



Institut National des Sciences Appliquées et des Technologies
UNIVERSITE DE CARTHAGE

STAGE INGÉNIEUR

Génie Logiciel

**Implementation, Analysis and Predictive modeling of Mean
Payoff Games using a Self Learning approach**

Auteur:

Rami ZOUARI

2021/2022

Résumé

Les réseaux de neurones sont devenus très utilisés dans l'intelligence artificielle grâce à leurs performances de prédictions.

Ces réseaux de neurones sont parfois très complexes, et il n'est pas pratique de les utiliser dans des systèmes à ressources limitées.

Pour cela, dans ce rapport nous allons introduire les réseaux de neurones binaires (BNNs), les formaliser, étudier quelques modèles binarisés et dériver leurs formules, implémenter les résultats trouvés dans une bibliothèque qu'on va nommer **binaryflow**.

Et finalement, nous allons implémenter et entraîner des modèles binarisés pour la classification et régression, et nous allons comparer les performances de prédition, ainsi que les performances temps et mémoire de ces BNNs et leurs contrepart classique.

Remerciement

Je veux remercier mes encadreurs:

- Mme. Meriem JAÏDANE
- Mme. Yousra BEN JEMÂA
- Mme. Rim AMARA BOUJEMAA
- Mr. Nader MECHERGUI

ainsi que toutes l'équipe de **dB Sense**, qui m'ont donné la chance de travailler sur ce projet intéressant, et leur expertise a été extrêmement précieuse dans la formulation des questions de recherche et de la méthodologie

Vos commentaires perspicaces m'ont poussés à affiner ma réflexion et ont fait passer le travail au niveau supérieur.

J'ai eu la chance de quitter ma zone de confort en travaillant sur ce sujet original, et je m'en suis très reconnaissants.

Contenu

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Liste des Figures | 5 |
| Liste des Tableaux | 7 |
| Introduction | 9 |
| 1 Project context | 10 |
| 1.1 Presentation of the host institute | 10 |
| 1.1.1 Presentation of the institute of Algebra | 10 |
| 1.1.2 Research interest | 10 |
| 1.2 Project definition | 10 |
| 1.2.1 General frame | 10 |
| 1.2.2 Motivations | 11 |
| 1.2.3 Presentation of the project | 11 |
| 1.3 Requirement | 11 |
| 1.3.1 Functional Requirements | 11 |
| 1.3.2 Non-funcitonal requirements | 12 |
| 1.4 Introduction to learning approaches | 14 |
| 1.4.1 Machine learning | 14 |
| 1.4.2 Deep learning | 14 |
| 1.4.3 Reinforcement learning | 15 |
| 1.4.4 Self Play | 16 |
| 1.5 Work methodologies | 17 |
| 1.5.1 Agile Methodology | 17 |
| 1.5.2 Crisp-DM | 17 |
| 2 Analysis & Implementation | 20 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 20 |
| 2.2 Formalisation | 20 |
| 2.2.1 Di-Graph | 20 |
| 2.2.2 Mean Payoff Game | 20 |
| 2.2.3 Well Foundness | 21 |
| 2.2.4 Properties | 22 |
| 2.2.5 Symmetries | 22 |
| 2.2.6 Strategy | 23 |
| 2.2.7 Mean Payoff | 25 |
| 2.3 Evaluating Strategies | 26 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 2.3.1 | Monte-Carlo Simulations | 26 |
| 2.3.2 | Positional Strategies | 26 |
| 2.3.3 | Probabilistic Strategies | 28 |
| 2.4 | Countering Strategies | 29 |
| 2.4.1 | Deterministic Counter Strategy | 29 |
| 2.4.2 | Probabilistic Counter Strategy | 29 |
| 2.5 | Learning Strategies | 29 |
| 2.6 | State of the Art | 29 |
| 2.7 | Library Implementation | 30 |
| 2.7.1 | mpg | 30 |
| 2.7.2 | mpgcpp | 33 |
| 2.7.3 | Environment | 35 |
| 2.7.4 | Testing | 35 |
| 2.7.5 | Structure | 35 |
| 3 | Dataset Generation & Annotation | 36 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 36 |
| 3.2 | Analysis | 36 |
| 3.3 | Graph Distributions | 36 |
| 3.3.1 | $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Family | 36 |
| 3.3.2 | $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ Family | 36 |
| 3.3.3 | $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Construction | 37 |
| 3.3.4 | Choice Function | 38 |
| 3.3.5 | Complexity of Optimised $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Construction | 40 |
| 3.3.6 | $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ Construction | 41 |
| 3.4 | Sinkless Conditionning | 41 |
| 3.4.1 | Graph Rejection Construction | 42 |
| 3.4.2 | Degree Rejection Construction | 43 |
| 3.5 | Proposed MPG distributions | 44 |
| 3.5.1 | Desired properties of MPG distributions | 44 |
| 3.5.2 | Implemented Distributions | 45 |
| 3.6 | MPG Generation | 45 |
| 3.6.1 | Distribution | 45 |
| 3.6.2 | Implementation | 46 |
| 3.6.3 | Deployment | 46 |
| 3.7 | Annotation | 46 |
| 3.7.1 | Approach | 46 |
| 3.7.2 | Target Values | 47 |
| 3.7.3 | Heuristics | 47 |
| 3.7.4 | Implementation | 49 |
| 3.8 | Deployment | 51 |
| 3.8.1 | Pipeline | 51 |
| 3.8.2 | Results | 54 |
| 4 | Model Design | 55 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 55 |
| 4.2 | Objectives | 55 |
| 4.3 | Properties | 55 |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-----------|
| 4.3.1 | Totality | 55 |
| 4.3.2 | Node Agnostic | 55 |
| 4.3.3 | Invariance under Positive Scaling | 57 |
| 4.3.4 | Permutation Equivariance | 58 |
| 4.3.5 | Stability under Padding | 58 |
| 4.4 | Considered Models | 59 |
| 4.4.1 | Value based Model | 59 |
| 4.4.2 | Strategy based Model | 60 |
| 4.5 | Building the Model | 60 |
| 4.5.1 | Preprocessing Block | 60 |
| 4.5.2 | Weighted Graph Convolutional Network | 64 |
| 4.5.3 | Convolutional Block | 65 |
| 4.5.4 | Prediction Block | 66 |
| 4.5.5 | Model Architecture | 66 |
| 5 | Reinforcement learning and Self play approach | 68 |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 68 |
| 5.2 | Reinforcement Learning | 68 |
| 5.2.1 | Definition | 68 |
| 5.2.2 | Theory | 68 |
| 5.2.3 | RL formalization of a MPG | 69 |
| 5.3 | Monte Carlo Tree Search | 70 |
| 5.3.1 | Selection | 70 |
| 5.3.2 | Expansion | 70 |
| 5.3.3 | Simulation | 70 |
| 5.3.4 | Backpropagation | 70 |
| 5.3.5 | Wrapping up | 72 |
| 5.4 | Model based MCTS | 73 |
| 5.4.1 | Create children | 73 |
| 5.4.2 | Playout Policy | 74 |
| 5.4.3 | Selection Policy | 75 |
| 5.4.4 | Wrapping up | 75 |
| 5.4.5 | Updating model | 75 |
| 5.5 | Services | 76 |
| 5.5.1 | Rationale | 76 |
| 5.5.2 | Learner | 77 |
| 5.5.3 | Actor | 77 |
| 5.5.4 | Evaluator | 77 |
| 5.6 | Pipeline | 78 |
| 5.7 | Configuration | 79 |
| 6 | Analysse | 80 |
| Conclusion | | 81 |
| A | On Constraint Satisfaction Problems | 83 |
| A.1 | Constraint Satisfaction Problem | 83 |
| A.1.1 | Definition | 83 |

| | | |
|----------------------|---|------------|
| A.1.2 | Assignment | 83 |
| A.1.3 | Polymorphism | 83 |
| A.2 | Ternary Max Atom Systems | 83 |
| A.2.1 | Definition | 83 |
| A.2.2 | Example | 84 |
| A.3 | Max Atom Systems | 84 |
| A.3.1 | Definition | 84 |
| A.3.2 | $MA \leq MA_3$ | 84 |
| A.3.3 | Polymorphisms | 87 |
| A.4 | Min-Max System | 87 |
| A.4.1 | Transforming to Max Atom Systems | 87 |
| A.5 | Solving Mean Payoff | 90 |
| A.5.1 | Reduction to Min Max System | 90 |
| A.5.2 | Arc Consistency | 90 |
| B | On Random Mean Payoff Graphs | 93 |
| B.1 | Introduction | 93 |
| B.2 | Sinkless $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph | 93 |
| B.2.1 | Property | 93 |
| B.2.2 | Basic Comparison with Normal $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ | 93 |
| B.2.3 | Property Probability | 94 |
| B.2.4 | Asymptotic Analysis For Dense $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ | 94 |
| B.2.5 | Asymptotic Analysis For Sparse $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ | 95 |
| B.3 | Expected Mean Payoff | 96 |
| B.3.1 | Definition | 96 |
| B.3.2 | Matrix Form | 96 |
| C | On Probabilistic Strategies | 97 |
| C.1 | Markovian Nature | 97 |
| C.1.1 | Fixing Π^{Opt} | 97 |
| C.1.2 | Fixing both Π^{Max} and Π^{Min} | 97 |
| C.2 | Expected Reward of a MRP | 97 |
| C.2.1 | Markov Reward Process | 97 |
| C.2.2 | Expected discounted reward | 98 |
| C.2.3 | Expected average-time reward | 99 |
| C.3 | Evaluation of probabilistic strategies | 100 |
| C.3.1 | Definition | 100 |
| C.3.2 | Matrix Form | 100 |
| Bibliographie | | 104 |

Liste des Figures

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1.1 | An illustration of a neural network | 14 |
| 1.2 | Relation between AI, ML and DL | 15 |
| 1.3 | An example of deep learning model | 15 |
| 1.4 | An example of a reinforcement learning system | 16 |
| 1.5 | Alpha Go pipeline | 16 |
| 1.6 | Agile development cycle | 17 |
| 1.7 | Agile development cycle | 18 |
| 1.8 | Gantt diagram | 19 |
| 2.1 | An example of an execution with non-convergent Mean Payoffs | 22 |
| 2.2 | mpg library | 30 |
| 2.3 | Generated visualisation for a Mean Payoff Game with the optimal strategies | 31 |
| 2.4 | games module | 32 |
| 2.5 | mpgcpp library | 33 |
| 2.6 | games module | 34 |
| 3.1 | Experimental performance to generate dense & sparse graphs | 41 |
| 3.2 | Exponential blowup when using the graph rejection method | 43 |
| 3.3 | Small slowdown due to the degree rejection method | 44 |
| 3.4 | HPC pipeline to generate mean payoff graphs | 46 |
| 3.5 | A counter example to the Linear Bound heuristic | 48 |
| 3.6 | HPC pipeline to annotate mean payoff graphs | 52 |
| 3.7 | Activity diagram describing the behaviour of a node | 53 |
| 4.1 | Three isomorphic Mean Payoff Games | 56 |
| 4.2 | Mean Payoff Game, with a rescaled version using Maximum normalization | 58 |
| 4.3 | Mean Payoff Game before and after removing unreachable nodes | 59 |
| 4.4 | An MPG where the first player always wins. | 60 |
| 4.5 | Preprocessing Block | 63 |
| 4.6 | Graph Convolutional Network | 64 |
| 4.7 | Weighted Graph Convolutional Network | 64 |
| 4.8 | Graph Convolutional Block | 65 |
| 4.9 | Graph Convolutional Block | 66 |
| 4.10 | Model Architecture | 67 |
| 5.1 | A Reinforcement Learning system | 69 |
| 5.2 | One iteration of a MCTS algorithm | 73 |
| 5.3 | Relation between services | 78 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| 5.4 Pipeline Architecture | 79 |
|-------------------------------------|----|

Liste des Tableaux

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.1 | Non functional requirements | 13 |
| 2.1 | Winning conditions for Mean Payoff Games | 21 |
| 3.1 | Le tableau d'avancement des BNNs | 45 |
| 3.2 | List of heuristics used by the solver | 54 |

List of Algorithms

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Deterministic strategies evaluation | 28 |
| 2 | Probabilistic strategies evaluation | 28 |
| 3 | $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Generation | 37 |
| 4 | $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Generation Optimisation | 37 |
| 5 | $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Choice without replacement | 38 |
| 6 | Fine tuned $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Choice without replacement | 40 |
| 7 | Fine tuned $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Choice without replacement | 41 |
| 8 | Solving a Mean Payoff Graph for all states | 50 |
| 9 | Selection algorithm for MCTS | 70 |
| 10 | Expansion algorithm for MCTS | 71 |
| 11 | Simulation algorithm for MCTS | 71 |
| 12 | Backpropagation algorithm for MCTS | 72 |
| 13 | MCTS Algorithm | 72 |
| 14 | Create children | 74 |
| 15 | Alpha Zero MCTS Simulation | 74 |
| 16 | model-based MCTS playout policy | 75 |
| 17 | Converting a Max Atom System to Ternary Max Atom System | 86 |
| 18 | Converting a Min-Max System to Max Atom | 89 |
| 19 | Converting a Mean Payoff Game to a Min Max system | 90 |
| 20 | AC3 for Ternary Max Atom systems | 91 |
| 21 | AC3 Optimized for Ternary Max Atom systems | 92 |

Introduction

Avec l'explosion de l'intelligence artificielle, et surtout les modèles d'apprentissage profonds, la complexité des modèles a subi une croissance considérable, qui les rend inexploitable dans les systèmes à complexité limitée.

Dans ce rapport, nous allons étudier la quantification des paramètres et des entrées des couches du réseau de neurones sur un seul bit.

Ce rapport va détailler notre approche de la formalisation des BNNs, de l'analyse et généralisation des approches existantes, vers l'implémentation d'une bibliothèque unifiant les BNNs, et son utilisation. Il est composé de 6 chapitres.

Dans le premier chapitre, nous allons présenter la société **dB Sense** et sa méthodologie.

Dans le deuxième chapitre, nous allons donner une petite histoire de l'apprentissage profond, et puis poser le problème de la grande complexité de ces modèles, en posant la binarisation comme une solution.

Dans le troisième chapitre, nous allons formaliser notre approche, en définissant les BNNs. Après nous allons poser quelques problèmes dans l'entraînement. Après nous allons proposer les optimisations temps et mémoire qu'on peut exploiter avec les BNNs.

Finalement, nous allons proposer l'algorithme d'entraînement et d'interférence des BNNs.

Dans le quatrième chapitre, nous allons étudier et analyser quelques BNNs répandus dans la littérature, en conformant avec notre définition proposée.

Dans le cinquième chapitre, nous allons implémenter la bibliothèque **binaryflow**, en justifiant les paradigmes utilisés.

Dans le sixième chapitre, nous allons utiliser les différents BNNs étudiés sur 3 jeux de données. Pour chacun de ces modèles nous allons analyser son performance de prédiction, sa taille mémoire au déploiement, et une estimation sur la complexité de son interférence en calculant le nombres d'instruction équivalents.

Chapter 1

Project context

1.1 Presentation of the host institute

1.1.1 Presentation of the institute of Algebra

Algebra (from Arabic: al-dschabir "the joining of broken parts") is one of the oldest scientific disciplines of all. As a doctrine of solving equations and systems of equations, it already developed in Babylon and in ancient Egypt. In the 19th century this theory ("classical algebra") was largely completed by the fundamental theorem of algebra by Gauss and the theorem by Abel-Ruffini. Modern algebra developed - on the basis of the work of Galois and Abel - as the theory of algebraic structures, above all of groups, rings and solids. Algebra has fundamental importance within mathematics, since almost all mathematics is based on sets and operations or relations on their elements. In addition to mathematics, various sub-areas of algebra are essential for other research areas, e.g. for symmetry studies in physics and chemistry or for coding theory and cryptography in computer science.

Algebra is a rich field of science with many exciting and dynamic fields of research.

1.1.2 Research interest

The main research areas at the Institute for Algebra are constraint satisfaction problems, finite group theory, and valued rings and fields. All of these topics require the linking of a variety of mathematical theories such as graph theory, group theory, general algebra, order theory and topology.

1.2 Project definition

1.2.1 General frame

With the major boom in Artificial Intelligence, and especially Deep Learning in the 21st century. Research institutions are looking for Machine Learning Learning techniques to approximate solutions of hard games that are intractable to humans and even conventional algorithms.

Mean Payoff Games are a class of games on graphs that can be explained very easily¹ to a layman.

¹With a slight modification of rules.

In the other hand, it is hard even for computers to guess a good strategy, let alone calculate the optimal one. Therefore, a sophisticated ML algorithm is needed for that purpose.

1.2.2 Motivations

Recent breakthroughs in Reinforcement Learning techniques made superhuman performances in previously intractable games such as Go [44].

Furthermore, for a popular game like Chess, it even surpassed the strongest conventional engines² [45].

This advances were gradually applied to theoretical games such as Stochastic Parity Games [7]. Now, This interesting, as the class of Stochastic Parity Games is a subclass of Stochastic Mean Payoff Game (SMPG), which is our ultimate goal.

Now, to not dive directly into the stochastic version which is more subtle, we limit our approach to Mean Payoff Game (MPG), but try to make it as general as possible, so that it can be incorporated to the stochastic case.

