

Equalizer zero-determinant strategy in discounted repeated Stackelberg asymmetric game *

CHENG Zhaoyang · CHEN Guanpu · HONG Yiguang

DOI:

Received: x x 20xx / Revised: x x 20xx

©The Editorial Office of JSSC & Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany 2021

Abstract This paper focuses on the performance of equalizer zero-determinant (ZD) strategies in discounted repeated Stackelberg asymmetric games. In the leader-follower adversarial scenario, the strong Stackelberg equilibrium (SSE) deriving from the opponents' best response (BR), is technically the optimal strategy for the leader. However, computing an SSE strategy may be difficult since it needs to solve a mixed-integer program and has exponential complexity in the number of states. To this end, we propose to adopt an equalizer ZD strategy, which can unilaterally restrict the opponent's expected utility. We first study the existence of an equalizer ZD strategy with one-to-one situations, and analyze an upper bound of its performance with the baseline SSE strategy. Then we turn to multi-player models, where there exists one player adopting an equalizer ZD strategy. We give bounds of the sum of opponents' utilities, and compare it with the SSE strategy. Finally, we give simulations on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and the moving target defense (MTD) to verify the effectiveness of our approach.

Keywords Equalizer zero-determinant strategy, Strong Stackelberg equilibrium strategy, Discounted repeated Stackelberg asymmetric game.

CHENG Zhaoyang

Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Beijing, 100190, China, and School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100049, China. Email: chengzhaoyang@amss.ac.cn

CHEN Guanpu

School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, 100 44, Sweden. Email: guanpu@kth.se

HONG Yiguang (Corresponding author)

Department of Control Science and Engineering, Tongji University, Shanghai, 201804, China, and Shanghai Research Institute for Intelligent Autonomous Systems, Tongji University, Shanghai, 210201, China. Email: yghong@iss.ac.cn

*This work was supported by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under No. 2022YFA1004700, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under No. 62173250, and Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project under No. 2021SHZDZX0100.

1 Introduction

In recent years, agent interaction has been widely considered in smart grids, sensor networks, or cyber-physical systems (CPS), while many of them are modeled by game theory [1–4]. Actually, agents often face the situation with dynamic and persistent interactions. For example, smart power grids often confront long-term and persistent attacks, and sensor networks also have repeated periodic detections [5, 6]. The repeated game is a typical theoretical model to analyze the interaction in these situations [7, 8].

Actually, one player may have advantages in the strategy implementation sequence, such as the defender in moving target defense (MTD) problem and the drone leader in unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) [9, 10]. The typical case is always denoted as the repeated Stackelberg asymmetric game, which is one of the important categories to characterize players' behaviors [11–13]. Specifically, consider a Stackelberg game model between two players. The follower tends to choose the best response (BR) strategy after observing the strategy of the leader, while the leader picks the strong Stackelberg equilibrium (SSE) strategy based on the opponent's BR strategy [14–16]. Thus, an SSE strategy can be regarded as the optimal solution in a long-period repeated Stackelberg game.

However, the computation of the SSE in such a repeated game is complex, which is always transformed into a mixed-integer non-linear program with a non-convex optimization objective [11, 16]. The non-convexity makes the computation much difficult, and even mixed-integer polynomial programs have exponential complexity in the size of states [17, 18]. Thus, although the SSE strategy is optimal for the leader, we hope to adopt another efficient strategy, in order to avoid the cost in computing.

Markedly, the zero-determinant (ZD) strategy has become popular in repeated games [13, 19–21], which is derived from Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma (IPD). Briefly, ZD strategies can unilaterally enforce the two players' expected utilities subjected to a linear relation. Besides, the equalizer ZD strategy is one of the typical classes of ZD strategies to unilaterally set the opponent's utility. It has been widely studied to promote cooperation or unilaterally extortion in many research fields, like public goods games (PGG), human-computer interaction (HCI), and evolutionary games [22, 23], where most players has symmetric payoffs.

Further, the asymmetric situation has become increasingly attractive since players may have different preferences or abilities in achieving their purposes [24]. For example, in security games, defenders often need to defend against the intrusion of many attackers of different types. In fact, the situation where each player has two actions to choose from is an important multi-player game. For example, in asymmetric public goods games and asymmetric snowdrift games, with [25–27], players can choose to cooperate and work together to complete the task, or refuse to make an effort and only enjoy the benefits. As an extension of repeated symmetric games [20], the discussion of ZD strategies and SSE strategies in such an asymmetric game is also important.

Hence, we are inspired to apply ZD-based approaches to a class of repeated games, which is representative and important in CPS or UAV scenarios. We consider discounted long-term

utilities in asymmetric situations, which are consistent with the fact that players are attracted by the reward in recent stages and may have individual preferences. On this basis, this paper studies the performance of the equalizer ZD strategy for the leader, compared with the baseline SSE strategy. The main contribution of this work is summarized as follows.

- In the discounted repeated Stackelberg asymmetric game with one-to-one scenarios, we reveal an existence condition of equalizer ZD strategies. Also, we analyze an upper bound of expected utilities when adopting an equalizer ZD strategy. Our results give the leader a choice set in selecting the ZD strategy to avoid computation burden in seeking the SSE strategy.
- We further study multi-player scenarios, and similarly, when one player chooses an equalizer ZD strategy, we give a bound of the sum of opponents' utilities. Also, in the multi-player situation, we show the gap between the leader's utility with ZD strategies and that with SSE strategies. The leader could adopt the equalizer ZD strategy and maintain its utility, facing multiple opponents.
- We verify our results in experiments by providing the leader with proper equalizer ZD strategies and making comparisons with an SSE strategy as the baseline. In the moving target defense (MTD) and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), we show utility performances and action interactions among players. Our experiments also illustrate that the equalizer ZD strategy can help the leader maintain its utility.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, multi-player game models and strategies are provided. In Section 3, we consider a typical case, the one-to-one situation, and show the utility analysis between ZD strategies and SSE strategies. Also, in Section 4, we extend the results in one-to-one scenarios to multi-player scenarios, which are more general than one-to-one models in real stochastic adversarial scenarios. In Section 5, we show the experiments to verify our results in both the one-to-one situation and the multi-player situation. Finally, we conclude this article in Section 6.

2 Preliminary

In this section, we give the formulation of the multi-player repeated game, and show the definition of strong Stackelberg equilibrium (SSE) strategies and zero-determinant (ZD) strategies.

