

# SOME UPPER BOUNDS ON THE RUNNING TIME OF POLICY ITERATION ON DETERMINISTIC MDPS

RITESH GOENKA, EASHAN GUPTA<sup>†</sup>, SUSHIL KHYALIA<sup>†</sup>, PRATYUSH AGARWAL\*, MULINTI SHAIK WAJID\*, AND SHIVARAM KALYANAKRISHNAN

ABSTRACT. Policy Iteration (PI) is a widely used family of algorithms to compute optimal policies for Markov Decision Problems (MDPs). We derive upper bounds on the running time of PI on Deterministic MDPs (DMDPs): the class of MDPs in which every state-action pair has a unique next state. Our results include a non-trivial upper bound that applies to the entire family of PI algorithms, and affirmation that a conjecture regarding Howard’s PI on MDPs is true for DMDPs. Our analysis is based on certain graph-theoretic results, which may be of independent interest.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Policy Iteration	3
3.	Number of Cycles in Digraphs	5
4.	Bounds for Policy Iteration on Deterministic MDPs	15
	References	20

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A Markov Decision Problem (MDP) (Puterman [37]) is an abstraction of a decision-making task in which the effect of any given *action* from any given *state* is a stochastic transition to a next state, coupled with a numeric reward. A *policy* (taken in this article to be Markovian, and deterministic) for an MDP specifies the action to take from each state. The utility of a policy is usually taken as some form of the expected *long-term* reward it yields. A common definition of long-term reward (also the one we use in this article) is as a discounted sum of the individual rewards over an infinite number of time steps. For an MDP with a finite number of states and actions, the set of policies is also finite, and this set necessarily contains an *optimal* policy, which maximises the expected long-term reward starting from each state in the MDP (Bellman [9]). For a given MDP—specified by its sets of states and actions, transition probabilities, rewards, and discount factor—the desired solution is an optimal policy for the MDP.

Policy Iteration (PI) [26] is a widely-used family of algorithms to solve MDPs. A PI algorithm is initialised with some arbitrary policy, and iterates through a sequence of policies that is guaranteed to terminate in an optimal policy. In each iteration, a (possibly empty) set of “improving” actions is identified for each state. Any policy obtained by switching one or more of the current policy’s actions to improving ones is guaranteed to dominate the current one, and hence can be selected as the subsequent iterate. Each algorithm from the PI family is defined by its choice of improving actions for switching to at each step. An alternative perspective of PI algorithms emerges by considering a standard linear program  $P_M$  derived from the input MDP  $M$  [37, Section 6.9.1]. The vertices of the feasible polytope of  $P_M$  are in bijective correspondence with policies for  $M$ . PI algorithms restricted to changing the action only at a single state essentially perform a Simplex update on the feasible polytope. On the other hand, the generic PI update, which could involve changing actions at multiple states, amounts to a block-pivoting step.

---

*Date:* November 29, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 90C40; Secondary: 68Q25, 05C35, 05C38.

*Key words and phrases.* MDP; Deterministic MDP; Policy improvement; Policy iteration; Computational complexity.

<sup>†</sup> and \* indicate equal contribution.

A Deterministic MDP (DMDP) is an MDP in which the transitions are all deterministic. In other words, for every state  $s$  and action  $a$  in a DMDP, there is a unique state  $s'$  (determined by  $s$  and  $a$ ), which is reached whenever  $a$  is taken from  $s$ . With the challenge of stochasticity removed, DMDPs would appear to be an easier class of problems to solve than MDPs—and several results affirm this to be the case. For example, solving MDPs has been established to be  $P$ -complete, whereas solving DMDPs is in  $NC$  (Papadimitriou [34]). Moreover, it has been established that DMDPs can be solved in *strongly polynomial* time (this means that if any arithmetic or relational operation can be performed in constant time, regardless of the size of the operands, then the total number of such operations required is at most a polynomial in the number of states and actions, with no dependence on other input parameters). Madani [29] proposes a specialised algorithm for DMDPs that enjoys a strongly polynomial upper bound, while Post and Ye [36] establish that the classical “max gain” variant of the Simplex algorithm (an instance of PI) runs in strongly polynomial time on DMDPs.

**1.1. Contribution.** By upper-bounding the complexity of specific algorithms on DMDPs, the preceding results indirectly upper-bound the running time of the *best* algorithm from a particular family. In this article, we adopt a complementary perspective. We derive running-time upper bounds that apply to the entire family of PI algorithms, and hence to the *worst* among them, when run on DMDPs. Concretely, consider a finite DMDP with  $n \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 2$  actions (with the convention that each of the  $k$  actions is available from each state). The total number of policies,  $k^n$ , serves as a trivial upper bound on the number of iterations taken by any PI algorithm. We show the number of iterations taken by *every* PI algorithm on an  $n$ -state,  $k$ -action DMDP is at most  $\text{poly}(n, k) \cdot \alpha(k)^n$ , where

$$(1) \quad \alpha(k) = \frac{k - 1 + \sqrt{(k - 1)^2 + 4}}{2}.$$

In turn, this quantity is upper-bounded by  $\text{poly}(n, k) \cdot \left(k - \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^n = \text{poly}(n, k) \cdot (k - 0.3819\dots)^n$ .

We obtain a tighter upper bound when we constrain the PI algorithm’s strategy for action selection (while the algorithm is still free to select on which *states* to switch). In particular, if the algorithm selects from the available improving actions in any state greedily based on “max gain”, we show that the total number of iterations is at most  $\text{poly}(n, k) \cdot \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)\right)^n \frac{k}{e}$ .

The significance of our results is most apparent for the special case of  $k = 2$  actions. Melekopoglou and Condon [32] have constructed an  $n$ -state, 2-action MDP on which variant of PI visits all the  $2^n$  policies. On the other hand, our result is that no PI algorithm can exceed  $\text{poly}(n) \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^n$  iterations on any  $n$ -state, 2-action DMDP. As yet, it is not clear if this separation between DMDPs and MDPs also holds for  $k \geq 3$  actions. Another interesting corollary of our results concerns Howard’s PI (HPI) [26], arguably the most commonly used variant of the PI family, in which a switch is made at every state with improving actions. On  $n$ -state, 2-action MDPs, the tightest upper bound known for this algorithm is  $O\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$  iterations [30, 25], which is only a linear improvement over the trivial upper bound. It has been conjectured in the context of the “order regularity problem” [22, 18], which relates to the running time of Howard’s PI on all  $n$ -state, 2-action MDPs, that the complexity increases at the rate of the Fibonacci numbers. Our upper bound affirms this conjecture, albeit up to a polynomial factor, for the special case of DMDPs.

Our results follow from the solution of two graph-theoretic problems, which constitute the technical core of the article. Every DMDP  $M$  induces a directed graph  $G_M$  in which the vertices are the states, and the edges are the actions in  $M$ . In turn, each policy induces a subgraph of  $G_M$ , with the restriction of having a single outgoing edge from each vertex. Constraints on the sequence of policies visited by PI (chiefly that each iterate dominates the preceding one) imply a relationship between the length of the policy improvement sequence and certain structural properties of  $G_M$ . We obtain novel bounds on two structural properties of  $G_M$ , which then yield upper bounds on the running time of PI algorithms—one for arbitrary PI variants, and the other for variants that perform “max gain” action selection.

This paper is organised as follows. We provide requisite definitions and background along with some related work in Section 2, before presenting our results in Sections 3 and 4. The reader prepared to assume graph-theoretic results without proof may skip Section 3 and proceed directly to Section 4, in which we use these results to prove upper bounds on the running time of PI algorithms on DMDPs.

## 2. POLICY ITERATION

We begin by defining MDPs, and thereafter describe the PI family of algorithms for solving them. Next, we discuss related work on upper bounds on the number of steps taken by PI to find an optimal policy.

### 2.1. Markov Decision Problems.

**Definition 1.** An MDP is a 5-tuple  $(S, A, T, R, \gamma)$ , where  $S$  is a set of states;  $A$  is a set of actions;  $T : S \times A \times S \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the transition function with  $T(s, a, s')$  being the probability of reaching state  $s' \in S$  by taking action  $a \in A$  from state  $s \in S$  (hence  $\sum_{s'} T(s, a, s') = 1$ );  $R : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the reward function with  $R(s, a)$  being the expected reward obtained on taking action  $a \in A$  from state  $s \in S$ ; and  $\gamma \in [0, 1)$  is the discount factor.

Given an MDP  $M = (S, A, T, R, \gamma)$ , a *policy* (assumed deterministic and Markovian)  $\pi : S \rightarrow A$  specifies an action  $a \in A$  for each state  $s \in S$ . We denote the set of all policies for a given MDP  $M$  by  $\Pi_M$  (or just  $\Pi$  if the underlying MDP  $M$  is evident from the context). In this work, we assume that  $S$  and  $A$  are finite, with  $|S| = n \geq 2$  and  $|A| = k \geq 2$ . Consequently,  $\Pi$  is also finite, and contains  $k^n$  policies.

**Definition 2.** For policy  $\pi \in \Pi$ , the *value function*  $V^\pi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  gives the expected infinite discounted reward obtained by starting from each state  $s \in S$  and following the policy  $\pi$ . Let  $s_0, a_0, r_0, s_1, a_1, r_1, \dots$  be the state-action-reward trajectory generated by  $M$  over time (the subscript indicates the time step). Then for  $s \in S$ ,

$$V^\pi(s) := E \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t, a_t) \right],$$

where  $s_0 = s$ , and for  $t \geq 0$ ,  $a_t = \pi(s_t)$ ,  $s_{t+1} \sim T(s_t, a_t)$ . The *action value function*  $Q^\pi : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  applied to  $s \in S, a \in A$  is the expected infinite discounted reward obtained by starting from  $s$  taking  $a$ , and thereafter following  $\pi$ . Finally, the *gain function*  $\rho^\pi : S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  provides the difference between  $Q^\pi$  and  $V^\pi$ .

All three functions,  $V^\pi$ ,  $Q^\pi$ , and  $\rho^\pi$ , can be computed efficiently (in  $\text{poly}(n, k)$  arithmetic operations) by solving the following equations for  $s \in S, a \in A$ .

$$\begin{aligned} V^\pi(s) &= R(s, \pi(s)) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in S} T(s, \pi(s), s') V^\pi(s'). \\ Q^\pi(s, a) &= R(s, a) + \gamma \sum_{s' \in S} T(s, a, s') V^\pi(s'). \\ \rho^\pi(s, a) &= Q^\pi(s, a) - V^\pi(s). \end{aligned}$$

The first set of equations above, used to compute  $V^\pi$  for some fixed policy  $\pi \in \Pi$ , are called the Bellman equations for  $\pi$ .

We now define relations  $\leq$  and  $<$  to compare policies in  $\Pi$ .

**Definition 3.** For  $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \Pi$ ,  $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$  if  $V^{\pi_1}(s) \leq V^{\pi_2}(s)$  for all  $s \in S$ . Moreover,  $\pi_1 < \pi_2$  if  $\pi_1 \leq \pi_2$  and additionally  $V^{\pi_1}(s) < V^{\pi_2}(s)$  for some state  $s \in S$ .

**Definition 4.** An policy  $\pi^* \in \Pi$  is called an *optimal* policy if  $\pi \leq \pi^*$  for all  $\pi \in \Pi$ .

### 2.2. Policy improvement.

**Definition 5.** For policy  $\pi \in \Pi$ , the *improvable set*  $I^\pi$  is defined as the set of state-action pairs  $(s, a) \in S \times A$  such that  $\rho^\pi(s, a) > 0$ . A set  $I \subseteq I^\pi$  is said to be a *valid* improvement set for  $\pi$  if for each  $s \in S$ , there exists at most one action  $a \in A$  such that  $(s, a) \in I$ , and moreover,  $|I| \geq 1$ .

**Definition 6.** Suppose that for policy  $\pi \in \Pi$ , the set  $I^\pi$  is non-empty. Fix an arbitrary, valid improvement set  $I \subseteq I^\pi$ . Consider policy  $\pi' \in \Pi$ , given by

$$(2) \quad \pi'(s) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } (s, a) \in I, \\ \pi(s), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $\pi'$  is called a *locally-improving* policy of  $\pi$ . The operation of obtaining  $\pi'$  from  $\pi$ , by switching to corresponding actions in the improvement set  $I$ , is called *policy improvement*.




