

Qualitative Multi-Objective Reachability for Ordered Branching MDPs

Kousha Etessami*
U. of Edinburgh

Emanuel Martinov†
U. of Edinburgh

Abstract

We study qualitative multi-objective reachability problems for Ordered Branching Markov Decision Processes (OBMDPs), or equivalently context-free MDPs, building on prior results for single-target reachability on Branching Markov Decision Processes (BMDPs).

We provide two separate algorithms for “almost-sure” and “limit-sure” multi-target reachability for OBMDPs. Specifically, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , given a starting non-terminal, and given a set of *target* non-terminals K of size $k = |K|$, our first algorithm decides whether the supremum probability, of generating a tree that contains every target non-terminal in set K , is 1. Our second algorithm decides whether there is a strategy for the player to almost-surely (with probability 1) generate a tree that contains every target non-terminal in set K .

The two separate algorithms are needed: we show that indeed, in this context, “almost-sure” \neq “limit-sure” for multi-target reachability, meaning that there are OBMDPs for which the player may not have any strategy to achieve probability exactly 1 of reaching all targets in set K in the same generated tree, but may have a sequence of strategies that achieve probability arbitrarily close to 1. Both algorithms run in time $2^{O(k)} \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$, where $|\mathcal{A}|$ is the total bit encoding length of the given OBMDP, \mathcal{A} . Hence they run in polynomial time when k is fixed, and are fixed-parameter tractable with respect to k . Moreover, we show that even the qualitative almost-sure (and limit-sure) multi-target reachability decision problem is in general NP-hard, when the size k of the set K of target non-terminals is not fixed.

1 Introduction

Ordered Branching Markov Decision Processes (OBMDPs) can be viewed as controlled/probabilistic context-free grammars, but without any terminal symbols, and where moreover the non-terminals are partitioned into two sets: controlled non-terminals and probabilistic non-terminals. Each non-terminal, N , has an associated set of grammar rules of the form $N \rightarrow \gamma$, where γ is a (possibly empty) sequence of non-terminals. Each probabilistic non-terminal is equipped with a given probability distribution on its associated grammar rules. For each controlled non-terminal, M , there is an associated non-empty set of available actions, A_M , which is in one-to-one correspondence with the grammar rules of M . So, for each action, $a \in A_M$, there is an associated grammar rule $M \xrightarrow{a} \gamma$. Given an OBMDP, given a “start” non-terminal, and given a “strategy” for the controller, these together determine a probabilistic process that generates a (possibly infinite) random ordered tree. The tree is formed via the usual parse tree expansion of grammar rules, proceeding

*kousha@inf.ed.ac.uk

†eo.martinov@gmail.com

generation by generation, in a top-down manner. Starting with a root node labeled by the “start” non-terminal, the ordered tree is generated based on the controller’s (possibly randomized) choice of action at each node of the tree that is labeled by a controlled non-terminal, and based on the probabilistic choice of a grammar rule at nodes that are labeled by a probabilistic non-terminal.

We assume that a general *strategy* for the controller can operate as follows: at each node v of the ordered tree, labeled by a controlled non-terminal, the controller (player) can choose its action (or its probability distribution on actions) at v based on the entire “ancestor history” of v , meaning based on the entire sequence of labeled nodes and actions leading from the root node to v , *as well as* based on the ordered position of each of its ancestors (including v itself) among its siblings in the tree.

Ordered Branching Processes (OBPs) are OBMDPs without any controlled non-terminals. Both OBPs and OBMDPs are very similar to classic multi-type branching processes (BPs), and to Branching MDP (BMDPs), respectively. The only difference is that for OB(MD)Ps the generated tree is *ordered*. In particular, the rules for an OBMDP have an ordered *sequence* of non-terminals on their right hand side, whereas there is no such ordering in BPs or BMDPs: each rule for a given type associates an unordered multi-set of “offsprings” of various types to that given type. Branching processes and stochastic context-free grammars have well-known applications in many fields, including in natural language processing, biology/bioinformatics (e.g., [17], population genetics [16], RNA modeling [7], and cancer tumor growth modelling [1, 20]), and physics (e.g., nuclear chain reactions). Generalizing these models to MDPs is natural, and can allow us to study, and to optimize algorithmically, settings where such random processes can partially be controlled.

The single-target reachability objective for OBMDPs amounts to optimizing (maximizing or minimizing) the probability that, starting at a given start (root) non-terminal, the generated tree contains some given target non-terminal. This objective has already been thoroughly studied for BMDPs, as well as for (concurrent) stochastic game generalizations of BMDPs ([10, 11]). Moreover, it turns out that there is really no difference at all between BMDPs and OBMDPs when it comes to the single-target reachability objective: all the algorithmic results from [10, 11] carry over, *mutatis mutandis*, for OBMDPs, and for their stochastic game generalizations.

A natural generalization of single-target reachability is multi-objective reachability, where the goal is to optimize each of the respective probabilities that the generated tree contains each of several different target non-terminals. Of course, there may be a trade-offs between these different objectives.

Our main concern in this paper is *qualitative* multi-objective reachability problems, where the aim is to determine whether there is a strategy that guarantees that each of the given set of target non-terminals is almost-surely (respectively, limit-surely) contained in the generated tree, i.e., with probability 1 (respectively, with probability arbitrarily close to 1). In fact, we show that the *almost-sure* and *limit-sure* problems do not coincide. That is, there are OBMDPs for which there is no single strategy that achieves probability exactly 1 for reaching all targets, but where nevertheless, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a strategy that guarantees a probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$, of reaching all targets.

By contrast, for both BMDPs and OBMDPs, for single-target reachability, the *qualitative* almost-sure and limit-sure questions do coincide: there is a strategy that guarantees reaching the target non-terminal with probability 1 if and only if there is a sequence of strategies that guarantee reaching the target with probabilities arbitrarily close to 1 ([10]).¹

¹The notion of general “strategy” employed for BMDPs in [10] is somewhat different than what we define in this paper for OBMDPs: it allows the controller to not only base its choice at a tree node on the ancestor chain of

We give two separate algorithms for almost-sure and limit-sure multi-objective reachability. For the *almost-sure* problem, we are given an OBMDP, a start non-terminal, and a set of target non-terminals, and we must decide whether there exists a strategy using which the process generates, with probability 1, a tree that contains all the given target non-terminals. If the answer is “yes”, the algorithm can also construct a (randomized) witness strategy that achieves this.² The algorithm for the *limit-sure* problem decides whether the supremum probability of generating a tree that contains all given target non-terminals is 1. If the answer is “yes”, the algorithm can also construct, given any $\epsilon > 0$, a randomized non-static strategy that guarantees probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$. The limit-sure algorithm is only slightly more involved.

Both algorithms run in time $2^{O(k)} \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$, where $|\mathcal{A}|$ is the total bit encoding length of the given OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and $k = |K|$ is the size of the given set K of target non-terminals. Hence they run in polynomial time when k is fixed, and are fixed-parameter tractable with respect to k . Moreover, we show that the qualitative almost-sure (and limit-sure) multi-target reachability decision problem is in general NP-hard, when k is not fixed.

Going beyond the goal of assuring probability 1 of reaching each of a set of target non-terminals, we also consider more general qualitative multi-objective reachability/non-reachability problems, where we are given a set of target non-terminals, K , and where for each non-terminal $M \in K$, we are also given a 0/1 probability $b_M \in \{0, 1\}$, and an inequality $\Delta_M \in \{=, <, >\}$, and where we wish to decide whether the controller has a single strategy using which, for all $M \in K$ the probability that the generated tree contains the non-terminal M is $\Delta_M b_M$. We show that in some special cases these problems are decidable (efficiently). However, we leave open the decidability of the most general case of *arbitrary* boolean combinations of such qualitative reachability and non-reachability queries over different target non-terminals. Furthermore, we leave open all (both decision and approximation) *quantitative* multi-objective reachability questions, including when the goal is to approximate the tradeoff *pareto curve* of optimal probabilities for different reachability objectives. These are intriguing questions for future research.

Related work. As already mentioned, the single-target reachability problem for OBMDPs (and its stochastic game generalization) is equivalent to the same problem for BMDPs, and was studied in detail in [10, 11], even in the quantitative sense. The same holds for another fundamental objective, namely *termination/extinction*, i.e., where the objective is to optimize the probability that the generated tree is finite. The extinction objective for BMDPs, and the closely related model of 1-exit recursive MDPs, was thoroughly studied in [14, 13, 9], including both qualitative

that node, but on the entire tree up to that “generation”. This is needed for BMDPs because there is no ordering available on “siblings” in the tree generated by a BMDP. However, a careful look shows that the results of [10] imply that, for OBMDPs, for single-target reachability, almost-sure and limit-sure reachability also coincide under the notion of “strategy” we have defined in this paper, where choices are based only on the “ancestor history” (with ordering information) of each node in the *ordered* tree. In particular the key “queen/workers” strategy employed for almost-sure (=limit-sure) reachability in [10] can be mimicked using the ordering with respect to siblings that is available in ancestor histories of OBMDPs. A natural question is what happens for multi-objective qualitative reachability in OBMDPs, if we allow the more general definition of strategy, which can depend at each node on the entire tree up to the “generation” of that node (even on nodes that are not among its ancestors). We leave this question open in this paper, but we conjecture that under that richer notion of strategy “almost-sure” = “limit-sure” for multi-target reachability for (O)BMDPs, and that essentially the same algorithm that we provide for limit-sure multi-target reachability for OBMDPs under the weaker notion of strategy used in this paper works also to decide both limit-sure and almost-sure multi-target reachability under that richer notion of strategy for (O)BMDPs.

²This strategy is, however, necessarily not “static”, meaning it must actually use the ancestor history: the action distribution cannot be defined solely based on which non-terminal is being expanded.

and quantitative algorithmic questions. In particular, it was shown in [14] that qualitative decision problems for termination of (O)BMDPs and 1-exit RMDPs can be decided in polynomial time. By directly using this result and building on it, it was shown in [2] that “almost-sure” single-target reachability in 1-exit RMDPs, or equivalently in context-free MDPs with *leftmost derivation*, can be decided in polynomial time. However, context-free MDPs with leftmost derivation are very different than (O)BMDPs, which allow *simultaneous* derivation of the tree from all unexpanded non-terminals in each generation (not just the leftmost one). Indeed, unlike single-target reachability for OBMDPs (equivalently, context-free MDPs with simultaneous derivation), even for single-target reachability for 1-exit RMDPs (equivalently, context-free MDPs with leftmost derivation), “almost-sure” \neq “limit-sure” and the decidability of “limit-sure” reachability of a given target non-terminal remains an open question (despite the fact that there is a polynomial time algorithm for almost-sure reachability).

Algorithms for checking other properties of BPs and BMDPs have also been investigated before, some of which generalize termination and reachability. In particular, model checking of BPs with properties given by a deterministic parity tree automaton was studied in [4], and in [18] for properties represented by a subclass of alternating parity tree automata. More recently, [19] investigated the determinacy and the complexity of decision problems for ordered branching simple (turn-based) stochastic games with respect to properties defined by finite tree automata defining regular languages on infinite trees. They showed that (unlike the case with reachability) already for some basic regular properties these games are not even determined, meaning they do not have a value. Moreover, they show that for what amounts to OBMDPs with a regular tree objective it is undecidable to compare the optimal probability to a threshold value. Their results do not have implications for (neither quantitative nor qualitative) multi-objective reachability.

Multi-objective reachability and model checking (with respect to omega-regular properties) has been studied for finite-state MDPs in [12], both with respect to qualitative and quantitative problems. In particular, it was shown in [12] that for multi-objective reachability in finite-state MDPs, memoryless (but randomized) strategies are sufficient, that both qualitative and quantitative multi-objective reachability queries can be decided in P-time, and the *Pareto curve* for them can be approximated within a desired error $\epsilon > 0$ in P-time in the size of the MDP and $1/\epsilon$.

Organization of the paper. Section 2 provides background and basic definitions. Section 3 gives an algorithm for determining the non-terminals starting from which there is a strategy that ensures that with a positive probability all target non-terminals in the given target set are in the generated tree. Sections 4 and 5 provide, respectively, our algorithms for the limit-sure and almost-sure multi-target reachability problems. Section 6 considers other special cases of qualitative multi-objective reachability/non-reachability.

2 Background

This section introduces background and definitions for Ordered Branching Markov Decision Processes (OBMDPs), and for the analysis of multi-objective reachability. First, we define OBMDPs in a general way that combines both control and probabilistic rules at each non-terminal, and that allows rules to have an arbitrarily long string of non-terminals on their right-hand side (RHS). Then we show that any OBMDP can be converted efficiently to an “equivalent”³ one in “normal”

³Equivalent w.r.t. all (multi-objective) reachability objectives we consider.

form.

Definition 1. An *Ordered Branching Markov Decision Process (OBMDP)*, \mathcal{A} , is a 1-player controlled stochastic process, represented by a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (V, \Sigma, \Gamma, R)$, where $V = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ is a finite set of non-terminals, and Σ is a finite non-empty action alphabet. For each $i \in [n]$, $\Gamma^i \subseteq \Sigma$ is a finite non-empty set of actions for non-terminal $T_i \in V$, and for each $a \in \Gamma^i$, $R(T_i, a)$ is a finite set of probabilistic rules associated with the pair (T_i, a) . Each rule $r \in R(T_i, a)$ is a triple, denoted by $T_i \xrightarrow{p_r} s_r$, where $s_r \in V^*$ is a (possibly empty) ordered sequence (string) of non-terminals and $p_r \in (0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$ is the positive probability of the rule r (which we assume to be a rational number for computational purposes). We assume that for each non-terminal $T_i \in V$ and each $a \in \Gamma^i$, the rule probabilities in $R(T_i, a)$ sum to 1, i.e., $\sum_{r \in R(T_i, a)} p_r = 1$.

We denote by $|\mathcal{A}|$ the total bit encoding length of the OBMDP. If $|\Gamma^i| = 1$ for all non-terminals $T_i \in V$, then the model is called an **Ordered Branching Process (OBP)**.

In order to simplify the structure of the OBMDP model and to facilitate the proofs throughout the paper, we observe a simplified “equivalent” normal form for OBMDPs (Proposition 2.2 later on shows that OBMDPs can always be translated efficiently into this normal form). We extend the notation for rules in the model to adopt actions and not only probabilities, i.e., we will be using $T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j$, where $a \in \Gamma^i$, to denote a rule where a non-terminal T_i generates as a child (under player’s choice of action $a \in \Gamma^i$) a copy of non-terminal T_j (with probability 1).

Definition 2. An OBMDP is in *simple normal form (SNF)* if each non-terminal T_i is in one of three possible forms:

- L-FORM: T_i is a “linear” or “probabilistic” non-terminal (i.e., the player has no choice of actions), and the associated rules for T_i are given by: $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,0}} \emptyset, T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,1}} T_1, \dots, T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,n}} T_n$, where for all $0 \leq j \leq n$, $p_{i,j} \geq 0$ denotes the probability of each rule, and $\sum_{j=0}^n p_{i,j} = 1$.
- Q-FORM: T_i is a “quadratic” (or “branching”) non-terminal, with a single associated rule (and no associated actions), of the form $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$.
- M-FORM: T_i is a “controlled” non-terminal, with a non-empty set of associated actions $\Gamma^i = \{a_1, \dots, a_{m_i}\} \subseteq \Sigma$, and the associated rules have the form $T_i \xrightarrow{a_1} T_{j_1}, \dots, T_i \xrightarrow{a_{m_i}} T_{j_{m_i}}$.⁴

A *derivation* for an OBMDP, starting at some start non-terminal $T_{start} \in V$, is a (possibly infinite) labeled ordered tree, $X = (B, s)$, defined as follows. The set of nodes $B \subseteq \{l, r, u\}^*$ of the tree, X , is a *prefix-closed* subset of $\{l, r, u\}^*$.⁵ So each node in B is a string over $\{l, r, u\}$, and if $w = w'a \in B$, where $a \in \{l, r, u\}$, then $w' \in B$. As usual, when $w \in B$ and $w' = wa \in B$, for some $a \in \{l, r, u\}$, we call w the *parent* of w' , and we call w' a *child* of w in the tree. A *leaf* of B is a node $w \in B$ that has no children in B . Let $\mathcal{L}_B \subseteq B$ denote the set of all leaves in B . The *root* node is the empty string ε (note that B is prefix-closed, so $\varepsilon \in B$). The function $s : B \rightarrow V \cup \{\emptyset\}$ assigns either a non-terminal or the empty symbol as a label to each node of the tree, and must satisfy the following conditions: Firstly, $s(\varepsilon) = T_{start}$, in other words the root must be labeled by the start non-terminal; Inductively, if for any *non-leaf* node $w \in B \setminus \mathcal{L}_B$ we have $s(w) = T_i$, for some $T_i \in V$, then:

⁴We assume, without loss of generality, that for $0 \leq t < t' \leq m_i$, $T_{j_t} \neq T_{j_{t'}}$.

⁵Here ‘l’, ‘r’, and ‘u’, stand for ‘left’, ‘right’, and ‘unique’ child, respectively.

- if T_i is a Q-form (branching) non-terminal, whose associated unique rule is $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_{j'}$, then w must have exactly two children in B , namely $wl \in B$ and $wr \in B$, and moreover we must have $s(wl) = T_j$ and $s(wr) = T_{j'}$.
- if T_i is a L-form (linear/probabilistic) non-terminal, then w must have exactly one child in B , namely wu , and it must be the case that either $s(wu) = T_j$, where there exists some rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,j}} T_j$ with a positive probability $p_{i,j} > 0$, or else $s(wu) = \emptyset$, where there exists a rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,0}} \emptyset$, with an empty right-hand side, and a positive probability $p_{i,0} > 0$.
- if T_i is a M-form (controlled) non-terminal, then w must have exactly one child in B , namely wu , and it must be the case that $s(wu) = T_{j_t}$, where there exists some rule $T_i \xrightarrow{a_t} T_{j_t}$, associated with some action $a_t \in \Gamma^i$, having non-terminal T_i as its left-hand side.

A derivation $X = (B, s)$ is *finite* if the set B is finite. A derivation $X' = (B', s')$ is called a *subderivation* of a derivation $X = (B, s)$, if $B' \subseteq B$ and $s' = s|_{B'}$ (i.e., s' is the function s , restricted to the domain B'). We use $X' \preceq X$ to denote the fact that X' is a subderivation of X .

A *complete* derivation, or a *play*, $X = (B, s)$, is by definition a derivation in which for all leaves $w \in \mathcal{L}_B$, $s(w) = \emptyset$. For a play $X = (B, s)$, and a node $w \in B$, we define the *subplay of X rooted at w* , to be the play $X^w = (B^w, s^w)$, where $B^w = \{w' \in \{l, r, u\}^* \mid ww' \in B\}$ and $s^w : B^w \rightarrow V \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is given by, $s^w(w') := s(ww')$ for all $w' \in B^w$.⁶ Consider any derivation $X = (B, s)$, and any node $w = w_1 \dots w_m \in B$, where $w_t \in \{l, r, u\}$ for all $t \in [m]$. We define the *ancestor history* of w to be a sequence $h_w \in V(\{l, r, u\} \times V)^*$, given by $h_w := s(\varepsilon)(w_1, s(w_1))(w_2, s(w_1w_2))(w_3, s(w_1w_2w_3)) \dots (w_m, s(w_1w_2 \dots w_m))$. In other words, the ancestor history h_w of node w specifies the sequence of moves that determine each ancestor of w (starting at ε and including w itself), and also specifies the sequence of non-terminals that label each ancestor of w .

For an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , a sequence $h \in V(\{l, r, u\} \times V)^*$ is called a *valid* ancestor history if there is some derivation $X = (B', s')$ of \mathcal{A} , and node $w \in B'$ such that $h = h_w$. We define the *current non-terminal* of such a valid ancestor history h to be $s'(w)$. In other words, it is the non-terminal that labels the last node of the ancestor history h . Let $\mathbf{current}(h)$ denote the current non-terminal of h . Let $H_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq V(\{l, r, u\} \times V)^*$ denote the set of all valid ancestor histories of \mathcal{A} . A valid ancestor history $h \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ is said to *belong to the controller*, if $\mathbf{current}(h)$ is a M-form (controlled) non-terminal. Let $H_{\mathcal{A}}^C$ denote the set of all valid ancestor histories of the OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , that belong to the controller.

For an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , a *strategy* for the controller is a function, $\sigma : H_{\mathcal{A}}^C \rightarrow \Delta(\Sigma)$ from the set of valid ancestor histories belonging to the controller, to probability distributions on actions, such that moreover for any $h \in H_{\mathcal{A}}^C$, if $\mathbf{current}(h) = T_i$, then $\sigma(h) \in \Delta(\Gamma^i)$. (In other words, the probability distribution must have support only on the actions available at the current non-terminal.) Note that the strategy can choose different distributions on actions at different occurrences of the same non-terminal in the derivation tree, even when these occurrences happen to be “siblings” in the tree.

