

Probabilistic analysis of three-player symmetric quantum games played using EPR setting

Azhar Iqbal^{a,b}, Taksu Cheon^c, and Derek Abbott^a

^aSchool of Electrical & Electronic Engineering, The University of Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia.

^bCentre for Advanced Mathematics and Physics, National University of Sciences & Technology, Campus of College of Electrical & Mechanical Engineering, Peshawar Road, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.

^cKochi University of Technology, Tosa Yamada, Kochi 782-8502, Japan.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Three-player symmetric games	2
2.1	Three-player Prisoner’s Dilemma	3
3	Playing three-player games using coins	4
3.1	Three-coin setup	5
3.2	Six-coin setup	5
3.2.1	Payoff relations and the Nash equilibria	6
3.3	Playing Prisoner’s Dilemma	8
3.3.1	With three-coin setup	8
3.3.2	With six-coin setup	8
4	Three-player quantum games	10
4.1	Three-player quantum games using EPR setting	10
4.2	Three-player quantum Prisoner’s Dilemma	13
4.2.1	Fate of the classical Nash equilibrium	15
5	Discussion	15

Abstract

This paper extends our probabilistic framework for two-player quantum games to the multiplayer case, while giving a unifying perspective on both classical and quantum games. Considering joint probabilities in the standard Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) setting for three observers, we use this setting in order to play general three-player non-cooperative symmetric games. We analyze how the peculiar non-factorizable joint probabilities provided by the EPR setting can change the outcome of a game, while requiring that the quantum game attains a classical interpretation for factorizable joint probabilities. In this framework, our analysis of the three-player generalized Prisoner’s Dilemma (PD) shows that the players can indeed escape from the classical outcome of the game, because of non-factorizable joint probabilities that the EPR setting can provide. This surprising result for three-player PD contrasts strikingly with our earlier result for two-player PD, played in the same framework, in which even non-factorizable joint probabilities do not result in escaping from the classical consequence of the game.

1 Introduction

Although multiplayer games have been extensively studied in the game theory literature [1,2] their analysis is often more complex than for two-player games [3]. Economics [4] and mathematical biology [5–7] are the areas where most applications of multiplayer games are usually found.

Game-like situations involving many agents were brought to quantum regime in 1990 by Mermin [8,9]. He analyzed a multiplayer game that can be won with certainty when it is played using spin-half particles in a Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state [10]. He showed that no classical strategy can win his game with certainty, whereas a quantum strategy can do so.

An interesting three agent situation in the quantum regime was discussed by Vaidman [11,12], in 1999, who illustrated the GHZ paradox [10] using a game among three players, which is well known in literature as the Vaidman’s game. In a similar vein, Aharonov and Rohrlich [13] and Fulton [14] have discussed a quantum shell game for which quantum mechanics significantly helps its chances of winning.

The motivation behind these works is using games to demonstrate the remarkable, and often counter intuitive, quantum correlations that arise when many agents interact while sharing quantum resources.

With the advent of the area of quantum game theory in 1999 [15,16] systematic procedures were suggested [17–33] to quantize a given game, which quite often is a noncooperative game and is given in its normal-form [1].

Quantum game theory introduces a distinct approach to playing games, while sharing quantum resources. Instead of inventing special games in which the weird quantum correlations manifest themselves in some strange way, quantum game theory proposes generalized quantization procedures for given and very often for well known games. That is, instead of tailoring a ‘winning condition’ for some invented games, which understandably can only be satisfied using quantum resources, quantum game theory re-expresses quantum correlations in terms of different or displaced solution(s) or the outcome(s) of well known games. The emphasis is, therefore, shifted from inventing games with invented winning conditions, often suitably tailored to be fulfilled only by sharing quantum resources, to writing prescription(s) for quantizing games and to bringing game theory to the domain of quantum mechanics.

In the area of quantum game theory, multiplayer games were first studied by Benjamin and Hayden [17] and have subsequently been considered by many others [34–41].

This paper extends to multiplayer quantum games the probabilistic framework originally proposed for two-player noncooperative games by present authors in Ref. [42]. This framework unifies classical and quantum two-player games while using standard Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) setting [43–50] to play a two-player game.

It has been reported in literature [51–53] that joint probabilities in EPR setting may not be factorizable. This led us in Ref. [42] to construct quantum games from non-factorizable joint probabilities. To ensure that the classical game remains embedded within the corresponding quantum game, this framework requires that quantum game attains a classical interpretation when joint probabilities are factorizable. As this framework proposes an entirely probabilistic argument to construct quantum games it thus provides a unifying perspective for both classical and quantum games. It also presents a more accessible analysis of quantum games, which can be of potential interest to readers outside the quantum physics domain.

2 Three-player symmetric games

We consider three-player symmetric (noncooperative) games in which three players (henceforth labelled as Alice, Bob, and Charles) make their choices simultaneously. We assume that each player has two choices that are his/her pure strategies. After the players have made their choices, a referee rewards them using payoff relations made public at the start of the game. Players’ rewards depend on the game they play, their strategies, and the set of joint probabilities relevant to the probabilistic system the players share to play the game.

We assume Alice's strategies are S_1, S_2 ; Bob's strategies are S'_1, S'_2 ; and Charles' strategies are S''_1, S''_2 , and that we have the following pure-strategy payoff relations [37] that define the game

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &= \alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) &= \alpha_5, \beta_5, \gamma_5; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &= \alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) &= \alpha_6, \beta_6, \gamma_6; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) &= \alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) &= \alpha_7, \beta_7, \gamma_7; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) &= \alpha_4, \beta_4, \gamma_4; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2) &= \alpha_8, \beta_8, \gamma_8;
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the subscripts A, B , and C refer to Alice, Bob, and Charles, respectively. In one of these payoff relations, the three entries in brackets on left side are Alice's, Bob's, and Charles' pure strategies, respectively, and the three numbers on the right side are their rewards, respectively. For example, $\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) = \alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3$ states that Alice, Bob, and Charles obtain $\alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3$, respectively, when they play the strategies S_1, S'_2, S''_1 , respectively.

In repeated runs, a player can choose between his/her two choices with some probability, which defines his/her mixed-strategy. We denote a mixed-strategy by $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ for Alice, Bob, and Charles, respectively. These are probabilities with which Alice, Bob, and Charles play the pure strategies S_1, S'_1, S''_1 , respectively. They then play the pure strategies S_2, S'_2, S''_2 with probabilities $(1-x), (1-y), (1-z)$, respectively, and the mixed-strategy payoff relations, therefore, read

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(x, y, z) &= xyz\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) + x(1-y)z\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) + \\
&xy(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) + x(1-y)(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) + \\
&(1-x)yz\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) + (1-x)(1-y)z\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) + \\
&(1-x)y(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) + (1-x)(1-y)(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In this paper we consider symmetric three-player games defined by the condition that a player's payoff is decided by his/her strategy and not by his/her identity. Mathematically, this is expressed by the conditions

$$\Pi_A(x, y, z) = \Pi_A(x, z, y) = \Pi_B(y, x, z) = \Pi_B(z, x, y) = \Pi_C(y, z, x) = \Pi_C(z, y, x). \tag{3}$$

The payoff relations (2) satisfy these conditions (3) when [37],

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_1 &= \alpha_1, & \beta_2 &= \alpha_3, & \beta_3 &= \alpha_2, & \beta_4 &= \alpha_3, \\
\beta_5 &= \alpha_6, & \beta_6 &= \alpha_5, & \beta_7 &= \alpha_6, & \beta_8 &= \alpha_8, \\
\gamma_1 &= \alpha_1, & \gamma_2 &= \alpha_3, & \gamma_3 &= \alpha_3, & \gamma_4 &= \alpha_2, \\
\gamma_5 &= \alpha_6, & \gamma_6 &= \alpha_6, & \gamma_7 &= \alpha_5, & \gamma_8 &= \alpha_8, \\
\alpha_6 &= \alpha_7, & \alpha_3 &= \alpha_4.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

A symmetric three-player game can, therefore, be defined by only six constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_6$, and α_8 . In the rest of this paper we will define these six constants to be $\alpha, \beta, \delta, \epsilon, \theta, \omega$ where $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_2 = \beta, \alpha_3 = \delta, \alpha_5 = \epsilon, \alpha_6 = \theta$, and $\alpha_8 = \omega$. The pure-strategy payoff relations (1) are then re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &= \alpha, \alpha, \alpha; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) &= \epsilon, \theta, \theta; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &= \beta, \delta, \delta; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) &= \theta, \epsilon, \theta; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) &= \delta, \beta, \delta; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) &= \theta, \theta, \epsilon; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) &= \delta, \delta, \beta; & \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2) &= \omega, \omega, \omega.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

2.1 Three-player Prisoner's Dilemma

Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) is a noncooperative game [1] widely known in the areas of economics, social and political sciences. In recent years quantum physics has been added to this list. This game was investigated [16] early in the history of quantum games and is known to have had provided significant motivation for further work in this area.

