Provided for non-commercial research and educational use. Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.

## Serdica

Bulgariacae mathematicae publicationes

## Сердика

# Българско математическо списание

The attached copy is furnished for non-commercial research and education use only. Authors are permitted to post this version of the article to their personal websites or institutional repositories and to share with other researchers in the form of electronic reprints. Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to third party websites are prohibited.

For further information on
Serdica Bulgaricae Mathematicae Publicationes
and its new series Serdica Mathematical Journal
visit the website of the journal http://www.math.bas.bg/~serdica
or contact: Editorial Office
Serdica Mathematical Journal
Institute of Mathematics and Informatics
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Telephone: (+359-2)9792818, FAX:(+359-2)971-36-49
e-mail: serdica@math.bas.bg

### ON THE NASH-BARGAINING SOLUTION IN STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL GAMES

SVETOSLAV D. GAIDOV

The paper deals with two-person cooperative games in which the dynamics is described by Ito stochastic differential equations. The Nash-bargaining solution for such games is introduced. Sufficient conditions for verification of the strategies composing this type of a solution are found. The Pareto-optimality of these strategies is also established.

1. Introduction. It is well-known that Pareto-optimality is one of the basic notions in cooperative differential games. There is a lot of publications on these topics, mainly in the deterministic case (see [8]). In stochastic differential games Pareto-optimal strategies are considered by the author in [3].

Let us mention that Pareto-optimality comes in for criticism at least in two aspects (see [8]). First, the application of Karlin's lemma and the reduction of the problem to a single criterial optimization imply the ambiguity of the strategies. Second, Pareto-optimal strategies can supply some players with values of their cost-functions even greater than the guaranteeing (minimax) strategies can do.

These disadvantages can be overcome if we restrict, in some definite sense, the set of Pareto-optimal strategies. One possibility is to use the Nash-bargaining solution.

The results presented here have been announced without any proof and details in our recent paper [5].

Note that for reduction of calculations we consider games with two participant.

2. Formalization of a stochastic differential game. Consider the system (game)

$$\Gamma = \langle \{1, 2\}, \Sigma, \{\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2\}, \{J_1, J_2\} \rangle.$$

Here  $\{1, 2\}$  is the set of players participating in  $\Gamma$ . The evolution of the dynamic system  $\Sigma$  is described by the following stochastic differential equation of ito type.

(\*) 
$$dx(t) = f(t, x(t), u_1, u_2)dt + g(t, x(t), u_1, u_2)dw(t), t \in [t_0, T]$$

with an initial condition  $x(t_0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $0 \le t_0 < T$ . The process  $w = \{w(t), t \in [t_0, T]\}$  is a standard *m*-dimensional Wiener process, defined on some complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  and adapted to a given family  $F = \{\mathcal{F}_i, t \in [t_0, T]\}$  of nondecreasing sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\mathcal{F}$ . The vectors  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state process and  $u_i \in U_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$  is the control of the *i*-th player, i = 1, 2.

Let us make the following assumptions about the functions  $f(t, x, u_1, u_2)$  and  $g(t, x, u_1, u_2)$ . Suppose

$$f: [t_0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \times U_1 \times U_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

and

$$g \colon [\mathsf{t_0}, \ T] \times \mathsf{R}^n \times U_1 \times U_2 {\longrightarrow} \mathsf{R}^n \times \mathsf{R}^m$$

have continuous partial derivatives in x,  $u_1$ ,  $u_2$ . Further, let  $C\!>\!0$  be a constant such that

SERDICA Bulgaricae mathematicae publicationes. Vol. 16, 1990, p. 120-125.

$$|f(t, 0, 0, 0)| + |g(t, 0, 0, 0)| \le C$$
,  $|f_x| + |g_x| + |f_{u_1}| + |g_{u_1}| + |f_{u_2}| + |g_{u_3}| \le C$ ,

where is a general symbol for the norm in the respective space.

We suppose that each player has perfect observations of the vector x(t) at each moment  $t([t_0, T])$  and constructs his strategy in the game  $\Gamma$  as an admissible feedback control (see [2]) of the type

Here 
$$u_i = u_j(t, x(t)), \quad i = 1, 2.$$
 
$$u_i(\cdot, \cdot) : [t_0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^n \to U_i$$

is a Borel function satisfying the following conditions:

