
ϵ -Optimally Solving Zero-Sum POSGs

Erwan Escudie

University of Groningen
e.c.escudie@rug.nl

Matthia Sabatelli

University of Groningen
m.sabatelli@rug.nl

Jilles S. Dibangoye

University of Groningen
j.s.dibangoye@rug.nl

Abstract

A recent method for solving zero-sum partially observable stochastic games (zs-POSGs) embeds the original game into a new one called the occupancy Markov game. This reformulation allows applying Bellman’s principle of optimality to solve zs-POSGs. However, improving a current solution requires solving a linear program with exponentially many potential constraints, which significantly restricts the scalability of this approach. This paper exploits the optimal value function’s novel uniform continuity properties to overcome this limitation. We first construct a new operator that is computationally more efficient than the state-of-the-art update rules without compromising optimality. In particular, improving a current solution now involves a linear program with an exponential drop in constraints. We then also show that point-based value iteration algorithms utilizing our findings improve the scalability of existing methods while maintaining guarantees in various domains.

1 Introduction

The application of Bellman’s principle of optimality to partially observable stochastic games (POSGs) can be traced back to the 70s when Aström [1], Smallwood and Sondik [19], Sondik [22] introduced it for single-player POSGs—*i.e.*, partially observable Markov decision processes (POMDPs)—imperfect-information games against Nature. This approach embeds the original game into a fully observable Markov game, namely the occupancy Markov game (OMG): it solves the latter and then transfers its solution to the original game. Recently, a large body of works has successfully adapted this methodology to different many-player subclasses of POSGs ranging from common-reward [23, 15, 8, 7, 17] to zero-sum games [25, 14, 13, 12, 3, 5, 21], allowing the transfer of theories and algorithms from fully observable Markov games to POSGs, without compromising optimality. In common-reward settings, there has been significant progress in understanding the decomposition of the OMG into subgames, identifying uniform continuity properties of optimal solutions, and using them to solve subgames efficiently. In zero-sum settings, however, the scalability remains limited.

There are two distinct but interrelated reasons for the current ineffectiveness of this approach in zero-sum settings. The most widespread reason is the curse of dimensionality: the states of an OMG, *i.e.*, occupancy states, reside in a continuum whose dimensions grow exponentially with time. Uniform continuity properties of optimal solutions have been identified to overcome this drawback, but their effectiveness remains questionable [25, 5]. The less well-known reason for this poor scaling behavior is the inefficiency of the update operators used to improve a current solution. State-of-the-art update operators use linear programs with exponentially many potential constraints [5]. Although distinct, these limitations are interdependent. The weaker the uniform continuity properties designed to cope with the curse of dimensionality, the less effective the update operators are in improving current solutions. The conjunction of these two limitations has restricted the scaling behaviors of this approach in competitive settings.

This paper exploits recent uniform continuity properties to construct efficient update operators in zero-sum partially observable stochastic games. We build on the recent proof that the optimal value function of the corresponding OMG is the maximum of piecewise-linear and concave functions over occupancy states [4]. Although this uniform continuity property is stronger than the previous ones, little is known about how it affects update operators. Our main contribution is the proof that the update operator exploiting this property consists of two components. Firstly, a linear program with an exponential drop in constraints enables any subgame to be efficiently solved. Secondly, a polynomial-time update rule uses the solution of a subgame to improve the current value function. We also show how to use this update operator in the point-based value iteration algorithm. Experimental results conducted on a set of benchmarks from the literature support the effectiveness of our approach.

2 Background

This section presents the original formulation of zero-sum partially observable stochastic games alongside its reformulation.

2.1 Problem Formulation

A zero-sum, partially observable stochastic game (zs-POSGs) [11] is a tuple $M = (X, U, Z, p, r, s_0, \gamma, \ell)$ where \bullet and \circ represent the maximizing and minimizing players, respectively. X denotes a finite set of hidden states, denoted x or y . $U = U^* \times U^\circ$ represents the finite set of joint controls $u = (u^*, u^\circ)$. Similarly, $Z = Z^* \times Z^\circ$ denotes the finite set of joint observations $z = (z^*, z^\circ)$. The transition function $p: X \times U \rightarrow \Delta(X \times Z)$ specifies the probability $p_{xy}^{uz} = p(y, z|x, u)$ of the game being in state y upon taking control u in state x and receiving observation z . The reward function $r: X \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defines the immediate reward $r_{xu} = r(x, u)$ that player \bullet receives upon taking control u in state x . Additionally, s_0 represents the initial state distribution, $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ is a discount factor, and $\ell < \infty$ is the number of game stages.

The primary aim of this study is to tackle general zs-POSGs. However, this research also explores the application of our findings in subclasses. The subclasses under scrutiny in this paper are as follows: i) M with full observability, see [9], which implies the existence of a function, $f_{fo}: Z^* \cup Z^\circ \rightarrow X$, such that for every non-zero value of $p(z, y|x, u)$, $f_{fo}(z^*) = f_{fo}(z^\circ) = y$; ii) M with public actions and observations, see [10], which implies the existence of a function, $f_{pao}: Z^* \cup Z^\circ \rightarrow Z \times U$, such that for every non-zero value of $p(z, y|x, u)$, $f_{pao}(z^*) = f_{pao}(z^\circ) = (z, u)$.

Optimally solving M aims at finding a joint policy $a_0 = (a_0^*, a_0^\circ)$, one policy for each player. A policy of player \bullet (resp. \circ), denoted $a_0^\bullet = (a_0^\bullet, \dots, a_{\ell-1}^\bullet)$, is a sequence of decision rules from stage 0 down to $\ell - 1$, one decision rule per stage. A τ -stage decision rule $a_\tau^\bullet: O_\tau \rightarrow \Delta(U^*)$ maps histories $o_\tau^\bullet = (u_{0:\tau-1}^\bullet, z_{1:\tau}^\bullet)$ of controls and observations of player \bullet to distributions over its controls. A τ -stage joint decision rule $a_\tau: O_\tau \rightarrow \Delta(U)$ maps joint histories $o_\tau = (o_\tau^*, o_\tau^\circ)$ of actions and observations to distributions over joint controls, *i.e.*, for all joint control $u \in U$, joint history $o \in O_\tau$, $a_\tau(u|o) = a_\tau^*(u_\tau^*|o_\tau^*) \cdot a_\tau^\circ(u_\tau^\circ|o_\tau^\circ)$. We will denote A_τ (resp. A_τ°) the set of all τ -stage individual decision rules a_τ^* (resp. a_τ°), and $A_\tau = A_\tau^* \times A_\tau^\circ$ the set of all τ -stage joint decision rules.

The state- and action-value functions under a fixed joint policy satisfy Bellman equations: for any stage τ , joint policy $a_\tau = (a_\tau, a_{\tau+1}, \dots, a_{\ell-1})$, $\alpha_\tau^{a_\tau}: (x, o) \mapsto \sum_u a_\tau(u|o) \cdot \beta_\tau^{a_\tau}(x, o, u)$ and $\beta_\tau^{a_\tau}: (x, o, u) \mapsto r(x, u) + \gamma \sum_y \sum_z \alpha_{\tau+1}^{a_{\tau+1}}(y, (o, u, z))$ with boundary condition $\alpha_\ell(\cdot) = \beta_\ell(\cdot) = 0$. An optimal joint policy $\bar{a}_0 = (\bar{a}_0^*, \bar{a}_0^\circ)$, *i.e.*, a Nash equilibrium, consists of player policies, *e.g.*, \bar{a}_0^* , whose worst-case expected returns, *e.g.*, $v_0^*(s_0; \bar{a}_0^*) = \min_{a_0^\circ} \sum_x s_0(x) \cdot \alpha_0^{\bar{a}_0^*, a_0^\circ}(x)$, regardless the opponent policy are the value of the game $v_0^*(s_0) = \max_{a_0^*} \min_{a_0^\circ} \sum_x s_0(x) \cdot \alpha_0^{a_0^*, \bar{a}_0^\circ}(x)$.

Optimally solving M using Bellman's principle of optimality is perceived as challenging due to the complexity involved in defining a suitable common ground that allows the original game to be segmented into subgames that can be solved recursively [11]. To comprehend this challenge better, it is imperative to note that each player in the game acts simultaneously without having the ability to perceive the current state of the game or communicate their actions and observations with others.

Consequently, neither the individual players' histories nor the joint histories can act as a common ground. This insight explains the impetus for a problem reformulation.

