

Hierarchical Decompositions of Stochastic Pursuit-Evasion Games

Yue Guan¹ Mohammad Afshari² Qifan Zhang³ Panagiotis Tsiotras⁴

Abstract—In this work we present a hierarchical framework for solving discrete stochastic pursuit-evasion games (PEGs) in large grid worlds. With a partition of the grid world into superstates (e.g., “rooms”), the proposed approach creates a two-resolution decision-making process, which consists of a set of local PEGs at the original state level and an aggregated PEG at the superstate level. Having much smaller cardinality, both the local games and the aggregated game can be easily solved to a Nash equilibrium. To connect the decision-making at the two resolutions, we use the Nash values of the local PEGs as the rewards for the aggregated game. Through numerical simulations, we show that the proposed hierarchical framework significantly reduces the computation overhead, while still maintaining a satisfactory level of performance when competing against the flat Nash policies.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuit-evasion games (PEGs) [1], also known as optimal tag games [2], were introduced in 1960s. An abundance of literature exists on the topic, and some notable examples include [3]–[5]. Many of the original pursuit-evasion games are in a continuous setting, which makes their solution extremely difficult. Often, some form of discretization is proposed to cast the problem on a finite-dimensional space. A common numerical approach to discretize these continuous stochastic games is via a Markov chain approximation method (MCAM) [6]. MCAM approximates the original continuous stochastic PEG with a series of discrete PEGs, each formulated as a Markov game. The discrete transition probabilities are constructed based on the stochastic differential equations (SDEs) governing the original stochastic game. Previous work [7] discussed the details of the application of MCAM to PEGs. Under certain assumptions, and as the discretization size approaches zero, the performance of the optimal policy for the discrete PEG (extended to continuous domain through holding time) converges to that of an optimal policy for the original PEG.

To achieve a good approximation, MCAM requires a fine discretization, which leads to discrete PEGs with a prohibitively large state space. However, solving for the Nash




Fig. 1. A schematic of the proposed hierarchical approach. **Left** presents the aggregated PEG, where the game is played at the room level and the agents select options. **Right** is a local game restricted within a room. In this scenario, the PEG ends with a successful capture.

equilibrium for such large games is a challenge. For the zero-sum case we consider in this paper, the classic value iteration for stochastic games [8] requires solving a matrix game (equivalent to a linear program) at *each* state and at *each* iteration. Even though efficient algorithms exist for solving linear programs (LPs) [9], the sheer number of LPs to be solved makes the classic “flat” state-space approach without hierarchy extremely expensive. To address this challenge, we propose a hierarchical framework to decompose a large PEG into multiple smaller ones.

In the single-agent domain, hierarchical decision-making has seen many successes in expediting learning [10], addressing sparse rewards [11], etc. One of the fundamental concepts in this area is the concept of options [12]. An option is a generalization of the concept of action, which, upon execution, selects primitive actions (actions from the original action space) to reach certain subgoals. Options can be regarded as a set of useful behaviors that an agent can use directly off-the-shelf. By using options instead of primitive actions, an agent can shorten its planning horizon and break down complex tasks into multiple simpler subtasks.

Previous works [13]–[15] have extended the option framework and the hierarchical approach to the multi-agent domain. However, the majority of that research focuses on cooperative games [13] or team games [14], [15]; general results in the competitive setting are still lacking. The key challenge in the multi-agent scenario comes from the fact the subgoal exists in the joint state space of all the agents. Subsequently, a subgoal preferable to one agent may not be favorable to the others, especially in competitive games. As a result, it is not straightforward to extend single-agent hierarchical techniques to multi-agent competitive scenarios.

In this work, we propose a hierarchical framework to solve large two-agent zero-sum pursuit-evasion games (PEGs). Under this framework, the grid world is first abstracted into mul-

¹Yue Guan is a PhD Candidate with the School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA. Email: yguan44@gatech.edu

²Mohammad Afshari is a Postdoctoral Fellow with the Institute for Robotics and Intelligent Machines, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA. Email: mafshari@gatech.edu

³Qifan Zhang is currently a Software Engineer at Google, Mountain View, CA, USA. This work was done while QZ was at Georgia Tech. Email: qzhang410@gatech.edu

⁴Panagiotis Tsiotras is the David & Andrew Lewis Chair and Professor with the School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA. Email: tsiotras@gatech.edu

tuple superstates (i.e. “rooms”). The proposed method then exploits the separable dynamics of the PEGs¹ to construct options that serve as generalized action to navigate agents among their *individual* superstates. With the superstates and the options, we construct a competitive decision-making process operating at two resolutions: **local PEGs** operating at the original resolution of the state space, each restricted within a superstate, and an **aggregated PEG** operating at the superstate-level, where the agents select options to navigate among the superstates and the options subsequently select primitive actions to reach the target superstate. An illustrative schematic is presented in Fig. 1. The local PEGs and the aggregated game have much smaller state spaces than the original game, and their Nash equilibria can be easily computed. A key element in our approach is a way to transfer information between the two levels. Specifically, we connect the two resolution levels through a value propagation: we solve the Nash equilibrium of the local PEGs first and use the computed Nash values as the rewards in the aggregated PEG. The end result is a hierarchical policy that operates at the two resolutions. Finally, through numerical simulations, we demonstrate that the proposed hierarchical approach significantly reduces the computation overhead, while still achieving satisfactory performance when competing against flat Nash policies.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a discrete two-player pursuit-evasion game (PEG) over a grid world. An example is presented in Fig. 2, where a Pursuer (red) and an Evader (blue) inhabit a 11-by-11 grid world and the dark cells denote obstacles (e.g., walls). At the beginning of each episode, both the Pursuer and the Evader start at a randomly-chosen position. The Pursuer needs to capture the Evader by having the Evader within its capture zone (red dashed square), while the Evader tries to avoid capture. The episode ends when the Evader is captured. To ensure capture, we assume that the Pursuer can move at most two cells in each of the four directions, while the Evader can move at most one cell. Together with the “no-move” action, the Pursuer has nine primitive actions, while the Evader has five. The reachable states for the two agents are marked with the color of each agent, respectively, as shown in Fig. 2. If an agent intends to make a move that will hit the wall, it stays at its original position and no penalty is given.

