

OPTIMAL MIXED STRATEGIES TO THE ZERO-SUM LINEAR DIFFERENTIAL GAME

TAO XU, WANG XI, AND JIANPING HE *

Abstract. This paper exploits the weak approximation method to study a zero-sum linear differential game under mixed strategies. The stochastic nature of mixed strategies poses challenges in evaluating the game value and deriving the optimal strategies. To overcome these challenges, we first define the mixed strategy based on time discretization given the control period δ . Then, we design a stochastic differential equation (SDE) to approximate the discretized game dynamic with a small approximation error of scale $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$ in the weak sense. Moreover, we prove that the game payoff is also approximated in the same order of accuracy. Next, we solve the optimal mixed strategies and game values for the linear quadratic differential games. The effect of the control period is explicitly analyzed when the payoff is a terminal cost. Our results provide the first implementable form of the optimal mixed strategies for a zero-sum linear differential game. Finally, we provide numerical examples to illustrate and elaborate on our results.

Key words. mixed strategy, differential game, optimal control, weak approximation.

MSC codes. 93E20, 49L25, 49J55, 49N70, 49K45, 91A23, 91A15

1. Introduction. Deriving the optimal strategies is one of the most fundamental problems for a zero-sum differential game. Since the differential game stands at the intersection of the optimal control theory and the game theory, traditional methods for optimal control such as Pontryagin maximum principle and dynamic programming can be naturally adapted to derive optimal *pure strategies* for the differential games [4]. For an optimal control problem, optimality means the minimization or maximization of the payoff; for a differential game, optimality means the Nash equilibrium (NE) of the payoff, which may not exist under pure strategies. To handle this, *mixed strategies*, as a generalization of pure strategies, are widely applied to ensure the existence of NE. It leads to the problem of deriving the optimal mixed strategy for a differential game, which is open and challenging [12].

Specifically, we consider a two-player zero-sum linear differential game, where player 1 tries to minimize the game payoff while player 2 tries to maximize it. Since each player's choice of control strategy affects the other player's choice, a reasonable player always considers her worst-case payoff performance during the game. For player 1, the worst case indicates an information disadvantage, i.e., player 2 always knows the control strategy of player 1 before making her own choice of control. The worst-case payoffs for players 1 and 2 are called the *upper and lower value* of the game, respectively. Furthermore, if the upper and lower values meet, we say an NE is attained, where the payoff and control inputs are defined as the *game value* and the optimal strategies respectively. When both players are limited to taking pure strategies, i.e., the control inputs are determined functions of time and game state, the game value may not exist. In this case, the upper value is strictly larger than the lower value. Therefore, whether knowing the opponents' control strategy directly decides the game payoff.

To attain a stable NE such that the game payoff does not rely on the information advantage, mixed strategies should be used. For a static game, the pure strategy

*The authors are with the Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and Key Laboratory of System Control and Information Processing, Ministry of Education of China, Shanghai 200240, China. E-mail: {Zerken, bddwyx, jphe}@sjtu.edu.cn. Preliminary results have been accepted by the 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control [30].

chooses a control input from the admissible action space, while the mixed strategy samples input from a probability distribution over the admissible action space. For a differential game, the pure strategy is a control input function, while the mixed strategy is a stochastic process. It is proved that using mixed strategy ensures the existence of NE and game value for the differential game [6]. However, how to derive an implementable form of optimal mixed strategy is still challenging. The challenges are three-fold: i) the game dynamic is not a canonical differential equation or stochastic differential equation, hence hard to be analyzed, ii) optimizing the game payoff over stochastic processes is theoretically untractable because the space of admissible stochastic processes is of uncountably infinite dimension, where traditional optimization methods can not be applied, iii) to get an implementable mixed strategy needs time discretization, analyzing how the control period affects the game is difficult.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We introduce a novel weak-approximation-based method to approximate the game dynamic by designing an SDE. Based on our design, the approximation error is guaranteed to be of scale $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$ given the control period δ . This method sheds light on a new approach to analyzing and designing mixed strategies in general differential games.
- The challenge of optimizing over stochastic processes is tackled by a dimension reduction technique. Specifically, we transform the functional space whose dimension is uncountably infinite into a finite-dimensional space under a mild assumption in the form of the payoff.
- We obtained the optimal mixed strategy and game value for the linear quadratic differential game based on the Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs (HJI) equation. We also get the approximately optimal mixed strategies given a fixed control period. Furthermore, the effect of the control period on the game value is explicitly analyzed when the payoff is a terminal cost.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the related works. Section III defines the differential game under mixed strategies and formulates the problem of interest. Sec. IV expounds on the weak approximation method and the design of approximated stochastic differential equation. Sec. V proved the main theorem on the approximation performance. Sec. VI solves the optimal mixed strategies for linear quadratic differential games. Sec. VII shows simulation results and analysis. Sec. VIII presents concluding remarks.

2. Related Works. The study of differential games has a rich history, with numerous contributions from researchers in game theory, control theory, and applied mathematics. One of the earliest works in this area was the pioneering work by Isaacs [15]. Since then, a large body of literature has emerged on various aspects of differential games, including their existence and uniqueness of equilibrium solutions, numerical methods for solving them, and applications in diverse fields such as economics [10], robotics [20], and biology [31].

In contrast to defining mixed strategies for a static game or a repeated game, there is no well-admitted definition of mixed strategies for differential games [9]. Basically, there are two ways to define mixed strategies for a differential game. The direct definition is to treat mixed strategy as a random variable over the functional space of pure strategies. It follows from the seminal works from Aumann [2], which specify a measurable structure for the space of pure strategies. This naturally inspired the extensions to the differential game in [8, 9]. If not wanting to consider measure-valued controls, another indirect definition is available. Based on time discretization,

the mixed strategy for a differential game can be approximated by the mixed strategy for a difference game. The approximation error can be eliminated as the mesh tends to zero [6]. A lot of works follow this definition and investigate the mixed strategies for other kinds of differential games, including stochastic differential game [7], the law of large numbers differential game [12], differential games with mixed delayed strategies [25], and differential games with randomly changing information advantages [13] etc.

Though the rigorous definition of mixed strategies for the differential game is technical, these randomized strategies are widely used in the games such as pursuit-evasion problems [14, 28, 16, 17]. [14] considers evaders that actively avoid the pursuer, then describes the probabilistic pursuit-evasion game as a partial information Markov game and introduces the discrete stochastic strategies to solve it. [28] continues to study the intelligent evader strategies by further considering vision-based detection. [16] investigates the randomized pursuit strategies and provides a drastic increase in the power of the pursuer even if the evader is faster than the pursuer and knows the position of the pursuers all the time. [17] further studies the case where only local visibility is available for the pursuer. These works show that mixed strategies can improve performances for both pursuer and evader in differential games. However, optimality is not guaranteed for these proposed strategies because of the difficulty in optimizing over mixed strategies.

The evaluation of the game value and the optimal strategies are always of great challenge. Even for the differential game with pure strategies, the game value generically has no explicit expression or just does not exist [11]. Traditional methods to solve the differential games with pure strategies include the Pontryagin maximum principle [29] and viscosity solutions [1]. Our mixed strategy problem is similar to but sharply different from solving the stochastic differential game [5, 23, 22], whose game dynamic is driven by Brownian motion but not general mixed strategies. There is relatively little research on solving optimal mixed strategies for a differential game. In [12], the existence of approximately optimal mixed strategies for a zero-sum differential game is proved. However, there is no implementable procedure to derive an optimal mixed strategy. In terms of this issue, we introduce a novel weak approximation method [21, 18, 19]. Based on this, we propose a framework to do optimization on mixed strategies by using a stochastic differential equation to approximate the dynamic of mixed strategy game.




FIG. 1. Logic flow of the major results and game approximations.

3. Problem Formulation and Time Discretization. In this section, we first formulate the differential game with mixed strategies as \mathcal{G}^0 . To solve the optimal control strategies of \mathcal{G}^0 , we need the concept of δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 , which serves as a discrete approximation of \mathcal{G}^0 . We then outline the primary issues that are of concern.

3.1. Differential Game \mathcal{G}^0 . Consider a linear time-invariant zero-sum differential game with mixed strategies,

$$\mathcal{G}^0 : \begin{cases} J^0(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ g(x(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T h(t, u_1, u_2, x) dt \right\}, \\ \dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + B_1 u_1(t) + B_2 u_2(t), \quad x(t_0) = x_0, \end{cases}$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the game state, and the matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $B_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_1}$ and $B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d_2}$ are the system and input matrices. The controls/strategies adopted by players 1 and 2 are $u_1 = \{u_1(t)\}_{t=t_0}^T \in \mathcal{U}_1$ and $u_2 = \{u_2(t)\}_{t=t_0}^T \in \mathcal{U}_2$, respectively. Both u_1 and u_2 are stochastic processes under mixed strategies. For each $t \in [t_0, T]$, $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$ take values in some compact sets $U_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ and $U_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$.

For the game payoff function J^0 , $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the terminal cost being bounded and Lipschitz continuous, and $h : [t_0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times U_1 \times U_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the running cost being bounded, continuous, and uniformly Lipschitz continuous with respect to t, x for $(u_1, u_2) \in U_1 \times U_2$.

To achieve a complete depiction of the differential game, it is essential to introduce both the upper and lower value functions of the game.

DEFINITION 3.1. *The lower and upper value functions of the game \mathcal{G}^0 are given by*

$$\mathbf{V}_-^0(t_0, x_0) := \sup_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2} \inf_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1} J^0(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2),$$

and

$$\mathbf{V}_+^0(t_0, x_0) := \inf_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1} \sup_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2} J^0(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2).$$

The upper value may be thought of as the situation where the player 2 always knows $u_1(t)$ before choosing the control $u_2(t)$. In other words, the player 2 has an information advantage [12] such that the control strategy u_2 can be a function of u_1 . Therefore, the upper value can be viewed as the worst-case performance for the player 1, and the lower value can be viewed as the worst-case performance for the player 2. If the Nash equilibrium exists, then there is a pair of optimal strategies such that the upper and lower value coincide. As a result, the information advantage will not affect the game payoff if both players take up their optimal strategies.