Two-player PD is about two criminals (treated hereafter as players) who are arrested after having committed a crime. The investigators have the following plan to make them confess their crime. Both are placed in separate cells and are not allowed to communicate (noncooperative

game). They are contacted individually and are asked to choose between two choices (strategies): *to confess* (D) and *not to confess* (C), where C and D stand for Cooperation and Defection and this well-known wording of their available choices refers to the fellow prisoner and not to the authorities.

The rules state that if neither prisoner confesses, i.e. (C, C) , both are given freedom; when one prisoner confesses (D) and the other does not (C), i.e. (C, D) or (D, C) , the prisoner who confesses gets freedom as well as financial reward, while the prisoner who did not confess ends up in the prison for a longer term. When both prisoners confess, i.e. (D, D) , both are given a reduced term.

In two-player case the strategy pair (D, D) comes out as the unique NE (and the rational outcome) of the game, leading to the situation of both having reduced term. The game offers a dilemma as the rational outcome (D, D) differs from the outcome (C, C) , which is an available choice, and for which both prisoners get freedom.

The three-player PD is defined by making the association:

$$S_1 \sim C, S_2 \sim D, S'_1 \sim C, S'_2 \sim D, S''_1 \sim C, S''_2 \sim D \quad (6)$$

and afterwards imposing the following conditions [54]:

a) The strategy S_2 is a dominant choice [1] for each player. For Alice this requires:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &> \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_1), \\ \Pi_A(S_2, S'_2, S''_2) &> \Pi_A(S_1, S'_2, S''_2), \\ \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) &> \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_2), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and similar inequalities hold for players Bob and Charles.

b) A player is better off if more of his opponents choose to cooperate. For Alice this requires:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &> \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) > \Pi_A(S_2, S'_2, S''_2), \\ \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &> \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) > \Pi_A(S_1, S'_2, S''_2), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and similar relations hold for Bob and Charles.

c) If one player's choice is fixed, the other two players are left in the situation of a two-player PD. For Alice this requires:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) &> \Pi_A(S_2, S'_2, S''_2), \\ \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &> \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_2), \\ \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) &> (1/2) \{ \Pi_A(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) + \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) \}, \\ \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &> (1/2) \{ \Pi_A(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) + \Pi_A(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and similar relations hold for Bob and Charles.

Translating the above conditions while using the notation introduced in (5) requires:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{a) } &\beta > \alpha, \quad \omega > \epsilon, \quad \theta > \delta \\ \text{b) } &\beta > \theta > \omega, \quad \alpha > \delta > \epsilon \\ \text{c) } &\delta > \omega, \quad \alpha > \theta, \quad \delta > (1/2)(\epsilon + \theta), \quad \alpha > (1/2)(\delta + \beta) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which define a generalized three-player PD. For example [54], all of these conditions hold by letting $\alpha = 7, \beta = 9, \delta = 3, \epsilon = 0, \omega = 1, \theta = 5$ all of these conditions hold.

3 Playing three-player games using coins

Consider the situation when three players share a probabilistic system to play the three-player symmetric game defined in the Section (2). For this system, in a run, a player has to choose one out of two choices and, in either case, the outcome (of some measurement, or observation, which follows after players have made their choices) is either $+1$ or -1 .

When we associate $+1$ to the head and -1 to the tail of a coin, sharing coins (not necessarily unbiased) can provide a possible physical realization of a probabilistic physical system. In the

following we consider two setups, both of which use coins in order to play the symmetric three-player game (5). It is found that the later setup provides the appropriate arrangement to introduce joint probabilities (associated to an EPR setting involving three observers) to the playing of a three-player game.

In the standard EPR setting, in a run, each one of the spatially-separated observers makes one of two measurements, the outcome of which, for either of the two measurements, is either +1 or -1.

3.1 Three-coin setup

The most natural scenario for playing a three-player game, when they share a probabilistic physical system of three coins, is the one when in a run each player is given a coin in a ‘head up’ state, and ‘to flip’ or to ‘not to flip’ are the player’s available strategies. We denote Alice’s, Bob’s, and Charles’ strategy ‘to flip’ by S_1 , S'_1 , and S''_1 , respectively, and likewise, we denote Alice’s, Bob’s, and Charles’ strategy ‘not to flip’ by S_2 , S'_2 , and S''_2 , respectively. The three coins are then passed to a referee who rewards players after observing the state of the three coins.

In repeated runs, the players Alice, Bob, and Charles can play mixed strategies denoted by $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$, respectively. Here x, y, z are the probabilities to choose S_1 (out of S_1 and S_2), S'_1 (out of S'_1 and S'_2), and S''_1 (out of S''_1 and S''_2), by Alice, Bob, and Charles, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(x, y, z) = & xyz(\alpha, \alpha, \alpha) + x(1-y)z(\delta, \beta, \delta) + xy(1-z)(\delta, \delta, \beta) + \\ & x(1-y)(1-z)(\epsilon, \theta, \theta) + (1-x)yz(\beta, \delta, \delta) + (1-x)(1-y)z(\theta, \theta, \epsilon) + \\ & (1-x)y(1-z)(\theta, \epsilon, \theta) + (1-x)(1-y)(1-z)(\omega, \omega, \omega) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Assume (x^*, y^*, z^*) is a Nash equilibrium (NE) [1]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_A(x, y^*, z^*) &\geq 0, \\ \Pi_B(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_B(x^*, y, z^*) &\geq 0, \\ \Pi_C(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_C(x^*, y^*, z) &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the following we will use “NE” when we refer to either a Nash equilibrium or to Nash equilibria, as determined by the context. We call this arrangement, which uses three coins to play a three-player game, the *three-coin setup*.

3.2 Six-coin setup

The three-player game (5) can also be played using six coins (not necessarily unbiased) instead of the three. Two coins are assigned to each player before the game begins. In a run each player chooses one out of the two, which defines his/her strategy in the run. Three coins are, therefore, chosen in a run. The three chosen coins are passed to a referee who tosses them together and observes the outcome. Many such outcomes are observed as the process of receiving, choosing, and subsequently tossing the chosen coins is repeated many times.

After many runs, the referee rewards the players according to their strategies (i.e. which coin(s) they have had chosen over many runs), the outcomes of several tosses giving rise to the underlying statistics of the coins and from the six coefficients defining the three-player symmetric game defined in Section (2).

Notice that coins are tossed in each run, which makes playing of a game inherently probabilistic both in content and character, thus paving the way to step into the quantum regime and to introduce quantum probabilities.

We call this arrangement of using six coins for playing a three-player game the *six-coin setup*. Why introduce a six-coin setup when a three-player game can also be played in three-coin setup? The answer is provided by the EPR setting that involves three observers and 64 joint probabilities. The six coin setup allows us to translate the playing of a three-player game in terms of 64 joint probabilities. When these joint probabilities are quantum mechanical (and are obtained from

an EPR setting involving three observers) they may have the unusual character of being non-factorizable. That is, the six-coin setup serves as an intermediate step allowing us to see the impact of non-factorizable quantum probabilities on the solution of a game.

In the six-coin setup, a player plays a pure strategy¹ when s/he chooses the same coin over all the runs and s/he plays a mixed strategy when s/he chooses his/her first coin with some probability over the runs.

Notice that, by its construction, this setup requires a large number of runs to play a game irrespective of whether players play pure strategies or mixed strategies, as in either case players' rewards depend on outcomes of many tosses.

We denote Alice's two coins by S_1, S_2 ; Bob's two coins by S'_1, S'_2 ; and Charles' two coins by S''_1, S''_2 . The head of a coin is associated (as it is in the three-coin setup) to $+1$ and its tail to -1 , and we denote the outcome of Alice's, Bob's, and Charles' coins as π_A, π_B , and π_C , respectively.