2.2 Problem Reformulation

To overcome the limitation of the original formulation, Szer et al. [23] and later Nayyar et al. [15], Dibangoye et al. [8, 7], Oliehoek [17] suggest formalizing M from the perspective of an offline central planner. This planner acts on behalf of both players by selecting a joint decision rule to be executed at each stage based on all data available about the game at the planning phase, namely the information state. The information state at the end of stage τ , denoted $\iota_{\tau+1} = (s_0, a_{0:\tau})$, is a sequence of joint decision rules the planner selected starting at the initial state distribution s_0 . Hence, the information state satisfies the following recursion: $\iota_0 = s_0$ and $\iota_{\tau+1} = (\iota_\tau, a_\tau)$ for all stage τ , resulting in an ever-growing sequence. Dibangoye et al. [8, 7] introduce the concept of occupancy state along with bookkeeping to replace information state without losing the ability to find an optimal joint policy. The τ -stage occupancy state s_τ is a distribution over hidden states and joint histories conditional on information state ι_τ at stage τ , *i.e.*, $s_\tau: (x, o) \mapsto \Pr\{x, o | \iota_\tau\}$. It is important to stress that in general the occupancy state is neither public nor accessible to either player at the online execution phase. It summarizes the total information available to a central algorithm to solve the original game using Bellman's principle of optimality at an offline planning phase.

It is worth noting that occupancy states possess several crucial properties. When restricted to subclasses, occupancy states become more compact. For instance, when a game exhibits full observability, the occupancy state represents a state. If the game has either public actions and observations or one-sided partial observability, the occupancy state becomes a belief state [12]. Lastly, for one-sided information-sharing games, the occupancy state is a distribution over belief states [26]. Occupancy states serve as sufficient statistics of the information state when estimating the immediate reward to be gained by executing a joint decision rule: $R: (s_\tau, a_\tau) \mapsto \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{o \in O_\tau} s_\tau(x, o) \sum_{u \in U} a_\tau(u|o) \cdot r(x, u)$. In addition, the τ -stage occupancy state s_τ is a sufficient statistic of the information state ι_τ to predict the next occupancy state $s_{\tau+1}$ upon taking a joint decision rule a_τ , *i.e.*, $s_{\tau+1}: (y, (o, u, z)) \mapsto a_\tau(u|o) \sum_{x \in X} s_\tau(x, o) \cdot p(y, z | x, u)$, where $T: (s_\tau, a_\tau) \mapsto s_{\tau+1}$ describes the transition rule. Together, these properties make the occupancy state a sufficient statistic of the information state when estimating the value function under a fixed joint policy. Unfortunately, optimal joint policies cannot depend on occupancy states since players cannot access them. This insight makes the central planning process an open-loop control problem. However, a bookkeeping strategy enables us to keep track of relevant information to ensure that the planning process stores the optimal joint policy [5].

The open-loop control problem $M' = (S, A, T, R, s_0, \gamma, \ell)$ that occupancy states describe is called the occupancy Markov game. Similarly to POMDPs, it was proven that M can be recast into M' and an optimal solution of M' is also an optimal solution for M [25, 5]. M' is a non-observable deterministic Markov game with respect to M , where state space $S = \cup_{\tau=0}^{\ell-1} S_\tau$ is the set of occupancy states up to stage $\ell - 1$; action space $A = \cup_{\tau=0}^{\ell-1} A_\tau$ is the set of joint decision rules up to stage $\ell - 1$; the transition rule is T ; the reward model is R ; and quantities s_0, γ , and ℓ are as in the original game M . Optimally solving M' (resp. M) aims at finding a joint policy $(\bar{a}_0^\bullet, \bar{a}_0^\circ)$ such that $v_0^\bullet(s_0; \bar{a}_0^\bullet) = v_0^\circ(s_0; \bar{a}_0^\circ) = v_0^*(s_0)$. The application of Bellman's principle of optimality allows us to compute $v_0^*(s_0)$ by solving subgames recursively, *i.e.*, for any stage τ , occupancy state s_τ ,

$$v_\tau^*(s_\tau) = \max_{a_\tau^\bullet \in A_\tau^\bullet} \min_{a_\tau^\circ \in A_\tau^\circ} R(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \gamma v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau)) \quad (1)$$

with boundary condition $v_\ell^*(\cdot) = 0$. As we solve the problem M' , we need to ensure consistency with M . For this, we use a bookkeeping strategy to keep track of partial policies \bar{a}_τ^\bullet and \bar{a}_τ° . These policies ensure that we always meet constraint $v_\tau^\circ(s_\tau; \bar{a}_\tau^\circ) = v_\tau^\bullet(s_\tau; \bar{a}_\tau^\bullet) = v_\tau^*(s_\tau)$ throughout the planning process. To simplify notation, we use $v_\tau^\circ(s_\tau)$ and $v_\tau^\bullet(s_\tau)$ instead of $v_\tau^\circ(s_\tau; \bar{a}_\tau^\circ)$ and $v_\tau^\bullet(s_\tau; \bar{a}_\tau^\bullet)$ when the policies are not explicitly needed.

In principle, exact backward induction should apply to M' . Unfortunately, the occupancy states lie in a continuum, which makes exact backward induction infeasible. When the optimal value functions exhibit uniform continuity properties, one can restrict attention to a small set of representative occupancy states and iteratively apply value updates to those points while preserving the ability to achieve the ϵ -optimal value of the game. Let $v_{\tau+1}^\bullet$ and $v_{\tau+1}^\circ$ be the value functions at stage $\tau + 1$ of players \bullet and \circ , respectively. Operators at any point s_τ involved in solving M' include the greedy-

action selection operators $\mathbb{G}^\bullet : (v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau) \mapsto a_\tau^\bullet$ and $\mathbb{G}^\circ : (v_{\tau+1}^\circ, s_\tau) \mapsto a_\tau^\circ$, and the Bellman's update operators $\mathbb{H}^\bullet : (v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau, a_\tau) \mapsto v_\tau^\bullet$ and $\mathbb{H}^\circ : (v_{\tau+1}^\circ, s_\tau, a_\tau) \mapsto v_\tau^\circ$.

2.3 Uniform Continuity Properties

Various uniform continuity properties of optimal value functions have been identified recently to define efficient point-based operators \mathbb{G} and \mathbb{H} [25, 5, 4]. To discuss these properties, we need two concepts associated with an occupancy state, *i.e.*, marginal and conditional occupancy states. For any occupancy state s_τ , the marginal occupancy state $s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}$ of player \circ is defined as the marginal distribution of s_τ over histories O_τ° , *i.e.*, for all history $o^\circ \in O_\tau^\circ$, $s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}(o^\circ) = \sum_x \sum_{o^*} s_\tau(x, (o^\circ, o^*))$. Furthermore, for any occupancy state s_τ and any history $o^\circ \in O_\tau^\circ$, the conditional occupancy state $s_\tau^{c,\circ}$ of s_τ associated with history o° is defined as the conditional distribution of s_τ associated with history o° , *i.e.*, for all $x \in X$ and $o^* \in O_\tau^*$, $s_\tau(x, (o^\circ, o^*)) = s_\tau^{c,\circ}(x, o^*) \cdot s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}(o^\circ)$. We shall use $s_\tau^{c,\circ}$ to denote a family $\{s_\tau^{c,\circ} | o^\circ \in O_\tau^\circ\}$ of conditional occupancy states and $s_\tau^{c,\circ} \odot s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}$ to describe occupancy state s_τ such that, for all $x \in X$ and $(o^\circ, o^*) \in O_\tau$, $s_\tau(x, (o^\circ, o^*)) = s_\tau^{c,\circ}(x, o^*) \cdot s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}(o^\circ)$. We are now ready to state the main uniform continuity properties.




Figure 1: Generalization across marginal occupancy states of the value function given by a collection $V = \{g_{s^{c,\circ}}, g_{s^{c,\circ}}, g_{s^{c,\circ}}\}$ of linear functions over unknown marginal occupancy states. Figure A shows no generalization on marginal occupancy state $s^{\text{m},\circ}$ because $s^{\text{m},\circ} \notin \{s^{\text{m},\circ}, s^{\text{m},\circ}, s^{\text{m},\circ}\}$, *cf.* Theorem 2.1. Figure B shows generalization over unknown marginal occupancy state $s^{\text{m},\circ}$ from known marginal occupancy state $s^{\text{m},\circ}$ with offset $\kappa \|s - s^{\text{m},\circ} \odot s^{c,\circ}\|_1$, *cf.* Theorem 2.2. **Best viewed in color.**

Theorem 2.1 (Adapted from Wiggers et al. [25]). *For any arbitrary M' , the optimal value functions (v_0^*, \dots, v_ℓ^*) solutions of (1) are convex over marginal occupancy states for a fixed conditional occupancy-state family, *i.e.*, there exists collections (G_0, \dots, G_ℓ) of linear functions over marginal occupancy states such that: for any stage τ , occupancy state $s_\tau = s_\tau^{c,\circ} \odot s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}$,*

$$v_\tau^*(s_\tau) = \max_{g_{s_\tau^{c,\circ}} \in G_\tau} g_{s_\tau^{c,\circ}}(s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}),$$

where $g_{s_\tau^{c,\circ}} : O_\tau^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function associated with conditional occupancy-state family $s_\tau^{c,\circ}$.