It is known that when the strategies are limited to pure strategies, the Nash equilibrium may not exist if the Isaacs condition does not hold [15]. Then, the primary issue to be considered is whether the Nash equilibrium exists when mixed strategies are allowed. In [6], it is proved that there exist mixed strategies such that the upper and lower value of \mathcal{G}^0 meets, i.e., $\mathbf{V}^0(t_0, x_0) := \mathbf{V}_+^0(t_0, x_0) = \mathbf{V}_-^0(t_0, x_0)$. However, it remains open and challenging to implementably derive a pair of optimal control strategies.

PROBLEM 1. *Determine a pair of mixed strategy (u_1^*, u_2^*) such that $\mathbf{V}^0(t_0, x_0) = J^0(t_0, x_0, u_1^*, u_2^*)$.*

3.2. Control Period, Discrete Mixed Strategy and \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . Notice that the formulation of mixed strategies hinges on the utilization of stochastic processes, solving Problem 1 needs to make optimization over the complicated functional spaces \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 that the mixed strategies belong to. Naturally, we need to partition the continuous time interval $[t_0, T]$ into discrete ones, and use the induced discrete differential game to approximate \mathcal{G}^0 . This discretization method, originally due to [26], is widely used in the study of mixed strategies for differential games [8, 6, 9, 7].

Given the *control period* δ , we divide the interval $[t_0, T]$ into n intervals I_k of equal length δ , which is:

$$I_k = \{t; t_{k-1} < t \leq t_k\}$$

where $t_k = t_0 + k\delta$, $0 \leq k \leq n$, and $n = \lfloor \frac{T}{\delta} \rfloor$. On each interval, I_k , the control input for player i is generated from a random variable u_{ik} , and the *discrete mixed strategy* is a sequence of random variables, i.e., $u_i^\delta := \{u_{ik}\}_{k=0}^{n-1} \in \mathcal{U}_i^\delta$. Let $x_k = x(k\delta)$, we have the following δ -game.

DEFINITION 3.2 (δ -game). *Given a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, the δ -game of the differential game \mathcal{G}^0 is*

$$\mathcal{G}_\delta^1 : \begin{cases} J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ g(x_n) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(t, u_{1k}, u_{2k}, x_k) \delta \right\}, \\ x_{k+1} = e^{A\delta} x_k + \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau (B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k}), x_0 = x_0. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we study this δ -game by defining the upper and lower value functions.

DEFINITION 3.3. *The lower and upper value functions of the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 are given by*

$$\mathbf{V}_-^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \sup_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2^\delta} \inf_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1^\delta} J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2),$$

and

$$\mathbf{V}_+^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \inf_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1^\delta} \sup_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2^\delta} J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2).$$

In [12], it is proved that there exist mixed strategies such that the upper and lower value of \mathcal{G}_δ^1 meets, i.e., $\mathbf{V}^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \mathbf{V}_+^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \mathbf{V}_-^1(t_0, x_0, \delta)$. Moreover, it is also guaranteed that $\mathbf{V}^0(t_0, x_0) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{V}^1(t_0, x_0, \delta)$. If the optimal mixed strategies (u_{1k}^*, u_{2k}^*) are derived, the optimal mixed strategy for \mathcal{G}^0 immediately follows by letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Specifically,

$$u_i^*(t) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{T}{\delta} \rfloor - 1} (u_{ik}^* \cdot \mathbb{I}_{I_k}(t)),$$

where $\mathbb{I}_{I_k}(t) = 1$ if $t \in I_k$ and otherwise 0. In this way, we can focus on solving the optimal mixed strategies for \mathcal{G}_δ^1 .

This time-discretization method has reduced the functional space \mathcal{U}_i to a smaller space \mathcal{U}_i^δ for $i = 1, 2$, which raises the following problem.

PROBLEM 2. *Determine a pair of discrete mixed strategy $(u_1^{\delta*}, u_2^{\delta*})$ such that $\mathbf{V}^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) = J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1^{\delta*}, u_2^{\delta*})$.*

The solution of Problem 2 can be used to solve Problem 1 by letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Additionally, since the practical control strategies in control engineering are discrete based on the control period δ , solving Problem 2 is inherently significant.

Although the functional spaces \mathcal{U}_1^δ and \mathcal{U}_2^δ are relatively smaller, their mathematical structure is still too complicated to be handled. A natural idea is to approximate the game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 such that the dimension of the functional spaces can be reduced to a finite scale. Hence, the game value can be solved by traditional optimization methods. Moreover, if the approximation error can be limited to the same scale of δ , this approximated solution can be used to derive the solution of Problem 1 as δ approaches

0. In the next section, we apply the weak approximation method from the stochastic analysis theory to overcome this challenge.

4. Weak Approximation of the Game. In this section, we introduce the weak approximation method as a tool for studying the δ -game with mixed strategies. We provide preliminaries on the weak approximation, highlighting its significance in the analysis of mixed strategy. Subsequently, we present a step-by-step heuristic process for deducing the design of stochastic differential equations, including a first-order design and a second-order design.

4.1. Preliminaries on Weak Approximation. The weak approximation is a method of approximating a discrete-time stochastic process by a continuous-time stochastic process, which is usually an SDE driven by Brownian motion. To introduce the concept of weak approximation, we need a test function class called polynomial growth functions.

DEFINITION 4.1 (Polynomial growth functions [19]). *Let \mathbf{G} denote the set of continuous functions $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of at most polynomial growth, i.e., $\psi(\cdot) \in \mathbf{G}$ if there exists positive integers $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$ such that*

$$|\psi(x)| \leq \kappa_1 (1 + |x|^{2\kappa_2})$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, for each integer $\alpha \geq 1$ we denote by \mathbf{G}^α the set of α -times continuously differentiable functions $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which, together with its partial derivatives up to and including order α , belong to \mathbf{G} .

Intuitively, the SDE should approximate the original process in a weak sense, i.e., the differences between the expectations of two processes over a broad range of test functions are small. To quantify the idea of weak sense, one has the following definition of weak approximation.

DEFINITION 4.2 (Weak approximation [19]). *For $T > 0$, $\delta \in (0, 1 \wedge T)$, and $\alpha \geq 1$ as an integer, let $N = \lfloor T/\delta \rfloor$. We define a continuous-time stochastic process $\{X_t : t \in [0, T]\}$ to be an order α weak approximation of a discrete stochastic process $\{x_k : k = 0, \dots, N\}$ if for every $\psi \in \mathbf{G}^{\alpha+1}$, there is a positive constant C that does not depend on δ such that*

$$\max_{k=0, \dots, N} |\mathbb{E}\psi(x_k) - \mathbb{E}\psi(X_{k\delta})| \leq C\delta^\alpha.$$

This weak approximation method encourages us to design a canonical SDE to approximate the game dynamics of \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . Our goal is to reduce the dimension of the functional spaces \mathcal{U}_1^δ and \mathcal{U}_2^δ to a finite scale.

4.2. Heuristic Design of Weak Approximation. Rewrite the dynamic of \mathcal{G}_δ^1 as

$$(4.1) \quad x_{k+1} - x_k = (e^{A\delta} - I)x_k + \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau (B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k}),$$

where I is an identity matrix. Let γ_{ik} and σ_{ik} be the expectation and covariance of u_{ik} respectively, then we approximate $(B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k})$ by the Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\gamma_k, \sigma_k)$, where

$$\gamma_k := \mathbb{E}\{B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k}\} = B_1 \gamma_{1k} + B_2 \gamma_{2k},$$

and

$$\sigma_k := \text{Cov} \{B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k}\} = B_1 \sigma_{1k} B_1^\top + B_2 \sigma_{2k} B_2^\top.$$

Let $\{W_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a standard Wiener process, since $W_{(k+1)\delta} - W_{k\delta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta)$, there is $\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (W_{(k+1)\delta} - W_{k\delta}) + \gamma_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\gamma_k, \sigma_k)$. Then, the dynamic (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$x_{k+1} - x_k = (e^{A\delta} - I)x_k + \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \left[\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (W_{(k+1)\delta} - W_{k\delta}) + \gamma_k \right].$$

To make it more like a standard SDE driven by the Brownian motion, we reformulate it as

$$x_{k+1} - x_k = (e^{A\delta} - I)x_k + \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \gamma_k + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \sigma_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (W_{(k+1)\delta} - W_{k\delta}).$$

For the convenience of notation, we let Γ_{it} and Σ_{it} be the expectation and covariance of $u_{i, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor}$ respectively. Substituting $x_{k+1} - x_k$, δ and $W_{(k+1)\delta} - W_{k\delta}$ with dX_t , dt and dW_t respectively, we have the following SDE:

$$(4.2) \quad dX_t = \left[\frac{e^{A\delta} - I}{\delta} x_k + \frac{1}{\delta} \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \Gamma_t \right] dt + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \Sigma_t^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t,$$

where Γ_t and Σ_t are the expectation and covariance of $B_1 u_{1, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor} + B_2 u_{2, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor}$ respectively, i.e.,

$$\Gamma_t := \mathbb{E} \left\{ B_1 u_{1, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor} + B_2 u_{2, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor} \right\} = B_1 \Gamma_{1t} + B_2 \Gamma_{2t},$$

and

$$\Sigma_t := \text{Cov} \left\{ B_1 u_{1, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor} + B_2 u_{2, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor} \right\} = B_1 \Sigma_{1t} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2t} B_2^\top.$$

When δ is small, there are different methods to approximate $e^{A\delta}$ in the above expression, resulting in weak approximations of different orders.