(a) There exists a constant  $M_i > 0$  such that

$$|u_i(t, x)| \leq M_i(1+|x|) \text{ for all } t \in [t_0, T], x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(b) For each bounded set  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $T^* \in (t_0, T)$  there exists a constant  $K_i > 0$  such that for arbitrary  $x, y \in B$  and  $t \in [t_0, T^*]$ 

$$|u_i(t, x) - u_i(t, y)| \leq K_i |x - y|.$$

Denote by  $\mathscr{U}_i$  the set of strategies of the *i*-th player, i=1, 2 and  $\mathscr{U}=\mathscr{U}_1\times\mathscr{U}_2$ . Let the pair of strategies  $u=(u_1, u_2)$  be called for brevity just a strategy. The assumptions mentioned above imply the existence and sample path uniqueness (see [2]) of the solution  $X=\{x(t), t\in [t_0, T]\}$  of Ito equation (\*) corresponding to the control  $u=(u_1, u_2)$ . Moreover, X is an a. s. continuous Markov process and if  $\mathscr{A}(u)$  denotes its infinitesimal operator (see [1]), then

$$\mathscr{A}(u)W(t, x) = f'(t, x, u_1, u_2)Wx(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}[g(t, x, u_1, u_2)g'(t, x, u_1, u_2)Wxx(t, x)].$$

Here prime denotes vector or matrix transpose and W(t, x) is a real-valued function with continuous partial derivatives up to second order for all  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let us consider the continuous functions  $Q_i$  satisfying the growth condition

$$|Q_i(t,x)| \leq C_i(1+|x|^k),$$

where  $C_{ij}$  k are positive constants. Introduce now the cost function  $J_{ij}(u)$  of the i-th player of a terminal type

$$J_i(u) = \mathbf{E}_{t_0}, \ x_0 \ \{Q_i(T, x(T))\}, \quad i = 1, 2$$
al situation  $x(t_0) = x_0$ .

with respect to the initial situation  $x(t_0) = x_0$ .

Every stochastic differential game develops in the following way. Each player, e.g. the i-th one, chooses his strategy  $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i$  according to some principle of optimality. Thus we have the pair of strategies  $u = (u_1, u_2)$ . Further, the solution X of Ito equation (\*) is found. Finally, X and u determine the value of  $J_i(u)$ , i = 1, 2. The object of each player in the game  $\Gamma$  is to minimize his cost-function.

3. Definition and properties. Let us recall the following notion of an optimal

strategy in a stochastic differential game (see [4]).

Definition. The strategy  $u^g = (u_1^g, u_2^g)$  is a guaranteeing (minimax) strategy in the game  $\Gamma$  if

$$\min_{u_1} \max_{u_2} J_1(u_1, u_2) = \max_{u_2} J_1(u_1^g, u_2) = J_1^g$$

and

$$\min_{u_1} \max_{u_2} J_1(u_1, u_2) = \max_{u_2} J_1(u_1^g, u_2) = J_1^g$$

$$\min_{u_2} \max_{u_1} J_2(u_1, u_2) = \max_{u_1} J_2(u_1, u_2^g) = J_2^g,$$

122 S. D. Gaidov

Now introduce the functional

$$I_{nb}(u) = [J_1^g - J_1(u)] [J_2^g - J_2(u)].$$

Definition. The strategy  $u^{nb} = (u_1^{nb}, u_2^{nb})$  is called a Nash-bargaining solution in the game  $\Gamma$ , if for each  $u=(u_1, u_2)$  we have

$$I_{nb}(u) \leq I_{nb}(u^{nb}).$$

Note that in deterministic game theory Nash-bargaining solutions are discussed in [7, 8]. This theory requires the consideration of  $J_1(u)$  only for strategies  $u \in U$  such that  $J_i(u) \le J_i^g$ , i = 1, 2. Thus we come to the first property of  $u^{nb}$ , namely

$$J_{i}(u^{nb}) \leq J_{i}^{g}, i = 1, 2.$$

Proposition. The Nash-bargaining solution is Pareto-optimal. Proof. Let  $u^{nb}$  be not Pareto-optimal (see [3]). Then there exists a strategy  $u = (u_1, u_2)$  such that the system

$$J_i(\overline{u}) \leq J_i(u^{nb}), i=1, 2$$

holds, where at least one of these two inequalities is strict. Hence

$$J_i^g - J_i(\bar{u}) \ge J_i^g - J_i(u^{nb}) \ge 0, i = 1, 2$$

where at least one inequality is strict. Therefore

$$[J_1^g - J_1(\overline{u})][J_2^g - J_2(\overline{u})] > [J_1^g - J_1(u^{nb})][J_2^g - J_2(u^{nb})],$$

i. e.

$$I_{nb}(\overline{u}) > I_{nb}(u^{nb}).$$

Obviously this relation contradicts the definition of  $u^{nb}$ . Thus we get the Pareto-optimality of  $u^{nb}$ .