Wiggers et al. [25] presents a detailed proof of Theorem 2.1, which asserts that if two occupancy states exhibit identical conditional occupancy-state families, it is possible to generalize the value from the first occupancy state to the second one. Unfortunately, this conditional uniform continuity property alone does not facilitate value generalization across different occupancy states. Figure 1 (A) illustrates the lack of generalization capabilities across occupancy states. To overcome this limitation, Delage et al. [5] blends the Lipschitz continuity and the conditional uniform continuity property, hence allowing for a value generalization across unknown occupancy states.

Theorem 2.2 (Adapted from Delage et al. [5]). *For any arbitrary M' , the optimal value functions (v_0^*, \dots, v_ℓ^*) solutions of (1) are Lipschitz continuous over occupancy states, *i.e.*, there exists collections (G_0, \dots, G_ℓ) of linear functions over marginal occupancy states such that: for any stage τ , κ_τ is the Lipschitz constant associated with v_τ^* , and occupancy state $s_\tau = s_\tau^{c,\circ} \odot s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}$,*

$$v_\tau^*(s_\tau) \leq g_{s_\tau^{c,\circ}}(s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}) + \kappa_\tau \|s_\tau - s_\tau^{c,\circ} \odot s_\tau^{\text{m},\circ}\|_1$$

where $g_{s_\tau^{c,\circ}} : O_\tau^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any function in V_τ associated with conditional occupancy-state family $s_\tau^{c,\circ}$.

The process of generalizing values across different occupancy states is hindered by imprecise approximations from using Lipschitz constants in Theorem 2.2, see also Figure 1 (B). In addition, greedy-action selection operators, e.g., $\mathbb{G}^\circ : (v_{\tau+1}^\circ, s_\tau) \mapsto \operatorname{argmax}_{a_\tau^\circ} \min_{a_\tau^\circ} R(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \gamma v_{\tau+1}^\circ(T(s_\tau, a_\tau))$, using this non-linear value function approximation require the enumeration of exponentially many possible decision rules a_τ° . Delage et al. [5] performs a greedy-action selection using a linear program with exponentially many potential constraints. For instance, if $v_{\tau+1}^\circ$ is known, the following linear program, i.e., $\max\{v | a_\tau^\circ \in A_\tau^\circ, v \in \mathbb{R}, v \leq R(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \gamma v_{\tau+1}^\circ(T(s_\tau, a_\tau)), \forall a_\tau^\circ \in A_\tau^\circ\}$, performs a greedy-action selection with $\mathcal{O}(|U^\circ|^{|\bar{O}_\tau^\circ|})$ constraints where $\bar{O}_\tau^\circ = \{o_\tau^\circ | o_\tau^\circ \in O_\tau^\circ, \Pr\{o_\tau^\circ | s_\tau\} > 0\}$. Delage et al. [5] mitigated this burden by considering only previously experienced (stochastic) decision rules a_τ° instead of all of them. These drawbacks nonetheless impede algorithmic efficiency and call for alternative approaches to improve efficiency.

Theorem 2.3 (Adapted from Cunha et al. [4]). *For any arbitrary M' , the optimal value functions (v_0^*, \dots, v_ℓ^*) solutions of (1) are maximum of piece-wise linear and concave functions of occupancy states, i.e., there exists families $(\mathbb{V}_0^*, \dots, \mathbb{V}_\ell^*)$ of collections of linear functions over conditional occupancy states such that: for any stage τ*

$$v_\tau^* : s_\tau \mapsto \max_{V_\tau \in \mathbb{V}_\tau^*} \sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} s_\tau^{m, \circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha_\tau \in V_\tau} \alpha_\tau(s_\tau^{c, o^\circ}) \quad (2)$$

where collection V_τ represents the optimal (piecewise-linear and concave) value function of player \circ given that player \bullet acts according to a fixed policy.




Figure 2: Generalization across occupancy states as provided by Cunha et al. [4]’s uniform continuity properties. Plot A describes generalization across all conditional occupancy states where the value function is given by a collection $\{\omega, \omega, \omega\}$ of piecewise-linear and concave functions of conditional occupancy states, cf. Theorem 2.3. Plot B describes generalization across any occupancy state s given as a distribution over conditional occupancy states, such that value $\omega(s)$ given by $s^{m, \circ}(o^\circ) \cdot \omega(s^{c, o^\circ}) + s^{m, \circ}(o^\circ) \cdot \omega(s^{c, o^\circ}) + s^{m, \circ}(o^\circ) \cdot \omega(s^{c, o^\circ})$ is also a convex combinations of values from conditional occupancy states, cf. Theorem 2.4. In this form, the piece-wise linear and concave functions of conditional occupancy states become linear functions. **Best viewed in color.**

Figure 2 (A) showcases piece-wise linear and concave functions across conditional occupancy states, as described by Theorem 2.3. It should be noted that a change of basis effectively reveals the convexity property of the optimal value function across occupancy states. It will interest the reader to know that each piece-wise linear and concave function lower-bounds the optimal value function, i.e., $v_\tau^*(s_\tau) \geq \sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} s_\tau^{m, \circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha_\tau \in V_\tau} \alpha_\tau(s_\tau^{c, o^\circ})$ for any collection of linear functions $V_\tau \in \mathbb{V}_\tau^*$. So, as we populate a family $\mathbb{V}_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{V}_\tau^*$, the induced values lower-bound the optimal values.

Theorem 2.4 (Adapted from Cunha et al. [4]). *For any arbitrary M' , the optimal value functions (v_0^*, \dots, v_ℓ^*) solutions of (1) are maximum of linear functions of occupancy states, when occupancy states are expressed as distributions over conditional occupancy states, i.e., there exists collections $(\mathbb{W}_0^*, \dots, \mathbb{W}_\ell^*)$ of linear functions over occupancy states such that: for any stage τ*

$$v_\tau^* : s_\tau \mapsto \max_{\omega_\tau \in \mathbb{W}_\tau^*} \omega_\tau(s_\tau). \quad (3)$$

Cunha et al. [4] presents a detailed proof of Theorem 2.3. Although the property of uniform continuity it establishes is stronger than its predecessors, little is known about the maintenance of value

function representations and the eventual discovery of optimal value functions. Cunha et al. [4] also demonstrated that when occupancy states are expressed as distributions over conditional occupancy states, the optimal value function is convex over occupancy states, *cf.* Theorem 2.4. In this paper, we investigate the following question.

How can we define efficient point-based operators \mathbb{G}^ and \mathbb{H}^* (resp. \mathbb{G}° and \mathbb{H}°) of value functions represented using Theorem 2.3, while ensuring the identification of an ϵ -optimal joint policy for occupancy Markov game M' (resp. M)?*

3 Exploiting Uniform Continuity

This section uses the value function representation introduced in Theorem 2.3 to define the operators \mathbb{G}^* and \mathbb{H}^* (resp. \mathbb{G}° and \mathbb{H}°) used to optimally solve M' . The main result of this section establishes the formal proof that $\mathbb{G}^*: (v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau) \mapsto a_\tau^*$ are solutions of linear programs with a polynomial number of constraints. We shall draw our attention to point-based operators, *i.e.*, operators build upon a sample set of occupancy states. The resulting value functions are built only upon this sample set of occupancy states, yet they generalize over the entire occupancy space thanks to the uniform continuity property stated in Theorem 2.3 from [4].