4.2.1. A first-order weak approximation. When δ is small, there is $(e^{A\delta} - I) \approx Ae^{A\delta}\delta$, $\int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \approx \delta I$, then it follows approximately

$$(4.3) \quad dX_t = (Ae^{A\delta} X_t + \Gamma_t) dt + \sqrt{\delta} \Sigma_t^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t.$$

We shall prove that (4.3) is a first-order weak approximation to the dynamic of \mathcal{G}_δ^1 .

4.2.2. A second-order weak approximation. When δ is small, there is $(e^{A\delta} - I) \approx A\delta$, $\int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \approx \delta I$, then it follows approximately

$$(4.4) \quad dX_t = (AX_t + \Gamma_t) dt + \sqrt{\delta} \Sigma_t^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t.$$

We shall prove that (4.4) is a second-order weak approximation to the dynamic of \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . Since it has a higher order of approximation accuracy, we use (4.4) to solve the optimal mixed strategies in the later sections of this paper.

Using the SDE as the game state dynamic, we have a stochastic differential game (SDG) \mathcal{G}_δ^2 as a weak approximation to the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 .

DEFINITION 4.3 (SDG). *Given a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, a zero-sum stochastic differential game with payoff function J_δ^2 is*

$$\mathcal{G}_\delta^2 : \begin{cases} J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ g(X(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T h(t, u_1, u_2, X) dt \right\} \\ dX_t = (AX_t + \Gamma_t)dt + \sqrt{\delta} \Sigma_t^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t, X_{t_0} = x_0 \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we consider the value of this stochastic game by studying the upper and lower value functions.

DEFINITION 4.4. *The lower and upper value functions of the stochastic differential game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 are given by*

$$\mathbf{V}_-^2(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \sup_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2} \inf_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1} J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2),$$

and

$$\mathbf{V}_+^2(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \inf_{u_1 \in \mathcal{U}_1} \sup_{u_2 \in \mathcal{U}_2} J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2).$$

Since \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is in a special form of \mathcal{G}^0 , the game value exists, i.e., $\mathbf{V}^2(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \mathbf{V}_+^2(t_0, x_0, \delta) = \mathbf{V}_-^2(t_0, x_0, \delta)$.

Compared to \mathcal{G}^0 , \mathcal{G}_δ^2 differs significantly in the game dynamics: the dynamic of \mathcal{G}^0 is controlled by two continuous-time stochastic process $(u_1(t), u_2(t))_{t=t_0}^T$, while the dynamic of \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is controlled by $(\Gamma_t, \Sigma_t)_{t=t_0}^T$, which are two determined functions on interval $[t_0, T]$. For \mathcal{G}_δ^2 , since the first two moments are sufficient to determine the game dynamic, one can optimize over the finite-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ rather than the infinite-dimensional functional spaces \mathcal{U}_1 and \mathcal{U}_2 .

If the SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 indeed approximates the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 in a weak sense such that the approximation errors of both game dynamics and payoffs are at least of scale $O(\delta)$, then the original game \mathcal{G}^0 with mixed strategies can be accurately described by SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 when $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In this way, the most challenging problem is handled by the technique of weak approximation and dimension reduction.

In the next section, we prove that (4.3) and (4.4) are first-order and second-order weak approximations to the dynamics of δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 respectively.

5. Performance of Weak Approximation. In this section, we prove the weak approximation performance of the game dynamics. Then, we provide a straightforward one-dimensional example to demonstrate the efficacy of this approach. The discussion showcases the potential of weak approximation in game theory as an essential analytical tool for the study of mixed strategies. Finally, we prove that the approximation error between game values is of scale $O(\delta^2)$.

The proof of both first-order and second-order weak approximation follows a classical two-step procedure [19]: i) investigate the one-step approximation errors between the dynamic of \mathcal{G}_1^δ and the designed SDE. ii) if the one-step approximation errors possess an order of $\alpha + 1$, then the approximation error on the whole interval has an order of α .

5.1. Proof of the First-order Weak Approximation. To begin with, we study the one-step approximation errors of SDE (4.3) and expand the expression based on the order of δ .

LEMMA 5.1. *For the SDE (4.3), define the one-step difference $\Delta = X_\delta - x$. Let $\Delta_{(i)}$ be the i th element of Δ , there is*

- 1) $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{(i)} = (Ae^{A\delta}x + \Gamma_0)_{(i)}\delta + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$,
- 2) $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{(i)}\Delta_{(j)} = \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$.

Proof. Please see appendix A. □

Then, we study the one-step approximation errors of the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 .

LEMMA 5.2. *For the dynamic of game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 , define the one-step difference $\bar{\Delta} = x_1 - x$. Let $\bar{\Delta}_{(i)}$ be the i th element of $\bar{\Delta}$, there is*

- 1) $\mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta}_{(i)} = [Ae^{A\delta}x + \gamma_0]_{(i)}\delta + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$,
- 2) $\mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta}_{(i)}\bar{\Delta}_{(j)} = \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$.

Proof. Please see appendix B. □

Finally, we combine the above two lemmas to derive the main theorem.

THEOREM 5.3 (First-order approximation). *SDE (4.3) is an order 1 weak approximation to the dynamic of δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 such that for every $\psi \in \mathbf{G}$, there exists $C > 0$, independent of δ , such that for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}\psi(X_{k\delta}) - \mathbb{E}\psi(x_k)| < C\delta.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix C. □

5.2. Proof of the Second-order Weak Approximation. To begin with, we study the one-step approximation errors of SDE (4.4) and expand the expression based on the order of δ .

LEMMA 5.4. *For the SDE (4.4), define the one-step difference $\Delta = X_\delta - x$. Let $\Delta_{(i)}$ be the i th element of Δ , then we have*

- 1) $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{(i)} = (Ax + \Gamma_0)_{(i)}\delta + \frac{1}{2}[A(Ax + \Gamma_0)]_{(i)}\delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$,
- 2) $\mathbb{E}\Delta_{(i)}\Delta_{(j)} = [(Ax + \Gamma_0)_{(i)}(Ax + \Gamma_0)_{(j)} + \Sigma_{0(i,j)}]\delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$,
- 3) $\mathbb{E}\prod_{j=1}^3 \Delta_{(i_j)} = \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$.

Proof. Please see Appendix D. □

Then, we study the one-step approximation errors of the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 and compare the errors to δ .

LEMMA 5.5. *For the dynamic of game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 , define the one-step difference $\bar{\Delta} = x_1 - x$. Let $\bar{\Delta}_{(i)}$ be the i th element of $\bar{\Delta}$, then we have*

- 1) $\mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta}_{(i)} = (Ax + \gamma_0)_{(i)}\delta + \frac{1}{2}[A(Ax + \gamma_0)]_{(i)}\delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$,
- 2) $\mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta}_{(i)}\bar{\Delta}_{(j)} = [(Ax + \gamma_0)_{(i)}(Ax + \gamma_0)_{(j)} + \sigma_{0(i,j)}]\delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$,
- 3) $\mathbb{E}\prod_{j=1}^3 \bar{\Delta}_{(i_j)} = \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$.

Proof. Please see Appendix E. □

Next, we combine the above two lemmas to derive the main theorem.

THEOREM 5.6 (Approximation accuracy). *SDE (4.4) is an order 2 weak approximation to the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 such that for every $\psi \in \mathbf{G}$, there exists $C > 0$, independent of δ , such that for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$,*

$$|\mathbb{E}\psi(X_{k\delta}) - \mathbb{E}\psi(x_k)| < C\delta^2.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix F. □

Remark 5.7. The proofs reflect the essence of weak approximation: approximating the distribution of a sample path rather than the sample path itself. In fact,

one can roughly view the distribution of a random variable as a vector with infinite dimension, since the distribution is determined by its moment function. Weak approximation requires that the approximation errors between all the order of moments should be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\delta^\alpha)$, which can be realized by requiring the one-step approximation error be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\delta^{\alpha+1})$.

5.3. A One-Dimensional Example. Obtaining an explicit expression of x_t in \mathcal{G}^0 is impossible even for the simplest game with mixed strategies, and this difficulty still exists for the discretized δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . However, the SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 makes the explicit expression of X_t possible because the SDE driven by Brownian motion can be explicitly expressed in some simple cases.

THEOREM 5.8. *Consider the SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 in the one-dimension case with constant $\Gamma_t = \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, constant $\Sigma_t = \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \mathbb{R} < 0$, there is*

$$(5.1) \quad X_t \sim \mathcal{N} \left(x_0 e^{-\theta t} + \xi (1 - e^{-\theta t}), \frac{\delta \sigma}{2\theta} (1 - e^{-2\theta t}) \right).$$

Proof. Please see Appendix G. □

Let $A = -1$, $B_1 = B_2 = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $\sigma = 25$ and $x_0 = 2$, we numerically simulate the dynamics of the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 and the weak approximated game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 , where δ is set as 0.01. For simplicity, we suppose that $B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k}$ is a uniformly distributed random variable. Since its expectation and variance are γ and σ respectively, we have $B_1 u_{1k} + B_2 u_{2k} \sim \text{Uni}(\gamma - \sqrt{3\sigma}, \gamma + \sqrt{3\sigma})$.




FIG. 2. *Simulation of a one-dimensional differential game with mixed strategies. (a) presents the dynamics of the weak approximated game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 ; (b) shows the approximation errors between \mathcal{G}_δ^1 and \mathcal{G}_δ^2 on the first two moments*

Fig. 2(b) verifies the approximation error between δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 and the weak approximated game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is of the scale $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$. Therefore, it is reasonable to use the dynamic of game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 to analyze the game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . \mathcal{G}_δ^2 has a huge advantage for analyzing the game dynamic in this simulation setting because it shows explicitly the distribution of state X_t , which asymptotically converges to an equilibrium Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N} \left(-\frac{\gamma}{Ae^{A\delta}}, -\frac{\delta\sigma}{2Ae^{A\delta}} \right)$. When δ is fixed, the expectation and variance are determined by γ and σ respectively.

