Reachability games with relaxed energy constraints

Loïc Hélouët  Nicolas Markey  Ritam Raha
Inria & CNRS & Univ. Rennes, France  Chennai Mathematical Institute, India

We study games with reachability objectives under energy constraints. We first prove that under strict energy constraints (either only lower-bound constraint or interval constraint), those games are LOGSPACE-equivalent to energy games with the same energy constraints but without reachability objective (i.e., for infinite runs). We then consider two kinds of relaxations of the upper-bound constraints (while keeping the lower-bound constraint strict): in the first one, called weak upper bound, the upper bound is absorbing, in the sense that it allows receiving more energy when the upper bound is already reached, but the extra energy will not be stored; in the second one, we allow for temporary violations of the upper bound, imposing limits on the number or on the amount of violations.

We prove that when considering weak upper bound, reachability objectives require memory, but can still be solved in polynomial-time for one-player arenas; we prove that they are in coNP in the two-player setting. Allowing for bounded violations makes the problem PSPACE-complete for one-player arenas and EXPTIME-complete for two players.

1 Introduction

Games on weighted graphs. Weighted games are a common way to formally address questions related to consumption, production and storage of resources: the arenas of such game are two-player turn-based games in which transitions carry positive or negative integers, representing the accumulation or consumption of resource. Various objectives have been considered for such arenas, such as optimizing the total or average amount of resources that have been collected along the play, or maintaining the total amount within given bounds. The latter kind of objectives, usually referred to as energy objectives [8, 3], has been widely studied in the untimed setting [9, 11, 13, 17, 21, 23, 26, 6, 4, 14], and to a lesser extent in the timed setting [2, 5]. As their name indicates, energy objectives can be used to model the evolution of the available energy in an autonomous system: besides achieving its tasks, the system has to take care of recharging batteries regularly enough so as to never run out of power. Energy objectives were also used to model moulding machines: such machines inject molten plastic into a mould, using pressure obtained by storing liquid in a tank [7]; the level of liquid has to be controlled in such a way that enough pressure is always available, but excessive pressure in the tank would reduce the service life of the valve.

Energy games impose strict constraints on the total amount of energy at all stages of the play. Two kinds of constraints have been mainly considered in the literature: lower-bound constraints (a.k.a. L-energy constraints) impose a strict lower bound (usually zero), but impose no upper bound; on the other hand, lower- and upper-bound constraints (a.k.a. LU-energy constraints) require that the energy level always remains within a bounded interval \([L; U]\). Finding strategies that realize L-energy objectives along infinite runs is in PTIME in the one-player setting, and in \(NP \cap \text{coNP}\) for two players; for LU-energy objectives, it is respectively PSPACE-complete and EXPTIME-complete [3]. Some works have also considered the existence of an initial energy level for which a winning strategy exist [11].

In this paper, we focus on weighted games combining energy objectives together with reachability objectives. Our first result is the (expected) proof that L-energy games with or without reachability objectives are interreducible; the same holds for LU-energy games. We then focus on relaxations of
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the energy constraints, in two different directions. In both cases, the lower bound remains unchanged, as it corresponds to running out of energy, which we always want to avoid. We thus only relax the upper-bound constraint. The first direction concerns weak upper bounds, already introduced in [3]: in that setting, hitting the upper bound is allowed, but there is no overload: trying to exceed the upper bound will simply maintain the energy level at this maximal level. Yet, a strict lower bound is still imposed. Following [3], we name these objectives LW-energy objectives. They could be used as a (simplified) model for batteries. When considered alone, LW-energy objectives are not much different from L-energy objectives, in the sense that the aim is to find a reachable positive loop. LW-energy games (with no other objectives besides maintaining the energy above L) are in PTIME for one-player games, and in NPhard∩coNP for two players [3]. When combining LW-energy and reachability objectives, we prove in this paper that the situation changes: different loops may have different effects on the energy level, and we have to keep track of the final energy level reached when iterating those loops.

We introduce and study a second way of relaxing upper bounds, which we call soft upper bound: it consists in allowing a limited number (or amount) of violations of the soft upper bound (possibly within an additional strong upper-bound): when modeling a pressure tank, the lower-bound constraint is strict (pressure should always be available) but the upper bound is soft (excessive pressure may be temporarily allowed if needed). We consider different kinds of restrictions (on the number or amount of violations), and prove that deciding whether Player 1 has a strategy to keep violations below a given bound is PSPACE-complete for one-player arenas, and EXPTIME-complete for two-player ones. We also provide algorithms to optimize violations of the soft upper bound under a given strict upper bound.

Related work. Quantitative games have been the focus of numerous research articles since the 1970s, with various kinds of objectives, such as ultimately optimizing the total payoff, mean-payoff [15, 27], or discounted sum [27, 1]. Energy objectives, which are a kind of safety objectives on the total payoff, were introduced in [8] and rediscovered in [3]. Several works have extended those works by combining quantitative conditions together, e.g. multi-dimensional energy conditions [17, 23] or conjunctions of energy- and mean-payoff objectives [11]. Combinations with qualitative objectives (e.g. reachability [10] or parity objectives [9, 12, 14]) were also considered. Similar objectives have been considered in slightly different settings e.g. Vector Addition Systems with States [25] and one-counter machines [19, 20].

2 Preliminaries

**Definition 1** A two-player arena is a 3-tuple $G = (Q_1, Q_2, E)$ where $Q = Q_1 \sqcup Q_2$ is a set of states, $E \subseteq Q \times \mathbb{Z} \times Q$ is a set of weighted edges. For $q \in Q$, we let $qE = \{(q, w, q') \in E \mid w \in \mathbb{Z}, q' \in Q\}$, which we assume is non-empty for any $q \in Q$. A one-player arena is a two-player arena where $Q_2 = \emptyset$.

