \mathcal{E}, \eta, (f_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E})} \rangle$  be a parametric value function. For all locations  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$ , we can compute a parametric value function  $F' = \langle \mathcal{E}', \eta', (f'_c)_{c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}')} \rangle$  such that  $\eta' \leq \eta$ , and  $\llbracket F' \rrbracket_p = \text{Perturb}_\ell^p(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)$  for all  $p \leq \eta'$ .*

**Proof.** We suppose that the parametric partition is atomic. Let  $\nu$  be a valuation. We have:

$$\text{Perturb}_\ell^p(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)(\nu) = \sup_{\varepsilon \in [0, 2p]} [\varepsilon \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket F \rrbracket_p(\nu + \varepsilon)].$$

We want to use the same technique as for  $\text{Pre}_\ell$ , that is to write this supremum as a maximum over a finite number of functions, in particular using the borders of the partition. However, the situation is more complex since  $2p$  is now a possible delay, and moreover all delays should

be at most  $2p$  which suppresses some possible non diagonal borders in the diagonal half-line from  $\nu$ .

We take care of the first issue by considering  $\varepsilon = 0$  and  $\varepsilon = 2p$  as special cases. We take care of the second issue by first modifying the parametric partition, in order to incorporate the  $2p$  granularity over the delays. Indeed, we let  $\langle \mathcal{E}_1, \eta_1 \rangle$  be the atomic parametric partition obtained by Lemma 13 from the set of expressions that contains  $\mathcal{E}$  and all expressions  $E - 2p$  for  $E$  a non-diagonal expression of  $\mathcal{E}$ . We can restrict the affine functions  $f_c$  to be also defined on cells of  $\mathcal{E}_1$ .

We now claim that, similarly to the proof of  $\text{Pre}_\ell$ , for every cell  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1)$  and perturbation  $p \leq \eta_1$ , if two valuations  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$  belong to  $\llbracket c \rrbracket_p$ , then the open diagonal segments from the valuation to the valuation translated by the delay  $2p$  cross the same cells and borders of  $\mathcal{E}$ . We again let  $D_c$  and  $B_{c,c'}$  the set of cells  $c'$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  crossed by the open diagonal segments of length  $2p$  from valuations in  $c$ , and the non diagonal borders of  $c'$  that are indeed crossed. Moreover, for all valuations  $\nu \in \llbracket c \rrbracket_p$ , the valuation  $\nu + 2p$  is always in the same cell  $c''$  of  $\mathcal{E}$ , independent on the choice of  $\nu$  and  $p$ . Thus, for  $c \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $\nu \in \llbracket c \rrbracket_p$ , we can write  $\text{Perturb}_\ell^p(\llbracket F \rrbracket_p)(\nu)$  as

$$\max \begin{cases} \llbracket f_c \rrbracket_p(\nu) \\ \max_{c' \in D_c} \max_{B \in B_{c,c'}} [t_{\nu,B,p} \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket f_{c'} \rrbracket(\nu + t_{\nu,B,p})] \\ \llbracket f_{c''} \rrbracket(\nu + 2p) \end{cases}$$

with  $t_{\nu,B,p}$  defined as in the proof of  $\text{Pre}_\ell$ . The last term can be rewritten as a parametric affine expression, as is the first term. The value  $t_{\nu,B,p} \text{wt}(\ell) + \llbracket f_{c'} \rrbracket(\nu + t_{\nu,B,p})$  can be computed in a way that does not depend on  $\nu$  and  $p$ , for similar reasons as for  $\text{Pre}_\ell$ . We thus conclude by repeated applications of Lemma 34.  $\blacktriangleleft$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 14.

## **J** Proof of Theorem 16

► **Theorem 16.** *The robust value problem is decidable over the subclass of divergent WTGs without configurations of value  $-\infty$ .*

We recall that to compute the robust value of a divergent WTG (without configurations with a value equal to  $-\infty$ ), we prove that the value iteration algorithm converges in a finite time (i.e. the number of iterations does not depend on  $p$ ) by relying on the decomposition into SCC of divergent WTG.