Formally, we define a discrete pursuit-evasion game (PEG) as a tuple $\mathcal{G} = \langle \mathcal{S}^1, \mathcal{S}^2, \mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2, \mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{F}, \beta \rangle$. The discrete individual state space \mathcal{S}^i corresponds to the position of agent i , and the discrete individual action space \mathcal{A}^i denotes the actions agent i can take. We refer to these actions as the *primitive* actions. We use $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^1 \times \mathcal{S}^2$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^1 \times \mathcal{A}^2$ to denote the joint state and action spaces. The superscript i denotes that an entity is associated with agent i . An entity without a superscript is assumed to be associated with the

¹The spatial transitions of the individual agents are independent of the other agent’s position and action.




Fig. 2. A pursuit-evasion game.




Fig. 3. The four “rooms”.

joint (state or action) space. The terminal set \mathcal{F} consists of all joint states $s = (s^1, s^2)$ that correspond to successful capture. The movement of the agents is characterized by the individual agent dynamics $\mathcal{T}^i : \mathcal{S}^i \times \mathcal{A}^i \times \mathcal{S}^i \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $\mathcal{T}^i(s^{i'} | s^i, a^i)$ denotes the probability that agent i transitions from its current state (position) s^i to $s^{i'}$ under the action a^i . The joint dynamics is given by $\mathcal{T}(s' | s, a) = \mathcal{T}^1(s^{1'} | s^1, a^1) \mathcal{T}^2(s^{2'} | s^2, a^2)$ for all states $s = (s^1, s^2) \notin \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{T}(s | s, a) = 1$ for all joint action $a \in \mathcal{A}$ if $s \in \mathcal{F}$. In other words, all terminal joint states in \mathcal{F} are absorbing. The function $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]$ provides the reward at the joint state s . We assume a zero-sum reward structure and let the Pursuer be the maximizing Agent 1 and the Evader be the minimizing Agent 2. We further consider a sparse reward and assign $\mathcal{R}(s) = +1$ for $s \in \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{R}(s) = 0$ otherwise. Finally, $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is the discount factor.

Assuming full observation of the joint states, we first consider Markovian mixed policies for the two agents. Specifically, the policy π^i for agent i is a mapping $\pi^i : \mathcal{A}^i \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $\pi^i(a^i | s)$ gives the probability of choosing action a^i at the joint state s . Given a policy pair (π^1, π^2) , we denote the induced value at each state $s \in \mathcal{S}$ as

$$\mathcal{V}^{\pi^1, \pi^2}(s) = \mathbb{E}^{\pi^1, \pi^2} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \mathcal{R}(s_t) | s_0 = s \right], \quad (1)$$

where $s_t = (s_t^1, s_t^2)$ is the joint state at time step t .

The Nash equilibrium (NE) is then defined as a policy pair (π^{1*}, π^{2*}) , such that, at each joint state, $s \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\mathcal{V}^{\pi^1, \pi^{2*}}(s) \leq \mathcal{V}^{\pi^{1*}, \pi^{2*}}(s) \leq \mathcal{V}^{\pi^{1*}, \pi^2}(s), \quad (2)$$

for all admissible policies π^1 and π^2 . That is, there is no incentive for either agent to unilaterally deviate from a NE. Even though multiple NEs may exist in a zero-sum game, the max-min (optimal) value of a NE is unique and can be computed via value iterations [8] with the following update rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}(s, a^1, a^2) & \\ &= \mathcal{R}(s) + \beta \sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{T}(s' | s, a^1, a^2) \text{Nash}(\mathcal{Q}_k(s')), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the subscript k indicates the iteration step and the Q-matrix $\mathcal{Q}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}^1| \times |\mathcal{A}^2|}$ is defined as $[\mathcal{Q}(s)]_{a^1, a^2} = \mathcal{Q}(s, a^1, a^2)$. At each joint state s , the Nash value of the Q-matrix can be computed via the following linear program

from Agent 1’s perspective:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{v, \pi^1(s)} v \\ \text{subject to} & \quad v \mathbb{1} - \pi^1(s)^\top \mathcal{Q}(s) \leq 0, \\ & \quad \mathbb{1}^\top \pi^1(s) = 1, \quad \pi^1(s) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\pi^1(s) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{A}^1|}$ is the policy of Agent 1 in vector form and $\mathbb{1}$ is a column vector full of ones of compatible dimension. The solution v^* of (4) gives the Nash value $v^* = \text{Nash}(\mathcal{Q}(s))$, and $\pi^{1*}(s)$ gives the Nash policy for Agent 1 at state s . The Nash policy for Agent 2 can be solved through a similar linear program.

Although efficient algorithms exist to solve linear programs [9], there are still 4,624 states for the example shown in Fig. 2 (68 position states for each agent). That is, to compute the Nash equilibrium for this rather small problem one needs to solve 4,624 linear programs for *each* value iteration. The number of linear programs can easily get prohibitively large. For example, the last example in Fig. 7 requires almost one million LPs per iteration. Consequently, we seek an alternative approach that will allow us to decompose a large game into smaller pieces using a hierarchical approach.

