Mathematical Proofs of Nash Equilibrium in Attacker–Defender Information Security Games

Aryan Ninad Dalvi
Pace University, New York, USA
ad36837n@pace.edu

Abstract

The concept of Nash Equilibrium forms the cornerstone of modern non-cooperative game theory, providing a mathematically rigorous notion of strategic stability in adversarial decision-making environments. In systems characterized by rational agents with opposing objectives, equilibrium analysis requires formal proof rather than heuristic justification. This paper presents a proof-oriented mathematical study of Nash Equilibrium, emphasizing its existence in finite strategic games through fixed-point theory. Mixed strategies are modeled using probability simplices, and equilibrium existence is established via Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem. Supporting results from convex analysis, continuity theory, and best-response correspondences are developed in detail. While attacker–defender interactions in information security provide motivating examples, the primary contribution of this work lies in its rigorous mathematical exposition of equilibrium theory and its applicability to adversarial systems governed by rational strategic behavior.

1 Introduction

Strategic interaction among rational agents has long been a central object of study in mathematics, economics, and theoretical computer science. Whenever the outcome of a decision depends not only on an individual's action but also on the actions of others, the problem naturally assumes a game-theoretic structure. Such interactions arise in markets, political systems, communication networks, and adversarial environments, including information security. From a mathematical perspective, these problems are unified by the challenge of characterizing stable outcomes under rational choice.

The notion of Nash Equilibrium provides a formal definition of strategic stability. An equilibrium is a configuration of strategies in which no agent can improve its payoff through unilateral deviation. Although intuitive, the existence of such equilibria is not self-evident. In many strategic settings, particularly those involving discrete actions and conflicting objectives, equilibrium existence must be demonstrated through rigorous mathematical argumentation. The development of Nash Equilibrium theory marked a significant advance by showing that stability can be guaranteed under broad and well-defined conditions.

In contemporary adversarial systems, particularly in information security, strategic models frequently assume equilibrium behavior to justify defensive or offensive strategies. However, without a solid mathematical foundation, such assumptions risk being merely heuristic. From a theoretical standpoint, it is essential to establish that equilibrium states exist independently of domain-specific interpretations. This paper addresses this requirement by focusing on the mathematical underpinnings of Nash Equilibrium rather than its applied implementations.

The objective of this work is to present a comprehensive, proof-based analysis of Nash Equilibrium existence in finite non-cooperative games. Emphasis is placed on the mathematical structure of strategy spaces, the role of convexity and compactness, and the application of fixed-point theorems. Information security serves only as a motivating context for adversarial interaction, while the core of the paper remains firmly rooted in mathematical theory.

2 Literature Review

The mathematical foundations of Nash Equilibrium are deeply rooted in fixed-point theory and convex analysis. Nash's seminal works in 1950 and 1951 established that every finite non-cooperative game admits at least one equilibrium in mixed strategies. The key insight of Nash's proof was the reduction of the equilibrium problem to the existence of a fixed point in a suitably defined strategy space. This approach transformed equilibrium analysis from an economic intuition into a formal mathematical result.

The development of fixed-point theory played a crucial role in this advancement. Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem provided early guarantees for continuous functions on compact convex sets, but its applicability was limited to single-valued mappings. Kakutani extended this result to set-valued correspondences, enabling the analysis of best-response mappings that may admit multiple optimal strategies. Kakutani's theorem became the central mathematical tool underlying Nash's existence proof.

Subsequent research refined and generalized these results. Debreu and Glicksberg extended equilibrium existence to games with infinite strategy spaces under continuity and compactness assumptions. Von Neumann's Minimax Theorem provided an alternative equilibrium characterization for two-player zero-sum games, linking equilibrium behavior to convex optimization and duality theory. Later works by Fudenberg and Tirole, as well as Osborne and Rubinstein, offered rigorous treatments of equilibrium stability, best-response correspondences, and the geometry of mixed strategies.

3 Mathematical Preliminaries

This section develops the mathematical foundations required for the formal proof of Nash Equilibrium existence. The exposition focuses on real analysis, convex geometry, and fixed-point theory, emphasizing the structural properties of strategy spaces used throughout the paper.

