

Fragility and Robustness in Mean-payoff Adversarial Stackelberg Games

Mrudula Balachander

Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Shibashis Guha

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, India

Jean-François Raskin

Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Abstract

Two-player mean-payoff Stackelberg games are nonzero-sum infinite duration games played on a bi-weighted graph by Leader (Player 0) and Follower (Player 1). Such games are played sequentially: first, Leader announces her strategy, second, Follower chooses his best-response. If we cannot impose which best-response is chosen by Follower, we say that Follower, though strategic, is adversarial towards Leader. The maximal value that Leader can get in this nonzero-sum game is called the adversarial Stackelberg value (ASV) of the game.

We study the robustness of strategies for Leader in these games against two types of deviations: (i) Modeling imprecision - the weights on the edges of the game arena may not be exactly correct, they may be delta-away from the right one. (ii) Sub-optimal response - Follower may play epsilon-optimal best-responses instead of perfect best-responses. First, we show that if the game is zero-sum then robustness is guaranteed while in the nonzero-sum case, optimal strategies for ASV are fragile. Second, we provide a solution concept to obtain strategies for Leader that are robust to both modeling imprecision, and as well as to the epsilon-optimal responses of Follower, and study several properties and algorithmic problems related to this solution concept.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Solution concepts in game theory; Theory of computation → Mathematical optimization; Theory of computation → Logic and verification

Keywords and phrases mean-payoff, Stackelberg games, synthesis

Funding This work is partially supported by the PDR project Subgame perfection in graph games (F.R.S.-FNRS), the ARC project Non-Zero Sum Game Graphs: Applications to Reactive Synthesis and Beyond (Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles), the EOS project Verifying Learning Artificial Intelligence Systems (F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO), and the COST Action 16228 GAMENET (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

1 Introduction

Stackelberg games [18] were first introduced to model strategic interactions among rational agents in markets that consist of Leader and Follower(s). Leader in the market makes her strategy public and Follower(s) respond by playing an optimal response to this strategy. Here, we consider Stackelberg games as a framework for the synthesis of reactive programs [16, 2]. These programs maintain a continuous interaction with the environment in which they operate; they are *deterministic functions* that given a history of interactions so far choose an action. Our work is a contribution to *rational synthesis* [9, 15], a nonzero-sum game setting where both the program and the environment are considered as rational agents that have their own goals. While Boolean ω -regular payoff functions have been studied in [9, 15], here we study the quantitative long-run average (mean-payoff) function.

We illustrate our setting with the example of a game graph as shown in Figure 1. The set V of vertices is partitioned into V_0 (represented by circles) and V_1 (represented by


squares) that are owned by Leader (also called Player 0) and Follower (also called Player 1) respectively. In the tuple on the edges, the first element is the payoff of Leader, while the second one is the payoff of Follower (weights are omitted if they are both equal to 0). Each player's objective is to maximize the long run average of the payoffs that she receives (a.k.a. mean-payoff). In the adversarial Stackelberg setting, Player 0 (Leader) first announces how she will play then Player 1 (Follower) chooses one of his best-responses to this strategy. Here, there are two choices for Player 0: L or R . As Player 1 is assumed to be rational, Player 0 deduces that she must play L . Indeed, the best response of Player 1 is then to play LL and the reward she obtains is 10. This is better than playing R , for which the best-response of Player 1 is RL , and the reward is 8 instead of 10. Note that if there are several possible best responses for Player 1, then we consider the worst-case: Player 0 has no control on the choice of best-responses by Player 1.

Quantitative models and robustness The study of adversarial Stackelberg games with mean-payoff objectives has been started in [8] with the concept of *adversarial Stackelberg value* (ASV for short). ASV is the best value that Leader can obtain by fixing her strategy and facing any rational response by Follower. As this setting is quantitative, it naturally triggers questions about *robustness* that were left open in the above paper.

Robustness is a *highly desirable* property of quantitative models: small changes in the quantities appearing in a model M (e.g. rewards, probabilities, etc.) should have small impacts on the predictions made from M , see e.g. [1]. Robustness is thus crucial because it accounts for modelling imprecision that are inherent in quantitative modelling and those imprecision may have important consequences. For instance, a reactive program synthesized from a model M should provide acceptable performances if it is executed in a real environment that differ slightly w.r.t. the quantities modeled in M .

Some classes of models are robust. For instance, consider two-player *zero-sum* mean-payoff games where players have fully antagonistic objectives. The *value* of a two-player zero-sum mean-payoff \mathcal{G} is the maximum mean-payoff that Player 0 can ensure against all strategies of Player 1. A strategy σ_0 that enforces the optimal value c in \mathcal{G} is *robust* in the following sense. Let $\mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$ be the set of games obtained by increasing or decreasing the weights on the edges of \mathcal{G} by at most δ . Then for all $\delta > 0$, and for all $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$, the strategy σ_0 ensures in \mathcal{H} a mean-payoff of at least $c - \delta$ for Player 0 against any strategy of Player 1 (Theorem 1). So slight changes in the quantities appearing in the model have only a small impact on the worst-case value enforced by the strategy.

The situation is more complex and less satisfactory in *nonzero-sum* games. Strategies that enforce the ASV proposed in [8] may be *fragile*: slight differences in the weights of the game, or in the optimality of the response by Player 1, may lead to large differences in the value obtained by the strategy. We illustrate these difficulties on our running example. The strategy of Player 0 that chooses L in v_0 ensures her a payoff of 10 which is the ASV. Indeed, the unique best-response of Player 1 against L is to play LL from v_1 . However, if the weights in \mathcal{G} are changed by up to $\pm\delta = \pm 0.6$ then there is a game $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$ in which the weight on the self-loop over vertex v_4 changes to e.g. 9.55, and the weight on the self-loop over v_3 changes to e.g. 9.45, and the action LR becomes better for Player 1. So the value of L in \mathcal{H} against a rational adversary is now 0 instead of 10. Thus a slight change in the rewards for Player 1 (due to e.g. modelling imprecision) may have a dramatic effect on the value of the optimal strategy L computed on the model \mathcal{G} when evaluated in \mathcal{H} .



■ **Figure 1** A game in which the strategy of Leader that maximizes the adversarial Stackelberg is fragile while the strategy of Leader that maximizes the $\epsilon = 1$ -adversarial Stackelberg value is robust.

Contributions As a remedy to this situation, we provide an alternative notion of value that is better-suited to synthesize strategies that are robust against perturbations. We consider two types of perturbations. First, the strategies computed for this value are robust against *modeling imprecision*: if a strategy has been synthesized from a weighted game graph with weights that are possibly slightly wrong, the value that this strategy delivers is guaranteed to be close to what the model predicts. Second, strategies computed for this value are robust against *sub-optimal responses*: small deviations from the best-response by the adversary have only limited effect on the value guaranteed by the strategy.

Our solution relies on relaxing the notion of best-responses of Player 1 *in the original model* \mathcal{G} . More precisely, we define the ϵ -adversarial Stackelberg value (ASV^ϵ , for short) as the value that Leader can enforce against all ϵ -best responses of Follower. Obviously, this directly accounts for the second type of perturbations. But we show that, additionally, this accounts for the first type of perturbations: if a strategy σ_0 enforces an ASV^ϵ equal to c then for all games $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm \frac{\epsilon}{2}}$, we have that σ_0 enforce a value larger than $c - \epsilon$ in \mathcal{H} (Theorem 6 and Theorem 5).

We illustrate this by considering again the example of Figure 1. Here, if we consider that the adversary can play $2\delta = 1.2$ -best responses instead of best responses only, then the optimal strategy of Player 0 is now R and it has a ASV^ϵ equal to 8. This value is guaranteed to be robust for all games $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm \delta}$ as R is guaranteed to enforce a payoff that is larger than $8 - \delta$ in all games in $\mathcal{G}^{\pm \delta}$. Stated otherwise, we use the notion of ASV^ϵ in the original game to find a strategy for Player 0 that she uses in the perturbed model while playing against a rational adversary. Thus we show that in the event of modelling imprecision resulting in a perturbed model, the solution concept to be used is ASV^ϵ instead of ASV since the former provides strategies that are robust to such perturbations.

	Robustness	Threshold Problem	Computing ASV	Achievability
Adversarial best responses of Follower	No [Prop 2, Prop 3]	NP [8] Finite Memory Strategy [Thm 18] Memoryless Strategy [Thm 20]	Theory of Reals [8]	No [8]
Adversarial ϵ -best responses of Follower	Yes [Thm 5, Thm 6]	NP [Thm 12] Finite Memory Strategy [Thm 12] Memoryless Strategy [Thm 20]	Theory of Reals [Thm 25] Solving LP in EXPTIME [Thm 28]	Yes [Thm 31] (Requires Infinite Memory [Thm 34])

■ **Table 1** Summary of our results

In addition to proving the fragility of the original concept introduced in [8] (Proposition 2) and the introduction of the new notion of value ASV^ϵ that is robust against modelling

imprecision (Theorem 5), we provide algorithms to handle ASV^ϵ . First, we show how to decide the threshold problem for ASV^ϵ in nondeterministic polynomial time and that finite memory strategies suffice (Theorem 12). Second, we provide an algorithm to compute ASV^ϵ when ϵ is fixed (Theorem 25). Third, we provide an algorithm that given a threshold value c , computes the largest possible ϵ such that $ASV^\epsilon > c$ (Corollary 30). These three results form the core technical contributions of this paper and they are presented in Section 4 and Section 5. Additionally, in Section 6, we show that ASV^ϵ is always achievable (Theorem 31), which is in contrast to the case in [8] where Follower only plays best-responses. Finally, we provide results that concern the memory needed for players to play optimally, and complexity results for subcases (for example when Players are assumed to play memoryless). Our contributions have been summarized in Table 1, where the results obtained in this work are in bold.

Related Works Stackelberg games on graphs have been first considered in [9], where the authors study rational synthesis for ω -regular objectives with co-operative Follower(s). In [8], Stackelberg mean-payoff games in adversarial setting, and Stackelberg discounted sum games in both adversarial and co-operative setting have been considered. However, as pointed out earlier, the model of [8] is not robust to perturbations. In [10], mean-payoff Stackelberg games in the co-operative setting have been studied. In [13], the authors study the effects of limited memory on both Nash and Stackelberg (or leader) strategies in multi-player discounted sum games. Incentive equilibrium over bi-matrix games and over mean-payoff games in a co-operative setting have been studied in [11] and [12] respectively. In [15], adversarial rational synthesis for ω -regular objectives have been studied. In [7], precise complexity results for various ω -regular objectives have been established for both adversarial and co-operative settings. In [6, 4], secure Nash equilibrium has been studied, where each player first maximises her own payoff, and then minimises the payoff of the other player; Player 0 and Player 1 are symmetric there unlike in Stackelberg games. For discounted sum objectives, in [8], the gap problem has been studied. Given rationals c and δ , a solution to the gap problem can decide if $ASV > c + \delta$ or $ASV < c - \delta$. The threshold problem was left open in [8], and is technically challenging. We leave the case of analysing robustness for discounted sum objective for future work.

2 Preliminaries

We denote by \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{N}^+ , \mathbb{Q} , and \mathbb{R} the set of naturals, the set of naturals excluding 0, the set of rationals, and the set of reals respectively.

Arenas An (bi-weighted) arena $\mathcal{A} = (V, E, \langle V_0, V_1 \rangle, w_0, w_1)$ consists of a finite set V of vertices, a set $E \subseteq V \times V$ of edges such that for all $v \in V$ there exists $v' \in V$ and $(v, v') \in E$, a partition $\langle V_0, V_1 \rangle$ of V , where V_0 (resp. V_1) is the set of vertices for Player 0 (resp. Player 1), and two edge weight functions $w_0 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $w_1 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. In the sequel, we denote the maximum absolute value of a weight in \mathcal{A} by W . A strongly connected component of a directed graph is a subgraph that is strongly connected. In the sequel, unless otherwise mentioned, we denote by SCC a subgraph that is strongly connected, and which may or may not be maximal.

Plays and histories A play in \mathcal{A} is an infinite sequence of vertices $\pi = \pi_0 \pi_1 \dots \in V^\omega$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(\pi_k, \pi_{k+1}) \in E$. A *history* in \mathcal{A} is a (non-empty) prefix of a play

in \mathcal{A} . Given $\pi = \pi_0\pi_1\cdots \in \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the prefix $\pi_0\pi_1\cdots\pi_k$ of π is denoted by $\pi_{\leq k}$. We denote by $\text{inf}(\pi)$ the set of vertices v that appear infinitely many times along π , i.e., $\text{inf}(\pi) = \{v \in V \mid \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \cdot \exists j \in \mathbb{N}, j \geq i : \pi(j) = v\}$. It is easy to see that $\text{inf}(\pi)$ forms an SCC in the underlying graph of the arena \mathcal{A} . We denote by $\text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\text{Hist}_{\mathcal{A}}$ the set of plays and the set of histories in \mathcal{A} respectively; the symbol \mathcal{A} is omitted when clear from the context. Given $i \in \{0, 1\}$, the set $\text{Hist}_{\mathcal{A}}^i$ denotes the set of histories such that their last vertex belongs to V_i . We denote the first vertex and the last vertex of a history h by $\text{first}(h)$ and $\text{last}(h)$ respectively.

Games A *mean-payoff game* $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \langle \underline{\text{MP}}_0, \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \rangle)$ consists of a bi-weighted arena \mathcal{A} , payoff functions $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 : \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1 : \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for for Player 0 and Player 1 respectively which are defined as follows. Given a play $\pi \in \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $i \in \{0, 1\}$, the payoff $\underline{\text{MP}}_i(\pi)$ is given by $\underline{\text{MP}}_i(\pi) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} w_i(\pi_{\leq k})$, where the weight $w_i(h)$ of a history $h \in \text{Hist}$ is the sum of the weights assigned by w_i to its edges. In our definition of the mean-payoff, we have used \liminf as the limit of the successive average may not exist. We will also need the \limsup case for technical reasons. Here is the formal definition together with its notation: $\overline{\text{MP}}_i(\pi) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} w_i(\pi_{\leq k})$. The size of the game \mathcal{G} , denoted $|\mathcal{G}|$, is the sum of the number of vertices and edges appearing in the arena \mathcal{A} .

Unfolding of a game Let V and E be respectively the set of vertices and the set of edges of \mathcal{G} . The *unfolding* of the game \mathcal{G} starting from a vertex $v \in V$ is a tree $T_v(\mathcal{G})$ of infinite depth with its root v such that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of plays π of \mathcal{G} with $\text{first}(\pi) = v$ and the branches of $T_v(\mathcal{G})$. Every node v_1 of $T_v(\mathcal{G})$ belongs to V , and there is an edge from v_1 to v_2 in $T_v(\mathcal{G})$ iff $(v_1, v_2) \in E$. Every node $p \in V^+$ of $T_v(\mathcal{G})$ is a play $p = v_1 \dots v_n$ in \mathcal{G} , where $v_1 = v$. There is an edge from $p = v_1 \dots v_n$ to $p' = v_1 \dots v_n v'_n$ iff $(v_n, v'_n) \in E$.

