

Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives: Complexity and Algorithms

Ali Asadi 

Institute of Science and Technology Austria (ISTA), Austria

Krishnendu Chatterjee 

Institute of Science and Technology Austria (ISTA), Austria

Raimundo Saona 

Institute of Science and Technology Austria (ISTA), Austria

Jakub Svoboda 

Institute of Science and Technology Austria (ISTA), Austria

Abstract

We study two-player zero-sum concurrent stochastic games with finite state and action space played for an infinite number of steps. In every step, the two players simultaneously and independently choose an action. Given the current state and the chosen actions, the next state is obtained according to a stochastic transition function. An objective is a measurable function on plays (or infinite trajectories) of the game, and the value for an objective is the maximal expectation that the player can guarantee against the adversarial player. We consider: (a) stateful-discounted objectives, which are similar to the classical discounted-sum objectives, but states are associated with different discount factors rather than a single discount factor; and (b) parity objectives, which are a canonical representation for ω -regular objectives. For stateful-discounted objectives, given an ordering of the discount factors, the limit value is the limit of the value of the stateful-discounted objectives, as the discount factors approach zero according to the given order.

The computational problem we consider is the approximation of the value within an arbitrary additive error. The above problem is known to be in EXPSPACE for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and in PSPACE for parity objectives. The best-known algorithms for both the above problems are at least exponential time, with an exponential dependence on the number of states and actions. Our main results for the value approximation problem for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and parity objectives are as follows: (a) we establish TFNP[NP] complexity; and (b) we present algorithms that improve the dependency on the number of actions in the exponent from linear to logarithmic. In particular, if the number of states is constant, our algorithms run in polynomial time.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Logic and verification

Keywords and phrases Concurrent Stochastic Games, Parity Objectives, Discounted-sum Objectives

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...



© Ali Asadi, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Raimundo Saona, and Jakub Svoboda;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics
Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

List of major symbols

Main symbols

n	Number of states
m	Number of actions per player and state
d	Index of parity and number of discount factors
B	Bit size of transition and reward functions
ε	Additive error

Dynamics

\mathcal{A}	Set of actions per state of Player 1
\mathcal{B}	Set of actions per state of Player 2
\mathcal{C}	Markov Chain (MC)
\mathcal{P}	Markov Decision Process (MDP)
δ	Transition probability function
\mathcal{S}	Set of states
Σ	Set of strategies of Player 1
σ	Strategy of Player 1
Γ	Set of strategies of Player 2
τ	Strategy of Player 2
G	Concurrent Stochastic Game (CSG)
G_σ, G_τ	Induced MDPs
$G_{\sigma,\tau}$	Induced MC

Objectives and values

χ	Assignment function
Λ	Discount function
Disc_Λ	Stateful-discounted objective
λ	Discount factor
Parity_p	Parity objective
p	Priority function
Reach_T	Reachability objective
r	Reward function
T	Set of targets
val	Value of a matrix game
val_χ	Limit of the stateful-discounted value
val_Λ	Stateful-discounted value
val_p	Parity value
val_T	Reachability value

Other symbols

\mathcal{D}	Set of distributions represented in floating point
D	Degree of a polynomial
∇	Determinant function for stationary strategies
μ	Probability distribution
\mathcal{F}	Set of floating point numbers
Id	Identity matrix
\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}	Sets of polynomials
P, Q, C	Polynomials
W	Auxiliary matrix game

1 Introduction

In this work, we present improved complexity results and algorithms for the value approximation of concurrent stochastic games with two classical objectives. Below we present the model of concurrent stochastic games, the relevant objectives, the computational problems, previous results, and finally our contributions.

Concurrent stochastic games. Concurrent stochastic games are two-player zero-sum games played on finite-state graphs for an infinite number of steps. These games were introduced in the seminal work of Shapley [29] and are a fundamental model in game theory. In each step, both players simultaneously and independently of the other player choose an action. Given the current state and the chosen actions, the next state is obtained according to a stochastic transition function. An infinite number of such steps results in a play which is an infinite sequence of states and actions. Concurrent stochastic games have been widely studied in the literature from the mathematical perspective [29, 17, 18, 27], and from the algorithmic and computational complexity perspective, including: complexity for reachability objectives [10, 16, 19, 24], algorithms for limit-average objectives [23, 28], complexity for qualitative solutions for omega-regular objectives [11], complexity for quantitative solutions for omega-regular objectives [8, 15], and in the context of temporal logic [1]. In particular, in analysis of reactive systems, concurrent games provide the appropriate model for reactive systems with components that interact synchronously [1, 13, 14].

Objectives. An objective is a measurable function that assigns to every play a real-valued reward. The classical discounted-sum objective is as follows: every transition is assigned a reward and the objective assigns to a play the discounted-sum of the rewards. While the classical objective has a single discount factor, the stateful-discounted objective has multiple discount factors. In the stateful-discounted objective, each state is associated with a discount factor, and, in the objective, the discount at a step depends on the current state. We also consider the boolean parity objectives, which are a canonical form to express all ω -regular objectives [32], where every state is associated with an integer priority, and a play is winning for (or satisfies) the objective if the minimum priority visited infinitely often is even.

Strategies, values, and the computational problems. Strategies are recipes that define the choice of actions of the players. They are functions that, given a game history, return a distribution over actions. Given a concurrent stochastic game and an objective, the value of Player 1 at a state is the maximal expectation that the player can guarantee for the objective against all strategies of Player 2. For stateful-discounted objectives, given an ordering of the discount factors, the limit value at a state is the limit of the value function as the discount factors approach zero in the given order. Given a concurrent stochastic game, the main computational problems are: (a) the *value-decision* problem, given a state and a threshold α , asks whether the value at the state is at least α ; and (b) the *value-approximation* problem, given a state and an error $\varepsilon > 0$, asks to compute an approximation of the value for the state within an additive error of ε . We consider the above problems for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and the value for parity objectives.

Motivation. The motivation to study the limit of the stateful-discounted objective is as follows. First, this limit generalizes the classical limit-average objectives. Second, it characterizes the value for the parity objectives in concurrent stochastic games [21, 12]. Third, the limit value has been shown to correspond to the value for other objectives such as priority mean-payoff for various subclasses of concurrent stochastic games [22].

Previous results. For a single discount factor, the limit value corresponds to the value of the well-studied mean-payoff or long-run average objectives [27], and, for parity objectives,

	Complexity	
	Previous	Ours
Limit	EXPSpace (Theory of reals)	TFNP[NP]
Parity	PSPACE [8, 7]	(Theorem 5-Item 1, Theorem 6-Item 1)

■ **Table 1** Complexity upper bounds of the value-approximation in concurrent stochastic games for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and parity objectives.

the computational problems admit a linear reduction to the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives [21, 12]. The value-decision problem for concurrent stochastic games is SQRT-SUM hard [16]: this result holds for reachability objectives, and hence also for parity objectives and the limit value for even a single discount factor. The SQRT-SUM problem is a classical problem in computational geometry, and whether SQRT-SUM belongs to NP has been a long-standing open problem. The complexity upper bounds for the value-approximation problem of concurrent stochastic games is as follows: (a) EXPSpace for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives; and (b) PSPACE for parity objectives [7, 8]. The above result for the limit value follows from a reduction to the theory of reals, where the number of discount factors corresponds to the number of quantifier alternation. For the special class of reachability objectives, the complexity upper bound of TFNP[NP] for the value-approximation problem has been established in [19], where TFNP[NP] is the total functional form of the second level of the polynomial hierarchy. The result of [19] has been recently extended to limit-average objectives (which correspond to the limit-value of single discount factor) [6]. To the best of our knowledge, the above complexity upper bounds are the best bounds for limit value of general stateful-discounted objectives and parity objectives. The best known algorithms for the value-approximation problem are as follows: (a) double exponential time for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives; (b) exponential time for parity objectives, where the exponent is a product that depends at least linearly on the number of states and actions [8, 7] (see Section 3 for further details).

Our contributions. In this work, our main contributions are as follows: (a) we establish TFNP[NP] upper bounds for the value-approximation problem for concurrent stochastic games, both for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and the parity objectives; and (b) we present algorithms which are exponential time and improve the dependency on the number of actions in the exponent from linear to logarithmic. In particular, if the number of states is constant, our algorithms run in polynomial time. The comparison of previous results and our results is summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Technical contributions. Our main technical contributions are as follows. We first present a bound on the roots of multi-variate polynomials with integer coefficients (Section 4.2). Given the bounds on roots of polynomials, we establish new characterizations for the limit and stateful-discounted values (Section 4.3 and Section 4.4), which lead to an approximation of the limit value by the stateful-discounted value when the discount factors are double-exponentially small (Section 4.5). Given this connection, we establish the improved complexities and algorithms for the value-approximation for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and parity objectives in Section 5 and Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

We present standard definitions related to concurrent stochastic games.

	Algorithms	
	Previous	Ours
Limit	$\exp\left(\mathcal{O}(2^d m^2 n + \log(1/\varepsilon) + \log(B))\right)$ (Theory of reals)	$\exp\left(\mathcal{O}\left(\begin{array}{c} nd \log(m) + \log(B) \\ + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon)) \end{array}\right)\right)$ (Theorem 5-Item 2, Theorem 6-Item 2)
Parity	$\exp\left(\mathcal{O}\left(\begin{array}{c} mn + d \log(n) + \log(B) \\ + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon)) \end{array}\right)\right)$ [8, 7]	

■ **Table 2** Algorithmic upper bounds of the value-approximation in concurrent stochastic games for the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives and parity objectives, where n is the number of states, m is the number of actions, d is the number of discount factors/parity index, B is the bit-size of numbers in the input, ε is the additive error, and \exp is the exponential function.

Basic Notations. Given a finite set \mathcal{X} , a probability distribution over \mathcal{X} is a function $\mu: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x) = 1$. The set of all probability distributions over \mathcal{X} is denoted by $\Delta(\mathcal{X})$. For $\mu \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})$, the support of μ is defined as $\text{supp}(\mu) := \{x \mid \mu(x) > 0\}$. For a positive integer k , the set of positive integers smaller than or equal to k is defined as $[k] := \{1, \dots, k\}$. Given a real x , we denote 2^x by $\exp(x)$.

Concurrent stochastic games. A concurrent stochastic game (CSG) is a two-player finite game $G = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \delta)$ consisting of

- the set of states \mathcal{S} , of size n ;
- the sets of actions for each player \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , consist of at most m actions; and
- the stochastic transition function $\delta: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$.

Steps. Given an initial state $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the game proceeds as follows. In each step, both players choose an action simultaneously, $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Based on both actions (a, b) and current state s , the next state is drawn according to the probability distribution $\delta(s, a, b)$.

Histories and plays. At step k of CSGs, each player possesses information in the form of the finite sequence of the states visited and the actions chosen by both players. A k -history $\omega^{(k)} = \langle s_0, a_0, b_0, s_1, a_1, b_1 \dots, s_k \rangle$ is a finite sequence of states and actions such that, for all steps $0 \leq t < k$, we have $s_{t+1} \in \text{supp}(\delta(s_t, a_t, b_t))$. The set of all k -histories is denoted by $\Omega^{(k)}$. Similarly, a play $\omega = \langle s_0, a_0, b_0, s_1, a_1, b_1 \dots \rangle$ is an infinite sequence of states and actions such that, for all steps $t \geq 0$, we have $s_{t+1} \in \text{supp}(\delta(s_t, a_t, b_t))$. The set of all plays is denoted by Ω . For any state s , the set of all plays starting at s , i.e., $\omega = \langle s_0, a_0, b_0 \dots \rangle$ where $s_0 = s$, is denoted by Ω_s .

Objectives. An objective is a measurable function that assigns a real number to all plays. Player 1 aims to maximize the expectation of the objective, while Player 2 minimizes it.