1.2.3 Presentation of the project

This work is a different approach for solving MPG. Exact methods are currently computationally inefficient, and we will instead opt for approximation methods based on DL.

In this project, we:

- Formalised and analysed MPGs.
- Made a Python library for MPGs with time-critical functions implemented in C++.
- Generated and annotated a large dataset of MPGs, using a High Power Computing (HPC) system.
- Analysed the results, to empirically verify our unproven hypotheses about the game.
- Conceptualized and implemented a Graph Neural Network (GNN) model that predicts the optimal strategy for a player.
- Implemented a Self Play (SP) algorithm, based on Alpha Zero [45] that uses the GNN model.

,

1.3 Requirement

1.3.1 Functional Requirements

The ultimate goal of this project is to design and implement a SP system for MPG.

As we were not able to discover any implementation regarding MPG. Before diving into the modeling part, we implemented and tested a library that we called **MPG**. We generated and annotated two large datasets of MPGs to understand more properties about the game and strategies. And finally then, we started implementing a GNN model that will be used as part of the SP system.

²This was at the time of writing the article in 2017. Now, chess engines are a lot stronger, and incorporated DL methods.

1.3.2 Non-functional requirements

| Scope | Requirements |
|-----------|--|
| Library | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance: Time-critical operations should have minimal overhead. Correctness: The implemented methods must be formally correct. Modularity: The library should be modular and extensible. |
| Solver | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance: Solving a MPG should take as less time as possible. Robustness: Each thread should account for a wide range of errors, and resume operation if affected without disrupting the whole program. |
| Analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rigour: The analysis should be as formal as possible, with proofs if possible. Graphical: The analysis should contain graphical visualisations. |
| Model | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dynamic: The model should work on any graph no matter its size. Symmetry: The model should account for the symmetries of the game. Stability: The model's result should only differ slightly when there is a small change in the game parameters. Performance: The model should not be slower than the conventional solver. |
| Self Play | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just in time: The self play algorithm must support just in time generated graphs. Scalability: The self playinig system should scale horizontally and vertically. Adaptability: The system can detect new or defect nodes and act accordingly. Continuity: The learning process must be Integration: The model should account for the symmetries of the game. |

Table 1.1: Non functional requirements

1.4 Introduction to learning approaches

1.4.1 Machine learning

Machine Learning Learning (ML) is a subfield of Artificial Intelligence (AI), which is broadly defined as the capability of a machine to imitate intelligent human behavior. AI systems are used to perform complex tasks in a way that is similar to how humans solve problems.

ML focalises on the use of data and algorithms to imitate the way that humans learn, gradually improving its accuracy.

To formalise the definition, we will directly use Mitchell's famous definition [35, page. 2]: “*A computer program is said to learn from experience E with respect to some class of tasks T and performance measure P if its performance at tasks in T, as measured by P, improves with experience E.*”

1.4.2 Deep learning

Neural Networks

Neural Network (NN), are a subset of Machine Learning Learning (ML) and are at the heart of Deep Learning (DL) algorithms. Their name and structure are inspired by the human brain, mimicking the way that biological neurons signal to one another.




Figure 1.1: An illustration of a neural network

NN are comprised of a node layers, containing an input layer, one or more hidden layers, and an output layer. Each node, or artificial neuron, connects to another and has an associated weight and threshold. These series of connections make the possibility to learn complex features from the dataset.

Definition

Deep Learning (DL) is a subset of Machine Learning Learning (ML), which is essentially a neural network with three or more layers. These neural networks attempt to simulate the behavior of the human brain—albeit far from matching its ability—allowing it to “learn” from large amounts of data.




Figure 1.2: Relation between AI, ML and DL

The term deep learning originated from new methods and strategies designed to generate these deep hierarchies of non-linear features by overcoming the problems with vanishing gradients so that we can train architectures with dozens of layers.




Figure 1.3: An example of deep learning model

1.4.3 Reinforcement learning

Reinforcement Learning (RL) is the science of decision making. It is about learning the optimal behavior in an environment to obtain maximum reward. This optimal behavior is learned through interactions with the environment and observations of how it responds, similar to children exploring the world around them and learning the actions that help them achieve a goal.

In the absence of a supervisor, the learner must independently discover the sequence of actions that maximize the reward. This discovery process is akin to a trial-and-error search. The quality of actions is measured by not just the immediate reward they return, but also the delayed reward they might fetch. As it can learn the actions that result in eventual success in an unseen environment without the help of a supervisor, reinforcement learning is a very powerful tool.




Figure 1.4: An example of a reinforcement learning system

Due to its generality, reinforcement learning is studied in many disciplines, such as game theory, control theory, operations research, information theory, simulation-based optimization, multi-agent systems, swarm intelligence, and statistics.

1.4.4 Self Play

In Reinforcement Learning (RL), the term self-play describes a kind of Multi-Agent Learning (MAL) that deploys an algorithm against copies of itself to test compatibility in various stochastic environments.

Self Play (SP) rose to prominence after the great success of Alpha Go [44] and its subsequent version Alpha Zero [45].




Figure 1.5: Alpha Go pipeline
src:

1.5 Work methodologies

This section is dedicated to describing the three methodologies we selected to conduct this project, complemented by the Gantt chart which illustrates the distribution of our tasks over the duration of the internship.

Each of the three methodologies we selected dealt with a different part of the project. These parts were very different in nature. As a result, we effectively considered them as distinct subprojects.

The choice of more than one methodology was necessary in our case, as each subproject had to be approached with a unique mindset.

1.5.1 Agile Methodology

As the first goal of the project was to implement and test a MPG library, we followed the **Agile** methodology.




Figure 1.6: Agile development cycle

Agile methodology is a project management approach that prioritizes cross-functional collaboration and continuous improvement. It divides projects into smaller phases and guides teams through cycles of planning, execution, and evaluation.

Agile's entire framework revolves around the program's core values. Many of the Agile Principles are directly based on these values:

1.5.2 Crisp-DM

The second subproject was to analyse, and implement a reinforcement learning model for MPGs. For that part, we used the **Crisp-DM**

CRISP-DM, which stands for Cross-Industry Standard Process for Data Mining, is an industry-proven way to guide the data mining efforts.




Figure 1.7: Agile development cycle

As a methodology, it includes descriptions of the typical phases of a project, the tasks involved with each phase, and an explanation of the relationships between these tasks. As a process model, CRISP-DM provides an overview of the data mining life cycle.

GANTT Diagram




Figure 1.8: Gantt diagram

Chapter 2

Analysis & Implementation

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Formalisation

To define a Mean Payoff Game, we will start by formalising a weighted di-graph¹.

2.2.1 Di-Graph

A Weighted Di-Graph G is a tuple (V, E, W) where:

- V is the set of vertices.
- $E \subseteq V \times V$ is the set of edges.
- $W : E \rightarrow \mathbb{G}$ is the weight function, assigning a weight for every edge, with \mathbb{G} some ordered abelian group².

2.2.2 Mean Payoff Game

Formally, a **Mean Payoff Graph** is a tuple (V, E, W, P, s, p) where:

- $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, W)$ is a di-graph.
- $s \in V$ denotes the starting position.
- $P = \{\text{Max}, \text{Min}\}$ is the set of players.
- $p \in P$ the starting player

A **Mean Payoff Game** is a perfect information, zero-sum, turn based game played indefinitely on a Mean Payoff Graph as follow:

- The game starts at $u_0 = s$, with player $p_0 = p$ starting.
- For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, Player p_n will choose a vertex $u_{n+1} \in \text{Adj } u_n$, with a payoff $w_n = W(u_n, u_{n+1})$

¹Directed Graph

²This definition is too general. We will only consider $\mathbb{G} \in \{\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}\}$. Also, \mathbb{G} itself should be clear from the context.

- The winner of the game will be determined by the Mean Payoff. There are different winning conditions.

| Name | Max winning criteria | Min winning criteria | Draw criteria |
|-------|--|---|--|
| C_1 | $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k \geq 0$ | $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k < 0$ | |
| C_2 | $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k > 0$ | $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k < 0$ | $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k = 0$ |
| C_3 | $\liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k > 0$ | $\limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k < 0$ | $\begin{cases} \liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k \leq 0 \\ \limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k \geq 0 \end{cases}$ |

Table 2.1: Winning conditions for Mean Payoff Games

Here, table 2.1 gives the different winning criteria that we have considered:

- C_1 was used in [3] to calculate the optimal strategy for player Max
- C_2 is modification of C_1 that introduces the possibility of drawing.
- C_3 is symmetric³, and will be used for our machine learning. It was referenced in [6].

Now, there is a slight difference between the three winning conditions.

For example, an optimal strategy with respect to C_1 may not be optimal with respect to C_2 . While this can happen, it is unlikely.

What about C_2 and C_3 ? As different as they appear, they are equivalent in the scope of this report⁴. This is demonstrated in 2.2.7.

2.2.3 Well Foundness

It is not very clear from the definition that the game is well founded.

In fact, there are choices for which the mean payoff does not converge. That is the sequence $\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ does not converge.

One such example is the sequence defined by:

$$w_n = (-1)^{\lfloor \log_2(n+1) \rfloor}$$

³It does not give an advantage towards any player.

⁴They are still different conditions in general.

For that sequence, the $(2^r - 1)$ -step mean payoff is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{k=0}^{2^r-2} w_k &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^r-1} (-1)^{\lfloor \log_2(k) \rfloor} = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=2^i}^{2^{i+1}-1} (-1)^{\lfloor \log_2(j) \rfloor} \\
 &= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=2^i}^{2^{i+1}-1} (-1)^i = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (2^{i+1} - 2^i)(-1^i) \\
 &= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-2)^i = \frac{1 - (-2)^r}{3} \\
 \implies \frac{1}{2^r - 1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^r-2} w_k &= \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1 - (-2)^r}{2^r - 1} = \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{2^{-r} - (-1)^r}{1 - 2^{-r}}
 \end{aligned}$$

That sequence has two accumulation points $\pm \frac{1}{3}$, and thus, it does not converge.

On the other hand, the introduction of the supremum and infimum operators in the table 2.1 will solve the convergence problem, as the resulting sequences will become monotone.

An example of an execution that gives a rise to such payoffs is the following Meab Payoff Game instance⁵:




Figure 2.1: An example of an execution with non-convergent Mean Payoffs

2.2.4 Properties

A Mean Payoff Game has many properties that are interesting from a game theory perspective.

Two Player


The game is a two player game.

Turn Based

2.2.5 Symmetries

Mean Payoff Games exhibits many natural symmetries.

⁵Note that the proposed pair of strategies is odd in the sense that it appears that both players cooperated on the construction of non-convergent mean payoffs instead of trying to win the game.



Duality

The main symmetry is the duality between Max and Min .

For this we will define the dual \bar{G} of a mean payoff game $G = (V, E, WP, s, p)$ as the following:

$$\bar{G} = (V, E, -W, s, \bar{p})$$

This duality is important due to the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *For every mean payoff game G , the objective of player Max is equivalent to the objective of player Min in \bar{G} .*

With that, there is not any major difference between Max and Min from a theoretical point of view. In fact, without any loss of generality, we can assume that Max is the starting player. And this is what we will do by default in this report.

2.2.6 Strategy

Deterministic Strategies

Let p be a player.

A (deterministic) strategy is a function $\Pi^p : V^+ \rightarrow V$ such that:

$$\forall v_0 \dots v_r \in V^+, \quad \Pi_p(v_0 \dots v_r) \in \text{Adj } v$$

If the strategy does only depend on the current vertex, we say it is a memoryless (deterministic) strategy. $\Pi : V \rightarrow V$

In this report, we will use the term positional strategies as an alias for memoryless deterministic strategies, which is conforming to the established litterature of mean payoff games.

Positional strategies are crucial for our analysis as a result of the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *For all Mean Payoff Games, each player has an optimal positional strategy.*

Probabilistic Strategies

A probabilistic strategy is a random process that assigns for each sequence of vertices $v \in \mathcal{V}$ a probability distribution over $\text{Adj } v$. This constitutes the most general strategy of a player:

$$\forall v_0 \dots v_r \in V^+, \quad \Pi_p(v_0 \dots v_r) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Adj } v)$$

Considered Strategies

Strategies that depends in complete past histories are in general intractable. For Mean Payoff Game, it is proven that the optimal strategy is a **deterministic** and **memoryless**.

For that we will only consider **memoryless** strategies. And for the scope of this report:

- A deterministic strategy should refer to memoryless deterministic strategy.
- A probabilistic strategy should refer to memoryless probabilistic strategy.
- A strategy should refer to memoryless deterministic strategy.

We will still consider (memoryless) probabilistic strategies as they reside in a smooth space, and thus they can be used for machine learning purposes.

Deterministic Optimal Strategy

There are three kinds of optimality:

Weak Optimality : In the deterministic case, a strategy Φ of player $p \in P$ is weakly optimal if one of the following is true:

- For each strategy Φ^p of player p , player \bar{p} can win the game by finding a countering strategy $\Phi^{\bar{p}}$.
- Player p will not lose the game no matter his opponent's strategy

Strong Optimality : In the deterministic case, a strategy Φ of player $p \in P$ is strongly optimal if one of the following is true:

- For each strategy Φ^p of player p , player \bar{p} can win or tie the game by finding a countering strategy $\Phi^{\bar{p}}$.
- Player p will win the game no matter his opponent's strategy

Payoff Optimality : In the deterministic case, a strategy Φ of player $p \in P$ is payoff optimal if independently of \bar{p} 's strategy it:

- Maximises the Mean Payoff if $p = \text{Min}$
- Minimises the Mean Payoff otherwise

Now we have the following hierarchy considering the set of optimal strategies:

$$\forall \text{Mean Payoff Game } G, \forall p \in P, \quad \text{PayoffOptimal}(G, p) \subseteq \text{StrongOptimal}(G, p) \subseteq \text{WeakOptimal}(G, p)$$

2.2.7 Mean Payoff

We have used the word “Mean Payoff” extensively, and they are the central entity in mean payoff games⁶ but we still did not define it.

We had to delay the definition as it requires the knowledge of the mechanics of the game, and how strategies work. This section will define and formalize the mean payoff, and highlights its relevance.

Mean Payoff

For a mean payoff game G , with a deterministic pair of strategies $(\Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$, we will define two terms $v^+(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$ and $v^-(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$ as follow⁷:

$$v^+(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) = \limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k$$

$$v^-(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) = \liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k$$

Where $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the sequence of payoffs generated by the instance.

These two terms were used in table 2.1 when discussing the winning conditions, and we will call them respectively the supremum mean payoff, and the infimum mean payoff.

Theorem 3 *For every mean payoff game G , and every pair of strategies $(\Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$, both the supremum mean payoff $v^+(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$ and the infimum mean payoff $v^-(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$ are guaranteed to exist, and:*

$$v^-(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) \leq v^+(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) \quad (2.1)$$

If both terms are equal in equation (2.1), we say that the game instance has a mean payoff $v(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) = v^-(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) = v^+(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$.

Convergence Issues

This mean payoff itself is the heart of mean payoff games. A major problem lies in the fact that the existence of a mean payoff is not guaranteed, and an example for such case is found in the figure 2.1.

Now, fortunately, this is not an issue, as we are interested in good strategies. Theorem 2 proven in [14] states that for each player, the set of optimal strategies contains a positional one. This is a very important result as we can limit the domain of our optimization problem⁸ to the more tractable positional⁹ and behavioural¹⁰ strategies.

We start by tackling the existence of the mean payoff for positional strategies in the the following theorem:

Theorem 4 *For every mean payoff G , and a pair of positional strategies $(\Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$, the mean payoff $v(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$ exists.*

⁶This explains the name “mean payoff game”.

⁷For probabilistic strategies, both terms are random variables, so we will be interested in their expected values.

⁸The problem of finding optimal strategies

⁹memoryless and deterministic

¹⁰memoryless and probabilistic

We will give a constructive proof of theorem 4 in section 2.3. We will also provide a linear algorithm for its calculation.

Furthermore, in our machine learning model, we will approach the problem using behavioural strategies. Also luckily, its existence is guaranteed by the following theorem:

Theorem 5 *For every mean payoff G , and a pair of behavioural strategies $(\Pi^{\text{Max}}, \Pi^{\text{Min}})$, the expected mean payoff $\mathbb{E}[v(G, \Pi^{\text{Max}}, \Pi^{\text{Min}})]$ exists.*

Unlike theorem 4 theorem 5 was very challenging to prove, and we were not able to find a direct proof in the literature. We had some probabilistic arguments that affirmed the result for almost all mean payoff games. This alone was enough for us to use it as a metric for probabilistic strategies. Eventually, we were able to give a formal proof, which is detailed in the appendix C.

Game Value

By combining both theorems 2 and 4, there is a mean payoff $v(G)$ that both players are guaranteed to achieve if they play optimally:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \forall \Phi^{\text{Min}}, \quad v^-(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) &\geq v(G) \\ \exists \Phi^{\text{Min}}, \forall \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \quad v^+(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) &\leq v(G) \end{aligned}$$

Such mean payoff is called the value of the game. This value determines the winner of the game assuming both players play optimally.