Alice's outcome of $\pi_A = +1$ or -1 , whether she goes for the S_1 -coin or the S_2 -coin in a run, is independent from Bob's outcome of $\pi_B = +1$ or -1 as well as whether he goes for the S'_1 -coin or the S'_2 -coin in the same run. Also, both of these outcomes are independent of Charles' outcome of $\pi_C = +1$ or -1 as well as whether he goes for the S''_1 -coin or the S''_2 -coin in the same run.

The associated probabilities are, therefore, factorizable in the sense that the probability for triplet of outcomes can be expressed as the product of probability for each outcome separately. Mathematically, this is expressed by writing joint probabilities as the arithmetic product of their respective marginals, i.e.

$$\Pr(\pi_A, \pi_B, \pi_C; S_{1,2}, S'_{1,2}, S''_{1,2}) = \Pr(\pi_A, S_{1,2}) \Pr(\pi_B, S'_{1,2}) \Pr(\pi_C, S''_{1,2}) \quad (13)$$

where, for example, Bob can set $S'_{1,2}$ at S'_1 or at S'_2 and the probability $\Pr(\pi_A, \pi_B, \pi_C; S_2, S'_1, S''_2)$ factorizes to $\Pr(\pi_A; S_2) \Pr(\pi_B; S'_1) \Pr(\pi_C; S''_2)$.

As S_1, S'_1, S''_1 are Alice's, Bob's, and Charles' first coins, respectively, we assign probabilities $r, r', r'' \in [0, 1]$ by defining $r = \Pr(+1; S_1)$, $r' = \Pr(+1; S'_1)$, and $r'' = \Pr(+1; S''_1)$. Namely, r is the probability of getting head for (Alice's) S_1 -coin; r' is the probability of getting head for (Bob's) S'_1 -coin; and r'' is the probability of getting head for (Charles') S''_1 -coin.

Similarly, we assign probabilities $s, s', s'' \in [0, 1]$ to S_2, S'_2, S''_2 that are Alice's, Bob's, and Charles' second coins, respectively: $s = \Pr(+1; S_2)$, $s' = \Pr(+1; S'_2)$, $s'' = \Pr(+1; S''_2)$. Namely, s is the probability of getting head for (Alice's) S_2 -coin; s' is the probability of getting head for (Bob's) S'_2 -coin; and s'' is the probability of getting head for (Charles') S''_2 -coin. Factorizability, then, for example, allows us to write $\Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2) = s(1 - r')(1 - s'')$.

3.2.1 Payoff relations and the Nash equilibria

Given how we have defined a 'pure strategy' in the six-coin setup the players' pure-strategy payoff relations can now be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)rr'r'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)r(1 - r')r'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)rr'(1 - r'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)r(1 - r')(1 - r'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1 - r)r'r'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1 - r)(1 - r')r'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1 - r)r'(1 - r'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1 - r)(1 - r')(1 - r''); \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)sr'r'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)s(1 - r')r'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)sr'(1 - r'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)s(1 - r')(1 - r'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1 - s)r'r'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1 - s)(1 - r')r'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1 - s)r'(1 - r'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1 - s)(1 - r')(1 - r''); \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)rs'r'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)r(1 - s')r'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)rs'(1 - r'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)r(1 - s')(1 - r'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1 - r)s'r'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1 - r)(1 - s')r'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1 - r)s'(1 - r'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1 - r)(1 - s')(1 - r''); \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

¹This definition of a pure strategy, of course, corresponds to the usual definition of a mixed-strategy, in accordance with the known result in quantum games that a product pure state results in a mixed-strategy classical game.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)rr's'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)r(1-r')s'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)rr'(1-s'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)r(1-r')(1-s'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1-r)r's'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1-r)(1-r')s'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1-r)r'(1-s'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1-r)(1-r')(1-s''); \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)rs's'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)r(1-s')s'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)rs'(1-s'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)r(1-s')(1-s'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1-r)s's'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1-r)(1-s')s'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1-r)s'(1-s'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1-r)(1-s')(1-s''); \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)sr's'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)s(1-r')s'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)sr'(1-s'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)s(1-r')(1-s'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1-s)r's'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1-s)(1-r')s'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1-s)r'(1-s'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1-s)(1-r')(1-s''); \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)ss'r'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)s(1-s')r'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)ss'(1-r'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)s(1-s')(1-r'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1-s)s'r'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1-s)(1-s')r'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1-s)s'(1-r'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1-s)(1-s')(1-r''); \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)ss's'' + (\delta, \beta, \delta)s(1-s')s'' + (\delta, \delta, \beta)ss'(1-s'') + \\ &(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)s(1-s')(1-s'') + (\beta, \delta, \delta)(1-s)s's'' + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)(1-s)(1-s')s'' + \\ &(\theta, \epsilon, \theta)(1-s)s'(1-s'') + (\omega, \omega, \omega)(1-s)(1-s')(1-s''); \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where, on right side of each equation, the three constants in brackets correspond to the players Alice, Bob, and Charles respectively. We take that Eqs. (14-21) are pure-strategy payoff relations, as they represent the situation when each of the three players chooses the same coin for all runs. For example, referring to Eq. (16), $\Pi_A(S_1, S'_2, S''_1)$ is Alice's payoff when she goes for the S_1 -coin, Bob goes for S'_2 -coin, and Charles goes for S''_1 -coin for all runs.

A mixed-strategy game, in the six-coin setup, corresponds to when, over repeated runs of the game, the player(s) choose one of their coin(s) with some probability. Let x, y , and z be the probabilities with which Alice, Bob, and Charles, respectively, choose the coins S_1, S'_1 , and S''_1 , respectively. The players' six-coin mixed-strategy payoff relations then read,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{A,B,C}(x, y, z) &= xyz\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) + x(1-y)z\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) + \\ &xy(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) + x(1-y)(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) + \\ &(1-x)yz\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) + (1-x)(1-y)z\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) + \\ &(1-x)y(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) + (1-x)(1-y)(1-z)\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Notice that the right side of Eq. (22) contains expressions that are given by Eqs. (14-21).

Six-coin mixed-strategy payoff relations (22) are mathematically identical to the three-coin mixed-strategy payoff relations (2). However, these equations are to be interpreted differently as the definitions of a strategy in three- and six-coin setups are different. In (2) the numbers x, y , and z are the probabilities with which Alice, Bob, and Charles, respectively, flip the coin that s/he receives. Whereas in (22) the numbers x, y , and z are the probabilities with which, over repeated runs, Alice, Bob, and Charles select the S_1 -coin, the S'_1 -coin, and the S''_1 -coin, respectively.

Referring to (22), the triplet (x^*, y^*, z^*) becomes a NE when the following inequalities hold

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_A(x, y^*, z^*) &\geq 0, \\ \Pi_B(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_B(x^*, y, z^*) &\geq 0, \\ \Pi_C(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_C(x^*, y^*, z) &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which, though being mathematically identical to (12), refers to the relations (22) and Eqs. (14-21). Also, these inequalities are to be interpreted in terms of how a strategy is defined in the six-coin setup.

3.3 Playing Prisoner's Dilemma

In the following we use the three-coin and the six-coin setups to play PD.

3.3.1 With three-coin setup

In three-coin setup, the inequalities (12) give

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_A(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_A(x, y^*, z^*) &\geq 0, \\ \Pi_B(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_B(x^*, y, z^*) &\geq 0, \\ \Pi_C(x^*, y^*, z^*) - \Pi_C(x^*, y^*, z) &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ comes out as a unique NE at which players' payoffs are $\Pi_A(0, 0, 0) = \omega$, $\Pi_B(0, 0, 0) = \omega$, and $\Pi_C(0, 0, 0) = \omega$.

3.3.2 With six-coin setup

The NE conditions (23) are evaluated using the payoff relations (22) and the Eqs. (14-21). We consider the case when $(s, s', s'') = (0, 0, 0)$ i.e. the probabilities of getting head for each player's second coin is zero. This reduces the NE conditions (23) to

$$\begin{aligned} (x^* - x) \{y^* z^* (rr' r'') \Delta_1 + r(z^* r'' + y^* r') \Delta_2 + r \Delta_3\} &\geq 0, \\ (y^* - y) \{x^* z^* (rr' r'') \Delta_1 + r'(z^* r'' + x^* r) \Delta_2 + r' \Delta_3\} &\geq 0, \\ (z^* - z) \{x^* y^* (rr' r'') \Delta_1 + r''(y^* r' + x^* r) \Delta_2 + r'' \Delta_3\} &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $\Delta_1 = (\alpha - \beta - 2\delta + 2\theta + \epsilon - \omega)$, $\Delta_2 = (\delta - \epsilon - \theta + \omega)$, and $\Delta_3 = (\epsilon - \omega)$. For PD we have $\Delta_3 < 0$, it then follows from (25) that, when $(s, s', s'') = (0, 0, 0)$, the strategy triplet $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (0, 0, 0)$, as is defined in the six-coin setup, comes out to be a unique NE in the three-player symmetric game of PD. In other words, this is described by saying that the triplet $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ emerges as a unique NE when the probabilities of getting head for each player's second coin is zero and, along with this, that the joint probabilities are factorizable.

