

# Towards a strongly polynomial algorithm for deterministic payoff games ?

Bruno Scherrer\*

April 1, 2022

## Abstract

Given a zero-sum two-player  $\gamma$ -discounted deterministic game with  $n$  states, we try to build an algorithm that is polynomial on  $n$  (and independent of  $\gamma$ ).

Consider a zero-sum two-player  $\gamma$ -discounted game with  $n$  states and  $m$  transitions, and its corresponding Bellman operators:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu,\nu}v &= r + \gamma P_{\mu,\nu}v, \\ T_{\mu}v &= \min_{\nu \in N} T_{\mu,\nu}v, \\ \tilde{T}_{\nu} &= \max_{\mu \in M} T_{\mu,\nu}v, \\ Tv &= \max_{\mu \in M} T_{\mu}v = \min_{\nu \in N} \tilde{T}_{\nu}v. \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that the optimal value  $v_*$  is the only fixed point of  $T$  and that any pair of stationary policies  $(\mu_*, \nu_*)$  such that  $T_{\mu_*, \nu_*}v_* = v_*$  form a pair of optimal policies.

We shall consider non-stationary policies  $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{\ell}) \in M^{\ell}$  and  $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{\ell}) \in N^{\ell}$ . The operators above can be extended straightforwardly to this kind of policies:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}} &= P_{\mu_1, \nu_1} \dots P_{\mu_{\ell}, \nu_{\ell}}, \\ T_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}}v &= T_{\mu_1, \nu_1} \dots T_{\mu_{\ell}, \nu_{\ell}}v, \\ T_{\vec{\mu}}v &= \min_{\vec{\nu} \in N^{\ell}} T_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}}v = T_{\mu_1} \dots T_{\mu_{\ell}}v, \\ \tilde{T}_{\vec{\nu}}v &= \max_{\vec{\mu} \in M^{\ell}} T_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}}v = \tilde{T}_{\nu_1} \dots \tilde{T}_{\nu_{\ell}}v, \\ T^{\ell}v &= \max_{\vec{\mu} \in M^{\ell}} T_{\vec{\mu}}v = \min_{\vec{\nu} \in N^{\ell}} \tilde{T}_{\vec{\nu}}v. \end{aligned}$$

For any stationary policy  $\mu$  or  $\nu$ , we shall write  $\mu^{\ell}$  and  $\nu^{\ell}$  for their non-stationary clones  $(\mu, \mu, \dots, \mu)$  and  $(\nu, \nu, \dots, \nu)$ .

Let

$$I = \{ (i, j) ; 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \}.$$

For any non-stationary policies  $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in M^n$  and  $\vec{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in N^n$ , for all  $(i, j) \in I$ , we shall write  $\vec{\mu}_i^j$  and  $\vec{\nu}_i^j$  for the sub-policies:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\mu}_i^j &= \mu_i \mu_{i+1} \dots \mu_{j-1} \mu_j, \\ \vec{\nu}_i^j &= \nu_i \nu_{i+1} \dots \nu_{j-1} \nu_j. \end{aligned}$$

---

\*INRIA, Université de Lorraine, bruno.scherrer@inria.fr

# 1 A Policy Iteration algorithm

Take an arbitrary stationary policy  $\mu_0$ . Initialize the set  $C_0 = \emptyset$ . We shall describe how we compute  $C_{k+1}$  and  $\mu_{k+1}$  from  $C_k$  and  $\mu_k$ .

Let  $v_k$  be the value of  $\mu_k$  against its best adversary:

$$v_k = T_{\mu_k} v_k = \min_{\nu} T_{\mu_k, \nu} v_k.$$

Compute the set of policies that avoid the cycles of  $C_k$ :

$$M_{C_k} = \{ \vec{\mu} \in M^n ; \forall \vec{\nu} \in N^n, \forall (x, c) \in C_k, \forall (i, j) \in I, \mathbb{1}_x P_{\vec{\mu}_i^j, \vec{\nu}_i^j} \neq \mathbb{1}_x \}.$$

Identify policies  $\vec{\mu} \in M_{C_k} \cup \{(\mu_k)^n\}$  and  $\vec{\nu} \in N^n$  such that

$$\max_{\vec{\mu}' \in M_{C_k} \cup \{(\mu_k)^n\}} T_{\vec{\mu}'} v = T_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}} v.$$

If  $T_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}} v_k = v_k$ , stop (and output  $\mu_k$ ).