FIGURE 1. An example of a 3-state 2-action MDP with  $\gamma = 0.9$  (left) and the corresponding policy improvement digraph (right). In the left figure, the dashed (red) edges and solid (black) edges correspond to actions 0 and 1, respectively. Each transition in the MDP is marked with (transition probability, reward) pair. In the right figure, the solid and dashed edges correspond to policy improvement steps switching action on a single state and multiple states, respectively.

Notice that if  $|I^\pi| > 1$ , there are multiple possible choices of valid improvement sets  $I \subseteq I^\pi$ . The well-known policy improvement theorem, stated below, provides a guarantee that applies to every such choice of  $I$ .

**Theorem 1.** Fix  $\pi \in \Pi$ . (1) If  $I^\pi = \emptyset$ , then  $\pi$  is an optimal policy. (2) If  $I^\pi \neq \emptyset$ , let  $\pi' \in \Pi$  be obtained from policy improvement to  $\pi$  using any valid improvement set  $I \subseteq I^\pi$ . Then  $\pi < \pi'$ .

We omit the proof of the theorem, which is available in standard references (see, e.g., [27]). The theorem establishes the existence of an optimal policy for every MDP. Indeed “solving” an MDP amounts to computing an optimal policy for it. Although there are multiple possible solution techniques, a natural approach is evident from the theorem itself. This approach gives rise to PI. Algorithms from the PI family proceed through a sequence of policies  $\pi_1 \rightarrow \pi_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \pi_\ell$ , wherein  $\pi_1 \in \Pi$  is an arbitrary initial policy;  $\pi_\ell$  for some  $\ell \geq 1$  is an optimal policy; and for each  $1 \leq i < \ell$ ,  $\pi_{i+1}$  is obtained by performing policy improvement to  $\pi_i$ .

Given any MDP  $M$ , we can now define its Policy Improvement Directed Acyclic Graph (PI-DAG) in the following manner: it is a directed graph with  $\Pi$  as its set of vertices, and there is an edge from  $\pi$  to  $\pi'$  if  $\pi'$  can be obtained from  $\pi$  by a single step of policy improvement. Note that the resulting digraph is acyclic since the presence of a cycle  $\pi_1 \rightarrow \pi_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \pi_\ell \rightarrow \pi_1$  would imply  $\pi_1 < \pi_1$ , resulting in a contradiction. See Figure 1 for an example MDP and its PI-DAG. Note that directed paths starting at some vertex and ending at a sink vertex in the PI-DAG are in bijective correspondence with the possible trajectories of PI algorithms on the MDP  $M$ .

**2.3. Switching rules.** Variants from the PI family are distinguished by their “switching rule”—in other words their choice of legal improvement set  $I \subseteq I^\pi$  to improve the current policy  $\pi$ . In principle, this choice can depend on the entire sequence of policies visited yet, along with any accompanying information gathered from each iteration. However, most common variants of PI are “memoryless”: that is, they select the improvement set  $I \subseteq I^\pi$  solely based on  $I^\pi$ , and sometimes with additional knowledge of  $\rho^\pi(s, a)$  for  $(s, a) \in I^\pi$ . For our purposes, it is convenient to view switching rules as a sequence of two steps: the first to select which *states* will be given new actions, and the second to select improving actions for each of these states. Concretely, let  $S^+(\pi)$  denote the set of all states  $s \in S$  for which there exists some action  $a \in A$  such that  $(s, a) \in I^\pi$ . For each state  $s \in S^+(\pi)$ , let  $A^+(\pi, s)$  be the set of actions  $a \in A$  such that  $(s, a) \in I^\pi$ . Any switching rule must select a non-empty subset  $S_{\text{switch}} \subseteq S^+(\pi)$ , and for each  $s \in S_{\text{switch}}$ , select an action  $a_{\text{switch}}(s)$ . Note that in general,  $S_{\text{switch}}$  and  $a_{\text{switch}}(\cdot)$  can both be random. Also, note that  $a_{\text{switch}}(s)$  is trivially determined for each  $s \in S_{\text{switch}}$  when the MDP has only  $k = 2$  actions.

In our upcoming analysis of the number of iterations taken by PI on DMDPs, we place no restriction on how  $S_{\text{switch}}$  is selected from  $S^+(\pi)$ . However, we consider two distinct settings for action selection. (1) With *arbitrary* action selection, there is no restriction on how  $a_{\text{switch}}(s)$  is selected from  $A^+(\pi, s)$  for  $s \in S_{\text{switch}}$ . (2) Under *max-gain* action selection, we have  $a_{\text{switch}}(s) \in \arg \max_{a \in A^+(\pi, s)} \rho^\pi(s, a)$  for  $s \in S_{\text{switch}}$ , with arbitrary tie-breaking. The max-gain action-selection rule is used widely in practice. To the best of our knowledge, existing upper bounds on the complexity of PI on MDPs (presented shortly) all assume some constraint on the state selection step in the switching rule. Since we place no such restriction, our upper bounds when action selection is arbitrary apply to *every* PI algorithm, including those whose switching choices depend on memory and additional information.

**2.4. Upper bounds.** We briefly review upper bounds on the running time of PI, restricted to bounds that depend only on the number of states  $n \geq 2$  and actions  $k \geq 2$  in the input MDP. Arguably the most common variant from the PI family is Howard’s PI [26], under which  $S_{\text{switch}} = S^+(\pi)$ . Mansour and Singh show an upper bound of  $O(k^n/n)$  iterations when Howard’s PI is coupled with arbitrary action selection; Taraviya and Kalyanakrishnan [45] obtain a tighter bound of  $(O(\sqrt{k \log k}))^n$  iterations when random action selection is used instead. Mansour and Singh [30] also propose a randomised PI variant in which  $S_{\text{switch}}$  is chosen uniformly at random from among the non-empty subsets of  $S^+(\pi)$ . They give an upper bound of  $O\left(\left(1 + \frac{2}{\log k}\right) \frac{k}{2}\right)^n$  iterations (with high probability) when action selection is arbitrary. Their bound of  $O(2^{0.78n})$  expected iterations for the special case of  $k = 2$  was subsequently improved to  $O(n^5)(3/2)^n$  by Hansen et al. [24].

PI variants that switch only a single state in each iteration (that is, enforce  $|S_{\text{switch}}| = 1$ ) may be interpreted as variants of the Simplex algorithm, being run on a linear program (LP) that is induced by the input MDP. Vertices in the feasible polytope of this LP are in bijective correspondence with the set of policies  $\Pi$ ; single switch policy improvements amount to shifting to a neighbouring vertex that increases the objective function, which at vertex corresponding to policy  $\pi \in \Pi$  is  $\sum_{s \in S} V^\pi(s)$ . Suppose the set of states  $S$  is indexed; without loss of generality take  $S = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Kalyanakrishnan et al. [27] show an upper bound of  $(2 + \ln(k - 1))^n$  expected iterations for a variant of PI in which  $S_{\text{switch}} = \{\max_{s \in S^+(\pi)} s\}$ , and action selection is random. Interestingly, Melekopoglou and Condon [32] show that the same rule results in a policy improvement sequence of length  $2^n$  for an  $n$ -state, 2-action MDP. Among deterministic variants of PI, the best known upper bound is  $\text{poly}(n, k) \cdot k^{0.7207n}$  [21], for a variant which generalized the idea of the well known Fibonacci seesaw [43] algorithm for finding the sink in abstract cubes.

Upper bounds above for MDPs also apply to DMDPs, but a much stronger result was shown by Post and Ye [36]. They demonstrate that the max-gain variant of the Simplex indeed terminates after a polynomial number of iterations on  $n$ -state,  $k$ -action DMDP. In this variant, the improvement set is  $\{(\bar{s}, \bar{a})\}$ , where  $\bar{s}, \bar{a} \in \arg \max_{(s, a) \in S \times A} \rho^\pi(s, a)$ , with ties broken arbitrarily. As we shall see in Section 4, every DMDP  $M$  induces a directed graph  $G_M$ , with each policy inducing a subgraph that is guaranteed to contain a directed cycle. Post and Ye establish that the max gain simplex algorithm registers a significant jump in the objective function when proceeding from  $\pi$  to  $\pi'$  if some cycle induced by  $\pi$  is *not* induced by  $\pi'$ . Moreover, such a break of a cycle must occur within a polynomial number of iterations, resulting in an overall upper bound of  $O(n^5 k^2 \log^2 n)$  iterations for the max gain simplex algorithm. Their bound has subsequently been improved by a factor of  $n$  [23] and also generalised [40]. Our analysis of PI on DMDPs, coming up in the next section, also depends crucially on the directed cycles induced by policies in  $G_M$ .

### 3. NUMBER OF CYCLES IN DIGRAPHS

In this section, we discuss results on the maximum number of cycles in directed multigraphs with constraints on degree and edge multiplicity.

The problem of bounding the number of cycles in graphs has a long history. Bounds have been established in terms of several basic graph properties, including the number of edges, vertices, minimum/maximum/average degree, and cyclomatic number [1, 8, 15, 16, 20, 46]. Furthermore, restrictions of this problem to specific classes of graphs are also well studied: planar graphs [4, 6, 11, 15], graphs with forbidden subgraphs [33], Hamiltonian graphs [38, 41], triangle-free graphs [7, 14], random graphs [44], bipartite graphs [6],  $k$ -connected graphs [28], grid graphs [6], outerplanar and series-parallel graphs [12], complement of a tree [39, 47], 3-connected cubic (Hamiltonian) graphs [2, 3], and 3-colorable triangulated graphs [6].

Analogous literature for digraphs is relatively sparse. Yoshua Perl [35] proved bounds for directed multi-graphs with a fixed number of edges. Some restrictions to specific classes of digraphs have also been studied: digraphs with large girth [5] and digraphs with restricted cycle lengths [17]. A few other studies have considered the very closely related question of bounding the number of paths between two given vertices in the digraph: (acyclic) simple digraphs with a given number of edges [13, 35] and simple acyclic digraphs with a given number of vertices and edges [19].

We shall consider directed multigraphs with restrictions on degree and edge multiplicity. In the next section (in particular, Lemmas 5 and 6), we illustrate how the bounds on the number of cycles (that we prove later in this section) can be used to establish bounds on the number of paths and path-cycles (see Section 4 for definition) in the considered digraphs. Before we prove the main results of this section, we provide some basic definitions and set up some notation.

**3.1. Definitions.** We use the term *digraph* to refer to directed graphs possibly containing multi-edges and self-loops. A digraph is said to be *simple* if it does not contain self-loops or multi-edges. For any digraph  $G$ , we shall denote its set of vertices and edges by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$ , respectively. By an edge  $(u, v) \in E(G)$ , we mean the multi-edge from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G$  unless otherwise specified, and denote its multiplicity by  $\text{mult}(u, v)$ . For  $V_0 \subseteq V(G)$ , we denote the induced subgraph of  $G$  on  $V_0$  by  $G[V_0]$ . Finally, we shall denote the digraph obtained by deleting an edge  $(u, v)$  from  $G$  by  $G \setminus (u, v)$  and the digraph obtained by contracting (defined below) an edge  $(u, v)$  in  $G$  by  $G/(u, v)$ .

**Definition 7.** For integers  $n \geq 0, k \geq 2$ , we define  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$  as the set of all digraphs with  $n$  vertices, outdegree at most  $k$ , with the additional restriction that the digraph does not contain any multi-edge.

**Definition 8.** For integers  $n \geq 0, k \geq 2$ , we define  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$  as the set of all digraphs with  $n$  vertices, outdegree exactly  $k$ , with the restriction that the multiplicity of edges connecting distinct vertices is at most  $k - 1$ .

Note that digraphs in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$  might contain self-loops. Also note that  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{0,k} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{0,k}$  and both of these sets contain a single element, the empty digraph  $(\phi, \phi)$ .

**Definition 9.** Given a digraph  $G$ , its *skeleton*  $\text{Skel}(G)$  is defined as the digraph obtained by replacing each edge in  $G$  with the corresponding edge of multiplicity 1.

We remark that a digraph can be specified by its skeleton and the multiplicities of its edges.

