

A Graph-Theoretic Network Security Game

M. Mavronicolas*, V. Papadopoulou*, A.
Philippou* and P. Spirakis§

University of Cyprus, Cyprus*
University of Patras and RACTI, Greece§

A Network Security Problem

- Information network with
 - nodes *insecure* and vulnerable to *infection* by **attackers** e.g., viruses, Trojan horses, eavesdroppers, and
 - a *system security software* or a **defender** of limited power, e.g. able to clean a part of the network.
- In particular, we consider
 - a graph G with
 - ν attackers each of them **locating on a node** of G and
 - a defender, able to clean a **single edge** of the graph.

A Network Security Game: *Edge Model*

- We modeled the problem as a **Game**

$$\Pi_M(G) = \langle \mathcal{N}, \{S_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}, \{IP\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \rangle$$

- on a graph $G(V, E)$ with two kinds of players (set \mathcal{N}):
- ν attackers (set \mathcal{N}_{vp}) or **vertex players (vps)** vp_i , each of them with **action set**, $S_{vp_i} = V$,
- a defender or the **edge player** ep , with **action set**, $S_{ep} = E$,

and **Individual Profits** in a profile $\mathbf{s} = \langle s_1, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{N}_{vp}|}, s_{ep} \rangle \in \mathcal{S}$

- vertex player vp_i : $IP_i(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ if $s_i \in s_{ep}$ or 1 otherwise
i.e., 1 if it is not caught by the edge player, and 0 otherwise.
- Edge player ep : $IC_{ep}(\mathbf{s}) = |\{s_i : s_i \in s_{ep}\}|$,
i.e. gains the number of vps incident to its selected edge s_{ep} .

Nash Equilibria in the Edge Model

- We consider **pure** and **mixed strategy profiles**.
- Study associated **Nash equilibria (NE)**, where no player can unilaterally improve its Individual Cost by switching to another configuration.

Notation

- $P_s(ep, e)$: probability ep chooses edge e in s
- $P_s(vp_i, v)$: probability vp_i chooses vertex v in s
- $P_s(vp, v) = \sum_{i \in N_{vp}} P_s(vp_i, v)$: # vps located on vertex v in s
- $D_s(i)$: the support (actions assigned positive probability) of player $i \in \mathcal{N}$ in s .
- $E\text{Neigh}_s(v) = \{(u, v) \in E : (u, v) \in D_s(ep)\}$
- $P_s(\text{Hit}(v)) = \sum_{e \in E\text{Neigh}(v)} P_s(ep, e)$: the hitting probability of v
- $m_s(v) = \sum_{i \in N_{vp}} P_s(vp_i, v)$: expected # of vps choosing v
- $m_s(e) = m_s(u) + m_s(v)$
- $\text{Neigh}_G(X) = \{u \notin X : (u, v) \in E(G)\}$

Expected Individual Costs

- vertex players vp_i :

$$IP_i(s) = \sum_{v \in V} P_s(vp_i, v) \cdot (1 - P_s(Hit(v))) \quad (1)$$

- edge player ep :

$$IP_{ep}(s) = \sum_{e=(u,v) \in E} P_s(ep, e) \cdot (m_s(u) + m_s(v)) \quad (2)$$

Previous Work for the Edge Model

- No instance of the model contains a pure NE (ISAAC 05)
- A graph-theoretic characterization of mixed NE (ISAAC 05)

Summary of Results

- Polynomial time computable mixed NE on various graph instances:
 - regular graphs,
 - graphs with, polynomial time computable, r -regular factors
 - graphs with perfect matchings.
- Define the **Social Cost** of the game to be
 - the expected number of attackers catch by the protector
- The **Price of Anarchy** in any mixed NE is
 - upper and lower bounded by a linear function of the number of vertices of the graph.
- Consider the generalized variation of the problem considered, the **Path model**
 - The existence problem of a pure NE is NP-complete

Significance

- The *first* work (with an exception of ACY04) to model *network security problems* as *strategic game* and study its associated Nash equilibria.
- One of the few works highlighting a fruitful interaction between *Game Theory* and *Graph Theory*.
- Our results contribute towards answering the general question of Papadimitriou about the complexity of Nash equilibria for our special game.
- We believe *Matching Nash* equilibria (and/or extensions of them) will find further *applications* in *other network games*.