- *Parity objective.* Given a priority function $p: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, d\}$ with d as its index, the *parity* objective is an indicator of the even parity condition on minimal priority visited infinitely often in plays. More formally, we define $\text{Parity}_p: \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as

$$\text{Parity}_p(\omega) := \begin{cases} 1 & \min\{p(s) \mid \forall i \geq 0 \exists j \geq i s_j = s\} \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- *Stateful-discounted objective.* Consider d discount factors $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d \in (0, 1]$. Given an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, we define the discount function $\Lambda: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$ as $\Lambda(s) := \lambda_{\chi(s)}$ for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Given a reward function $r: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$

XX:6 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

that assigns a reward value $r(s, a, b)$ for all (s, a, b) , the stateful-discounted objective $\text{Disc}_\Lambda: \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is defined as, for all $\omega = \langle s_0, a_0, b_0, \dots \rangle$,

$$\text{Disc}_\Lambda(\omega) := \sum_{i \geq 0} \left(r(s_i, a_i, b_i) \Lambda(s_i) \prod_{j < i} 1 - \Lambda(s_j) \right).$$

Strategies. A strategy is a function that assigns a probability distribution over actions to every finite history and is denoted by $\sigma: \bigcup_k \Omega^{(k)} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ for Player 1 (resp. $\tau: \bigcup_k \Omega^{(k)} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{B})$ for Player 2). Given strategies σ and τ , the game proceeds as follows. At step k , the current history is some $\omega^{(k)} \in \Omega^{(k)}$. Player 1 (resp. Player 2) chooses an action according to the distribution $\sigma(\omega^{(k)})$ (resp. $\tau(\omega^{(k)})$). The set of all strategies for Player 1 and Player 2 is denoted by Σ and Γ respectively. A *stationary* strategy depends on the past observations only through the current state. A stationary strategy for Player 1 (resp. Player 2) is denoted by $\sigma: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ (resp. $\tau: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{B})$). The set of all stationary strategies for Player 1 and Player 2 is denoted by Σ^S and Γ^S respectively. A *pure stationary* strategy $\sigma: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\tau: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$) for Player 1 (resp. Player 2) is a stationary strategy that maps to Dirac distributions only. The set of all pure stationary strategies for Player 1 and Player 2 is denoted by Σ^{PS} and Γ^{PS} respectively.

Probability space. An initial state s and a pair of strategies (σ, τ) induce a unique probability over Ω_s , endowed with the sigma-algebra generated by the cylinders corresponding to finite histories. We denote by $\mathbb{P}_s^{\sigma, \tau}$ and $\mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}$ the probability and the expectation respectively.

We state the determinacy for CSGs with stateful-discounted and parity objectives.

► **Theorem 1** (Parity determinacy [26]). *For all CSGs, states s , and priority functions p ,*

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \inf_{\tau \in \Gamma} \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Parity}_p] = \inf_{\tau \in \Gamma} \sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Parity}_p].$$

► **Theorem 2** (Stateful-discounted determinacy [29]). *For all CSGs, states s , reward functions, and discount functions Λ , we have*

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma^S} \inf_{\tau \in \Gamma^S} \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Disc}_\Lambda] = \inf_{\tau \in \Gamma^S} \sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma^S} \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Disc}_\Lambda].$$

Values. The above determinacy results imply that switching the quantification order of strategies do not make a difference and leads to the unique notion of value. The stateful-discounted value for a state s is defined as

$$\text{val}_\Lambda(s) := \sup_{\sigma \in \Sigma^S} \inf_{\tau \in \Gamma^S} \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Disc}_\Lambda].$$

We define the parity value $\text{val}_p(s)$ for a state s analogously. The limit value for a state s is defined as

$$\text{val}_\chi(s) := \lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \dots \lim_{\lambda_d \rightarrow 0^+} \text{val}_\Lambda(s).$$

ε -optimal strategies. Given $\varepsilon \geq 0$, a strategy σ for Player 1 is ε -optimal for the stateful-discounted objective if, for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\inf_{\tau \in \Gamma^S} \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Disc}_\Lambda] \geq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \varepsilon.$$

We say the strategy is *optimal* if $\varepsilon = 0$. The notion of ε -optimal strategies for Player 2 is defined analogously. Similarly, we define ε -optimal strategies for the parity objectives.

Approximate value problems. We consider two value problems stated as follows.

LIMITVALUE. Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, and an additive error ε . The transition function δ and the reward function r are represented by rational numbers using at most B bits. Compute an approximation v of the limit value at state s such that

$$|v - \text{val}_\chi(s)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

PARITYVALUE. Consider a CSG G , a state s , a priority function p with index d , and an additive error ε . The transition function δ is represented by rational numbers using at most B bits. Compute an approximation v of the parity value at state s such that

$$|v - \text{val}_p(s)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

3 Overview of Results

We first discuss the previous results in the literature, and then, we show our contributions.

Previous results. We discuss the previous works on computing the approximation of limit and parity values in CSGs. A natural approach for these computational problems is via the theory of reals. We first recall the main computational result of the theory of reals, which is a specialization of Theorem 1 of [4].

► **Theorem 3** ([4]). Consider ℓ variables x_1, \dots, x_ℓ and the set of polynomials $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$, where, for all $i \in [k]$, we have P_i is a polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_ℓ of degree at most D with integer coefficients of bit-size at most B . Let X_1, \dots, X_d be a partition of x_1, \dots, x_ℓ into d subsets such that X_i has size ℓ_i . Let

$$\Phi = (Q_d X_d) \cdots (Q_1 X_1) \phi(P_1, \dots, P_k)$$

be a sentence with d alternating quantifiers $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ such that $Q_{i+1} \neq Q_i$, and $\phi(P_1, \dots, P_k)$ is a quantifier-free formula with atomic formulas of the form $P_i \bowtie 0$ where $\bowtie \in \{<, >, =\}$. Then, there exists an algorithm to decide the truth of Φ in time

$$k \prod_i \mathcal{O}(\ell_i + 1) \cdot D \prod_i \mathcal{O}(\ell_i) \cdot \mathcal{O}(\text{len}(\phi) B^2),$$

where $\text{len}(\phi)$ is the length of the quantifier-free formula ϕ .

Along with the above algorithmic result, the following complexity result also follows from [4]: if there are constant number of quantifier alternations, then complexity is PSPACE, and in general the complexity is EXPSPACE. We now discuss the algorithms and complexity results from the literature for the limit value of stateful discounted-sum objectives. The basic computational approach is via the theory of reals. For a single discount factor, the reduction to the theory of reals and dealing with its limit (which corresponds to limit-average objectives) was presented in [9]. In the general case (d discount factors), each limit can be considered as the quantification $\exists \varepsilon_{i'} \forall \varepsilon_i \leq \varepsilon_{i'}$ in the theory of reals. Thus, concurrent stochastic games with the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives can be reduced to the

theory of reals with quantifier alternation. This reduction gives a theory of reals sentence with the following parameters:

$$\ell = \mathcal{O}(m^2n), \quad k = \mathcal{O}(m^2n), \quad D = 4, \quad \prod_i (\ell_i + 1) = \mathcal{O}(2^d m^2n),$$

Applying Theorem 3 to the reduction we obtain the following result.

► **Theorem 4** (LIMITVALUE: Previous Result). *For the LIMITVALUE problem, the following assertions hold.*

1. *The problem is in EXPSPACE; and*
 2. *the problem can be solved in time $\exp(\mathcal{O}(2^d m^2n + \log(1/\varepsilon) + \log(B)))$.*
- For parity objectives, the result of [21, 12] reduces CSGs with parity objectives to CSGs with the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives. The reduction is achieved as follows. Consider the formula $R(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n-1})$ from [12], which is a formula with multiple discount factors. Since for stateful-discounted objectives the mapping is contractive, the fixpoints are unique (least and greatest fixpoints coincide). The last sentence of [12, Theorem 4] states that the limit of $R(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2n-1})$ corresponds to the value for parity objectives. The Pre operator of the formula corresponds to the Bellman-operator for stateful-discounted objectives, which establish the connection to stateful-discounted games. This connection is made more explicit in the construction provided in [21, Section 2.2]. This linear reduction and the above theorem leads to similar results for parity objectives. Besides this reduction to the theory of reals, there are two other approaches for the PARITYVALUE problem. First, we can consider the nested fixpoint characterization as provided in [15] and a reduction to the theory of reals with quantifier alternation. However, this does not lead to a better complexity. Second, a different approach is presented in [8, 7, Chapter 8]. This approach has the following components: (a) it enumerates over all possible subsets of actions for every state; (b) for each of the enumeration, it requires a solution of a qualitative value problem (or limit-sure winning) in concurrent stochastic games with parity objectives, and the value-approximation for concurrent stochastic games with reachability objectives. This approach gives PSPACE complexity and the algorithmic complexity is $\exp(\mathcal{O}(mn + d \log(n) + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon)) + \log(B)))$.

Our contributions. Our main results are as follows:

► **Theorem 5** (LIMITVALUE: Complexity and Algorithm). *For the LIMITVALUE problem, the following assertions hold.*

1. *The problem is in TFNP[NP]; and*
2. *the problem can be solved in time $\exp(\mathcal{O}(nd \log(m) + \log(B) + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon))))$.*

► **Theorem 6** (PARITYVALUE: Complexity and Algorithm). *For the PARITYVALUE problem, the following assertions hold.*

1. *The problem is in TFNP[NP]; and*
2. *the problem can be solved in time $\exp(\mathcal{O}(nd \log(m) + \log(B) + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon))))$.*

4 Mathematical Properties

In this section, we present a new approach of the limit value approximation via the stateful-discounted value (Theorem 19). We use this technical result to improve complexities and algorithmic bounds of computing ε -approximation of the limit and parity values. The section is organized as follows. In Section 4.1, we present some useful definitions and previous results in the literature. In Section 4.2, we present a bound on the roots of multi-variate polynomials which is used to establish a connection between the stateful-discounted and limit values. In

Sections 4.3 and 4.4, we introduce new characterizations of the stateful-discounted and limit values. In Section 4.5, we finally show Theorem 19.

4.1 Notations and Selected Results from Literature

We first present some basic notations and definitions.

Basic notations. Given a positive integer k , we define $\text{bit}(k) := \lceil \log_2(k+1) \rceil$. For a rational k_1/k_2 , we define $\text{bit}(k_1/k_2) := \text{bit}(k_1) + \text{bit}(k_2)$. Given a real x , the sign function is

$$\text{sign}(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x < 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, we use the classical arithmetic with infinity, i.e., $x + \infty = \infty$ and $x - \infty = -\infty$.

Polynomials. A *uni-variate* polynomial P of degree D with integer coefficients of bit-size B is defined as $P(x) := \sum_{i=0}^D c_i x^i$ where $|c_i| < 2^B$. We define $\|P\|_\infty := \max(|c_0|, \dots, |c_D|)$. A k -variate polynomial P in x_1, \dots, x_k of degree D_1, \dots, D_k with integer coefficients of bit-size B is defined as

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \sum_{0 \leq i_1 \leq D_1} \dots \sum_{0 \leq i_k \leq D_k} c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \prod_{j=1}^k x_j^{i_j},$$

where $|c_{i_1, \dots, i_k}| \leq 2^B$. Polynomial P is nonzero if $c_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \neq 0$ for some i_1, \dots, i_k . We say α is a root of P if $P(\alpha) = 0$. In this work, we only consider real roots.

Matrix notations. Given a square matrix M , we denote the determinant of M by $\det(M)$ and denote the signed sum of all minors of M by $S(M)$. Given two $k \times \ell$ matrices M_1 and M_2 , we denote the Hadamard product of M_1 and M_2 by $M_1 \odot M_2$. Given a positive integer k , often implicitly clear from context, we denote by $\mathbf{1}$ (resp. $\mathbf{0}$) the k -dimensional vector with all elements equal to 1 (resp. 0) and denote by Id the $k \times k$ identity matrix.

Bellow we recall some useful results from the literature regarding the value of a matrix game (Lemma 7) and the determinant of a polynomial matrix (Lemma 8).

► **Lemma 7** ([30, Thm. 2]). *Consider a matrix game M . Then, there exists a square sub-matrix M_0 such that $S(M_0) \neq 0$ and $\text{val}(M) = \frac{\det(M_0)}{S(M_0)}$.*

► **Lemma 8** ([5, Prop. 8.12]). *Consider a $k \times k$ matrix M whose entries are polynomials in x_1, \dots, x_ℓ of degrees D_1, \dots, D_ℓ with integer coefficients of bit-size B . Then, $\det(M)$ is a polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_ℓ of degrees kD_1, \dots, kD_ℓ with integer coefficients of bit-size $kB + k \text{bit}(k) + \ell \text{bit}(k \max(D_1, \dots, D_\ell) + 1)$.*

► **Corollary 9.** *Consider a $k \times k$ matrix M whose entries are polynomials in x_1, \dots, x_ℓ of degrees D_1, \dots, D_ℓ with integer coefficients of bit-size B . Then, $S(M)$ is a polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_ℓ of degrees kD_1, \dots, kD_ℓ with integer coefficients.*

Proof. By definition, $S(M)$ is the signed sum of all minors of M . Therefore, the result follows from Lemma 8. ◀

4.2 Bounds on Roots of Polynomials with Integer Coefficients

In this subsection, we present a bound on the roots of multi-variate polynomials P with integer coefficients (Lemma 10). This result shows that there exists a region close to $\mathbf{0}$ within

XX:10 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

which P does not have a root. We use this technical result to establish a connection between the stateful-discounted value and limit value.