Strategies and payoffs A strategy for Player $i \in \{0, 1\}$ in the game \mathcal{G} is a function $\sigma : \text{Hist}_{\mathcal{A}}^i \rightarrow V$ that maps histories ending in a vertex $v \in V_i$ to a successor of v . The set of all strategies of Player $i \in \{0, 1\}$ in the game \mathcal{G} is denoted by $\Sigma_i(\mathcal{G})$, or Σ_i when \mathcal{G} is clear from the context. A strategy has memory M if it can be realized as the output of a state machine with M states. A memoryless strategy is a function that only depends on the last element of the history $h \in \text{Hist}$. We denote by Σ_i^{ML} the set of memoryless strategies of Player i , and by Σ_i^{FM} her set of finite memory strategies. A *profile* is a pair of strategies $\bar{\sigma} = (\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$, where $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0(\mathcal{G})$ and $\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1(\mathcal{G})$. As we consider games with perfect information and deterministic transitions, any profile $\bar{\sigma}$ yields, from any history h , a unique play or *outcome*, denoted $\text{Out}_h(\mathcal{G}, \bar{\sigma})$. Formally, $\text{Out}_h(\mathcal{G}, \bar{\sigma})$ is the play π such that $\pi_{\leq |h|-1} = h$ and $\forall k \geq |h| - 1$ it holds that $\pi_{k+1} = \sigma_i(\pi_{\leq k})$ if $\pi_k \in V_i$. We write $h \leq \pi$ whenever h is a prefix of π . The set of outcomes compatible with a strategy $\sigma \in \Sigma_{i \in \{0, 1\}}(\mathcal{G})$ after a history h is $\text{Out}_h(\mathcal{G}, \sigma) = \{\pi \mid \exists \sigma' \in \Sigma_{1-i}(\mathcal{G}) \text{ such that } \pi = \text{Out}_h(\mathcal{G}, (\sigma, \sigma'))\}$. Each outcome $\pi \in \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \langle \underline{\text{MP}}_0, \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \rangle)$ yields a payoff $\underline{\text{MP}}(\pi) = (\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi))$.

Usually, we consider instances of games such that the players start playing at a fixed vertex v_0 . Thus, we call an initialized game a pair (\mathcal{G}, v_0) , where \mathcal{G} is a game and $v_0 \in V$ is the initial vertex. When v_0 is clear from context, we use \mathcal{G} , $\text{Out}(\mathcal{G}, \bar{\sigma})$, $\text{Out}(\mathcal{G}, \sigma)$, $\underline{\text{MP}}(\bar{\sigma})$ instead of \mathcal{G}_{v_0} , $\text{Out}_{v_0}(\mathcal{G}, \bar{\sigma})$, $\text{Out}_{v_0}(\mathcal{G}, \sigma)$, $\underline{\text{MP}}_{v_0}(\bar{\sigma})$. We sometimes omit \mathcal{G} when it is clear from the context.

Best-responses, ϵ -best-responses Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \langle \underline{\text{MP}}_0, \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \rangle)$ be a two-dimensional mean-payoff game on the bi-weighted arena \mathcal{A} . Given a strategy σ_0 for Player 0, we define

1. Player 1's best responses to σ_0 , denoted by $\text{BR}_1(\sigma_0)$, as:

$$\{\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1 \mid \forall v \in V. \forall \sigma'_1 \in \Sigma_1 : \text{MP}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) \geq \text{MP}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma'_1))\}$$

2. Player 1's ϵ -best-responses to σ_0 , for $\epsilon > 0^1$, denoted by $\text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$, as:

$$\{\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1 \mid \forall v \in V. \forall \sigma'_1 \in \Sigma_1 : \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma'_1)) - \epsilon\}$$

We note here that the definitions of best-responses can also be defined if we consider \limsup instead of \liminf in the mean-payoff functions.

We also introduce the following notation for zero-sum games (that are needed as intermediary steps in our algorithms). Let \mathcal{A} be an arena, $v \in V$ one of its states, and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be a set of plays (called objective), then we write $\mathcal{A}, v \models i \gg \mathcal{O}$, if:

$$\exists \sigma_i \in \Sigma_i. \forall \sigma_{1-i} \in \Sigma_{1-i} : \text{Out}_v(\mathcal{A}, (\sigma_i, \sigma_{1-i})) \in \mathcal{O}, \text{ for } i \in \{0, 1\}$$

All the zero-sum games we consider in this paper are *determined* meaning that for all \mathcal{A} , for all objectives $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$ we have that $\mathcal{A}, v \models i \gg \mathcal{O} \iff \mathcal{A}, v \not\models 1-i \gg \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{O}$. We sometimes omit \mathcal{A} when the arena being referenced is clear from the context.

Convex hull and F_{\min} Given a finite dimension d , a finite set $X \subset \mathbb{Q}^d$ of rational vectors, we define the convex hull $\text{CH}(X) = \{v \mid v = \sum_{x \in X} \alpha_x \cdot x \wedge \forall x \in X : \alpha_x \in [0, 1] \wedge \sum_{x \in X} \alpha_x = 1\}$ as the set of all their convex combinations. Let $f_{\min}(X)$ be the vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d)$ where $v_i = \min\{c \mid \exists x \in X : x_i = c\}$ i.e. the vector v is the pointwise minimum of the vectors in X . For $S \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^d$, we define $F_{\min}(S) = \{f_{\min}(P) \mid P \text{ is a finite subset of } S\}$.

Mean-payoffs induced by simple cycles A *cycle* c is a sequence of edges that starts and stops in a given vertex v , it is simple if it does not contain repetition of any other vertex. Given an SCC S , we write $\mathbb{C}(S)$ for the set of simple cycles inside S . Given a simple cycle c , for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, let $\text{MP}_i(c) = \frac{w_i(c)}{|c|}$ be the mean of the weights² in each dimension along the edges in the simple cycle c , and we call the pair $(\text{MP}_0(c), \text{MP}_1(c))$ the mean-payoff coordinate of the cycle c . We write $\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S))$ for the convex-hull of the set of mean-payoff coordinates of simple cycles of S .

Adversarial Stackelberg Value for MP Since the set of best-responses in mean-payoff games can be empty (See Lemma 3 of [8]), we use the notion of ϵ -best-responses for the definition of ASV which are guaranteed to always exist³. We define

$$\text{ASV}(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0, \epsilon > 0} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))^4$$

¹ Since we will use ϵ in ASV^ϵ to add robustness, we only consider the cases in which ϵ is strictly greater than 0.

² We do not use $\underline{\text{MP}}_i$ since \liminf and \limsup are the same for a finite sequence of edges.

³ For a game \mathcal{G} , we also use $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon$, and drop the subscript \mathcal{G} when it is clear from the context.

⁴ The definition of ASV, as it appears in [8], is syntactically different but the two definitions are equivalent, and the one presented here is simpler.

We also associate a (adversarial) value to a strategy $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0$ of Player 0, denoted

$$\text{ASV}(\sigma_0)(v) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)).$$

Clearly, we have that $\text{ASV}(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \text{ASV}(\sigma_0)(v)$.

In the sequel, unless otherwise mentioned, we refer to a two-dimensional nonzero-sum two-player mean-payoff game simply as a mean-payoff game.

Zero-sum case Zero-sum games are special cases of nonzero-sum games, where for all edges $e \in E$, we have that $w_0(e) = -w_1(e)$, i.e. the gain of one player is always equal to the opposite (the loss) of the other player. For zero-sum games, the classical concept is the notion of (worst-case) value. It is defined as

$$\text{Val}_{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$$

Additionally, we define the *value* of a Player 0 strategy σ_0 from a vertex v in a zero-sum mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} as $\text{Val}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v) = \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$.

3 Fragility and robustness in games

In this section, we study fragility and robustness properties in *zero-sum* and *nonzero-sum* games. Additionally, we provide a notion of value, for the nonzero-sum case, that is well-suited to synthesize strategies that are robust against two types of perturbations:

- **Modeling imprecision:** We want guarantees about the value that is obtained by a strategy in the Stackelberg game even if this strategy has been synthesized from a weighted game graph with weights that are possibly slightly wrong: small perturbations of the weight should have only limited effect on the value guaranteed by the strategy.
- **Sub-optimal responses:** We want guarantees about the value that is obtained by a strategy in the Stackelberg game even if the adversary responds with an ϵ -best response instead of a perfectly optimal response (for some $\epsilon > 0$): small deviations from the best-response by the adversary should have only limited effect on the value guaranteed by the strategy.

Formalizing deviations To formalize modeling imprecision, we introduce the notion of a *perturbed game graph*. Given a game \mathcal{G} with arena $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} = (V, E, \langle V_0, V_1 \rangle, w_0, w_1)$, and a value $\delta > 0$, we write $\mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$ for the set \mathcal{H} of games with arena $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{H}} = (V, E, \langle V_0, V_1 \rangle, w'_0, w'_1)$ where edge weight functions respect the following constraints:


$$\forall (v_1, v_2) \in E, \forall i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad w'_i(v_1, v_2) \in (w_i(v_1, v_2) + \delta, w_i(v_1, v_2) - \delta).$$

We note that as the underlying game graph (V, E) is not altered, for both players, the set of strategies in \mathcal{G} is identical to the set of strategies in \mathcal{H} . Finally, to formalize *sub-optimal responses*, we naturally use the notion of ϵ -best response introduced in the previous section.


Robustness in zero-sum games In zero-sum games, the worst-case value $\text{Val}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)$ is robust against both modeling imprecision and sub-optimal responses of Player 1.

► **Proposition 1** (Robustness in zero-sum games). *For all zero-sum mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} with a set V of vertices, for all Player 0 strategies σ_0 , and for all vertices $v \in V$ we have that:*

$$\forall \delta, \epsilon > 0 : \forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta} : \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{1,\mathcal{H}}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{H}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > \text{Val}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v) - \delta.$$



■ **Figure 2** In the original game \mathcal{G} : $\text{ASV}(v_0) = 0$.



■ **Figure 3** For $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$, we have $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(v_0) \leq \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0) - \mu$.

Proof. We first note that it comes with no surprise that considering sub-optimal responses. $(\text{BR}_1^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0))$ instead of optimal responses $(\text{BR}_1(\sigma_0))$ of Player 1 does not decrease the *value* of the game for Player 0 when she plays σ_0 as the game is zero-sum. Hence the value of σ_0 is obtained when Player 1 plays an optimal strategy or the best-response strategy. Therefore, we only need to show that all strategies of Player 0 are robust against weight perturbations. Formally, we must show that $\forall \delta > 0 : \forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta} : \text{Val}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v) > \text{Val}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v) - \delta$.

In the case of δ -perturbations, since the weight on an edge of \mathcal{H} can be at most δ less than the same edge in \mathcal{G} , the mean-payoff over a path in \mathcal{H} can be at most δ less than the mean-payoff of the same path in \mathcal{G} . ◀

Fragility in non-zero sum games On the contrary, the adversarial Stackelberg value $\text{ASV}(\sigma_0)$ is fragile against both modeling imprecision and sub-optimal responses.

► **Proposition 2** (Fragility - modeling imprecision). *For all $\mu > 0$, we can construct a nonzero-sum mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} and a Player 0 strategy σ_0 , such that there exist $\delta > 0$, a perturbed game $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$, and a vertex v in \mathcal{G} with $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v) < \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v) - \mu$.*

Proof. Consider the example in Figure 2, where we assume $0 < \iota/2 < \delta$. Note that for all values of $\iota > 0$, we have that $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0) = 0$, since Player 1 has no incentive to go to the left, thus the payoff of Player 0 is 0 corresponding to a best-response of Player 1. Thus $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0) = 0$.


Now we consider the perturbed game $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$ in Figure 3. Taking the left edge and the right edge are equally good for Player 1, and so the value that Player 0 can ensure is at most $-2\mu < 0 - \mu$. Hence $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v_0) < \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v_0) - \mu$. ◀

► **Proposition 3** (Fragility - sub-optimal responses). *For all $\mu > 0$, we can construct a nonzero-sum mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} and a Player 0 strategy σ_0 , such that there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a vertex v in \mathcal{G} with $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)} \text{MP}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) < \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v) - \mu$.*


Proof. We again consider the example in Figure 2, where we now assume $\iota > 0$. Note that for all values of $\mu > 0$, we have that $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v_0) = 0$, since Player 1 has no incentive to go to the left, thus the payoff of Player 0 is 0 corresponding to a best-response of Player 1. Thus $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v_0) = 0$. We also note that for all $\epsilon > \iota/2$, we have that, in \mathcal{G} , playing $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$ is an ϵ -best response for Player 1. Thus, we have that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)} \text{MP}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_{v_0}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) = -2\mu$.

Therefore, for all $\mu > 0$, we have that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)} \text{MP}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_{v_0}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) < \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma_0)(v_0) - \mu$. ◀

Note that μ can be arbitrarily large and thus the adversarial Stackelberg value in the model under deviations can be arbitrarily worse than in the original model.



■ **Figure 4** In this game \mathcal{G} , all vertices are controlled by Player 1. Here, $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}(v_1) = \mu'$.



■ **Figure 5** A δ -perturbed game \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} in Figure 4. Here, we consider $0 < l < \delta$. Here, $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(v_1) = \mu' - l$.

Relation between the two types of deviations In nonzero-sum mean-payoff games, robustness against modeling imprecision does not imply robustness against sub-optimal responses.

► **Lemma 4.** *For all $\mu, \delta, \epsilon > 0$, we can construct a nonzero-sum mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} such that for all Player 0 strategies σ_0 and vertex v in \mathcal{G} , we have that:*

$$\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta} : \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v) > \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{1,\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) + \mu.$$

Proof. Consider the game \mathcal{G} shown in Figure 4. Here, since all the vertices are controlled by Player 1, the strategy of Player 0 is inconsequential. For every $\delta > 0$, we claim that the best strategy for Player 1 across all perturbed games $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$ is to play $v_1 \rightarrow v_1$ forever. One such example of a perturbed game is shown in Figure 5. Here, for every $0 < l < \delta$, we have that $v_1 \rightarrow v_1$ is the only best-response for Player 1. Therefore, we have that $\inf_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}} \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v_1) = \mu' - \delta$, for all $\delta > 0$.

However, if we relax the assumption that Player 1 plays optimally and assume that he plays an ϵ -best response in the game \mathcal{G} , we note that Player 1 can play a strategy $(v_1^{k_1+1} v_2^{k_2+1})^\omega$, for some $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\frac{2\delta \cdot k_1}{k_1 + k_2 + 2} > 2\delta - \epsilon$, and Player 0 gets a payoff of $\frac{k_1 \cdot \mu'}{k_1 + k_2 + 2} > \mu'(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2\delta})$. Thus, we have that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{1,\mathcal{G}}^\epsilon} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) = \mu'(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2\delta})$. We note that the choice of μ' is arbitrary, and we can have a μ' such that $\mu' - \delta > \mu'(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2\delta}) + \mu$, i.e., we choose μ' to be large enough so that $\mu < \mu' \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{2\delta} - \delta$. ◀

On the contrary, robustness against sub-optimal responses implies robustness against modeling imprecision.

► **Theorem 5 (Robust strategy in non-zero sum games).** *For all non-zero sum mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} with a set V of vertices, for all $\epsilon > 0$, for all vertices $v \in V$, for all strategies σ_0 of Player 0, we have that $\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\epsilon} : \text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v) > \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{1,\mathcal{G}}^{2\epsilon}} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) - \epsilon$.*

Proof. Consider a nonzero-sum mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} and a vertex v in \mathcal{G} and a strategy σ_0 of Player 0. We let $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{1,\mathcal{G}}^{2\epsilon}} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) = c$, for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let the supremum of the payoffs that Player 1 gets when Player 0 plays σ_0 be y , where $y \in \mathbb{Q}$, i.e., $\sup\{\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\rho) \mid \rho \in \text{Out}_v(\mathcal{G}, \sigma_0)\} = y$. For all outcomes ρ which are in Player 1's 2ϵ -best response of σ_0 , we have that $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\rho) > y - 2\epsilon$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\rho) \geq c$.

