

Markov Decision Processes with Sure Parity and Multiple Reachability Objectives

Raphaël Berthon*, Joost-Pieter Katoen^{*,**}, and Tobias Winkler^{**}

RWTH Aachen University, 52062 Aachen, Germany

Abstract. This paper considers the problem of finding strategies that satisfy a mixture of sure and threshold objectives in Markov decision processes. We focus on a single ω -regular objective expressed as parity that must be surely met while satisfying n reachability objectives towards sink states with some probability thresholds too. We consider three variants of the problem: (a) strict and (b) non-strict thresholds on all reachability objectives, and (c) maximizing the thresholds with respect to a lexicographic order. We show that (a) and (c) can be reduced to solving parity games, and (b) can be solved in EXPTIME. Strategy complexities as well as algorithms are provided for all cases.

Keywords: MDPs · Parity · Reachability · Multi-objective

1 Introduction

Markov decision processes (MDPs) [6,37] are prominent models for strategic planning and decision making in face of stochastic uncertainty. An important, yet intricate, problem is to determine if and how a combination of *multiple* properties, or *objectives*, is realizable in a given MDP. As objectives may be *conflicting*, it does not suffice to analyze each of them independently [20,39,4]. Instead, *trade-offs* between the objectives have to be taken into account. In this paper, we combine objectives of different nature: *Sure objectives* must be fulfilled on *all* possible executions of the MDP, even on those with probability 0. Thus, sure objectives do not depend on the exact transition probabilities; in fact, they can be analyzed by replacing the probabilities with an adversary. *Threshold objectives*, on the other hand, have to be satisfied with some probability of at least (or greater than) a given constant. Various combinations of sure and threshold objectives have been investigated in prior work [24,1,12,8,22,7]. Here, we focus on MDPs with a single sure ω -regular objective expressed as a *parity* condition together with n *reachability* threshold objectives towards sink states.

Running example In a game show a contestant plays a gamble to win either a bike, a surfboard, or both prizes. The gamble is as follows: The contestant must

* Supported by the DFG Grant Nr. 520530521 “POMPOM”

** Supported by the DFG RTG 2236 “UnRAVeL”




Fig. 1. An MDP with $Act = \{a, b, pair_1, pair_2, *\}$, target sets F_1 , F_2 , and parity condition ρ assigning 0 to the sinks and 1 to the non-sinks. *Right:* The Pareto frontier.

choose one out of two pairs of 6-sided dice. Each pair consists of a **green** and a **red** die. The four dice are all different; each of their faces shows either the bike, the board, both bike and board, or the symbol \circ (“repeat”):

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 pair_1 & \text{red: } 3 \times \circ, 1 \times \text{both}, 2 \times \text{bike} \quad \text{green: } 6 \times \text{board} \\
 pair_2 & \text{red: } 3 \times \circ, 1 \times \text{both}, 2 \times \text{board} \quad \text{green: } 2 \times \text{both}, 2 \times \text{bike}, 2 \times \text{board}
 \end{array}$$

After committing to a pair of dice, the contestant rolls one die from their pair. The **green** die immediately ends the gamble with the resulting prize(s). The **red** die either ends the gamble or, in case of \circ , allows the contestant to roll again (the same die or the other one). However, since the show is broadcast on live TV, there is an additional rule: The gamble may not be prolonged indefinitely, i.e., the contestant may try the **red** die at most an arbitrary, but *a priori* fixed number of times. Clearly, optimal strategies depend on how much the contestant prefers one prize over the other. The MDP in Figure 1 models this gamble. Prizes are encoded as reachability of sinks ($F_1 \hat{=} \text{bike}, F_2 \hat{=} \text{board}$); the additional constraint is a sure parity condition.

This paper We study the following three problems: Given a finite MDP, decide if it is possible to satisfy a sure parity objective and, at the same time, n sink reachability objectives with (a) all *strict*, or (b) all *non-strict* probability thresholds. In addition, we consider the problem (c) of checking existence of a *lexicographically* maximal achievable threshold vector w.r.t. a given linear order on the reachability objectives. In all cases, we are also interested in computing witnessing strategies if they exist. These problems are challenging, both computationally and conceptually. Already for two reachability objectives (without any sure objective) the set of achievable thresholds—the *Pareto frontier*—is a convex polytope with superpolynomially many vertices in general [27]. The problems we study are more general than this and add further subtleties: While it is easy to show that the thresholds in the *interior* of the Pareto frontier are satisfiable with *any* sure parity objective (Section 3), identifying exactly which points on the *boundary* of the frontier are achievable is quite involved (Section 5).

Table 1. Some existing and our new (in bold) results on multi-objective MDPs.

<i>Sure objective</i>	<i>Probabilistic objective(s)</i>	<i>Complexity</i>	<i>Memory</i>	<i>Reference</i>
1 sure parity	-	$\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$	finite	[26]
1 sure parity	1 threshold parity	$\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$	infinite	[8]
1 sure parity	n almost-sure parity	$\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$	infinite	[7]
n sure parity	n almost-sure parity	$\text{P}^{\text{NP}} (= \Delta_2^{\text{P}})$	infinite	[7]
1 sure parity	1 threshold reach	$\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$	finite	[8]
-	n threshold sink reach	PTIME	finite	[27]
1 sure parity	n strict threshold sink reach (a)	$\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$	finite	[Thm. 2]
1 sure parity	n threshold sink reach (c)	EXPTIME	finite	[Thm. 4]
-	lexicographic Streett	PTIME	finite	[17]
1 sure parity	lexicographic sink reach (b)	$\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$	finite	[Thm. 3]

Contributions Our three main results are summarized in bold in Table 1. (a) Checking if a sure parity objective and n *strict* sink reachability thresholds are achievable simultaneously is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ (Section 3). This is done via a reduction to parity games, admitting a quasi-polynomial algorithm [13].

(c) We propose an algorithm that finds a strategy ensuring a sure parity objective while also maximizing the probability of reaching n sinks w.r.t. a *lexicographic* order (Section 4). It relies on a concept we call *projection*, a notion also used in prior work [27,4,17]. Our algorithm solves polynomially many parity games in sequence, hence the problem is (again) in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$.

(b) We present an algorithm for finding a strategy satisfying a sure parity objective and n sink reachability objectives with *non-strict* thresholds (Section 5). Our algorithm alternates between computing Pareto frontiers, making projections, and pruning states not satisfying the sure parity objective; to our knowledge, this idea is new. Its time complexity is exponential in the size of the MDP, as it relies on computing exact Pareto frontiers.

We also treat strategy complexity for each case. Our results are a further step towards a solution for general combinations of sure and probabilistic objectives.

Related work Previous research [7] on mixtures of sure and probabilistic objectives focused on *qualitative* thresholds, i.e., >0 and $=1$. Here, we also allow *quantitative* thresholds strictly between 0 and 1. We rely on some results of [8] that studied combining one sure parity and *one threshold parity* objective. This problem was shown to be in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$, via a reduction to parity games with weights that can be solved in quasi-polynomial time [40]. The main difference to [8] is that we consider *multiple reachability* threshold objectives. The setting of one sure parity and one almost-sure parity has been further studied in [22] where it was shown that the restriction to finite memory strategies is still in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ for MDPs, and coNP -complete for stochastic games.

The seminal paper [27] shows that computing the Pareto frontier for a mixture of either reachability or ω -regular objectives can be reduced to solving linear programs. An efficient technique, value iteration, is exploited by tools such as

PRISM [35], Storm [32], and MultiGain [11]. The work [19] considers MDPs with two different kinds of stochastic mean-payoff objectives, and supports computing the Pareto frontier. *Percentile queries*, multiple threshold constraints that must each be satisfied with some probability, were studied in [38]. In [9,31], multiple reachability conditions associated to the expected or accumulated cost to reach a target are considered.

Lexicographic optimization is a widely employed principle in multi-objective decision making [36,43]. The idea is that a strategy should prioritize a primary objective while still doing best possible for a secondary objective, etc. The work of [17] imposes a lexicographic order on multiple, possibly conflicting, reachability, safety and ω -regular objectives. Reinforcement learning with lexicographic ω -regular conditions is studied in [30]. To the best of our knowledge, lexicographic optimization in MDPs together with a sure condition has not been studied yet.

Other approaches have been considered. Combinations of parity and mean-payoff [1], and parity and weighted games [40] have been studied in prior work. An alternative way to combining objectives is *strategy logic* (SL) [16], an extension of CTL that can express formulas involving the change of strategies. A probabilistic SL has been defined in [2].

2 Preliminaries

We write $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $[n]_0 = [n] \cup \{0\}$. Vectors $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are written in bold. For $\mathbf{v} \in [0, 1]^n$ and $i \in [n]$, we denote by v_i the i -th component of \mathbf{v} . Given $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, their *dot product* is defined as $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{u} = \sum_{i \in [n]} v_i \cdot u_i$. The symbol $\mathbf{e}_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is the unit vector where the i -th component is 1 and all others are 0. The componentwise order on \mathbb{R}^n is denoted with \leq . Given a finite set A , a (*probability*) *distribution* on A is a function $f: A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{a \in A} f(a) = 1$. $\mathcal{D}(A)$ denotes the set of all distributions on A . We define the *support* $\text{supp}(f) = \{a \in A \mid f(a) > 0\}$.