Theorem 1. [Proof in Appendix A] *Let s_τ be an occupancy state and $v_{\tau+1}^*$ be the value function of the player \bullet at stage $\tau + 1$. The greedy decision rule $\mathbb{G}^*(s_\tau, v_{\tau+1}^*)$ of the player \bullet , *i.e.*, $\operatorname{argmax}_{a_\tau^*} \min_{a_\tau^\circ} R(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \gamma v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau))$ is the solution of the linear program in Figure 3.*

Maximize $\sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} \alpha_\theta(o^\circ)$
Subject to
 $\alpha_\theta(o^\circ) \leq \sum_V \sum_{z^\circ} \beta_V(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ), \forall o^\circ \in O^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ$
 $\beta_V(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ) \leq \sum_{o^* \in O^*} \sum_{u^* \in U^*} g_V^{\alpha}(o, u, z^\circ) \cdot \theta(V, u^* | o^*), \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, \alpha \in \mathbb{V}, o^\circ \in O^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ, z^\circ \in Z^\circ$
 $\sum_V \sum_{u^*} \theta(V, u^* | o^*) = 1, \forall o^* \in O^*$
Variables
 $\alpha_\theta(o^\circ) \in \mathbb{R}, \forall o^\circ \in O^\circ$
 $\theta(V, u^* | o^*) \in [0, 1], \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, u^* \in U^*, o^* \in O^*$
 $\beta_V(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ) \in \mathbb{R}, \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, o^\circ \in O^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ, z^\circ \in Z^\circ.$

Figure 3: The linear program for the selection of greedy decision rule $\mathbb{G}^*(s_\tau, v_{\tau+1}^*)$, with function $g_V^{\alpha}(o, u, z^\circ) = \sum_x s_\tau(x, o) \sum_{y, z^*} p_{xy}^{uz} \cdot (\frac{r_{xy}}{|Z^\circ|} + \gamma \alpha(y, o^* u^* z^*))$. The **red** quantities are variables; **green** ones are constraint identifiers, and black ones are constants. **Best viewed in color.**

$$V_\theta \doteq \{w^{s_\tau, o^\circ} | \bar{s}_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau, o^\circ \in \bar{O}_\tau(\bar{s}_\tau)\} \quad (4)$$

$$w^{s_\tau, o^\circ}(x, o^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{w^{s_\tau, o^\circ}} \sum_{x, o} s_\tau(x, o) \cdot w_{V, \alpha}^{s_\tau, o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ}(x, o^*), \forall o^\circ \in \bar{O}_\tau^\circ \quad (5)$$

$$w^{s_\tau, o^\circ, u^\circ}(x, o^*) = \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \sum_{z^\circ} w_V^{s_\tau, o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ}(x, o^*), \forall o^\circ \in \bar{O}_\tau^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ \quad (6)$$

$$w_V^{s_\tau, o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ}(x, o^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{w_V^{s_\tau, o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ}} \sum_{x, o} s_\tau(x, o) \cdot w_{V, \alpha}^{s_\tau, o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ}(x, o^*), \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, o^\circ \in \bar{O}_\tau^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ, z^\circ \in Z^\circ \quad (7)$$

$$w_{V, \alpha}^{s_\tau, o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ}(x, o^*) = \sum_{u^*, z^*} \sum_y \theta(V, u^* | o^*) p_{xy}^{uz} (\frac{r_{xy}}{|Z^\circ|} + \gamma \alpha(y, o^* u^* z^*)), \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, \alpha \in \mathbb{V}, o^\circ \in \bar{O}_\tau^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ, z^\circ \in Z^\circ \quad (8)$$

Figure 4: Computing V_θ from the solution θ of the linear program of Figure 3. **Best viewed in color.**

Theorem 1 specifies linear programs necessary to implement the point-based greedy-action selection operator \mathbb{G}^* . It is worth noticing that the number of constraints in these linear programs is polynomial in the size of the value function $v_{\tau+1}^*: s_{\tau+1} \mapsto \max_{V \in \mathbb{V}_{\tau+1}} \sum_{o^\circ} s_{\tau+1}^{m, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{V}} \alpha(s_{\tau+1}^{c, o^\circ})$. To better understand this, if we let $\bar{O}_\tau^\circ(s_\tau) = \{o^\circ | o^\circ \in O_\tau^\circ, s_{\tau+1}^{m, o^\circ}(o^\circ) > 0\}$ and $\bar{V} \in \operatorname{argmax}_{V \in \mathbb{V}_{\tau+1}} |V|$ then the linear program in Figure 3 involves about $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbb{V}_{\tau+1}| |\bar{V}| |\bar{O}_\tau^\circ(s_\tau)| |U^\circ| |Z^\circ|)$ constraints. After defining how to select the greedy decision rules for either player, resulting in a joint greedy decision rule, we now present an implementation of

the Bellman’s update operator for player \bullet $\mathbb{H}^\bullet : (v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau, \mathbb{G}^\bullet(v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau)) \mapsto v_\tau^\bullet$. A point-based update operator of a family of collections of linear functions is sound if it improves the current value function at least in one occupancy state but it overestimates the optimal value function nowhere.

Theorem 2. [Proof in Appendix B] *Let s_τ be an occupancy state, v_τ^\bullet and $v_{\tau+1}^\bullet$ be value functions of the player \bullet given by \mathbb{V}_τ and $\mathbb{V}_{\tau+1}$, respectively. If we let $\theta = \mathbb{G}^\bullet(v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau)$ be the solution of the greedy operator at occupancy state s_τ for player \bullet , and V_θ be the collection of linear functions computed as in Figure 4, then the updated value function $\mathbb{H}^\bullet(v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau, \theta)$ at stage τ , given by $\mathbb{V}_\tau = \mathbb{V}_\tau \cup \{V_\theta\}$, is sound.*

Notice that as the updates proceed families of collections $\mathbb{V}_0 := (\mathbb{V}_0, \mathbb{V}_1, \dots, \mathbb{V}_{\ell-1})$ may become cumbersome. For this reason, we investigate pruning techniques tailored for families of collections. A collection of linear functions V_τ is said to be dominated by collections in the family of collections \mathbb{V}_τ if its removal does not affect the value function $v_\tau : s_\tau \mapsto \max_{V_\tau \in \mathbb{V}_\tau} \sum_{o^\circ \in \mathcal{O}^\circ} s_\tau^{\text{m}, \circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha_\tau \in V_\tau} \alpha_\tau(s_\tau^{\text{c}, \circ})$. We rely on bounded pruning, cf. Algorithm 2 in Appendix, to remove point-based dominated collections in a given family and a sample set of occupancy states. To somewhat mitigate the growth of the families of collections, we also prune occupancy states that support no collections.

4 Point-Based Value Iteration

This section discusses how the point-based value-iteration (PBVI) algorithm [18] can be adapted to compute an ϵ -optimal joint policy for M' (or M) starting from an initial state distribution s_0 , for a planning horizon ℓ . The PBVI algorithm was chosen because it is guaranteed to find near-optimal solutions asymptotically. It is worth noting that our update operators are not designed to explore the occupancy-state space optimistically. This is because our uniform continuity property is intended to represent only pessimistic value functions. Therefore, algorithms such as heuristic search value iteration [20], which account for optimistic explorations, cannot be used.

The PBVI algorithm, cf. Algorithm 1, has two main parts for solving M' (or M). First, it uses a finite and reachable occupancy-state subset \bar{S}_τ to bound the size of the value functions for either player at each stage τ of the game. Next, it optimizes the value functions represented in a collection \mathbb{V}_τ at each stage τ using point-based backups. This means backups are executed in no particular order, and each iteration traverses occupancy-state subsets bottom-up. The process repeats until convergence when the difference between $v_0^\bullet(s_0)$ and $v_0^\circ(s_0)$ is less than or equal to a certain threshold (ϵ), or until a budget (such as CPU time, memory, or the number of iterations) has been exhausted. The algorithm adds supplemental points into occupancy subsets to improve the value functions further. It selects candidate points using a portfolio of exploration strategies such as random explorations and greedy approaches with respect to the underlying (PO)MDP value functions. For each stage τ , the algorithm only adds candidate points beyond a certain distance from the occupancy subset \bar{S}_τ to create a new occupancy-state set $\bar{S}_{\tau+1}$. For any arbitrary occupancy-state subsets \bar{S}_0 , PBVI produces value $v_0^\bullet(s_0)$. The error between $v_0^\bullet(s_0)$ and $v_0^*(s_0)$ is bounded. The bound depends on how \bar{S}_0 samples the entire occupancy-state space; with denser sampling, the estimate $v_0^\bullet(s_0)$ converges to $v_0^*(s_0)$. The remainder of this section states and proves our error bound.

Define the density $\delta_{\bar{S}_0}$ to be the maximum distance from any legal occupancy state to subsets \bar{S}_0 . More precisely, $\delta_{\bar{S}_0} = \max_{\tau \in [0: \ell-1]} \max_{s \in S_\tau} \min_{s' \in \bar{S}_\tau} \|s - s'\|_1$. Define a positive scalar c such that $\|r(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq c$.