Now, consider a game $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\epsilon}$ and a Player 0 strategy σ_0 played in \mathcal{H} . We can see that the maximum payoff that Player 1 gets when Player 0 plays σ_0 is bounded by $y + \epsilon$ and $y - \epsilon$, i.e., $y - \epsilon < \sup\{\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\rho) \mid \rho \in \text{Out}_v(\mathcal{H}, \sigma_0)\} < y + \epsilon$. We let this value be denoted by $y_{\mathcal{H}}$. We note that if $\sup_{\rho \in \text{Out}_v(\mathcal{H}, \sigma_0)} (\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\rho)) = y_{\mathcal{H}}$, then for the corresponding play $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}$ in the game \mathcal{G} , the mean-payoff of Player 1 in $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}$ is $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\rho_{\mathcal{H}}) > y - 2\epsilon$. Thus, in the game \mathcal{G} ,

we note that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\rho_{\mathcal{H}}) \geq c$ and for the corresponding play in \mathcal{H} , we have $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\rho_{\mathcal{H}}) > c - \epsilon$. Thus, we have $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}(\sigma_0)(v) > c - \epsilon = \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{1,\mathcal{G}}^{2\epsilon}} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) - \epsilon$. \blacktriangleleft

We note that in the above theorem, we need to consider a strategy that is robust against 2ϵ -best-responses to ensure robustness against ϵ weight perturbations.

ϵ -Adversarial Stackelberg Value The results above suggest that, in order to obtain some robustness guarantees in nonzero-sum mean-payoff games, we must consider a solution concept that accounts for ϵ -best responses of the adversary. This leads to the following definition: Given an $\epsilon > 0$, we define the adversarial value of Player 0 strategy σ_0 when Player 1 plays ϵ -best-responses as

$$\text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)(v) = \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) \quad (1)$$

and the ϵ -Adversarial Stackelberg value at vertex v is: $\text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)(v)$, and we note that $\text{ASV}(v) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v)$. We can now state a theorem about combined robustness of ASV^{ϵ} .

► Theorem 6 (Combined robustness of ASV^{ϵ}). *For all nonzero-sum mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} with a set V of vertices, for all $\epsilon > 0$, for all $\delta > 0$, for all $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$, for all vertices $v \in V$, and for all strategies σ_0 , we have that if $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{G}}^{2\delta+\epsilon}(\sigma_0)(v) > c$, then for all $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$, we have that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_{\mathcal{H}}^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0^{\mathcal{H}}(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > c - \delta$.*

Proof. The proof for Theorem 6 is very similar to the proof of Theorem 5 and involves looking at the set of ϵ -best-responses in the game \mathcal{H} and showing that the corresponding plays lie in the set of $(2\delta + \epsilon)$ -best-responses in the game \mathcal{G} . This would imply that the corresponding Player 0 mean-payoffs for the ϵ -best-responses of Player 1 in every perturbed game $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{G}^{\pm\delta}$ would always be greater than $c - \delta$. Therefore, we can extrapolate that $\text{ASV}_{\mathcal{H}}^{\epsilon}(\sigma_0)(v) > c - \delta$. \blacktriangleleft

In the rest of the paper we study properties of ASV^{ϵ} and solve the following two problems:

- **Threshold Problem of ASV^{ϵ} :** Given \mathcal{G} , $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, an $\epsilon > 0$, and a vertex v , we provide a nondeterministic polynomial time algorithm to decide if $\text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v) > c$ (see Theorem 12).
- **Computation of ASV^{ϵ} and largest ϵ :** Given \mathcal{G} , an $\epsilon > 0$, and a vertex v , we provide an exponential time algorithm to compute $\text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v)$ (see Theorem 25). We also establish that ASV^{ϵ} is achievable (see Theorem 31). Then we show, given a fixed threshold c , how to computation of largest ϵ such that $\text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v) > c$. Formally, we compute $\sup\{\epsilon > 0 \mid \text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v) > c\}$ (See Corollary 30).

4 Threshold problem for the ASV^{ϵ}

In this section, given $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, and a vertex v in game \mathcal{G} , we study the threshold problem which is to determine if $\text{ASV}^{\epsilon}(v) > c$.

Witnesses for ASV^{ϵ} For a game \mathcal{G} and $\epsilon > 0$, we associate with each vertex v in \mathcal{G} , sets of pairs or real numbers (c, d) such that Player 1 has a strategy to ensure that the mean-payoffs of Player 0 and Player 1 are at most c and greater than $d - \epsilon$ respectively. Formally, we have:

$$\Lambda^{\epsilon}(v) = \{(c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon\}.$$

A vertex v is $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad if $(c, d) \in \Lambda^\epsilon(v)$. Let $c' \in \mathbb{R}$. A play π in \mathcal{G} is called a $(c', d)^\epsilon$ -witness of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) = (c', d)$ where $c' > c$, and π does not contain any $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex. A play π is called a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if it is a $(c', d)^\epsilon$ -witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ for some c', d .

We first state the following technical lemma which states that if $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$, then there exists a strategy σ_0 for Player 0 that enforces $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$.

► **Lemma 7.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all rationals c , we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ iff there exists a strategy $\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0$ such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$.*

Proof. The right to left direction of the proof is trivial as σ_0 can play the role of witness for $\sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > c$, i.e., if there exists a strategy σ_0 of Player 0 such that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > c$, then $\sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > c$.

For the left to right direction of the proof, let $\sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) = c'$.

By definition of sup, for all $\delta > 0$, there exists σ_0^δ such that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0^\delta)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0^\delta, \sigma_1)) > c' - \delta$.

Let us consider a $\delta > 0$ such that $c' - \delta > c$. Such a δ exists as $c' > c$. Then we have that there exists σ_0 such that $\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) > c' - \delta > c$. ◀

The following theorem relates the existence of a witness and the threshold problem.

► **Theorem 8.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if and only if there exists a $(c', d)^\epsilon$ -witness of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$, where $d \in \mathbb{Q}$.*

Towards proving the existence of the witness, we first recall a result from [8, 5] which states that for every pair of points (x, y) present in $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$, we can construct a play π in the SCC S such that $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) = (x, y)$. Further, for every play π in SCC S , we have that the $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi))$ is present in $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$.

► **Lemma 9.** ([8, 5]) *Let S be an SCC in the arena \mathcal{A} with a set V of vertices, and W be the maximum of the absolute values appearing on the edges in \mathcal{A} . We have that*

1. *for all $\pi \in \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$, if $\text{inf}(\pi) \subseteq S$, then $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) \in F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$*
2. *for all $(x, y) \in F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$, there exists a play $\pi \in \text{Plays}_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\text{inf}(\pi) = S$ and $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) = (x, y)$.*
3. *The set $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ is effectively expressible in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$ as a conjunction of $\mathcal{O}(m^2)$ linear inequalities, where m is the number of mean-payoff coordinates of simple cycles in S , which is $\mathcal{O}(W \cdot |V|)$. Hence this set of inequalities can be pseudopolynomial in size.*

Now we have the ingredients to prove Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. In [8] it has been shown that $\text{ASV}(v) > c$ if and only if there exists a witness for $\text{ASV}(v) > c$. We begin by proving the right to left direction, that is, showing that the existence of a $(c', d)^\epsilon$ -witness implies that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. The proof of this direction is similar to the proof in [8] for the case of ASV. We are given a play π in \mathcal{G} that starts from v and the play π is such that $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) = (c', d)$ for $c' > c$ and does not cross a $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex. We need to prove that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. We do this by defining a strategy σ_0 for Player 0, such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$:

1. $\forall h \leq \pi$, if $\text{last}(h)$ is a Player 0 vertex, the strategy σ_0 is such that $\sigma_0(h)$ follows π .
2. $\forall h \not\leq \pi$, where there has been a deviation from π by Player 1, we assume that Player 0 switches to a punishing strategy defined as follows: In the subgame after history h' where $\text{last}(h')$ is the first vertex from which Player 1 deviates from π , we know that Player 0 has a strategy to enforce the objective: $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \leq d - \epsilon$. This is true because π does not cross any $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex and since n -dimensional mean-payoff games are determined.

Let us now establish that the strategy σ_0 satisfies $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$. First note that, since $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi) = d$, we have that $\sup_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) \geq d$. Now consider some strategy $\sigma'_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$ and let $\pi' = \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma'_1)$. Clearly, π' is such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') > \sup_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) - \epsilon \geq d - \epsilon$. If $\pi' = \pi$, we know that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c$. If $\pi' \neq \pi$, then when π' deviates from π we know that Player 0 employs the punishing strategy, thus making sure that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') \leq d - \epsilon$. Since $\sigma'_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$, it must be true that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c$. Thus, $\forall \sigma'_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$, we have $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma'_1)) > c$. Therefore, $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$, which implies $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$.

We now consider the left to right direction of the proof that requires new technical tools. We are given that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. From Lemma 7, we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ iff there exists a strategy σ_0 of Player 0 such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$. Thus, there exists a $\delta > 0$, such that

$$\inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) = c' = c + \delta$$

Let $d = \sup_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$. We first prove that for all $\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$, we have that $\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$ does not cross a $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex. For every $\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$, we let $\pi_{\sigma_1} = \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$. We note that $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi_{\sigma_1}) > d - \epsilon$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi_{\sigma_1}) > c$. For every $\pi' \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$, we know that if $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') > d - \epsilon$, then there exists a strategy $\sigma'_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$ such that $\pi' = \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma'_1)$. This means that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c$. Thus we can see that every deviation from π_{σ_1} either gives Player 1 a mean-payoff that is at most $d - \epsilon$ or Player 0 a mean-payoff greater than c . Therefore, we conclude that π_{σ_1} does not cross any $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex.

Now consider a sequence $(\sigma_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of Player 1 strategies such that $\sigma_i \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_i)) = d$. Let $\pi_i = \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_i)$. Let $\inf(\pi_i)$ be the set of vertices that occur infinitely often in π_i , and let V_{π_i} be the set of vertices appearing along the play π_i . Since there are finitely many SCCs, w.l.o.g., we can assume that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that $\inf(\pi_i) = \inf(\pi_j)$, that is, all the plays end up in the same SCC, say S , and also $V_{\pi_i} = V_{\pi_j} = V_\pi$ (say). Note that $S \subseteq V_\pi$.

Note that for every $\epsilon \geq \delta > 0$, there is a strategy $\sigma_1^\delta \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$ of Player 1, and a corresponding play $\pi' = \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1^\delta)$ such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') > d - \delta$, and $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') \geq c'$. Also the set $V_{\pi'}$ of vertices appearing in π' be such that $V_{\pi'} \subseteq V_\pi$, and $\inf(\pi') \subseteq S$.

Now since $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ is a closed set, we have that $(\hat{c}, d) \in F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ for some $\hat{c} \geq c' > c$. We now use a result from [8, 5] which states that for every pair of points (x, y) in $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$, we can construct a play π in the SCC S such that $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) = (x, y)$. Further, for every play π in SCC S , we also have that $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi))$ is in $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$. This is formally stated as Lemma 9. Thus, we have that, there exists a play π^* such that $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi^*), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi^*)) = (\hat{c}, d)$. Also $\inf(\pi^*) \subseteq S$, and $V_{\pi^*} \subseteq V_\pi$. The proof follows since for all vertices $v \in V_\pi$, we have that v is not $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad. \blacktriangleleft

Now, we establish a small witness property to show that the threshold problem is in NP. We do this by demonstrating that the witness consists of two simple cycles l_1 and l_2 in a strongly connected component of the game graph that is reachable from v such that the convex combination of the payoffs of Player 0 in these cycles exceeds the threshold c .

► **Lemma 10.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all rationals c , we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if and only if there exist two simple cycles l_1, l_2 , three simple paths π_1, π_2, π_3 from v to l_1 , from l_1 to l_2 , and from l_2 to l_1 respectively, and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, where $\alpha + \beta = 1$, such that*

- (i) $\alpha \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_2) = c' > c$, and
- (ii) $\alpha \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_2) = d$, for some rational d , and
- (iii) there is no $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex v' along π_1, π_2, π_3, l_1 and l_2 .

Furthermore, α, β , and d can be chosen so that they can be represented with a polynomial number of bits.

Proof. This proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 8 in [8]. For the right to left direction of the proof, where we are given finite acyclic plays π_1, π_2, π_3 , simple cycles l_1 and l_2 and constants α, β , we consider the witness $\pi = \pi_1 \rho_1 \rho_2 \rho_3 \dots$ where, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\rho_i = l_1^{[\alpha \cdot i]} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{[\beta \cdot i]} \cdot \pi_3$. We know that $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi) = \alpha \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_2) = d$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi) = \alpha \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_2) > c$. For all vertices v in π_1, π_2, π_3, l_1 and l_2 , it is given that v is not $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad. Therefore, π is a suitable witness thus proving from Theorem 8 that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$.

For the left to right direction of the proof, we are given $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. Using Theorem 8, we can construct a play π such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi) > c$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi) = d$, and π does not cross a $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex, i.e., for all vertices v' appearing in π , we have that $v' \not\ll \epsilon \ll \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$. First, the value d must be chosen so that the vertices v' appearing in π do not belong to the $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertices. Let $\text{inf}(\pi) = S$ be the set of vertices appearing infinitely often in π . Note that S forms an SCC. By abuse of notation, we also denote this SCC by S here. By Lemma 9, we have that $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) \in \text{F}_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$. From Proposition 1 of [5], for a bi-weighted arena, we have that $\text{F}_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S))) = \text{CH}(\text{F}_{\min}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$. Since $\text{CH}(\text{F}_{\min}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ can be expressed using conjunctions of linear inequalities whose coefficients have polynomial number of bits, the same also follows for $\text{F}_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ in a bi-weighted arena. In addition, it is proven in [3] that the set $\Lambda^\epsilon(v')$ is definable by a disjunction of conjunctions of linear inequalities whose coefficients have polynomial number of bits in the descriptions of the game \mathcal{G} and of ϵ . Hence $\overline{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v')$ is also definable by a disjunction of conjunctions of linear inequalities whose coefficients have polynomial number of bits in the descriptions of the game \mathcal{G} and of ϵ . As a consequence of Theorem 2 in [3] which states that given a system of linear inequalities that is satisfiable, there exists a point with polynomial representation that satisfies the system, we have that d can be chosen such that $(c, d) \in \overline{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v')$ and $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), d) \in \text{F}_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$, and hence d can be represented with a polynomial number of bits.

Second, by applying the Carathéodory baricenter theorem, we can find two simple cycles l_1, l_2 in the SCC S and acyclic finite plays π_1, π_2 and π_3 from π , and two positive rational constants $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, such that $\text{first}(\pi_1) = v$, $\text{first}(\pi_2) = \text{last}(\pi_1)$, $\text{first}(\pi_3) = \text{last}(\pi_2)$, $\text{first}(\pi_2) = \text{last}(\pi_3)$, and $\text{first}(\pi_2) = \text{first}(l_1)$, and $\text{first}(\pi_3) = \text{first}(l_2)$, and $\alpha + \beta = 1$, $\alpha \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_2) > c$ and $\alpha \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_2) = d$. Again, using Theorem 2 in [3], we can assume that α and β are rational values that can be represented using a polynomial number of bits. We note that for all vertices v in π_1, π_2, π_3, l_1 and l_2 , we have that v is not $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad. ◀

A play π is called a *regular-witness* of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if it is a witness of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ and can be expressed as $\pi = u \cdot v^\omega$, where u is a prefix of a play, and where v is a finite sequence of edges. We prove in that following theorem there exists a *regular* witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. The existence of a regular witness helps in the construction of a finite memory strategy for Player 0.