2.3 Evaluating Strategies

Suppose we have a pair of potentially probabilistic strategies $(\Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$. The problem is to evaluate the winner without doing an infinite simulation of the game.

2.3.1 Monte-Carlo Simulations

This is the most intuitive evaluation method

2.3.2 Positional Strategies

If both strategies are deterministic and memoryless. Then the generated sequence of vertices $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ will be completely determined by the recurrence relation:

$$s_n = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \Phi^{\text{Max}}(s_{n-1}) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \Phi^{\text{Min}}(s_{n-1}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This can be represented in the compact form:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad (s_n, p_n) = (\Phi^{p_{n-1}}(s_{n-1}), \bar{p}_{n-1}) = F(s_{n-1}, p_{n-1})$$

Since $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{P}$ is a finite set and F is a function, such sequence will be eventually periodic, that is:

$$\exists N \in \mathbb{N}, \exists T \in \mathbb{N}^* / \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq N}, \quad (s_n, p_n) = (s_{n+T}, p_{n+T})$$

We can calculate its eventual period using the turtle hare algorithm.

Now, the mean payoff will be equal to the mean of weights that appears on the cycle. This can be proven as follow.:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{aT+b+N} &= \sum_{k=0}^{aT+b+N-1} w_k \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} w_k + \sum_{k=0}^{aT+b-1} w_{k+N} \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} w_k + a \sum_{r=0}^{T-1} w_{r+N} + \sum_{r=0}^{b-1} w_{r+N} \\
 \implies \left| S_{n+N} - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{T} \right\rfloor \sum_{r=0}^T w_{k+N} \right| &\leq (N+T-1) \max_{(u,v)\in\mathcal{E}} |\mathcal{W}(u,v)| \\
 &\leq (N+T-1) \|\mathcal{W}\|_\infty \\
 \implies \left| \frac{1}{n+N} S_{n+N} - \frac{1}{n+N} \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{n}{T} \right\rfloor \sum_{r=0}^{T-1} w_{k+N} \right| &\leq \frac{N+T-1}{n+N} \|\mathcal{W}\|_\infty
 \end{aligned}$$

Now it can be proven that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n+N} \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{n}{T} \right\rfloor \sum_{r=0}^T w_{k+N} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{r=0}^{T-1} w_{r+N}$$

With that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} w_k = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{r=0}^{T-1} w_{r+N} \quad \blacksquare$$

Now, our algorithm will be composed of 3 main parts:

- Calculating the transition function $F : V \times P \rightarrow V \times P$. This is straightforward from the construction.
- Calculating the period and the offset of the sequence. We will use Floyd's cycle finding algorithm for that.
- Calculating the Mean Payoff

This is an illustrative implementation of our algorithm.

Algorithm 1 Deterministic strategies evaluation

Require: $G = (V, E, P, s, p)$ a mean payoff game
Require: $(\Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$ the edge probability
Ensure: R The mean payoff

```

 $F \leftarrow \text{Transition}(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$                                  $\triangleright$  Calculate the transition function
 $x_0 \leftarrow (s, p)$ 
 $(T, r) \leftarrow \text{FloydCycleFinding}(F, x_0)$                                           $\triangleright$  Find the period and the offset
 $S \leftarrow 0$                                                                 $\triangleright S$  represents the cumulative payoffs along a cycle
 $x \leftarrow x_0$ 
for  $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  do                                          $\triangleright$  Advance until arriving to the cycle
     $x \leftarrow F(x)$ 
end for
for  $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$  do
     $y \leftarrow F(x)$ 
     $u \leftarrow \text{projection}(x)$                                           $\triangleright$  Extracts the current vertex
     $\quad V \times P \rightarrow V$ 
     $v \leftarrow \text{projection}(y)$                                           $\triangleright$  Extracts the next vertex
     $\quad V \times P \rightarrow V$ 
     $S \leftarrow S + W(u, v)$ 
     $x \leftarrow y$ 
end for
return  $R \leftarrow \frac{S}{T}$ 

```

2.3.3 Probabilistic Strategies

Due to the undeterministic nature of probabilistic strategies, it does not make sense to evaluate the mean payoffs, as different executions may lead to different mean payoffs.

Instead, probabilistic strategies gives rise to a discrete distribution of mean payoffs.

Now two closely related, but different evaluations are possible

- Expected Mean Payoff
- Distribution of winners

Now, with both strategies fixed. A Mean Payoff Game can be considered as a Markov Chain.

Algorithm 2 Probabilistic strategies evaluation

Require: $G = (V, E, P, s, p)$ a mean payoff game
Require: $(\Pi^{\text{Max}}, \Pi^{\text{Min}})$ the edge probability
Ensure: $\mathbb{E}[R]$ The expected mean payoff

```

 $(A, W) \leftarrow \text{MRP}(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}})$                                  $\triangleright$  Extract the MRP form. This is detailed in C.1.2
 $u \leftarrow (A \odot W) \mathbf{1}$ 
 $X \leftarrow \text{NullSpace}(\text{Id} - A)$                                           $\triangleright$  Extract the kernel-basis of  $\text{Id} - A$ 
 $Y \leftarrow \text{NullSpace}(\text{Id} - A^T)$                                           $\triangleright$  Extract the kernel-basis of  $\text{Id} - A^H$ .
 $T \leftarrow X(Y^T X)^{-1} Y^T$                                           $\triangleright$  Calculate the limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k$ . This is detailed in C.2.3
return  $\mathbb{E}[R] \leftarrow Tu$ 

```

2.4 Countering Strategies

By fixing the strategy of player pP to Φ^p , then the Markov Game Process reduces to a Markov Decision Process, which can be solved by Linear Programming tools

Moreover, in a deterministic Mean Payoffs, a counter strategy can be calculated efficiently by reducing the problem to finding a negative cycle in a di-graph.

2.4.1 Deterministic Counter Strategy

For simplicity, we assume that $p = \text{Max}$, the same results apply for Min player.

For a Mean Payoff Game (V, E, P, s, p') , we introduce the following graph:

$$G' = (V, E', W')$$

where:

- E' is defined as follow:

$$E' = \{(u, \Phi^p(v)), \quad (u, v) \in E\}$$

- Also, W' is defined adequately:

$$\forall (u, v) \in E : W'(u, \Phi^p(v)) = W(u, v) + W(v, \Phi^p(v))$$

The problem of finding a counter strategy will be reduced to finding a negative cycle \mathcal{C} in G' . This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^3)$

2.4.2 Probabilistic Counter Strategy

On the other hand, if Φ^p is probabilistic, then the problem can be reduced to optimizing the mean payoff of an infinite-horizon Markov Decision Process.

2.5 Learning Strategies

2.6 State of the Art

Mean Payoff Games are well-known in many fields, such that Optimization[2], Game Theory[14], Formal Verification[19], Constraint Satisfaction Problems[6, 3], Reinforcement Learning[43].

While we were not able to trace the exact origin of Mean Payoff Games, we were able to find references to it since the seventies [14]. The problem itself is interesting as it connects many related fields. First of all, it is closely related to many problems in constraint satisfaction [6, 3], model-checking [19], game theory [14].

Also, another interesting fact is that deciding the winner of a mean payoff game is polynomial time equivalent¹¹ to the Max Atom problem [3], which is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{co-NP}$, but its membership to P is still open. This is remarkable, there are only few problems that share such fate [36].

This influenced mainly two research axes. The first deals with solving the decision problem¹², and

¹¹Each instance of both problems can be transformed to the latter in polynomial time.

¹²The decision problem of a mean payoff game is deciding the winner.

also optimization problem¹³ related to calculating the optimal strategies.

The optimization problem itself can be solved using exact methods [3], as well as iterative methods [43, 2].

While we did not find a machine learning approach on mean payoff games in the literature, we were able to find some results in a superclass, known as stochastic parity games. In fact, a model free reinforcement learning approach was proposed using the Q-learning minimax algorithm , as well as a supervised learning approach on solved instances of that game.

2.7 Library Implementation

We have two implementations of our mean payoff game library:

- The first is called **mpg**. It is implemented in Python, and it contains the core functionalities of mean payoff games, as well as serialization, visualisation and support for machine learning methods.
- The second one is called **mpgcpp**. It is implemented in C++ to maximize efficiency.

Also, the time-critical C++ functions are exported to Python. In they can be used via the **wrapper** module.

2.7.1 mpg

We have implemented a library called **mpg** that contains all the functionalities that we have discussed for mean payoff games.

Here we list the modules of that library:




Figure 2.2: **mpg** library

This library contains the following modules:

¹³The optimization problem is calculating the best strategy for each player.

csp

This module contains the constraint satisfaction methods used to solve Mean Payoff Games. They are described in details in the appendix A.

graphs

This module contains some graph algorithms needed for Mean Payoff Games, such as:

- Floyd-Warshall method to find negative cycles.
- Methods to generate random graphs as described in section 3. The theoretical details are in the appendix B

visualisation

This module serves as a front-end for Jupyter Notebook, so we can visualise mean payoff games, and also the strategy of each player.




Figure 2.3: Generated visualisation for a Mean Payoff Game with the optimal strategies

games

This module defines the core functionalities related to mean payoff games. It also defines the methods to read/write Mean Payoff Graphs. It uses the weighted edgelist format, and supports compression.




Figure 2.4: **games** module

ml

This module defines the required layers, blocks, and model architectures to do machine learning on Mean Payoff Games. This is detailed in chapter 4.

gnn

This module defines the basic functionalities of graph neural networks [42] that are required for our models.

rl

This module defines the required functions to do reinforcement learning on Mean Payoff Games¹⁴.

sp

This module defines a basic AlphaZero based agent to learn the game.

wrapper

This module contains a binding to the C++ implementation of time-critical methods for mean payoff games.

We will give details about this wrapper in the next section.

2.7.2 mpgcpp

This library contains the




Figure 2.5: **mpgcpp** library

csp

This module contains the constraint satisfaction methods used to solve Mean Payoff Games.

games

This module defines the core functionalities related to mean payoff games.

¹⁴The current version of this module only supports Mean Payoff Games where at least one player has a fixed strategy.




Figure 2.6: **games** module

mpgio

Unlike **mpg**, which has support for mean payoff graph I/O from files via **NetworkX**. In the C++ library, we have to implement this functionalities from scratch. We used standard I/O utilities with **boost** to interact with compressed streams conforming to the format used by **mpg**.

2.7.3 Environment

2.7.4 Testing

2.7.5 Structure

Chapter 3

Dataset Generation & Annotation

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Analysis

Generating a Mean Payoff Game can be decomposed into two subsequent objectives.

1. Generate the Graph itself.
2. Generate the Weights

3.3 Graph Distributions

There are many well studied graph distributions in the litterature. One of the most explored ones are the $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ and $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$ families.

We will offer here a directed variant of these two distributions that suits for MPGs.

3.3.1 $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Family

For $n \in \mathbb{N}, p \in [0, 1]$, a di-graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to follow a $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ distribution if $|V| = n$ and:

$$\forall e \in V \times V, \quad \mathcal{P}(s \in E) = p$$

This is the directed version of the binomial random graph distribution $\mathcal{G}(n, p)$ [16, Section. 1.1].

3.3.2 $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ Family

For $n \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}$, a graph G is said to follow a $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$ distribution if $|V| = n, |E| = m$ and the edges e_1, \dots, e_m were drawn uniformly and without replacement from the set $V \times V$

This is the directed version of the uniform random graph distribution $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$ [16, Section. 1.1].

While $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ has a more natural definition, the analysis of $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ is easier. Also there are many results showing similarities between the two distributions [16, Section. 1.1]. For this reason, we will focus primarily on $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ graphs.

3.3.3 $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Construction

Naive Method

The definition of $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ gives a straightforward construction.

This is achieved by flipping a coin¹ for each pair of node $(u, v) \in V^2$, we add an edge if we get a Head.

This is implemented in the following algorithm:

Algorithm 3 $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Generation

Require: $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ the size of the graph
Require: $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ the edge probability
Ensure: $G \sim \mathcal{D}(n, p)$

```

 $A : (u, v) \in V \times V \rightarrow 0$ 
for  $u \in V$  do
    for  $v \in V$  do
        Generate  $X \sim \mathcal{B}(p)$                                  $\triangleright \mathcal{B}(p)$  is the bernoulli distribution
         $A(u, v) \leftarrow X$ 
    end for
end for
return  $G \leftarrow \text{GraphFromAdjacencyMatrix}(A)$ 
```

The complexity² of the following algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

Optimized Method

Instead of iterating over all possible pair of nodes. For each vertex $v \in V$:

- We can sample a number d from the outgoing degree distribution³
- We then choose d numbers uniformly without replacement from an indexable representation of V

The following algorithm implements the optimized method:

Algorithm 4 $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Generation Optimisation

Require: $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ the size of the graph
Require: $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ the edge probability
Ensure: $G \sim \mathcal{D}(n, p)$

```

 $A : u \in V \rightarrow \emptyset$ 
for  $u \in V$  do
    Generate  $d \sim \mathcal{B}(n, p)$                                  $\triangleright d$  represents the degree,  $\mathcal{B}(n, p)$  is the binomial distribution
     $A(u) \leftarrow \text{choice}(V, d)$ 
end for
return  $G \leftarrow \text{GraphFromAdjacencyList}(A)$ 
```

¹The coin is potentially biased with a probability of obtaining head equal to $p \in [0, 1]$

²We assume the cost of generating a Bernoulli random variable as $\mathcal{O}(1)$

³Or the ingoing degree distribution, they are in fact equal.

Now, let $C(a, b)$ be the cost of choice function.

The expected complexity of this algorithm as a function of $n = |V|$ and the degrees d_1, \dots, d_n is:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n 1 + \mathbb{E}[C(n, d_i)]\right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[C(n, d_i)]\right) \quad (3.1)$$

We will show on the next section what choice function should we use.

3.3.4 Choice Function

First Proposition

We propose here a simple choice algorithm, but it is still efficient for our use case.

It works simply by drawing without replacement, but we ignore duplicate elements. This is implemented as follow

Algorithm 5 $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Choice without replacement

Require: S a list

Require: $m \in \{0, \dots, |S|\}$ the number of chosen elements

Ensure: H a set of size m containing uniformly drawn elements without replacement.

```

 $H \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
while  $|H| < m$  do
    Generate  $v \sim \mathcal{U}(S)$  ▷ Where  $\mathcal{U}(S)$  is the uniform distribution over  $S$ 
     $H \leftarrow H \cup \{v\}$ 
end while
return  $H$ 

```

To estimate the cost of this algorithm, we will use probabilistic reasoning.

Let $X_{n,m} = C(n, m)$ the running time of an execution of algorithm 5 in a set S of size n , with m elements to be chosen. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_{n,0} &\text{ is deterministic} \\
 X_{n,0} &= \mathcal{O}(1) \\
 \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m}] &= 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m} \mid \text{The last drawn number is } k] \\
 &= 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{m-2} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m}] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=m-1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m-1}] \\
 &= 1 + \frac{m-1}{n} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m}] + \frac{n-m+1}{n} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m-1}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Now we arrived at a recurrent formula. We will simplify it as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{n-m+1}{n} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m}] &= \frac{n-m+1}{n} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m-1}] + 1 \\
 \implies \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m}] &= \frac{n-m+1}{n-m+1} \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m-1}] + \frac{n}{n-m+1} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[X_{n,m-1}] + \frac{n}{n-m+1} \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{n}{n-k+1} + \mathcal{O}(1) \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{n}{n-k} + \mathcal{O}(1) \\
 &= n \sum_{k=n-m+1}^n \frac{1}{k} + \mathcal{O}(1) \\
 &= n(H_n - H_{n-m}) + \mathcal{O}(1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $(H)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$ is the harmonic series, and we define $H_0 = 0$.

Complexity

The expected complexity of algorithm 5 depends on both n and m :

- If $m = kn + o(n)$ with $k \in]0, 1[$, then it is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m)$.
- If $m = n - o(n)$, It is⁴ $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m \log m)$.

To prove this result, we use a well-known asymptotic approximation of the Harmonic series⁵ [26, Section 1.2.11.2]:

$$H_n = \ln n + \gamma - \frac{1}{2n} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)$$

We can prove this claim as follow for $m = km + o(m)$, $k \in [0, 1[$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[C(n, m)] &= -n \ln\left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{n}{n-m}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
 &= -n \ln(1 - k + o(1)) + \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1-k+o(1)}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
 &= \mathcal{O}(m)
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

For $m = n - o(n)$, we prove it by noting that:

$$\mathbb{E}[C(n, m)] \leq \mathbb{E}[C(n, n)] = \mathcal{O}(nH_n) = \mathcal{O}(m \log m)$$

⁴Here we use the minus sign to emphasize that $m \leq n$

⁵This asymptotic approximation can be proven using the Euler–Maclaurin formula

Refinement

If m tends to n , it is more hard to select m elements from a set of size n without replacement. This explains the extra logarithmic factor.

In that case, we can instead focus on the dual problem: “Find the $n - m$ elements that will not be selected”. This can be calculated in $\mathcal{O}(n - m)$.

Once we find the elements that will not be selected, their set complement are exactly the m elements that will be selected. This new algorithm is guaranteed to be $\mathcal{O}(m)$ irrespective of n and m

Algorithm 6 Fine tuned $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Choice without replacement

Require: S a list

Require: $m \in \{0, \dots, |S|\}$ the number of chosen elements

Require: choice The choice function defined on algorithm 5

Require: τ a fine tuned threshold. We will use $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$ for all practical purposes.