The proposed hierarchical approach is motivated by the following intuitive observations: (i) when the two agents are far away, knowing the approximate position of the opponent is enough to make a decent decision, and at this stage, the agents do not need to perform fine maneuvers to achieve satisfactory performance; and (ii) when the two agents are close and a capture is imminent, the agents need the exact position to perform precise maneuvers to achieve (or avoid) capture. In this case, the agents can further restrict their attention to the local environment and ignore the rest of the grid world. Motivated by these two observations, we want to design intelligent agents that make decisions according to various resolutions of the state space, depending on the circumstances.

III. THE HIERARCHICAL PEG

In this section, we will first partition the grid world domain (individual state space S^i) into smaller components, which we refer to as the individual superstates (or “rooms,” see Fig. 3). A decision-making process is then constructed to operate at two different resolutions: **(i) superstate-level**, at which the two agents navigate among the “rooms” using options [12], and the Pursuer tries to be in the same room as the Evader; and **(ii) state-level**, where the two agents play a local PEG restricted within a superstate that contains a terminal state². If capture occurs, the game terminates (visualized in Fig. 1); otherwise, the Evader escapes to another room, and the process reverses back to the aggregated game at the superstate level. The end product is a hierarchical policy, whose execution will be discussed in Section IV.

²With the capture region in Fig. 2, a capture may happen when the two agents are in neighboring rooms. For conciseness, however, we visualize local games when the two agents are in the same room.




Fig. 4. Boundary (blue stripes) and Periphery (red stripes) of Room-0.




Fig. 5. The option for navigating from Room-0 to Room-2.

A. Superstates

We first formalize the definition of “rooms” through the concept of individual superstates. Let $\Gamma^i = \{\gamma_1^i, \dots, \gamma_\ell^i\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) be a partition of the *individual* state space S^i for agent i , where each γ_k^i , $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$ is a subset of S^i . We say that a partition Γ^i is an aggregated state space for agent i if $S^i = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\ell} \gamma_k^i$ and $\gamma_j^i \cap \gamma_k^i = \emptyset$ for all $j \neq k$. We refer to the subset $\gamma^i \in \Gamma^i$ as an individual *superstate*, while the original individual state $s^i \in S^i$ will still be referred to as an individual *state* for agent i .

Remark 1: The “rooms” give a natural definition of individual superstates. That is, each room can be treated as a single individual superstate. However, the concept of superstate is much more general than the concept of a “room,” as it does not hinge on a geometric interpretation.

Next, we identify two important classes of individual states that serve as a medium through which agents transition from one individual superstate to another.

Definition 1 (adopted from [16]): The *periphery* and the *boundary* of an individual superstate $\gamma^i \in \Gamma^i$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Peri}(\gamma^i) &= \{s^{i'} \notin \gamma^i \mid \exists s^i \in \gamma^i, a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{T}^i(s^{i'}|s^i, a^i) > 0\}, \\ \text{Bndry}(\gamma^i) &= \{s^{i'} \in \gamma^i \mid \exists s^i \notin \gamma^i, a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{T}^i(s^{i'}|s^i, a^i) > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

In words, $\text{Peri}(\gamma^i)$ is the set of individual states outside γ^i that can be reached from γ^i within one transition. Similarly, $\text{Bndry}(\gamma^i)$ is the set of individual states within γ^i that can be reached from outside γ^i within one transition. The periphery and boundary for the Evader are visualized in Fig. 4, for the environment shown in Fig. 3.

Definition 2: An individual superstate $\gamma^{i'}$ is *adjacent* to γ^i , denoted as $\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}$, if $\text{Peri}(\gamma^i) \cap \gamma^{i'} \neq \emptyset$.

The joint aggregated state space is then defined as the Cartesian product $\Gamma = \Gamma^1 \times \Gamma^2$, and the notion of periphery, boundary and adjacency can be easily extended to the joint superstates.³ For example, the periphery of a joint superstate $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is defined as

$$\text{Peri}(\gamma) = \{s' \notin \gamma \mid \exists s \in \gamma, a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{T}(s'|s, a) > 0\},$$

where s and a are joint state and joint action, respectively.

³For simplicity, we consider the case where $\Gamma^1 = \Gamma^2$. However, the proposed framework can be easily extended to the scenarios where different abstractions of the environment are used by the two agents.

B. Options

To construct the corresponding macro-actions of the aggregated game that result in transitions among individual superstates we leverage the option framework [12]. The separable dynamics of PEGs allows us to generate options in the *individual* state space, which significantly alleviates the computational burden.

Definition 3: An *option* for agent i is a tuple

$$o^i = \langle \mathcal{S}_{o^i}^i, \mathcal{F}_{o^i}^i, \pi_{o^i}^i \rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{o^i}^i \subset \mathcal{S}^i$ is the domain of the option, and the option o^i is only available over the individual states within the domain; $\mathcal{F}_{o^i}^i$ is the terminal set, and the option terminates once agent i reaches an individual state within the set; finally, $\pi_{o^i}^i : \mathcal{S}_{o^i}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^i$ is the local policy, according to which agent i selects its primitive action given its individual state within the domain.

