

Synchronous dynamic game on system observability considering one or two steps optimality [★]

Yueyue Xu ^{*} Xiaoming Hu ^{**} Lin Wang ^{*}

^{*} Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China. (e-mail: merryspread99, wanglin@sjtu.edu.cn).

^{**} KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm 10044, Sweden (e-mail: hu@kth.se).

Abstract: This paper studies a system security problem in the context of observability based on a two-party non-cooperative asynchronous dynamic game. A system is assumed to be secure if it is not observable. Both the defender and the attacker have means to modify dimension of the unobservable subspace, which is set as the value function. Utilizing tools from geometric control, we construct the best response set under one-step or two-step optimality to minimize or maximize the value function. We find that the best response sets under one-step optimality are not single-valued maps, resulting in a variety of game outcomes. In the dynamic game considering two-step optimality, definition and existence conditions of lock and oscillation game modes are given. Finally, the best response under two-step optimality and the Stackelberg game equilibrium are compared.

Keywords: Linear systems, dynamic game, unobservable subspace, geometric control, \mathcal{V}^* space.

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing emphasis on enhancing the security of control systems, specifically addressing the vulnerabilities present in remote sensors (Zhang and Ye (2020), Gao et al. (2022) and Ding et al. (2022)). These vulnerabilities pose significant risks, as highlighted by the notorious Stuxnet attack, which targeted the logic controllers of centrifuges at Iran's Natanz nuclear facility. By manipulating the code of logic controllers, this attack successfully sabotaged the centrifuges responsible for uranium enrichment at Iran's Natanz nuclear facility. What made it even more insidious was its ability to conceal the true state of the system from operators, allowing it to inflict damage undetected for an extended period (Howser and McMillin (2014)). Scholars have recognized the significance of observability in control systems and have conducted extensive research in areas such as state reconstruction and partially observable games.

In the realm of state reconstruction amidst attacks, Chong et al. (2015), along with similar findings by Fawzi et al. (2014) and Shoukry and Tabuada (2015) in discrete time, investigated the challenge of system observability when an attacker manipulated certain outputs of a continuous linear system. Notably, when more than half of the sensors fell victim to attacks, accurately reconstructing the initial state became impossible. Mitra and Sundaram (2018) introduced the concept of "eigenvalue observability" to explore methods of estimating locally undetectable states caused by attacks, focusing on scenarios where a single node could exchange information with its neighboring

nodes. Building upon their previous work, Mitra and Sundaram (2019) developed a fully distributed algorithm that successfully reconstructed the system state despite the presence of sensor attacks within the network.

Partial observable game in cybersecurity is a crucial aspect where attackers and defenders have limited information. Horák et al. (2019) developed a partially observable stochastic game, representing defender's uncertainty effectively. Zheng et al. (2022) proposed a partially observable Stackelberg game model, using ϵ -Stackelberg equilibrium to prevent state information leakage. Lu and Quevedo (2023) demonstrated the independence of control and scheduling strategies in a partially observable stochastic game, proving its equivalence to a complete information game.

The previous research primarily focused on qualitative aspects such as system state reconstruction and game conditions in the context of partial observability. However, they did not quantitatively investigate the dimension of the unobservable subspace (Maccarone and Cole (2020)). Additionally, most existing game models utilize continuous value functions, such as quadratic functions, and equilibrium solutions are obtained through methods like dynamic programming (Wu et al. (2020)) and Q-learning (Rizvi and Lin (2018)). These methods are not suitable for discrete value functions, such as the dimension of the unobservable subspace.

To address these limitations, we propose a non-cooperative synchronous dynamic game between the attacker and the defender. The defender aims to prevent system observability and potential security breaches, while the attacker seeks to make the system observable to reveal valuable

^{*} This work was supported by Shanghai Talent Development Fund and Shuguang Scholar of Shanghai.

information. The main contributions of the paper are as follows.

(1) Taking the unobservable subspace dimension of linear system as a game value function, the derivation and algorithm of maximizing or minimizing the dimension are studied. The game antagonism of system observability is quantitatively studied.

(2) In asynchronous dynamic game considering one-step optimality, it is found that the best response sets of players are not single-valued maps, leading to multiple cases in the game results. The dimension of maximal (A, B) -invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C$ is revealed to be one of the causes of uncertainty.

(3) In asynchronous dynamic game considering two-steps optimality, the definition and existence conditions of different game modes including lock mode and oscillation mode are given. And a special lock mode condition is given.

Based on (Xu et al. (2023)), this paper further studies the multiple cases of game results caused by multi-valued maps of best response set in the asynchronous dynamic game considering one-step optimization. Plus, we studies the asynchronous dynamic game considering two-steps optimization, gives the conditions of different game results and compares it with the Stackelberg game equilibrium.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the necessary preliminaries are introduced and we formulate our problem. In Section 3, derivations and algorithms are given to minimize or maximize the dimension. In Section 4, under the framework of asynchronous dynamic game, results analysis considering one-step optimality and two-steps optimality are given respectively. And the best responses of players are compared to Stackelberg game equilibrium. Section 5 is a brief conclusion of this paper.

Notations: $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is the set of $m \times n$ -dimensional real matrices. \mathbb{R}^n is the set of n -dimensional real vectors. For matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\text{Im } A = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m : v = Aq, \forall q \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ is the image space, $\text{Ker } A = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n : Aw = 0\}$ is the kernel space, $\text{pinv}(A) = (A^\top A)^{-1} A^\top$ is its pseudo inverse, $\text{Col}_k(A)$ is the k -th column of matrix A and $\delta_n^k = \text{Col}_k(I_n)$, $k = 1, \dots, n$. For matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, the direct sum of matrix A and B is defined as $A \oplus B = \begin{bmatrix} A & \mathbf{0}_{m \times q} \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times n} & B \end{bmatrix}$.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

2.1 Preliminaries

Given a system (A, B, C)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Ax + Bu, \\ y &= Cx, \end{aligned}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Define \mathcal{V}^* space and relative degree as follows.

Definition 1. \mathcal{V} is an (A, B) -invariant subspace if there exists a matrix F such that $(A + BF)\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. Such an F is called a friend of \mathcal{V} and denote the set of friends by $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V})$. Among all \mathcal{V} in $\text{Ker } C$, there is a maximal (A, B) -invariant subspace which is denoted as \mathcal{V}^* .

Definition 2. Let $m = k$. The system (A, B, C) is said to have relative degree (r_1, \dots, r_m) where $C = [c_1^\top, c_2^\top, \dots, c_m^\top]^\top$, if

$$\begin{aligned} c_i A^j B &= \mathbf{0}, \forall j = 0, \dots, r_i - 2, \\ c_i A^{r_i - 1} B &\neq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and the matrix

$$L := \begin{bmatrix} c_1 A^{r_1 - 1} B \\ \vdots \\ c_m A^{r_m - 1} B \end{bmatrix}$$

is non-singular.