Ensure: H a set of size m containing uniformly drawn elements without replacement.

```

if  $\frac{m}{|S|} \leq \tau$  then
     $H \leftarrow \text{choice}(V, n)$ 
else
     $H \leftarrow S \setminus \text{choice}(S, n - m)$ 
end if
return  $H$ 

```

Also, an important point is that by combining the analysis of all possible cases, we can extract a constant factor that is independent⁶ of n . So that the Big-O bound is only a dependent on m .

3.3.5 Complexity of Optimised $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph Construction

Now, using algorithm 6 as the choice algorithm, we can further simplify equation (3.1) as a function of only $n = |V|$ and $m = |E|$.

This proves that $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ construction can be achieved in expected linear time:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[C(n, d_i)]\right) &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(n + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i\right) \\
 &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + m)
 \end{aligned}$$

⁶The independence can be proven by taking the supremum of the right-hand side of equation (3.2) over $[0, \tau]$, and the fact that τ is fixed.




Figure 3.1: Experimental performance to generate dense & sparse graphs

3.3.6 $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ Construction

To construct a random $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ graph, we only have to select m uniformly random elements from the set $V \times V$.

We will use algorithm 6 for this purpose⁷:

Algorithm 7 Fine tuned $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Choice without replacement

Require: $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$

Require: $m \in \{0, \dots, n^2\}$ the number of chosen elements

Ensure: $G \sim \mathcal{D}(n, m)$

$E \leftarrow \text{choice}(\text{Lazy}(V) \times \text{Lazy}(V), m)$ ▷ We only need the m elements on-demand.
return $G \leftarrow \text{GraphFromEdges}(E)$ ▷ This justifies using Lazy

Here $\text{Lazy}(V) \times \text{Lazy}(V)$ is a lazy implementation of cartesian product that supports bijective indexing⁸ over $\{0, \dots, n^2 - 1\}$.

The complexity of this construction is: $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(m)$

3.4 Sinkless Conditionning

Sampling from a graph distribution may lead to graphs that have at least one sink.

These graphs are problematic as Mean Payoff Graphs are exactly the sinkless graphs.

To mitigate this, we will impose a conditionning on both distribution that will gives a guaranteed Mean Payoff Graph.

We will explore such conditionning both distribution:

⁷It is essential that the list $V \times V$ be lazy loaded. In particular, each element will only be loaded when it is indexed. This is essential to reduce the complexity. Otherwise, we will be stuck in an $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ algorithm.

⁸Indexing is required for uniform sampling

- $\mathcal{D}^*(n, p)$: This is the distribution of graphs following $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ with the requirement that they do not have a sink.
- $\mathcal{D}^*(n, m)$: This is the distribution of graphs following $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ with the requirement that they do not have a sink.

3.4.1 Graph Rejection Construction

Estimating Complexity

Now the method of rejecting graphs that have sinks and retrying give us a natural question about how many times will the algorithm reject graph until finding a desirable one.

The number of such rejections will follow a geometric law $\mathcal{G}(h(n, p))$ where:

$$h(n, p) = \mathcal{P}(\text{Sinkless}(\mathcal{D}(n, p))) = (1 - (1 - p)^n)^n \quad (3.3)$$

Proof of (3.3) is found in section B.2.3

With that, the expected complexity of the algorithm will be:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{C(n, p)}{h(n, p)}\right) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{C(n, p)}{(1 - (1 - p)^n)^n}\right)$$

With $C(n, p)$ the cost of building the graph, depending on the algorithm⁹.

Dense Graph case Now it is clear for dense enough graphs, in particular with $p(n) \geq \frac{\ln(n)}{n}$ for large enough n , the expected complexity will reduce to $\mathcal{O}(C(n, p))$. This is a result of equation (B.3).

In the dense case, we consider the rejection method to be efficient.

Sparse Graph case If $p(n) = \frac{k \ln n}{n} + c$ with $k < 1$. We have as a result of:

$$(1 - (1 - p)^n)^n = e^{-e^{-c}x^{1-k} + o(x^{1-k})}$$

With that, the expected complexity of the rejection method will be:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(C(n, p) \times \exp\left(e^{-c}x^{1-k} + o(x^{1-k})\right)\right)$$

which is an exponential algorithm, and thus inefficient for large graphs. Since property P is increasing, this argument generalises to $p(n) \leq \frac{k \ln n}{n} + c$ for large enough n

⁹The two algorithms that we have discussed are the naive $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ algorithm and the more optimized $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + m)$ algorithm.




Figure 3.2: Exponential blowup when using the graph rejection method

3.4.2 Degree Rejection Construction

Instead of throwing the whole graph at once. For every vertex $u \in V$, we try to construct the adjacent vertices of u , and repeat if the procedure gives $\text{Adj } u = \emptyset$. With this trick, the expected complexity will reduce for both algorithms to:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\frac{C(n, p)}{1 - (1 - p)^n}\right)$$

Now for our case, it is natural to assume that $p(n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$, as a Mean Payoff Graph does not have a sink. With that:

$$1 - (1 - p)^n \geq 1 - (1 - \frac{1}{n})^n \geq 1 - e^{-1}$$

Therefore, the expected complexity will simplify to:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(C(n, p))$$

Moreover, the cost of the conditionning makes at most a constant $\frac{1}{1-e^{-1}} \approx 1.582$ factor slowdown, which is effectively negligible.




Figure 3.3: Small slowdown due to the degree rejection method

3.5 Proposed MPG distributions

3.5.1 Desired properties of MPG distributions

Fairness

This is essential, as we intend to generate a sequence of Mean Payoff Games that do not favour statistically a certain player.

A game distribution is said to be fair if:

$$\mathcal{P}(\text{Max wins } G \text{ assuming optimal strategies}) = \mathcal{P}(\text{Min wins } G \text{ assuming optimal strategies}) \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, if we assume C_2 or C_3 as the winning conditions, (3.4) is equivalent to the following equation:

$$\mathcal{P}(v(G) > 0) = \mathcal{P}(v(G) < 0)$$

Symmetric

A real distribution is said to be symmetric if:

$$\forall [a, b] \in \mathbb{R}, X \sim \mathcal{W}, \quad \mathcal{P}(X \in [a, b]) = \mathcal{P}(X \in [-b, -a])$$

We will define a symmetric Mean Payoff Game distribution as a distribution of Mean Payoff Game whose weights are independent and identically distributed on a symmetric real distribution.

We will require a symmetric MPG as we do not want a player to have an inherit advantage over

the other one¹⁰

3.5.2 Implemented Distributions

The following table resumes the implemented distributions:

| Distribution Family | Parameters | Type |
|--|--|---------------------|
| $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n : Graph size • p : Edge probability | Graph distribution |
| $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n : Graph size • m : Number of edges | Graph distribution |
| $\mathcal{U}_{\text{discrete}}(-r, r)$ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • r : The radius of the support | Weight distribution |
| $\mathcal{U}(-r, r)$ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • r : The radius of the support | Weight distribution |
| $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • σ : The standard deviation | Weight distribution |

Table 3.1: Le tableau d'avancement des BNNs

Also, to generate the initial state, we have defaulted to:

- The uniform distribution over the vertices to generate the starting vertex
- The bernoulli distribution to generate the starting player.

With all that said, distributions are fair in the limit and are symmetric, provided that the underlying graph distribution and weight distribution are chosen from the table 3.1.

3.6 MPG Generation

3.6.1 Distribution

- Each generated graph will follow a distribution $\mathcal{G}(n, p(n))$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$
- The weights will follow the discrete uniform distribution $\mathcal{D}(-1000, 1000)$

We will generate two kinds of datasets, depending on the nature of the graph

Dense Graphs

- Let $\mathcal{P} = \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1\}$
- $\mathcal{N} = \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 200, 250, 300, 400, 500\}$
- For each $(n, p) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{P}$, we will generate $K = 1000$ observations $G_1^{n,p}, \dots, G_K^{n,p} \sim \mathcal{G}(n, p)$

¹⁰Other than the first move.

The total number of examples is:

$$K \times |\mathcal{N}| \times |\mathcal{P}| = 160000$$

Sparse Graphs

3.6.2 Implementation

We have implemented a python application called

3.6.3 Deployment

We have deployed the pipeline in the HPC system. We have launched the following command. The figure below shows the pipeline:




Figure 3.4: HPC pipeline to generate mean payoff graphs

The generation was done on a 'haswell64' partition with 24 cores. and it took 02:12:38 hours.

3.7 Annotation

3.7.1 Approach

We used the Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP) algorithm 21 to annotate the dataset, potentially augmented with some heuristics.

We implemented a program that takes the path of the dataset, and solves the Mean Payoff Games one by one.

To maximize efficiency, the program launches many solver threads, with each one independently working on a single file, and the results are accumulated using a ConcurrentQueue.

3.7.2 Target Values

The solver will calculate the following targets:

- The optimal pair of strategies
- The mean payoffs for each starting position, turn.
- The winners for each starting position, turn.

Also, some additional metadata are generated for analysis:

- **dataset**: The name of the whole dataset
- **graph**: The name of the graph.
- **status**: The solver's status on the given graph. In particular, whether it succeeded to solve the instance or not¹¹. Equal to "OK" if the execution is successful.
- **running_time**: The time needed to solve the instance.

3.7.3 Heuristics

To accelerate the annotation of the two datasets, we had to apply some heuristics to the algorithm. We made essentially two kinds of heuristics.

Linear Bound

This is the heuristic based on the view that for almost all solutions of a Ternary Max Atom system extracted from our generated random games, either:

- All variables are infinite:

$$X(u) = -\infty \quad \forall u \in V$$

- The diameter of assignments is in the order of $\|W\|_\infty$

$$\Delta X = \sup_{u \in V} X(u) - \inf_{u \in V, X(u) > -\infty} X(u) = \mathcal{O}(\|W\|_\infty)$$

This heuristic suggests a much tighter search space to the worst case $\|W\|_1$ one.

We believe this heuristic arises due to the random property of graphs, because in general, one can build an infinite family of ternary max atom systems that violate this heuristic.

In fact, going further, one can build a family of ternary max atom systems were the $\|W\|_1$ estimation is tight. This is demonstrated in the following figure:

¹¹We expect that the solver may crash due to several reasons (corrupted file, out of memory, etc...). For that we made additional effort for exception handling, so that an error for a single instance does not propagate to the whole program.

$$\begin{cases} X_0 & \leq \max(X_0, X_1) - 1 \\ \dots & \dots \\ X_{n-1} & \leq \max(X_{n-1}, X_n) - 1 \end{cases}$$

Figure 3.5: A counter example to the Linear Bound heuristic

To generate the dataset, we applied this heuristic with $\Delta X = 4\|W\|_\infty$

$$D = \{-\infty, -2\|W\|_\infty, -2\|W\|_\infty + 1, \dots, 2\|W\|_\infty\}$$

Early Stopping

If after any iteration of arc consistency, $\max_{x \in V} \nu(x) < \sup D$. Then, $\nu(t)$ will converge to $-\infty$ for all t .

Thus, we stop the algorithm and sets $\nu(t) \leftarrow -\infty, \quad \forall t$

Preuve 1 suppose that in fact there is an assignment with:

$$-\infty < \max_{u \in V} \nu(u) < \sup D$$

We will take the u with the biggest such $\nu(u)$.

Now our system is a tropical max atom system, which means translations are also a polymorphism of this system, so for any assignment $\nu : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $X + t$ is also an assignment $\forall t \in \mathbb{Z}$. With that, $\nu + \sup D - \nu(u)$ is also an assignment.

This assignment has the property:

$$\forall s \in V, \quad \nu(s) + \sup D - \nu(u) \in D$$

Which is a contradiction, as it violates the consistency of arc consistency, and the maximality of the solution with respect to the domain D

The efficiency of the Early Stopping heuristic depends on the density of the graph. Empirically, for dense graphs. the analoguous ternary max atom system usually has two kind of assignments:

1. Either all variables are finite
2. Either all variables are $-\infty$

This translates back in a dense Mean Payoff setting, that the winner of the game usually does not depend in the starting position and the starting turn.

With that, the Early Stopping heuristic will quickly detect the second case, which we believe as the hurdle of the algorithm.

On the other hand, for sparse graphs, we do not have this nice distinction between finite and infinite assignments, and they can overlap, and so will make this heuristic useless in practice.

3.7.4 Implementation

Algorithm

We implemented a Mean Payoff Graph solver. It calculates the optimal move for each player in each position. Thus, our implementation gives an exact solution to the optimization problem¹² for Mean Payoff Games.

It works by transforming a mean payoff game to an equivalent min-max system, then applying two subsequent reductions to a n -ary max atom system, then to a ternary max atom system. The solution of the latter is propagated back to mean payoff game to induce an optimal strategy.

¹²In its current version, It gives a weak optimal strategy for both players Max, and Min . The winning condition is C_2

Algorithm 8 Solving a Mean Payoff Graph for all states

Require: G a Mean Payoff Graph

Require: D the domain of the variables. Can be chosen by heuristics.

Ensure: $\Phi : V \times P \rightarrow V$ The optimal strategy of each player

```

 $\Phi \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
for  $p \in P$  do
    if  $p$  is Max then
         $G' \leftarrow G$ 
    else
         $G' \leftarrow \bar{G}$ 
    end if
     $S \leftarrow \underset{\text{MPG} \rightarrow \text{Min-Max}}{\text{transform}}(G', D)$ 
     $S' \leftarrow \underset{\text{Min-Max} \rightarrow \text{Max}}{\text{transform}}(S)$ 
     $S'' \leftarrow \underset{\text{Max} \rightarrow \text{Max}_3}{\text{transform}}(S')$ 
     $L \leftarrow \inf D$ 
     $R \leftarrow \sup D$ 
     $Q \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
     $\mathcal{V} \leftarrow \text{Variables}(S'')$ 
    for  $u \in \mathcal{V}$  do
         $X(u) \leftarrow R$ 
         $\text{append}(Q, u)$ 
    end for
    while  $Q \neq \emptyset$  do
         $X \leftarrow \text{arcconsistency}(S'', X, Q, L)$ 
    end while
    for  $\mathcal{C} \in S''$  do                                 $\triangleright$  Iterate over constraints of  $S''$ 
         $\text{OP} \leftarrow \text{Operator}(\mathcal{C})$            $\triangleright$  Get the operator of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Either Max or Min
         $Y$  the right-hand side variables of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
         $C$  the right-hand side constants of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
         $x$  the left-hand side variable of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
         $u \leftarrow \text{projection}(x)$                    $\triangleright$  Extract the vertex
         $\underset{V \times P \rightarrow V}{}$ 
        if  $\text{OP}$  is Max then
             $y^*, c^* \leftarrow \underset{(y,c) \in \text{zip}(Y,C)}{\text{argmax}} \{X(y) + c\}$            $\triangleright$  Extracts the maximum assignment
             $\Phi(u, p) \leftarrow \underset{V \times P \rightarrow V}{\text{projection}}(y^*)$            $\triangleright$  The Strategy is the vertex of the maximum assignment
        end if
    end for
end for
return  $\Phi$ 

```

Here $\text{zip}(Y, C)$ of lists Y and C is the list $L = [(y_1, c_1), \dots, (y_n, c_n)]$

These transformations were not trivial to find, we had to improve the reductions offered by [3], we also proposed a refinement to arc consistency that works for a ternary max-atom system, that takes advantage of polymorphisms, as well as the symmetries.

This is very technical, and for that, the details are listed in the appendix A.

Complexity Analysis

For simplicity will suppose that the domain D is finite¹³, our algorithm runs in:

$$\mathcal{O}((|V| + |E|)^2 \cdot |D|)$$

Otherwise, if D is a real domain, the algorithm still converges if D is bounded¹⁴, since arc consistency takes a function and produces a smaller one. With that said, we did not produce a complexity estimation, as our work directly relies to the generated graphs that we have discussed in section 3.6, we recall that their weights are finite.

3.8 Deployment

3.8.1 Pipeline

After some experiments, it was very clear that vertical scaling with the number of threads is not sufficient. By analysing the running time of some samples, we estimated the total running time solving both datasets to exceed 30 days.

As a result of this, we deployed a pipeline of 24 nodes, each with 24 threads working simultaneously on a partition of the dataset.

¹³In particular, a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}

¹⁴ $D \subseteq [a, b]$ for some interval $[a, b]$




Figure 3.6: HPC pipeline to annotate mean payoff graphs

The figure 3.6 above highlights the pipeline used to annotate mean payoff graphs. For illustrative purposes, we omitted the following details:

- The SLURM manager splits the graph files and partition them along the computing nodes.
- Each node produces its own annotation file, which is **unique** per computing node. So we do not have any race condition.¹⁵
- Each of the standard output and error streams is transferred to a file, which is **unique** per computing node.
- Once all jobs terminate, we have a helper script that concatenates all the results into a single file.

¹⁵Processes that access the same file.