4. Sufficient conditions for the Nash-bargaining solution. First we shall consider the following auxiliary proposition.

Lemma. Let X be the solution of Ito equation (\*) with initial condition  $x(t_0) = x_0$ . Then there is a positive constant A<sub>0</sub> such that the following estimate holds:

$$|\mathbf{E}_{t_0,x_0}\{Q_1(T, x(T))Q_2(T, x(T))\} - \mathbf{E}_{t_0,x_0}\{Q_1(T, x(T))\}\mathbf{E}_{t_0,x_0}\{Q_2(T, x(T))\}| \leq A_0,$$

where  $Q_1$ ,  $Q_2$  are the functions defining the cost-functions.

Proof. Taking into account some properties of conditional expectations, Cauchy-Bunyakovskii-Schwarz inequality, the growth conditions of the functions  $Q_i$  and a result (see [6], Part 1, § 6, Th. 4), we get

$$\begin{split} &|\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{Q_1,\ (T,\ x(T))\,Q_2(T,\ x(T))\} - \mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{Q_1(T,\ x(T))\}\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{Q_2(T,\ x(T))\}| \\ \leq &|\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{Q_1(T,\ x(T))\,Q_2(T,\ x(T))\}| + |\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{Q_1(T,\ x(T))\}| \cdot |\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{Q_2(T,\ x(T))\}| \\ \leq &2(\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{|Q_1(T,\ x(T))|^2\}\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{|Q_2(T,\ x(T))|^2\}^{1/2} \\ \leq &2(\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{C_1^2(1+|x(T)|^k)\}\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{C_2^2[1+|x(T)|^k]^2\})^{1/2} \\ = &2C_1C_2\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{(1+|x(T)|^k)^2\} \leq 4C_1C_2\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{1+|x(T)|^{2k}\} \\ = &4C_1,\ C_2(1+\mathbf{E}_{t_0:x_0}\{|x(T)|^{2k}\}) \leq 4C_1,\ C_2[1+K(1+|x_0|^{2k})] = A_0, \end{split}$$

where K is a suitably chosen constant.

Remark. Further we shall use the result of the Lemma in the form

$$\mathbf{E}_{t_0,x_0}\{Q_1(T, x(T))Q_2(T, x(T))\} - \mathbf{E}_{t_0,x_0}\{Q_1(T, x(T))\}\mathbf{E}_{t_0,x_0}\{Q_2(T, x(T))\} \ge -A_0.$$

Now we are in position to formulate and prove sufficient conditions, satisfied by the Nash-bargaining solution.

Theorem. The strategy  $u^{nb} = (u_1^{nb}, u_2^{nb})$  is a Nash-bargaining solution in the game  $\Gamma$ , if there exist real-valued functions  $V^{(i)}(t, x)$  such that for all  $t \in [t_0, T]$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and i = 1, 2 the following conditions jointly hold:

- (a)  $V^{(i)}$ ,  $V_{x}^{(i)}$ ,  $V_{x}^{(i)}$ ,  $V_{xx}^{(i)}$  are continuous;
- (b)  $[V_t^{(1)}(t, x) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(1)}(t, x)][V^{(2)}(t, x) J_2^g] + [V_t^{(2)}(t, x) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(2)}(t, x)][V^{(1)}(t, x) J_1^g] + [V_x^{(1)}(t, x)]'g(t, x, u_1, u_2)g'(t, x, u_1, u_2)V_x^{(2)}(t, x) \le -A$

for each  $u = (u_1, u_2)$  where  $A = A_0/(T - t_0)$ ;

- (c)  $V_t^{(i)}(t, x) + \mathcal{A}(u^{nb})V_t^{(i)}(t, x) = 0$ ;
- (d)  $V^{(i)}(T, x) = Q_i(T, x)$ .

Proof. Let  $x^{nb}(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_0, T]$  be the sample path of the solution of Ito equation (\*) corresponding to the strategy  $u^{nb} = (u_1^{nb}, u_2^{nb})$ . Conditions (c), (d) and Theorem 5 (see [6], part II, ch. 2, § 9) imply the relation

$$V^{(i)}(t_0, x_0) = \mathbf{E}_{t_0, x_0} \{ Q_i(T, x^{nb}(T)) \} = J_i(u^{nb}), i = 1, 2.$$