► **Theorem 11.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all rationals c , we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if and only if there exists a regular $(c', d)^\epsilon$ -witness of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$, where d is some rational.*

Proof. Consider the witness π in the proof of Lemma 10. We construct a regular-witness π' for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ where $\pi' = \pi_1 \cdot (l_1^{[\alpha' \cdot k]} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{[\beta' \cdot k]} \cdot \pi_3)^\omega$ and α', β' are constants in \mathbb{Q} and k is some large integer. We construct π' by modifying π as follows. We need to consider the following cases.

Case 1: $\text{MP}_0(l_1) > \text{MP}_0(l_2)$ and $\text{MP}_1(l_1) < \text{MP}_1(l_2)$

Here, one simple cycle, l_1 , increases Player 0's mean-payoff while the other simple cycle, l_2 , increases Player 1's mean-payoff. We can build a witness $\pi' = \pi_1 \cdot (l_1^{[\alpha \cdot k]} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{[\beta \cdot (k+\tau)]} \cdot \pi_3)^\omega$ for some very large $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for some small $\tau > 0$ such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d$.⁵ We note that k and τ are polynomial in the size of \mathcal{G} , and the largest weight W appearing on the edges of \mathcal{G} .

Case 2: $\text{MP}_0(l_1) < \text{MP}_0(l_2)$ and $\text{MP}_1(l_1) > \text{MP}_1(l_2)$

This is analogous to **case 1**, and proceeds as mentioned above.

Case 3: $\text{MP}_0(l_1) > \text{MP}_0(l_2)$ and $\text{MP}_1(l_1) > \text{MP}_1(l_2)$

One cycle, l_1 , increases both Player 0 and Player 1's mean-payoffs, while the other, l_2 , decreases it. In this case, we can just omit one of the cycles and consider the one that gives a larger mean-payoff, to get a finite memory strategy. Thus, $\pi' = \pi_1 \cdot l_1^\omega$ and we get $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c$, $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') \geq d$. Suppose $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d' \geq d$. Since no vertex in π_1, π_2, π_3, l_1 , and l_2 is $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad, we also have that they are not $(c, d')^\epsilon$ -bad, and thus π' is a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$.

Case 4: $\text{MP}_0(l_1) < \text{MP}_0(l_2)$ and $\text{MP}_1(l_1) < \text{MP}_1(l_2)$

This is analogous to **case 3**, and proceeds as mentioned above.

In each of these cases, we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$: $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') > c$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') \geq d$. Since we know that π does not cross a $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex, and the vertices of the play π' are a subset of the vertices of the play π , we have that π' is a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. ◀

The following statement can be obtained by exploiting the existence of finite regular witnesses of polynomial size proved above.

► **Theorem 12.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, it can be decided in nondeterministic polynomial time if $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$, and a pseudopolynomial memory strategy of Player 0 suffices for this threshold. Furthermore, this decision problem is at least as hard as solving zero-sum mean-payoff games.*

For proving Theorem 12, we start by stating a property of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games proved in [17] that we rephrase here for a two-dimensional mean-payoff game. This

⁵ For more details, we refer the reader to the Appendix A.

property expresses a relation between mean-payoff lim sup and mean-payoff lim inf objectives. We recall that in [17], the objective of Player 1 is to maximize the payoff in each dimension, i.e., for two-dimensional setting, given two rational c and d , Player 1 wins if he has a winning strategy for $\underline{MP}_0 \geq c \wedge \underline{MP}_1 \geq d$; otherwise Player 0 wins due to determinacy of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games. We call the mean-payoff game setting in [17] 2D-max mean-payoff games to distinguish it from the mean-payoff games that we consider here. Later we will relate the two settings.

► **Proposition 13. (Lemma 14 in [17])** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in the game \mathcal{G} , and for all rationals c, d , we have*

$$v \models \ll 1 \gg \overline{MP}_0 \geq c \wedge \underline{MP}_1 \geq d$$

if and only if

$$v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{MP}_0 \geq c \wedge \underline{MP}_1 \geq d$$

We now recall another property of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games proved in [17] that we rephrase here for a 2D-max mean-payoff game. This property expresses a bound on the weight of every finite play $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$ where σ_0 is a memoryless winning strategy for Player 0.

► **Lemma 14. (Lemma 10 in [17])** *For all 2D-max mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all rationals c, d , if Player 0⁶ wins $\underline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ from v then she has a memoryless winning strategy σ_0 to do so, and there exist three constants $m_{\mathcal{G}}, c_{\mathcal{G}}, d_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that: $c_{\mathcal{G}} < c, d_{\mathcal{G}} < d$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$, i.e. starting from v and compatible with σ_0 , we have that*

$$w_0(\pi^f) \leq m_{\mathcal{G}} + c_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

or

$$w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_{\mathcal{G}} + d_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

We now relate the 2D-max mean-payoff game in [17] where the objective of Player 1 is to maximize the payoff in both dimensions to our setting where in a game \mathcal{G} , Player 1 maximizes the payoff in the second dimension, and minimizes the payoff on the first dimension from his set of available responses to a strategy of Player 0. The objective of Player 0 then is to maximize the payoff in the first dimension and minimize the payoff in the second dimension, i.e. given two rationals c and d , Player 0's objective is to ensure $v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$. We now state a modification of Lemma 14 as follows:

► **Lemma 15.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all rationals c, d , if Player 0 wins $\underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ from v , then she has a memoryless winning strategy σ_0 to do so, and there exist three constants $m_{\mathcal{G}}, c_{\mathcal{G}}, d_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_{\mathcal{G}} > c, d_{\mathcal{G}} < d$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$, i.e. starting in v and compatible with σ_0 , we have that*

$$w_0(\pi^f) \geq -m_{\mathcal{G}} + c_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

or

$$w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_{\mathcal{G}} + d_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

⁶ Player 0 is called Player 2 in [17].

Proof. We show this by a reduction to a 2D-max mean-payoff game where Player 0's objective is to ensure $v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in a 2D-max mean-payoff game.

We prove this lemma in two parts. If Player 0 wins $\underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$, we show (i) the existence of a memoryless strategy σ_0 for Player 0, and (ii) that there exist three constants $m_G, c_G, d_G \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_G > c, d_G < d$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$, i.e. starting from v and compatible with σ_0 , we have that either $w_0(\pi^f) \geq -m_G + c_G \cdot |\pi^f|$ or $w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_G + d_G \cdot |\pi^f|$.

Assume that Player 0 has a winning strategy from vertex v in \mathcal{G} for $\underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$. To prove (i), we subtract $2c$ from the weights on the first dimension of all the edges, followed by multiplying them with -1 . We call the resultant 2D-max mean-payoff game \mathcal{G}' , and we have that $v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in \mathcal{G} if and only if $v \models \ll 0 \gg \overline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in \mathcal{G}' . Using Proposition 13 and determinacy of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games, it follows that $v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in \mathcal{G} if and only if $v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in \mathcal{G}' . Also from [17], we have that if Player 0 has a winning strategy in \mathcal{G}' for $\underline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$, then she has a memoryless strategy σ_0 for the same, and the proof of Lemma 14 in [17] shows that same memoryless strategy σ_0 is also winning for $\overline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$, thus concluding that if Player 0 wins $\underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in \mathcal{G} from vertex v , then she has a memoryless winning strategy.

We prove (ii) by contradiction. Assume that Player 0 wins $\underline{MP}_0 > c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ from vertex v in \mathcal{G} , and by part (i), she has a memoryless winning strategy σ_0 . Assume for contradiction, that there does not exist three constants $m_G, c_G, d_G \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_G > c, d_G < d$, such that for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$, i.e. starting in v and compatible with σ_0 , we have either $w_0(\pi^f) \geq -m_G + c_G \cdot |\pi^f|$ or $w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_G + d_G \cdot |\pi^f|$.

Consider the steps in the construction of \mathcal{G}' as defined above. As we subtract $2c$ from the weights on the first dimension of each edge, and multiply the resultant weights on the first dimension by -1 , we have that there does not exist three constants $m_G, c_G, d_G \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_G > c, d_G < d$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$ in \mathcal{G} , i.e. starting from v and compatible with σ_0 , we have either

$$w_0(\pi^f) \geq -m_G + c_G \cdot |\pi^f|$$

or

$$w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_G + d_G \cdot |\pi^f|$$

if and only if there does not exist three constants $m_G, c_G, d_G \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_G > c, d_G < d$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$ in the 2D-max mean-payoff game \mathcal{G}' for the objective $\underline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$, i.e. starting in v and compatible with σ_0 , we have either

$$w_0(\pi^f) \leq m_G + (2c - c_G) \cdot |\pi^f|$$

or

$$w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_G + d_G \cdot |\pi^f|$$

Let $2c - c_G = c'_G$, and we have that $c'_G < c$. Now since σ_0 is a winning for Player 0 for the objective $\underline{MP}_0 < c \vee \underline{MP}_1 < d$ in \mathcal{G}' from v , we reach a contradiction by Lemma 14, and due to determinacy of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games. \blacktriangleleft

Using Lemma 15, we can now prove that Player 0 can ensure from a vertex v that $v \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{MP}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{MP}_1 > d$ if and only if she can also ensure that $v \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{MP}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{MP}_1 \geq d'$ for all $d' > d$. This is established in the following lemma.

► **Lemma 16.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices $v \in \mathcal{G}$, and for all rationals c, d , we have that:*

$$v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d$$

if and only if there exists a $d' \in \mathbb{R}$, where $d' > d$ such that

$$v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$$

Proof. For the right to left direction of the proof, it is trivial to see that if $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$ for some $d' > d$, then we have that $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d$.

For the left to right direction of the proof, we prove the contrapositive, i.e., we assume that $\forall d' > d$, we have $v \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$. Now we prove that $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d$.

Since $\forall d' > d$, Player 1 loses $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$ from a given vertex v , due to determinacy of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games, Player 0 wins $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d'$ from vertex v . By Lemma 15, Player 0 has a memoryless strategy σ_0 to achieve the objective $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d'$ from vertex v . Note that Player 0 has only finitely many memoryless strategies. Therefore there exists a strategy σ_0^* that achieves the objective $v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d'$ for all $d' > d$. Now from Lemma 14, for every $d' > d$, there exists three constants $m_{\mathcal{G}}, c_{\mathcal{G}}, d'_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_{\mathcal{G}} > c, d'_{\mathcal{G}} < d'$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0^*)$, we have that

$$w_0(\pi^f) \geq -m_{\mathcal{G}} + c_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

or

$$w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_{\mathcal{G}} + d'_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

Note that since the above is true for every $d' > d$, we can indeed consider a $d_{\mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}$, where $d_{\mathcal{G}} \leq d$, such that for all $d' > d$, and for all finite plays $\pi^f \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0^*)$, we have that

$$w_0(\pi^f) \geq -m_{\mathcal{G}} + c_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

or we have that

$$w_1(\pi^f) \leq m_{\mathcal{G}} + d_{\mathcal{G}} \cdot |\pi^f|$$

Hence, for every play $\pi \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0^*)$, we have that

$$\overline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi) \geq c_{\mathcal{G}} \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi) \leq d_{\mathcal{G}}$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} v \models \ll 0 \gg \overline{\text{MP}}_0 &\geq c_{\mathcal{G}} \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \leq d_{\mathcal{G}} \\ \iff v \models \ll 0 \gg \overline{\text{MP}}_0 &> c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d' \quad \text{for every } d' > d, \text{ since } c_{\mathcal{G}} > c \text{ and } d_{\mathcal{G}} < d'. \end{aligned}$$

We now construct a 2D-max mean-payoff game \mathcal{G}' from the given game \mathcal{G} by multiplying the first dimension of the weights of all the edges by -1 . Thus, in the game \mathcal{G}' , we get

$$\begin{aligned} v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 &< -c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d' \quad \text{for every } d' > d \\ \iff v \models \ll 0 \gg \overline{\text{MP}}_0 &< -c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d' \quad \text{for every } d' > d \text{ [from Proposition 13]} \end{aligned}$$

We now construct a game \mathcal{G}'' from the game \mathcal{G}' by multiplying the first dimension of the weights of all the edges by -1. Note that, we get back the original game \mathcal{G} after this modification, i.e. \mathcal{G}'' has the same arena as that of \mathcal{G} . Thus, in the game \mathcal{G} , we have that

$$v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d' \quad \text{for every } d' > d$$

Recall by Lemma 15, if Player 0 wins $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 < d'$, then she has a memoryless strategy for this objective, and since there are finitely many memoryless strategies, there exists a memoryless strategy σ_0^* of Player 0 that wins for all $d' > d$. This also implies that by using σ_0^* , from vertex v , Player 0 can ensure $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \leq d$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} v \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \leq d \\ \iff v \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d \quad \text{[By determinacy of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games]} \end{aligned}$$

◀

We are finally ready to prove Theorem 12.

Proof of Theorem 12. According to Lemma 10, we consider a nondeterministic Turing machine that establishes the membership to NP by guessing a reachable SCC S , a finite play π_1 to reach S from v , two simple cycles l_1, l_2 , along with the finite play π_1 from v to l_1 , and the two finite plays π_2 and π_3 that connects the two simple cycles, and parameters $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}^+$. Additionally, for each vertex v' that appear along the plays π_1, π_2 and π_3 , and on the simple cycles l_1 and l_2 , the Turing machine guesses a memoryless strategy $\sigma_0^{v'}$ for Player 0 that establishes $v' \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$ which implies by determinacy of multi-dimensional mean-payoff games, that $v' \models \ll 0 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \leq d - \epsilon$.

Besides, from Theorem 11, we can obtain a regular witness π' . Using π' , we build a finite memory strategy σ_0^{FM} for Player 0 as stated below:

1. Player 0 follows π' if Player 1 does not deviate from π' . The finite memory strategy stems from the finite k as required in the proof of Theorem 11.
2. For each vertex $v' \in \pi'$, Player 0 employs the memoryless strategy $\sigma_0^{v'}$ that establishes $v' \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$. The existence of such a memoryless strategy follows from the proof of Lemma 16.

It remains to show that all the guesses can be verified in polynomial time. The only difficult part concerns the memoryless strategies of Player 0 to punish deviations of Player 1 from the witness play π' . These memoryless strategies are used to prove that the witness does not cross $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad vertices. For vertex $v' \in \pi'$, we consider a memoryless strategy $\sigma_0^{v'}$, and we need to establish that it can enforce $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 > c \vee \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \leq d - \epsilon$. Towards this, we adapt the proof of Lemma 10 in [17], which in turn is based on the polynomial time algorithm of Kosaraju and Sullivan [14] for detecting zero-cycles in multi-weighted directed graphs.

Consider the bi-weighted graph obtained from \mathcal{G} by fixing the choices of Player 0 according to the memoryless strategy $\sigma_0^{v'}$. We first compute the set of maximal SCCs that are reachable from v' in this bi-weighted graph. This can be done in linear time. For each SCC S , we need to check that Player 1 cannot achieve $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$.

We first recall the definition of multi-cycles from [17], which is a multi-set of simple cycles from the SCC S . For a simple cycle $C = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$, let $w(c) = \sum_{e \in C} w(e)$. For a multi-cycle \mathcal{C} , let $w(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} w(C)$ (note that in this summation, a cycle C may appear multiple times in \mathcal{C}). A non-negative multi-cycle is a non-empty multi-set of simple cycles \mathcal{C}

such that $w(\mathcal{C}) \geq 0$ (i.e., in both the dimensions, the weight is non-negative). In [17], it has been shown that the problem of deciding if S has a non-negative multi-cycle can be solved in polynomial time by solving a set of linear inequalities. In our case, we are interested in multi-cycles such that $w_0(\mathcal{C}) \leq c$ and $w_1(\mathcal{C}) > d - \epsilon$. As in the proof of Lemma 10 in [17], this can be checked by defining the following set of linear constraints. Let V_S and E_S respectively denote the set of vertices and the set of edges in S . For every edge $e \in E_S$, we consider a variable χ_e .