Let Ψ be the set of all strategies. We say $\sigma \in \Psi$ is *deterministic* if for all $h \in H_{\mathcal{A}}^C$, $\sigma(h)$ puts probability 1 on a single action. We say $\sigma \in \Psi$ is *static* if for each M-form (controlled) non-

⁶To avoid confusion, note that subderivation and subplay have very different meanings. Saying derivation X is a “subderivation” of X' , means that in a sense X is a “prefix” of X' , as an ordered tree. Saying play X is a subplay of play X' , means X is a “suffix” of X' , more specifically X is a subtree rooted at a specific node of X' .

terminal T_i , there is some distribution $\delta_i \in \Delta(\Gamma^i)$, such that for any $h \in H_{\mathcal{A}}^C$ with $\mathbf{current}(h) = T_i$, $\sigma(h) = \delta_i$. In other words, a static strategy σ plays, for each M-form non-terminal T_i , exactly the same distribution on actions at every occurrence of T_i , regardless of the ancestor history.

For an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , fixing a start non-terminal T_i , and fixing a strategy σ for the controller, determines a stochastic process that generates a random play, as follows. The process generates a sequence of finite derivations, $X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots$, one for each “generation”, such that for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $X_t \preceq X_{t+1}$. $X_0 = (B_0, s_0)$ is the initial derivation, at generation 0, and consists of a single (root) node $B_0 = \{\varepsilon\}$, labeled by the start non-terminal, $s_0(\varepsilon) = T_i$.⁷ Inductively, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ the derivation $X_{t+1} = (B_{t+1}, s_{t+1})$ is obtained from $X_t = (B_t, s_t)$ as follows. For each leaf $w \in \mathcal{L}_{B_t}$:

- if $s_t(w) = T_i$ is a Q-form (branching) non-terminal, whose associated unique rule is $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_{j'}$, then w must have exactly two children in B_{t+1} , namely $wl \in B_{t+1}$ and $wr \in B_{t+1}$, and moreover we must have $s_{t+1}(wl) = T_j$ and $s_{t+1}(wr) = T_{j'}$.
- if $s_t(w) = T_i$ is a L-form (probabilistic) non-terminal, then w has exactly one child in B_{t+1} , namely wu , and for each rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,j}} T_j$ with $p_{i,j} > 0$, the probability that $s_{t+1}(wu) = T_j$ is $p_{i,j}$, and likewise when $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,0}} \emptyset$ is a rule with $p_{i,0} > 0$, then $s_{t+1}(wu) = \emptyset$ with probability $p_{i,0}$.
- if $s_t(w) = T_i$ is a M-form (controlled) non-terminal, then w has exactly one child in B_{t+1} , namely wu , and for each action $a_z \in \Gamma^i$, with probability $\sigma(h_w)(a_z)$, $s_{t+1}(wu) = T_{j_z}$, where $T_i \xrightarrow{a_z} T_{j_z}$ is the rule associated with a_z .

There are no other nodes in B_{t+1} . In particular, if $s_t(w) = \emptyset$, then in B_{t+1} the node w has no children. This defines a stochastic process, X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots , where $X_t \preceq X_{t+1}$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that there is a unique play, $X = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$, such that $X_t \preceq X$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. In this sense, the random process defines a probability space of plays.

For our purposes, an *objective* is specified by a property (i.e., a measurable set), \mathcal{F} , of plays, whose probability the player wishes to optimize (maximize or minimize). Different objectives can be considered for OBMDPs (and for their game extensions). In the *termination* objective, the player aims to maximize/minimize the probability that the process terminates, i.e., that the play is a finite tree. This was studied in [15] for purely stochastic OBPs, and in [14] (and [13]) for their MDP and (concurrent) stochastic game generalizations. Another objective is (single-target) *reachability*, where the goal is to optimize (maximize or minimize) the probability of the play containing a given target non-terminal, starting at a given non-terminal. This objective was studied in [10] (and [11]) for OBMDPs and their (concurrent) stochastic game generalizations.⁸

This paper considers the *multi-objective reachability problem*, which is a natural extension of the previously studied (single-target) reachability problem. In the multi-objective setting we have multiple target non-terminals, and we want to optimize each of the respective probabilities of achieving multiple given objectives, each one being a boolean combination of reachability and

⁷We can assume, without loss of generality, that the initial derivation consists of a single given root, because for any given collection $\mu \in V^*$ of multiple roots, we can always add an auxiliary non-terminal T_f to the set V , where $\Gamma^f = \{a\}$ and the set $R(T_f, a)$ contains a single probabilistic rule, $T_f \xrightarrow{1} \mu$.

⁸The models analysed in [10] and [11] are game generalizations of Branching Processes, but for the case of a single target computing reachability probabilities in Branching Processes is equivalent to computing reachability probabilities in Ordered Branching Processes (same holds for the MDP and game generalizations of these models).

non-reachability properties over different target non-terminals. Of course, there may be tradeoffs between optimizing the probabilities of achieving the different objectives.

To formalize things, we need some notation. Given a target non-terminal T_q , $q \in [n]$, let $Reach(T_q)$ denote the set of plays that contain some copy (some node) of non-terminal T_q . Respectively, let $Reach^c(T_q)$ denote the complement event, i.e., the set of plays that do *not* contain a node labelled by non-terminal T_q . For any measurable set (i.e., property) of plays, \mathcal{F} , and for any strategy σ for the player and a given start non-terminal T_i , we denote by $Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}]$ the probability that, starting at a non-terminal T_i and under strategy σ , the generated play is in the set \mathcal{F} . Let $Pr_{T_i}^*[\mathcal{F}] := \sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}]$.

The *quantitative* multi-objective decision problem for OBMDPs is the following problem. We are given an OBMDP, a starting non-terminal $T_s \in V$, a collection of objectives (properties) $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$ and corresponding probabilities p_1, \dots, p_k . The problem asks to decide whether there exists a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] \Delta_i p_i$ holds, where $\Delta_i \in \{<, \leq, =, \geq, >\}$. Observe that terms (i.e., probability queries $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] \Delta_i p_i$, for any $i \in [k]$) with $\Delta_i := \leq$ and $\Delta_i := \geq$ inequalities can be converted to asking whether either $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] = p_i$, or $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] < p_i$ (respectively, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] > p_i$). Moreover, we could in general allow for any boolean combination of terms (not just a conjunction). In any case, the whole query can be put into disjunctive normal form and the quantification over strategies can be pushed inside the disjunction. So any multi-objective question can eventually be transformed into a disjunction of finite number of (smaller) queries. (Note that, of course, this number can be exponential in the size of the original multi-objective question.) Hence, we can define a multi-objective decision problem only as a conjunction of equality and strict inequality queries.

One could also ask the *limit* version of this question. For instance, whether for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a strategy σ'_ϵ , such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i] \geq p_i - \epsilon$. Moreover, we can also ask quantitative questions regarding computing (or approximating) the *Pareto curve* for the multiple objectives, but we will not consider such questions in this paper.

The qualitative *almost-sure* multi-objective decision problems for OBMDPs are the special case where $p_i = \{0, 1\}$ for each $i \in [k]$. In other words, these problems are phrased as asking whether, starting at a given non-terminal $T_s \in V$, there exists a strategy $\sigma \in \Psi$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i] \Delta_i \{0, 1\}$ (where as mentioned $\Delta_i \in \{<, =, >\}$). We can simplify the expression by transforming each clause of the form $Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i] > 0$ and $Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i] = 0$ into $Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i^c] < 1$ and $Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i^c] = 1$, respectively, where each \mathcal{F}_i^c is the complement objective of \mathcal{F}_i .

Then, for a strategy $\sigma \in \Psi$ and a starting non-terminal $T_s \in V$, the expression can be rephrased as: $\bigwedge_{i \in [k_1]} Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i] < 1 \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [k_2]} Pr_{T_s}^\sigma[\mathcal{F}_i] = 1$, where $k_1 + k_2 = k$. And by Proposition 2.1(1.) below, the qualitative (almost-sure) multi-objective decision problem reduces to asking whether there exists a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k_1]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] < 1 \wedge Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k_2]} \mathcal{F}_i] = 1$.

The qualitative *limit-sure* multi-objective decision problem for OBMDPs asks to decide whether, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a strategy $\sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Again by Proposition 2.1(5.) below, it follows that the qualitative limit-sure multi-objective decision problem can be rephrased as asking whether, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a strategy $\sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

The following proposition shows scenarios where the qualitative multi-objective problem for OBMDPs can be rephrased as a qualitative single-objective problem, but with multiple targets!

Proposition 2.1. *Given an OBMDP, with a starting non-terminal $T_s \in V$ and a collection*

$\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$ of k objectives:

$$(1.) \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] = 1.$$

$$(2.) \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigvee_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] < 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] < 1.$$

$$(3.) \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] = 0.$$

$$(4.) \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigvee_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] > 0.$$

Moreover, in each of the equivalence statements (1.) - (4.), a witness strategy σ' for one of the sides is also a witness strategy for the other.

$$(5.) \text{ Similar equivalence holds for the qualitative limit-sure multi-objective problem: } \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi : Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

And from a witness strategy σ'_ϵ (for $\epsilon > 0$) for one of the two sides a witness strategy σ''_ϵ (for potentially different $\epsilon' > 0$) can be obtained for the other.

Proof.

(1.). For one direction of the statement, suppose there is a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi$ for the player such that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] = 1$, i.e., almost-surely all objectives are satisfied in the same generated play. It follows that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i^c] = 0$. Clearly, for each $i \in [k]$, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i^c] = 0$ and hence, for each $i \in [k]$: $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] = 1$.

Showing the other direction, suppose that there exists a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi$ for the player such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] = 1$. Then, $\forall i \in [k]$, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i^c] = 0$. By the union bound, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i^c] = 0$ and, hence, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] = 1$.

(2.). For one direction of the statement, suppose there is a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] < 1$. Then $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i^c] > 0$. Clearly, $\exists i' \in [k]$ such that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_{i'}^c] > 0$ (otherwise, by the union bound the probability of the union of the events is 0). Hence, $\bigvee_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_i] < 1$.

As for the other direction, suppose there is a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi$ and some $i' \in [k]$ such that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_{i'}] < 1$. Then $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] \leq Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'}[\mathcal{F}_{i'}] < 1$.

(3.) and (4.) follow directly from (1.) and (2.), respectively.

(5.). For one direction of the statement, suppose that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a strategy $\sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon$, i.e., limit-surely (with probability arbitrarily close to 1) all objectives are satisfied in the same generated play. It follows that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i^c] \leq \epsilon$. Clearly, for each $i \in [k]$, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i^c] \leq \epsilon$, and hence, for each $i \in [k]$: $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Showing the other direction, suppose that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a strategy $\sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi$ such that $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Then, for every $i \in [k]$, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\mathcal{F}_i^c] \leq \epsilon$. By the union bound, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcup_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i^c] \leq k\epsilon$, and hence, $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - k\epsilon$. So for any $\epsilon > 0$, let $\epsilon' := \epsilon/k$ and $\sigma_\epsilon := \sigma'_{\epsilon'}$, where $\sigma'_{\epsilon'}$ satisfies $\bigwedge_{i \in [k]} Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma'_{\epsilon'}}[\mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - \epsilon' = 1 - \epsilon/k$. Then it follows that $Pr_{T_s}^{\sigma_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{i \in [k]} \mathcal{F}_i] \geq 1 - k\epsilon' = 1 - \epsilon$. \square

In this paper, we address the qualitative (almost-sure and limit-sure) multi-objective reachability decision problems for OBMDPs. We are given a collection of *generalized* reachability objectives $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$, where each such generalized reachability objective $\mathcal{F}_i, i \in [k]$ represents a set of plays described by a boolean combination in CNF form over the sets (of plays) $Reach(T_q), T_q \in V$ and under the operators *union*, *intersection* and *complementation*. That is, each generalized reachability objective $\mathcal{F}_i, i \in [k]$ is of the form $\bigcap_{t \in [z_i]} (\bigcup_{t' \in [z_{i,t}]} \Phi(T_{q_{i,t,t'}}))$, where $\Phi \in \{Reach, Reach^c\}$, $T_{q_{i,t,t'}} \in V$ and the values $z_i, z_{i,t}$ are part of the objective \mathcal{F}_i .

We will show that, even in the case of having a single objective that asks to reach multiple target non-terminals from a given set in the same play, the almost-sure and limit-sure questions do not coincide and we give separate algorithms for detecting almost-sure and limit-sure multi-target reachability. (Recall from the related work section, that in the case of a single target the almost-sure and limit-sure questions are equivalent.) The following example indeed illustrates that there are OBMDPs where, even though the supremum probability of reaching all target non-terminals from a given set in the same play is 1, there may not exist a strategy for the player that actually achieves probability exactly 1.

Example 1 Consider the following OBMDP with non-terminals $\{M, A, R_1, R_2\}$, where R_1 and R_2 are the target non-terminal. M is the only “controlled” non-terminal, and the rules are:

$$\begin{array}{ll} M \xrightarrow{a} MA & A \xrightarrow{1/2} R_1 \\ M \xrightarrow{b} R_2 & A \xrightarrow{1/2} \emptyset \end{array}$$

The supremum probability, $Pr_M^*[Reach(R_1) \cap Reach(R_2)]$, starting at a non-terminal M , of reaching both targets is 1. To see this, for any $\epsilon > 0$, let the strategy keep choosing deterministically action a until $l := \lceil \log_2(\frac{1}{\epsilon}) \rceil$ copies of non-terminal A have been created, i.e., until the play reaches generation l . Then in the (unique) copy of non-terminal M in generation l the strategy switches deterministically to action b . The probability of reaching target R_2 is 1. The probability of reaching target R_1 is $1 - 2^{-l} \geq 1 - \epsilon$. The player can delay arbitrarily long the moment when to switch from choosing action a to choosing action b for a non-terminal M . Hence, $Pr_M^*[Reach(R_1) \cap Reach(R_2)] = 1$.

However, $\nexists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_M^\sigma[Reach(R_1) \cap Reach(R_2)] = 1$. To see this, note that if the strategy ever puts a positive probability on action b in any “round”, then with a positive probability target R_1 will not be reached in the play. So, to reach target R_1 with probability 1, the strategy must deterministically choose action a forever, from every occurrence of non-terminal M . But if it does this the probability of reaching target R_2 would be 0. \square

The following proposition is easy to prove (similar to analogous propositions in [10, 11]) and shows that we can always efficiently convert an OBMDP into its SNF form (Definition 2).

Proposition 2.2. *Every OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , can be converted in P-time to an “equivalent” OBMDP, \mathcal{A}' , in SNF form, such that $|\mathcal{A}'| \in O(|\mathcal{A}|)$. More precisely, the non-terminals $V = \{T_i \mid i \in [n]\}$ of \mathcal{A} are a subset of the non-terminals of \mathcal{A}' , and any strategy σ of \mathcal{A} can be converted to a strategy σ' of \mathcal{A}' (and vice versa), such that starting at any non-terminal $T_s \in V$, and for any generalized reachability objective \mathcal{F} , using the strategies σ and σ' in \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' , respectively, the probability that the resulting play is in the set of plays, \mathcal{F} , is the same in both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' .*

Proof. For a rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_r} s_r$, $s_r \in V^*$ in \mathcal{A} and a non-terminal T_j , let $m_{r,j} := |\{d \mid (s_r)_d = T_j, 1 \leq d \leq |s_r|\}|$ be the number of copies of T_j in string s_r . We use the following procedure to convert, in P-time, any OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , into its SNF-form OBMDP, \mathcal{A}' .

1. Initialize \mathcal{A}' by adding all the non-terminals $T_i \in V$ from \mathcal{A} and their corresponding action sets Γ^i .
2. For each non-terminal T_i , such that $m_{r,i} > 1$ for some non-terminal T_j , action $a \in \Gamma^j$ and rule $r \in (T_j, a)$ from \mathcal{A} , create new non-terminals T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_z} in \mathcal{A}' where $z = \lfloor \log_2(\max_{r \in R} \{m_{r,i}\}) \rfloor$. Then add the rules $T_{i_1} \xrightarrow{1} T_i T_i$, $T_{i_2} \xrightarrow{1} T_{i_1} T_{i_1}$, \dots , $T_{i_z} \xrightarrow{1} T_{i_{z-1}} T_{i_{z-1}}$ to \mathcal{A}' . For every rule $r \in R$ in OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , where $m_{r,i} > 1$, if the binary representation of $m_{r,i}$ is $l_z \dots l_2 l_1 l_0$, then we remove all copies of T_i in string s_r (i.e., the right-hand side of rule r) and add a copy of non-terminal T_{i_t} to string s_r if bit $l_t = 1$, for every $0 \leq t \leq [z]$. After this step, for every rule $r \in R$, the string s_r consists of at most one copy of any non-terminal.
3. For each non-terminal T_i , for each action $a_d \in \Gamma^i$, create a new non-terminal T_d in \mathcal{A}' and add the rule $T_i \xrightarrow{a_d} T_d$ to \mathcal{A}' .
4. Next, for each such new non-terminal T_d from point 3., for each rule r from set $R(T_i, a_d)$ in \mathcal{A} : if $s_r = \emptyset$ (i.e., the set of offsprings under rule r is empty), then add the rule $T_d \xrightarrow{p_r} \emptyset$ to \mathcal{A}' ; if the set of offsprings consists of a single copy of some non-terminal T_j , then add the rule $T_d \xrightarrow{p_r} T_j$ to \mathcal{A}' ; and if the set of offsprings is larger and s_r does not have an associated non-terminal already, then create a new non-terminal T_{d_r} , associated with string s_r , in \mathcal{A}' and add the rule $T_d \xrightarrow{p_r} T_{d_r}$ to \mathcal{A}' .
5. Next, for each such new non-terminal T_{d_r} , associated with $s_r, r \in R(T_i, a_d)$, where s_r has $m \geq 2$ non-terminals T_{j_1}, \dots, T_{j_m} : if $m = 2$, add rule $T_{d_r} \xrightarrow{1} T_{j_1} T_{j_2}$ to \mathcal{A}' ; and if $m > 2$, create $m - 2$ new non-terminals $T_{l_1}, \dots, T_{l_{m-2}}$ in \mathcal{A}' and add the rules $T_{d_r} \xrightarrow{1} T_{j_1} T_{l_1}$, $T_{l_1} \xrightarrow{1} T_{j_2} T_{l_2}$, $T_{l_2} \xrightarrow{1} T_{j_3} T_{l_3}$, \dots , $T_{l_{m-2}} \xrightarrow{1} T_{j_{m-1}} T_{j_m}$ to \mathcal{A}' .

Now all non-terminals are of form L, Q or M.

The above procedure converts any OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , into one in SNF form by introducing $O(|\mathcal{A}|)$ new non-terminals and blowing up the size of \mathcal{A} by a constant factor $O(1)$. Moreover, any strategy σ of the original OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , can be converted to a strategy σ' of the SNF-form OBMDP, \mathcal{A}' (and vice versa), such that, under strategies σ and σ' in \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' , respectively, the probability that the resulting play is in the set of plays of a given generalized reachability objective \mathcal{F} is the same in both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}' . \square

From now on, throughout the rest of the paper *we may assume, without loss of generality, that any OBMDP is in SNF form*. We shall hereafter use the notation $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ (respectively, $T_i \not\rightarrow T_j$), to denote that for non-terminal T_i there *exists* (respectively, there does *not* exist) either an associated (controlled) rule $T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j$, where $a \in \Gamma^i$, or an associated probabilistic rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,j}} T_j$ with a positive probability $p_{i,j} > 0$. Similarly, let $T_i \rightarrow \emptyset$ (respectively, $T_i \not\rightarrow \emptyset$) denote that the rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{i,0}} \emptyset$ has a positive probability $p_{i,0} > 0$ (respectively, has probability $p_{i,0} = 0$).

Definition 3. *The **dependency graph** of a SNF-form OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , is a directed graph that has a node T_i for each non-terminal T_i , and contains an edge (T_i, T_j) if and only if: either $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ or there is a rule $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$ or a rule $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_r T_j$ in \mathcal{A} .*

Throughout this paper, for (SNF-form) OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , with non-terminals set V , we let $G = (U, E)$, with $U = V$, denote the dependency graph of \mathcal{A} and let $G[C]$ denote the subgraph of G induced by the subset $C \subseteq U$ of nodes (non-terminals).

Sometimes when the specific OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , is not clear from the context, we use \mathcal{A} as superscript to specify the OBMDP in our notations. So, for instance, $\Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$ is the set of all strategies for \mathcal{A} ; $G^{\mathcal{A}}$ is the dependency graph of \mathcal{A} ; and $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\mathcal{F}]$ is the probability of event \mathcal{F} , starting at a non-terminal T_i , under strategy σ , in \mathcal{A} .

We also extend the notation regarding probabilities of properties to “start” at a given ancestor history. That is, for an ancestor history h , we use $Pr_h^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\mathcal{F}]$ to denote the conditional probability that, using $\sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$, conditioned on the event that there is a node in the play whose ancestor history is h , the *subplay* rooted at $\mathbf{current}(h)$, is in the set \mathcal{F} . Whenever we use the notation $Pr_h^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\mathcal{F}]$, the underlying conditional probability will be well defined. Again, the superscript \mathcal{A} will be omitted when clear from context.

Note that one ancestor history h can be a prefix of another ancestor history. We use the notation $h' := h(x, T_i)$, for some $x \in \{l, r, u\}$, to denote that h is the immediately prior ancestor history to h' , which is obtained by concatenating the pair (x, T_i) at the end of h .