2.1 Repeated leader-follower game

Consider a repeated asymmetric game $\mathcal{G} = \{N, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{S}, r, P\}$. $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the player set. Each player has two actions $\mathcal{A}_i = \{1, 2\}$ to select in each stage, and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_n$ is the action set of all players. $\mathbf{r} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ is the reward set of players. For convenience, at each stage, denote 1-selector as the player chooses action 1, and 2-selector as the player chooses action 2. Each player's utility depends on its own action and the number of 1-selectors among

other players, as shown in Table 1. For example, for player i facing with the situation where there are k players selecting action 1, player i gets $U_{1,k}^i$ when it chooses action 1, and gets $U_{2,k}^i$ when it chooses action 2. We consider that the utility matrix is asymmetric for players, i.e., $U_{jk}^{i_1} \neq U_{jk}^{i_2}$, for some $i_1 \neq i_2$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Table 1: Utility matrix of player i

Number of 1-selectors among other players	$n-1$	$n-2$	\dots	1	0
1-selector's payoff	$U_{1,n-1}^i$	$U_{1,n-2}^i$	\dots	$U_{1,1}^i$	$U_{1,0}^i$
2-selector's payoff	$U_{2,n-1}^i$	$U_{2,n-2}^i$	\dots	$U_{2,1}^i$	$U_{2,0}^i$

Example 2.1 The asymmetric utility matrix in Table 1 is an extension of the matrix in some typical symmetric games. Actually, consider the case that $U_{jk}^{i_1} = U_{jk}^{i_2}$, for any $k_1 \neq k_2$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. In this case, the game is a symmetric game and was widely analyzed recently, such as public goods games and multi-player snowdrift games [20, 28]. In public goods games, take 1-selector as the cooperater and 2-selector as the defector. In this case, each cooperater contributes an amount $c > 0$, and its contribution to a public good is multiplied by an enhancement factor r . Each player gets an equal share of the public good. Thus, the cooperater's utility is $U_{1,k}^i = \frac{rc(k+1)}{n} - c$, and the defector's utility is $U_{2,j}^i = \frac{rck}{n}$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. Besides, in multi-player snowdrift games, cooperaters need to clear out a snowdrift so that everyone can go on their merry way. All cooperaters share a cost c to clear out the snowdrift together, and each one gets a fixed benefit b . Thus, the cooperater's utility is $U_{1,k}^i = b - \frac{c}{k+1}$. The defector's utility is $U_{2,k}^i = b, k \neq 0$, if there is at least one cooperater, $U_{2,0}^i = 0$, since no one clear out the snowdrift.

Example 2.2 In asymmetric public goods game [25, 26], players may not get an equal share of the public good due to asymmetry in the distribution of resources. Take a_i as player i 's share factor, where $\sum_i^n a_i = 1$. Then, player i gets the utility $U_{1,k}^i = a_i rc(k+1) - c$ if it cooperates, while player i gets the utility $U_{2,k}^i = a_i rck$ if it defects, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. Besides, in asymmetric snowdrift games [27], players may have different benefits b_i . Thus, the cooperater's utility is $U_{1,k}^i = b_i - \frac{c}{k+1}$. The defector's utility is $U_{2,k}^i = b_i, k \neq 0$, if there is at least one cooperater, $U_{2,0}^i = 0$, since no one clears out the snowdrift. Moreover, in asymmetric security games, there are two typical players, defenders and attackers. For convenience, consider player 1 as the defender, and other players are attackers. Then the defender hopes to select the target that faces many attacks, while the attacker has the opponent's preference as the defender. Thus, for player 1, i.e. the defender, $U_{1,i}^1 > U_{1,j}^1$, $U_{2,i}^1 < U_{2,j}^1$, for $i < j$. For $k \neq 1$, player k , i.e. the attacker, $U_{1,i}^1 < U_{1,j}^1$, $U_{2,i}^1 > U_{2,j}^1$, for $i < j$.

Besides, denote $\mathcal{S} = \{(1, \dots, 1), (1, \dots, 1), \dots, (2, \dots, 2)\}$ as the set of states, which is composed by the previous actions. $P : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the transition function, where $P(s'|s, \mathbf{a})$ shows the probability to the next state $s' \in \mathcal{S}$ from the current state s when players take

\mathbf{a} , and $\sum_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} P(s'|s, \mathbf{a}) = 1$, for $s \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{a} = (a^1, \dots, a^n) \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $P(s'|s, a^1, \dots, a^n) = 1$ if and only if $s' = (a^1, \dots, a^n)$ for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Thus, the next state depends on players' strategies and the current state. Each player's strategy depends on the current state. The strategy of player i is a probability distribution π_i , where $\pi_i(a^i|s) \in \Delta \mathcal{A}_i$ with $\Delta \mathcal{A}_i$ denoting a probability simplex defined on the space \mathcal{A}_i . π_i is actually a memory-one strategy in the repeated game. Thus, set $M = \{P(s, s')\}_{s, s' \in \mathcal{S}}$ as the state transition matrix, where $P(s, s') = \pi_1(a^1|s)\pi_2(a^2|s)\dots\pi_n(a^n|s)$, and $s' = (a^1, \dots, a^n)$. Take a_t^i as player i 's action in stage t . Then player i 's utility in stage t is $r_i(a_t^1, a_t^2, \dots, a_t^n) = U_{a_t^i, z}^i$, where z is the number of $a_t^j = 1, j \neq i$.

The expected long-term discounted utility of player i in \mathcal{G} is

$$U_i(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n) = \mathbb{E} \left(\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \delta) \sum_{t=0}^T \delta^t r_i(a_t^1, a_t^2, \dots, a_t^n) \right), i \in \{1, \dots, n\},$$

where $\{a_t^i \sim \pi_i(\cdot | s_t^i)\}_{t \geq 1}$, and $s_t^i = (a_{t-1}^1, \dots, a_{t-1}^n)$ describe the evolution of states and actions over stage. $\pi_i^0(1)$ denotes the probability of player i choosing action 1 in stage 0. Each player aims to maximize its own expected utility.

2.2 Strong Stackelberg equilibrium strategy

The strong Stackelberg equilibrium (SSE) strategy can be regarded as the optimal solution for the leader in an actual Stackelberg game. We consider that player 1 is a leader and declares a strategy in advance, while other players are followers and choose their strategies after observing player 1's strategy. The best response (BR) strategy set of player i is denoted as $\mathbf{BR}_i(\pi_{-i}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_i \in \Delta \mathcal{A}_i} U_i(\delta, \pi_i, \pi_{-i})$. Without loss of generality, followers break ties optimally for the leader if there are multiple options. In this case, followers choose the following BR strategy profile:

$$\pi_1^{\overline{\mathbf{BR}}}(\pi_1) \in \overline{\mathbf{BR}}(\pi_1) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_i \in \mathbf{BR}_i(\pi_{-i}), i \neq 1} U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n).$$

Player 1 aims to maximize its expected utility via the above optimization, and the equilibrium is defined as below [15, 16].

Definition 2.3 A strategy profile $(\pi_1^{SSE}, \pi_2^{SSE}, \dots, \pi_n^{SSE})$ is said to be an SSE of \mathcal{G} if

$$(\pi_1^{SSE}, \pi_2^{SSE}, \dots, \pi_n^{SSE}) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_1 \in \Delta \mathcal{A}_1, \pi_i \in \mathbf{BR}_i(\pi_{-i}), i \neq 1} U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n).$$

Typically, in the one-to-one situation between player 1 and player 2, player 2 is a follower and chooses the following BR strategy: $\pi_2^{\overline{\mathbf{BR}}}(\pi_1) \in \overline{\mathbf{BR}}(\pi_1) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi_2 \in \mathbf{BR}_2(\pi_1)} U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2)$. Different from the multi-player situation, player 2 does not need to take other followers' actions and preferences into account, when adopting its own strategy.

However, the computation of the SSE in such a repeated game is complex, which is always transformed into a mixed-integer non-linear program with a non-convex optimization objective. The non-convexity makes the computation much difficult. Also, even mixed-integer polynomial

programming programs have exponential complexity in the number of states. Thus, although the SSE strategy is optimal for player 1, we hope to replace the SSE strategy with another effective strategy, to avoid too much cost of time.