2.2 Problem formulation

Consider the following linear system,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}} &= A_0 \tilde{x} + B_1 u_1 + B_2 u_2, \\ \tilde{y} &= C_0 \tilde{x}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ and $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are state and output of the system; $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times n_0}$, $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times m}$, $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0 \times k}$ and $C_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_0}$ are system matrices; $u_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ are two inputs.

In this paper, it is assumed that an attacker (or player 1) wants to reveal system information by minimizing the unobservable subspace. The attacker has an input channel and can control input u_1 . To the contrary the defender (or player 2) wants to protect system information from being stolen and aims to maximize the unobservable subspace. It also has an input channel and can control input u_2 .

In particular, we consider a special case in which $\text{Im } B_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*$, where \mathcal{V}^* is the maximal (A_0, B_1) -invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C_0$. We further assume that (A_0, B_1, C_0) has a relative degree. Define a coordinate change as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j^i &= c_i A_0^{j-1} \tilde{x}, i = 1, \dots, m; j = 1, \dots, r_i, \\ z_i &= p_i \tilde{x} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where p_i is defined by $p_i B_1 = \mathbf{0}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_0 - s$, $s = \sum_{i=1}^m r_i$.

Transform linear system (1) according to (2) and get the normal form as

$$\dot{z} = Nz + E\xi + B'_2 u_2, \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}_1^i &= \xi_2^i, \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\xi}_{r_i-1}^i &= \xi_{r_i}^i, \\ \dot{\xi}_{r_i}^i &= R_i z + S_i \xi + c_i A_0^{r_i-1} B_1 u_1, \\ \tilde{y}_i &= \xi_1^i, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\xi = [\xi_1^1, \dots, \xi_{r_1}^1, \dots, \xi_1^m, \dots, \xi_{r_m}^m]^\top$,

$$B'_2 = \begin{bmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \vdots \\ p_{(n_0-s)} \end{bmatrix} B_2, \tilde{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1 \\ \tilde{y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_m \end{bmatrix} \text{ and matrices } N, E, R_i, S_i$$

are determined by coordinate change accordingly.

It is found that B_2 only appears in the evolution equation of z . This is because $\text{Im } B_2 \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*$, the maximal (A_0, B_1) -invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C_0$. For (C_0, A_0, B_1) satisfy relative degree condition and under coordinate change (2),

there is $\mathcal{V}^* = \{(z, \xi) : \xi = \mathbf{0}\} = \{x : c_i A^{j-1} x = \mathbf{0}, i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, r_i\}$. Thus $c_i A^{j-1} B_2 = \mathbf{0}$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, r_i$. Calculate ξ_j^i , for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1^i &= \tilde{y}_i = c_i x \\ \xi_2^i &= \tilde{y}_i^{(1)} = c_i \dot{x} = c_i (Ax + B_1 u_1 + B_2 u_2) = c_i A x \\ \xi_3^i &= \tilde{y}_i^{(2)} = c_i A \dot{x} = c_i A (Ax + B_1 u_1 + B_2 u_2) = c_i A^2 x \\ &\vdots \\ \xi_{r_i}^i &= \tilde{y}_i^{(r_i-1)} = c_i A^{r_i-2} \dot{x} = c_i A^{r_i-2} (Ax + B_1 u_1 + B_2 u_2) \\ &= c_i A^{r_i-1} x \\ \xi_{r_i}^i &= \tilde{y}_i^{(r_i)} = c_i A^{r_i-1} \dot{x} = c_i A^{r_i-1} (Ax + B_1 u_1 + B_2 u_2) \\ &= c_i A^{r_i} x + c_i A^{r_i-1} B_1 u_1. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Thus B_2 does not appear in the evolution equation of ξ , which implies that player 2 can only change the internal dynamics of the system when the output is set to zero.

The complete evolution equation of $\xi_{r_i}^i$ can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \xi_{r_1}^1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{r_m}^m \end{bmatrix} = Rz + S\xi + Lu_1, \quad (7)$$

where

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} R_1 \\ \vdots \\ R_m \end{bmatrix}, S = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 \\ \vdots \\ S_m \end{bmatrix}, L = \begin{bmatrix} c_1 A^{r_1-1} B_1 \\ \vdots \\ c_m A^{r_m-1} B_1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n_0-s)}$, $S \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}$, $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Now define the feedback strategies used by players 1 and 2 as

$$u_1 = K_1 \xi + U_1 z, u_2 = K_2 \xi + U_2 z, \quad (9)$$

where $K_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times s}$, $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n_0-s)}$ are determined by player 1 and $K_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times s}$, $U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (n_0-s)}$ are determined by player 2.

Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \xi_{r_1}^1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi_{r_m}^m \end{bmatrix} = (R + LU_1)z + (S + LK_1)\xi. \quad (10)$$

If the system is observable, when $\tilde{y} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, there is $\begin{pmatrix} z \\ \xi \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathbf{0}$.

Consider $\tilde{y} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, according to the coupling relationship between \tilde{y}_i and $(\xi_1^1, \dots, \xi_{r_1}^1, \dots, \xi_1^m, \dots, \xi_{r_m}^m) = \xi^\top$, we have $\xi \equiv \mathbf{0}$. Thus we only need to prove $z \equiv \mathbf{0}$, where z satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= Nz + B_2' U_2 z, \\ \mathbf{0} &= (R + LU_1)z. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Define $(R + LU_1)z = \hat{y}$. Then the condition for the system (4)-(6) to be completely observable becomes: if $\hat{y} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, there is $z \equiv \mathbf{0}$. It is also the condition for the following system to be observable

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= Nz + B_2' U_2 z, \\ \hat{y} &= (R + LU_1)z \triangleq \hat{C}z, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $z \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_0-s)}$ and $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are state and output of the observability equivalent system; $N \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_0-s) \times (n_0-s)}$

and $B_2' \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_0-s) \times k}$ are system matrices; $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n_0-s)}$ and $U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (n_0-s)}$ are feedback matrices determined by player 1 and player 2. Because L is non-singular, for all $\hat{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n_0-s)}$, there exists $U_1 = L^{-1}(\hat{C} - R)$. Thus

player 1 can completely control \hat{C} . With this we have reformulated the game strategies of players 1 and 2 as the control of \hat{C} and U_2 . Later we will only discuss the game problem for this special case.

For the convenience of reading and the following derivation, we change the matrices letters of system (12) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Ax + BFx, \\ y &= Cx, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the system state and output; $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ are system matrices; $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ are determined by the attacker and the defender respectively. The value function $\Phi(C, F)$ is defined as the dimension of unobservable subspace, which has variables matrices C and F ,

$$\Phi(C, F) = \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \dim \text{Ker} \Omega(C, F), \quad (14)$$

where $\Omega(C, F)$ is the observability matrix of the system, which has variables matrices C and F . An attacker wants to reveal system information by minimizing the unobservable subspace. It controls system sensors, i.e., controlling matrix C . While a defender who wants to protect system information from being stolen aims to maximize the unobservable subspace by state feedback control, i.e., controlling matrix F . The objectives for two players are

$$C^* = \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \Phi(C, F), \quad (15)$$

$$F^* = \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \Phi(C, F). \quad (16)$$

The above derivation can be found in (Xu et al. (2023)).