Definition 4. For a directed graph $G = (U, E)$, and a partition of its vertices $U = (U_1, U_P)$, an **end-component** is a set of vertices $C \subseteq U$ such that $G[C]$: (1) is strongly connected; (2) for all $u \in U_P \cap C$ and all $(u, u') \in E$, $u' \in C$; (3) and if $C = \{u\}$ (i.e., $|C| = 1$), then $(u, u) \in E$. A **maximal end-component (MEC)** is an end-component not contained in any larger end-component. A **MEC-decomposition** is a partition of the graph into MECs and nodes that do not belong to any MEC.

MECs are disjoint and the unique MEC-decomposition of such a directed graph G (with partitioned nodes) can be computed in P-time ([6]).⁹ More recent work provides more efficient algorithms for MEC-decomposition (see [3]). We will also be using the notion of a strongly connected component (SCC), which can be defined as a MEC where condition (2) from Definition 4 above is not required. It is also well-known that an SCC-decomposition of a directed graph can be done in linear time.

For our setting here, given a SNF-form OBMDP with its dependency graph $G = (U, E)$, $U = V$, the partition of U that we will use is the following: $U_P := \{T_i \in U \mid T_i \text{ is of L-form}\}$ and $U_1 := \{T_i \in U \mid T_i \text{ is of M-form or Q-form}\}$.

Before we continue with the algorithms, let us observe that the qualitative multi-target reachability problems are in general NP-hard (coNP-hard), if the size of the set K of target non-terminals is not bounded by a fixed constant.

Proposition 2.3.

- (1.) The following two problems are both NP-hard: given an OBMDP, a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of target non-terminals and a starting non-terminal $T_i \in V$, decide whether: (i) $\exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1$, and (ii) $Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1$.
- (2.) The following problem is coNP-hard: given an OBP (i.e., an OBMDP with no controlled non-terminals, and hence with only one trivial strategy σ), a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of target non-terminals and a starting non-terminal $T_i \in V$, decide whether $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 0$.

⁹In [6], maximal end-components are referred to as *closed components*.

Proof. For (1.) we reduce from 3-SAT, and for (2.) from the complement problem (i.e., deciding unsatisfiability of a 3-CNF formula). The reductions are nearly identical, so we describe them both together. Consider a 3-CNF formula over variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$:

$$\bigwedge_{q \in [m]} (l_{q,1} \vee l_{q,2} \vee l_{q,3})$$

where every $l_{q,j}$ is either x_r or $\neg x_r$ for some $r \in [n]$. We construct an OBMDP as follows: to each clause $q \in [m]$ we associate a target non-terminal R_q with a single associated rule $R_q \xrightarrow{1} \emptyset$; for each variable $x_r, r \in [n]$, we associate two purely probabilistic non-terminals T_{r_a}, T_{r_b} , and

- for (1.), a controlled non-terminal C_r with rules $C_r \xrightarrow{a} T_{r_a}$ and $C_r \xrightarrow{b} T_{r_b}$, or
- for (2.), a probabilistic non-terminal C_r with rules $C_r \xrightarrow{1/2} T_{r_a}$ and $C_r \xrightarrow{1/2} T_{r_b}$.

For each non-terminal $T_{r_a}, r \in [n]$ we would in principle like to create a single rule, with probability 1, whose RHS consists of the following non-terminals (in any order): $\{R_q \mid \exists j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ s.t. } l_{q,j} = x_r\}$, as well as the non-terminal C_{r+1} if $r < n$; likewise, for each non-terminal $T_{r_b}, r \in [n]$, we would like to create a single rule, with probability 1, whose RHS consists of $\{R_q \mid \exists j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ s.t. } l_{q,j} = \neg x_r\}$, as well as C_{r+1} if $r < n$.

However, due to the simple normal form we have adopted in our definition of OBMDPs, such rules need to be “expanded” (as shown in Proposition 2.2) into a sequence of rules whose RHS has length ≤ 2 , using auxiliary non-terminals. So, for example, instead of a single rule of the form $T_{1_b} \xrightarrow{1} R_2 R_3 R_4 C_2$, we will have the following rules (using auxiliary non-terminals $T_{1_b}^j$): $T_{1_b} \xrightarrow{1} T_{1_b}^1 C_2$, $T_{1_b}^1 \xrightarrow{1} T_{1_b}^2 R_2$, and $T_{1_b}^2 \xrightarrow{1} R_3 R_4$. See Figure 1 for an example.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
C_1 \xrightarrow{a} T_{1_a} & T_{1_a} \xrightarrow{1} R_1 C_2 & C_2 \xrightarrow{a} T_{2_a} & T_{2_a} \xrightarrow{1} T_{2_a}^1 C_3 & C_3 \xrightarrow{a} T_{3_a} & T_{3_a} \xrightarrow{1} R_1 R_3 \\
C_1 \xrightarrow{b} T_{1_b} & T_{1_b} \xrightarrow{1} T_{1_b}^1 C_2 & C_2 \xrightarrow{b} T_{2_b} & T_{2_a}^1 \xrightarrow{1} R_2 R_3 & C_3 \xrightarrow{b} T_{3_b} & T_{3_b} \xrightarrow{1} R_2 R_4 \\
& T_{1_b}^1 \xrightarrow{1} T_{1_b}^2 R_2 & & T_{2_b} \xrightarrow{1} T_{2_b}^1 C_3 & & \\
& T_{1_b}^2 \xrightarrow{1} R_3 R_4 & & T_{2_b}^1 \xrightarrow{1} R_1 R_4 & &
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: Reduction example: an OBMDP obtained from the 3-SAT formula $(x_1 \vee \neg x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \neg x_3) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee \neg x_2 \vee \neg x_3)$. This construction is for problem (1.); the construction for problem (2.) is very similar, with the controlled non-terminals $C_r, r \in [n]$ changed to purely probabilistic non-terminals instead (with 1/2 probability on each of their two rules).

This reduction closely resembles a well-known reduction ([21, Theorem 3.5]) for NP-hardness of model checking eventuality formulas in linear temporal logic. The immediate children of the branching non-terminals T_{r_a} and T_{r_b} keep track of which clauses are satisfied under each of the two truth assignments to the variable x_r (‘true’ corresponds to T_{r_a} , and ‘false’ corresponds to T_{r_b}). In fact, for the OBMDP obtained for problem (1.), there is a one-to-one correspondence between truth assignments to all variables of the formula and deterministic static strategies.

It follows that, for the OBMDP in statement (1.), if there exists a satisfying truth assignment for the formula, then starting at non-terminal C_1 , there exists a (deterministic and static) strategy σ' for the player such that $Pr_{C_1}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{q \in [m]} Reach(R_q)] = 1$.

Otherwise, if the formula is unsatisfiable, then we claim that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{C_1}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in [m]} Reach(R_q)] = 0$. (And hence, that $Pr_{C_1}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{q \in [m]} Reach(R_q)] = 0 < 1$.) To see this, note that an arbitrary (possibly randomized, and not necessarily static) strategy in the constructed OBMDP corresponds to a (possibly correlated) probability distribution on assignments of truth values to the variables in the corresponding formula. (The distribution may be correlated, because the strategy may be non-static, but this doesn't matter.) So if the formula is unsatisfiable, then under any strategy for the player (i.e., any probability distribution on assignments of truth values), there is probability 0 that the generated play tree contains all target non-terminals (respectively, that the random truth assignment satisfies all clauses in the formula).

For the OBP obtained for problem (2.), it follows from the same arguments that the formula is unsatisfiable if and only if $Pr_{C_1}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in [m]} Reach(R_q)] = 0$ (where σ is just the trivial strategy, since there are no controlled non-terminals in the OBP obtained for (2.)). \square

3 Algorithm for deciding $\max_{\sigma} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] \stackrel{?}{=} 0$

In this section we present an algorithm that, given an OBMDP and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, computes, for every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$, the set $Z_{K'} \subseteq V$ of non-terminals such that, starting at a non-terminal $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, using any strategy σ , the probability that the generated play contains a copy of every non-terminal in K' is 0. In other words, the algorithm (Figure 2) computes, $\forall K' \subseteq K$, the set $Z_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0\}$. The algorithm uses as a preprocessing step an algorithm from [10, Proposition 4.1]. Namely, let us denote by W_q the set $\{T_q\} \cup \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] > 0\}$. We can compute, for each $q \in K$, the set W_q in P-time using the algorithm from [10, Proposition 4.1], together with a single deterministic static witness strategy for every non-terminal in W_q . Let K'_{-i} denote the set $K' - \{i\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *The algorithm in Figure 2 computes, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, for every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$, the set $Z_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0\}$. The algorithm runs in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$. The algorithm can also be augmented to compute a deterministic (non-static) strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$ and a rational value $b_{K'} > 0$, such that for all $T_i \notin Z_{K'}$, $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'} > 0$.*

Proof. The running time of the algorithm follows from the facts that step II. executes for 2^k iterations and inside each iteration, step II.1. requires time at most $2^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$ and the loop at step II.2. executes in time at most $|\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$.

We need to prove that for every $K' \subseteq K : T_i \in Z_{K'}$ if and only if $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^c(T_q)] = 1$ (or equivalently, that $T_i \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$ if and only if $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] > 0$). We in fact show that there is a value $b_{K'} > 0$ and a strategy $\sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi$ such that $T_i \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$ if and only if $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'}$. We analyse this by a double induction with the top-layer induction based on the size of set K' , or in other words the time of constructing set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$. Clearly for the base case (step I.) of a single target

- I. Initialize $\bar{Z}_{\{q\}} := W_q$, for each $q \in K$. Let $\bar{Z}_\emptyset := V$.
- II. For $l = 2 \dots k$:
 - For every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$ of size $|K'| = l$:
 1. Initialize $\bar{Z}_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid \text{one of the following holds:}\}$
 - T_i is of L-form where $i \in K'$ and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'_{-i}}$.
 - T_i is of M-form where $i \in K'$ and $\exists a' \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a'} T_j$, $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'_{-i}}$.
 - T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where $i \in K'$ and $\exists K_L \subseteq K'_{-i} : T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{K'_{-i}-K_L}$.
 - T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $\exists K_L \subset K' (K_L \neq \emptyset) : T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{K'-K_L}$.
 2. Repeat until no change has occurred to $\bar{Z}_{K'}$:
 - (a) add $T_i \notin \bar{Z}_{K'}$ to $\bar{Z}_{K'}$, if of L-form and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$.
 - (b) add $T_i \notin \bar{Z}_{K'}$ to $\bar{Z}_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\exists a' \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a'} T_j$, $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$.
 - (c) add $T_i \notin \bar{Z}_{K'}$ to $\bar{Z}_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'} \vee T_r \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$.
 3. $Z_{K'} := V - \bar{Z}_{K'}$.

Figure 2: Algorithm for computing set $\{T_i \in V \mid \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0\}$ for every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$ in a given OBMDP.

non-terminal $T_q, q \in K$, by the P-time algorithm from [10, Proposition 4.1], there is a (deterministic static) strategy $\sigma'_{\{q\}}$ for the player and a value $b_{\{q\}} > 0$ where $T_i \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$ if and only if $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{\{q\}}}[Reach^{\mathbb{L}}(T_q)] \leq 1 - b_{\{q\}} < 1 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{\{q\}}}[Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{\{q\}} > 0$. Now, constructing set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ for a subset $K' \subseteq K$ of target non-terminals of size l , assume that for each $K'' \subset K'$ of size $\leq l - 1$, there is a strategy $\sigma'_{K''}$ for the player and a value $b_{K''} > 0$ such that for all $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K''}$, $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K''}}[\bigcup_{q \in K''} Reach^{\mathbb{L}}(T_q)] \leq 1 - b_{K''} < 1 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K''}}[\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K''} > 0$. And for all $T_j \in Z_{K''}$, it holds that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] = 0$.

First, let us prove the direction where if $T_i \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$, then $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{L}}(T_q)] \leq 1 - b_{K'} < 1 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'} > 0$, for some value $b_{K'} > 0$. We use a second (nested) induction, based on the iteration in which non-terminal T_i was added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$. Consider the base case where T_i is a non-terminal added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ at the initialization step II.1.

- (i) Suppose T_i is of L-form where $i \in K'$ (i.e., T_i is a target non-terminal in set K') and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'_{-i}}$, where $\exists \sigma'_{K'_{-i}} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'_{-i}}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'_{-i}}$, for some value $b_{K'_{-i}} > 0$. Due to the fact that the play up to (and including) a copy of non-terminal $T_i, i \in K'$ has already reached the target T_i and using strategy $\sigma'_{K'_{-i}}$ from the next generation as if the play starts in it, it follows that there exists a strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$ such that, for an ancestor history

$h := T_i(u, T_j)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q) \mid Reach(T_i) \right] \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} \left[Reach(T_i) \right] \\
&= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q) \right] \geq p_{ij} \cdot Pr_h^{\sigma'_{K'}} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q) \right] \\
&= p_{ij} \cdot Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'_{-i}}} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q) \right] \geq p_{ij} \cdot b_{K'_{-i}} > 0
\end{aligned}$$

where $p_{ij} > 0$ is the probability of the rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{ij}} T_j$. So let $b_{K'}^i := p_{ij} \cdot b_{K'_{-i}}$.

- (ii) Suppose T_i is of M-form where $i \in K'$ and $\exists a' \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a'} T_j, T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'_{-i}}$. Again let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. By combining the witness strategy $\sigma'_{K'_{-i}}$ from the induction assumption for a starting non-terminal T_j with the initial local choice of choosing deterministically action a' starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain a combined strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$, such that starting at a (target) non-terminal T_i , we satisfy $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'_{-i}}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'_{-i}} > 0$. So let $b_{K'}^i := b_{K'_{-i}}$.
- (iii) Suppose T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$) and there exists a proper split of the target non-terminals from K' , implied by $K_L \subset K'$ (where $K_L \neq \emptyset$) and $K' - K_L$, such that $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{K' - K_L}$. So, by the inductive assumption, $\exists \sigma'_{K_L} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K_L}} [\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K_L} > 0$ and $\exists \sigma'_{K' - K_L} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'_{K' - K_L}} [\bigcap_{q \in K' - K_L} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K' - K_L} > 0$, for some values $b_{K_L}, b_{K' - K_L} > 0$. Let $h_l := T_i(l, T_j)$ and $h_r := T_i(r, T_r)$. Hence, by combining the two strategies σ'_{K_L} and $\sigma'_{K' - K_L}$ to be used from the next generation from the left and right child, respectively, as if the play starts in them, it follows that $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq Pr_{h_l}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K' - K_L} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K_L}} [\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'_{K' - K_L}} [\bigcap_{q \in K' - K_L} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K_L} \cdot b_{K' - K_L} > 0$, and so let $b_{K'}^i := b_{K_L} \cdot b_{K' - K_L}$.
- (iv) Suppose T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$) where $i \in K'$ and there exists a split of the target non-terminals from set K'_{-i} , implied by $K_L \subseteq K'_{-i}$ and $K'_{-i} - K_L$, such that $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{K'_{-i} - K_L}$. Combining in the same way as in (iii) above the two witness strategies from the induction assumption for non-terminals T_j and T_r , and the fact that the play starts in the target non-terminal $T_i, i \in K'$, it follows that $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i}} Reach(T_q)] \geq Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K_L}} [\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'_{K'_{-i} - K_L}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_{-i} - K_L} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K_L} \cdot b_{K'_{-i} - K_L} > 0$, and so let $b_{K'}^i := b_{K_L} \cdot b_{K'_{-i} - K_L}$.

Now consider the inductive step of the nested induction, i.e., non-terminals T_i added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ at step II.2. If T_i is of L-form, then for a non-terminal T_i there is a positive probability

of generating a child of a non-terminal $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$, for which we already know that $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'}^j > 0$. Let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. Using the strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$ in the next generation as if the play starts in it, we get an augmented strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$, such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq p_{ij} \cdot Pr_h^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = p_{ij} \cdot Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq p_{ij} \cdot b_{K'}^j > 0$, where $p_{ij} > 0$ is the probability of the rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{ij}} T_j$. Let $b_{K'}^i := p_{ij} \cdot b_{K'}^j$.

If type T_i is of M-form, then $\exists a' \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a'} T_j$, $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$, where $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'}^j > 0$. Again let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. Hence, by combining the witness strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$ for a starting non-terminal T_j (from the nested induction assumption) with the initial local choice of choosing deterministically action a' starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain an augmented strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$ for a starting non-terminal T_i , such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{K'}^j > 0$, where let $b_{K'}^i := b_{K'}^j$.

If type T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'} \vee T_r \in \bar{Z}_{K'}$, and so $\exists \sigma'_{K'} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq 1 - b_{K'}^y < 1$, where $y \in \{j, r\}$. Let $h_y := T_i(x, T_y)$ and $h_{\bar{y}} := T_i(\bar{x}, T_{\bar{y}})$, where $\bar{y} \in \{j, r\} - \{y\}$, $x \in \{l, r\}$ and $\bar{x} \in \{l, r\} - \{x\}$. By augmenting this $\sigma'_{K'}$ to be used from the next generation from the child of non-terminal T_y as if the play starts in it and using an arbitrary strategy from the child of non-terminal $T_{\bar{y}}$, it holds that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{h_y}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_{\bar{y}}}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma'_{K'}} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq 1 - b_{K'}^y < 1$, where let $b_{K'}^i := b_{K'}^y$.

Finally, let $b_{K'} := \min_{T_i \in \bar{Z}_{K'}} \{b_{K'}^i\}$.

Clearly, the constructed non-static strategy $\sigma'_{K'}$ can be described in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$.

Secondly, let us show the opposite direction, i.e., where if non-terminal $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, then $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0$. For all non-terminals $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, for a copy of non-terminal T_i in the play, it holds that: if T_i is of L-form, only a child of a non-terminal in $Z_{K'}$ can be generated; if T_i is of M-form, regardless of player's choice on actions Γ^i , similarly only a child of a non-terminal in $Z_{K'}$ is generated as an offspring; if T_i is of Q-form, both children have non-terminals belonging to $Z_{K'}$. This is due to non-terminals not being added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ at step II.2.

Fix an arbitrary strategy σ for the player. Then starting at a non-terminal $T_i \in Z_{K'}$ and under σ , the generated tree can contain only copies of non-terminals in set $Z_{K'}$, i.e., the play stays confined to non-terminals from set $Z_{K'}$ (note that the play may terminate). What is more, there is *no* Q-form non-terminal T_i in $Z_{K'}$ (whether T_i is a target from K' or not) such that non-terminal T_i splits the job, of reaching the target non-terminals from set K' , amongst its two children. In other words, for each Q-form non-terminal $T_i \in Z_{K'}$ (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), $\forall K_L \subset K'$ (where $K_L \neq \emptyset$): $T_j \in Z_{K_L} \vee T_r \in Z_{K' - K_L}$; and if T_i happens to be a target non-terminal itself from set K' (i.e., $i \in K'$), then $\forall K_L \subseteq K'_{-i} : T_j \in Z_{K_L} \vee T_r \in Z_{K'_{-i} - K_L}$ (this is due to non-terminal T_i not added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ at step II.1.). So the only possibility, under σ and starting at some non-terminal $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, to generate with a positive probability a tree (play) that contains copies of all targets from set K' , is (1) if all target non-terminals from K' were never added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ and, thus, belong to set $Z_{K'}$, and (2) if it is, in fact, some path w (starting at the root) in the generated tree that contains copies of all the target non-terminals from set K' . Consider such a path w and the very first copy o of

any of the target non-terminals $T_q, q \in K'$ along path w . Let o be of a L-form target non-terminal T_v , let o' be the successor child of o along the path w (say of some non-terminal T_j), and let h be an ancestor history that follows along path w up until (and including) o' and ends in o' (i.e., $\text{current}(h) = T_j$). Then it follows that $Pr_h^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'_v} \text{Reach}(T_q)] > 0$. But it is easy to see that

from σ one can easily construct a strategy $\sigma'_{K'_v}$ such that $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_{K'_v}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_v} \text{Reach}(T_q)] > 0$, i.e., $T_j \in \bar{Z}_{K'_v}$. But this contradicts the fact that the L-form non-terminal T_v hasn't been added to set $\bar{Z}_{K'}$ at step II.1. Similarly follows the argument for if T_v is of M-form or Q-form.

So for all non-terminals $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, regardless of strategy σ for the player, there is a zero probability of generating a tree that contains all target non-terminals from set K' (i.e., $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 0$). That concludes the proof. \square

4 Algorithm for deciding $Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] \stackrel{?}{=} 1$

In this section we present an algorithm for deciding, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals and a starting non-terminal T_i , whether $Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] := \sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1$, i.e., the optimal probability of generating a play (tree) that contains all target non-terminals from set K is $= 1$. Recall, from Example 1, that there need not be a strategy for the player that achieves probability exactly 1, which is the question in the next section (almost-sure multi-target reachability). However, there may nevertheless be a sequence of strategies that achieve probabilities arbitrarily close to 1 (limit-sure multi-target reachability), and the question of the existence of such a sequence is what we address in this section. In other words, we are asking whether there exists a sequence of strategies $\langle \sigma_{\epsilon_j}^* \mid j \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ such that $\forall j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\epsilon_j > \epsilon_{j+1} > 0$ (i.e., $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_j = 0$) and $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{\epsilon_j}^*}[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon_j$. The algorithm runs in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$, and hence is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to k .