Figure 3.7: Activity diagram describing the behaviour of a node

3.8.2 Results

| Dataset | Size | Cardinality | Annotated | Linear Bound | Early Stopping | Time |
|---------|------|-------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|------|
| Dense | ? | 160000 | 160000 | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Sparse | ? | 160000 | 150000 | ✓ | ✗ | |

Table 3.2: List of heuristics used by the solver

Chapter 4

Model Design

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Objectives

The main objective

4.3 Properties

We expect the model \mathcal{M} to verify the following properties:

4.3.1 Totality

Definition

A function is total if it is defined in the whole domain.

Also, we will say a model \mathcal{M} is total if it works on all Mean Payoff Games..

Importance

This property implies two main characteristics:

1. The model works for any Mean Payoff Game whatever the size of $|V|$. This is tricky as most machine learning models act on a batch of data with a fixed shape.
2. The model works for any Mean Payoff Game whatever the representation is; This is implicitly verified by an encoding of the Mean Payoff Games.

4.3.2 Node Agnostic

This property tells that a model should not use any extra information about the nodes.

Formalisation

Let $G_1(V_1, E_1, W_1, s_1), G_2(V_2, E_2, W_2, s_2)$ two isomorphic Mean Payoff Games in the sense that there exists a bijection $\Phi : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= \{(\Phi(u), \Phi(v)), (u, v) \in E_1\} \\ \forall (u, v) \in E_1, \quad W_2(u, v) &= W_1(\Phi(u), \Phi(v)) \\ s_2 &= \Phi(s_1) \end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$\Phi(\mathcal{M}(G_1)) = \mathcal{M}(G_2)$$

Explanation

The property tells that if two graphs mean payoffs only differ by their node representation, then the results should also only differ by the representation of the nodes.

Importance

This property implies that we can simply encode a mean payoff as $G(V, E, W, s)$ as $G'(V', E', W', s')$ with $V' = \{0, ;|V| - 1\}$, and E', W', s' defined accordingly.

In fact, the encoding is done implicitly by our model¹.




Figure 4.1: Three isomorphic Mean Payoff Games

In the figure 4.1, we have 3 equivalent Mean Payoff Games. To illustrate a node agnostic model:

- Let \mathcal{M} be a model that predicts for a given Mean Payoff Game, the action to be played at the starting node, and the winner.
- Suppose also that $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = (3, \text{Max})$

If \mathcal{M} is node agnostic, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(G_2) &= (1, \text{Max}) \\ \mathcal{M}(G_3) &= (\text{Dog}, \text{Max}) \end{aligned}$$

¹While the encoding is done implicitly, the model itself can violate this property. An example of this is a Multi Layer Perceptron. Which lead to different results for different encodings.

4.3.3 Invariance under Positive Scaling

This property comes directly from the fact that both the winner and the set of optimal strategies² are invariant under a positive scaling of the weights.

Now, it is very easy to make augment a model \mathcal{M} into such invariant model \mathcal{M}' . We only do the following:

$$\mathcal{M}'(E, W, s) = \mathcal{M}'(E, \text{Normalize}(W), s)$$

Where Normalize is any endomorphism of weight functions that verify the following constraint:

$$\forall_{\text{MPG}} G(E, W), \forall, \quad \text{Normalize}(W) = \frac{W}{H(W)}$$

With $H : \mathcal{F}(E, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(E, \mathbb{R})$ a function satisfying³:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall s \in \mathbb{R}_+^*, \quad H(sW) &= sH(W) \\ H(W) &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

Standard Scaling

This scaling treats the values of W as samples of random variables, and divides W by an estimate of their variance.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Normalize}(W) &= \frac{W}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}[W]}} \\ \mathbb{V}[W] &= \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} (W(u, v) - \mathbb{E}[W])^2 \\ \mathbb{E}[W] &= \frac{1}{|E|} \sum_{(u,v) \in E} W(u, v) \end{aligned}$$

Maximum Scaling

This scaling reduces the interval of the weights to $[-1, 1]$ by dividing by the largest weight in terms of absolute value:

$$\text{Normalize}(W) = \frac{W}{\|W\|_\infty}$$

Implementation Notes: The weights function is implemented as a matrix W , which is equal to 0 for $(u, v) \notin E$.

It is important to ignore these zeros⁴ in both normalisations, otherwise it may lead to biased scaling.

²Whatever the definition of optimality (Weak, Strong, Payoff).

³Special care must be when H is \geq instead of $>$

⁴And only these zeros. If $W(u, v) = 0$ for $(u, v) \in E$, this term should be accounted.




Figure 4.2: Mean Payoff Game, with a rescaled version using Maximum normalization

4.3.4 Permutation Equivariance

Definition

This property states that the model should output the same results for permuted nodes, up to permutation of the results.

Importance

While it is a special case of the Node Agnostic property, but it is still important as the encoding of the graphs is done implicitly, and thus Permutation Equivariance is enough to get a Node Agnostic model.

4.3.5 Stability under Padding

Definition

- Let $G_1(V_1, E_1, W_1, s_1), G_2(V_2, E_2, W_2, s_2)$ be two disjoint Mean Payoff Games, in the sense that $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$.
- Let $B = (E_3, W_3)$ with $E_3 \subseteq V_2 \times V_1$ a bridge from G_2 to G_1 , and W_3 is the weight function of E_3

The padding of G_1 by G_2 using B as a bridge, denoted as $G_1 \xtriangleright^B G_2$ is defined as:

$$G_1 \xtriangleright^B G_2 = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3, W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3, s_1)$$

If the bridge B is empty, in the sense that $E_3 = \emptyset$, then we denote we will simplify the notation to $G_1 \triangleright G_2$.

A model is said to be stable under padding if:

$$\mathcal{M}(G_1 \xtriangleright^B G_2) = \mathcal{M}(G_1)$$

Importance

Deep Learning algorithms generally accept batches of data having a homogeneous shape. In the other hand, graph input generally has different shapes, and thus are problematic to most learning algorithms.

While we succeeded in experimenting a learning algorithm with a ragged batch⁵, it suffered the

⁵ A batch of inhomogeneous input

following limits:

- It greatly limits the choice of potential models.
- The training is not supported by GPU, as some core operations were only implemented in the CPU for ragged batches.

For this reasons, we opted to pad the graphs to get homogeneous batches, and this is why the stability under padding is important.

Removing Unreachable Nodes

Another major point for this property, is it gives the possibility to remove unreachable nodes without affecting the model's results.




Figure 4.3: Mean Payoff Game before and after removing unreachable nodes

Following the example under figure 4.3, if the model \mathcal{M} is stable under padding, then the vertices $\{4, 5, 6\}$ can be removed without affecting the results.

In fact, this is true as the original mean payoff game can be constructed from the reduced one with a suitable padding.

4.4 Considered Models

While there are many possible predictive models. We considered mainly two families of predictive models.

4.4.1 Value based Model

Such model predicts the evaluation of a certain position.

The evaluation is a function $\mathcal{M} : V \times P \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ with the following interpretation:

- $\mathcal{M}(s, p) = 1$ when the model predicts that player p will win the game given the position.
- $\mathcal{M}(s, p) = -1$ when the model predicts that player p will lose the game given the position.
- $\mathcal{M}(s, p) = 0$ when the model predicts that the position will result in a draw.




Figure 4.4: An MPG where the first player always wins.

Now, while such a model can be used to predict the winner. We claim that it is not efficient⁶ to extract the strategy from such model, as the information of winning alone does not directly induce a strategy.

The following figure illustrates an example.

4.4.2 Strategy based Model

Such model predicts the strategy for each player.

This is a function $\mathcal{M} : V \times P \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(V)$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (u, p) \in V \times P, \quad \mathcal{M}(u, p) &\in \text{Adj } u \\ \forall (u, p) \in V \times P, \forall v \in \text{Adj } u, \quad \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}(u, p) = v) &\in [0, 1] \\ \forall (u, p) \in V \times P, \quad \sum_{v \in \text{Adj } u} \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}(u, p) = v) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

4.5 Building the Model

Our model follows from well established graph neural network architectures, with minor modifications to suit our needs.

It is composed of blocks, each containing a **Weighted Graph Convolutional Network**.

4.5.1 Preprocessing Block

The preprocessing block is responsible to convert the graph to a format recognizable by the convolutional blocks.

It takes the following steps:

1. It takes a batch, add a padding to each graph so that the resulting batch is of homogenous shape.

⁶Efficient in the sense that we cannot extract the best strategy from the evaluation in linear time.

2. It adds some random edges to each graph, with some low probability `random_connection_probability`.
3. It normalizes the weights.
4. It adds some noise to the weights.

Padding Layer

First of all, we define H_k be the graph of size k in which all the edges are loops with 0 as a weight. Each graph $G^{(i)} = (A^{(i)}, W^{(i)})$ in the batch has a size r_i .

Let $r = \max_i r_i$. The padding layer adds a potential padding to each graph in the following manner:

$$G^{(i)} \leftarrow G^{(i)} \triangleright I_{r-r_i}$$

With that, the resulting batch will be of shape $(?, r, r, 2)$

Random Connections

This layer adds an edge with some probability p :

$$A^{(i)} \leftarrow A^{(i)} \vee B^{(i)}$$

Where $B^{(i)}$ is a matrix of shape (r, r) whose elements are sampled from the bernoulli distribution $\mathcal{B}(p)$.

Weights Normalisation

We want the model to be invariant under positive scaling. To achieve that, we implemented a weights normalization layer conforming to section 4.3.5

Weights Noise

For regularization, we implemented a weights noise layer, that adds a small additive noise to the weights, in the following manner:

$$W^{(i)} \leftarrow W^{(i)} + N^{(i)} \odot A^{(i)}$$

Where $N^{(i)}$ is the noise matrix. We implemented two kinds of noise:

- Uniform noise, where each element of $N^{(i)}$ follows $\mathcal{U}(-r, r)$
- Gaussian noise, where each element of $N^{(i)}$ follows $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$

Now, we should choose the noise small enough so that we do not change the winner of the mean payoff game, nor the optimal strategies.

Theorem 6 *For a Mean Payoff Game $G = (V, E, W, s, p)$, with integer weights.*

If $\|N\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2|V|}$, then G and $G' = (V, E, W + N, s, p)$ have the same sets of C_3 -optimal strategies for each player.

Preuve 2 *Without loss of generality, we assume that Max wins.*

Let $\Phi^{\text{Max}} \in \text{Optimal}(G, \text{Max})$ and $\Phi^{\text{Min}} \in \text{Optimal}(G, \text{Min})$

Without a loss of generality, we assume that both $\Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}$ are positional.

Let $\mathcal{C} = (u_0, \dots, u_m)$ the cycle of vertices induced by both strategies in G .
 As Max wins, we have:

$$v(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{k=1}^m W(u_{k-1}, u_k) > 0$$

As all the weights are integers, we have:

$$\sum_{k=1}^m W(u_{k-1}, u_k) \geq 1$$

With that, we conclude the following lower bound of the mean payoff:

$$v(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) \geq \frac{1}{m} \geq \frac{1}{2|V|}$$

Finally, we show that Max is also winning in G' :

$$\begin{aligned} v(G', \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) &\geq \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{k=1}^m W(u_{k-1}, u_k) + N(u_{k-1}, u_k) \\ &\geq v(G, \Phi^{\text{Max}}, \Phi^{\text{Min}}) - \|N\|_{\infty} \\ &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

This result gives the theoretical interval in which the noise will not change the optimal strategies in an integer Mean Payoff Game.

In practice, as N follows a symmetric distribution, the noise will tend to cancel itself, and the mean of the noise will tend to zero.

For that reason, we do believe that a noise $N \sim \mathcal{U}(-0.1, 0.1)$ or $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1)$ will keep the winners and strategies intact for most generated mean payoff games⁷.

One Hot Encoding

The one hot encoding layer, as its name suggests, applies one hot encoding to the position s .

⁷Even for mean payoff games with real weights, we do believe that the same applies for weights following the distribution $\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$.




Figure 4.5: Preprocessing Block

4.5.2 Weighted Graph Convolutional Network

The weighted graph convolutional network **WGCN**, as its name suggests, is a convolutional operator acting on graphs, with many desirable properties such as “Permutation Equivariance” and “Stability under Padding”.

It is based on the graph convolutional network as described on the following figure




Figure 4.6: Graph Convolutional Network

Here \oslash denotes the point-wise division operator.

The problem with **GCN** is that they ignore the weights information. For Mean Payoff Games, such information is crucial to determine the winner and the strategies.

For that, we introduced **WGCN** to capitalize on the weights information. The figure below shows how it is implemented.




Figure 4.7: Weighted Graph Convolutional Network

The **WGCN** operator exhibits the desired properties described on 4.3, except property 4.3.3, the latter is already verified as a result of the preprocessing layer.

We were not able to find a reference to **WGCN** in the literature. The closest thing we have found that a PyTorch based GNN library named **Geometric** has an implementation for **GCN** supporting weighted graphs. Interestingly, we only differ to them by the normalization of the degrees.

As we are using *TensorFlow*, we cannot use their approach, so we had to implement **WGCN** from scratch.

4.5.3 Convolutional Block

Each intermediate block is composed of a graph convolution, and then a batch normalisation operator, as described by the figure below:




Figure 4.8: Graph Convolutional Block

This block was inspired from convolutional blocks used in computer vision models.

4.5.4 Prediction Block




Figure 4.9: Graph Convolutional Block

4.5.5 Model Architecture

Putting all building block together, we designed a model that takes arbitrary graphs, encode them, predicts the strategy and the evaluation of the position.

We were very careful in the design so that we can verify all the desired properties described in section 4.3.

The figure below shows the whole architecture:




Figure 4.10: Model Architecture

Chapter 5

Reinforcement learning and Self play approach

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Reinforcement Learning

5.2.1 Definition

Sutton and Barto [48, Chapter. 1] gave an excellent in-depth definition, which not only defines what Reinforcement Learning (RL) is, but also compare it with other Machine Learning Learning (ML) methods.

We will summarize it as follow:

Définition 1 *RL deals with opti*

5.2.2 Theory

Single Agent

In most settings, the theory of reinforcement learning deals with environments where we would like to optimize a single agent. This is called single-agent reinforcement learning. This is usually modeled with a Markov Decision Process [48, Chapter 3].

Reinforcement Learning methods differ by their underlying assumptions

Multi Agent

In our case, a Mean Payoff Game can be modelled in the reinforcement learning setting as a Stochastic Game¹ [46].

This is a powerfull tool, as it can also model the stochastic version of mean payoff games [37].

¹Also known as Markov Game




Figure 5.1: A Reinforcement Learning system

Markov Chains

Markov Reward Process

5.2.3 RL formalization of a MPG

State abstraction

Remember that an MPG is modeled as a tuple $G = (V, E, W, s, p)$. For the reinforcement learning setting, we will define

5.3 Monte Carlo Tree Search

Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) is an advanced algorithm in decision making that appeared in 2007. Coulom first coined the term MCTS as application of Monte-Carlo methods to game-tree search [11]. It is an important algorithm for adversarial search. that had a huge success at improving the competence of Go engines to a master level [15]. This alone was a feat considering that previous state of the art alpha-beta implementations were unable to get past beginner level.

Much development occurred to MCTS, which made it a little hard to define. Sutton and Barto gave the following definition [48, section. 8.8]: “*Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) is a planning algorithm that accumulates value estimates obtained from Monte Carlo simulations in order to successively direct simulations towards more highly-rewarded trajectories.*”

This definition alone is unsatisfactory, Russell gave an intuitive explanation [40, Section 6.4] of how Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) works for a game. And we will base this section on his work.

Essentially, MCTS consists of the following 4 steps:

5.3.1 Selection

Starting at the root, we choose a child following a **selection policy** $\Pi^{\text{selection}}$, and repeat the step until arriving to a leaf node.

Algorithm 9 Selection algorithm for MCTS

Require: r the root of the MCTS.

Require: $\Pi^{\text{selection}}$ the current selection policy..

Ensure: s a leaf of the MCTS.

```
 $s \leftarrow r$ 
while not leaf( $r$ ) do
     $s \leftarrow \Pi^{\text{selection}}(r)$ 
end while
return  $s$ 
```

5.3.2 Expansion

At the selected leaf s , we grow the MCTS by adding a new child t that is a result of some action a from s .

5.3.3 Simulation

Starting from the new child t , we perform a complete playout, that is, we choose moves for all players according to the playout policy Π^{playout} .

The generated sequence of nodes in the playout will not be recorded in the MCTS

5.3.4 Backpropagation

Once a simulation is complete, we use its result to update the all search nodes going from t up to the root.

Algorithm 10 Expansion algorithm for MCTS

Require: s a leaf MCTS.

Require: H the mean reward of each node in the MCTS

Require: T the number of simulations for each node in the MCTS

Ensure: t a new child of s

```

 $C \leftarrow \text{expand\_children}(s)$                                  $\triangleright$  Generate a set of children from  $s$ 
 $\text{for } c \in C \text{ do}$ 
     $T(c) \leftarrow 0$                                                $\triangleright c$  is currently visited 0 times
     $H(c) \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$                                           $\triangleright$  The reward of each player at  $c$  is initialized to 0
 $\text{end for}$ 
 $t \leftarrow \text{choose}(C)$                                           $\triangleright$  Choose a child from  $C$ 
 $\text{return } t$ 

```

Algorithm 11 Simulation algorithm for MCTS

Require: t the new child of the MCTS.

Require: Π^{playout} the current playout policy..

