


Positionality of mean-payoff games on infinite graphs

Pierre Ohlmann

University of Warsaw

Context The mean-payoff objective was introduced by Ehrenfeucht and Mycielski [3] who first proved its positionality over finite game graphs. By now, many additional proofs of positionality are available, using the GKK algorithm [5], the reduction to discounted games [8, 9], first-cycle games [2, 1], concavity [6], or the 1-to-2 player lift of [4]. All these proofs have in common that finiteness of the game graph is required. In fact, if defined without care, mean-payoff games fail to be positional over infinite graphs (even with degree 2), as shown in Figure 1.



■ **Figure 1** Two infinite games of finite degree witnessing failure of positionality for different variants of the mean-payoff objective. Circles are controlled by Eve, the minimizer, while squares are controlled by the opponent. In the game displayed at the top, Eve requires non-positional strategies to ensure a path whose weights $w_0w_1\dots$ satisfy $\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i \leq 0$. In the game at the bottom, Eve requires non-positional strategies to ensure a path whose weights $w_0w_1\dots$ satisfy $\liminf_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i \leq 0$, or that the same quantity is < 0 .

Result In this short note, we establish that, if the mean-payoff objective is defined adequately, positionality (for Eve) is recovered over arbitrary game graphs. To do so, we define a well-founded monotone graph which is universal for the mean-payoff objective, and then rely on [7, Theorem 3.2]. For all definitions and notations relative to graphs, games, positionality, universality and monotonicity, we refer to [7].

Mean-payoff We define the mean-payoff function to be

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mp} : \quad \mathbb{Z}^\omega &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} \\ w_0w_1\dots &\mapsto \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i \end{aligned}$$

and the (threshold) mean-payoff objective to be

$$W = \{w \in \mathbb{Z}^\omega \mid \text{mp}(w) < 0\}.$$

Note that the three other variants (changing \limsup for \liminf and/or < 0 for ≤ 0) are non-positional (see Figure 1), even over graphs of degree 2.

Positionality of mean-payoff games on infinite graphs

A well-founded monotone graph Consider the graph U over $V(U) = \mathbb{N}^{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{N}$, ordered lexicographically (with the first coordinate as most important) and given by

$$(m, t) \xrightarrow{w} (m', t') \in E(U) \iff m > m' \text{ or } [m = m' \text{ and } mw \leq t - t' - 1].$$

Clearly, U is a well-founded monotone graph.

► **Lemma 1.** *The graph U satisfies the objective W .*

Proof. Consider an infinite path $(m_0, t_0) \xrightarrow{w_0} (m_1, t_1) \xrightarrow{w_1} \dots$ and let $w = w_0 w_1 \dots$. By well-foundedness, there is i_0 such that $(m_i)_{i \geq i_0}$ is constant, say, equal to $m \geq 1$. Then by definition of U , for all $i \geq i_0$, we have $m w_i \leq t_i - t_{i+1} - 1$ which leads to

$$\text{mp}(w) = \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{i_0-1} w_i + \frac{t_{i_0} - t_n - (n - i_0)}{m} \right] \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} -\frac{1}{m} < 0,$$

where $\stackrel{(*)}{\leq}$ holds since for all n , $t_n \geq 0$. ◀

Proof of universality We now prove that for any cardinal κ , U is almost κ -universal for W , which implies, by [7, Lemma 4.5], that $U \cdot \kappa$ is κ -universal for W . Below, $G[v]$ denotes the restriction of a graph G to vertices reachable from v in G .


► **Lemma 2.** *Let G be a graph satisfying W . There exists $v \in V(G)$ such that $G[v] \rightarrow U$.*

Proof. Given a finite path π , we use $\text{sum}(\pi)$ and $\text{avg}(\pi)$ to denote respectively the sum or the average of the weights appearing on π . The proof hinges on the following claim.

▷ **Claim 3.** There exists $v \in V(G)$, $m \geq 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all finite paths π of length ℓ from v we have

$$\text{sum}(\pi) \leq \frac{-\ell + t}{m}.$$

The statement of Claim 3 is illustrated in Figure 2.



■ **Figure 2** Constraining all paths below some affine line with negative slope, as in the statement of Claim 3.

Proof. We prove the claim by contradiction, so assume that for all $v \in V(G)$ and all $m \geq 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a finite path π of length ℓ from v such that

$$\text{sum}(\pi) > \frac{-\ell + t}{m}. \quad (*)$$

Pick $v_0 \in V(G)$; we aim to construct a path from v_0 in G with mean-payoff ≥ 0 , which contradicts the fact that G satisfies W . It will be of the form

$$v_0 \xrightarrow{\pi_0} v_1 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} \dots,$$

where each π_i is non-empty. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\pi_{<n}$ denote the concatenation of π_0, \dots, π_{n-1} (which is the empty path for $n = 0$). The idea is to ensure that at the n -th step, the average of the partial sum on our path exceeds $-1/(n+1)$:

$$\text{avg}(\pi_{<n}) \geq -\frac{1}{n+1}.$$

This implies our claim: since averages of partial sums have a subsequence lower bounded by one that goes to 0, the limsup is ≥ 0 .