First, as a preprocessing step, for each subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$, we compute the set $Z_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 0\}$, using the algorithm from Proposition 3.1. Let also denote by AS_q , for every $q \in K$, the set of non-terminals T_j (including the target non-terminal T_q itself) for which $Pr_{T_j}^*[\text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1$. These sets can be computed in P-time by applying the algorithm from [10, Theorem 9.3] to each target non-terminal T_q , $q \in K$. Recall that it was shown in [10] that for OBMDPs with a single target the almost-sure and limit-sure reachability problems coincide. So in fact, for every $q \in K$, there exists a strategy τ_q such that for every $T_j \in AS_q : Pr_{T_j}^{\tau_q}[\text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1$.

After this preprocessing step, we apply the algorithm in Figure 3 to identify the non-terminals T_i for which $Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1$. Again let K'_i denote the set $K' - \{i\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *The algorithm in Figure 3 computes, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, for each subset $K' \subseteq K$, the set of non-terminals $F_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q)] = 1\}$. The algorithm runs in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$. Moreover, for each $K' \subseteq K$, given $\epsilon > 0$, the algorithm can also be augmented to compute a randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all non-terminals $T_i \in F_{K'}$.*

Proof. We will refer to the loop executing steps II.5. through II.10. for a specific subset $K' \subseteq K$ as the “inner” loop and the iteration through all subsets of K as the “outer” loop. Clearly the

- I. Let $F_{\{q\}} := AS_q$, for each $q \in K$. $F_\emptyset := V$.
- II. For $l = 2 \dots k$:
 - For every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$ of size $|K'| = l$:
 1. $D_{K'} := \{T_i \in V - Z_{K'} \mid \text{one of the following holds:}$
 - T_i is of L-form where $i \in K'$, $T_i \not\rightarrow \emptyset$ and $\forall T_j \in V$: if $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, then $T_j \in F_{K'_i}$.
 - T_i is of M-form where $i \in K'$ and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'_i}$.
 - T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where $i \in K'$ and $\exists K_L \subseteq K'_i : T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K'_i - K_L}$.
 - T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where $\exists K_L \subset K'$ ($K_L \neq \emptyset$): $T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K' - K_L}$.
 2. Repeat until no change has occurred to $D_{K'}$:
 - (a) add $T_i \notin D_{K'}$ to $D_{K'}$, if of L-form, $T_i \not\rightarrow \emptyset$ and $\forall T_j \in V$: if $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, then $T_j \in D_{K'}$.
 - (b) add $T_i \notin D_{K'}$ to $D_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in D_{K'}$.
 - (c) add $T_i \notin D_{K'}$ to $D_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in D_{K'} \vee T_r \in D_{K'}$.
 3. Let $X := V - (D_{K'} \cup Z_{K'})$.
 4. Initialize $S_{K'} := \{T_i \in X \mid \text{either } i \in K', \text{ or } T_i \text{ is of L-form and } T_i \rightarrow \emptyset \vee T_i \rightarrow T_j, T_j \in Z_{K'}\} \cup \bigcup_{\emptyset \subset K'' \subset K'} (X \cap S_{K''})$.
 5. Repeat until no change has occurred to $S_{K'}$:
 - (a) add $T_i \in X - S_{K'}$ to $S_{K'}$, if of L-form and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$.
 - (b) add $T_i \in X - S_{K'}$ to $S_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$.
 - (c) add $T_i \in X - S_{K'}$ to $S_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'} \wedge T_r \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$.
 6. $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow$ MEC decomposition of $G[X - S_{K'}]$.
 7. For every $q \in K'$, let $H_q := \{T_i \in X - S_{K'} \mid T_i \text{ is of Q-form } (T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r) \text{ and } ((T_j \in X - S_{K'} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}) \vee (T_j \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}} \wedge T_r \in X - S_{K'}))\}$.
 8. Let $F_{K'} := \bigcup \{C \in \mathcal{C} \mid P_C = K' \vee (P_C \neq \emptyset \wedge P_C \neq K' \wedge \exists T_i \in C, \exists a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j, T_j \in F_{K' - P_C})\}$, where $P_C = \{q \in K' \mid C \cap H_q \neq \emptyset\}$.
 9. Repeat until no change has occurred to $F_{K'}$:
 - (a) add $T_i \in X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'})$ to $F_{K'}$, if of L-form and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$.
 - (b) add $T_i \in X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'})$ to $F_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'}$.
 - (c) add $T_i \in X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'})$ to $F_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in F_{K'} \vee T_r \in F_{K'}$.
 10. If $X \neq S_{K'} \cup F_{K'}$, let $S_{K'} := X - F_{K'}$ and go to step 5.
 11. Else, i.e., if $X = S_{K'} \cup F_{K'}$, let $F_{K'} := F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$.

III. Output F_K .

Figure 3: Algorithm for limit-sure multi-target reachability. The output is the set $F_K = \{T_i \in V \mid Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] = 1\}$.

inner loop terminates, due to step II.10. always adding at least one non-terminal to set $S_{K'}$ and step II.11. eventually executing. The running time of the algorithm follows from the facts that the outer loop executes for 2^k iterations and inside each iteration of the outer loop, steps II.1. and II.4. require time at most $2^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$ and the inner loop executes for at most $|V|$ iterations, where during each inner loop iteration the nested loops execute in time at most $|\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$.

For the proof of correctness, we show that for every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$, $F_{K'}$ (from the decomposition $V = F_{K'} \cup S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$) is the set of non-terminals T_i for which the following property holds:

$$(A)_{K'}^i: \sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^* [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1, \text{ i.e., } \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \sigma_{K'}^\epsilon, \text{ such that} \\ Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Otherwise, if $T_i \in S_{K'}$, then the following property holds:

$$(B)_{K'}^i: \sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1, \text{ i.e., there exists a value } g > 0 \text{ such that} \\ \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g.$$

Clearly, for non-terminals $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, property $(B)_{K'}^i$ holds, since $\sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0 < 1$ (by Proposition 3.1). Finally, the answer for the full set of targets is $F := F_K$.

We base this proof on an induction on the size of subset K' , i.e., on the time of computing sets $S_{K'}$ and $F_{K'}$ for $K' \subseteq K$. And in the process, for each subset $K' \subseteq K$ of target non-terminals, we show how to construct a randomized *non-static* strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ (for any given $\epsilon > 0$) that ensures $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for each non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$.

Clearly for any subset of target non-terminals, $K' := \{q\} \subseteq K$, of size $l = 1$, each non-terminal $T_i \in F_{\{q\}}$ (respectively, $T_i \in V - F_{\{q\}}$) satisfies property $(A)_{\{q\}}^i$ (respectively, $(B)_{\{q\}}^i$), due to step I. and the definition of the $AS_{q,q} \in K$ sets. Furthermore, for each such subset $\{q\} \subseteq K$, there is in fact a strategy $\sigma_{\{q\}}$ such that $\forall T_i \in F_{\{q\}} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{\{q\}}} [Reach(T_q)] = 1$. Moreover, by [10, Theorem 9.4], this strategy $\sigma_{\{q\}}$ is non-static and deterministic. Analysing subset K' of target non-terminals of size l as part of step II., assume that, for every $K'' \subset K'$ of size $\leq l - 1$, sets $S_{K''}$ and $F_{K''}$ have already been computed, and for each non-terminal T_j belonging to set $F_{K''}$ (respectively, set $S_{K''}$) property $(A)_{K''}^j$ (respectively, $(B)_{K''}^j$) holds. That is, by induction assumption, for each $K'' \subset K'$, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K''}^\epsilon$ such that for any $T_j \in F_{K''}$: $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K''}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$, and also for any $T_j \in S_{K''}$: $\sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_j}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] < 1$. We now need to show that at end of the inner loop analysis of subset K' , property $(A)_{K'}^i$ (respectively, $(B)_{K'}^i$) holds for every non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$ (respectively, $T_i \in S_{K'}$).

First we show that property $(A)_{K'}^i$ holds for each non-terminal T_i belonging to set $D_{K'} (\subseteq F_{K'})$, pre-computed prior to the execution of the inner loop for K' .

Lemma 4.2. *Every non-terminal $T_i \in D_{K'}$ satisfies property $(A)_{K'}^i$.*

Proof. The lemma is proved via a nested induction based on the time when a non-terminal is added to set $D_{K'}$. Consider the base case where $T_i \in D_{K'}$ is a non-terminal, added at the initialization step II.1.

- (i) Suppose T_i is of L-form where $i \in K'$ and for all associated rules a child is generated that is of a non-terminal $T_j \in F_{K'_{-i}}$, where property $(A)_{K'_{-i}}^j$ holds. Then, for every $\epsilon > 0$, using

the witness strategy $\sigma_{K'_i}^\epsilon$ from the induction assumption for all such non-terminals T_j in the next generation as if the play starts in it, we obtain a strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for a starting (target) non-terminal T_i such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q) \mid Reach(T_i) \right] \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[Reach(T_i) \right] \\
&= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q) \right] = \sum_j p_{ij} \cdot Pr_{T_i(u, T_j)}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q) \right] \\
&= \sum_j p_{ij} \cdot Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'_i}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q) \right] \geq \sum_j p_{ij} \cdot (1 - \epsilon) = 1 - \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

where p_{ij} is the probability of rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{ij}} T_j$.

- (ii) Suppose T_i is of M-form where $i \in K'$ and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i$ such that $T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'_i}$, where property $(A)_{K'_i}^j$ holds. Let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. By combining every witness strategy $\sigma_{K'_i}^\epsilon$, $\epsilon > 0$ from property $(A)_{K'_i}^j$ from the induction assumption for non-terminal T_j , as if the play starts in it, with the initial local choice of choosing action a^* deterministically starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain for every $\epsilon > 0$ a combined strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ such that starting at a (target) non-terminal T_i , it follows that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'_i}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.
- (iii) Suppose T_i is of Q-form ($T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$) where $i \in K'$ and there exists a split of the rest of the target non-terminals, implied by $K_L \subseteq K'_i$ and $K'_i - K_L$, such that $T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K'_i - K_L}$. Let $h_l := T_i(l, T_j)$ and $h_r := T_i(r, T_r)$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, if we let $\epsilon' := 1 - \sqrt{1 - \epsilon}$, then by combining the two witness strategies $\sigma_{K_L}^{\epsilon'}$ and $\sigma_{K'_i - K_L}^{\epsilon'}$ from the induction assumption for non-terminals T_j and T_r , respectively, to be used in the next generation as if the play starts in it, we obtain a strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for a starting (target) non-terminal T_i such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] \geq Pr_{h_l}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_i - K_L} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K_L}^{\epsilon'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma_{K'_i - K_L}^{\epsilon'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'_i - K_L} Reach(T_q)] \geq (1 - \epsilon')^2 = (\sqrt{1 - \epsilon})^2 = 1 - \epsilon$.
- (iv) Suppose T_i is of Q-form ($T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$) where there exists a proper split of the target non-terminals from set K' , implied by $K_L \subset K'$ (where $K_L \neq \emptyset$) and $K' - K_L$, such that $T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K' - K_L}$. Similarly, for each $\epsilon > 0$, let $\epsilon' := 1 - \sqrt{1 - \epsilon}$ and combine the two witness strategies $\sigma_{K_L}^{\epsilon'}$ and $\sigma_{K' - K_L}^{\epsilon'}$ from the induction assumption for non-terminals T_j and T_r in the same way as in (iii). It follows that property $(A)_{K'}^i$ is satisfied.

Now consider non-terminals T_i added to set $D_{K'}$ at step II.2. If T_i is of L-form, then all associated rules generate a child of non-terminal T_j already in $D_{K'}$, where $(A)_{K'}^j$ holds by the (nested) induction. So using for every $\epsilon > 0$ the strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ from the nested induction assumption

for each such non-terminal T_j and applying the same argument as in (i), then property $(A)_{K'}^i$ is also satisfied.

If T_i is of M-form, then $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j, T_j \in D_{K'}$. Again let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. By combining, for every $\epsilon > 0$, the witness strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for non-terminal T_j (from the nested induction assumption), as if the play starts in it, with the initial local choice of choosing action a^* deterministically starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain an augmented strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for a starting non-terminal T_i such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

If T_i is of Q-form ($T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then $T_j \in D_{K'} \vee T_r \in D_{K'}$, i.e., for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\exists \sigma_{K'}^\epsilon \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \leq \epsilon$, where $y \in \{j, r\}$. Let $h_y := T_i(x, T_y)$ and $h_{\bar{y}} := T_i(\bar{x}, T_{\bar{y}})$, where $\bar{y} \in \{j, r\} - \{y\}$, $x \in \{l, r\}$ and $\bar{x} \in \{l, r\} - \{x\}$. By augmenting strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ to be used from the next generation from the child of non-terminal T_y as if the play starts in it and using an arbitrary strategy from the child of non-terminal $T_{\bar{y}}$, it follows that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{h_y}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_{\bar{y}}}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \leq \epsilon \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$, i.e., property $(A)_{K'}^i$ holds. \square

Next, we show that if $T_i \in S_{K'}$, then property $(B)_{K'}^i$ is satisfied.

Lemma 4.3. *Every non-terminal $T_i \in S_{K'}$ satisfies property $(B)_{K'}^i$.*

Proof. Again this is proved via a nested induction based on the time a non-terminal is added to set $S_{K'}$. Assuming that all non-terminals T_j , added already to set $S_{K'}$ in previous iterations and steps of the inner loop, satisfy $(B)_{K'}^j$, then we need to show that for a new addition T_i to set $S_{K'}$, property $(B)_{K'}^i$ also holds.

Consider the non-terminals T_i added to set $S_{K'}$ at the initialization step II.4.

If T_i is of L-form where $T_i \rightarrow \emptyset \vee T_i \rightarrow T_j, T_j \in Z_{K'}$, then with a constant positive probability non-terminal T_i immediately either does not generate any offspring at all or generates a child of non-terminal $T_j \in Z_{K'}$, for which we already know that $(B)_{K'}^j$ holds. It is clear that property $(B)_{K'}^i$ is also satisfied.

If, for some subset $K'' \subset K', T_i \in S_{K''}$, i.e., property $(B)_{K''}^i$ holds, then there is a value $g > 0$ such that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$ and so property $(B)_{K'}^i$ is also satisfied. Note that if, for some subset $K'' \subset K', T_i \in Z_{K''}$, then similarly $T_i \in Z_{K'}$ and so already $T_i \notin X$.

If T_i is a target non-terminal in set K' (i.e., $i \in K'$), then since it has not been added to set $D_{K'}$ in step II.1: (1) if of L-form, it generates with a constant positive probability a child of non-terminal $T_j \in S_{K'_i} \cup Z_{K'_i}$, where $(B)_{K'_i}^j$ holds; (2) if of M-form, irrespective of the strategy it generates a child of non-terminal $T_j \in S_{K'_i} \cup Z_{K'_i}$, where again $(B)_{K'_i}^j$ holds; (3) and if of Q-form, it generates two children of non-terminals T_j, T_r , for which no matter how we split the rest of the target non-terminals from set K'_i (into subsets $K_L \subseteq K'_i$ and $K'_i - K_L$), either $(B)_{K_L}^j$ holds or $(B)_{K'_i - K_L}^r$ holds. In other words, for a target non-terminal T_i in the initial set $S_{K'}$ there is no sequence of strategies to ensure that the rest of the target non-terminals are reached with probability arbitrarily close to 1 (the reasoning behind this last statement is the same as the arguments in (i) - (iii) below, since for a starting (target) non-terminal $T_i : \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)]$).

Observe that by the end of step II.4. all target non-terminals $T_q, q \in K'$ belong either to set $D_{K'}$ or set $S_{K'}$. Now consider a non-terminal T_i added to set $S_{K'}$ in step II.5. during some iteration of the inner loop.

- (i) Suppose T_i is of L-form. Then $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, where $(B)_{K'}^j$ holds. So irrespective of the strategy there is a constant positive probability to generate a child of the above non-terminal T_j such that $Pr_{T_j}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$, or in other words, $\exists g > 0$ such that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$. Let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. But, there is a value $g > 0$ such that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq p_{ij} \cdot Pr_h^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq p_{ij} \cdot g$ if and only if $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq g$, where $p_{ij} > 0$ is the probability of the rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{ij}} T_j$. And since the latter part of the statement holds, then the former, showing property $(B)_{K'}^i$, also holds.
- (ii) Suppose T_i is of M-form. Then $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$. So irrelevant of strategy σ for the player, starting in a non-terminal T_i the next generation surely consists of some non-terminal T_j with the property $\sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$, i.e., $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$, for some value $g > 0$. Clearly, for some value $g > 0$, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq \max_{\{T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}\}} Pr_{T_i(u, T_j)}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$ (i.e., property $(B)_{K'}^i$) if and only if $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \max_{\{T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}\}} Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$, where the latter is satisfied.
- (iii) Suppose T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then $T_j, T_r \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, i.e., both $(B)_{K'}^j$ and $(B)_{K'}^r$ are satisfied. We know that:
 - 1) Neither of the two children can single-handedly reach all target non-terminals from set K' with probability arbitrarily close to 1. That is, for some value $g > 0$, for every $\sigma \in \Psi$, $Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$ and $Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$.
 - 2) Moreover, since T_i was not added to set $D_{K'}$ in step II.1., then $\forall K_L \subset K'$ (where $K_L \neq \emptyset$) either $(B)_{K_L}^j$ holds (i.e., $T_j \notin F_{K_L}$) or $(B)_{K' - K_L}^r$ holds (i.e., $T_r \notin F_{K' - K_L}$), i.e., there is some value $g > 0$ such that either $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$ or $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K' - K_L} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$.
(Statements 1) and 2) hold for the same value $g > 0$, since there are only finitely many subsets of K' , so we can take g to be the minimum of all such values from all the properties $(B)_{K''}^{j/r}$ ($K'' \subseteq K'$).

Let $h_l := T_i(l, T_j)$ and $h_r := T_i(r, T_r)$. Notice that for any $\sigma \in \Psi$ and for any $q' \in K'$, $Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})] = Pr_{h_l}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})]$.

We claim that $\exists g_i > 0$ such that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in K'} Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq g_i$. But for any $q \in K'$ and for any $\sigma \in \Psi$ one can obviously construct $\sigma' \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] = Pr_{h_l}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)]$ and similarly for non-terminal T_r . Therefore, it follows from the claim that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in K'} Pr_{h_l}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq g_i$ and, therefore, it follows that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq g_i \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g_i$.

Suppose the opposite, i.e., assume (\mathcal{P}) that $\forall g' > 0, \exists \sigma_{g'} \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K'} Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{g'}}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma_{g'}}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] < g'$. Now for any $q \in K'$, by statement 2) above, we know that $T_j \notin$

$F_{\{q\}} \vee T_r \notin F_{K'_{-q}}$ and $T_j \notin F_{K'_{-q}} \vee T_r \notin F_{\{q\}}$. First, suppose that in fact for some $q' \in K'$ it is the case that $T_j \notin F_{\{q'\}} \wedge T_r \notin F_{\{q'\}}$ (i.e., $T_j \in S_{\{q'\}} \cup Z_{\{q'\}} \wedge T_r \in S_{\{q'\}} \cup Z_{\{q'\}}$). That is, for some value $g > 0$, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^G(T_{q'})] \geq g$ and $Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[Reach^G(T_{q'})] \geq g$, where our claim follows directly by letting $g_i := g^2$ (hence, contradiction to (\mathcal{P})). Second, suppose that for some $q' \in K'$ it is the case that $T_j \notin F_{K'_{-q'}} \wedge T_r \notin F_{K'_{-q'}}$ (i.e., $T_j \in S_{K'_{-q'}} \cup Z_{K'_{-q'}} \wedge T_r \in S_{K'_{-q'}} \cup Z_{K'_{-q'}}$). But then T_i would have been added to set $S_{K'_{-q'}}$ at step II.5.(c) when constructing the answer for subset of targets $K'_{-q'}$. However, we already know that $T_i \in \bigcap_{K'' \subset K'} F_{K''}$ (following from steps II.3. and II.4. that $T_i \notin \bigcup_{K'' \subset K'} (S_{K''} \cup Z_{K''})$). Hence, again a contradiction.

Therefore, it follows that for every $q \in K'$, either $T_j \notin F_{\{q\}} \wedge T_j \notin F_{K'_{-q}}$ or $T_r \notin F_{\{q\}} \wedge T_r \notin F_{K'_{-q}}$. And in particular, the essential part is that $\forall q \in K'$, either $T_j \notin F_{\{q\}}$ or $T_r \notin F_{\{q\}}$. That is, for every $q \in K'$, for some value $g > 0$ either $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^G(T_q)] \geq g$, or $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[Reach^G(T_q)] \geq g$. But then, combined with assumption (\mathcal{P}) , it actually follows that there exists a subset $K'' \subseteq K'$ such that $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $\exists \sigma_\epsilon \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K''} Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma_\epsilon}[Reach^G(T_q)] \leq \epsilon \wedge \bigwedge_{q \in K' - K''} Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_\epsilon}[Reach^G(T_q)] \leq \epsilon$. And by Proposition 2.1(5.), it follows that $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $\exists \sigma'_\epsilon \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon \wedge Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'_\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K' - K''} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$, i.e., $T_j \in F_{K' - K''} \wedge T_r \in F_{K''}$, contradicting the known facts 1) and 2). Hence, assumption (\mathcal{P}) is wrong and our claim is satisfied.