Theorem 3. [Proof in Appendix C] *For any occupancy subsets \bar{S}_0 , the error of the PBVI algorithm is bounded by $v_0^*(s_0) - v_0^\bullet(s_0) \leq 2c\delta_{\bar{S}_0} \frac{1+\ell\gamma^{\ell+1} - (\ell+1)\gamma^\ell}{(1-\gamma)^2}$.*

Algorithm 1 PBVI for M' .

```

function PBVI()
Initialize  $\bar{S}_0$ ,  $\mathbb{V}_0$ , and  $v_0^\bullet$ .
while has not converged do
    improve( $\mathbb{V}_0$ ).
     $\bar{S}_0 \leftarrow \text{expand}(\bar{S}_0)$ .
end while
function improve()
for  $\tau = \ell - 1$  to 0 do
    for  $s_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau$  do
         $\mathbb{V}_\tau \leftarrow \mathbb{V}_\tau \cup \{V_{\mathbb{G}^\bullet(v_{\tau+1}^\bullet, s_\tau)}\}$ .
    end for
end for

```

Notice that the error that the PBVI algorithm does is $2c\delta_{\bar{S}_0}/(1-\gamma)^2$ whenever $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, which is equivalent to the error bound from Pineau et al. [18].

5 Experiments

We test our proposed method’s performance on several well-known benchmarks: Adversarial Tiger, Competitive Tiger, Recycling, Mabc, and Matching Pennies. These are among challenging benchmarks available in the literature of partially observable stochastic games, for which we refer the reader to <http://masplan.org/> for an in-depth description. Many of them are well-known common-payoff benchmark problems adapted to our competitive setting by making player \circ minimize (rather than maximize) the objective function. Further experimental details are provided in Appendix H.

For each problem, we report the performance of three versions of the PBVI algorithm: $PBVI_1$, which is the most basic version of the algorithm as it does not rely on any pruning, and $PBVI_2$ and $PBVI_3$ which both implement the bounded pruning algorithm presented in Algorithm 2. Pruning is either applied on the collection of linear functions V_τ , or on the points that are linked to such functions. Their performance is compared against that obtained by Delage et al. [5], where the HSVI algorithm was used, and that obtained by the CFR+ algorithm of Tammelin [24]. Table 1 shows a panoramic of our results: we report the best value obtained by each algorithm (in pink) on the aforementioned benchmarks for several horizons ℓ of increasing complexity. Specifically, all algorithms were tested on $\ell \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10\}$. Note that the larger the value of ℓ , the more memory- or time-demanding the task becomes, which might prevent the algorithms from converging. If this is the case, we report the final performance of the algorithms as OOM and OOT, respectively. We can see from the reported results that, overall, all versions of the PBVI algorithm are able to tackle the

Table 1: Snapshot of empirical results. For each game and algorithm, we report time (in hours) and the best value for horizons $\ell \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10\}$. OOT means a time limit of 2 hours has been exceeded, while OOM means that the algorithms ran out of memory

Problem	ℓ	$PBVI_3$	$PBVI_2$	$PBVI_1$	HSVI [5]	CFR+ [24]
Adversarial Tiger	2	0 -0.4	0 -0.4	0 -0.4	0 -0.4	0 -0.4
	3	0 -0.56	0 -0.56	0 -0.56	0 -0.56	0 -0.56
	4	0 -0.76	0.02 -0.76	0.02 -0.71	OOT [-1.89, 0.11]	0 -0.75
	5	0.07 -0.96	0.07 -0.96	1.7 -0.96	OOT [-3.54, 1.13]	- OOM
	7	1.3 -1.36	0.1 -1.4	2 -1.36	OOT [-4.4, 2.24]	- OOM
10	0.18 -1.99	0.16 -2	2.8 -1.98	1 [-42, 24.6]	- OOM	
Competitive Tiger	2	0 -0.01	0 -0.015	0 -0.015	0 0	0 0
	3	0 -0.06	0 -0.033	0 -0.033	1 [-0.45, 0.45]	0.11 0
	4	0.11 -0.06	0.06 -0.056	0.03 -0.056	OOT [-1.11, 1.11]	- OOM
	5	1.5 -0.07	0.1 -0.055	0.05 -0.079	OOT [-1.84, 1.84]	- OOM
	7	OOT -0.14	OOT -0.16	3 -0.15	OOT [-7.31, 7.31]	- OOM
10	OOT -0.2	OOT -0.18	OOT -0.22	1 [-52, 52]	- OOM	
Recycling	2	0 0.26	0 0.26	0 0.26	0 0.26	0 0.26
	3	0 0.32	0 0.32	0.03 0.32	0.03 0.32	0 0.32
	4	0 0.36	0 0.36	0.4 0.36	OOT [-0.04, 0.78]	0.3 0.36
	5	0 0.4	0.08 0.4	0.1 0.4	OOT [-0.49, 1.39]	- OOM
	7	0.12 0.48	3 0.48	0.31 0.47	OOT [-1.3, 2.5]	- OOM
10	OOT 0.58	OOT 0.59	0.7 0.6	OOT [16.2, -10.7]	- OOM	
Mabc	2	0 0.078	0 0.078	0 0.078	0 0.078	0 0.08
	3	0 0.097	0 0.098	0 0.097	0 0.098	0 0.098
	4	0.03 0.11	0.03 0.11	0.03 0.11	OOT [0.1, 0.15]	0 0.11
	5	0.08 0.12	0 0.12	0.1 0.12	1.6 [0.08, 0.27]	0.1 0.12
	7	0 0.14	0 0.14	2.8 0.14	OOT [0.08, 0.5]	- OOM
10	0.1 0.16	0.4 0.17	0.3 0.17	OOT [3.2, 0.35]	- OOM	
Matching Pennies	2	0 0.2	0 0.2	0 0.2	0 0.2	0 0.2
	3	0 0.37	0 0.4	0 0.4	0 0.4	0 0.4
	4	OOT 0.61	0 0.6	0 0.6	0 0.6	0 0.6
	5	OOT 1.17	0.1 0.8	0 0.8	OOT 0.8	0 0.8
	7	OOT 1.19	0 1.157	0 1.2	OOT [-1.7, 3.95]	0 1.2
10	OOT 1.8	0 1.8	0 1.8	-	- 0.4 1.8	

forementioned benchmarks successfully. Specifically, we can note that the $PBVI_2$ variation of the algorithm performs on par with its $PBVI_1$ counterpart across most games and horizons ℓ , therefore highlighting the benefits of including pruning to the algorithm (see again Appendix 2 for further details). However, there are also cases where $PBVI_3$ shows promising results (see, for example, the results obtained on Recycling and Box Pushing). Yet, it is important to note that these results are not as robust as the ones obtained by $PBVI_2$, as demonstrated by the performance obtained on the Matching Pennies game.

Overall, one can identify the main strength of our proposed approach in its scalability, as, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first example where such benchmarks can be solved even for very large horizons, a scenario that the techniques proposed by Delage et al. [5] and Tammelin [24] are not capable of dealing with. We visually represent the scalability of our PBVI variants across five games in Figure 5, where the challenging horizon of $\ell = 10$ is considered. The capability of our PBVI variants to rapidly find optimal solutions comparable to HSVI is also depicted in the plots presented in Appendix E, where the same games presented in Figure 5 are reported but for

$\ell = 4$. Additionally, we also successfully applied $PBVI_1$ to address specific subclasses of zs-POSGs, including fully-observable zs-POSGs (MGs) and zs-POSGs with public actions and observations (POMGs), as detailed in Appendix G. All these results illustrate the adaptability of our methods to subclasses of zs-POSGs while maintaining high efficiency. In certain domains, the scalability of our PBVI variants to larger games and planning horizons is constrained by the considerable number of iterations (and consequently samples) required. Point pruning techniques can be employed, like in $PBVI_3$, although this comes at the cost of sacrificing theoretical guarantees.




Figure 5: A visual representation of the performance of our proposed algorithms for the challenging horizon $\ell = 10$ across five different games. We can see that for Adversarial Tiger, Competitive Tiger and Recycling all three PBVI variants perform equally. $PBVI_2$ also matches the performance of $PBVI_1$ on Mabc and Matching Pennies, with the latter benchmark being harder to solve for $PBVI_3$. **Best viewed in color.**

6 Conclusion

We have introduced an offline point-based value iteration algorithm for finding near-optimal zs-POSG solutions. It leverages a recently discovered uniform continuity property, allowing for the design of update and backup operators with significantly reduced complexity. This approach yields point-based value iteration algorithms capable of scaling to larger games and planning horizons while retaining theoretical guarantees. Finally, we also provided the first offline algorithm, building upon Bellman’s principle of optimality, which can effectively scale to large games. Experimental results conducted on various domains support these claims.