3. TO MINIMIZE OR MAXIMIZE THE DIMENSION

We first give derivations and algorithms for two players to minimize or maximize the dimension of unobservable subspace.

3.1 To minimize unobservable subspace

The attacker aims to minimize the unobservable subspace by controlling C , i.e.,

$$C^* = \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \Phi(C, F) = \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

which is equal to

$$\arg \max_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Im}[C^\top, (A + BF)^\top C^\top, \dots, (A + BF)^{(n-1)\top} C^\top].$$

Define the dual system of system (13) as

$$\dot{\hat{x}} = \hat{A}\hat{x} + \hat{B}\hat{u}, \quad (17)$$

where $\bar{A} = (A + BF)^\top$, $\bar{B} = C^\top$. Thus the optimal strategy becomes

$$\arg \max_{\bar{B}} \dim \text{Im} [\bar{B}, \bar{A}\bar{B}, \dots, \bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{B}] = \arg \max_{\bar{B}} \dim \text{Im} \Gamma,$$

where $\Gamma = \Gamma(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ refers to the controllability matrix of the dual system. Now the problem becomes how to choose \bar{B} to make the dual system controllable.

We decompose the derivation into four parts: Part A gives a similar transformation and a necessary and sufficient condition for complete controllability; Part B gives formula for calculating the dimension of controllable subspace; Part C gives a sufficient and necessary condition for maximizing the controllable subspace; Part D gives a specific algorithm.

Part A: Find similar transformation matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ of system (17) which makes \bar{A} become Jordan normal form,

$$T^{-1}\dot{\hat{x}} = T^{-1}\bar{A}\hat{x} + T^{-1}\bar{B}\hat{u}. \quad (18)$$

Define $J = T^{-1}\bar{A}T$, $T^{-1}\hat{x} = \hat{x}$ and $T^{-1}\bar{B} = \hat{B}$, we get the Jordan normal form of the dual system

$$\dot{\hat{x}} = J\hat{x} + \hat{B}\hat{u}. \quad (19)$$

For the above J , let its l eigenvalues be: λ_1 (algebraic multiplicity: σ_1 , geometric multiplicity: α_1), λ_2 (algebraic multiplicity: σ_2 , geometric multiplicity: α_2), ..., λ_l (algebraic multiplicity: σ_l , geometric multiplicity: α_l). Assume $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j, \forall i \neq j$ and $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \dots + \sigma_l = n$.

Thus we have

$$J = J(\lambda_1) \oplus J(\lambda_2) \oplus \dots \oplus J(\lambda_l), \quad (20)$$

$$\hat{B} = [\hat{B}_1^\top, \hat{B}_2^\top, \dots, \hat{B}_l^\top]^\top \quad (21)$$

where \oplus is the direct sum of matrices,

$$J(\lambda_i) = \begin{bmatrix} J_1(\lambda_i) & & & \\ & J_2(\lambda_i) & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & J_{\alpha_i}(\lambda_i) \end{bmatrix}, \hat{B}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{B}_{i1} \\ \hat{B}_{i2} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{B}_{i\alpha_i} \end{bmatrix},$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$, where

$$J_k(\lambda_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & 1 & & \\ & \lambda_i & 1 & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{B}_{ik} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{b}_{1ik} \\ \hat{b}_{2ik} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{b}_{rik} \end{bmatrix},$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots, \alpha_i$, where $J_k(\lambda_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{ik} \times r_{ik}}$, $\hat{B}_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_{ik} \times m}$. r_{ik} is the dimension of $J_k(\lambda_i)$, $\sum_{k=1}^{\alpha_i} r_{ik} = \sigma_i$.

Give the following lemma which is the Jordan normal type criterion for complete controllability.

Lemma 1. (Chen (1999)) For the Jordan normal form of linear system, the necessary and sufficient condition for the complete controllability is

$$\text{rank} [\hat{b}_{ri1}^\top, \hat{b}_{ri2}^\top, \dots, \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i}^\top]^\top = \alpha_i, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, l, \quad (22)$$

which means the last rows of $\hat{B}_{i1}, \hat{B}_{i2}, \dots, \hat{B}_{i\alpha_i}$ are linearly independent.

Define $\max\{\alpha_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, l\} = \alpha_*$. Thus \hat{B} has at least α_* columns to make the system completely controllable. However, for $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, if $\alpha_* > m$, how to maximize the controllable subspace?

Modify (22) and get

$$\text{rank} [\hat{b}_{ri1}, \hat{b}_{ri2}, \dots, \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i}] = \min\{m, \alpha_i\}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, l, \quad (23)$$

which can be proved as a necessary but not sufficient condition to maximize the rank of controllability matrix. The insufficiency is shown in the following example.

Example 1. For $J = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b \end{pmatrix}$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}, b \in$

$\mathbb{R}, a \neq b$. It has two eigenvalues: a (algebraic multiplicity: 3, geometric multiplicity: 2), b (algebraic multiplicity: 1, geometric multiplicity: 1). If $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can find

$$\hat{B}1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \hat{B}2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \hat{B}3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ which}$$

satisfy (23). But the dimensions of controllability matrix $\Gamma(J, \hat{B})$ for different \hat{B} are different. $\dim \Gamma(J, \hat{B}1) = 2$, $\dim \Gamma(J, \hat{B}2) = 3$ and $\dim \Gamma(J, \hat{B}3) = 3$. Actually $\{B_2, B_3\} \in \arg \max_{\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \Gamma(J, \hat{B})$.

Part B: In order to get necessary and sufficient condition to maximize the rank of controllability matrix, We first give a lemma, which calculates the dimension of controllability matrix according to the structure of \hat{B} .

Consider the problem, for system (19), $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is fixed beforehand. For each eigenvalue $\lambda_i (\forall i = 1, 2, \dots, l)$ of J ,

calculate the rank of corresponding matrix $[\hat{b}_{ri1}^\top, \hat{b}_{ri2}^\top, \dots, \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i}^\top]^\top$

in (22) and define its rank as s_i . Define $\{\hat{b}_{ri1}, \hat{b}_{ri2}, \dots, \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i}\}$ as a vector set \mathcal{I}_i with α_i vectors, among which s_i vectors are linearly independent. Define ik as the serial number of vector \hat{b}_{rik} , which is the last row of \hat{B}_{ik} and the position of \hat{B}_{ik} in J is $J_k(\lambda_i)$. Find s_i vectors from set \mathcal{I}_i which are linearly independent, and define the combinations of these vectors' serial number as a set \mathcal{I}_{ij} , where $j = 1, 2, \dots, p_i$, which means we can find p_i sets with s_i vectors which are linearly independent. Then we have the following lemma to calculate the dimension of controllability matrix.