Now let x(t),  $t \in [t_0, T]$  be the sample path of the solution of Ito equation (\*) corresponding to an arbitrary strategy  $u = (u_1, u_2)$ . Write Ito formula for  $V^{(i)}(t, x)$ , x(t) and u (see [2]):

$$dV^{(i)}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) = [V_t^{(i)}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(i)}(t, \mathbf{x}(t))] dt + [V_t^{(i)}(t, \mathbf{x}(t))]'g(t, \mathbf{x}(t), u_1, u_2)dw(t), i=1, 2.$$

Then we have

$$d[V^{(1)}(t, x(t))V^{(2)}(t, x(t))] = \{ [V_t^{(1)}(t, x(t)) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(1)}(t, x(t))]V^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + [V_t^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(2)}(t, x(t))]V^{(1)}(t, x(t)) + [V_x^{(1)}(t, x(t))]'g(t, x(t), u_1, u_2)g'(t, x(t), x(t)) + [V_x^{(2)}(t, x(t))]V^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + [V_x^{(1)}(t, x(t))]'g(t, x(t), u_1, u_2)V_x^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + [V_x^{(2)}(t, x(t))]V^{(2)}(t, x(t))V^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + [V_x^{(2)}(t, x(t))]V^{(2)}(t, x(t))V^{(2)}(t, x(t)) \} dw(t).$$

Hence by integration we get

$$\begin{split} V^{(1)}(T, \ x(T))V^{(2)}(T, \ x(T)) - V^{(1)}(t, \ x(t))V^{(2)}(t, \ x(t)) \\ &= \int_{t}^{T} \{ [V_{t}^{(1)}(\tau, \ x(\tau)) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(1)}(\tau, \ x(\tau))]V^{(2)}(\tau, \ x(\tau)) + [V_{t}^{(2)}(\tau, \ x(\tau)) \\ &+ \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau))]V^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau)) + [V_{x}^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau))]'g(\tau, x(\tau), u_{1}, u_{2})g'(\tau, x(\tau), u_{1}, u_{2})V_{x}^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau))\}d\tau \\ &+ \int_{t}^{T} \{ g'(\tau, x(\tau), u_{1}, u_{2})V_{x}^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau))V^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau)) + g'(\tau, x(\tau), u_{1}, u_{2})V_{x}^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau))V^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau))\}dw(\tau). \end{split}$$

Therefore

$$V^{(1)}(t, x)V^{(2)}(t, x) = \mathbf{E}_{t,x} \{ V^{(1)}(T, x(T))V^{(2)}(T_t | x(T)) \}$$

$$= \int_t^T \{ [V_t^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau)) + \mathscr{A}(u)V^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau))] V^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau)) + [V_t^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau))] \}^{\frac{p}{2}}$$

 $+\mathscr{A}(u)V^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau))]V^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau)) + [V_x^{(1)}(\tau, x(\tau))]g'(\tau, x, (\tau), u_1, u_2)g'(\tau, x(\tau), u_1, u_2)V_x^{(2)}(\tau, x(\tau))]d\tau$ . Taking into consideration condition (d) we have

$$V^{(1)}(t_0, x_0) V^{(2)}(t_0, x_0) = \mathbf{E}_{t_0, x_0} \{ Q_1(T, x(T)) Q_2(T, x(T)) - \int_{t_0}^{T} \{ [V_t^{(1)}(t, x(t)) + \mathscr{A}(u)V^{(1)}(t, x(t))]V^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + [V_t^{(2)}(t, x(t)) + \mathscr{A}(u)V^{(2)}(t, x(t))]V^{(1)}(t, x(t)) + [V_t^{(1)}(t, x(t))]'g(t, x(t), u_1, u_2)g'(t, x(t), u_1, u_2)V_x^{(2)}(t, x(t))]dt \}.$$

Further, Ito-Dynkin formula (see [2], Ch. 5, Th. 5. 2) gives us

$$V^{(i)}(t_0, x_0) = \mathbf{E}_{t_0, x_0} \{ Q_i(T, \mathbf{x}(T)) - \int_{t_0}^{T} [V_t^{(i)}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) + \mathcal{A}(u) V_t^{(i)}(t, \mathbf{x}(t))] dt \}, \ i = 1, 2.$$