Pure and Mixed Nash Equilibria

- **Theorem 1.** [ISAAC05] *If G contains more than one edges, then $\Pi(G)$ has no pure Nash Equilibrium.*
- **Theorem 2.** [ISAAC05] (characterization of mixed NE)
A mixed configuration s is a Nash equilibrium for any $\Pi(G)$ if and only if:
 1. $D_s(ep)$ is an edge cover of G and
 2. $D_s(vp)$ is a vertex cover of the graph obtained by $D_s(ep)$.
 3. (a) $P(\text{Hit}(v)) = P_s(\text{Hit}(u)) = \min_v P_s(\text{Hit}(v))$, $\forall u, v \in D_s(vp)$,
(b) $\sum_{e \in D_s(ep)} P_s(ep, e) = 1$
 4. (a) $m_s(e_1) = m_s(e_2) = \max_e m_s(e)$, $\forall e_1, e_2 \in D_s(ep)$ and
(b) $\sum_{v \in V(D_s(vp))} m_s(v) = v$.

Background

- **Definition 1.** A graph G is polynomially computable r -factor graph if its vertices can be partitioned, in polynomial time, into a sequence G_{r_1}, \dots, G_{r_k} of k r -regular vertex disjoint subgraphs, for an integer k , $1 \leq k \leq n$, $G_r' = \{G_{r_1} \cup \dots \cup G_{r_k}\}$ the graph obtained by the sequence.
- A *two-factor* graph is can be recognized and decomposed into a sequence C_1, \dots, C_k , $1 \leq k \leq n$, in polynomial time (via Tutte's reduction).

Polynomial time NE : Regular Graphs

Theorem 1. *For any $\Pi(G)$ for which G is an r -regular graph, a mixed NE can be computed in constant time $O(1)$.*

Proof.

Construct profile s^r on $\Pi(G)$:

For any $i \in \mathcal{N}_{vp}$, $P_{s^r}(vp_i, v) := \frac{1}{n}$, $\forall v \in V(G)$ and then set, $s^r_j := s^r_i$, $\forall j \neq i, j \in \mathcal{N}_{vp}$. Set $P_{s^r}(ep, e) := \frac{1}{m}$, $\forall e \in E$.

$\Rightarrow \forall v \in V, P_s(\text{Hit}(v)) = |E\text{Neigh}(v)| / m$

$\Rightarrow \forall v \in V$ and $vp_i, IC_i(s^r_{-i}, [v]) = 1 - r/m$

• Also, $\forall e \in E, m(e) = |v \in V : v \in e| = r$. Thus, $\forall e \in E, IC_{ep}(s^r_{-ep}, [e]) = 2r/m$

$\Rightarrow s^r$ is a NE.

Polynomial time NE : r-factor Graphs

- **Corollary 1.** *For any $\Pi(G)$, such that G is a polynomial time computable r -factor graph, a mixed NE can be computed in polynomial time $O(T(G))$, where $O(T(G))$ is the time needed for the computation of G_r from G .*

Polynomial time NE : Graphs with Perfect Matchings

Theorem 2. For any $\Pi(G)$ for which G has a perfect matching, a mixed NE can be computed in polynomial time, $O(n^{1/2} \phi m)$.

Proof.

- Compute a perfect matching of G , M using time $O(n^{1/2} \phi m)$.
- Construct the following profile s^f on $\Pi(G)$:

For any $i \in \mathcal{N}_{vp}$, $P_{s^f}(vp_i, v) := \frac{1}{n}$, $\forall v \in V(G)$ and set $s^f_j := s^f_i$,
 $\forall j \neq i, j \in \mathcal{N}_{vp}$. Set $P_{s^f}(ep, e) := \frac{1}{|M|}$, $\forall e \in E$.

- $\forall v \in V, P_s(\text{Hit}(v)) = 1/|M|$

$\Rightarrow \forall v \in V$ and $vp_j, IC_i(s^f_{-i}, [v]) = 1 - 1/|M| = 1 - 2/n$

- Also, $\forall e \in E, m(v) = v \phi (1/n)$. Thus, $\forall e \in E, IC_{ep}(s^f_{-ep}, [e]) = 2 \phi v/n$

$\Rightarrow s^f$ is a NE.