For each pair of adjacent individual superstates $\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}$, we construct a Markov Decision Process (MDP) to generate the local policy for option $o_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i$ that navigates agent i from individual states in γ^i to $\gamma^{i'}$. This local MDP is defined as $\mathcal{M}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i = \langle \mathcal{S}^i|_{\gamma^i}, \mathcal{A}^i, \mathcal{T}^i|_{\gamma^i}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i, \beta \rangle$, where

- i) $\mathcal{S}^i|_{\gamma^i} = \gamma^i \cup \text{Peri}(\gamma^i)$ is the restricted local state space;
- ii) \mathcal{A}^i is the original action space;
- iii) $\mathcal{T}^i|_{\gamma^i}$ is the restricted transition kernel, such that, for all $a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^i|_{\gamma^i}(s^{i'}|s^i, a^i) &= \mathcal{T}^i(s^{i'}|s^i, a^i) \text{ if } s^i \in \gamma^i, s^{i'} \in \mathcal{S}^i|_{\gamma^i} \\ \mathcal{T}^i|_{\gamma^i}(s^i|s^i, a^i) &= 1, \quad \text{if } s^i \in \text{Peri}(\gamma^i). \end{aligned}$$

- iv) $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i : \mathcal{S}^i|_{\gamma^i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the local pseudo-reward, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i(s^i) &= +1, & \text{if } s^i \in \text{Peri}(\gamma^i) \cap \gamma^{i'}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i(s^i) &= 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

The local pseudo-reward provides an incentive for agent i to move to the periphery states in the target individual superstate $\gamma^{i'}$. Once the agent reaches the target superstate, the local MDP terminates. The local MDP $\mathcal{M}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i$ is a *single-agent* problem and can be easily solved via value iterations or policy iterations⁴. The resulting optimal policy $\pi^{i*} : \mathcal{S}^i|_{\gamma^i} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^i$ is then assigned as the local policy for option $o_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i$. Note that the local policy operates on the individual state space.

We set the domain for option $o_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i$ as $\gamma^i \subset \mathcal{S}^i$, and the terminal set as $\text{Peri}(\gamma^{i'})$. Consequently, agent i can initiate option $o_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}^i$ within superstate γ^i and the option automatically terminates when the agent leaves γ^i . An example of the Evader's 'Room-0 To Room-2' option is presented in Fig 5. The arrows are the actions taken by the local policy at each specific cell within the room, and the red cells are the target periphery states within the individual superstate 'Room-2'.

⁴We let both agent maximizes with respect to this pseudo-reward, just for reaching the target superstate.

For each adjacent pair of individual superstates, we solve for all such options, and we use \mathcal{O}^i to denote the set of all these options for agent i . Furthermore, we let $\mathcal{O}^i(\gamma)$ denote the options available to agent i at the joint superstate γ .

C. Local Games

One key ingredient we are still missing for the aggregated game is the aggregated rewards. Since the aggregated game transitions to a local game when the two agents are in the same room², we use the Nash value of the local PEG to inform the decision-making at the superstate level.

Formally, we construct local games for each of the *joint* superstates γ such that $\gamma \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$, where \mathcal{F} is the set of joint states that correspond to successful capture in PEG.

A local game, restricted to a joint superstate γ , is defined as a tuple $\mathcal{G}_\gamma = \langle \mathcal{S}|_\gamma, \mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2, \mathcal{T}_\gamma, \mathcal{R}_\gamma, \beta \rangle$, where

- i) $\gamma \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$.
- ii) $\mathcal{S}|_\gamma$ is the restricted local joint state space, defined as

$$\mathcal{S}|_\gamma = \gamma \cup \text{Peri}(\gamma).$$

- iii) \mathcal{A}^i ($i = 1, 2$) are the original action spaces.
- iv) \mathcal{T}_γ is the joint transition restricted to the local state space, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\gamma(s'|s, a^1, a^2) &= \mathcal{T}(s'|s, a^1, a^2), \text{ if } s \in \gamma, s' \in \mathcal{S}|_\gamma \\ \mathcal{T}_\gamma(s|s, a^1, a^2) &= 1, \quad \text{if } s \in \text{Peri}(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

- v) \mathcal{R}_γ is the local reward, and

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma(s) = \mathcal{R}(s) \quad \forall a^i \in \mathcal{A}^i, s \in \mathcal{S}|_\gamma.$$

The local games terminates⁵ once the agents leave the superstate γ , which corresponds to reaching the periphery states of the joint superstate γ . Consequently, the local games have absorbing peripheries. Meanwhile, each of these local games has a much smaller state space than the original game and can be easily solved via value iteration as in (3)-(4). We denote the local Nash value as \mathcal{V}_γ^* and the local Nash policies as π_γ^{i*} , $i = 1, 2$. The local Nash policy π_γ^{i*} governs the behaviors of agent i when it is in the superstate γ . The Nash values will be used as the rewards for the aggregated game in the next subsection.

D. Aggregated Game

The aggregated game operates over the joint superstates. Instead of directly selecting a primitive action, the agent in the aggregated game selects an option based on the current joint superstate observation. First, we define the transition probabilities between the joint superstates resulting from the options introduced in Section III-B.

We leverage the discounted multi-step transition probability [12] to properly address the different timescale on which the aggregated game operates. With the convention $s = (s^1, s^2)$ and $s' = (s^{1'}, s^{2'})$, the discounted multi-step transition probability between two joint superstates γ and γ' can be computed as

⁵If a capture happens, the PEG terminates. Otherwise, the Evader escaped to another superstate, and we transition back to the aggregated game.