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a non-empty set. A function

$$f : X \to \mathbb{R}$$

is said to be *continuous* if for every sequence $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset X$ such that $x_k \to x \in X$, it follows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} f(x_k) = f(x).$$

Continuity ensures that small perturbations in strategy profiles lead to small changes in payoff values, a property essential for equilibrium stability.

3.1 Compactness

A subset $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is *compact* if it is both closed and bounded. Compactness plays a central role in equilibrium analysis because it guarantees the existence of solutions to optimization problems.

Theorem 1 (Extreme Value Theorem)**.** *If $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and X is compact, then there exist points $x_{\min}, x_{\max} \in X$ such that*

$$f(x_{\min}) \leq f(x) \leq f(x_{\max}) \quad \textit{for all } x \in X.$$

In the context of strategic games, compactness of strategy spaces ensures that payoff maximization problems admit solutions, thereby guaranteeing the existence of best responses.

3.2 Convexity

A set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be *convex* if for all $x, y \in C$ and all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y \in C.$$

Convexity is fundamental in game theory because mixed strategies are formed as convex combinations of pure strategies. Convex strategy spaces ensure that randomization preserves feasibility and that optimization problems behave predictably.

3.3 Probability Simplex

Let $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k\}$ be a finite set of pure strategies. The space of mixed strategies over S is defined as the probability simplex

$$\Delta(S) = \left\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^k \;\middle|\; p_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i,\ \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i = 1 \right\}.$$

The simplex $\Delta(S)$ is a compact and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Each vertex of the simplex corresponds to a pure strategy, while interior points correspond to randomized strategies.

Geometrically, the simplex is a $(k-1)$-dimensional polytope. Its compactness and convexity are essential for fixed-point arguments used in equilibrium existence proofs.

3.4 Correspondences and Upper Hemicontinuity

In many strategic settings, optimal responses are not unique. Such situations are modeled using *correspondences*, also known as set-valued mappings. A correspondence

$$F : X \rightrightarrows Y$$

assigns to each $x \in X$ a non-empty subset $F(x) \subseteq Y$.

A correspondence F is said to be *upper hemicontinuous* at a point $x \in X$ if for every open set $V \subset Y$ such that $F(x) \subset V$, there exists a neighborhood U of x for which

$$F(x') \subset V \quad \text{for all } x' \in U.$$

Upper hemicontinuity ensures that small changes in input do not lead to sudden expansions of the correspondence's values, a regularity condition required for fixed-point theorems.

3.5 Fixed-Point Theorems

Fixed-point theory provides the mathematical foundation for Nash Equilibrium existence. A fixed point of a mapping is a point that is mapped to itself.

Theorem 2 (Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem)**.** *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a compact and convex set, and let*

$$f : X \to X$$

be a continuous function. Then there exists a point $x^* \in X$ such that

$$f(x^*) = x^*.$$

Brouwer's theorem applies to single-valued functions. Equilibrium analysis, however, requires a more general result capable of handling set-valued mappings.

Theorem 3 (Kakutani Fixed Point Theorem)**.** *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a non-empty, compact, and convex set. Let*

$$F : X \rightrightarrows X$$

be a correspondence satisfying the following conditions:

1. *$F(x)$ is non-empty and convex for all $x \in X$,*
2. *F is upper hemicontinuous.*

Then there exists a point $x^* \in X$ such that

$$x^* \in F(x^*).$$

Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem serves as the central mathematical tool used in the proof of Nash Equilibrium existence presented in subsequent sections.

4 Strategic Games: Formal Mathematical Construction

The formal analysis of Nash Equilibrium begins with a precise mathematical definition of strategic interaction. A strategic or normal-form game abstracts away temporal ordering and focuses instead on the simultaneous choice of strategies by rational agents. This abstraction allows strategic behavior to be studied using static mathematical tools while still capturing essential adversarial features.

Let $N = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ denote a finite set of players. For each player $i \in N$, let S_i be a finite, non-empty set of pure strategies available to that player. The Cartesian product

$$S = \prod_{i=1}^{n} S_i$$

represents the set of all pure strategy profiles. Associated with each player is a payoff function

$$u_i : S \to \mathbb{R},$$

which assigns a real-valued utility to every possible combination of strategies. The finiteness of strategy sets plays a critical mathematical role. Finite sets ensure compactness once mixed strategies are introduced, thereby enabling fixed-point arguments. While infinite strategy games can also admit equilibria, additional topological assumptions are required, and the proofs become significantly more complex.