2.3 Zero-determinant strategy

Fortunately, methods based on zero-determinant (ZD) strategies have emerged in these years. When adopting a ZD strategy, one player can unilaterally enforce the two players' expected utilities subjected to a linear relation [19]. Recently, ZD strategies have been widely studied to promote cooperation or unilaterally extortion in public goods games (PGG), human-computer interaction (HCI), and evolutionary games [29]. For this discounted repeated asymmetric game with multiple players \mathcal{G} , the player 1's ZD strategy is defined as follows [20]:

Definition 2.4 The strategy π_1^{ZD} is called a ZD strategy of player 1, if there exist constants η, γ, ϕ , and weights ω_j such that

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\pi_1^{ZD}(1) &= \phi \left(\eta \mathbf{S}^1 - \sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma \right) - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1} + \hat{\pi}, \\ \pi_1^{ZD}(2) &= 1 - \pi_1^{ZD}(1),\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j = 1$, $\hat{\pi} = [1, 1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ is the repeated strategy, and

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1(k) &= [\pi_1(k|1, \dots, 1), \pi_1(k|1, \dots, 2), \dots, \pi_1(k|2, \dots, 2)]^T, k \in N, \\ \mathbf{S}^j &= [r(1, \dots, 1), r(1, \dots, 2), \dots, r(2, \dots, 2)]^T.\end{aligned}$$

It is called the zero-determinant strategy because players' expected utilities are subjected to a linear relation:

$$\eta U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) - \omega_2 U_2(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) - \dots - \omega_n U_n(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) + \gamma = 0, \text{ for all } \pi_i \in \Delta \mathcal{A}_i, i \neq 1.$$

Further, by taking $\eta = 0$, the corresponding strategy is called an equalizer ZD strategy, which can unilaterally control the sum of the opponent's utility

$$\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j U_j(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) = \gamma, \text{ for all } \pi_i \in \Delta \mathcal{A}_i, i \neq 1.\tag{2}$$

Take $\Xi(\delta)$ as the set of all feasible equalizer strategies.

Typically, in the one-to-one situation between player 1 and player 2, the strategy π_1^{ZD} is called a ZD strategy if

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\pi_1^{ZD}(1) &= \eta \mathbf{S}^1 + \beta \mathbf{S}^2 + (\gamma - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1))\mathbf{1}_4 + \hat{\pi}, \\ \pi_1^{ZD}(2) &= 1 - \pi_1^{ZD}(1),\end{aligned}$$

where $\eta, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{\pi} = [1, 1, 0, 0]^T$, and $\pi_1(k) = [\pi_1(k|1, 1), \pi_1(k|1, 2), \pi_1(k|2, 1), \pi_1(k|2, 2)]^T$, $k \in N$. Further, by taking $\eta = 0$, the corresponding strategy is called an equalizer ZD strategy, which can unilaterally control the opponent's utility

$$\beta U_2(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2) + \gamma = 0, \text{ for all } \pi_2 \in \Delta \mathcal{A}_2.\tag{3}$$

The equalizer ZD strategy can unilaterally set the opponent's utility as $U_2(\pi_1, \pi_2) = -\frac{\gamma}{\beta}$, when $\beta \neq 0$. Equation (3) is the same as equation (2), when $n = 2$ and $\omega_2 = -\beta$.

Recall that the computation of an SSE strategy has exponential complexity in the number of states. According to [17], there may be a branch-and-bound algorithm that proves the solution's validity and may take more than $O(2^m)$ iterations, where m is the number of states s . Moreover, if we have a linear relation and the corresponding parameters ω_j, γ , we only need to solve the parameter θ which makes the ZD strategy feasible. Then we can directly get the ZD strategy according to equation (1). Actually, it at most spends $O(m)$ times for us to solve θ , since we only need to verify $0 \leq \pi_1^{ZD}(1) \leq 1$. Thus, to reduce the time cost, we aim to find equalizer ZD strategies with acceptable performance in discounted repeated asymmetric games, compared with the baseline SSE strategy.

However, the analysis of a general multi-player situation is more difficult than that in its typical case, the one-to-one situation. For example, the utility functions of players in a multi-player situation are more complex than the utility functions of players in a one-to-one situation obviously. The complex functions make it difficult to compare expected utilities and calculate SSE strategies since it has exponential complexity in the number of states. Secondly, the interaction between followers needs to be considered in multi-player games, while one-to-one does not since it only has one follower. Followers have many internal interactions, such as cooperation, competition, and so on, in multi-player games. In the one-to-one game, player 2 only needs to maximize its own utility. Therefore, we hope to consider the one-to-one situation in the next section.

3 One-to-one situation

As a fundamental case of a multi-player situation, we consider one-to-one situations in this section. Actually, the two-player game is one of the most popular game mechanisms, where many games are based on the discussion of two-person games. For example, a general security game is based on a typical model with one attacker and one defender. Whether two players cooperate has also inspired the analysis of snowdrift games and public goods games. Moreover, the two-player asymmetric game in this paper has also been widely analyzed. For example, in an asymmetric public goods game between two players, players may not get an equal share of the public good due to asymmetry in the distribution of resources [30]. Besides, In asymmetric snowdrift games, one player may gain more than the other [31]. Also, in security games, the defender and the attacker have different preferences, where the defender tends to protect the vulnerable target and the attacker tends to implement invasions on the unprotected target [13].

First, we need to verify the existence for equalizer ZD strategies in the discounted repeated asymmetric game, since not all linear relations can be enforced by feasible ZD strategies. For

convenience, take the set

$$\Lambda(\delta) = \left\{ \phi : \phi \leq \frac{\min_{x \in \{(1,1), (1,0)\}, y \in \{(2,1), (2,0)\}} \{U_x^2 - U_y^2\}}{1 - \delta}, \right. \\ \left. \phi \geq \max \left\{ \frac{|U_{1,1}^2 - U_{1,0}^2|}{\delta}, \frac{|U_{2,1}^2 - U_{2,0}^2|}{\delta}, \frac{\max_{x \in \{(1,1), (1,0)\}, y \in \{(2,1), (2,0)\}} \{U_x^2 - U_y^2\}}{1 + \delta} \right\} \right\}.$$

Actually, when we verify whether ϕ is in the set $\Lambda(\delta)$, we only need to check ϕ with ten compared elements. The following lemma provides a sufficient condition for the existence of equalizer ZD strategies.

Lemma 3.1 *An equalizer ZD strategy exists if $\Lambda(\delta)$ is nonempty.*

Lemma 3.1 shows that the linear relation between players' expected utility can be enforced by player 1's equalizer ZD strategy if $\Lambda(\delta)$ is nonempty.

Next, the equalizer ZD strategy of player 1 can unilaterally control the opponent's utility, but the performance of this unilateral control is indeed bounded. Thus, we need to explore bounds of the opponent utility when adopting equalizer ZD strategies. Denote

$$\Gamma_1^+(\delta) = \max_{\phi \in \Lambda(\delta)} \min \left\{ U_x^2 - \frac{(1-\delta)(1-\pi_1^0(1))}{\phi}, U_y^2 + \frac{\delta + (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, \right. \\ \left. x \in \{(1,1), (1,0)\}, y \in \{(2,1), (2,0)\} \right\},$$

and

$$\Gamma_1^-(\delta) = \min_{\phi \in \Lambda(\delta)} \max \left\{ U_x^2 - \frac{1 - (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, U_y^2 + \frac{(1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, \right. \\ \left. x \in \{(1,1), (1,0)\}, y \in \{(2,1), (2,0)\} \right\}.$$

Then we give a bound of the opponent's utility when adopting equalizer ZD strategies in the following result.