- (a) For $v \in V_S$, let $\text{In}(v)$ and $\text{Out}(v)$ respectively denote the set of incoming edges to v and the set of outgoing edges from v . For every $v \in V_S$, we define the linear constraint $\sum_{e \in \text{In}(v)} \chi_e = \sum_{e \in \text{Out}(v)} \chi_e$ which intuitively models flow constraints.
- (b) For every $e \in E_S$, we define the constraint $\chi_e \geq 0$.
- (c) We also add the constraint $\sum_{e \in E_S} \chi_e \cdot w_0(e) \leq c$ and $\sum_{e \in E_S} \chi_e \cdot w_1(e) > d - \epsilon$.
- (d) Finally, we define the constraint $\sum_{e \in E_S} \chi_e \geq 1$ that ensures that the multi-cycle is non-empty.

This set of linear constraints can be solved in polynomial time, and formally following the arguments from [14], it has a solution if and only if there exists a multi-cycle \mathcal{C} such that $w_0(\mathcal{C}) \leq c$ and $w_1(\mathcal{C}) > d - \epsilon$. The NP-membership follows since we have linearly many maximal SCCs from each vertex v' in the bi-weighted graph that is obtained from \mathcal{G} by fixing the choices of Player 0 according to the memoryless strategy $\sigma_0^{v'}$, and there are linearly many vertices v' for which we need to check that v' is not $(c, d)^\epsilon$ -bad.

Now we show that the memory required by the strategy σ_0^{FM} as described above is pseudopolynomial in the input size. Recall from the proof of Theorem 11 that k and τ are polynomial in the size of \mathcal{G} , and the largest weight W appearing on the edges of \mathcal{G} . Assuming that the weights are given in binary, the number of states in the finite state machine realizing this strategy is thus $\text{poly}(|\mathcal{G}|, W)$, and hence pseudopolynomial in the input size, assuming that the weights are given in binary.

Now we prove that the threshold problem is at least as hard as solving zero-sum mean-payoff games. We show the proof for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. The proof for the case of $\text{ASV}(v) > c$ is exactly the same. Consider a zero-sum mean-payoff game $\mathcal{G}_0 = (\mathcal{A}, \text{MP})$, where $\mathcal{A} = (V, E, \langle V_0, V_1 \rangle, w)$. We construct a bi-weighted mean-payoff game $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}', \text{MP}_0, \text{MP}_1)$ from \mathcal{G}_0 simply by adding to the arena \mathcal{A} a weight function w_1 that assigns a weight 0 to each edge. Stated formally, $\mathcal{A}' = (V, E, \langle V_0, V_1 \rangle, w, w_1)$ such that for all $e \in E$, we have that $w_1(e) = 0$.

Now consider that from a vertex $v \in V$, Player 0 has a winning strategy σ_0 in \mathcal{G}_0 such that $\text{MP}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1) > c$ for all Player 1 strategies σ_1 , and where c is a rational. We show that by playing σ_0 from v in \mathcal{G} , we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. For every play $\pi \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$ in \mathcal{G} , we have that $\text{MP}_1(\pi) = 0$, and Player 1 has a response σ_π such that $\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_\pi) = \pi$. In \mathcal{G} , Player 1 thus chooses a strategy that minimizes the mean-payoff of Player 0, and since in \mathcal{G}_0 , we have that $\text{MP}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1) > c$ for all strategies σ_1 of Player 1, it follows that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$.

Now in the other direction, consider that in \mathcal{G} , we have $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. Thus from Lemma 7, there exists a strategy σ_0 for Player 0 such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)(\sigma_0) > c$. Using similar arguments as above, we see that σ_0 is also a winning strategy in \mathcal{G}_0 giving a mean-payoff greater than c to Player 0. \blacktriangleleft

Finite memory strategies of Player 0 In [8], it has been shown that given a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , a vertex v in \mathcal{G} , and a rational c , the problem of deciding if $\text{ASV}(v) > c$ is in NP. The use of an infinite memory strategy σ_0 for Player 0 such that $\text{ASV}(\sigma_0)(v) > c$ has been shown in [8]. Here we give an improvement to that result in [8] showing that if $\text{ASV}(v) > c$,

then there exists a finite memory strategy σ_0 of Player 0 such that $\text{ASV}(\sigma_0)(v) > c$. The proof arguments are similar to that of Theorem 12, and hence omitted.

Towards this, we first define the notion of a witness for ASV as it appears in [8].

Witnesses for ASV For a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , we associate with each vertex v in \mathcal{G} , the following set of pairs of real numbers: $\Lambda(v) = \{(c, d) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d\}$. A vertex v is said to be (c, d) -bad if $(c, d) \in \Lambda(v)$. Let $c' \in \mathbb{R}$. A play π in \mathcal{G} is called a (c', d) -witness of $\text{ASV}(v) > c$ if $(\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi), \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)) = (c', d)$ where $c' > c$, and π does not contain any (c, d) -bad vertex. A play π is called a witness of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ if it is a (c', d) -witness of $\text{ASV}(v) > c$ for some c', d .

We state the following theorem which is similar to Theorem 11, but in the context of ASV instead of ASV^ϵ .

► **Theorem 17.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all rationals c , we have that $\text{ASV}(v) > c$ if and only if there exists a regular (c', d) -witness of $\text{ASV}(v) > c$.*

The proof of this theorem is exactly the same as that of Theorem 11, and hence omitted.

Now using Lemma 8 in [8] (which is similar to Lemma 10, but in the context of ASV instead of ASV^ϵ), and using Theorem 17, we obtain the following theorem.

► **Theorem 18.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices $v \in V$, and for all rationals c , if $\text{ASV}(v) > c$, then there exists a pseudopolynomial memory strategy σ_0 for Player 0 such that $\text{ASV}(\sigma_0)(v) > c$.*

The proof follows since as in the proof of Theorem 11, the values of k and τ are polynomial in the size of \mathcal{G} , and the weights on the edges which are assumed to be given in binary. The proof arguments are similar to that of Theorem 12, and hence omitted.

We now define the ϵ -adversarial Stackelberg value and adversarial Stackelberg value when Player 0 is restricted to using finite memory strategies as :

$$\text{ASV}_{\text{FM}}^\epsilon(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0^{\text{FM}}} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$$


$$\text{ASV}_{\text{FM}}(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0^{\text{FM}}} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$$

where Σ_0^{FM} refers to the set of all finite memory strategies of Player 0. We note that for every finite memory strategy σ_0 of Player 0, a best-response of Player 1 to σ_0 always exists as noted in [8]. As a corollary of Theorem 12, we observe that in a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , the ASV^ϵ from every vertex v does not change even if Player 0 is restricted to using only finite memory strategies. The result also holds for ASV due to Theorem 18. Formally,

► **Corollary 19.** *For all games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all $\epsilon > 0$, we have that $\text{ASV}_{\text{FM}}^\epsilon(v) = \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ and $\text{ASV}_{\text{FM}}(v) = \text{ASV}(v)$.*

Let $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = c$ ($\text{ASV}(v) = c$), for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. Note that for every $c' < c$, there exists a finite memory strategy σ_0^{FM} for Player 0 such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^{\text{FM}})(v) > c'$ ($\text{ASV}(\sigma_0^{\text{FM}})(v) > c'$) leading to $\sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0^{\text{FM}}} \text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) = \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = c$ ($\sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0^{\text{FM}}} \text{ASV}(\sigma_0)(v) = \text{ASV}(v) = c$). This gives $\text{ASV}_{\text{FM}}^\epsilon(v) = \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ ($\text{ASV}_{\text{FM}}(v) = \text{ASV}(v)$).

This corollary is important from a practical point of view as it implies that both the ASV^ϵ and ASV can be approached to any precision with a finite memory strategy. Nevertheless, we show in Theorem 31 that infinite memory is necessary to achieve the exact ASV^ϵ .



■ **Figure 6** Reduction of the partition problem to the threshold problem where Player 0 is restricted to memoryless strategies.

Memoryless strategies of Player 0 We now establish that the threshold problem is NP-complete when Player 0 is restricted to play *memoryless* strategies. First we define

$$\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0^{\text{ML}}} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$$

and

$$\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0^{\text{ML}}} \inf_{\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1(\sigma_0)} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1))$$

where Σ_0^{ML} is the set of all memoryless strategies of Player 0.

► **Theorem 20.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all rationals c , the problem of deciding if $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v) > c$ ($\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}(v) > c$) is NP-Complete.*

Proof. The proof of hardness is a reduction from the partition problem while easiness is straightforwardly obtained by techniques used in the proof of Theorem 12. Note that Player 0 can guess a memoryless strategy σ_0 from a vertex v in NP, and we consider the bi-weighted graph obtained by fixing the choices of Player 0 according to the strategy σ_0 . The set of maximal SCCs that are reachable from v in this bi-weighted graph can be computed in linear time. For each SCC S , we need to check that Player 1 cannot achieve $\underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$ ($\underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d$) to ensure $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0) > c$ ($\text{ASV}(\sigma_0) > c$). This can be done in polynomial time as has been done in the proof of Theorem 12.

We prove the NP-hardness result by reducing an NP-complete problem, i.e., the *partition problem*, to solving the threshold problem in a two-player nonzero-sum mean-payoff game. The partition problem is described as follows: Given a set of natural numbers $S = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n\}$, to decide if we can partition S into two sets R and M such that $\sum_{a_i \in R} a_i = \sum_{a_j \in M} a_j$. W.l.o.g. assume that $\sum_{a_i \in S} a_i = 2T$.

Given an instance of a partition problem, we construct a two-player nonzero-sum mean-payoff game as described in Figure 6 such that $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v_0) > \frac{T-1}{n}$ for some $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2n}$ if and only if there exists a solution to the partition problem.

Consider the case, where a solution to the partition problem exists. In the game in Figure 6, we can construct a Player 0 strategy σ_0 as follows: from each Player 0 vertex v_i , for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, Player 0 chooses to play $(a_i, 0)$ (or the top-arrow) if $a_i \in R$ or $(0, a_i)$ (or the bottom-arrow) if $a_i \in M$ and from v' , she plays $v' \rightarrow v'$. Thus, we have that from vertex v_0 , if Player 1 chooses to play $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, both players get a mean-payoff of $\frac{T}{n}$, but if

he chooses to play $v_0 \rightarrow v'$, Player 1 gets a mean-payoff of $\frac{T-0.5}{n}$ which is not the ϵ -best response for $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2n}$. Thus, we can see that $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v_0) > \frac{T-1}{n}$.

Now consider the case, where the solution to the partition problem does not exist. We note that any memoryless strategy σ_0 for Player 0 would involve choosing to play from every vertex v_i , where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, either $(a_i, 0)$ (or the top-arrow) or $(0, a_i)$ (or the bottom-arrow). This leads to a cycle from $v_1 \rightarrow v_n$, which either gives Player 1 a mean-payoff of $\leq \frac{T-1}{n}$ or Player 0 a mean-payoff of $\leq \frac{T-1}{n}$. In the first case, the ϵ -best response of Player 1 would be to play $v_0 \rightarrow v'$, and thus $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v_0) = 0$. For the second case, although Player 1's ϵ -best response is to play $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, Player 0 would only get a mean-payoff which is $\leq \frac{T-1}{n}$. Thus, $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v_0) \leq \frac{T-1}{n}$. Therefore in the two-player nonzero-sum mean-payoff game described in Figure 6, we have that $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}^\epsilon(v) > \frac{T-1}{n}$ if and only if there exists a solution to the partition problem for the set S .

We can construct a similar argument for the case of $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}(v)$ by considering only best-responses (and not ϵ -best responses) to the Player 0 strategy σ_0 . Thus, in the two-player nonzero-sum mean-payoff game described in Figure 6, we have that $\text{ASV}_{\text{ML}}(v) > \frac{T-1}{n}$ if and only if there exists a solution to the partition problem for the set S . \blacktriangleleft

5 Computation of the ASV^ϵ and the largest ϵ possible

Here, we express the ASV^ϵ as a formula in the theory of reals by adapting a method provided in [8] for ASV. We then provide a new EXPTIME algorithm to compute the ASV^ϵ based on LP which in turn is applicable to ASV as well.

Extended mean-payoff game Given a mean-payoff game $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A}, \langle \text{MP}_0, \text{MP}_1 \rangle)$ with $\mathcal{A} = (V, E, \langle V_0, V_1 \rangle, w_0, w_1)$, we construct an extended mean-payoff game $\mathcal{G}^{\text{ext}} = (\mathcal{A}^{\text{ext}}, \langle \text{MP}_0, \text{MP}_1 \rangle)$, and whose vertices and edges are defined as follows. The set of vertices is $V^{\text{ext}} = V \times 2^V$. With every history h in \mathcal{G} , we associate a vertex in \mathcal{G}^{ext} which is a pair (v, P) , where $v = \text{last}(h)$ and P is the set of the vertices traversed along h . Accordingly the set of edges and the weight functions are respectively defined as $E^{\text{ext}} = \{((v, P), (v', P')) \mid (v, v') \in E \wedge P' = P \cup \{v'\}\}$ and $w_i^{\text{ext}}((v, P), (v', P')) = w_i(v, v')$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. We observe that there exists a bijection between the plays π in \mathcal{G} and the plays π^{ext} in \mathcal{G}^{ext} which start in vertices of the form $(v, \{v\})$, i.e. π^{ext} is mapped to the play π in \mathcal{G} that is obtained by erasing the second dimension of its vertices. Note that the second component of the vertices of the play π^{ext} stabilises into a set of vertices of \mathcal{G} which we denote by $V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}})$.

To relate the witnesses with the ASV^ϵ in the game \mathcal{G}^{ext} , we introduce the following proposition. This proposition is an adaptation of Proposition 10 in [8] that is used to compute ASV.

► **Proposition 21.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , the following holds:*

- *Let π^{ext} be an infinite play in the extended mean-payoff game and π be its projection on the original mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} (over the first component of each vertex); the following properties hold:*
 - *For all $i < j$, if $\pi^{\text{ext}}(i) = (v_i, P_i)$ and $\pi^{\text{ext}}(j) = (v_j, P_j)$, then $P_i \subseteq P_j$*
 - $\text{MP}_i(\pi^{\text{ext}}) = \text{MP}_i(\pi)$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$.
- *The unfolding of \mathcal{G} from v and the unfolding of \mathcal{G}^{ext} from $(v, \{v\})$ are isomorphic and so $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\})$*

By the first point of the above proposition and since the set of vertices of the mean-payoff game is finite, the second component of any play π^{ext} , that keeps track of the set of vertices visited along π^{ext} , stabilises into a set of vertices of \mathcal{G} which we denote by $V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}})$.

We now characterize $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ with the notion of witness introduced earlier and the decomposition of \mathcal{G}^{ext} into SCCs. For a vertex v in V , let $\text{SCC}^{\text{ext}}(v)$ be the set of strongly-connected components in \mathcal{G}^{ext} which are reachable from $(v, \{v\})$.