In adversarial interpretations, such as attacker–defender models, payoff functions encode opposing objectives. However, from a mathematical standpoint, the specific interpretation of payoffs is irrelevant. What matters is that each payoff function is well-defined on the product space of strategies and can be extended continuously to mixed strategies.

5 Mixed Strategies and the Geometry of Randomization

Pure strategies represent deterministic actions, but many strategic games do not admit equilibrium in pure strategies alone. The introduction of mixed strategies resolves this issue by allowing players to randomize over available actions. This extension is not merely a modeling convenience; it is a mathematical necessity for equilibrium existence.

For each player i, the set of mixed strategies is defined as the probability simplex

$$\Delta(S_i) = \left\{ \sigma_i \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_i|} \;\middle|\; \sigma_i(s) \geq 0 \text{ for all } s \in S_i, \ \sum_{s \in S_i} \sigma_i(s) = 1 \right\}.$$

Each mixed strategy assigns a probability to every pure strategy. Pure strategies correspond to extreme points of the simplex, while mixed strategies correspond to interior points.

Geometrically, the simplex $\Delta(S_i)$ is a compact, convex polytope embedded in Euclidean space. Convexity reflects the fact that probabilistic mixtures of strategies remain valid strategies. Compactness ensures that sequences of mixed strategies admit convergent subsequences, a property that will later guarantee equilibrium existence.

The joint mixed strategy space for all players is given by

$$\Delta(S) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Delta(S_i).$$

which inherits compactness and convexity from its components. This product structure allows strategic interactions to be analyzed using multivariate fixed-point theory.

6 Expected Utility Theory

Once mixed strategies are introduced, payoff functions must be extended from pure strategies to probability distributions. This extension is accomplished through expected utility theory, which provides a linear and continuous mapping from mixed strategies to real-valued payoffs.

Given a mixed strategy profile $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in \Delta(S)$, the expected payoff for player i is defined as

$$U_i(\sigma) = \sum_{s \in S} u_i(s) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_j(s_j).$$

This expression represents the expected value of the payoff under independent randomization by each player.

From a mathematical perspective, several properties of expected utility functions are essential. First, U_i is continuous in all arguments. This continuity follows from the fact that U_i is a finite sum of products of probabilities and payoff values. Second, U_i is linear in the player's own mixed strategy while holding opponents' strategies fixed. Linearity implies that optimization over mixed strategies reduces to convex analysis.

These properties ensure that expected utility maximization problems are well-posed and admit solutions on compact strategy spaces. Without expected utility theory, the mathematical structure required for equilibrium proofs would collapse.

7 Optimization over Mixed Strategy Spaces

A player's strategic problem can be viewed as an optimization problem defined over the probability simplex. Given opponents' mixed strategies σ_{-i}, player i seeks to maximize the function

$$\sigma_i \longmapsto U_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i})$$

over the compact convex set $\Delta(S_i)$.

Because the objective function is continuous and linear, the Extreme Value Theorem guarantees the existence of at least one maximizer. Moreover, the linearity of the objective implies that the set of maximizers is itself convex. This observation has important implications for equilibrium analysis, as it ensures that best-response correspondences satisfy the convexity conditions required by fixed-point theorems.

The optimization problem faced by each player is independent of interpretation. Whether the players represent economic agents, network defenders, or adversarial attackers, the underlying mathematics remains unchanged. This abstraction highlights the universality of equilibrium theory.

8 Best Response Correspondences: Formal Analysis

The notion of best response captures optimal strategic behavior in response to opponents' actions. Because optimization may admit multiple solutions, best responses are naturally modeled as correspondences rather than functions.

Formally, the best response correspondence for player i is defined as

$$BR_i(\sigma_{-i}) = \{\sigma_i \in \Delta(S_i) \mid U_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}) \geq U_i(\sigma_i', \sigma_{-i}) \text{ for all } \sigma_i' \in \Delta(S_i)\}.$$

Several mathematical properties of this correspondence are fundamental. Non-emptiness follows from compactness and continuity. Convexity follows from the linearity of expected utility in σ_i. Upper hemicontinuity follows from the continuity of payoff functions and can be established rigorously using the Maximum Theorem.