Theorem 3.2 *If $\Lambda(\delta)$ is nonempty, then there exists an equalizer ZD strategy such that $U_2 = \gamma$ with $\Gamma_1^-(\delta) \leq \gamma \leq \Gamma_1^+(\delta)$.*

Proof: Since $\Lambda(\delta)$ is nonempty, there are β, γ , and ϕ , such that

$$(1-\delta)(1-\pi_1^0(1)) \leq -\phi(\beta U_{1,1}^2 + \gamma) \leq 1 - (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1), \\ (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1) \leq \phi(\beta U_{2,1}^2 + \gamma) \leq \delta + (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1), \\ (1-\delta)(1-\pi_1^0(1)) \leq -\phi(\beta U_{1,0}^2 + \gamma) \leq 1 - (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1), \\ (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1) \leq \phi(\beta U_{2,0}^2 + \gamma) \leq \delta + (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1).$$

Without loss of generality, take $\beta = -1$. Then

$$(1-\delta)(1-\pi_1^0(1)) \leq -\phi(-U_{1,1}^2 + \gamma) \leq 1 - (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1), \quad (4a)$$

$$(1-\delta)(1-\pi_1^0(1)) \leq -\phi(-U_{1,0}^2 + \gamma) \leq 1 - (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1), \quad (4b)$$

$$(1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1) \leq \phi(-U_{2,1}^2 + \gamma) \leq \delta + (1-\delta)\pi_1^0(1), \quad (4c)$$

$$(1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1) \leq \phi(-U_{2,0}^2 + \gamma) \leq \delta + (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1). \quad (4d)$$

First, suppose $\phi > 0$. By multiplying both sides of (4a) (4b) by $-\frac{1}{\phi}$, and (4c) (4d) by $\frac{1}{\phi}$, the above inequalities can be converted to

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1 - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi} &\leq -U_{1,1}^2 + \gamma \leq -\frac{(1 - \delta)(1 - \pi_1^0(1))}{\phi}, \\ -\frac{1 - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi} &\leq -U_{1,0}^2 + \gamma \leq -\frac{(1 - \delta)(1 - \pi_1^0(1))}{\phi}, \\ \frac{(1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi} &\leq -U_{2,1}^2 + \gamma \leq \frac{\delta + (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, \\ \frac{(1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi} &\leq -U_{2,0}^2 + \gamma \leq \frac{\delta + (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have following inequalities:

$$\gamma \leq \min\left\{U_x^2 - \frac{(1 - \delta)(1 - \pi_1^0(1))}{\phi}, U_y^2 + \frac{\delta + (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, x \in \{(1, 1), (1, 0)\}, y \in \{(2, 1), (2, 0)\}\right\},$$

and

$$\gamma \geq \max\left\{U_x^2 - \frac{1 - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, U_y^2 + \frac{(1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)}{\phi}, x \in \{(1, 1), (1, 0)\}, y \in \{(2, 1), (2, 0)\}\right\}.$$

Since $\phi \in \Lambda(\delta)$, $\Gamma_1^-(\delta) \leq \gamma \leq \Gamma_1^+(\delta)$. Moreover, we can get the same result considering the case $\phi < 0$. \square

We learn from Theorem 3.2 that player 1 can unilaterally set the opponent's utility in $[\Gamma_1^-(\delta), \Gamma_1^+(\delta)]$ and needs not care about what strategies the opponent selects. Actually, for any $\gamma \in [\Gamma_1^-(\delta), \Gamma_1^+(\delta)]$, an equalizer ZD strategy is feasible for the player 1 to enforce the linear relation. Thus, it gives player 1 a choice, a ZD strategy, to enforce unilateral control to the opponent's utility in the repeated game \mathcal{G} .

Next, we analyze how player 1 gains the best utility by the equalizer ZD strategy and reduces the utility gap between SSE strategies and ZD strategies. According to Definition 2.3, the SSE strategy always brings the highest utility for the leader with the follower's BR strategy. Thus, we need to show the upper limit of the performance of ZD strategies, and the loss compared with the SSE strategy. Actually, the discounted repeated game has a complex expected utility $U_2(\pi_1, \pi_2)$, which can be written as the division of two determinants in the repeated game with average-sum utilities [19]. For convenience, we denote $\pi_1^+(\pi_1^-)$ as the equalizer ZD strategy to enforce $U_2 = \Gamma_1^+(\delta)(\Gamma_1^-(\delta))$, and U_1^{SSE} as player 1's utility in SSE. Denote $\Pi(\mathcal{B}) = \{\pi_2 \in \Delta\mathcal{B} | \pi_2(b|s) \in \{0, 1\}, \forall b, s\}$, and

$$D(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \mathbf{f}) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta\pi_1(1|1, 1)\pi_2(1|1, 1) - 1 & \delta\pi_1(1|1, 1) - 1 & \delta\pi_2(1|1, 1) - 1 & f_1 \\ \delta\pi_1(1|1, 2)\pi_2(1|1, 2) & \delta\pi_1(1|1, 2) - 1 & \delta\pi_2(1|1, 2) & f_2 \\ \delta\pi_1(1|2, 1)\pi_2(1|2, 1) & \delta\pi_1(1|2, 1) & \delta\pi_2(1|2, 1) - 1 & f_3 \\ \delta\pi_1(1|2, 2)\pi_2(1|2, 2) & \delta\pi_1(1|2, 2) & \delta\pi_2(1|2, 2) & f_4 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$L(\delta) = \max_{\pi_1 \in \{\pi_1^+, \pi_1^-\}, \pi_2 \in \Pi(\mathcal{B})} \frac{(1-\delta)D(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \mathbf{S}^1)}{\det(\mathbf{I}_4 - \delta M)}. \quad (5)$$

Then we show the utility gap of player 1's utilities between an equalizer ZD strategy and the SSE strategy in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3 *If $\Lambda(\delta)$ is nonempty and $\pi_1^0(1) = \pi_2(0) = 0$, then we get a utility bound below*

$$\min_{\pi_1^{ZD} \in \Xi(\delta)} U_1 \left(\delta, \pi_1^{SSE}, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^{SSE}) \right) - U_1 \left(\delta, \pi_1^{ZD}, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^{ZD}) \right) = U_1^{SSE} - L(\delta).$$

Proof: For any π_1, π_2 , take $v(0) = [\pi_1^0(1)\pi_2^0(1), \pi_1^0(1)(1-\pi_2^0(1)), (1-\pi_1^0(1))\pi_2^0(1), (1-\pi_1^0(1))(1-\pi_2^0(1))]$ as the probability of the initial state, and the state transition matrix as