The dynamic of \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is presented in Fig. 2(a). The expected value of X_t given by $x_0 e^{-\theta t} + \xi (1 - e^{-\theta t})$ approaches ξ exponentially with a decay rate of $-\theta$. However, the variance of X_t given by $\frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta} (1 - e^{-2\theta t})$ increases from zero to a limiting value of

$\frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta}$. The transition time point between the descent phase and the fluctuation phase is determined by equating the expected value of X_{t^*} to the square root of its variance. When $t < t^*$, descent dominates, and when $t > t^*$, fluctuation dominates.

In a pursuit-evasion game setting, γ represents the pursuer's prediction error on the expected strategy of the evader at each δ step, and σ quantifies how random the mixed strategies are. Intuitively, the pursuer desires to minimize γ and σ so that the expected distance is 0 and the fluctuation is so small that with a high probability, the distance is maintained in an acceptable scale.

5.4. Approximation Accuracy of the Game Value. While the approximation performance for the game dynamics is guaranteed, we still need to prove that the value functions of the continuous SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 well approximate the game value of \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . It is demonstrated that the approximation error has the scale of $O(\delta^2)$. To begin with, we apply Theorem 5.6 to the payoff functions, and the following lemma shows that the approximation error of payoff functions is also of scale $O(\delta^2)$.

LEMMA 5.9 (Payoff approximation). *Given u_1 and u_2 , there exists a constant $C_1(u_1, u_2) > 0$ such that*

$$|J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) - J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2)| \leq C_1(u_1, u_2)\delta^2.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix H. □

The payoff approximation lemma helps to prove that the upper and lower value functions of δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 and SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 are also well approximated with the scale of $O(\delta^2)$.

THEOREM 5.10 (Value approximation). *There exists $C > 0$, independent of δ , such that*

$$|\mathbf{V}^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) - \mathbf{V}^2(t_0, x_0, \delta)| \leq C\delta^2.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix I. □

Since the game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 well approximates game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 in both state dynamics and game values, we can focus on solving the optimal mixed strategies for \mathcal{G}_δ^2 .

6. Optimal Mixed Strategy. It should be noted that the game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is still different from a standard SDG: although the game state dynamic (4.4) is a standard SDE controlled by Γ_t and Σ_t , the payoff function $J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2)$ still may be affected by higher moments of u_1 and u_2 . Since classical theories on SDG can not be directly applied to solve \mathcal{G}_δ^2 , a gap exists between knowing the existence of a game value and practically solving the game.

To overcome this difficulty, we need to limit our attention to the case where the value of J^2 is totally determined by the first two moments Γ_t and Σ_t . This idea motivates us to make the following assumption in the form of J^2 . Specifically, we only need to limit the form of the running cost $h(t, u_1, u_2, X(t))$ in J^2 .

ASSUMPTION 1. *There exists a function \tilde{h} such that the expectation of h is irrelevant of the moments of $u_1(t)$ and $u_2(t)$ that are higher than two, i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E}h(t, x, u_1(t), u_2(t)) = \tilde{h}(t, x, \Gamma_{1t}, \Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{1t}, \Sigma_{2t}),$$

where $\Gamma_{i,t} = \mathbb{E}u_{i, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor}$ and $\Sigma_{i,t} = \text{Cov } u_{i, \lfloor \frac{t}{\delta} \rfloor}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Remark 6.1. Although limited, it encompasses a large range of functions. For example, when h is quadratic on u_1 and u_2 , this assumption is immediately satisfied.

When Assumption 1 is satisfied, $J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2)$ only depends on $\Gamma_{i,t}$ and $\Sigma_{i,t}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is a classical SDG with pure strategies, and \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is in the canonical form of an SDG:

$$\mathcal{G}_\delta^2 : \begin{cases} J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ g(X(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T \tilde{h}(t, X, \Gamma_{1t}, \Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{1t}, \Sigma_{2t}) dt \right\} \\ dX_t = (AX_t + B_1\Gamma_{1t} + B_2\Gamma_{2t}) dt + \sqrt{\delta} (B_1\Sigma_{1t}B_1^T + B_2\Sigma_{2t}B_2^T)^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t, \\ X_{t_0} = x_0. \end{cases}$$

The game value can be characterized by the classical Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaccs (HJI) equation. The task of solving optimal stochastic processes u_1^* and u_2^* has been reduced to optimizing over their first two moments.

THEOREM 6.2 (HJI). *If Assumption 1 holds, the value function \mathbf{V}^2 is a solution of the HJI equation*

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t \mathbf{V}^2 - H(t, x, \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2) = 0, & (t, x) \in (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d, \\ \mathbf{V}^2(T, x) = g(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} H(t, x, p, A) = & \sup_{\Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{2t}} \inf_{\Gamma_{1t}, \Sigma_{1t}} \left\{ \langle p, AX_t + \Gamma_t \rangle \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} [\delta \Sigma_t A] + \tilde{h}(t, x, \Gamma_{1t}, \Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{1t}, \Sigma_{2t}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $(\Gamma_{1t}^*, \Sigma_{1t}^*, \Gamma_{2t}^*, \Sigma_{2t}^*)$ make (6.2) hold, the optimal strategies for \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is the set

$$\{(u_1^*, u_2^*) \mid \mathbb{E}u_i^*(t) = \Gamma_{it}, \text{Cov } u_i^*(t) = \Sigma_{it}, i = 1, 2\}.$$

Proof. The HJI description of an SDG is a classical conclusion, please refer to [24, 3] for detailed proof. For the optimal strategy of \mathcal{G}_δ^2 , since the payoff and dynamic of \mathcal{G}_δ^2 are determined by the first two moments of u_1, u_2 , any strategy that has the same first two moments as $(\Gamma_{1t}^*, \Sigma_{1t}^*, \Gamma_{2t}^*, \Sigma_{2t}^*)$ is an optimal mixed strategy. \square

Remark 6.3. Now we have an implementable procedure to solve the optimal mixed strategy for \mathcal{G}^0 : (i) solve (6.2) for $(\Gamma_{1t}^*, \Sigma_{1t}^*, \Gamma_{2t}^*, \Sigma_{2t}^*)$, which explicitly relies on δ ; (ii) letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ to get the limits of these first two moments; (iii) any mixed strategy that has these limit first two moments is an optimal mixed strategy for \mathcal{G}^0 , practically one can choose a Gaussian process as the mixed strategy.

6.1. Payoff Function with Quadratic Running Cost. In this part, we consider the case where the running cost $h(t, u_1, u_2, x)$ is quadratic in u_1, u_2 :

$$h(t, u_1, u_2, x) = \frac{1}{2} u_1^T R_1 u_1 - \frac{1}{2} u_2^T R_2 u_2 + f(t, x),$$

where $f(t, x)$ denotes a state-dependent cost, and R_1 and R_2 are positive matrices. With an upper bound on the covariances, the SDG \mathcal{G}_δ^2 is given as follows.

$$(6.3) \quad \mathcal{G}_{\delta,q}^2 : \begin{cases} J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E} \left\{ g(X(T)) + \int_{t_0}^T \frac{1}{2} u_1^T R_1 u_1 - \frac{1}{2} u_2^T R_2 u_2 + f(t, x) dt \right\} \\ dX_t = (AX_t + B_1 \Gamma_{1t} + B_2 \Gamma_{2t}) dt + \sqrt{\delta} (B_1 \Sigma_{1t} B_1^T + B_2 \Sigma_{2,t} B_2^T)^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t, \\ X_{t_0} = x_0, \\ \Sigma_{it} \preceq m_i \mathbf{I} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

The following theorem characterizes $\mathbf{V}^2(t, x)$ by an HJI equation and provides explicit expressions for the equilibrium strategies.

THEOREM 6.4. *The game $\mathcal{G}_{\delta,q}^2$ has a unique viscosity solution for the following stochastic HJI PDE:*

$$(6.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\partial_t \mathbf{V}^2 = (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top Ax + f(x) + \\ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top (B_2 R_2^{-1} B_2^T - B_1 R_1^{-1} B_1^T) \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2 + \\ m_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\lambda}_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}, \\ \mathbf{V}^2(T, x) = g(x), \end{cases}$$

where $(t, x) \in (t_0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $\tilde{\lambda}_i$ is the i -th largest eigenvalue of the matrix $\delta B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 - R_2$ and $\mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}$ equals 1 when $\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0$ and otherwise equals 0. Moreover, the **optimal control strategies** are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{1t}^* &= -R_1^{-1} B_1^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \\ \Gamma_{2t}^* &= R_2^{-1} B_2^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \\ \Sigma_{1t}^* &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \Sigma_{2t}^* &= m_2 Q \operatorname{diag}\{\mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top, \end{aligned}$$

where Q is an orthogonal matrix such that $\delta B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 - R_2 = Q \operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top$.

Proof. Please see Appendix J. \square

Remark 6.5. When $\delta \rightarrow 0$, there is $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \Sigma_{1t}^* = \mathbf{0}$, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \Sigma_{2t}^* = \mathbf{0}$, and the HJI PDE is

$$-\partial_t \mathbf{V}^2 = (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top Ax + f(x) + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top (B_2 R_2^{-1} B_2^T - B_1 R_1^{-1} B_1^T) \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2,$$

which means the optimal mixed strategies converge to the optimal pure strategies. This convergence is caused by the fact that game $\mathcal{G}_{\delta,q}^2$ satisfies the Isaccs' condition, hence the game value already exists for linear quadratic differential games with pure strategy. However, since the control period δ will never be improved to be 0 in practice, the mixed strategies can always make a difference by resulting in a different game value compared to the pure strategies.