► **Lemma 10.** *Consider a nonzero polynomial P in x_1, \dots, x_ℓ of degrees D_1, \dots, D_ℓ with integer coefficients of bit-size B . Let $D := \max(D_1, \dots, D_\ell)$ and $B_1 := 4\ell \text{ bit}(D) + B + 1$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1 \in (0, \exp(-B_1)] \quad \forall x_2 \in (0, (x_1)^{D+1}] \quad \dots \quad \forall x_\ell \in (0, (x_{\ell-1})^{D+1}] \\ |P(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)| \geq \exp(B_1 - \ell) \cdot (x_\ell)^{D+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We proceed with the proof by induction on ℓ .

Base case $\ell = 1$. Consider $P(x_1) = c_0 + c_1x_1 + \dots + c_{D_1}x_1^{D_1}$. Note that P is nonzero. Let k be the smallest index where $c_k \neq 0$. Therefore, for all $x_1 \leq \exp(-B_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |P(x_1)| &\geq |c_k|x_1^k - \sum_{j>k} |c_j|x_1^j && \text{(triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq |c_k|x_1^k - x_1^{k+1} \sum_{j>k} |c_j| && (x_1^j \leq x_1^{k+1}) \\ &\geq x_1^k - x_1^{k+1} \sum_{j>k} |c_j| && (|c_k| \geq 1) \\ &\geq x_1^k - D \exp(B)x_1^{k+1} && (|c_j| \leq \exp(B)) \\ &\geq x_1^k (1 - D \exp(B)x_1) && \text{(rearrange)} \\ &\geq x_1^k (\exp(B_1)x_1 - D \exp(B)x_1) && (x_1 \leq \exp(-B_1)) \\ &\geq \exp(B_1 - 1)x_1^{D+1}, && (k \leq D \text{ and } D \exp(B) \leq \exp(B_1 - 1)) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the case.

Induction case $\ell > 1$. We partition P into

$$P(x) = P_0 + P_1(x_1) + \dots + P_\ell(x_1, \dots, x_\ell).$$

Note that P is nonzero. Therefore, let i be the smallest index where $P_i \neq 0$. By the choice of i , for all $j < i$, we have that $P_j = 0$. Fix x_1, \dots, x_ℓ such that $x_1 \leq \exp(-B_1)$, and $x_i \leq x_{i-1}^{D+1}$ for $i > 1$. We show that

$$|P_i(x_1, \dots, x_i)| - \sum_{j>i} |P_j(x_1, \dots, x_j)| \geq \exp(B_1 - \ell)x_\ell^{D+1}, \quad (1)$$

which concludes the case.

To bound the term $|P_i(x_1, \dots, x_i)|$ of LHS of Eq. (1) from below, we define

$$Q(y) := P_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{D_i} C_j(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})y^j,$$

where for all $1 \leq j \leq D_i$, we have

$$C_j(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) := \sum_{j_1=0}^{D_1} \dots \sum_{j_{i-1}=0}^{D_{i-1}} c_{j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j, 0, \dots, 0} \prod_{k=1}^{i-1} x_k^{j_k}.$$

Note that Q is a univariate polynomial of degree at most D_i , where the absolute value of coefficients are at most

$$\begin{aligned} |C_j(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})| &\leq \exp(\mathsf{B})(D+1)^{i-1} \\ &\leq \exp(\mathsf{B} + (i-1) \text{bit}(D+1)) \\ &\leq \exp(\mathsf{B} + 2\ell \text{bit}(D)) \\ &\leq \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - \text{bit}(D) - (i+1)) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where in the first inequality we use $c_{j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j, 0, \dots, 0} \leq \exp(\mathsf{B})$, in the second inequality we use $(D+1)^{i-1} \leq \exp((i-1) \text{bit}(D+1))$, in the third inequality we use $i-1 \leq \ell$ and $\text{bit}(D+1) \leq 2 \text{bit}(D)$, and in the fourth inequality we use $\mathsf{B} + 2\ell \text{bit}(D) + \text{bit}(D) + (i+1) \leq \mathsf{B}_1$. For all $1 \leq j \leq D_i$, Note that C_j is a polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_{i-1} of degrees D_1, \dots, D_{i-1} with integer coefficients of bit-size B . Therefore, if C_j is nonzero, then by induction, we have

$$C_j(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) \geq \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i-1))x_{i-1}^{D+1} \geq \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i-1))x_i. \quad (3)$$

Consider $Q(y) = c_0 + c_1y + \dots + c_{D_i}y^{D_i}$, where for all j , we have $c_j = C_j(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$. Since P_i is nonzero, by the definition of Q , there exists j such that $C_j \neq 0$. Therefore, by Eq. (3), we have that Q is also nonzero. Let k be the smallest index where $c_k \neq 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_i(x_1, \dots, x_i)| &= |Q(x_i)| && \text{(def. } Q) \\ &\geq |c_k x_i^k| - \sum_{j>k} |c_j x_i^j| && \text{(triangle inequality)} \\ &\geq |c_k x_i^k| - x_i^{k+1} \sum_{j>k} |c_j| && \left(x_i^j \leq x_i^{k+1}\right) \\ &= x_i^k \left(|c_k| - x_i \sum_{j>k} |c_j| \right) && \text{(rearrange)} \\ &\geq x_i^k (|c_k| - \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i+1))x_i) && \text{(Eq. (2))} \\ &\geq x_i^k (\exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i-1))x_i - \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i+1))x_i) && \text{(Eq. (3))} \\ &\geq x_i^{D+1} (\exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i-1)) - \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i+1))) . && (k \leq D) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

To bound the term $\sum_{j>i} |P_j(x_1, \dots, x_j)|$ of the LHS of Eq. (1) from above, consider P_j for all $j > i$. Recall that P_j is a polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_j of degrees at most D_1, \dots, D_j with integer coefficients of bit-size B . Therefore, the number of terms in P_j is at most $(D+1)^j$, and for each term, the degree of x_j is at least 1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_j(x_1, \dots, x_j)| &\leq (D+1)^j \cdot \exp(\mathsf{B}) \cdot x_j && (c_{i_1, \dots, i_j, 0, \dots, 0} \leq \exp(\mathsf{B})) \\ &\leq (D+1)^\ell \cdot \exp(\mathsf{B}) \cdot x_j && ((D+1)^j \leq (D+1)^\ell) . \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j>i} |P_j(x_1, \dots, x_j)| &\leq (D+1)^\ell \exp(\mathsf{B}) \sum_{j>i} x_j \\ &\leq \ell (D+1)^\ell \exp(\mathsf{B}) \cdot x_{i+1} \\ &\leq \exp(\text{bit}(\ell) + \ell \text{bit}(D+1) + \mathsf{B}) \cdot x_{i+1} \\ &\leq \exp(\text{bit}(\ell) + 2\ell \text{bit}(D) + \mathsf{B}) \cdot x_{i+1} \\ &\leq \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i+1))x_{i+1} \\ &\leq \exp(\mathsf{B}_1 - (i+1))x_i^{D+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where in the second inequality we use $x_j \leq x_{i+1}$ for all $j \geq i+1$, in the third inequality we use $\ell \cdot (D+1)^\ell \leq \exp(\text{bit}(\ell) + \ell \text{bit}(D+1))$, in the fourth inequality we use $\text{bit}(D+1) \leq 2 \text{bit}(D)$, in the fifth inequality we use $\text{bit}(\ell) + 2\ell \text{bit}(D) + B + (i+1) \leq B_1$, and in the sixth inequality we use $x_{i+1} \leq x_i^{D+1}$. By combining Eqs. (4) and (5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |P_i(x_1, \dots, x_i)| - \sum_{j>i} |P_j(x_1, \dots, x_j)| &\geq \exp(B_1 - i)x_i^{D+1} \\ &\geq \exp(B_1 - \ell)x_i^{D+1} && (i \leq \ell) \\ &\geq \exp(B_1 - \ell)x_\ell^{D+1}, && (x_\ell \leq x_i) \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the claim and completes the case and yields the result. \blacktriangleleft

4.3 Characterization of Stateful-discounted Value

In this subsection, we introduce a new characterization of the stateful-discounted value in CSGs (Corollary 12 and Lemma 11), which generalizes the result presented in [2] from a single discount factor to multiple discount factors. In particular, Corollary 12 generalizes Theorem 1 of [2].

Stateful-discounted payoff. Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , and a discount function Λ . Given a pair of stationary strategies (σ, τ) , we define the stateful-discounted payoff as

$$\nu^{\sigma, \tau}(s) := \mathbb{E}_s^{\sigma, \tau}[\text{Disc}_\Lambda].$$

By fixing σ and τ , we obtain a transition function

$$\delta^{\sigma, \tau}(s, s') := \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{A} \\ b \in \mathcal{B}}} \sigma(s)(a) \cdot \tau(s)(b) \cdot \delta(s, a, b)(s'),$$

which is described as a matrix, i.e., $\delta^{\sigma, \tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. The stage reward function is defined as

$$r^{\sigma, \tau}(s) := \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{A} \\ b \in \mathcal{B}}} \sigma(s)(a) \cdot \tau(s)(b) \cdot r(s, a, b),$$

which is described as a vector, i.e., $r^{\sigma, \tau} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Therefore, the Bellman operator defined in [29] can be written as a recursive expression:

$$\nu^{\sigma, \tau} = \Lambda \odot r^{\sigma, \tau} + (\mathbf{1} - \Lambda) \odot (\delta^{\sigma, \tau} \nu^{\sigma, \tau}).$$

The matrix $\text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^\top) \odot \delta^{\sigma, \tau}$ is strictly diagonally dominating, and therefore, is invertible. By Cramer's rule, we have

$$\nu^{\sigma, \tau}(s) = \frac{\nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma, \tau)}{\nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \tau)}, \tag{6}$$

where $\nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \tau) := \det(\text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^\top) \odot \delta^{\sigma, \tau})$ and $\nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma, \tau)$ is the determinant of an $n \times n$ matrix derived by substituting the s -th column of the matrix $\text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^\top) \odot \delta^{\sigma, \tau}$ with $\Lambda \odot r^{\sigma, \tau}$.

Auxiliary matrix game $W_\Lambda^s(z)$. We define a matrix game where the actions of each player are the pure stationary strategies in the stochastic game. The payoff of the game is obtained

by the linearization of the quotient in Eq. (6). More formally, for all parameters $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}$, and $\hat{\tau} \in \Gamma^{PS}$, we define the payoff of the matrix game as

$$W_{\Lambda}^s(z)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}] := \nabla_{\Lambda}^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}) - z \cdot \nabla_{\Lambda}(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}).$$

The value of $W_{\Lambda}^s(z)$ is denoted by $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z))$.

The following statements (Lemma 11 and Corollary 12) connect the stateful-discounted value with the value of the matrix game.

► **Lemma 11.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, and an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$. Then, the following assertions hold.*

1. *The map $(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \mapsto \text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z))$ is continuous;*
2. *for all discount factors $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, the map $z \mapsto \text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z))$ is strictly decreasing; and*
3. *for all discount factors $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, we have $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(\text{val}_{\Lambda}(s))) = 0$.*

► **Corollary 12.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, and a discount function Λ . Then, $\text{val}_{\Lambda}(s)$ is the unique $z^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z^*)) = 0.$$

Below we define randomized strategies in the matrix game derived from stationary strategies in concurrent stochastic games.

Strategies for the matrix game. Given a Player-1 (resp. Player 2) stationary strategy σ (resp. τ), we denote by σ (resp. τ) a randomized strategy for the matrix game $W_{\Lambda}^s(z)$ defined as

$$\sigma(\hat{\sigma}) := \prod_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sigma(s)(\hat{\sigma}(s)) \quad \forall \hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}.$$

Also, we define

$$W_{\Lambda}^s(z)[\sigma, \tau] := \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sum_{\hat{\tau} \in \Gamma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) \cdot \tau(\hat{\tau}) \cdot W_{\Lambda}^s(z)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}].$$

The following result is instrumental to prove that the value of the matrix game is strictly decreasing (Lemma 11-Item 2).