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_1(1|1,1)\pi_2(1|1,1) & \pi_1(1|1,1)\pi_2(2|1,1) & \pi_1(2|1,1)\pi_2(1|1,1) & \pi_1(2|1,1)\pi_2(2|1,1) \\ \pi_1(1|1,2)\pi_2(1|1,2) & \pi_1(1|1,2)\pi_2(2|1,2) & \pi_1(2|1,2)\pi_2(1|1,2) & \pi_1(2|1,2)\pi_2(2|1,2) \\ \pi_1(1|2,1)\pi_2(1|2,1) & \pi_1(1|2,1)\pi_2(2|2,1) & \pi_1(2|2,1)\pi_2(1|2,1) & \pi_1(2|2,1)\pi_2(2|2,1) \\ \pi_1(1|2,2)\pi_2(1|2,2) & \pi_1(1|2,2)\pi_2(2|2,2) & \pi_1(2|2,2)\pi_2(1|2,2) & \pi_1(2|2,2)\pi_2(2|2,2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then player 1's expected long-term discounted utility can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2) \\ &= (1-\delta) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t v(0) M^t \cdot \mathbf{S}^1 \\ &= (1-\delta) v(0) (I_4 - \delta M)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}^1 \\ &= \frac{1-\delta}{\det(I - \delta M)} v(0) \begin{bmatrix} A_{11}U_{11}^1 + A_{21}U_{12}^1 + A_{31}U_{21}^1 + A_{41}U_{22}^1 \\ A_{12}U_{11}^1 + A_{22}U_{12}^1 + A_{32}U_{21}^1 + A_{42}U_{22}^1 \\ A_{13}U_{11}^1 + A_{23}U_{12}^1 + A_{33}U_{21}^1 + A_{43}U_{22}^1 \\ A_{14}U_{11}^1 + A_{24}U_{12}^1 + A_{34}U_{21}^1 + A_{44}U_{22}^1 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where A_{ij} is the element of the adjugate matrix of δM . Denote $\det[M, \mathbf{f}, i]$ as the determinate of the matrix where the i th column of $\delta M - \mathbf{I}$ is replaced by \mathbf{f} . For example,

$$\det[M, \mathbf{f}, 4] = \begin{bmatrix} \delta\pi_1(1|1,1)\pi_2(1|1,1) - 1 & \delta\pi_1(1|1,1)\pi_2(2|1,1) & \delta\pi_1(2|1,1)\pi_2(1|1,1) & f_1 \\ \delta\pi_1(1|1,2)\pi_2(1|1,2) & \delta\pi_1(1|1,2)\pi_2(2|1,2) - 1 & \delta\pi_1(2|1,2)\pi_2(1|1,2) & f_2 \\ \delta\pi_1(1|2,1)\pi_2(1|2,1) & \delta\pi_1(1|2,1)\pi_2(2|2,1) & \delta\pi_1(2|2,1)\pi_2(1|2,1) - 1 & f_3 \\ \delta\pi_1(1|2,2)\pi_2(1|2,2) & \delta\pi_1(1|2,2)\pi_2(2|2,2) & \delta\pi_1(2|2,2)\pi_2(1|2,2) & f_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, player 1's expected utility can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2) \\
&= \frac{1 - \delta}{\det(I - \delta M)} v(0) \begin{bmatrix} \det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 1] \\ \det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 2] \\ \det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 3] \\ \det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 4] \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1 - \delta}{\det(I - \delta M)} (\pi_1^0(1)\pi_2^0(1)\det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 1] + \pi_1^0(1)(1 - \pi_2^0(1))\det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 2] \\
&\quad + (1 - \pi_1^0(1))\pi_2^0(1)\det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 3] + (1 - \pi_1^0(1))(1 - \pi_2^0(1))\det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 4])
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi_1^0(1) = \pi_2^0(1) = 0$, we have $U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2) = \frac{(1-\delta)\det[M, \mathbf{S}^1, 4]}{\det(I-\delta M)} = \frac{(1-\delta)D(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \mathbf{S}^1)}{\det(\mathbf{1}_4 - \delta M)}$.

According to Theorem 3.2, player 1 can unilaterally set the opponents' utility as $U_2 = \gamma$, where $\Gamma_1^-(\delta) \leq \gamma \leq \Gamma_1^+(\delta)$. Notice that $U_y^2 \leq \Gamma_1^-(\delta), \Gamma_1^+(\delta) \leq U_x^2$, for $x \in \{(1, 1), (1, 0)\}, y \in \{(2, 1), (2, 0)\}$. We first consider

$$\max\{U_x^1, x \in \{(1, 1), (1, 0)\}\} > \max\{U_y^1, y \in \{(2, 1), (2, 0)\}\}.$$

Then player 1's best equalizer ZD strategy is π_1^+ , and $\pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1) \in \Pi(\mathcal{B})$. Thus, $U_1(\delta, \pi_1^+, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^+)) = \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi(\mathcal{B})} \frac{(1-\delta)D(\delta, \pi_1^+, \pi_2, \mathbf{S}^1)}{\det(\mathbf{1}_4 - \delta M)}$. Similarly, when

$$\max\{U_x^1, x \in \{(1, 1), (1, 0)\}\} < \max\{U_y^1, y \in \{(2, 1), (2, 0)\}\},$$

we have $U_1(\delta, \pi_1^-, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^-)) = \max_{\pi_2 \in \Pi(\mathcal{B})} \frac{(1-\delta)D(\delta, \pi_1^-, \pi_2, \mathbf{S}^1)}{\det(\mathbf{1}_4 - \delta M)}$. Thus, $\max_{\pi_1^{ZD} \in \Xi(\delta)} U_1(\delta, \pi_1^{ZD}, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^{ZD})) = L(\delta)$. Finally, we have

$$\min_{\pi_1^{ZD} \in \Xi(\delta)} U_1\left(\delta, \pi_1^{SSE}, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^{SSE})\right) - U_1\left(\delta, \pi_1^{ZD}, \pi_2^{\overline{BR}}(\pi_1^{ZD})\right) = U_1^{SSE} - L(\delta),$$

which yields the conclusion \square

Theorem 3.3 shows that the defender can adopt ZD strategies to get a tolerable loss in the utility compared with SSE strategies. On this basis, when setting the opponent's utility as $\Gamma^+(\delta)$ or $\Gamma^-(\delta)$, player 1 can receive the best utility of adopting equalizer ZD strategies. Notice that computing an SSE strategy is difficult and yields computing resources. If player 1 can endure the bounded loss, then it can adopt the corresponding equalizer ZD strategy to avoid the cost of computing the SSE strategy. Thus, it also can be regarded as a tradeoff for different strategy choices.

4 Multi-player situation

It is time to consider the general case, multi-player situation, and many practical problems involve multiple players' interactions [20, 32–34]. For example, in security games among multiple players, defenders often need to defend against the intrusion of many attackers of different types

[15]. Also, the information interaction among drones is also realistic due to UAV networks [35]. In fact, the situation where each player has two actions to choose from is an important multi-player game. For example, in the multi-player public goods game and the multi-player snowdrift game, players can choose to cooperate and work together to complete the task, or refuse to make an effort and only enjoy the benefits [28]. Next, we discuss the multi-player game in which players have two actions.

Similar to Section 3, we first need to examine the conditions under which the ZD policy exists. It is the foundation when the player has an alternative ZD strategy to replace the SSE strategy. Take

$$\Lambda_2(\delta) = \{(\phi, \gamma) : \phi(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma) \geq (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1) + \hat{\pi}, \\ \phi(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma) \leq \delta + (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1} + \hat{\pi}\},$$

$\Gamma_2^+(\delta) = \max_{(\phi, \gamma) \in \Lambda_2(\delta)} \gamma$, and $\Gamma_2^-(\delta) = \min_{(\phi, \gamma) \in \Lambda_2(\delta)} \gamma$. We have the following theorem to show player 1's control on bounds of the weighted sum of the opponents' utilities.