**Definition 10.** Let  $G$  be a digraph, and  $(u, v)$  be an edge with distinct end points  $u$  and  $v$ . The digraph  $G/(u, v)$  obtained by contracting the edge  $(u, v)$  in  $G$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} G/(u, v) = & (V(G) \setminus \{u, v\} \cup \{w\}, \\ & E(G) \cup \{(w, y) : (u, y) \in E(G) \text{ or } (v, y) \in E(G) \text{ with } y \notin \{u, v\}\} \\ & \cup \{(x, w) : (x, v) \in E(G) \text{ or } (x, u) \in E(G) \text{ with } x \notin \{u, v\}\} \\ & \cup \{(w, w) : (v, u) \in E(G) \text{ or } (u, u) \in E(G) \text{ or } (v, v) \in E(G)\} \\ & \setminus \{(x, y) \in E(G) : x, y \in \{u, v\}\}). \end{aligned}$$

The multi-edge contraction operation (or edge contraction as defined above) on  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  replaces  $u$  and  $v$  with a single vertex  $w$  such that all edges incident to  $u$  or  $v$ , other than the said multi-edge, are now incident to  $w$ .

**Definition 11.** Let  $G$  be a simple digraph. An edge  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  is said to be *in-contractible* if there does not exist any vertex  $x \in V(G)$  distinct from  $u$  and  $v$  such that  $(x, u), (x, v) \in E(G)$ . Similarly,  $(u, v)$  is said to be *out-contractible* if there does not exist any vertex  $x \in V(G)$  distinct from  $u$  and  $v$  such that  $(u, x), (v, x) \in E(G)$ . Finally,  $(u, v)$  is said to be *contractible* if it is both in-contractible and out-contractible.

We refer the reader to Figure 2 for an example illustrating the above notions of contractibility and the edge contraction operation.

It follows directly from the definition that if an edge  $(u, v)$  in a simple digraph  $G$  is contractible, it can be contracted without forming multi-edges in the resulting digraph. Note that the digraph obtained may contain self-loops even if the above property is satisfied.




FIGURE 2. An example of a simple digraph  $G$  (centre). The edges  $(v_1, v_2)$  and  $(v_4, v_3)$  are contractible,  $(v_4, v_1)$  is not out-contractible,  $(v_3, v_2)$  is not in-contractible, and  $(v_1, v_3)$  is neither in-contractible nor out-contractible. Contraction of the edge  $(v_1, v_2)$  leads to the graph  $G/(v_1, v_2)$  (left) with no multi-edges since  $(v_1, v_2)$  is contractible, while contraction of the edge  $(v_3, v_2)$  leads to the graph  $G/(v_3, v_2)$  (right) containing a multi-edge since  $(v_1, v_2)$  is not in-contractible.

We use the term *cycle* to refer to a directed cycle unless otherwise specified. For a digraph  $G$ , we shall denote the number of cycles in  $G$  by  $C(G)$ . Further, for a vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , we denote the number of cycles in  $G$  passing through  $v$  by  $C(G, v)$ . Similarly, for a multi-edge  $e \in E(G)$ , we denote the number of cycles in  $G$  passing through  $e$  by  $C(G, e)$ . Finally, for  $E \subseteq E(G)$ , we denote the number of cycles in  $G$  passing through at least one edge in  $E$  by  $C(G, E)$ . We remark that our definitions incorporate the multiplicity of edges while computing the number of cycles, i.e., cycles passing through distinct edges that are part of the same multi-edge are considered distinct.

Now, we define  $M_k(n) = \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}} C(G)$ : that is,  $M_k(n)$  denotes the maximum number of cycles in any digraph in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$ . Similarly, we define  $F_k(n) = \max_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}} C(G)$ : that is,  $F_k(n)$  denotes the maximum number of cycles in any digraph in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$ .

**Definition 12.** Given digraphs  $G$  and  $H$ , we say that  $G$  is  $H$ -free if it has no subgraph isomorphic to  $H$ .

**3.2. Bounds on the number of cycles.** We now prove upper bounds on  $M_k(n)$  and  $F_k(n)$ .

**3.2.1. Bounds for simple digraphs.** Dvořák et al. [15] proved a more general version of the theorem below for the case of undirected graphs. Their proof idea works for digraphs, as well. We include the full proof for the sake of completeness.

**Theorem 2.** For integers  $n \geq 0$ ,  $k \geq 2$ ,  $M_k(n) \leq (k+1)!^{n/(k+1)}$ .

*Proof.* The result clearly holds for  $n = 0, 1$ , and  $2$  since  $M_k(0) = 0$ ,  $M_k(1) = 1$ , and  $M_k(2) \leq 3 \leq (k+1)!^{2/(k+1)}$  for all  $k \geq 2$ . Further, it is easy to check that  $M_2(3) = 5 \leq 6 = (2+1)!^{3/(2+1)}$  and  $M_k(3) = 8 \leq (k+1)!^{3/(k+1)}$  for all  $k \geq 3$ . We shall henceforth assume that  $n \geq 4$ . Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$  and  $V(G) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\ell_i \in \{0, 1\}$  denote the number of self-loops on  $v_i$  in  $G$  and  $d_i = \text{outdegree}(v_i)$ . Further, let  $G_0$  be the simple digraph obtained by removing all self-loops from  $G$ . Let  $A_0$  be the adjacency matrix of  $G_0$  and  $A' = A_0 + I$ . For each cycle  $C$  in  $G_0$ , there exists a unique permutation  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)$  whose cycle decomposition contains the cycle  $C$  and fixes the rest of the vertices. Therefore,  $C(G_0)$  is less than or equal to the permanent of  $A'$ , which is defined by

$$\text{perm}(A') = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(n)} \prod_{i=1}^n a'_{i, \sigma(i)}.$$

Note that the sum of the entries in the  $i$ th row of  $A'$  is equal to  $d_i + 1 - \ell_i$ . Hence, using Brègman's theorem [10], we obtain

$$\text{perm}(A') \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i + 1 - \ell_i)!^{1/(d_i + 1 - \ell_i)},$$

which further yields

$$(3) \quad C(G_0) \leq \text{perm}(A') \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (k+1 - \ell_i)!^{1/(k+1 - \ell_i)}$$




FIGURE 3. The digraph  $G_{\text{example}}^{3,3}$ .

since  $d_i \leq k$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and the function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $f(m) = m^{1/m}$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  is monotonically increasing. Now, using  $C(G) = C(G') + \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i$  in (3), we obtain

$$(4) \quad C(G) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (k+1-\ell_i)^{1/(k+1-\ell_i)} + \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i.$$

We now show that changing the value of any  $\ell_i$  from 1 to 0 increases the value of the RHS of (4). If  $\ell_i = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , then  $C(G) \leq (k+1)^{1/(k+1)}$ . Suppose that  $\ell_1 = 1$  without loss of generality. We show that changing the value of  $\ell_1$  to 0 increases the value of the RHS of (4). For  $k \geq 2$ , we have  $(k+1)^{1/(k+1)} - k^{1/k} \geq 1/e$ , and

$$\prod_{i=2}^n (k+1-\ell_i)^{1/(k+1-\ell_i)} \geq 2^{(n-1)/2} \geq 2^{3/2}.$$

Combining these two inequalities, we obtain

$$k^{1/k} \prod_{i=2}^n (k+1-\ell_i)^{1/(k+1-\ell_i)} + \frac{2^{3/2}}{e} \leq (k+1)^{1/(k+1)} \prod_{i=2}^n (k+1-\ell_i)^{1/(k+1-\ell_i)},$$

which further yields

$$k^{1/k} \prod_{i=2}^n (k+1-\ell_i)^{1/(k+1-\ell_i)} + 1 + \sum_{i=2}^n \ell_i \leq (k+1)^{1/(k+1)} \prod_{i=2}^n (k+1-\ell_i)^{1/(k+1-\ell_i)} + \sum_{i=2}^n \ell_i.$$

Repeating the same argument for each  $\ell_i$  that is equal to 1, we conclude that changing the value of  $\ell_i$  to 0 for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  increases the value of the RHS of (4).

Hence,  $C(G) \leq (k+1)^{n/(k+1)}$ . Since this bound holds for each  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$ , we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

We now provide a particular example of a digraph in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$ . For  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$ , we define the simple digraph  $G_{\text{example}}^{\ell,k}$  which consists of  $\ell$  units of single vertices and  $k$ -cliques arranged in an alternating cyclic fashion. Formally,  $G_{\text{example}}^{\ell,k} = (V, E)$ , where  $V = \{v_{i,j} : 0 \leq i < \ell, 0 \leq j \leq k\}$  and  $E = \{(v_{i,0}, v_{i,j}) : 0 \leq i < \ell, 1 \leq j \leq k\} \cup \{(v_{i,j_1}, v_{i,j_2}) : 0 \leq i < \ell, 1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq k\} \cup \{(v_{i_1,j}, v_{i_2,0}) : i_2 - i_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{\ell}, 0 \leq i_1 < \ell, 0 \leq i_2 < \ell, 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ . See Figure 3 for an example digraph  $G_{\text{example}}^{3,3}$ . It can be shown using direct enumeration that

$$(5) \quad C(G_{\text{example}}^{\ell,k}) = \ell \left( 2^{k+1} - \binom{k}{2} - 2k - 2 \right) + \left( \sum_{r=0}^k \frac{k!}{r!} - 1 \right)^\ell.$$

We remark that the upper bound on  $M_k(n)$  in Theorem 2 is asymptotically sharp in the sense that

$$(6) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{C(G_{\text{example}}^{\ell,k})}{(k+1)^\ell} \right)^{1/(\ell(k+1))} = 1,$$






FIGURE 4. The digraphs  $G_6$ ,  $G_{6,3}$  and  $G'_{6,3}$  (from left to right).

which implies that  $M_k(n)^{1/n}$  is equal to  $(k+1)!^{1/(k+1)}$  upto a multiplicative factor that gets arbitrarily close to 1 as  $k$  goes to infinity.

**3.2.2. Bounds for directed multigraphs.** We begin by providing two particular examples of digraphs in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$ , with the same skeleton. For  $n \geq 3$ , we define the simple digraph  $G_n = (V, E)$  with  $V = \{v_i : 0 \leq i < n\}$  and  $E = \{(v_i, v_j) : j - i \equiv 1 \pmod n \text{ or } j - i \equiv 2 \pmod n\}$ . Let  $G_{n,k}$  be the digraph with skeleton  $\text{Skel}(G_{n,k}) = G_n$  in which edges  $(v_i, v_j)$  with  $j - i \equiv 1 \pmod n$  have multiplicity  $k - 1$  while the remaining edges have multiplicity 1. Similarly, let  $G'_{n,k}$  be the digraph with skeleton  $\text{Skel}(G'_{n,k}) = G_n$  in which edges  $(v_i, v_j)$  with  $j - i \equiv 1 \pmod n$  having multiplicity equal to 1 while the remaining edges have multiplicity  $k - 1$ . Note that  $G_{n,2}$ ,  $G'_{n,2}$  and  $G_n$  are isomorphic. From the above definitions, it is easy to see that  $G_{n,k}, G'_{n,k} \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$ . Further, it can be shown using direct enumeration that

$$(7) \quad C(G_{n,k}) = \begin{cases} S_{n-2} + S_n + 1, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ S_{n-2} + S_n, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $S_n$  is defined by the recurrence relation  $S_n = (k - 1)S_{n-1} + S_{n-2}$  with boundary condition  $S_0 = 1, S_1 = k - 1$ . For any vertex  $v \in V(G_{n,k})$ ,  $C(G_{n,k})$  can be written as a sum of the number of cycles passing through  $v$  and those not passing through  $v$ . In this case,  $C(G_{n,k}) - C(G_{n,k}, v) = S_{n-2}$  and the 1 extra cycle contributing to  $C(G_{n,k}, v)$  for odd  $n$  corresponds to the Hamiltonian cycle comprised of all edges of multiplicity 1 in  $G_{n,k}$ . Similarly, one can also show that

$$(8) \quad C(G'_{n,k}) = \begin{cases} (k - 1)T_{n-2} + T_n + (k - 1)^n, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\ (k - 1)T_{n-2} + T_n, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $T_n$  is defined by the recurrence relation  $T_n = T_{n-1} + (k - 1)T_{n-2}$  with boundary condition  $T_0 = 1, T_1 = 1$ .

In Lemma 1, we show that the number of cycles in  $G_{n,k}$  is greater than or equal to the number of cycles in  $G'_{n,k}$ .