2.1 MDPs, Strategies, and Objectives

A *Markov decision process* (MDP) is a tuple $\Gamma = (S, \text{Act}, \mathbf{P})$ where $S \neq \emptyset$ is a countable set of *states*, $\text{Act} \neq \emptyset$ is a finite set of *actions*, and $\mathbf{P}: S \times \text{Act} \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a *transition probability function* satisfying $\sum_{s' \in S} \mathbf{P}(s, a, s') \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $s \in S, a \in \text{Act}$. If the sum is 1 for a state-action pair s, a , then a is *enabled* at s . We write $\text{Act}(s)$ for the set of all actions enabled at s , and require that $\text{Act}(s) \neq \emptyset$. An MDP Γ is called *finite* if S is finite. A state $s \in S$ is called a *sink* if for all $a \in \text{Act}(s)$ we have $\mathbf{P}(s, a, s) = 1$. For technical convenience we assume $|\text{Act}(s)| = 1$ for all sinks $s \in S$. Note that we may consider the same MDP with different initial states since the latter is not fixed in our definition. See Figure 1 for a finite example MDP.

A (discrete-time) *Markov chain* (MC) is an MDP with $|\text{Act}| = 1$. We omit Act from the definition of MC and just write $\mathcal{M} = (S, \mathbf{P})$. We also identify \mathbf{P} with a function of type $S \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

A *strategy* for an MDP Γ is a state machine $\sigma = (Q, q_i, \delta, o)$ where Q is a countable set of memory modes, $q_i \in Q$ is the initial mode, $\delta: Q \times S \rightarrow Q$ is a transition function, and $o: Q \times S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\text{Act})$ is an output function with $\text{supp}(o(q, s)) \subseteq \text{Act}(s)$ for all $q \in Q, s \in S$. σ is called *finite-memory* if $|Q| < \infty$, *memoryless* if $|Q| = 1$, and *deterministic* if $|\text{supp}(o(q, s))| = 1$ for all $q \in Q, s \in S$.

Given an MDP $\Gamma = (S, \text{Act}, \mathbf{P})$ with strategy $\sigma = (Q, q_i, \delta, o)$, we define the *induced MC* $\Gamma[\sigma] = (S \times Q, \mathbf{P}^\sigma)$ where $\mathbf{P}^\sigma((s, q), (s', q')) = \mathbf{P}(s, o(q, s), s')$ if $\delta(q, s) = q'$, and otherwise $\mathbf{P}^\sigma((s, q), (s', q')) = 0$. In the following, we only consider finite MDPs, but when considering an infinite-memory strategy, the resulting MC is countably infinite. In the context of algorithms, we always assume that the probabilities in the given MDPs, strategies, and probability thresholds are *rational* numbers encoded as numerator-denominator pairs in binary.

Given an MC $\mathcal{M} = (S, \mathbf{P})$ with a distinguished initial state $s \in S$, we consider the σ -algebra \mathcal{F} generated by the *cylinder sets* $\{\pi S^\omega \mid \pi \in S^*\}$ and the associated probability measure $\text{Pr}_s^{\mathcal{M}}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which is uniquely defined by requiring that for all $\pi = s_0 \dots s_k \in S^+, k \geq 0$, we have $\text{Pr}_s^{\mathcal{M}}(\pi S^\omega) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{P}(s_i, s_{i+1})$ if $s_0 = s$, and $\text{Pr}_s^{\mathcal{M}}(\pi S^\omega) = 0$ if $s_0 \neq s$. See, e.g. [5, Chapter 10] for more details. The sets in \mathcal{F} are called *measurable*. Further, we define $\text{Paths}_s^{\mathcal{M}} = \{s_0 s_1 \dots \in S^\omega \mid s_0 = s \wedge \forall i \geq 0: \mathbf{P}(s_i, s_{i+1}) > 0\}$.

An *objective* for an MDP Γ is a measurable¹ set of paths $\Omega \subseteq S^\omega$. A *reachability* objective for Γ is of the form $\diamond F = \{\pi \in S^\omega \mid \exists k \geq 0: \pi(k) \in F\}$ where $F \subseteq S$. *Bounded reachability* objectives have the form $\diamond^{\leq B} F = \{\pi \in S^\omega \mid \exists k \in [B]_0: \pi(k) \in F\}$, for some $B \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A *parity* objective for Γ is defined via a *priority function* $\rho: S \rightarrow [k]_0$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For $\pi \in S^\omega$, let $\text{inf}(\pi) = \{s \in S \mid \forall i \geq 0: \exists j \geq i: \pi(j) = s\}$ be the set of states visited infinitely often on π . Then the parity objective defined by ρ is $\{\pi \in S^\omega \mid \max \rho(\text{inf}(\pi)) \text{ is even}\}$. In the following, we identify the function ρ with the objective it defines.

2.2 Multi-Objectives and Pareto Frontiers

A *multi-objective (MO) formula* for MDP Γ is a syntactic object $\varphi = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{atom}_i$ with $\text{atom}_i \in \{\mathbf{S}(\Omega), \text{Pr}_{\sim p}(\Omega) \mid \Omega \text{ an objective for } \Gamma, \sim \in \{>, \geq\}, p \in [0, 1]\}$. An MC \mathcal{M} with a distinguished initial state s satisfies a *threshold* constraint $\text{Pr}_{\sim p}(\Omega)$ if $\text{Pr}_s^{\mathcal{M}}(\Omega) \sim p$, a *sure* constraint $\mathbf{S}(\Omega)$ if $\text{Paths}_s^{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \Omega$, and it satisfies the formula φ (in symbols: $s \models_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi$) if it satisfies atom_i for all $i \in [n]$. For an MDP Γ with strategy σ we write $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \varphi$ if $s \models_{\Gamma[\sigma]} \varphi$, and $s \models_{\Gamma} \varphi$ if $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \varphi$ for *some* strategy σ for Γ . In this paper, we only consider formulas of the form $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{\sim p_1}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{Pr}_{\sim p_n}(\diamond F_n)$, i.e., conjunctions of one sure parity and $n \geq 1$ reachability objectives, either all with strict or non-strict thresholds.

We now define Pareto frontiers. Given an MO formula φ for MDP Γ containing n threshold constraints $\text{Pr}_{\sim p_1}(\Omega_1), \dots, \text{Pr}_{\sim p_n}(\Omega_n)$ (in this order), we write $\varphi(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \varphi(\mathbf{p})$ to emphasize the dependency of φ on the threshold vector $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$. We also write $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ without further qualifying \mathbf{x} to indicate that the

¹ Measurability is actually only important for probabilistic objectives, not for sure objectives. However, all concrete objectives considered in this paper are measurable.

thresholds are *variables* $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. We define the set of *achievable threshold vectors* as $Ach(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x})) = \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n \mid s \models_{\Gamma} \varphi(\mathbf{p})\} \subseteq [0, 1]^n$. Note that $Ach(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x}))$ is *downward-closed* as $\sim \in \{\geq, >\}$, and *convex* since a convex combination $c \cdot \mathbf{p} + (1-c) \cdot \mathbf{p}'$, $c \in (0, 1)$, of achievable threshold vectors \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' is achieved by a strategy that plays the strategy for \mathbf{p} with probability c and the one for \mathbf{p}' with probability $1-c$, see, e.g. [27]. Given a set of vectors X , we define $\text{gen}(X)$, the subspace generated by X , as the intersection of all subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n containing X . It is the smallest subspace containing X . For the next definition recall that the *boundary* ∂X of a set $X \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ is defined as $\overline{X} \setminus \text{int } X$, where \overline{X} is the closure of X and $\text{int } X$ is the interior, i.e., the largest open subset of X .

Definition 1 (Pareto frontier). *Let $\Gamma = (S, Act, \mathbf{P})$ be an MDP, $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ an MO formula for Γ , and $s \in S$. We define $\text{Pareto}(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x})) = \partial Ach(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x}))$.*

The above definition is similar to the one from [3]; other authors define the Pareto frontier in a slightly different way, e.g., as the \leq -maxima of $Ach(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x}))$ [28].

The Pareto frontier is the boundary of a convex polytope of dimension at most n [27]. Such a polytope P has faces of lower dimension, from 0 (a vertex) to $n - 1$. These faces are defined as follows: given a hyperplane H intersecting P , the polytope $H \cap P$ is a face of P iff P lies fully on one of the two closed half-spaces defined by H . When considering the polytope associated to a Pareto frontier (and by generalization the Pareto frontier itself), we can freely separate points between those strictly in the interior, those on the border, and those in the exterior. In what follows, we only consider faces defined by intersection with hyperplanes whose normal vectors only have non-negative components. More on convex polytopes can be found in [29].

Example 1. Consider the MDP Γ in Figure 1 on page 2 and the formula $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \Pr_{\geq x_1}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{\geq x_2}(\diamond F_2)$ (we ignore parity). Let s be the marked initial state.