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta(\gamma'|\gamma, o^1, o^2) = \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \phi(\gamma'|s, o^1, o^2), \quad (5)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\gamma'|s, o^1, o^2) &= \beta \sum_{s' \in \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s'|s, \pi_{o^1}^1(s^1), \pi_{o^2}^2(s^2)) \\ &+ \beta \sum_{s' \in \gamma} \mathcal{T}(s'|s, \pi_{o^1}^1(s^1), \pi_{o^2}^2(s^2)) \phi(\gamma'|s', o^1, o^2). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The computation performed in (5) is equivalent to: (a) fix agent i 's policy to $\pi_{o^i}^i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and set the $\text{Peri}(\gamma)$ as absorbing, (b) start the Markov Chain induced by $(\pi_{o^1}^1, \pi_{o^2}^2)$ with a uniform distribution over $\text{Bndry}(\gamma)$, and (c) compute the probability of the Markov Chain ending up in joint superstate γ' and properly discount the probability based on the arrival time. See Appendix I for more details.

With the multi-step transitions, we can define the aggregated game $\mathcal{G}_\Gamma = \langle \Gamma^1, \Gamma^2, \mathcal{O}^1, \mathcal{O}^2, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta, \tilde{\mathcal{R}}, \beta \rangle$, where

- i) $\Gamma = \Gamma^1 \times \Gamma^2$ is the joint aggregated state space.
- ii) \mathcal{O}^i is the set of options constructed for agent i to navigate between its individual superstates.
- iii) $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta$ is the discounted transitions in (5)-(6).
- iv) $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ is the aggregated reward, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\gamma) &= \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \mathcal{V}_\gamma^*(s), \quad \text{if } \gamma \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\gamma) &= 0, \quad \text{if } \gamma \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{V}_γ^* is the Nash value of the local game within γ .

We will denote the Nash policies for the aggregated game by π_Γ^{i*} ($i = 1, 2$).

Remark 2: Since the boundary states are the entry points to a superstate, when computing the aggregated transitions, we assign the initial distribution over the boundary states. Since no prior knowledge is given regarding how agents approach this superstate, a uniform distribution is considered. Similarly, we average the Nash value on the boundary states and assign it as the terminal reward for the aggregated game.

E. Proposed Algorithm

We summarize the procedure to find the hierarchical policy for the PEG in Algorithm 1.

Remark 3: Each of the local games can be further decomposed if needed. The trade-off between having multiple levels of decomposition and having a single level with local games of smaller size is a topic for future investigation.

F. Complexity Analysis

We present a complexity comparison between the flat Nash approach and the hierarchical approach. Suppose we have a grid world with $M \times M$ rooms, each room consisting of $N \times N$ cells, and we generate an individual superstate each with a single room within it.

Algorithm 1: Hierarchical Decomposition Algorithm

- 1 **Inputs:** Game \mathcal{G} , Individual State Space Partition Γ^i ;
/* Superstates and options */
 - 2 Generate the superstates [Section III-A] ;
 - 3 Generate option $\mathcal{O}_{\gamma^i \rightsquigarrow \gamma^{i'}}$ for each agent i and each adjacent individual superstate pair [Section III-B] ;
 - 4 Store the options in \mathcal{O}^i ;
/* Local games */
 - 5 Generate local games for joint superstate γ if $\gamma \cap \mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$ [Section III-C];
 - 6 Solve the Nash equilibrium of the local games;
 - 7 Store the values of the local game within γ as \mathcal{V}_γ^* and the local Nash policies as π_γ^{i*} ;
/* Aggregated game */
 - 8 Construct the aggregated game with \mathcal{O}^i as the action space and \mathcal{V}_γ^* as the rewards [Section III-D];
 - 9 Solve the NE of the aggregated game;
 - 10 Store the Nash policy of the aggregated game as π_Γ^{i*} ;
 - 11 **Outputs:** Option sets \mathcal{O}^i ; Local game NE π_γ^{i*} ;
Aggregated game NE π_Γ^{i*} .
-

a) *Time Complexity:* The original PEG has $(MN)^4$ joint states. Then, for each value iteration, the flat Nash solution needs to compute $\mathcal{O}(M^4N^4)$ matrix games. On the other hand, we have an aggregated game with M^2 individual superstates, where each individual superstate containing a room with N^2 individual states. There are at most $5M^2$ local games to be solved², each with N^4 joint states. There is an extra aggregated game with M^4 joint superstates. Consequently, the total number of matrix game solved per iteration⁶ in the hierarchical approach is $\mathcal{O}(M^2N^4 + M^4)$.

b) *Space Complexity:* We present a space complexity analysis for storing the flat Nash policy and the hierarchical policies. The flat Nash policy for agent i is a mapping from the original joint state space to a distribution over the action space \mathcal{A}^i . Storing this flat policy is equivalent to storing a vector with $\mathcal{O}(M^4N^4|\mathcal{A}^i|)$ entries.

The hierarchical policy for agent i has three components: the aggregated Nash policy, the local Nash policies, and the local option policies. The aggregated Nash policy observes the joint superstate and selects options, consequently it requires $(M^4|\mathcal{O}^i|)$ entries to store. We have at most $5M^2$ local games, and each has a local Nash policy that requires $(N^4|\mathcal{A}^i|)$ entries to store. Finally, we have M^2 individual superstates, each with at most four adjacent superstates (“rooms”). That is at most $4M^2$ options, each requiring $(N^2|\mathcal{A}^i|)$ entries to store. Under the assumption that the number of options available at each joint superstate is of the same order as the number of actions, we have the total amount of entries for the hierarchical policy of agent i as $\mathcal{O}((M^4 + M^2N^4 + 4M^2N^2)|\mathcal{A}^i|)$.

⁶The hierarchical approach does not solve all these games simultaneously. We just sum the number of matrix games solved per iteration for each of the games to give a qualitative comparison.