The utilization of dynamic programming presents an appealing approach by decomposing the original zs-POSG into smaller subgames, subsequently solving them optimally in reverse order. This methodology also enables the extrapolation of values from one subgame to another through uniform continuity properties. These two attributes mutually reinforce each other while upholding theoretical guarantees. To the best of our knowledge, this work represents the first algorithmic framework for zs-POSGs that concurrently demonstrates such characteristics.

The utilization of the dynamic programming approach is significant due to its association with reinforcement learning. Recent studies have showcased the capability to address reinforcement learning operators related to common-payoff occupancy Markov games (common-payoff OMGs), as evidenced by Dibangoye and Buffet [6]. This paper is anticipated to serve as a fundamental basis

for further advancements in dynamic programming and reinforcement learning methodologies for zs-POSGs as zero-sum occupancy Markov games (zero-sum OMGs).

References

- [1] Karl J Aström. Optimal Control of Markov Decision Processes with Incomplete State Estimation. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 10:174–205, 1965.
- [2] Richard E Bellman. *Dynamic Programming*. Dover Publications, Incorporated, 1957.
- [3] Olivier Buffet, Jilles S. Dibangoye, Abdallah Safidine, and Vincent Thomas. ϵ -optimally solving zs-POSGs using Bellman’s optimality principle. Technical report, Inria Nancy Grand-Est, 2020.
- [4] Rafael F Cunha, Jacopo Castellini, Johan Peralez, and Jilles S Dibangoye. On convex optimal value functions for POSGs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09459*, 2023.
- [5] Aurélien Delage, Olivier Buffet, Jilles S Dibangoye, and Abdallah Saffidine. HSVI can solve zero-sum partially observable stochastic games. *Dynamic Games and Applications*, pages 1–55, 2023.
- [6] Jilles Dibangoye and Olivier Buffet. Learning to act in decentralized partially observable MDPs. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1233–1242, 2018.
- [7] Jilles S Dibangoye, Christopher Amato, Olivier Buffet, and François Charpillet. Optimally Solving Dec-POMDPs as Continuous-State MDPs. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 55, 2016.
- [8] Jilles Steeve Dibangoye, Christopher Amato, Olivier Buffet, and François Charpillet. Optimally solving Dec-POMDPs as continuous-state MDPs. In *IJCAI*, pages 90–96, 2013.
- [9] J. Filar and K. Vrieze. *Competitive Markov Decision Processes*. Springer, 1997.
- [10] MK Ghosh, D McDonald, and S Sinha. Zero-sum stochastic games with partial information. *JOTA*, 121, 2004.
- [11] Eric A Hansen, Daniel S Bernstein, and Shlomo Zilberstein. Dynamic Programming for Partially Observable Stochastic Games. In *AAAI*, 2004.
- [12] Karel Horák and Branislav Božanský. Solving partially observable stochastic games with public observations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- [13] Karel Horák, Branislav Božanský, and Michal Pěchouček. Heuristic search value iteration for one-sided partially observable stochastic games. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31, 2017.
- [14] Ashutosh Nayyar and Abhishek Gupta. Information structures and values in zero-sum stochastic games. In *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 3658–3663, 2017.
- [15] Ashutosh Nayyar, Aditya Mahajan, and Demosthenis Teneketzis. Decentralized stochastic control with partial history sharing: A common information approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(7):1644–1658, 2013.
- [16] J. von Neumann. Zur theorie der gesellschaftsspiele. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100:295–320, 1928. URL <http://eudml.org/doc/159291>.
- [17] Frans Adriaan Oliehoek. Sufficient plan-time statistics for decentralized pomdps. In *Twenty-Third International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2013.
- [18] Joelle Pineau, Geoff Gordon, Sebastian Thrun, et al. Point-based value iteration: An anytime algorithm for pomdps. In *IJCAI*, volume 3, pages 1025–1032, 2003.

- [19] Richard D Smallwood and Edward J Sondik. The optimal control of partially observable Markov decision processes over a finite horizon. *Operations Research*, 21(5):1071–1088, 1973.
- [20] Trey Smith and Reid G Simmons. Focused Real-Time Dynamic Programming for MDPs: Squeezing More Out of a Heuristic. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1227–1232, 2006.
- [21] Samuel Sokota, Ryan D’Orazio, Chun Kai Ling, David J. Wu, J. Zico Kolter, and Noam Brown. Abstracting imperfect information away from two-player zero-sum games. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 32169–32193. PMLR, 2023.
- [22] Edward J Sondik. The Optimal Control of Partially Observable Markov Decision Processes Over the Infinite Horizon: Discounted cost. *Operations Research*, 12:282–304, 1978.
- [23] Daniel Szer, François Charpillet, and Shlomo Zilberstein. MAA*: A Heuristic Search Algorithm for Solving Decentralized POMDPs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2005.
- [24] Oskari Tammelin. Solving large imperfect information games using CFR+. *CoRR*, 2014.
- [25] Auke J. Wiggers, Frans A. Oliehoek, and Diederik M. Roijers. Structure in the value function of two-player zero-sum games of incomplete information. In *ECAI*, 2016.
- [26] Yuxuan Xie, Jilles Dibangoye, and Olivier Buffet. Optimally solving two-agent decentralized POMDPs under one-sided information sharing. In *ICML*, pages 10473–10482, 2020.

A Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1. [Proof in Appendix A] Let s_τ be an occupancy state and $v_{\tau+1}^*$ be the value function of the player \bullet at stage $\tau + 1$. The greedy decision rule $\mathbb{G}^*(s_\tau, v_{\tau+1}^*)$ of the player \bullet , i.e., $\operatorname{argmax}_{a_\tau^*} \min_{a_\tau^\circ} R(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \gamma v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau))$ is the solution of the linear program in Figure 3.

Proof. The proof starts with the definition of the greedy-action selection at occupancy state s_τ , and value function $v_{\tau+1}^*: s_{\tau+1} \mapsto \max_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \sum_{o_\tau^\circ \in O_\tau^\circ} s_{\tau+1}^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_\tau^\circ) \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{V}} \alpha(s_{\tau+1}^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_\tau^\circ))$. Let $q_\tau^*: (s_\tau, a_\tau) \mapsto R(s_\tau, a_\tau) + \gamma v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau))$. Then, $\mathbb{G}^*(s_\tau, v_{\tau+1}^*) = \operatorname{argmax}_{a_\tau^*} \min_{a_\tau^\circ} q_\tau^*(s_\tau, a_\tau)$. Let $s_{\tau+1}^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)$ and $s_{\tau+1}^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)$ be marginal probability and conditional occupancy state associated with $T(s_\tau, a_\tau)$. The injection of (2) into $v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau))$ produces the following expression:

$$v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau)) = \max_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \sum_{o_{\tau+1}^\circ \in O_{\tau+1}^\circ} s_{\tau+1}^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ) \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{V}} \alpha(s_{\tau+1}^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)).$$

If we replace $\max_{V \in \mathbb{V}}$ by $\max_{\xi \in \Delta(\mathbb{V})}$ then there is no loss in optimality, i.e.,

$$= \max_{\xi \in \Delta(\mathbb{V})} \sum_{o_{\tau+1}^\circ \in O_{\tau+1}^\circ} \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{V}} \xi(V) s_{\tau+1}^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ) \alpha(s_{\tau+1}^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)).$$

Cunha et al. [4] shows that these statistics $s_{\tau+1}^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)$ and $s_{\tau+1}^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)$ depend on $T(s_\tau, a_\tau)$ only through marginal probability $s_\tau^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_\tau^\circ)$, conditional occupancy state $s_\tau^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_\tau^\circ)$ associated with s_τ , action probability $a_\tau^\circ(u_\tau^* | o_\tau^\circ)$, observation $z_{\tau+1}^\circ$, and decision rule a_τ^* , i.e., for all $y \in X$ and $o_{\tau+1} = (o_\tau, u, z) \in O_{\tau+1}$

$$s_{\tau+1}^{\text{m}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ) \cdot s_{\tau+1}^{\text{c}, \circ}(o_{\tau+1}^\circ)(y, o_{\tau+1}^\circ) = a_\tau^\circ(u^\circ | o_\tau^\circ) \cdot a_\tau^*(u^* | o_\tau^*) \sum_{x \in X} s_\tau(x, o_\tau) \cdot p_{xy}^{uz}.$$