Lemma 2. The dimension of controllable subspace is

$$\dim \text{Im} \Gamma(J, \hat{B}) = \sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{ik \in \mathcal{I}_{ij}^*} r_{ik}, \quad (24)$$

where set \mathcal{I}_{ij}^* is defined as the set which has the largest sum of the corresponding Jordan block dimensions, i.e.,

$$j^* = \arg \max_j \sum_{ik \in \mathcal{I}_{ij}} r_{ik}, j = 1, 2, \dots, p_i. \quad (25)$$

Part C: According to the above way to calculate dimension of controllability matrix, we can give the necessary and sufficient condition to maximize the rank of controllability matrix by choosing a proper \hat{B} .

Consider the problem, for system (19), $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is

to be determined. For each eigenvalue λ_i of J , calculate the geometric multiplicity α_i . For $m < \alpha_i$, define $\{\hat{b}_{ri1}, \hat{b}_{ri2}, \dots, \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i}\}$, which is the last row of \hat{B}_{ik} and the position of \hat{B}_{ik} in J is $J_k(\lambda_i)$, as a vector set \mathcal{I}_i with α_i vectors. The dimension of $J_k(\lambda_i)$ is r_{ik} and find m -th largest dimensions in $\{r_{ik}, k = 1, 2, \dots, \alpha_i\}$, whose corresponding vectors \hat{b}_{rij} form a set \mathcal{I}_i^* . Then a necessary and sufficient condition to maximize the rank of controllability matrix is give as follows.

Proposition 1. The dimension of controllable subspace is maximized by choosing $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ if and only if

$$\begin{cases} \text{rank} \left[\hat{b}_{ri1}^\top, \hat{b}_{ri2}^\top, \dots, \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i}^\top \right]^\top = \alpha_i, & \text{for } m \geq \alpha_i, \\ \text{rank } \mathcal{I}_i^* = m, & \text{for } m < \alpha_i. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Proof: For $m \geq \alpha_i$, according to Lemma 1, it is the necessary and sufficient condition for the complete controllability of the linear system. Thus it is apparent that the dimension of controllable subspace is maximized.

For $m < \alpha_i$, (sufficiency) according to Lemma 2, $\max_{\hat{B}} \dim \text{Im } \Gamma = \max_{\hat{B}} \sum_{i=1}^l \sum_{ik \in \mathcal{I}_{ij}^*} r_{ik}$. \mathcal{I}_{ij}^* is the largest sum of the corresponding Jordan block dimensions in combinations of vectors which are linearly independent. $\text{rank } \mathcal{I}_i^* = m$ makes vectors \hat{b}_{rij} which corresponds to m -th largest dimensions in $\{r_{ik}, k = 1, 2, \dots, \alpha_i\}$ linearly independent, thus their dimensions can be added in the dimension of controllable subspace and the dimension of controllable subspace is maximized.

(Necessity) If the dimension of controllable subspace is maximized, according to Lemma 2, \mathcal{I}_{ij}^* includes m -th largest dimensions in $\{r_{ik}, k = 1, 2, \dots, \alpha_i\}$. This means $\text{rank } \mathcal{I}_i^* = m$. ■

Part D: Now we give a specific way to choose \hat{B} , which is a sufficient condition to maximize dimension of controllable subspace.

Define $\{ik\}$ as the serial number set of Jordan blocks $J_k(\lambda_i)$ and $\{r_{i1}, r_{i2}, \dots, r_{i\alpha_i}\}$ as the dimensions of corresponding blocks. Resort $\{r_{i1}, r_{i2}, \dots, r_{i\alpha_i}\}$ in a descending order and get new serial number for the dimensions $\{\beta_{i1}, \beta_{i2}, \dots, \beta_{i\alpha_i}\}$, where β_{ij} is the j -th largest block of λ_i dimension r_{ik} 's sequence number, $\beta_{ij} = k$.

Corollary 1. The sufficient condition to maximize dimension of controllable subspace is to set the last rows of $\hat{B}_{i1}, \hat{B}_{i2}, \dots, \hat{B}_{i\alpha_i}$ to be

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{b}_{ri1} \\ \hat{b}_{ri2} \\ \vdots \\ \hat{b}_{ri\alpha_i} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} [\delta_{\alpha_i}^{\beta_{i1}}, \delta_{\alpha_i}^{\beta_{i2}}, \dots, \delta_{\alpha_i}^{\beta_{im}}], & \text{for } \alpha_i \geq m, \\ [I_{\alpha_i} \mathbf{0}_{\alpha_i \times (m - \alpha_i)}], & \text{for } \alpha_i < m, \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

where $\delta_{\alpha_i}^{\beta_{ij}} = \text{Col}_{\beta_{ij}}(I_{\alpha_i})$. Let other rows of $\hat{B}_{i1}, \hat{B}_{i2}, \dots, \hat{B}_{i\alpha_i}$ be zero rows.

Proof: Apparently, equation (27) is a special condition of (26), according to Proposition 1, dimension of controllable subspace is maximized. ■

Finally, the optimal strategy of attacker is

$$C = \bar{B}^\top = (T\hat{B})^\top = \hat{B}^\top T^\top \quad (28)$$

In order to minimize the unobservable subspace with fixed m , the algorithm for player 1 to choose C using the way in Corollary 1 is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for C to minimize the unobservable subspace

Set $\bar{A} = (A + BF)^\top$.
 Calculate geometric multiplicity α_i of J 's eigenvalue λ_i ;
 Calculate dimensions of Jordan blocks of $\lambda_i, \{r_{i1}, r_{i2}, \dots, r_{i\alpha_i}\}$;
 Calculate sequence numbers of dimensions in descending order $\{\beta_{i1}, \beta_{i2}, \dots, \beta_{i\alpha_i}\}$.
 Set $\hat{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ all zeros matrix.
 Update \hat{B} according to *Corollary 1*.
 Calculate $C = \hat{B}^\top T^\top$.

Remark 1. It is found that the value function $\Phi(C, F) = \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$ is determined by the maximal geometric multiplicity of $(A + BF)$. This value can be determined by F , which is controlled by the defender. The larger this value is, the larger the non-observable subspace dimension of the system is, and the more beneficial it is to the defender.

3.2 To maximize unobservable subspace

The defender aims to maximize the unobservable subspace by controlling F , i.e.,

$$F^* = \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \Phi(C, F) = \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

Define $\text{Ker } \Omega \triangleq \mathcal{V}$. Because $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}, (A + BF)^j v \in \text{Ker } C$, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, (n - 1)$. According to Cayley-Hamilton theorem, $\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, (A + BF)^j v \in \text{Ker } C$. Thus \mathcal{V} is an (A, B) -invariant subspaces contained in $\text{Ker } C$. Among all (A, B) -invariant subspaces contained in $\text{Ker } C$, there is a maximal one $\mathcal{V}^*(C)$, whose dimension is independent of F , i.e.,

$$\max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} = \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C). \quad (29)$$

$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C)$ is related to matrices A, B and C . Now we give a lemma to find \mathcal{V}^* .

Lemma 3. (Basile and Marro (1969)) Let $\mathcal{V}_0 = \text{Ker } C$ and define, for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\mathcal{V}_{i+1} = \{x \in \text{Ker } C \mid Ax \in \mathcal{V}_i + \text{Im } B\}. \quad (30)$$

Then $\mathcal{V}_{i+1} \subset \mathcal{V}_i$. There exists $q \in \mathbb{R}, q \leq \dim \mathcal{V}_0$, $\mathcal{V}_{q+1} = \mathcal{V}_q = \mathcal{V}^*$.