Now the crucial step follows: Requiring coins to satisfy the constraint $(s, s', s'') = (0, 0, 0)$ can also be translated in terms of constraints on the joint probabilities associated to the six coins. To find these constraints we identify the 64 joint probabilities p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{64} that can be defined for six coins, and are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= rr' r'', & p_5 &= (1-r)r' r'', \\ p_2 &= r(1-r')r'', & p_6 &= (1-r)(1-r')r'', \\ p_3 &= rr'(1-r''), & p_7 &= (1-r)r'(1-r''), \\ p_4 &= r(1-r')(1-r''), & p_8 &= (1-r)(1-r')(1-r''), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_9 &= sr' r'', & p_{13} &= (1-s)r' r'', \\ p_{10} &= s(1-r')r'', & p_{14} &= (1-s)(1-r')r'', \\ p_{11} &= sr'(1-r''), & p_{15} &= (1-s)r'(1-r''), \\ p_{12} &= s(1-r')(1-r''), & p_{16} &= (1-s)(1-r')(1-r''), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_{17} &= rs' r'', & p_{21} &= (1-r)s' r'', \\ p_{18} &= r(1-s')r'', & p_{22} &= (1-r)(1-s')r'', \\ p_{19} &= rs'(1-r''), & p_{23} &= (1-r)s'(1-r''), \\ p_{20} &= r(1-s')(1-r''), & p_{24} &= (1-r)(1-s')(1-r''), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_{25} &= rr' s'', & p_{29} &= (1-r)r' s'', \\ p_{26} &= r(1-r')s'', & p_{30} &= (1-r)(1-r')s'', \\ p_{27} &= rr'(1-s''), & p_{31} &= (1-r)r'(1-s''), \\ p_{28} &= r(1-r')(1-s''), & p_{32} &= (1-r)(1-r')(1-s''), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{33} &= rs's'', & p_{37} &= (1-r)s's'', \\
p_{34} &= r(1-s')s'', & p_{38} &= (1-r)(1-s')s'', \\
p_{35} &= rs'(1-s''), & p_{39} &= (1-r)s'(1-s''), \\
p_{36} &= r(1-s')(1-s''), & p_{40} &= (1-r)(1-s')(1-s''),
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{41} &= sr's'', & p_{45} &= (1-s)r's'', \\
p_{42} &= s(1-r')s'', & p_{46} &= (1-s)(1-r')s'', \\
p_{43} &= sr'(1-s''), & p_{47} &= (1-s)r'(1-s''), \\
p_{44} &= s(1-r')(1-s''), & p_{48} &= (1-s)(1-r')(1-s''),
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{49} &= ss'r'', & p_{53} &= (1-s)s'r'', \\
p_{50} &= s(1-s')r'', & p_{54} &= (1-s)(1-s')r'', \\
p_{51} &= ss'(1-r''), & p_{55} &= (1-s)s'(1-r''), \\
p_{52} &= s(1-s')(1-r''), & p_{56} &= (1-s)(1-s')(1-r''),
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{57} &= ss's'', & p_{61} &= (1-s)s's'', \\
p_{58} &= s(1-s')s'', & p_{62} &= (1-s)(1-s')s'', \\
p_{59} &= ss'(1-s''), & p_{63} &= (1-s)s'(1-s''), \\
p_{60} &= s(1-s')(1-s''), & p_{64} &= (1-s)(1-s')(1-s'').
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

With these definitions the payoff relations (14-21) are re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_1 + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_2 + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_3 + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_4 + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_5 + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_6 + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_7 + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_8;
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_9 + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{10} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{11} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{12} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{13} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{14} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{15} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{16};
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_{17} + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{18} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{19} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{20} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{21} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{22} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{23} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{24};
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_{25} + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{26} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{27} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{28} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{29} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{30} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{31} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{32};
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_{33} + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{34} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{35} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{36} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{37} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{38} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{39} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{40};
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_{41} + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{42} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{43} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{44} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{45} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{46} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{47} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{48};
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_{49} + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{50} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{51} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{52} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{53} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{54} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{55} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{56};
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_{57} + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{58} + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{59} + \\
&+ (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{60} + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{61} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{62} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{63} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{64}.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Now, from the definitions (26-33), requiring coins to satisfy the constraint $(s, s', s'') = (0, 0, 0)$ makes a number of the joint probabilities vanish:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_9 &= 0, p_{10} = 0, p_{11} = 0, p_{12} = 0; \\
p_{17} &= 0, p_{19} = 0, p_{21} = 0, p_{23} = 0; \\
p_{25} &= 0, p_{26} = 0, p_{29} = 0, p_{30} = 0; \\
p_{33} &= 0, p_{34} = 0, p_{35} = 0, p_{37} = 0, p_{38} = 0, p_{39} = 0; \\
p_{41} &= 0, p_{42} = 0, p_{43} = 0, p_{44} = 0, p_{45} = 0, p_{46} = 0; \\
p_{49} &= 0, p_{50} = 0, p_{51} = 0, p_{52} = 0, p_{53} = 0, p_{55} = 0; \\
p_{57} &= 0, p_{58} = 0, p_{59} = 0, p_{60} = 0, p_{61} = 0, p_{62} = 0, p_{63} = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

which, in turn, reduces the pure-strategy payoff relations (34-41) to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\alpha, \alpha, \alpha)p_1 + (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_2 + (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_3 + \\
&(\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_4 + (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_5 + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_6 + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_7 + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_8; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_1) &= (\beta, \delta, \delta)p_{13} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{14} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{15} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{16}; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_1) &= (\delta, \beta, \delta)p_{18} + (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{20} + (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{22} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{24}; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_1, S''_2) &= (\delta, \delta, \beta)p_{27} + (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{28} + (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{31} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{32}; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_1, S'_2, S''_2) &= (\epsilon, \theta, \theta)p_{36} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{40}; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_1, S''_2) &= (\theta, \epsilon, \theta)p_{47} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{48}; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_1) &= (\theta, \theta, \epsilon)p_{54} + (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{56}; \\
\Pi_{A,B,C}(S_2, S'_2, S''_2) &= (\omega, \omega, \omega)p_{64};
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where only those joint probabilities are left that can have non-zero value(s). These (pure strategy) payoff relations ensure that when the joint probabilities (involved in these expressions) become factorizable the classical outcome of the game results.

4 Three-player quantum games

In the quantum game literature [15–22, 26, 27, 29], three-player games have attracted relatively less attention as compared to the two-player games as their analysis is often found to be significantly harder even in the classical regime. However, as mentioned in Section 1, an interesting example of a three-player quantum game was discussed by Vaidman [11, 12] that describes the GHZ paradox [10] as a game among three players.

Vaidman's game is a purpose-built, specially-designed, or an invented game in which the winning conditions are tailored in order to ensure that a team of three players having access to GHZ state will win the game always.

Probabilistic analysis of Vaidman's game, in view of the context of the present paper, one notices that it can be won always by a team of three quantum players having access to a probabilistic physical system for which joint probabilities are non-factorizable, in a particular way that is described by the winning conditions of the game. These conditions are such that a set of non-factorizable joint probabilities generated by a GHZ state can result in the team always winning the game.

Although the Vaidman's game demonstrates how a GHZ state can be helpful in winning a game, by itself this game does not propose a quantization procedure for a general three-player noncooperative game. This was achieved by Benjamin and Hayden [17] who developed a multiplayer extension of Eisert et al.'s quantization scheme [16], originally proposed for two-player noncooperative games. Eisert et al.'s scheme is widely considered to have led to the birth of the area of quantum games.

The interesting situation, however, which the Vaidman's game presents certainly motivates one to ask what may happen to a generalized three-player noncooperative symmetric quantum game, when the players share a probabilistic system for which joint probabilities are not factorizable. This is precisely the question that we aim to address in this paper.