► **Lemma 22.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} and for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , we have*

$$\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = \max_{S \in \text{SCC}^{\text{ext}}(v)} \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi^{\text{ext}} : \pi^{\text{ext}} \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\}) > c \text{ and } V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}}) = S\}$$

Proof. First, we note the following sequence of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) &= \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) \geq c\} \\ &= \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c\} \\ &= \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi : \pi \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c\} \\ &= \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi^{\text{ext}} : \pi^{\text{ext}} \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\}) > c\} \\ &= \max_{S \in \text{SCC}^{\text{ext}}(v)} \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi^{\text{ext}} : \pi^{\text{ext}} \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\}) > c \text{ and } V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}}) = S\} \end{aligned}$$

The first two equalities follow from the definition of the supremum and that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. The third equality follows from Theorem 8 that guarantees the existence of witnesses for strict inequalities. The fourth equality is due to the second point in Proposition 21. The last equality is a consequence of first point in Proposition 21. ◀

By definition of \mathcal{G}^{ext} , for every SCC S of \mathcal{G}^{ext} , there exists a set $V^*(S)$ of vertices of \mathcal{G} such that every vertex of S is of the form $(v', V^*(S))$, where v' is a vertex in \mathcal{G} . Now, we define $\Lambda_S^{\text{ext}} = \bigcup_{v \in V^*(S)} \Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ as the set of (c, d) such that Player 1 can ensure $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$ from some vertex $v \in S$. The set Λ_S^{ext} can be represented by a formula $\Psi_S^\epsilon(x, y)$ in the first order theory of reals with addition, $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$, with two free variables. Before we begin to prove the above, we refer to the following lemma which has been established in [8].

► **Lemma 23.** [Lemma 9 in [8]] *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all rationals c, d , we can effectively construct a formula $\Psi_v(x, y)$ of $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$ with two free variables such that $(c, d) \in \Lambda(v)$ if and only if the formula $\Psi_v(x, y)[x/c, y/d]$ is true.*

Using the above lemma, we can now compute an effective representation of the infinite set of pairs $\Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ for each vertex v of the mean-payoff game. This is stated in the following lemma.

► **Lemma 24.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , for all $\epsilon > 0$, and for all rationals c, d , we can effectively construct a formula $\Psi_v^\epsilon(x, y)$ of $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$ with two free variables such that $(c, d) \in \Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ if and only if the formula $\Psi_v^\epsilon(x, y)[x/c, y/d]$ is true.*

Proof. From the definition of $\Lambda(v)$ from [8], we know that a pair of real values $(c, d) \in \Lambda(v)$ if $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d$. We now recall from the definition of $\Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ that $(c, d) \in \Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ if $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$. From this, we can see that

$$\Psi_v^\epsilon(x, y) \equiv \exists e > 0 \cdot \Psi_v(x, y - \epsilon + e)$$

◀

We can now state the following theorem about the computability of $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$:

► **Theorem 25.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} and for all $\epsilon > 0$, the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ can be effectively expressed by a formula in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$, and can be computed from this formula.*

Proof. To prove this theorem, we build a formula in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$ that is true iff $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = z$. Recall from Lemma 22 that

$$\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = \max_{S \in \text{SCC}^{\text{ext}}(v)} \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi^{\text{ext}} : \pi^{\text{ext}} \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\}) > c \text{ and } V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}}) = S\}$$

Since it is easy to express $\max_{S \in \text{SCC}^{\text{ext}}(v)}$ in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$, we concentrate on one SCC S reachable from $(v, \{v\})$, and we show how to express

$$\sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi^{\text{ext}} : \pi^{\text{ext}} \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\}) > c \text{ and } V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}}) = S\}$$

in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$.

Such a value of c can be encoded by the following formula

$$\rho_v^S(c) \equiv \exists x, y \cdot x > c \wedge \Phi_S(x, y) \wedge \neg \Psi_S^\epsilon(c, y)$$

where $\Phi_S(x, y)$ is the symbolic encoding of $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$ as defined in Lemma 9. This states that the pair of values (x, y) are the mean-payoff values realisable by some play in S . By Lemma 24, the formula $\neg \Psi_S^\epsilon(c, y)$ expresses that the play does not cross a $(c, y)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex. So the conjunction $\exists x, y \cdot x > c \wedge \Phi_S(x, y) \wedge \neg \Psi_S^\epsilon(c, y)$ establishes the existence of a witness with mean-payoff values (x, y) for the threshold c , and hence satisfying this formula implies that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. Now we consider the formula

$$\rho_{\max, v}^S(z) \equiv \forall e > 0 \cdot \rho_v^S(z - e) \wedge \forall c \cdot \rho_v^S(c) \implies c < z$$

which is satisfied by a value that is the supremum over the set of values c such that c satisfies the formula ρ_v^S , and hence the formula $\rho_{\max, v}^S(z)$ expresses

$$\sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists \pi^{\text{ext}} : \pi^{\text{ext}} \text{ is a witness for } \text{ASV}^\epsilon(v, \{v\}) > c \text{ and } V^*(\pi^{\text{ext}}) = S\}$$


From the formula $\rho_{\max, v}^S$, we can compute the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ by quantifier elimination in

$$\max_{S \in \text{SCC}^{\text{ext}}(v)} \exists z \cdot \rho_{\max, v}^S(z)$$


and obtain the unique value of z that makes this formula true, and equals $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$. ◀

► **Example 26.** We illustrate the computation of ASV^ϵ with an example. Consider the mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} depicted in Figure 7 and its extension \mathcal{G}^{ext} as shown in Figure 8.


Note that in \mathcal{G}^{ext} there exist three SCCs which are $S_1 = \{v'_{02}, v'_1\}$, $S_2 = \{v'_{21}\}$, and $S_3 = \{v'_{22}\}$. The SCCs S_2 and S_3 are similar, and thus $\rho_{\max, v_0}^{S_2}(z)$ and $\rho_{\max, v_0}^{S_3}(z)$ would be equivalent. We start with SCC S_1 that contains two cycles $v'_1 \rightarrow v'_1$ and $v'_{02} \rightarrow v'_1, v'_1 \rightarrow v'_{02}$, and SCC S_2 contains one cycle $v'_{21} \rightarrow v'_{21}$. Since S_3 is similar to S_2 , we consider only S_2 in our example. Thus, the set $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S_1)))$ is represented by the Cartesian points within the triangle represented by $(0, 2)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 1)$ ⁷ and $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S_2))) = \{(0, 1)\}$. Thus, we get that $\Phi_{S_1}(x, y) \equiv (x \geq 0 \wedge x \leq 1) \wedge (y \geq 1 \wedge y \leq 2) \wedge (x + y) \leq 2$ and $\Phi_{S_2}(x, y) \equiv x = 0 \wedge y = 1$. Now, we calculate $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{02})$, $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{21})$ and $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_1)$ for some value of ϵ less than 1. We note that the vertex v'_1 is not $(0, 2 + \epsilon - \delta)^\epsilon$ -bad, for all $0 < \delta < 1$, as Player 0 can always choose the edge




■ **Figure 7** Example to calculate $ASV^\epsilon(v)$




■ **Figure 8** Extended Mean-Payoff Game where $v'_{01} = (v_0, \{v_0\})$, $v'_{02} = (v_0, \{v_0, v_1\})$, $v'_1 = (v_1, \{v_0, v_1\})$, $v'_{21} = (v_1, \{v_0, v_2\})$, and $v'_{22} = (v_2, \{v_0, v_1, v_2\})$



■ **Figure 9** The red triangle represents the set of points in Φ_{S_1} .



■ **Figure 10** The blue region under and excluding the line $y = (1 + \epsilon)$ represents the set of points in $\Psi_{S_1}^\epsilon$ and $\Psi_{S_2}^\epsilon$.



■ **Figure 11** The formula $\rho^{S_1}(c)$ is represented by the points in Φ_{S_1} and not in $\Psi_{S_1}^\epsilon$, i.e., the points in the triangle which are not strictly below the line $y = (1 + \epsilon)$. Here, the max c value is represented by point A .

(v'_1, v'_{02}) from v'_1 , thus giving Player 1 a mean-payoff of 1. Additionally, the vertex v'_{02} is both $(0, 1 + \epsilon - \delta)^\epsilon$ -bad, for all $\delta > 0$, since Player 1 can choose the edge (v'_{02}, v'_{22}) from v'_{02} , and $(1, 1 + \epsilon - \delta)^\epsilon$ -bad, for all $\delta > 0$, since Player 1 can choose the edge (v'_{02}, v'_1) from v'_{02} . Thus, we get that $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_1) = \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{02}) = \{(c, d) \mid (c \geq 1 \wedge d < 1 + \epsilon) \cup \{(c, d) \mid (c \geq 0 \wedge d < 1 + \epsilon)\}\}$ which is the same as $\{(c, d) \mid (c \geq 0 \wedge d < 1 + \epsilon)\}$, and $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{21}) = \{(c, d) \mid (c \geq 0 \wedge d < 1 + \epsilon)\}$. Therefore, we have that $\Lambda_{S_1}^{\text{ext}} = \Lambda_{S_2}^{\text{ext}} = \{(c, d) \mid (c \geq 0 \wedge d < 1 + \epsilon)\}$. Hence, we get that $\Psi_{S_1}^\epsilon(x, y) = \Psi_{S_2}^\epsilon(x, y) \equiv (x \geq 0 \wedge y < 1 + \epsilon)$ as shown in Figure 10. From Figure 11, the formula $\rho^{S_1}(c)$ holds true for values of c less than $(1 - \epsilon)$ and the formula $\rho^{S_2}(c)$ holds for values of c less than 0. Hence, by assigning $(1 - \epsilon)$ to x , and $(1 + \epsilon)$ to y , we get that $\rho_{\max, v_0}^{S_1}(z)$ holds true for $z = (1 - \epsilon)$. Additionally, by assigning 0 to x , and 1 to y , we get that $\rho_{\max, v_0}^{S_2}(z)$ holds true for $z = 0$. It follows that $ASV^\epsilon(v_0) = 1 - \epsilon$ for $\epsilon < 1$ as it is the maximum of the values over all the SCCs. ◀

An EXPTIME algorithm for computing ASV^ϵ Now we provide a new linear programming based method that extends the previous approach to compute the ASV^ϵ , and show that the value can be computed in EXPTIME. We first illustrate our approach with the help of the following example by constructing the LP formulation for $\rho_v^S(c)$ for each SCC S thereby building the system of LPs for computing $ASV^\epsilon(v_0)$.

⁷ Note that the coordinate $(0, 1)$ is obtained as the pointwise minimum over the two coordinates separately.

► **Example 27.** We previously showed that the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0)$ can be computed by quantifier elimination of a formula in the theory of reals with addition. Now, we compute the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0)$ by solving a set of linear programs for every SCC in \mathcal{G}^{ext} . We recall that there are three SCCs S_1, S_2 and S_3 in \mathcal{G}^{ext} . From Lemma 9, we have that $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S_i)))$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ can be defined using a set of linear inequalities. Now recall that $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S_2))) = F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S_3))) = \{(0, 1)\}$, and $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S_1)))$ is represented by the set of points enclosed by the triangle formed by connecting the points $(0, 1)$, $(1, 1)$ and $(0, 2)$ as shown in Figure 9, and $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{02}) = \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{21}) = \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{22}) = \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_1) = \{(c, y) \mid c \geq 0 \wedge y < 1 + \epsilon\}$. Now, we consider the SCC S_1 , and the formula $\neg\Psi_{S_1}^\epsilon$. We start this by finding the complement of $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{02})$ and $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_1)$, that is, $\bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_{02}) = \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_1) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} - \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{02}) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} - \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_1) = \{(c, y) \mid c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon\}$. Now, we get that $\neg\Psi_{S_1}^\epsilon = \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_{02}) \cap \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_1) = \{(c, y) \mid c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon\}$.

Similarly for the SCC S_2 and SCC S_3 , we calculate the complement of $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{21})$ and $\Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{22})$, that is, $\bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_{22}) = \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_{21}) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} - \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{21}) = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} - \Lambda^\epsilon(v'_{22}) = \{(c, y) \mid c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon\}$ and obtain $\neg\Psi_{S_2}^\epsilon = \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_{21}) = \{(c, y) \mid c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon\}$ and $\neg\Psi_{S_3}^\epsilon = \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v'_{22}) = \{(c, y) \mid c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon\}$. Note that the formulae $\Phi_{S_2}(x, y)$ and $\Phi_{S_3}(x, y)$ are represented by the set of linear inequations $x = 0 \wedge y = 1$ and the formula $\Phi_{S_1}(x, y)$ is represented by the set of linear inequations $y \geq 1 \wedge y \leq 2 \wedge x \leq 1 \wedge (x + y) \leq 2$. Now the formula $\rho_{v_0}^{S_1}(c)$ can be expressed using a set of linear equations and inequalities as follows: $x > c \wedge y \geq 1 \wedge y \leq 2 \wedge x \leq 1 \wedge (x + y) \leq 2 \wedge (c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon)$ and the formula $\rho_{v_0}^{S_2}(c)$ can be expressed using a set of linear equations and inequalities as follows: $x > c \wedge x = 0 \wedge y = 1 \wedge (c < 0 \vee y \geq 1 + \epsilon)$. We maximise the value of c in the formula $\rho_{v_0}^{S_1}(c)$ to get the following two linear programs: *maximise c in $(x > c \wedge y \geq 1 \wedge y \leq 2 \wedge x \leq 1 \wedge (x + y) \leq 2 \wedge c < 0)$* which gives a solution $\{0\}$ and *maximise c in $(x > c \wedge y \geq 1 \wedge y \leq 2 \wedge x \leq 1 \wedge (x + y) \leq 2 \wedge y \geq (1 + \epsilon))$* which gives us a solution $\{(1 - \epsilon)\}$. Similarly, maximising c in the formulae $\rho_{v_0}^{S_2}(c)$ and $\rho_{v_0}^{S_3}(c)$ would give us the following two linear programs: *maximise c in $(x > c \wedge x = 0 \wedge y = 1 \wedge c < 0)$* which gives a solution $\{0\}$ and *maximise c in $(x > c \wedge x = 0 \wedge y = 1 \wedge y \geq (1 + \epsilon))$* which gives us a solution $\{0\}$. Thus, we conclude that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0) = 1 - \epsilon$ which is the maximum value amongst all the SCCs. Note that in an LP, the strict inequalities are replaced with non-strict inequalities, and computing the supremum in the objective function is replaced by maximizing the objective function.

Again, for every SCC S and for every LP corresponding to S , we can fix a value of c and change the objective function to *maximise ϵ* from *maximise c* in order to obtain the maximum value of ϵ that allows $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0) > c$. For example, consider the LP $(x > c \wedge y \geq 1 \wedge y \leq 2 \wedge x \leq 1 \wedge (x + y) \leq 2 \wedge y \geq (1 + \epsilon))$ in SCC S_1 and fix a value of c , and then maximize the value of ϵ . Doing this over all linear programs in an SCC, and over all SCCs, reachable from v_0 for a fixed c gives us the supremum value of ϵ such that we have $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0) > c$. ◀

While no complexity upper bound for the computation of the ASV was reported in [8], we show here that our procedure executes in EXPTIME. Indeed, for each SCC S , we express the formulae in $\langle \mathbb{R}, +, < \rangle$ as a set of exponentially many linear programs and thus, solve them in EXPTIME. Therefore, we state the following theorem.

► **Theorem 28.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} and for all $\epsilon > 0$, the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ can be computed in EXPTIME.*

To prove Theorem 28, we begin by stating and proving the following technical lemma.

► **Lemma 29.** *The set $\bigcap_{v \in V^*(S)} \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$ can be expressed as a union of exponentially many systems of strict and non-strict inequalities*

Proof. From Lemma 4 of [3], we have that $\Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ can be represented as a finite union of polyhedra. Considering a d -dimensional space, the set of points that satisfy the same set

of linear inequalities forms an equivalence class, also called *cells* [3]. Let V_G denote the set of mean-payoff coordinates of simple cycles in \mathcal{G} , and we have that $|V_G| = \mathcal{O}(W \cdot |V|)^{\text{poly}(d)}$. Let $B(V_G)$ denote the set of geometric centres where each geometric centre is a centre of at most $d + 1$ points from V_G . Thus $|B(V_G)| = \mathcal{O}(|V_G|^{d+1})$. From Lemma 6 of [3] that uses Carathéodory baricenter theorem in turn, we have that $\Lambda^\epsilon(v)$ can be represented as a union of all cells that contain a point from $B(V_G)$ which is in $\Lambda^\epsilon(v)$. Each cell is a polyhedron that can be represented by $\mathcal{O}(V_G)$ extremal points, or equivalently, by Theorem 3 of [3], by $\mathcal{O}(V_G) \cdot 2^d$ inequalities. It follows that $\bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$ can also be represented as a union of $\mathcal{O}(|V_G|^{d+1})$ polyhedra. Hence $\bigcap_{v \in V^*(S)} \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$ can also be represented as a union of $\mathcal{O}(|V_G|^{d+1})$ polyhedra.