**Lemma 1.** For natural numbers  $n \geq 3, k \geq 2, C(G_{n,k}) \geq C(G'_{n,k})$ .

*Proof.* We will show using induction that  $(k - 1)T_{n-2} + T_n + (k - 1)^n \leq S_{n-2} + S_n + 1$  for all  $n \geq 3$ , thereby implying  $C(G_{n,k}) \geq C(G'_{n,k})$  for each  $n \geq 3$ . For simplicity, let  $L_n$  and  $R_n$  denote the LHS and RHS of the above inequality, respectively. It is easy to check that  $L_3 = R_3$  and  $L_4 + 2(k - 2)^2 = R_4$ . Now, by induction hypothesis, we have  $L_{n-1} \leq R_{n-1}$  and  $L_n \leq R_n$ , which implies  $(k - 1)L_n + L_{n-1} \leq (k - 1)R_n + R_{n-1}$ , which when expanded and rearranged yields

$$(9) \quad (k - 1)((k - 1)T_{n-2} + T_{n-3}) + ((k - 1)T_n + T_{n-1}) + (k - 1)^{n+1} + (k - 1)^{n-1} \leq S_{n-1} + S_{n+1} + k.$$

Since  $\{T_n\}$  is a monotonically increasing sequence,  $(k - 1)T_m + T_{m-1} \geq T_m + (k - 1)T_{m-1} = T_{m+1}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using this inequality and  $(k - 1)^{n-1} \geq k - 1$  in (9), we obtain

$$(k - 1)T_{n-1} + T_{n+1} + (k - 1)^{n+1} \leq S_{n-1} + S_{n+1} + 1.$$

□




FIGURE 5. The digraphs  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  (from left to right).

We now compute  $C(G_{n,k})$ . Solving the recurrence relation for  $S_n$  with appropriate boundary conditions, we obtain

$$S_n = \frac{\left(\frac{k-1+\sqrt{(k-1)^2+4}}{2}\right)^{n+1} - \left(\frac{k-1-\sqrt{(k-1)^2+4}}{2}\right)^{n+1}}{\sqrt{(k-1)^2+4}},$$

which when used in (7) yields  $C(G_{n,k}) = \lceil \alpha(k)^n \rceil$ , where  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  is the ceiling function and

$$(10) \quad \alpha(k) = \frac{k-1+\sqrt{(k-1)^2+4}}{2}.$$

**Remark 1.** The digraph  $G_n$  is an example of a Cayley graph [31, Sec. 1.5] since  $G_n = (V, \{(v, v+s) : v \in V, s \in S\})$ , where  $V = \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = \{1, 2\}$  is a generating set for  $G$ . Cayley graphs are known to be extremal examples for various problems in graph theory.

For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $H_i$  be the digraph  $(V, E_i)$ , where  $V = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ ,  $E_1 = \{(v_2, v_1), (v_3, v_1), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_2)\}$ , and  $E_2 = \{(v_1, v_2), (v_1, v_3), (v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_2)\}$ . See Figure 5 for drawings of  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ .

In Lemma 2, we prove a bound on the number of edges that are not in-contractible in a simple two-regular  $H_1$ -free and  $H_2$ -free digraph. Furthermore, we characterise the graphs for which this bound is achieved. In Lemma 3, we provide an upper bound on the number of cycles for these characterised graphs. These results are used in the proof of Theorem 3 in the following way: if the graph has few edges that are not in-contractible, then we contract edges to obtain a recursive bound on the number of cycles; if the graph has many edges that are not in-contractible, then we use Lemma 3 to bound the number of cycles.

**Lemma 2.** Let  $G$  be a simple two-regular  $H_1$ -free and  $H_2$ -free digraph on  $n$  vertices. Then,  $G$  can have at most  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible. Further,  $G$  has exactly  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible if and only if each connected component of  $G$  is isomorphic to  $G_m$  for some  $m \geq 4$ .

*Proof.* For any  $v \in V(G)$ , we have distinct vertices  $x, y \in V(G)$  such that  $(x, v), (y, v) \in E(G)$  since  $G$  is simple. If the edge  $(x, v)$  is not in-contractible, then  $(y, x) \in E(G)$ . Similarly, if the edge  $(y, v)$  is not in-contractible, then  $(x, y) \in E(G)$ . Suppose both  $(x, v)$  and  $(y, v)$  are not in-contractible. Then, the subgraph  $(\{x, y, v\}, \{(x, v), (y, v), (x, y), (y, x)\})$  of  $G$  is isomorphic to  $H_1$ , a contradiction. The sets consisting of incoming edges to a vertex in  $G$  constitute a uniform  $n$ -partition of  $E(G)$ . Since at most one edge in each such set is not in-contractible, the digraph  $G$  can have at most  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible.

Now, suppose that  $G$  has exactly  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible. Then, for any vertex  $v$  in  $G$ , exactly one of the two incoming edges to  $v$  must be in-contractible. Let us pick a vertex  $v_1 \in G$  with  $(v_2, v_1), (v_3, v_1) \in E(G)$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that the edge  $(v_2, v_1)$  is not in-contractible: that is,  $(v_3, v_2) \in E(G)$ . The other incoming edge to  $v_2$  cannot originate from (i)  $v_1$  since otherwise  $G$  would contain a subgraph isomorphic to  $H_2$ , (ii)  $v_2$  since otherwise  $G$  would contain a self-loop, and (iii)  $v_3$  since otherwise  $G$  would contain a multi-edge. Therefore, it originates from a vertex  $v_4 \notin \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ . Now, among the incoming edges  $(v_3, v_2)$  and  $(v_4, v_2)$  to  $v_2$ , the edge  $(v_4, v_2)$  must be in-contractible since otherwise  $(v_3, v_4) \in E(G)$ , which is a contradiction to the fact that  $\text{outdegree}(v_3) = 2$ . Therefore, the edge  $(v_3, v_2)$  is not in-contractible and hence  $(v_4, v_3) \in E(G)$ . The other incoming edge to  $v_3$  cannot originate from (i)  $v_2$  since otherwise  $G$  would contain a subgraph isomorphic to  $H_1$ , (ii)  $v_3$  since otherwise  $G$  would contain a self-loop, and (iii)  $v_4$  since otherwise  $G$  would contain a multi-edge. Therefore, the other incoming edge to  $v_3$  could either originate from  $v_1$  or a vertex  $v_5 \notin \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ .

In the case where the other incoming edge to  $v_3$  originates from  $v_1$ , the edge  $(v_1, v_3)$  must be in-contractible since otherwise  $(v_4, v_1) \in E(G)$ , which is a contradiction to the fact that  $\text{outdegree}(v_4) = 2$ . Therefore, the edge  $(v_4, v_3)$  is not in-contractible and hence  $(v_1, v_4) \in E(G)$ . Finally,  $(v_2, v_4) \in E(G)$  since one incoming edge to  $v_4$  must not be in-contractible, yielding a connected component  $G_4$  of  $G$ .

In the case where the other incoming edge to  $v_3$  originates from a vertex  $v_5 \notin \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ , we have  $(v_5, v_4) \in E(G)$ . Now, the other incoming edge to  $v_4$  could either originate from  $v_1, v_2$  or a vertex  $v_6 \notin \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$  since the outdegree of  $v_3, v_4$ , and  $v_5$  is already satisfied. It cannot originate from  $v_2$  since both incoming edges to  $v_4$  would otherwise be in-contractible. If it originates from  $v_1$ , we get a connected component  $G_5$  of  $G$ . If it originates from a vertex  $v_6 \notin \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$ , we continue in a similar way until we get a connected component  $G_m$  of  $G$  for some  $m > 5$ .

Conversely, suppose each connected component of  $G$  is isomorphic to  $G_m$  for some  $m \geq 4$ . Then, within a connected component  $G_m$ , it is easy to check that the  $m$  edges  $(v_i, v_j)$  with  $j - i \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$  are not in-contractible while the  $m$  edges with  $j - i \equiv 2 \pmod{m}$  are in-contractible. Summing over the connected components of  $G$ , we get exactly  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible in  $G$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** Under the same hypothesis as Lemma 2, one can prove the following analogous symmetric result (although we require only one of these results):  $G$  can have at most  $n$  edges that are not out-contractible. Further,  $G$  has exactly  $n$  edges that are not out-contractible if and only if each connected component of  $G$  is isomorphic to  $G_m$  for some  $m \geq 4$ .

**Lemma 3.** Let  $G$  be a digraph with  $n$  vertices, each of whose connected components is  $G_{m,k}$  or  $G'_{m,k}$  for some  $m \geq 4$ . Then,  $C(G) \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ .

*Proof.* For any natural number  $m \geq 3$ , we have  $C(G_{m,k}) \leq F_k(m)$  since  $G_{m,k} \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{m,k}$ . Using (7) in this inequality, we obtain  $S_{m-2} + S_m + 1 \leq (k-1)F_k(m-1) + F_k(m-2)$ . For natural numbers  $p, q \geq 3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} C(G_{p,k}) + C(G_{q,k}) &\leq (S_{p-2} + S_p + 1) + (S_{q-2} + S_q + 1) \\ &= (S_{p-2} + (S_{q-2} + 1)) + (S_p + (S_q + 1)) \\ &\leq (S_{p+q-3} + S_{p+q-4}) + (S_{p+q-1} + S_{p+q-2}) \\ &\leq S_{p+q-2} + S_{p+q} \\ &\leq C(G_{p+q,k}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have  $C(G) = \sum_{i=1}^l C(G^i)$ , where  $G^i$  is the  $i$ -th connected component of  $G$  and  $l$  is the number of connected components in  $G$ . Let  $m_i = |V(G^i)|$ , so that  $\sum_{i=1}^l m_i = n$ . Using the subadditivity of the function  $C(G_{\cdot,k})$  and the fact that  $C(G'_{m,k}) \leq C(G_{m,k})$  for all  $m \geq 3$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} C(G) &= \sum_{i=1}^l C(G^i) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^l C(G_{m_i,k}) \\ &\leq C(G_{\sum_{i=1}^l m_i,k}) \\ &= C(G_{n,k}) \\ &\leq S_{n-2} + S_n + 1 \\ &\leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We now prove the main result of this section, an asymptotically tight formula for  $F_k(n)$ . The proof proceeds by reducing the digraph into smaller digraphs belonging to the same family to obtain several non-homogeneous linear recursive bounds of order up to 3 based on a case analysis, and finally combining all these bounds to obtain the final result.

**Theorem 3.** For  $k \geq 2$ ,

$$F_k(n) = \Theta(\alpha(k)^n),$$

where  $\alpha(k)$  is as defined in (10). In particular,  $F_2(n) = \Theta(F_n)$ , where  $F_n$  denotes the  $n$ -th Fibonacci number.

*Proof.* We begin by making a few elementary observations about the function  $F_k$ . Clearly,  $F_k(0) = 0$ ,  $F_k(1) = k$ , and  $F_k(2) = \max(\{2k, (k-1)^2 + 2\})$ , corresponding to the empty digraph, the digraph with a single vertex having a self-loop of multiplicity  $k$ , and the digraph with 2 vertices, each having a self-loop of multiplicity  $k$  or each having a self-loop of multiplicity 1 along with an edge of multiplicity  $k-1$  to the other vertex, respectively. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $G^* \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n-1, k}$  be such that  $C(G^*) = F_k(n-1)$  (such a digraph exists since  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n-1, k}$  is finite) and let  $G$  be the digraph obtained by adding a single vertex with a self-loop of multiplicity  $k$  to  $G^*$ . Then,  $F_k(n) \geq C(G) = C(G^*) + k = F_k(n-1) + k$ . In particular,  $F_k(n) \geq k$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since we have already computed the values of  $F_k(n)$  for  $n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , we shall henceforth assume that  $n \geq 3$ .

Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n, k}$ . In the next three paragraphs of this proof, we argue that one may assume without loss of generality certain restrictions on the structure of  $G$  without reducing the number of cycles or  $C(G) \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ .

Suppose that  $G$  contains a vertex  $v$  with a self-loop of multiplicity  $k$ . Then  $C(G) = C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) + k \leq F_k(n-1) + k \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ . Note that the digraph  $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$  might not necessarily be in  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n-1, k}$ . However, one can add a self-loop of sufficient multiplicity to each vertex of  $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$  to obtain a digraph  $G' \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n-1, k}$  so that  $C(G) \leq C(G') \leq F_k(n-1)$ .