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume the path constructed up to v_n (this is trivially verified for $n = 0$). Apply (*) to obtain a finite path $\pi_n : v_n \rightsquigarrow v_{n+1}$ of length ℓ satisfying

$$\text{sum}(\pi_n) \geq -\frac{\ell}{n+1} + \max\left(-\text{sum}(\pi_{<n}) - \frac{\ell'}{n+1}, 1\right),$$

where $\ell' = |\pi_{<n}|$. Note that since the max is > 0 , π_n must be non-empty (this is the only purpose of the max above). Then we get

$$\text{avg}(\pi_{<n+1}) = \frac{\text{sum}(\pi_{<n}) + \text{sum}(\pi_n)}{\ell' + \ell} \geq \frac{-\frac{\ell'}{n+1} - \frac{\ell}{n+1}}{\ell' + \ell} \geq -\frac{1}{n+1},$$

as required. This concludes the proof of the claim. \triangleleft

Thus we take $v \in V(G)$, $m \geq 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$ as given by the above claim.

\triangleright **Claim 4.** For any v' reachable from v in G , there exists t' such that for all finite paths π' of length ℓ' from v' we have

$$\text{sum}(\pi') \leq \frac{-\ell' + t'}{m}.$$

Proof. Fix a path $v \xrightarrow{\pi} v'$ of length ℓ and let $t' = \lceil t - \ell - m \text{sum}(\pi) \rceil$. Then we get

$$\text{sum}(\pi') \leq \text{sum}(\pi\pi') - \text{sum}(\pi) \leq \frac{-(\ell + \ell') + t - m \text{sum}(\pi)}{m} \leq \frac{-\ell' + t'}{m},$$

as required. \triangleleft

Now, for each v' reachable from v (including v itself), we define $t_{v'}$ to be the minimal t' as in Claim 4, and define a map $\phi : V(G[v]) \rightarrow V(U)$ by setting $\phi(v') = (m, t_{v'})$.

\triangleright **Claim 5.** The map ϕ defines a morphism $G[v] \rightarrow U$.

Proof. Let $u \xrightarrow{w} u'$ be an edge in $G[v]$, we must prove that $(m, t_u) \xrightarrow{w} (m, t_{u'})$ is an edge in U , which rewrites as

$$mw \leq t_u - t_{u'} - 1.$$

By minimality of $t_{u'}$, there exists a finite path π' of length ℓ' from u' satisfying

$$\text{sum}(\pi') > \frac{-\ell' + t_{u'} - 1}{m}. \tag{1}$$

But then $(u \xrightarrow{w} u')\pi'$ defines a path of length $\ell' + 1$ from u , and weight $w + \text{sum}(\pi')$ therefore by definition of t_u we get

$$w + \text{sum}(\pi') \leq \frac{-(\ell' + 1) + t_u}{m}. \quad (2)$$

Subtracting (1) from (2) yields

$$w < \frac{-(\ell' + 1) + t_u + \ell' - t_{u'} + 1}{m} = \frac{t_u - t_{u'}}{m}.$$

Since $mw < t_u - t_{u'}$ and these are integers, we get $mw \leq t_u - t_{u'} - 1$, as required. \triangleleft

This concludes our proof. \blacktriangleleft

► **Remark 6.** The reader may wonder what happens when real weights are allowed, instead of just integers. We claim that the exact same construction remains universal, which proves positionality. The proof of universality becomes slightly more subtle, the idea is to take v, m, t as in Claim 3, then continue the proof with $2m$ instead of m , and by rounding up the weights within $\frac{z}{2m}$. The move from m to $2m$ gives some extra slack that compensates for the loss from the rounding. To keep the note short, we do not include a detailed proof.

References

- 1 Benjamin Aminof and Sasha Rubin. First-cycle games. *Inf. Comput.*, 254:195–216, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2016.10.008.
- 2 Henrik Björklund, Sven Sandberg, and Sergei G. Vorobyov. Memoryless determinacy of parity and mean payoff games: a simple proof. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 310(1-3):365–378, 2004. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(03)00427-4.
- 3 A. Ehrenfeucht and J. Mycielski. Positional strategies for mean payoff games. *Int. J. Game Theory*, 8(2):109–113, jun 1979. doi:10.1007/BF01768705.
- 4 Hugo Gimbert and Wiesław Zielonka. Games where you can play optimally without any memory. In *CONCUR*, volume 3653 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 428–442. Springer, 2005. doi:10.1007/11539452_33.
- 5 V. A. Gurvich, A. V. Karzanov, and L. G. Khachiyan. Cyclic games and an algorithm to find minimax cycle means in directed graphs. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, 28:85–91, 1988.
- 6 Eryk Kopczyński. Half-positional determinacy of infinite games. In *ICALP*, pages 336–347, 2006.
- 7 Pierre Ohlmann. Characterizing Positionality in Games of Infinite Duration over Infinite Graphs. *TheoretCS*, Volume 2, January 2023. URL: <https://theoretics.episciences.org/10878>, doi:10.46298/theoretics.23.3.
- 8 Anuj Puri. *Theory of Hybrid Systems and Discrete Event Systems*. PhD thesis, EECS Department, University of California, Berkeley, dec 1995. URL: <http://www2.eecs.berkeley.edu/Pubs/TechRpts/1995/2950.html>.
- 9 Uri Zwick and Mike Paterson. The complexity of mean payoff games on graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 158(1-2):343–359, 1996. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(95)00188-3.