

# Strategic Defense of Feedback-Controlled Parallel Queues against Reliability and Security Failures

Qian Xie, Jiayi Wang and Li Jin \*

January 30, 2023

## Abstract

Parallel traffic service systems such as transportation, manufacturing, and computer systems typically involve feedback control (e.g., dynamic routing) to ensure stability and to improve throughput. Such control relies on connected cyber components for computation and communication. These components are susceptible to random malfunctions and malicious attacks, which motivates the design of strategic defense that are both traffic-stabilizing and cost-efficient under reliability/security failures. In this paper, we consider a parallel queuing system with dynamic routing subject to such failures. For the reliability setting, we consider an infinite-horizon Markov decision process where the system operator strategically activates the protection mechanism upon each job arrival based on the traffic state. We use Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation to show that the optimal protection strategy is a deterministic threshold policy. For the security setting, we extend the model to an infinite-horizon stochastic game where the attacker strategically manipulates routing assignment. We show that a Markov perfect equilibrium of this game always exists and that both players follow a threshold strategy at each equilibrium. For both settings, we also consider the stability of the traffic queues in the face of failures. Finally, we develop approximate dynamic programming algorithms to compute the optimal/equilibrium policies and present numerical examples for validation and illustration.

**Keywords:** Queuing systems, cyber-physical security, stochastic games, Markov decision processes, HJB equation, Lyapunov function.

---

\*This work was in part supported by US NSF Award CMMI-1949710, C2SMART University Transportation Center, NYU Tandon School of Engineering, SJTU-UM Joint Institute, J. Wu & J. Sun Endowment Fund, and Cornell University McMullen Fellowship. Q. Xie is with the School of Operations Research and Information Engineering, Cornell University, USA. J. Wang is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, San Diego, USA. L. Jin is with the UM Joint Institute, and the Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China. Q. Xie and L. Jin were with the Tandon School of Engineering, New York University, USA. J. Wang was with the UM Joint Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China. (emails: qx66@cornell.edu, jiw139@ucsd.edu, li.jin@sjtu.edu.cn).

# 1 Introduction

Parallel queuing system is a typical model for characterizing a service system of multiple servers, each with a waiting queue. Real-world instances include packet switching networks [35, 21], manufacturing systems [24], transportation facilities [25], etc. Such systems use feedback from the state observation to generate routing decisions that ensure stability and improve throughput. Meanwhile, the feedback control relies heavily on connected cyber components for data collection and transmission. Such cyber components are subject to persistent threat due to random malfunctions and malicious attacks [8]. For instance, transportation infrastructure information (e.g., traffic sensors, traffic lights) and vehicle communications can be intruded and manipulated [17, 38, 1]. Real-world incidents indicated that a simulated traffic jam can cause motorists to deviate from their planned routes [20]. Similar security risks also exist in industrial control [3] and communication systems [2, 31, 12]. Such real-world systems will not be accepted by the authorities, the industry, and the public, unless the security problems are well addressed. However, cyber security risks have not been sufficiently studied in conjunction with the physical queuing dynamics. Moreover, it is economically infeasible and technically unnecessary to perfectly avoid cyber failures. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the impact due to such threats and to design strategic defense mechanisms.

In response to such concerns, we try to address the following two research questions:

- (i) *How to model the security vulnerabilities and quantify the security risks for parallel queuing systems?*
- (ii) *How to design traffic-stabilizing, cost-efficient defense strategies against failures?*

For the first question, we consider two scenarios of failures, viz. *reliability failures* and *security failures*. We quantitatively characterize the security risks in terms of failure-induced queuing delays and defending costs. For the second question, we analyze the stability criteria of the failure-prone system with defense, and characterize the structure of the cost-efficient strategies. We also develop algorithms to compute such strategies, and discuss how to incorporate the stability condition. Our results are demonstrated via a series of numerical examples and simulations.

This paper is related to two lines of work: queuing control and game theory. On the queuing side, the majority of the existing analysis and design are based on perfect observation of the states (i.e., queue lengths) and perfect implementation of the control [13, 23, 15, 21, 26]. Besides, researchers have noted the impact of delayed [28, 32], erroneous [6], or decentralized information [36]. Although these results provide hints for our problem, they do not directly apply to the security setting with failures such as imperfect sensing (state observation) and imperfect control implementation. On the game side, a variety of game-theoretic models have been applied to studying cyber-physical security in transportation [43, 29], communication [7, 2, 31], and infrastructure systems [46, 31]. However, to the best of our knowledge, security risks of feedback-controlled systems have not been well studied from a combined game-theoretic and feedback-control perspective, which is essential for capturing the coupling between the queuing dynamics and the attacker-defender interactions.

Our model includes two parts: the physical model (parallel queuing system) and the cyber model (dynamic routing subject to failures). Specifically, we consider a system of

parallel servers and queues with possibly faulty dynamic routing. Dynamic routing is a classical feedback control strategy that assigns jobs to one of the parallel queues according to the current system state (queue length). We assume that the routing instructions can be faulty due to the following two threats:

1. **Reliability failures.** Due to random malfunctions, a fault may occur to each arrival with a constant probability. For instance, the operator may lose the observation of the state or fail to deliver the routing instruction temporarily [19], and then the job joins a random queue; see Fig. 1a.
2. **Security failures.** An adversary may strategically launch attacks on the arrivals for selfish or malicious intent. Typical attack modes include (i) denial-of-service that cuts off the operator’s observation of the state [45, 44, 1], (ii) falsification that injects falsified data or creates fictitious traffic to mislead the operator [1, 38], and (iii) spoofing that manipulates the routing instruction (e.g., sending jobs to a busy server) by impersonating the operator [17, 38]. The consequence of an attack is that an incoming job joins a queue selected by the attacker; see Fig. 1b.

The system operator can protect/defend<sup>1</sup>the routing instructions for incoming jobs based on the state observation. The activation of protection/defense mechanisms induces a cost rate on the operator. For the reliability setting, we formulate the operator’s trade-off between queuing costs and protecting costs as an infinite-horizon, continuous-time, and discrete-state *Markov decision process*. For the security setting, we formulate the interaction between the attacker and the operator as an infinite-horizon *stochastic game*.


To study the stability of the queuing system, previous works typically relied on characterization or approximation of the steady-state distribution of the queuing state [18]; however, this approach is hard to be synthesized with failure models. In addition, it is hard to study the steady-state distribution of queuing systems with state-dependent transition rates. To address such challenges, we use a *Lyapunov function*-based approach to study the stability (in this paper we consider mean boundedness [33]) of queuing systems under control and to obtain upper bounds for the mean number of jobs in the system [34]. Such an approach has been applied to queuing systems in no-failure scenarios [27, 10, 14, 47]. Importantly, we use this approach to derive *stability criterion* for protection under reliability failures and defense against the security failures.

To analyze the cost efficiency of the system operator’s decision, we formulate the optimization problem in terms of queuing and protecting costs and then derive its *Hamiltonian-Jacobian-Bellman (HJB) equation* [48]. We show that the optimal protecting policy under reliability failures is a deterministic *threshold policy*: the operator either protects or does not protect, according to threshold functions in the multi-dimensional state space. Similar approaches have been discussed in [5, 22] for two queues, and we generalize the analysis to  $n$  queues and to failure-prone settings. For the attacker-defender game, we again use HJB equation to show the threshold properties of the *Markov perfect equilibria*.


The above analysis leads to useful insights for designing strategic protection/defense that are both stabilizing and cost-efficient. A key finding is that the system operator has

---

<sup>1</sup>In the rest of the paper, we use the word “protect” for the reliability setting and “defend” for the security setting.



(a) Scenario of reliability failures.



(b) Scenario of security failures.

Figure 1: An  $n$ -queue system with shortest-queue routing under reliability/security failures. See Section 2 for definitions of notations.

a higher incentive to protect/defend if the queues are more “unbalanced”. In addition, our numerical analysis shows that 1) the incentive to protect increases with the failure probability, decreases with the technological cost, and increases with the demand-capacity ratio; 2) the optimal protecting policy performs better than static policies such as never protect and always protect. We also note that the optimal decision is not always stabilizing. Considering this, we propose how to compute the stability-constrained optimal policy by imposing the stability condition on the HJB equation.