Henceforth, we shall assume that each vertex in  $G$  has at least one outgoing edge, which is not a self-loop. Note that for any vertex  $v \in V(G)$ ,  $C(G)$  is equal to the sum of the number of cycles passing through the vertex  $v$  and those not passing through  $v$ . Let  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k$  be the outgoing simple edges from  $v$  (some of these edges might have the same end points since  $G$  is a multigraph). Then, the number of cycles passing through  $v$  is equal to the sum of the number of cycles passing through each of these edges. Now, there exists a permutation  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(k)$  such that  $C(G, e_{\sigma(1)}) \geq C(G, e_{\sigma(2)}) \geq \dots \geq C(G, e_{\sigma(k)})$  and the end points of  $e_{\sigma(1)}$  are not the same as the end points of  $e_{\sigma(k)}$  (it is possible to satisfy the latter condition since  $G$  does not contain edges of multiplicity  $k$  connecting distinct vertices). In such a case, we can construct a digraph  $G^*$  from  $G$  by deleting  $e_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(k-1)}$  and adding  $(k-2)$  copies of  $e_{\sigma(1)}$ . The resulting digraph  $G^*$  has the property  $C(G^*) \geq C(G)$  and that the vertex  $v$  in  $G^*$  has two outgoing edges, one with multiplicity 1 and the other with  $k-1$ . Applying this operation successively to every vertex in the digraph, we obtain a digraph  $G'$  with  $C(G) \leq C(G')$ , which also has the property that every vertex in  $G'$  has two outgoing edges, one with multiplicity 1 and the other with  $k-1$ . Further, for any vertex  $v \in V(G')$ , the number of cycles in  $G'$  passing through the outgoing edge of multiplicity  $k-1$  from  $v$  is greater than  $(k-1)$  times the number of cycles passing through the outgoing edge of multiplicity 1 from  $v$ . Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality (renaming  $G'$  to  $G$ ) that each vertex in  $\text{Skel}(G)$  has outdegree 2 (one of these outgoing edges has multiplicity  $k-1$  and the other has multiplicity 1 in  $G$ ).

If  $\text{Skel}(G)$  contains a vertex  $v$  with a self-loop but no other incoming edge, we have  $C(G) \leq C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) + k - 1 \leq F_k(n-1) + k - 1 \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ . If  $\text{Skel}(G)$  contains an indegree 2 vertex  $v$  with a self-loop and the other incoming edge  $(u, v)$  participating in a 2-cycle, we have  $C(G) \leq C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) + (k-1)^2 + 1 \leq F_k(n-1) + (k-1)k \leq F_k(n-1) + (k-1)F_k(n-2) \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ . Finally, we consider the case where each vertex with a self-loop in  $\text{Skel}(G)$  has an incoming edge other than the self-loop not participating in a 2-cycle. For any such vertex  $v$  and an incoming edge  $(u, v)$  not participating in a 2-cycle, the digraph  $G'$  formed by deleting the self-loop on  $v$  from  $G$  and adding the edge  $(v, u)$  with the same multiplicity as the self-loop, has at least as many cycles as the original digraph  $G$ . We repeatedly apply this operation to the digraph  $G$  until no self-loops remain to obtain a digraph  $G'$  satisfying  $C(G) \leq C(G')$ . Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality (renaming  $G'$  to  $G$ ) that  $G$  contains no self-loops.

We now consider the following mutually exclusive exhaustive set of cases:

*Case 1.* There is a vertex  $v \in \text{Skel}(G)$  with  $\text{indegree}(v) = 0$ . In this case, we have  $C(G) = C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) \leq F_k(n-1) \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$  since none of the cycles in  $G$  pass through  $v$ .

*Case 2.* There is a vertex  $v \in \text{Skel}(G)$  with  $\text{indegree}(v) = 1$ . Let  $(u, v)$  be the unique incoming edge incident to  $v$  in  $G$ . Let  $(u, w)$  be the other outgoing edge from  $u$  in  $G$ . The number of cycles passing through  $(u, w)$  in  $G$  is bounded above by the number of cycles in the digraph obtained by deleting the vertex  $v$  and the incoming edges to  $w$  other than the edge  $(u, w)$ , and contracting the edge  $(u, w)$ , which is less than or equal to  $\text{mult}(u, w)F_k(n-2)$ . Similarly, the number of cycles not passing through

$(u, w)$  in  $G$  is equal to the number of cycles in the digraph obtained by deleting the edge  $(u, w)$  from  $G$  and contracting the edge  $(u, v)$ , which is bounded above by  $\text{mult}(u, v)F_k(n-1)$ . Therefore, we obtain  $F_k(n) \leq \max(\{(k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2), (k-1)F_k(n-2) + F_k(n-1)\}) = (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ .

*Case 3.* All vertices in  $\text{Skel}(G)$  have indegree equal to 2: that is,  $\text{Skel}(G)$  is 2-regular.

*Case 3.1.* Suppose that  $k \geq 3$ . We consider the case when  $G$  contains a vertex  $v$ , both of whose incoming edges  $(a, v)$  and  $(b, v)$  have multiplicity 1. We shall assume without loss of generality that  $C(G, (b, v)) \geq C(G, (a, v))$ . Let  $(b, w)$  be the other outgoing edge from  $b$  in  $G$ . Then,  $C(G, (b, w)) \geq (k-1)C(G, (b, v))$ . Further, we have

$$C(G, v) = C(G, (a, v)) + C(G, (b, v)) \leq 2C(G, (b, v)),$$

and

$$C(G) \geq C(G, b) = C(G, (b, v)) + C(G, (b, w)) \geq kC(G, (b, v)).$$

Combining the above inequalities, we obtain  $C(G, v) \leq 2C(G)/k$ , which further implies  $C(G) \leq kC(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}])/(k-2) \leq kF_k(n-1)/(k-2)$ . For  $k \geq 4$ , we have  $k/(k-2) \leq k-1$ , which implies  $C(G) \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1)$ . Now, we shall focus on the case  $k = 3$ . Let  $(v, y)$  and  $(v, z)$  be the outgoing edges from  $v$  in  $G$  with multiplicities 1 and 2, respectively. For  $v_1 \in \{a, b\}$  and  $v_2 \in \{y, z\}$ , we define  $x_{v_1, v_2}$  to be the fraction of cycles in  $G$  passing through the path  $v_1 \rightarrow v \rightarrow v_2$ , i.e.,

$$x_{v_1, v_2} = C(G, \{(v_1, v), (v, v_2)\})/C(G).$$

Let  $\mathbf{x} = [x_{a,y} \ x_{a,z} \ x_{b,y} \ x_{b,z}]^T$ . We consider the following mutually exclusive exhaustive set of cases.

*Case 3.1.1.* We first consider the case when  $(a, z), (b, z) \notin E(G)$ . Let  $G'$  be the digraph obtained by adding the edges  $(a, z)$  and  $(b, z)$  with multiplicity 1 to the digraph  $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$ . Then, we have

$$(11) \quad C(G') = C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) + C(G', (a, z)) + C(G', (b, z)) = C(G) - C(G, v) + C(G, \{(a, v), (v, z)\})/2 + C(G, \{(b, v), (v, z)\})/2 \geq C(G) - C(G, v) + C(G, v)/3 \geq C(G) - 4C(G)/9 = 5C(G)/9.$$

Now, since  $C(G') \leq F_3(n-1)$ , we obtain  $C(G) \leq 9F_3(n-1)/5$ .

*Case 3.1.2.* We now consider the case when  $(a, z) \in E(G)$  with multiplicity 2. Let  $G'$  be the digraph obtained by adding the edges  $(b, z)$  and  $(a, y)$  with multiplicity 1 to the digraph  $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$ . Then, we have

$$(12) \quad C(G') = C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) + C(G', \{(b, z), (a, y)\}) + C(G' \setminus (a, y), (b, z)) + C(G' \setminus (b, z), (a, y)) \geq C(G) - C(G, v) + x_{b,z}C(G)/2 + x_{a,y}C(G) = C(G)(1 - x_{a,z} - x_{b,y} - x_{b,z}/2).$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (x_{a,y} + x_{a,z})C(G) &= C(G, (a, v)) \leq C(G, (b, v)) = (x_{b,y} + x_{b,z})C(G), \\ 2(x_{a,y} + x_{b,y})C(G) &= 2C(G, (v, y)) \leq C(G, (v, z)) = (x_{a,z} + x_{b,z})C(G), \\ 3(x_{b,y} + x_{b,z}) &= 3C(G, (b, v)) \leq C(G), \\ (x_{a,z} + x_{b,z})C(G) + 2(x_{a,y} + x_{a,z})C(G) &\leq C(G, (v, z)) + C(G, (a, z)) = C(G, z) \leq C(G). \end{aligned}$$

Minimizing the function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = -x_{a,z} - x_{b,y} - x_{b,z}/2$  subject to the above constraints along with the constraint  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^4$ , we obtain  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq -9/16$ , which when used in (12) yields  $C(G') \geq 7C(G)/16$ . Therefore,  $C(G) \leq 16F_3(n-1)/7$ .

*Case 3.1.3.* We now consider the case when  $(b, z) \in E(G)$  with multiplicity 2. Let  $G'$  be the digraph obtained by adding the edges  $(a, z)$  and  $(b, y)$  with multiplicity 1 to the digraph  $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$ . Then, we have

$$(13) \quad C(G') = C(G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]) + C(G', \{(a, z), (b, y)\}) + C(G' \setminus (b, y), (a, z)) + C(G' \setminus (a, z), (b, y)) \geq C(G) - C(G, v) + x_{a,z}C(G)/2 + x_{b,y}C(G) = C(G)(1 - x_{a,y} - x_{a,z}/2 - x_{b,z}).$$




FIGURE 6. The cases 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, and 3.2.4 (from left to right).

Similar to the previous case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(x_{a,y} + x_{a,z})C(G) &= C(G, (a, v)) \leq C(G, (b, v)) = (x_{b,y} + x_{b,z})C(G), \\
2(x_{a,y} + x_{b,y})C(G) &= 2C(G, (v, y)) \leq C(G, (v, z)) = (x_{a,z} + x_{b,z})C(G), \\
3(x_{b,y} + x_{b,z}) &= 3C(G, (b, v)) \leq C(G), \\
(x_{a,z} + x_{b,z})C(G) + 2(x_{b,y} + x_{b,z})C(G) &\leq C(G, (v, z)) + C(G, (b, z)) = C(G, z) \leq C(G).
\end{aligned}$$

Minimizing the function  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = -x_{a,y} - x_{a,z}/2 - x_{b,z}$  subject to the above constraints along with the constraint  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^4$ , we obtain  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) \geq -11/20$ , which when used in (13) yields  $C(G') \geq 9C(G)/20$ . Therefore,  $C(G) \leq 20F_3(n-1)/9$ .

We shall henceforth assume that each vertex of  $G$  has one incoming edge with multiplicity  $k-1$  and the other with multiplicity 1.

*Case 3.2.* We consider the case in which  $\text{Skel}(G)$  contains a subgraph isomorphic to  $H_1$  and/or  $H_2$ . As shown in Figure 6, we consider the following mutually disjoint exhaustive set of cases:

*Case 3.2.1.*  $G$  contains distinct vertices  $v, a$ , and  $b$  such that  $(v, a), (v, b), (a, b), (b, a), (a, v), (b, v) \in E(G)$ . In this case, we have  $C(G) = C(G[V(G) - \{a, b, v\}]) + (k-1)^3 + 3(k-1) + 1 \leq F_k(n-3) + (k-1)^3 + 3(k-1) + 1$ .

*Case 3.2.2.*  $G$  contains distinct vertices  $u, v, a$ , and  $b$  such that  $(u, a), (u, b), (a, b), (b, a), (a, v), (b, v) \in E(G)$ . In this case, we have  $C(G) \leq ((k-1)^3 + 2(k-1) + 1)C(G') + (k-1) \leq ((k-1)^3 + 2(k-1) + 1)F_k(n-3) + (k-1)$ , where  $G'$  is the digraph obtained by merging the vertices  $u, v, a$  and  $b$  in  $G$ .

*Case 3.2.3.*  $G$  contains distinct vertices  $u, a$ , and  $b$  such that  $(u, a), (u, b), (a, b), (b, a) \in E(G)$  but there doesn't exist any vertex  $v$  such that  $(a, v), (b, v) \in E(G)$ . In this case, we get  $C(G) \leq ((k-1)^2 + 1)C(G') + (k-1) \leq ((k-1)^2 + 1)F_k(n-2) + (k-1)$ , where  $G'$  is the digraph obtained by merging the vertices  $a, b$  and  $u$  in  $G$ .

*Case 3.2.4.*  $G$  contains distinct vertices  $v, a$ , and  $b$  such that  $(a, v), (b, v), (a, b), (b, a) \in E(G)$  but there doesn't exist any vertex  $u$  such that  $(u, a), (u, b) \in E(G)$ . In this case, we get  $C(G) \leq ((k-1)^2 + 1)C(G') + (k-1) \leq ((k-1)^2 + 1)F_k(n-2) + (k-1)$ , where  $G'$  is the digraph obtained by merging the vertices  $a, b$  and  $v$  in  $G$ .

