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In this paper open-loop three-level Stackelberg strategies in deterministic, sequential decision-making problems for linear discretetime descriptor systems and quadratic cost function are studied. Necessary conditions for existence of open-loop Stackelberg strategies are derived. Open-loop Stackelberg solutions (norm - minimizing) are calculated from the necessary conditions and the conditions for existence of a unique solution of the necessary conditions are given. An example is given to illustrate the results of the paper.

## 1. Introduction

A great deal of attention has been paid to methods of design and analysis of Stackelberg strategies in multi-level sequential decision-making problems [1,5,810]. During the last 20 years, there has been much interest in studying of the descriptor systems $[3-4,6-7]$. To the best knowledge of the present authors, there are no published results for multi-level sequential decision-making problems characterized by descriptor systems. In section 2, multi-level sequential
decision-making problems characterized by quadratic cost functions and linear time-invariant discrete descriptor systems are considered, and necessary conditions for the existence of open-loop Stackelberg strategies are given. In section 3, open-loop Stackelberg solutions (norm-minimizing) are calculated from the necessary conditions and the conditions for existence of a unique solution of the necessary conditions are given. An example is given to illustrate the results of the paper in section 4.

## 2. Problem formulation and derivation of necessary conditions

Consider a tree-level Stackelberg problem for a linear descriptor system

$$
\begin{equation*}
E x(k+1)=A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k) \quad E x(0)=E x_{0} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with associated cost function for each decision maker $P_{i}$

$$
\begin{align*}
J_{i}\left(u^{1}, u^{2}, u^{3}\right) & =1 / 2 \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}\left[x(k)^{\prime} Q^{i} x(k)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} u^{j}(k)^{\prime} R^{i j} u^{j}(k)\right] \\
& +1 / 2 x(K)^{\prime} E^{\prime} Q^{i}(K) E x(K) \quad i=1,2,3 \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $E$ is a square matrix with $\operatorname{rank}(E)=r<n$, and $\operatorname{det}[s E-A] \not \equiv 0$ for any $s \in R, x(k) \in R^{n}$ is a descriptor vector, $u^{j}(k) \in R^{r j}$ is control vector of $P_{j}$, the usual positive-(semi)definiteness conditions are imposed on $Q^{i}, Q^{i}(k), R^{i j}, i, j=$ $1,2,3$, as in the associated optimal control problem.

Now let us assume that the decision-making sequence is $\left\{P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{3}\right\}$, that is, decision maker $P_{3}$ is the leader and selects his strategy first; $P_{2}$ is the first follower and selects his strategy as the second; and $P_{1}$ is the second follower and selects his strategy as the last. Consequently, in making his decision, $P_{1}$ knows the control $u^{2}$ and $u^{3}$ of the other decision makers; $P_{2}$ knows $u^{3}$, and he knows that $P_{1}$ reacts according to declared functions $u^{2}$ and $u^{3} ; P_{3}$ knows that $P_{2}$ reacts according to his declared control $u^{3}$, and he must take into account the reaction of $P_{1}$ to declared controls $u^{2}$ and $u^{3}$. The simplest problem is solved by $P_{1}$ (an optimal control problem); a more complex problem is solved by $P_{2}$ (a two-level Stackelberg problem); and the most complex problem is solved by $P_{3}$ (a three-level Stackelberg problem). The complete solution of the problem is obtained by the solution of the leader's control problem, since the leader must solve problems faced by both $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ to determine their reactions to a given
$u^{3}$, in order to select that control which is best with respect to $J_{3}$, taking these reactions of the followers into account.

Therefore, in order to solve three-level Stackelberg problem, we must first determine the rational reaction of $P_{1}$ to controls $u^{2}$ and $u^{3}$ which are declared by $P_{2}$ and $P_{3}$, respectively. Since the underlying information pattern is open-loop, the optimization problem faced by $P_{1}$ is reduced to an optimal control problem defined by (2.1) and (2.2), for $i=1$, given $u^{2}$ and $u^{3}$. In order to solve this optimization problem we append the constraint (2.1) to, the cost function $J_{1}$ using the Lagrange multiplier $p^{1}(k)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{1}\left(u^{1}, u^{2}, u^{3}\right) & =1 / 2 x(K)^{\prime} E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E x(K) \\
& +\sum_{k=0}^{k-1}\left[H_{1}(k)-p^{1}(k+1)^{\prime} E x(k+1)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{1}(k) & =p^{1}(k+1)^{\prime}\left[A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k)\right] \\
& +1 / 2\left[x(k)^{\prime} Q^{1} x(k)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} u^{j}(k)^{\prime} R^{1 j} u^{j}(k)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