Ensure: W the cumulative rewards after the playout for each player.

```

 $s \leftarrow \text{state}(t)$                                           $\triangleright$  get the current state
 $p \leftarrow \text{state}(t)$                                           $\triangleright$  get the current player
 $W \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$ 
 $\text{while not } \text{terminal}(s) \text{ do}$ 
     $a \leftarrow \Pi^{\text{playout}}(s, p)$ 
     $(s, p, U) \leftarrow \text{apply}(s, a)$                                  $\triangleright$  Apply action  $a$  at state  $s$ , and getting reward  $U$ 
     $W \leftarrow W + U$ 
 $\text{end while}$ 
 $\text{return } W$ 

```

Algorithm 12 Backpropagation algorithm for MCTS

Require: t the new child of the MCTS.
Require: W the reward after the simulation.
Require: W' the cumulative reward up to node t
Require: H the mean reward of each node in the MCTS
Require: T the number of simulations for each node in the MCTS

```

while not root( $s$ ) do
     $T(s) \leftarrow T(s) + 1$                                  $\triangleright$  Increment the number of visits of  $s$ 
     $H(s) \leftarrow H(s) - \frac{W+W'-H(s)}{T(s)}$            $\triangleright$  Update the mean reward at  $s$ 
     $s \leftarrow \text{parent}(s)$                              $\triangleright$  Go to the parent node
end while
return  $W$ 

```

5.3.5 Wrapping up

Once we have the 4 elements of MCTS, the full algorithm will be just repeating these steps in order until certain desired condition is satisfied. In practice, most implementations use the following conditions for halting the algorithm:

- Execution time exceeds some threshold T
- Total number of simulations (at root) exceeds some threshold N

Algorithm 13 MCTS Algorithm

Require: state some state of the game

Ensure: An action $a \in \text{actions(state)}$

```

 $r \leftarrow \text{tree(state)}$ 
while Exit condition not satisfied do
     $s \leftarrow \text{select}(r)$ 
     $t \leftarrow \text{expand}(s)$ 
     $W \leftarrow \text{simulate}(t)$ 
    backpropagation( $t, W$ )
end while
return  $a \leftarrow \underset{a \in \text{actions(state)}}{\text{argmax}} T(a)$                                  $\triangleright$  Get the most visited action

```




Figure 1: Outline of a Monte-Carlo Tree Search.

Figure 5.2: One iteration of a MCTS algorithm

5.4 Model based MCTS

While we explained how MCTS works in the previous section, some components were left without much discussion:

1. The selection policy $\Pi^{\text{selection}}$
2. The playout policy Π^{playout}
3. Children creation

This was deliberate, as the full power of *MCTS* requires a good choice of the components, especially $\Pi^{\text{selection}}$ and Π^{playout} .

In our case, both functions will be based on the model \mathcal{M} that we designed in chapter 4 and illustrated in figure 4.10.

Remember that our model \mathcal{M} takes a MPG², and produces two outputs:

1. The predicted evaluation v .
2. The predicted strategy Π .

Both of these terms will be used in the MCTS.

5.4.1 Create children

In this version of MCTS, create children will return the list of all adjacent states. It does also apply an optional Dirichlet noise $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ if the current node is root.

²In fact, it takes a batch of MPGs, but this can be easily mitigated.

Algorithm 14 Create children

Require: h current node
Require: Dirichlet noise parameter $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$
Require: Exploration noise parameter $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$
Require: Prior distribution Π
Ensure: A list of children C
Ensure: Optionally update Π

$G = (V, E, W, s, p)$ is the underlying MPG related to node h
 $m \leftarrow |\text{Adj } s|$
if $\text{root}(h)$ **then**
 generate $\nu \sim \mathcal{D}(\alpha \mathbf{1}_m)$ $\triangleright \mathbf{1}_m \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the vector of ones
for $(v, x) \in \text{zip}(\text{Adj } s, \nu)$ **do**
 $\Pi(v) \leftarrow (1 - \varepsilon)\Pi(v) + \varepsilon x$
end for
end if
 $C \leftarrow \emptyset$
for $t \in \text{Adj } s$ **do**
 $G' \leftarrow (V, E, W, t, \bar{p})$
append(C, G')
end for
return C

5.4.2 Playout Policy

In Alpha Zero's implementation of MCTS [44], the playout policy is exactly the predicted distribution Π .

Also, the simulation algorithm 11 was modified to only play one move:

Algorithm 15 Alpha Zero MCTS Simulation

Require: t the new child of the MCTS.
Require: \mathcal{M} the neural network model
Ensure: W the cumulative rewards after the playout for each player.

$G \leftarrow \text{MPG}(t)$ \triangleright get the current state
 $p \leftarrow \text{player}(t)$ \triangleright get the current player
if p is Min **then**
 $G \leftarrow \bar{G}$
end if
 $(v, \Pi) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(G)$
if p is Min **then**
 $v \leftarrow -v$
end if
 $W \leftarrow v$ **return** W

5.4.3 Selection Policy

Algorithm 16 model-based MCTS playout policy

Require: h current node
Require: $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ exploration parameter
Ensure: An child MPG G'

```

 $Z \leftarrow 0$ 
for  $c \in \text{children}(h)$  do
     $Z(c) \leftarrow \text{PUCT}(c, h, \Pi(c), C)$ 
end for
return  $c \leftarrow \underset{c \in \text{children}(h)}{\text{argmax}} Z(c)$ 

```

Here PUCT is defined as follow:

$$\text{PUCT}(c, h, \Pi(c), C) = H(c) + C \cdot \Pi(c) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{N(h)}}{N(c) + 1} \quad (5.1)$$

Here $H(c)$ is the reward of the current player at node c .

The equation (5.1) was defined in the Alpha Go paper [44] as a model-based variant of UCT [27]. We show the latter's expression to show the difference between vanilla MCTS and model-based MCTS:

$$\text{UCT}(c, h, C) = H(c) + C \cdot \frac{\log N(h)}{N(c) + 1}$$

In fact, the additional term $\Pi(c)$ is used to weight the children selection by the prior distribution Π , and we believe that using the square root instead of the logarithmic function was deliberate to boost exploration.

5.4.4 Wrapping up

Our model-based MCTS is heavily inspired from the one used at Alpha Zero.

It uses the algorithm 13 with a threshold number of iterations N as exit condition³. It avoids complete rollouts, and instead uses the simulation algorithm 15 that uses the model \mathcal{M} .

Also, the predictions of model \mathcal{M} are directly used in the selection policy defined at section 5.4.3 and the playout policy defined at section 5.4.2.

5.4.5 Updating model

Once the MCTS algorithm terminates. We get for each node a new estimates of both the strategy and the evaluation.

³This applies to the model training phase. While deploying the algorithm, we can use a different exit condition.

Evaluation estimate

The term H used in the MCTS is used for the expected reward for the algorithm. Now as each node t of the tree encodes a MPG G , $H(t)$ will be the updated estimate of the evaluation:

$$v(G) = \mathcal{M}(G)_{\text{evaluation}}$$

For that, we will denote the updated value as $v'(G) = H(t)$

Strategy estimate

To illustrate our point, we will need the following definitions:

- Let t be a node.
- Let $G = (V, E, W, s, p)$ be the MPG encoded by t .
- Let $a \in \text{Adj } s$ be an action eligible from t .
- Let c be the⁴ node resulting from applying a

Now, we want an estimate of the strategy implied by the MCTS. In fact, the term N used for total explorations helps us to achieve this as following:

$$\Pi'(G)(a) = \frac{N(c)}{N(t)} \quad (5.2)$$

Here, $\Pi'(G)$ will be the refined estimate of $\Pi(G)$

Refitting

- Let Θ be the learnable parameters of $\mathcal{M}_\Theta = (v_\Theta, \Pi_\Theta)$
- Let $G^{(1)}, \dots, G^{(m)}$ a batch of MPGs.

We will execute the MCTS on each game $G^{(i)}$ with the model \mathcal{M}_Θ to get a finer estimate of the evaluation $v'_\Theta(G^{(i)})$ and the strategy $\Pi'_\Theta(G^{(i)})$.

Once, we generate enough samples with MCTS. We train the model \mathcal{M}_Θ against $(v'_\Theta(G^{(1)}), \Pi'_\Theta(G^{(1)})), \dots, (v'_\Theta(G^{(m)}), \Pi'_\Theta(G^{(m)}))$ using the objective function defined on.

This will give us new learnable parameters Θ' , and thus a new model $\mathcal{M}_{\Theta'}$. With that, we will repeat the process indefinitely.

5.5 Services

5.5.1 Rationale

In section 5.4, we discussed our model-based implementation of MCTS. Roughly speaking, it can be divided into two main components that are repeated indefinitely:

⁴It is unique as an MPG is deterministic. For a stochastic MPG, which is out of the scope of this report, one should do a more careful analysis.

1. Executing MCTS using model $\mathcal{M}_{\Theta^{(i)}}$ to generate a dataset \mathcal{D} :

$$\mathcal{D} = \left[(v'_\Theta(G^{(1)}), \Pi'_\Theta(G^{(1)})), \dots, (v'_\Theta(G^{(m)}), \Pi'_\Theta(G^{(m)})) \right]$$

2. Fit $\mathcal{M}_{\Theta^{(i)}}$ against \mathcal{D} to get a better model $\mathcal{M}_{\Theta^{(i+1)}}$

Each one of these steps is computationally intensive. And for that, we will separate them in our as distinct services.

This separation, while not necessary, is beneficial as it gives the freedom to scale the self-play pipeline.

5.5.2 Learner

The learner, as its name suggests, is the service that trains the model \mathcal{M} upon receiving enough samples from the actors⁵

5.5.3 Actor

An actor, is a service designed for generating samples to the learner by using model-based MCTS.

In contrast to the learner, which is unique by design. The self-play pipeline can have many actors, and this is required in our case as it accelerates the execution of the whole pipeline.

5.5.4 Evaluator

This service, is a third component that is used to evaluate the performance of model-based MCTS against a fixed player.

Like the actor, a self-play pipeline can have many evaluators, and this is also required in our case as it gives performance metrics against a wide range of players.

⁵Which we will define in the next section.




Figure 5.3: Class

5.6 Pipeline




Figure 5.4: Pipeline Architecture

5.7 Configuration

Chapter 6

Analyse

For $x \in \mathcal{X}, Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}^m, c \in I$, let $\text{MA}(x, Y, c)$ be defined as follow:

$$\text{MA}(x, Y, c) \iff x \leq \max Y + c$$

New York (NY) Hi

Conclusion

Durant ce stage, nous avons étudié les BNNs, implémenté une bibliothèque de BNNs basée sur tensorflow et larq qu'on a nommé **binaryflow**.

Dans le premier chapitre, nous avons présenté **dB Sense** et ses activités.

Dans le deuxième chapitre, nous avons présenté le problème de la grande complexité, introduit le concept des BNNs et proposé **binaryflow** comme notre solution pour les BNNs

Dans le troisième chapitre, nous avons formalisé les BNNs, et nous avons décris leurs optimisations possibles, et les problèmes rencontrés dans leur implémentation.

Dans le quatrième chapitre, nous avons présenté des modèles BNNs, chacun en dérivant ses formules

Dans le cinquième chapitre, nous avons donné notre implémentation de **binaryflow** en justifiant les paradigmes utilisés

Dans le sixième chapitre, nous avons analysé 3 jeux de données en implémentant des modèles BNNs pour chacune de ces 3 jeux de données, et en comparant les performances de prédiction et la complexité temps et mémoire des modèles entraînés.

Notre travail n'est qu'une petite introduction des BNNs. En effet, la liste des BNNs proposés dans la littérature est très vaste, et il existe plusieurs autres approches pour faciliter l'entraînement et l'interférence des BNNs que nous n'avons pas considéré vu les contraintes de stage, y parmi:

1. Les méthodes d'optimisations discrètes
2. Les optimiseurs dédiés aux BNNs
3. Les binarisations entraînables
4. Les méthodes ensemblistes pour régulariser les BNNs

De plus, nous avons réussi à vérifier l'optimisation de la multiplication matricielle (L'exécution est parfois 30 fois plus rapide), mais nous n'avons pas pu intégrer cette optimisation aux modèles tensorflow. Et malgré que larq supporte lui-même un déploiement optimisé, nous n'avons pas aussi pu l'exploiter puisque ce déploiement ne supporte que les processeurs ARMv8, et nous utilisons une machine avec un processeur d'architecture x86-64.

Finalement, nous avons fait une petite intégration du code carbone comme une mesure de coût

d’entraînement. Une fois le problème de déploiement est résolu, nous recommanderions l’utilisation de ce même métrique pour estimer le coût d’interférence qui va justifier l’utilisation des BNNs.

Appendix A

On Constraint Satisfaction Problems

In the previous chapters, we described how the system works, without formalising the CSP approach.

On this chapter, we will describe the CSP systems that we have used, with an equivalence proof between them.

A.1 Constraint Satisfaction Problem

A.1.1 Definition

A constraint satisfaction problem

A.1.2 Assignment

An assignment of a $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{X}, D, \Gamma)$ is a function $X : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow D$ such that, by replacing each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, by $X(x)$, all the constraints will evaluate to **True**

A.1.3 Polymorphism

A function $F : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, D)^k \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{X}, D)$ is said to be a polymorphism if:

$\forall X_1, \dots, X_k$ assignments of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{X}, D, \Gamma)$, $F(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ is also an assignment of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{X}, D, \Gamma)$

Now, in the next section, we will define an important class of CSPs that is used to solve Mean Payoff Games, with the polymorphisms required for the solution algorithm's correctness

A.2 Ternary Max Atom Systems

A.2.1 Definition

- Let \mathcal{X} be a finite set of variables
- Let $D = I \cup \{-\infty\}$, with $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

- For $x, y, z \in \mathcal{X}, c \in I$, let $\text{MA}_3(x, y, z, c)$ be defined as follow:

$$\text{MA}_3(x, y, z, c) \iff x \leq \max(y, z) + c$$

A ternary max atom system is $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$ where:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma &= \{\text{MA}_3(x, y, z, c), \quad (x, y, z, c) \in \mathcal{R}\} \\ \mathcal{R} &\subseteq \mathcal{X}^3 \times I \\ \mathcal{R} &\text{ is finite}\end{aligned}$$

A.2.2 Example

An example of a ternary max atom system is the following $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$ with $D = \mathbb{Z}$ and Γ represented as follow:

$$\begin{aligned}x &\leq \max(y, z) - 1 \\ y &\leq \max(z, x) - 1 \\ z &\leq \max(x, y) - 1\end{aligned}$$

A.3 Max Atom Systems

A.3.1 Definition

- Let \mathcal{X} be a finite set of variables
- Let $D = I \cup \{-\infty\}$, with $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$
- For $x \in \mathcal{X}, Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}^m, c \in I$, let $\text{MA}(x, Y, c)$ be defined as follow:

$$\text{MA}(x, Y, c) \iff x \leq \max Y + c$$

A max atom system is $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$ where:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma &= \{\text{MA}(x, Y, c), \quad (x, Y, c) \in \mathcal{R}\} \\ \mathcal{R} &\subseteq \mathcal{X} \times (\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \times I \\ \mathcal{R} &\text{ is finite}\end{aligned}$$

A.3.2 $\text{MA} \leq \text{MA}_3$

- Let $S = \text{CSP}(\mathcal{X}, D, \Gamma)$ a max atom system.
- Let $R \in \Gamma$
- Let $x \in \mathcal{X}, Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), c \in I$ such that $R = \text{MA}(x, Y, c)$ such that $|Y| > 2$

Recursive Reduction

We will reduce the arity of R as follow:

- Let $y, z \in Y$ such that $y \neq z$
- We introduce a variable $w \notin \mathcal{X}$
- Let $\mathcal{X}' = \mathcal{X} \cup \{w\}$
- Let $Y' = (Y \cup \{w\}) \setminus \{y, z\}$
- Let $R' = \text{MA}(x, Y', c)$
- Let $R_w = \text{MA}(w, \{y, z\}, 0)$
- Let $\Gamma' = (\Gamma \cup \{R', R_w\}) \setminus \{R\}$
- Let $S' = \text{CSP}(\mathcal{X}', D, \Gamma)$

We will prove that S' is equivalent to S .

Implication Let $X : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow D$ an assignment of S' . It is trivial that by removing $X(w)$, $X|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an assignment of S

Equivalence

- Let $X : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow D$ such that $X|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an assignment of S .
- We will set $X(w) = \max(X(y), X(z))$

Then, X is an assignment of S'

Induction

Since the number of variables is finite, the arity of each constraint is finite. Also, as the the number of constraints is finite, Applying such reduction iteratively will eventually give a system S^* equivalent to S with:

- \mathcal{X}^* the set of variables with $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^*$
- Γ^* is the set of constraints:
- Each constraint is of the form $\text{MA}(x, Y, c)$ with $x \in \mathcal{X}^*, Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}^*, c \in I$ with $|Y| \leq 2$

Now such system can be transformed to a ternary system S_3 as follow:

- The set of variables is \mathcal{X}^*
- The domain is D
- For every relation $R = \text{MA}(x, Y, c)$ we map it to the relation $R_3 = \text{MA}(x, y, z, c)$ as follow:
 - If $|Y| = 2$, then y, z are the elements of Y .
 - Otherwise, $|Y| = 1$, and $y = z$ are the same element of the singleton¹ Y .