Now consider non-terminals T_i added to set $S_{K'}$ in step II.10. at some iteration of the inner loop, i.e., $T_i \in Y_{K'} := X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'}) \subseteq \bar{Z}_{K'}$. Due to the fact that T_i has not been added previously to sets $D_{K'}$, $S_{K'}$ or $F_{K'}$, then all of the following hold:

- (1.) $i \notin K'$;
- (2.) if T_i is of L-form, then a non-terminal T_i generates with probability 1 a non-terminal which belongs to set $Y_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to sets $S_{K'}$ or $F_{K'}$ in step II.4., II.5. or step II.9., respectively);
- (3.) if T_i is of M-form, then $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_d$, $T_d \notin F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to sets $F_{K'}$ or $D_{K'}$ in step II.2. or step II.9., respectively), and $\exists' a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a'} T_j$, $T_j \notin S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, i.e., $T_j \in Y_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to set $S_{K'}$ in step II.5.); and
- (4.) if T_i is of Q-form ($T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then w.l.o.g. $T_j \in Y_{K'}$ and $T_r \in Y_{K'} \cup S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$ (since T_i has not been added to the other sets in steps II.2., II.5., or II.9.).

Observe that any MEC in subgraph $G[X - S_{K'}]$, that contains a node from set $Y_{K'}$, is in fact entirely contained in subgraph $G[Y_{K'}]$, and also that there is at least one MEC in $G[Y_{K'}]$. This is due to statements (2.) - (4.) and the two key facts that all nodes in $G[Y_{K'}]$ have at least one outgoing edge and there is only a finite number of nodes.

However, consider any MEC, C , in $G[Y_{K'}]$ ($Y_{K'} \subseteq X - S_{K'}$). As C has not been added to set $F_{K'}$ at step II.8., then $P_C \neq K'$ (where $P_C = \{q \in K' \mid C \cap H_q \neq \emptyset\}$) and:

- either $P_C = \emptyset$,

- or $P_C \neq \emptyset$ and for every $T_u \in C$ of M-form it holds that $\forall b \in \Gamma^u : T_u \xrightarrow{b} T_v, T_v \notin F_{K'-P_C}$.

First, let us focus on the second point. Note that for any non-terminal $T_j \in C$, clearly $T_j \in F_{P_C}$, and in fact, $\exists \sigma_{P_C} \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{P_C}} [\bigcap_{q \in P_C} Reach(T_q)] = 1$. That is because, starting at a non-terminal $T_j \in C$, due to C being a MEC in $G[Y_{K'}]$, such a strategy σ_{P_C} can ensure that, for each $q \in P_C$, infinitely often a copy of a Q-form non-terminal in set $H_q \cap C$ is generated, which in turn spawns an independent copy of some non-terminal in set $\bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$ and thus infinitely often provides a positive probability bounded away from zero (by Proposition 3.1) to reach target non-terminal T_q .

- (*) We claim that for any Q-form non-terminal $T_i \in C$ (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$ where w.l.o.g. $T_j \in C \subseteq Y_{K'}$), it is guaranteed that $T_r \notin F_{K'-P_C}$. To see this, if it was the case that $T_r \in F_{K'-P_C}$, then, since $T_j \in F_{P_C}$, it would follow that T_i would have been added to set $D_{K'}$ in step II.1., leading to a contradiction.
- (**) What is more, due to the definition of set P_C , it follows that for any Q-form non-terminal $T_i \in C$ (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$ where w.l.o.g. $T_j \in C$), $T_r \in \bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} Z_{\{q'\}}$, i.e., $\sup_{\sigma \in \Psi} Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma} [Reach(T_{q'})] = 0$, for each $q' \in K' - P_C$. Note also that $T_r \notin C$, since $C \subseteq Y_{K'} \subseteq \bar{Z}_{K'} \subseteq \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}, \forall q \in K'$ (so if $T_r \in C$, then $P_C = K'$ and C would have been added to set $F_{K'}$ in step II.8.).
- (***) Furthermore, as stated in the second bullet point above, for every non-terminal $T_u \in C$ of M-form and $\forall b \in \Gamma^u : T_u \xrightarrow{b} T_v, T_v \notin F_{K'-P_C}$.

And as we know, for every $T_v \in S_{K'-P_C} \cup Z_{K'-P_C}$, property $(B)_{K'-P_C}^v$ holds. In other words, there exists a value $g > 0$ such that regardless of strategy σ , for any $T_v \notin F_{K'-P_C}$, $Pr_{T_v}^{\sigma} [\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q)] \leq 1 - g$.

Now let σ be an arbitrary strategy fixed for the player. Denote by w the path (in the play), where w begins at a starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$ and evolves in the following way. If the current copy o on the path w is of a L-form or a M-form non-terminal $T_j \in C$, then w follows along the unique successor of o in the play. And if the current copy o on path w is of a Q-form non-terminal $T_j \in C$ ($T_j \xrightarrow{1} T_{j'} T_r$ where w.l.o.g. $T_{j'} \in C$), then w follows along the child of non-terminal $T_{j'}$. If the current copy o on path w is of a non-terminal not belonging in C , then the path w terminates. Denote by $\square C$ the event that path w is infinite, i.e., all non-terminals observed along path w are in C and path w never leaves C and never terminates. Then for any starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$:

$$\begin{aligned}
Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in P_C} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q) \right) \right] \\
&\leq Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q) \right] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \square C \right] + \\
Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square C \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square C \right] \\
&\leq \max_{T_v \notin F_{K'-P_C}} \sup_{\tau \in \Psi} Pr_{T_v}^{\tau} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'-P_C} Reach(T_q) \right] \leq 1 - g
\end{aligned}$$

The event of reaching all target non-terminals from set $K' - P_C$ can be split into the event of reaching all targets non-terminals from set $K' - P_C$ and path w being infinite union with the event of reaching all targets non-terminals from set $K' - P_C$ and path w being finite. Moreover,

$Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[(\bigcap_{q \in K' - P_C} Reach(T_q)) \cap \Box C] = 0$, due to statements (1.), (*) and (**). The second to last inequality follows: because of statement (**); and also due to statements (*), (**) and (***), once event $\neg \Box C$ occurs and path w leaves MEC, C , it terminates immediately in some non-terminal $T_v \notin C$ which also satisfies that $T_v \notin F_{K' - P_C}$. And the last inequality follows from property $(B)_{K' - P_C}^v$ for any such non-terminal $T_v \notin F_{K' - P_C}$.

And since σ was an arbitrary strategy for the player, then it follows that for any such MEC, C , in $G[Y_{K'}]$ (where $P_C \neq \emptyset$) and for any non-terminal $T_i \in C$: $Pr_{T_i}^*[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$, i.e., property $(B)_{K'}^i$ holds.

Analysing MECs, C , where $P_C = \emptyset$, the argument is similar. Property (**) holds by definition of set P_C . And by property (3.), for every M-form non-terminal $T_u \in C$ and for every $b \in \Gamma^u$: $T_u \xrightarrow{b} T_{u'}$, $T_{u'} \in (Y_{K'} \cup S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'})$. Then because of properties (1.), (3.) and (**), it follows that for any $T_i \in C$, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi$: $Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq \max_{T_{u'} \in (Y_{K'} \cup S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'})} Pr_{T_{u'}}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)]$.

For non-terminals $T_{u'}$ in sets $S_{K'}$ and $Z_{K'}$, we already know by induction that property $(B)_{K'}^{u'}$ is satisfied. Moreover, from standard algorithms for MEC-decomposition, one can see that there is an ordering of the MECs in $G[Y_{K'}]$ where the bottom level (level 0) consists of MECs, C'' , that have no out-going edges from the MEC at all (these are analogous to bottom strongly connected components in an SCC-decomposition) and for which $P_{C''} \neq K'$, and for further “levels” of MECs in the ordering the following is true: MECs or nodes that do not belong to any MEC, at level $t \geq 1$, have directed paths out of them leading to MECs (or nodes not in any MEC) at levels $< t$. If we rank the MECs and the independent nodes (not belonging to any MEC) in $G[Y_{K'}]$, using this ordering, and use an inductive argument, it can be shown that, in the case when the above mentioned non-terminal $T_{u'}$ belongs to $Y_{K'}$ and MEC, C , has rank $t \geq 1$ in the ordering, then $T_{u'}$ belongs to a lower rank $< t$, and thus by the inductive argument, has been shown to have property $(B)_{K'}^{u'}$.

Therefore, for any non-terminal T_i in any MEC, C , in $G[Y_{K'}]$, $(B)_{K'}^i$ holds. And also by the inductive argument above for the ordering of nodes in $G[Y_{K'}]$, same holds for any non-terminal $T_i \in Y_{K'}$ not belonging to a MEC. \square

Now we show that for non-terminals $T_i \in F_{K'}$, when the inner loop for subset $K' \subseteq K$ terminates, the property $(A)_{K'}^i$ is satisfied. That is:

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \sigma_{K'}^\epsilon \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

We will also show how to construct such a strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$, for a given $\epsilon > 0$. Since we have already proved it for non-terminals in set $D_{K'}$, in the following Lemma we refer to the part of set $F_{K'}$ not containing set $D_{K'}$, i.e., to set $F_{K'} = X - S_{K'}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Every non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$ satisfies the property $(A)_{K'}^i$.*

Proof. Denote by $F_{K'}^0$, the initialized set of non-terminals from step II.8. Let us first observe the properties for non-terminals $T_i \in F_{K'} = X - S_{K'}$. None of them is a target non-terminal from set K' , i.e., $i \notin K'$. If T_i is of L-form, then:

- (L.0) if T_i belongs to a MEC, $C \subseteq F_{K'}^0$, then a non-terminal T_i generates with probability 1 as offspring some non-terminal either in set C or in set $D_{K'}$ (since L-form non-terminals in $X - S_{K'}$ do not have associated probabilistic rules to non-terminals in $S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$).

(L) otherwise, a non-terminal T_i generates with probability 1 as offspring some non-terminal either in set $F_{K'}$ or in set $D_{K'}$.

If T_i is of M-form, then $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_d, T_d \notin D_{K'}$ and:

(M.0) if T_i belongs to a MEC, $C \subseteq F_{K'}^0$, then $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j, T_j \in C$.

(M) otherwise, $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j, T_j \in F_{K'}$.

If T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then $T_j, T_r \notin D_{K'}$ and:

if T_i belongs to a MEC, $C \subseteq F_{K'}^0$, then:

(Q.0) either, w.l.o.g., $T_j \in C$ and there exists some $q \in K'$ such that $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$,

(Q.1) or, w.l.o.g., $T_j \in C$ and there is no $q \in K'$ such that $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$.

(Q) otherwise, i.e., if $T_i \notin F_{K'}^0$, then w.l.o.g., $T_j \in F_{K'}$.

(\mathfrak{P}) Let us recall that for every $q \in K'$, there is a deterministic static strategy $\sigma'_{\{q\}}$ for the player and a value $b_{\{q\}} > 0$ such that, for each non-terminal $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$, $Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'_{\{q\}}}[\text{Reach}(T_q)] \geq b_{\{q\}}$. Let $b := \min_{q \in K'} \{b_{\{q\}}\} > 0$.

Given $\epsilon > 0$, let $\epsilon' := (1 - \sqrt{1 - \epsilon})/k$ (where $k = |K|$) and let us prove the Lemma and construct the randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ inductively.

Consider the non-terminals added to set $F_{K'}$ at the initialization step II.8. during the last iteration of the inner loop. And, in particular, consider every MEC, C , added at step II.8. There is one of two reasons for why C was added to set $F_{K'}^0$.

For the first reason, suppose that $1 \leq |P_C| < l = |K'|$ and that there is a non-terminal $T_u \in C$ of M-form where $\exists b \in \Gamma^u : T_u \xrightarrow{b} T_{u'}, T_{u'} \in F_{K'-P_C}$.

Consider any finite ancestor history h of height t (meaning the length of the sequence of ancestors that the history represents is t) such that h starts at a non-terminal $T_v \in C$ and all non-terminals in h belong to the MEC, C . Let o denote the non-terminal copy at the end of the ancestor history h .

If o is a copy of the non-terminal $T_u \in C$ (from above), let strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ choose uniformly at random among actions from statement (M.0) if it is not the case that, for each $q \in P_C$, at least $d := \lceil \log_{(1-\frac{b}{k})} \epsilon' \rceil$ copies of the Q-form non-terminals $T_j \in C \cap H_q$ have been encountered along the ancestor history h . Otherwise, $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ chooses deterministically action b , and therefore generates immediately a child o'' of non-terminal $T_{u'}$ (from above). In the entire subtree, rooted at o'' , strategy τ is employed as if the play starts in o'' , where $Pr_{T_{u'}}^\tau[\bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} \text{Reach}(T_{q'})] \geq \sqrt{1 - \epsilon}$ (exist by the induction assumption due to $T_{u'} \in F_{K'-P_C}$).

If o is of another M-form non-terminal $T_i \in C$, let $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ choose uniformly at random among actions from statement (M.0) and so in the next generation the single generated successor o' is of a non-terminal $T_j \in C$, where we proceed to use strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ (that is being described). If o is of a non-terminal $T_i \in C$ of L-form, from statement (L.0) we know that in the next generation the single generated successor o' is of some non-terminal $T_j \in C \cup D_{K'}$. If $T_j \in D_{K'}$, then we use at o' and its subtree of descendants the randomized non-static strategy from property (A) $_{K'}^j$, that

guarantees probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ of reaching all targets in set K' , as if the play starts in o' . If $T_j \in C$, then we proceed by using the same strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ (that is currently being described) at o' . If o is of a non-terminal $T_i \in C$ of Q-form ($T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), there are two cases for the two successor children o' (of non-terminal T_j) and o'' (of non-terminal T_r):

- **either** property (Q.0) is satisfied, i.e., $T_j \in C$ and $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$, for some $q \in K'$. Then, in the next generation, we continue using the same strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ (that is currently being described) at o' and for the entire subtree of play, rooted at o'' , strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ chooses uniformly at random a target non-terminal $T_q, q \in K'$, such that $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$, and employs the strategy $\sigma'_{\{q\}}$ from statement (\mathfrak{P}) as if the play starts at o'' . Note that $Pr_{h(r, T_r)}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\text{Reach}(T_q)] \geq \frac{b}{|P_C|} \geq \frac{b}{k} > 0$, where $h(r, T_r)$ refers to the ancestor history for the right child o'' and where $|P_C| < l = |K'| \leq k = |K|$.
- **or** property (Q.1) is satisfied. Then, in the next generation, we continue using strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for o' , whereas for o'' the strategy is irrelevant and an arbitrary one is chosen for o'' and thereafter in o'' 's tree of descendants.

That concludes the description of the randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for non-terminals in MEC, C . Now we need to show that, indeed, that for any $T_i \in C$: $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Denote by w the path (in the play) that begins at a starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$ and is defined as follows. If the current copy o on the path w is of a L-form or a M-form non-terminal $T_j \in C$, then w follows along the unique successor of o in the play. And if the current copy o on path w is of a Q-form non-terminal $T_j \in C$ ($T_j \xrightarrow{1} T_{j'} T_r$ where w.l.o.g. $T_{j'} \in C$), then w follows along the child of non-terminal $T_{j'}$. If the current copy o on path w is: either of a non-terminal not belonging in C ; or of the non-terminal $T_{u'} \in F_{K'-P_C}$ (from above) and, for each $q \in P_C$, at least d copies of the Q-form non-terminals in set $C \cap H_q$ have already been encountered along w - then the path w terminates. Denote by $\square C$ the event that path w (as defined) is infinite, i.e., path w never terminates, and by $\neg \square_D C$ (respectively, $\neg \square_{u'} C$) the event that path w is finite and terminates (according to the above definition of when it can terminate) in a copy of a non-terminal in set $D_{K'}$ (respectively, in a copy of non-terminal $T_{u'} \in F_{K'-P_C}$). Observe that under strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for any starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$, $P_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\square C] = 0$, and let $p := P_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\neg \square_D C]$ (note that $P_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\neg \square_{u'} C] = 1 - p$).

Now under strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ and starting at any non-terminal $T_i \in C$, with probability 1:

- either path w terminates in a copy o of a non-terminal in set $D_{K'}$, for which we already know that there is a strategy to reach all target non-terminals from set K' with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ (and according to $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$, such a strategy is employed at o and its subtree of descendants). Hence, in the event of $\neg \square_D C$, with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ all target non-terminals from set K' are contained in the generated play, i.e., $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_D C] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.
- or, path w terminates in a copy of a non-terminal $T_{u'} \in F_{K'-P_C}$. Then, for each $q \in P_C$, with probability 1 (due to C being a MEC and due to the description of strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$) at least $d = \lceil \log_{(1-\frac{b}{k})} \epsilon \rceil$ copies o of the Q-form non-terminals $T_j \in C \cap H_q$ were generated along the path w . And each such copy o generates two children, o' of some non-terminal $T_{j'} \in C$ (the successor on path w) and o'' of some non-terminal $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$, where o'' has independently a positive probability bounded away from zero (in fact, $\geq \frac{b}{k}$ due to the uniformly at random

choice over strategies from statement (\mathfrak{P}) , where, by Proposition 3.1, the value $b > 0$ does not depend on the history or the time when o'' is generated) to reach the respective target non-terminal T_q in a finite number of generations.

So suppose event $\neg \square_{u'} C$ occurs and let, for each $q \in P_C$, $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\diamond_{\leq m} T_q \mid \neg \square_{u'} C]$ denote the conditional probability, starting at a non-terminal $T_i \in C$ and under the described strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$, to reach target T_q with at most m generated copies of the Q-form non-terminals in set $C \cap H_q$ along the path w in the play, conditioned on event $\neg \square_{u'} C$ occurring. Note that $\forall q \in P_C : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\diamond_{\leq 1} T_q \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] \geq \frac{b}{|P_C|} \geq \frac{b}{k}$. That is, because with probability 1 under strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$, starting at a non-terminal $T_i \in C$, a copy o of a Q-form non-terminal in set $C \cap H_q$ is generated along path w and then there is a probability $\geq \frac{b}{k}$ to reach target T_q from the right child of o . It follows that for any $T_i \in C$ and any $q \in P_C$:

$$Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\neg \diamond_{\leq d} T_q \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] \leq \left(1 - \frac{b}{k}\right)^d \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\diamond_{\leq d} T_q \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] \geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{b}{k}\right)^d$$

Since $d \geq \log_{(1-\frac{b}{k})} \epsilon'$, then $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\diamond_{\leq d} T_q \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] \geq 1 - \epsilon'$. Then for any $T_i \in C$ and any $q \in P_C$:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\text{Reach}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] &\geq Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\diamond_{\leq d} T_q \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] \geq 1 - \epsilon' \Leftrightarrow \\ Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon}[\text{Reach}^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C] &\leq \epsilon' \end{aligned}$$

So, by the union bound:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcup_{q \in P_C} \text{Reach}^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] &\leq |P_C| \cdot \epsilon' \leq k \cdot \epsilon' = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} \\ \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in P_C} \text{Reach}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] &\geq \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

And in some finite number of generations, in a copy of the non-terminal T_u along path w action $b \in \Gamma^u$ is chosen deterministically, where $T_u \xrightarrow{b} T_{u'}$, $T_{u'} \in F_{K'-P_C}$. There exists $\sigma_{K'-P_C}^{1-\sqrt{1-\epsilon}} \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_{u'}}^{\sigma_{K'-P_C}^{1-\sqrt{1-\epsilon}}}[\bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} \text{Reach}(T_{q'})] \geq \sqrt{1 - \epsilon}$. Then for any starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$:

$$Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} \text{Reach}(T_{q'}) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] = Pr_{T_{u'}}^{\sigma_{K'-P_C}^{1-\sqrt{1-\epsilon}}} \left[\bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} \text{Reach}(T_{q'}) \right] \geq \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} \quad (2)$$

The equality follows from the fact that there is zero probability to reach targets from set $K' - P_C$ before path w terminates and also from the fact that strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ utilizes strategy $\sigma_{K'-P_C}^{1-\sqrt{1-\epsilon}}$ from the occurrence of $T_{u'}$ (when event $\neg \square_{u'} C$ happens) as if the play starts in it.