**Our contributions** lie in the following three aspects:

- **Modeling:** 1) We build a framework for modeling the cyber-physical vulnerabilities of queuing systems with feedback control (dynamic routing) subject to reliability/security failures. 2) We propose a formulation of protection under reliability failures as an infinite-horizon Markov decision process and defense against security failures as an attacker-defender stochastic game.
- **Analysis:** 1) We provide stability criteria under failures and control based on Lyapunov functions. 2) We show the threshold properties of the optimal protection and the game equilibria on multidimensional state space based on HJB equations.
- **Design:** Our theoretical results provide insights on the design of traffic-stabilizing and cost-efficient protecting policy and defending response. We also propose approximate dynamic programming algorithms to numerically compute the optimal policy and equilibrium strategies.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the queuing model and the failure models. Section 3 studies protection against reliability failures and Section 4 analyzes defense against security failures. Section 5 gives a concluding remark.

## 2 Parallel queuing system and failure models

### 2.1 Parallel queuing system

Consider a queuing system with  $n$  identical servers in parallel. Jobs arrive according to a Poisson process of rate  $\lambda > 0$ . Each server serves jobs at an exponential rate of  $\mu > 0$ . We use  $X(t) = [X_1(t) \ X_2(t) \ \cdots \ X_n(t)]^T$  to denote the number of jobs at time  $t$ , either waiting or being served, in the  $n$  servers, respectively. The state space of the parallel queuing system is  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Specifically, the initial system state (queue length) is  $X(0) = x = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \cdots \ x_n]^T$ .

We use  $x + (-)e_i$  to denote adding (subtracting) 1 from  $x_i$ . Since the queue lengths are always non-negative, i.e.  $x_i \geq 0$ , we use  $(x - e_i)^+ = \max(x - e_i, 0)$  to avoid the case that subtracting 1 makes the element negative. Let  $x_{\min} = \min_i x_i$  and  $x_{\max} = \max_i x_i$ . We use  $x_{-i}$  to denote variables in  $x$  other than  $x_i$ . We call  $x$  a diagonal vector if  $x_1 = x_2 = \cdots = x_n$  and a non-diagonal vector otherwise. Denote the one-norm of the vector  $x$  as  $\|x\|_1 := x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n$ . Then  $\|X(t)\|_1$  means the total number of jobs in the system at time  $t$ . We use  $x \succ \mathbf{0}$  to denote that  $x$  is not a zero vector, i.e.,  $\|x\|_1 > 0$ .

Without any failures, any incoming job is allocated to the shortest queue. If there are multiple shortest queues, then the job is randomly allocated to one of them with (not necessarily equal) probabilities.

## 2.2 Reliability failures

Suppose that when a job arrives at the system, the fault occurs with a constant probability  $a \in (0, 1]$ . The system operator can deploy additional security resources to ensure correct routing. Let  $\Delta(\{\text{NP}, \text{P}\}) := \{(1 - b, b) : b \in [0, 1]\}$  denote the probability distribution over the action set  $\{\text{not protect}, \text{protect}\}$ . The system operator selects a *Markovian policy*  $\beta : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \Delta(\{\text{NP}, \text{P}\})$  that depends only on the current state but not on the history of states and actions. We write  $b(x)$  as the state-dependent protecting probability at state  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . With a slight abuse of notation, when the policy is deterministic, we rewrite the mapping as  $\beta : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \{\text{NP}, \text{P}\}$ .

Protecting a job induces a one-time technological cost of  $c_b > 0$ . If the fault occurs but the system operator does not protect, the routing instruction is faulty, and the job joins a random queue; the probability of joining the  $i$ th queue is  $p_i \in [0, 1]$  where  $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ , and we define

$$p_{\max} = \max(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n).$$

Otherwise, the routing instruction is correct, and the job joins the shortest queue, as shown in Fig. 1a.

The objective of the system operator is to balance the queuing cost and the protecting cost. We formulate this problem as an *infinite-horizon continuous-time Markov decision process*. Specifically, the operator aims to minimize the expected cumulative discounted cost  $J(x; \beta)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(x) &:= \min_{\beta} J(x; \beta) \\ &= \min_{\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} C(X(t); \beta) dt \mid X(0) = x \right], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho \in (0, 1)$  is the discounted factor and  $C : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the cost rate defined as

$$C(\xi; \beta) = \|\xi\|_1 + c_b b(\xi).$$

The optimal protecting policy is essentially the policy that minimizes the expected cumulative discounted cost.

**Definition 1 (Optimal protecting policy)** *The optimal protecting policy  $\beta^*$  against reliability failures is defined as:*

$$\beta^*(x) := \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta} J(x; \beta), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n.$$

## 2.3 Security failures

Suppose that when each job arrives, a malicious attacker is able to manipulate the routing such that the job is allocated to a non-shortest queue. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the attacker's best action (and thus the operator's worst case), i.e., the job goes to the longest queue, as shown in Fig. 1b. Let  $\Delta(\{\text{NA}, \text{A}\}) := \{(1-a, a) : a \in [0, 1]\}$  denote the probability distribution over the action set {not attack, attack}. The attacker selects a (possibly mixed) *Markov strategy*  $\alpha : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \Delta(\{\text{NA}, \text{A}\})$ . With a slight abuse of notation, we write  $a(x)$  as the state-dependent attacking probability. Note that here  $a(x)$  has a different meaning from the constant fault probability  $a$  in the reliability failure setting. Attacking a job induces a one-time technological cost of  $c_a > 0$ .

The system operator's action is similar to that in the reliability setting. The only difference is that in the security setting, the system operator knows there is a strategic attacker making decisions simultaneously. We formulate the interaction between the attacker and the operator (also called defender) as an *infinite-horizon stochastic game* with Markov strategies that do not depend on the history of states and actions. The attacker aims to maximize the expected cumulative discounted reward  $V(x; \alpha, \beta)$  given the operator's Markov strategy  $\beta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} V_A^*(x; \beta) &:= \max_{\alpha} V(x; \alpha, \beta) \\ &= \max_{\alpha} \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\rho t} R(X(t); \alpha, \beta) dt \mid X(0) = x \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $R : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the immediate reward defined as

$$R(\xi; \alpha, \beta) = \|\xi\|_1 + c_b b(\xi) - c_a a(\xi).$$

Here the attacker's reward not only considers the queuing cost and the attacking cost, but also minus the defending cost. This is because the attacker has the incentive to increase the system's total operating cost, viz. the sum of queuing and defending costs. Similarly, the operator aims to minimize the expected cumulative discounted loss given the attacker's Markov strategy  $\alpha$ :

$$V_B^*(x; \alpha) = \min_{\beta} V(x; \alpha, \beta).$$

We can also define the Markov perfect equilibrium of such an attacker-defender game:

**Definition 2 (Markov perfect equilibrium)** *The equilibrium attacking (resp. defending) strategy  $\alpha^*$  (resp.  $\beta^*$ ) satisfies that for each state  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^*(x) &= \operatorname{argmax}_{\alpha} V(x; \alpha, \beta^*) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\alpha} V_A^*(x; \beta^*), \\ \beta^*(x) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta} V(x; \alpha^*, \beta) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta} V_B^*(x; \alpha^*). \end{aligned}$$

*The equilibrium value of the attacker (defender) is  $V_A^*(x; \beta^*)$  (resp.  $V_B^*(x; \alpha^*)$ ). In particular,  $(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$  is a Markov perfect equilibrium.*

### 3 Protection against reliability failures

In this section, we consider the design of the system operator's state-dependent protecting policy from two aspects: stability and optimality.

It is well known that a parallel  $n$ -queue system is stabilizable if and only if the demand is less than the total capacity, i.e.,  $\lambda < n\mu$ . In the following results, we will see that even this condition is met, in the absence of defense, reliability failures can still destabilize the queuing system, especially when the probability of failures is high and when the random faulty routing is highly heterogeneous; the following summarizes the above insights.

**Proposition 1** *The unprotected  $n$ -queue system with faulty probability  $a$  is stable if and only if*

$$\lambda < n\mu, \tag{2a}$$

$$ap_{\max}\lambda < \mu. \tag{2b}$$

Furthermore, when the system is stable, the long-time average number of jobs is upper-bounded by

$$\bar{X} := \frac{1}{t} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\tau=0}^t \mathbb{E}[X(\tau)] \leq \frac{\lambda + n\mu}{2 \left( \mu - \max(ap_{\max}, \frac{1}{n})\lambda \right)}.$$

The next result provides a stability criterion for an  $n$ -queue system with a given protecting policy. The proof of this result is presented in Section 3.1.