Theorem 6.4 shows that the optimal mixed strategy is attained by controlling the first two moments, which can be regarded as adding unbiased stochastic noises to a pure strategy. Specifically, the pure strategy is determined by Γ_{1t}^* and Γ_{2t}^* , which is actually in a similar form as the optimal strategy in a linear quadratic

differential game with pure strategies. Then, the covariances of the added unbiased noises are determined by Σ_{1t}^* and Σ_{2t}^* . For the player 1, the fact that $\Sigma_{1t}^* = \mathbf{0}$ shows that it should not add noises to its control input. For the player 2, the fact that $\Sigma_{2t}^* = m_2 Q \text{diag}\{\mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top$ shows that it should add the maximal variances only on the directions where the according eigenvalues of $\delta B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 - R_2$ are positive.

6.2. Payoff Function without Running Cost. Another large class of differential game problems focuses on the case where the payoff function has no running cost, in other words, $h(t, x, u_1, u_2) \equiv 0$. Specifically, we consider the following SDG: (6.5)

$$\mathcal{G}_{\delta,t}^2 : \begin{cases} J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) = \mathbb{E} \|X_T\|_2^2 \\ dX_t = (AX_t + B_1 \Gamma_{1t} + B_2 \Gamma_{2t}) dt + \sqrt{\delta} (B_1 \Sigma_{1t} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2,t} B_2^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_t, \\ X_{t_0} = x_0, \\ \Sigma_{it} \preceq m_i \mathbf{I}, \quad \|\Gamma_{it}\|_2 \leq c_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 6.6. *The game $\mathcal{G}_{\delta,t}^2$ has a unique viscosity solution for the following stochastic HJI PDE:*

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{V}^2 = (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top A x - c_1 \|(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_1\|_2 \\ \quad + c_2 \|(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_2\|_2 + \frac{\delta}{2} m_2 \text{tr}\{B_2 B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2\}, \\ \mathbf{V}^2(T, x) = \|x\|_2^2. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the **optimal control strategies** are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{1t}^* &= - \frac{c_1}{\|B_1^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2\|_2} B_1^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \\ \Gamma_{2t}^* &= \frac{c_2}{\|B_2^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2\|_2} B_2^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \\ \Sigma_{1t}^* &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \Sigma_{2t}^* &= m_2 \mathbf{I}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Please see Appendix K. □

Remark 6.7. When $\delta \rightarrow 0$, we have the HJI PDE of the game value function as

$$\partial_t \mathbf{V}^2 = (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top A x - c_1 \|(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_1\|_2 + c_2 \|(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_2\|_2,$$

which is the same as the HJI equation for the pure strategy's case. Different to $\mathcal{G}_{\delta,q}^2$, Σ_{2t}^* remains as $m_2 \mathbf{I}$ without being affected by the value of δ . Still, since the control period δ will never be improved to be 0 in practice, the mixed strategies can always make a difference by resulting in a gain in the game value compared to the pure strategies. This gain is characterized in 6.8 and is upper bounded in 6.9.

Just as the optimal mixed strategies in Theorem 6.4, we can also view the optimal strategies in Theorem 6.6 as adding some well-designed stochastic noises to a pure strategy determined by Γ_{1t}^* and Γ_{2t}^* . Similarly, player 1 should not add noise to its pure strategy, while player 2 should add the maximal variances to its pure strategy. Intuitively, this optimal mixed strategy makes sense because game $\mathcal{G}_{\delta,t}^2$ has no running cost, and adding noise arise no burden to the payoff function.

It should be noted that the linearity of the SDE admits a good property that it

has an explicit solution:

$$(6.7) \quad X_T = e^{A(T-t_0)}x_0 + \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)}(B_1\Gamma_{1s} + B_2\Gamma_{2s})ds + \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)}\sqrt{\delta} (B_1\Sigma_{1s}B_1^\top + B_2\Sigma_{2s}B_2^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_s.$$

Still considering the quadratic payoff, we can directly derive the expression of $\mathbb{E}\|X_T\|_2^2$ in the following lemma.

THEOREM 6.8. *Given the first two moments of the mixed control strategies for the δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 with quadratic terminal cost and no running cost, i.e., given Γ_{it} and Σ_{it} for $i = 1, 2$ and $g(X_T) = \|X_T\|_2^2, h(t, x, u_1, u_2) = 0$, the payoff function is*

$$(6.8) \quad \mathbb{E}\|X_T\|_2^2 = \left\| e^{A(T-t_0)}x_0 + \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)}(B_1\Gamma_{1s} + B_2\Gamma_{2s})ds \right\|_2^2 + \delta \int_{t_0}^T \text{tr} \left\{ e^{A(T-s)}(B_1\Sigma_{1s}B_1^\top + B_2\Sigma_{2s}B_2^\top)e^{A^\top(T-s)} \right\} ds.$$

Proof. Please see Appendix L. \square

COROLLARY 6.9. *The maximal performance gain for a δ -game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 with no running cost is $\delta m_2 \text{tr} \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)}B_2B_2^\top e^{A^\top(T-s)} \right\}$.*

Proof. The upper bound of performance gain follows immediately by substituting Σ_{1t}^* and Σ_{2t}^* into equation (6.8). \square

7. Simulation. In this section, we numerically simulate the linear quadratic differential game (6.3), and compare the effect of optimal pure strategies with the optimal mixed strategies.

7.1. Simulation Setup. For the linear system, we take $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.1 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 30 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $B_1 = B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 5 \end{pmatrix}$, $x_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $\delta = 0.1$, and the upper bound of the scale of noise covariance is $m_1 = m_2 = 1$.

For the payoff function, we take $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $Q_f = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$, $R_1 = (1)$, $R_2 = (2)$ and $T = 10$.

For the optimal pure strategy, classical linear quadratic differential game theory shows that $u_1^*(t) = -R_1^{-1}B_1^\top P_t x_t$ and $u_2^*(t) = R_2^{-1}B_2^\top P_t x_t$.

For the optimal mixed strategy, we choose the Gaussian distribution and control the first two moments according to previous conclusions. Specifically, $u_1^*(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\Gamma_{1t}^*, \Sigma_{1t}^*)$ and $u_2^*(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(\Gamma_{2t}^*, \Sigma_{2t}^*)$.

7.2. Results and Analysis. Fig. 3(a) shows that the optimal mixed strategy increases the game payoff compared to the optimal pure strategy, and a prominent upward shift is presented. Fig. 3(b) compares one sample path under the optimal mixed strategy to the trajectory under the optimal pure strategy, and the game state under the mixed strategy can not be regulated to zero.

8. Conclusions. This paper contributes to the differential games with mixed strategies by presenting an implementable procedure to derive optimal mixed strategies. Using time discretization, the original game \mathcal{G}^0 is approximated by a discrete




FIG. 3. Simulation of a linear quadratic differential game under both optimal pure strategies and optimal mixed strategies. (a) compares the game payoffs of pure and mixed strategies when the initial state is fixed to be x_0 ; (b) compares the game states of optimal pure and mixed strategies.

game \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . Then, we introduce the weak approximation method to design a stochastic differential game \mathcal{G}_δ^2 to approximate \mathcal{G}_δ^1 . Our design ensures that the approximation errors of game dynamic and payoff are of scale $\mathcal{O}(\delta^2)$, and the functional space to be optimized is reduced to a finite dimension. Therefore, \mathcal{G}_δ^2 can be solved based on the HJI equation, and \mathcal{G}^0 can be solved by letting δ approach zero. We highlight that this weak approximation method can be extended to analyze other dynamic games with mixed strategies, and this procedure for solving optimal mixed strategies is easy to be applied. Moreover, our method helps to analyze the effect of the control period δ on the game payoff. We studied the games with quadratic running costs and the games with only terminal costs, where explicit optimal mixed strategies and analysis on δ are provided.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 5.1. This lemma is a direct application of the Lemma 4 in [19] by letting $b_0(x, \epsilon) = b_0(x) = Ae^{A\delta}x + \Gamma_0$ without relying on the auxiliary variable ϵ .

Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 5.2. According to the definition, there is

$$(B.1) \quad \bar{\Delta} = (e^{A\delta} - I)x + (B_1u_{1,0} + B_2u_{2,0}) \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau,$$

then

$$(B.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta} - [Ae^{A\delta}x + \gamma_0] \delta &= (e^{A\delta} - I - \delta Ae^{A\delta})x + \left(\int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau - \delta \right) \gamma_0 \\ &= (e^{A\delta} - I - \delta Ae^{A\delta})x + \left[\int_0^\delta (e^{A\tau} - I) d\tau \right] \gamma_0. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $e^{A\delta} - I = \delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2}A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$, the above equation follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2}A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) - \delta A e^{A\delta})x + \left[\int_0^\delta (\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2}A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3))d\tau \right] \gamma_0 \\
\text{(B.3)} \quad &= [\delta A(I - e^{\delta A}) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)] x + \left(\delta^2 A + \frac{\delta^3}{2}A^2 \right) \gamma_0 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4) \\
&= [\delta A(-\delta A + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)] x + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(\delta^2),
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the first conclusion is proved. Notice that $e^{A\delta} - I = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$ and $\int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau = \mathcal{O}(\delta)$, we have

$$\bar{\Delta}_{(i)} = \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad \forall i.$$

Therefore, the second conclusion can be easily obtained.

Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 5.3. First, according to the above two lemmas, there exists $K_1 \in \mathbf{G}$ independent of δ such that

$$\text{(C.1)} \quad \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^s \Delta_{(i_j)}(x) - \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^s \bar{\Delta}_{(i_j)}(x) \right| \leq K_1(x) \delta^2,$$

for $s = 1$ and

$$\text{(C.2)} \quad \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^2 |\Delta_{(i_j)}(x)| \leq K_1(x) \delta^2$$

for all $i_j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Second, according to the compactness of U_1 and U_2 , for each $m \geq 1$, the $2m$ -moment of x_k is uniformly bounded with respect to k and δ , i.e., there exists a $K_2 \in \mathbf{G}$, independent of δ, k , such that

$$\text{(C.3)} \quad \mathbb{E} |x_k|^{2m} \leq K_2(x)$$

for all $k = 0, \dots, \lfloor T/\delta \rfloor$.

Finally, according to Theorem 3 in [19], we have the weak approximation conclusion proved.

Appendix D. Proof of Lemma 5.4. This lemma is a direct application of the Lemma 4 in [19] by letting $b_0(x, \epsilon) = b_0(x) = Ax + \Gamma_0$ and $b_1(x, \epsilon) = 0$ without relying on the auxiliary variable ϵ . For the first moment, there is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \Delta_{(i)} &= b_0(x)_{(i)} \delta + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j b_0(x)_{(j)} \partial_{(j)} b_0(x)_{(i)} \delta^2 + b_1(x)_{(i)} \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \\
&= (Ax + \Gamma_0)_{(i)} \delta + \frac{1}{2} [A(Ax + \Gamma_0)]_{(i)} \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3).
\end{aligned}$$

For the second moment, there is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \Delta_{(i)} \Delta_{(j)} &= b_0(x)_{(i)} b_0(x)_{(j)} \delta^2 + \sum_k \Sigma_{0(i,k)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma_{0(j,k)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3), \\
&= b_0(x)_{(i)} b_0(x)_{(j)} \delta^2 + \sum_k \Sigma_{0(i,k)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Sigma_{0(k,j)}^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3), \\
&= [(Ax + \Gamma_0)_{(i)} (Ax + \Gamma_0)_{(j)} + \Sigma_{0(i,j)}] \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the third moment is of $\mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$ directly from the Lemma 4 in [19].

Appendix E. Proof of Lemma 5.5. According to the definition of δ -game, there is

$$(E.1) \quad \bar{\Delta} = (e^{A\delta} - I)x + \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau (B_1 u_{1,0} + B_2 u_{2,0}),$$

then

$$(E.2) \quad \mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta} = (e^{A\delta} - I)x + \int_0^\delta e^{A\tau} d\tau \gamma_0.$$

Through Taylor's expansion, there is

$$(E.3) \quad e^{A\delta} - I = \delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3).$$

Substituting this expansion into $\int_0^\delta e^{A\delta} d\tau$, we have

$$(E.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^\delta e^{A\delta} d\tau &= (e^{A\delta} - I)d\tau + \delta I \\ &= \int_0^\delta \tau A + \frac{\tau^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^3) d\tau + \delta I \\ &= \delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A + \frac{\delta^3}{6} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the expectation of $\bar{\Delta}$ can be approximated as

$$(E.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta} &= \left[\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right] x + (\delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3)) \gamma_0 \\ &= (Ax + \gamma_0)\delta + \left(\frac{1}{2} A^2 x + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0 A \right) \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3), \end{aligned}$$

and the first claim is proved.

For the claim on the second moment, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta}_{(i)}\bar{\Delta}_{(j)} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) x + \left(\delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) Q \right]_{(i)} \\ &\quad \cdot \left[\left(\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) x + \left(\delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) Q \right]_{(j)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $Q = B_1 u_{10} + B_2 u_{20}$. Expand the formula and organize it based on the order of δ , we have the coefficients of δ^0 and δ^1 are both 0, and the coefficient of δ^2 is

$$(E.6) \quad (Ax)_{(i)}(Ax)_{(j)} + \mathbb{E}(Q_{(i)})(Ax)_{(j)} + (Ax)_{(i)}\mathbb{E}(Q_{(j)}) + \mathbb{E}(Q_{(i)}Q_{(j)}).$$

According to the definition of covariance matrix, there is $\mathbb{E}(Q_{(i)}Q_{(j)}) = (\text{Cov } Q)_{i,j} + \mathbb{E}Q_{(i)}\mathbb{E}Q_{(j)} = \sigma_{0_{(i,j)}} + \gamma_{0_{(i)}}\gamma_{0_{(j)}}$, then we have the coefficient of δ^2 as

$$(E.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &(Ax)_{(i)}(Ax)_{(j)} + \gamma_{0_{(i)}}(Ax)_{(j)} + (Ax)_{(i)}\gamma_{0_{(j)}} + \sigma_{0_{(i,j)}} + \gamma_{0_{(i)}}\gamma_{0_{(j)}} \\ &= (Ax + \gamma_0)_{(i)}(Ax + \gamma_0)_{(j)} + \sigma_{0_{(i,j)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the second claim is proved.

Finally, the third claim can be obtained by expanding the following expression based on the order of δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\bar{\Delta}_{(i_1)}\bar{\Delta}_{(i_2)}\bar{\Delta}_{(i_3)} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) x + \left(\delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) Q \right]_{(i_1)} \\ &\quad \cdot \left[\left(\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) x + \left(\delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) Q \right]_{(i_2)} \\ &\quad \cdot \left[\left(\delta A + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) x + \left(\delta I + \frac{\delta^2}{2} A^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^3) \right) Q \right]_{(i_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the coefficients of δ^0 , δ^1 and δ^2 are all 0, which means the expression is of scale $\mathcal{O}(\delta^3)$, and the third claim is proved.

Appendix F. Proof of Theorem 5.6. First, according to the above two lemmas, there exists $K_1 \in \mathbf{G}$ independent of δ such that

$$(F.1) \quad \left| \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^s \Delta_{(i_j)}(x) - \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^s \bar{\Delta}_{(i_j)}(x) \right| \leq K_1(x) \delta^3,$$

for $s = 1, 2$ and

$$(F.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^3 |\Delta_{(i_j)}(x)| \leq K_1(x) \delta^3$$

for all $i_j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Second, according to the compactness of U_1 and U_2 , for each $m \geq 1$, the $2m$ -moment of x_k is uniformly bounded with respect to k and δ , i.e., there exists a $K_2 \in \mathbf{G}$, independent of δ, k , such that

$$(F.3) \quad \mathbb{E} |x_k|^{2m} \leq K_2(x)$$

for all $k = 0, \dots, \lfloor T/\delta \rfloor$.

Finally, according to Theorem 3 in [19], we have the weak approximation conclusion proved.

Appendix G. Proof of Theorem 5.8. For the game dynamic, we have a one-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) (OU) process [27]:

$$(G.1) \quad dX_t = \theta(\xi - X_t) dt + \sqrt{\delta\sigma} dW_t, \quad X_0 = x_0,$$

where $\theta = -A$, $\xi = -\frac{\gamma}{A}$.

Following the traditional procedure to solving the OU process, we apply the Itô formula to $\phi(x, t) := xe^{\theta t}$, it follows that

$$d\phi(X_t, t) = \theta \xi e^{\theta t} dt + \sqrt{\delta\sigma} e^{\theta t} dW_t,$$

which we can integrate from 0 to T to get

$$(G.2) \quad X_t = x_0 e^{-\theta t} + \xi (1 - e^{-\theta t}) + \sqrt{\delta\sigma} \int_0^t e^{-\theta(t-s)} dW_s.$$

To determine the distributional characteristics of the SDE (G.1), a path-wise solution is not necessary. Instead, we only need to know the distribution of the random variable X_t at a fixed time $t \in [0, T]$. As the integrand in the Wiener integral is deterministic, X_t can be considered a Gaussian process. Therefore, we can compute its moments to obtain the necessary information. By applying expectation to equation (G.2), we can derive these moments. It follows that,

$$\mathbb{E}X_t = x_0 e^{-\theta t} + \xi (1 - e^{-\theta t})$$

Furthermore, the covariance function is

$$\mathbb{E}(X_t - \mathbb{E}X_t)(X_s - \mathbb{E}X_s) = \delta\sigma \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t e^{\theta(u-s)} dW_u \int_0^s e^{\theta(v-s)} dW_v \right].$$

Itô's isometry formula ensures that, for any W_t adapted process ϕ_t, ψ_t there is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \phi_u dW_u \int_0^t \psi_v dW_v \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \phi_s \psi_s ds \right]$$

Therefore, for $s \leq t$,

$$(G.3) \quad \text{cov}(X_s, X_t) = \frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta} \left(e^{-\theta|t-s|} + e^{-\theta(t+s)} \right),$$

and in particular, for fixed $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$(G.4) \quad \text{Var}(X_t) = \frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta} (1 - e^{-2\theta t}).$$

Hence, we have

$$(G.5) \quad X_t \sim \mathcal{N} \left(x_0 e^{-\theta t} + \xi (1 - e^{-\theta t}), \frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta} (1 - e^{-2\theta t}) \right).$$

Asymptotically, there is

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}X_t = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_0 e^{-\theta t} + \xi (1 - e^{-\theta t}) = \xi = -\frac{\gamma}{A},$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} X_t = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta} (1 - e^{-2\theta t}) = \frac{\delta\sigma}{2\theta} = -\frac{\delta\sigma}{2A}.$$

Appendix H. Proof of Lemma 5.9. According to the definitions of J_δ^1 and J^2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2) - J_\delta^2(t_0, x_0, u_1, u_2)| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}\{g(x_n) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(t, u_{1k}, u_{2k}, x_k)\delta - g(X(T)) - \int_{t_0}^T h(t, u_1, u_2, X)dt\}| \\ (H.1) \quad & \leq |\mathbb{E}\{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(t, u_{1k}, u_{2k}, x_k)\delta - \int_{t_0}^T h(t, u_1, u_2, X)dt\}| + |\mathbb{E}\{g(x_n) - g(X(T))\}| \\ & \leq \int_{t_0}^T |\mathbb{E}\{h(t, u_1, u_2, x) - h(t, u_1, u_2, X)\}|dt + |\mathbb{E}\{g(x_n) - g(X(T))\}|. \end{aligned}$$

By the weak approximation theorem, there are $C_2(u_1, u_2), C_3(u_1, u_2)$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}\{h(t, u_1, u_2, x) - h(t, u_1, u_2, X)\}| \leq C_2(u_1, u_2)\delta^2,$$

and

$$|\mathbb{E}\{g(x_n) - g(X(T))\}| \leq C_3(u_1, u_2)\delta^2.$$

Let $C_1(u_1, u_2) = (T - t_0)C_2(u_1, u_2) + C_3(u_1, u_2)$, the proof is completed.