Using (1) and (2), it follows that for any starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} \text{Reach}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in P_C} \text{Reach}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} \text{Reach}(T_{q'}) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] \\ &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in P_C} \text{Reach}(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] \cdot Pr_{T_{u'}}^{\sigma_{K'-P_C}^{1-\sqrt{1-\epsilon}}} \left[\bigcap_{q' \in K'-P_C} \text{Reach}(T_{q'}) \right] \geq (\sqrt{1 - \epsilon})^2 = 1 - \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

And putting it all together, it follows that for any starting non-terminal $T_i \in C$:

$$\begin{aligned}
Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \square C \right] \\
&+ Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square_D C \right] + Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square_{u'} C \right] \\
&= Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \mid \neg \square_D C \right] \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\neg \square_D C \right] + \\
&Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \mid \neg \square_{u'} C \right] \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} \left[\neg \square_{u'} C \right] \geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot p + (1 - \epsilon) \cdot (1 - p) = 1 - \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

Now the second reason, why a MEC, C , in $G[F_{K'}]$ was added to $F_{K'}^0$, at step II.8., is if $P_C = K'$. Consider any finite ancestor history h , that starts at a non-terminal $T_v \in C$ and that all non-terminals in h belong to the MEC, C . Let o denote the non-terminal copy at the end of the ancestor history h . If o is of a L-form or Q-form non-terminal in C , let $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ behave the same way as was described before. And if o is of a M-form non-terminal $T_i \in C$, let $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ choose uniformly at random among actions from statement (M.0). So with probability 1: either a copy of a L-form non-terminal in C generates a child o' of some non-terminal in set $D_{K'}$, where $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ employs a strategy at o' and its subtree of descendants such that all targets in set K' are reached with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ (exists by the induction assumption); or, for each $q \in P_C = K'$, infinitely often copies of the Q-form non-terminals $T_j \in C \cap H_q$ are observed. In the latter case, it follows that, for each $q \in P_C = K'$, infinitely many independent copies o' of non-terminals $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$ are generated, each of which has independently a positive probability bounded away from zero (again, $\geq \frac{b}{k}$ where, by Proposition 3.1, value $b > 0$ does not depend on the history or the time when entity o' is generated) to reach the corresponding target non-terminal T_q in a finite number of generations. Hence for any $T_v \in C$, it is satisfied that $Pr_{T_v}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Therefore, for each type T_i in some MEC, $C \subseteq F_{K'}^0$, property $(A)_{K'}^i$ is satisfied.

Now consider the non-terminals T_i added to set $F_{K'}$ in step II.9. during the last iteration of the inner loop.

- (i) If T_i is of L-form, then by statement (L) we know that with probability 1 a copy o of non-terminal T_i in the next generation produces a single successor o' of some non-terminal $T_j \in F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$, where by induction $(A)_{K'}^j$ holds. So using, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, the strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ from the induction assumption for each such non-terminal T_j in the next generation as if the play starts in it, then property $(A)_{K'}^i$ is also satisfied.
- (ii) If T_i is of M-form, then by statement (M), $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j, T_j \in F_{K'}$. Let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. So, for every $\epsilon > 0$, combining the already described strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for non-terminal T_j (from the induction assumption), as if the play starts in it, with the initial local choice of choosing deterministically action a^* , starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain an augmented strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for a starting non-terminal T_i such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$, i.e., $(A)_{K'}^i$ holds.

(iii) If T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then, by statement (Q), w.l.o.g. $T_j \in F_{K'}$, where we already know that, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ such that $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Let $h_l := T_i(l, T_j)$ and $h_r := T_i(r, T_r)$. Augmenting strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ to be used from the next generation from the child of non-terminal T_j as if the play starts in it and using an arbitrary strategy from the child of non-terminal T_r , it follows that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{h_l}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \leq \epsilon$, resulting in property (A) $_{K'}^i$ also being satisfied. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1 and the analysis of the limit-sure algorithm. The proof of Lemma 4.4 describes how to construct, for any subset $K' \subseteq K$ and any given $\epsilon > 0$, the witness strategy $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ for the non-terminals in set $F_{K'}$. These non-static strategies $\sigma_{K'}^\epsilon$ are described as functions that map finite ancestor histories belonging to the controller to distributions over actions for the current non-terminal in the ancestor history, and can be described in such a form in time $(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon})^{O(1)} \cdot 4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$. □

5 Algorithm for deciding $\overset{?}{\exists} \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] = 1$

In this section we present an algorithm for solving the qualitative almost-sure multi-target reachability problem for an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , i.e., given a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals and a starting non-terminal T_i , deciding whether there is a strategy for the player under which the probability of generating a tree that contains all target non-terminals from set K is 1. The algorithm runs in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$, and hence is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to k .

As in the previous section, first as a preprocessing step, for each subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$, we compute the set $Z_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0\}$, using the algorithm from Proposition 3.1. Let also denote by AS_q , for every $q \in K$, the set of non-terminals types T_j (including the target non-terminal T_q itself) for which there exists a strategy τ such that $Pr_{T_j}^\tau [Reach(T_q)] = 1$. These sets can be computed in P-time by applying the algorithm from [10, Theorem 9.3] to each target non-terminal T_q , $q \in K$. Recall that it was shown in [10] that for OBMDPs with a single target the almost-sure and limit-sure reachability problems coincide.

After this preprocessing step, we apply the algorithm in Figure 4 to identify the non-terminals T_i for which there is a strategy σ^* for the player such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma^*} [\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] = 1$. Again K'_{-i} denotes the set $K' - \{i\}$.

Theorem 5.1. *The algorithm in Figure 4 computes, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, for each subset $K' \subseteq K$, the set of non-terminals $F_{K'} := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1\}$. The algorithm runs in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$. Moreover, for each $K' \subseteq K$, the algorithm can also be augmented to compute a randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K'}^*$ such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}^*} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1$ for all non-terminals $T_i \in F_{K'}$.*

Proof. We will refer to the loop executing steps II.5. through II.10. for a specific subset $K' \subseteq K$ as the “inner” loop and the iteration through all subsets of K as the “outer” loop. Clearly the inner loop terminates, due to step II.10. always adding at least one non-terminal to set $S_{K'}$ and step II.11. eventually executing. The running time of the algorithm follows from the facts that

I. Let $F_{\{q\}} := AS_q$, for each $q \in K$. $F_\emptyset := V$.

II. For $l = 2 \dots k$:

For every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$ of size $|K'| = l$:

1. $D_{K'} := \{T_i \in V - Z_{K'} \mid \text{one of the following holds:}$

- T_i is of L-form where $i \in K'$, $T_i \not\rightarrow \emptyset$ and $\forall T_j \in V$: if $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, then $T_j \in F_{K'_i}$.
- T_i is of M-form where $i \in K'$ and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'_i}$.
- T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where $i \in K'$ and $\exists K_L \subseteq K'_i : T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K'_i - K_L}$.
- T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where $\exists K_L \subset K'$ ($K_L \neq \emptyset$): $T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K' - K_L}$.

2. Repeat until no change has occurred to $D_{K'}$:

(a) add $T_i \notin D_{K'}$ to $D_{K'}$, if of L-form, $T_i \not\rightarrow \emptyset$ and $\forall T_j \in V$: if $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, then $T_j \in D_{K'}$.

(b) add $T_i \notin D_{K'}$ to $D_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in D_{K'}$.

(c) add $T_i \notin D_{K'}$ to $D_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in D_{K'} \vee T_r \in D_{K'}$.

3. Let $X := V - (D_{K'} \cup Z_{K'})$.

4. Initialize $S_{K'} := \{T_i \in X \mid \text{either } i \in K', \text{ or } T_i \text{ is of L-form and } T_i \rightarrow \emptyset \vee T_i \rightarrow T_j, T_j \in Z_{K'}\} \cup \bigcup_{\emptyset \subset K'' \subset K'} (X \cap S_{K''})$.

5. Repeat until no change has occurred to $S_{K'}$:

(a) add $T_i \in X - S_{K'}$ to $S_{K'}$, if of L-form and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$.

(b) add $T_i \in X - S_{K'}$ to $S_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$.

(c) add $T_i \in X - S_{K'}$ to $S_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'} \wedge T_r \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$.

6. $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow$ SCC decomposition of $G[X - S_{K'}]$.

7. For every $q \in K'$, let $H_q := \{T_i \in X - S_{K'} \mid T_i \text{ is of Q-form } (T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r) \text{ and } ((T_j \in X - S_{K'} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}) \vee (T_j \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}} \wedge T_r \in X - S_{K'}))\}$.

8. Let $F_{K'} := \bigcup \{\bigcup_{q \in K'} (H_q \cap C) \mid C \in \mathcal{C} \text{ s.t. } \forall q' \in K' : H_{q'} \cap C \neq \emptyset\}$.

9. Repeat until no change has occurred to $F_{K'}$:

(a) add $T_i \in X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'})$ to $F_{K'}$, if of L-form and $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$.

(b) add $T_i \in X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'})$ to $F_{K'}$, if of M-form and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'}$.

(c) add $T_i \in X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'})$ to $F_{K'}$, if of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ and $T_j \in F_{K'} \vee T_r \in F_{K'}$.

10. If $X \neq S_{K'} \cup F_{K'}$, let $S_{K'} := X - F_{K'}$ and go to step 5.

11. Else, i.e., if $X = S_{K'} \cup F_{K'}$, let $F_{K'} := F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$.

III. Output F_K .

Figure 4: Algorithm for almost-sure multi-target reachability. The output is the set $F_K = \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] = 1\}$.

the outer loop executes for 2^k iterations and inside each iteration of the outer loop, steps II.1. and II.4. require time at most $2^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$ and the inner loop executes for at most $|V|$ iterations, where during each inner loop iteration the nested loops execute in time at most $|\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$.

For the proof of correctness, we show that for every subset of target non-terminals $K' \subseteq K$, $F_{K'}$ (from the decomposition $V = F_{K'} \cup S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$) is the set of non-terminals T_i for which the following property holds:

$$(A)_{K'}^i: \exists \sigma_{K'} \in \Psi \text{ such that } Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1.$$

Otherwise, if $T_i \in S_{K'}$, then the following property holds:

$$(B)_{K'}^i: \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} [\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^c(T_q)] > 0, \text{ i.e., the probability of generating a tree that contains at least one copy for each of the } T_q, q \in K' \text{ target non-terminals, is } < 1.$$

Clearly, for non-terminals $T_i \in Z_{K'}$, property $(B)_{K'}^i$ holds because, by Proposition 3.1, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 0 < 1$. Finally, the answer for the full set of targets is $F := F_K$.

As in the proof from the previous section, we base this proof on an induction on the size of subset K' , i.e. on the time of computing sets $S_{K'}$ and $F_{K'}$ for $K' \subseteq K$. And in the process, for each subset $K' \subseteq K$ of target non-terminals, we construct a randomized *non-static* strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ for the player that ensures $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1$ for each non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$. In the end, $\sigma := \sigma_K$ is the strategy that guarantees almost-sure reachability of all given targets in the same play.

To begin with, observe that clearly for any subset of target non-terminals, $K' := \{q\} \subseteq K$, of size $l = 1$, each non-terminal $T_i \in F_{\{q\}}$ (respectively, $T_i \in V - F_{\{q\}}$) satisfies property $(A)_{\{q\}}^i$ (respectively, $(B)_{\{q\}}^i$), due to step I. and the definition of the $AS_q, q \in K$ sets. Hence, for each such subset $\{q\} \subseteq K$, there is a strategy $\sigma_{\{q\}}$ such that $\forall T_i \in F_{\{q\}} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{\{q\}}} [Reach(T_q)] = 1$. Moreover, by [10, Theorem 9.4] this strategy $\sigma_{\{q\}}$ is non-static and deterministic. Analysing subset K' of target non-terminals of size l as part of step II., assume that, for every $K'' \subset K'$ of size $\leq l - 1$, sets $S_{K''}$ and $F_{K''}$ have already been computed, and for each non-terminal T_j belonging to set $F_{K''}$ (respectively, set $S_{K''}$) property $(A)_{K''}^j$ (respectively, $(B)_{K''}^j$) holds. That is, by induction assumption, for each $K'' \subset K'$, there is a randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K''}$ such that for any $T_j \in F_{K''}$: $Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K''}} [\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] = 1$, and for any $T_j \in S_{K''}$: $\forall \sigma \in \Psi, Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma} [\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] < 1$. We now need to show that at end of the inner loop analysis of subset K' , property $(A)_{K'}^i$ (respectively, $(B)_{K'}^i$) holds for every non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$ (respectively, $T_i \in S_{K'}$).

First we show that property $(A)_{K'}^i$ holds for each non-terminal T_i belonging to set $D_{K'} (\subseteq F_{K'})$, pre-computed prior to the execution of the inner loop for subset K' .

Lemma 5.2. *Every non-terminal $T_i \in D_{K'}$ satisfies property $(A)_{K'}^i$.*

Proof. The lemma is proved via a nested induction based on the time of a non-terminal being added to set $D_{K'}$. Consider the base case where $T_i \in D_{K'}$ is a non-terminal, added at the initialization step II.1.

- (i) Suppose T_i is of L-form where $i \in K'$ and for all associated rules a child is generated that is of a non-terminal $T_j \in F_{K'_{-i}}$, where property $(A)_{K'_{-i}}^j$ holds. Then using the witness strategy from property $(A)_{K'_{-i}}^j$ for all such non-terminals T_j in the next generation as if the play starts in it and, since target non-terminal T_i is already reached, clearly property $(A)_{K'}^i$ holds.

- (ii) Suppose T_i is of M-form where $i \in K'$ and $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i$ such that $T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'_i}$, where property $(A)_{K'_i}^j$ holds. Let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. Then, by combining the witness strategy $\sigma_{K'_i}$ from the induction assumption for non-terminal T_j , as if the play starts in it, with the initial local choice of choosing deterministically action a^* starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain a combined strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ such that starting at a (target) non-terminal T_i , we satisfy $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q) \mid Reach(T_i)] \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[Reach(T_i)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}^{-i}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] = 1$.
- (iii) Suppose T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where $i \in K'$ and there exists a split of the rest of the target non-terminals, implied by $K_L \subseteq K'_i$ and $K'_i - K_L$, such that $T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K'_i - K_L}$. Let $h_l := T_i(l, T_j)$ and $h_r := T_i(r, T_r)$. By combining the two witness strategies σ_{K_L} and $\sigma_{K'_i - K_L}$ from the induction assumption for non-terminals T_j and T_r , respectively, to be used from the next generation as if the play starts in it, and the fact that target T_i is reached (since T_i is the starting non-terminal), it follows that $\exists \sigma_{K'} \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)] \geq Pr_{h_l}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i - K_L} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma_{K'}^{-K_L}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i - K_L} Reach(T_q)] = 1$.
- (iv) Suppose T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$ where there exists a proper split of the target non-terminals from set K' , implied by $K_L \subset K'$ (where $K_L \neq \emptyset$) and $K' - K_L$, such that $T_j \in F_{K_L} \wedge T_r \in F_{K' - K_L}$. Combining the two witness strategies from the induction assumption for non-terminals T_j, T_r in the same way as in (iii), it follows that there exists a strategy $\sigma_{K'} \in \Psi$ such that property $(A)_{K'}^i$ holds.

Now consider non-terminals T_i added to set $D_{K'}$ at step II.2., i.e., the inductive step. If non-terminal T_i is of L-form, then all rules, associated with it, generate a child of a non-terminal T_j already in $D_{K'}$, for which $(A)_{K'}^j$ holds by the (nested) induction. Hence, $(A)_{K'}^i$ clearly also holds for the same reason as in (i) above.

If non-terminal T_i is of M-form, then $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j, T_j \in D_{K'}$. Again let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. By combining the witness strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ for non-terminal T_j (from the nested induction assumption), as if the play starts in it, with the initial local choice of choosing deterministically action a^* starting at a non-terminal T_i , we obtain an augmented strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ for a starting non-terminal T_i such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_h^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1$.

If T_i is of Q-form $(T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r)$, then either $T_j \in D_{K'}$ or $T_r \in D_{K'}$, i.e., $\exists \sigma_{K'} \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] = 0$, where $y \in \{j, r\}$. Let $h_y := T_i(x, T_y)$ and $h_{\bar{y}} := T_i(\bar{x}, T_{\bar{y}})$, where $\bar{y} \in \{j, r\} - \{y\}$, $x \in \{l, r\}$ and $\bar{x} \in \{l, r\} - \{x\}$. By augmenting this $\sigma_{K'}$ to be used from the next generation from the child of non-terminal T_y as if the play starts in it and using an arbitrary strategy from the child of non-terminal $T_{\bar{y}}$, it follows that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{h_y}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_{\bar{y}}}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] \leq Pr_{T_y}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\complement}(T_q)] = 0$, i.e., property $(A)_{K'}^i$ is satisfied. \square

Next we show that if $T_i \in S_{K'}$, then property $(B)_{K'}^i$ holds.

Lemma 5.3. *Every non-terminal $T_i \in S_{K'}$ satisfies property $(B)_{K'}^i$.*

Proof. This can be done again via another (nested) induction, based on the time a non-terminal is added to set $S_{K'}$. That is, assuming all non-terminals T_j , added already to set $S_{K'}$ in previous iterations and steps of the inner loop, satisfy property $(B)_{K'}^j$, then we show that for a new addition T_i to set $S_{K'}$, property $(B)_{K'}^i$ is also satisfied.

Consider the initialized set $S_{K'}$ of non-terminals T_i constructed at step II.4.

If T_i is of L-form, where $T_i \rightarrow \emptyset \vee T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in Z_{K'}$, then with a positive probability non-terminal T_i immediately either does not generate a child at all or generates a child of non-terminal $T_j \in Z_{K'}$, for which we already know that $(B)_{K'}^j$ holds. Clearly, this results in $(B)_{K'}^i$ being also satisfied.

If, for some subset $K'' \subset K'$, $T_i \in S_{K''}$, then $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K''} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$ (i.e., property $(B)_{K''}^i$). But, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K''} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$, so property $(B)_{K'}^i$ also holds. Note that if, for some subset $K'' \subset K'$, $T_i \in Z_{K''}$, then $T_i \in Z_{K'}$ and so already $T_i \notin X$.

And if T_i is a target non-terminal in set K' , then due to not being added to set $D_{K'}$ in step II.1. it follows that: (1) if of L-form, it generates with a positive probability a child of a non-terminal $T_j \in S_{K'_i} \cup Z_{K'_i}$, for which $(B)_{K'_i}^j$ holds; (2) if of M-form, irrespective of the strategy it generates a child of a non-terminal $T_j \in S_{K'_i} \cup Z_{K'_i}$, for which again $(B)_{K'_i}^j$ holds; (3) and if of Q-form, it generates two children of non-terminals T_j, T_r , for which no matter how we split the rest of the target non-terminals in set K'_i (into subsets $K_L \subseteq K'_i$ and $K'_i - K_L$), either $(B)_{K_L}^j$ holds or $(B)_{K'_i - K_L}^r$ holds. In other words, a target T_i in the initial set $S_{K'}$ has no strategy to ensure that the rest of the target non-terminals are reached with probability 1 (the reasoning behind this last statement is the same as the arguments in (i) - (iii) below, since for a starting (target) non-terminal $T_i : \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'_i} Reach(T_q)]$).

Observe that by the end of step II.4. all target non-terminals $T_q, q \in K'$ belong either to set $D_{K'}$ or set $S_{K'}$. Now consider a non-terminal T_i added to set $S_{K'}$ in step II.5. during some iteration of the inner loop.

- (i) Suppose T_i is of L-form. Then $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, where property $(B)_{K'}^j$ holds. So regardless of the strategy σ for the player, there is a positive probability to generate a child of the above non-terminal T_j , where $Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$. Let $h := T_i(u, T_j)$. But note that, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq p_{ij} \cdot Pr_h^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$ if and only if $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : p_{ij} \cdot Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$, where $p_{ij} > 0$ is the probability of the rule $T_i \xrightarrow{p_{ij}} T_j$. And since the latter part of the statement holds, then the former (i.e., property $(B)_{K'}^i$) is satisfied.
- (ii) Suppose T_i is of M-form. Then $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_j$, $T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$. So irrelevant of strategy σ for the player, starting in a non-terminal T_i , the next generation surely consists of some non-terminal T_j such that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$. Clearly $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] \leq \max_{\{T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}\}} Pr_{T_i(u, T_j)}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$ (i.e., property $(B)_{K'}^i$) if and only if $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \max_{\{T_j \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}\}} Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$, where the latter is satisfied.

(iii) Suppose T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$). Then $T_j, T_r \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, i.e., both $(B)_{K'}^j$ and $(B)_{K'}^r$ are satisfied. We know that:

- 1) Neither of the two children can single-handedly reach all target non-terminals from set K' with probability 1. That is, for every $\sigma \in \Psi$, $Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$ and $Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$.
- 2) Moreover, since T_i was not added to set $D_{K'}$ in step II.1., then $\forall K_L \subset K'$ (where $K_L \neq \emptyset$) either $(B)_{K_L}^j$ holds (i.e., $T_j \notin F_{K_L}$) or $(B)_{K'-K_L}^r$ holds (i.e., $T_r \notin F_{K'-K_L}$), i.e., either $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K_L} Reach(T_q)] < 1$ or $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'-K_L} Reach(T_q)] < 1$.

Let $h_l := T_i(l, T_j)$ and $h_r := T_i(r, T_r)$. Notice that for any $\sigma \in \Psi$ and for any $q' \in K'$, $Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \geq Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})] = Pr_{h_l}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})]$.

We claim that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in K'} Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$. But for any $q \in K'$ and for any $\sigma \in \Psi$ one can easily construct $\sigma' \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] = Pr_{h_l}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)]$ and similarly for non-terminal T_r . So it follows from the claim that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in K'} Pr_{h_l}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{h_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$ and, therefore, it follows that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcup_{q \in K'} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0 \Leftrightarrow Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$.