IV. THE HIERARCHICAL POLICY

The hierarchical policy constructed under the proposed framework consists of policies in two resolutions: (i) the aggregated Nash policy π_{Γ}^{i*} observes the *joint* superstate γ and selects an option $o^i \in \mathcal{O}^i(\gamma)$; once an option o^i is selected, the local policy $\pi_{o^i}^i(s^i)$ observes the *individual state* s^i and selects primitive actions; (ii) When the system transitions to a joint superstate γ that contains a local game, the local Nash policy $\pi_{\gamma}^{i*}(s)$ is deployed, and the agents directly selects its primitive action based on state observation. If the system later leaves the superstate that contains a local game, the process reverse back to the aggregated game. Algorithm 2 presents the execution of the proposed hierarchical policy. The while loop in lines 5 to 9 makes the hierarchical policy

Algorithm 2: Execution of the Hierarchical Policy

```

1 Inputs: Option sets  $\mathcal{O}^i$ , Local game NEs  $\pi_{\gamma}^{i*}$ ,
   Aggregated game NE  $\pi_{\Gamma}^{i*}$ , ( $i = 1, 2$ );
2 while PEG not terminated do
3   Observe current superstate  $\gamma$ ;
4   if  $\gamma$  contains a local game then
5     while Local PEG not terminated do
6       Observe current state  $s$ ;
7       Select action  $a^i$  according to  $\pi_{\gamma}^{i*}(s)$ ;
8       Environment step forward with  $(a^1, a^2)$ ;
9     end
10  else
11    Select option  $o^i$  according to  $\pi_{\Gamma}^{i*}(\gamma)$ ;
12    while Not leaving joint  $\gamma$  do
13      Observe current individual state  $s^i$ ;
14      Select action  $a^i$  according to option local
15      policy  $\pi_{o^i}^i(s^i)$ ;
16      Environment step forward with  $(a^1, a^2)$ 
17    end
18 end

```

non-Markovian, since once an option is selected, the option policy is executed till the option terminates. Consequently, the primitive action taken by the agent depends not only on its current state, but also on the option it has selected when entering the superstate. At line 12, we let the agents terminate their old options when the joint superstate makes a transition⁷. Note that this “any” condition [15] is consistent with the definition of the aggregated transitions in (5).

An example of the execution of the proposed hierarchical policy is presented in Fig. 6. The agents first start with the aggregated game and select their options based on the current superstate. After the selected option executes a sequence of primitive actions, the system transitions to a local game, where the agents select primitive actions according to the local Nash. In the last subplot, the Evader escaped the room, and the system transitions back to the aggregated game, and the process continues.

⁷Equivalent to *any* one of the agents reaches the terminal set of its option.




Fig. 6. An example of the execution of the proposed hierarchical policy.

Finally, the hierarchical policy has a different information structure from the flat policy. The flat Nash policy requires the exact individual state information of both the agents at all time steps. The hierarchical policy, on the other hand, requires the exact location of the opponent only when the two agents are in the same room. When the two agents are far away, the hierarchical policy only requires the room information of the opponent. In that respect, the hierarchical policy can accommodate cases when the sensors of the players are inaccurate and do not provide the precise location of the other agent when the two are far apart.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we verify the efficacy of the proposed algorithm through numerical simulations. We solve the original Nash equilibrium and the hierarchical solution for four PEGs with different sizes, shown in Fig. 7.




Fig. 7. The test grid worlds: 2×2 (4.7K joint states), 3×3 (56.6K joint states), 4×4 (78.9K joint states), and 6×6 (0.9M joint states).

Table I shows the computation time using the flat method and the proposed hierarchical approach. Each component of the hierarchical approach is also presented. One easily sees that the computation time is significantly reduced through the hierarchical decomposition of large games. Meanwhile, the majority of the computation time is spent on the computation of NEs of the local games. This is expected, as we have multiple local games and they are all executed at the finest resolution. However, solving for the NE of the local games can be easily parallelized, since the local games are independent from one another. One also observes that when the state space is small (as in the 2×2 case), the hierarchical approach is slower than the flat approach. This is due to the additional auxiliary tasks the hierarchical approach needs to perform (such as generating the abstract transitions and the local games) that add to the initial computational overhead.

We provide a log-log plot in Fig. 8 to better illustrate the trend of computation time vs. state space size. The computation time of the hierarchical approach grows slower with respect to the size of the PEG than the flat approach, which confirms the motivation of this work.

TABLE I
COMPUTATION TIME COMPARISON [IN SECONDS]

PEG Size	2×2	3×3	4×4	6×6
Flat	380.62	916.85	7068.72	37412.62
Hierarchical	477.46	638.91	2095.70	4501.27
- Option	0.92	2.07	4.70	9.70
- Local Game	462.54	610.98	2034.33	4257.70
- Abstract Game	14.00	25.86	56.67	233.87




Fig. 8. The log-log plot of the computation time vs. state space size trend.

Table II compares the performance of the hierarchical policy versus the flat Nash policy. For each grid world, we ran 2,000 episodes, with randomly selected initial positions for the Pursuer and the Evader. We used the average number of transitions till capture as the performance metric. We let the agents with different types of policies play against each other. When the hierarchical pursuer competed against the Nash evader, it took about 15% more steps to capture compared to a Nash pursuer. This performance drop is expected, since the Nash pursuit policy is, by definition, the best response to the Nash evasion policy, but the relative performance drop decreases when the state space gets larger.