Appendix I. Proof of Lemma 5.10. Without loss of generality, we only need to prove the approximation for the lower value function. Let $\mathbf{V}_-^1(t_0, x_0, \delta) = J_\delta^1(t_0, x_0, u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(1)})$ and $\mathbf{V}_-^2(t_0, x_0, \delta) = J^2(t_0, x_0, u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(2)})$. For ease of notation, we omit t_0, x_0 in J_δ^1 and J^2 in this proof without causing any confusion.

According to the definition of the lower value function, it follows that

$$(I.1) \quad \begin{aligned} J_\delta^1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)}) &\leq J_\delta^1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(1)}) \leq J_\delta^1(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(1)}), \\ J^2(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(1)}) &\leq J^2(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(2)}) \leq J^2(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, Lemma 5.9 reveals that

$$(I.2) \quad \begin{aligned} |J_\delta^1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)}) - J^2(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)})| &\leq C_1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)})\delta^2, \\ |J_\delta^1(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(1)}) - J^2(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(1)})| &\leq C_1(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(1)})\delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $C = \max\{C_1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)}), C_1(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(1)})\}$, we have

$$(I.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &|J_\delta^1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(1)}) - J^2(u_1^{(2)}, u_2^{(2)})| \\ &\leq |J_\delta^1(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)}) - J^2(u_1^{(1)}, u_2^{(2)})| \\ &\leq C\delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Appendix J. Proof of Theorem 6.4. To begin with, we need to explicitly express the Hamilton variable,

$$(J.1) \quad \mathbb{E}h(t, u_1, u_2, x) = f(t, x) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)^\top \left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)\right] - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(R_2^{\frac{1}{2}}u_2\right)^\top \left(R_2^{\frac{1}{2}}u_2\right)\right].$$

Notice the matrix formula that $\text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA)$, there is

$$(J.2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)^\top \left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)\right] = \text{tr}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)^\top\right] \\ &= \text{tr}\left\{\text{cov}\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)\mathbb{E}\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1^\top\right)^\top\right\} \\ &= \text{tr}\left\{\text{cov}\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)\right\} + \mathbb{E}\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right)^\top \mathbb{E}\left(R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1\right) \\ &= \text{tr}\left\{R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\Sigma_{1t}R_1^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\} + \Gamma_{1t}^\top R_1 \Gamma_{1t} = \text{tr}\{R_1\Sigma_{1t}\} + \Gamma_{1t}^\top R_1 \Gamma_{1t}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H(t, x, \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2) &= \sup_{\Gamma_{1t}, \Sigma_{1t}} \inf_{\Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{2t}} f(x) + (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top (Ax + B_1 \Gamma_1 + B_2 \Gamma_2) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} [(B_1 \Sigma_{1t} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2t} B_2^\top) \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \{ \text{tr}(R_1 \Sigma_{1t}) + \Gamma_{1t}^\top R_1 \Gamma_{1t} - \text{tr}(R_2 \Sigma_{2t}) - \Gamma_{2t}^\top R_2 \Gamma_{2t} \} \\
&= \sup_{\Gamma_{1t}, \Sigma_{1t}} \inf_{\Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{2t}} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top Ax + f(x) \\
\text{(J.3)} \quad &\quad + \left[(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_1 \Gamma_{1t} + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{1t}^\top R_1 \Gamma_{1t} \right] \\
&\quad + \left[(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_2 \Gamma_{2t} - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{2t}^\top R_2 \Gamma_{2t} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{1t} (\delta B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 + R_1) \} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{2t} (\delta B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 - R_2) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since Γ_{1t} , Σ_{1t} , Γ_{2t} , and Σ_{2t} are separated, the right hand side of (J.3) can be minimized over Γ_{1t} , Σ_{1t} and maximized over Γ_{2t} , Σ_{2t} respectively. First consider the optimization on Γ_{1t} and Γ_{2t} , which can be directly derived by the property of quadratic functions:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{1t}^* &= \arg \min_{\Gamma_{1t}} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_1 \Gamma_{1t} + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{1t}^\top R_1 \Gamma_{1t} \\
&= -R_1^{-1} B_1^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \\
\Gamma_{2t}^* &= \arg \max_{\Gamma_{2t}} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_2 \Gamma_{2t} - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{2t}^\top R_2 \Gamma_{2t} \\
&= R_2^{-1} B_2^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2.
\end{aligned}
\text{(J.4)}$$

Then we consider the optimization over Σ_{1t} and Σ_{2t} :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{1t}^* &= \arg \min_{\Sigma_{1t}} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{1t} (\delta B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 + R_1) \} \\
\Sigma_{2t}^* &= \arg \max_{\Sigma_{2t}} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{2t} (\delta B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 - R_2) \}.
\end{aligned}
\text{(J.5)}$$

Notice that $\Sigma_{1t} \succeq \mathbf{0}$, $(\delta B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 + R_1) \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and the fact that the trace of a matrix equals the sum of its eigenvalues, there is $\text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{1t} (\delta B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 + R_1) \} \geq 0$. Moreover, equality holds when $\Sigma_{1t} = \mathbf{0}$. Then, $\Sigma_{1t}^* = \mathbf{0}$. Next, consider that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma_{2t} \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{2t} (\delta B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 - R_2) \} \\
\text{(J.6)} \quad &= \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma_{2t} \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \text{tr} \{ \Sigma_{2t} Q \text{diag} \{ \tilde{\lambda}_i \}_{i=1}^n Q^\top \} \\
&= \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma_{2t} \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \text{tr} \{ \text{diag} \{ \tilde{\lambda}_i \}_{i=1}^n Q^\top \Sigma_{2t} Q \}.
\end{aligned}$$

By letting $\Sigma = Q^\top \Sigma_{2t} Q$, the optimization problem is transformed as follows:

$$\text{(J.7)} \quad \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \text{tr} \{ \text{diag} \{ \tilde{\lambda}_i \}_{i=1}^n \Sigma \}.$$

According to Von Neumann's trace inequality, there is

$$(J.8) \quad \text{tr}\{\text{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n \Sigma\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\Sigma) \tilde{\lambda}_i,$$

where $\lambda_i(\Sigma)$ represents the i -th largest eigenvalue of Σ . Since $\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}$, it follows that

$$(J.9) \quad \text{tr}\{\text{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n \Sigma\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n m_2 \tilde{\lambda}_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}.$$

Moreover, when $\Sigma = m_2 \text{diag}\{\mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}\}_{i=1}^n$, the equality holds. Therefore, we have $\Sigma_{2t}^* = m_2 Q \text{diag}\{\mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top$.

Finally, by substituting the expressions of Γ_{1t}^* , Γ_{2t}^* , Σ_{1t}^* and Σ_{2t}^* into the definition of Hamilton function, we have

$$(J.10) \quad \begin{aligned} H(t, x, \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2) &= (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top Ax + f(x) + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top \\ & (B_2 R_2^{-1} B_2^\top - B_1 R_1^{-1} B_1^\top) \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2 + m_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\lambda}_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i > 0}, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed.

Appendix K. Proof of Theorem 6.6. Similar to the problem in the last section, we can optimize Γ_{1t} , Γ_{2t} , Σ_{1t} , and Σ_{2t} separately to calculate the Hamilton function:

$$(K.1) \quad \begin{aligned} H(t, x, \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2) &= \sup_{\Gamma_{1t}, \Sigma_{1t}} \inf_{\Gamma_{2t}, \Sigma_{2t}} f(x) + (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top (Ax + B_1 \Gamma_1 + B_2 \Gamma_2) \\ & + \frac{\delta}{2} \text{tr} [(B_1 \Sigma_{1t} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2t} B_2^\top) \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2]. \end{aligned}$$

First consider the optimization on Γ_{1t} and Γ_{2t} , which can be directly derived by classical linear programming:

$$(K.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{1t}^* &= \arg \min_{\|\Gamma_{1t}\|_2 \leq c_1} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_1 \Gamma_{1t} \\ &= - \frac{c_1}{\|B_1^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2\|_2} B_1^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \\ \Gamma_{2t}^* &= \arg \max_{\|\Gamma_{2t}\|_2 \leq c_2} (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_2 \Gamma_{2t} \\ &= \frac{c_2}{\|B_2^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2\|_2} B_2^\top \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then we consider the optimization over Σ_{1t} :

$$(K.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \Sigma_{1t}^* &= \arg \min_{\Sigma_{1t}} \text{tr}\{B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 \Sigma_{1t}\} \\ \Sigma_{2t}^* &= \arg \max_{\Sigma_{2t}} \text{tr}\{B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 \Sigma_{2t}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\Sigma_{1t} \succeq \mathbf{0}$, $B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and the fact that the trace of a matrix equals the sum of its eigenvalues, there is $\text{tr}\{B_1^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_1 \Sigma_{1t}\} \geq 0$. Moreover, equality holds

when $\Sigma_{1t} = \mathbf{0}$. Then, $\Sigma_{1t}^* = \mathbf{0}$. Next, consider that

$$\begin{aligned}
(K.4) \quad & \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma_{2t} \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \operatorname{tr}\{B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 \Sigma_{2t}\} \\
&= \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma_{2t} \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \operatorname{tr}\{\Sigma_{2t} Q \operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top\} \\
&= \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma_{2t} \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \operatorname{tr}\{\operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top \Sigma_{2t} Q\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2 B_2 \Sigma_{2t} = Q \operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n Q^\top$. By letting $\Sigma = Q^\top \Sigma_{2t} Q$, the optimization problem is transformed as follows:

$$(K.5) \quad \max_{\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}} \operatorname{tr}\{\operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n \Sigma\}.$$

