arXiv:2007.14758v2 [math.CO] 19 Nov 2020

Some Game Theoretic Remarks on Two-Player Generalized Cops and Robbers Games

Athanasios Kehagias and Georgios Konstantinidis

Abstract

In this paper we study the two-player *generalized Cops and Robber* (GCR) games introduced by Bonato and MacGillivray. Our main goal is to present a full, self-contained game theoretic analysis of such games.

1 Introduction

In this paper we present a *game theoretic* analysis of the *two-player Generalized Cops and Robber* (henceforth GCR) games introduced by Bonato and MacGillivray in [4]. GCR can be understood as a general framework for *pursuit games on graphs*. We have two main goals.

First, while [4] presents a very broad and interesting generalization of the "classic" Cops and Robbers (henceforth CR) game, it follows the tradition of the CR literature, which is dominated by graph theoretic and combinatorial arguments but pays little attention to core game theoretic concepts such as the *payoff function*, *value* of a game, *optimal strategies* etc. Because we consider such concepts essential to the study of games (and in particular of pursuit games on graphs), in the current paper we will try to bring them to the foreground.

Secondly, as we will argue in the sequel, eschewing the classic game theoretic analysis can result in nonrigorous treatment of certain game aspects. Hence our second goal in using game theoretic tools is to fill certain gaps which (we believe) exist in the analysis of GCR games [4] and even the classic CR game [7].

The "classic" CR game was introduced (independently) in [17] and [18, 19, 20] and has been the subject of intense research ever since. A good and relatively recent review of the literature appears in the excellent book [3] and additional references can be found in [5, 8]. As already mentioned, Bonato and MacGillivray present in [4] a very broad generalization of the classic CR game. The abovementioned reviews contain references to many of the CR "variants" which have appeared in the literature. Almost all such works use a graph theoretic and/or combinatorial approach; as far as we are aware, very few authors deal with the game theoretic aspects of both classic CR and its variants.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present definitions and notations which will be used in the sequel. In Section 3 we *solve* the GCR game, i.e., we compute its *value* and *optimal strategies*. We present two different solutions. The solution of Section 3.1 is based on a *vertex labeling* (VL) algorithm which has been used in [4, 7]; we prove *rigorously* that this algorithm computes the value and optimal strategies (in the game theoretic sense) of

the GCR game; furthermore, this analysis is *self-contained*, i.e., all our claims are proved within this paper. The solution of Section 3.2, on the other hand, first proves the existence of value and *afterwards* shows that the value can be computed by the VL algorithm of Section 3.1; this analysis is not self-contained; several classic Game Theoretic results are used, in particular the Minimax Theorem [22]. In Section 4 we discuss the connection of previous analyses of both GCR and classic CR to our own. We summarize and conclude in Section 5. Finally, Appendix A contains some useful, basic facts from Game Theory.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Informal Description of the GCR Game

We first provide an informal description of the GCR game. This description is inspired by the one given in [4] but, as will be explained, differs in several respects.

To motivate our description, first recall the basic elements of the classic CR game. CR is played on a graph G, in discrete time steps (*turns*) and involves two players: the *Cop* (or *Pursuer*) and the *Robber* (or *Evader*). At every turn each player is *located* on a vertex v of G, and a *single* player can move to a new location (a vertex v' adjacent to v). The Cop wins if he "captures" the Robber, i.e., if at some turn they are both located in the same vertex[1].

The *generalized* CR game (GCR game) can be informally described as follows. It involves two *players*, the Pursuer and the Evader; the game is played in turns; in each turn a single player can (subject to certain restrictions) move between elements of a finite set, resulting in a new "configuration" of player locations; there is a set of target ("capture") configurations; the Pursuer wins if a target configuration is reached and the Evader wins otherwise.

It is easy to see that the classic CR is a special case of GCR game. As explained in [4] (where details and references are provided) the definition of GCR games also encompasses the following games: Distance-k Cops and Robbers, Tandem-win Cops and Robbers, Cops and Robbers with Traps, Eternal Domination, Revolutionaries and Spies, Seepage and many more.

2.2 Formal Description of the GCR Game

We now give, in several steps, our formal description of the GCR game; it is quite similar but not identical to the one given in [4].

2.2.1 General Rules

A GCR game involves two *players*, P^1 (Pursuer) and P^2 (Evader); for $n \in \{1,2\}$, P^n's possible *locations* are the elements of a finite set V^n.

A *nonterminal game state* (or *position*) is a triple (x^1, x^2, p) where (for $n \in \{1,2\}$) $x^n \in V^n$ indicates P^n's *location* and p indicates the *single* player who currently "has the move" (i.e. can change his location). The set of all nonterminal game states is

$$\overline{S} = V^1 \times V^2 \times \{1,2\}\,.$$

[1]Note that in the usual CR description time is counted in *rounds*, where each round encompasses (in our terminology) one cop and one robber turn. The two approaches are equivalent.

We will also use a *terminal state* τ, so that the full state set is

$$S = \overline{S} \cup \{\tau\}.$$

The game starts at a prespecified *initial state* $s_0 \in \overline{S}$ and is played in *turns*; in each turn a *single* player moves (i.e., either changes location or stays in his current location). *Movement rules* will be described in Section 2.2.2.

A *target set* $S_c \subseteq \overline{S}$ is given; S_c is the set of *capture states*. The set of *noncapture states* is $S_{nc} = \overline{S} \backslash S_c$. So we have the partition

$$\overline{S} = S_{nc} \cup S_c.$$

We will also need the sets

$$\forall n \in \{1,2\} : S^n = \left\{ s = \left(x^1, x^2, n\right) \right\};$$

i.e., S^n is the set of states in which P^n has the move. This results in another partition of $\overline{S}$:

$$\overline{S} = S^1 \cup S^2.$$

It is assumed that both players have *perfect information*, i.e., at every turn of the game both players have complete knowledge of the way the game has been played so far.

Example 2.1 In the CR game P^1 is the Cop and P^2 is the Robber. The location sets are $V^1 = V^2 = V$, the vertex set of a graph $G = (V, E)$. The nonterminal state set is

$$\overline{S} = \left\{ \left(x^1, x^2, n\right) : x^1, x^2 \in V, n \in \{1,2\} \right\}.$$

The capture set S_c is

$$S_c = \left\{ \left(x^1, x^1, n\right) : x^1 \in V, n \in \{1,2\} \right\}.$$

This is *almost* exactly the classic CR game, with one difference: we omit the classic "placement phase" in which first the Cop and then the Robber choose initial positions. We assume instead that both initial positions (as well as the first player to move) are given by the prespecified initial state $s_0 = (x_0^1, x_0^2, n_0)$.

2.2.2 Movement Rules

At each turn, a player can change his location subject to some movement rules, which are specific to each particular GCR game. For example, in the classic CR game each player can move from his current vertex to any adjacent vertex (or stay in place).

To specify movement rules, we will often use the following standard game theoretic notation: for each $n \in \{1,2\}$ we use $-n$ to indicate the index of the "other player" (obviously, $-n$ is *not* meant as the negative of n). For example, suppose player P^n has location x^n, then the "other" player is P^{-n} and has location x^{-n}.

We have already mentioned that each game state specifies which player makes the next move. Unlike both classic CR and the GCR of [4], *we do not demand that the players alternate*

in taking moves; in making a move, a player may take the game to a state in which he again has the move.

For every state $s = (x^n, x^{-n}, n)$ there exists a nonempty set of possible next moves for P^n (the player who has the move). To each such move corresponds a unique next state and conversely. Hence we fully describe possible next moves from state s by the set $N(s)$ of possible next states. For instance, with $s = (x^n, x^{-n}, n) \in \overline{S}$ we have

$$N\left(x^n, x^{-n}, n\right) = \left\{\left(y, x^{-n}, -n\right) : y \in M\left(x^n, x^{-n}, n\right)\right\}.$$

We assume that the GCR game is played for an *infinite* number of turns[2]. That is, even after a capture state is reached, the game will continue ad infinitum, but in a trivial manner. Namely, in every GCR game the only successor of a capture state is the terminal state:

$$s \in S_c \Rightarrow N(s) = \{\tau\}$$

which can only transit into itself

$$N(\tau) = \{\tau\}.$$

In short, the movement rules of a particular GCR game can be encoded by

$$\mathbf{N} = (N(s))_{s \in S},$$

the collection of possible next moves of each state. Note that $\mathbf{N}$ also specifies (implicitly) the state set S which in turn specifies the location sets V^1, V^2.

Example 2.2 Continuing from Example 2.1, in the CR game played on the graph $G = (V, E)$ we have

$$\forall s = \left(x^n, x^{-n}, n\right) \in \overline{S} : N(s) = \left\{\left(z, x^{-p}, p\right) : \{x^p, z\} \in E\right\} \text{ and } N(\tau) = \{\tau\}.$$

2.2.3 Payoff Functions, Winning Conditions

It remains to define *winning conditions* for the GCR game. In accordance with the classic CR game, a reasonable definition is that the Pursuer wins iff a capture state is reached. To conform with the game theoretic formulation, this definition should be given, in terms of a *payoff function*. Actually, we will use a somewhat different definition which involves *two* payoff functions, as seen below.