Exploiting this insight along with the linearity of α yields:

$$v_{\tau+1}^*(T(s_\tau, a_\tau)) = \max_{\xi \in \Delta(\mathbb{V})} \sum_{o_{\tau+1}^\circ} \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{V}} a_\tau^\circ(u^\circ | o_\tau^\circ) \xi(V) \sum_{o_\tau^*, u^*} a_\tau^*(u^* | o_\tau^*) \sum_{x, y, z^*} \alpha(y, o_{\tau+1}) s_\tau(x, o_\tau) p_{xy}^{uz}.$$

Define the following two intermediate functions g_V^α and q_V^α for all joint histories $ou z$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_V^\alpha &: (ou z^\circ) \mapsto \sum_x s_\tau(x, o) \left(\frac{r_{xy}}{|Z^\circ|} + \gamma \sum_{y, z^*} \alpha(y, o^* u^* z^*) p_{xy}^{uz} \right) \\ q_V^\alpha &: (o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ) \mapsto \sum_{o^*} \sum_{u^*} a^*(u^* | o^*) \cdot g_V^\alpha(ou z^\circ). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the action value $q_\tau^*(s_\tau, a_\tau)$ can be rewritten as follows:

$$\max_{\xi \in \Delta(\mathbb{V})} \sum_{o^\circ} \sum_{u^\circ} a^\circ(u^\circ | o^\circ) \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \xi(V) \sum_{z^\circ} \min_{\alpha \in V} q_V^\alpha(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ).$$

Thus, the greedy decision rule of player \bullet is the solution of the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{a^*} \min_{a^\circ} \max_{\xi \in \Delta(\mathbb{V})} \sum_{o^\circ, u^\circ} a^\circ(u^\circ | o^\circ) \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \xi(V) \sum_{z^\circ} \min_{\alpha \in V} q_V^\alpha(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ).$$

Since the function $o^\circ \mapsto \sum_{u^\circ} a^\circ(u^\circ | o^\circ) \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \xi(V) \sum_{z^\circ} \min_{\alpha \in V} q_V^\alpha(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ)$ is a bilinear function of a° and ξ as the quantities $\sum_{z^\circ} \min_{\alpha \in V} q_V^\alpha(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ)$ are constants *w.r.t.* any pair (a°, ξ) . Using Von Neuman minimax theorem [16], one can swap both operators \min_{a° and \max_ξ with no loss in optimality, *i.e.*,

$$\max_{\xi, a^*} \min_{a^\circ} \sum_{o^\circ, u^\circ} a^\circ(u^\circ | o^\circ) \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \xi(V) \sum_{z^\circ} \min_{\alpha \in V} q_V^\alpha(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ).$$

Let us define the decision variable $\theta(V, u^* | o^*) = \xi(V) \cdot a^*(u^* | o^*)$ and function $\beta_V^\alpha: (o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ) \mapsto \xi(V) \cdot q_V^\alpha(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ) = \sum_{o^*} \sum_{u^*} \theta(V, u^* | o^*) \cdot g_V^\alpha(ou z^\circ)$, such that the greedy decision rule is the solution of the maximin optimization problem:

$$\max_{\theta} \min_{a^\circ} \sum_{o^\circ, u^\circ} a^\circ(u^\circ | o^\circ) \sum_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \sum_{z^\circ} \min_{\alpha \in V} \sum_{o^*} \sum_{u^*} \theta(V, u^* | o^*) \cdot g_V^\alpha(ou z^\circ).$$

Using Wald's maximin model we can convert this maximin optimization problem into a maximization mathematical program, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } \sum_{o^\circ} \alpha_\theta(o^\circ) \\ &\text{subject to } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha_\theta(o^\circ) \leq \sum_V \sum_{z^\circ} \beta_V(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ), \quad \forall u^\circ \in U^\circ, o^\circ \in O^\circ \\ \beta_V(o^\circ u^\circ z^\circ) \leq \sum_{o^*} \sum_{u^*} \theta(V, u^* | o^*) \cdot g_V^\alpha(ou z^\circ), \quad \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, \alpha \in V, o^\circ \in O^\circ, u^\circ \in U^\circ, z^\circ \in Z^\circ \\ \sum_V \sum_{u^*} \theta(V, u^* | o^*) = 1, \quad \forall o^* \in O^* \end{array} \right. \\ &\text{variables } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta(V, u^* | o^*) \in [0, 1], \quad \forall V \in \mathbb{V}, o^* \in O^*, u^* \in U^* \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the solution of the linear program in Figure 3 is the greedy decision rule of player \bullet , which ends the proof. \square

B Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2. [Proof in Appendix B] Let s_τ be an occupancy state, v_τ^* and $v_{\tau+1}^*$ be value functions of the player \bullet given by \mathbb{V}_τ and $\mathbb{V}_{\tau+1}$, respectively. If we let $\theta = \mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau)$ be the solution of the greedy operator at occupancy state s_τ for player \bullet , and V_θ be the collection of linear functions computed as in Figure 4, then the updated value function $\mathbb{H}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau, \theta)$ at stage τ , given by $\mathbb{V}_\tau = \mathbb{V}_\tau \cup \{V_\theta\}$, is sound.

Proof. The proof starts from a formal description of a sound point-based update operator. The updated value function $\mathbb{H}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau, \mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau))$, given by $\mathbb{V}_\tau = \mathbb{V}_\tau \cup \{V_{\mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau)}\}$, is sound if the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A}_1) \quad &\mathbb{H}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau, \mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau))(s_\tau) \geq v_\tau^*(s_\tau), \\ (\mathbf{A}_2) \quad &\mathbb{H}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau, \mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau))(\bar{s}_\tau) \leq \mathbb{H}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, \bar{s}_\tau, \mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, \bar{s}_\tau))(\bar{s}_\tau), \text{ for } \bar{s}_\tau \neq s_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of inequality (\mathbf{A}_1) follows that of Theorem 1 since $\mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau)$ is the outcome of greedy action-selection operator at occupancy state s_τ . It only remains to prove inequality (\mathbf{A}_2) . To do so,

we need to prove the value generated at occupancy state $\bar{s}_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau$ by the collection of linear functions across conditional occupancy states, $V_{\mathbb{G}^*(v_{\tau+1}^*, s_\tau)}$, constructed for s_τ .

Figure 4 constructs a linear function for each conditional occupancy state $\bar{s}^{c, \circ}$ from occupancy state $\bar{s}_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau$ assuming a fixed policy of player \bullet . The constructed linear function for conditional occupancy state $\bar{s}^{c, \circ}$ minimizes the value of player \circ assuming a fixed policy of player \bullet . Because the fixed policy of \bullet was not constructed to maximize value of player \bullet at occupancy state \bar{s}_τ , the resulted linear function at $\bar{s}^{c, \circ}$ lower-bounds the one that would have been created if player \bullet maximized upon occupancy state \bar{s}_τ . As a consequence, inequality (A₂) holds. Which ends the proof. \square

C Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3. [Proof in Appendix C] For any occupancy subsets \bar{S}_0 , the error of the PBVI algorithm is bounded by $v_0^*(s_0) - v_0(s_0) \leq 2c\delta_{\bar{S}_0} \frac{1+\ell\gamma^{\ell+1}-(\ell+1)\gamma^\ell}{(1-\gamma)^2}$.

Proof. This proof builds upon Theorem 2.4. Let s_τ^* an occupancy state, never visited during the planning phase by the PBVI algorithm. There exists an occupancy state $s_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau$ such that $\|s_\tau^* - s_\tau\|_1 \leq \delta_{\bar{S}_0}$. Let α_τ be a linear function, over occupancy states expressed as distributions over conditional occupancy states, computed during the planning phase by the PBVI algorithm at occupancy state s_τ after a backup. Let α_τ^* be the optimal linear function at occupancy state s_τ^* that would have been computed during the planning phase by the PBVI algorithm at occupancy state s_τ^* after a backup. Let $\epsilon_\tau = |\alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau^*) - \alpha_\tau(s_\tau)|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_\tau &= \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau^*) - \alpha_\tau(s_\tau) \\ &= \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau^*) - \alpha_\tau(s_\tau) + \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau) - \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau), \quad (\text{add zero}) \\ &\leq \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau^*) - \alpha_\tau(s_\tau) + \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau) - \alpha_\tau(s_\tau), \quad (\text{since } \alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau) \leq \alpha_\tau(s_\tau)) \\ &= (\alpha_\tau^* - \alpha_\tau) \cdot (s_\tau^* - s_\tau), \quad (\text{re-arranging terms}) \\ &\leq \|\alpha_\tau^* - \alpha_\tau\|_\infty \|s_\tau^* - s_\tau\|_1, \quad (\text{by Holder's inequality}) \\ &\leq c\delta_{\bar{S}_0} \sum_{\tau=t}^{\ell-1} \gamma^{t-\tau}, \quad (\text{since } \|s_\tau^* - s_\tau\|_1 \leq \delta_{\bar{S}_0} \text{ and } \|r(\cdot, \cdot)\|_\infty \leq c) \\ &= c\delta_{\bar{S}_0} \frac{1 - \gamma^{\ell-\tau}}{1 - \gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, after ℓ backups, the error the PBVI algorithm makes is given by $\epsilon = \sum_\tau \gamma^\tau \cdot (\alpha_\tau^*(s_\tau^*) - \alpha_\tau(s_\tau)) = \sum_\tau \gamma^\tau \cdot \epsilon_\tau = 2c\delta_{\bar{S}_0} \frac{1+\ell\gamma^{\ell+1}-(\ell+1)\gamma^\ell}{(1-\gamma)^2}$. Which ends the proof. \square