Before to prove this result, we provide some preliminary results. First, we recall that a strategy for  $\text{Min}$ ,  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$ , is  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\text{rVal}^p$  when, for all configurations  $(\ell, \nu)$ ,  $\sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon$ . Then, we prove that the conservative semantics does not create new cyclic path. In particular, if the WTG is divergent under the exact semantics, then all cyclic play following a cyclic region path under the conservative semantics have the same weight.

### **The conservative semantics preserves the sign of paths**

Since the conservative semantics only filter plays from the exact semantics, we prove that the positivity or the negativity of the paths of  $\mathcal{G}$  are preserved by the conservative semantics:

► **Lemma 39.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG and  $\pi$  be a cyclic path of  $\mathcal{G}$ . If  $\pi$  is positive (resp. negative), then all plays defined with the conservative semantics along  $\pi$  are positive (resp. negative).*

**Proof.** We suppose that  $\pi$  is a positive cyclic path (the negative case is analogous). Let  $\rho$  be a play in  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t. the conservative semantics following  $\pi$ , and we prove that  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho) \geq 1$ . To do it, we define a play  $\rho'$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  w.r.t. the exact semantics such that  $\rho'$  follows  $\pi$  and  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho) = \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho')$ . Indeed, in this case, by hypothesis on  $\pi$ , we know that  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho') > 1$ , thus  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho) > 1$ .

To conclude the proof, we define a function to define  $\rho'$ . In particular, we define the function  $\text{inj} : \text{FPlays}^p \rightarrow \text{FPlays}^0$  by induction on the length of plays such that for all finite plays ending in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$   $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$ , we let

$$\text{inj}(\rho) = \begin{cases} (\ell, \nu) & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu) \\ (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} \text{inj}(\rho') & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} \rho' \text{ with } \ell \in L_{\text{Max}} \\ (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t+\varepsilon} \text{inj}(\rho') & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} \rho' \text{ with } \ell \in L_{\text{Min}} \\ (\ell, \nu, \delta, t + \varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\delta, 0} \text{inj}(\rho') & \text{if } \rho = (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} \rho' \end{cases}$$

The function  $\text{inj}$  fulfils the following properties: given a play w.r.t. the conservative semantics  $\rho \in \text{FPlays}^p$ , we have

1.  $\text{inj}(\rho) \in \text{FPlays}^0$  and  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$  if and only if  $\text{last}(\text{inj}(\rho)) \in \text{Conf}$ . Moreover, if  $\text{last}(\rho) \in \text{Conf}$ , then  $\text{last}(\rho) = \text{last}(\text{inj}(\rho))$ ;
2. let  $\pi$  be a region path followed by  $\rho$ , then  $\text{inj}(\rho)$  follows  $\pi$ ;
3. if  $\rho$  ends in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho) = \text{wt}_\Sigma(\text{inj}(\rho))$ .

The proof of (1) is given by definitions of the conservative semantics and the function  $\text{inj}$ .

Next, we prove (2) by remarking that  $\text{inj}$  that does not change the sequence of transitions of the play (that defines a path) nor the sequence of configuration by (1) (that defines the sequence of regions in a region path).