Definition 2.3 *The* turn payoff function $q(s)$ *specifies the amount gained by the Evader (and lost by the Pursuer) at every turn of GCR in which the current state is s; it is defined by*

$$q(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{iff } s \in S_{nc} \\ 0 & \textit{iff } s \in S_c \cup \{\tau\} \end{cases}. \tag{1}$$

Definition 2.4 *The* total payoff function $Q(s_0 s_1 ...)$ *specifies the amount gained by the Evader (and lost by the Pursuer) in a play of GCR with state sequence $s_0 s_1 ...$; it is defined by*

$$Q(s_0 s_1 s_2 ...) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} q(s_t). \tag{2}$$

[2]This is done to conform to a *stochastic game* formulation, as will be explained in the sequel.

The following remarks can be made regarding the significance of the payoff functions.

1. When the game goes through the state sequence $s_0 s_1 ...$, clearly $Q(s_0 s_1 s_2 ...)$ is the *capture time*, i.e., the number of turns until capture is effected; if $Q(s_0 s_1 s_2 ...) = \infty$ then capture is never effected.

2. It is also clear that, by the above payoff functions, GCR is a *zero-sum* game. The Pursuer wants to minimize (and the Evader wants to maximize) capture time.

3. Hence we have refined the original winning condition: the Pursuer not only wants to capture the Evader in finite time (and hence win); he wants to capture in the *shortest possible* time.

2.2.4 The Stochastic Game GCR

Keeping in mind all of the above, we have the following two definitions.

Definition 2.5 *A* GCR game *is a tuple* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ *where*

1. $\mathbf{N}$ *describes the movement rules (and implicitly the state set* S *and the location sets* V^1, V^2*);*

2. S^1 *and* S^2 *describe which player has the move in every state;*

3. S_c *describes the capture (winning) condition;*

4. s_0 *is the initial state.*

Definition 2.6 *A* GCR game family *is a tuple* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$.

By the above definitions, given the game family $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$ and a specific initial state $s_0 \in S$, we obtain a particular game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$. In other words, every element of the family $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$ is a game played by the same rules but from a different initial state. In Section 3 we will mostly prove properties of the entire family $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$ which will also imply corresponding properties of all specific games $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$.

Now recall the definition of a stochastic game [9]. It is a sequence of one-turn games; at every turn a particular one-turn game is played, the players receive their *turn payoff* and the next game to be played is selected, depending on the current game and players' actions; the *total payoff* to each player is the sum of his turn payoffs[3]. Obviously, a GCR *game family* is a *stochastic game* and we could, at this point, obtain the full GCR solution by invoking well known stochastic games results [9]. However we will avoid this route since, as mentioned, we want to present a self-contained solution.

At first sight, our definition of GCR games and the one given by Bonato and MacGillivray [4] differ in several respects; these differences will be discussed in Section 4, where we will show that our results also apply to the Bonato-MacGillivray games. Here we only mention what

[3]Despite the term "stochastic", the above definition contains as a special case a game which evolves in a fully deterministic manner (when all player actions and transitions to the next game are deterministic).

we consider to be the most important difference. Namely, the GCR game of [4] starts with a "placement phase", in which first P^1 and then P^2 chooses his initial location. This yields an initial state s_0 and the remaining part of the Bonato-MacGillivray game is basically our $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ game.

2.3 Additional Game Theoretic Concepts

We conclude this section by presenting some additional standard game theoretic concepts which will prove useful in the sequel. In what follows we assume that a game family ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1, S^2, S_c) has been specified, so it is usually omitted from the notation.

Definition 2.7 *A* history $h = s_0 s_1 ...$ *is a finite or infinite sequence of states.*

Definition 2.8 *We define the following sets of histories*

$$\begin{aligned} &\textit{the set of finite length histories}: H_* = \{h : h = s_0 s_1 s_2 ... s_T,\ T \in \mathbb{N}_0,\ \forall t : s_t \in S\}, \\ &\textit{the set of infinite length histories}: H_\infty = \{h : h = s_0 s_1 s_2 ...,\ \forall t : s_t \in S\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.9 *A (*pure *or* deterministic*)* strategy $\sigma : H_* \to S$ *is a function which maps finite histories to* next states*.*

Regarding the above definition, the following points must be emphasized.

1. We could also have defined *randomized*[4] strategies but these will not be needed in our analysis, because the GCR game has perfect information.

2. We deviate from the "standard" pure strategy definition. In the context of stochastic games, the usual definition specifies a strategy as a function which maps finite histories to next *moves*. However, since the GCR game evolves deterministically, a move specifies the next state. Hence our definition is sufficient (and more convenient) for our purposes.

Definition 2.10 *A strategy* σ^m *is called* positional *if it depends only on the current state* s_t*, but neither on previous states nor on current time* t*, i.e.,*

$$\forall h = s_0 s_1 ... s_t, h' = s'_0 s'_1 ..., s'_{t'} : s_t = s'_{t'} = s \Rightarrow \sigma^m(h) = \sigma^m(h') = \sigma^m(s).$$

A strategy is called nonpositional *iff it is not positional.*

Notation 2.11 $H(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ *denotes the infinite history* $s_0 s_1 s_2 ...$ *generated when: (i) the game is* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ *and (ii) for* $n \in \{1, 2\}$, P^n *uses* σ^n*. When* ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1, S^2, S_c) *is understood from the context, we simply write* $H(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | s_0)$*.*

Notation 2.12 $T(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | \mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ *denotes the* capture time*, i.e., the first (actually the only) time at which a capture state* $s \in S_c$ *is reached when: (i) the game is* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ *and (ii) for* $n \in \{1, 2\}$, P^n *uses* σ^n*. When* ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1, S^2, S_c) *is understood from the context, we simply write* $T(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | s_0)$*.*

[4] More precisely, *behavioral* strategies [9].

Remark 2.13 It is obvious that

$$T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|\mathbf{N},S^1,S^2,S_c,s_0\right)=Q\left(H\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|\mathbf{N},S^1,S^2,S_c,s_0\right)\right).$$

We conclude by presenting several well-known definitions and facts about zero-sum games in a notation specific to a GCR game[5]. What follows concerns a specific game ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c), which we assume known and (for brevity) do not include in the notation.

Definition 2.14 *For every s we define the following two quantities*

$$\text{lower value } of\ \left(\mathbf{N},S^1,S^2,S_c\right):T^-(s)=\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right),$$
$$\text{upper value } of\ \left(\mathbf{N},S^1,S^2,S_c\right):T^+(s)=\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right).$$

Proposition 2.15 *For every s we have*

$$T^-(s)=\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)\leq\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=T^+(s).$$

Definition 2.16 *We say that game ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c) has a* value $\widehat{T}(s)$ *iff*

$$T^-(s)=\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=T^+(s).$$

in which case we define $\widehat{T}(s)$ to be

$$\widehat{T}(s)=\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right).$$

Proposition 2.17 *We say that the game ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c,s) has* optimal strategies $\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2$ *iff*

$$\forall\sigma^2:\ T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\sigma^2|s\right)\leq T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right),$$
$$\forall\sigma^1:T\left(\sigma^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)\geq\widehat{T}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right).$$

Proposition 2.18 *The game ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c,s) has value $\widehat{T}(s)$ and optimal strategies $\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2$ iff*

$$\forall\sigma^2:\ T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\sigma^2|s\right)\leq\widehat{T}(s),$$
$$\forall\sigma^1:T\left(\sigma^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)\geq\widehat{T}(s).$$

3 Solution of the GCR Game

In Section 2.2 we have formulated GCR as a two-player, zero-sum stochastic game family ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c). By "solving ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c)" we mean proving that, for every $s\in\overline{S}$, the game ($\mathbf{N}$,S^1,S^2,S_c,s) has value and optimal strategies, as well as computing these quantities. All of these things can be achieved by using standard results regarding stochastic games [9]. However, as mentioned, we want to provide a self-contained solution. Actually, we will provide two such solutions, one in Section 3.1 and another in Section 3.2.

[5]The general form of these facts appears in Appendix A.

3.1 Vertex Labeling Solution

Our first solution of $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$ is obtained by studying the properties of a *vertex labeling* algorithm (VL algorithm) which is a modification of an algorithm first presented in [7] (for the CR game) and then in [4] (for the GCR game). Our analysis is more detailed than the ones presented in [7, 4], mainly because we spell out all the game theoretic aspects missing from [7, 4]. The differences between our approach and that of [7, 4] will be discussed in Section 4.

Algorithm 1 : The Vertex Labeling Algorithm

Require: The game family $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$.

for $s \in \overline{S}$ **do**
  if $s \in S_c$ **then**
    $T^0(s) = 0$
  else
    $T^0(s) = \infty$
  end if
end for
for $i = 1, 2, ..$ **do**
  for $s \in \overline{S}$ **do**
    if $T^{i-1}(s) < \infty$ **then**
      $T^i(s) = T^{i-1}(s)$
    else if $s \in S^1$ **then**
      $T^i(s) = 1 + \min_{s' \in N(s)} T^{i-1}(s')$
    else if $s \in S^2$ **then**
      $T^i(s) = 1 + \max_{s' \in N(s)} T^{i-1}(s')$
    end if
  end for
end for

The VL algorithm produces, for every $s \in S$, an infinite sequence

$$T^0(s), T^1(s), T^2(s), ...$$

The only two forms which $(T^i(s))_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ can take are:

1. for every $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $T^i(s)$ has the same value (which is either 0 or ∞),
2. there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T^i(s) = \infty$ for $i \in \{0, ..., n-1\}$ and $T^i(s) = m \in \mathbb{N}$ for $i \in \{n, n+1, ...\}$.

Hence the following are well defined (with the understanding that $\min \emptyset = \infty$).