**Theorem 1 (Stability under reliability failures)** *Consider an  $n$ -queue system subject to reliability failures with probability  $a > 0$ . Suppose that the system operator selects a Markovian protecting policy  $\beta$  characterized by a state-dependent probability  $b(x) \in [0, 1]$  at each state  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Then we have the following:*

(i) *The system is stable if for every non-diagonal vector  $x$ , the protecting probability  $b(x)$  satisfies*

$$b(x) > 1 - \frac{\mu \|x\|_1 - \lambda x_{\min}}{a\lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min} \right)}. \tag{3}$$

(ii) *When (2a) holds, there must exist a policy satisfying (3). When (2b) holds, every policy satisfies (3).*

(iii) *If (3) holds, the long-time average number of jobs in the system is upper-bounded by*

$$\bar{X} \leq \frac{\lambda + n\mu}{2c}, \tag{4}$$

where

$$c = \min_{x > \mathbf{0}} \left\{ \mu - \lambda \frac{x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} - a(1 - b(x))\lambda \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} \right\}.$$



The next result characterizes the structure of the optimal protecting policy for the dynamic routing. The key findings are: 1) the optimal protecting policy is deterministic, i.e., the system operator either protects or does not protect; 2) the system operator chooses to protect when the queue lengths are more “unbalanced”.

**Theorem 2 (Optimal protecting policy)** *Consider a  $n$ -queue system subject to reliability failures. The optimal protecting policy  $\beta^*$  has the following properties:*

- (i)  $\beta^*$  is deterministic in the sense that either  $\beta^*(x) = NP$  or  $\beta^*(x) = P$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ .
- (ii)  $\beta^*$  is a threshold policy characterized by  $n$  threshold functions  $f_m$  ( $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ) via

$$b^*(x) = \mathbb{1} \left\{ \bigwedge_{m=1}^n (f_m(x) > 0) \right\},$$

where for each  $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,

- (a)  $f_m : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  separates the polyhedron  $\mathcal{X}_m = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid x_i \geq x_m, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  into two subsets:  $\{x \in \mathcal{X}_m \mid \beta^*(x) = NP\}$  and  $\{x \in \mathcal{X}_m \mid \beta^*(x) = P\}$  by means of

$$b^*(x) = \mathbb{1}\{f_m(x) > 0\}, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_m;$$

- (b) the optimal protecting probability  $b^*(x)$  is monotonically non-decreasing (resp. non-increasing) in  $x_i$  ( $\forall i \neq m$ ) (resp.  $x_m$ ) while other variables  $x_{-i}$  (resp.  $x_{-m}$ ) are fixed.




Figure 2: The characterization of the optimal protecting policy  $\beta^*$  for a two-queue system ( $p_1 = 0.1, p_2 = 0.9, \rho = 1, a = 0.9$ ).

Here the threshold functions qualitatively characterize the degree of “unbalancedness”. They separate the state space into  $n + 1$  subsets of states: one containing “balanced” states such that the action “not protect” is optimal, and the other  $n$  containing “unbalanced” states such that the action “protect” is optimal. See Fig. 2. The concept “threshold function” has appeared in previous works [5, 22, 41]. The rest of this section is devoted to the proofs and discussions of Theorem 1-2.

### 3.1 Stability under reliability failures

In this subsection, we provide a proof of the stability condition under the protected case (Theorem 1) and leave the proof of the stability condition under the unprotected case (Proposition 1) to Appendix A.1. Both proofs are based on Foster-Lyapunov drift condition [34].

*Proof of Theorem 1.* (i) and (iii) Consider the quadratic Lyapunov function

$$W(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2. \quad (5)$$

By applying *infinitesimal generator* [11, 4] under protecting policy  $\beta$  (denoted as  $\mathcal{L}^\beta$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\beta W(x) &= a(1 - b(x)) \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i ((x_i + 1)^2 - x_i^2) \\ &\quad + (1 - a(1 - b(x))) \frac{\lambda}{2} ((x_{\min} + 1)^2 - x_{\min}^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{x_i > 0} ((x_i - 1)^2 - x_i^2) \\ &= a(1 - b(x)) \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i + (1 - a(1 - b(x))) \lambda x_{\min} \\ &\quad - \mu \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \frac{1}{2} \lambda + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{x_i > 0\} \mu \\ &\leq a(1 - b(x)) \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min} \right) + (\lambda x_{\min} \\ &\quad - \mu \|x\|_1) + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda + n\mu). \end{aligned}$$

By (3) there exists constants  $c = \min_{x > \mathbf{0}} \{ \mu - \lambda \frac{x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} - a(1 - b(x)) \lambda \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} \} > 0$  and  $d = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda + n\mu)$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}^\beta W(x) \leq -c \|x\|_1 + d, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n. \quad (6)$$

By [34, Theorem 4.3], this drift condition implies the upper bound (4) and thus the stability.  $\square$

(ii) When  $\lambda < n\mu$ , for every non-diagonal vector  $x$ , we have  $\mu \|x\|_1 - \lambda x_{\min} > \mu \|x\|_1 - \lambda \frac{\|x\|_1}{n} = (\mu - \frac{\lambda}{n}) \|x\|_1 > 0$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min} > 0$ , then

$$1 - \frac{\mu \|x\|_1 - \lambda x_{\min}}{a \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min} \right)} < 1.$$

Thus,  $b(x) \equiv 1$  satisfies the stability condition (3) and  $\beta(x) \equiv \text{P}$  is a stabilizing policy that exists.

When  $\max(ap_{\max}, 1/n)\lambda < \mu$ , for every non-diagonal vector  $x$ , we have  $a\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i + (1-a)\lambda x_{\min} \leq \max(ap_{\max}, 1/n)\lambda \|x\|_1 < \mu \|x\|_1$ , and then

$$1 - \frac{\mu \|x\|_1 - \lambda x_{\min}}{a\lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min} \right)} < 0.$$

Thus, every policy satisfies the stability criterion (3).  $\square$

Theorem 1 provides a stability criterion for any state-dependent protecting probability. This implies that the operator needs to protect, i.e., choose some positive protecting probability to stabilize the system at certain states (queue lengths). We will use such stabilizing threshold probabilities to obtain a stability-constrained optimal policy. See Section 3.3 and Appendix A.5.

### 3.2 Optimal protecting policy

A standard way to solve the discounted infinite-horizon minimization problem (1) is to write down its HJB equation for optimality [9, Chapter 4]:

$$0 = \min_{\beta} \{ \|x\|_1 + c_b b(x) - \rho J^*(x) + \mathcal{L}^{\beta} J^*(x) \}. \quad (7)$$

We can rewrite it as the following recurrence form:

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho + \lambda + n\mu)J^*(x) = \min_{\beta} \left\{ \|x\|_1 + c_b b(x) + \right. \\ \left. \mu \sum_{i=1}^n J^*((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} J^*(x + e_j) + (1 - b(x))a\lambda \right. \\ \left. \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i J^*(x + e_i) - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} J^*(x + e_j) \right) \right\}. \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

The optimal protecting policy  $\beta^*$  is essentially the solution of (7) and (8). A direct observation is that when there is no failure, i.e.,  $a = 0$ , the system operator never needs to protect (i.e.,  $\forall x, \beta^*(x) = \text{NP}$ ); when all queue lengths are equal, i.e.,  $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$ , the operator deterministically chooses not to protect at this state  $x$  (i.e.,  $\beta^*(x) = \text{NP}$ ). Furthermore, Theorem 2(i) indicates that  $\beta^*$  is deterministic (not probabilistic) at each state, i.e., either protects or does not protect.

*Proof of Theorem 2(i).* The expression to be minimized in the right-hand side of the HJB equation (8) is linear in  $b(x)$ , so the minimum is reached at the endpoints, that is,  $b(x) = 0$  or  $b(x) = 1$ .  $\square$

Now the HJB equation (8) turns into

$$\begin{aligned}
(\rho + \lambda + n\mu)J^*(x) &= \min_{b \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \|x\|_1 + c_b b \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mu \sum_{i=1}^n J^*((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} J^*(x + e_j) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (1 - b)a\lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i J^*(x + e_i) - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} J^*(x + e_j) \right) \right\} \\
&:= \min_{b \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ c(x, b) + \sum_{x'} q(x'|x, b) J^*(x') \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $q(x'|x, b)$  are the transition rates from state  $x$  to state  $x'$  given protecting probability  $b$ . For example,  $q((x - e_i)^+|x, b) = \mu$  for  $b = 0, 1$ .

Using the uniformization trick [30, 37], we have

$$J^*(x) := \min_b \left\{ \tilde{c}(x, b) + \gamma \sum_{x'} p(x'|x, b) J^*(x') \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\Lambda = \lambda + n\mu$ ,  $\gamma = \Lambda/(\rho + \Lambda)$ ,  $\tilde{c}(x, b) = c(x, b)/(\rho + \Lambda)$  and  $p(x'|x, b) = q(x'|x, b)/\Lambda$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $\rho + \Lambda = 1$  in the following.