Finally, we prove (3) by induction on the length of  $\rho$ . If  $\rho = (\ell, \nu)$  then the property is trivial. Otherwise, we let  $\rho = (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} \rho'$  and we distinguish two cases according to  $\ell$ . If  $\ell \in L_{\text{Max}}$ , then we have  $\text{inj}(\rho) = (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t} \text{inj}(\rho')$ . We conclude by hypothesis of induction applied on  $\rho'$ . Otherwise  $\ell \in L_{\text{Min}}$  and, since  $\rho$  ends in a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we rewrite  $\rho' = (\ell, \nu, \delta, t) \xrightarrow{\delta, \varepsilon} \rho''$ . Thus, we have  $\text{inj}(\rho) = (\ell, \nu) \xrightarrow{\delta, t+\varepsilon} (\ell, \nu, \delta, t+\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\delta, 0} \text{inj}(\rho'')$ . Moreover, since  $\rho''$  is a play (it starts by a configuration), we have  $\text{wt}_\Sigma(\text{inj}(\rho'')) = \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho'')$  (by the induction hypothesis applied on  $\rho''$ ). Now, by definition of the conservative semantics, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}_\Sigma(\text{inj}(\rho)) &= \text{wt}_\Sigma(\text{inj}(\rho'')) + (t + \varepsilon) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) \\ &= \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho'') + (t + \varepsilon) \text{wt}(\ell) + \text{wt}(\delta) = \text{wt}_\Sigma(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad \blacktriangleleft$$

### The case of positive SCCs

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG that only contains positive cyclic region paths (or just a positive SCC). Intuitively, in such a WTG, the interest of Min is to quickly reach a target location of  $\mathcal{G}$  to minimise the number of positive cyclic region paths followed along the play. Formally, by letting  $A$  be the bound obtained in Proposition 5 on the length of plays to reach a target location and  $Q$  be the set of region locations of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we deduce the following lemma:

► **Lemma 40.** *Let  $p > 0$  be a perturbation, and  $(\ell, \nu)$  be a configuration from which Min can reach a target location in  $[[\mathcal{G}]]^p$ . Let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  be an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\text{rVal}^p$ , and  $\rho$  be a play conforming to  $\chi$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ . Then,  $|\rho| \leq (AW_e + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|$ .*

**Proof.** First, since Min can reach a target location in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ , there exists a (robust) strategy  $\chi^*$  for Min such that, for all plays  $\rho^*$  conforming to  $\chi^*$  in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ ,  $\text{wt}(\rho^*) \leq AW_e$  (by Proposition 19). In particular, we deduce that  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) \leq AW_e$ . Moreover, since  $\chi$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\text{rVal}^p$ , we obtain that

$$\text{wt}(\rho) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon \leq AW_e + \varepsilon.$$

By contradiction, we suppose that  $|\rho| > (AW_e + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|$ . In particular,  $\rho$  follows at least  $(AW_e + |Q|W_e + 1)$  positive cyclic region paths before reaching a target location within  $|Q|$  steps. Thus, we deduce that

$$\text{wt}(\rho) \geq AW_e + |Q|W_e + 1 - |Q|W_e = AW_e + 1 > AW_e + \varepsilon.$$

Finally, we obtain a contradiction by combining both inequalities.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Using this property, we obtain a bound  $H^+$  (independent of  $p$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) over the length of the plays conforming to an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy of Min w.r.t.  $\text{rVal}^p$ . In particular, since Min can avoid the plays longer than  $H^+$ , we deduce that these are irrelevant in the computation of the robust value. Thus,  $H^+$  is a bound on the number of iterations needed for the value iteration to get its fixpoint. In particular, we use the fixed-perturbation robust value at horizon  $i$  (introduced in the proof of Lemma 10). We recall that the fixed-perturbation robust value at horizon  $i$ , denoted by  $\text{rVal}_i^p$ , is defined by

$$\text{rVal}_i^p(\ell, \nu) = \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}^i((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta))$$

where  $\text{Play}^i((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)$  denotes the plays of length at most  $i$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$  and conforming to both strategies. Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, by grouping all infimum/supremum together along the computation of  $\mathcal{F}_p$ , we obtain (2), i.e.  $\text{rVal}_i^p = (\mathcal{F}_p)^i(\mathbb{V}^0)$ . Moreover, since for all  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$ , and  $\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$ ,  $\text{wt}(\text{Play}^i((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \in \{\text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)), +\infty\}$ , then  $\text{rVal}^p \leq \text{rVal}_i^p$ .