Definition 3.1 *For all $s \in \overline{S}$ we define*

$$\overline{T}(s) = \lim_{i \to \infty} T^i(s), \tag{3}$$

$$\widetilde{T}(s) = \min\{i : T^i(s) < \infty\}. \tag{4}$$

Our next goal is to show that, for all $s \in \overline{S}$, $\overline{T}(s) = \widetilde{T}(s)$. In other words, if $T^i(s)$ attains a finite value at the i-th iteration of the VL algorithm, this value (which equals the limit $\overline{T}(s)$) will be i. We need the following auxiliary proposition.

Proposition 3.2 *For all $s \in \overline{S}$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have*

$$\left(\widetilde{T}(s) = n\right) \Rightarrow \left(\forall i \geq n : T^i(s) = \overline{T}(s) \leq n\right). \tag{5}$$

Proof. Let us first prove that, for all $s \in \overline{S}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\left(\widetilde{T}(s) = n\right) \Rightarrow T^n(s) \leq n. \tag{6}$$

Clearly (6) holds for $n = 0$; assume it holds for $n \in \{0, 1, ..., k\}$. Now, if for some s we have $\widetilde{T}(s) = k+1$ then $T^k(s) = \infty$ and $T^{k+1}(s) < \infty$. From this and lines 10-16 of the VL algorithm, we see that

$$T^{k+1}(s) = 1 + T^k(s')$$

for some $s' \in N(s)$ which satisfies $T^k(s') = m < \infty$. But then $\widetilde{T}(s') \leq k$ which, by the inductive assumption, implies $T^k(s') \leq k$. Hence $T^{k+1}(s) \leq k+1$ and we have proved (6) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Now (5) follows from lines 10-11 of the VL algorithm. ■

Proposition 3.3 *For every $s \in \overline{S}$ we have:*

$$\overline{T}(s) = \widetilde{T}(s). \tag{7}$$

Proof. We partition $\overline{S}$ into the following two sets

$$S_a = \left\{s : \widetilde{T}(s) = \infty\right\}, \qquad S_b = \left\{s : \widetilde{T}(s) < \infty\right\}.$$

If $s \in S_a$, then $\widetilde{T}(s) = \infty$; then

$$\{i : T^i(s) < \infty\} = \emptyset \Rightarrow \left(\forall i : T^i(s) = \infty\right);$$

hence $\overline{T}(s) = \infty$. We conclude that

$$\forall s \in S_a : \ \overline{T}(s) = \widetilde{T}(s). \tag{8}$$

To complete the proof of (7), we must prove

$$\forall s \in S_b : \ \overline{T}(s) = \widetilde{T}(s). \tag{9}$$

To this end we will show that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\forall s \in S_b : \ \widetilde{T}(s) = n \Rightarrow \overline{T}(s) = T^n(s) = T^{n+1}(s) = ... = n. \tag{10}$$

Now, (10) clearly holds for $n = 0$. Suppose it holds for $n \in \{0, 1, ..., k\}$. Take any state $s \in S_b$ such that $\widetilde{T}(s) = k+1$. Then we have

$$T^k(s) = \infty, \tag{11}$$

$$T^{k+1}(s) = T^{k+2}(s) = ... = \overline{T}(s) = m \leq k+1 < \infty. \tag{12}$$

1. If $s \in S^1$, (11)-(12) imply that there exists some $s' \in N(s)$ such that

$$T^k(s') = \min_{u \in N(s)} T^k(u) \qquad \text{and} \qquad T^{k+1}(s) = 1 + T^k(s').$$

Also (11) implies that $\min_{u \in N(s)} T^{k-1}(u) = \infty$ and hence

$$T^{k-1}(s') = \infty. \tag{13}$$

But $T^k(s') = T^{k+1}(s) - 1 < \infty$; hence $\widetilde{T}(s') = k$ and, using the inductive assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{T}(s') = T^k(s') = T^{k+1}(s') = ... = k \Rightarrow \\ &\overline{T}(s) = T^{k+1}(s) = T^{k+2}(s) = ... = 1 + T^k(s') = 1 + k. \end{aligned}$$

2. If $s \in S^2$, (12) implies that $\max_{u \in N(s)} T^k(u) < \infty$; hence for all $u \in N(s)$ we have $T^k(u) < \infty$. On the other hand, (11) implies that there exists some $s' \in N(s)$ such that $T^{k-1}(s') = \infty$. Hence $\widetilde{T}(s') = k$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} T^{k+1}(s) = m < \infty &\Rightarrow \left(\forall u \in N(s) : T^k(u) < \infty\right) \\ &\Rightarrow \left(\forall u \in N(s) : \widetilde{T}(u) \leq k\right) \\ &\Rightarrow \left(\forall u \in N(s) : \overline{T}(u) = T^k(u) \leq k\right) \end{aligned}$$

(the last line following from Proposition 3.2). Hence s' achieves the maximum:

$$T^k(s') = \max_{u \in N(s)} T^k(u) = k$$

and so

$$\overline{T}(s) = T^{k+1}(s) = T^{k+2}(s) = ... = 1 + T^k(s') = 1 + k.$$

Thus we have proved that (10) holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and we are done. ■

We also have the following useful and easily provable proposition.

Proposition 3.4 *The collection* $\left(\overline{T}(s)\right)_{s \in \overline{S}}$ *satisfies the following:*

$$\forall s \in S^1 \backslash S_c : \overline{T}(s) = 1 + \min_{s' \in \mathbf{N}(s)} \overline{T}(s'), \tag{14}$$

$$\forall s \in S^2 \backslash S_c : \overline{T}(s) = 1 + \max_{s' \in \mathbf{N}(s)} \overline{T}(s'), \tag{15}$$

Proof. Simply take the limits in lines 13 and 15 of the VL algorithm. ■

The system of equations (14)-(15) is the perfect information version of the *optimality equations* which play a central role in stochastic games [9].

We will next show that, for every $s \in \overline{S}$, $\overline{T}(s)$ is the *value* of the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$. Furthermore, we will use the collection $\left(\overline{T}(s)\right)_{s\in\overline{S}}$ to define *optimal* strategies for P^1 and P^2.

To avoid ambiguities in the definition of the optimal strategies we modify the functions arg min and arg max as follows. Given the collection of successor states $\mathbf{N} = (N(s))_{s\in\overline{S}}$, we assume that $\overline{S}$ is equipped with a fixed total order. Then, for every $s \in \overline{S}$, expressions such as "the *first* element of $N(s)$ such that ..." are well (i.e., uniquely) defined. Now, for every function $f : \overline{S} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, we (re)define arg min and arg max:

$$\forall s \in \overline{S} : \arg\min_{s'\in N(s)} f(s') = \text{"the } \textit{first} \text{ element } u \in N(s) \text{ s.t. } f(u) = \min_{s'\in N(s)} f(s')\text{"},$$
$$\forall s \in \overline{S} : \arg\max_{s'\in N(s)} f(s') = \text{"the } \textit{first} \text{ element } u \in N(s) \text{ s.t. } f(u) = \max_{s'\in N(s)} f(s')\text{"}.$$

Definition 3.5 *Given the game family $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$, with labels $\left(\overline{T}(s)\right)_{s\in S_c}$, we define the following two strategies*

$$\textit{A Pursuer strategy } \widehat{\sigma}^1 : \forall s \in S^1 \backslash S_c : \widehat{\sigma}^1(s) = \arg\min\nolimits_{s'\in N(s)} \overline{T}(s'),$$
$$\textit{An Evader strategy } \widehat{\sigma}^2 : \forall s \in S^2 \backslash S_c : \widehat{\sigma}^2(s) = \arg\max\nolimits_{s'\in N(s)} \overline{T}(s').$$

Proposition 3.6 *Given the game family $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$, for every $s \in \overline{S}$: $\overline{T}(s)$ is the value of the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$, and $\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2$ are optimal positional strategies.*

Proof. Assuming $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c)$ given and fixed, we drop it from all subsequent notation.

It follows immediately from Definition 3.5 that $\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2$ are positional strategies. Given Proposition 2.18, to prove the rest of the theorem it suffices to show that

$$\forall s \in S : \forall \sigma^2 : \; T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) \leq \overline{T}(s), \tag{16}$$
$$\forall s \in S : \forall \sigma^1 : \; T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right) \geq \overline{T}(s). \tag{17}$$

The rest of the proof is divided into two parts.

Part I. Take any s such that $\overline{T}(s) < \infty$.

1. First we show that $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ satisfies (16), by showing that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have:

$$\forall s : \overline{T}(s) = n \Rightarrow \left(\forall \sigma^2 : T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) \leq \overline{T}(s)\right). \tag{18}$$

Obviously (18) holds when $\overline{T}(s) = 0$ (because then $s \in S_c$ and $T(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | s) = 0$ for all σ^1, σ^2). Assume it holds for all $n \in \{0, 1, ..., k\}$ and pick any s such that $\overline{T}(s) = k + 1$.

(a) Suppose $s \in S^1$. From (14) we have

$$k + 1 = 1 + \min_{s'\in N(s)} \overline{T}(s') \Rightarrow \min_{s'\in N(s)} \overline{T}(s') = k.$$

Hence, for $\overline{s} = \widehat{\sigma}^1(s) = \arg\min_{s'\in N(s)} \overline{T}(s')$ we have $\overline{T}(\overline{s}) = k$. By the inductive assumption, we then have

$$\forall \sigma^2 : \; T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | \overline{s}\right) \leq \overline{T}(\overline{s}) = k.$$

In other words, if P^1 uses $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ in the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, \overline{s})$ then he will achieve capture in at most k moves, no matter how P^2 plays. Since $\overline{s} \in N(s)$, P^1 can also use $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ in the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$. This means he will move from s to $\overline{s}$ and then will play exactly as in game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, \overline{s})$. This ensures capture in at most $k+1$ moves, no matter how P^2 plays, i.e.,

$$\forall \sigma^2 : \; T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) \leq k+1.$$

Therefore $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ satisfies (16) for all $s \in S^1$ with $\overline{T}(s) = k+1$.