*Case 3.3.* We now consider the case when  $\text{Skel}(G)$  is  $H_1$ -free and  $H_2$ -free. For any vertex  $v \in V(\text{Skel}(G))$ , let us define  $E_v = \{(x, y) : (x, v) \in E(\text{Skel}(G)), (x, y) \in E(\text{Skel}(G)), v \neq y\}$ . Note that  $|E_v| = 2$  and  $E_v \cap E_u = \emptyset$  for any two distinct vertices  $u, v \in V(\text{Skel}(G))$ . Therefore, the sets  $E_v$  form a uniform  $n$ -partition of  $E(\text{Skel}(G))$ .

*Case 3.3.1.* If  $\text{Skel}(G)$  contains exactly  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible, then by Lemma 2, each connected component of  $\text{Skel}(G)$  must be isomorphic to  $G_m$  for some  $m \geq 4$ . Now, it is easy to check that  $G_{m,k}$  and  $G'_{m,k}$  are the only digraphs whose skeleton is isomorphic to  $G_m$  with each vertex in the digraph incident to two incoming (outgoing) edges, one with multiplicity 1 and the other with multiplicity  $k-1$ . Therefore, each connected component of  $G$  is isomorphic to one of  $G_{m,k}$  and  $G'_{m,k}$  for some  $m \geq 4$ . Finally, from Lemma 3, we have  $C(G) \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ .

*Case 3.3.2.* If  $\text{Skel}(G)$  contains strictly less than  $n$  edges that are not in-contractible, then we can find a vertex  $x \in V(\text{Skel}(G))$  such that both edges in  $E_x$  are in-contractible. Let  $(v, x)$  and  $(w, x)$  be the incoming edges to  $x$  in  $G$ . Let us assume that  $(v, y)$  and  $(w, z)$  are the other outgoing edges from  $v$  and  $w$ , respectively. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $(v, x)$  has multiplicity 1 in  $G$ . The number of cycles not passing through  $(v, x)$  in  $G$  is less than or equal to  $(k-1)C(G')$ , where  $G'$  is the digraph obtained from  $G$  by

deleting the edge  $(v, x)$  followed by contracting the edge  $(v, y)$ . The number of cycles passing through  $(v, x)$  in  $G$  is equal to the number of cycles passing through  $v$  in the digraph  $G''$  formed by deleting the edges  $(v, y)$  and  $(w, x)$  from  $G$ , which is further less than or equal to  $C(G''')$ , where  $G'''$  is the digraph obtained by contracting the edges  $(w, z)$  and  $(v, x)$  in  $G'$ . Thus, we obtain  $C(G) \leq (k-1)C(G') + C(G''') \leq (k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2)$ .

Combining all the recurrent upper bounds obtained through the proof, we obtain

$$(14) \quad F_k(n) \leq \max\{\{(k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2), ((k-1)^2 + 1)F_k(n-2) + (k-1), \\ ((k-1)^3 + 2(k-1) + 1)F_k(n-3) + (k-1), F_k(n-3) + (k-1)^3 + 3(k-1) + 1\}\}$$

for  $k \geq 2, k \neq 3$ . Now, we will show that  $F_k(n) \leq 5\alpha(k)^n$ , where  $\alpha(k)$  is as defined in (10). Using the expressions for  $F_k(0), F_k(1)$  and  $F_k(2)$  from the beginning of this proof, it is easy to check that  $F_k(n) \leq 5\alpha(k)^n$  for  $n = 0, 1, 2$ . Now, assuming that the result holds for all natural numbers up to  $n-1$ , we have

$$(k-1)F_k(n-1) + F_k(n-2) \leq 5(k-1)\alpha(k)^{n-1} + 5\alpha(k)^{n-2} = 5\alpha(k)^n.$$

Further, it is easy to check that if the inequality

$$((k-1)^2 + 1)5\alpha(k)^{n-2} + (k-1) \leq 5\alpha(k)^n$$

holds for  $n = 3$ , then it holds for all  $n \geq 3$  since  $\alpha(k) \geq 1$ . And it is also easy to verify that the result indeed holds for  $n = 3$ . Therefore, we have

$$((k-1)^2 + 1)F_k(n-2) + (k-1) \leq ((k-1)^2 + 1)5\alpha(k)^{n-2} + (k-1) \leq 5\alpha(k)^n$$

for all  $n \geq 3$ . Similar results can be shown for  $F_k(n) \leq ((k-1)^3 + 2(k-1) + 1)F_k(n-3) + (k-1)$  and  $F_k(n) \leq F_k(n-3) + (k-1)^3 + 3(k-1) + 1$ . Hence, we obtain the result  $F_k(n) \leq 5\alpha(k)^n$  for all non-negative integers  $n$  and  $k$  with  $k \geq 2, k \neq 3$ . Recall that for  $k = 3$ , we have the extra inequality  $F_3(n) \leq 16F_3(n-1)/7$ . But since  $16\alpha(3)^{n-1}/7 \leq \alpha(3)^n$ , the result holds for  $k = 3$  as well. Note that the constant 5 in this result can be improved; however, we do not concern ourselves with finding the best possible constant. Finally, since  $F_k(n) \geq C(G_{n,k}) \geq \alpha(k)^n$ , we obtain  $F_k(n) = \Theta(\alpha(k)^n)$ . The constant  $\alpha(2) = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$  is the golden ratio and hence  $F_2(n) = \Theta(F_n)$ , where  $F_n$  is the  $n$ -th Fibonacci number.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** It is possible to show that  $F_k(n) \leq (k-2 + 6^{1/3})^n$  using the star bound [42], a generalization of Brègman's theorem. However, this bound is exponentially weaker than the one we have proved in Theorem 3, which is tight up to a known constant.

#### 4. BOUNDS FOR POLICY ITERATION ON DETERMINISTIC MDPs

We begin with the formal definition of a DMDP and then discuss the structure of policies for DMDPs.

**Definition 13.** A DMDP is an MDP  $(S, A, T, R, \gamma)$  with a deterministic transition function, i.e. the codomain of  $T$  is  $\{0, 1\}$ .

A DMDP  $M$  can be viewed as a digraph  $G_M$  with  $S$  as the set of vertices, which contains an edge corresponding to each state-action pair. Further, a policy  $\pi \in \Pi_M$  can be viewed as a directed graph  $G_\pi$  in which each vertex has outdegree one. Such graphs are known as functional graphs since they correspond to functions defined on the set of vertices. A functional graph is a union of its connected components, each containing a single cycle and paths leading into the cycle. See Figure 7 for an example. Post and Ye's [36] analysis suggests that the value function of any policy is primarily dictated by the cycles present in the corresponding digraph. We now describe an alternative, slightly different way to view policies for DMDPs.

**Definition 14.** A digraph isomorphic to  $G = (\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}, \{(v_i, v_{i+1}) : 1 \leq i < n\} \cup \{(v_n, v_m)\})$  for some  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $m \leq n$  is called a path-cycle.

Let  $M$  be a DMDP with its set of states  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ . A policy  $\pi \in \Pi_M$  can be viewed as an  $n$ -tuple  $(P_{s_1}^\pi, \dots, P_{s_n}^\pi)$  of path-cycles, where  $P_s^\pi$  is the path-cycle obtained by following  $\pi$  starting from state  $s$ . We shall call  $(P_{s_1}^\pi, \dots, P_{s_n}^\pi)$  the (path-cycle) representation of policy  $\pi$ . Note that  $V^\pi(s)$  is completely determined by the corresponding path-cycle  $P_s^\pi$  for any  $s \in S$ .




FIGURE 7. An example of a directed multigraph corresponding to a 10-state 2-action DMDP, the policy digraph  $G_\pi$  for  $\pi = 0010101010$ , and the path-cycles  $P_{s_2}^\pi$  and  $P_{s_8}^\pi$  (from left to right), where the dashed (red) edges and solid (black) edges correspond to actions 0 and 1 respectively.

**Lemma 4.** Let  $M$  be a DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies in  $\Pi_M$ . Then, for each  $1 < i \leq \ell$ , the representation of  $\pi_i$  contains a path-cycle which is not part of representations of  $\pi_j$  for any  $1 \leq j < i$ .

*Proof.* Let  $1 < i \leq \ell$ . Since  $\pi_{i-1} < \pi_i$ , we have  $V^{\pi_{i-1}}(s) < V^{\pi_i}(s)$  for some state  $s \in S$ . Now since  $\pi_j \leq \pi_{i-1}$  for  $1 \leq j < i$ ,  $V^{\pi_j}(s) < V^{\pi_i}(s)$  for  $1 \leq j < i$ . If  $P_s^{\pi_i}$  were a part of the path-cycle representation of  $\pi_j$  for some  $1 \leq j < i$ , then  $V^{\pi_j}(s) = V^{\pi_i}(s)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

By virtue of Lemma 4, we can associate a possibly non-unique sequence of distinct path-cycles to any increasing sequence of policies. This fact shall be useful in later proofs in this section.

Before we prove results about the number of steps PI takes to converge, we establish some graph theoretic notation and results, which shall be useful later.

For any digraph  $G$ , we denote the number of path-cycles and paths in  $G$  by  $C'(G)$  and  $C''(G)$ , respectively. Clearly,  $C(G) \leq C'(G)$  since every cycle is a path-cycle.

For integers  $n \geq 0$ ,  $k \geq 2$ , we define  $\mathcal{G}^{n,k}$  as the set of all digraphs with  $n$  vertices and outdegree  $k$  (we allow the digraphs to contain loops and multi-edges, as mentioned in Section 3). Note that if  $M$  is an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP, then  $G_M \in \mathcal{G}^{n,k}$ .

**Definition 15.** For  $G \in \mathcal{G}^{n,k}$ , we define  $N_1(G)$  to be the number of path-cycles in the digraph  $G'$  obtained from  $G$  by replacing each multi-edge of multiplicity  $k$  with a corresponding edge of multiplicity 1, i.e.,  $N_1(G) = C'(G')$ . Similarly, we define  $N_2(G)$  to be the number of path-cycles in the skeleton of  $G$ , i.e.,  $N_2(G) = C'(\text{Skel}(G))$ .

We prove below some bounds on  $N_1(G)$  and  $N_2(G)$  using the bounds on the number of cycles established in Section 3.

**Lemma 5.** Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$ . Then  $C'(G) \leq n^2 k(k+1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$ .

*Proof.* A path-cycle in  $G$  can be viewed as a pair consisting of a path and an edge from the terminal vertex of the path to a vertex in the path. Therefore,  $C'(G) \leq kC''(G)$ . Let  $s, t \in V(G)$  and the number of paths from  $s$  to  $t$  in  $G$  be denoted by  $C''_{s,t}(G)$ . Then  $C''_{s,t}(G) \leq C'(G')$ , where  $G'$  is the graph obtained by deleting all incoming edges to  $s$  and outgoing edges from  $t$  in  $G$  followed by merging vertices  $s$  and  $t$ . It is easy to check that  $G' \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n-1,k}$ . Therefore, we have  $C'(G') \leq (k+1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$  from Theorem 2. Hence,  $C''_{s,t}(G) \leq (k+1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$ . Summing over all pairs of vertices  $s, t \in V(G)$ , we obtain  $C''(G) \leq n^2 (k+1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$ , which combined with  $C'(G) \leq kC''(G)$  yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$ . Then  $C'(G) \leq 5n^2 k\alpha(k)^{n-1}$ .