Before proving Theorem 2, we first present properties of the optimal cost function  $J^*$  since they are useful for showing the threshold property of optimal policy  $\beta^*$ .

**Proposition 2** *The optimal cost function  $J^* : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has the following properties:*

- (i) (symmetry)  $J^*$  is symmetric, i.e.,  $J^*(x) = J^*(\sigma x)$  where  $\sigma x$  is a permutation of  $x$ .
- (ii) (Schur convexity)  $J^*$  is Schur convex, i.e.,  $J^*(x + e_i) \geq J^*(x + e_j)$  if  $x_i \geq x_j$ .
- (iii) (monotonicity)  $J^*$  is non-decreasing, i.e.,  $J^*(x) \geq J^*(y)$  if  $x_i \geq y_i$  for all  $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ).
- (iv) (convexity)  $J^*$  is convex in each variable, i.e.,  $J^*(x + e_i) - J^*(x) \leq J^*(x + 2e_i) - J^*(x + e_i)$ .
- (v) (supermodularity)  $J^*$  is supermodular, i.e.,  $J^*(x + e_i + e_j) + J^*(x) \geq J^*(x + e_i) + J^*(x + e_j)$ .

The proof of Proposition 2 is left to Appendix A.3 and we will particularly use property (i)-(ii), i.e., symmetry and Schur convexity to prove Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2(ii).* Let  $m = \operatorname{argmin}_i x_i$ . Similar to the idea in [5, Chapter 4.6], we can demonstrate (a) the existence of the threshold functions by showing (b) the monotonicity of the optimal protecting probability:

$$\begin{aligned}
b^*(x + e_i) &\geq b^*(x), \quad \forall i \neq m \\
b^*(x + e_m) &\leq b^*(x).
\end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Now we prove (10). Because of Schur convexity,  $J^*(x + e_i) \geq J^*(x + e_m)$  ( $\forall i \neq m$ ). We can rewrite (9) as

$$J^*(x) = \min_{b \in \{0,1\}} \left\{ \|x\|_1 + c_b b + \mu \sum_{i=1}^n J^*((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \right. \\ \left. J^*(x + e_m) + (1 - b)a\lambda \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n p_i J^*(x + e_i) - J^*(x + e_m) \right] \right\}.$$

Let  $\Delta^*(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i J^*(x + e_i) - J^*(x + e_m)$ . Note that by Definition 1 and Theorem 2(i),  $b^*(x) = 1$  if  $\Delta^*(x) > c_b$  and  $b^*(x) = 0$  if  $\Delta^*(x) < c_b$ . Then the monotonicity of  $b^*$  is essentially the monotonicity of  $\Delta^*$ . Thus, (10) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^*(x + e_i) &\geq \Delta^*(x), \quad \forall i \neq m \\ \Delta^*(x + e_m) &\leq \Delta^*(x). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We defer the proof of (11) to Appendix A.2. The high-level idea is to use induction based on value iteration.  $\square$

To obtain an estimated optimal policy, we propose an algorithm called truncated policy iteration (TPI). See Algorithm 1 in Appendix A.5. It is adapted from the classic policy iteration algorithm [42] and based on the following value iteration form of the HJB equation (9):

$$J^{k+1}(x) = \min_b \left\{ \tilde{c}(x, b) + \gamma \sum_{x'} p(x'|x, b) J^k(x') \right\}. \tag{12}$$

Now we use the estimated optimal policy to conduct numerical analysis on 1) the relationship between the incentive to protect and the system parameters; 2) the comparison between the optimal policy and two naive static policies: always protect and never protects.

We first analyze the tipping points when the system operator starts to protect “riskier” states under the optimal policy  $\beta^*$ , i.e.,  $\exists x$  s.t.  $\beta^*(x) = P$ , as the failure probability  $a$  and technological cost  $c_b$  change. It can be seen from Fig. 3 that the incentive to protect is non-decreasing in the failure probability  $a$ , non-increasing in the technological cost  $c_b$  and non-decreasing in the demand-capacity ratio (a.k.a. *utilization ratio*)  $\rho = \lambda/\mu$ . That is, the system operator has higher incentive to protect when 1) the failure probability is higher; 2) the technological cost is lower; 3) the utilization ratio is higher.

In the following simulation, we will see that the optimal policy  $\beta^*$  can significantly reduce the security risk, compared to the static policies:  $\beta(x) \equiv P$  (always protects) and  $\beta(x) \equiv NP$  (never protects). See Fig. 4 where the yellow curves are below the red curves and the green curves. The Monte Carlo simulation result is based on the cumulative discounted cost within 50000s. Here the cumulative discounted cost is calculated as the sum of the total queuing cost and total technological cost in the episode, and we normalized it to be a value between 0 and 1. Note that under the static policy  $\beta(x) \equiv P$  (i.e.,  $\forall x, b(x) = 1$ ), the job always joins the shortest queue regardless of the failure probability, so the cumulative discounted cost is a constant (red curve).




Figure 3: The tipping points when the system operator starts to protect “riskier” states under the optimal policy as the failure probability and the technological cost change.




Figure 4: Comparison of the normalized cumulative discounted costs between the optimal policy and the static policies ( $p_1 = 0.1$ ,  $p_2 = 0.9$ ,  $\rho = 1.6$ ).

### 3.3 Stability-constrained optimal policy

The optimal policy may not always be stabilizing. For example, the optimal policy under the system parameters  $p_1 = 0.1$ ,  $p_2 = 0.9$ ,  $\rho = 1$ ,  $a = 0.9$  does not satisfy the stability condition (3). In this case, we can choose the optimal policy from the subset of policies satisfying the stability criterion, called *stability-constrained optimal policy*. The operator needs to randomize over  $\{P, NP\}$  at some states, see Fig. 5. We denote such policy as  $\hat{\beta}^*$  with state-dependent protecting probability  $\hat{b}^*(x)$ . Specifically, we can consider the stability-constrained MDP by imposing (3) on the HJB equation. Appendix A.5 gives a corresponding modification of the TPI algorithm.




Figure 5: The characterization of the stability-constrained optimal policy  $\hat{\beta}^*$  for a two-queue system ( $p_1 = 0.1$ ,  $p_2 = 0.9$ ,  $\rho = 1$ ,  $a = 0.9$ ).

Besides, we can have a quick check of the existence of a stabilizing policy and stabilizability of the optimal policy using stability conditions (2a)-(2b) as follows:

- When (2a)-(2b) hold, i.e.,  $\max(ap_{\max}, 1/n)\lambda < \mu$ , the optimal protecting policy is also stabilizing.
- When only (2a) holds, i.e.,  $\lambda/n < \mu \leq ap_{\max}\lambda$ , the optimal protecting policy may not be stabilizing.
- When (2a) does not hold, i.e.,  $\lambda \geq \mu n$ , no stabilizing protecting policy exists.

## 4 Defense against security failures

In this section, we analyze the attacker's attacking strategy and system operator's defending strategy from two aspects: stability and game equilibrium.

The following criterion can be used for checking the stability of the  $n$ -queue system under any state-dependent attacking and defending strategies:

**Theorem 3 (Stability under security failures)** Consider an  $n$ -queue system subject to security failures. Suppose that at each state  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , the attacker (resp. system operator) attacks (resp. defends) each job following Markov strategy  $\alpha$  (resp.  $\beta$ ) characterized by a state-dependent probability  $a(x) \in [0, 1]$  (resp.  $b(x) \in [0, 1]$ ). Then we have the following:

(i) The system is stable if for every non-diagonal vector  $x$ , the attacking and defending probabilities satisfy

$$a(x)(1 - b(x)) < \frac{\mu \|x\|_1 - \lambda x_{\min}}{\lambda(x_{\max} - x_{\min})}. \quad (13)$$

(ii) When  $\lambda < n\mu$ , there must exist a strategy  $\beta$  with defending probability  $b(x)$  satisfying (13).

(iii) Furthermore, if (13) holds, then the long-time average number of jobs is upper-bounded by

$$\bar{X} \leq \frac{\lambda + n\mu}{2c}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$c = \min_{x > \mathbf{0}} \left\{ \mu - \lambda \frac{x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} - a(x)(1 - b(x))\lambda \frac{x_{\max} - x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} \right\}.$$

The next result characterizes the structure of the strategy of the Markov perfect equilibria of the stochastic game: the equilibrium defending probability is higher when the queue lengths are more “unbalanced”.