- $\mathbf{p}_1 = (1, 1/3)$ is achievable from s by choosing *pair*₁, and then playing *a* repeatedly to reach F_1 with $2/3$, and both F_1 and F_2 with probability $1/3$.
- $\mathbf{p}_2 = (1/3, 1)$ is achievable from s by choosing *pair*₂, and then *a* repeatedly to reach F_2 with $2/3$ and both F_1 and F_2 with probability $1/3$.
- As mentioned earlier, a convex combination of two achievable points is achievable by following one of the two strategies with suitable probabilities. However, in this specific example, the vector $\mathbf{p}_3 = (2/3, 2/3) = 0.5 \cdot \mathbf{p}_1 + 0.5 \cdot \mathbf{p}_2$ is achievable with a *deterministic* strategy as well: First choose *pair*₂ in s and then *b* to reach state F_1 with $1/3$, state F_2 with $1/3$, and both F_1 and F_2 with probability $1/3$. These points will be relevant in Sections 4 and 5.
- The above strategies are all *Pareto-optimal*, but there are also sub-optimal strategies, e.g., choosing *pair*₁ in s and then *b* leads to reaching F_1 and F_2 with probability 0 and 1, respectively. This is sub-optimal as $(0, 1) \leq \mathbf{p}_2$.

We consider *clean* MDPs throughout the rest of the paper:

Definition 2 (Clean MDP). *Let $\Gamma = (S, Act, \mathbf{P})$ be an MDP. Γ is clean ...*

- ... w.r.t. a parity objective $\rho: S \rightarrow [k]_0$ if for all $s \in S$, we have $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho)$, i.e., ρ is surely satisfiable from every state s .
- ... w.r.t. target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$ if for all $s \in S$, we have $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{Pr}_{\geq 1}(\diamond F)$, where $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i$, and every state in F is a sink.

Example 2. The MDP from Figure 1 is clean w.r.t. ρ because from every state, there is a strategy that surely reaches a sink with priority 0. For instance, from the topmost state, the rightmost sink is reachable by playing action b . The MDP is also clean w.r.t. F_1, F_2 because from every state there exists a strategy reaching $F = F_1 \cup F_2$ with probability one, and because F contains sink states only.

Some remarks about clean MDPs are in order: (i) One can *clean* an MDP w.r.t. parity by identifying and removing states that violate $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$. The latter can be done by solving the 2-player deterministic parity game obtained by replacing the randomness in the MDP by an antagonistic player. Note that deciding the winner in a parity game (and hence checking if $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho)$ holds for state s) is in $\mathbf{NP} \cap \mathbf{coNP}$ [13], and even in $\mathbf{UP} \cap \mathbf{coUP}$ [33], but is not known to be in \mathbf{PTIME} . (ii) Reachability towards *sinks* only is a more severe restriction. We make it because simultaneous almost-sure reachability of n general target sets in an MDP is already \mathbf{PSPACE} -complete [38]. Intuitively, this is because strategies have to remember which targets were already seen. Contrarily, sink reachability often admits more practical complexities as shown in Sections 3 and 4 (also see, e.g., [17] and [42]) and is still of practical interest. We leave a solution for general reachability for future work, since it would likely further improvements on the techniques we introduce.

2.3 Existing Results

We recall the following known results:

Theorem 1 (Known results). *Let $\Gamma = (S, \text{Act}, \mathbf{P})$ be a finite MDP with target set $F \subseteq S$.*

1. (Optimal reachability; see, e.g. [5, Lem. 10.102] or [23, Sec. 28.4.1]). *There exists a memoryless and deterministic strategy σ^* for Γ such that for all $s \in S$ we have $\mathbf{Pr}_s^{\Gamma[\sigma^*]}(\diamond F) = \sup_{\sigma} \mathbf{Pr}_s^{\Gamma[\sigma]}(\diamond F) =: v_s^*$, where the supremum ranges over all strategies for Γ . Moreover, both σ^* and the probabilities $(v_s^*)_{s \in S}$ are computable in polynomial time.*
2. (Sure parity [13, Thm. 2.1]). *Let $\rho: S \rightarrow [k]_0$ be a priority function. Then deciding $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho)$ for a state $s \in S$ is in $\mathbf{NP} \cap \mathbf{coNP}$, and there exist memoryless deterministic witness strategies for the YES-instances.*
3. (Sure parity and threshold reachability [8, Thm. 4]). *Let $\rho: S \rightarrow [k]_0$ be a priority function, and $p \in [0, 1]$ a probability threshold. Then deciding $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \mathbf{Pr}_{\sim p}(\diamond F)$ for a state $s \in S$ and $\sim \in \{>, \geq\}$ is in $\mathbf{NP} \cap \mathbf{coNP}$, and there exist polynomial memory (possibly randomized) witness strategies for the YES-instances.*

4. (Multi-objective reachability [27, Cor. 3.5]). Suppose that Γ is clean w.r.t. $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$ and let $\sim \in \{\geq, >\}$. Then deciding $s \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\sim p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ for a state $s \in S$ and thresholds $p_1, \dots, p_n \in [0, 1]$ is in PTIME, and memoryless (but possibly randomized) witness strategies for the YES-instances can be constructed in polynomial time.

3 Sure Parity and n Strict Reachability Thresholds

We study MO formulas of the form $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ in this section, i.e., with *strict* thresholds only. Non-strict thresholds are more involved, see Section 5. We start by stating the main result of this section. Note that it is formulated for MDPs that are clean w.r.t. the parity objective ρ and the target sets F_i . The assumption of being clean w.r.t. parity can be dropped, but this incurs the additional complexity of solving a parity game (see Definition 2 and subsequent remarks), and hence leads to an $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ complexity bound on the associated decision problem.

Theorem 2. *Let Γ be a clean MDP w.r.t. parity objective ρ and target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. Further, let $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$, and let $s \in S$ be a state. Then:*

1. *The decision problem $\exists \sigma: s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ is in PTIME.*
2. *A witness strategy σ using at most $2^{\text{poly}(|\Gamma|+nD)}$ memory, where D is the bit-complexity of the rational numbers in \mathbf{p} , can be effectively constructed for the YES-instances.*

Example 3. Reconsider the MDP Γ from Figure 1 with initial state s , yellow target F_1 and blue target F_2 . To surely satisfy ρ , we must visit non-sink states only finitely often (this is a co-Büchi condition). We show that $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{>1/2}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{>1/6}(\diamond F_2)$, achieving a value strictly greater than $\mathbf{p}_4 = (1/2, 1/6)$ which is strictly inside the Pareto frontier. To achieve this objective, we take the following strategy: we first play action pair_1 , then a twice. By doing so, we have probability $1/4$ of reaching the leftmost state (contained in both F_1 and F_2), and probability $1/2$ of reaching the state only fulfilling F_1 . If we now play action b , we satisfy condition ρ surely. We end up reaching F_1 with probability $3/4 > 1/2$ and reaching F_2 with probability $1/2 > 1/6$. Note that in general, thresholds that are achievable with strict inequalities are located strictly inside the Pareto frontier.

Theorem 2 relies on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that Γ is clean w.r.t. $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$, and $s \in S$ is such that $s \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>p_i}(\diamond F_i)$, where all the p_i are probabilities representable as fractions of integers with bit-size at most D . Then there exists a memoryless (but possibly randomized) strategy σ and $B \leq 2^{\text{poly}(|\Gamma|+nD)}$ such that*

$$s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>p_i}(\diamond^{\leq B} F_i) .$$

Lemma 2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 and $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>x_i}(\diamond F_i)$,*

$$\text{Ach}(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x})) = \text{Ach}(\Gamma, s, \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \varphi(\mathbf{x})) ,$$

i.e., the Pareto frontiers of $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ coincide.

3.1 Proof of Lemma 1

We use the following auxiliary result to prove Lemma 1:

Lemma 3. *Consider a finite MC $\mathcal{M} = (S, \mathbf{P})$ with a state $s \in S$, target set $F \subseteq S$, and a rational probability $p = q/r$ where $q \geq 0, r > 0$ are integers with bit-size² at most D . Then if $s \models_{\mathcal{M}} \Pr_{>p}(\diamond F)$, we also have that $s \models_{\mathcal{M}} \Pr_{>p}(\diamond^{\leq B} F)$, where B can be chosen such that $B \leq 2^{\text{poly}(|\mathcal{M}|)+D}$ for a fixed polynomial poly.*

Proof. We give a proof based on Markov's inequality. Recall that Markov's inequality states that for a non-negative random variable X and all $a > 0$, we have $\Pr(X \geq a) \leq \frac{E[X]}{a}$, where $E[X]$ denotes the expected value of X . Now let $X_F: S^\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$ be the random variable $X_F(s_0 s_1 \dots) = \min\{i \mid s_i \in F\}$, with the convention that $\min \emptyset = \infty$. Intuitively, X_F is the number of steps until F is visited for the first time, or ∞ if F is not reached at all. We write $E_s[X_F]$ for the expected value of X_F w.r.t. probability measure $\Pr_s^{\mathcal{M}}$. Applying Markov's inequality directly to X_F is not useful because $E_s[X_F] = \infty$ is possible. However, since \mathcal{M} is finite, $E_s[X_F] = \infty$ if and only if $\Pr(\diamond F) < 1$, and moreover, $\Pr(X_F = \infty) = 1 - \Pr(\diamond F)$. Now consider the \mathbb{N}_0 -valued random variable \tilde{X}_F which is defined in the same way as X_F except that \tilde{X}_F is 0 if X_F is ∞ . With these definitions, it holds for all integers $B \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_s(\diamond^{\leq B} F) &= 1 - \Pr_s(X_F \geq B + 1) \\ &= 1 - \Pr_s(\tilde{X}_F \geq B + 1) - \Pr_s(X_F = \infty) \quad (\text{by definition of } \tilde{X}_F) \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{E_s[\tilde{X}_F]}{B + 1} - (1 - \Pr_s(\diamond F)) \quad (\text{Markov's inequality}) \\ &= \Pr_s(\diamond F) - \frac{E_s[\tilde{X}_F]}{B + 1} \quad (\text{simplifying}) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that if $B > \frac{E_s[\tilde{X}_F]}{\Pr_s(\diamond F) - p}$ then $\Pr_s(\diamond^{\leq B} F) > p$.