Upper hemicontinuity ensures that small changes in opponents' strategies do not cause sudden expansions of the best response set. This regularity condition is essential for ensuring that the collective best response correspondence satisfies the hypotheses of Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem.

9 Strategic Stability and Fixed-Point Interpretation

The concept of Nash Equilibrium emerges naturally from the structure of best response correspondences. A strategy profile is stable if each player's strategy is an element of their best response set given the strategies of others. Mathematically, this condition is equivalent to the existence of a fixed point of the product correspondence formed by all players' best responses.

Define the collective best response correspondence by

$$BR(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} BR_i(\sigma_{-i}).$$

A Nash Equilibrium is a point $\sigma^* \in \Delta(S)$ such that

$$\sigma^* \in BR(\sigma^*).$$

This formulation recasts equilibrium analysis as a fixed-point problem. Rather than searching directly for stable strategy profiles, one seeks points in strategy space that are invariant under the best response mapping. This perspective allows powerful results from topology and convex analysis to be brought to bear on strategic interaction problems.

10 Relevance to Adversarial Systems

Although this paper is mathematically focused, the structure developed thus far provides a rigorous foundation for modeling adversarial systems. In attacker–defender scenarios, each agent's strategy set may represent abstract actions or policies, and payoff functions encode opposing objectives.

The existence of Nash Equilibrium guarantees that stable strategic configurations exist independently of heuristic assumptions. The mathematical framework developed here justifies the use of equilibrium concepts in adversarial modeling by demonstrating that strategic stability is an inherent consequence of rational choice under compactness and continuity assumptions.

11 Nash Equilibrium: Formal Definition and Mathematical Properties

The notion of Nash Equilibrium provides a precise mathematical definition of strategic stability in non-cooperative games. Rather than describing equilibrium informally as a balance of competing interests, the concept is defined through optimization and fixed-point conditions that can be analyzed rigorously.

Let

$$G = (N, \{S_i\}_{i \in N}, \{u_i\}_{i \in N})$$

be a finite strategic game and let

$$\Delta(S) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Delta(S_i)$$

denote the joint mixed strategy space. A mixed strategy profile

$$\sigma^* \in \Delta(S)$$

is called a Nash Equilibrium if, for every player $i \in N$,

$$U_i(\sigma_i^*, \sigma_{-i}^*) \geq U_i(\sigma_i, \sigma_{-i}^*) \quad \text{for all } \sigma_i \in \Delta(S_i).$$

This condition formalizes the idea that no player can improve their expected payoff by deviating unilaterally. From a mathematical standpoint, Nash Equilibrium is not merely a behavioral concept but a structural property of the strategy space and payoff functions.

One of the most important characteristics of Nash Equilibrium is that it need not be unique. Multiple equilibrium may exist, reflecting the possibility of different stable strategic configurations. Furthermore, equilibrium may involve mixed strategies even when pure strategies are available, highlighting the importance of randomization in achieving stability.

Another key property is that Nash Equilibrium does not require coordination or communication among players. Each player's equilibrium strategy is optimal given the strategies of others, independent of how those strategies are selected. This independence is crucial for modeling adversarial systems, where cooperation cannot be assumed.

12 Equilibrium as a Fixed Point

A central insight of Nash's equilibrium theory is that equilibrium can be characterized as a fixed point of a suitably defined correspondence. This interpretation allows equilibrium existence to be studied using topological methods rather than combinatorial enumeration of strategies.

Consider the best response correspondence

$$BR : \Delta(S) \rightrightarrows \Delta(S),$$

defined by

$$BR(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} BR_i(\sigma_{-i}),$$

where each BR_i is the best response correspondence of player i. A strategy profile σ^* is a Nash Equilibrium if and only if it is a fixed point of BR, meaning that

$$\sigma^* \in BR(\sigma^*).$$

This fixed-point formulation shifts the problem of equilibrium existence from strategic reasoning to functional analysis. Rather than directly solving a system of inequalities, one seeks a point in the joint strategy space that is invariant under the best response mapping.