4.1 Three-player quantum games using EPR setting

We consider a standard EPR setting for three spatially-separated observers and use it to play a general three-player symmetric noncooperative game. In this setting the three observers are the players Alice, Bob, and Charles whose locations are spatially distant and are not able to communicate among themselves.

In a run, each player receives a particle on which s/he can make one of two measurements, the outcome of each of which is either +1 or -1. We assume that the two possible measurements, for each player, correspond to her/him choosing between two directions of measurement.

Instead of coins, we let S_1 and S_2 be Alice's two directions of measurement. Similarly, we let S'_1 and S'_2 be Bob's two directions of measurement, and let S''_1 and S''_2 be Charles' two directions of measurement.

In a run each one of the three players chooses one of his/her two directions and informs his/her choice to a referee. The referee, after knowing which three directions the three players have chosen in that run, rotates his/her Stern-Gerlach type apparatus along the three chosen directions and performs a quantum measurement. The outcome of measurement in each of these three chosen directions is either +1 or -1.

The runs are repeated as players make choices in each run and outcome of the measurements are recorded. The arrangement is comparable to the six-coin setup, when for each player the two available directions, in a run, refer to choosing between two coins, and the outcome of a quantum measurement corresponds to the outcome of a toss which involves three coins.

Notice that when the standard EPR setting (involving three observers) is used to play a three-player game, the players' strategies are exactly the same as they are in the case when they play classical strategies using coins. Over repeated runs, each player can either choose the same direction or s/he can choose one direction with some probability.

This definition of a strategy serves three purposes: a) it allows using the standard EPR setup (involving three observers) for playing a three-player game, b) it appears to avoid the argument [55] stating that allowing players extended sets of actions, in a quantum game setup, can be equated to extending their sets of pure strategies in the classical game, c) it gives ground to the expectation that the peculiar non-factorizable quantum mechanical probabilities, which emerge in EPR setting, might have implications for the outcome(s) of a game.

Using this convention and noticing the notation for 64 six-coin joint probabilities in (26-33) convinces one to introduce the same notation for 64 joint probabilities corresponding to the EPR setting, which involves three observers:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), & p_5 &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), \\
p_2 &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), & p_6 &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), \\
p_3 &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), & p_7 &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), \\
p_4 &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1), & p_8 &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1);
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_9 &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), & p_{13} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), \\
p_{10} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), & p_{14} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), \\
p_{11} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), & p_{15} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), \\
p_{12} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1), & p_{16} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_1);
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{17} &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{21} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), \\
p_{18} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{22} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), \\
p_{19} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{23} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), \\
p_{20} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{24} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1);
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{25} &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{29} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), \\
p_{26} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{30} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), \\
p_{27} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{31} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), \\
p_{28} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{32} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2);
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{33} &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{37} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), \\
p_{34} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{38} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), \\
p_{35} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{39} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), \\
p_{36} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{40} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2);
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{41} &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{45} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), \\
p_{42} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{46} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), \\
p_{43} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{47} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), \\
p_{44} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2), & p_{48} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_1, S''_2);
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{49} &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{53} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), \\
p_{50} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{54} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), \\
p_{51} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{55} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), \\
p_{52} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1), & p_{56} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_1);
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{57} &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{61} &= \Pr(-1, +1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), \\
p_{58} &= \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{62} &= \Pr(-1, -1, +1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), \\
p_{59} &= \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{63} &= \Pr(-1, +1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), \\
p_{60} &= \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2), & p_{64} &= \Pr(-1, -1, -1; S_2, S'_2, S''_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Notice that for these coins the joint probabilities are factorizable and (44-51) reduce to (26-33).

We notice that quantum mechanics imposes constraints on the joint probabilities (44-51) that are usually known [50] as the normalization and the causal communication constraints. Using the definitions (44-51) the constraints imposed by normalization are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^8 p_i &= 1, & \sum_{i=9}^{16} p_i &= 1, & \sum_{i=17}^{24} p_i &= 1, & \sum_{i=25}^{32} p_i &= 1, \\
\sum_{i=33}^{40} p_i &= 1, & \sum_{i=41}^{48} p_i &= 1, & \sum_{i=49}^{56} p_i &= 1, & \sum_{i=57}^{64} p_i &= 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Speaking physically, the first equation in (52) with reference to the definitions (44) of the joint probabilities p_1, p_2, \dots, p_8 , for example, describes the situation when Alice, Bob, and Charles play S_1, S'_1 , and S''_1 , respectively, over all runs. In this case the probabilities p_1, p_2, \dots, p_8 correspond to the outcomes $(+1, +1, +1), (+1, -1, +1), (+1, +1, -1), (+1, -1, -1), (-1, +1, +1), (-1, -1, +1), (-1, +1, -1)$, and $(-1, -1, -1)$, respectively. As these are the only possible outcomes for the strategy triplet (S_1, S'_1, S''_1) , the corresponding probabilities must add up to one. The remaining seven equations in (52) can be interpreted similarly.

Notice that in six-coin setup the triplet (S_1, S'_1, S''_1) refers to the situation when Alice, Bob, and Charles go for the S_1 -coin, the S'_1 -coin, and the S''_1 -coin, respectively, for all runs. The corresponding eight coin probabilities (26) are normalized and satisfy the first equation in (52). The same holds true for the remaining coin probabilities (27-33) as they satisfy the remaining equations in (52).

Along with the constraints that normalization imposes on joint probabilities, there are other constraints that are imposed by requirements of causal communication. Often these constraints are referred [50] to as the condition of ‘parameter independence’, ‘simple locality’, ‘signal locality’, or ‘physical locality’. Essentially, they say, for example, that the probability $\Pr^A(+1; S_1)$ of Alice obtaining the outcome $+1$ when she plays S_1 is not changed by Bob’s choice for S'_1 or S'_2 and Charles’ choice for S''_1 or S''_2 . That is, the probability of a particular measurement outcome on one part of the system is independent of which measurement is performed on the other part(s) [50]. Causal communication constraints make it impossible for the participating agents to acausally exchange the classical information.

Probability $\Pr^A(+1; S_1)$ corresponds to when Alice chooses S_1 and obtains the outcome $+1$. Independence of Bob’s and Charles’ choices requires that,

$$\Pr^A(+1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1) = \Pr^A(+1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2) = \Pr^A(+1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1) = \Pr^A(+1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2), \tag{53}$$

which can be expanded using (44-51) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(+1; S_1) &= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1) + \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1) + \\
&\quad \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1) + \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_1) \\
&= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2) + \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2) + \\
&\quad \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2) + \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_1, S''_2) \\
&= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1) + \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1) + \\
&\quad \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1) + \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_1) \\
&= \Pr(+1, +1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2) + \Pr(+1, +1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2) + \\
&\quad \Pr(+1, -1, +1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2) + \Pr(+1, -1, -1; S_1, S'_2, S''_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

This reads as,

$$p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 = p_{25} + p_{26} + p_{27} + p_{28} = p_{17} + p_{18} + p_{19} + p_{20} = p_{33} + p_{34} + p_{35} + p_{36}. \quad (55)$$

Constraints similar to (54) can be written for the probabilities $\Pr^A(-1; S_1), \Pr^A(+1; S_2), \Pr^A(-1; S_2)$ that correspond to Alice's choices; for the probabilities $\Pr^B(+1; S'_1), \Pr^B(-1; S'_1), \Pr^B(+1; S'_2), \Pr^B(-1; S'_2)$ that correspond to Bob's choices; and for the probabilities $\Pr^C(+1; S''_1), \Pr^C(-1; S''_1), \Pr^C(+1; S''_2), \Pr^C(-1; S''_2)$ that correspond to Charles' choices.