The above Lemma can be changed into matrix computation form. Define $\mathcal{V}_0 = \text{Ker } C$. Find $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{q_i}\}$ as a basis in \mathcal{V}_i , for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and set the column stacked matrix $V_i = [v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_{q_i}]$. Let $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{p_i}\}$ be a basis of $\text{Ker } [V_i \ B]'$, which satisfies

$$[V_i \ B]' z_j = \mathbf{0}, \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, p_i. \quad (31)$$

Define $Z_i = \begin{bmatrix} z'_1 \\ z'_2 \\ \vdots \\ z'_i \\ \vdots \\ z'_p \end{bmatrix}$. Because $[V_i \ B]' Z_i' = \mathbf{0}$, $Z_i [V_i \ B] =$

0. According to Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{i+1} &= \text{Ker } C \cap \{x \mid Ax \in \text{Im} [V_i \ B] = \text{Ker } Z_i\} \\ &= \text{Ker } C \cap \text{Ker} [Z_i A]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Thus a basis in space \mathcal{V}_{i+1} forms a column stacked matrix V_{i+1} which satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} C \\ Z_i A \end{bmatrix} V_{i+1} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (33)$$

If space $\mathcal{V}_{i+1} = \mathcal{V}_i$, then space $\mathcal{V}^* = \mathcal{V}_{i+1}$. Otherwise, let matrix $V_i = V_{i+1}$ and repeat the above steps.

With \mathcal{V}^* , the defender should find a friend matrix $F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$ of \mathcal{V}^* which satisfies $(A + BF)\mathcal{V}^* \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*$. Then a necessary and sufficient condition to maximize the unobservable subspace is give as follows.

Proposition 2. The dimension of unobservable subspace is maximized by choosing $F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, if and only if it is the friend matrices (i.e. $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*)$) of the maximal (A, B)-invariant subspaces contained in $\text{Ker } C$ (i.e. \mathcal{V}^*). That is

$$\arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*). \quad (34)$$

Proof: (Sufficiency) For $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*)$,

$$\dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF_0) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF_0)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} = \dim \mathcal{V}^*.$$

According to the definition of \mathcal{V}^* , the dimension of unobservable subspace has reached the maximum value. Thus

$$F_0 \in \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F).$$

(Necessity) If $F_1 \in \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$,

$$\dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF_1) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF_1)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix} = \dim \mathcal{V}^*.$$

According to the definition of friend matrix, $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*)$. ■

Now give a way to find such friend matrices F. Define $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$ as a basis in \mathcal{V}^* and set the column stacked matrix as $V = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r]$. There exists non-zero matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ which satisfies

$$(A + BF)V = VX. \quad (35)$$

Define

$$-FV = U, \quad (36)$$

we have

$$AV = VX + BU = (V \ B) \begin{pmatrix} X \\ U \end{pmatrix}. \quad (37)$$

Because U is not unique in some cases, we use pseudo inverse $\text{pinv}()$ to calculate U .




Fig. 1. Scenario of game model.

$$\begin{pmatrix} X \\ U \end{pmatrix} = \text{pinv}(V \ B) AV. \quad (38)$$

F is also not unique in some cases according to (36), and we use pseudo inverse pinv again,

$$F = -U * \text{pinv}(V). \quad (39)$$

Thus the above derivation is a sufficient but unnecessary condition to get a friend matrix. The algorithm for the defender to choose F using pseudo inverse is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for F to maximize the unobservable subspace

Set $\text{Im } V_i = \text{Ker } C$, $SZ = [V_i \ B]'$, $\text{Im } Z_i = \text{Ker}(SZ)'$
 $SV = [C; Z_i * A]$.

Calculate $\text{Im } V_{i+1} = \text{Ker}(SV)$.

while $V_i \neq V_{i+1}$ **do**

Set $V_i = V_{i+1}$, $SZ = [V_i \ B]'$, $\text{Im } Z_i = \text{Ker}(SZ)'$

$SV = [C; Z_i * A]$.

Calculate $\text{Im } V_{i+1} = \text{Ker}(SV)$.

end while

Set $V = V_{i+1} = [v_1 \ v_2 \ \dots \ v_r]$.

Calculate $[X; U] = \text{pinv}(V \ B) AV$, choose the last $(n - r)$ columns as U .

Calculate $F = -U * \text{pinv}(V)$.

Remark 2. According to (29) and Proposition 2, the value function $\Phi(C, F) = \max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$ is determined by matrices A, B and C. Thus it can be determined by the attacker, who controls C.

4. ASYNCHRONOUS DYNAMIC GAME

Then we formulate the problem in asynchronous dynamic game and give results analysis considering one-step optimality and two-steps optimality respectively.

4.1 Asynchronous dynamic game considering one step

The game problem is defined before the evolution of state x in system (13). We assume that matrices A, B and players's actions are known to two players. two players




Fig. 2. Sequence of actions.

update strategies asynchronously and repeat the game for many times.

Fig. 1 shows the scenario of game model. Apart from the attacker and the defender, there is a third person. From the perspective of the attacker, its goal is to help the third person acquire system information. We assume that the attacker cannot directly reveal system information to the third person, like firewall NGFW incorporates the function of covert channel detection to cut off the transmission of information (Arefin et al. (2021)). But it can help the third person get system information by controlling matrix C and minimizing the dimension of the unobservable subspace. From the perspective of the defender, it tries to protect system information from being observed by the third person and wants to maximize the dimension of the unobservable subspace by controlling matrix F .

Fig. 2 shows the sequence of actions. An epoch is defined once a player acts. In odd epochs, only the attacker acts and in even epochs, only the defender acts. Because two players have opposite goals, one player's strategy update will trigger another player to change strategy. Thus two players repeat the game for many times.

The update dynamics of the value function $\Phi(C, F)$ in epoch i is,

$$\Phi_i(C, F) = \begin{cases} \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F), & \text{for } i = 2j - 1, j \in \mathbb{N}^*, \\ \max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F), & \text{for } i = 2j, j \in \mathbb{N}^*. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

The best response for the attacker considering one step is

$$BR1_a = \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (41)$$

The best response for the defender considering one step is

$$BR1_d = \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker} \begin{bmatrix} C \\ C(A + BF) \\ \vdots \\ C(A + BF)^{n-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

$BR1_a$ has been discussed in Section 3.1 and $BR1_d$ has been discussed in Section 3.2. Apart from Algorithm 1 (or Algorithm 2), there are also other ways to choose C (or F) which belong to the best response sets.

As for $BR1_a$, we can choose \hat{B} which satisfies equation (26) according to Proposition 1. And

$$BR1_a = \hat{B}^T T^T, \quad (43)$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the similar transformation matrix which makes $(A + BF)^T$ become Jordan normal form.

As for $BR1_d$, we have to find the friend matrices of the maximal (A, B) -invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C$, i.e.,

$$BR1_d = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*). \quad (44)$$

In Algorithm 2, we only get the friend matrix F calculated by pseudo inverse.