► **Lemma 13.** *Consider a $k \times k$ stochastic matrix M and a discount function $\Lambda: [k] \rightarrow \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$. Then, we have*

$$\det(\text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^{\top}) \odot M) \geq \left(\min_i \lambda_i\right)^k.$$

Proof. Fix $\widehat{M} := \text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^{\top}) \odot M$. We claim that the matrix \widehat{M} is a strictly diagonally dominating matrix. Indeed, M is a stochastic matrix. Therefore, for the i -th row of \widehat{M} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}_{i,i} - \sum_{j \neq i} |\widehat{M}_{i,j}| &= 1 - (1 - \Lambda(i)) \sum_j M_{i,j} && \text{(def. } \widehat{M}) \\ &= \Lambda(i). && (M \text{ is a stochastic matrix}) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the (possibly complex) eigenvalues ξ_1, \dots, ξ_k . By Gershgorin circle theorem [20], for all i , we have that $|\xi_i - 1| \leq 1 - \min_i \lambda_i$. Therefore, we have

$$\det(\widehat{M}) = \prod_i \xi_i \geq \left(\min_i \lambda_i\right)^k,$$

which concludes the proof. ◀

XX:14 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

The following statement quantifies the monotonicity of the value of the matrix game.

► **Lemma 14.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, and a discount function $\Lambda: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$. For all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $z_1 < z_2$, we have*

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_1)) - \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_2)) \geq (z_2 - z_1) \left(\min_i \lambda_i \right)^n.$$

Proof. For all $\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}$ and $\hat{\tau} \in \Gamma^{PS}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_\Lambda^s(z_1)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}] - W_\Lambda^s(z_2)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}] &= (z_2 - z_1) \nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}) && \text{(def. } W_\Lambda^s) \\ &= (z_2 - z_1) \det \left(\text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^\top) \odot \delta^{\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}} \right) && \text{(def. } \nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})) \\ &\geq (z_2 - z_1) \left(\min_i \lambda_i \right)^n && \text{(Lemma 13)} \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from the fact that increasing each entry of a matrix game by at least t increases the value by at least t . ◀

The following result is instrumental to prove that the stateful-discounted value forces the matrix game to have value zero (Lemma 11-Item 3).

► **Lemma 15.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, a discount function Λ , and a Player-1 stationary strategy σ . Then, for all $\hat{\tau} \in \Gamma^{PS}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$W_\Lambda^s(z)[\sigma, \hat{\tau}] = \nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma, \hat{\tau}) - z \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \hat{\tau}),$$

where σ is the strategy for $W_\Lambda^s(z)$ derived by the strategy σ .

Proof. For all $\sigma \in \Sigma^S$ and $\tau \in \Gamma^S$, we define $M(\sigma, \tau) := \text{Id} - ((\mathbf{1} - \Lambda)\mathbf{1}^\top) \odot \delta^{\sigma, \tau}$. We also denote by $\sigma_{s \rightarrow a}$ the stationary strategy derived from σ where Player 1 chooses the action a at the state s . By definition, $\nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \tau) = \det(M(\sigma, \tau))$. We now show that

$$\nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \hat{\tau}) = \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}).$$

Indeed, the s -th row of $M(\sigma, \hat{\tau})$ only depends on $\sigma(s)$. Therefore, by multi-linearity of the determinant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M(\sigma, \hat{\tau})) &= \det \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sigma(s)(a) M(\sigma_{s \rightarrow a}, \hat{\tau}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sigma(s)(a) \cdot \det(M(\sigma_{s \rightarrow a}, \hat{\tau})). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by induction, we have

$$\nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \hat{\tau}) = \det(M(\sigma, \hat{\tau})) = \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) \cdot \det(M(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})) = \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}).$$

By similar arguments, we can show that

$$\nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma, \hat{\tau}) = \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) \cdot \nabla_\Lambda^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} W_\Lambda^s(z)[\sigma, \hat{\tau}] &= \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) \cdot W_\Lambda^s(z)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}] \\ &= \sum_{\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma^{PS}} \sigma(\hat{\sigma}) [\nabla_\Lambda^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}) - z \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})] \\ &= \nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma, \hat{\tau}) - z \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\sigma, \hat{\tau}), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Lemma 11. We prove the three items as follows.

1. By the continuity of the determinant, the entries of $W_\Lambda^s(z)$ depend continuously on parameters $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. Therefore, the map $(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \mapsto \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ is continuous, which yields the item.
2. By Lemma 14, for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $z_1 < z_2$, we have $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_1)) - \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_2)) \geq 0$, which yields the item.
3. By the result of [29], there exist optimal stationary strategies σ^* and τ^* for CSGs with stateful-discounted objectives. Therefore, for all $\hat{\tau} \in \Gamma^{PS}$, we have

$$\nu^{\sigma^*, \hat{\tau}}(s) = \frac{\nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma^*, \hat{\tau})}{\nabla_\Lambda(\sigma^*, \hat{\tau})} \geq \text{val}_\Lambda(s).$$

Hence,

$$\nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma^*, \hat{\tau}) - \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\sigma^*, \hat{\tau}) \geq 0.$$

By Lemma 15, in the matrix game $W_\Lambda^s(\text{val}_\Lambda(s))$, we have

$$W_\Lambda^s(\text{val}_\Lambda(s))[\sigma^*, \hat{\tau}] = \nabla_\Lambda^s(\sigma^*, \hat{\tau}) - \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\sigma^*, \hat{\tau}) \geq 0 \quad \forall \hat{\tau} \in \Gamma^{PS},$$

which guarantees that $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(\text{val}_\Lambda(s))) \geq 0$. By symmetric arguments on τ^* , we get $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(\text{val}_\Lambda(s))) \leq 0$. The result follows from combining these two inequalities. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Corollary 12. By Lemma 11-Item 2, the mapping $z \mapsto \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ is strictly decreasing. By Lemma 11-Item 3, we know that $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(\text{val}_\Lambda(s))) = 0$. Hence, there exists the unique $z^* = \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z^*)) = 0,$$

which yields the result. \blacktriangleleft

4.4 Characterization of Limit Value

In this subsection, we introduce a new characterization of the limit value in CSGs (Corollary 17 and Lemma 16), which generalizes the result presented in [2] from a single discount factor to multiple discount factors. In particular, Corollary 17 generalizes Theorem 2 of [2].

Limit function. Given a CSG G , a reward function, and an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, we define the limit function as

$$F_\chi^s(z) := \lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \cdots \lim_{\lambda_d \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))}{(\lambda_d)^n}.$$

XX:16 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

► **Lemma 16.** Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, and an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$. Then, the following assertions hold.

1. For all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, the limit $F_\chi^s(z)$ exists in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$; and
2. For all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $z_1 < z_2$, we have $F_\chi^s(z_1) \geq F_\chi^s(z_2) + z_2 - z_1$.
3. There exists $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_\chi^s(z_2) \leq 0 \leq F_\chi^s(z_1)$.

► **Corollary 17.** Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, and an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$. Then, $\text{val}_\chi(s)$ is the unique $z^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\forall z > z^* \quad F_\chi^s(z) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall z < z^* \quad F_\chi^s(z) > 0.$$

Below we first present Lemma 18, which shows that, given a fixed parameter z , the value of the matrix game is a rational function when discount factors are small enough, which implies the existence of the limit function. We then prove Lemma 16 and Corollary 17.

► **Lemma 18.** Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function, an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, and a real number $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, there exist two polynomials P and Q in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \lambda_1^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \lambda_1^0) \quad \dots \quad \exists \lambda_d^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, \lambda_d^0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z)) = \frac{P(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 7, there exists a sub-matrix M in $W_\Lambda^s(z)$ such that

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z)) = \frac{\det(M)}{S(M)}.$$

Since z is fixed, the matrix M is a matrix with polynomial entries in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. Therefore, by Lemma 8 and Corollary 9, there exist two polynomials P and Q in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ such that

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z)) = \frac{P(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}.$$

Since the matrix $W_\Lambda^s(z)$ is finite, the set of all sub-matrices is finite. Therefore, there exist two finite sets of polynomials \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} such that for all $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, there exists $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z)) = \frac{P(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}.$$

By Lemma 11-Item 1, we have $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ is continuous in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$. Therefore, as $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ varies in $(0, 1]^d$, the value of the matrix game can only jump from one rational function to another if the graphs of two rationals intersect. More formally, $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ can jump from $\frac{P_1}{Q_1}$ to $\frac{P_2}{Q_2}$ when discount factors are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, if we have

$$\frac{P_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)} = \frac{P_2(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q_2(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)},$$

We now claim that for every $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$, either $\frac{P_1}{Q_1}$ and $\frac{P_2}{Q_2}$ are congruent, or

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \lambda_1^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \lambda_1^0) \quad \dots \quad \exists \lambda_d^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, \lambda_d^0) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{P_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)} \neq \frac{P_2(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q_2(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, we define the polynomial $C := P_1 \cdot Q_2 - P_2 \cdot Q_1$.

Case $C = 0$. If $C = 0$, then $\frac{P_1}{Q_1}$ and $\frac{P_2}{Q_2}$ are congruent, which complete the case.

Case $C \neq 0$. If $C \neq 0$, then by Lemma 10, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \lambda_1^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \lambda_1^0) \quad \cdots \quad \exists \lambda_d^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, \lambda_d^0) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad C(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $C(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \neq 0$, then $\frac{P_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)} \neq \frac{P_2(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q_2(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}$, which completes the case and concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Lemma 16. We prove the two items as follows.

1. It is a direct implication of Lemma 18.
2. By Lemma 14, for every $z_1 < z_2$ and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ where $\lambda_d = \min_i \lambda_i$, we have

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_1)) \geq \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_2)) + (z_2 - z_1)(\lambda_d)^n.$$

By dividing both side by $(\lambda_d)^n$ and taking $\lambda_d, \dots, \lambda_1$ to 0 respectively, we get

$$F_\chi^s(z_1) \geq F_\chi^s(z_2) + z_2 - z_1.$$

3. We define $z_1 := \min r(s, a, b)$ and $z_2 := \max r(s, a, b)$. For all $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, we have

$$\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_2)) \leq \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(\text{val}_\Lambda(s))) \leq \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z_1)).$$

By dividing both side by $(\lambda_d)^n$ and taking $\lambda_d, \dots, \lambda_1$ to 0 respectively, we get

$$F_\chi^s(z_2) \leq 0 \leq F_\chi^s(z_1),$$

which yields the result. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Corollary 17. Let z^* be the point where $z \mapsto F_\chi^s(z)$ changes sign. The existence of z^* is given by Lemma 16-Items 2 and 3. For all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have that $F_\chi^s(z^* + \varepsilon) < 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \lambda_1^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \lambda_1^0) \quad \cdots \quad \exists \lambda_d^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, \lambda_d^0) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z^* + \varepsilon)) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 11-Item 2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \lambda_1^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \lambda_1^0) \quad \cdots \quad \exists \lambda_d^0 > 0 \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, \lambda_d^0) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \text{val}_\Lambda(s) < z^* + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we get

$$\lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \cdots \lim_{\lambda_d \rightarrow 0^+} \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \leq z^* + \varepsilon.$$

By taking ε to 0, we have

$$\lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \cdots \lim_{\lambda_d \rightarrow 0^+} \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \leq z^*.$$

By symmetric arguments on $z^* - \varepsilon$, we get

$$\lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \cdots \lim_{\lambda_d \rightarrow 0^+} \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \geq z^*,$$

which concludes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

4.5 Approximation of Limit Value

In this subsection, we introduce an approach for the approximation of the limit value via the stateful-discounted value (Theorem 19). The rest of the subsection is dedicated to its proof.