Using the definitions (44-51) for Alice's choices these constraints read

$$\begin{aligned} p_5 + p_6 + p_7 + p_8 &= p_{29} + p_{30} + p_{31} + p_{32} = p_{21} + p_{22} + p_{23} + p_{24} = p_{37} + p_{38} + p_{39} + p_{40}, \\ p_9 + p_{10} + p_{11} + p_{12} &= p_{41} + p_{42} + p_{43} + p_{44} = p_{49} + p_{50} + p_{51} + p_{52} = p_{57} + p_{58} + p_{59} + p_{60}, \\ p_{13} + p_{14} + p_{15} + p_{16} &= p_{45} + p_{46} + p_{47} + p_{48} = p_{53} + p_{54} + p_{55} + p_{56} = p_{61} + p_{62} + p_{63} + p_{64}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

and for Bob's choices they read

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 + p_3 + p_5 + p_7 &= p_{25} + p_{27} + p_{29} + p_{31} = p_9 + p_{11} + p_{13} + p_{15} = p_{41} + p_{43} + p_{45} + p_{47}, \\ p_2 + p_4 + p_6 + p_8 &= p_{26} + p_{28} + p_{30} + p_{32} = p_{10} + p_{12} + p_{14} + p_{16} = p_{42} + p_{44} + p_{46} + p_{48}, \\ p_{17} + p_{19} + p_{21} + p_{23} &= p_{33} + p_{35} + p_{37} + p_{39} = p_{49} + p_{51} + p_{53} + p_{55} = p_{57} + p_{59} + p_{61} + p_{63}, \\ p_{18} + p_{20} + p_{22} + p_{24} &= p_{34} + p_{36} + p_{38} + p_{40} = p_{50} + p_{52} + p_{54} + p_{56} = p_{58} + p_{60} + p_{62} + p_{64}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and for Charles' choices they read

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 + p_2 + p_5 + p_6 &= p_{17} + p_{18} + p_{21} + p_{22} = p_9 + p_{10} + p_{13} + p_{14} = p_{49} + p_{50} + p_{53} + p_{54}, \\ p_3 + p_4 + p_7 + p_8 &= p_{19} + p_{20} + p_{23} + p_{24} = p_{11} + p_{12} + p_{15} + p_{16} = p_{51} + p_{52} + p_{55} + p_{56}, \\ p_{25} + p_{26} + p_{29} + p_{30} &= p_{33} + p_{34} + p_{37} + p_{38} = p_{41} + p_{42} + p_{45} + p_{46} = p_{57} + p_{58} + p_{61} + p_{62}, \\ p_{27} + p_{28} + p_{31} + p_{32} &= p_{35} + p_{36} + p_{39} + p_{40} = p_{43} + p_{44} + p_{47} + p_{48} = p_{59} + p_{60} + p_{63} + p_{64}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Notice that the coin probabilities (26-33) satisfy the causal communication constraints (55-58) along with the constraints (52) imposed by normalization.

However, in an EPR setting involving three observers, there may emerge a set of quantum mechanical joint probabilities (44-51) that cannot be expressed in the form of the joint probabilities (26-33), which correspond to six coins. In words this means that for this set it is not possible to find six numbers $r, s, r', s', r'', s'' \in [0, 1]$ such that the set (44-51) can be reproduced from the coin probabilities using (26-33).

4.2 Three-player quantum Prisoner's Dilemma

The set of joint probabilities in the six-coin setup is factorizable in terms of six probabilities r, s, r', s', r'', s'' and the constraints (42) ensure that this set leads to the emergence of the strategy triplet $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (0, 0, 0)$ as a NE in three-player symmetric game of PD. Whereas a set of quantum mechanical joint probabilities that is obtained, for example, from three qubits in some quantum state, is not necessarily factorizable.

To ensure that the classical game and its classical solution remains embedded in the quantum game we require that the set of quantum mechanical joint probabilities (44-51) also satisfies the constraints (42). This is central to present argument as it guarantees that when the set (44-51) is factorizable the strategy triplet (D, D, D) , also represented as $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (0, 0, 0)$, comes out to be the unique NE of the game. When the constraints (42) are fulfilled, the relations (52) describing normalization and the relations (56-58), which describe the causal communication constraint, are reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 + p_5 + p_6 + p_7 + p_8 &= 1, \\
p_{13} + p_{14} + p_{15} + p_{16} &= 1, \\
p_{18} + p_{20} + p_{22} + p_{24} &= 1, \\
p_{27} + p_{28} + p_{31} + p_{32} &= 1, \\
p_{36} + p_{40} &= 1, \quad p_{47} + p_{48} = 1, \\
p_{54} + p_{56} &= 1, \quad p_{64} = 1;
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 &= p_{27} + p_{28} = p_{18} + p_{20} = p_{36}, \\
p_5 + p_6 + p_7 + p_8 &= p_{31} + p_{32} = p_{22} + p_{24} = p_{40}, \\
p_{13} + p_{14} + p_{15} + p_{16} &= 1;
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 + p_3 + p_5 + p_7 &= p_{27} + p_{31} = p_{13} + p_{15} = p_{47}, \\
p_2 + p_4 + p_6 + p_8 &= p_{28} + p_{32} = p_{14} + p_{16} = p_{48}, \\
p_{18} + p_{20} + p_{22} + p_{24} &= 1;
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 + p_2 + p_5 + p_6 &= p_{18} + p_{22} = p_{13} + p_{14} = p_{54}, \\
p_3 + p_4 + p_7 + p_8 &= p_{20} + p_{24} = p_{15} + p_{16} = p_{56}, \\
p_{27} + p_{28} + p_{31} + p_{32} &= 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Requiring a set of 64 joint probabilities to satisfy the constraints (42) embeds the classical game within quantum as when the set becomes factorizable the strategy triplet $(D, D, D) \equiv (0, 0, 0)$ emerges as unique NE. Now, for PD the most interesting situation is when the strategy of Cooperation (C) , on the behalf of all the three players, comes out as a NE of the game—as this is also the Pareto-optimal [1] solution of the game. In our notation, (C, C, C) is given by $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (1, 1, 1)$.

We now explore whether the strategy profile (C, C, C) can be a NE for a set of non-factorizable, and thus quantum mechanical, joint probabilities. The explicit expressions, which state the conditions (23) for the strategy profile (C, C, C) to be a NE in PD, can be found as follows. Use the payoff relations (22) and (43) along with the constraints (59-62) to reduce the conditions (23) to

$$\begin{aligned}
\{p_5 + (\alpha/\beta)p_1 - p_{13}\} + (\theta/\beta)\{p_6 + p_7 - p_{14} - p_{15} + (\delta/\theta)(p_2 + p_3)\} + \\
(\omega/\beta)\{p_8 - p_{16} + (\epsilon/\omega)p_4\} \geq 0;
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\{p_2 + (\alpha/\beta)p_1 - p_{18}\} + (\theta/\beta)\{p_4 + p_6 - p_{20} - p_{22} + (\delta/\theta)(p_3 + p_5)\} + \\
(\omega/\beta)\{p_8 - p_{24} + (\epsilon/\omega)p_7\} \geq 0;
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\{p_3 + (\alpha/\beta)p_1 - p_{27}\} + (\theta/\beta)\{p_4 + p_7 - p_{28} - p_{31} + (\delta/\theta)(p_2 + p_5)\} + \\
(\omega/\beta)\{p_8 - p_{32} + (\epsilon/\omega)p_6\} \geq 0;
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

where the definition (10) of generalized three-player PD requires that each one of the five quantities $\alpha/\beta, \theta/\beta, \delta/\theta, \omega/\beta, \epsilon/\omega$ are less than 1.

With this our question, whether the strategy profile (C, C, C) can exist as a NE in a symmetric three-player quantum game of PD, is now re-expressed in terms of finding five quantities $\alpha/\beta, \theta/\beta, \delta/\theta, \omega/\beta, \epsilon/\omega$ (all less than 1) and a set of 64 (non-factorizable) joint probabilities for which the conditions (59, 60-62) as well as the constraints (42) hold. If the inequalities (63-65) hold for these five quantities and for the set of 64 (non-factorizable) joint probabilities, it will show that the strategy profile (C, C, C) becomes a NE in the quantum game.

It turns out that, in fact, it is not difficult to find such five quantities, all less than 1, and a set of 64 joint probabilities for which all of the above requirements hold. Consider the following example. Assign values $\alpha/\beta = 9/10, \theta/\beta = 1/100, \delta/\theta = 1/5, \omega/\beta = 1/100,$ and $\epsilon/\omega = 9/10$ for which the game becomes that of PD. Let the ten probabilities $p_1, p_3, p_5, p_6, p_{13}, p_{15}, p_{18}, p_{20}, p_{22}, p_{27}$ be ‘independent’ and assign values to them as $p_1 = 1/10, p_3 = 13/100, p_5 = 4/25, p_6 = 1/10, p_{13} = 7/50, p_{15} = 2/5, p_{18} = 13/100, p_{20} = 1/4, p_{22} = 37/100,$ and $p_{27} = 1/5.$ Note that the constraints (42) assign zero value to thirty seven probabilities out of the remaining joint probabilities. Then the values assigned to the rest of (out of the total of 64) joint probabilities can be found from (59) and (60-62) as $p_2 = 7/50, p_4 = 1/100, p_7 = 3/20, p_8 = 21/100, p_{14} = 9/25,$

$p_{16} = 1/10$, $p_{24} = 1/4$, $p_{28} = 9/50$, $p_{31} = 17/50$, $p_{32} = 7/25$, $p_{36} = 19/50$, $p_{40} = 31/50$, $p_{47} = 27/50$, $p_{48} = 23/50$, $p_{54} = 1/2$, and $p_{56} = 1/2$.