(b) Suppose $s \in S^2$. From relation (15) we have

$$k+1 = 1 + \max_{s' \in N(s)} \overline{T}(s') \Rightarrow \max_{s' \in N(s))} \overline{T}(s') = k.$$

Thus, whatever the initial move by player P^2 in game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$, the resulting state $\overline{s}$ will satisfy $\overline{T}(\overline{s}) \leq k$. Again, by the inductive assumption, we have

$$\forall \sigma^2 : \; T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | \overline{s}\right) \leq \overline{T}(\overline{s}) \leq k$$

and hence, in the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, \overline{s})$, P^1 can use $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ and capture in at most k moves (no matter what P^2 plays). We then get, by the same reasoning as above, that

$$\forall \sigma^2 : \; T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) \leq k+1.$$

Therefore $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ satisfies (16) for all $s \in S^2$ with $\overline{T}(s) = k+1$.

Hence we have shown that $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ satisfies (16),

2. Next we show inductively that $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ satisfies (17). I.e., we show that: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have:

$$\forall s : \overline{T}(s) = n \Rightarrow \left(\forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right) \geq \overline{T}(s)\right). \tag{19}$$

Obviously (19) holds when $\overline{T}(s) = 0$. Assume it holds for all $n \in \{0, 1, ..., k\}$ and pick any s such that $\overline{T}(s) = k+1$.

(a) Suppose $s \in S^2$. Similarly to the previous case, from (15) we get $\max_{s' \in N(s)} \overline{T}(s') = k$. Hence for $\overline{s} = \widehat{\sigma}^2(s) = \arg\max_{s' \in N(s)} \overline{T}(s')$ we have $\overline{T}(\overline{s}) = k$. By the inductive assumption we then have

$$\forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | \overline{s}\right) \geq \overline{T}(\overline{s}) = k.$$

Hence P^2 using $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ in the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, \overline{s})$ can ensure capture will take k turns or more, no matter how P^1 plays. Reasoning as previously, P^2 using $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ in $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ can ensure capture will take $k+1$ turns or more, no matter how P^1 plays, i.e.,

$$\forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right) \geq k+1.$$

Therefore $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ satisfies (17) for all $s \in S^2$ with $\overline{T}(s) = k+1$.

(b) Finally, suppose $s \in S^1$; by an argument similar to that of case 1.b above we get that

$$\forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right) \geq k+1.$$

Therefore $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ satisfies (17) for all $s \in S^1$ with $\overline{T}(s) = k+1$.

Hence we have shown that $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ satisfies (17).

We have completed the proof of (16)-(17) for all s such that $\overline{T}(s) < \infty$.

Part II. Now take any state s such that $\overline{T}(s) = \infty$. Then we clearly have

$$\forall s \in S : \forall \sigma^2 : \ T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) \leq \overline{T}(s) = \infty;$$

which proves (16). To prove (17), first set $s_0 = s$ and then, for any Pursuer strategy σ^1, let

$$s_0 s_1 s_2 ... = H\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s_0\right).$$

We want to show that $s_0 s_1 s_2 ...$ never reaches a capture state. We will actually prove something (apparently) stronger:

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0, s_t \in H(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s_0) : \overline{T}\left(s_t\right) = \infty. \tag{20}$$

Suppose (20) is false and let s_{k+1} be the first element of $s_0 s_1 s_2 ...$ with $\overline{T}\left(s_t\right) < \infty$. I.e.,

$$\forall t \leq k : \overline{T}\left(s_t\right) = \infty \text{ and } \overline{T}\left(s_{k+1}\right) = m < \infty. \tag{21}$$

If $s_k \in S^2$, then $s_{k+1} = \widehat{\sigma}^2\left(s_k\right) = \arg\max_{s' \in N(s_k)} \overline{T}\left(s'\right)$ and

$$\infty = \overline{T}\left(s_k\right) = 1 + \overline{T}\left(s_{k+1}\right) \Rightarrow \overline{T}\left(s_{k+1}\right) = \infty. \tag{22}$$

If $s_k \in S^1$, then clearly (for any σ^1) $s_{k+1} \in N\left(s_k\right)$. Since $\overline{T}\left(s_{k+1}\right) = m < \infty$ we will have

$$\overline{T}\left(s_k\right) = 1 + \min_{s' \in N(s_k)} \overline{T}\left(s'\right) \leq 1 + \overline{T}\left(s_{k+1}\right) = 1 + m < \infty. \tag{23}$$

In both (22) and (23) we have a contradiction. We conclude that we cannot have $\overline{T}\left(s_t\right) < \infty$ for any t; consequently (20) is true. Hence we have completed the proof of (16)-(17) for all s such that $\overline{T}(s) = \infty$. ■

Remark 3.7 It is worth noting that the VL algorithm implements both *Backward Induction* and *Value Iteration*.

3.2 An Alternative Solution

We will now present an alternative approach to the solution of the GCR game. While this approach reaches the same conclusions as the VL-based approach of Section 3.1, it underscores certain aspects of the GCR game which are not obvious in the VL-based approach. On the other hand, the new approach is not totally self-contained; in particular it invokes Von Neumann's famous MinMax Theorem [22].

There is another sense in which the approach of this section *appears* weaker than the VL-based one. Namely, *we will henceforth assume here that the two players move alternately*, i.e., that every move by P^n is followed a move by P^{-n}. However this assumption is introduced only for clarity of presentation; the proofs can be modified so that they hold when the alternate-moves assumption is removed.

We start by introducing the concepts of *Pursuer-win* and *Evader-win* games, which are generalizations of the well known concepts of cop-win and robber-win graphs.

Definition 3.8 *The game* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ *is called* Pursuer-win *(*P-win*) iff* P^1 *has a strategy* $\overline{\sigma}^1$ *which effects capture for every Evader strategy* σ^2*;* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ *is called* Evader-win *(*E-win*) iff* P^2 *has a strategy* $\overline{\sigma}^2$ *which avoids capture for every Pursuer strategy* σ^1*. In other words*

$$\left(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s\right) \text{ is P-win } \textit{iff}: \exists \overline{\sigma}^1 : \forall \sigma^2 : T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) < \infty, \tag{24}$$

$$\left(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s\right) \text{ is E-win } \textit{iff}: \exists \overline{\sigma}^2 : \forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2 | s\right) = \infty \tag{25}$$

A point that is not often stressed in the discussion of cop-win and robber-win graphs is that we cannot *automatically* conclude that a graph is either cop-win or robber-win. More generally, we cannot automatically conclude that the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is either P-win or E-win, because the opposite of (24) is

$$\forall \sigma^1 : \exists \sigma^2_{\sigma^1} : T\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2_{\sigma^1} | s\right) = \infty \tag{26}$$

(i.e., the Evader strategy $\sigma^2_{\sigma^1}$ which ensures no capture takes place will in general depend on the Pursuer strategy σ^1); and (26) is not equivalent to (25). However, we can *prove* that, indeed, any $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is either E-win or P-win.

Proposition 3.9 *Every* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ *is either P-win or E-win.*

Proof. Pick any $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ which is not P-win. We will show that it is E-win by constructing an Evader strategy $\overline{\sigma}^2$ which satisfies (25).

Suppose that s belongs to S^1 and let $s_0 = s$. Further, suppose that P^1 uses some strategy by which the game moves from s_0 to some s_1. From (26) we know that for *any* such s_1, P^2 has at least one strategy by which he can ensure capture never takes place. Suppose by some such strategy the game moves to some s_2 (which will in general depend on s_0 and s_1). For all possible s_1's define

$$\overline{\sigma}^2\left(s_0 s_1\right) = s_2.$$

This defines the part of $\overline{\sigma}^2$ which applies to histories of length two, i.e., the ones belonging to

$$\left\{h = s_0 s_1 : s_1 \in N\left(s_0\right)\right\}.$$

Now, from $s_2 = \overline{\sigma}^2\left(s_0 s_1\right)$ the game can (depending on P^1's strategy) move to any $s_3 \in N\left(s_2\right)$; since $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ is not P-win, P^2 has at least one strategy by which he can ensure capture never takes place from s_3. Suppose by some such strategy the game moves to some s_4 (which will in general depend on $s_0 s_1 s_2 s_3$). For all possible s_3's define

$$\overline{\sigma}^2\left(s_0 s_1 s_2 s_3\right) = s_4.$$

This defines the part of $\overline{\sigma}^2$ which applies to all histories belonging to

$$\{h = s_0 s_1 s_2 s_3 : s_t \in N(s_{t-1}) \text{ for } t \in \{1,2,3\}\}.$$

Continuing in this manner we can extend the definition of $\overline{\sigma}^2$ to all legal histories starting at s_0 and having finite length; where at each step P^2 chooses a move not leading to a P-win state. In other words, the extension is such that: for every finite history $s_0 s_1 ... s_{2n+1}$, $\overline{\sigma}(s_0 s_1 ... s_{2n+1})$ leads to a state from which P^2 can ensure capture never takes place. We can complete the definition of $\overline{\sigma}^2$ (on the rest of its domain H_*) by specifying legal but otherwise arbitrary moves. Hence we have constructed a $\overline{\sigma}^2$ which ensures that capture will never take place, no matter how P^1 plays. In other words we have shown that

$$\exists \overline{\sigma}^2 : \forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma_1, \overline{\sigma}^2 | s_0\right) = \infty$$

which is exactly (25) and shows that $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ is E-win. So we have shown that: for every $s_0 \in S^1$, if $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s_0)$ is not P-win, then it is E-win.