For every  $x$ , there exists a minimal pair  $(i_x, j_x) \in I$  and  $y_x$  such that the trajectory first reach a loop of length  $c_x = j_x - i_x - x + 1$  involving  $y_x$ , i.e. such that

$$\mathbb{1}_x P_{\vec{\mu}_1^{i_x-1}, \vec{\nu}_1^{i_x-1}} = \mathbb{1}_x P_{\vec{\mu}_1^{j_x}, \vec{\nu}_1^{j_x}} = \mathbb{1}_{y_x} = \mathbb{1}_y P_{\vec{\mu}_{i_x}^{j_x}, \vec{\nu}_{i_x}^{j_x}}.$$

We take

$$C_{k+1} = C_k \cup \{(y_x, c_x) ; \mathbb{1}_{y_x} (T_{\vec{\mu}_{i_x}^n, \vec{\nu}_{i_x}^n} v_k - T_{\vec{\mu}_{j_x+1}^n, \vec{\nu}_{j_x+1}^n} v_k) = 0\}.$$

## 2 Analysis of the 1-player case

Let us first consider the situation of a 1-player game (where  $N = \nu$ ). We shall omit all references to  $\nu$  for clarity.

## 3 Analysis of the 2-player case

### 3.1 Monotonicity

We begin by a monotonicity property:

**Lemma 1.** *For all  $k$ , and all  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ ,*

$$v_{k+1} \geq w_{k,i,j} \geq v_k.$$

*Proof.* Since  $v_k \leq T v_k$ , by monotonicity of the operator  $T$ , we have

$$T^n v_k \geq T^{n-1} v_k \geq \dots \geq T v_k \geq v_k.$$

Therefore, for every  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ , writing  $c = j - i + 1$ , we have for any

$$\begin{aligned} w_{k,i,j} - v_k &\geq v_{ij} - T^{n-j} v_k \\ &= (I - \gamma^c P_{\vec{\mu}_i^j, \nu_i^j})^{-1} (T_{\vec{\mu}_i^j, \nu_i^j} T^{n-j} v_k - T^{n-j} v_k) \\ &= (I - \gamma^c P_{\vec{\mu}_i^j, \nu_i^j})^{-1} \underbrace{(T^{n-i+1} v_k - T^{n-j} v_k)}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that  $w_k \geq v_k$ .

Now take any  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$  and  $c = j - i + 1$ . To finish the proof, we are going to prove that  $v_{k+1} \geq w_{k,i,j}$ . By monotonicity of  $T_{\mu_{k+1}}$ , we have for all  $i \leq \ell \leq j$ ,

$$T_{\mu_{k+1}} w_k \geq T_{\mu_{k+1}} T_{\vec{\mu}_\ell^j} w_{k,i,j}.$$

□

### 3.2 Strong contraction

Consider the following sets of policies:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{x,c}(\mu) &= \{ \vec{v} \in N^c ; \mathbb{1}_x P_{\mu^c, \vec{v}} = \mathbb{1}_x \}, \\ M_{x,c} &= \{ \mu ; \arg \min v_{\mu, \nu} \cap N_{x,c}(\mu) \neq \emptyset \}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\bigcup_{x,c} M_{x,c} = M.$$

For every  $x$ , there exist  $i_x, j_x, c_x$  such that  $1 \leq i_x < j_x \leq n$ , and

$$\mathbb{1}_x P_{\vec{\mu}_{i_x}^{j_x}, \vec{v}_{i_x}^{j_x}} = \mathbb{1}_x.$$

Take a  $\mu \in M_{x,c}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} v_\mu(x) - v(x) &= \min_{\nu} v_{\mu, \nu}(x) - v(x) \\ &= \min_{\nu \in N_{x,c}(\mu)} v_{\mu, \nu}(x) - v(x) \\ &= \min_{\nu \in N_{x,c}(\mu)} \mathbb{1}_x (I - (\gamma P_{\mu, \nu})^c)^{-1} (T_{\mu, \nu}^c v - v) \\ &= \min_{\nu \in N_{x,c}(\mu)} \frac{1}{1 - \gamma^c} \mathbb{1}_x (T_{\mu, \nu}^c v - v). \end{aligned}$$

When running  $\vec{\mu}$  against its adversary, there exists a  $x$  such that

$$v_{\vec{\mu}}(x) - v(x) \leq \frac{1}{n(1 - \gamma)} \mathbb{1}_x (T^n v - v)$$

For all policies such  $\mu_+ \in M_x(v)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\mu_+}(x) - v_{\vec{\mu}}(x) &= v_{\mu_+}(x) - v(x) + v(x) - v_{\vec{\mu}}(x) \\ &\leq (1 - \frac{2}{n})(v_{\mu_+}(x) - v(x)) \end{aligned}$$