Suppose the opposite, i.e., assume (\mathcal{P}) such that $\exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K'} Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \cdot Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] = 0$. Now for any $q \in K'$, by statement 2) above, we know that $T_j \notin F_{\{q\}} \vee T_r \notin F_{K'_-q}$ and $T_j \notin F_{K'_-q} \vee T_r \notin F_{\{q\}}$. First, suppose that in fact for some $q' \in K'$ it is the case that $T_j \notin F_{\{q'\}} \wedge T_r \notin F_{\{q'\}}$ (i.e., $T_j \in S_{\{q'\}} \cup Z_{\{q'\}} \wedge T_r \in S_{\{q'\}} \cup Z_{\{q'\}}$). That is, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})] > 0$ and $Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_{q'})] > 0$, where our claims follows directly (hence, contradiction to (\mathcal{P})). Second, suppose that for some $q' \in K'$ it is the case that $T_j \notin F_{K'_-q'} \wedge T_r \notin F_{K'_-q'}$ (i.e., $T_j \in S_{K'_-q'} \cup Z_{K'_-q'} \wedge T_r \in S_{K'_-q'} \cup Z_{K'_-q'}$). But then T_i would have been added to set $S_{K'_-q'}$ at step II.5.(c) when constructing the answer for subset of targets K'_-q' . However, we already know that $T_i \in \bigcap_{K'' \subset K'} F_{K''}$ (follows from steps II.3 and II.4. that $T_i \notin \bigcup_{K'' \subset K'} (S_{K''} \cup Z_{K''})$). Hence, again a contradiction.

Therefore, it follows that for every $q \in K'$, either $T_j \notin F_{\{q\}} \wedge T_j \notin F_{K'_-q}$ or $T_r \notin F_{\{q\}} \wedge T_r \notin F_{K'_-q}$. And in particular, the essential part is that $\forall q \in K'$, either $T_j \notin F_{\{q\}}$ or $T_r \notin F_{\{q\}}$. That is, for every $q \in K'$, either $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_j}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$, or $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^\sigma[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] > 0$. But then, combined with assumption (\mathcal{P}) , it actually follows that there exists a subset $K'' \subseteq K'$ such that $\exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K''} Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] = 0 \wedge \bigwedge_{q \in K'-K''} Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'}[Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] = 0$. And by Proposition 2.1(1.), it follows that $\exists \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{q \in K''} Reach(T_q)] = 1 \wedge Pr_{T_j}^{\sigma'}[\bigcap_{q \in K'-K''} Reach(T_q)] = 1$, i.e., $T_j \in F_{K'-K''} \wedge T_r \in F_{K''}$, contradicting the known facts 1) and 2). Hence, assumption (\mathcal{P}) is wrong and our claim is satisfied.

Now consider any non-terminal T_i that is added to set $S_{K'}$ in step II.10. at some iteration of the inner loop (i.e., $T_i \in Y_{K'} := X - (S_{K'} \cup F_{K'}) \subseteq \bar{Z}_{K'}$). Since non-terminal T_i has not been previously added to sets $D_{K'}$, $S_{K'}$ or $F_{K'}$, then all of the following hold:

- (1.) $i \notin K'$;

- (2.) if T_i is of L-form, then a non-terminal T_i generates with probability 1 a non-terminal which belongs to $Y_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to sets $S_{K'}$ or $F_{K'}$ in step II.4, II.5. or II.9., respectively);
- (3.) if T_i is of M-form, then $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_d, T_d \notin F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to sets $D_{K'}$ or $F_{K'}$ in step II.2. or step II.9., respectively), and $\exists a' \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a'} T_j, T_j \notin S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, i.e., $T_j \in Y_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to set $S_{K'}$ in step II.5.); and
- (4.) if T_i is of Q-form ($T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then w.l.o.g. $T_j \in Y_{K'}$ and $T_r \in (Y_{K'} \cup S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'})$ (as T_i has not been added to the other sets in steps II.2., II.5. or II.9.).

Due to the statements (2.) - (4.) above, notice that the dependency graph G does not contain outgoing edges from set $Y_{K'}$ to sets $D_{K'}$ and $F_{K'}$. So any SCC in subgraph $G[X - S_{K'}]$, that contains a node from set $Y_{K'}$, is in fact entirely contained in subgraph $G[Y_{K'}]$.

Furthermore, one of the following is the reason for a Q-form non-terminal $T_i \in Y_{K'}$ not having been added to set $F_{K'}$ at the initialization step II.8.:

- (4.1.) either T_i does not belong to any of the sets $H_q, q \in K'$. So, from step II.7., $T_r \in Z_{\{q\}}$ for every $q \in K'$ (recall that w.l.o.g. $T_j \in Y_{K'} \subseteq \bar{Z}_{K'} \subseteq \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}, \forall q \in K'$),
- (4.2.) or T_i does belong to some set $H_{q'}, q' \in K'$, but if T_i belongs to a strongly connected component C' in $G[Y_{K'}]$, then $\exists q'' \in K'$ such that $H_{q''} \cap C' = \emptyset$.

We can treat the Q-form non-terminals with property (4.1.) as if they have only one child (namely the child of non-terminal T_j), since the other child (of non-terminal T_r) does not contribute to reaching, even with a positive probability, any of the target non-terminals from set K' .

We need to show that for every non-terminal $T_i \in Y_{K'}$ property $(B)_{K'}^i$ holds, i.e., $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$.

From standard algorithms about SCC-decomposition, it is known that there is an ordering of the SCCs in $G[Y_{K'}]$, where the bottom level in this ordering (level 0) consists of bottom strongly connected components (BSCCs) that have no edges leaving the BSCC at all, and for further levels in the ordering of SCCs the following is true: SCCs or nodes not in any SCC, at level $t \geq 1$, have directed paths out of them leading to SCCs or nodes not in any SCC, at levels $< t$. We rank the SCCs and the independent nodes (not belonging to any SCC) in $G[Y_{K'}]$ according to this ordering, denoting by $Y_{K'}^t, t \geq 0$ the nodes (non-terminals) at levels up to and including t , and use the following induction on the level:

- For the base case: for any BSCC, C , at level 0 (i.e., $C \subseteq Y_{K'}^0$), clearly for any non-terminal $T_i \in C, \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1$ if and only if $H_q \cap C \neq \emptyset, \forall q \in K'$. But, by property (4.2), there is no such component C in $G[Y_{K'}]$ that contains a Q-form non-terminal from each of the sets $H_q, q \in K'$.
- As for the inductive step, assume that for some $t \geq 1$ for any $T_v \in Y_{K'}^{t-1}, \forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_v}^\sigma[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$, i.e., $(B)_{K'}^v$ is satisfied. Let σ be an arbitrary strategy fixed for the player. For a SCC, C' , at level $t \geq 1$, let w denote the path (in the play), where w begins at a starting non-terminal $T_i \in C'$ and evolves in the following way. If the current copy o on the path w is of a L-form or a M-form non-terminal $T_j \in C'$, then w follows

along the unique successor of o in the play. And if the current copy o on path w is of a Q-form non-terminal $T_j \in C'$ ($T_j \xrightarrow{1} T_{j'} T_r$, where w.l.o.g. $T_{j'} \in C'$), then w follows along the child of non-terminal $T_{j'}$. (Note that $T_r \notin C'$, since we already know from (4.) that $T_{j'} \in Y_{K'} \subseteq \bar{Z}_{K'} \subseteq \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$, $\forall q \in K'$, and so if $T_r \in C' \subseteq Y_{K'}$ then property (4.2.) will be contradicted.) If the current copy o on path w is of a non-terminal not belonging in C' , then the path w terminates. Denote by $\square C'$ the event that path w is infinite, i.e., all non-terminals observed along path w are in C' and path w never leaves C' and never terminates. Then for any starting non-terminal $T_i \in C'$:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] &= Pr_{T_i}^\sigma \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \square C' \right] \\ &+ Pr_{T_i}^\sigma \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square C' \right] = Pr_{T_i}^\sigma \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square C' \right] \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)) \cap \square C'] = 0$, due to statements (1.) and (4.2.).

By property (3.) and also due to the ranking of SCCs and nodes in $G[Y_{K'}]$, if path w terminates, then it does in a non-terminal $T_v \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'} \cup Y_{K'}^{t-1}$. Also due to properties (1.) - (4.) and (4.2.), in the case of event $\neg \square C'$ occurring, all the targets in set K' are reached with probability 1, starting in $T_i \in C'$, if and only if they are all reached with probability 1, starting from such a non-terminal $T_v \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'} \cup Y_{K'}^{t-1}$. To see this, note that for any of the Q-form non-terminals $T_j \in C'$ ($T_j \xrightarrow{1} T_{j'} T_r$, where w.l.o.g. $T_{j'} \in C'$), $T_r \notin F_{\{q\}}$ for any $q \in K'$ (otherwise, if $T_r \in F_{\{q'\}}$ for some $q' \in K'$, then since T_j was not added to set $D_{K'}$ at step II.1., it follows that $T_{j'} \notin F_{K'_{-q'}}$, i.e., $T_{j'} \in S_{K'_{-q'}} \cup Z_{K'_{-q'}}$, and hence $T_{j'} \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'}$, which contradicts that $T_{j'} \in C' \subseteq Y_{K'}$). So none of the targets in set K' is reached with probability 1 (but it is possible with a positive probability) from a non-terminal spawned off of the path w .

It follows that for a starting non-terminal $T_i \in C'$:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'} \left[\left(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right) \cap \neg \square C' \right] &= 1 \text{ if and only if} \\ \exists \sigma'' \in \Psi : \max_{\langle T_v \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'} \cup Y_{K'}^{t-1} \mid \exists T_j \in C', b \in \Gamma^j : T_j \xrightarrow{b} T_v \rangle} Pr_{T_v}^{\sigma''} \left[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q) \right] &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of this statement is clearly not satisfied since we already know that $T_v \in S_{K'} \cup Z_{K'} \cup Y_{K'}^{t-1}$ satisfy property (B) $_{K'}^v$.

So it follows that $\forall \sigma' \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'} [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'} [(\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)) \cap \neg \square C'] < 1$.

As for nodes (non-terminals) $T_i \in Y_{K'}^t$, at level t , that do not belong to any SCC, using a similar argument, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$.

By this inductive argument, it follows that for any non-terminal $T_i \in Y_{K'}$ and for any strategy $\sigma \in \Psi$: $Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] < 1$. \square

Now we show that for non-terminals $T_i \in F_{K'}$, when the inner loop for subset $K' \subseteq K$ terminates, the property (A) $_{K'}^i$ is satisfied. We will also construct a witness strategy, under which this

property holds for each non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$. Since we have already proved it for non-terminals in set $D_{K'}$, in the following Lemma we refer to the part of set $F_{K'}$ not containing set $D_{K'}$, i.e., to set $F_{K'} = X - S_{K'}$.

Lemma 5.4. *Every non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$ satisfies the property $(A)_{K'}^i$.*

Proof. For the rest of this proof denote by $F_{K'}^0$, the initialized set at step II.8. Let us first observe the properties for the non-terminals $T_i \in F_{K'} = X - S_{K'}$. None of the non-terminals is a target non-terminal from set K' , i.e., $i \notin K'$. If T_i is of L-form, then:

- (L) a non-terminal T_i generates with probability 1 as offspring some non-terminal belonging either to set $F_{K'}$ or to set $D_{K'}$.

If T_i is of M-form, then $\forall a \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a} T_d, T_d \notin D_{K'}$ and:

- (M) $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j, T_j \in F_{K'}$.

If T_i is of Q-form (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then $T_j, T_r \notin D_{K'}$ and:

- (Q.0) if $T_i \in F_{K'}^0, \exists q \in K'$ such that w.l.o.g. $T_j \in F_{K'} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$,
- (Q.1) otherwise, w.l.o.g. $T_j \in F_{K'}$.

- (\mathfrak{P}) Let us recall that for every $q \in K'$, there is a deterministic static strategy $\sigma'_{\{q\}}$ for the player and a value $b_{\{q\}} > 0$ such that, starting at a non-terminal $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}, Pr_{T_r}^{\sigma'_{\{q\}}} [Reach(T_q)] \geq b_{\{q\}}$. Let $b := \min_{q \in K'} \{b_{\{q\}}\} > 0$.

We construct now the non-static strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ for the player in the following way. In each generation, there is going to be one non-terminal in the generation that is declared to be a “queen” and the rest of the non-terminals in the generation are called “workers” (we will see the difference between the two labels, especially in the choices of actions). Suppose the initial population is a non-terminal $T_v \in F_{K'}$, declared to be the initial queen.

Consider any finite ancestor history h , that starts at the initial non-terminal $T_v \in F_{K'}$, and let o denote the non-terminal copy at the end of the ancestor history h . If o is a queen of L-form non-terminal T_i , then from statement (L) we know that in the next generation the single generated successor child o' is of some non-terminal $T_j \in F_{K'} \cup D_{K'}$. If $T_j \in D_{K'}$, then we use at o' and its subtree of descendants the randomized non-static witness strategy from property $(A)_{K'}^j$ as if the play is starting in o' . If $T_j \in F_{K'}$, then we label o' as the queen in the next generation and use the same strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ (that is currently being described) at it. If o is a queen of M-form non-terminal T_i , then $\sigma_{K'}$ chooses at o uniformly at random among actions a^* from statement (M) and, hence, in the next generation a single child o' of some non-terminal $T_j \in F_{K'}$ will be generated. Again o' is declared to be the queen in the next generation and the same strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ (currently being described) is used at it. If o is a queen of Q-form non-terminal T_i (i.e., $T_i \xrightarrow{1} T_j T_r$), then there are two cases for the two successor children o' and o'' of non-terminals T_j and T_r , respectively:

- **either** property (Q.0) is satisfied, i.e., $T_i \in F_{K'}^0$, and $T_j \in F_{K'} \wedge T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$, for some target $q \in K'$. Then, in the next generation, we declare o' to be the queen and use the currently described strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ for it. As for the child o'' , it is declared to be a worker and the strategy used at the entire subtree, rooted at o'' , is some strategy $\sigma'_{\{q'\}}$ (from statement (\mathfrak{P})), where $q' \in K'$ is chosen uniformly at random among all targets $q \in K$ such that $T_r \in \bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$. The randomization in the strategy of the worker is needed, since non-terminal T_i can belong to more than one set H_q , i.e., T_r can belong to more than one set $\bar{Z}_{\{q\}}$.
- **or** property (Q.1) is satisfied, i.e., $T_i \in F_{K'} - F_{K'}^0$ and w.l.o.g. $T_j \in F_{K'}$. Then, in the next generation, the child o' is again declared to be the queen and the same strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ is used for it, whereas the child o'' is again labelled as a worker, but the strategy for it is irrelevant and so an arbitrary one is chosen for its entire subtree of descendants.

That concludes the description of strategy $\sigma_{K'}$. Now we need to show that, indeed, the randomized non-static strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ is an almost-sure strategy for the player, i.e., that for any $T_i \in F_{K'} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{K'}}[\bigcap_{q \in K'} Reach(T_q)] = 1$.

As previously stated, $F_{K'}^0$ is the initial set $F_{K'}$ at step II.8. Also let $T_{x_1}, T_{x_2}, \dots, T_{x_t}$ be the non-terminals in set $F_{K'} - F_{K'}^0$ indexed with respect to the time at which they were added to set $F_{K'}$ at step II.9. Let $\gamma := \max_{i \in [n]} |\Gamma^i|$ and let λ be the minimum of $\frac{1}{\gamma}$ and the minimum rule probability in the OBMDP. Consider the sequence of queens. We claim that with a positive probability $\geq \lambda^n$ in the next $n = |V|$ generations we reach a Q-form queen of a (specific) non-terminal in set $F_{K'}^0$. To show this, we define, for each non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$, a finite “auxiliary” tree \mathcal{T}_i , rooted at T_i , which represents why T_i was added to set $F_{K'}$ (i.e., based on steps II.8. and II.9. in the last iteration before step II.11. terminates the inner loop). If $T_i \in F_{K'}^0$, then the tree \mathcal{T}_i is constructed of just a single node (leaf) labelled by T_i . If T_i is of L-form, added at step II.9., then $T_i \rightarrow T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'}$ (otherwise T_i would have been added to set $D_{K'}$) and the tree \mathcal{T}_i has an edge from its root (labelled by T_i) to a child labelled by T_j (the root of the subtree \mathcal{T}_j), for each such $T_j \in F_{K'}$. If T_i is of M-form, added at step II.9., then the tree \mathcal{T}_i has an edge from its root (labelled by T_i) to a child labelled by T_j (the root of the subtree \mathcal{T}_j), for every T_j such that $\exists a^* \in \Gamma^i : T_i \xrightarrow{a^*} T_j$, $T_j \in F_{K'}$. And if T_i is of Q-form, added at step II.9., then the tree \mathcal{T}_i has an edge from its root (labelled by T_i) to a child labelled by T_j (from property (Q.1)), which is the root of the subtree \mathcal{T}_j .

The “auxiliary” tree, just defined, has depth of at most n , since there is a strict order in which the non-terminals entered set $F_{K'}$. Now observe that, if we consider any generation of the play, assuming that the current queen (in this generation) is of some non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$, it can be inductively shown that with a positive probability (at least λ^n) in at most n generations the sequence of queens follows a *specific* root-to-leaf path in \mathcal{T}_i . That is because if we are at a queen of a L-form non-terminal T_j (respectively, in node labelled by T_j , which is the root of tree \mathcal{T}_j), then in the next generation with probability $\geq \lambda$ the queen is of non-terminal $T_{j'} \in F_{K'}$, which is a child of the root of \mathcal{T}_j and is also itself the root of $\mathcal{T}_{j'}$. And if we are at a queen of a M-form non-terminal T_j , then in the next generation (due to the fixed strategy $\sigma_{K'}$) with probability $\geq 1/|\Gamma^j| \geq 1/\gamma \geq \lambda$ the successor queen is of a non-terminal $T_{j_a} \in F_{K'}$, which is a child of the root of \mathcal{T}_j and is also the root of \mathcal{T}_{j_a} . And if we are at a queen of a Q-form non-terminal T_j , which is not a leaf in this “auxiliary” tree, then in the next generation with probability 1 the queen is of a non-terminal $T_{j'}$, which is the root of $\mathcal{T}_{j'}$ and the unique child of the root of \mathcal{T}_j . Since the depth of the “auxiliary” defined tree is at most n , then with probability $\geq \lambda^n$, from a current queen of some non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$, in the next $\leq n$ steps we arrive at a *specific* leaf T_v of the tree \mathcal{T}_i , i.e., a queen of non-terminal $T_v \in F_{K'}^0$.

is generated.

If somewhere along the sequence of queens, a queen of a L-form non-terminal happens to generate a non-terminal in $D_{K'}$, then the sequence of queens is actually finite. Therefore, if the sequence of queens is infinite, since it has to follow root-to-leaf paths in the defined “auxiliary” tree, then it follows that with probability 1 infinitely often a queen of a Q-form non-terminal in set $F_{K'}^0$ is observed.

Now consider any $q \in K'$ and any Q-form non-terminal $T_u \in F_{K'}^0 \cap H_q$. Since in the subgraph of the dependency graph, induced by $X - S_{K'} = F_{K'}$ (i.e., $G[F_{K'}]$), node T_u is part of a SCC that contains at least one node (non-terminal) from each set $H_{q'}, q' \in K'$, then, along the sequence of queens, from a queen of non-terminal T_u , for any $q' \in K'$ there is a non-terminal $T_{u'} \in F_{K'}^0 \cap H_{q'}$ that can be reached as a queen, under the described strategy $\sigma_{K'}$, in at most n generations with a positive probability bounded away from zero (in fact, at least λ^n). Note: There is a positive probability, under strategy $\sigma_{K'}$, to exit the particular SCC of T_u . However, under $\sigma_{K'}$ and starting at any non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$, almost-surely the sequence of queens eventually reaches a queen whose non-terminal is in a SCC, C'' , in $G[F_{K'}]$ which can only have an outgoing edge to set $D_{K'}$ and where, moreover, for each target in K' there is a branching (Q-form) node in C'' whose “extra” child can hit that target with a positive probability (bounded away from zero).

Hence, starting at a non-terminal $T_i \in F_{K'}$ and under strategy $\sigma_{K'}$, the sequence of queens follows root-to-leaf paths in the defined “auxiliary” tree and, for each $q \in K'$, infinitely often a queen of a Q-form non-terminal from set H_q is observed. And each such queen generates an independent worker, that reaches the respective target non-terminal T_q in a finite number of generations with a positive probability bounded away from zero (due to the uniformly at random choice over strategies from statement (\mathfrak{B}) , for each worker, and due to the fact that the value $b > 0$ from statement (\mathfrak{B}) does not depend on history or time when the worker is generated). And, more importantly, since the queens of Q-form non-terminals from the sets $H_q, q \in K'$ form SCCs in $G[F_{K'}]$, then collectively the independent workers (under their respective strategies) have infinitely often a positive probability bounded away from zero to reach all target non-terminals from set K' in a finite number of generations. Hence, all target non-terminals from set K' are reached with probability 1. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1 and the analysis of the almost-sure algorithm. The proof of Lemma 5.4 describes how to construct, for any subset $K' \subseteq K$, the witness strategy $\sigma_{K'}$ for the non-terminals in set $F_{K'}$. These non-static strategies $\sigma_{K'}$ are described as functions that map finite ancestor histories belonging to the controller to distributions over actions for the current non-terminal of the ancestor history, and can be described in such a form in time $4^k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$. \square

6 Further cases of qualitative multi-objective (non-)reachability

In this section we present algorithms for deciding some other cases of qualitative multi-objective problems for OBMDPs, involving certain kinds of boolean combinations of qualitative reachability and non-reachability queries with respect to given target non-terminals.