*Proof.* A path-cycle in  $G$  can be viewed as a pair consisting of a path and an edge from the terminal vertex of the path to a vertex in the path. Therefore,  $C'(G) \leq kC''(G)$ . Let  $s, t \in V(G)$  and the number of paths



from  $s$  to  $t$  in  $G$  be denoted by  $C''_{s,t}(G)$ . Then  $C''_{s,t}(G) \leq C(G')$ , where  $G'$  is the graph obtained by deleting all incoming edges to  $s$  and outgoing edges from  $t$  in  $G$  followed by merging vertices  $s$  and  $t$ . Note that some vertices in  $G'$  could have outdegree less than  $k$ . We add a sufficient number of self-loops to each such vertex so that the outdegree of each vertex is equal to  $k$  in the resulting graph  $G''$ , which satisfies  $C(G') \leq C(G'')$ . Since  $G'' \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$ , we have  $C(G'') \leq 5\alpha(k)^{n-1}$  from Theorem 3. Therefore,  $C''_{s,t}(G) \leq 5\alpha(k)^{n-1}$ . Summing over all pairs of vertices  $s, t \in V(G)$ , we obtain  $C''(G) \leq 5n^2\alpha(k)^{n-1}$ , which combined with  $C'(G) \leq kC''(G)$  yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.** Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}^{n,k}$ . Then we have

- (1)  $N_1(G) \leq 5n^2k\alpha(k)^{n-1}$ , and
- (2)  $N_2(G) \leq n^2k(k+1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $G \in \mathcal{G}^{n,k}$ . Let  $G'$  be the digraph obtained from  $G$  by replacing each multi-edge of multiplicity  $k$  with a corresponding edge of multiplicity 1. Note that some vertices in the graph  $G'$  could have outdegree less than  $k$ . We add a sufficient number of self-loops to each such vertex so that the outdegree of each vertex is equal to  $k$  in the resulting graph  $G''$ , which satisfies  $C'(G') \leq C'(G'')$ . Now, from Lemma 6, we obtain  $C'(G'') \leq 5n^2k\alpha(k)^{n-1}$  since  $G'' \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{multi}}^{n,k}$ . Therefore,  $N_1(G) = C'(G') \leq C'(G'') \leq 5n^2k\alpha(k)^{n-1}$ . This finishes the proof of (1).

Now suppose that  $G \in \mathcal{G}^{n,k}$ . Note that  $\text{Skel}(G) \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{simple}}^{n,k}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 5, we obtain  $N_2(G) = C'(\text{Skel}(G)) \leq n^2k(k+1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$ .  $\square$

**4.1. Policy iteration with arbitrary action selection.** We begin by defining an equivalence relation on the edges of a DMDP digraph and an induced equivalence relation on the path-cycles therein.

**Definition 16.** Let  $M = (S, A, T, R, \gamma)$  be a DMDP. We say that a state  $s \in S$  is *non-branching* if there exists  $s' \in S$  such that  $T(s, a, s') = 1$  for all  $a \in A$ . For any  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ , we say that the edges corresponding to  $(s, a_1)$  and  $(s, a_2)$  in  $G_M$  are equivalent if  $s$  is a non-branching state. Given two path-cycles  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  in  $G_M$ , we say that  $P_1 \sim P_2$  if  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  differ only in equivalent edges.

Given a DMDP  $M$ ,  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation on the set of path-cycles in  $G_M$ .

Our approach to proving a bound on the number of policies visited by a PI algorithm with arbitrary action selection is as follows:

- (1) associate a sequence of distinct path-cycles to the sequence of policies visited (see Lemma 3),
- (2) show that this sequence doesn't contain many equivalent path-cycles (see Lemma 7), and
- (3) use Proposition 1 to bound the number of path-cycles in the digraph obtained by identifying edges under the equivalence relation defined in Definition 16.

In the following lemma, we show that a sequence of distinct path-cycles associated with an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with arbitrary action selection doesn't contain many equivalent path-cycles.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $M = (S, A, T, R, \gamma)$  be an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with arbitrary action selection. Further, let  $P = P_{s_1}^{\pi_1}, \dots, P_{s_\ell}^{\pi_\ell}$  be an associated sequence of path-cycles. Then, the size of each equivalence class of  $P$  under the equivalence relation  $\sim$  is at most  $kn$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S' \subseteq S$  be the set of non-branching states. Suppose that  $1 \leq i < \ell$  is such that the successive policies  $\pi_i$  and  $\pi_{i+1}$  differ by an action in some state  $s \in S'$  (the policies may differ in actions taken from additional states). Then  $\rho^{\pi_i}(s, a') > \rho^{\pi_i}(s, a)$ , where  $a' = \pi_{i+1}(s)$  and  $a = \pi_i(s)$ . But since  $s \in S'$ , this implies  $R(s, a') > R(s, a)$ . Since  $s$  is a non-branching state, this further implies that action  $a$  is not an improving action for  $\pi_j$  for all  $i \leq j < \ell$ . Therefore,  $\pi_j(s) \neq a$  for all  $i < j \leq \ell$ .

Let  $Q = P_{s_{i_1}}^{\pi_{i_1}}, \dots, P_{s_{i_m}}^{\pi_{i_m}}$  be a subsequence of  $P$  consisting of equivalent path-cycles. For  $1 \leq j < m$ ,  $P_{s_{i_j}}^{\pi_{i_j}}$  and  $P_{s_{i_{j+1}}}^{\pi_{i_{j+1}}}$  differ in at least one edge coming out of a non-branching state, say  $\pi_{i_j}(s) = a$  and  $\pi_{i_{j+1}}(s) = a'$  for some  $s \in S'$  and distinct actions  $a, a' \in A$ . Then it follows from our discussion in the previous paragraph that the outgoing edge from state  $s$  corresponding to action  $a$  cannot be a part of any subsequent path-cycles

in  $Q$  (since there exists some  $i \in [i_j, i_{j+1})$  such that  $\pi_i(s) = a$  but  $\pi_{i+1}(s) \neq a$ ). Therefore, the number of path-cycles in  $Q$  is bounded above by the number of edges in  $G_M$ , which equals  $kn$ .  $\square$

In Theorem 4, we show that the length of any increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement (as in Lemma 7) for DMDP  $M$  is bounded above by  $N_1(G_M)$  up to a multiplicative factor polynomial which is polynomial in  $n$  and  $k$ . Equivalently, one may view the following theorem as providing an upper bound on the length of the longest directed path in the PI-DAG of the DMDP  $M$ .

**Theorem 4.** Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with arbitrary action selection. Then  $\ell \leq knN_1(G_M)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with arbitrary action selection. And let  $P = P_{s_1}^{\pi_1}, \dots, P_{s_\ell}^{\pi_\ell}$  be an associated sequence of path-cycles. Then, the number of path-cycles in  $P$  equals the sum of the sizes of the equivalence classes of  $P$  under  $\sim$ . Using Lemma 7, we obtain

$$(15) \quad \ell \leq knC'(G'_M),$$

where  $G'_M$  is the graph obtained from  $G_M$  by replacing each multi-edge of multiplicity  $k$  with a corresponding edge of multiplicity 1. Using  $N_1(G_M) = C'(G'_M)$  in the above inequality yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** Any run of a PI algorithm with arbitrary action selection on an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP terminates in at most  $5n^3k^2\alpha(k)^{n-1} = O(n^3k\alpha(k)^n)$  steps.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be the sequence of policies in  $\Pi_M$  encountered during a run of a PI algorithm with arbitrary action selection on  $M$ . Then, using Theorem 4, we obtain  $\ell \leq knN_1(G_M)$ . Further, we have  $N_1(G_M) \leq 5n^2k\alpha(k)^{n-1}$  from Proposition 1 (1), which implies  $\ell \leq 5n^3k^2\alpha(k)^{n-1}$ . Finally, since  $\alpha(k) \geq k/2$ , we obtain  $\ell = O(n^3k\alpha(k)^n)$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Policy iteration with max-gain action selection.** We begin by defining an equivalence relation on the edges of a DMDP digraph and an induced equivalence relation on the path-cycles therein.

**Definition 17.** Let  $M = (S, A, T, R, \gamma)$  be a DMDP. For  $s \in S$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ , we say that the edges corresponding to  $(s, a_1)$  and  $(s, a_2)$  in  $G_M$  are equivalent if there exists  $s' \in S$  such that  $T(s, a_1, s') = T(s, a_2, s') = 1$ . Given two path-cycles  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  in  $G_M$ , we say that  $P_1 \approx P_2$  if  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  differ only in equivalent edges.

Given a DMDP  $M$ ,  $\approx$  is an equivalence relation on the set of path-cycles in  $G_M$ . We define a stronger notion of equivalence between edges below, which shall be useful in the proof of Lemma 8.

**Definition 18.** For  $s \in S$  and  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ , we say that the edges corresponding to  $(s, a_1)$  and  $(s, a_2)$  are quasi-equal, denoted  $(s, a_1) \equiv (s, a_2)$ , if  $(s, a_1)$  and  $(s, a_2)$  are equivalent in the sense of Definition 17 and  $R(s, a_1) = R(s, a_2)$ .

Let  $E_{\max}$  be the set of state-action pairs with the highest reward among the state-action pairs in their respective equivalence classes. Note that if  $(s, a) \in E_{\max}$ , then the intersection of  $E_{\max}$  with the equivalence class of  $(s, a)$  is equal to the quasi-equality class of  $(s, a)$ .

We use the same proof strategy as for PI with arbitrary action selection. In the following lemma, we show that a sequence of distinct path-cycles associated with an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with max-gain action selection doesn't contain many equivalent path-cycles.

**Lemma 8.** Let  $M = (S, A, T, R, \gamma)$  be an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with max-gain action selection. Further, let  $P = P_{s_1}^{\pi_1}, \dots, P_{s_\ell}^{\pi_\ell}$  be an associated sequence of path-cycles. Then, the size of each equivalence class of  $P$  under the equivalence relation  $\approx$  is at most  $(n + 1)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $Q = P_{s_{i_1}}^{\pi_{i_1}}, \dots, P_{s_{i_m}}^{\pi_{i_m}}$  be a subsequence of  $P$  consisting of equivalent path-cycles. For  $1 \leq j < m$ ,  $P_{s_{i_j}}^{\pi_{i_j}}$  and  $P_{s_{i_{j+1}}}^{\pi_{i_{j+1}}}$  differ in equivalent but not quasi-equal edges coming out of at least one state, say  $(s, a_1)$  and  $(s, a_2)$ , respectively, for some  $s \in S$  and distinct actions  $a_1, a_2 \in A$ .

We claim that  $(s, \pi(s)) \equiv (s, a_2)$  for any subsequent path-cycle  $P_{s'}^\pi$  in  $Q$ . To see this, first note that there exists some  $i \in (i_j, i_{j+1}]$  such that the action at state  $s$  is switched to  $a_2$  while going from  $\pi_i$  to  $\pi_{i+1}$ . Since we are considering policy improvement with max-gain action selection, any edge that is switched to must be contained in  $E_{\max}$ . Therefore,  $(s, a_2) \in E_{\max}$ . Similarly, for any subsequent path-cycle  $P_{s'}^\pi$  in  $Q$ , we have  $(s, \pi(s)) \in E_{\max}$ . Further, the edges  $(s, a_2)$  and  $(s, \pi(s))$  must be equivalent since all path-cycles in  $Q$  are equivalent. Therefore, we conclude that  $(s, \pi(s)) \equiv (s, a_2)$ .

Thus, each time we transition along  $Q$  from  $P_{s_{ij}}^{\pi_{ij}}$  to  $P_{s_{i_{j+1}}}^{\pi_{i_{j+1}}}$ , one state is eliminated in the sense that the edge coming out of that state cannot change its quasi-equality class in subsequent transitions along the subsequence  $Q$ . Hence, there can be at most  $n$  transitions, implying  $m \leq n + 1$ .  $\square$

In the following theorem, we show that the length of any increasing sequence of policies (as in Lemma 8) for DMDP  $M$  is bounded above by  $N_2(G_M)$  up to a multiplicative factor polynomial in  $n$  and  $k$ .

**Theorem 5.** Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with max-gain action selection. Then  $\ell \leq (n + 1)N_2(G_M)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be an increasing sequence of policies obtained via policy improvement with max-gain action selection. And let  $P = P_{s_1}^{\pi_1}, \dots, P_{s_\ell}^{\pi_\ell}$  be an associated sequence of path-cycles. Then, the number of path-cycles in  $P$  equals the sum of the sizes of the equivalence classes of  $P$  under  $\approx$ . Using Lemma 8, we obtain

$$(16) \quad \ell \leq (n + 1)C'(\text{Skel}(G_M)).$$

Now using  $N_2(G_M) = C'(\text{Skel}(G_M))$  in the above inequality yields the desired result.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** Any run of a PI algorithm with arbitrary action selection on an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP terminates in at most  $(n + 1)n^2k(k + 1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)} = O\left(n^3 \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)\right) \frac{k}{e}\right)^n$  steps.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDP and  $\pi_1 < \dots < \pi_\ell$  be the sequence of policies in  $\Pi_M$  encountered during a run of a PI algorithm with max-gain action selection on  $M$ . Then, using Theorem 5, we obtain  $\ell \leq (n + 1)N_2(G_M)$ . Further, we have  $N_2(G_M) \leq n^2k(k + 1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$  from Proposition 1 (2), which implies  $\ell \leq (n + 1)n^2k(k + 1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$ . Now since  $n + 1 \leq 2n$  and  $(k + 1)!^{1/(k+1)} \geq (k + 1)/e \geq k/e$ , we obtain  $\ell = O(n^3(k + 1)!^{n/(k+1)})$ .