Theorem 4.1 *If $\Lambda_2(\delta)$ is nonempty, then there exists an equalizer ZD strategy such that $\sum_{i \neq 1} \omega_j U_j(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) = \gamma$ with $\Gamma_2^-(\delta) \leq \gamma \leq \Gamma_2^+(\delta)$.*

Proof: Since $\Lambda_2(\delta)$ is nonempty, there are ω_j, γ , and ϕ , such that

$$\phi(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma) \geq (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1) + \hat{\pi}, \\ \phi(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma) \leq \delta + (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1}_{2n} + \hat{\pi},$$

Therefore, we have following inequalities:

$$(1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1}_{2n} + \hat{\pi} \leq \phi\left(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma\right) \leq (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1}_{2n} + \hat{\pi} + \delta\mathbf{1}_{2n}. \quad (6)$$

Take π_1^{ZD} as follows:

$$\delta\pi_1^{ZD}(1) = \phi\left(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma\right) - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1}_{2n} + \hat{\pi}, \\ \pi_1^{ZD}(2) = 1 - \pi_1^{ZD}(1),$$

Due to (6), we have $0 \leq \phi\left(-\sum_{j \neq 1} \omega_j \mathbf{S}^j + \gamma\right) - (1 - \delta)\pi_1^0(1)\mathbf{1}_{2n} + \hat{\pi} \leq \delta\mathbf{1}_{2n}$. Thus, $0 \leq \pi_1^{ZD}(1) \leq \mathbf{1}_{2n}$, and π_1^{ZD} is a feasible equalizer ZD strategy for player 1. Moreover, $\min_{(\phi, \gamma) \in \Lambda_2(\delta)} \gamma \leq \gamma \leq \max_{(\phi, \gamma) \in \Lambda_2(\delta)} \gamma$. Then $\Gamma_2^-(\delta) \leq \gamma \leq \Gamma_2^+(\delta)$. \square

Theorem 4.1 indicates that player 1 can unilaterally set the sum of opponents' utilities in $[\Gamma_2^-(\delta), \Gamma_2^+(\delta)]$ and needs not care about what strategies the opponents select. Actually, for any $\gamma \in [\Gamma_2^-(\delta), \Gamma_2^-(\delta)]$, an equalizer ZD strategy is feasible for the player 1 to enforce the linear relation. Thus, the player is able to make use of unilateral control in the sum of opponents' utilities to achieve its intention.

Next, we analyze how player 1 gains the best utility by the equalizer ZD strategy and reduces the utility gap between SSE strategies and ZD strategies. Similar to two-player situations, we need to provide an upper bound of the performance of ZD strategies, and the loss compared with the SSE strategy in multi-player situations. Take π_1^+ (π_1^-) as the equalizer ZD strategy to enforces $\sum_{i \neq 1} \omega_j U_j(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) = \Gamma_2^+(\delta)$ ($\Gamma_2^-(\delta)$). Let $\Pi_{-1}(\mathcal{B}) = \{\pi_j \in \Delta \mathcal{A} | \pi_j(a|s) \in \{0, 1\}, \forall a, s, j \neq 1\}$. Denote $s = [s(1), s(2), \dots, s(m)] = [(1, 1, \dots, 1), (1, 1, \dots, 2), \dots, (2, 2, \dots, 2)]^T$ as all possible state, where $m = 2^n$. Then take $D(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n, \mathbf{f})$ as an extension of $D(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \mathbf{f})$, where

$$D(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n, \mathbf{f}) = \begin{bmatrix} \delta\pi(s(1)|s(1)) - 1 & \delta\pi(s(2)|s(1)) - 1 & \delta\pi(s(3)|s(1)) - 1 & \dots & f_1 \\ \delta\pi(s(1)|s(2)) & \delta\pi(s(2)|s(2)) - 1 & \delta\pi(s(3)|s(2)) & \dots & f_2 \\ \vdots & & & & \\ \delta\pi(s(1)|s(m)) & \delta\pi(s(2)|s(m)) & \delta\pi(s(3)|s(m)) & \dots & f_m \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\pi(s(i)|s(j)) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k(g(i, k)|h(j, k))$, $g(i, k) = ((\lceil \frac{i}{2^{n-k}} \rceil + 1) \bmod 2) + 1$, and $h(j, k) = (g(j, k), \sum_{z \neq k} 1_{g(j, z)=1})$. Set

$$L_2(\delta) = \max_{\pi_1 \in \{\pi_1^+, \pi_1^-\}, \pi_{-1} \in \Pi_{-1}(\mathcal{B})} \frac{(1 - \delta)D(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n, \mathbf{S}^1)}{\det(I - \delta M)}. \quad (7)$$

Then we have the following result for an upper bound of player 1's utility in multi-player situations.

Theorem 4.2 *If $\Lambda_2(\delta)$ is nonempty, $S^{j_1} = S^{j_2}$, and $\pi_i(0) = 0$ for $j_1, j_2 \neq 1, i \in N$, then we get a utility bound below*

$$\min_{\pi_1^{ZD} \in \Xi_1(\delta)} U_1(\delta, \pi_1^{SSE}, \overline{\pi_{-1}^{BR}}(\pi_1^{SSE})) - U_1(\delta, \pi_1^{ZD}, \overline{\pi_{-1}^{BR}}(\pi_1^{ZD})) = U_1^{SSE} - L_2(\delta).$$

Proof: For any $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n$, take $v(0) = [\pi^0(s(1)), \dots, \pi^0(s(m))]$ as the probability of the initial state, and

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \pi(s(1)|s(1)) & \pi(s(2)|s(1)) & \dots & \pi(s(m)|s(1)) \\ \pi(s(1)|s(2)) & \pi(s(2)|s(2)) & \dots & \pi(s(m)|s(2)) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \pi(s(1)|s(m)) & \pi(s(2)|s(m)) & \dots & \pi(s(m)|s(m)) \end{bmatrix}$$

as the state transition matrix. Then player 1's expected long-term discounted utilities can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n) \\
&= (1 - \delta) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t v(0) M^t \cdot \mathbf{S}^1 \\
&= (1 - \delta) v(0) (I_m - \delta M)^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{S}^1 \\
&= \frac{1 - \delta}{\det(I - \delta M)} v(0) \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{21} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{m1} \mathbf{S}_m^1 \\ A_{12} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{22} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{m2} \mathbf{S}_m^1 \\ \vdots \\ A_{1m} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{2m} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{mm} \mathbf{S}_m^1 \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

where A_{ij} is the element of the adjugate matrix of $\delta M - \mathbf{I}$.