The fixed-point perspective also clarifies the role of mixed strategies. The convexity of mixed strategy spaces ensures that best response correspondences satisfy the conditions required by fixed-point theorems. Without randomization, strategy spaces would lack the necessary geometric structure for such results.

13 Preliminary Lemmas for Equilibrium Existence

Before presenting the main existence theorem, several auxiliary results must be established. These lemmas formalize properties of the strategy space and best response correspondences that are required for the application of Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem.

First, the joint mixed strategy space $\Delta(S)$ is compact and convex. Compactness follows from the fact that each simplex $\Delta(S_i)$ is compact and that finite products of compact sets are compact. Convexity follows from the convexity of each simplex and the fact that products of convex sets are convex.

Second, the best response correspondence BR is non-empty-valued. For any strategy profile $\sigma \in \Delta(S)$, each player faces a well-defined optimization problem over a compact set with a continuous objective function. The Extreme Value Theorem guarantees the existence of at least one maximizer, ensuring that best response sets are non-empty.

Third, the values of the best response correspondence are convex. Because expected payoff functions are linear in a player's own mixed strategy, any convex combination of best responses is also a best response. This convexity is essential for fixed-point arguments.

Finally, the best response correspondence is upper hemicontinuous. Informally, this means that small changes in opponents' strategies cannot cause the best response set to suddenly expand. Formally, upper hemicontinuity follows from the continuity of expected payoff functions and can be established using the Maximum Theorem.

Together, these properties ensure that the best response correspondence satisfies all hypotheses of Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem.

14 Existence of Nash Equilibrium

The central mathematical result of non-cooperative game theory is the existence of Nash Equilibrium in finite strategic games. This result establishes that strategic stability is not exceptional but guaranteed under general conditions.

Let

$$X = \Delta(S)$$

denote the joint mixed strategy space. As established previously, X is compact and convex. Define the correspondence

$$F : X \rightrightarrows X$$

by

$$F(\sigma) = BR(\sigma).$$

By the lemmas established in the previous section, the correspondence F is non-empty-valued, convex-valued, and upper hemicontinuous. Therefore, all conditions of Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem are satisfied. It follows that there exists at least one point

$$\sigma^* \in X$$

such that

$$\sigma^* \in F(\sigma^*).$$

This fixed point corresponds precisely to a Nash Equilibrium, as each player's strategy is a best response to the strategies of all other players. The existence proof is entirely independent of the specific interpretation of strategies or payoffs, relying only on topological and convexity properties of the strategy space.

This result demonstrates that Nash Equilibrium is a mathematically inevitable feature of finite strategic interaction. Strategic stability arises not from special assumptions about behavior but from fundamental properties of optimization and geometry.

15 Interpretation for Adversarial and Attacker-Defender Model

Although the proof of equilibrium existence is purely mathematical, it has important implications for adversarial systems such as attacker–defender models in information security. In such systems, agents operate under conflicting objectives and limited information, making strategic stability a critical concern.

By modeling attacker–defender interactions as finite non-cooperative games, one can appeal directly to Nash's existence theorem to justify the presence of stable strategic configurations. Importantly, this justification does not depend on specific security mechanisms, attack vectors, or defensive technologies. Instead, it rests on the abstract structure of strategic interaction.

From a theoretical perspective, this result provides a rigorous foundation for equilibrium-based analysis in adversarial domains. Rather than assuming that attackers and defenders will settle into stable patterns of behavior, one can demonstrate mathematically that such patterns must exist under rational choice assumptions.

16 Remarks on Uniqueness and Stability

While Nash's theorem guarantees existence, it does not guarantee uniqueness. Multiple equilibria may coexist, raising questions about equilibrium selection and stability. From a mathematical standpoint, equilibrium multiplicity reflects the richness of strategic interaction rather than a deficiency of the model.

Stability concepts, such as trembling-hand perfection and refinement criteria, attempt to address these issues by imposing additional structure on equilibrium behavior. Although these refinements lie beyond the scope of this paper, they highlight the depth and complexity of equilibrium theory.