Thus we have exponentially many linear programs corresponding to $\bigcap_{v \in V^*(S)} \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$, since the weights on the edges are given in binary. In our case, we have $d = 2$. Further, from Lemma 9, for bi-weighted arena, we have that $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ can be represented by $\mathcal{O}(|V_G|^2)$ linear inequalities, and hence $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S))) \cap \bigcap_{v \in V^*(S)} \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$ can be represented by exponentially many LPs. Further, these LPs can be constructed in exponential time. \blacktriangleleft

We are now ready to prove Theorem 28.

Proof of Theorem 28. First note that using Lemma 9, for each SCC S in \mathcal{G}^{ext} , the set satisfying the formula $\Phi_S(x, y)$, which is the symbolic encoding of $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$, can be expressed as a set of *exponentially* many inequalities. Now recall that the formula Ψ_S^ϵ corresponds to $\bigcup_{v \in V^*(S)} \Lambda^\epsilon(v)$, and hence $\neg \Psi_S^\epsilon$ in the formula $\rho_v^S(c)$ corresponds to the set $\bigcap_{v \in V^*(S)} \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$. We show in Lemma 29 that this set can be represented as a union of exponentially many systems of strict and non-strict inequalities.

For each SCC S in the mean-payoff game \mathcal{G}^{ext} , we see that the value satisfying the formula $\rho_{\max, v}^S$ can be expressed as a set of linear programs in the following manner. For each linear program, we have two variables x and y that represent the mean-payoff values of Player 0 and Player 1 respectively, corresponding to the formula $\Phi_S(x, y)$, and equivalently for plays in $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$, and a third variable c represents the c in the formula $\rho_v^S(c)$. The formula $\rho_v^S(c)$ can be expressed as a disjunction of a set of linear equations and inequalities, i.e., $\bigvee_i \text{Cst}_i$ where each Cst_i is a conjunction of linear inequalities. We use the variables (c, d) in the linear inequalities which represent the set $\bigcap_{v \in V^*(S)} \bar{\Lambda}^\epsilon(v)$, and the variables (x, y) in the linear inequalities representing the set $F_{\min}(\text{CH}(\mathbb{C}(S)))$ as mentioned above. We also include the inequation $x > c$. Further, the variable d should assume the value of y that corresponds to the mean-payoff of Player 1. In the LP formulation, each strict inequation is replaced by a non-strict inequation, and supremum in the objective function is replaced with maximizing the objective. The set of linear programs we solve is *maximise c under the linear constraints Cst_i for each $\text{Cst}_i \in \bigvee_i \text{Cst}_i$* .

We solve the above sets of LPs for each SCC S present in \mathcal{G} to get a set of values satisfying the formula $\rho_{\max, v}^S$. We choose the maximum of this set of values which is the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$. The algorithm runs in EXPTIME as there can be exponentially many SCCs. \blacktriangleleft

On the other hand, as illustrated in Example 27, we note that if we fix a value of c in every linear program corresponding to an SCC S , and replace the objective function *maximise c* with the function *maximise ϵ* , then we can find the supremum over ϵ which allows $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ in S . Again, taking the maximum over all SCCs reachable from $(v, \{v\})$, we get the largest ϵ possible so that we have $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$. Thus we get the following corollary.

► **Corollary 30.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all $c \in Q$, we can compute in EXPTIME the maximum possible value of ϵ such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$.*

6 Additional Properties of ASV^ϵ

In this section, we first show that the ASV^ϵ is *achievable*, i.e., there exists a Player 0 strategy that achieves ASV^ϵ . Then we study the memory requirement in strategies of Player 0 for achieving the ASV^ϵ , as well as the memory requirement by Player 1 for playing the the ϵ -best-responses.

Achievability of the ASV^ϵ We formally define achievability as follows. Given $\epsilon > 0$, we say that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = c$ is achievable from a vertex v , if there exists a strategy σ_0 for Player 0 such that $\forall \sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0) : \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) \geq c$. We note that this result is in contrast to the case for ASV as shown in [8].

► **Theorem 31.** *For all mean-payoff games \mathcal{G} , for all vertices v in \mathcal{G} , and for all $\epsilon > 0$, we have that the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ is achievable.*

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 31. We start by defining the notion of a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v)$ for a strategy σ_0 of Player 0.

Witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v)$ Given a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , a vertex v in \mathcal{G} , and an $\epsilon > 0$, we say that a play π is a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c$ for a strategy σ_0 of Player 0 if (i) $\pi \in \text{Out}_v(\sigma_0)$, and (ii) π is a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) > c$ when Player 0 uses strategy σ_0 where the strategy σ_0 is defined as follows:

1. σ_0 follows π if Player 1 does not deviate from π .
2. If Player 1 deviates from π , then for each vertex $v \in \pi$, we have that σ_0 consists of a memoryless strategy that establishes $v \not\ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d - \epsilon$, where $d = \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi)$. The existence of such a memoryless strategy of Player 0 has been established in Section 4.

Assume that the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ cannot be achieved by a finite memory strategy. We show that for such cases, it can indeed be achieved by an infinite memory strategy.

Let $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = c$. For every $c' < c$, from Theorem 12, there exists a finite memory strategy σ_0 such that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v) > c'$, and recall from Theorem 11 that there exists a corresponding regular witness. First we state the following proposition.

► **Proposition 32.** *There exists a sequence of increasing real numbers, $c_1 < c_2 < c_3 < \dots < c$, such that the sequence converges to c , and a set of finite memory strategies $\sigma_0^1, \sigma_0^2, \sigma_0^3, \dots$ of Player 0 such that for each c_i , we have $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) > c_i$, and there exists a play π^i that is a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) > c_i$, where $\pi^i = \pi_1(l_1^{\alpha \cdot k_i} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{\beta \cdot k_i} \cdot \pi_3)^\omega$, and π_1, π_2 and π_3 are simple finite plays, and l_1, l_2 are simple cycles in the arena of the game \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Consider the play $\pi^i = \pi_1(l_1^{\alpha \cdot k_i} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{\beta \cdot k_i} \cdot \pi_3)^\omega$ which is a witness for $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) > c_i$ for the strategy σ_0^i . Let $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi^i) = c'_i > c_i$.

We have that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi^i)$ increases proportionally with i as $\alpha \cdot k_i$ and $\beta \cdot k_i$ increase with increasing k_i . This follows because we disregard the cases where $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ is achievable with some finite memory strategy of Player 0, i.e., we only consider the case where $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ is not achievable by a finite memory strategy of Player 0.

Note that there are finitely many possible simple plays and simple cycles. Thus w.l.o.g. we can assume that in the sequence $(\pi^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$, the finite plays $\pi_{1i}, \pi_{2i}, \pi_{3i}$, and the simple

cycles l_{1i}, l_{2i} are the same for different values of i . Thus, $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi_{1i}(l_{1i}^{\alpha \cdot k_i} \cdot \pi_{2i} \cdot l_{2i}^{\beta \cdot k_i} \cdot \pi_{3i})^\omega) = c'_i > c_i$, $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi_{1i}(l_{1i}^{\alpha \cdot k_{i+1}} \cdot \pi_{2i} \cdot l_{2i}^{\beta \cdot k_{i+1}} \cdot \pi_{3i})^\omega) = c'_{i+1} > c'_i$, $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi_{1i}(l_{1i}^{\alpha \cdot k_{i+2}} \cdot \pi_{2i} \cdot l_{2i}^{\beta \cdot k_{i+2}} \cdot \pi_{3i})^\omega) = c'_{i+2} > c'_{i+1}$, and so on, and the only difference in the strategies σ_0^i as i changes is the value of k_i , i.e., we increase the value of $\alpha \cdot k_i$ and $\beta \cdot k_i$ with increasing k_i such that the effect of π_2 and π_3 on the mean-payoff is minimised. Thus, at the limit, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, the sequence $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ converges to $\alpha \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_0(l_2) = c$. \blacktriangleleft

These witnesses or plays in the sequence are regular, and they differ from each other only in the value of k_i that they use.

To show that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) = c$, we construct a play π^* that starts from v , follows π^1 until the mean-payoff of Player 0 over the prefix becomes greater than c_1 . Then for $i \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, starting from $\text{first}(l_1)$, it follows π^i , excluding the initial simple finite play π_1 , until the mean-payoff of the prefix of π^i becomes greater than c_i . Then the play π^* follows the prefix of the play π^{i+1} , excluding the initial finite play π_1 , and so on. Clearly, we have that $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi^*) = c$. We let $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi^*) = d = \alpha \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_2)$.

For the sequence of plays $(\pi^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ which are witnesses for $(\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) > c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ for the strategies $(\sigma_0^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$, we let $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi_i) = d_i$. We state the following proposition.

► **Proposition 33.** *The sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonic, and it converges to d in the limit.*

Proof. Recall that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi^i)$ increases monotonically with increasing i . Since the effect of the finite simple plays π_2 and π_3 decreases with increasing $\alpha \cdot k_i$ and $\beta \cdot k_i$, the mean-payoff on the second dimension also changes monotonically. If $\alpha \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot \text{MP}_1(l_2) \geq \frac{w_1(\pi_2) + w_1(\pi_3)}{|\pi_2| + |\pi_3|}$, then the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically non-decreasing. Otherwise, the sequence is monotonically decreasing.

The fact that this sequence converges to d in the limit can be seen from the construction of π^* as described above. \blacktriangleleft


The above two propositions establish the existence of an infinite sequence of regular witnesses $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) > c_i$ for a sequence of increasing numbers $c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c$, such that the mean-payoffs of the witnesses are monotonic and at the limit, the mean-payoffs of the witnesses converge to c and d for Player 0 and Player 1 respectively. These observations show the existence of a witness π^* which gives Player 0 a mean-payoff value at least c and Player 1 a mean-payoff value equal to d . Assuming that Player 0 has a corresponding strategy σ_0 , we show that Player 1 does not have an ϵ -best response to σ_0 that gives Player 0 a payoff less than c . Now, we have the ingredients to prove Theorem 31.

Proof of Theorem 31. We consider a sequence of increasing numbers $c_1 < c_2 < c_3 < \dots < c$ such that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, by Theorem 12, we consider a finite memory strategy σ_0^i of Player 0 that ensures $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0^i)(v) > c_i$.

If the ASV^ϵ is not achievable, then there exists a strategy of Player 1 to enforce some play π' such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') = c' < c$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d' > d - \epsilon$. Now, we use the monotonicity of the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ established in Proposition 33 to show a contradiction. Since the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonic, there can be two cases:

1. The sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically non-decreasing.
2. The sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically decreasing.

We start with the first case where the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is non-decreasing. Assume for contradiction that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ is not achievable, i.e. Player 1 deviates from π^* to enforce the play π' such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') = c' < c$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d'$.



■ **Figure 12** Finite memory strategy of Player 0 may not achieve $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0)$. Also, no finite memory ϵ -best response exists for Player 1 for the strategy σ_0 of Player 0.

Since $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is non-decreasing, and thus $d \geq d_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and since Player 1 can let his payoff to be reduced by an amount that is less than ϵ in order to reduce the payoff of Player 0, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$ we have that $d' > d_i - \epsilon$. We know that the sequence $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is increasing. Thus, there exists a $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c' < c_j$. Note that if $\pi' = \pi^r$ for some index r , we consider some j which is also greater than r .

Now, consider the strategy σ_0^j of Player 0 which follows the play π_j . We know that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi_j) > c_j$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi_j) = d_j$. We also know from Lemma 10 that the play π_j does not cross a $(c_j, d_j)^\epsilon$ -bad vertex. Since by the construction of π^* , and by Proposition 32, the set of vertices appearing in the play π^* is the same as the set of vertices appearing in the play π_j , for every vertex v in π^* , we have that Player 1 does not have a strategy such that $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c' \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d_j - \epsilon$. Since $c' < c_j$ and $d' > d_j - \epsilon$, it also follows that Player 1 does not have a strategy such that $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c' \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$. Stated otherwise, from the determinacy of multi-player mean-payoff games, we have that Player 0 has a strategy to ensure $v \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c' \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$ for every vertex v appearing in π^* . In fact, Player 0 can ensure $v \not\models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c' \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 \geq d'$ by choosing the strategy $\sigma_{j'}$ for some $j' \geq j$. Since $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v) = \sup_{\sigma_0 \in \Sigma_0} \text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v)$, and the sequence $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is increasing, and we have that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(\sigma_i)(v) > c_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, it follows that the existence of π' is a contradiction.

Now, we consider the case where the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically decreasing. Again, assume for contradiction that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$ is not achievable, i.e., Player 1 deviates from σ_0^* to enforce the play π' such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') = c' < c$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d'$. Since the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically decreasing, we know that there must exist a $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (i) $d' > d_j - \epsilon$, and $\forall i \geq j$, we have that $d' > d_i - \epsilon$, and (ii) $c_j > c'$, which follows since $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is a strictly increasing sequence. Thus for every vertex v in π^* , Player 1 does not have a strategy such that there exists a play π in $\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0^j)$, and $v \models \ll 1 \gg \underline{\text{MP}}_0 \leq c_j \wedge \underline{\text{MP}}_1 > d_j - \epsilon$.

Finally, using the fact that $c' < c_j$ and $d' > d_j - \epsilon$, the contradiction follows exactly as above where the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically non-decreasing.⁸ ◀

Memory requirements of the players' strategies First we show that there exists a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} in which Player 0 needs an infinite memory strategy to achieve the ASV^ϵ .

► **Theorem 34.** *There exist a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , a vertex v in \mathcal{G} , and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that Player 0 needs an infinite memory strategy to achieve the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$.*

⁸ We note that in the definition of ϵ -best response in Section 2, if we allow $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)) \geq \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\text{Out}_v(\sigma_0, \sigma'_1)) - \epsilon$, then the existence of a j for the case when the sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is monotonically decreasing, does not necessarily hold true.

Proof. Consider the example in Figure 12. We show that in this example the $ASV^\epsilon(v_0) = 1$, and that this value can only be achieved using an infinite memory strategy. Assume a strategy σ_0 for Player 0 such that the game is played in rounds. In round k : (i) if Player 1 plays $v_0 \rightarrow v_0$ repeatedly at least k times before playing $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, then from v_1 , play $v_1 \rightarrow v_1$ repeatedly k times and then play $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$ and move to round $k + 1$; (ii) else, if Player 1 plays $v_0 \rightarrow v_0$ less than k times before playing $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, then from v_1 , play $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$. Note that σ_0 is an infinite memory strategy.


The best-response for Player 1 to strategy σ_0 would be to choose k sequentially as $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, to get a play $\pi = ((v_0)^i(v_1)^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. We have that $\underline{MP}_1(\pi) = 1 + \epsilon$ and $\underline{MP}_0(\pi) = 1$. Player 1 can only sacrifice an amount that is less than ϵ to minimize the mean-payoff of Player 0, and thus he would not play $v_0 \rightarrow v_2$.