D Pruning Methods

D.1 Exact Pruning Method

The mixed-integer linear program 9 tests whether a collection V_τ is dominated by the collections in \mathbb{V}_τ . This mixed-integer linear program finds the occupancy state s_τ in which the value function v_τ improved the most by added the collection V_τ to \mathbb{V}_τ . If the value δ_{V_τ} maximized by the mixed-integer linear program is non-positive, the collection V_τ is dominated. Otherwise, the collection V_τ is not dominated and δ_{V_τ} is the amount by which it gives a better value for the occupancy state s_τ than any collection in \mathbb{V}_τ . While the pruning technique we discussed so far applies over the entire occupancy space, one can drastically reduced time and space complexities by attention of value functions over sample subsets $\bar{S}_0 = (\bar{S}_0, \bar{S}_1, \dots, \bar{S}_{\ell-1})$. A point-based pruning algorithm takes as input a family of collections \mathbb{V}_τ and returns a subset $\mathbb{V}'_\tau \subseteq \mathbb{V}_\tau$.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{maximize} \quad \delta_{V_\tau} \\
\text{subject to} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\delta_{V_\tau} \leq \sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} (w_{V_\tau}^{o^\circ} - w_{V_\tau^{(\kappa)}}^{o^\circ}), \quad \forall V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in \mathbb{V}_\tau \\
w_{V_\tau}^{o^\circ} \leq s_\tau^{\text{m}, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \alpha_\tau(s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ}), \quad \forall \alpha_\tau \in V_\tau \\
w_{V_\tau^{(\kappa)}}^{o^\circ} \leq s_\tau^{\text{m}, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \alpha_\tau(s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ}), \quad \forall V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in \mathbb{V}_\tau, \forall \alpha_\tau \in V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \\
w_{V_\tau^{(\kappa)}}^{o^\circ} \geq s_\tau^{\text{m}, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)}(s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ}) + (1 - c_{\alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)}}^{o^\circ}) \mathbf{M}, \quad \forall V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in \mathbb{V}_\tau, \forall \alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \\
\sum_{V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in \mathbb{V}_\tau} \sum_{\alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in V_\tau^{(\kappa)}} c_{\alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)}}^{o^\circ} = 1 \\
\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{o \in O_\tau} s_\tau(x, o) = 1
\end{array} \right. \quad (9) \\
\text{variables} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
c_{\alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)}}^{o^\circ} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in \mathbb{V}_\tau, \forall \alpha_\tau^{(\kappa)} \in V_\tau^{(\kappa)} \\
s_\tau(x, o) \in [0, 1] \\
\delta_{V_\tau} \in \mathbb{R}.
\end{array} \right.
\end{array}$$

D.2 Bounded Pruning Method

The bounded pruning, *cf.* Algorithm 2, is a pruning algorithm that works under the assumption that the subsets $\bar{S}_{0:}$ of occupancy states are finite. The algorithm is bounded in the sense that the families $\mathbb{V}_{0:}$ of collections of linear functions are guaranteed to be no larger than $|\bar{S}_{0:}|$. It tests whether a collection V_τ is dominated by the collections in \mathbb{V}_τ if for any occupancy state $s_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau$,

$$\max_{V_\tau' \in \mathbb{V}_\tau} \sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} s_\tau^{\text{m}, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha \in V_\tau'} \alpha(s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ}) - \sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} s_\tau^{\text{m}, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha \in V_\tau} \alpha(s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ}) \geq 0.$$

Its result \mathbb{V}_τ' is typically smaller than the minimum-size subset that is sound with respect to the whole occupancy simplex, *e.g.*, resulting from the mixed-integer linear program 9. With catching, the inner products, *e.g.*, $\alpha_\tau(s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ})$, need to be computed only once for each collection $V_\tau \in \mathbb{V}_\tau$, each vector $\alpha_\tau \in V_\tau$ and each conditional occupancy state $s_\tau^{\text{c}, o^\circ}$, which makes the running time of the bounded pruning method about $\mathcal{O}(|\mathbb{V}_\tau| |\bar{V}_\tau| |\bar{S}_\tau| |X| |\bar{O}_\tau(s_\tau)|)$ where $\bar{O}_\tau(s_\tau) = \max_{s_\tau \in \bar{S}_\tau} \{o | o \in O_\tau, \Pr\{o | s_\tau\} > 0\}$.

Algorithm 2 Bounded pruning for M' .

```

function Bounded-Pruning( $\mathbb{V}, \bar{S}, \delta$ )
  for  $V \in \mathbb{V}$  do
    refCount( $V$ )  $\leftarrow$  0.
  end for
  for  $s \in \bar{S}$  do

```

$$V^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{V \in \mathbb{V}} \sum_{o^\circ \in O^\circ} s^{\text{m}, o^\circ}(o^\circ) \min_{\alpha \in V} \alpha(s^{\text{c}, o^\circ})$$

```

    increment refCount( $V^*$ )
  end for
  return  $\{V \in \mathbb{V} \mid \text{refCount}(V) > 0\}$ 

```




Figure 6: Comparison between exact and bounded pruning methods.

Figure 6 compares the results of the exact and bounded pruning approaches on an example family of collections of linear functions. (Right) The purple collection would be pruned under bounded pruning, the foundation point of the purple line being on the red line. However, it would not be pruned under exact pruning, because it is strictly optimal for occupancy points outside of its foundation point (purple point). **Best viewed in color.**

E Additional Plots




Figure 7: A visual representation of the performance of our best performing algorithm (PBVI₂) against the HSVI algorithm of Delage et al. [5] for horizon $\ell = 4$ across five different games. **Best viewed in color.**

F Experiments on Larger Benchmarks

Preliminary experiments on larger benchmarks were already carried out to test the scalability of the method. Both chosen benchmarks exhibit a larger hidden state, action and observation space, yet PBVI₃ seems to show very promising results.

Table 2: Snapshot of empirical results for larger benchmarks (Box pushing and Mars). For each game, we report time (in hours) and the best value for horizons ℓ computed with PBVI_3 . OOT means a time limit of 2 hours has been exceeded.

Problem	ℓ	PBVI_3	
Box pushing	2	0	4.1
	3	2.36	4.92
	4	OOT	123
	5	OOT	216
	7	OOT	400
	10	OOT	723
Mars	2	0.08	-1.12
	3	40	-4.0

G Experiments on Subclasses

Table 3: Snapshot of empirical results. For each subclass of game (Markov Game and Public Observable Markov Game) and algorithms, we report time (in seconds) and the best value for the horizon ℓ .

Problem	MG			POMG		
	ℓ	Time	Value	ℓ	Time	Value
Adversarial tiger	1	0	0.25	1	0	0.25
	50	0	11.9	2	0	0
	100	0	23.8	3	0	0.2
	1000	2	238	4	2	0.2
Competitive tiger	1	0	0	1	0	0
	50	0	0	2	0	0
	100	0	0	3	2	0
	1000	3	0	4	0	0
Recycling	1	0	-0.4	1	0	-0.4
	50	0	1.36	2	0	0.28
	100	0	2.41	3	2	0.34
	1000	4	21	4	26	0.38
Mabc	1	0	0.05	1	0	0.05
	50	0	0.52	2	0	0.88
	100	0	0.98	3	0	0.99
	1000	3	9.15	4	4	0.11
Matching pennies	1	0	0	1	0	0
	50	0	-49	2	0	-1
	100	0	-99	3	0	-2
	1000	2	-999	4	0	-3

H Computational Resources

The results presented in this paper were run on CPU. For CFR+, AMD Ryzen was used with 90G of available space. For HSVI/PBVI, a CPU was also used with 30-70G of available space for smaller horizons and 90-110G for higher horizons.