Consider a state $q_0 \in Q$. A finite path in an arena $G$ from an initial state $q_0$ is an finite sequence of edges $\pi = (e_i)_{0 \leq i < n}$ such that for every $0 \leq i < n$, writing $e_i = (q_i, w_i, q_i')$, it holds $q_i' = q_{i+1}$. Fix a path $\pi = (e_i)_{0 \leq i < n}$. Using the notations above, we write $|\pi|$ for the size $n$ of $\pi$, $\bar{\pi}_i$ for the $i$-th state $q_i$ of $\pi$ (with the convention that $q_0 = q_{n-1}'$), and first($\pi$) = $\bar{\pi}_0$ for its first state and last($\pi$) = $\bar{\pi}_n$ for its last state. The empty path is a special finite path from $q_0$: its length is zero, and $q_0$ is both its first and last state. Given two finite paths $\pi = (e_i)_{0 \leq i < n}$ and $\pi' = (e'_j)_{0 \leq j < n'}$ such that last($\pi$) = first($\pi'$), the concatenation $\pi \cdot \pi'$ is the finite path $(f_k)_{0 \leq k \leq n+n'}$ such that $f_k = e_k$ if $0 \leq k < n$ and $f_k = e'_{k-n}$ if $n \leq k < n + n'$. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, the $k$-th prefix of $\pi$ is the finite path $\pi_{<k} = (e_i)_{0 \leq i < k}$. We write $\text{FPaths}(G, q_0)$ for the set of finite paths in $G$ issued from $q_0$ (we may omit to mention $G$ in this notation when it is clear from the context). Infinite paths are defined analogously: we write $\text{Paths}(G, q_0)$ for the set of infinite paths from $q_0$. 

A strategy for Player 1 (resp. Player 2) from $q_0$ is a function $\sigma : \mathcal{FPaths}(q_0) \to E$ associating with any finite path $\pi$ with last($\pi$) $\in Q_1$ (resp. last($\pi$) $\in Q_2$) an edge originating from last($\pi$). A strategy is said memoryless when $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma(\pi')$ whenever last($\pi$) = last($\pi'$).

A finite path $\pi = (e_i)_{0 \leq i < n}$ conforms to a strategy $\sigma$ of Player 1 (resp. of Player 2) from $q_0$ if $e_0 = (q_0, l_0)$ and for every $0 \leq k < n$, either $e_k = (\pi, \sigma(\pi))$, or last($\pi_{<k}$) $\in Q_2$ (resp. last($\pi_{<k}$) $\in Q_1$). This is extended to infinite paths in the natural way. Given a strategy $\sigma$ of Player 1 (resp. of Player 2) from $q_0$; the outcomes of $\sigma$ is the set of all (finite or infinite) paths $\pi$ issued from $q_0$ that conform to $\sigma$.

A game is a triple $(G, q_0, O)$ where $G$ is a two-player arena, $q_0$ is an initial state in $Q$, and $O \subseteq \mathcal{PPaths}(G, q_0)$ is a set of infinite paths, also called objective (for Player 1). A strategy for Player 1 from $q_0$ is winning in $(G, q_0, O)$ if its infinite outcomes all belong to $O$.

Given a set $R \subseteq Q$ of states, the reachability objective defined by $R$ is the set of all paths containing some state in $R$, while the safety objective defined by $R$ is the set of all infinite paths never visiting any state in $R$. In this paper, we also focus on energy objectives [8, 3], which we now define.

**Definition 2** Fix a finite-state arena $G = (Q_1, Q_2, E)$. Let $L \in \mathbb{Z}$. The $L$-energy arena associated with $G$ is the infinite arena $G_L = (C_1, C_2, T)$ where $C_1 = \{q_{err}\} \cup Q_1 \times [L; +\infty)$ and $C_2 = Q_2 \times [L; +\infty)$ are sets of configurations, and $T \subseteq C_1 \times \mathbb{Z} \times C_2$ is such that

- for any $(q, l)$ and $(q', l')$ in $Q \times [L; +\infty)$ and any $w \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $((q, l), w, (q', l')) \in T$ if, and only if, $(q, w, q') \in E$ and $l' = l + w \geq L$; we also impose a loop $(q_{err}, 0, q_{err}) \in T$.
- for any $(q, l) \in Q \times [L; +\infty)$, we have $((q, l), w, q_{err}) \in T$ if, and only if, there is a transition $(q, w, q') \in E$ such that $l + w < L$.

Similarly, given $L \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $U \in \mathbb{Z}$, the $L$-$U$ energy arena associated with $G$ is the finite-state arena $G_{LU} = (C_1, C_2, T)$ where $C_1 = \{q_{err}\} \cup Q_1 \times [L; U]$ and $C_2 = Q_2 \times [L; U]$, and $T \subseteq C_1 \times \mathbb{Z} \times C_2$ is such that

- for any $(q, l)$ and $(q', l')$ in $Q \times [L; U]$ and any $w \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $((q, l), w, (q', l')) \in T$ if, and only if, $(q, w, q') \in E$ and $l' = l + w \in [L; U]$; we also impose a loop $(q_{err}, 0, q_{err}) \in T$.
- for any $(q, l) \in Q \times [L; U]$, we have $((q, l), w, q_{err}) \in T$ if, and only if, there is a transition $(q, w, q') \in E$ such that $l + w < L$ or $l + w > U$.

Finally, given $L \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $W \in \mathbb{Z}$, the $L$-$W$ energy arena associated with $G$ is the finite-state arena $G_{LW} = (C_1, C_2, T)$ where $C_1 = \{q_{err}\} \cup Q_1 \times [L; W]$ and $C_2 = Q_2 \times [L; W]$, and $T \subseteq C_1 \times \mathbb{Z} \times C_2$ is such that

- for any $(q, l)$ and $(q', l')$ in $Q \times [L; W]$ and any $w \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $((q, l), w, (q', l')) \in T$ if, and only if, $(q, w, q') \in E$ and $l' = \min(W, l + w) \geq L$; we also impose a loop $(q_{err}, 0, q_{err}) \in T$.
- for any $(q, l) \in Q \times [L; W]$, we have $((q, l), w, q_{err}) \in T$ if, and only if, there is a transition $(q, w, q') \in E$ such that $l + w < L$.

An $L$-run (resp. $LU$-run, $LW$-run) $\rho$ in $G$ from $q$ with initial energy level $l$ is a path in $G_L$ (resp $G_{LU}$, $G_{LW}$) from $(q, l)$ never visiting $q_{err}$. With such a run $\rho = (t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $G$, writing $t_i = ((q_i, l_i), w_i, (q'_i, l'_i))$, we associate the path $\pi = (e_i)_{i}$ such that $e_i = (q_i, w_i, q'_i)$. We define $\tilde{p}_i = (q_i, l_i)$, corresponding to the $i$-th configuration along $\rho$, and $\tilde{p}_i = l_i$, which we name the energy level in that configuration.

Similarly, a path $\pi$ is said $L$-feasible (resp. $LU$-feasible, $LW$-feasible) from initial energy level $L$ if there exists an $L$-run (resp. $LU$-run, $LW$-run) from (first($\pi$), $L$) whose associated path is $\pi$. Notice that if such a run exists, it is unique (because paths are defined as sequences of transitions).