The existence proof presented here serves as a foundational result upon which more refined analyses can be built. Any discussion of equilibrium stability or refinement presupposes the existence of equilibrium, underscoring the importance of Nash's original contribution.

17 Zero-Sum Games and the Minimax Theorem

A particularly important class of strategic games is the class of two-player zero-sum games. In such games, the interests of the players are perfectly opposed, meaning that one player's gain is exactly the other player's loss. Formally, a game is zero-sum if the payoff functions satisfy

$$u_1(s_1, s_2) = -u_2(s_1, s_2)$$

for all strategy profiles (s_1, s_2). This structure allows equilibrium analysis to be reduced to a single objective function.

Zero-sum games admit a powerful equilibrium characterization through von Neumann's Minimax Theorem. The theorem states that for any finite two-player zero-sum game, the maximum payoff a player can guarantee themselves equals the minimum payoff their opponent can enforce. In terms of mixed strategies, the theorem asserts that

$$\max_{\sigma_1 \in \Delta(S_1)} \min_{\sigma_2 \in \Delta(S_2)} U_1(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \min_{\sigma_2 \in \Delta(S_2)} \max_{\sigma_1 \in \Delta(S_1)} U_1(\sigma_1, \sigma_2).$$

The equality of these expressions implies the existence of saddle points in the mixed strategy space. At a saddle point, neither player can improve their outcome by deviating unilaterally, which coincides with the definition of Nash Equilibrium in zero-sum games.

The proof of the Minimax Theorem relies on convexity and duality arguments. The expected payoff function is linear in each player's mixed strategy, and the strategy spaces are compact and convex. These properties enable the application of separation theorems from convex analysis, leading to the existence of optimal mixed strategies.

Although the full proof is beyond the scope of this paper, its structure mirrors the fixed-point arguments used in Nash's theorem and further illustrates the deep connection between equilibrium theory and convex geometry.

18 Mathematical Interpretation for Attacker–Defender Systems

While the preceding analysis is purely mathematical, it has direct implications for adversarial systems such as attacker–defender interactions in information security. These systems are naturally modeled as non-cooperative games in which agents pursue opposing objectives under resource constraints.

From a mathematical perspective, the specific interpretation of strategies and payoffs is secondary. What matters is that the strategic interaction satisfies the structural assumptions of finite strategy sets, continuity of payoffs, and rational optimization. Under these conditions, Nash's existence theorem guarantees the presence of equilibrium strategy profiles.

In attacker–defender models, equilibria correspond to stable configurations in which neither side can improve its outcome by unilaterally changing strategy. The mathematical results presented in this paper justify the use of equilibrium concepts in adversarial modeling without appealing to heuristic assumptions about behavior. Strategic stability emerges as a consequence of geometry, topology, and optimization rather than domain-specific intuition.

19 Extensions of Equilibrium Theory

The equilibrium existence results established in this paper rely on assumptions of finite strategy sets, complete information, and static interaction. While these assumptions are mathematically convenient, they are not always realistic. Consequently, significant research has been devoted to extending equilibrium theory to more general settings.

In Bayesian games, players possess incomplete information about the characteristics or types of other players. Strategies are defined as functions from types to actions, and equilibrium is defined in terms of expected utility with respect to beliefs. Bayesian Nash Equilibrium extends the existence results of finite games by incorporating probability measures over types, though the proofs require additional measure-theoretic machinery.

Repeated games introduce temporal structure by allowing players to interact over multiple periods. In this setting, equilibrium concepts such as subgame-perfect equilibrium refine Nash Equilibrium by requiring optimal behavior after every possible history. The mathematical analysis of repeated games relies on dynamic programming and fixed-point arguments in function spaces.

Dynamic and differential games further generalize strategic interaction by allowing strategies to evolve continuously over time. These models often require tools from differential equations, optimal control theory, and stochastic analysis. Despite their complexity, many dynamic games retain equilibrium existence results under appropriate continuity and compactness assumptions.

These extensions demonstrate the robustness of equilibrium theory and highlight the central role of mathematics in understanding strategic behavior across a wide range of settings.

20 Limitations of Equilibrium Analysis

Although Nash Equilibrium provides a powerful notion of strategic stability, it is not without limitations. Existence does not imply uniqueness, and multiple equilibria may coexist. From a mathematical standpoint, equilibrium multiplicity reflects the richness of the strategic environment but also complicates prediction and selection.