**Theorem 4 (Markov perfect equilibrium)** For each Markov perfect equilibrium  $(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$  of the attacker-defender game, we have the following:

(i)  $(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$  is qualitatively different over the following three subsets of the state space  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ :

- (a)  $S_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid (\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x)) = (NA, NP)\}$ ; (“low risk”)
- (b)  $S_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid (\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x)) = (A, NP)\}$ ; (“medium risk”)
- (c)  $S_3 = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid (\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x)) \text{ is mixed}\}$ . (“high risk”)

(ii) The boundaries between  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , as well as those between  $S_2$  and  $S_3$  are characterized by threshold functions  $g_{ij}, h_{ij}$  ( $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ ) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (g_{ij}(x) < 0) \right\}, \\ S_2 &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (g_{ij}(x) > 0 \vee h_{ij}(x) < 0) \right\}, \\ S_3 &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (h_{ij}(x) > 0) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where for each  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  ( $i \neq j$ ),



- (a)  $g_{ij}, h_{ij} : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  separate the polyhedron  $\mathcal{X}_{ij} = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid x_i = x_{\max}, x_j = x_{\min}\}$  into three subsets:  $S_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_{ij}$ ,  $S_2 \cap \mathcal{X}_{ij}$  and  $S_3 \cap \mathcal{X}_{ij}$ ;
- (b) state  $x$  has a lower (resp. higher) or equal security level than state  $x + e_i$  (resp.  $x + e_j$ ).

Here the threshold functions also characterize the degree of “unbalancedness”. Intuitively,  $S_1$ – $S_3$  correspond to various security risk levels, and thus correspond to the incentive of the operator to defend: when the queues are more “unbalanced” and the risk is higher, the operator has a higher incentive to defend. Fig. 6 visualizes the equilibria for a two-queue system, which help understand Theorem 4. For a detailed argument about the relationship between the security levels and the system parameters (e.g., technological costs and utilization ratio), see Section 4.2.




Figure 6: The equilibrium attacking and defending strategies for a two-queue system ( $\rho = 1$ ,  $c_a = 0.1$ ,  $c_b = 0.2$ ).

We also find that the security game has four equilibrium regimes under different combinations of attacking cost  $c_a$  and defending cost  $c_b$ ; see Fig. 7. Each regime is labeled with corresponding subsets of Markov perfect equilibria and security levels.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proofs of Theorem 3-4, as well as an additional discussion on Markov perfect equilibrium.




Figure 7: Equilibrium regimes of the security game ( $\rho = 1.6$ ).

#### 4.1 Stability under security failures

*Proof of Theorem 3.* By applying infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{L}^{\alpha,\beta}$  under the attacking strategy  $\alpha$  and the defending strategy  $\beta$  to the same Lyapunov function (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^{\alpha,\beta}W(x) &= a(x)(1 - b(x))\lambda x_{\max} + (1 - a(x)(1 - b(x))) \\
&\quad \lambda x_{\min} - \sum_{i=1}^n \mu x_i + \frac{1}{2}\lambda + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{x_i > 0\}\mu \\
&\leq a(x)(1 - b(x))\lambda(x_{\max} - x_{\min}) \\
&\quad + \lambda x_{\min} - \mu\|x\|_1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + n\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (13) there exists  $c = \min_{x>0} \{\mu - \lambda \frac{x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1} - a(x)(1 - b(x))\lambda \frac{x_{\max} - x_{\min}}{\|x\|_1}\} > 0$  and  $d = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + n\mu)$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}^{\alpha,\beta}W(x) \leq -c\|x\|_1 + d, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n.$$

By [34, Theorem 4.3], this drift condition implies the upper bound (14) and thus the stability. Besides, when  $\lambda < n\mu$ , for every non-diagonal vector  $x$ , we have  $\mu\|x\|_1 \geq n\mu x_{\min} > \lambda x_{\min}$ , and  $x_{\max} > x_{\min}$ , implying  $\frac{\mu\|x\|_1 - \lambda x_{\min}}{\lambda(x_{\max} - x_{\min})} > 0$ . Thus, no matter what strategy the attacker chooses, the defending strategy with  $b(x) \equiv 1$  satisfies the stability condition (13).  $\square$

#### 4.2 Markov perfect equilibrium

For the stochastic attacker-defender game, we first show the existence of Markov perfect equilibrium.

**Proposition 3** *Markov perfect equilibrium  $(\alpha^*, \beta^*)$  of the stochastic attacker-defender game always exists.*

*Proof.* Note that the state space  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  is countable and the action space  $\{0, 1\}$  is finite (and thus compact). By [16, Theorem 1], Markov perfect equilibrium (also called discounted equilibrium point of policies) exists.  $\square$

Next, we discuss the derivation of Markov perfect equilibria. According to Shapley's extension on minimax theorem for stochastic game [39], the attacker and the defender have the same equilibrium (minimax) value:

$$V_B^*(x; \alpha^*) = V_A^*(x; \beta^*) = V^*(x).$$

Thus, we only need to compute the minimax value  $V^*$  of the stochastic game. Similar to the derivation of (9), we obtain the following HJB equation of the minimax problem (assuming  $\rho + \lambda + n\mu = 1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(x) = \max_{\alpha} \min_{\beta} & \left\{ \|x\|_1 + c_b b(x) - c_a a(x) + \right. \\ & \mu \sum_i V^*((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \min_j V^*(x + e_j) + a(x)(1 - b(x)) \\ & \left. \lambda \left( \max_j V^*(x + e_j) - \min_j V^*(x + e_j) \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For each state  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , let  $\delta^*(x) = \lambda(\max_j V(x + e_j) - \min_j V(x + e_j))$  and build an auxiliary matrix game

$$\begin{aligned} M(x, V^*) = & \left( \|x\|_1 + \mu \sum_{i=1}^n V^*((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \min_j V^*(x + e_j) \right) \\ & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & c_b \\ -c_a + \delta^*(x) & -c_a + c_b \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Then given  $\delta^*(x)$ , the equilibrium strategies  $(\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x))$  can be obtained by *Shapley-Snow method* [40], a convenient algorithm for finding the minimax value and equilibrium strategies of any two-player zero-sum game.

*Proof of Theorem 4(i).* Consider the matrix game  $M(x, V^*)$  defined as (16) where the attacker and the system operator are the row player and the column player. Based on Shapley-Snow method, the equilibrium strategies  $(\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x))$  are in the following three cases depending on the relationship between  $\delta^*(x)$  and the technological costs  $c_a, c_b > 0$ :

- (a) When  $\delta^*(x) \leq c_a$ , it is obvious that  $\alpha^*(x) = \text{NA}$  (i.e.,  $a^*(x) = 0$ ) is a dominant strategy. Then  $c_b > 0$  implies  $\beta^*(x) = \text{NP}$  (i.e.,  $b^*(x) = 0$ ). That is, the attacker has no incentive to attack, and thus the defender does not need to defend. At this pure strategy equilibrium, the security risk is low.

- (b) When the defending cost  $c_b$  is higher than the attacking cost  $c_a$ , and  $c_a < \delta^*(x) \leq c_b$ , it is obvious that  $\beta^*(x) = \text{NP}$  (i.e.,  $b^*(x) = 0$ ) is a dominant strategy. Then  $c_b > -c_a + c_b$  implies  $\alpha^*(x) = \text{A}$  (i.e.,  $a^*(x) = 1$ ). That is, the defender has no incentive to defend and consequently the attacker prefers to attack. At this pure strategy equilibrium, the security risk is higher than the first case but tolerable.
- (c) When  $\delta^*(x) > \max\{c_a, c_b\} > 0$ , no saddle point exists. Then both the attacker and the system operator consider mixed strategies such that  $a^*(x) = \frac{c_b}{\delta^*(x)}$ ,  $b^*(x) = 1 - \frac{c_a}{\delta^*(x)}$ . Particularly, the operator needs to select positive protecting probability, and now the security risk is high.

The above three cases correspond to the three subsets of states. Note that the subset  $S_2$  is empty when  $c_a > c_b$ .  $\square$

From the above proof, we observe that for fixed technological costs  $c_a$  and  $c_b$ , the security risk level is only higher when  $\delta^*$  is larger. Then as in the proof of Theorem 2, we use the fact that the monotonicity of the security risk level is equivalent to the monotonicity of  $\delta^*$  to show the threshold property of the equilibrium. Besides, since  $\delta^*$  is also related to the equilibrium value function  $V^*$ , we also need the following properties of  $V^*$ .