The $L$-energy (resp. $LU$-energy, $LW$-energy) objective is the set of infinite paths that are $L$-feasible (resp. $LU$-feasible, $LW$-feasible) (from initial energy level $L$). Similarly, given a target set $R \subseteq Q$, the $L$-energy (resp. $LU$-energy-, $LW$-energy-) reachability objective is the set of $L$-feasible (resp. $LU$-feasible, $LW$-feasible) paths visiting $R$. 
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Remark 3 Taking $L$ as the initial energy level results in no loss of generality, since any energy level can be obtained by adding an initial transition from $(q_0, L)$.

In many cases, strong upper bounds are too strict, as many system do not break as soon as their maximal energy level is reached. Imposing a weak upper bound is a way to relax these constraints. We introduce another way to relax energy constraints, by allowing for (limited) violations of the upper bound: given two strict bounds $L$ and $U$ in $\mathbb{Z}$, a soft upper bound $S \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $L \leq S \leq U$, and an LU-run $\rho$, the set of violations along $\rho$ is the set $V(\rho) = \{i \in \{0\}; |\rho_i| \geq S\}$ of positions along $\rho$ where the energy level exceeds the soft upper bound $S$. There are many ways to quantify violations along a run. We consider three of them in this paper, namely the total number of violations, the maximal number of consecutive violations, and the sum of the violations. We thus define the following three quantities: $\#V (\rho)$ (resp. maximal number of consecutive violations $\max_{\rho} \{i-j \mid \forall k \in [i,j], \rho_k \geq S\}$), and the sum $\Sigma V (\rho) = \sum_{\rho \in V(\rho)} (\tilde{\rho_i} - S)$.

Figure 1 shows the evolution of $\#V$ along a winning run in an LSU$^*$-energy game. One can notice that with a strong upper bound of 3, state $q_i$ would not be reachable. On the other hand, if the strong upper bound is set to 6, then there exists a run from $q_0$ to $q_i$, but that requires 3 violations of soft upper bound $S = 3$ (and the total amount of violations is 6).

Given three values $L \leq S \leq U$, and a threshold $V \in \mathbb{N}$, the LSU$^*$-energy (resp. LSU$^\#$-energy, LSU$^\Sigma$-energy) objective is the set of LU-feasible infinite paths $\pi$ such that, along their associated runs $\rho$, the number $\#V(\rho)$ of violations (resp. maximal number of consecutive violations $\max_{\rho} \{i-j \mid \forall k \in [i,j], \rho_k \geq S\}$, and the sum $\Sigma V(\rho)$ of violations) of the soft upper bound $S$ is at most $V$. Similarly, for a set of states $R$, the LSU$^*$-energy-reachability (resp. LSU$^\#$-energy-reachability, LSU$^\Sigma$-energy-reachability) objective is the set of LU-feasible paths $\pi$ reaching $R$ such that along their associated run from $(q_0, L)$, the number $\#V(\rho)$ of violations (resp. maximal number of consecutive violations $\max_{\rho} \{i-j \mid \forall k \in [i,j], \rho_k \geq S\}$, and the sum $\Sigma V(\rho)$ of violations) of the soft upper bound $S$ is at most $V$.

We study the complexity of deciding the existence of a winning strategy for the objectives defined above, in both the one- and two-player settings. Further, for LSU$^*$-energy games (for $*$ in $\{\#, \#, \Sigma\}$), we also address the following problems:

- **bound existence**: Given $L$, $S$ and $V$, decide if there exists a value $U \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that Player 1 wins the LSU$^*$-energy game;

- **minimization**: Given $L$ and $S$, and a bound $V_{\max}$, find a value $U \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that Player 1 wins the game with the least possible violations less than $V_{\max}$, if any.

Table 1 summarizes known results, and the results obtained in this paper (where LSU$^*$-energy gathers all three energy constraints with violations). We furthermore show that the minimization problem for
LSU*-energy (reachability) games require algorithms that run in PSPACE in the one-player case, and in EXPTIME in the two-player case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reachability</th>
<th>Infinite runs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 player</td>
<td>2 players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-energy</td>
<td>in PTIME</td>
<td>in NP ∩ coNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-energy</td>
<td>PSPACE-c.</td>
<td>EXPTIME-c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW*-energy</td>
<td>in PTIME</td>
<td>in coNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU*-energy</td>
<td>PSPACE-c.</td>
<td>EXPTIME-c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound existence</td>
<td>PSPACE-c.</td>
<td>EXPTIME-c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>PSPACE-c.</td>
<td>EXPTIME-c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of our results

3 Energy reachability games with strict bounds

In this section, we focus on the L-energy-reachability and LU-energy-reachability problems. We first prove that L-energy-reachability problems are inter-reducible with L-energy problems, which entails:

**Theorem 4** Two-player L-energy-reachability games are decidable in NP ∩ coNP. The one-player version is in PTIME.

**Remark 5** It is worth noticing that these results are not a direct consequence of the results of [9] about energy parity games: in that paper, the authors focus on the existence of an initial energy level for which Player 1 has a winning strategy with energy-parity objectives (which encompass our energy-reachability objectives). When the answer is positive, they can compute the minimal initial energy level for which a winning strategy exists, but the (deterministic) algorithm runs in exponential time.

**Remark 6** These results were already proven in [10]: for one-player arenas, the authors develop a PTIME algorithm, while they prove LOGSPACE-equivalence with L-energy games for the two-player setting (the result then follow from [3]). Our proof uses similar arguments as in the latter proof, but with the same full and direct reductions back and forth both for the one- and two-player cases.

**Proof.** We prove that L-energy and L-energy-reachability are LOGSPACE-equivalent; our reductions are valid both for one- and two-player arenas. The result then follows from [3].

Intuitively, take a two-player L-energy game $G$, and build the arena $G'$ as in Fig. 2: roughly, $G'$ is obtained from $G$ by increasing all weights by some small\(^1\) positive value $\varepsilon$, and Player 1 is given the possibility to go to the target state, with a large negative cost $-\delta$, after each transition. If Player 1 wins in $G$, playing her winning strategy in $G'$ will grow the energy level arbitrarily high, and will eventually allow her to take a transition to $q_1$. Conversely, if Player 1 wins in $G'$, then she must be able to grow the energy to above $\delta$; taking $\delta$ to be larger than the sum of all positive weights in $G$, Player 1 must have a strategy to force positive cycles before reaching $q_1$. If $\varepsilon$ is small enough, any positive cycle in $G'$ is a non-negative cycle in $G$, so that the repeating same strategy is winning in $G$.