From the results of [3] or [6], we deduce that the necessary conditions, under which $u^{1}$ constitutes the rational reaction to given $u^{2}$ and $u^{3}$, take the form

$$
\begin{align*}
& E x(k+1)=A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k) \quad E x(0)=E x_{0}(2.3 \mathrm{a}) \\
& E^{\prime} p^{1}(k)=Q^{1} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{1}(k+1) \quad E^{\prime} p^{1}(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E x(K)  \tag{2.3b}\\
& 0=R^{11} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{1}(k+1) \tag{2.3c}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, let us consider the problem faced by $P_{2}$. In deciding on the rational reaction of the second follower $P_{2}$ to $u^{3}$, the rational reaction of $P_{1}$ to $u^{2}$ and $u^{3}$ must be taken into account. Thus what $P_{2}$ must do is to minimize the cost function (2.2) for $i=2$ subject to (2.3). Toward this end, by introducing the Lagrange multipliers $p^{2}(k), n^{1}(k), m^{1}(k)$ and $n^{1}(K)$, one can get

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{2}\left(u^{1}, u^{2}, u^{3}\right) & =1 / 2 x(K)^{\prime} E^{\prime} Q^{2}(K) E x(K) \\
& +n^{1}(K)^{\prime}\left[E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E x(K)-E^{\prime} p^{1}(K)\right] \\
& +\sum_{k=0}^{k-1}\left[H_{2}(k)-p^{2}(k+1)^{\prime} E x(k+1)-n^{1}(k)^{\prime} E^{\prime} p^{1}(k)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{2}(k) & =p^{2}(k+1)^{\prime}\left[A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k)\right] \\
& +1 / 2\left[x(k)^{\prime} Q^{2} x(k)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} u^{j}(k)^{\prime} R^{2 j} u^{j}(k)\right] \\
& +n^{1}(k)^{\prime}\left[Q^{1} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{1}(k+1)\right] \\
& +m^{1}(k)^{\prime}\left[R^{11} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{1}(k+1)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

By using the standard variational techniques, the necessary conditions that characterize $u^{2}$ being the rational reaction of $P_{2}$ to $u^{3}$ are obtained in the form