By a similar argument we reach the same conclusion for all $s_0 \in S^2$; hence the proof is complete. ■

The next proposition shows that: (i) if $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is P-win then there is a Pursuer strategy which provides an upper bound (*valid for all σ^2 strategies*) on the capture time; (ii) if $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is E-win then there is an Evader strategy which ensures capture never takes place. Our proof is an adaptation of Zermelo's proof of a similar proposition regarding *chess* [14, 21]. While our proof is more detailed than Zermelo's, it is based on his basic ideas.

Proposition 3.10 *If $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is P-win, then*

$$\exists T_a(s) : \exists \overline{\sigma}^1 : \sup_{\sigma^2} T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) \leq T_a(s) < \infty. \tag{27}$$

If $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is E-win, then

$$\exists \overline{\sigma}^2 : \inf_{\sigma^1} T\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2 | s\right) = \infty \tag{28}$$

Proof. Let us define the following sets

$$S_p = \left\{ s : \exists \overline{\sigma}^1 : \text{(i) } \forall \sigma^2 : T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) < \infty \text{ and (ii) } \sup_{\sigma^2} T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) < \infty \right\},$$
$$S_q = \left\{ s : \exists \overline{\sigma}^1 : \text{(i) } \forall \sigma^2 : T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) < \infty \text{ and (ii) } \sup_{\sigma^2} T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) = \infty \right\},$$
$$S_r = \left\{ s : \exists \overline{\sigma}^2 : \forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2 | s\right) = \infty \right\}.$$

Clearly $S_c \subseteq S_p$. Also $S_p \cup S_q$ (resp. S_r) is the set of all states such that $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is P-win (resp. E-win). It follows from Proposition 3.9, that the complement of S_r is $S_p \cup S_q$. Also, clearly, $S_p \cap S_q = \emptyset$. Hence S_p, S_q, S_r form a partition of $\overline{S}$.

We will prove by contradiction that $S_q = \emptyset$ and hence conclude that (27) is true. So suppose that there exists $s_0 \in S_q \cap S^1$. If the Pursuer has a move from s_0 into some $s_1 \in S_p$, then

$$\left(\exists \overline{\sigma}^1 : \sup_{\sigma^2} T\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s_1\right) < \infty \right) \Rightarrow \left(\exists \widetilde{\sigma}^1 : \sup_{\sigma^2} T\left(\widetilde{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s_0\right) < \infty \right) \Rightarrow s \notin S_q$$

which contradicts the initial assumption. Hence all the Pursuer's moves must lead to some $s_1 \in (S_q \cup S_r) \cap S_2$. Applying the same reasoning to s_1, we see that the Evader must have a move into some $s_2 \in (S_q \cup S_r) \cap S_1$. Continuing in this manner, we see that

$$\exists \widetilde{\sigma}^2 : \forall \sigma^1 : H\left(\sigma^1, \widetilde{\sigma}^2 | s_0\right) = s_0 s_1 s_2 ... \text{ such that: } \forall n : s_n \in S_q \cup S_r$$

which, since $S_c \cap (S_q \cup S_r) = \emptyset$, means

$$\exists \widetilde{\sigma}^2 : \forall \sigma^1 : T\left(s_0 | \sigma^1, \widetilde{\sigma}^2\right) = \infty$$

which contradicts $s_0 \in S_q$. Hence there cannot exist any $s_0 \in S_q \cap S^1$. Similarly we prove that there cannot exist any $s_0 \in S_q \cap S^2$. Hence S_q is empty and we have proved (27).

We prove (28) immediately by using (25):

$$\left(\forall \sigma^1 : T\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2 | s\right) = \infty\right) \Rightarrow \inf_{\sigma^1} T\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2 | s\right) = \infty.$$

The proof of the proposition is complete. ■

Our next goal is to prove that every $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ has a value and optimal Pursuer and Evader strategies. Before proceeding in this direction we need some auxiliary material.

Definition 3.11 *Given the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ and any $K \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the K-*truncated game *(or simply the* truncated game*) $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{[K]}$ is identical to $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ except for the fact that it is played for K turns; consequently it has payoff function*

$$Q\left(s_0 s_1 ... s_K\right) = \sum_{t=0}^{K} q\left(s_t\right).$$

Proposition 3.12 *For every $K \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{[K]}$ has a value and deterministic optimal strategies.*

Proof. A full proof can be found in [22]. The main point is that the truncated game is a *finite* game and hence known to have a value and optimal strategies. The strategies are deterministic because the game has perfect information. ■

Definition 3.13 *Given the truncated game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{[K]}$ and strategies σ^1, σ^2, we define*

$$T_{[K]}\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | s\right) = Q\left(H\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | s\right)\right).$$

In other words, $T_{[K]}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2 | s)$ is P^2's payoff in $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{[K]}$ when the strategies σ^1, σ^2 are used.

We use the bound $T_a(s)$ of Proposition 3.10 to define the truncated game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{[T_a(s)]}$; by Definition 3.13, when the players use strategies σ^1 and σ^2 the corresponding payoff is $T_{[T_a(s)]}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2|s)$. To simplify notation we write $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ in place of $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{[T_a(s)]}$ and $T_{\#}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2|s)$ in place of $T_{[T_a(s)]}(\sigma^1, \sigma^2|s)$. As mentioned, $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ has a value $\widehat{T}(s)$ and an optimal deterministic strategy pair $(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$.

In what follows we will often need to use the "same" strategies in both $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ and $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$. The domain of a strategy σ^n for $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is the set of all finite histories, so we can also use σ^n in $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ by applying it only to histories of length at most $T_a(s)$. To use a $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ strategy σ^n in $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$, we extend it as follows: for each history h with length greater than $T_a(s)$, $\sigma^n(h)$ is the stay-in-place move.

We are now ready to prove that $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ has a value $\widehat{T}(s)$ and an optimal deterministic strategy pair $(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$.

Proposition 3.14 *For every $s \in \overline{S}$, the game $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ has a value $\widehat{T}(s)$ and optimal Pursuer and Evader strategies $\widehat{\sigma}^1$, $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ which attain the value, i.e., $\widehat{T}(s) = T(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s)$.*

Proof. We treat the P-win and E-win cases separately. Because of perfect information, all strategies mentioned in the rest of the proof are *deterministic*.
Part I. Suppose that $s \in \overline{S}$ is such that $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is P-win. Keeping in mind the stay-in-place extension of strategies we see the following.

1. P^1 can use the $\overline{\sigma}^1$ of Proposition 3.10 in $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ and clearly we have

$$\sup_{\sigma^2} T_{\#}\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2|s\right) \leq T_a(s)$$

   (the Evader cannot have a higher payoff than the number of turns).

2. P^1 (resp. P^2) can use $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ (resp. $\widehat{\sigma}^2$) in $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ and

$$T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right) = T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right) = \sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1} T_{\#}\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2|s\right) = \inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2} T_{\#}\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2|s\right) \leq T_a(s). \quad (29)$$

   The equality $T(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s) = T_{\#}(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s)$ follows from the fact that $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ is P-win; hence, by Proposition 3.10, $\overline{\sigma}^1$ guarantees capture in at most $T_a(s)$ turns and $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ (which is optimal) will do at least as well. Since $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{\#}$ lasts for $T_a(s)$ turns, the required inequality is obvious.

3. From optimality and Proposition 2.18 we also get

$$\forall \sigma^1, \sigma^2 : T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2|s\right) \leq T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right) \leq T_{\#}\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right). \quad (30)$$

Now suppose there exists some strategy $\widetilde{\sigma}^1$ such that

$$T\left(\widetilde{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right) < T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right) \leq T_a(s).$$

Then we will also have

$$T_{\#}\left(\widetilde{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T\left(\widetilde{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)<T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)$$

which contradicts (30).

Similarly, suppose there exists some strategy $\widetilde{\sigma}^2$ such that

$$T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)<T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right). \tag{31}$$

Then we have the following cases.

1. If $T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right)\leq T_a\left(s\right)$ then (both $(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2)$ and $(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2)$ result in capture before the truncated game is over):

   $$T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)<T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right);$$

   which contradicts (30).

2. If $T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right)>T_a\left(s\right)$ then $T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T_a\left(s\right)$ (the truncated game finishes before capture) and we have the following subcases.

   $$T_a\left(s\right)>T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)\Rightarrow T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T_a\left(s\right)>T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)$$

   which contradicts (30); and

   $$T_a\left(s\right)=T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)\Rightarrow T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widetilde{\sigma}^2|s\right)=T_a\left(s\right)=T_{\#}\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2|s\right)$$

   which contradicts (31).