It is trivial that S^* is equivalent to S_3 . With that, S is equivalent to S_3 .

¹A set with only one element

Algorithm 17 Converting a Max Atom System to Ternary Max Atom System

Require: S an N -ary Max Atom system

Ensure: S' a ternary Max Atom system

```

 $S' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
 $H \leftarrow \emptyset$   $\triangleright H$  is a symmetric map between variable,variable to variables
 $V \leftarrow \text{Variables}(S)$   $\triangleright V$  is a set containing all variables
for  $\mathcal{C} \in S$  do  $\triangleright$  Iterate over constraints
     $c$  is the constant in the right hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
     $Y$  is the variables in the right hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
     $x$  is the variable in the left hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
    while  $|Y| > 2$  do
         $y \leftarrow \text{pop}(Y)$ 
         $z \leftarrow \text{pop}(Y)$ 
        if  $(y, z) \notin \text{domain } H$  then
             $w \leftarrow \text{newVariable}(V)$   $\triangleright$  Generate a new formal variable not included in  $V$ 
             $V \leftarrow V \cup \{w\}$ 
             $H(y, z) \leftarrow w$ 
             $H(z, y) \leftarrow w$ 
        end if
         $w \leftarrow H(y, z)$ 
         $S' \leftarrow S' \cup \{\text{MA}(w, y, z, c)\}$ 
         $Y \leftarrow Y \cup \{w\}$ 
    end while
end for
return  $S'$ 

```

A.3.3 Polymorphisms

Two main family of polymorphisms are defined for Max Atom systems:

- The max polymorphisms M^k defined by:

$$M^k(X_1, \dots, X_k)(x) = \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, k\}} X_k(x)$$

- The translation polymorphisms T_c defined by:

$$T_c(X)(x) = X(x) + c$$

A.4 Min-Max System

- Let \mathcal{X} be a finite set of variables
- Let I be the domain of the variables.
- Let $D = I \cup \{-\infty\}$, with $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$
- For $x \in \mathcal{X}, Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}^m, C \in I^m$, let $\text{MA}(x, Y, C)$ be defined as follow:

$$\text{MA}(x, Y, c) \iff x \leq \max(Y + C)$$

- For $x \in \mathcal{X}, Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}^m, C \in I^m$, let $\text{MI}(x, Y, C)$ be defined as follow:

$$\text{MI}(x, Y, C) \iff x \leq \min(Y + C)$$

A min-max system is $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \{O(x, Y, C), \quad (O, x, Y, C) \in \mathcal{R}\} \\ \mathcal{R} &\subseteq \{\text{MA}, \text{MI}\} \times \mathcal{X} \times (\mathcal{X} \times I)^+ \\ \mathcal{R} &\text{ is finite} \end{aligned}$$

A.4.1 Transforming to Max Atom Systems

A Max Atom system is trivially a Min Max system. So we will only prove the latter implication.

Let $S' = \text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$ be a Min Max system, and let:

- Γ_{MI} be the constraints that has MI
- Γ_{MA} be the constraints that has MA

Transforming MI constraints

For each $\text{MI}(x, Y, c) \in \Gamma_{\text{MI}}$. we replace it with the following constraints:

$$\Gamma_{\text{MI}}^{x, Y, C} = \{\text{MA}(x, \{y\}, c), \quad y, c \in \text{zip}(Y, C)\}$$

Transforming MA constraints

For each $(y, c) \in \mathcal{X} \times I$ present in a max constraint of the system:

- We add a formal variable $z^{y,c}$ if $c \neq 0$.
- Else, we will simply represent by $z^{y,c}$ the variable y .

By denoting $Z^{Y,C}$ the following set:

$$Z^{Y,C} = \{z^{y,c}, \quad (y, c) \in \text{zip}(Y, C)\}$$

We build the following constraints:

$$\Gamma_{\text{MA}}^{x,Y,C} = \{\text{MA}(x, Z^{Y,C}, 0)\} \cup \{\text{MA}(z^{y,c}, \{y\}, c), \quad (y, c) \in \text{zip}(Y, C)\}$$

Building the Max Atom System

Now, let:

$$\Gamma' = \bigcup_{\text{OP} \in \{\text{MI, MA}\}} \bigcup_{\text{OP}(x, Y, C) \in \Gamma_{\text{OP}}} \Gamma_{\text{OP}}^{x,Y,C}$$

The system $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma')$ is an equivalent max system.

Equivalence

Let:

- $\mathcal{X}' = \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}_{\text{Generated}}$ the augmented set of variables.
- $\mathcal{C} = \text{OP}(x, Y, C) \in \text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$ be a constraint.
- $X : \mathcal{X}' \rightarrow D$ an assignment of $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma')$.

If $\text{OP} = \text{MI}$, it is trivial that $\text{OP}(x, Y, C)$ is equivalent to $\Gamma_{\text{OP}}^{x,Y,C}$.

Otherwise, for each $(y, c) \in \text{zip}(Y, C)$ we have:

$$X(z^{y,c}) \leq \max\{X(y)\} + c = X(y) + c$$

Now, we also have:

$$X(x) \leq \max_{(y,c) \in \text{zip}(Y,C)} X(z^{y,c}) + 0 \leq \max_{(y,c) \in \text{zip}(Y,C)} (X(y) + c)$$

With that, $X|_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an assignment of $\text{CSP}(D, \Gamma)$

Algorithm 18 Converting a Min-Max System to Max Atom

Require: S a Min-Max system

Ensure: S' an N -ary Max Atom system

```

 $S' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
 $H \leftarrow \emptyset$                                  $\triangleright H$  is a map between variable,offsets to variables
 $V \leftarrow \text{Variables}(S)$                      $\triangleright V$  is a set containing all variables
for  $\mathcal{C} \in S$  do                           $\triangleright$  Iterate over constraints
     $C$  is the constants in the right hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
     $Y$  is the variables in the right hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
     $x$  is the variable in the left hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
    if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a min constraint then
         $S' \leftarrow S' \cup \{\text{MA}(x, \{y, y\}, c), (y, c) \in \text{zip}(Y, C)\}$ 
    else
         $Z \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
        for  $(y, c) \in \text{zip}(Y, C)$  do
            if  $(y, c) \notin \text{domain } H$  then
                 $z \leftarrow \text{newVariable}(V)$            $\triangleright$  Generate a new formal variable not included in  $V$ 
                 $V \leftarrow V \cup \{z\}$ 
                 $H(y, c) \leftarrow z$ 
            end if
             $S' \leftarrow S' \cup \{\text{MA}(H(y, c), \{y, y\}, c)\}$ 
             $Z \leftarrow Z \cup \{H(y, c)\}$ 
        end for
         $S' \leftarrow S' \cup \{\text{MA}(x, Z, 0)\}$ 
    end if
end for

```

A.5 Solving Mean Payoff

A.5.1 Reduction to Min Max System

In this section, we will solve the mean payoff by converting it to a equivalent min max system. The method we use is formalised in [3], and the equivalence is also proven in [3].

We have made a slight modification, as the original equivalence solves the problem “Does Max wins² at all starting vertices?”, our version instead solves the problem “In which starting states Max wins at all vertices?”

Furthermore, the solution is constructive, in the sense that if the answer is positive, we can build an optimal³ strategy.

Algorithm 19 Converting a Mean Payoff Game to a Min Max system

Require: G a Mean Payoff Game

Ensure: S an Min-Max system

```

 $E \leftarrow E(G)$                                  $\triangleright$  The edges of  $G$ 
 $V \leftarrow V(G)$                                  $\triangleright$  The variables of  $G$ 
 $W \leftarrow W(G)$                                  $\triangleright$  The weight function of  $G$ 
 $P \leftarrow P(G)$                                  $\triangleright$  The set of player of  $G$ 
for  $(u, p) \in V \times P$  do
     $x \leftarrow (u, p)$ 
     $A \leftarrow \text{Adj}(x)$ 
     $Y = \{(a, \bar{p}), \quad a \in A\}$ 
     $C \leftarrow W(A)$                                  $\triangleright$  Calculating the weights element wise.
    if  $p$  is Max then:
         $OP \leftarrow MA$ 
    else
         $OP \leftarrow MI$ 
    end if
     $S \leftarrow S \cup \{OP(x, Y, C)\}$ 
end for

```

A.5.2 Arc Consistency

First Implementation

At first, we took the original implementation of AC3 [40, page. 171] and modify it to support the max atom system:

²Winning here is defined as condition C_1 in table 2.1

³Weakly-optimal with the C_1 winning condition.

Algorithm 20 AC3 for Ternary Max Atom systems

Require: \mathcal{C} a ternary Max Atom constraint

Require: $\nu : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(D)$ the admissible values function

Require: Q a Queue of pending updates

Ensure: ν update the admissible values function.

```

 $x \leftarrow$  the left-hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
 $(y, z) \leftarrow$  the right-hand side variables of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
 $c \leftarrow$  the right-hand side constant  $\mathcal{C}$ 
 $Z \leftarrow [x, y, z]$ 
for  $o \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  do ▷ Iterate over all rotations
     $x \leftarrow Z[o]$ 
     $y \leftarrow Z[(o + 1) \bmod 3]$ 
     $z \leftarrow Z[(o + 2) \bmod 3]$ 
     $\mu \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Set of values to delete
    for  $a \in \nu(x)$  do
        for  $(b, c) \in \nu(y) \times \nu(z)$  do
             $T \leftarrow [a, b, c]$ 
             $p \leftarrow T[(-o) \bmod 3]$ 
             $q \leftarrow T[(1 - o) \bmod 3]$ 
             $q \leftarrow T[(2 - o) \bmod 3]$ 
            if  $p \leq \max(q, r) + c$  then
                 $\mu \leftarrow \mu \cup \{a\}$ 
            end if
        end for
        if not admissible then
             $\mu \leftarrow \mu \cup \{a\}$ 
        end if
    end for
    if  $|\mu| > 0$  then
         $\nu(x) \leftarrow \nu(x) \setminus \mu$ 
        append( $Q$ , Adj  $x$ )
    end if
end for

```

This version was very slow, took a considerable time even for Mean Payoff Games with less than 20 vertices.

Refinement

We were able to make many simplifications to the algorithm by taking advantage of the symmetry⁴ of the system and the fact that it has translations and maximum as polymorphisms [6]:

Algorithm 21 AC3 Optimized for Ternary Max Atom systems

Require: \mathcal{C} a ternary Max Atom constraint

Require: $\nu : V \rightarrow D$ the maximum admissible value for each variable.

Require: Q a Queue of pending updates

Require: $L = \inf D$ the smallest admissible value

Ensure: ν update the maximum admissible values function.

```

 $x \leftarrow$  the left-hand side of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
 $(y, z) \leftarrow$  the right-hand side variables of  $\mathcal{C}$ 
 $c \leftarrow$  the right-hand
 $r \leftarrow \max(\nu(y), \nu(z)) + c$ 
if  $r < L$  then
     $r \leftarrow -\infty$ 
end if
if  $r < \nu(x)$  then
     $\nu(x) \leftarrow r$ 
    append( $Q, x$ )
end if
```

⁴max is a symmetric function: $\max(x, y) = \max(y, x)$

Appendix B

On Random Mean Payoff Graphs

In the previous chapters, we gave a rough analysis of graph generation. In this chapter, we will dive into a more detailed analysis.

B.1 Introduction

B.2 Sinkless $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$ Graph

B.2.1 Property

Let \mathbb{P} be the property¹ “Graph has not sink”. This property is increasing in the sense that:

$$\forall H \text{ spanning subgraph of } G, \quad H \in \mathbb{P} \implies G \in \mathbb{P}$$

As a consequence:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, p, p' \in [0, 1] / \quad p \leq p', \quad \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}(n, p) \in \mathbb{P}) \leq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}(n, p') \in \mathbb{P})$$

We will be interested in two properties:

- The property “Vertex v has no sinks”. We denote it by $\text{NoSink}(v)$.
- The property “Graph G has no sinks at all”. We denote it by $\text{Sinkless}(G)$.

B.2.2 Basic Comparison with Normal $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$

We will calculate the expected value of $\deg v$. By applying the law of total expectancy:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\deg v] &= \mathbb{E}[\deg v \mid \deg v > 0] \times \mathcal{P}(\deg v > 0) + \mathbb{E}[\deg v \mid \deg v = 0] \times \mathcal{P}(\deg v = 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\deg v \mid \text{Sinkless}(G)] \times \mathcal{P}(\text{NoSink}(v)) \end{aligned}$$

¹Formally, a property is just a set of graphs. In practice, it is a set that has desirable “properties”.

With that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\deg v \mid \text{Sinkless}(G)] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\deg v]}{\mathcal{P}(\text{NoSink}(v))} = \frac{np}{1 - (1 - p)^n} \leq \frac{np}{1 - e^{-1}} \\ \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{E}|] &= \sum_{v \in V} \mathbb{E}[\deg v \mid \text{Sinkless}(G)] = \frac{n^2 p}{1 - (1 - p)^n} \leq \frac{n^2 p}{1 - e^{-1}}\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the conditional distribution does inflict a small multiplicative bias on the expected number of edges and expected degree.

This serves as an evidence that $\mathcal{D}^S(n, p)$ is similar enough to $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$

B.2.3 Property Probability

- Let $G \sim \mathcal{D}(n, p)$
- Let v a vertex of G

The probability that $\text{NoSink}(v)$ occurs is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}(\text{NoSink}(v)) &= 1 - \mathcal{P}(\text{Adj } v = \emptyset) \\ &= 1 - \mathcal{P}(\deg v = 0) \\ &= 1 - (1 - p)^n\end{aligned}$$

Now, it is clear that the sequence of events $(\text{NoSink}(v))_{v \in V}$ is independent.

With that, the probability that the whole graph is sinkless is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}(\text{Sinkless}(G)) &= \mathcal{P}(\text{Adj } v \neq \emptyset \quad \forall v \in V) \\ &= \mathcal{P}\left(\bigwedge_{v \in V} \text{NoSink}(v)\right) \\ &= \prod_{v \in V} \mathcal{P}(\text{NoSink}(v)) \\ &= (1 - (1 - p)^n)^n\end{aligned}\tag{B.1}$$

B.2.4 Asymptotic Analysis For Dense $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$

Let $c > 0$. We have for large enough n :

$$(1 - p)^n \leq \frac{c}{n}$$

Which implies:

$$(1 - \frac{c}{n})^n \leq (1 - (1 - p)^n)^n \leq 1$$

If we take the limit, we have:

$$e^{-c} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (1 - (1 - p)^n)^n \leq 1 \quad \forall c > 0$$

By tending c to 0, we get:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (1 - (1 - p)^n)^n = 1$$

B.2.5 Asymptotic Analysis For Sparse $\mathcal{D}(n, p)$

Let:

$$\begin{aligned} f : \mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ x, k, c \rightarrow (1 - g(x, k, c))^x \\ g : \mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ x, k, c \rightarrow \left(1 - \frac{k \ln x + c}{x}\right)^x \end{aligned}$$

By construction, $f(n, k, c)$ is the probability of a graph following $\mathcal{G}(n, \frac{k \ln n + c}{n})$ to contain no sink.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln g(k, x, c) &= x \ln \left(1 - \frac{k \ln x + c}{x}\right) \\ &= -k \ln x - c - \frac{(k(\ln x) + c)^2}{2x} + o\left(\frac{(\ln x)^3}{x^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

By applying the exponential function to both sides:

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, k, c) &= \exp\left(-k \ln x - c - \frac{(k \ln x + c)^2}{2x} + o\left(\frac{(\ln x)^3}{x^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{e^{-c}}{x^k} \times e^{\frac{-(k \ln x + c)^2}{2x} + o\left(\frac{(\ln x)^3}{x^2}\right)} \\ &= \frac{e^{-c}}{x^k} \left(1 - \frac{(k \ln x + c)^2}{2x} + o\left(\frac{(\ln x)^3}{x^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{e^{-c}}{x^k} - e^{-c} \frac{k^2 (\ln x)^2}{2x^{k+1}} + o\left(\frac{(\ln x)^3}{x^{k+2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{e^{-c}}{x^k} + o\left(\frac{1}{x^k}\right) \\ \implies 1 - g(x, k, c) &= 1 - \frac{e^{-c}}{x^k} + o\left(\frac{1}{x^k}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we apply \ln to both sides, and multiply by x :

$$\begin{aligned} x \ln(1 - g(x, k, c)) &= -\frac{e^{-c}}{x^{k-1}} + o\left(\frac{1}{x^{k-1}}\right) \\ &\sim -\frac{e^{-c}}{x^{k-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we apply the exponential function to both sides, to get the desired estimation of f :

$$f(x, k, x) = e^{-\frac{e^{-c}}{x^{k-1}} + o(\frac{1}{x^{k-1}})} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Now with that:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} x \ln(1 - g(x, k, c)) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } k \in [0, 1[\\ -e^{-c} & \text{if } k = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise if } k \in]1, +\infty[\end{cases}$$

Finally, we can conclude that:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x, k) \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \in [0, 1[\\ e^{-e^{-c}} & \text{if } k = 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise if } k \in]1, +\infty[\end{cases} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

B.3 Expected Mean Payoff

B.3.1 Definition

- Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a mean-payoff game
- For $u \in \mathcal{V}$, Let $\mathcal{P}(u)$ be the set of probability distributions over the set $\text{Adj}(u)$
- We define a fractional strategy as a function $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$

B.3.2 Matrix Form

- Let $n = |\mathcal{V}|$
- Let u_1, \dots, u_n an enumeration of elements of \mathcal{V} A fractional strategy can be represented as a matrix A such that:

$$\mathcal{P}(\Phi(u_i) = u_j) = A_{i,j}$$

Appendix C

On Probabilistic Strategies

In the previous chapters, we gave a rough analysis of graph generation. In this chapter, we will dive into a more detailed analysis.