It only remains to bound the quantity $\frac{E_s[\tilde{X}_F]}{\Pr_s(\diamond F) - p}$.

- We consider the denominator first. $\Pr_s(\diamond F)$ is a rational number computable in polynomial time in $|\mathcal{M}|$ (by solving a linear equation system; see, e.g., [5, Chapter 10]), thus $\Pr_s(\diamond F)$ can be represented as a fraction of integers where both the numerator and the denominator have at most $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(|\mathcal{M}|))$ many bits. As a consequence, the number $\Pr_s(\diamond F) - p$ can be represented as a fraction of integers with bit-size at most $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(|\mathcal{M}|) + D)$.

² A positive integer n has bit-size $D = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil + 1$. The integer 0 has bit-size 1.

- Similarly, the expected value of \tilde{X}_F can also be expressed as the unique solution of a linear equation system with $|S|$ many equations and rational coefficients whose bit-size is at most polynomial in $|\mathcal{M}|$. We state this equation system (which appears to be somewhat less well known; see, e.g., equation (9) in [41]) for the sake of completeness: For all $s \in S$ we have a variable x_s and the equation

$$x_s = \begin{cases} \Pr_s(\diamond F) + \sum_{s' \in S} \mathbf{P}(s, s') \cdot x_{s'} & \text{if } s \notin F \wedge \Pr_s(\diamond F) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The unique solution of the above equation system is $x_s = E_s[\tilde{X}_F]$. Since the coefficients in the equation system have polynomial bit size (see previous point), the same applies to the expected value $E_s[\tilde{X}_F]$.

- It follows that $\frac{E_s[\tilde{X}_F]}{\Pr_s(\diamond F) - p}$ can be represented as fraction of integers where the numerator has bit-size at most $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(|\mathcal{M}|) + D)$ for a fixed polynomial poly. Hence it suffices to choose $B = 2^{\text{poly}(|\mathcal{M}|) + D}$. This completes the proof.

Proof (of Lemma 1). Since $s \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>p_i}(\diamond F_i)$, Theorem 1(4) asserts existence of a memoryless (but possibly randomized) strategy σ that can be constructed in time at most $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(|\Gamma| + nD))$, i.e., the probabilities in σ are representable as fractions of integers with bit-size at most $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(|\Gamma| + nD))$. Now consider the induced MC $\Gamma[\sigma]$. We have that $|\Gamma[\sigma]| \in \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(|\Gamma| + nD))$. Applying Lemma 3 we find that each individual F_i is reached with probability strictly greater than p_i after at most $2^{\text{poly}(|\Gamma| + nD)}$ steps.

3.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Lemma 2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 and $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>x_i}(\diamond F_i)$,*

$$\text{Ach}(\Gamma, s, \varphi(\mathbf{x})) = \text{Ach}(\Gamma, s, \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \varphi(\mathbf{x})) ,$$

i.e., the Pareto frontiers of $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \varphi(\mathbf{x})$ coincide.

Proof. We have to show that for all $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$, if $s \models_{\Gamma} \varphi(\mathbf{p})$ then $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \varphi(\mathbf{p})$. Suppose that $s \models_{\Gamma} \varphi(\mathbf{p})$. By Lemma 1 there exists a memoryless (but possibly randomized) strategy $\sigma_{\mathbf{Pr}}$ such that $s, \sigma_{\mathbf{Pr}} \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{>p_i}(\diamond^{\leq B} F_i)$, and thus in particular $s, \sigma_{\mathbf{Pr}} \models_{\Gamma} \varphi(\mathbf{p})$. Moreover, by the assumption that Γ is clean w.r.t. ρ there exists a memoryless deterministic strategy $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$ such that $s', \sigma_{\mathbf{S}} \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho)$ for all $s' \in S$. We now define a finite-memory strategy σ as follows: Play $\sigma_{\mathbf{Pr}}$ for B steps, then play according to $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$ ad infinitum. σ uses finite-memory because it only has to “count” to B and because both $\sigma_{\mathbf{Pr}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{S}}$ are memoryless. Then clearly $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \varphi(\mathbf{p})$, and moreover $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho)$ because parity is prefix-independent and σ switches to a winning strategy for $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$ after a finite prefix of the game. This concludes the proof.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Theorem 2.1 follows directly from Lemma 2 (which says that $\varphi(\mathbf{p}) \wedge \mathcal{S}(\rho)$ is achievable iff $\varphi(\mathbf{p})$ is achievable) and Theorem 1.4 (which asserts that checking if $\varphi(\mathbf{p})$ is achievable is in PTIME). Theorem 2.2 follows from the construction in the proof of Lemma 2.

4 Sure Parity and Lexicographic Reachability

We are now interested in surely satisfying a parity objective while maximizing the probability of reaching n target sets in lexicographic order. Towards this goal we define the notion of *projection* in Definition 3, a concept also used extensively in Section 5. We then propose an algorithm using projection and prove it correct.

Recall that the *lexicographic order* on $[0, 1]^n$ is the total order defined as $\mathbf{x} <_{lex} \mathbf{y}$ iff there is $k \in [n]$ such that (i) $x_k < y_k$ and (ii) $x_i = y_i$ for all $i \in [k-1]$. In the following, the order of our target sets F_1, \dots, F_n is relevant: For all $i, j \in [n]$, F_i appears before F_j iff F_i is more important than F_j .

One of the difficulties is that when considering the set of achievable points, the lexicographic supremum may not be achievable, i.e., the lexicographic maximum may not exist. We now formally give the main result of this section.

Theorem 3. *Let MDP Γ be clean w.r.t. parity objective ρ and target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$, and let $s \in S$ be a state. Then:*

- *It is decidable if $\mathbf{p}^* = \max_{lex} \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n \mid s \models_{\Gamma} \mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)\}$ exists by solving $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(n))$ many parity games (hence the problem is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ [10]).*
- *A witnessing strategy using at most $2|\Gamma||\rho|$ memory can be effectively constructed for the YES-instances.*

Our approach considers every target set F_i one by one, following the lexicographic order. The general idea is to successively remove all transitions that do not achieve the maximal probability to reach F_i . Thus, after having pruned transitions w.r.t. the first i target sets, any strategy that maximizes the probability to reach the set $F = F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n$ also maximizes the probabilities of reaching F_1, \dots, F_i lexicographically [18]. In order to find the maximal probability to achieve a single objective, we adapt the notion of *projection* from [27,28]. The main difference is that we keep reachability objectives, instead of converting them into reward objectives, enabling us to use existing results [8] on combinations of sure and almost-sure objectives.

We define the MDP $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$, the projection of MDP Γ on a non-zero vector $\mathbf{v} \in [0, 1]^n$ where we can freely assume $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 = 1$. Intuitively, to obtain $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$, we consider a k -dimensional face of the Pareto frontier of $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$, maximal in the direction \mathbf{v} . This is thus an intersection with a hyperplane, and defines a face of dimension k . We remove all available actions that are used in none of the strategies achieving this face of dimension k , i.e. we remove all non-optimal




Fig. 2. The MDP from Figure 1 projected on $\mathbf{v} = (0, 1)$. *Right:* The set of achievable points w.r.t. $\mathfrak{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq x_1}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{\geq x_2}(\diamond F_2)$ is $[0, 1/3] \times [0, 1] \cup \{(0, 1)\}$; the lexicographic maximum for order F_2, F_1 is thus $\mathbf{p}^* = (1, 0)$.

actions when trying to maximize in the direction \mathbf{v} . Our purpose is to obtain a new MDP, in which every strategy that almost-surely reaches a final state in F also maximizes the probability to reach these states weighted with the direction \mathbf{v} . We remark that in this new MDP, the parity condition ρ may not be surely satisfied from every state; we will thus need to address this condition later.

Definition 3 (Projection). Let $\Gamma = (S, \text{Act}, \mathbf{P})$ be clean w.r.t. $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. The projection $\Gamma^{\pi\mathbf{v}}$ of Γ in direction $\mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{0}$ with $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 = 1$, is defined in two steps: (1) Let $\Gamma' = (S', \text{Act}, \mathbf{P}')$ be an MDP where

- $S' = S \cup \{\perp\}$ where \perp is a fresh sink state, and
- \mathbf{P}' is defined similar to \mathbf{P} with the following modifications (let $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i$):
 - For all $s \in S \setminus F$, $a \in \text{Act}(s)$, and $s' \in F$, we set $\mathbf{P}'(s, a, s') = \mathbf{P}(s, a, s') \cdot \sum_{i: s' \in F_i} v_i$ and $\mathbf{P}'(s, a, \perp) = 1 - \sum_{s'' \in S} \mathbf{P}'(s, a, s'')$.
 - $\mathbf{P}'(\perp, a, \perp) = 1$, where $a \in \text{Act}$ is arbitrary.