Because the best response for both the attacker $BR1_a$ and the defender $BR1_d$ are not single-valued maps, there are different game results according to the choices of players. Here are examples of different choices of C and F leading to different game results.

$$\text{Example 2. } A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.2 \end{bmatrix}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 5}, F \in$$

$\mathbb{R}^{1 \times 5}, B = [0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1]^T, F_0 = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$, which denotes F in epoch 0.

Case 1: If the attacker chooses C according to Algorithm 1 and the defender chooses F according to Algorithm 2, the values of players' strategies C and F have a loop of four epochs: In first two epochs, the attacker chooses $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and the defender chooses $F = [-0.1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.1 \ 0]$; in last two epochs, the attacker chooses $C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and the defender chooses $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$. Fig. 3 shows the game results of dimensions.

Case 2: If the attacker chooses $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ instead of $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ when $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$, which also belongs to $BR1_a$ and all other strategies follow Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, the defender will choose $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$ in the second epoch and the values of players' strategies C and F are locked. Fig. 4 shows the game results of dimensions.

Case 3: If the defender chooses $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.2 \ 0.1]$ instead of $F = [-0.1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.1 \ 0]$ when $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, which also belongs to $BR1_d$ and all other strategies follow Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, the values of players' strategies C and F have a loop of four epochs: In first two epochs, the attacker chooses $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and the defender chooses $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.2 \ 0.1]$; in last two epochs, the attacker chooses $C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and the defender chooses $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]$. Fig. 5 shows the game results of dimensions.

Remark 3. Different choices in best response sets will lead to different game results. This is because different values of C in best response set $BR1_a$ have different values of $\dim \mathcal{V}^*$. When $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\dim \mathcal{V}^* = 3$; when $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\dim \mathcal{V}^* = 1$. And different values of F in best response set $BR1_d$ will influence the maximal




Fig. 3. Game results with $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ when $F = 0$.




Fig. 4. Game results with $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ when $F = 0$.




Fig. 5. Game results with $F = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0.2 \ 0.1]$ when $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

geometric multiplicity of $(A + BF)$, which is the value of $\min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$ in the next epoch. Thus we should take $\dim \mathcal{V}^*$ and maximal geometric multiplicity of $(A + BF)$ into consideration, which lead to the following two-steps optimization.

4.2 Asynchronous dynamic game considering two steps

Assume the attacker is smart enough to choose an action in the best response set $BR1_a$ which is relative better in the next epoch after the defender makes a decision. Because the best response for the defender $BR1_d = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*)$ and $\max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) = \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C)$, we have a smarter best response for the attacker which considers two steps,

$$\begin{aligned} BR2_a &= \arg \min_{C \in BR1_a} \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) \\ &= \arg \min_{C \in BR1_a} \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the defender is also smart enough to choose an action in the best response set $BR1_d$ which is relative better after the attacker makes a decision. Because the best response for the attacker is determined by the maximal geometric multiplicity of eigenvalues of $(A + BF)$, we have a smarter best response for the defender which considers two steps,

$$\begin{aligned} BR2_d &= \arg \max_{F \in BR1_d} \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) \\ &= \arg \max_{F \in BR1_d} [\text{maximum geometric multiplicity of } (A + BF)] \end{aligned}$$

However, the best responses including $BR2_a$ and $BR2_d$ are still not single-valued maps. To simplify the analysis, give the following assumption.

Assumption 1. The attacker (or the defender) prefers to keep strategy unchanged if the old strategy C (or F) belongs to $BR2_a$ (or $BR2_d$) in this epoch.

Define two modes of game results.

Definition 3. The game result is defined as a lock mode, if $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \exists \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \Phi_i(C, F) = \gamma$.

Definition 4. The game result is defined as an oscillation mode, if $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \Phi_i(C, F) \neq \Phi_{i+1}(C, F)$.

Actually, the game result depends on the relation of $\min_C \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C)$ and $\min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$. Define a set which is similar to $BR2_a$ as follows.

$$BR2X_a = \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C), \quad (45)$$

where the difference between $BR2X_a$ and $BR2_a$ is the value range of matrix C . Give the following lemma.

Lemma 4. $\forall A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}, C_1 \in BR2X_a, C_2 \in BR1_a$, there is $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C_1, A, B) \geq \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C_2, A, B)$.

Proof: $\forall C_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, it is apparent that the maximal (A,B)-invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C_0$ is larger than A-invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C_0$, i.e., $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C_0) \geq \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C_0)$. Thus $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C_1) \geq \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C_1) \geq \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C_2)$. \blacksquare

Then give a sufficient but unnecessary condition when three sets $BR1_a, BR2_a, BR2X_a$ are reciprocal equivalence.

Lemma 5. For fixed $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$, the condition $BR1_a = BR2_a \subset BR2X_a$ satisfies if, $\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C \in BR1_a, A, B) = \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR1_a, A, B)$.

Proof: According to Lemma 4, $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR2X_a) \geq \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C \in BR1_a)$. If $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR1_a) = \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C \in BR1_a)$, there is $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR2X_a) \geq \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR1_a)$. According to the definition of $BR2X_a, \forall C_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}, \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR2X_a) \leq \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C_0)$. Thus there is $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR2X_a) = \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR1_a)$ and $BR1_a \subset BR2X_a$, which means $\forall C_1 \in BR1_a$, it minimizes $\dim \mathcal{V}^*$. According to the definition of $BR2_a$, it is apparent that $BR1_a = BR2_a$. ■

A necessary and sufficient condition is established to verify the game results to be lock mode.

Theorem 1. The game result is lock mode in epoch $i \geq l, (l = 2j + 1, j \in \mathbb{N})$, if and only if, in epoch l , $\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C \in BR1_a) = \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C \in BR1_a)$.

Proof: (Sufficiency) Assume $\min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_l = \dim \mathcal{V}_l^* = \gamma$, where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. When epoch $i = l$, according to Lemma 5, $BR1_a = BR2_a$. When $i = l + 1, V_{l+1} = \max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega \leq \dim \mathcal{V}_l^* = \gamma$. Because $\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(F_{l-1}) = \dim \mathcal{V}_l^*$, there is $F_{l-1} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*)$, namely $F_{l-1} \in BR1_d$. According to Lemma 4, $\min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) \leq \dim \mathcal{V}^*$. When $F_{l+1} = F_{l-1}$, $\min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(F_{l+1}) = \dim \mathcal{V}^*$, i.e., $\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$ reaches the upper bound and $F_{l-1} \in BR2_d$. Because of Assumption 1, the defender chooses $F_{l+1} = F_{l-1}$. When $i = l + 2, V_{l+2} = \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$, because $F_{l+1} = F_{l-1}, C_l \subseteq BR2_a$. Because of Assumption 1, the attacker chooses $C_{l+2} = C_l$. Thus $\forall i \geq l$, the attacker and the defender keep C and F unchanged and $\Phi_i = \gamma$.