► **Theorem 19.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, and an additive error $\varepsilon > 0$. The transition function δ and the reward function r are represented by rational numbers of bit-size B . Fix*

$$D := \max(|\Sigma^{PS}|, |\Gamma^{PS}|), \quad B_1 := 11Dn(B + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + \text{bit}(\varepsilon)),$$

and, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, we have $\lambda_i^0 := \exp(-B_1(nD + 1)^{i-1})$. Then, we have

$$|\text{val}_{\Lambda^0}(s) - \text{val}_{\chi}(s)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

► **Remark 20 (Novelty).** As mentioned previously, our result is a generalization of [2]. The key non-trivial aspect of the generalization relies on the fact that [2] considers uni-variate polynomials, whereas our result requires analysis of multi-variate polynomials. Lemma 10 is the key mathematical foundation, and the complete proofs require significant technical generalization.

Below we first show the algebraic properties of $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z))$ (Lemma 21) to derive some insights on the asymptotic behavior of the sign of the map $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \mapsto \text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z))$ as $\lambda_d, \dots, \lambda_1$ go to 0 respectively (Lemma 22). We then use Lemma 22 to establish a connection between the stateful-discounted value and the limit value in Theorem 19.

► **Lemma 21.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , and an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$. The transition function δ and the reward function r are represented by rational numbers of bit-size B . Let $D := \max(|\Sigma^{PS}|, |\Gamma^{PS}|)$. Then, there exist two finite sets \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} of nonzero polynomials in $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees D, nD, \dots, nD with integer coefficients such that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, there exist $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$Q(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \neq 0, \quad \text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s(z)) = \frac{P(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}.$$

Moreover, the coefficients of P are of bit-size $7Dn(B + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D))$.

Proof. By definition, $W_{\Lambda}^s(z)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}] = \nabla_{\Lambda}^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}) - z \cdot \nabla_{\Lambda}^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ for all pure stationary strategies $\hat{\sigma}$ and $\hat{\tau}$. Note that $\nabla_{\Lambda}^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ and $\nabla_{\Lambda}(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ are the determinant of two matrices whose entries are polynomial in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees $1, 1, \dots, 1$ with coefficients from the set $\{0, 2^{-B}, 2 \cdot 2^{-B}, \dots, 1\}$. Therefore, by Lemma 8, the entries of $2^{nB}W_{\Lambda}^s(z)$ are polynomials in $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees $1, n, \dots, n$ with integer coefficients of bit-size

$$nB + n \text{bit}(n) + d \text{bit}(n + 1) \leq nB + 3n \text{bit}(n) =: B'.$$

We now define two sets of nonzero polynomials \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} as

$$\mathcal{P} := \{\det(M) \mid M \text{ is a sub-matrix of } 2^{nB}W_{\Lambda}^s(z)\},$$

$$\mathcal{Q} := \{2^{nB}S(M) \mid M \text{ is a sub-matrix of } 2^{nB}W_{\Lambda}^s(z)\}.$$

By Lemma 7, for all z , there exists a sub-matrix M in the matrix game $2^{nB}W_{\Lambda}^s(z)$ such that

$$\text{val}(W_{\Lambda}^s) = \frac{\det(M)}{2^{nB}S(M)},$$

where the equality is due to the fact that $\det(2^{-nB}M) = 2^{-knB} \det(M)$ and $S(2^{-nB}M) = 2^{-(k-1)nB}S(M)$ for the $k \times k$ matrix M . Note that M is a polynomial matrix. Hence, there exist $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that for all z and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$, we have

$$Q(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \neq 0, \quad \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s) = \frac{P(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}{Q(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)}.$$

We now show that \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} satisfy the requirements of the lemma. Let $P := \det(M)$ and $Q := 2^{nB}S(M)$, where M is a $k \times k$ sub-matrix of $2^{nB}W_\Lambda^s(z)$. First, by Lemma 11-Item 2, we know that $z \mapsto \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ is strictly decreasing, therefore P is nonzero. Second, We know that entries of M are polynomials in $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees $1, n, \dots, n$ with integer coefficients of bit-size B' . Therefore, by Lemma 8, we have that P is a polynomial in $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees k, kn, \dots, kn with integer coefficients of bit-size

$$\begin{aligned} kB' + k \text{bit}(k) + (d+1) \text{bit}(kn+1) &\leq DB' + D \text{bit}(D) + (d+1) \text{bit}(nD+1) \\ &\leq D(B' + \text{bit}(D) + 4n \text{bit}(nD)) \\ &= D(nB + 3n \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + 4n \text{bit}(nD)) \\ &\leq Dn(B + 3 \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + 4 \text{bit}(nD)) \\ &\leq 7Dn(B + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D)), \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we use $k \leq D$, in the second inequality we use $(d+1) \text{bit}(nD+1) \leq 4nD \text{bit}(nD)$, in the first equality we use $B' = nB + 3n \text{bit}(n)$, in the third inequality we use $\text{bit}(D) \leq n \text{bit}(D)$, and in the fourth inequality we use $\text{bit}(nD) \leq \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D)$.

Similarly, since $S(M)$ is the sum of the entries of the adjugate matrix of M , by Corollary 9, we have that Q is a polynomial in $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees D, nD, \dots, nD with integer coefficients, which completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

► Lemma 22. *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, and a rational number z of bit-size κ . The transition function δ and the reward function r are represented by rational numbers of bit-size B . Fix*

$$D := \max(|\Sigma^{PS}|, |\Gamma^{PS}|), \quad B_1 := 11Dn(B + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + \kappa),$$

and, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, we have $\lambda_i^0 := \exp(-B_1(nD+1)^{i-1})$. Then,

$$\begin{cases} \text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z)) > 0 &\implies F_\chi^s(z) \geq 0, \\ \text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z)) < 0 &\implies F_\chi^s(z) \leq 0, \\ \text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z)) = 0 &\implies F_\chi^s(z) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \exp(-B_1)] \quad \dots \quad \forall \lambda_i \in (0, (\lambda_{i-1})^{nD+1}] \quad \dots \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, (\lambda_{d-1})^{nD+1}] \\ \text{sign}(\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))) = \text{sign}(\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z))), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the theorem. By Lemma 11-Item 1, the map $(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \mapsto \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ is continuous. Therefore, the necessary condition for changing sign of $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \mapsto \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ is that $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^1}^s(z)) = 0$ for some $\lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_d^1$. For the sake of contradiction, assume there exists $\lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_d^1$ such that $\lambda_1^1 \leq \exp(-B_1)$ and $\lambda_i^1 \leq (\lambda_{i-1}^1)^{nD+1}$ for all $i > 1$. Let \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} be the finite sets defined in Lemma 21. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^1}^s(z)) = \frac{P(z, \lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_d^1)}{Q(z, \lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_d^1)}.$$

Since $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^1}^s(z)) = 0$, we have that $P(z, \lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_d^1) = 0$. Let z be fixed. We define

$$P_z(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) := \exp(\kappa d) \cdot P(z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d).$$

Polynomial P is a polynomial in $z, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees D, nD, \dots, nD with integer coefficients of bit-size $7Dn(\text{B} + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D))$. Since z is a rational number of bit-size κ , we have that P_z is a polynomial in $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ of degrees nD, \dots, nD with integer coefficients of bit-size $7Dn(\text{B} + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + \kappa)$. If $P_z = 0$, then on the one hand, we have $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z)) = 0$, and on the other hand, we have that

$$\forall \lambda_1 \in (0, \exp(-\text{B}_1)] \quad \dots \quad \forall \lambda_i \in (0, (\lambda_{i-1})^{nD+1}] \quad \dots \quad \forall \lambda_d \in (0, (\lambda_{d-1})^{nD+1}] \\ \text{val}(W_{\Lambda^s}^s(z)) = 0,$$

which implies that $F_{\chi^s}(z) = 0$ and the proof of this case is done. Therefore, P_z is nonzero. Since $\text{B}_1 = 11Dn(\text{B} + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + \kappa)$, by Lemma 10, we have that $P_z(\lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_d^1) \neq 0$, which contradicts with the assumption and completes the proof. \blacktriangleleft

Proof of Theorem 19. We set $\kappa := \text{bit}(\varepsilon)$. We define $\mathcal{Z} := \{0, 2^{-\kappa}, 2 \cdot 2^{-\kappa}, \dots, 1\}$. By Lemma 11-Item 2, we have that $z \mapsto \text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z))$ is strictly decreasing. Therefore, there exists $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ such that $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z)) \geq 0$ and $\text{val}(W_{\Lambda^0}^s(z + 2^{-\kappa})) \leq 0$. By Lemma 11-Item 2, we have

$$z \leq \text{val}_{\Lambda^0}(s) \leq z + 2^{-\kappa}. \quad (7)$$

By Lemma 22 and Corollary 17, we have

$$z \leq \text{val}_{\chi}(s) \leq z + 2^{-\kappa}. \quad (8)$$

The result follows from combining Eq. (7) and Eq. (8). \blacktriangleleft

5 Algorithms for LIMITVALUE and PARITYVALUE

In this section, we present algorithms for computing ε -approximation of stateful-discounted, limit, and parity values. The section is organized as follows. In Section 5.1, we recall two classical algorithmic procedures that are used in our algorithms. In Section 5.2, we present an algorithm for computing ε -approximate stateful-discounted value. In Section 5.3, we present an algorithm for computing ε -approximate limit value, and as a consequence, we also obtain an algorithm for computing ε -approximate parity value.

5.1 Selected Algorithms from Literature

In this subsection, we recall classical algorithms for computing the determinant of a matrix and computing the value of a matrix game.

► **Lemma 23** ([3]). *Consider a $k \times k$ matrix M with rational entries of bit-size B . Then, there exists a procedure $\text{DET}(M)$ that computes the determinant of M in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^4 \text{B}^2)$, and $\text{DET}(M)$ is of bit-size $\mathcal{O}(k \log(k) \text{B})$.*

► **Lemma 24** ([25]). *Consider a $k \times k$ matrix game M with rational entries of bit-size B . Then, there exists a procedure $\text{VAL}(M)$ that computes the value of the matrix game M in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(k^{3.5} \text{B})$, and $\text{VAL}(M)$ is of bit-size $\mathcal{O}(\text{B})$.*

5.2 Algorithm for Approximate Stateful-discounted Value

In this subsection, we present an algorithm for computing ε -approximation of the stateful-discounted value in CSGs. Given a CSG G , a reward function, and a discount function Λ , the procedure runs a binary search over the stateful-discounted value of state s . At the beginning, \underline{z} and \bar{z} are the under and over approximation of $\text{val}_\Lambda(s)$. In each step, the algorithm halves the interval $[\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$ by increasing \underline{z} or decreasing \bar{z} based on the sign of $\text{val}\left(W_\Lambda^s\left(\frac{\underline{z}+\bar{z}}{2}\right)\right)$. After $\text{bit}(\varepsilon)$ steps, the algorithm outputs the ε -approximate value $(\bar{z} + \underline{z})/2$. The formal description is shown in Algorithm 1, and the correctness and the time complexity of the algorithm is shown in Lemma 25.

■ Algorithm 1 APPROXDISCOUNTED

Input: Game G , state s , reward function r , a discount function Λ , additive error ε

Output: Approximate stateful-discounted value v such that $|v - \text{val}_\Lambda(s)| \leq \varepsilon$

```

1: procedure APPROXDISCOUNTED( $G, s, r, \Lambda, \varepsilon$ )
2:    $\underline{z} \leftarrow 0$  and  $\bar{z} \leftarrow 1$ 
3:   while  $\bar{z} - \underline{z} > \varepsilon$  do
4:      $z \leftarrow \frac{\underline{z} + \bar{z}}{2}$ 
5:      $\nu \leftarrow \text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$ 
6:     if  $\nu \geq 0$  then
7:        $\underline{z} \leftarrow z$ 
8:     else
9:        $\bar{z} \leftarrow z$ 
10:  return  $\frac{\underline{z} + \bar{z}}{2}$ 

```

► **Lemma 25.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , a discount function Λ , and an additive error $\varepsilon > 0$. The transition function δ , the reward function r , and the discount function Λ are represented by rational numbers of bit-size B . Then, Algorithm 1 computes the ε -approximation of the stateful-discounted value of state s . Moreover, the algorithm runs in time $\exp(\mathcal{O}(n \log(m) + \log(B) + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon))))$.*

Proof. We first present the proof of correctness and then the time complexity of the algorithm.