**► Proposition 41.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG that contains only positive cyclic region paths, and  $p > 0$  be a perturbation. Then,  $\text{rVal}^p = (\mathcal{F}_p)^{(AW_e + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|}(\mathbb{V}^0)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $N = (AW_e + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|$ . Let  $(\ell, \nu)$  be a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ . We distinguish two cases according to the existential robust reachability value in  $\mathcal{G}$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ :

- If Min cannot reach a target location in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ , then for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}_p)^i(\mathbb{V}^0)(\ell, \nu) = +\infty$ . Thus, we have  $(\mathcal{F}_p)^N(\mathbb{V})(\ell, \nu) = +\infty = \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ .
- Otherwise, Min can reach a target location in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ . In particular, we need to prove that  $\text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) = \text{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu)$  to conclude by (2). Since, for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{rVal}^p \leq \text{rVal}_i^p$ , we just need to prove that  $\text{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ .

To prove this inequality, by letting  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ , we remark that all plays conforming to an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\text{rVal}^p$  for Min have a length at most  $N$  (by Lemma 40). In particular, we have

$$\inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{N,p}} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon$$

where  $\text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{N,p}$  denotes the set of strategies of Min such that all plays conforming to them has a length at most  $N$ , i.e. for all  $\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$ ,  $\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta) = \text{Play}^N((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)$ . In particular, from this definition, we deduce that

$$\inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^{N,p}} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}^N((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon.$$

Now, by considering an infimum over all possible strategies for Min, we deduce that

$$\mathbf{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu) = \inf_{\chi \in \mathbf{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \sup_{\zeta \in \mathbf{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}^N((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \mathbf{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon.$$

Since this holds for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we conclude that  $\mathbf{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) = \mathbf{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu)$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

### The case of negative SCCs

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG that only contains negative cyclic region paths (or just a negative SCC) and no configurations of value  $-\infty$ . In this case, Max can always reach a target location (otherwise, Min controls a negative cyclic region path, and the value of each locations in this cyclic region path is  $-\infty$  [21]). In particular, the interest of Max is to quickly reach a target location of  $\mathcal{G}$  to minimise the number of negative cyclic region paths followed along the play. Formally, by letting  $B = |\inf_{(\ell, \nu) \in \llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket} \mathbf{rVal}^0(\ell, \nu)|$  (that is finite by hypothesis over the value in  $\mathcal{G}$ ) and  $Q$  be the set of region locations of  $\mathcal{G}$ , we obtain the following lemma:

► **Lemma 42.** *Let  $p > 0$  be a perturbation and  $(\ell, \nu)$  be a configuration from where Min can reach a target location in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$ . Let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,  $\zeta \in \mathbf{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$  be an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\mathbf{rVal}^p$ , and  $\rho$  be a play conforming to  $\zeta$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ . Then,  $|\rho| \leq (B + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|$ .*

**Proof.** First, since  $\zeta$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\mathbf{rVal}^p$ , we obtain (by Lemma 7) that

$$\text{wt}(\rho) \geq \mathbf{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) - \varepsilon \geq \mathbf{rVal}^0(\ell, \nu) - \varepsilon > \mathbf{rVal}^0(\ell, \nu) - 1.$$

Now, by contradiction, we suppose  $|\rho| > (B + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|$ . In particular,  $\rho$  follows at least  $(B + |Q|W_e + 1)$  negative cyclic region paths before reaching a target location within  $|Q|$  steps. Since  $-B \leq \mathbf{rVal}^0(\ell, \nu)$ , we deduce that

$$\text{wt}(\rho) \leq |Q|W_e - |Q|W_e - B - 1 = -B - 1 \leq \mathbf{rVal}^0(\ell, \nu) - 1$$

Thus, we obtain a contradiction by combining both inequalities.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Using this property, we obtain a bound  $H^-$  (independent of  $p$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) over the length of the plays conforming to an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy of Max w.r.t.  $\mathbf{rVal}^p$ . In particular, since Max can avoid the plays longer than  $H^-$ , we deduce that these are irrelevant in the computation of the robust value. Thus,  $H^-$  is a bound on the number of iterations needed for the value iteration to get its fixpoint.