(Necessity) Because in epoch $i \geq l$, it is lock mode, $\exists \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\Phi_i = \gamma$. For $l = 2j + 1, j \in \mathbb{N}, V_l = \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_l(C, F) = \gamma. V_{l+1} = \max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) = \dim \mathcal{V}_{l+1}^*$. Because state feedback control does not change $\dim \mathcal{V}^*$, we have $\dim \mathcal{V}_{l+1}^* = \dim \mathcal{V}_l^*$. Thus $\min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_l(C, F) = \dim \mathcal{V}_l^*$. ■

Based on this theorem, a corollary is derived to verify the game results to be lock mode.

Corollary 2. If for $l = 2j + 1, j \in \mathbb{N}, \dim \mathcal{V}_l^* > \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_l$, it is oscillation mode. And $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} \geq l$, the amplitude $|\Phi_{i+1} - \Phi_i| = \dim \mathcal{V}_{\text{even}(i, i+1)}^* - \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_{\text{odd}(i, i+1)}$, where $\text{even}(i, i+1)$ means choosing the even item in set $\{i, i+1\}$ and $\text{odd}(i, i+1)$ means choosing the odd item in set $\{i, i+1\}$.

Proof: $V_{\text{odd}(i, i+1)} = \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_{\text{odd}(i, i+1)}, V_{\text{even}(i, i+1)} = \max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega_{\text{even}(i, i+1)} = \dim \mathcal{V}_{\text{even}(i, i+1)}^*$, thus we can get the above proposition easily. ■

Remark 4. The amplitude can be controlled by F by changing the optimal result of $\min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$. Because the state feedback F can change the maximum geometric multiplicity of the system matrix $(A + BF)$ through pole assignment. When $|\Phi_{i+1} - \Phi_i| = 0$, it becomes lock mode. Because $\min_C \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C) \geq \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$, the defender is purpose is to reduce the amplitude by controlling F and even make the oscillation mode to be lock mode.

Give another corollary which is a sufficient condition of a special oscillation mode whose results have a loop.

Corollary 3. If the game result is oscillation mode and $0 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*)$, the game results have a loop.

Proof: Because $F = 0, (A + BF)$ return to the initial value A , which lead to the loop. ■

Actually, the game results of case 1 in example 2 have a loop. The next theorem describes a special condition which is lock mode.

Theorem 2. For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$.

(1) When $n - m \geq k$. If $\text{Im} B \subseteq \text{Ker } C$ and $\forall v \neq 0 \in \text{Ker } C, CAv \neq 0$.

(2) When $n - m < k$. If $\text{Ker } C \subseteq \text{Im} B$ and $\forall v \neq 0 \in \text{Ker } C, Z_i Av \neq 0$, where Z_i satisfies $Z_i B = 0$.

There is $\dim \mathcal{V}^* = 0$ and it is locked mode.

Proof: (1) When $n - m \geq k$. Because $\text{Im} B \subseteq \text{Ker } C, CB = 0$. Then $\forall v \neq 0 \in \text{Ker } C, \forall K, C(A + BK)v = CAv \neq 0$. Thus $(A + BK)v \notin \text{Ker } C$, which means $(A + BK)$ -invariant subspace contained in $\text{Ker } C$ is 0. Thus $\dim \mathcal{V}^* = 0$.

(2) When $n - m < k$. Because $Z_i B = 0, \forall v \neq 0 \in \text{Ker } C, \forall K, Z_i(A + BK)v = Z_i Av \neq 0$. Thus $(A + BK)v \notin \text{Im } B$. Because $\text{Ker } C \subseteq \text{Im} B, (A + BK)v \notin \text{Ker } C$, which means $(A + BK)$ -invariant subspace contained in $\text{Ker } C$ is 0. Thus $\dim \mathcal{V}^* = 0$. ■

There are examples which illustrate Theorem 2.

Example 3. For $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}, C \in$

$\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. When $n - m \geq k$, consider $C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

$\text{Ker } C = [\delta_4^3 \delta_4^4]$, where $\delta_n^k = \text{Col}_k(I_n)$. $CA\delta_4^3 \neq 0, CA\delta_4^4 \neq 0$. According to Theorem 2, $\text{Im } B \subseteq \text{Ker } C, \text{Im } B = \delta_4^3$ or δ_4^4 or $[\delta_4^3 \delta_4^4]$. In this case, $\dim \mathcal{V}^* = 0$. Otherwise, when $\text{Im} B = \delta_4^1$ or $\delta_4^2, \dim \mathcal{V}^* = 1$. When $\text{Im} B = [\delta_4^1 \delta_4^2], \dim \mathcal{V}^* = 2$. When $n - m < k$, consider $B = [\delta_4^2 \delta_4^3 \delta_4^4]$. For $Z_i B = 0, Z_i = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0], Z_i A = [0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0]$. If $V_i = \text{Ker } C = \delta_4^3, Z_i A \delta_4^3 \neq 0, \dim \mathcal{V}^* = 0$. If $V_i = \delta_4^2$ or $\delta_4^4, Z_i A \delta_4^2 = Z_i A \delta_4^4 = 0, \dim \mathcal{V}^* = 1$. If $V_i = \text{Ker } C = [\delta_4^3 \delta_4^4], Z_i A \delta_4^3 \neq 0, Z_i A v_2 \delta_4^2 = 0, \dim \mathcal{V}^* = 1$. If $V_i = \text{Ker } C = [\delta_4^2 \delta_4^3 \delta_4^4], Z_i A \delta_4^2 = 0, Z_i A \delta_4^3 \neq 0, Z_i A \delta_4^4 = 0, \dim \mathcal{V}^* = 2$.

4.3 Comparison with Stackelberg game

Actually, the best responses for players which consider two steps are special cases of single-leader single-follower Stackelberg game equilibrium. We compare the above best response results with Stackelberg game equilibrium action in this part.

Definition 5. A single-leader single-follower Stackelberg game is a tuple $(N, (A_i)_{i \in N}, (u_i)_{i \in N})$, where $N = \{\text{leader}(l), \text{follower}(f)\}$ is a set of players, A_i is the action set of player $i \in N$, and $u_i : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the payoff function of player i , where $A := \prod_{i \in N} A_i$. The leader knows the payoff function of the follower and makes decisions first considering how the follower will react. The follower can observe the strategy of the leader and adjust the strategy accordingly.

Under this model, the follower and the leader choose action according to the following definitions.

Definition 6. (Best Response) The best response set of the follower f in single-leader single-follower Stackelberg game to action $a_l \in \mathbb{A}_l$ of the leader is

$$A_f^*(a_l) = \{a_f^* \in \mathbb{A}_f : u_f(a_l, a_f^*) \geq u_f(a_l, a_f)\}. \quad (46)$$

Definition 7. (Optimal Leader Action) Action $a_l^* \in \mathbb{A}_l$ satisfies a Stackelberg equilibrium for the leader if

$$A_l^*(a_f) = \{a_l^* \in \mathbb{A}_l : \min_{a_f \in R_f(a_l)} u_l(a_l^*, a_f)\} \quad (47)$$

$$= \max_{a_l \in \mathbb{A}_l} \min_{a_f \in R_f(a_l)} u_l(a_l, a_f) \quad (48)$$

Definition 8. (Stackelberg Equilibrium) Let $a_l^* \in \mathbb{A}_l$ be a Stackelberg strategy for the leader. Then any element $a_f^* \in R_f(a_l^*)$ is an optimal strategy for the follower. The action profile $\{a_l^*, a_f^*\}$ is a Stackelberg equilibrium.