**Proposition 4** *The equilibrium value function  $V^* : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has the following properties:*

- (i)  $V^*$  is symmetric, i.e.,  $V^*(x) = V^*(\sigma x)$  where  $\sigma x$  is a permutation of  $x$ .
- (ii)  $V^*$  is Schur convex, i.e.,  $V^*(x + e_i) \geq V^*(x + e_j)$  if  $x_i \geq x_j$ .
- (iii)  $V^*$  is non-decreasing, i.e.,  $V^*(x) \geq V^*(y)$  if  $x_i \geq y_i$  for all  $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ).
- (iv)  $V^*$  is convex in each variable, i.e.,  $V^*(x + e_i) - V^*(x) \leq V^*(x + 2e_i) - V^*(x + e_i)$ .
- (v)  $V^*$  is supermodular, i.e.,  $V^*(x + e_i + e_j) + V^*(x) \geq V^*(x + e_i) + V^*(x + e_j)$ .

Since the proof of Proposition 4 is analogous to the proof of Proposition 2, we omit it here. Now we are ready to present the proof of Theorem 4(ii) which uses symmetry (property (i)) and Schur Convexity (property (ii)).

*Proof of Theorem 4(ii).* By symmetry, without loss of generality, we only need to consider the case when  $x_1 = x_{\max}$ ,  $x_n = x_{\min}$ . Besides, Schur convexity implies that  $V(x + e_1) = \max_j V(x + e_j)$ ,  $V(x + e_n) = \min_j V(x + e_j)$ . We can rewrite the HJB equation (15) as

$$\begin{aligned}
V^*(x) = \max_{\alpha} \min_{\beta} \left\{ \|x\|_1 + c_b b(x) - c_a a(x) + \lambda V^*(x + e_n) \right. \\
\left. + \mu \sum_i V^*((x - e_i)^+) + a(x)(1 - b(x))\delta^*(x) \right\}, \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta^*(x) = \lambda(V^*(x + e_1) - V^*(x + e_n))$ . Since the monotonicity of the security risk level of the states is equivalent to the monotonicity of  $\delta^*$ , and implies the existence of the threshold functions, it is sufficient to show that  $\delta^*$  is monotonically non-decreasing (resp.

non-increasing) in the largest variable  $x_1$  (resp. the smallest variable  $x_n$ ) when other variables are fixed; that is,

$$\delta^*(x + e_1) \geq \delta^*(x), \quad \delta^*(x + e_n) \leq \delta^*(x). \quad (18)$$

The proof of (18) also uses induction based on value iteration and can be found in Appendix A.4.  $\square$

Last, we discuss the numerical computation of the minimax value  $V^*(x)$  and the equilibrium strategies  $(\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x))$  for each state  $x$ . Based on the value iteration form of HJB equation (15), we develop an algorithm adapted from Shapley's algorithm [39, 2, 44]. See Algorithm 2 in Appendix 2.

The algorithm proceeds as follows. In each iteration and for each state  $x$ , let  $\delta(x) = \lambda(\max_j V(x + e_j) - \min_j V(x + e_j))$  and build an auxiliary matrix game  $M(x, V)$  similar to (16); then update  $V(x)$  with the minimax value  $val(M)$  given by Shapley-Snow method:

- when  $\delta(x) \leq c_a$ ,  $val(M) = \|x\|_1 + \mu \sum_{i=1}^n V((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \min_j V(x + e_j)$ ;
- when  $c_a < \delta(x) \leq c_b$ ,  $val(M) = \|x\|_1 - c_a + \mu \sum_{i=1}^n V((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \max_j V(x + e_j)$ ;
- when  $\delta(x) > \max\{c_a, c_b\}$ ,  $val(M) = \|x\|_1 + c_b + \mu \sum_{i=1}^n V((x - e_i)^+) + \lambda \min_j V(x + e_j) - \frac{c_a c_b}{\delta(x)}$ .

When  $V(x)$  converges to  $V^*(x)$ , we again use Shapley-Snow method to solve the matrix game  $M(x, V^*)$  and obtain the estimation of the equilibrium  $(\alpha^*(x), \beta^*(x))$ .

### 4.3 Equilibrium regimes

In the last subsection, we have seen that no medium risk states when  $c_a > c_b$ . Then in this subsection, we will discuss the existence of different security levels under different combinations of  $c_a$  and  $c_b$ .

In Fig. 7, various regimes correspond to particular combinations of security levels. Under large attacking cost, the attacker has no incentive to attack, then only the low risk states exist (see regime IV). When the attacking cost goes smaller but still greater than the defending cost ( $c_a > c_b$ ), not only the low risk states but also the high risk states exist (see regime III) since the attacker has less incentive to attack. As the defending cost increases to be greater than the attacking cost ( $c_b > c_a$ ), the defender has less incentive to defend, and now all risk levels including the medium risk exist (see regime II).

## 5 Concluding Remarks

In this work, we analyze the reliability and security risks of feedback-controlled parallel queuing systems and propose advice for strategic protection and defense. Our stability analysis

shows that without secure feedback control, the queuing system is vulnerable to random faults and malicious attacks, and our stability conditions can be used to check whether the feedback-controlled queuing system is stable under such failures. We also propose cost-efficient strategic defense advice for the system operator based on queue length, utilization ratio, and technical costs. Our theoretical results also provide practical insights for the design of fault-tolerant feedback control such as vehicle navigation, signal-free intersection control, flight dispatch, and data packet routing. Interesting future directions include 1) the extension to general queuing networks, and 2) the design of efficient (in both time and space) algorithms for estimating the optimal policy and equilibrium strategies.

## Acknowledgement

The authors appreciate the discussions with Manxi Wu, Siddhartha Banerjee, Zhengyuan Zhou, Yu Tang, Haoran Su, Xi Xiong, and Nairen Cao. Undergraduate student Dorothy Ng also contributed to this project.

## References

- [1] Mohammed Saeed Al-Kahtani. Survey on security attacks in vehicular ad hoc networks (vanets). In *2012 6th international conference on signal processing and communication systems*, pages 1–9. IEEE, 2012.
- [2] Tansu Alpcan and Tamer Başar. *Network security: A decision and game-theoretic approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [3] Martín Barrère, Chris Hankin, Nicolas Nicolaou, Demetrios G Eliades, and Thomas Parisini. Measuring cyber-physical security in industrial control systems via minimum-effort attack strategies. *Journal of information security and applications*, 52:102471, 2020.
- [4] Michel Benaïm, Stéphane Le Borgne, Florent Malrieu, and Pierre-André Zitt. Qualitative properties of certain piecewise deterministic markov processes. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 51, pages 1040–1075, 2015.
- [5] D Bertsekas. *Dynamic programming and optimal control, vol II: Approximate dynamic programming*, 2012.
- [6] Frederick J Beutler and Demosthenis Teneketzis. Routing in queueing networks under imperfect information: Stochastic dominance and thresholds. *Stochastics: An International Journal of Probability and Stochastic Processes*, 26(2):81–100, 1989.
- [7] Stephan Bohacek, Joao Hespanha, Junsoo Lee, Chansook Lim, and Katia Obraczka. Game theoretic stochastic routing for fault tolerance and security in computer networks. *IEEE transactions on parallel and distributed systems*, 18(9):1227–1240, 2007.

- [8] Alvaro Cardenas, Saurabh Amin, Bruno Sinopoli, Annarita Giani, Adrian Perrig, Shankar Sastry, et al. Challenges for securing cyber physical systems. In *Workshop on future directions in cyber-physical systems security*, volume 5. Citeseer, 2009.
- [9] Fwu-Ranq Chang. *Stochastic optimization in continuous time*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [10] Jim G Dai and Sean P Meyn. Stability and convergence of moments for multiclass queueing networks via fluid limit models. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(11):1889–1904, 1995.
- [11] Mark HA Davis. Piecewise-deterministic markov processes: A general class of non-diffusion stochastic models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 46(3):353–376, 1984.
- [12] Claudio De Persis and Pietro Tesi. Input-to-state stabilizing control under denial-of-service. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(11):2930–2944, 2015.
- [13] Anthony Ephremides, P Varaiya, and Jean Walrand. A simple dynamic routing problem. *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, 25(4):690–693, 1980.
- [14] Atilla Eryilmaz and Rayadurgam Srikant. Fair resource allocation in wireless networks using queue-length-based scheduling and congestion control. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 15(6):1333–1344, 2007.
- [15] Patrick Eschenfeldt and David Gamarnik. Join the shortest queue with many servers. the heavy-traffic asymptotics. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 43(3):867–886, 2018.
- [16] Awi Federgruen. On n-person stochastic games by denumerable state space. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 10(2):452–471, 1978.
- [17] Yiheng Feng, Shihong Ed Huang, Wai Wong, Qi Alfred Chen, Z Morley Mao, and Henry X Liu. On the cybersecurity of traffic signal control system with connected vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2022.
- [18] Robert D Foley and David R McDonald. Join the shortest queue: stability and exact asymptotics. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 11(3):569–607, 2001.
- [19] Howard Frank and Ivan T Frisch. Communication, transmission, and transportation networks. 1971.
- [20] Lidar Gravé-Lazi. Technion students find way to hack waze, create fake traffic jams. *The Jerusalem Post Available at: <https://www.jpost.com/enviro-tech/technion-students-find-way-to-hack-waze-create-fake-traffic-jams-346377>*, 2014.
- [21] Varun Gupta, Mor Harchol Balter, Karl Sigman, and Ward Whitt. Analysis of join-the-shortest-queue routing for web server farms. *Performance Evaluation*, 64(9-12):1062–1081, 2007.