Thus we obtain the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{split} J_{1}(u^{nb})J_{2}(u^{nb}) - J_{1}^{g}J_{2}(u^{nb}) - J_{2}^{g}J_{1}(u^{nb}) &= V^{(1)}\left(t_{0},\ x_{0}\right)V^{(2)}(t_{0}\ x_{0}) - J_{1}^{g}V^{(2)}\left(t_{0},\ x_{0}\right) - J_{2}^{g}V^{(1)}\left(t_{0},\ x_{0}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{t_{0},x_{0}}\left\{Q_{1}(T,\ x(T))Q_{2}\left(T,\ x(T)\right) - J_{1}^{g}Q_{2}(T,\ x(T)) - J_{2}^{g}Q_{1}(T,\ x(T)) \\ &- \int_{t_{0}}^{T}\left\{\left[V_{1}^{(1)}\left(t,\ x(t)\right) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(1)}(t,\ x(t))\right]\left[V^{(2)}(t,\ x(t)) - J_{2}^{g}\right] + \left[V_{1}^{(2)}(t,\ x(t)) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(2)}(t,\ x(t))\right]\right\} \\ &+ \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(2)}(t,\ x(t))\left\{V^{(1)}(t,\ x(t)) - J_{1}^{g}\right\} + \left[V_{1}^{(1)}(t,\ x(t))\right]g(t,\ x(t), \\ &\times u_{1},\ u_{2})g'\left(t,\ x(t),\ u_{1},\ u_{2}\right)V^{(2)}(t,\ x(t))\right\}dt \Big\}. \end{split}$$

Hence

$$\begin{split} J_{1}(u^{nb}) J_{2}(u^{nb}) - J_{1}^{\kappa} J_{2}(u^{nb}) - J_{2}^{\kappa} J_{1}(u^{nb}) &= J_{1}(u)J_{2}(u) - J_{1}^{\kappa} J_{2}(u) - J_{2}^{\kappa} J_{1}(u) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{t_{0},x_{0}} \{Q_{1}(T, x(T))Q_{2}(T, x(T))\} - \mathbb{E}_{t_{0},x_{0}} \{Q_{1}(T, x(T))\} \mathbb{E}_{t_{0},x_{0}} \{Q_{2}(T, x(T))\} \\ &- \mathbb{E}_{t_{0},x_{0}} \{ \int_{t_{0}}^{T} \{ [V_{1}^{(1)}(t, x(t) + \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(1)}(t, x(t))] [V^{(2)}(t, x(t)) - J_{2}^{\kappa}] + [V_{1}^{(2)}(t, x(t)) \\ &+ \mathcal{A}(u)V^{(2)}(t, x(t))] [V^{(1)}(t, x(t)) - J_{1}^{\kappa}] + [V_{x}^{(1)}(t, x(t))]^{2} g(t, x(t), \\ &\times u, u_{2})g'(t, x(t), u_{1}, u_{2})V_{x}^{(2)}(t, x(t)) \} dt \}. \end{split}$$

Now condition (b) and the Remark to the Lemma imply that

$$J_1(u^{nb})J_2(u^{nb})-J_1^gJ_2(u^{nb})-J_2^gJ_1(u^{nb})\geq J_1(u)J_2(u)-J_1^gJ_2(u)-J_2^gJ_1(u).$$

Therefore for arbitrary  $u = (u_1, u_2)$ 

$$[J_1^g - J_1(u^{nb})] [J_2^g - J_2(u^{nb})] \ge [J_1^g - J_1(u)] [J_2^g - J_2(u)].$$

The proof of the Theorem is completed.

Remark. The problem of existence of the Nash-bargaining solutions has been considered in a separate paper and it will be published independently.

Acknowledgement. The author expresses his gratitude to Dr. J. Stoyanov for the useful comments concerning the previous version of this paper. This research was supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education under Contract No 1035.

#### REFERENCES

L Baronaur noam a fi-mi

1. E. Dynkin. Markov Processes, Berlin, 1965.
2. W. Fleming P. Britanian and P. Britanian a

 W. Fleming. R. Rishel. Deterministic and Stochastic Optimal Control. Berlin, 1975.
 S. Gaidov. Pareto-optimality in stochastic differential games. Problems of Control and Information Theory, 15, 1986, 6, 439-450.

Theory, 15, 1986, 6, 439-450.
4. S. Gaidov. Guaranteeing strategies in many-player stochastic differential games. In: Mathematics and Education in Mathematics, 1986 (Proc. 15th Spring Conf. UBM), Sofia, 1986, 379-383.
5. S. Gaidov. Two cooperative solutions in stochastic differential games. C. R. Acad. Bulg. Sci., 41, 1988, 1, 19-22.
6. I. Gihman, A. Skorohod. Stochastic Differential Equations. Berlin, 1972.
7. R. Luce, H. Raiffa. Games and Decisions. New York, 1957.
8. E. Vaisbord, V. Zhukovskii. Introduction to Multi-Player Differential Games and Their Applications. New York, 1988.

Department of Mathematics University of Plovdiv BG-4000 Plovdiv Bulgar,a

Received 28. 03. 1989 Revised 22. 11. 1989