(2) For each state $s \in S'$, let $y_s = \max_{\sigma} \Pr_s^{\Gamma'[\sigma]}(\diamond F)$ be the maximum probability to reach F from s in Γ' . The MDP $\Gamma^{\pi\mathbf{v}}$ is then obtained from Γ' by removing all actions $a \in \text{Act}(s)$ that do not satisfy $y_s = \sum_{s' \in S'} \mathbf{P}'(s, a, s') \cdot y_{s'}$.

Example 4. The MDP in Figure 2 results from projecting the MDP from Figure 1 on $\mathbf{v} = (0, 1)$ (\perp is not reachable). Only the actions reaching the blue target F_2 with maximal probability remain.

Given Γ, F_1, \dots, F_n and \mathbf{v} , it is clear from Definition 3 that we can construct the projection $\Gamma^{\pi\mathbf{v}}$ in polynomial time. Note that strategies in $\Gamma^{\pi\mathbf{v}}$ are still valid in Γ , but the converse is not necessarily the case as projection removes actions.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 3

We start with the following Lemma.

Lemma 4. Let MDP $\Gamma = (S, \text{Act}, \mathbf{P})$ be clean w.r.t. $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. For every $\mathbf{v} \in [0, 1]^n$, the MDP $\Gamma^{\pi\mathbf{v}}$ is computable.

Proof. To decide which actions to prune in Γ , we consider MDP Γ' as in Definition 3. We remark that strategies in Γ and in Γ' coincide since the new sink state \perp of Γ' only appears in transitions of Γ already going to a sink, and every other state and transition is identical in Γ and Γ' . In addition, for all strategies σ , given the maximal \mathbf{p} such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma'} \Pr_{\geq \mathbf{p}}(\diamond F)$, and among the $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]$ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$, any \mathbf{x} that maximizes $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ satisfies $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$. Indeed, any transition of Γ to some $s' \in F_i$ with probability x , goes to s' with probability $x \cdot v_i$ in Γ' . Thus $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma'} \Pr_{\geq p^*}(\diamond F)$ where p^* is the maximum achievable value if and only if both $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is maximal and $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]$.

For all states, we can compute all the actions that could be taken by some strategy σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma'} \Pr_{\geq x^*}(\diamond F)$. These actions coincide with the actions taken by a strategy σ such that $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is maximal, and $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]$. By removing all the other actions from every state, we obtain $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$.

It remains to show that any strategy that almost-surely reaches a target in $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$ is also maximizing $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ in the original MDP Γ . Since these MDPs share strategies maximizing $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ by construction, this is straightforward. We give the formal proof next.

Lemma 5. (*Key property of projection*) *Let $\Gamma = (S, Act, \mathbf{P})$ be clean w.r.t. $F_1, \dots, F_n, \perp \subseteq S$, and let $\mathbf{v} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 = 1$. Then for all strategies σ of $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$, the following holds: $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$ iff there exists $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ such that (i) $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is maximal among the achievable \mathbf{x} , and (ii) $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$.*

Proof. We first show the left to right direction. Let σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$. Let Γ' be as in Definition 3, hence $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma'} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond(F \cup \perp))$. There exists some optimal value p^* and some memoryless strategy σ' such that $s, \sigma' \models_{\Gamma} \Pr_{\geq p^*}(\diamond F)$. Since only actions maximizing the probability to reach F remain in $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$, we have $p^* = \Pr_{\Gamma'[\sigma]}(\diamond F) / \Pr_{\Gamma'[\sigma]}(\diamond(F \cup \perp)) = \Pr_{\Gamma'[\sigma]}(\diamond F)$. Thus $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \Pr_{\geq p^*}(\diamond F)$. As a consequence, there exists some \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ is maximal among the achievable \mathbf{x} , and $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$.

For the right to left direction, let σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ with $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ maximal among the achievable \mathbf{x} . Since Γ is clean there is some σ' such that $s, \sigma' \models_{\Gamma} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$. For every vector \mathbf{x}' such that $s, \sigma' \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x'_i}(\diamond F_i)$ we have $\mathbf{x}' \cdot \mathbf{v} \leq \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}$. Thus by considering Γ' we have for every $p \in [0, 1]$, if $s, \sigma' \models_{\Gamma'} \Pr_{\geq p}(\diamond F)$ then $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma'} \Pr_{\geq p}(\diamond F)$. Since $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}$ is obtained by removing states of Γ' that neither σ nor σ' visits, and since $s, \sigma' \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$ we have $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{v}}} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$.

We can now give an algorithm computing a strategy achieving a sure parity condition while maximizing lexicographically ordered reachability conditions. Remark that in this section we only need projection on unit vectors, the general construction is only used in Section 5. With Algorithm 1, we can then prove Theorem 3.

Algorithm 1 Sure parity and lexicographic reachability

Input: MDP Γ – clean w.r.t. parity objective ρ and $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$, a state $s \in S$
Output: If $\mathbf{p}^* = \max_{lex} \{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n \mid s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)\}$ exists, then the output is a witness strategy σ , otherwise the output is **false**.

- 1: $\Gamma_0 \leftarrow \Gamma$
- 2: $F \leftarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i$
- 3: **for** i from 1 to n **do**
- 4: Compute $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi e_i}$ ▷ See Definition 3.
- 5: $\Gamma_i \leftarrow$ result of pruning all states not satisfying $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ in $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi e_i}$.
- 6: **end for**
- 7: **if** s is not a state of Γ_n **then return false**
- 8: **else return** σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_n} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ ▷ By Theorem 3.
- 9: **end if**

Example 5. We follow Algorithm 1 and project the MDP of Figure 1 on $e_1 = (1, 0)$. After this projection, there only remains the uppermost state with action a , associated to point $(1, 1/3)$. This projected MDP does not satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$ and we conclude that there is no lexicographically optimal point for the order (e_1, e_2) .

We now show what happens if we start projecting on $e_2 = (0, 1)$. We obtain the MDP in Figure 2, with both full and dashed transitions: only the points that reach the blue state F_2 with maximal probability remain. Since the lowermost state does not satisfy the parity condition, it refutes $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$, and we also prune it, only keeping the full transitions. We thus only keep point $(0, 1)$ that can be achieved while satisfying parity condition ρ , and is thus optimal for this order.

Proof (of Theorem 3). We follow Algorithm 1. During iteration i , in line 4 we project the current MDP Γ_{i-1} on the next target set F_i , obtaining $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi e_i}$. By Lemma 5, a strategy satisfies $\text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ in $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi e_i}$ iff it maximizes p such that $\text{Pr}_{\geq p}(\diamond F_i)$ in Γ_{i-1} . We then prune all states that do not satisfy the conjunction with the parity condition $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$.

If the algorithm outputs a strategy σ , it follows $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_n} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ and is maximal for $<_{lex}$ on Γ . Let \mathbf{x} be the largest vector such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$. We now take any σ' , and the associated largest \mathbf{x}' and $m \in [n]$ such that for all $i \in [m]_0$ we have $x_i = x'_i$, but not for $m+1$, and such that $s, \sigma' \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \text{Pr}_{\geq x'_i}(\diamond F_i)$ (if such a σ' does not exist, all strategies yield the same value and so σ is optimal). Thus both σ and σ' are well defined on Γ_i and since σ is a strategy of the projected MDP $\Gamma_m^{\pi e_{m+1}}$, by Lemma 5 we have that $x'_{i+1} \leq x_{i+1}$, proving that σ is maximal for $<_{lex}$ on Γ .

If the output is **false**, since only Step 5 can prune states, this means that there was some strategy lexicographically maximizing the k first components and satisfying $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$, but of all these strategies, those also maximizing the $(k+1)$ th component did not satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$, hence there was no lexicographically optimal strategy satisfying $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$.

We show that Algorithm 1 solves a polynomial number of parity games of size polynomial in $|\Gamma|$. Indeed, $|\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi e_i}|$ only has one more state than Γ and at

most $|I|$ additional transitions (that may lead from states originally in I to the new state \perp). We then remove all states that do not satisfy $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$, which can be done by solving a polynomial number of parity games [8]. We do this step n times. Since there are n targets in I we have $n \leq |I|$. Thus we end up solving a number of parity games polynomial in I .

If the output is **true**, using [8] we can generate optimal finite-memory strategies. We give a precise bound on the amount of memory needed: such a finite-memory strategy is obtained through a reduction to a parity-Büchi game, which, as shown in the proof of Lemma 3 of [1], can be reduced to a mean-payoff parity game with a strict threshold of 0. It has been shown in Theorem 4 of [15] that if there exists a strategy for strict threshold 0, there also exists a strategy for threshold $\frac{1}{|I|}$ which implies there exists a winning strategy in the energy parity game with energy value $1 - \frac{1}{|I|(|I|+1)}$ for Büchi states and energy value $-\frac{1}{|I|(|I|+1)}$ for non-Büchi states. By Lemma 5 of [15] such energy parity games require winning strategies with memory at most $2|I||\rho|$. These strategies need to visit Büchi states infinitely often to satisfy their energy condition, and so are winning the parity-Büchi game initially defined. Winning strategies for energy parity games can be computed in $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$. A quasi-polynomial algorithm exists for mean-payoff parity games [25] (which is indeed quasi-polynomial since there are only two possible payoffs for every state, which is bounded: payoffs are either 0 or 1), but it is unclear if it can be used to find such polynomial-memory strategies.