The converse reduction is similar: this time, starting from a two-player L-energy-reachability game $G$, we build a two-player L-energy game $G'$ by first restricting\(^2\) to states from which Player 1 has a strategy

---

\(^1\)The value of $\varepsilon$ will generally be a rational, but it can be made integer by scaling up all constants.

\(^2\)This may require to add a (losing) sink state, so that each state has an outgoing transition.
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Theorem 7 One-player LU-energy-reachability games are PSPACE-complete. Two-player LU-energy-reachability games are EXPTIME-complete.

Proof. Membership in EXPTIME is proven by considering the expanded game $G_{LU}$: it can be used to check reachability for both the one- and the two-player cases. For the one-player case, this can be achieved by proceeding on-the-fly, without explicitly building the expanded game; the resulting algorithm runs in PSPACE. For the two-player case, we solve reachability in that exponential-size game, which results in an EXPTIME algorithm.

For both the one- and the two-player settings, the hardness proofs for LU-energy objectives are readily adapted to LU-energy-reachability objectives, since they are based on reachability-like problems (reachability in bounded one-counter automata [18] and countdown games [22], respectively).

4 Energy reachability games with weak upper bound

Finding a strategy that satisfies an LW-energy constraint along an infinite run is conceptually easy: it suffices to find a cycle that can be iterated once with a positive effect. It follows that memoryless
strategies are enough, and the LW-energy problem was shown to be in PTIME for one-player arenas, and in NP ∩ coNP for two-player arenas [3].

The situation is different when we have a reachability condition: players may have to keep track of the exact energy level in order to find their way to the target state. Obviously, considering the expanded arena $G_{\text{LW}}$, we easily get exponential-time algorithms for LW-energy-reachability objectives. However, as proved below, in the one-player case, a PTIME algorithm exists.

**Example 8** Consider the one-player arena of Fig. 4, where the lower bound is $L = 0$, the weak-upper bound is $W = 5$, and the target state is $q_t$. Starting from $q_0$ with initial credit $0$, we first have to move to $q_1$, and then iterate the positive cycle $\beta_1 = (q_1, +2, q_2) \cdot (q_2, -2, q_3) \cdot (q_3, +1, q_1)$ three times, ending up in $q_1$ with energy level 3. We then take the cycle $\beta_2 = (q_1, +2, q_2) \cdot (q_2, -5, q_4) \cdot (q_4, +5, q_1)$, which raises the energy level to 5 when we come back to $q_1$, so that we can reach $q_t$. Notice that $\beta_1$ has to be repeated three times before taking cycle $\beta_2$, and that repeating $\beta_1$ more than three times maintains the energy level at 4, which is not sufficient to reach $q_t$. This suggests that Player 1 needs memory and cannot rely on a single cycle to win LW-energy-reachability games.

![Figure 4: A one-player arena with LW-energy-reachability objective](image)

This example shows that winning strategies for Player 1 may have to monitor the exact energy level all along the computation, thereby requiring exponential memory (assuming that all constants are encoded in binary; with unary encoding, the expanded game $G_{\text{LW}}$ would have polynomial size and directly give a polynomial-time algorithm).

**Proposition 9** In LW-energy-reachability games, exponential memory may be necessary for Player 1 (assuming binary-encoded constants).

Notice that this does not prevent from having PTIME algorithms: the strategy in Example 8 is not very involved, but it depends on the energy level (up to $W$).

From now on, and until Lemma 24, we consider the one-player case. In order to get a polynomial-time algorithm, we analyze cycles in the graph, and prove that a path witnessing LW-energy reachability can have a special form, which can be represented compactly using polynomial size. We begin with a series of simple lemmas.

**Lemma 10** Let $\pi$ be a finite path in a one-player arena $G$. If $(q, u) \xrightarrow{\pi} (q', u')$, then for any $v \geq u$, $(q, v) \xrightarrow{\pi} (q', v')$ for some $v' \geq u'$.

This lemma states that starting with higher energy level can only be beneficial. Notice that, even if we add condition $u' > u$ in the hypotheses of Lemma 10, it need not be the case that $v' > v$. In other terms, a sequence of transitions may have a positive effect on the energy level from some configuration, and a negative effect from some other configuration, due to the weak upper bound. Below, we prove a series of results related to this issue, and that will be useful for the rest of the proof. First, the effect of a given path (i.e., the net amount of energy that is harvested) decreases when the initial energy level increases:
Lemma 11 Let \( \pi \) be a finite path in a one-player arena \( G \), and consider two LW-runs \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',u') \) and \( (q,v) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',v') \) with \( u \leq v \). Then \( u' - u \geq v' - v \), and if the inequality is strict, then the energy level along the run \( (q,v) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',v') \) must have hit \( W \).

The next lemma is more precise about the effect of following a path when starting from the maximal energy level \( W \):

Lemma 12 Let \( \pi \) be a finite path in a one-player arena \( G \), for which there is an LW-run \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',u') \). If \( u' \) is the maximal energy level along that run, then \( (q,W) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',W) \); if \( u \) is the maximal energy level along the run above, then \( (q,W) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',W + u' - u) \).

From Lemma 10, it follows that any run witnessing LW-energy reachability can be assumed to contain no cycle with nonpositive effect. Formally:

Lemma 13 Let \( \pi \) be a finite path in a one-player arena \( G \). If \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',u') \) and \( \pi \) can be decomposed as \( \pi_1 \cdot \pi_2 \cdot \pi_3 \) in such a way that \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi_1} LW (s,v) \xrightarrow{\pi_2} LW (s,v') \xrightarrow{\pi_3} LW (q',u') \) with \( v \leq v' \), then \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi_1 \cdot \pi_2 \cdot \pi_3} LW (q',u'') \) with \( u'' \geq u' \).

The following lemmas show that several occurrences of a cycle having positive effect along a path can be gathered together. This will be useful to prove the existence of a short path witnessing LW-energy reachability.

Lemma 14 Let \( \pi \) be a finite path in a one-player arena \( G \). If \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',u') \) with \( u' > u \) and \( (q,w) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',w') \) with \( w' > w \), then for any \( u \leq v \leq w \), it holds that \( (q,v) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q',v') \) with \( v' > v \).

Lemma 15 Let \( \pi \) be a cycle on \( q \) such that \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q,v) \) for some \( u \leq v \). Then \( (q,u) \xrightarrow{\pi W \cdot \pi} LW (q,v) \) for some \( v' \geq v \), and \( (q,v') \xrightarrow{\pi} LW (q,v') \).