$$
\begin{align*}
& E x(k+1)=A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k) \quad E x(0)=E x_{0}(2.4 \mathrm{a}  \tag{2.4a}\\
& E^{\prime} p^{1}(k)=Q^{1} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{1}(k+1) \quad E^{\prime} p^{1}(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E x(K)  \tag{2.4b}\\
& 0=R^{11} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{1}(k+1)  \tag{2.4c}\\
& E^{\prime} p^{2}(k)=Q^{2} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{2}(k+1)+Q^{1} n^{1}(k) \\
& E^{\prime} p^{2}(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{2}(K) E x(K)+E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E n^{1}(K)  \tag{2.4~d}\\
& E n^{1}(k+1)=A n^{1}(k)+B^{1} m^{1}(k) \quad E n^{1}(0)=0  \tag{2.4e}\\
& 0=R^{21} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{2}(k+1)+R^{11} m^{1}(k)  \tag{2.4f}\\
& 0=R^{22} u^{2}(k)+B^{2 \prime} p^{2}(k+1) \tag{2.4~g}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally, consider the problem solved by $P_{3} . P_{3}$ minimizes his own function (2.2) for $i=3$, and at the same time he must take account (2.4) which characterizes the rational reactions of $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ to $u^{3}$. Now by appending the constraints (2.4) to the cost function $J_{3}$ by means of the Lagrange multipliers $p^{3}(k), n^{2}(k), n^{3}(k), q(k), m^{2}(k), m^{3}(k), w(k), n^{2}(K)$ and $n^{3}(K)$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{3}\left(u^{1}, u^{2}, u^{3}\right) & =1 / 2 x(K)^{\prime} E^{\prime} Q^{3}(K) E x(K) \\
+ & n^{2}(K)^{\prime}\left[E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E x(K)-E^{\prime} p^{1}(K)\right] \\
+ & n^{3}(K)^{\prime}\left[E^{\prime} Q^{2}(K) E x(K)+E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E n^{1}(K)-E^{\prime} p^{2}(K)\right] \\
+ & \sum_{k=0}^{k-1}\left[H_{3}(k)-p^{3}(k+1)^{\prime} E x(k+1)-n^{2}(k)^{\prime} E^{\prime} p^{1}(k)\right. \\
& \left.\quad-n^{3}(k)^{\prime} E^{\prime} p^{2}(k)-q(k+1)^{\prime} E n^{1}(k+1)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{3}(k) & =p^{3}(k+1)^{\prime}\left[A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k)\right] \\
& +1 / 2\left[x(k)^{\prime} Q^{3} x(k)+\sum_{j=1}^{3} u^{j}(k)^{\prime} R^{3 j} u^{j}(k)\right] \\
& +n^{2}(k)^{\prime}\left[Q^{1} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{1}(k+1)\right] \\
& +n^{3}(k)^{\prime}\left[Q^{2} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{2}(k+1)+Q^{1} n^{1}(k)\right] \\
& +q(k+1)^{\prime}\left[A n^{1}(k)+B^{1} m^{1}(k)\right] \\
& +m^{2}(k)^{\prime}\left[R^{11} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{1}(k+1)\right] \\
& +w(k)^{\prime}\left[R^{21} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{2}(k+1)+R^{11} m^{1}(k)\right] \\
& +m^{3}(k)^{\prime}\left[R^{22} u^{2}(k)+B^{2 \prime} p^{2}(k+1)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the necessary conditions for the control $u^{3}$ constituting the open-loop Stackelberg solution of the leader $p_{3}$ take the form

$$
\begin{align*}
& E x(k+1)=A x(k)+B^{1} u^{1}(k)+B^{2} u^{2}(k)+B^{3} u^{3}(k)  \tag{2.5a}\\
& E^{\prime} p^{1}(k)=Q^{1} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{1}(k+1) \quad E^{\prime} p^{1}(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E x(K)  \tag{2.5b}\\
& 0=R^{11} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{1}(k+1)  \tag{2.5c}\\
& E^{\prime} p^{2}(k)=Q^{2} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{2}(k+1)+Q^{1} n^{1}(k) \\
& E^{\prime} p^{2}(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{2}(K) E x(K)+E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E n^{1}(K)  \tag{2.5d}\\
& E n^{1}(k+1)=A n^{1}(k)+B^{1} m^{1}(k) \quad E n^{1}(0)=0  \tag{2.5e}\\
& 0=R^{21} u^{1}(k)+B^{1 \prime} p^{2}(k+1)+R^{11} m^{1}(k)  \tag{2.5f}\\
& 0=R^{22} u^{2}(k)+B^{2 \prime} p^{2}(k+1)  \tag{2.5g}\\
& E^{\prime} p^{3}(k)=Q^{3} x(k)+A^{\prime} p^{3}(k+1)+Q^{1} n^{2}(k)+Q^{2} n^{3}(k) \\
& E^{\prime} p^{3}(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{3}(K) E x(K)+E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E n^{2}(K)+E^{\prime} Q^{2}(K) E n^{3}(K)(2.5 \mathrm{~h}) \\
& E n^{2}(k+1)=A n^{2}(k)+B^{1} m^{2}(k) \quad E n^{2}(0)=0  \tag{2.5i}\\
& E n^{3}(k+1)=A n^{3}(k)+B^{2} m^{3}(k)+B^{1} w(k) E n^{3}(0)=0  \tag{2.5j}\\
& E^{\prime} q(k)=Q^{1} n^{3}(k)+A^{\prime} q(k+1) \quad E^{\prime} q(K)=E^{\prime} Q^{1}(K) E n^{3}(K)  \tag{2.5k}\\
& 0=R^{31} u^{1}(k)+B^{1{ }^{3}} p^{3}(k+1)+R^{11} m^{2}(k)+R^{21} w(k)  \tag{2.51}\\
& 0=R^{32} u^{2}(k)+B^{2 \prime} p^{3}(k+1)+R^{22} m^{3}(k)  \tag{2.5m}\\
& 0=B^{1^{\prime}} q(k+1)+R^{11} w(k)  \tag{2.5n}\\
& 0=R^{33} u^{3}(k)+B^{3 \prime} p^{3}(k+1) \tag{2.50}
\end{align*}
$$