5 Sure Parity and n non-Strict Reachability Thresholds

Finally, we consider the case of one sure parity condition and multiple *non-strict* threshold reachability objectives, i.e., formulas like $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$. We do not impose a lexicographic ordering on the target sets. Our main result is:

Theorem 4. *Let MDP Γ be clean w.r.t. parity objective ρ and target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. Further, let $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$, and let $s \in S$ be a state. Then:*

1. *The decision problem $\exists \sigma: s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ is in EXPTIME.*
2. *A witness strategy σ using at most $2^{\text{poly}(|I|+nD)}$ memory, where D is the bit-complexity of the rational numbers in \mathbf{p} , can be effectively constructed for the YES-instances.*

We solved the case where \mathbf{p} is strictly inside the Pareto frontier in Section 3. It remains to show how to achieve $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ when \mathbf{p} is exactly on the frontier. We first consider the case where \mathbf{p} is a vertex of the Pareto frontier, that we will then use as a base case for an arbitrary point \mathbf{p} of the frontier. We sketch the proof in the remainder of the section.

Since the Pareto frontier does not depend on the sure objective (cf. Lemma 2), to determine whether \mathbf{p} is exactly on the Pareto frontier, it suffices to check if $s \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ and $s \not\models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{> p_i}(\diamond F_i)$. The first formula checks if

\mathbf{p} is achievable, the second checks whether it is on the boundary. Hence the main difficulty is to decide whether adding a sure parity condition keeps the achievability of a point. We illustrate this in the following example.

Example 6. In the MDP of Figure 1, playing $pair_1$ then a forever gives a total probability of 1 of reaching F_1 and probability $1/3$ of reaching F_2 . This strategy does not surely satisfy the parity condition though, since there exists a path that visits the uppermost state, labelled 1, forever. Playing $pair_1$ and then b once surely reaches F_2 . It is thus possible to satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F_2)$, but not $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 1/3}(\diamond F_2)$. Still, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can achieve $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 1-\varepsilon}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 1/3-\varepsilon}(\diamond F_2)$ by Theorem 2, using a finite-memory strategy.

5.1 Vertex of the Pareto frontier

We first consider the easier case where we want to achieve a point which is a vertex of the Pareto frontier. We assume \mathbf{p} to be a vertex of the Pareto frontier. Our proof relies on projection (Definition 3). Indeed, since \mathbf{p} is a vertex, there exists some vector \mathbf{v} such that \mathbf{p} is the *unique* point of the Pareto frontier maximizing $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v}$. We obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Suppose that the MDP Γ is clean w.r.t. parity objective ρ and target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. Further, let $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$, and let $s \in S$ be a state. If \mathbf{p} is a vertex of the Pareto frontier of $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ from s , then we can decide if $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq p_i}(\diamond F_i)$ and if so give a finite-memory strategy.*

Proof. Since \mathbf{p} is a vertex of the Pareto frontier P , which is a convex polytope, there exists a half-space $H = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{x} \leq c\} \supseteq P$ where $c \in [0, 1]$, $\mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $\|\mathbf{w}\|_1 = 1$, and \mathbf{p} is the only element of P satisfying the constraint defining H with *equality*, that is $\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{p} = c$. By Lemma 5, $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{w}}} \Pr_{\geq 1}(\diamond F)$ iff $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ for all strategies σ in $\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{w}}$, and thus also

$$s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{w}}} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 1}(\diamond F) \quad \text{iff} \quad s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i).$$

Thus, using Theorem 1.3, we can decide whether $s \models_{\Gamma^{\pi \mathbf{w}}} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 1}(\diamond F)$ holds and if so, obtain a finite-memory strategy σ .

5.2 Arbitrary Point of the Pareto Frontier

We now consider any arbitrary point \mathbf{p} of the Pareto frontier. Since \mathbf{p} may be contained in a k -dimensional face of the frontier (with $k > 0$; $k = 0$ means that \mathbf{p} is a vertex, see Section 5.1), projecting on this face will not be sufficient to obtain \mathbf{p} . Similar to Algorithm 1, we iterate projections and state removal, thereby reducing the dimension of the Pareto frontier until either reducing \mathbf{p} to a vertex, or entering a situation where we cannot project anymore. We remark that the latter only happens in specific cases. To properly define these cases,




Fig. 3. The MDP of Figure 1 after projection on $\mathbf{v} = (1, 1)$.

given a Pareto frontier P , we consider the smallest vector space containing P . We show that we cannot project any more when \mathbf{p} is an interior point of P for this subspace, denoted $\mathbf{p} \in \text{int}_{\text{gen}(P)}(P)$. We obtain Algorithm 2.

Example 7. After projecting the MDP of Figure 1 on $\mathbf{v} = (1, 1)$, we obtain the MDP in Figure 3 (including both the dashed and the solid transitions). Since from the uppermost state, no strategy surely satisfies the parity condition, $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ does not hold. We thus prune the dashed transitions, and the Pareto frontier is now restricted between $(1/3, 1)$ and $(2/3, 2/3)$, see Figure 3 (right). To achieve e.g. $\mathbf{p} = (1/2, 5/6)$, which is strictly inside this line segment, it suffices to play pair_2 , then a once, and then finally b once.

To obtain our result, we prove the following. After projecting on a given vector, and removing any state refuting $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ we obtain some polytope P ; any point of P that is a topologically interior point in the smallest vector space containing P is achievable. Formally:

Lemma 7. *Let the MDP Γ be clean w.r.t. parity objective ρ and target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. Further, let $\mathbf{v} \in [0, 1]^n$, and $s \in S$. Let Γ_ρ be obtained by taking the MDP $\Gamma^{\pi\mathbf{v}}$ and pruning all states that refute $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$. Let $B \subseteq [0, 1]^n$ be the set of \leq -maximal points of the Pareto frontier of Γ_ρ from s . Then: For every $\mathbf{x} \in \text{int}_{\text{gen}(B)}(B)$, we have $s \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$, and we can compute a strategy that achieves this.*

The proof of this lemma is quite involved. Figure 4 provides some intuition on the proof. If \mathbf{x} is inside an m -dimensional surface B , we can find $m + 1$ elements of B such that \mathbf{x} is within their convex hull. These are y^1, y^2, y^3 in Figure 4. For every y^j , we can find a strategy satisfying $\bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \text{Pr}_{\geq y_i^j}(\diamond F_i)$. By playing such a strategy for sufficiently many steps, then switching to a strategy satisfying $\mathcal{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$, we can ε -approximate the y^j while staying inside B . Points achieved by such approximation are denoted z^1, z^2, z^3 in Figure 4. It then remains to show that if ε is small enough, \mathbf{x} is within the convex hull of z^1, z^2, z^3 and thus can be achieved.




Fig. 4. To obtain x on the two-dimension plane, we first take three points y^1, y^2, y^3 , then find ε small enough for x to be within the convex hull of any ε -approximation z^1, z^2, z^3 of y^1, y^2, y^3 .

Proof (of Lemma 7). We first show that it is sufficient to ε -approximate any point of B . Let m be the number of dimensions of B . Given $\mathbf{x} \in B$, we have $\mathbf{x} \in \text{int}_{\text{gen}(B)}(B)$ if and only if there exist $m+1$ points of B , denoted $\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{m+1} \in B$ such that \mathbf{x} is strictly inside the convex hull of $\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{m+1}$. There also exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{m+1} \in B$, if we have for all $j \in [m+1]$ that $|\mathbf{y}^j - \mathbf{z}^j| \leq \varepsilon$ (that is for all $i \in [n]$ we have $|y_i^j - z_i^j| \leq \varepsilon$), then \mathbf{x} is inside the convex hull of $\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{m+1}$. If for every \mathbf{z}^j we can find a strategy satisfying $s \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq z_i^j}(\diamond F_i)$, then by using a convex combination of such strategies we can get a strategy satisfying $s \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$. Given \mathbf{x} , we can find such $\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{m+1}$ and such ε . There remains to find for every \mathbf{y}^j a \mathbf{z}^j such that $|\mathbf{y}^j - \mathbf{z}^j| \leq \varepsilon$.

We now show that for any $\mathbf{y} \in B$, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathbf{z} \in B$ such that for all $i \in n$ we have $|y_i - z_i| \leq \varepsilon$ and a strategy σ such that $s \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq z_i}(\diamond F_i)$. The result follows since any interior point $\mathbf{x} \in \text{int}_{\text{gen}(B)}(B)$ can be obtained as a convex combination using strict inequalities of such vertices, and thus as a convex combination of some approximations of these vertices.

We fix $\mathbf{y} \in B$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let σ_y be a memoryless strategy such that $s \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq y_i}(\diamond F_i)$. Using Theorem 1, we can get $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that after playing σ_y for k rounds, we have probability at least $y_i - \varepsilon$ to have reached F_i . There exists some strategy σ_ρ such that for all states $s \in S$ we have $s, \sigma_\rho \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$. We now define strategy σ as follows: play σ_y for k steps, then from the current state s play σ_ρ . Strategy σ satisfies $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$ since it suffices σ_ρ does. Now, since $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$, by Lemma 5 there exists some $\mathbf{z} \in B$ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq z_i}(\diamond F_i)$. Since $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_\rho} \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq y_i - \varepsilon}(\diamond F_i)$, we have $z_i \geq y_i - \varepsilon$ and thus $|z_i - y_i| \leq \varepsilon$, concluding the proof.

We can now give our result stating that we can verify the achievability of an arbitrary point of the Pareto frontier.