In our problem, the players set includes the attacker and the defender. The action set of the attacker is $A_a = C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and action set of the defender is $A_d = F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}$. The payoff function of the attacker is $u_a(C, F) = -\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$ and payoff function of the defender is $u_d(C, F) = \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)$.

There are two scenarios. In scenario 1, the attacker is the leader and the defender is the follower. The best response of the defender is

$$\begin{aligned} A_{f-d}^*(C) &= \{F^* \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n} : \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F^*) \geq \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F)\} \\ &= \arg \max_F \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C) \\ &= \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}^*(C)), \end{aligned}$$

which is actually the best response for the defender considering one step, i.e.,

$$A_{f-d}^* = BR1_d. \quad (49)$$

The Stackelberg equilibrium action of the attacker is

$$\begin{aligned} A_{l-a}^*(F) &= \arg \max_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \min_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} -\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) \\ &= \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) \\ &= \arg \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \mathcal{V}^*(C), \end{aligned}$$

which is similar to the best response for the attacker considering two steps $BR2_a$. The difference is the matrix C is value range, where for $BR2_a$, $C \in BR1_a$. This difference comes from that, in asynchronous dynamic game considering two steps, the attacker aims to maximize the value function after action at once. However, in Stackelberg game, the leader aims to maximize payoff function after the follower acts. According to (45), we have

$$A_{l-a}^* = BR2X_a. \quad (50)$$

In scenario 2, the defender is the leader and the attacker is the follower, and the analysis is similar to scenario 1. The best response of the attacker is

$$\begin{aligned} A_{f-a}^*(F) &= \{C^* \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} : -\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(F, C^*) \geq -\dim \text{Ker } \Omega(F, C)\} \\ &= \arg \min_C \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(F), \end{aligned}$$

which is actually the best response for the attacker considering one step, i.e.,

$$A_{f-a}^* = BR1_a. \quad (51)$$

The Stackelberg equilibrium action of the defender is

$$\begin{aligned} A_{l-d}^*(C) &= \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} \min_{C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}} \dim \text{Ker } \Omega(C, F) \\ &= \arg \max_{F \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times n}} [(A + BF) \text{ is max geometric multiplicity}] \end{aligned}$$

which is similar to the best response for the defender considering two steps $BR2_d$. The difference is the matrix F is value range, where for $BR2_d$, $F \in BR1_d$. The difference comes from similar reason in Scenario 1.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we study the two-person non-cooperative game based on the unobservable subspace dimension of the system. Derivation and algorithms of maximizing or minimizing the unobservable subspace dimension are given. In the framework of one-step optimal asynchronous dynamic game, it is found that because the best response set of players are not single-valued maps, there are different cases of game results. The dimension of the maximal (A, B) -invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C$ is one of the causes of uncertainty. In a two-steps optimal asynchronous dynamic game, the definition and existence conditions of lock and oscillation game result modes are given. We also find a special lock mode condition with the dimension of the maximal (A, B) -invariant subspace in $\text{Ker } C$ equals to zero. Finally, the best responses of the attacker and the defender are compared to Stackelberg game equilibrium strategies. In the future, we can study the problem in more complex scenarios. Factors such as system stability, energy consumption and non-observable subspace can be combined to construct value functions, so as to study the game between the attacker and the defender.

REFERENCES

- Arefin, M.T., Uddin, M.R., Evan, N.A., and Alam, M.R. (2021). Enterprise network: Security enhancement and policy management using next-generation firewall (ngfw). In *Computer Networks, Big Data and IoT: Proceedings of ICCBI 2020*, 753–769. Springer.
- Basile, G. and Marro, G. (1969). Controlled and conditioned invariant subspaces in linear system theory. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 3, 306–315.
- Chen, C. (1999). Linear system theory and design: Oxford university press. *New York, USA*.
- Chong, M.S., Wakaiki, M., and Hespanha, J.P. (2015). Observability of linear systems under adversarial attacks. In *2015 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2439–2444. IEEE.
- Ding, S.X., Li, L., Zhao, D., Louen, C., and Liu, T. (2022). Application of the unified control and detection framework to detecting stealthy integrity cyber-attacks on feedback control systems. *Automatica*, 142, 110352.
- Fawzi, H., Tabuada, P., and Diggavi, S. (2014). Secure estimation and control for cyber-physical systems under adversarial attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 59(6), 1454–1467.
- Gao, W., Deng, C., Jiang, Y., and Jiang, Z.P. (2022). Resilient reinforcement learning and robust output regulation under denial-of-service attacks. *Automatica*, 142, 110366.
- Horák, K., Bošanský, B., Tomášek, P., Kiekintveld, C., and Kamhoua, C. (2019). Optimizing honeypot strategies against dynamic lateral movement using partially observable stochastic games. *Computers & Security*, 87, 101579.

- Howser, G. and McMillin, B. (2014). A modal model of stuxnet attacks on cyber-physical systems: A matter of trust. In *2014 Eighth international conference on software security and reliability (SERE)*, 225–234. IEEE.
- Lu, J. and Quevedo, D.E. (2023). A jointly optimal design of control and scheduling in networked systems under denial-of-service attacks. *Automatica*, 148, 110774.
- Maccarone, L.T. and Cole, D.G. (2020). A game-theoretic approach for defending cyber-physical systems from observability attacks. *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part B: Mechanical Engineering*, 6(2), 021004.
- Mitra, A. and Sundaram, S. (2018). Distributed observers for lti systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(11), 3689–3704.
- Mitra, A. and Sundaram, S. (2019). Byzantine-resilient distributed observers for lti systems. *Automatica*, 108, 108487.
- Rizvi, S.A.A. and Lin, Z. (2018). Output feedback q-learning for discrete-time linear zero-sum games with application to the h-infinity control. *Automatica*, 95, 213–221.
- Shoukry, Y. and Tabuada, P. (2015). Event-triggered state observers for sparse sensor noise/attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(8), 2079–2091.
- Wu, C., Li, X., Pan, W., Liu, J., and Wu, L. (2020). Zero-sum game-based optimal secure control under actuator attacks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(8), 3773–3780.
- Xu, Y., Hu, X., Liu, Z., Zhang, H., and Wang, L. (2023). A game approach for defending system security from an attacker. *IFAC*.
- Zhang, T.Y. and Ye, D. (2020). False data injection attacks with complete stealthiness in cyber-physical systems: A self-generated approach. *Automatica*, 120, 109117.
- Zheng, W., Jung, T., and Lin, H. (2022). The stackelberg equilibrium for one-sided zero-sum partially observable stochastic games. *Automatica*, 140, 110231.