Fix a path \( \pi \) in \( G \), and assume that some cycle \( \phi \) appears (at least) twice along \( \pi \): the first time from some configuration \( (q,u) \) to some configuration \( (q,u') \), and the second time from \( (q,v) \) to \( (q,v') \). First, we may assume that \( \phi \) has length at most \( |Q| \), since otherwise we can take an inner subcycle. We may also assume that \( v > u' \), as otherwise we can apply Lemma 13 to get rid of the resulting nonpositive cycle between \( (q,u') \) and \( (q,v) \). For the same reason we may assume \( u' > u \) and \( v' > v \). As a consequence, by Lemmas 14 and 10, by repeatedly iterating \( \phi \) from \( (q,u) \), we eventually reach some configuration \( (q,w) \) with \( w \geq v' \), from which we can follow the suffix of \( \pi \) after the second occurrence of \( \phi \). It follows that all occurrences of \( \phi \) along \( \pi \) can be grouped together, and we can restrict our attention to runs of the form \( \alpha_1 \cdot \phi^{n_1}_1 \cdot \alpha_2 \cdot \phi^{n_2}_2 \cdot \phi^{n_3}_3 \cdot \alpha_{k+1} \) where the cycles \( \phi_j \) are distinct, and have size at most \( |Q| \), and the finite runs \( \alpha_j \) are acyclic. Notice that each occurrence of any cycle \( \phi_j \) can be assumed to have positive effect, and by Lemma 15, we may assume \( n_j = W - L \) for all \( j \).

While this allows us to only consider paths of a special form, this does not provide short witnesses, since there may be exponentially many cycles of length less than or equal to \( |Q| \), and the witnessing run may need to iterate several cycles looping on the same state (see Example 8). In order to circumvent this problem, we have to show that all cycles need not be considered, and that one can compute the "useful" cycles efficiently. For this, we introduce universal cycles, which are cycles that can be iterated from any initial energy level (above \( L \)).

Definition 16 Let \( G \) be a one-player arena, and \( q \) be a state of \( G \). Let \( W \) be a weak-upper bound and \( L \leq W \) be a lower bound. A universal cycle on \( q \) in \( G \) is a cycle \( \phi \) with \( \text{first}(\phi) = \text{last}(\phi) = q \) such that \( (q,L) \xrightarrow{\phi} LW (q,v_{\phi,L}) \) for some \( v_{\phi,L} \)(i.e., the energy level never drops below the lower bound \( L \) when following \( \phi \) with initial energy level \( L \)). A universal cycle is positive if \( v_{\phi,L} > L \).
When a cycle \( \varphi \) is iterated \( W-L \) times in a row, then some universal cycle \( \sigma \) is also iterated \( W-L-1 \) times (by considering the state with minimal energy level along \( \varphi \)). As a consequence, iterating only universal cycles is enough: we may now only look for runs of the form \( \beta_1 \cdot \sigma_1^{m_1} \cdot \beta_2 \cdot \sigma_2^{m_2} \cdots \sigma_k^{m_k} \cdot \beta_{k+1} \), where \( \sigma_j \)'s are universal cycles of length at most \( |Q| \). Now, assume that some state \( q \) admits two universal cycles \( \sigma \) and \( \sigma' \), and that both cycles appear along a given run \( \pi \). Write \( h \) (resp. \( h' \)) for the energy levels reached after iterating \( \sigma \) (resp. \( \sigma' \)) \( W-L \) times. We define a preorder on universal cycles of \( q \) by letting \( \sigma \triangleright \sigma' \) when \( h \geq h' \). Then if \( \sigma \triangleright \sigma' \), each occurrence of \( \sigma' \) along \( \pi \) can be replaced with \( \sigma \), yielding a run \( \pi' \) that still satisfies the LW-energy condition (and has the same first and last states). Generalizing this argument, each state that admits universal cycles has an optimal universal cycle of length at most \( |Q| \), and it is enough to iterate only this universal cycle to find a path witnessing reachability. This provides us with a small witness, of the form \( \gamma_1 \cdot \tau_{1}^{W-L} \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot \tau_{2}^{W-L} \cdots \tau_{k}^{W-L} \cdot \gamma_{k+1} \) where \( \tau_j \) are optimal universal cycles of length at most \( |Q| \) and \( \gamma_j \) are acyclic paths. Since it suffices to consider at most one universal cycle per state, we have \( k \leq |Q| \). From this, we immediately derive an NP algorithm for solving LW-energy reachability for one-player arenas: it suffices to non-deterministically select each portion of the path, and compute that each portion is LW-feasible (notice that there is no need for checking universality nor optimality of cycles; those properties were only used to prove that small witnesses exist). Checking LW-feasibility requires computing the final energy level reached after iterating a cycle \( W-L \) times; this can be performed by detecting the highest energy level along that cycle, and computing how much the energy level decreases from that point on until the end of the cycle. This provides us with a way of accelerating the computation of the effect of iterating cycles.

We now prove that optimal universal cycles of length at most \( |Q| \) can be computed for a given state \( q_0 \). For this we unwind the graph from \( q_0 \) as a DAG of depth \( |Q| \), so that it includes all cycles of length at most \( |Q| \). We name the states of this DAG \([q',d]\), where \( q' \) is the name of a state of the arena and \( d \) is the depth of this state in the DAG (using square brackets to avoid confusion with configurations \((q,l)\) where \( l \) is the energy level); hence there are transitions \([(q',d),w,(q'',d+1)]\) in the DAG as soon as there is a transition \((q',w,q'')\) in the arena.

We then explore this DAG from its initial state \([q_0,0]\), looking for (paths corresponding to) universal cycles. Our aim is to keep track of all runs from \([q_0,0]\) to \([q',d]\) that are prefixes of universal cycles starting from \( q_0 \). Actually, we do not need to keep track of those runs explicitly, and it suffices for each such run to remember the following two values:

- the maximal energy level \( M \) that has been observed along the run so far (starting from energy level \( L \), with weak upper bound \( W \));
- the difference \( m \) between the maximal energy level \( M \) and the final energy level in \([q',d]\). Notice that \( m \geq 0 \), and that the final energy level in \([q',d]\) is \( M-m \).

**Example 17** Figure 5 shows two universal cycles from \( q_0 \) in an LW-energy game with \( L = 0 \) and \( W = 5 \). The first cycle, going via \( q_2 \), ends with \( M_1 = 5 \) (reached in \( q_2 \)) and \( m_1 = 4 \), thus with a final energy level of 1 (when starting from energy level 0); actually, iterating this cycle will not improve this final energy level. The second cycle, via \( q_4 \) and \( q_5 \), has a maximal energy level \( M_2 = 4 \) (reached in \( q_5 \)) and ends with \( m_2 = 1 \). Hence, after one iteration of this cycle, one can end in state \( q_0 \) with energy level \( W - m_2 = 4 \).