According to Von Neumann's trace inequality, there is

$$(K.6) \quad \operatorname{tr}\{\operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n \Sigma\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i(\Sigma) \tilde{\lambda}_i,$$

where $\lambda_i(\Sigma)$ represents the i -th largest eigenvalue of Σ . Since $\mathbf{0} \preceq \Sigma \preceq m_2 \mathbf{I}$, it follows that

$$(K.7) \quad \operatorname{tr}\{\operatorname{diag}\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^n \Sigma\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n m_2 \tilde{\lambda}_i.$$

Moreover, when $\Sigma = m_2 \mathbf{I}$, the equality holds. Therefore, we have $\Sigma_{2t}^* = m_2 Q \mathbf{I} Q^\top = m_2 \mathbf{I}$.

Finally, by substituting the expressions of Γ_{1t}^* , Γ_{2t}^* , Σ_{1t}^* and Σ_{2t}^* into the definition of Hamilton function, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(K.8) \quad & H(t, x, \partial_x \mathbf{V}^2, \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2) = (\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top A x - c_1 \|(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_1\|_2 \\
& + c_2 \|(\partial_x \mathbf{V}^2)^\top B_2\|_2 + \frac{\delta}{2} m_2 \operatorname{tr}\{B_2 B_2^\top \partial_x^2 \mathbf{V}^2\},
\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed.

Appendix L. Proof of Lemma 6.8. To begin with, the expectation of $\|X_T\|_2^2$ can be decomposed into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
(L.1) \quad & \mathbb{E}\|X_T\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E} \operatorname{tr}(X_T X_T^\top) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbb{E} X_T X_T^\top) \\
& = \operatorname{tr}(\operatorname{Cov}(X_T) + (\mathbb{E} X_T)(\mathbb{E} X_T)^\top) \\
& = \|\mathbb{E} X_T\|_2^2 + \operatorname{tr}(\operatorname{Cov}(X_T)).
\end{aligned}$$

According to the expression (6.7), there is

$$\begin{aligned}
(L.2) \quad & \mathbb{E} X_T = e^{A(T-t_0)} x_0 + \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)} (B_1 \Gamma_{1s} + B_2 \Gamma_{2s}) ds + \\
& \mathbb{E} \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)} \sqrt{\delta} (B_1 \Sigma_{1s} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2s} B_2^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}} dW_s. \\
& = e^{A(T-t_0)} x_0 + \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)} (B_1 \Gamma_{1s} + B_2 \Gamma_{2s}) ds,
\end{aligned}$$

hence the first term of (L.1) is

$$\left\| e^{A(T-t_0)x_0} + \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)}(B_1\Gamma_{1s} + B_2\Gamma_{2s})ds \right\|_2^2.$$

As for the second term, by Itô isometry, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\text{Cov}(X_T)) &= \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(e^{A(T-s)} \sqrt{\delta} (B_1 \Sigma_{1s} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2s} B_2^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(e^{A(T-s)} \sqrt{\delta} (B_1 \Sigma_{1s} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2s} B_2^\top)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^\top \right\} \\ \text{(L.3)} \quad &= \delta \text{tr} \left\{ \int_{t_0}^T e^{A(T-s)} (B_1 \Sigma_{1s} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2s} B_2^\top) e^{A^\top(T-s)} ds \right\} \\ &= \delta \int_{t_0}^T \text{tr} \left\{ e^{A(T-s)} (B_1 \Sigma_{1s} B_1^\top + B_2 \Sigma_{2s} B_2^\top) e^{A^\top(T-s)} \right\} ds, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is completed.

REFERENCES

- [1] *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, vol. 25 of Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.
- [2] R. J. AUMANN, *Mixed and Behavior Strategies in Infinite Extensive Games*, Princeton University Princeton, 1961.
- [3] T. BAŞAR AND G. ZACCOUR, *Handbook of Dynamic Game Theory*, Springer International Publishing, June 2018.
- [4] A. BRESSAN, *Noncooperative differential games*, Milan Journal of Mathematics, 79 (2011), pp. 357–427.
- [5] R. BUCKDAHN AND J. LI, *Stochastic differential games and viscosity solutions of hamilton-jacobi-bellman-isaacs equations*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 47 (2008), pp. 444–475.
- [6] R. BUCKDAHN, J. LI, AND M. QUINCAMPOIX, *Value function of differential games without isaacs conditions. an approach with nonanticipative mixed strategies*, International Journal of Game Theory, 42 (2013), pp. 989–1020.
- [7] R. BUCKDAHN, J. LI, AND M. QUINCAMPOIX, *Value in mixed strategies for zero-sum stochastic differential games without isaacs condition*, The Annals of Probability, 42 (2014), pp. 1724–1768.
- [8] P. CARDALIAGUET, *Differential games with asymmetric information*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 46 (2007), pp. 816–838.
- [9] P. CARDALIAGUET, C. JIMENEZ, AND M. QUINCAMPOIX, *Pure and random strategies in differential game with incomplete informations*, Journal of Dynamics and Games, 1 (2014), pp. 363–375.
- [10] E. J. DOCKNER, S. JORGENSEN, N. VAN LONG, AND G. SORGER, *Differential Games in Economics and Management Science*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [11] R. ELLIOTT, *The existence of value in stochastic differential games*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 14 (1976), pp. 85–94.
- [12] W. H. FLEMING AND D. HERNANDEZ-HERNANDEZ, *Mixed strategies for deterministic differential games*, Communications on Stochastic Analysis, 11 (2017).
- [13] D. HERNÁNDEZ-HERNÁNDEZ AND M. SÎRBU, *Zero-sum stochastic differential games without the isaacs condition: Random rules of priority and intermediate hamiltonians*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 56 (2018), pp. 2095–2119.
- [14] J. HESPANHA, M. PRANDINI, AND S. SASTRY, *Probabilistic pursuit-evasion games: A one-step nash approach*, in Proceedings of the 39th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (Cat. No.00CH37187), vol. 3, Dec. 2000, pp. 2272–2277 vol.3.
- [15] R. ISAACS, *Differential Games: A Mathematical Theory with Applications to Warfare and Pursuit*, Control and Optimization, Courier Corporation, 1999.

- [16] V. ISLER, S. KANNAN, AND S. KHANNA, *Randomized pursuit-evasion in a polygonal environment*, IEEE Transactions on Robotics, 21 (2005), pp. 875–884.
- [17] V. ISLER, S. KANNAN, AND S. KHANNA, *Randomized pursuit-evasion with local visibility*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 20 (2006), pp. 26–41.
- [18] Q. LI, C. TAI, AND E. WEINAN, *Stochastic modified equations and adaptive stochastic gradient algorithms*, in International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2017, pp. 2101–2110.
- [19] Q. LI, C. TAI, AND E. WEINAN, *Stochastic modified equations and dynamics of stochastic gradient algorithms i: Mathematical foundations*, The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 20 (2019), pp. 1474–1520.
- [20] Y. LI, G. CARBONI, F. GONZALEZ, D. CAMPOLO, AND E. BURDET, *Differential game theory for versatile physical human–robot interaction*, Nature Machine Intelligence, 1 (2019), pp. 36–43.
- [21] G. N. MIL'SHTEIN, *Weak approximation of solutions of systems of stochastic differential equations*, Theory of Probability & Its Applications, 30 (1986), pp. 750–766.
- [22] J. MOON, *A sufficient condition for linear-quadratic stochastic zero-sum differential games for markov jump systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 64 (2019), pp. 1619–1626.
- [23] J. MOON, T. E. DUNCAN, AND T. BAŞAR, *Risk-sensitive zero-sum differential games*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 64 (2019), pp. 1503–1518.
- [24] K. M. RAMACHANDRAN AND C. P. TSOKOS, *Stochastic Differential Games. Theory and Applications*, vol. 2, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [25] M. SÎRBU, *On martingale problems with continuous-time mixing and values of zero-sum games without the isaacs condition*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 52 (2014), pp. 2877–2890.
- [26] P. E. SOUGANIDIS, *Approximation schemes for viscosity solutions of hamilton-jacobi equations*, Journal of differential equations, 59 (1985), pp. 1–43.
- [27] G. E. UHLENBECK AND L. S. ORNSTEIN, *On the theory of the brownian motion*, Physical review, 36 (1930), p. 823.
- [28] R. VIDAL, O. SHAKERNIA, H. KIM, D. SHIM, AND S. SASTRY, *Probabilistic pursuit-evasion games: Theory, implementation, and experimental evaluation*, IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation, 18 (2002), pp. 662–669.
- [29] G. WANG AND Z. YU, *A pontryagin's maximum principle for non-zero sum differential games of bsdes with applications*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 55 (2010), pp. 1742–1747.
- [30] T. XU, *Differential game with mixed strategies: A weak approximation approach*, in 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), IEEE, accepted.
- [31] Q. ZHU, H. TEMBINE, AND T. BAŞAR, *Hybrid risk-sensitive mean-field stochastic differential games with application to molecular biology*, in 2011 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference, IEEE, 2011, pp. 4491–4497.