Correctness. The procedure is a binary search over the stateful-discounted value of state s . At the beginning, \underline{z} and \bar{z} are the under and over approximation of $\text{val}_\Lambda(s)$. In each step, by Lemma 11-Item 2, the algorithm halves the interval $[\underline{z}, \bar{z}]$ by increasing (resp. decreasing) \underline{z} (resp. \bar{z}) based on the sign of ν . Therefore, in all steps, $\underline{z} \leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \leq \bar{z}$ is invariant. The algorithm terminates after at most $\text{bit}(\varepsilon)$ steps. The correctness of the procedure follows from the invariant $\underline{z} \leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) \leq \bar{z}$ and $\bar{z} - \underline{z} \leq \varepsilon$.

Time complexity. The procedure executes at most $\text{bit}(\varepsilon)$ iterations. All lines except Line 5 require constant arithmetic operations. Line 5 consists of two parts as follows.

■ *Construction of $W_\Lambda^s(z)$.* Recall that

$$W_\Lambda^s(z)[\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}] = \nabla_\Lambda^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}) - z \cdot \nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau}),$$

where $\nabla_\Lambda^s(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ and $\nabla_\Lambda(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\tau})$ are the determinants of two $n \times n$ matrices. The construction of matrices runs in time $\mathcal{O}(n^2B)$. The algorithm uses DET to compute the determinants, which runs in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^4B^2)$ by Lemma 23. The determinants are of bit-size $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n)B)$. The number of entries of $W_\Lambda^s(z)$ is at most m^{2n} . Therefore, its construction runs in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m^{2n})$. The entries of $W_\Lambda^s(z)$ is of bit-size $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n)B + \log(1/\varepsilon))$.

- *Computation of $\text{val}(W_\Lambda^s(z))$.* The procedure uses VAL to compute the value of the matrix game $W_\Lambda^s(z)$. Therefore, by Lemma 24, it runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{3.5n}B^2 \log^2(1/\varepsilon))$. Hence, Algorithm 1 runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{3.5n}B^2 \log^3(1/\varepsilon))$, which completes the proof. ◀

5.3 Algorithms for Approximate Limit and Parity Values

In this subsection, we present an algorithm for computing ε -approximation of the limit and parity values in CSGs. Given a CSG G , a reward function, and an assignment function χ , the procedure outputs the $\varepsilon/2$ -approximate of the stateful-discounted value of state s by calling APPROXDISCOUNTED. By Theorem 19, the stateful-discounted value is an $\varepsilon/2$ -approximation of the limit value. Thus, the returned value of the algorithm is indeed an ε -approximate of the limit value. The formal description is shown in Algorithm 2, and the correctness and the time complexity of the algorithm is shown in Lemma 26. Since CSGs with parity objectives have a linear-size reduction to CSGs with the limit value of stateful-discounted objectives, as a consequence of the above algorithm, we obtain an algorithm for parity value approximation.

■ **Algorithm 2** APPROXLIMIT

Input: Game G , state s , reward function r , assignment function χ , additive error ε

Output: Approximate limit value v such that $|v - \text{val}(s)| \leq \varepsilon$

- 1: **procedure** APPROXLIMIT($G, s, r, \chi, \varepsilon$)
 - 2: $D \leftarrow m^n$
 - 3: $B_1 \leftarrow 11Dn(B + \text{bit}(n) + \text{bit}(D) + \text{bit}(\varepsilon))$
 - 4: **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ to d **do**
 - 5: $\lambda_i^0 \leftarrow \exp(-B_1(nD + 1)^{i-1})$
 - 6: $v \leftarrow \text{APPROXDISCOUNTED}(G, s, r, \Lambda^0, \varepsilon/2)$
 - 7: **return** v
-

► **Lemma 26.** *Consider a CSG G , a state s , a reward function r , an assignment function $\chi: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [d]$, and an additive error $\varepsilon > 0$. The transition function δ and the reward function r are represented by rational numbers of bit-size B . Then, Algorithm 2 computes the ε -approximation of the limit value of state s . Moreover, the algorithm runs in time $\exp(\mathcal{O}(nd \log(m) + \log(B) + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon))))$.*

Proof. We first present the proof of correctness and then the time complexity of the algorithm. *Correctness.* The procedure computes the $\varepsilon/2$ -approximate stateful-discounted value v for Λ^0 and outputs v as the approximate limit value. The procedure APPROXDISCOUNTED outputs v such that

$$|v - \text{val}_{\Lambda^0}(s)| \leq \varepsilon/2. \tag{9}$$

By Theorem 19, we have that

$$|\text{val}_{\Lambda^0}(s) - \text{val}_\chi(s)| \leq \varepsilon/2. \tag{10}$$

By combining Eqs. (9) and (10), we get that v is ε -approximation of $\text{val}_\chi(s)$.

Time complexity. All lines except Line 6 require at most $\mathcal{O}(d)$ arithmetic operations. In Algorithm 2, the algorithm calls APPROXDISCOUNTED with parameters $(G, s, r, \Lambda^0, \varepsilon/2)$. The bit-size of the discount function Λ^0 is $\tilde{O}(n^d m^{nd}(B + \text{bit}(\varepsilon)))$. Therefore, this line runs in time $\tilde{O}(m^{7.5nd}B^2 \log^5(1/\varepsilon))$, which completes the proof. ◀

Proof of Theorem 5-Item 2. It is a direct implication of Lemma 26. ◀

► **Corollary 27.** *Consider a CSG G , a priority function p , a state s , and an additive error $\varepsilon > 0$. The transition function δ is represented by rational numbers of bit-size B . Then, there exists an algorithm that computes the ε -approximation of the parity value of state s . Moreover, the algorithm runs in time $\exp(\mathcal{O}(nd \log(m) + \log(B) + \log(\log(1/\varepsilon))))$.*

Proof. By [21, 12], there exists a linear-size reduction from the CSGs with parity objectives to the CSGs with the limit-value of stateful-discounted objectives. Therefore, the result follows from Lemma 26. ◀

Proof of Theorem 6-Item 2. It is a direct implication of Corollary 27. ◀

6 Complexities of LIMITVALUE and PARITYVALUE

In this section, we show that the LIMITVALUE and PARITYVALUE problems are in TFNP[NP]. This section is organized as follows. In Section 6.1, we present some useful definitions and selected results from the literature related to Markov Chains (MCs) and Markov Decision Processes (MDPs), and floating-point representation. In Sections 6.2–6.4, we present algorithms for computing ε -approximate stateful-discounted value in MCs, MDPs, and CSGs. Each algorithm is used in the subsequent algorithm as a procedure. By our technical result on the limit value approximation via the stateful-discounted value (Theorem 19), we consequently obtain a TFNP[NP] procedure for the LIMITVALUE problem. Since there exists a linear-size reduction from CSGs with parity objectives to CSGs with the limit-value of stateful-discounted objectives [21, 12], the PARITYVALUE problem is also in TFNP[NP].

6.1 Definitions and Selected Results from Literature

We present some basic notations and definitions related to Markov Chains, Markov Decision Processes, and the classical symbolic representation for numbers and probability distributions, called floating-point.

Markov decision processes and Markov chains. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, a Player- i Markov decision process (Player- i MDP) is a special class of CSGs where the other player has only one action and is denoted by $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \delta: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S}))$. A Markov chain (MC) is a special class of MDPs where both players have only one action and is denoted by $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{S}, \delta: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S}))$. In Markov chains we write $\delta(s, s')$ to denote $\delta(s)(s')$.

Absorbing MCs. We say an MC \mathcal{C} is *absorbing* if there exists a subset of absorbing states $\mathcal{S}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that

- For all $s \in \mathcal{S}_0$, we have $\delta(s, s) = 1$; and
 - For all $s_0 \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_0$, there exist states s_1, \dots, s_k such that $\delta(s_i, s_{i+1}) > 0$ and $s_k \in \mathcal{S}_0$.
- States in \mathcal{S}_0 are called absorbing.

MDPs and MCs given stationary strategies in CSGs. Given a stationary strategy σ for Player 1 in a game G , by fixing the strategy σ , we obtain a Player-2 MDP $G_\sigma = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}, \delta_\sigma)$ where the transition function $\delta_\sigma: \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ is given by

$$\delta_\sigma(s, b)(s') := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \delta(s, a, b)(s') \cdot \sigma(s)(a),$$

for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Analogously, we obtain Player-1 MDP G_τ by fixing a stationary strategy τ for Player 2. Moreover, by fixing stationary strategies σ and τ for both players,

XX:24 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

we obtain an MC $G_{\sigma,\tau} = (\mathcal{S}, \delta_{\sigma,\tau})$, where the transition function $\delta_{\sigma,\tau}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ is given by

$$\delta_{\sigma,\tau}(s)(s') = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} \delta(s, a, b)(s') \cdot \sigma(s)(a) \cdot \tau(s)(b),$$

for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$.

Reachability objectives in MCs. Given an MC \mathcal{C} and a target set $T \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, the reachability objective is the indicator function of plays eventually reaching T . More formally, for a play $\omega = \langle s_0, s_1, \dots \rangle$, we define $\text{Reach}_T: \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as

$$\text{Reach}_T(\omega) := \begin{cases} 1 & \exists i \geq 0 \ s_i \in T \\ 0 & \end{cases}$$

We define the probability of reaching the target set T from state s as $\text{val}_T(s) := \mathbb{E}_s[\text{Reach}_T]$.

Floating-point number representation. We define the set of floating-point numbers with precision ℓ as

$$\mathcal{F}(\ell) := \{m \cdot 2^e \mid m \in \{0, \dots, 2^\ell - 1\}, \ e \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

The floating-point representation of an element $x = m \cdot 2^e \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$ uses $\text{bit}(m) + \text{bit}(|e|)$ bits. We define the relative distance of two real numbers x, \tilde{x} as

$$\text{rel}(x, \tilde{x}) := \max \left\{ \frac{x}{\tilde{x}}, \frac{\tilde{x}}{x} \right\} - 1 = \inf \{ \alpha > 0 \ : \ x \leq (1 + \alpha)\tilde{x}, \ \tilde{x} \leq (1 + \alpha)x \}.$$

We say x is (ℓ, i) -close to \tilde{x} if $\text{rel}(x, \tilde{x}) \leq (1 - 2^{1-\ell})^{-i} - 1$, where ℓ is a positive integer and i is a non-negative integer.

Arithmetic operations. We define $\oplus^\ell, \ominus^\ell, \otimes^\ell, \oslash^\ell$ as finite precision arithmetic operations $+, -, *, /$ respectively by truncating the result of the exact arithmetic operation to ℓ bits. We drop the superscript ℓ if context is clear.

Floating-point probability distribution representation. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(\ell)$ the set of all floating-point probability distributions. A probability distribution $\mu \in \Delta([t])$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}(\ell)$ if there exists $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_t \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$ such that

- For all $i \in [t]$, we have $\mu(i) = \frac{w_i}{\sum_{j \in [t]} w_j}$; and
- $\sum_{j \in [t]} w_j$ and 1 are (ℓ, t) -close.

We define the relative distance rel for probability distributions as $\text{rel}(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) := \max \{ \text{rel}(\mu(i), \tilde{\mu}(i)) \ : \ i \in [t] \}$. We say μ is (ℓ, i) -close to $\tilde{\mu}$ if $\text{rel}(\mu, \tilde{\mu}) \leq (1 - 2^{1-\ell})^{-i} - 1$, where ℓ is a positive integer and i is a non-negative integer.

Below we recall some useful results from the literature related to MCs, MDPs, and the floating-point representation.

► **Lemma 28** ([31, Thm. 6]). *Consider two absorbing MCs \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ with identical state sets and a target set T . We denote by val_T and $\widetilde{\text{val}}_T$ the reachability value of \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ respectively. Fix $\varepsilon := \max_{s, s'} \text{rel}(\delta(s, s'), \tilde{\delta}(s, s'))$. Then, for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have*

$$|\text{val}_T(s) - \widetilde{\text{val}}_T(s)| \leq 4n\varepsilon.$$

► **Lemma 29** ([19, Thm. 4]). *Consider an absorbing MC \mathcal{C} and a target set T . For all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\delta(s) \in \mathcal{D}(\ell)$ where $\ell \geq 1000n^2$. Then, there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, computes an approximation $v \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$ for the reachability value such that*

$$|v - \text{val}_T(s)| \leq 80n^4 2^{-\ell}.$$

► **Lemma 30** ([19, Lemma 1]). *Consider three non-negative real numbers x, y, z . If x and y are (ℓ, i) -close, and y and z are (ℓ, j) -close, then x and z are $(\ell, i + j)$ -close.*

► **Lemma 31** ([19, Lemma 4]). *Consider non-negative real numbers x, y . Let $\tilde{x} \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$ be a number that is (ℓ, i) -close to x and $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$ be a number that is (ℓ, j) -close to y . Then, the following assertions hold.*

1. *The number $\tilde{x} \oplus \tilde{y}$ is $(\ell, \max(i, j) + 1)$ -close to $x + y$;*
2. *The number $\tilde{x} \ominus \tilde{y}$ is $(\ell, \max(i, j) + 1)$ -close to $x - y$;*
3. *The number $\tilde{x} \otimes \tilde{y}$ is $(\ell, i + j + 1)$ -close to $x * y$; and*
4. *The number $\tilde{x} \oslash \tilde{y}$ is $(\ell, i + j + 1)$ -close to x/y .*

Moreover, all arithmetic operations can be computed in polynomial time with respect to ℓ .