Now, for these values the left sides of the NE inequalities (63-65) are found as 106/1000, 96/1000, and 17/1000, respectively, showing that in this case the strategy profile (C, C, C) is a NE. Note that this NE emerges because the resulting set of joint probabilities is non-factorizable and that the constraints (42) ensure that when this set becomes factorizable this NE disappears and (D, D, D) becomes the unique NE.

We notice that for a given set of numbers α/β , θ/β , δ/θ , ω/β (each being less than 1) not every non-factorizable set of joint probabilities can result in the strategy triplet (C, C, C) being a NE. That is, in this framework non-factorizability is necessary but not sufficient to make the strategy triplet (C, C, C) result in a NE. Also, in this paper we have not explored which other NE, apart from the strategy triplet (C, C, C) , may emerge for a given non-factorizable set of probabilities.

In the above approach considering three-player quantum game of PD we have assumed that for a given set² of joint probabilities, for which both the "normalization condition" and the "causal communication constraint" hold³, it is always possible in principle to find a three-party two-choice EPR setting, with the relevant pure or mixed state(s) and appropriate directions of measurements for the three observers, which can always generate the given set of joint probabilities.

4.2.1 Fate of the classical Nash equilibrium

For factorizable joint probabilities the strategy profile (D, D, D) is the unique NE, represented by the strategy triplet $(x^*, y^*, z^*) = (0, 0, 0)$. Here we show that this strategy profile remains a NE even when joint probabilities may become non-factorizable. Using the payoff relations (22) and (43) along with the constraints (59, 60-62), the NE conditions (23) for the strategy profile (D, D, D) for PD read

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_A(0, 0, 0) - \Pi_A(x, 0, 0) &= -x(\epsilon p_{36} + \omega p_{40} - \omega), \\ \Pi_B(0, 0, 0) - \Pi_B(0, y, 0) &= -y(\epsilon p_{47} + \omega p_{48} - \omega), \\ \Pi_C(0, 0, 0) - \Pi_C(0, 0, z) &= -z(\epsilon p_{54} + \omega p_{56} - \omega).\end{aligned}\tag{66}$$

Now, from (59) we have $p_{36} + p_{40} = 1$, $p_{47} + p_{48} = 1$, and $p_{54} + p_{56} = 1$. This makes the above three payoff differences to be $xp_{36}(\omega - \epsilon)$, $yp_{47}(\omega - \epsilon)$, and $zp_{54}(\omega - \epsilon)$ for Alice, Bob, and Charles, respectively. As for PD we have $\omega > \epsilon$ which makes these quantities non-negative and the strategy profile (D, D, D) remains a NE even when the joint probabilities become non-factorizable. That is, a set of non-factorizable joint probabilities can only add to the classical NE of (D, D, D) .

5 Discussion

This paper extends our probabilistic framework for playing two-player quantum games to the multiplayer case. This framework presents an argument for the construction of quantum games without referring to the tools of quantum mechanics and thus making this area more accessible to workers outside the quantum physics discipline.

Where does this framework stand in front of Enk and Pike's criticism [55], which refers to standard setting for playing a quantum game? Their criticism considers a quantum game equivalent to playing another classical game in which players have access to extended set of classical strategies. This paper uses EPR setting for playing quantum in which an observer's two directions of measurement are taken as his/her pure strategies. A mixed strategy is then defined to be the probability of playing one of his/her pure strategies. As the sets of strategies remain identical, and extended sets of strategies are not allowed, either when the game is classically interpretable or when it is not the case, thus making it difficult to construct an Enk and Pike type argument [55] for a quantum game played in this framework.

²It may, however, not be known whether such a set has been obtained classically or quantum mechanically.

³as described by Cereceda [50].

In the literature the wording ‘quantum games’ has been used in much different contexts, which involve games and quantum settings in one way or the other. In view of this the present paper comes in line with the approach towards quantum games that originated with Eisert et al.’s quantization of Prisoner’s Dilemma [16], where they proposed a general procedure to quantize a given noncooperative two-player game. This approach is distinct, and is to be contrasted, from other approaches that also use the wording ‘quantum game’, in that it is placed in the context of classical game theory with the use of the Nash equilibrium concept. For example, in some approaches both ‘the game’ and its ‘winning condition(s)’ are arbitrarily defined, tailored or constructed, in order to show that only using a quantum-mechanical implementation the winning condition(s) can be fulfilled. In contrast, this paper begins by defining payoff relations, instead of the ‘winning condition(s)’, and then finds how game-theoretic outcome(s) of a noncooperative game may change in relation to the quantum mechanical aspects of a probabilistic physical system, which the players share in order to play the game.

The approach followed in this paper establishes a relationship between the ‘classicality’ of the physical system (expressed by the joint probabilities being factorizable) and a ‘classical game’, in the sense that using a classical system to play a game results in the classical game. Establishing this relationship allows us in the following step to find how non-classical (thus quantum) behavior of the physical system (expressed by the joint probabilities being non-factorizable) may change the outcome(s) of the game.

This paper considers very unusual non-factorizable joint probabilities, which may emerge from an entangled quantum state, by putting forward three- and six-coin setups in order to play a three-player symmetric non-cooperative game. In the six-coin setup, players choose coins in each run, not necessarily unbiased, which are subsequently tossed and the outcome of each toss is observed. This setup translates playing of the game in terms of 64 joint probabilities. In the following step, this translation of the game allows us to consider the corresponding quantum game by bringing in the same number of joint probabilities, which now may not be factorizable. We then consider how these quantum mechanical probabilities may change the Nash equilibria of the game under the constraint that factorizable joint probabilities must lead to the classical solution of the game.

We achieve this by re-expressing players’ payoffs in terms of 64 joint probabilities p_i , the players’ strategies x, y, z and the coefficients defining the game. We then use Nash inequalities to find the equilibria. We find constraints on p_i which ensure that for factorizable p_i the game gives the classical outcome and thus it becomes interpretable as a classical mixed-strategy game. This is carried out by playing the game in the six-coin setup and using Nash inequalities to obtain constraints on the coin probabilities r, s, r', s', r'', s'' , which reproduce the outcome of the classical mixed-strategy game. We use the relations (26-33), resulting from p_i being factorizable, to translate the constraints on r, s, r', s', r'', s'' in terms of constraints on p_i . We refer to the standard three-party EPR setup and allow p_i to be non-factorizable, while retaining the constraints on p_i . We then ask if non-factorizability may lead to the emergence of new solution(s) of the game. In case non-factorizability leads to new solution(s), given as a triplet(s) (x^*, y^*, z^*) , there is always a set of 64 non-factorizable joint probabilities that are associated with it.

The probabilistic framework towards quantum games, developed in Ref. [42] and extended to multiplayer games in this paper, uses the classical concept of probability, which is well known to be more restrictive than the quantum notion [56]. Essentially, the classical concept describes ‘probability’ as being a number between zero and one and that for a joint probability of two events this number is less or equal to the numbers corresponding to each of the events. Though being more restrictive, as Pitowski [56] describes it, this concept is “nevertheless rooted in some very basic intuition.” If quantum games can be expressed in terms of this basic concept this can only be helpful to introduce this area to researchers outside the quantum domain.

It is relevant here to point out that the probabilistic framework for quantum games, proposed originally for two-player games in Ref. [42] and extended to three-player games in the present paper, appears close to Einstein’s statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics [57, 58]. The key assertion of this interpretation describes a quantum state (pure or otherwise), representing an ensemble of similarly prepared systems, and need not provide a complete description of an

individual system. By using coin tosses in order to translate playing of a classical game in terms of joint probabilities and subsequently introducing unusual quantum mechanical non-factorizable joint probabilities, the suggested framework uses the concept of an ensemble of similarly prepared systems. Multiple coin tosses, which are central to the present framework, are found helpful in understanding how quantum mechanical predictions in quantum game theory do not pertain to a single measurement, but relate to an ensemble of similar measurements.