When $\pi_i^0(1) = 0$, for $i = \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\pi^0(s(i)) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k^0(g(i, k)),$$

where $g(i, k) = ((\lceil \frac{i}{2^{n-k}} \rceil + 1) \bmod 2) + 1$. Then

$$\pi^0(s(m)) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k^0(g(m, k)) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k^0\left(\left(\left(\lceil \frac{i}{2^{n-k}} \rceil + 1\right) \bmod 2\right) + 1\right) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k^0(2) = 1,$$

and, for $j < m$,

$$\pi^0(s(j)) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k^0(g(j, m)) = \prod_{k=1}^n \pi_k^0\left(\left(\left(\lceil \frac{i}{2^{n-k}} \rceil + 1\right) \bmod 2\right) + 1\right) = 0.$$

Thus, player 1's expected utility can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& U_1(\delta, \pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n) \\
&= \frac{1 - \delta}{\det(I - \delta M)} [0, 0, \dots, 0, 1] \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{21} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{m1} \mathbf{S}_m^1 \\ A_{12} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{22} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{m2} \mathbf{S}_m^1 \\ \vdots \\ A_{1m} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{2m} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{mm} \mathbf{S}_m^1 \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \frac{(1 - \delta)(A_{1m} \mathbf{S}_1^1 + A_{2m} \mathbf{S}_2^1 + \dots + A_{mm} \mathbf{S}_m^1)}{\det(I - \delta M)} \\
&= \frac{(1 - \delta) D(\delta, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_n, \mathbf{S}^1)}{\det(I - \delta M)}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, followers have the same preference, since $S^{j_1} = S^{j_2}$, $j_1 \neq j_2$. For any π_1 , we have $\pi_{-1}^{BR}(\pi_1) \in \Pi_{-1}(\mathcal{B})$.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3, player 1's best equalizer ZD strategy is π_1^+ or π_1^- . Then $\max_{\pi_1^{ZD} \in \Xi_1(\delta)} U_1(\delta, \pi_1^{ZD}, \overline{\pi}_{-1}(\pi_1^{ZD})) = L_2(\delta)$, and

$$\min_{\pi_1^{ZD} \in \Xi_1(\delta)} U_1(\delta, \pi_1^{SSE}, \overline{\pi}_{-1}(\pi_1^{SSE})) - U_1(\delta, \pi_1^{ZD}, \overline{\pi}_{-1}(\pi_1^{ZD})) = U_1^{SSE} - L_2(\delta).$$

□

Theorem 4.2 is an extension of Theorem 3.3 in multi-player situations. It provides an upper bound of player 1's utility with equalizer ZD strategies, when facing many opponents with the same preference. Then the utility gap helps player 1 make a tradeoff for an equalizer ZD strategy and the SSE strategy. On this basis, when setting the sum of opponents' utilities as $\Gamma_2^+(\delta)$ or $\Gamma_2^-(\delta)$, player 1 can receive the best utility of adopting equalizer ZD strategies. Also, computing the SSE strategy is difficult and time-consuming. Thus, player 1 can choose the corresponding equalizer ZD strategy to avoid the cost of computing the SSE strategy, if it can tolerate the bounded loss.

5 Examples

We design experiments to verify that ZD strategy's maintenance of utility and action inter-action, compared with the baseline SSE strategy.

5.1 Utility performance in UAVs

We provide experiments to verify that the ZD strategy can help the leader maintain its utility, where the baseline is the SSE strategy. Let us consider a UAV problem among drones [36, 37].

One-to-one scenario: Here we consider a one-to-one scenario between player 1 and player 2. Take $\theta \in [0, 1]$ as a parameter in the game, $\delta = 0.9$ and $U_{k,j}^i = p_{k,j}^i + q_{k,j}^i \theta^2$, where $p_{k,j}^i$ and $q_{k,j}^i$ are uniformly generated in the ranges $[0, 4]$ and $[0, 1]$, respectively, for $i \in N$. As for the strategy selection, we choose the equalizer ZD strategy according to Theorem 3.3, respectively, and solve the SSE through a mixed-integer non-linear program (MINLP) as shown in [11].




Figure 1: Performance of the equalizer ZD strategy compared with the SSE strategy in the one-to-one situation.

In Fig 1, we show the performance of the equalizer ZD strategy compared with the SSE strategy in the discounted repeated asymmetric game. Red dotted lines describe player 1's expected utilities adopting an SSE strategy, while blue solid lines describe player 1's expected utilities adopting the corresponding equalizer ZD strategy in Theorem 3.3. As shown in Fig 1, the expected utility of player 1 with an SSE strategy may be equal to the expected utility of player 1 with a ZD strategy, and is not lower than the expected utility of player 1 with a ZD strategy. Notice that the gap between utility with the SSE strategy and the ZD strategy may be zero, which is consistent with Theorem 3.3. Thus, player 1 can choose the corresponding equalizer ZD strategy to replace the SSE strategy to avoid computational resources.

Three-player scenario: In order to analyze the multiple-player situation, we consider a three-player scenario with player 1, player 2, and player 3. Similarly, take $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $\delta = 0.9$ and $U_{k,j}^i = p_{k,j}^i + q_{k,j}^i \theta^2$. As for the strategy selection, we choose the equalizer ZD strategy according to Theorem 4.2.

As shown in Fig 2, the expected utility of player 1 with an SSE strategy is always higher than that of player 1 with a ZD strategy. Notice that the gap between utility with the SSE strategy and the ZD strategy is small, and is consistent with Theorem 3.3. Thus, if the gap is tolerable to player 1, player 1 can choose the corresponding equalizer ZD strategy to replace the SSE strategy in order to save computing resources.




Figure 2: Performance of the equalizer ZD strategy compared with the SSE strategy in the three-player situation.


5.2 Action Interaction in MTD

In order to show the interaction process of the player, we specially simulated the selected actions in each stage. We consider MTD problems between a defender and attackers [38].


One-to-one scenario: We consider a one-to-one scenario between player 1 (defender) and player 2 (attacker), while each player chooses action 1 (target 1) or action 2 (target 2). We generate the utility matrix which satisfies $\min\{U_{11}^1, U_{22}^1\} > \max\{U_{12}^1, U_{21}^1\}$ and $U_{11}^2 < U_{12}^2$, and $U_{22}^2 < U_{21}^2$. It means that the defender tends to protect the vulnerable target, and the attacker tends to implement invasions on the unprotected target.

Moreover, in Fig 3(a),(b), we show the action interaction between the defender and the attacker. When the defender and the attacker choose the same target, the defender gains a high utility since it protects the right target under attack. Notice that, although the SSE

strategy has a better performance than the ZD strategy, the defender can still protect the right target sometimes and get a good utility, which is consistent with Theorem 3.3.



(a) Player 1 selects the ZD strategy




(b) Player 1 selects the SSE strategy


Figure 3: Target interaction between player 1 (the defender) and player 2 (the attacker). Blue solid lines show the target that player 1 protects, while red dotted lines show the target that player 2 attacks in each stage.

Three-player scenario: Next, we consider a three-player scenario with player 1 (a defender), player 2 (an attacker), and player 3 (an attacker), while each player chooses action 1 (target 1) or action 2 (target 2). We generate the utilities which satisfy $U_{1,i}^1 > U_{1,j}^1$, $U_{2,i}^1 < U_{2,j}^1$, for $i < j$, and $U_{1,i}^1 < U_{1,j}^1$, $U_{2,i}^1 > U_{2,j}^1$, for $i < j$ and $k \neq 1$. Thus, the defender hopes to select the targets that face many attacks, while the attacker has the opponent's preference as the defender.

In Fig 4(a),(b), we show the action interaction among the three players. Obviously, the defender, player 1, with the ZD strategy protects the target that the attacker invades frequently, which is not significantly worse than that with the SSE strategy. It is consistent with Theorem 4.2, that the ZD strategy has a good performance and brings bounded loss for player 1 than the SSE strategy does.



(a) Player 1 selects the ZD strategy



(b) Player 1 selects the SSE strategy

Figure 4: Target interaction among player 1 (a defender), player 2 (an attacker), and player 3 (an attacker). Blue solid lines show the target that player 1 protects, while red dotted lines and green dotted lines show the target that player 2 and player 3 attack, respectively.

