# **Stochastic Games**

#### Krishnendu Chatterjee



 $Institute \ of \ Science \ and \ Technology$ 

#### ARiSE Winter School, Vienna,

Feb, 2012





 Two-player perfect-information games on finite graphs with randomness in transitions.

- Various sub-classes
  - Brief discussion of applications.
  - Solution techniques.

#### **System Analysis**

 Formal analysis of systems to prove correctness with respect to properties.

#### System to game graph

- Vertices represent states.
- Edges represent transitions.
- Paths represent behavior.
- Players represent various interacting agents.

#### Mathematical framework for system analysis.

#### **Stochastic Games**



#### **Stochastic Games**



#### **Applications: Verification of Systems**

#### Verification of systems



satisfies property

Environment



Controller (Synthesis)



#### **Applications: Verification of Systems**

- Verification and synthesis of systems
  - System is fixed and the environment fixed: deterministic systems.
  - System is fixed, but not the environment: Demonic non-determinism.
  - Environment fixed but probabilistically (randomized scheduler): Markov chain.
  - Probabilistic environment and controller: Markov decision process.
  - Controller vs. environment: angelic vs. demonic non-determinism (alternation).

#### **Applications: Systems for Specification**

- Synthesis of systems from specification
  - Input/Output signals.
  - Automata over I/O that specifies the desired set of behaviors.
  - Can the input player present input such that no matter how the output player plays the generated sequence of I/O signals is accepted by automata ?
  - Deterministic automata: Games.
  - Some input signals generate probabilistic transition: Stochastic games.

## **Game Models Applications**

- -synthesis [Church, Ramadge/Wonham, Pnueli/Rosner]
- -model checking of open systems
- -receptiveness [Dill, Abadi/Lamport]
- -semantics of interaction [Abramsky]
- -non-emptiness of tree automata [Rabin, Gurevich/ Harrington]
- -behavioral type systems and interface automata [deAlfaro/ Henzinger]
- -model-based testing [Gurevich/Veanes et al.]
- -etc.

• Mathematicians (logic and set theory), Stochastic game theorists, Economists, Computer Scientists, Biologists (evolutionary games).

9

## Properties

- Properties in verification
  - Reachability to target set.
  - Liveness (Buechi) or repeated reachability.
  - Fairness.
  - Parity objectives: all  $\omega$ -regular specifications.

### **MARKOV CHAINS**

## Markov Chains

- Markov chain model: G=((S,E), δ)
- Finite set S of states.
- Probabilistic transition function  $\delta$
- $E = \{ (s,t) | \delta(s)(t) > 0 \}$
- The graph (S,E) is useful.













Cola and Pepsi:

Drink Cola today: Pepsi with prob. 0.6, Cola with prob. 0.4

Drink Pepsi today: Pepsi with prob. 0.5 Cola with prob. 0.5



Drink Cola today: Pepsi with prob. 0.6, Cola with prob. 0.4

Drink Pepsi today: Pepsi with prob. 0.5 Cola with prob. 0.5

Strongly connected Markov chain: Average frequency.

Linear equations: for every state s we have

$$\mathbf{x}_{s} = \sum_{t} \mathbf{x}_{t} \cdot \delta(t)(s)$$

## Markov Chain

- Properties of interest
  - Target set T: probability to reach the target set.
  - Target set B: probability to visit B infinitely often.

## **Objectives**

- Objectives are subsets of infinite paths, i.e.,  $\psi \subseteq S^{\omega}$ .
- Reachability: set of paths that visit the target T at least once.
- Liveness (Buechi): set of paths that visit the target B infinitely often.
- Parity: given a priority function p: S → {0,1,..., d}, the objective is the set of infinite paths where the minimum priority visited infinitely often is even.

## Parity Objectives

 Parity: given a priority function p: S → {0,1,..., d}, the objective is the set of infinite paths where the minimum priority visited infinitely often is even.



## Parity Objectives

 Parity: given a priority function p: S → {0,1,..., d}, the objective is the set of infinite paths where the minimum priority visited infinitely often is even.



## Parity Objectives

 Parity: given a priority function p: S → {0,1,..., d}, the objective is the set of infinite paths where the minimum priority visited infinitely often is even.





- Reachability: starting state is blue.
  - Red: probability is less than 1.
  - Blue: probability is 1.
  - Green: probability is 1.
- Liveness: infinitely often visit
  - Red: probability is 0.
  - Blue: probability is 0.
  - Green: probability is 1.