TABLE II
AVERAGE # STEPS TILL CAPTURE

P vs. E	2×2	3×3	4×4	6×6
Nash vs. Nash	5.41	13.12	18.42	25.85
Hier vs. Nash	6.62 (+22%)	15.55 (+18%)	20.61 (+12%)	28.18 (+9%)
Nash vs. Hier	4.47 (-18%)	10.86 (-17%)	16.26 (-12%)	23.05 (-10%)

One of the causes for the sub-optimal performance of the hierarchical approach comes from the information loss, when the agents make decisions based on the superstates. To better illustrate this point, we present two trajectories in Fig. 9. The trajectories are truncated from the 4×4 grid world, with the four rooms corresponds to the rooms in orange in Fig. 7. The right subplot presents a trajectory of a Nash Pursuer against a Nash Evader. The Nash Pursuer utilizes its speed advantage and captures the Evader with seven steps.

The left subplot in Fig. 9 presents the trajectory of a hierarchical Pursuer against a Nash Evader. At timestep 3 (highlighted with stripes), given the speed advantage, the Pursuer should directly chase down the Evader through Room-B. However, at that moment, the hierarchical pursuer is still playing the aggregated game. Based only on the room information, the Pursuer does not know the exact location of the Evader within room-D (light orange area). Furthermore, if the Evader is at the bottom part of room-D, it could easily escape to one of the other rooms. Consequently, the




Fig. 9. A comparison of sample trajectories: **left** is Hierarchical Pursuer vs. Nash Evader, and **right** is Nash Pursuer vs. Nash Evader. With the same starting state, the hierarchical Pursuer takes thirteen steps to capture the Nash Evader, while the Nash Pursuer only takes seven steps.

Pursuer follows the sub-optimal route down to Room-C and then come to Room-D to defend. Such behavior is inevitable owing to the abstraction.

Another cause for the loss of performance comes from the less frequent decision update in the hierarchical policy. While the Nash agent updates its ‘where-to-go’ decision every timestep, the hierarchical agent updates its ‘which-room-to-go’ decision only when the options terminate. Consequently, the hierarchical agents are less responsive than the flat Nash agents.

Finally, we present the impact the aggregation size has on the algorithm. Instead of having one room as one individual superstate, we have a $K \times K$ block of rooms as a single individual superstate. An example of such multi-room aggregation for the 6×6 grid world is presented in Fig. 10. The performance for different aggregation size is presented in Table III. Note that when all rooms coalesce into a single superstate, then the original game is recovered as a single local game, and we recover the same performance as the flat Nash policy. On the other extreme not presented here, where a single state is treated as a superstate, we can recover the original game as the aggregated game, under some additional conditions.




Fig. 10. Different aggregation sizes. Each blue block is an individual superstate. From left to right: 1×1 , 2×2 , 3×3 and 6×6 room-blocks.

TABLE III
PERFORMANCE WITH DIFFERENT AGGREGATIONS

P vs. E	each individual superstate contains			
	1 room	4 rooms	9 rooms	36 rooms
Nash vs. Nash	25.85	25.85	25.85	25.85
Hier vs. Nash	28.18 (+9%)	28.79 (+11%)	30.54 (+18%)	25.79
Nash vs. Hier	23.05 (-10%)	21.55 (-16%)	17.43 (-32%)	25.82

When each superstate contains more states, the corresponding local games would contain a larger region of the state space and the resulting hierarchical agents are better informed in the local PEG. However, a larger superstate also leads to a lower resolution for the aggregated game, and the

hierarchical agents ignore more information regarding the opponent's position when selecting options; this would result in a degraded performance due to playing an aggregated game. The trade-off between the performance of the local games and the aggregated game is not observed in this example. Future work will further investigate this trade-off.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we proposed a hierarchical framework to decompose a large pursuit-evasion game in a grid world. The proposed approach constructs a two-resolution decision making process, which consists of a set of local PEGs at the original state level and an aggregated PEG at the superstate level. For the local PEGs, the agents restrict their attention within a superstate, while in the aggregated PEG, the agents utilize options to navigate among the superstates. With this hierarchy, the decomposed PEGs have much smaller state spaces and can be easily solved to Nash equilibria. Through numerical simulations, we showed that the proposed approach significantly reduced the computation overhead compared to the non-hierarchical approach, while still maintaining a good level of performance. Future work will extend this framework to games with more than two players. It is also of interest to investigate the theoretical bounds for the sub-optimality induced by the hierarchical decomposition.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Ho, A. Bryson, and S. Baron, "Differential games and optimal pursuit-evasion strategies," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 385–389, 1965.
- [2] R. Isaacs, *Differential Games*. John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- [3] T. Başar, *Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory*. SIAM, 1998.
- [4] R. Vidal, O. Shakernia, H. J. Kim, D. H. Shim, and S. Sastry, "Probabilistic pursuit-evasion games: theory, implementation, and experimental evaluation," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 662–669, 2002.
- [5] D. W. Oyler, P. T. Kabamba, and A. R. Girard, "Pursuit–evasion games in the presence of obstacles," *Automatica*, vol. 65, pp. 1–11, 2016.
- [6] H. J. Kushner and P. G. Dupuis, *Numerical Methods for Stochastic Control Problems in Continuous Time*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2001, vol. 24.
- [7] Y. Guan, D. Maity, C. M. Kroninger, and P. Tsiotras, "Bounded-rational pursuit-evasion games," in *American Control Conference*, New Orleans, LA, May, 25–28, 2021, pp. 3216–3221.
- [8] J. Filar and K. Vrieze, *Competitive Markov Decision Processes*. Springer, 2012.
- [9] D. Bertsimas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Introduction to Linear Optimization*. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA, 1997, vol. 6.
- [10] T. G. Dietterich, "Hierarchical reinforcement learning with the MaxQ value function decomposition," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 13, pp. 227–303, 2000.
- [11] A. Levy, G. Konidaris, R. Platt, and K. Saenko, "Learning multi-level hierarchies with hindsight," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.00948*, 2017.
- [12] R. S. Sutton, D. Precup, and S. Singh, "Between MDPs and semi-MDPs: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 112, no. 1-2, pp. 181–211, 1999.
- [13] M. Ghavamzadeh, S. Mahadevan, and R. Makar, "Hierarchical multi-agent reinforcement learning," *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 197–229, 2006.
- [14] J. Yang, I. Borovikov, and H. Zha, "Hierarchical cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning with skill discovery," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.03558*, 2019.
- [15] R. Makar, S. Mahadevan, and M. Ghavamzadeh, "Hierarchical multi-agent reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Autonomous Agents*, 2001, pp. 246–253.
- [16] T. Dean and S.-H. Lin, "Decomposition techniques for planning in stochastic domains," in *IJCAI*, vol. 2. Citeseer, 1995, p. 3.