- [22] Bruce Hajek. Optimal control of two interacting service stations. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 29(6):491–499, 1984.
- [23] Shlomo Halfin. The shortest queue problem. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 22(4):865–878, 1985.
- [24] Seyed M Iravani, Bora Kolfal, and Mark P Van Oyen. Capability flexibility: a decision support methodology for parallel service and manufacturing systems with flexible servers. *IIE Transactions*, 43(5):363–382, 2011.
- [25] Li Jin and Saurabh Amin. Stability of fluid queueing systems with parallel servers and stochastic capacities. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(11):3948–3955, 2018.
- [26] Charles Knessl, B Matkowsky, Zeev Schuss, and Charles Tier. Two parallel queues with dynamic routing. *IEEE transactions on communications*, 34(12):1170–1175, 1986.
- [27] PR Kumar and Sean P Meyn. Stability of queueing networks and scheduling policies. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(2):251–260, 1995.
- [28] Joy Kuri and Anurag Kumar. Optimal control of arrivals to queues with delayed queue length information. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 40(8):1444–1450, 1995.
- [29] Aron Laszka, Waseem Abbas, Yevgeniy Vorobeychik, and Xenofon Koutsoukos. Detection and mitigation of attacks on transportation networks as a multi-stage security game. *Computers & Security*, 87:101576, 2019.
- [30] Steven A Lippman. Applying a new device in the optimization of exponential queueing systems. *Operations Research*, 23(4):687–710, 1975.
- [31] Mohammad Hossein Manshaei, Quanyan Zhu, Tansu Alpcan, Tamer Bacşar, and Jean-Pierre Hubaux. Game theory meets network security and privacy. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 45(3):25, 2013.
- [32] Saied Mehdian, Zhengyuan Zhou, and Nicholas Bambos. Join-the-shortest-queue scheduling with delay. In *2017 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1747–1752. IEEE, 2017.
- [33] Sean P Meyn and Douglas Down. Stability of generalized jackson networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, pages 124–148, 1994.
- [34] Sean P Meyn and Richard L Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes iii: Foster–lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 25(3):518–548, 1993.
- [35] Michael Neely, Eytan Modiano, and Charlie Rohrs. Packet routing over parallel time-varying queues with application to satellite and wireless networks. In *PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL ALLERTON CONFERENCE ON COMMUNICATION CONTROL AND COMPUTING*, volume 39, pages 1110–1111. The University; 1998, 2001.



- [36] Yi Ouyang and Demosthenis Teneketzis. Signaling for decentralized routing in a queueing network. *Annals of Operations Research*, pages 1–39, 2015.
- [37] Martin L Puterman. *Markov decision processes: discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [38] Fatih Sakiz and Sevil Sen. A survey of attacks and detection mechanisms on intelligent transportation systems: Vanets and iov. *Ad Hoc Networks*, 61:33–50, 2017.
- [39] Lloyd S Shapley. Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 39(10):1095–1100, 1953.
- [40] Lloyd S Shapley and RN Snow. Basic solutions of discrete games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 1:27–35, 1952.
- [41] Shaler Stidham and Richard Weber. A survey of markov decision models for control of networks of queues. *Queueing systems*, 13(1):291–314, 1993.
- [42] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [43] Yu Tang, Yining Wen, and Li Jin. Security risk analysis of the shorter-queue routing policy for two symmetric servers. In *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 5090–5095. IEEE, 2020.
- [44] Jérôme Thai, Chenyang Yuan, and Alexandre M Bayen. Resiliency of mobility-as-a-service systems to denial-of-service attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 5(1):370–382, 2016.
- [45] Yang Wang, Chuang Lin, Quan-Lin Li, and Yuguang Fang. A queueing analysis for the denial of service (dos) attacks in computer networks. *Computer Networks*, 51(12):3564–3573, 2007.
- [46] Manxi Wu and Saurabh Amin. Securing infrastructure facilities: When does proactive defense help? *Dynamic Games and Applications*, pages 1–42, 2018.
- [47] Qian Xie and Li Jin. Stabilizing queueing networks with model data-independent control. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2022.
- [48] Jiongmin Yong and Xun Yu Zhou. *Stochastic controls: Hamiltonian systems and HJB equations*, volume 43. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.

## A Appendices

### A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Here we provide the proof of the stability condition under the unprotected space. The proof uses the standard results on the subdivision of a Poisson process and stability condition of the join the shortest queue system.

*Proof of proposition 1.* The unprotected  $n$ -queue system has  $n + 1$  classes of jobs. The  $i$ -th class enters server  $i$  as a Poisson process of rate  $ap_i\lambda$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ). The  $(n + 1)$ -th class enters the  $n$ -queue system as a Poisson process of rate  $(1 - a)\lambda$ ; when a job of this class arrives, the job joins the shorter queue. By [18, Theorem 1], the  $(n + 1)$ -class,  $n$ -queue system is stable if and only if

$$\max(ap_i\lambda/\mu, \lambda/(n\mu)) < 1,$$

which is equivalent to (2a)-(2b).

Consider the same quadratic Lyapunov function (5) and apply infinitesimal generator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}W(x) &= a\lambda \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n p_i ((x_i + 1)^2 - x_i^2) \\ &\quad + (1 - a)\lambda \frac{1}{2} ((x_{\min} + 1)^2 - x_{\min}^2) \\ &\quad + \mu \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{x_i > 0} ((x_i - 1)^2 - x_i^2) \\ &= a\lambda \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i + (1 - a)\lambda x_{\min} - \mu \sum_{i=1}^n x_i + \frac{1}{2}\lambda \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{x_i > 0} \mu \\ &\leq (\max(ap_{\max}, 1/n)\lambda - \mu) \|x\|_1 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + n\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (2a)-(2b) there exists a constant  $c = \mu - \max(ap_{\max}, 1/n)\lambda > 0$  and  $d = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + n\mu)$  such that

$$\mathcal{L}W(x) \leq -c\|x\|_1 + d, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n.$$

By [34, Theorem 4.3], this drift condition implies the upper bound and thus the stability.  $\square$

## A.2 Induction part of Theorem 2

In this subsection, we continue the proof of Theorem 2 with the induction proving (11).

Let  $\Delta^k(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i J^k(x + e_i) - J^k(x + e_m)$ , it is sufficient to show for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^k(x + e_i) &\geq \Delta^k(x), \quad \forall i \neq m \\ \Delta^k(x + e_m) &\leq \Delta^k(x). \end{aligned}$$

One can verify that the above hold for  $k = 0, 1, 2$ . Here we consider multiple base cases to avoid reaching trivial conclusions, say all inequalities are just equalities.

Now we show the inductive step. According to the value iteration (12), we have  $\forall j \neq m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta^{k+1}(x + e_j) - \Delta^{k+1}(x) \\
&= \mu \sum_{i=1}^n [\Delta^k((x + e_j - e_i)^+) - \Delta^k((x - e_i)^+)] \\
&\quad + \lambda [\Delta^k(x + e_j + e_m) - \Delta^k(x + e_m)] \\
&\quad + f^k(x + e_j) - f^k(x), \\
& \Delta^{k+1}(x + e_m) - \Delta^{k+1}(x) \\
&= \mu \sum_{i=1}^n [\Delta^k((x + e_m - e_i)^+) - \Delta^k((x - e_i)^+)] \\
&\quad + \lambda [\Delta^k(x + 2e_m) - \Delta^k(x + e_m)] \\
&\quad + f^k(x + e_m) - f^k(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $f^k(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \min \{c_b, a\lambda\Delta^k(x + e_i)\} - \min \{c_b, a\lambda\Delta^k(x + e_m)\}$ .