C.1 Markovian Nature

C.1.1 Fixing Π^{Opt}

C.1.2 Fixing both Π^{Max} and Π^{Min}

C.2 Expected Reward of a MRP

C.2.1 Markov Reward Process

Definition

Let $\mathcal{R} = (V, E, W, A, \gamma)$ be a discrete markov reward model:

- V is a finite set of states
- $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a finite set of edges
- $W : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the weights function
- $A : E \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the transition function, satifying:

$$\sum_{v \in \text{Adj } u} A(u, v) = 1 \quad (\text{C.1})$$

- $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ is the discount factor

Such process models a markov chain where from a given state u , a transition $(u, v) \in E$ occurs with probability $A(u, v)$, and gives a reward of $W(u, v)$.

In this section, we will extend both A and W to $V \times V$ by requiring that:

$$\forall e \notin E, \quad A(e) = W(e) = 0$$

Execution and Award

The execution is formalized as follow:

- Fix $X_0 = s \in V$
- For $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, X_n will be chosen randomly from the discrete set $\text{Adj } X_{n-1}$ using probabilities from A

The cumulative (discounted) reward¹ $R_\gamma(s)$ is defined as:

$$R_\gamma(s) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \gamma^n W(X_n, X_{n+1}) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

This term converges for $\gamma \in [0, 1[$.

For undiscounted rewards², such reward may not converge.

For that the average time reward $\bar{R}(s)$ starting from s , is defined as follow:

$$\bar{R}(s) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} W(X_k, X_{k+1}) \quad (\text{C.3})$$

C.2.2 Expected discounted reward

The discounted reward is used to calculate the rewards, where in each step, the weight of that rewards decay by γ .

Here we will assume $\gamma \in [0, 1[$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[R_\gamma(u)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[R_\gamma(X_0) | X_1]] \\ \mathbb{E}[R_\gamma(u)] &= \sum_{v \in \text{Adj } u} \mathcal{P}(X_1 = v | X_0 = u) \times (W(u, v) + \gamma \mathbb{E}[R_\gamma(v)]) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} A(u, v) \times (W(u, v) + \gamma \mathbb{E}[R_\gamma(v)]) \end{aligned}$$

Now, by considering S_n, A, W as matrices, the equation can be simplified to³ :

$$\mathbb{E}[R_\gamma] = \gamma A \mathbb{E}[R_\gamma] + (A \odot W) \mathbf{1}$$

Here:

- \odot is the point-wise matrix product, and
- $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$ is the vector of ones.

With that, the discounted reward is calculated as follow:

$$\mathbb{E}[R_\gamma] = (I - \gamma A)^{-1} (A \odot W) \mathbf{1} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

¹ “reward” and “payoff” here as synonymous. We use the word “reward”

²Which means $\gamma = 1$.

³ γ has to be less than 1, as otherwise we cannot generally invert the matrix $I - \gamma A$.

C.2.3 Expected average-time reward

While the discounted reward converges for all $\gamma \in [0, 1[$. It may fail to converge in general for $\gamma = 1$. For that, we will use the average-time reward. Such metric is more informing as it does not prioritize earlier rewards. Instead, all the rewards have the same weight and the mean calculation.

In the other hand, while the intuition behind such metric is clear, it is more challenging to analyse its convergence, and calculate it directly. And this is exactly what we will do next.

Deriving Formula

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[S_n(u)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[S_n(X_0) | X_1]] \\ \mathbb{E}[S_n(u)] &= \sum_{\substack{v \in \text{Adj} \\ u}} \mathcal{P}(X' = v | X = u) \times (W(u, v) + \mathbb{E}[S_{n-1}(v)]) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} A(u, v) \times (W(u, v) + \mathbb{E}[S_{n-1}(v)])\end{aligned}$$

Now, by considering S_n, A, W as matrices, the equation can be simplified to:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[S_n] &= A\mathbb{E}[S_{n-1}] + (A \odot W)\mathbf{1} \\ &= A\mathbb{E}[S_{n-1}] + (A \odot W)\mathbf{1} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k (A \odot W)\mathbf{1} + A^n \mathbb{E}[S_0] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k (A \odot W)\mathbf{1}\end{aligned}$$

Now, by taking the mean, and then the limit, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{R}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k (A \odot W)\mathbf{1} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Convergence

It is not trivial that the right-hand side of (C.5) converges.

Rothblum[39] proved that such limits exists and calculated its value. We will reformulate his results in the following theorem.

Theorem 7 *For any stochastic matrix A , the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k$ exists, and is equal to the projection matrix T **uniquely** defined as follow:*

- $\text{Im } T = \ker(\text{Id} - A)$
- $\text{Im } T^H = \ker(\text{Id} - A^H)$

Now theorem 7 gives a straightforward construction of T . We only have to build a projection matrix such that:

- It spans $\ker(\text{Id} - A)$
- It cancels at $\ker T = \ker(\text{Id} - A^H)^\perp = \text{Im}(\text{Id} - A)$

Furthermore, Rothblum[39] gave a closed-form expression that applies to such projection T :

$$T = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} A^k = X(Y^H X)^{-1} Y^H \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Where:

- X is the matrix whose column vectors span $\text{Im } T$
- Y is the matrix whose column vectors span $\text{Im } T^H$

C.3 Evaluation of probabilistic strategies

C.3.1 Definition

- Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a mean-payoff game
- For $u \in \mathcal{V}$, Let $\mathcal{P}(u)$ be the set of probability distributions over the set $\text{Adj}(u)$
- We define a fractional strategy as a function $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}$

C.3.2 Matrix Form

- Let $n = |\mathcal{V}|$
- Let u_1, \dots, u_n an enumeration of elements of \mathcal{V} A fractional strategy can be represented as a matrix A such that:

$$\mathcal{P}(\Phi(u_i) = u_j) = A_{i,j}$$

Bibliographie

- [1] Dorit Aharonov and Oded Regev. “Lattice Problems in NP cap coNP”. In: *Foundations of Computer Science, 1975., 16th Annual Symposium on* (May 2004). DOI: 10.1109/FOCS.2004.35.
- [2] Xavier Allamigeon et al. “Combinatorial Simplex Algorithms Can Solve Mean Payoff Games”. In: *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 24.4 (2014), 2096–2117. DOI: 10.1137/140953800. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/140953800>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/140953800>.
- [3] Albert Atserias and Elitza Maneva. “Mean-Payoff Games and the Max-Atom Problem”. In: (Jan. 2009).
- [4] Yoshua Bengio, Nicholas Léonard, and Aaron C. Courville. “Estimating or Propagating Gradients Through Stochastic Neurons for Conditional Computation”. In: *CoRR* abs/1308.3432 (2013). arXiv: 1308.3432. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1308.3432>.
- [5] C. BERGE et al. “Contributions to the Theory of Games (AM-39), Volume III”. In: Princeton University Press, 1957, 179–187. ISBN: 9780691079363. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1b9x26z> (visited on 09/03/2023).
- [6] Manuel Bodirsky and Marcello Mamino. *Tropically convex constraint satisfaction*. 2017. arXiv: 1506.04184 [cs.CC].
- [7] Alper Kamil Bozkurt et al. *Model-Free Reinforcement Learning for Stochastic Games with Linear Temporal Logic Objectives*. 2020. arXiv: 2010.01050 [cs.R0].
- [8] Melissa Chan. *Go Player Finally Defeats Google’s AlphaGo After 3 Losses*. 14 Mar 2016. URL: <https://time.com/4257406/go-google-alphago-lee-sedol>.
- [9] Anne Condon. “The complexity of stochastic games”. In: *Information and Computation* 96.2 (1992), 203–224. ISSN: 0890-5401. DOI: 10.1016/0890-5401(92)90048-K. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/089054019290048K>.
- [10] Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. “Support-vector networks”. In: *Machine learning* 20.3 (1995), 273–297.
- [11] Rémi Coulom. “Efficient Selectivity and Backup Operators in Monte-Carlo Tree Search”. In: *Computers and Games*. Ed. by H. Jaap van den Herik, Paolo Ciancarini, and H. H. L. M. (Jeroen) Donkers. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, 72–83. ISBN: 978-3-540-75538-8.
- [12] Matthieu Courbariaux and Yoshua Bengio. “BinaryNet: Training Deep Neural Networks with Weights and Activations Constrained to +1 or -1”. In: *CoRR* abs/1602.02830 (2016). arXiv: 1602.02830. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.02830>.
- [13] Matthieu Courbariaux, Yoshua Bengio, and Jean-Pierre David. “BinaryConnect: Training Deep Neural Networks with binary weights during propagations”. In: *CoRR* abs/1511.00363 (2015). arXiv: 1511.00363. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00363>.

- [14] A. Ehrenfeucht and J. Mycielski. “Positional Strategies for Mean Payoff Games”. In: *Int. J. Game Theory* 8.2 (1979), 109–113. ISSN: 0020-7276. DOI: 10.1007/BF01768705. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01768705>.
- [15] Markus Enzenberger et al. “Fuego—An Open-Source Framework for Board Games and Go Engine Based on Monte Carlo Tree Search”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games* 2 (2010), 259–270. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:8323579>.
- [16] Alan Frieze and Michał Karoński. *Introduction to Random Graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781316339831.
- [17] Elizabeth Gibney. “Self-taught AI is best yet at strategy game Go”. In: *Nature* (Oct. 2017). DOI: 10.1038/nature.2017.22858.
- [18] Citu Group. *What is the carbon footprint of a house?* URL: <https://citu.co.uk/citu-live/what-is-the-carbon-footprint-of-a-house>.
- [19] Julian Gutierrez, Thomas Steeples, and Michael Wooldridge. “Mean-Payoff Games with $\&\omega;$ -Regular Specifications”. In: *Games* 13.1 (2022). ISSN: 2073-4336. DOI: 10.3390/g13010019. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4336/13/1/19>.
- [20] Koen Helwegen et al. “Latent Weights Do Not Exist: Rethinking Binarized Neural Network Optimization”. In: *CoRR* abs/1906.02107 (2019). arXiv: 1906.02107. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02107>.
- [21] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. “Long short-term memory”. In: *Neural computation* 9.8 (1997), 1735–1780.
- [22] IBM. *Présentation générale de CRISP-DM*. <https://www.ibm.com/docs/fr/spss-modeler/saas?topic=dm-crisp-help-overview>. 2017.
- [23] A.G. Ivakhnenko et al. *Cybernetics and Forecasting Techniques*. Modern analytic and computational methods in science and mathematics. American Elsevier Publishing Company, 1967. ISBN: 9780444000200. URL: <https://books.google.tn/books?id=rGFgAAAAMAAJ>.
- [24] Zohar Jackson. *Free Spoken Digits Dataset*. <https://github.com/Jakobovski/free-spoken-digit-dataset>. 2019.
- [25] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. “Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization”. In: *CoRR* abs/1412.6980 (2015).
- [26] Donald E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 1 (3rd Ed.): Fundamental Algorithms*. USA: Addison Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 1997. ISBN: 0201896834.
- [27] Levente Kocsis and Csaba Szepesvári. “Bandit Based Monte-Carlo Planning”. In: *Machine Learning: ECML 2006*. Ed. by Johannes Fürnkranz, Tobias Scheffer, and Myra Spiliopoulou. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, 282–293. ISBN: 978-3-540-46056-5.
- [28] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. “ImageNet Classification with Deep Convolutional Neural Networks”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Ed. by F. Pereira et al. Vol. 25. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012. URL: <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2012/file/c399862d3b9d6b76c8436e924a68c45b-Paper.pdf>.
- [29] Y. Lecun et al. “Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE* 86.11 (1998), 2278–2324. DOI: 10.1109/5.726791.
- [30] Yann LeCun. *THE MNIST DATABASE*. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist>. 1998.
- [31] Xiaofan Lin, Cong Zhao, and Wei Pan. “Towards Accurate Binary Convolutional Neural Network”. In: *CoRR* abs/1711.11294 (2017). arXiv: 1711.11294. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.11294>.
- [32] Seppo Linnainmaa. “Taylor Expansion of the Accumulated Rounding Error”. In: *BIT* 16.2 (1976), 146–160. ISSN: 0006-3835. DOI: 10.1007/BF01931367. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01931367>.

- [33] Zechun Liu et al. “Bi-Real Net: Enhancing the Performance of 1-bit CNNs With Improved Representational Capability and Advanced Training Algorithm”. In: *CoRR* abs/1808.00278 (2018). arXiv: 1808.00278. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00278>.
- [34] Kim Martineau. *Shrinking deep learning’s carbon footprint*. 7Aug 2021. URL: <https://news.mit.edu/2020/shrinking-deep-learning-carbon-footprint-0807>.
- [35] Tom M Mitchell. *Machine learning*. Vol. 1. 9. McGraw-hill New York, 1997.
- [36] *NP intersect coNP*. <https://kintali.wordpress.com/2010/06/06/np-intersect-conp/>. Accessed: 2023-08-28.
- [37] Nicolai Pisaruk. “Stochastic mean payoff games”. In: Apr. 2014.
- [38] Mohammad Rastegari et al. “XNOR-Net: ImageNet Classification Using Binary Convolutional Neural Networks”. In: *CoRR* abs/1603.05279 (2016). arXiv: 1603.05279. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.05279>.
- [39] G. Rothblum. “Computation of the eigenprojection of a nonnegative matrix at its spectral radius”. In: *Stochastic Systems: Modeling, Identification and Optimization, II*. Ed. by Roger J.-B. Wets. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1976, 188–201. ISBN: 978-3-642-00786-6. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0120751. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0120751>.
- [40] Stuart J. Russell. *Artificial intelligence : a modern approach*. Includes bibliographical references (pages 1063-1093) and index. Third edition. Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice Hall, [2010] ©2010, 2010. URL: <https://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/9910082172502121>.
- [41] Md. Sahidullah and Goutam Saha. “Design, analysis and experimental evaluation of block based transformation in MFCC computation for speaker recognition”. In: *Speech Communication* 54.4 (2012), 543–565. ISSN: 0167-6393. DOI: 10.1016/j.specom.2011.11.004. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167639311001622>.
- [42] Benjamin Sanchez-Lengeling et al. “A Gentle Introduction to Graph Neural Networks”. In: *Distill* (2021). <https://distill.pub/2021/gnn-intro>. DOI: 10.23915/distill.00033.
- [43] Sven Schewe. “An Optimal Strategy Improvement Algorithm for Solving Parity and Payoff Games”. In: *Computer Science Logic*. Ed. by Michael Kaminski and Simone Martini. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, 369–384. ISBN: 978-3-540-87531-4.
- [44] David Silver et al. “Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search”. In: *Nature* 529.7587 (2016), 484–489. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/nature16961. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16961>.
- [45] David Silver et al. “Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge”. In: *Nature* 550.7676 (2017), 354–359. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/nature24270. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24270>.
- [46] Eilon Solan and Nicolas Vieille. “Stochastic games”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112.45 (2015), 13743–13746. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1513508112. eprint: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1513508112>. URL: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1513508112>.
- [47] Emma Strubell, Ananya Ganesh, and Andrew McCallum. “Energy and Policy Considerations for Deep Learning in NLP”. In: *CoRR* abs/1906.02243 (2019). arXiv: 1906.02243. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.02243>.
- [48] Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. Cambridge, MA, USA: A Bradford Book, 2018. ISBN: 0262039249.
- [49] Tim Dettmers. *Deep Learning in a Nutshell: History and Training*. <https://developer.nvidia.com/blog/deep-learning-nutshell-history-training/>. 16 Dec. 2015.
- [50] Aimee Wynsberghe. “Sustainable AI: AI for sustainability and the sustainability of AI”. In: *AI and Ethics* 1 (Feb. 2021). DOI: 10.1007/s43681-021-00043-6.

- [51] Chunyu Yuan and Sos S. Agaian. “A comprehensive review of Binary Neural Network”. In: *CoRR* abs/2110.06804 (2021). arXiv: 2110 . 06804. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.06804>.
- [52] Chunyu Yuan and Sos S. Agaian. “A comprehensive review of Binary Neural Network”. In: *CoRR* abs/2110.06804 (2021), 3–4. arXiv: 2110 . 06804. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.06804>.
- [53] Uri Zwick and Michael S. Paterson. “The complexity of mean payoff games”. In: *Computing and Combinatorics*. Ed. by Ding-Zhu Du and Ming Li. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1995, 1–10. ISBN: 978-3-540-44733-7.
- [54] Maciej Świechowski et al. “Monte Carlo Tree Search: a review of recent modifications and applications”. In: *Artificial Intelligence Review* 56.3 (2022), 2497–2562. DOI: 10.1007/s10462-022-10228-y. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs10462-022-10228-y>.