APPENDIX I
DISCOUNTED MULTI-STEP TRANSITION PROBABILITIES

Suppose the joint system is currently in joint superstate γ , and the agents apply a joint option $o = (o^1, o^2)$, the Q-function under the joint options is given by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\gamma, o^1, o^2) = \mathcal{R}(\gamma, o^1, o^2) + \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma', \tau | \gamma, o^1, o^2) \beta^\tau \mathcal{V}^*(\gamma'),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma', \tau | \gamma, o^1, o^2)$ is the probability of transitioning from γ *directly* to γ' right after τ timesteps. In other words, τ is the timestep the joint process leaves γ for the first time. The discount term β^τ is introduced to address the different timescale on which the aggregated game operates. With the discounted multi-step transition probability

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta(\gamma' | \gamma, o) = \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma', \tau | \gamma, o), \quad (7)$$

we can compactly write the Q-function as

$$\mathcal{Q}(\gamma, o) = \mathcal{R}(\gamma, o) + \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta(\gamma' | \gamma, o) \mathcal{V}^*(\gamma'). \quad (8)$$

Note that the discount factor is absorbed in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta$, and therefore the discount factor is no longer explicitly presented in (8).

Since we do not know how the agents approach the superstate γ , we assume that the agents start with a uniform distribution on the boundary of γ (the entry points) and compute the τ -step transition among superstates as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma', \tau | \gamma, o) = \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma', \tau | s, o),$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\gamma', \tau | s, o)$ is the probability of the system *directly* reaching joint superstate γ' at time τ starting from joint state s . This probability can be computed as

$$\mathcal{T}(\gamma', \tau | s, o) = \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s', \tau | s, o),$$

where τ is the timestep the joint system leaves γ for the first time. Now, we can re-write the multi-step transition in (7) as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta(\gamma' | \gamma, o) &= \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(\gamma', \tau | \gamma, o) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s', \tau | s, o) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s', \tau | s, o) \\ &= \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \phi(\gamma' | s, o). \end{aligned}$$

We further examine the term $\phi(\gamma' | s, o)$, which represents the discounted multi-step transition starting from joint state s to joint superstate γ' under joint option o .

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\gamma' | s, o) &= \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s', \tau | s, o) \\ &= \beta \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s' | s, o) + \sum_{\tau=2}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s', \tau | s, o) \end{aligned} \quad (9a)$$

$$= \beta \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s' | s, o) + \sum_{\tau=2}^{\infty} \beta^\tau \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \sum_{\hat{s} \in \gamma} \mathcal{T}(\hat{s} | s, o) \mathcal{T}(s', \tau - 1 | \hat{s}, o) \quad (9b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \beta \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s' | s, o) + \beta \sum_{\hat{s} \in \gamma} \mathcal{T}(\hat{s} | s, o) \left(\sum_{\tau=2}^{\infty} \beta^{\tau-1} \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s', \tau - 1 | \hat{s}, o) \right) \\ &= \beta \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s' | s, o) + \beta \sum_{\hat{s} \in \gamma} \mathcal{T}(\hat{s} | s, o) \phi(\gamma' | \hat{s}, o). \end{aligned}$$

For the step from (9a) to (9b), we used the fact that τ is the first time that the joint process leaves the superstate γ . Consequently, if $\tau \geq 2$, the state \hat{s} at the timestep 1 needs to be within superstate γ . Otherwise, the process has either already reached the target γ' or has leaved γ and reached superstates other than γ' . The rest of the derivations are simple algebraic manipulations.

In summary, we can compute the discounted multi-step transition probability starting from joint state s to joint superstate γ' under joint option o as the fixed point of

$$\phi(\gamma'|s, o) = \beta \sum_{s' \in \text{Peri}(\gamma) \cap \gamma'} \mathcal{T}(s'|s, o) + \beta \sum_{\hat{s} \in \gamma} \mathcal{T}(\hat{s}|s, o) \phi(\gamma'|\hat{s}, o).$$

The above iteration is similar to the value iteration of MDPs. Subsequently, with $\beta \in (0, 1)$, one can easily show that the fixed point iteration above is guaranteed to converge to a unique fixed point.

Finally, the superstate-wise multi-step transition can be computed as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^\beta(\gamma'|\gamma, o) = \frac{1}{|\text{Bndry}(\gamma)|} \sum_{s \in \text{Bndry}(\gamma)} \phi(\gamma'|s, o).$$