Polynomial time NE : Trees

Algorithm Trees($\Pi(T)$)

Input: $\Pi(T)$

Output: a NE on $\Pi(T)$

1. Initialization: $VC := \emptyset$, $EC := \emptyset$, $r := 1$, $T_r := T$.
2. Repeat until $T_r = \emptyset$;
 - a) Find the leaves of the tree T_r , $\text{leaves}(T_r)$ and add $\text{leaves}(T_r)$ in VC .
 - b) For each $v \in \text{leaves}(T_r)$, add $(v, \text{parent}_{T_r}(v))$ in EC
 - c) Update tree: $T_r = T_r \setminus \text{leaves}(T_r) \setminus \text{parents}(\text{leaves}(T_r))$
3. Set \mathbf{s}^t : For any $i \in \mathcal{N}_{VP}$, set $D_{st}(vp_i) := VC$ and $D_{st}(ep) := EC$. Then set $D_{st}(vp_j) := D_{st}(vp_i)$, $\forall j \neq i, j \in \mathcal{N}_{VP}$.

and apply the uniform distribution on support of each player.

Analysis of the Tree Algorithm

- **Lemma 1.** Set VC , computed by Algorithm $Trees(\Pi(G))$, is an independent set of T .
- **Lemma 2.** Set EC is an edge cover of T and VC is a vertex cover of the graph obtained by EC .
- **Lemma 3.** For all $v \in D_s(vp)$, $m_s(v) = |D_s(vp)|$. Also, for all v' not in $D_s(vp)$, $m_s(v') = 0$.
- **Lemma 4.** Each vertex of IS is incident to exactly one edge of EC .

Analysis of the Algorithm (Cont.)

By Lemmas 2 and 4, we get,

- **Lemma 5.** For all $v \in D_{\text{st}}(vp)$, $P_s(\text{Hit}(v)) = \frac{1}{|D_{\text{st}}(ep)|}$.
Also, for all $v' \notin D_{\text{st}}(vp)$, $P_s(\text{Hit}(v')) \geq \frac{1}{|D_{\text{st}}(ep)|}$.

Thus,

Theorem 3. *For any $\Pi(T)$, where T is a tree graph, algorithm $\text{Trees}(\Pi(T))$ computes a mixed NE in polynomial time $O(n)$.*

Price of Anarchy

Lemma 7. For any $\Pi(G)$ and an associated mixed NE s^* , the social cost $SC(\Pi(G), s^*)$ is upper and lower bounded as follows:

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\nu}{|D_{s^*}(ep)|}, \frac{\nu}{|V(D_{s^*}(vp))|} \right\} \leq SC(\Pi(G), s^*) \leq \frac{\Delta(D_{s^*}(ep)) \cdot \nu}{|D_{s^*}(ep)|}$$

These bounds are tight.

Thus, we can show,

- **Theorem 4.** *The Price of Anarchy $r(\Pi)$ for the Edge model is $\frac{n}{2} \leq r(\Pi) \leq n$.*

Path Model

- If we let the protector to be able to select a single path of G instead of an edge, called the **path player** (pp)

⇒ **The Path Model**

- **Theorem.** *For any graph G , $\Pi(G)$ has a pure NE if and only if G contains a hamiltonian path.*

Proof.

- Assume in contrary: $\Pi(G)$ contains a pure NE s but G is not hamiltonian.
- There exists a set of nodes U of G not contained in pp 's action, s_{pp} .
- ⇒ for all players vp_i , $i \in N_{vp}$, it holds $s_i \in U$
- ⇒ Path player gains nothing, while he could gain more.
- ⇒ s is NOT a pure NE of $\Pi(G)$, contradiction.

Path Model

- **Corollary.** The existence problem of pure NE for the Path model is *NP*-complete.

Current and Future Work

- Develop other structured Polynomial time NE
 - for specific graph families,
 - exploiting their special properties
- Existence and Complexity of Matching equilibria for general graphs
- Generalizations of the Edge model

**Thank you
for your Attention !**