We now show that $ASV^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v_0) = ASV^\epsilon(v_0)$, and that no finite memory strategy of Player 0 can achieve an $ASV^\epsilon(v_0)$ of 1. First we observe in Figure 12 that a strategy σ_1 of Player 1 that prescribes playing the edge $v_0 \rightarrow v_2$ some time yields a mean-payoff of 1 for Player 1, and hence we conclude that $\sigma_1 \notin BR_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$. Player 1 cannot play any other strategy without increasing the mean-payoff of Player 0 and/or decreasing his own payoff. We can see that Player 1 does not have a finite memory best-response strategy. Thus, the $ASV^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v_0) = 1$.

We now prove the claim $ASV^\epsilon(\sigma_0)(v_0) = ASV^\epsilon(v_0)$. For every strategy σ_1 of Player 1 such that $\sigma_1 \in BR_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$, we note that the higher the payoff Player 1 has, the lower is the payoff for Player 0. For every other strategy σ'_0 of Player 0, if best-response of Player 1 to σ'_0 gives a mean-payoff less than $1 + \epsilon$, then Player 1 will switch to v_2 , thus giving Player 0 a payoff of 0. If best-response of Player 1 to σ'_0 gives him a mean-payoff greater than $1 + \epsilon$, then Player 0 will have a lower $ASV^\epsilon(\sigma'_0)$.

Now we show that a finite memory strategy of Player 0 cannot achieve an $ASV^\epsilon(v_0)$ of 1. In order to achieve $ASV^\epsilon(v_0)$ of 1, the edge $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$ and the edge $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$ need to be taken infinitely many times. If this does not happen, we note that either Player 1 would play $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$ and Player 0 would loop forever on v_1 or Player 1 would play $v_0 \rightarrow v_2$ and Player 0 would loop forever on v_2 , both of which yield a mean-payoff of 0 to Player 0. Additionally, we note that the two edges $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$ and $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$ have edge weights $(0, 0)$, i.e., it gives a payoff of 0 to both players. Therefore, we need a strategy which suppresses the effect of the edges on the mean-payoff of a play. This can be achieved by choosing these edges less and less frequently. We now show that this cannot be done with any finite memory strategy, and we indeed need an infinite memory strategy as described by the Player 0 strategy σ_0 . Consider a finite memory strategy of Player 0 and an infinite memory ϵ -best-response for Player 1 for which no finite memory strategy exists. Given that he owns only one vertex which is v_0 , such an infinite memory strategy can only lead to looping over v_0 more and more, thus giving him a payoff which is eventually 0. Thus consider a finite memory response of Player 1 to the finite memory strategy of Player 0. Note that Player 0 would choose a finite memory strategy such that the best-response of Player 1 gives him a value of at least $1 + \epsilon$. Also since both players have finite memory strategies, the resultant outcome is a regular play over vertices v_0 and v_1 . In every such regular play, the effect of the edge from v_0 to v_1 and the edge from v_1 to v_0 is non-negligible, and hence if the payoff of Player 1 is at least $1 + \epsilon$, the payoff of Player 0 will be less than 1. Thus no finite memory strategy can achieve an ASV^ϵ that is equal to 1. \blacktriangleleft

We also show that exist mean-payoff games in which a finite memory (but not memoryless) strategy for Player 0 can achieve the ASV^ϵ .



■ **Figure 13** an example in which a finite memory strategy for Player 0 achieves the $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0)$.

► **Theorem 35.** *There exists a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , a vertex v in \mathcal{G} , and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that a finite memory strategy of Player 0 that can not be represented by any memoryless strategy suffices to achieve $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v)$.*

Proof. To show the existence of mean-payoff games in which Player 0 can achieve the adversarial value with finite memory (but not memoryless) strategies, we consider the example in Figure 13. We show that $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0) = 1 - \epsilon$. Assume a strategy σ_0 for Player 0 defined as: repeat forever, from v_1 play j times $v_1 \rightarrow v_1$, and then repeat playing $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$ for k times, with j and k chosen such that mean-payoff for Player 0 is equal to $1 - \epsilon$. For every rational ϵ , such a k always exists. In this example, we have that $k = \frac{1-\epsilon}{2\epsilon}j$. The ϵ -best-response of Player 1 to σ_0 is to always play $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$ as by playing this edge forever, Player 1 gets a mean-payoff equal to $1 + \epsilon$, whereas if Player 1 plays $v_0 \rightarrow v_2$, then Player 1 receives a payoff of 1. Since $1 \not\geq (1 + \epsilon) - \epsilon$, a strategy of Player 1 that chooses $v_0 \rightarrow v_2$ is not an ϵ -best-response for Player 1, thus forcing Player 1 to play $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$. Thus $\text{ASV}^\epsilon(v_0)$ is achieved with a finite memory strategy of size k for Player 0. Note that this size k is a function of ϵ . ◀

Further, we show that there exist games such that for a strategy σ_0 of Player 0, and an $\epsilon > 0$, there does not exist any finite memory best-response of Player 1 to the strategy σ_0 .

► **Theorem 36.** *There exist a mean-payoff game \mathcal{G} , an $\epsilon > 0$, and a Player 0 strategy σ_0 in \mathcal{G} such that every Player 1 strategy $\sigma_1 \in \text{BR}_1^\epsilon(\sigma_0)$ is an infinite memory strategy.*

Proof. Consider the example in Figure 12, and the strategy σ_0 of Player 0 where the game is played in rounds as described in Theorem 34: In round k : (i) if Player 1 plays $v_0 \rightarrow v_0$ repeatedly at least k times before playing $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, then from v_1 , play $v_1 \rightarrow v_1$ repeatedly k times and then play $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$ and move to round $k + 1$; (ii) else, if Player 1 plays $v_0 \rightarrow v_0$ less than k times before playing $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, then from v_1 , play $v_1 \rightarrow v_0$. We can see that for all finite memory strategies, Player 1 gets at most 1, and thus no finite memory strategy is an ϵ -best-response to σ_0 . For each round k , Player 1's ϵ -best-response is to play $v_0 \rightarrow v_0$ repeatedly at least k times before playing $v_0 \rightarrow v_1$, which is an infinite memory strategy for Player 1. ◀

References

- 1 Roderick Bloem, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Karin Greimel, Thomas A. Henzinger, Georg Hofferek, Barbara Jobstmann, Bettina Könighofer, and Robert Könighofer. Synthesizing robust systems. *Acta Informatica*, 51(3-4):193–220, 2014.
- 2 Romain Brenguier, Lorenzo Clemente, Paul Hunter, Guillermo A. Pérez, Mickael Randour, Jean-François Raskin, Ocan Sankur, and Mathieu Sassolas. Non-zero sum games for reactive synthesis. In *Language and Automata Theory and Applications - 10th International Conference, LATA 2016, Prague, Czech Republic, March 14-18, 2016, Proceedings*, pages 3–23, 2016.

- 3 Romain Brenguier and Jean-François Raskin. Pareto curves of multidimensional mean-payoff games. In *Computer Aided Verification - 27th International Conference, CAV 2015, San Francisco, CA, USA, July 18-24, 2015, Proceedings, Part II*, pages 251–267, 2015.
- 4 Véronique Bruyère, Noémie Meunier, and Jean-François Raskin. Secure equilibria in weighted games. In *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, Vienna, Austria, July 14 - 18, 2014*, pages 26:1–26:26. ACM, 2014.
- 5 Krishnendu Chatterjee, Laurent Doyen, Herbert Edelsbrunner, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Philippe Rannou. Mean-payoff automaton expressions. In *CONCUR 2010 - Concurrency Theory, 21th International Conference, Paris, France, August 31-September 3, 2010. Proceedings*, pages 269–283, 2010.
- 6 Krishnendu Chatterjee, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Marcin Jurdzinski. Games with secure equilibria. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 365(1-2):67–82, 2006.
- 7 Rodica Condurache, Emmanuel Filiot, Raffaella Gentilini, and Jean-François Raskin. The complexity of rational synthesis. In *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016, July 11-15, 2016, Rome, Italy*, pages 121:1–121:15, 2016.
- 8 Emmanuel Filiot, Raffaella Gentilini, and Jean-François Raskin. The adversarial stackelberg value in quantitative games. In *47th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2020, July 8-11, 2020, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference)*, pages 127:1–127:18, 2020.
- 9 Dana Fisman, Orna Kupferman, and Yoad Lustig. Rational synthesis. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 16th International Conference, TACAS 2010, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2010, Paphos, Cyprus, March 20-28, 2010. Proceedings*, pages 190–204, 2010.
- 10 Anshul Gupta and Sven Schewe. Quantitative verification in rational environments. In *21st International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning, TIME 2014, Verona, Italy, September 8-10, 2014*, pages 123–131, 2014.
- 11 Anshul Gupta and Sven Schewe. Buying optimal payoffs in bi-matrix games. *Games*, 9(3):40, 2018.
- 12 Anshul Gupta, Sven Schewe, Ashutosh Trivedi, Maram Sai Krishna Deepak, and Bharath Kumar Padarathi. Incentive stackelberg mean-payoff games. In *Software Engineering and Formal Methods - 14th International Conference, SEFM 2016, Held as Part of STAF 2016, Vienna, Austria, July 4-8, 2016, Proceedings*, pages 304–320, 2016.
- 13 Anshul Gupta, Sven Schewe, and Dominik Wojtczak. Making the best of limited memory in multi-player discounted sum games. In *Proceedings Sixth International Symposium on Games, Automata, Logics and Formal Verification, GandALF 2015, Genoa, Italy, 21-22nd September 2015*, pages 16–30, 2015.
- 14 S. Rao Kosaraju and Gregory F. Sullivan. Detecting cycles in dynamic graphs in polynomial time (preliminary version). In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 2-4, 1988, Chicago, Illinois, USA*, pages 398–406, 1988.
- 15 Orna Kupferman, Giuseppe Perelli, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Synthesis with rational environments. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 78(1):3–20, 2016.
- 16 Amir Pnueli and Roni Rosner. On the synthesis of a reactive module. In *Conference Record of the Sixteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Austin, Texas, USA, January 11-13, 1989*, pages 179–190, 1989.
- 17 Yaron Velner, Krishnendu Chatterjee, Laurent Doyen, Thomas A. Henzinger, Alexander Moshe Rabinovich, and Jean-François Raskin. The complexity of multi-mean-payoff and multi-energy games. *Inf. Comput.*, 241:177–196, 2015.
- 18 Heinrich Freiherr von Stackelberg. *Marktform und Gleichgewicht*. Wien und Berlin, J. Springer, 1934.

A Additional details in the proof of Theorem 11

Below we compute the expressions for k and τ for case 1 in the proof of Theorem 11. We know that for play $\pi = \pi_1 \rho_1 \rho_2 \rho_3 \dots$, where $\rho_i = l_1^{[\alpha i]} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{[\beta i]} \cdot \pi_3$, constants $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are chosen such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \cdot \underline{\text{MP}}_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot \underline{\text{MP}}_0(l_2) &= c'' \text{ where } c'' > c \\ \alpha \cdot \underline{\text{MP}}_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot \underline{\text{MP}}_1(l_2) &= d \\ \alpha + \beta &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

We assume here that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(l_1) > \underline{\text{MP}}_0(l_2)$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(l_1) < \underline{\text{MP}}_1(l_2)$. This implies that one simple cycle, l_1 , increases Player 0's mean-payoff while the other simple cycle, l_2 , increases Player 1's mean-payoff. We build a play $\pi' = \pi_1 \cdot (l_1^{[\alpha \cdot k]} \cdot \pi_2 \cdot l_2^{[\beta \cdot (k+\tau)]} \cdot \pi_3)^\omega$ where we choose constant $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and constant $\tau > 0$ such that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') = c'$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d$ for some $c' > c$. We try to express the conditions for k and τ below:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') &= \frac{k \cdot \alpha \cdot w_0(l_1) + (k + \tau) \cdot \beta \cdot w_0(l_2) + w_0(\pi_2) + w_0(\pi_3)}{k \cdot \alpha \cdot |l_1| + (k + \tau) \cdot \beta \cdot |l_2| + |\pi_2| + |\pi_3|} \\ &= \frac{k \cdot (\alpha \cdot w_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot w_0(l_2)) + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_0(l_2) + w_0(\pi_2) + w_0(\pi_3)}{k \cdot (\alpha \cdot |l_1| + \beta \cdot |l_2|) + \tau \cdot \beta + |\pi_2| + |\pi_3|} \\ \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') &= \frac{k \cdot \alpha \cdot w_1(l_1) + (k + \tau) \cdot \beta \cdot w_1(l_2) + w_1(\pi_2) + w_1(\pi_3)}{k \cdot \alpha \cdot |l_1| + (k + \tau) \cdot \beta \cdot |l_2| + |\pi_2| + |\pi_3|} \\ &= \frac{k \cdot (\alpha \cdot w_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot w_1(l_2)) + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_1(l_2) + w_1(\pi_2) + w_1(\pi_3)}{k \cdot (\alpha \cdot |l_1| + \beta \cdot |l_2|) + \tau \cdot \beta + |\pi_2| + |\pi_3|} \end{aligned}$$

Let $|\pi_2| + |\pi_3| = v$, $\alpha \cdot w_0(l_1) + \beta \cdot w_0(l_2) = x_0$, $\alpha \cdot w_1(l_1) + \beta \cdot w_1(l_2) = x_1$, $\alpha \cdot |l_1| + \beta \cdot |l_2| = y$, $w_0(\pi_2) + w_0(\pi_3) = z_0$ and $w_1(\pi_2) + w_1(\pi_3) = z_1$. We simplify the inequalities above to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') &= \frac{k \cdot x_0 + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_0(l_2) + z_0}{k \cdot y + \tau \cdot \beta + v} \\ \underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') &= \frac{k \cdot x_1 + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_1(l_2) + z_1}{k \cdot y + \tau \cdot \beta + v} \end{aligned}$$

We know that $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') = c'$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k \cdot x_0 + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_0(l_2) + z_0}{k \cdot y + \tau \cdot \beta + v} &= c' \\ \frac{k \cdot x_1 + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_1(l_2) + z_1}{k \cdot y + \tau \cdot \beta + v} &= d \\ k \cdot x_0 + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_0(l_2) + z_0 &= c' \cdot (k \cdot y + \tau \cdot \beta + v) \\ k \cdot x_1 + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot w_1(l_2) + z_1 &= d \cdot (k \cdot y + \tau \cdot \beta + v) \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the above inequalities we get:

$$\begin{aligned} k \cdot (x_0 - c' \cdot y) &= c' \cdot v + \tau \cdot \beta \cdot (c' - w_0(l_2)) - z_0 \\ \tau \cdot \beta \cdot (w_1(l_2) - d) &= v \cdot d + k \cdot (d \cdot y - x_1) - z_1 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, after substitution of τ in the first inequality expression and further simplification of both expressions, we finally get:

$$k = \frac{(c' \cdot v - z_0)(w_1(l_2) - d) + (c' - w_0(l_2))(v \cdot d - z_1)}{(x_0 - c' \cdot y)(w_1(l_2) - d) - (d \cdot y - x_1)}$$

$$\tau = \frac{v \cdot d - z_1}{\beta \cdot (w_1(l_2) - d)} + \frac{d \cdot y - x_1}{w_1(l_2) - d} \cdot \frac{k}{\beta}$$

The above two inequalities specify the range from which we can choose a suitable k and τ , such that the requirements $\underline{\text{MP}}_0(\pi') = c'$ and $\underline{\text{MP}}_1(\pi') = d$ are met. We note that k and τ are polynomial in size of the game and the weights on the edges, i.e., $\mathcal{O}(k) = |W|^2 \cdot |V|^3$ and $\mathcal{O}(\tau) = |W|^3 \cdot |V|^5$.