If we know the values \((M,m)\) of some path from \([q_0,0]\) to \([q',d]\), we can decide if a given transition with weight \( w \) from \([q',d]\) to \([q'',d+1]\) can be taken (the resulting path can still be a prefix of a universal cycle if \( M - m + w \geq L \)), and how the values of \( M \) and \( m \) have to be updated: if \( w > m \), the run will reach a new maximal energy level, and the new pair of values is \((\min(W;M-m+w),0)\); if \( m + L - M \leq w \leq m \), then the transition can be taken: the new energy level \( M - m + w \) will remain between \( L \) and \( M \), and we
According to Lemma 11, energy level \( q' \) with \((q',d)\) is labelled with \((M,m)\), and if there is a transition from \([q',d]\) to \([q'',d+1]\) with weight \(w\):

- if \(w > m\), then we label \([q'',d+1]\) with the pair \((\min(W; M - m + w), 0)\);
- if \(m + L - M \leq w \leq m\), we label \([q'',d+1]\) with \((M,m-w)\).

The following lemma makes a link between runs in the DAG and labels computed by our algorithm:

**Lemma 18** Let \([q,d]\) be a state of the DAG, and \(M\) and \(m\) be two integers such that \(0 \leq m \leq M - L\). Upon termination of this algorithm, state \([q,d]\) of the DAG is labelled with \((M,m)\) if, and only if, there is an LW-run of length \(d\) from \((q_0,L)\) to \((q,M-m)\) along which the energy level always remains in the interval \([L,M]\) and equals \(M\) at some point.

**Lemma 19** Let \([q_0,d]\) be a state of the DAG, with \(d > 0\). Let \(m\) be a nonnegative integer such that \(L + m < W\). Upon termination of this algorithm, state \([q_0,d]\) is labelled with \((M,m)\) for some \(M > L + m\) if, and only if, there is a universal cycle \(\varphi\) on \(q_0\) of length \(d\) such that \((q_0,L) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,W - m)\).

**Proof.** First assume that \([q_0,d]\) is labelled with \((M,m)\) for some \(M\) such that \(M - m > L\). From Lemma 18, there is a cycle \(\varphi\) on \(q_0\) of length \(d\) generating a run \((q_0,L) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,M-m)\) along which the energy level is within \([L,M]\). Then \(M - m \geq L\), so that Lemma 15 applies: we then get \((q_0,L) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,E)\) with \((q_0,E) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,E)\) and \(E \geq L\). Write \((p_i)_{0 \leq i < |\varphi|}\) for the sequence of weights along \(\varphi\). Also write \(\rho\) for the run \((q_0,L) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,M-m)\), and \(\sigma\) for the run \((q_0,E) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,E)\).

As \(L < M - m\), then by Lemma 11, it must be the case that energy level \(W\) is reached along \(\sigma\). Write \(i_0\) for the first position along \(\rho\) for which the energy level is \(M\). Assume \(\bar{\sigma}_{i_0} \neq W\): by Lemma 10, we must have \(M = \bar{\rho}_{i_0} \leq \bar{\sigma}_{i_0} < W\). Then for all \(k \geq i_0\), \(\sum_{i=i_0}^{k} p_i \leq 0\). Since \(\bar{\sigma}_{i_0} < W\), then also \(\bar{\sigma}_k < W\) for all \(k \geq i_0\).

According to Lemma 11, energy level \(W\) is reached in \(\sigma\), so there exists some \(k_0 < i_0\) such that \(\bar{\sigma}_{k_0} = W\). However, as \(i_0\) is the index of the first maximal value in \(\rho\), we have \(\bar{\rho}_{i_0} < M\), and the energy level increases in run \(\rho\) between \(k_0\) and \(i_0\). So according to Lemma 12, we should have \(\bar{\sigma}_{i_0} = W\), which raises a contradiction. Hence we proved \(\bar{\sigma}_{i_0} = W\); applying the second result of Lemma 12, we get \(E = W - m\).

Conversely, if there is a universal cycle \(\varphi\) satisfying the conditions of the lemma, then it must have positive effect when run from energy level \(L\). Let \(F\) be such that \((q_0,L) \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-L}} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (q_0,F)\), and \(M\) be...
the maximal energy level encountered along the run \((q_0, L) \xrightarrow{w} (q_0, F)\). By Lemma 18, state \([q_0, d]\) is labelled with \((M, m')\) for some \(m' \geq 0\) such that \(F = M - m'\). By Lemma 15, we must have \((q_0, L) \xrightarrow{w-L} (q_0, W - m')\).

The algorithm above computes optimal universal cycles, but it still runs in exponential time (in the worst case) since it may generate exponentially many different labels in each state \([q, d]\) (one per path from \([q_0, 0]\) to \([q, d]\)). We now explain how to only generate polynomially-many pairs \((M, m)\). This is based on the following partial order on labels: we let \((M, m) \preceq (M', m')\) whenever \(M - m \leq M' - m'\) and \(m' \leq m\). Notice in particular that

- if \(M = M'\), then \((M, m) \preceq (M', m')\) if, and only if, \(m' \leq m\);
- if \(m = m'\), then \((M, m) \preceq (M', m')\) if, and only if, \(M \leq M'\).

The following lemma entails that it suffices to store maximal labels w.r.t. \(\preceq\):

**Lemma 20** Consider two paths \(\pi\) and \(\pi'\) such that \(\text{first}(\pi) = \text{first}(\pi')\) and \(\text{last}(\pi) = \text{last}(\pi')\), and with respective values \((M, m)\) and \((M', m')\) such that \((M, m) \preceq (M', m')\). If \(\pi\) is a prefix of a universal cycle \(\varphi\), then \(\pi'\) is a prefix of a universal cycle \(\varphi'\) with \(\varphi' \supseteq \varphi\).

It remains to prove that by keeping only maximal labels, we only store a polynomial number of labels:

**Lemma 21** If the algorithm labelling the DAG only keeps maximal labels (for \(\preceq\)), then it runs in polynomial time.

**Proof.** We prove that, when attaching to each node \([q, d]\) of the DAG only the maximal labels (w.r.t \(\preceq\)) reached for a path of length \(d\) ending in state \(q\), the number of values for the first component of the different labels that appear at depth \(d > 0\) in the DAG is at most \(d \cdot |Q|\). Since it only stores optimal labels, our algorithm will never associate to a state \([q, d]\) two labels having the same value on their first component. So, any state at depth \(d\) will have at most \(d \cdot |Q|\) labels.