Acknowledgement 1 *One of us (AI) is supported at the University of Adelaide by the Australian Research Council under the Discovery Projects scheme (Grant No. DP0771453). Part of this work was carried out at the Kochi University of Technology (KUT), Japan, where AI was supported by the Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS). At KUT this work was supported, in part, by the Grant-in-Aid for scientific research provided by Japan Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology under the contract numbers 18540384 and 18.06330.*

References

- [1] E. Rasmusen, *Games & Information: An Introduction to Game Theory*, 3rd Edition, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, (2001).
- [2] M. A. Khan and Y. Sun, Noncooperative games with many players, Chapter 46, Volume 3, *Handbook of Game Theory*, edited by R. J. Aumann and S. Hart, published by North-Holland (2002).
- [3] C. Daskalakis and C. H. Papadimitriou, Three-player games are hard, Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity, Report No. 139 (2005). Available from <http://eccc.hpi-web.de/eccc-reports/2005/TR05-139/Paper.pdf>
- [4] R. J. Aumann and S. Hart (editors), *Handbook of Game Theory*, published by North-Holland, (2002).
- [5] M. Broom, C. Cannings, and G. T. Vickers, Multiplayer matrix games, *Bull. Math. Biol.*, **59**, 931 (1997).
- [6] M. Broom, The use of multiplayer game theory in the modeling of biological populations, *Comments on Theo. Bio.*, **8**, 103 (2003).
- [7] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1988).
- [8] N. D. Mermin, Quantum mysteries revisited, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 731 (1990).
- [9] N. D. Mermin, Extreme quantum entanglement in a superposition of macroscopically distinct states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1838 (1990).
- [10] D. M. Greenberger, M. Horne, A. Shimony, and A. Zeilinger, Bell's theorem without inequalities, *Am. J. Phys.* **58**, 1131 (1990).
- [11] L. Vaidman, Variations on the theme of the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger proof, *Found. Phys.* **29**, 615 (1999).
- [12] L. Vaidman, Tests of Bell inequalities, *Phys. Lett. A* **286**, 241 (2001).
- [13] Y. Aharonov & D. Rohrlich, *Quantum Paradoxes, Quantum Theory for the Perplexed*, Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim (2005).
- [14] D. Fulton, The Quantum Shell Game, American Physical Society, April Meeting, 2004, May 1-4, 2004, Denver, Colorado April 2004.

- [15] D. A. Meyer, Quantum Strategies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1052 (1999). Also, by the same author, Quantum games and quantum algorithms, arXiv: quant-ph/0004092.
- [16] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, and M. Lewenstein. Quantum Games and Quantum Strategies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3077 (1999). See also, J. Eisert and M. Wilkens, Quantum Games. J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 2543 (2000).
- [17] S. C. Benjamin and P. M. Hayden, Multiplayer Quantum Games, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 030301 (2001).
- [18] L. Marinatto and T. Weber, A quantum approach to static games of complete information, Phys. Lett. A **272**, 291 (2000).
- [19] N. F. Johnson, Playing a quantum game with a corrupted source, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 020302 (2001).
- [20] E. W. Piotrowski and J. Sladkowski, Quantum market games, Physica A, **312**, 208 (2002).
- [21] J. Du, Hui Li, X. Xu, M. Shi, J. Wu, X. Zhou and R. Han, Experimental realization of quantum games on a quantum computer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 137902 (2002).
- [22] A. P. Flitney, Aspects of quantum game theory, PhD thesis, University of Adelaide (2005), and the references therein. Available from the URL <http://ariic.library.unsw.edu.au/adelaide/adt-SUA20051027-072026/>.
- [23] A. P. Flitney & D. Abbott, An introduction to quantum game theory, Fluct. Noise Lett. **2**, R175-87 (2002).
- [24] A. P. Flitney & D. Abbott, Advantage of a quantum player over a classical one in 2×2 quantum games, Proc. R. Soc. (London) A **459**, 2463 (2003).
- [25] A. P. Flitney & D. Abbott, Quantum games with decoherence, J. Phys. A **38**, 449 (2005).
- [26] T. Cheon and I. Tsutsui, Classical and quantum contents of solvable game theory on Hilbert space, Phys. Lett. A **348**, 147 (2006).
- [27] J. Shimamura, S. K. Özdemir, F. Morikoshi and N. Imoto, Quantum and classical correlations between players in game theory, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **2/1**, 79 (2004).
- [28] T. Cheon & A. Iqbal, Bayesian Nash equilibria and Bell inequalities, J. Phys. Soc. Japan, **77/2**, 024801 (2008).
- [29] A. Iqbal, Studies in the Theory of Quantum Games, PhD thesis, Quaid-i-Azam University (2004), and the references therein. [quant-ph/0503176](http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0503176).
- [30] A. Iqbal & A. H. Toor, Evolutionarily stable strategies in quantum games, Phys. Lett. A **280/5-6**, 249 (2001).
- [31] A. Iqbal & A. H. Toor, Quantum mechanics gives stability to a Nash equilibrium, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 022306 (2002).
- [32] A. Iqbal & A. H. Toor, Backwards-induction outcome in a quantum game, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052328 (2002)
- [33] A. Iqbal & S. Weigert, Quantum correlation games, J. Phys. A **37**, 5873 (2004).
- [34] R. Kay, N. F. Johnson and S. C. Benjamin, Evolutionary quantum game, J. Phys. A, **34**, L547 (2001).
- [35] J. Du, H. Li, X. Xu, X. Zhou, and R. Han, Entanglement enhanced multiplayer quantum games, Phys. Lett. A **302**, 229 (2002).

- [36] Y. -J. Han, Y. -S. Zhang and G. -C. Guo, W state and Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger state in quantum three person Prisoner's Dilemma, *Phys. Lett. A* **295**, 61 (2002).
- [37] A. Iqbal and A. H. Toor, Darwinism in quantum systems?, *Phys. Lett. A* **294/5-6**, 261 (2002).
- [38] A. P. Flitney and D. Abbott, Quantum two and three person duels, *J. Opt. B*, **6**, S860 (2004).
- [39] Q. Chen, Y. Wang, J. -T. Liu, and K. -L. Wang, N-player quantum minority game, *Phys. Lett. A* **327**, 98 (2004).
- [40] A. P. Flitney and L. C. L. Hollenberg, Multiplayer quantum minority game with decoherence, *Quant. Infor. Comput.*, **7**, 111(2007).
- [41] A. P. Flitney and L. C. L. Hollenberg, Nash equilibria in quantum games with generalized two-parameter strategies, *Phys. Lett. A* **363**, 381 (2007).
- [42] A. Iqbal and T. Cheon, Constructing quantum games from non-factorizable joint probabilities. *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 061122 (2007).
- [43] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
- [44] J. S. Bell, On the Einstein-Poldolsky-Rosen paradox, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1964).
- [45] J. S. Bell, On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 447452 (1966).
- [46] J. S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1987).
- [47] J. F. Clauser and A. Shimony, Bell's theorem: Experimental tests and implications, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **41**, 1881 (1978).
- [48] A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, Experimental test of Bell's inequalities using time-varying analyzers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 1804 (1982).
- [49] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1995).
- [50] J. L. Cereceda, Quantum mechanical probabilities and general probabilistic constraints for Einstein-Podolsky-Bohm experiments, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, **13** (5), (2000).
- [51] A. Fine, *The Shaky Game: Einstein, Realism, and the Quantum Theory*, Second Edition, The University of Chicago Press, (1996), page 59.
- [52] E. Winsberg and A. Fine, Quantum life: Interaction, entanglement, and separation, *Journal of Philosophy*, **C 80** (2003).
- [53] See Ref. [51] page 63.
- [54] M. J. O'Donnell, The three-player Prisoner's Dilemma, Available from the URL: <http://www.classes.cs.uchicago.edu/archive/1998/fall/CS105/Project/node6.html>, Department of Computer Science, The University of Chicago (1998).
- [55] S. J. van Enk and R. Pike, Classical rules in quantum games, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 024306 (2002).
- [56] I. Pitowsky, The range of quantum probability, *J. Math. Phys.* **27** (6), 1556 (1986).
- [57] L. E. Ballentine, The statistical interpretation of quantum mechanics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **42**(4), 358 (1970).
- [58] Max Jammer, *The Philisophy of Quantum Mechanics: The Interpretations of Quantum Mechanics in Historical Perspective* (see Chapter 10, "Statistical Interpretations") John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (1974).