- Parity
  - Blue infinitely often, or 1 finitely often.
  - In general, if priorities are 0,1, ..., 2d, then we require for some  $0 \le i \le d$ , that priority 2i infinitely often, and all priorities less than 2i is finitely often.

## Questions

- Qualitative question
  - The set where the property holds with probability 1.
  - Qualitative analysis.
- Quantitative question
  - What is the precise probability that the property holds.
  - Quantitative analysis.

Consider the graph of Markov chain.

- Closed recurrent set:
  - Bottom strongly connected component.
  - Closed: No probabilistic transition out.
  - Strongly connected.

- Theorem: Reach the set of closed recurrent set with probability 1.
- Proof.
  - Consider the DAG of the scc decomposition of the graph.
  - Consider a scc C of the graph that is not bottom.
  - Let  $\alpha$  be the minimum positive transition prob.
  - Leave C within n steps with prob at least  $\beta = \alpha^n$ .
  - Stay in C for at least k\*n steps is at most  $(1-\beta)^k$ .
  - As k goes to infinity this goes to 0.

- Theorem: Reach the set of closed recurrent set with probability 1.
- Proof.
  - Path goes out with  $\beta$ .
  - Never gets executed for k times is (1-β)<sup>k</sup>. Now let k goto infinity.



- Theorem: Given a closed recurrent set C, for any starting state in C, all states is reached with prob 1, and hence all states visited infinitely often with prob 1.
- Proof. Very similar argument like before.

#### Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

- Previous two results are the basis.
- Example: Liveness objective.
  - Compute max scc decomposition.
  - Reach the bottom scc's with prob 1.
  - A bottom scc with a target is a good bottom scc, otherwise bad bottom scc.
  - Qualitative: if a path to a bad bottom scc, not with prob
    1. Otherwise with prob 1.
  - Quantitative: reachability probability to good bottom scc.

### Quantitative Reachability Analysis

- Let us denote by C the set of bottom scc's (the quantitative values are 0 or 1). We now define a set of linear equalities. There is a variable x<sub>s</sub> for every state s. The equalities are as follows:
  - $x_s = 0$  if s in C and bad bottom scc.
  - $x_s = 1$  if s in C and good bottom scc.
  - $\mathbf{x}_{s} = \sum_{t \in S} \mathbf{x}_{t} * \delta(s)(t)$ .
- Brief proof idea: The remaining Markov chain is transient. Matrix algebra det(I-δ)≠ 0.

## Markov Chain Summary

	Reachability	Liveness	Parity
Qualitative	Linear time	Linear time	Linear time
Quantitative	Linear equalities (Gaussian elimination)	Linear equalities	Linear equalities

#### **MARKOV DECISION PROCESSES**

## Markov Decision Processes

- Markov decision processes (MDPs)
  - Non-determinism.
  - Probability.
  - Generalizes non-deterministic systems and Markov chains.
- An MDP G= ((S,E), (S<sub>1</sub>, S<sub>P</sub>),  $\delta$ )
  - $\delta : S_P \rightarrow D(S).$
  - For  $s \in S_P$ , the edge  $(s,t) \in E$  iff  $\delta(s)(t)>0$ .
  - E(s) out-going edges from s, and assume E(s) nonempty for all s.











# MDP

- Model
- Objectives
- How is non-determinism resolved: notion of strategies. At each stage can be resolved differently and also probabilistically.

## **Strategies**

 Strategies are recipe how to move tokens or how to extend plays. Formally, given a history of play (or finite sequence of states), it chooses a probability distribution over out-going edges.

•  $\sigma: S^* S_1 \to D(S).$ 

## **MDP: Strategy Example**



Token for k-th time: choose left with prob 1/k and right (1-1/k).

## **Strategies**

- Strategies are recipe how to move tokens or how to extend plays.
  Formally, given a history of play (or finite sequence of states), it chooses a probability distribution over out-going edges.
  - $\sigma: \mathbf{S}^* \mathbf{S}_1 \to \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{S}).$
- History dependent and randomized.
- History independent: depends only current state (memoryless or positional).
  - $\sigma: S_1 \rightarrow D(S)$
- Deterministic: no randomization (pure strategies).
  - $\sigma: \mathbf{S}^* \mathbf{S}_1 \to \mathbf{S}$
- Deterministic and memoryless: no memory and no randomization (pure and memoryless and is the simplest class).
  - $\sigma: S_1 \to S$

## **Example: Cheating Lovers**



Visit green and red infinitely often.