So we prove, by induction on \(d\), that the number of different values for the first component among the labels appearing at depth \(d > 0\) is at most \(d \cdot |Q|\). This is true for \(d = 1\) since the initial state \((q_0, 0)\) only contains \((M = 0, m = 0)\), and each transition with nonnegative weight \(w\) will create one new label \((w, 0)\) (transitions with negative weight are not prefixes of universal cycles). Now, since all those labels have value 0 as their second component, each state \([q, 1]\) in the DAG will be attached at most one label. Hence, the total number of labels (and the total number of different values for their first component) is at most \(|Q|\) at depth 1 in the DAG.

Now, assume that labels appearing at depth \(d > 1\) are all drawn from a set of labels \(\{(M_i, m_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}\) in which the number of different values of \(M_i\) is at most \(d \cdot |Q|\). Consider a state \([q', d]\), labelled with \(\{(M_i, m_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_{q', d}\}\) (even if it means reindexing the labels). Pick a transition from \([q', d]\) to \([q'', d + 1]\), with weight \(w\). For each pair \((M_i, m_i)\) associated with \([q', d]\), it creates a new label in \([q'', d + 1]\), which is

- either \((\min(W; M; m_i + w), 0)\) if \(m_i < w\) (maximal energy level increases);
- or \((M_i, m_i - w)\) if \(m_i + L - M_i \leq w \leq m_i\) (maximal energy level in unchanged).

Now, for a state \([q'', d + 1]\), the set of labels created by all incoming transitions can be grouped as follows:

- labels having zero as their second component; among those, our algorithm only stores the one with maximal first component, as \((M_i, 0) \preceq (M_j, 0)\) as soon as \(M_i \leq M_j\);
- for each \(M_i\) appearing at depth \(d\), labels having \(M_i\) as their first component; again, we only keep the one with minimal second component, as \((M, m_i) \preceq (M, m_j)\) when \(m_j \leq m_i\).
Last, for this state $[q''', d+1]$, we keep at most one label for each distinct value among the first components $M_i$ of labels appearing at depth $d$, and possibly one extra label with second value 0. In other terms, at depth $d+1$ the values that appear as first component of labels are obtained from values at depth $d$, plus possibly one per state; Hence, at depth $d+1$, there exists at most $(d+1) \cdot |Q|$ labels, which completes the proof of the induction step.

Using the algorithm above, we can compute, for each state $q$ of the original arena, the smallest value $m_q$ for which there exists a universal cycle on $q$ that, when iterated sufficiently many times, leads to configuration $(q, W - m_q)$. Since universal cycles can be iterated from any energy level, if $q$ is reachable, then it is reachable with energy level $W - m_q$. We make this explicit by adding to our arena a special self-loop on $q$, labelled with set($W - m_q$), which sets the energy level to $W - m_q$ (in the same way as recharge transitions of [16]).

In the resulting arena, we can restrict to paths of the form $\gamma_1 \cdot v_1 \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot v_2 \cdots v_k \cdot \gamma_{k+1}$, where $v_i$ are newly added transitions labelled with set($W - m$), and $\gamma_i$ are acyclic paths. Such paths have length at most $(|Q| + 1)^2$. We can then inductively compute the maximal energy level that can be reached (under our LW-energy constraint) in any state after paths of length less than or equal to $(|Q| + 1)^2$. This can be performed by unwinding (as a DAG) the modified arena from the source state $q_0$ up to depth $(|Q| + 1)^2$, and labelling the states of this DAG by the maximal energy level with which that state can be reached from $(q_0, L)$; this is achieved in a way similar to our algorithm for computing the effect of universal cycles, but this time only keeping the maximal energy level that can be reached (under LW-energy constraint). As there are at most $|Q|$ states per level in this DAG of depth at most $(|Q| + 1)^2$, we get:

**Theorem 22** The existence of a winning path in one-player LW-energy-reachability games can be decided in PTIME.

**Example 23** Consider the one-player arena of Fig. 6. We assume $L = 0$, and fix an even weak upper bound $W$. The state $s$ has $W/2$ disjoint cycles: for each odd integer $i$ in $[0; W - 1]$, the cycle $c_i$ is made of three consecutive edges with weights $-i$, $+W$ and $-W + i + 1$. Similarly, the state $s'$ has $W/2$ disjoint cycles: for even integers $i$ in $[0; W - 1]$, the cycle $c_i'$ has weights $-i$, $+W$ and $-W + i + 1$. Finally, there are: two sequences of $k$ edges of weight 0 from $s$ to $s'$ and from $s'$ to $s$; an edge from the initial state to $s$ of weight 1, and from $s'$ to target state $q_f$ of weight $-W$. The total number of states then is $2W + 2k + 2$.

In order to go from the initial state $q_0$, with energy level 0, to the final state $q_1$, we have to take the cycle $c_1$ (with weights $-1$, $+W$, $-W + 2$) on $s$ (no other cycles $c_i$ can be taken). We then reach configuration $(s', 2)$. Iterating $c_1$ has no effect, and the only next interesting cycle is $c_2$, for which we have to go to $s'$. After running $c_2$, we end up in $(s', 3)$. Again, iterating $c_2$ has no effect, and we go back to $s$, take $c_3$, and so on. We have to take each cycle $c_i$ (at least) once, and take the sequences of $k$ edges between $s$ and $s'$ $W/2$ times each. In the end, we have a run of length $3W + Wk + 2$.

![Figure 6: An example showing that more than one cycle per state can be needed.](image-url)
Let us look at the universal cycles that we have in this arena: besides the cycles made of the 2k edges with weight zero between s and s', the only possible universal cycles have to depart from the first state of each cycle \( c_i \) (as they are the only states having a positive outgoing edge). Following Lemma 15, such cycles can be iterated arbitrarily many times, and set the energy level to some value in \([L;W]\). Since the only edge available at the end of a universal cycle has weight \(+W\), the exact value of the universal cycles is irrelevant: the energy level will be \( W \) anyway when reaching the second state of each cycle \( c_i \). As a consequence, using set-edges in this example does not shorten the witnessing run, which then cannot be shorter than \( 3W + Wk + 2 \).

We now move to the two-player setting. We begin with proving a result similar to Lemma 10:

**Lemma 24** Let \( G \) be a two-player arena, equipped with an \( \text{LSU}\)-energy-reachability objective. Let \( q \) be a state of \( G \), and \( u \leq u' \in [L;W] \). If Player 1 wins the game from \((q,u)\), then she also wins from \((q,u')\).