Lemma 8. *Suppose that the MDP Γ is clean w.r.t. parity objective ρ and target sets $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$. Further, let $s \in S$ be a state, and*

$\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i \in [n]} \in [0, 1]^n$ *on the border of the Pareto frontier of $\bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$*

- *Checking whether $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ is decidable;*
- *if YES a witnessing strategy with at most $2|\Gamma||\rho|$ memory can be effectively computed.*

Proof. The proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of Theorem 3. We show that Algorithm 2 answers Lemma 8. The main differences with Algorithm 1 is that we must find the vector on which we project, and at the end of the loop of Algorithm 2 we have to split between the cases where \mathbf{x} is a vertex or not.

During iteration i , we first find a vector orthogonal to the face of P_i that \mathbf{x} belongs to. To do so, we may need to fully compute the Pareto frontier of Γ_{i-1} . In line 4 we project the current MDP Γ_{i-1} on vector \mathbf{v}_i , obtaining $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi \mathbf{v}_i}$. By Lemma 5, a strategy satisfies $\text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ in $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi \mathbf{e}_i}$ iff it maximizes p such that $\text{Pr}_{\geq p}(\diamond F_i)$ in Γ_{i-1} . We then prune all states that do not satisfy the conjunction with the parity condition $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$.

If \mathbf{x} is an interior point, it follows by Lemma 7 that we can find a strategy σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_i} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$. Otherwise, we start the loop again.

Since every time we project, it is onto a face of the Pareto frontier of dimension smaller than the current Pareto frontier, we can only take the loop at most n times. After this we go to line 9, and since \mathbf{x} is now a vertex of the Pareto frontier, we can use Lemma 6 to find whether there exists a strategy such that $s \models_{\Gamma_i} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$.

If the output is **false**, we remark that since projection in line 4 keeps all states belonging to strategies such that $\text{Pr}_{\geq p}(\diamond F_i)$ in Γ_{i-1} (by Lemma 5), it keeps all states belonging to strategies such that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$. Step 5 may prune states used in strategies such that $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$, but then by definition these strategies did not satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho)$. Hence, since none of the pruned states belonged to a strategies such that $s \models_{\Gamma_i} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$, the algorithm is correct.

We show that Algorithm 2 solves at most a polynomial number of parity game of size polynomial in $|\Gamma|$.

Indeed, to obtain $|\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi \mathbf{v}_i}|$, we have to compute the Pareto frontier of $|\Gamma_{i-1}|$. This new MDP only has one more state than Γ and at most $|\Gamma|$ additional transitions (that may lead from states originally in Γ to the new state \perp). We then remove once all states that do not satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$, which can be done by solving a polynomial number of parity games. Every time we do this step, we project onto a face of the Pareto frontier of dimension smaller than the current Pareto frontier and this can only happen at most n times. Thus we end up solving a number polynomial in n of parity game of size polynomial in Γ , and compute Pareto frontiers for MDPs with n objectives at most n times.

We output **true** iff we find a strategy σ that is a solution of $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_i} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \text{Pr}_{=1}(\diamond F)$ iff it is a solution of $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \text{Pr}_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$, and we can find strategies satisfying the left hand formula that use $2|\Gamma||\rho|$ memory, as proved in Theorem 3.

Algorithm 2 Sure parity and n non-strict reachability threshold objectives**Input:** MDP Γ – clean w.r.t. ρ and $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq S$, a state $s \in S$, a vector $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ **Output:** A strategy σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ if it exists, else **false**.

- 1: Set $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma$ and $i = 1$.
- 2: **while** \mathbf{x} is not a vertex of P_i , the Pareto frontier of Γ_i **do**
- 3: Get \mathbf{v}_i a vector orthogonal to the smallest face of P_i that \mathbf{x} belongs to.
- 4: Compute $\Gamma_i^{\pi \mathbf{v}_i}$ from s . ▷ By Lemma 5.
- 5: Set Γ_i by taking $\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi \mathbf{v}_i}$ and pruning all states that do not satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 1}(\diamond F)$.
- 6: If \mathbf{x} is an interior point of P_i return σ s.t. $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma_i} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ ▷
- By Lemma 7.
- 7: $i := i + 1$
- 8: **end while**
- 9: Check if there exists σ such that $s \models_{\Gamma_i} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$. ▷ By Lemma 6.
- 10: If such a σ does not exist then return **false**, else return σ .

Example 8. For the MDP from Figure 1, with initial state s , and where F_1 is the yellow target and F_2 is the blue target, we check if $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 2/3}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 2/3}(\diamond F_2)$. Point $(2/3, 2/3)$ is on the Pareto frontier but not a vertex of it, and following Algorithm 2, a vector orthogonal to it is $(1, 1)$. After projection on $(1, 1)$, we obtain the MDP in Figure 3 (left), with both full and dashed transitions. As in Example 7, no strategy satisfies surely the parity condition in the uppermost state, we prune the dashed transitions, restricting the Pareto frontier to between $(1/3, 1)$ and $(2/3, 2/3)$. Now $(2/3, 2/3)$ is a vertex of the new Pareto frontier, Lemma 6 tells us to project on vector $(2, 1)$, and so we prune transition a from the lowermost state, only keeping transition b . Since we can satisfy the parity condition from the lowermost state, we obtain that the strategy playing b twice satisfies $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 2/3}(\diamond F_1) \wedge \Pr_{\geq 2/3}(\diamond F_2)$.

5.3 Proof of Theorem 4

We can finally prove Theorem 4 as follows: We check if \mathbf{x} is on the border of the Pareto frontier. If it is not, Theorem 2 applies; otherwise, we apply Lemma 8.

Proof (of Theorem 4). We check if \mathbf{x} is on the border of the Pareto frontier of $\bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$. If it is not, $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$ holds by Theorem 2. Otherwise, it is on the border and we use Lemma 8 to decide if the property holds. Both cases give a finite-memory strategy σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$.

We show that Algorithm 2 solves at most a polynomial number of parity game of size polynomial in $|\Gamma|$. Indeed, to obtain $|\Gamma_{i-1}^{\pi \mathbf{v}_i}|$, we have to compute the Pareto frontier of $|\Gamma_{i-1}|$. This new MDP only has one more state than Γ and at most $|\Gamma|$ additional transitions (that may lead from states originally in Γ to the new state \perp). We then remove once all states that do not satisfy $\mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$, which can be done by solving a polynomial number of parity games. Every time we do this step, we project onto a face of the Pareto frontier of dimension smaller than the current Pareto frontier and this can only happen at most n times. Thus

we end up solving a number polynomial in n of parity game of size polynomial in Γ , and compute Pareto frontiers for MDPs with n objectives at most n times. Our EXPTIME complexity comes from the Pareto frontier computations. Indeed, Theorem 2.1 of [27] shows that such Pareto frontiers may have more than polynomially many vertices (more precisely, they may have $|\Gamma|^{\log(|\Gamma|)}$ many vertices). Thus, to our knowledge, the way to compute this Pareto frontier is to evaluate all possible memoryless strategies, which is exponential in the size of Γ .

We output **true** iff we find a strategy σ such that $s, \sigma \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \Pr_{=1}(\diamond F)$ iff σ is a solution of $s \models_{\Gamma} \mathbf{S}(\rho) \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} \Pr_{\geq x_i}(\diamond F_i)$.

The worst case memory bound comes from when we need to make a call to the strict threshold case, which as shown in Theorem 2 uses at most $2^{\text{poly}(|\Gamma|+nD)}$ memory.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

Combining sure parity and n reachability threshold objectives can be done via a reduction to parity games in the case of strict thresholds and when maximizing the threshold lexicographically, and in exponential time with non-strict thresholds. Finite-memory strategies suffice in all cases. One direction for future work is to implement our algorithms in the probabilistic model checker Storm [32]. Further open problems include the case where targets are not sinks, and the study of one sure parity and n parity threshold objectives. However, the exact memory required for one sure and *one* almost-sure parity is already unknown. It seems worthwhile to investigate if 1-bit Markov strategies suffice, as they do in countable MDPs with parity objectives [34]. In [1,8], the solution of sure parity and almost-sure reachability in MDPs relies on a reduction to a game with a *fair* opponent. Results in [14] concern *stochastic games* with a fair opponent, and may thus help extending the results from [1,8] to stochastic games. Another possible extension is to consider combinations of multiple objectives in *partially observable* MDPs (POMDPs), as in [21].