Furthermore, Nash Equilibrium assumes perfect rationality and unlimited computational ability. In practice, agents may operate under bounded rationality or incomplete optimization. While these considerations lie outside the scope of this paper, they motivate alternative equilibrium concepts and algorithmic approaches.

Importantly, none of these limitations undermine the mathematical validity of Nash's existence theorem. Rather, they point to the need for additional structure when equilibrium theory is applied to specific domains. The foundational result established here remains a necessary prerequisite for any refined analysis.

21 Managerial implications

Although this work is primarily mathematical, the equilibrium results derived have direct implications for strategic decision-making in adversarial and security-critical environments. The formal existence of Nash Equilibrium demonstrates that strategic stability is not an empirical coincidence but a structural consequence of rational behavior under compactness and convexity assumptions. For managers and system designers, this implies that stable outcomes can be analyzed and anticipated using formal models rather than relying solely on reactive or heuristic approaches.

The fixed-point characterization of equilibrium emphasizes the importance of anticipatory decision-making. Managerial strategies should be evaluated not in isolation, but in terms of the best responses they induce from adversaries. Policies that appear effective in static settings may become suboptimal once rational opponents adapt. The equilibrium framework therefore supports proactive strategy design in which decision-makers explicitly account for adversarial optimization when allocating resources or selecting defensive controls.

The role of mixed strategies carries particularly important operational implications. The existence of equilibria that require randomization indicates that deterministic policies may be inherently unstable in adversarial settings. Predictable enforcement schedules, inspection routines, or defensive deployments can be exploited by rational opponents. Managers should therefore incorporate controlled randomness into operational procedures, such as audit timing, monitoring intensity, or system configuration changes, to reduce predictability and improve robustness.

Equilibrium non-uniqueness further highlights the managerial relevance of equilibrium selection. Multiple stable outcomes may exist under identical structural conditions, differing in cost, risk exposure, or resilience. As a result, stability alone does not guarantee desirability. Decision-makers must apply secondary criteria, including organizational objectives and risk tolerance, to select among competing equilibria.

Finally, the abstraction of equilibrium existence from domain-specific assumptions reinforces the use of game-theoretic models as decision-support tools. Because the results depend only on structural properties of strategy spaces and payoff functions, they remain applicable across diverse adversarial contexts. For managers, this justifies integrating formal equilibrium analysis into strategic planning and risk management processes.

22 Conclusion

This paper presented a comprehensive, proof-oriented analysis of Nash Equilibrium, emphasizing its mathematical foundations rather than its applied interpretations. By developing the structure of strategic games, mixed strategy spaces, and best response correspondences, the analysis demonstrated how equilibrium existence follows naturally from convexity, compactness, and fixed-point theory.

The central result—that every finite non-cooperative game admits at least one Nash Equilibrium in mixed strategies which were established rigorously using Kakutani's Fixed Point Theorem. Additional discussion of zero-sum games and the Minimax Theorem further illustrated the deep connections between equilibrium theory, convex optimization, and geometry.

While information security provided a motivating context, the primary contribution of this work lies in its mathematical exposition. The results apply broadly to adversarial systems governed by rational strategic interaction. Future research may extend these proofs to dynamic, stochastic, and incomplete-information environments, further enriching the mathematical theory of strategic stability.

References

[1] Nash, J. F. (1950). Equilibrium points in n-person games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 36(1), 48–49.

[2] Nash, J. F. (1951). Non-cooperative games. *Annals of Mathematics*, 54(2), 286–295.

[3] Kakutani, S. (1941). A generalization of Brouwer's fixed point theorem. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 8(3), 457–459.

[4] von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press.

[5] Debreu, G. (1952). A social equilibrium existence theorem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 38(10), 886–893.

[6] Glicksberg, I. L. (1952). A further generalization of the Kakutani fixed point theorem. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 3(1), 170–174.

[7] Fudenberg, D., & Tirole, J. (1991). *Game Theory*. MIT Press.

[8] Osborne, M. J., & Rubinstein, A. (1994). *A Course in Game Theory*. MIT Press.