By Martin’s theorem [24], our games are determined. It follows that if Player 2 wins from some configuration \((q,v)\), she also wins from \((q,v')\) for all \( L \leq v' \leq v \) (assuming the contrary, i.e. \((q,v')\) winning for Player 1, would lead to the contradictory statement that \((q,v)\) is both winning for Player 1 and Player 2). Using classical techniques [9], we prove that Player 2 can be restricted to play memoryless strategies:

**Proposition 25** For two-player \( \text{LSU}\)-energy-reachability games, memoryless strategies are sufficient for Player 2.

A direct consequence of this result and of Theorem 22 is the following:

**Corollary 26** Two-player \( \text{LSU}\)-energy-reachability games are in \text{coNP}.

## 5 Energy reachability games with soft upper bound

We now consider games with limited violations, i.e. (reachability) games with \( \text{LSU}\)-energy, \( \text{LSU}\)-energy and \( \text{LSU}\)-energy objectives. We address the problems of deciding the winner in the one-player and two-player settings, and consider the existence and minimization questions.

**Theorem 27** \( \text{LSU}\)-energy, \( \text{LSU}\)-energy and \( \text{LSU}\)-energy (reachability) games are \text{PSPACE}-complete for one-player arenas, and \text{EXPTIME}-complete for two-player arenas.

**Proof.** Membership in \text{PSPACE} and \text{EXPTIME} can be obtained by building a variant \( G_{\text{LSU}} \) of the \( G_{\text{LU}} \) arena: besides storing the energy level in each state, we can also store the amount of violations (for any of the three measures we consider). More precisely, given an arena \( G \), lower and upper bounds \( L \) and \( U \) on the energy level, a soft bound \( S \), and a bound \( V \) on the measure of violations, we define a new arena\(^3\) \( G_{\text{LSU}} \) with set of states \( (Q \times ([L;U] \cup \{\bot\}) \times ([0;V] \cup \{\bot\})^3) \), and each transition \((q,w,q')\) of the original arena generates a transition from state \((q,l,(n,c,s))\) to state \((q',l',(n',c',s'))\) whenever

- \( l' \) correctly encodes the evolution of the energy level: if \( l \) and \( l + w \) are in \([L;U]\), then \( l' = l + w \); if the energy level leaves interval \([L;U]\) \((l + w < L \text{ or } l + w > U)\) or has formerly leaved interval \([L;U]\) (in this case \( l = \bot \)), then \( l' = \bot \).

- \( n' \) correctly stores the number of violations: \( n' = \bot \) if \( l' \in (S;U) \) and \( n + 1 > V \) (the number of violations allowed is exceeded); once the number of violations is exceeded \((n = \bot)\) or the maximal energy level is exceeded \((l' = \bot)\), we have \( n' = \bot \); last, \( n' = n \) if \( l' \in [L;S) \) (the current state does not violate bound \( S)\), and \( n' = n + 1 \) if \( l' \in [S;U) \) and \( n + 1 \leq V \) (the current state is an additional violation of soft bound \( S)\).

---

\(^3\)In order to factor our proof, we store all three measures of violations in one single arena, even if only one measure per type of \( \text{LSU}\)-energy game is needed.
We can similarly update $c'$ to count the current number of consecutive violations, and $s'$ for the sum of all violations. In the resulting arena, values $n$, $c$ and $s$ keep track of the number of violations, number of consecutive violations and sum of violations; their values range in $[0, V]$ and are set to $\bot$ as soon as they exceed bound $V$, or if the energy level has exceeded its bounds. The arena $G_{LSU}$ has size exponential, and $LSU^*$-energy-reachability problems can then be reduced to solving reachability of corresponding sets of states in $G_{LSU}$. The announced complexity results follow. Hardness results are obtained by a straightforward encoding of $LU$-energy reachability problems, taking $S = U$ and $V = 0$.

Solving $LSU^*$-energy, $LSU^{\#}$-energy, $LSU^{\Sigma}$-energy games (without reachability objective) can be performed with arena $G_{LSU}$ built above. Now, the objective in $LSU^*$-energy, $LSU^{\#}$-energy, $LSU^{\Sigma}$-energy games is to enforce infinite runs, that avoid states with $l = \bot$ and with $n = \bot$, $c = \bot$ or $s = \bot$, depending on the chosen measure of violations.

When the strong upper bound $U$ is not given, the existence problem consists in deciding if such a bound exists under which Player 1 wins the $LSU^*$-energy game. We have:

**Theorem 28** The existence problems for $LSU^*$-energy, $LSU^{\#}$-energy, and $LSU^{\Sigma}$-energy (reachability) games are PSPACE complete for the one-player case and EXPTIME-complete for the two-player case.

**Proof.** Along any outcome of a winning strategy, the energy level remains below $S + V \cdot w_{\max}$, where $w_{\max}$ is the maximal weight appearing on transitions of $G$. This gives a strong upper bound $U$, with which we can apply the construction above and check the existence of a winning strategy for Player 1. □

**Theorem 29** Let $G$ be an arena, $L$ and $S$ be integer bounds, and $V_{\max}$ be an integer. There exist algorithms that compute the value of $U$ (if any) that minimizes the value of $V$ (below $V_{\max}$) for which Player 1 has a winning strategy in a $LSU^*$-energy (reachability) game. These algorithms run in PSPACE for one-player games and in EXPTIME for two-player games. These bounds are sharp.

**Proof.** We perform a binary search for an optimal value for $V$ when the strict upper energy bound $U$ varies between $S$ and $S + V_{\max} \cdot w_{\max}$. For each value $U$, we discard from $G_{LSU}$ transitions for which the energy level exceeds $U$. One can remark that when $U$ grows, the minimal amount of violation may decrease, both in reachability and infinite-run games. We can hence discover optimal values with a polynomial number of PSPACE checks (for the one-player games), and EXPTIME checks in the two-player case. □

### 6 Conclusion

This paper has considered several variants of energy games. The first variant defines games with upper and lower bound constraints, combined with reachability objectives. The second variant defines games with a strong lower bound and a soft upper bound, which can be temporarily exceeded. In the one player case, complexities ranges from PTIME to PSPACE-complete, and in the two-player case from $NP \cap coNP$ to EXPTIME-complete. In general, the complexity is the same for a reachability and for an infinite run objective. Interestingly, for $LW$-energy games, the complexity of the single player case is PTIME, but reachability objectives require exponential memory (in the size of the weak upper bound) while strategies are memoryless for infinite run objectives.

A possible extension of this work is to consider energy games with mean-payoff functions and discounted total payoff, both for the energy level and for the violation constraints, and the associated minimization and existence problems.
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