Note that based on the induction hypothesis, we have  $\forall j \neq m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta^k((x + e_j - e_i)^+) &\geq \Delta^k((x - e_i)^+) \geq \Delta^k((x + e_m - e_i)^+), \\
\Delta^k(x + e_j + e_i) &\geq \Delta^k(x + e_i) \geq \Delta^k(x + e_m + e_i), \\
\Delta^k(x + e_j + e_m) &\geq \Delta^k(x + e_m) \geq \Delta^k(x + 2e_m).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta^{k+1}(x + e_j) &\geq \Delta^{k+1}(x) \quad (\forall j \neq m) \\
\Delta^{k+1}(x) &\leq \Delta^{k+1}(x + e_m).
\end{aligned}$$

### A.3 Proof of Proposition 2

We present the proofs of property (i) and (ii) below, and omit the proofs of (iii)-(v), as we only need symmetry and Schur convexity for proving Theorem 2 while the proofs of other properties are tedious and analogous.

*Proof of Proposition 2.* (i) Note that for any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ ,

- $\|\sigma x\|_1 = \|x\|_1$ ,
- $\{\sigma((x - e_1)^+), \dots, \sigma((x - e_n)^+)\}$  is a permutation of  $\{(x - e_1)^+, \dots, (x - e_n)^+\}$ ,

- $\{\sigma(x + e_1), \dots, \sigma(x + e_n)\}$  is a permutation of  $\{x + e_1, \dots, x + e_n\}$ ,

then by (9) we can conclude that  $J^*(x) = J^*(\sigma x)$ .

(ii) We will use induction to prove  $x_i \geq x_j$  implies  $J^k(x + e_i) \geq J^k(x + e_j)$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For the base cases, it is easy to verify that  $J^0 = 0$ ,  $J^1(x) = \|x\|_1$  and  $J^2(x) = (1 + \Lambda)\|x\|_1 + \lambda - \mu \sum_i \mathbb{I}_{x_i > 0}$ . Then we have  $x_i \geq x_j \Rightarrow J^2(x + e_i) \geq J^2(x + e_j)$  for any  $x$ . Note that the inequality is strict for some  $x$ , say  $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Now we show the inductive step. According to the value iteration (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& J^{k+1}(x + e_i) - J^{k+1}(x + e_j) \\
&= \mu \sum_{l=1}^n [J^k((x + e_i - e_l)^+) - J^k((x + e_j - e_l)^+)] \\
&+ \lambda \left[ \min_l J^k(x + e_i + e_l) - \min_l J^k(x + e_j + e_l) \right] \\
&+ \min \left\{ c_b, a\lambda \left[ \sum_{l=1}^n p_l J^k(x + e_i + e_l) - \min_l J^k(x + e_i + e_l) \right] \right\} \\
&- \min \left\{ c_b, a\lambda \left[ \sum_{l=1}^n p_l J^k(x + e_j + e_l) - \min_l J^k(x + e_j + e_l) \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that based on the induction hypothesis, when  $x_i \geq x_j$ ,  $\forall l$  ( $1 \leq l \leq n$ ) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& J^k((x - e_l)^+ + e_i) \geq J^k((x - e_l)^+ + e_j), \\
& J^k(x + e_i + e_l) \geq J^k(x + e_j + e_l),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& J^k((x + e_i - e_l)^+) \geq J^k((x + e_j - e_l)^+), \\
& \min_l J^k(x + e_i + e_l) \geq \min_l J^k(x + e_j + e_l).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can conclude that

$$J^{k+1}(x + e_i) \geq J^{k+1}(x + e_j).$$

Therefore, the Schur convexity  $x_i \geq x_j$  implies  $J^*(x + e_i) \geq J^*(x + e_j)$  always holds.  $\square$

## A.4 Induction part of Theorem 4

In this subsection, we continue the proof of Theorem 4 with the induction proving (18).

Let  $\delta^k(x) = \lambda(V^k(x + e_1) - V^k(x + e_n))$ , it is sufficient to show for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\delta^k(x + e_1) \geq \delta^k(x), \quad \delta^k(x + e_n) \leq \delta^k(x).$$

For the base cases, one can verify that the above inequalities hold for  $k = 0, 1, 2$ . Now we show the inductive step. According to the value iteration form of formula (17),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta^{k+1}(x + e_1) - \delta^{k+1}(x) \\
&= \mu[\delta^k(x) - \delta^k((x - e_1)^+)] \\
&+ \mu[\delta^k((x + e_1 - e_n)^+) - \delta^k((x - e_n)^+)] \\
&+ \lambda[\delta^k(x + e_1 + e_n) - \delta^k(x + e_n)] \\
&+ g^k(x + 2e_1) - g^k(x + e_1 + e_n) - g^k(x + e_1) + g^k(x + e_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$g^k(x) = \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ \delta^k(x) - c_a, c_b - \frac{c_a c_b}{\delta^k(x)} \right\} \right\}.$$

Note that based on the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^k((x + e_1 - e_n)^+) &\geq \delta^k((x - e_n)^+) \geq \delta^k(x) \geq \delta^k((x - e_1)^+), \\
\delta^k(x + 2e_1) &\geq \delta^k(x + e_1) \geq \delta^k(x + e_1 + e_n) \geq \delta^k(x + e_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we can conclude that  $\delta^{k+1}(x + e_1) \geq \delta^{k+1}(x)$  and prove  $\delta^{k+1}(x) \leq \delta^{k+1}(x + e_n)$  in a similar way.

## A.5 Truncated policy iteration

In this subsection, we present the truncated policy iteration algorithm for estimating stability-constrained optimal policy. This algorithm is adapted from the classic policy iteration algorithm [42] by combining the stability condition (3). Since the original state space is countably infinite, here we set a boundary to make the state space finite so that the algorithm can terminate in finite steps.

---

**Algorithm 1** Truncated policy iteration for estimating optimal policy  $\beta \approx \beta^*$  (continuing)

---

Algorithm parameter: small  $\epsilon > 0$

Input: arrival rate  $\lambda$ , service rate  $\mu$ , number of queues  $n$ , one-time protecting cost  $c_b$ , the probability of joining queues  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$

Initialize arrays:  $J(x) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $b(x) \in \{0, 1\}$  arbitrarily (e.g.,  $J(x) = 0$ ,  $b(x) = 0$ ) for all  $x \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, \dots, B\}^n$  #  $B$  is the queue length upper bound <sup>1</sup>

**repeat**

**repeat**

$\Delta \leftarrow 0$  # Policy evaluation

**foreach**  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  **do**

$v \leftarrow J(x)$

$c \leftarrow |x| + c_b b(x)$

$J(x) \leftarrow c + \sum_{x'} p(x'|x, b) J(x')$

$\Delta \leftarrow \max(\Delta, |v - J(x, b)|)$

**end**

**until**  $\Delta < \epsilon$ ;

$stable \leftarrow True$  # Policy improvement

**foreach**  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  **do**

        old-action  $\leftarrow b(x)$

**if**  $a\lambda \left( \sum_i p_i J^*(x + e_i) - \min_j J^*(x + e_j) \right) \leq c_b$  **then**

$b(x) = 0$  <sup>2</sup>

**end**

**else**

$b(x) = 1$

**end**

**if** old-action  $\neq \pi(x)$  **then**

$stable \leftarrow False$

**end**

**end**

**until**  $stable = True$ ;

Output  $\beta = (1 - b)NP + bP \approx \beta^*$

---

## A.6 Adapted Shapley's algorithm

Here we present the adapted Shpaley's algorithm for computing the minimax value and equilibrium strategies of the attacker-defender stochastic game. In each iteration, it builds an auxiliary matrix game and obtains the minimax value using Shapley-Snow method [40].

<sup>1</sup>Since the estimation errors are relative large at the boundary, we can set  $B$  to be larger than the real upper bound.

<sup>2</sup>For computing the stability-constrained optimal policy, we can modify the algorithm as follows. In the initialization, for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , if  $x_1 = \dots = x_n$  then continue, else set  $\theta(x) = \max \left( 1 - \frac{\mu \|x\| |1 - \lambda x_{\min}|}{a\lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i - x_{\min} \right)}, 0 \right)$ .

Then in the policy improvement, replace  $b(x) = 0$  with  $b(x) = \theta(x)$ .

---

**Algorithm 2** Adapted Shapley's algorithm for estimating equilibrium strategies  $\beta \approx \beta^*$ ,  $\alpha \approx \alpha^*$  (continuing)

---

Set  $V(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, B\}^{n-1}$

**repeat**

$\Delta \leftarrow 0$

**foreach**  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  **do**

$v \leftarrow V(x)$

        Build auxiliary matrix game  $M(x, V)$

        Compute the minimax value  $val(M)$  by using *Shapley-Snow method*

$V(x) \leftarrow val(M)$

$\Delta \leftarrow |v - V(x)|$

**end**

**until**  $\Delta < \epsilon$ ;

**foreach**  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  **do**

    Build auxiliary matrix game  $M(x, V)$

    Compute  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  from  $M(x, V)$  by using *Shapley-Snow method*

**end**

---