6.1 $\stackrel{?}{\exists} \sigma \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [Reach(T_q)] < 1$

Proposition 6.1. *There is an algorithm that, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, computes the set $F := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^\sigma [Reach(T_q)] < 1\}$. The*

algorithm runs in time $k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$ and can also compute a randomized static witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F .

Proof. First, as a preprocessing step, for each $q \in K$ we compute the set $W_q := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma_q \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_q}[Reach(T_q)] < 1\}$, together with a single deterministic static strategy σ_q that witnesses the property for every non-terminal in set W_q . This can be done in time $k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$, using the algorithm from [10, Theorem 9.3].

Then the Proposition is a direct consequence from the following Claim.

Claim 6.2. $F = \bigcap_{q \in K} W_q$.

Proof. We need to show that $T_i \in \bigcap_{q \in K} W_q$ if and only if $\exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'}[Reach(T_q)] < 1$.
 (\Leftarrow) Suppose $T_i \notin \bigcap_{q \in K} W_q$, i.e., $T_i \in \bigcup_{q \in K} \overline{W}_q$, where $\overline{W}_q := V - W_q$ for each $q \in K$. Then there exists some $q' \in K$ such that $T_i \in \overline{W}_{q'}$, i.e., $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_{q'})] = 1$. Clearly, this implies that $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] = 1$.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose that $T_i \in \bigcap_{q \in K} W_q$. Recall that for each $q \in K$ there is a deterministic static witness strategy σ_q for the non-terminals in set W_q . Let σ' be a randomized static strategy for the player defined as follows: σ' chooses uniformly at random a target $q \in K$ and copies exactly the deterministic static strategy σ_q . Then, for each target T_q , $q \in K$, under σ' and starting at a non-terminal $T_i \in \bigcap_{q \in K} W_q$:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'}[Reach(T_q)] &= \sum_{q' \in K} \frac{1}{k} \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{q'}}[Reach(T_q)] = \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \cdot Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_q}[Reach(T_q)] + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{q' \in K, q' \neq q} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_{q'}}[Reach(T_q)] < \frac{1}{k} + \frac{k-1}{k} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

The randomized static witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F is precisely the σ' constructed in the proof of the Claim above. □

6.2 $\overset{?}{\exists} \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] < 1$

Proposition 6.3. *There is an algorithm that, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, computes the set $F := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] < 1\}$. The algorithm runs in time $k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$ and can also compute a deterministic static witness strategy σ for a given starting non-terminal $T_i \in F$.*

Proof. First, as a preprocessing step, for each $q \in K$ we compute the set $W_q := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma_q \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma_q}[Reach(T_q)] < 1\}$, together with a single deterministic static strategy σ_q that witnesses the property for every non-terminal in set W_q . This can be done in time $k \cdot |\mathcal{A}|^{O(1)}$, using the algorithm from [10, Theorem 9.3].

Then the Proposition is a direct consequence from the claim that $F = \bigcup_{q \in K} W_q$. To see this claim, note that $T_i \in \bigcup_{q \in K} W_q$ if and only if there exists $\sigma' \in \Psi$ and some $q \in K$ such that

$Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'}[Reach(T_q)] < 1$ (by definition of the W_q , $q \in K$ sets). Then the claim follows directly from Proposition 2.1(2.).

For each $T_i \in F$, the witness strategy σ selects deterministically some $q \in K$, such that $T_i \in W_q$, and copies exactly the deterministic static strategy σ_q . \square

Consider the following two examples of OBMDPs with non-terminals $\{M, T, T', L, R_1, R_2\}$ and target non-terminals R_1 and R_2 . M is the only controlled non-terminal. The examples provide a good idea of the difference between the objectives in Propositions 6.1 and 6.3.

Example 2

$$\begin{array}{lll} M \xrightarrow{a} T & T \xrightarrow{1} L R_1 & L \xrightarrow{1/2} \emptyset \\ M \xrightarrow{b} T' & T' \xrightarrow{1} R_1 R_2 & L \xrightarrow{1/2} R_2 \end{array}$$

There exists a deterministic static witness strategy σ' for the player such that $Pr_M^{\sigma'}[Reach(R_1) \cap Reach(R_2)] < 1$, namely, starting at a non-terminal M , let the player choose deterministically action a . Thus, the probability of observing both target non-terminals in the generated tree is $1/2$. However, notice that for any strategy σ , starting at non-terminal M , target non-terminal R_1 is reached with probability 1. That is, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in \{1,2\}} Pr_M^{\sigma}[Reach(R_q)] = 1$.

Example 3

$$\begin{array}{lll} M \xrightarrow{a} T & T \xrightarrow{1} L R_1 & L \xrightarrow{1/2} R_1 \\ M \xrightarrow{b} T' & T' \xrightarrow{1} L R_2 & L \xrightarrow{1/2} R_2 \end{array}$$

There exists a static strategy σ' such that $\bigwedge_{q \in \{1,2\}} Pr_M^{\sigma'}[Reach(R_q)] < 1$, but the strategy needs to randomize, otherwise a deterministic choice in non-terminal M will generate a target non-terminal immediately in the next generation. Note that the same strategy σ' (although a deterministic one suffices) also guarantees $Pr_M^{\sigma'}[Reach(R_1) \cap Reach(R_2)] < 1$.

6.3 $\overset{?}{\exists} \sigma \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] > 0$

Proposition 6.4. *There is an algorithm that, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, computes the set $F := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] > 0\}$. The algorithm runs in time $O(k \cdot |V|^2)$ and can also compute a randomized static witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F .*

Proof. First, for each $q \in K$, we compute the attractor set of target non-terminal T_q with respect to the dependency graph $G = (U, E)$, $U = V$, of \mathcal{A} . That is, for each $q \in K$, we compute the set $Attr(T_q)$ as the limit of the following sequence $(Attr_t(T_q))_{t \geq 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned} Attr_0(T_q) &= \{T_q\} \\ Attr_t(T_q) &= Attr_{t-1}(T_q) \cup \{T_i \in V \mid \exists T_j \in Attr_{t-1}(T_q) \text{ s.t. } (T_i, T_j) \in E\} \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $Attr(T_q)$ is the set of nodes in G (or equivalently, non-terminals in \mathcal{A}) that have a directed path to the target node (non-terminal) T_q in the dependency graph G . For each $q \in K$, such a set can be computed in time $O(|V|^2)$. So all k attractor sets (one for each target non-terminal $T_q, q \in K$) can be computed in time $O(k \cdot |V|^2)$. The Proposition is a direct consequence from the following Claim.

Claim 6.5. $F = \bigcap_{q \in K} Attr(T_q)$.

Proof. To prove the Claim, we need to show that $T_i \in \bigcap_{q \in K} Attr(T_q)$ if and only if $\exists \sigma' \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'}[Reach(T_q)] > 0$.

(\Leftarrow .) Suppose that $T_i \notin \bigcap_{q \in K} Attr(T_q)$, i.e., there exists some $q' \in K$ such that $T_i \notin Attr(T_{q'})$. This implies that in the dependency graph G there is even no path from T_i to $T_{q'}$. Therefore, regardless of strategy σ for the player, $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_{q'})] = 0$ and hence, $\forall \sigma \in \Psi : \bigvee_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] = 0$.

(\Rightarrow .) Suppose that $T_i \in \bigcap_{q \in K} Attr(T_q)$. Let σ' be the randomized static strategy such that in every non-terminal $T_j \in V$ of M-form it chooses uniformly at random an action among its set of actions Γ^j . For each $q \in K$, in the dependency graph G there is a directed path from T_i to T_q . Then under the described strategy σ' , starting at a non-terminal T_i , there is a positive probability to generate any of the target non-terminals $\{T_q \mid q \in K\}$, because there is a positive probability for a path in the play (tree) to follow the directed path in G from T_i to T_q , for any $q \in K$.

Denote by λ the minimum of $\frac{1}{\max_{j \in [n]} |\Gamma^j|}$ and the minimum probability among the probabilistic rules of \mathcal{A} . Then, in fact, for each $q \in K$, under σ' there is a probability $\geq \lambda^n$ to generate a copy of target non-terminal T_q in the next $\leq n$ generations, i.e., $\bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma'}[Reach(T_q)] \geq \lambda^n > 0$. \square

The randomized static witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F is the σ' constructed in the proof of the Claim above. \square

6.4 $\stackrel{?}{\exists} \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \Delta \{0, 1\}$

Now let us consider the qualitative cases of multi-objective reachability where for a given OBMDP and a given set $K \subseteq [n]$ of target non-terminals, the aim is to compute those non-terminals $T_i \in V$ that satisfy the property that $\exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \Delta \{0, 1\}$, where $\Delta := \{<, =, >\}$.

First, due to the fact that the complement of the set (of plays) $\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)$ is the set (of plays) $\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)$, we give the following Lemma to show that this complement objective reduces to the objective of reachability of a single target non-terminal in a slightly modified OBMDP.

Lemma 6.6. *There is an algorithm that, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals $\{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\}$, runs in linear time $O(|\mathcal{A}|)$ and outputs another OBMDP, \mathcal{A}' , with a single target non-terminal T_f , such that for any $T_i \in V^{\mathcal{A}} - \{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\} = V^{\mathcal{A}'} - \{T_f\}$ and any strategy $\sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$, there exists a strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$ such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)]$.*

Proof. Consider the OBMDP, \mathcal{A}' , obtained from OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , by adding a new purely probabilistic target non-terminal T_f with a single rule $T_f \xrightarrow{1} \emptyset$, removing all target non-terminals $\{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\}$ and their associated rules, and replacing any occurrence of a non-terminal $T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}}, q \in K$,

on the right-hand side of some rule with non-terminal T_f . Hence, $V^{\mathcal{A}'} = (V^{\mathcal{A}} \cup \{T_f\}) - \{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\}$. Clearly, for any $T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}}$, with $q \in K$ and for any $\sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$, $Pr_{T_q}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcup_{q' \in K} Reach(T_{q'})] = 1$. Also, for $T_f \in V^{\mathcal{A}'}$ and for any $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$, $Pr_{T_f}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)] = 1$.

Observe that for any play (tree) \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{A} , there is a play \mathcal{T}' in \mathcal{A}' such that any copy o of a non-terminal $T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}}$, $q \in K$ in \mathcal{T} is replaced in \mathcal{T}' by a copy of non-terminal T_f and the subtree of descendants of o is non-existent in \mathcal{T}' .

Now consider any starting non-terminal $T_u \in V^{\mathcal{A}} - \{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\} = V^{\mathcal{A}'} - \{T_f\}$.

Let $\sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$ be any strategy for the player in \mathcal{A} . Define strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$ in \mathcal{A}' in the following way: for each non-terminal $T_i \in V^{\mathcal{A}'} - \{T_f\}$, strategy σ' behaves exactly like σ for all ancestor histories ending in T_i , and for non-terminal T_f strategy σ' acts arbitrarily in all ancestor histories ending in T_f since it is irrelevant. Note that, due to the construction of \mathcal{A}' and σ' , if a play (tree) \mathcal{T} , generated under strategy σ , belongs to set (objective) $\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)$ in \mathcal{A} , then in \mathcal{A}' under σ' the corresponding unique play \mathcal{T}' (as described above) belongs to set (objective) $Reach(T_f)$. Furthermore, all plays \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{A} with the same corresponding play \mathcal{T}' in \mathcal{A}' have a combined probability, of being generated under σ , equal to the probability of \mathcal{T}' being generated under σ' in \mathcal{A}' . Hence, $Pr_{T_u}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] = Pr_{T_u}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)]$. But σ was an arbitrary strategy.

For the opposite direction, let $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$ be any strategy for the player in \mathcal{A}' . Define $\sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$ to be the strategy that, for all non-terminals $T_i \in V^{\mathcal{A}} - \{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\}$, acts the same as σ' in all ancestor histories ending in T_i ; and for all non-terminals $T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}}$, $q \in K$ the strategy σ acts arbitrarily in all ancestor histories ending in T_q as it is irrelevant. Then, for any play $\mathcal{T}' \in Reach(T_f)$ in \mathcal{A}' under strategy σ' , there is at least one play $\mathcal{T} \in \bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)$ in \mathcal{A} under strategy σ , such that for any copy of non-terminal T_f in tree \mathcal{T}' there is a copy of some non-terminal $T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}}$, $q \in K$ at the corresponding position in tree \mathcal{T} . But note that the probability of generating \mathcal{T}' in \mathcal{A}' under σ' is equal to the sum of probabilities of generating all such corresponding plays \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{A} under σ . Hence, $Pr_{T_u}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)] = Pr_{T_u}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)]$. But σ' was an arbitrary strategy. \square

We now present a Proposition that deals with all four qualitative questions for the (set of plays) objective $\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)$ for a given set $K \subseteq [n]$ of target non-terminals.

Proposition 6.7. *There is a P-time algorithm that, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, computes the set $F := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \Delta \{0, 1\}\}$, where $\Delta := \{<, =, >\}$. The algorithm can also compute a deterministic witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F .*

Proof. We can rephrase the question of whether $\exists \sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathbb{G}}(T_q)] \Delta x$ accordingly into the form of asking whether $\exists \sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] \Delta_{\mathbb{C}} 1 - x$, where $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{C}}$ is $<, =, >$ if Δ is $>, =, <$, respectively. And as a consequence of Lemma 6.6, there exists a modified OBMDP, \mathcal{A}' , with a single target non-terminal T_f such that $\exists \sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma, \mathcal{A}}[\bigcup_{q \in K} Reach(T_q)] \Delta_{\mathbb{C}} 1 - x$ if and only if $\exists \sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'} : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)] \Delta_{\mathbb{C}} 1 - x$.

For the case of $1 - x = 0$, by [10, Proposition 4.1], there is a P-time algorithm to compute the set $F^{\mathcal{A}'}$ of non-terminals T_i in \mathcal{A}' and a deterministic static witness strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$ such that $T_i \in F^{\mathcal{A}'}$ are precisely the non-terminals that satisfy the property $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)] \Delta_{\mathbb{C}} 0$.

For the case of $1 - x = 1$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{C}}$ equal to $<$ (respectively, $=$), by [10, Theorem 9.3, 9.4], there is again a P-time algorithm to compute the set $F^{\mathcal{A}'}$ of non-terminals T_i in \mathcal{A}' and a deterministic

static (respectively, non-static) witness strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$ such that $T_i \in F^{\mathcal{A}'}$ are the non-terminals that satisfy the property $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)] < 1$ (respectively, $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma', \mathcal{A}'}[Reach(T_f)] = 1$).

Now for the qualitative decision questions where tuple $(\Delta_{\mathcal{C}}, 1 - x)$ is equal to $(=, 0)$ or $(<, 1)$, let $F = F^{\mathcal{A}} := F^{\mathcal{A}'}$; and where tuple $(\Delta_{\mathcal{C}}, 1 - x)$ is equal to $(>, 0)$ or $(=, 1)$, let $F = F^{\mathcal{A}} := (F^{\mathcal{A}'} - \{T_f\}) \cup \{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\}$. By the proof of Lemma 6.6, from a deterministic witness strategy $\sigma' \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}'}$ for the starting non-terminals from set $F^{\mathcal{A}'}$ we can obtain a corresponding deterministic (non-)static witness strategy $\sigma \in \Psi^{\mathcal{A}}$ for the starting non-terminals from set $F - \{T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}} \mid q \in K\}$. As for each non-terminal $T_q \in V^{\mathcal{A}}, q \in K$, let strategy σ make deterministically and statically an arbitrary choice of action from the action set Γ^q (in the case if T_q is of M-form), since if $T_q \notin F$ then strategy is irrelevant at T_q and if $T_q \in F$ then the property holds for any choice of the strategy in T_q . \square

$$6.5 \quad \overset{?}{\exists} \sigma \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] = 0$$

Proposition 6.8. *There is a P-time algorithm that, given an OBMDP, \mathcal{A} , and a set $K \subseteq [n]$ of $k = |K|$ target non-terminals, computes the set $F := \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : \bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] = 0\}$. The algorithm can also compute a deterministic static witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F .*

Proof. Note that the question of deciding whether there exists a strategy $\sigma \in \Psi$ for the player such that $\bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach(T_q)] = 0$ can be rephrased as asking whether there exists a strategy $\sigma \in \Psi$ such that $\bigwedge_{q \in K} Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[Reach^{\mathcal{C}}(T_q)] = 1$. By Proposition 2.1(1.), we already know that it is equivalent to ask instead whether there exists a strategy $\sigma \in \Psi$ such that $Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathcal{C}}(T_q)] = 1$. Hence, $F = \{T_i \in V \mid \exists \sigma \in \Psi : Pr_{T_i}^{\sigma}[\bigcap_{q \in K} Reach^{\mathcal{C}}(T_q)] = 1\}$. And by Proposition 6.7, there is a P-time procedure to compute the set F and to compute a deterministic static witness strategy σ for the non-terminals in set F . \square

We leave open the decidability of general boolean combinations of arbitrary qualitative reachability and non-reachability queries.

References

- [1] Bozic, et. al. Evolutionary dynamics of cancer in response to targeted combination therapy. *eLife*, volume 2, pages e00747, 2013.
- [2] T. Brázdil, V. Brožek, V. Forejt, and A. Kučera. Reachability in recursive markov decision processes. *Inf. & Comp.*, 206(5):520–537, 2008.
- [3] K. Chatterjee and M. Henzinger. Efficient and Dynamic Algorithms for Alternating Büchi Games and Maximal End-Component Decomposition. *Journal of the ACM*, 61(3):15:1–15:40, 2014.
- [4] T. Chen, K. Dräger, and S. Kiefer: Model Checking Stochastic Branching Processes. In Proc. of *MFCSS'12*, Springer LNCS 7464, pages 271–282, 2012.
- [5] A. Condon. The complexity of stochastic games. *Inf. & Comp.*, 96(2):203–224, 1992.

- [6] C. Courcoubetis and M. Yannakakis. Markov decision processes and regular events. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 43(10):1399–1418, 1998.
- [7] R. Durbin, S. R. Eddy, A. Krogh, and G. Mitchison. Biological Sequence Analysis: Probabilistic Models of Proteins and Nucleic Acids. *Cambridge University Press*, 1998.
- [8] K. Etessami, A. Stewart, and M. Yannakakis. A Polynomial-time algorithm for Computing Extinction Probabilities of Multi-type Branching Processes. *SIAM J. on Computing*, 46(5):1515–1553, 2017. (Incorporates part of the work of a conference paper in STOC’12.)
- [9] K. Etessami, A. Stewart, and M. Yannakakis. Polynomial-time algorithms for Branching Markov Decision Processes, and Probabilistic Min(Max) Polynomial Bellman Equations. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 45(1):34–62, 2020. (Conference version in ICALP’12.)
- [10] K. Etessami, A. Stewart, and M. Yannakakis. Greatest Fixed Points of Probabilistic Min/Max Polynomial Equations, and Reachability for Branching Markov Decision Processes. *Inf. & Comp.*, 261(2):355–382, 2018. (Conference version in ICALP’15.)
- [11] K. Etessami, E. Martinov, A. Stewart, and M. Yannakakis. Reachability for Branching Concurrent Stochastic Games. In *Proc. 46th Int. Coll. on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, 2019. (All references are to the full preprint arXiv:1806.03907 .)
- [12] K. Etessami, M. Kwiatkowska, M. Y. Vardi, and M. Yannakakis. Multi-Objective Model Checking of Markov Decision Processes. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* volume 4(4), 2008.
- [13] K. Etessami and M. Yannakakis. Recursive Concurrent Stochastic Games. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, volume 4(4), 2008.
- [14] K. Etessami and M. Yannakakis. Recursive Markov Decision Processes and Recursive Stochastic Games. *Journal of the ACM*, 62(2):1–69, 2015.
- [15] K. Etessami and M. Yannakakis. Recursive Markov Chains, Stochastic Grammars, and Monotone Systems of Nonlinear Equations. *Journal of the ACM*, 56(1), 2009.
- [16] P. Haccou, P. Jagers, and V. A. Vatutin. Branching Processes: Variation, Growth, and Extinction of Populations. *Cambridge University Press*, 2005.
- [17] M. Kimmel and D. E. Axelrod. Branching processes in biology. *Springer*, 2002.
- [18] H. Michalewski and M. Mio. On the Problem of Computing the Probability of Regular Sets of Trees. In *Proc. of FSTTCS’15*, pp. 489–502, 2015.
- [19] M. Przybyłko and M. Skrzypczak. On the Complexity of Branching Games with Regular Conditions. In *Proc. of MFCS’16*, LIPICS, volume 78, 2016.
- [20] G. Reiter, I. Bozic, K. Chatterjee, and M. A. Nowak. TTP: Tool for tumor progression. In *Proc. of CAV’2013*, pp. 101–106, Springer LNCS 8044, 2013.
- [21] A. P. Sistla and E. M. Clarke. The Complexity of Propositional Linear Temporal Logics. *J. of ACM*, 32(3):733–749, 1985.