Pure memoryless not good enough.

Strategy with memory: alternates.

Randomized memoryless: choose with uniform probability.

Certainty vs. probability 1.

## Values in MDPs

- Value at a state for an objective  $\psi$ 
  - Val( $\psi$ )(s) = sup<sub> $\sigma$ </sub> Pr<sub>s<sup> $\sigma$ </sup>( $\psi$ ).</sub>
- Qualitative analysis
  - Compute the set of almost-sure (prob 1) winning states (i.e., set of states with value 1).
- Quantitative analysis
  - Compute the value for all states.

#### Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

- Qualitative analysis
  - Liveness (Buechi) and reachability as a special case.
- Reduction of quantitative analysis to quantitative reachability.
- Quantitative reachability.

## **Qualitative Analysis for Liveness**

- An MDP G, with a target set B.
- Set of states such that there is a strategy to ensure that B is visited infinitely often with probability 1.
- We will show pure memoryless is enough.
- The generalization to parity (left as an exercise).

## Attractor

Random Attractor for a set U of states.

• 
$$U_0 = U$$
.

$$\begin{array}{ll} & U_{i+1} = U_i \cup \{s \in S_1 \mid E(s) \subseteq U_i\} \\ & \cup \{s \in S_P \mid E(s) \cap U_i \neq \emptyset\}. \end{array}$$

 From U<sub>i+1</sub> no matter what is the choice, U<sub>i</sub> is reached with positive probability. By induction U is reached with positive probability.

### Attractor

- Attr<sub>P</sub>(U) =  $\cup_{i \ge 0} U_i$ .
- Attractor lemma: From Attr<sub>P</sub>(U) no matter the strategy of the player (history dependent, randomized) the set U is reached with positive probability.
- Can be computed in O(m) time (m number of edges).
- Thus if U is not in the almost-sure winning set, then Attr<sub>P</sub>(U) is also not in the almost-sure winning set.



 Compute simple reachability to B (exist a path in the graph of the MDP (S,E). Let us call this set A.



- Let U= S \ A. Then there is not even a path from U to B. Clearly, U is not in the almost-sure set.
- By attractor lemma can take Attr<sub>P</sub>(U) out and iterate.



Attr<sub>P</sub>(U) may or may not intersect with B.



- Iterate on the remaining sub-graph.
- Every iteration what is removed is not part of almostsure winning set.
- What happens when the iteration stops.



- The iteration stops. Let Z be the set of states removed overall iteration.
- Two key properties.



- The iteration stops. Let Z be the set of states removed overall iteration.
- Two key properties:
  - No probabilistic edge from outside to Z.



- The iteration stops. Let Z be the set of states removed overall iteration.
- Two key properties:
  - No probabilistic edge from outside to Z.
  - From everywhere in A (the remaining graph) path to B.



- Two key properties:
  - No probabilistic edge from outside to Z.
  - From everywhere in A (the remaining graph) path to B.
- Fix a memoryless strategy as follows:
  - In A  $\setminus$  B: shorten distance to B. (Consider the BFS and choose edge).
  - In B: stay in A.



- Fix a memoryless strategy as follows:
  - In A  $\setminus$  B: shorten distance to B. (Consider the BFS and choose edge).
  - In B: stay in A.
- Argue all bottom scc's intersect with B. By Markov chain theorem done.



- Argue all bottom scc's intersect with B. By Markov chain theorem done.
- Towards contradiction some bottom scc that does not intersect.
  - Consider the minimum BFS distance to B.



- Argue all bottom scc's intersect with B. By Markov chain theorem done.
- Towards contradiction some bottom scc that does not intersect.
  - Consider the minimum BFS distance to B.
    - Case 1: if a state in S<sub>P</sub>, all edges must be there and so must be the one with shorter distance.
    - Case 2: if a state in S<sub>1</sub>, then the successor chosen has shorter distance.
    - In both cases we have a contradiction.

- Time complexity is O(n m).
- Pure memoryless almost-sure winning strategy.
- Exercise: extend it to parity with time complexity O(n m d).
- We are now done with qualitative analysis. We will now argue how to reduce quantitative analysis to quantitative reachability.

#### End of Part 1:

1. Markov chains: Qualitative and quantitative Analysis

2. MDPs: Qualitative analysis

Next Part:

1. MDPs: Quantitative Analysis

2. Stochastic games: Qualitative and quantitative Analysis