6 Conclusion

This paper studied equalizer ZD strategies in discounted repeated Stackelberg asymmetric games. In a typical case, the one-to-one situation, The existence condition of equalizer ZD strategies was verified, and an upper bound of the approach was revealed. Moreover, we extended our results into multi-player models and showed an upper bound with the equalizer ZD strategy. Finally, we gave a simulation of the interactions in UAVs and MTD problems to illustrate the effectiveness of our approach.

References

- [1] Y. Liu and L. Cheng, "Optimal resource allocation and feasible hexagonal topology for cyber-physical systems," *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, pp. 1–26, 2023.
- [2] G. Chen, Y. Ming, Y. Hong, and P. Yi, "Distributed algorithm for ε -generalized Nash equilibria with uncertain coupled constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109313, 2021.
- [3] D. Umsonst, S. Saritaş, and H. Sandberg, "A Nash equilibrium-based moving target defense against stealthy sensor attacks," in *Proceedings of the 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 3772–3778.

-
- [4] G. Xu, G. Chen, and H. Qi, "Algorithm design and approximation analysis on distributed robust game," *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 480–499, 2023.
- [5] F. Miao, M. Pajic, and G. J. Pappas, "Stochastic game approach for replay attack detection," in *Proceedings of the 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1854–1859.
- [6] F. Zhang, Z. Zheng, and L. Jiao, "Dynamically optimized sensor deployment based on game theory," *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, vol. 31, pp. 276–286, 2018.
- [7] R. K. Mishra, D. Vasal, and S. Vishwanath, "Model-free reinforcement learning for stochastic Stackelberg security games," in *Proceedings of the 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 348–353.
- [8] X. Feng, Z. Zheng, D. Cansever, A. Swami, and P. Mohapatra, "A signaling game model for moving target defense," in *Proceedings of the 36th IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–9.
- [9] H. Li, W. Shen, and Z. Zheng, "Spatial-temporal moving target defense: A markov Stackelberg game model," in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, 2020, pp. 717–725.
- [10] A. Tahir, J. Böling, M.-H. Haghbayan, H. T. Toivonen, and J. Plosila, "Swarms of unmanned aerial vehicles—a survey," *Journal of Industrial Information Integration*, vol. 16, p. 100106, 2019.
- [11] Y. Vorobeychik and S. Singh, "Computing Stackelberg equilibria in discounted stochastic games," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1478–1484.
- [12] D. Korzhyk, Z. Yin, C. Kiekintveld, V. Conitzer, and M. Tambe, "Stackelberg vs. Nash in security games: An extended investigation of interchangeability, equivalence, and uniqueness," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 41, pp. 297–327, 2011.
- [13] Z. Cheng, G. Chen, and Y. Hong, "Zero-determinant strategy in stochastic stackelberg asymmetric security game," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 11308, 2023.
- [14] D. Vasal *et al.*, "Stochastic Stackelberg games," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01997*, 2020.
- [15] Z. Cheng, G. Chen, and Y. Hong, "Single-leader-multiple-followers Stackelberg security game with hypergame framework," *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 17, pp. 954–969, 2022.
- [16] V. B. López, E. Della Vecchia, A. Jean-Marie, and F. Ordonez, "Stationary strong stackelberg equilibrium in discounted stochastic games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2022.
- [17] A. Basu, M. Conforti, M. Di Summa, and H. Jiang, "Complexity of branch-and-bound and cutting planes in mixed-integer optimization," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 198, no. 1, pp. 787–810, 2023.
- [18] A. Basu, "Complexity of optimizing over the integers," *Mathematical Programming*, pp. 1–42, 2022.
- [19] W. H. Press and F. J. Dyson, "Iterated prisoner's dilemma contains strategies that dominate any evolutionary opponent," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 109, no. 26, pp. 10 409–10 413, 2012.
- [20] A. Govaert and M. Cao, "Zero-determinant strategies in repeated multiplayer social dilemmas with discounted payoffs," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 10, pp. 4575–4588, 2020.
- [21] R. Tan, Q. Su, B. Wu, and L. Wang, "Payoff control in repeated games," in *Proceedings of the*

- 33rd Chinese Control and Decision Conference (CCDC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 997–1005.
- [22] Z. Wang, Y. Zhou, J. W. Lien, J. Zheng, and B. Xu, “Extortion can outperform generosity in the iterated prisoner’s dilemma,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2016.
- [23] C. Hilbe, M. A. Nowak, and K. Sigmund, “Evolution of extortion in iterated prisoner’s dilemma games,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 110, no. 17, pp. 6913–6918, 2013.
- [24] S. Hirai and F. Szidarovszky, “Existence and uniqueness of equilibrium in asymmetric contests with endogenous prizes,” *International Game Theory Review*, vol. 15, no. 01, p. 1350005, 2013.
- [25] L. Nockur, S. Pfattheicher, and J. Keller, “Different punishment systems in a public goods game with asymmetric endowments,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 93, p. 104096, 2021.
- [26] T. Reeves, H. Ohtsuki, and S. Fukui, “Asymmetric public goods game cooperation through pest control,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, vol. 435, pp. 238–247, 2017.
- [27] W.-B. Du, X.-B. Cao, M.-B. Hu, and W.-X. Wang, “Asymmetric cost in snowdrift game on scale-free networks,” *Europhysics Letters*, vol. 87, no. 6, p. 60004, 2009.
- [28] H. Liang, M. Cao, and X. Wang, “Analysis and shifting of stochastically stable equilibria for evolutionary snowdrift games,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 85, pp. 16–22, 2015.
- [29] Z. Cheng, G. Chen, and Y. Hong, “Misperception influence on zero-determinant strategies in iterated prisoner’s dilemma,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2022.
- [30] C.-J. Zhu, S.-W. Sun, L. Wang, S. Ding, J. Wang, and C.-y. Xia, “Promotion of cooperation due to diversity of players in the spatial public goods game with increasing neighborhood size,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 406, pp. 145–154, 2014.
- [31] J.-X. Han and R.-W. Wang, “Complex interactions promote the frequency of cooperation in snowdrift game,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 609, p. 128386, 2023.
- [32] H. Zhang, G. Chen, and Y. Hong, “Distributed algorithm for continuous-type Bayesian Nash equilibrium in subnetwork zero-sum games,” *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2023.
- [33] G. Chen, K. Cao, and Y. Hong, “Learning implicit information in Bayesian games with knowledge transfer,” *Control Theory and Technology*, vol. 18, pp. 315–323, 2020.
- [34] D. Mutzari, J. Gan, and S. Kraus, “Coalition formation in multi-defender security games.” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2021, pp. 5603–5610.
- [35] A. Sanjab, W. Saad, and T. Başar, “A game of drones: Cyber-physical security of time-critical uav applications with cumulative prospect theory perceptions and valuations,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 6990–7006, 2020.
- [36] T. Zhang and Q. Zhu, “Strategic defense against deceptive civilian gps spoofing of unmanned aerial vehicles,” in *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Decision and Game Theory for Security*. Cham: Springer, 2017, pp. 213–233.
- [37] T. Zhang, L. Huang, J. Pawlick, and Q. Zhu, “Game-theoretic analysis of cyber deception: Evidence-based strategies and dynamic risk mitigation,” *Modeling and Design of Secure Internet of Things*, pp. 27–58, 2020.
- [38] S. Wang, H. Shi, Q. Hu, B. Lin, and X. Cheng, “Moving target defense for internet of things based on the zero-determinant theory,” *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 661–668, 2019.