References

1. Shaull Almagor, Orna Kupferman, and Yaron Velner. Minimizing expected cost under hard boolean constraints, with applications to quantitative synthesis. In Josée Desharnais and Radha Jagadeesan, editors, *27th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2016, August 23-26, 2016, Québec City, Canada*, volume 59 of *LIPICs*, pages 9:1–9:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CONCUR.2016.9.
2. Benjamin Aminof, Marta Kwiatkowska, Bastien Maubert, Aniello Murano, and Sasha Rubin. Probabilistic strategy logic. In Sarit Kraus, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 32–38. ijcai.org, 2019. doi:10.24963/ijcai.2019/5.
3. Pranav Ashok, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Jan Kretínský, Maximilian Weininger, and Tobias Winkler. Approximating values of generalized-reachability stochastic games. In Holger Hermanns, Lijun Zhang, Naoki Kobayashi, and Dale Miller, editors, *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, pages 102–115. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3373718.3394761.
4. Christel Baier, Clemens Dubslaff, and Sascha Klüppelholz. Trade-off analysis meets probabilistic model checking. In Thomas A. Henzinger and Dale Miller, editors, *Joint Meeting of the Twenty-Third EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL) and the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS), CSL-LICS '14*, pages 1:1–1:10. ACM, 2014. doi:10.1145/2603088.2603089.
5. Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. *Principles of Model Checking*. MIT press, 2008.
6. Richard Bellman. A markovian decision process. *Journal of mathematics and mechanics*, pages 679–684, 1957.
7. Raphaël Berthon, Shibashis Guha, and Jean-François Raskin. Mixing probabilistic and non-probabilistic objectives in Markov decision processes. In Holger Hermanns, Lijun Zhang, Naoki Kobayashi, and Dale Miller, editors, *LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, pages 195–208. ACM, 2020. doi:10.1145/3373718.3394805.
8. Raphaël Berthon, Mickael Randour, and Jean-François Raskin. Threshold constraints with guarantees for parity objectives in Markov decision processes. In Ioannis Chatzigiannakis, Piotr Indyk, Fabian Kuhn, and Anca Muscholl, editors, *44th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2017, July 10-14, 2017, Warsaw, Poland*, volume 80 of *LIPICs*, pages 121:1–121:15. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.ICALP.2017.121.
9. Patricia Bouyer, Mauricio González, Nicolas Markey, and Mickael Randour. Multi-weighted Markov decision processes with reachability objectives. In *GandALF*, volume 277 of *EPTCS*, pages 250–264, 2018.
10. Gilles Brassard. A note on the complexity of cryptography (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 25(2):232–233, 1979.
11. Tomáš Brázdil, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Vojtech Forejt, and Antonín Kucera. Multigain: A controller synthesis tool for MDPs with multiple mean-payoff objectives. In Christel Baier and Cesare Tinelli, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 21st International Conference, TACAS*

2015. *Proceedings*, volume 9035 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 181–187. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-46681-0_12.
12. Véronique Bruyère, Emmanuel Filiot, Mickael Randour, and Jean-François Raskin. Meet your expectations with guarantees: Beyond worst-case synthesis in quantitative games. *Information and Computation*, 254:259–295, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2016.10.011.
 13. Cristian S. Calude, Sanjay Jain, Bakhadyr Khoussainov, Wei Li, and Frank Stephan. Deciding parity games in quasipolynomial time. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017*, pages 252–263. ACM, 2017. doi:10.1145/3055399.
 14. Pablo F. Castro, Pedro R. D’Argenio, Ramiro Demasi, and Luciano Putruele. Playing against fair adversaries in stochastic games with total rewards. In Sharon Shoham and Yakir Vizel, editors, *Computer Aided Verification - 34th International Conference, CAV 2022, Haifa, Israel, August 7-10, 2022, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 13372 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 48–69. Springer, 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-13188-2_3.
 15. Krishnendu Chatterjee and Laurent Doyen. Energy parity games. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 458:49–60, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2012.07.038.
 16. Krishnendu Chatterjee, Thomas A Henzinger, and Nir Piterman. Strategy logic. *Information and Computation*, 208(6):677–693, 2010.
 17. Krishnendu Chatterjee, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Stefanie Mohr, Maximilian Weininger, and Tobias Winkler. Stochastic games with lexicographic objectives. *Formal Methods in System Design*, pages 1–41, 2023.
 18. Krishnendu Chatterjee, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Maximilian Weininger, and Tobias Winkler. Stochastic games with lexicographic reachability-safety objectives. In *CAV (2)*, volume 12225 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 398–420. Springer, 2020.
 19. Krishnendu Chatterjee, Zuzana Kretínská, and Jan Kretínský. Unifying two views on multiple mean-payoff objectives in Markov decision processes. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 13(2), 2017. doi:10.23638/LMCS-13(2:15)2017.
 20. Krishnendu Chatterjee, Rupak Majumdar, and Thomas A. Henzinger. Markov decision processes with multiple objectives. In *STACS*, volume 3884 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 325–336. Springer, 2006.
 21. Krishnendu Chatterjee, Petr Novotný, Guillermo A. Pérez, Jean-François Raskin, and Dorde Zikelic. Optimizing expectation with guarantees in POMDPs. In Satinder Singh and Shaul Markovitch, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, February 4-9, 2017, San Francisco, California, USA*, pages 3725–3732. AAAI Press, 2017. URL: <http://aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI17/paper/view/14354>.
 22. Krishnendu Chatterjee and Nir Piterman. Combinations of qualitative winning for stochastic parity games. In *30th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2019*, volume 140 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019. URL: <http://www.dagstuhl.de/dagpub/978-3-95977-121-4>.
 23. Edmund M. Clarke, Thomas A. Henzinger, Helmut Veith, and Roderick Bloem, editors. *Handbook of Model Checking*. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8.
 24. Lorenzo Clemente and Jean-François Raskin. Multidimensional beyond worst-case and almost-sure problems for mean-payoff objectives. In *30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015*, pages 257–268. IEEE Computer Society, 2015. doi:10.1109/LICS.2015.33.

25. Laure Daviaud, Marcin Jurdzinski, and Ranko Lazic. A pseudo-quasi-polynomial algorithm for mean-payoff parity games. In Anuj Dawar and Erich Grädel, editors, *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2018, Oxford, UK, July 09-12, 2018*, pages 325–334. ACM, 2018. doi:10.1145/3209108.3209162.
26. E. Allen Emerson, Charanjit S. Jutla, and A. Prasad Sistla. On model checking for the μ -calculus and its fragments. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 258(1-2):491–522, 2001. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00034-7.
27. Kousha Etessami, Marta Z. Kwiatkowska, Moshe Y. Vardi, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Multi-objective model checking of Markov decision processes. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 4(4), 2008.
28. Vojtech Forejt, Marta Z. Kwiatkowska, and David Parker. Pareto curves for probabilistic model checking. In *ATVA*, volume 7561 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 317–332. Springer, 2012.
29. Branko Grünbaum, Victor Klee, Micha A Perles, and Geoffrey Colin Shephard. *Convex polytopes*, volume 16. Springer, 1967.
30. Ernst Moritz Hahn, Mateo Perez, Sven Schewe, Fabio Somenzi, Ashutosh Trivedi, and Dominik Wojtczak. Good-for-MDPs automata for probabilistic analysis and reinforcement learning. In *TACAS (1)*, volume 12078 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 306–323. Springer, 2020.
31. Arnd Hartmanns, Sebastian Junges, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Tim Quatmann. Multi-cost bounded tradeoff analysis in MDP. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 64(7):1483–1522, 2020.
32. Christian Hensel, Sebastian Junges, Joost-Pieter Katoen, Tim Quatmann, and Matthias Volk. The probabilistic model checker storm. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 24(4):589–610, 2022.
33. Marcin Jurdzinski. Deciding the winner in parity games is in $UP \cap co-UP$. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 68(3):119–124, 1998. doi:10.1016/S0020-0190(98)00150-1.
34. Stefan Kiefer, Richard Mayr, Mahsa Shirmohammadi, and Patrick Totzke. Strategy complexity of parity objectives in countable MDPs. In Igor Konnov and Laura Kovács, editors, *31st International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2020, September 1-4, 2020, Vienna, Austria (Virtual Conference)*, volume 171 of *LIPICs*, pages 39:1–39:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.CONCUR.2020.39.
35. Marta Z. Kwiatkowska, Gethin Norman, and David Parker. PRISM 4.0: Verification of probabilistic real-time systems. In *CAV*, volume 6806 of *LNCS*, pages 585–591. Springer, 2011.
36. Shuwa Miura, Kyle Hollins Wray, and Shlomo Zilberstein. Heuristic search for SSPs with lexicographic preferences over multiple costs. In Lukás Chrupa and Alessandro Saetti, editors, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Symposium on Combinatorial Search, SOCS 2022, Vienna, Austria, July 21-23, 2022*, pages 127–135. AAAI Press, 2022. URL: <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/SOCS/article/view/21760>.
37. Martin L. Puterman. *Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 1994.
38. Mickael Randour, Jean-François Raskin, and Ocan Sankur. Percentile queries in multi-dimensional Markov decision processes. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 50(2):207–248, 2017. doi:10.1007/s10703-016-0262-7.
39. Diederik M. Roijers, Peter Vamplew, Shimon Whiteson, and Richard Dazeley. A survey of multi-objective sequential decision-making. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 48:67–113, 2013. doi:10.1613/jair.3987.

40. Sven Schewe, Alexander Weinert, and Martin Zimmermann. Parity games with weights. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 15(3), 2019. doi:10.23638/LMCS-15(3:20)2019.
41. Tobias Winkler and Joost-Pieter Katoen. On certificates, expected runtimes, and termination in probabilistic pushdown automata. In *LICS*, pages 1–13, 2023.
42. Tobias Winkler and Maximilian Weininger. Stochastic games with disjunctions of multiple objectives. In *GandALF*, volume 346 of *EPTCS*, pages 83–100, 2021.
43. Kyle Hollins Wray, Shlomo Zilberstein, and Abdel-illah Mouaddib. Multi-objective MDPs with conditional lexicographic reward preferences. In Blai Bonet and Sven Koenig, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, January 25-30, 2015, Austin, Texas, USA*, pages 3418–3424. AAAI Press, 2015. URL: <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI15/paper/view/9471>.