We shall now show that  $(k + 1)!^{1/(k+1)} = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)\right) \frac{k}{e}$  to complete the proof of this theorem. From Stirling's approximation, we have  $k! \leq ek^{k+1/2}e^{-k}$ , which further yields  $(k + 1)! \leq e(k + 1)k^{k+1/2}e^{-k}$ . Taking  $(k + 1)$ th root on both sides, we obtain  $(k + 1)!^{1/(k+1)} \leq \frac{k}{e}(e^2(k + 1)k^{-1/2})^{1/(k+1)}$ . Now,  $(e^2(k + 1)k^{-1/2})^{1/(k+1)} \leq (k + 1)^{1/(k+1)}$  for  $k \geq e^4$ . Since  $(k + 1)^{1/(k+1)} = 1 + O\left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)$ , we conclude that  $(k + 1)!^{1/(k+1)} = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)\right) \frac{k}{e}$ .  $\square$

HPI uses max-gain action selection, and consequently, the bounds in the previous section apply. However, one can show that there are no equivalent path-cycles (except possibly the first one) in the sequence of path-cycles associated with a sequence of policies visited by HPI. Consequently, the polynomial factor in the bound can be improved by a factor of  $n$ , and a tighter upper bound of  $1 + n^2k(k + 1)!^{(n-1)/(k+1)}$  steps holds for HPI. Combining the bounds in Corollary 1 and Corollary 2, the tightest upper bound that we have proved for HPI on  $n$ -state  $k$ -action DMDPs is of the form  $O(\text{Poly}(n, k)\beta(k)^n)$ , where  $\beta(k)$  is given by

$$\beta(k) = \begin{cases} (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 & \text{if } k = 2, \\ (k + 1)!^{1/(k+1)} & \text{for } k \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

**Remark 4.** Post and Ye [36] derived multiple properties for the run of SPI on DMDPs and used them to prove polynomial bounds on the complexity of SPI. We observe that Lemmas 5, 6, and 7 in [36] also hold for the run of HPI on DMDPs. Therefore, at most polynomial many steps elapse between the creation of new cycles during a run of HPI on a DMDP. This result, coupled with the fact that a cycle can be formed at most once during the entire run, allows one to bound above the number of steps taken by HPI by the number of cycles in the skeleton of the DMDP digraph  $G_M$  up to a polynomial factor. The above method yields similar upper bounds for HPI on DMDPs as Corollary 2, albeit with a larger polynomial factor. However, this method cannot be used to establish bounds on the complexity of a general PI algorithm.

## REFERENCES

1. W Ahrens, *Ueber das gleichungssystem einer kirchhoff'schen galvanischen stromverzweigung*, *Mathematische Annalen* **49** (1897), no. 2, 311–324. [3](#)
2. Bader F. AlBdaiwi, *On the number of cycles in a graph*, *Mathematica Slovaca* **68** (2018), no. 1, 1–10. [3](#)
3. R.E.L Aldred and Carsten Thomassen, *On the number of cycles in 3-connected cubic graphs*, *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* **71** (1997), no. 1, 79–84. [3](#)
4. Robert EL Aldred and Carsten Thomassen, *On the maximum number of cycles in a planar graph*, *Journal of Graph Theory* **57** (2008), no. 3, 255–264. [3](#)
5. Eric W. Allender, *On the number of cycles possible in digraphs with large girth*, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **10** (1985), no. 3, 211–225. [3](#)
6. Helmut Alt, Ulrich Fuchs, and Klaus Kriegel, *On the number of simple cycles in planar graphs*, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **8** (1999), no. 5, 397–405. [3](#)
7. Andrii Arman, David S. Gunderson, and Sergei Tsaturian, *Triangle-free graphs with the maximum number of cycles*, *Discrete Mathematics* **339** (2016), no. 2, 699–711. [3](#)
8. Andrii Arman and Sergei Tsaturian, *The maximum number of cycles in a graph with fixed number of edges*, *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **26** (2017). [3](#)
9. Richard Bellman, *Dynamic programming*, 1 ed., Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 1957. [1](#)
10. L. M. Brègman, *Certain properties of nonnegative matrices and their permanents*, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **211** (1973), 27–30. MR 0327788 [3.2.1](#)
11. Kevin Buchin, Christian Knauer, Klaus Kriegel, André Schulz, and Raimund Seidel, *On the number of cycles in planar graphs*, *Computing and Combinatorics (Berlin, Heidelberg)* (Guohui Lin, ed.), Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 97–107. [3](#)
12. Anna de Mier and Marc Noy, *On the maximum number of cycles in outerplanar and series-parallel graphs*, *Graphs and Combinatorics* **28** (2012), no. 2, 265–275. [3](#)
13. Panayotis N. Delivorias and Reinhard J. Richter, *Maximum path digraphs*, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **50** (1994), no. 3, 221 – 237. [3](#)
14. Stephane Durocher, David S. Gunderson, Pak Ching Li, and Matthew Skala, *Cycle-maximal triangle-free graphs*, *Discrete Mathematics* **338** (2015), no. 2, 274–290. [3](#)
15. Zdeněk Dvořák, Natasha Morrison, Jonathan A. Noel, Sergey Norin, and Luke Postle, *Bounding the number of cycles in a graph in terms of its degree sequence*, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **91** (2021), 103206. [3](#), [3.2.1](#)
16. RC Entringer and PJ Slater, *On the maximum number of cycles in a graph*, *Ars Combin* **11** (1981), 289–294. [3](#)
17. Dániel Gerbner, Balázs Keszegh, Cory Palmer, and Balázs Patkós, *On the number of cycles in a graph with restricted cycle lengths*, *SIAM J. Discret. Math.* **32** (2018), no. 1, 266–279. [3](#)
18. Balázs Gerencsér, Romain Hollanders, Jean-Charles Delvenne, and Raphaël M. Jungers, *A complexity analysis of policy iteration through combinatorial matrices arising from unique sink orientations*, *Journal of Discrete Algorithms* **44** (2017), 21 – 38. [1.1](#)
19. Martin Charles Golumbic and Yehoshua Perl, *Generalized fibonacci maximum path graphs*, *Discrete Mathematics* **28** (1979), no. 3, 237 – 245. [3](#)
20. David R Guichard, *The maximum number of cycles in graphs*, *Congressus Numerantium* (1996), 211–215. [3](#)
21. Anchit Gupta and Shivaram Kalyanakrishnan, *Improved strong worst-case upper bounds for mdp planning*, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-17, 2017*, pp. 1788–1794. [2.4](#)
22. Thomas Dueholm Hansen, *Worst-case analysis of strategy iteration and the simplex method*, Ph.D. thesis, Aarhus University, 2012. [1.1](#)
23. Thomas Dueholm Hansen, Haim Kaplan, and Uri Zwick, *Dantzig's pivoting rule for shortest paths, deterministic mdps, and minimum cost to time ratio cycles*, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (USA), SODA '14, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2014*, p. 847–860. [2.4](#)
24. Thomas Dueholm Hansen, Mike Paterson, and Uri Zwick, *Improved upper bounds for random-edge and random-jump on abstract cubes*, pp. 874–881. [2.4](#)
25. Romain Hollanders, Balázs Gerencsér, Jean-Charles Delvenne, and Raphaël M. Jungers, *Improved bound on the worst case complexity of policy iteration*, *Oper. Res. Lett.* **44** (2016), no. 2, 267–272. [1.1](#)
26. R. A. Howard, *Dynamic programming and markov processes*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1960. [1](#), [1.1](#), [2.4](#)
27. Shivaram Kalyanakrishnan, Neeldhara Misra, and Aditya Gopalan, *Randomised procedures for initialising and switching actions in policy iteration*, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI'16, AAAI Press, 2016*, p. 3145–3151. [2.2](#), [2.4](#)
28. Martin Knor, *On the number of cycles in k-connected graphs*, *Acta Mathematica Universitatis Comenianae* **63** (1994), 315–321. [3](#)
29. Omid Madani, Mikkel Thorup, and Uri Zwick, *Discounted deterministic markov decision processes and discounted all-pairs shortest paths*, *ACM Trans. Algorithms* **6** (2010), no. 2. [1](#)
30. Yishay Mansour and Satinder Singh, *On the complexity of policy iteration*, *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (San Francisco, CA, USA), UAI'99, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1999*, p. 401–408. [1.1](#), [2.4](#)
31. John Meier, *Groups, graphs and trees: An introduction to the geometry of infinite groups*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, Cambridge University Press, 2008. [1](#)

32. Mary Melekopoglou and Anne Condon, *On the complexity of the policy improvement algorithm for markov decision processes*, ORSA Journal on Computing **6** (1994), no. 2, 188–192. [1.1](#), [2.4](#)
33. Natasha Morrison, Alexander Roberts, and Alex Scott, *Maximising the number of cycles in graphs with forbidden subgraphs*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **147** (2021), 201–237. [3](#)
34. Christos H. Papadimitriou and John N. Tsitsiklis, *The complexity of markov decision processes*, Mathematics of Operations Research **12** (1987), no. 3, 441–450. [1](#)
35. Yehoshua Perl, *Digraphs with maximum number of paths and cycles*, Networks **17** (1987), no. 3, 295–305. MR 898169 [3](#)
36. Ian Post and Yinyu Ye, *The simplex method is strongly polynomial for deterministic Markov decision processes*, Math. Oper. Res. **40** (2015), no. 4, 859–868. MR 3423742 [1](#), [2.4](#), [4](#), [4](#)
37. Martin L. Puterman, *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Applied Probability and Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1994, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR 1270015 [1](#)
38. Dieter Rautenbach and Irene Stella, *On the maximum number of cycles in a hamiltonian graph*, Discrete Mathematics **304** (2005), no. 1, 101–107. [3](#)
39. K.B. Reid, *Cycles in the complement of a tree*, Discrete Mathematics **15** (1976), no. 2, 163–174. [3](#)
40. Bruno Scherrer, *Improved and generalized upper bounds on the complexity of policy iteration*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, M. Welling, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, eds.), vol. 26, Curran Associates, Inc., 2013, pp. 386–394. [2.4](#)
41. Yongbing Shi, *The number of cycles in a hamilton graph*, Discrete Mathematics **133** (1994), no. 1, 249–257. [3](#)
42. George W. Soules, *Permanental bounds for nonnegative matrices via decomposition*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **394** (2005), 73–89. [3](#)
43. T. Szabo and E. Welzl, *Unique sink orientations of cubes*, Proceedings 42nd IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 2001, pp. 547–555. [2.4](#)
44. Lajos Takács, *On the limit distribution of the number of cycles in a random graph*, Journal of Applied Probability **25** (1988), 359–376. [3](#)
45. Meet Taraviya and Shivaram Kalyanakrishnan, *A tighter analysis of randomised policy iteration*, Proceedings of The 35th Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence Conference (Tel Aviv, Israel), Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, vol. 115, PMLR, 22–25 Jul 2020, pp. 519–529. [2.4](#)
46. Lutz Volkmann, *Estimations for the number of cycles in a graph*, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica **33** (1996), no. 2, 153–161. [3](#)
47. Bing Zhou, *The maximum number of cycles in the complement of a tree*, Discrete Mathematics **69** (1988), no. 1, 85–94. [3](#)

RITESH GOENKA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, VANCOUVER, BC, CANADA.  
*Email address:* [rgoenka@math.ubc.ca](mailto:rgoenka@math.ubc.ca)

EASHAN GUPTA, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS, USA.  
*Email address:* [eashang2@illinois.edu](mailto:eashang2@illinois.edu)

SUSHIL KHYALIA, SAMSUNG RESEARCH, SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA.  
*Email address:* [sus.hil@samsung.com](mailto:sus.hil@samsung.com)

PRATYUSH AGARWAL, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY, MUMBAI, MAHARASHTRA, INDIA.  
*Email address:* [pratyush@cse.iitb.ac.in](mailto:pratyush@cse.iitb.ac.in)

MULINTI SHAIK WAJID, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY, MUMBAI, MAHARASHTRA, INDIA.  
*Email address:* [wajid@cse.iitb.ac.in](mailto:wajid@cse.iitb.ac.in)

SHIVARAM KALYANAKRISHNAN, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY, MUMBAI, MAHARASHTRA, INDIA.  
*Email address:* [shivaram@cse.iitb.ac.in](mailto:shivaram@cse.iitb.ac.in)