► **Lemma 32** ([19, Lemma 5]). *Consider $x_1, \dots, x_t \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$. Let $\mu(i) := x_i \oslash \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^t x_j \right)$. Then, there exists $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{D}(\ell)$ such that for all i , we have $\tilde{\mu}(i) = \mu(i) / \left(\sum_{j=1}^t \mu(j) \right)$, and μ and $\tilde{\mu}$ are $(\ell, 2t)$ -close.*

► **Lemma 33** ([19, Lemma 6]). *Consider a probability distribution $\mu \in \Delta([t])$. Then, there exists $\tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{D}(\ell)$ such that μ and $\tilde{\mu}$ are $(\ell, 2t + 2)$ -close.*

6.2 Stateful-discounted Value Approximation in MCs

In this subsection, we present an algorithm for computing ε -approximate stateful-discounted value in MCs by a reduction from MCs with stateful-discounted objectives to MCs with reachability objectives.

► **Lemma 34.** *Consider an MC \mathcal{C} , a reward function r , and a discount function Λ . For all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have*

$$\delta(s) \in D(\ell), \quad r(s) \in \mathcal{F}(\ell), \quad \Lambda(s) \in \mathcal{F}(\ell),$$

where $\ell \geq 1000n^2$. Then, there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, computes an approximation v for the stateful-discounted value such that

$$|v - \text{val}_\Lambda(s)| \leq 104n^4 2^{-\ell}.$$

Proof. We construct a new MC \mathcal{C}_1 from \mathcal{C} with a reachability objective and two additional absorbing states \top and \perp so the set of states is $\mathcal{S}_1 := \mathcal{S} \cup \{\top, \perp\}$. The target set is $T := \{\top\}$, and the state \perp is absorbing. The transition function δ_1 is defined as

$$\delta_1(s, s') := \begin{cases} (1 - \Lambda(s)) \cdot \delta(s, s') & s, s' \in \mathcal{S} \\ \sum_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \Lambda(s) \cdot r(s) \cdot \delta(s, s'') & s \in \mathcal{S}, s' = \top \\ \sum_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \Lambda(s) \cdot (1 - r(s)) \cdot \delta(s, s'') & s \in \mathcal{S}, s = \perp \\ 1 & s = \{\top, \perp\}, s' = s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We denote by val_Λ the stateful-discounted value in \mathcal{C} and by val_T^1 the reachability value in \mathcal{C}_1 . Note that \mathcal{C}_1 is absorbing. Observe that the Bellman equation for \mathcal{C}_1 with the stateful-discounted objective is the same as the Bellman equation for \mathcal{C}_1 with the reachability objective. Therefore, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\text{val}_\Lambda(s) = \text{val}_T^1(s). \tag{11}$$

We define the approximate transition function as

$$\delta_2(s, s') := \begin{cases} (1 \ominus \Lambda(s)) \otimes \delta(s, s') & s, s' \in \mathcal{S} \\ \bigoplus_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \Lambda(s) \otimes r(s) \otimes \delta(s, s'') & s \in \mathcal{S}, s' = \top \\ \bigoplus_{s'' \in \mathcal{S}} \Lambda(s) \otimes (1 \ominus r(s)) \otimes \delta(s, s'') & s \in \mathcal{S}, s = \perp \\ 1 & s = \{\top, \perp\}, s' = s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By the definition of finite precision arithmetic operators, we have $\delta_2(s, s') \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$. Also, by Lemma 31, we have $\delta_1(s, s)$ and $\delta_2(s, s')$ are $(\ell, n + 3)$ -close, and δ_2 is computable in polynomial time. By Lemma 32, there exists $\delta_3 \in \mathcal{D}(\ell)$ such that δ_2 and δ_3 are $(\ell, 2n)$ -close. Moreover, δ_3 is computable in polynomial time. Therefore, by Lemma 30, we have δ_1 and δ_3 are $(\ell, 3n + 3)$ -close. Therefore, for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rel}(\delta_1(s, s'), \delta_3(s, s')) &\leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{1-\ell})^{3n+3}} - 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - (3n + 3)2^{1-\ell}} - 1 && \text{(Bernoulli inequality)} \\ &\leq \frac{(3n + 3)2^{1-\ell}}{1 - (3n + 3)2^{1-\ell}} && \text{(rearrange)} \\ &\leq (3n + 3)2^{-\ell} && (\ell \geq 1000n^2) \\ &\leq 6n2^{-\ell}. && (n \geq 1) \end{aligned}$$

We define an MC \mathcal{C}_2 derived from \mathcal{C}_1 with transition function δ_3 . We denote by $\text{val}_{\mathcal{T}}^2$ the reachability value in \mathcal{C}_2 . By Lemma 28, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$|\text{val}_{\mathcal{T}}^1(s) - \text{val}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(s)| \leq 24n^2 2^{-\ell}. \quad (12)$$

By Lemma 29, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we can compute an approximation $v(s)$ of the reachability value of \mathcal{C}_2 starting from s in polynomial time such that

$$|v(s) - \text{val}_{\mathcal{T}}^2(s)| \leq 80n^4 2^{-\ell}. \quad (13)$$

By combining Eqs. (11)–(13), for all states $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$|v(s) - \text{val}_{\Lambda}(s)| \leq 104n^4 2^{-\ell},$$

which yields the result. \blacktriangleleft

6.3 Stateful-discounted Value Approximation in MDPs

In this subsection, we present an NP procedure for the approximate decision problem of the stateful-discounted values in MDPs. This is accomplished by guessing a pure stationary strategy and verifying if the strategy achieves the given threshold. The verification procedure uses the algorithm for computing approximate stateful-discounted values in MCs.

► **Lemma 35.** *The problem of deciding if the stateful-discounted value for Player-1 MDPs is below a threshold up to an additive error is in NP where the input is a Player-1 MDP \mathcal{P} , a reward function r , a discount function Λ , a state s , a threshold $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, an additive error $\varepsilon = 2^{-\kappa}$ and a positive integer ℓ such that, for all $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have*

$$\delta(s', a) \in D(\ell), \quad r(s', a) \in \mathcal{F}(\ell), \quad \Lambda(s') \in \mathcal{F}(\ell), \quad \ell \geq 1000n^2 + \kappa.$$

Note that, the numbers α and ε are represented in fixed-point binary and the NP procedure is such that

- If $\alpha \leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \varepsilon$, then it outputs YES; and
- If $\alpha \geq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon$, then it outputs NO.

Proof. We first present the NP procedure and then prove its soundness and completeness.

Procedure. The procedure guesses a pure stationary strategy σ for Player 1. Note that the size of the representation of a pure stationary strategy is polynomial with respect to the size of the representation of \mathcal{P} . By fixing σ , we obtain an MC \mathcal{P}_σ . We denote by v_σ its stateful-discounted value. By Lemma 29, there exists a polynomial time algorithm that computes an ε -approximation \tilde{v}_σ of v_σ . Our procedure outputs YES if $\alpha \leq \tilde{v}_\sigma(s)$. If there exists no such pure stationary strategy, the procedure outputs NO.

Soundness. If $\alpha \leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \varepsilon$, then, by [18], there exists a pure stationary strategy σ such that $\text{val}_\Lambda = v_\sigma$. The procedure non-deterministically guesses σ . By Lemma 34, we have $\tilde{v}_\sigma(s) + \varepsilon \geq v_\sigma(s)$. Therefore, we have $\alpha \leq \tilde{v}_\sigma(s)$, and the procedure outputs YES.

Completeness. If $\alpha \geq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon$, then for all pure stationary strategies σ , we have $\alpha \geq v_\sigma(s) + \varepsilon$. By Lemma 34, we have $\tilde{v}_\sigma(s) - \varepsilon \leq v_\sigma(s)$. Therefore, $\alpha \geq \tilde{v}_\sigma(s)$ which implies that the procedure outputs NO and yields the result. ◀

Lemma 35 also holds for Player-2 MDPs by symmetric arguments. More formally, we have the following result.

▶ **Corollary 36.** *The problem of deciding if the stateful-discounted value for Player-2 MDPs is above a threshold up to an additive error is in NP where the input is a Player-2 MDP \mathcal{P} , a reward function r , a discount function Λ , a state s , a threshold $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, an additive error $\varepsilon = 2^{-\kappa}$ and a positive integer ℓ such that, for all $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we have*

$$\delta(s', a) \in D(\ell), \quad r(s', a) \in \mathcal{F}(\ell), \quad \Lambda(s') \in \mathcal{F}(\ell), \quad \ell \geq 1000n^2 + \kappa.$$

6.4 Stateful-discounted, Limit, and Parity Values Approximation in CSGs

In this subsection, we first present a continuity result for MDPs with the stateful-discounted objectives (Lemma 37), which is a generalization of [18, Eq. 4.19]. We then show the existence of ε -optimal stationary strategies for stateful-discounted objectives that are representable in polynomial-size with respect to the size of the game and $\text{bit}(\varepsilon)$ (Lemma 38). We finally present a TFNP[NP] algorithm for CSGs with the stateful-discounted objectives, where the discount function is represented in floating-point (Lemma 40). By our technical result on the limit value approximation via the stateful-discounted value (Theorem 19), we consequently obtain a TFNP[NP] procedure for the LIMITVALUE problem. Since there exists a linear-size reduction from CSGs with parity objectives to CSGs with the limit-value of stateful-discounted objectives [21, 12], the PARITYVALUE problem is also in TFNP[NP].

▶ **Lemma 37.** *Consider $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and two Player- i MDPs \mathcal{P} and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ with identical state and action sets, a reward function r , and a discount function Λ . We denote by val_Λ and $\tilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda$ the stateful-discounted value of \mathcal{P} and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ respectively. Then, for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have*

$$\left| \text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \tilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda(s) \right| \leq \frac{\|\delta - \tilde{\delta}\|_\infty}{\min_s \Lambda(s)}.$$