Part II. Suppose that $s\in\overline{S}$ is such that $(\mathbf{N},S^1,S^2,S_c,s)$ is E-win. In this case we start from (28) and get

$$\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\overline{\sigma}^2|s\right)=\infty\Rightarrow\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=\infty\Rightarrow\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}T\left(\sigma^1,\sigma^2|s\right)=\infty.$$

Hence we have shown $\widehat{T}\left(s\right)=\infty$. Since $\overline{\sigma}^2$ achieves $\widehat{T}\left(s\right)$, it is an Evader optimal strategy. Any σ^1 achieves $\widehat{T}\left(s\right)$, hence any σ^1 is a Pursuer optimal strategy. ■

Definition 3.15 *We define the following two* positional *strategies*

$$\begin{aligned}&\textit{A Pursuer strategy }\widehat{\sigma}^1:\forall s\in S^1\backslash S_c:\widehat{\sigma}^1\left(s\right)=\arg\min\nolimits_{s'\in N(s)}\widehat{T}\left(s'\right),\\&\textit{An Evader strategy }\widehat{\sigma}^2:\forall s\in S^2\backslash S_c:\widehat{\sigma}^2\left(s\right)=\arg\max\nolimits_{s'\in N(s)}\widehat{T}\left(s'\right).\end{aligned}$$

The next proposition shows $(\widehat{\sigma}^1,\widehat{\sigma}^2)$ is an optimal strategy pair in $(\mathbf{N},S^1,S^2,S_c,s)$ *for every* s. For the sake of brevity, in the proof we will use the following notation: given a positional strategy profile $\sigma=(\sigma^1,\sigma^2)$ and a state $s=(x^1,x^2,p)$, we let

$$\sigma\left(s\right)=\left(\sigma^p\left(s\right),x^{-p},-p\right).$$

In other words, $\sigma\left(s\right)$ is the state to which s transits when the player P^p (who has the move in s) applies his strategy σ^p.

Proposition 3.16 *For a given* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ *and for all* s*, we have*

$$\forall \sigma^1 : \forall s : T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right) \leq T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right), \tag{32}$$

$$\forall \sigma^2 : \forall s : T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s\right) \geq T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2 | s\right). \tag{33}$$

Proof. We will only prove (32) for any $s \in S^1$ (the proofs of the remaining parts are similar). Let $s_0 = s$ and $\widehat{\sigma} = (\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$; furthermore, pick any Pursuer strategy σ^1 and let $\widetilde{\sigma} = (\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$. Now define the state sequences $s_0\widetilde{s}_1\widetilde{s}_2...$ and $s_0\widehat{s}_1\widehat{s}_2...$ as follows

$$\begin{array}{llll} \widetilde{s}_1 = \widetilde{\sigma}(s_0), & \widetilde{s}_2 = \widetilde{\sigma}(\widetilde{s}_1), & \widetilde{s}_3 = \widetilde{\sigma}(\widetilde{s}_2), & \widetilde{s}_4 = \widetilde{\sigma}(\widetilde{s}_3), \quad ... \\ \widehat{s}_1 = \widehat{\sigma}(s_0), & \widehat{s}_2 = \widehat{\sigma}(\widehat{s}_1), & \widehat{s}_3 = \widehat{\sigma}(\widehat{s}_2), & \widehat{s}_4 = \widehat{\sigma}(\widehat{s}_3), \quad ... \end{array}$$

Note that $\widetilde{s}_0\widetilde{s}_1\widetilde{s}_2...$ is $H(\widetilde{\sigma}|s_0)$ but $\widehat{s}_0\widehat{s}_1\widehat{s}_2...$ is *not* $H(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0)$ (why?). Also note that

$$\widetilde{s}_2 = \widehat{s}_2, \quad \widetilde{s}_4 = \widehat{s}_4, \quad \widetilde{s}_6 = \widehat{s}_6, \quad \widetilde{s}_8 = \widehat{s}_8, \quad ... .$$

Because $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ always chooses minimizing successor states, we have the following sequence of inequalities.

$$\begin{array}{l} T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) = 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widehat{s}_1) \leq 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_1) \\ T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_1) = 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widehat{s}_2) = 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_2) \Rightarrow T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) \leq 2 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_2) \\ T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_2) = 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widehat{s}_3) \leq 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_3) \Rightarrow T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) \leq 3 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_3) \\ T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_3) = 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widehat{s}_4) = 1 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_4) \Rightarrow T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) \leq 4 + T(\widehat{\sigma}|\widetilde{s}_4) \\ \qquad ... \end{array}$$

This sequence of inequalities (i) either will continue until we reach some $\widetilde{s}_K \in S_c$ (ii) or, if no capture state is ever reached, will go on ad infinitum. Let us consider each case separately.

1. If there exists some $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\widetilde{s}_K \in S_c$, then $T(\widetilde{\sigma}|s_0) = K$ and we have

$$T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) \leq K + T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_K) = T(\widetilde{\sigma}|s_0) + 0.$$

2. If for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $s_k \notin S_c$, then $T(\widetilde{\sigma}|s_0) = \infty$ and we have

$$T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) \leq \infty = T(\widetilde{\sigma}|s_0).$$

In either case we have proved that $T(\widehat{\sigma}|s_0) \leq T(\widetilde{\sigma}|s_0)$ which, written in more detail, is

$$\forall \sigma^1 : \forall s_0 \in S^1 : T\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 | s_0\right) \leq T\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2 s_0\right).$$

In other words we have proved (32) when $s \in S^1$; the proof of (32) when $s \in S^2$ as well as the proof of (33) are similar. ■

To summarize, up to this point we have proved that $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)$ has a value and optimal positional strategies $\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2$ (specified in terms of the collection of values $\left(\widehat{T}(s)\right)_{s \in \overline{S}}$) *without using the VL algorithm of Section* 3.1. Our final target is to show, *without using the results of Section 3.1*, that the values (i) satisfy the optimality equations and (ii) can be computed by the VL algorithm.

Proposition 3.17 *The values* $\left(\widehat{T}(s)\right)_{s\in\overline{S}}$ *of the games* $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S_c, s)_{s\in\overline{S}}$ *satisfy the* optimality equations.

$$\forall s \in S_c : \widehat{T}(s) = 0, \tag{34}$$

$$\forall s \in S^1 \backslash S_c : \widehat{T}(s) = 1 + \min_{s'\in N(s)} \widehat{T}(s'), \tag{35}$$

$$\forall s \in S^2 \backslash S_c : \widehat{T}(s) = 1 + \max_{s'\in N(s)} \widehat{T}(s'). \tag{36}$$

Proof. Straightforward. ■

Proposition 3.18 *For every* $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *we have*

$$\forall s \in \overline{S} : \widehat{T}(s) = n \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \forall m < n : T^m(s) = \infty \\ \forall m \geq n : T^n(s) = \widehat{T}(s) \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

where $\left(\left(T^n(s)\right)_{s\in\overline{S}}\right)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *are the quantities computed by the VL algorithm.*

Proof. Clearly (37) holds for $n = 0$. Suppose it holds for all $n \in \{1, 2, ..., k\}$ and consider two cases.

1. Take any $s \in S^1$ such that $\widehat{T}(s) = k + 1$. Then

$$\widehat{T}(s) = 1 + \min_{s'\in N(s)} \widehat{T}(s').$$

Hence

$$\exists s_1 \in N(s) : \widehat{T}(s_1) = k \text{ and } \nexists s_2 \in N(s) : \widehat{T}(s_2) < k.$$

Then from the inductive hypothesis it follows that

$$\exists s_1 \in N(s) : T^k(s_1) = k, \tag{38}$$

$$\nexists s_2 \in N(s) : T^k(s_2) < k. \tag{39}$$

From (38)-(39) we have

$$k = \min_{s'\in N(s)} T^k(s') \Rightarrow T^{k+1}(s) = k + 1. \tag{40}$$

From (39) we also have

$$\left(\forall s' \in N(s) : T^0(s') = ... = T^{k-1}(s') = \infty\right) \Rightarrow T^k(s) = 1 + \infty = \infty. \tag{41}$$

From (40)-(41) and lines 10-16 of the VL algorithm we see that (37) holds for all $s \in S^1$ such that $\widehat{T}(s) = k + 1$.

2. Take any $s \in S^2$ such that $\widehat{T}(s) = k+1$. Then

$$\widehat{T}(s) = 1 + \max_{s' \in N_{out}[s]} \widehat{T}(s').$$

Hence

$$\exists s_1 \in N(s) : \widehat{T}(s_1) = k \text{ and } \forall s' \in N(s) : \widehat{T}(s') \leq k.$$

Then from the inductive hypothesis it follows that

$$\exists s_1 \in N(s) : T^k(s_1) = k, \tag{42}$$

$$\forall s' \in N(s) : T^k(s') \leq k. \tag{43}$$

From (42)-(43) we have

$$k = \max_{s' \in N(s)} T^k(s') \Rightarrow T^{k+1}(s) = k+1. \tag{44}$$

From (42) we also have

$$T^{k-1}(s_1) = \infty \Rightarrow T^k(s) = 1 + \infty = \infty. \tag{45}$$

From (44)-(45) and lines 10-16 of the VL algorithm we see that (37) holds for all $s \in S^2$ such that $\widehat{T}(s) = k+1$.

Hence (37) holds for all $s \in \overline{S}$ such that $\widehat{T}(s) = k+1$ and the proof is completed. ■

4 Comparison to Other Approaches

Our analysis of Section 3.1 is heavily inspired by [7, 4]. We will now discuss these two papers and also the less well known [1] in comparison to our own. Let us emphasize that, while we will criticize some aspects of [7, 4, 1], we find these papers extremely useful; they have provided the inspiration and foundation for our own more detailed approach.

4.1 Hahn and MacGillivray

In [7] Hahn and MacGillivray study a CR version with two generalizations of the classic game: (i) the game is played on a directed graph and (ii) more than one cops and/or robbers ("k-cop, l-robber") may be involved[6]. On the other hand, following the classic CR formulation, they count time (especially capture time) in *rounds*; one round includes one move by each cop and robber token. While we consider the single Cop and single Robber case, our own formulation can easily accommodate all of the above.