► **Proposition 43.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a WTG that contains only negative cyclic region paths and no configuration of value  $-\infty$ . Let  $p > 0$  be a perturbation, then  $\mathbf{rVal}^p = (\mathcal{F}_p)^{(B+|Q|W_e+1)|Q|}(\mathbb{V}^0)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $N = (B + |Q|W_e + 1)|Q|$ . We follow the same proof as for Proposition 41. Since for all  $\chi \in \mathbf{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$ , and  $\zeta \in \mathbf{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$ ,  $\text{wt}(\text{Play}^i((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \in \{\text{wt}(\text{Play}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)), +\infty\}$ , we also have  $\mathbf{rVal}^p \leq \mathbf{rVal}_i^p$ .

Let  $(\ell, \nu)$  be a configuration of  $\mathcal{G}$ . We distinguish two cases according to the existential robust reachability value in  $\mathcal{G}$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ :

- If Min cannot reach a target location in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ , then for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\mathcal{F}_p)^i(\mathbb{V}^0)(\ell, \nu) = +\infty$ . Thus, we have  $(\mathcal{F}_p)^N(\mathbb{V})(\ell, \nu) = +\infty = \mathbf{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ .
- Otherwise, Min can reach a target location in  $\llbracket \mathcal{G} \rrbracket^p$  from  $(\ell, \nu)$ . In particular, we need to prove that  $\mathbf{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) = \mathbf{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu)$  to conclude by (2). Again we just need to prove that  $\mathbf{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu) \leq \mathbf{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu)$ , since, for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{rVal}^p \leq \mathbf{rVal}_i^p$ .

To prove this inequality, let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,  $\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p$  and  $\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p$  be two  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategies for Min and Max respectively. Since  $\chi$  is  $\varepsilon$ -optimal, we have that  $\text{wt}(\text{Plays}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon$ . Moreover, since all plays conforming to an  $\varepsilon$ -optimal strategy w.r.t.  $\text{rVal}^p$  for Max have a length at most  $(|Q|W_e + B + 1)|Q|$  (by Lemma 42), we have

$$\text{wt}(\text{Plays}^N((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) = \text{wt}(\text{Plays}((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon$$

Now, by applying the supremum over robust strategies of Max in this inequality, we have

$$\sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Plays}^N((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon.$$

By considering an infimum over all possible strategies for Min, we have

$$\text{rVal}_N^p(\ell, \nu) = \inf_{\chi \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Min}}^p} \sup_{\zeta \in \text{Strat}_{\text{Max}}^p} \text{wt}(\text{Play}^N((\ell, \nu), \chi, \zeta)) \leq \text{rVal}^p(\ell, \nu) + \varepsilon$$

and we conclude since this the inequality holds for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

### The case of a divergent WTG

To compute the robust value in a divergent WTG, we combine both approaches by successively computing the robust value in each SCC of the graph of the region game. Formally, let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a divergent WTG without configurations of value  $-\infty$ . We prove that there exists  $H \in \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $p > 0$ ,  $\text{rVal}^p = \mathcal{F}_p^H(\mathbb{V}^0)$ . Then, since we know how to compute one iteration of  $\mathcal{F}_p$  (from Proposition 14), we can compute the robust value in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

The theoretical existence of the bound  $H$  above comes from the decomposition into SCCs of the graph of  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G})$ , though we do not need to compute this decomposition then to compute the robust value: we will simply stop as soon as we have reached a fixpoint (which is forced to happen by this proof). For each SCC, we use the bound ( $H^+$  or  $H^-$  according to the sign of the SCC) over the number of iterations of  $\mathcal{F}_p$  given by Propositions 41 or 43 to (only) solve the SCC. Then, for each branch along the (acyclic) decomposition into SCCs of the region game, we sum the bound of each SCC as well as its length. Finally, by letting  $H$  be the maximum obtained over each branch, we conclude the proof of Theorem 16.