XX:28 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

Proof. We only prove for Player-1 MDPs. The proof for Player-2 MDPs is symmetric. By the Bellman equation defined in [29], for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda(s) \right| \\
& \leq \max_a \left| \Lambda(s)r(s, a) + (1 - \Lambda(s)) \sum_{s'} \delta(s, a)(s') \text{val}_\Lambda(s') \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \Lambda(s)r(s, a) - (1 - \Lambda(s)) \sum_{s'} \widetilde{\delta}(s, a)(s') \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda(s') \right| \\
& = (1 - \Lambda(s)) \max_a \left| \sum_{s'} \delta(s, a)(s') (\text{val}_\Lambda(s') - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda(s')) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \sum_{s'} (\delta(s, a)(s') - \widetilde{\delta}(s, a)(s')) \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda(s') \right| \\
& \leq (1 - \Lambda(s)) \left(\|\text{val}_\Lambda - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty + \|\delta - \widetilde{\delta}\|_\infty \|\widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty \right) \\
& \leq (1 - \Lambda(s)) \left(\|\text{val}_\Lambda - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty + \|\delta - \widetilde{\delta}\|_\infty \right) \\
& \leq \left(1 - \min_s \Lambda(s) \right) \left(\|\text{val}_\Lambda - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty + \|\delta - \widetilde{\delta}\|_\infty \right), \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we use the Bellman equation, in the first equality we use algebraic manipulation, in the second inequality we use the definition of the norm and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, in the third inequality we use $\|\widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty \leq \|r\|_\infty \leq 1$, and in the fourth inequality we use $\min_s \Lambda(s) \leq \Lambda(s)$. Since Eq. (14) holds for all states s , we have

$$\|\text{val}_\Lambda - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty \leq \left(1 - \min_s \Lambda(s) \right) \left(\|\text{val}_\Lambda - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty + \|\delta - \widetilde{\delta}\|_\infty \right),$$

or equivalently

$$\|\text{val}_\Lambda - \widetilde{\text{val}}_\Lambda\|_\infty \leq \left(\frac{1 - \min_s \Lambda(s)}{\min_s \Lambda(s)} \right) \|\delta - \widetilde{\delta}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\delta - \widetilde{\delta}\|_\infty}{\min_s \Lambda(s)},$$

which yields the result. ◀

► **Lemma 38.** Consider a CSG G , a reward function, a discount function Λ , and an additive error $\varepsilon = 2^{-\kappa}$. Fix $\underline{\Lambda} := \min_s \Lambda(s)$. Let ℓ be a positive integer such that $\ell \geq 4n\kappa \text{bit}(\underline{\Lambda})$. Then, there exist ε -optimal stationary strategies σ and τ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall s \in \mathcal{S} & & \sigma(s) \in \mathcal{D}(\ell), \quad \tau(s) \in \mathcal{D}(\ell), \\
\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, a \in \mathcal{A} & & \sigma(s)(a) \neq 0 \implies \sigma(s)(a) \geq \frac{\underline{\Lambda}\varepsilon}{4}, \\
\forall s \in \mathcal{S}, b \in \mathcal{B} & & \tau(s)(b) \neq 0 \implies \tau(s)(b) \geq \frac{\underline{\Lambda}\varepsilon}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We only prove the existence of σ since the existence of τ follows by symmetric arguments. By [29], there exists the optimal stationary strategy σ^* for Player 1. We define σ_1 as

$$\sigma_1(s)(a) := \begin{cases} 0 & \sigma^*(s)(a) \leq \frac{\underline{\Lambda}\varepsilon}{2} \\ \sigma^*(s)(a) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then, we have $\|\sigma_1 - \sigma^*\|_\infty \leq \underline{\Delta}\varepsilon/2$. By Lemma 33, there exists σ_2 such that for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\sigma_2(s) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S})$, and $\sigma_1(s)$ and $\sigma_2(s)$ are $(\ell, 2n+2)$ -close. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_\infty &\leq \max_s \text{rel}(\sigma_1(s), \sigma_2(s)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{1-\ell})^{2n+2}} - 1 && \text{(def. } (\ell, 2n+2)\text{-close)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1 - (2n+2)2^{1-\ell}} - 1 && \text{(Bernoulli inequality)} \\
&\leq \frac{(2n+2)2^{1-\ell}}{1 - (2n+2)2^{1-\ell}} && \text{(rearrange)} \\
&\leq (2n+2)2^{-\ell} && (\ell \geq 1000n^2) \\
&\leq 4n2^{-\ell} && (n \geq 1) \\
&\leq \frac{\underline{\Delta}\varepsilon}{4}. && (\ell \geq 4n\kappa \text{ bit}(\underline{\Delta}))
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that for all states s and actions a , if $\sigma_2(s)(a) \neq 0$, then $\sigma_2(s)(a) \geq \underline{\Delta}\varepsilon/4$. By combining two inequalities $\|\sigma_1 - \sigma^*\|_\infty \leq \underline{\Delta}\varepsilon/2$ and $\|\sigma_1 - \sigma_2\|_\infty \leq \underline{\Delta}\varepsilon/4$, we get $\|\sigma_2 - \sigma^*\|_\infty \leq \underline{\Delta}\varepsilon$. Therefore, by Lemma 37, we have σ_2 is an ε -optimal strategy, completing the proof. \blacktriangleleft

► **Remark 39.** For all CSGs with stateful-discounted objectives, there exist ε -optimal stationary strategies which can be represented in polynomial size with respect to the size of the game and $\text{bit}(\varepsilon)$.

► **Lemma 40.** *The problem of computing an ε -approximation of the stateful-discounted value for CSGs is in TFNP[NP] for inputs CSGs G , reward functions, discount functions Λ , states s , additive errors $\varepsilon = 2^{-\kappa}$, and positive integers ℓ such that, for all states $s' \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $\Lambda(s') \in \mathcal{F}(\ell)$.*

Proof. We first present the procedure and then prove its soundness and completeness.

Procedure. The procedure guesses two $\varepsilon/4$ -optimal stationary strategies σ^* and τ^* and an integer $j \in [0, 2^{\kappa+2}]$. By Remark 39, the size of the representation of stationary strategies is polynomial with respect to the size of G and $\text{bit}(\varepsilon)$. By fixing strategy σ^* (resp. τ^*), we obtain a Player-2 MDP G_{σ^*} (resp. a Player-1 MDP G_{τ^*}). We denote by v_{σ^*} (resp. v_{τ^*}) the value of G_{σ^*} (resp. G_{τ^*}). We define $\alpha := j2^{-(\kappa+2)} \in [0, 1]$. The procedure outputs α if $\alpha - 3\varepsilon/4 \leq v_{\sigma^*} - \varepsilon/4$ and $\alpha + 3\varepsilon/4 \geq v_{\tau^*} + \varepsilon/4$ which can be verified by two NP oracles implemented by Lemma 35 and Corollary 36.

Soundness. We assume that α is not an ε -approximation of the stateful-discounted value of G , i.e., that $\alpha \notin [\text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \varepsilon, \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon]$, and prove that the procedure does not output α in this case. Without loss of generality, we assume $\alpha \geq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon$. For all stationary strategies σ , we have that $v_\sigma \leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s)$. Therefore, we have

$$\alpha - 3\varepsilon/4 > \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon/4 \geq v_\sigma + \varepsilon/4.$$

Hence, the NP procedure defined in Corollary 36 successfully decides that the inequality $\alpha - 3\varepsilon/4 \leq v_\sigma - \varepsilon/4$ is not true, and therefore the procedure does not outputs α , which yields the soundness of the procedure.

Completeness. By Remark 39, there exist $\varepsilon/4$ -optimal stationary strategies σ^* and τ^* which are polynomial-size representable. The procedure non-deterministically guesses σ^* and τ^* .

XX:30 Concurrent Stochastic Games with Stateful-discounted and Parity Objectives

Since both strategies are $\varepsilon/4$ -optimal, we have $\text{val}_\Lambda(s) \leq v_{\sigma^*} + \varepsilon/4$ and $v_{\tau^*} - \varepsilon/4 \leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s)$. By the choice of j , there exists α such that $\alpha \in [\text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \varepsilon/4, \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon/4]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha - 3\varepsilon/4 &\leq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) - \varepsilon/2 \leq v_{\sigma^*} - \varepsilon/4, \text{ and} \\ \alpha + 3\varepsilon/4 &\geq \text{val}_\Lambda(s) + \varepsilon/2 \geq v_{\tau^*} + \varepsilon/4,\end{aligned}$$

and the procedure outputs α . This yields the completeness of the procedure and completes the proof. ◀

Proof of Theorem 5-Item 1. It is a direct implication of Lemma 40 and Theorem 19. ◀

Proof of Theorem 6-Item 1. By [21, 12], there exists a linear-size reduction from the PARITYVALUE problem to the LIMITVALUE problem. Therefore, the result follows from Theorem 5-Item 1. ◀

Concluding remarks. In this work, we present improved complexity upper bounds and algorithms for the value approximation problem for concurrent stochastic games with two classical objectives. There are several interesting directions for future work. First, whether the complexity can be further improved from TFNP[NP] to TFNP is a major open question, even for reachability objectives. Second, whether for parity objectives, the dependency on d can be improved from linear to logarithmic, retaining the logarithmic dependence on m , is another interesting open question. Finally, the study of priority mean-payoff objectives for concurrent stochastic games and their connection to stateful-discounted objectives is another interesting direction for future work.

References

- 1 Rajeev Alur, Thomas A Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. Alternating-time temporal logic. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 49(5):672–713, 2002.
- 2 Luc Attia and Miquel Oliu-Barton. A formula for the value of a stochastic game. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(52):26435–26443, 2019.
- 3 Erwin H Bareiss. Sylvester’s identity and multistep integer-preserving gaussian elimination. *Mathematics of computation*, 22(103):565–578, 1968.
- 4 Saugata Basu. New results on quantifier elimination over real closed fields and applications to constraint databases. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 46(4):537–555, 1999.
- 5 Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy. *Algorithms in real algebraic geometry*, volume 10. Springer, 2006.
- 6 Sougata Bose, Rasmus Ibsen-Jensen, and Patrick Totzke. Bounded-memory strategies in partial-information games. <https://intranet.csc.liv.ac.uk/~patrick/assets/bib/BIT2023.pdf>, 2023. Accessed on: 2024-02-07.
- 7 Krishnendu Chatterjee. *Stochastic ω -regular games*. University of California, Berkeley, 2007.
- 8 Krishnendu Chatterjee, Luca de Alfaro, and Thomas A Henzinger. The complexity of quantitative concurrent parity games. In *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithm*, pages 678–687, 2006.
- 9 Krishnendu Chatterjee, Rupak Majumdar, and Thomas A Henzinger. Stochastic limit-average games are in exptime. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 37(2):219–234, 2008.
- 10 L de Alfaro, TA Henzinger, and O Kupferman. Concurrent reachability games. In *Proceedings 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 564–564. IEEE Computer Society, 1998.
- 11 Luca De Alfaro and Thomas A Henzinger. Concurrent omega-regular games. In *Proceedings Fifteenth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 141–154. IEEE, 2000.
- 12 Luca De Alfaro, Thomas A Henzinger, and Rupak Majumdar. Discounting the future in systems theory. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 1022–1037. Springer, 2003.
- 13 Luca De Alfaro, Thomas A Henzinger, and Freddy YC Mang. The control of synchronous systems. In *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*, pages 458–473. Springer, 2000.
- 14 Luca De Alfaro, Thomas A Henzinger, and Freddy YC Mang. The control of synchronous systems, part ii. In *International Conference on Concurrency Theory*, pages 566–581. Springer, 2001.
- 15 Luca de Alfaro and Rupak Majumdar. Quantitative solution of omega-regular games. In *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 675–683, 2001.
- 16 Kousha Etessami and Mihalis Yannakakis. Recursive concurrent stochastic games. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 4, 2008.
- 17 Hugh Everett. Recursive games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 3(39):47–78, 1957.
- 18 Jerzy Filar and Koos Vrieze. *Competitive Markov Decision Processes*. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- 19 Søren Kristoffer Stiil Frederiksen and Peter Bro Miltersen. Approximating the value of a concurrent reachability game in the polynomial time hierarchy. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 457–467. Springer, 2013.
- 20 Semyon Aranovich Gershgorin. Über die abgrenzung der eigenwerte einer matrix. *Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR, Serija Matematika*, 7(3):749–754, 1931.
- 21 Hugo Gimbert and Wiesław Zielonka. Discounting infinite games but how and why? *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 119(1):3–9, 2005.
- 22 Hugo Gimbert and Wiesław Zielonka. Blackwell optimal strategies in priority mean-payoff games. *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science*, 23(03):687–711, 2012.
- 23 Kristoffer Arnsfelt Hansen, Michal Koucky, Niels Lauritzen, Peter Bro Miltersen, and Elias P Tsigaridas. Exact algorithms for solving stochastic games. In *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 205–214, 2011.

- 24 Kristoffer Arnsfelt Hansen, Michal Koucky, and Peter Bro Miltersen. Winning concurrent reachability games requires doubly-exponential patience. In *2009 24th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic In Computer Science*, pages 332–341. IEEE, 2009.
- 25 Narendra Karmarkar. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 302–311, 1984.
- 26 Donald A Martin. The determinacy of Blackwell games. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 63(4):1565–1581, 1998.
- 27 Jean-François Mertens and Abraham Neyman. Stochastic games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 10:53–66, 1981.
- 28 Miquel Oliu-Barton. New algorithms for solving zero-sum stochastic games. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 46(1):255–267, 2021.
- 29 Lloyd Stowell Shapley. Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100, 1953.
- 30 Lloyd Stowell Shapley and Roger Snow. Basic solutions of discrete games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 1:27–35, 1952.
- 31 Eilon Solan. Continuity of the value of competitive Markov decision processes. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 16:831–845, 2003.
- 32 Wolfgang Thomas. Languages, automata, and logic. In *Handbook of Formal Languages: Volume 3 Beyond Words*, pages 389–455. Springer, 1997.