Next we describe two more substantial differences between Hahn and MacGillivray's approach and our own. These are really differences between the games being studied in each case. Namely, in [7]:

[6]Let us stress that they still deal with a two-player game: there is a single Cop player and a single Robbber player, but each can control one or more cop and robber *tokens*.

1. it is assumed that the two players move alternately and the game always starts with the Cop moving first (once again this follows the classic CR game formulation);

2. the game starts with an empty graph, the Cop's first move is to place his token on some vertex and the Robber's first move is to place his own token; these two moves constitute the "*placement round*".

However both of the above differences can be easily accommodated by our approach. Obviously, removing the "alternating moves" assumption makes our analysis more general. To accommodate the "placement round", we can use a one-round game which consists of two turns: first the Cop chooses a vertex x_0^1, then the Robber chooses a vertex x_0^2 and then the Robber gains (the Cop loses) $\widehat{T}\left(x_0^1, x_0^2, 1\right)$ payoff units, where $\widehat{T}\left(x_0^1, x_0^2, 1\right)$ has been computed for every vertex pair (x_0^1, x_0^2) by the VL algorithm. Clearly the new game has a value which is

$$\min_{x_0^1} \max_{x_0^2} \widehat{T}\left(x_0^1, x_0^2, 1\right).$$

Hence the solution of our GCR game also provides the solution to Hahn and MacGillivray's (classic) CR game.

One of the main components of [7] is a vertex labeling algorithm very similar to our own, which is used to compute optimal capture times (counted in *rounds*) and strategies. The main properties of this algorithm are established in Lemma 4 of [7]. We find the proof of this Lemma not quite rigorous, because precise definitions of *strategy* and *optimality* (and also *value*) are not provided.

Both "*strategy*" and "*optimal strategy*" are used informally in [7]. "*Strategy*" is not defined. "*Optimal strategy*" for the Cop is defined informally as follows: "a strategy from a configuration c_{xy} [is] *optimal* for the cop if no other strategy gives a win in fewer moves". But this is incorrect (indeed there exist Cop strategies which give capture time *better than optimal*, but only for *some* robber strategies) because it does not take into account the Robber's strategy. Similar remarks can be made regarding the informal definition of optimal Robber strategies.

To precisely define "*optimal strategy*" one must first define "*strategy*" (as a function from histories to moves) and then provide an optimality criterion. In Game Theory optimality is defined in connection with "game value" (which is neither defined nor used in [7]). In the context of CR and GCR the appropriate definitions are Definitions 2.16 and 2.18 as given in our Section 2.3.

Consequently, while the main ideas in the proof of Lemma 4 are correct, their elaboration is not always rigorous (in our opinion). But in some cases the authors' arguments can be improved quite easily. For instance, their statement "*the cop's move will be to an x' ... from which, by the induction hypothesis, the cop can win in $t-1$ rounds*" should be augmented by: "*no matter how the robber plays*"[7]. Similar remarks apply to other parts of [7].

4.2 Bonato and MacGillivray

As already stated, our main inspiration is [4], in which Bonato and MacGillivray generalize the games and results of [7]. In place of "Cop" and "Robber", they use the terms "Pursuer" and

[7] Of course this is just a verbal description of the sup and inf conditions of our Definition 2.16.

"Evader". "Alternating moves" and "placement round" are used in the same manner as in [7]. On the other hand capture is understood in a more general sense; slightly paraphrasing [4], the Pursuer wins if, at any time-step, the current position of the game belongs to the subset of *final positions*. Of course this is exactly analogous to our capture set S_c.

A vertex labeling algorithm is also provided in [4]; it counts time in turns (not rounds) and is essentially the same as our own VL Algorithm[8]. However, rather than proving directly the properties of their algorithm, the authors proceed in the following manner.

1. The construct, independently of the labeling algorithm, a sequence of orderings $\preceq_0$, $\preceq_1$, ... on Pursuer and Evader *positions*.

2. They prove that these converge to an ordering $\preceq$.

3. They relate winning and "optimal" game duration to $(\preceq_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and $\preceq$ (their Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2).

4. Finally they relate state labels to the orderings $(\preceq_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ (Theorem 3.3)

Hence their vertex labeling algorithm is peripheral, rather than central to the arguments of [4]. Nevertheless, the criticisms addressed to [7] can also be addressed to [4]. Namely, "strategy", "value" and "optimality" are used but not rigorously defined. An informal definition of optimality is that an "the Pursuer's optimal strategy is to move so that the game is over as quickly as possible, and the Evader's optimal strategy is to move so the game lasts as long as possible"; similarly to [7], this definition does not clarify the role of the "other" player's strategy. A correct verbal description would be: "the Pursuer's optimal strategy is to move so that the *longest possible* duration of the game is as short as possible" (and a similar modification should be appplied to the definition of the Evader's optimal strategy). Now, the above are simply verbal descriptions of the $\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}$ and $\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}$ conditions on capture time *and they do not suffice to ensure optimality* (we must have in addition that $\inf_{\sigma^1}\sup_{\sigma^2}$ equals $\sup_{\sigma^2}\inf_{\sigma^1}$, as in Definition 2.16).

4.3 Berarducci and Intrigila

The earliest investigation of optimal CR strategies that we know of is the one presented in [1] by Berarducci and Intrigila. As we will explain below, this work provides a very useful approach to the CR problem.

Berarducci and Intrigila *do* provide a definition of strategies, both general and positional. In their Remark 2.2 they apparently assume implicitly that an optimal solution can be found by considering only positional strategies but they actually justify (post facto) this assumption.

Interestingly, the results of [1] are established by using a sequence of sets W_0, W_1, ... (rather than a labeling algorithm). The sequence is defined inductively: their W_0 is our capture sets S_c and, for each n, W_n is defined (their Definition 2.4) in a manner which strongly resembles our VL Algorithm. The subsequent arguments (contained in their Lemmas 2.5-2.7) resemble the analysis of our VL Algorithm. Their main results are the following.

[8]There is one caveat: it is never specified in [4] whether once a state achieves a finite label can be subsequently relabeled (it should not); this is probably an oversight in the description.

1. The set W_n is the set of all these starting states from which the Cop *can* capture the Robber in n moves or less (their Lemma 2.5).

2. The sequence W_n converges to a state set W which has the following property: for every starting state $s \in W$ the Cop *can* capture the Robber in a finite number of moves; for every starting state $s \notin W$ the Cop *cannot* capture the Robber in a finite number of moves (their Lemma 2.6).

3. Optimal Cop and Robber strategies are also defined in the proof of Lemma 2.6 and they are, by their definition, positional.

While in the above results Berarducci and Intrigila make no explicit mention of the "other player's" strategy, the use of "can" implies that *the Cop has a strategy which guarantees capture no matter how the Robber plays*. Similarly, the use of "cannot" implies that *the Robber has a strategy which guarantees noncapture no matter how the Cop plays*.

The proof of the above results is correct. In our understanding, the important quantities are not the sets W_n but the sets $U_n = W_n \backslash W_{n-1}$. While not explicitly stated, it follows from their proof that U_n is the set of initial states from which

1. the Cop *can* capture the Robber in *at most* n rounds, *no matter how the Robber plays*;

2. but the Robber *can* delay capture for *at least* $n-1$ rounds, *no matter how the Cop plays*;

In short, the analysis of [1] respects, at least implicitly, all the relevant game theoretic considerations. It is also closely related to the previously mentioned vertex labeling algorithms. For example, it is easy to prove that, reverting to our own terminology, the state s belongs to U_n iff $\widehat{T}(s) = n$.

5 Concluding Remarks

We have presented two full game theoretic solutions of the GCR game. Let us briefly comment on each one.

Our first solution, presented in Section 3.1, is self-contained and follows closely [7] and [4]. The main tool for this solution is the VL algorithm which is based on similar algorithms introduced in [7, 4]. Our main contribution in Section 3.1 is to present in greater detail and precision certain implicit assumptions of [7, 4].

Our second solution, presented in Section 3.2, is also fully game theoretic but is not totally self-contained (it invokes Von Neumann's MinMax Theorem). It is also longer. The main reason we have presented it is that it brings into the foreground certain aspects of the CR and GCR game which are usually overlooked.

We conclude the current paper by listing (i) further generalizations of the GCR game and (ii) well known families of games which contain GCR as a special case.

Generalizations of GCR. The GCR game, as presented in both [4] and the current paper is a perfect information, two-person, zero-sum game. All of these aspects can be generalized.

1. *Concurrent GCR*. A standard assumption of both classic CR and Bonato and MacGillivray's GCR is that a single player moves in each turn of the game. An obvious generalization is to allow both players to move concurrently. In this case the game no longer has perfect information. It still has a value which, however, will in genral be achieved by randomized optimal strategies. An exploration in this direction appears in [10].

2. *Nonzero-sum GCR*. By modifying the payoff function we can obtain a two-player nonzero sum CR game. For example, introducing "energy cost", the Robber's payoff could be the capture time minus the distance he has traveled and the Cop's payoff could be the negative of the sum of capture time and the distance he has traveled. An example of a two-player, nonzero-sum GCR game has been presented in [11]; it involves two *selfish* Cop players who attempt to catch a "passive" robber; by "passive" we mean that the robber is not controlled by a player but follows, instead, a predetermined path, known to both cop players.

3. *Multi-player GCR*. Both the classic CR game and practically all its published variants are *two*-player, *zero*-sum games; the same holds for the GCR of [4]. While such games may involve more than one Pursuer, all Pursuers are controlled by a single player whose payoff is given by single function. On the other hand, in [12] we have studied an N-player (with $N \geq 2$), *nonzero*-sum version of the classic CR, the so-called *Selfish Cops and Adversarial Robber* (SCAR) game. As the name indicates, SCAR involves several *selfish* cops, each controlled by a separate player. All cop players share the goal of catching the robber but each cop player has his own payoff function which assigns a higher reward to the player who actually effects the capture; the robber player wants, as in the classic CR game, to delay capture as long as possible. We have generalized this approach in [13], where we have introduced *N-player Generalized CR Games*.

Additional Game Families

1. *Stochastic Games*. The above presented GCR games can be formulated and as stochastic games. Using standard stochastic game results [9] the following things can be shown for every GCR game:

   (a) if it is zero-sum, it possesses a value and optimal strategies, which can be computed by the *Value Iteration Algorithm*, a generalization of the VL algorithm presented in this paper;

   (b) if it is nonzero-sum, it possesses at least one *Nash Equilibrium* in deterministic positional strategies [12, 13].

2. *Reachability games*. The two-player, zero-sum GCR game (understood in the sense of either the current paper or [4]) can also be seen as a special type of *reachability game* [16, 2]. In a reachability game the first player's objective is to bring the game to a target state and the second player's objective is to keep the game away from all target states. This is very similar to the GCR game except that no assumption is made regarding the players' locations. Indeed, a reachability game can be represented by a tuple $(\mathbf{N}, S^1, S^2, S)$ where

N represents an abstract collection of successor states. Our solution of the GCR game can be applied to any reachability game. However the "usual" way to solve a reachability game is by constructing a sequence of *attractor sets*; this approach is practically identical to the one used in [1] to solve the classic CR game.

3. *Graphical Games*. Reachability games are perhaps the simplest example of *infinite perfect information games* [2, 6, 16, 23] which can also be understood as games in which two or more players move a token along the edges of a graph (hence the term "*graphical games*"). Various *infinitary* winning conditions can be used which, in general, depend on some property of the entire game history (for example: Player 1 wins if a certain state is visited infinitely often). In the most general setting we can have games with any number of players and nonzero-sum winning conditions.

A Some Facts about Zero-Sum Games

Here we present the general statements of several game theoretic definitions and propositions (these were presented in GCR-specific form in Section 2.3). All of the following definitions and propositions refer to a general two-player zero-sum game Γ (i.e., they are not specific to the games we discuss in the main body of the paper). The game is assumed to have a payoff to P^2 (the *maximizer*) equal to $U(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)$ where σ^n is the strategy used by P^n ($n \in \{1, 2\}$); the payoff to P^1 (the *minimizer*) is equal to $-U(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)$. Proofs can be found in [15, 22].

Definition A.1 *We define the following two quantities*

$$\text{lower value of } \Gamma : U^-(s) = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right),$$
$$\text{upper value of } \Gamma : U^+(s) = \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

Proposition A.2 *We always have*

$$U^- = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = U^+.$$

Definition A.3 *We say that $\overline{\sigma}^1$ is* minmax strategy *(for P^1) iff*

$$\forall \sigma^2 : U\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) = U^+ = \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

We say that $\overline{\sigma}^2$ is maxmin strategy *(for P^2) iff*

$$\forall \sigma^1 : U\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2\right) = U^- = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

Proposition A.4 *For every minmax strategy $\overline{\sigma}^1$ we have*

$$\forall \sigma^1, \sigma^2 : U\left(\overline{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

For every maxmin strategy $\overline{\sigma}^2$ we have

$$\forall \sigma^1, \sigma^2 : U\left(\sigma^1, \overline{\sigma}^2\right) \geq \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

Definition A.5 *We say that Γ has a* value $\widehat{U}$ *iff*

$$U^- = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = U^+.$$

in which case we define

$$\widehat{U} = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

Definition A.6 *If Γ has a value $\widehat{U}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ (resp. $\widehat{\sigma}^2$) is a minmax (resp. maxmin) strategy, then we call $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ (resp. $\widehat{\sigma}^2$) an* optimal strategy *for P^1 (resp. for P^2) and we also say that $(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$ is an* optimal strategy pair.

Proposition A.7 *Every* finite *(two player) zero-sum game has a value* $\widehat{U}$ *and an optimal strategy pair* $(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$*, for which the following hold*

$$\widehat{U} = U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

Definition A.8 *We say that* $(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$ *is a* Nash Equilbrium *(NE) of* Γ *iff*

$$\forall \sigma^1 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \leq U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right),$$
$$\forall \sigma^2 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \geq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right).$$

The next proposition says: $(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2)$ is an optimal strategy pair iff it is a *Nash Equilbrium.*

Proposition A.9 *The following two conditions are equivalent.*

$$U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) \tag{C1}$$

$$\forall \sigma^1 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \leq U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \text{ and } \forall \sigma^2 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \geq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right). \tag{C2}$$

Proof. To prove that **C1** implies **C2** we note that, since $\widehat{\sigma}^1$ (resp. $\widehat{\sigma}^2$) is optimal, it is also a minmax (resp. maxmin) strategy. Hence from **C1** we have

$$\forall \sigma^1, \sigma^2 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) \Rightarrow \forall \sigma^2 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq \inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right),$$
$$\forall \sigma^1, \sigma^2 : U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \geq \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) \Rightarrow \forall \sigma^1 : U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \geq \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right).$$

After rewriting (to improve clarity) we se that we have proved

$$\forall \sigma^2 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right),$$
$$\forall \sigma^1 : U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \geq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right),$$

which is **C2**.

To prove that **C2** implies **C1** we note [15, p.116, p.144][22, p.43] that we can rewrite **C2** as

$$\forall \sigma^1, \sigma^2 : U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \leq U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right)$$

and then we have

$$\sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \leq \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \Rightarrow$$
$$\inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \sigma^2\right) \leq U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \leq \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) \leq \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) \Rightarrow$$
$$\inf_{\sigma^1} \sup_{\sigma^2} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right) = U\left(\widehat{\sigma}^1, \widehat{\sigma}^2\right) = \sup_{\sigma^2} \inf_{\sigma^1} U\left(\sigma^1, \sigma^2\right)$$

which is **C1**. ■

References

[1] A. Berarducci and B. Intrigila. "On the cop number of a graph." *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 14.4 (1993): 389-403.

[2] D. Berwanger, "Graph games with perfect information." preprint (2013).

[3] A. Bonato and R. Nowakowski. *The Game of Cops and Robbers on Graphs*. American Mathematical Society (2011).

[4] A. Bonato and G. MacGillivray, "Characterizations and algorithms for generalized Cops and Robbers games", *Contributions to Discrete Mathematics*, vol.12 (2017).

[5] F. V. Fomin and D. M. Thilikos, "An annotated bibliography on guaranteed graph searching.

[6] K.R. Apt and E. Grädel. *Lectures in game theory for computer scientists*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[7] G. Hahn and G. MacGillivray. "A note on k-cop, l-robber games on graphs." *Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 306.19-20 (2006): 2492-2497.

[8] T.H. Chung, , G.A. Hollinger, and V. Isler. "Search and pursuit-evasion in mobile robotics." *Autonomous robots*, vol. 31 (2011): pp.299-310.

[9] J. Filar and K. Vrieze. *Competitive Markov decision processes*. 1996.

[10] G. Konstantinidis and Ath Kehagias. "Simultaneously moving cops and robbers." *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 645 (2016): 48-59.

[11] Ath. Kehagias and G. Konstantinidis. "Selfish cops and passive robber: Qualitative games." *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 680 (2017): 25-35.

[12] Ath. Kehagias and G. Konstantinidis, "Selfish cops and active robber: Multi-player pursuit evasion on graphs", *Theoretical Computer Science*, Vol. 780, pp.84-102, (2019).

[13] Ath. Kehagias, "Generalized Cops and Robbers: A Multi-player Pursuit Game on Graphs." *Dynamic Games and Applications*, vol. 9 (2019): 1076-1099.

[14] D. König, "Uber eine schlussweise aus dem endlichen ins unendliche", *Acta Litt. Ac. Sci. Hung. Fran. Joseph*, 3 (1927), 121–130.

[15] M. Maschler, E. Solan. and S. Zamir. *Game theory*. (2013)

[16] R. Mazala. "Infinite games." *Automata logics, and infinite games*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. pp. 23-38.

[17] R. Nowakowski and P. Winkler. "Vertex-to-vertex pursuit in a graph". *Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 43 (1983) 235–239.

[18] A. Quilliot, Thèse de 3ème cycle, Université de Paris VI, 1978, pp. 131–145.

[19] A. Quilliot, Problemes de jeux, de point fixe, de connectivite et de representation sur des graphes, des ensembles ordonnes et des hypergraphes, 1983.

[20] A. Quilliot, "A short note about pursuit games played on a graph with a given genus", *J. Comb. Theory*, Ser. B, 38 (1985) 89-92.

[21] U. Schwalbe and P. Walker, "Zermelo and the early history of game theory", *Games and economic behavior*, 34 (2001), no. 1, 123–137.

[22] L.C. Thomas. *Games, theory and applications*. Courier Corporation, 2012.

[23] M. Ummels. "Stochastic multiplayer games: Theory and algorithms". Amsterdam University Press, 2010.

[24] E. Zermelo, "Über eine Anwendung der Mengenlehre auf die Theorie des Schachspiels". *Proceedings of the fifth international congress of mathematicians*. Vol. 2. II, Cambridge UP, Cambridge, 1913.