## 3. Characterization of the optimal solution

For any $n \times n$ matrix E with $\operatorname{rank}(E)=r<n$, there exist $n \times n$ nonsingular matrices $U$ and $V$ and the $r \times r$ unit matrix $I$ such that

$$
U E V=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
I & 0  \tag{3.1a}\\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

Therefore, for convenience in the later derivation and without loss of generality, let us assume that $E$ has the form (3.1a), and $A, B^{j}$ and $Q^{j}$ have the corresponding form

$$
\left\{A\left|B^{j}\right| Q^{j}\right\}=\left\{\left[\begin{array}{ll}
A_{11} & A_{12}  \tag{3.1b}\\
A_{21} & A_{22}
\end{array}\right]\left|\left[\begin{array}{c}
B_{1}^{j} \\
B_{2}^{j}
\end{array}\right]\right|\left[\begin{array}{cc}
Q_{11}^{j} & Q_{12}^{j} \\
\left(Q_{12}^{j}\right)^{\prime} & Q_{22}^{j}
\end{array}\right]\right\}
$$

For facility of notation, we define the following matrices

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{R}^{11}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & A_{22} & B_{2}^{1} \\
A_{22}{ }^{\prime} & Q_{22}^{1} & 0 \\
B_{2}{ }^{\prime} & 0 & R^{11}
\end{array}\right] \quad \bar{Q}_{22}^{2}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & Q_{22}^{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & R^{21}
\end{array}\right] \quad \bar{B}_{2}^{2}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
B_{2}^{2} \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.2a}\\
& \bar{R}^{22}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \bar{R}^{11} & \bar{B}_{2}^{2} \\
\bar{R}^{11^{\prime}} & \bar{Q}_{22}^{2} & 0 \\
\bar{B}_{2}^{2^{\prime}} & 0 & R^{22}
\end{array}\right] \quad \bar{Q}_{22}^{3}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \tilde{Q}_{22}^{3} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & R^{32}
\end{array}\right] \quad \bar{B}_{2}^{3}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
B_{2}^{3} \\
0 \\
0
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.2b}\\
& \bar{R}^{33}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \bar{R}^{22} & \bar{B}_{2}^{3} \\
\bar{R}^{22^{\prime}} & \bar{Q}_{22}^{3} & 0 \\
\bar{B}_{2}^{3^{\prime}} & 0 & R^{33}
\end{array}\right] \quad \tilde{Q}_{22}^{3}=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & Q_{22}^{3} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & R^{31}
\end{array}\right]  \tag{3.2c}\\
& \bar{B}_{1}=\left(00000000000 A_{12} B_{1}^{1} B_{1}^{2} B_{1}^{3}\right) \\
& \bar{B}_{2}=\left(\begin{array}{llllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array} 00 A_{12} B_{1}^{1} 000000\right) \\
& \bar{B}_{3}=\left(\begin{array}{l}
\left.0 A_{12} B_{1}^{1} 0000000000000\right)
\end{array}\right. \\
& \bar{B}_{4}=\left(\begin{array}{lllllllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 A_{12} B_{1}^{1} B_{1}^{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array} 0000\right)  \tag{3.2d}\\
& \bar{S}_{1}=\left(A_{21}^{\prime} Q_{12}^{1} 00 Q_{12}^{2} 000000 Q_{12}^{3} 000\right) \\
& \bar{S}_{2}=\left(000 A_{21}^{\prime} Q_{12}^{1} 0000000000\right) \\
& \bar{S}_{3}=\left(\begin{array}{lllllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array} 000 A_{21}^{\prime} Q_{12}^{1} 000\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
\bar{S}_{4}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
0 & 0 & 0
\end{array} 00000 A_{21}^{\prime} Q_{12}^{1} 00 Q_{12}^{2} 000\right.
\end{array}\right), ~ \begin{aligned}
\bar{u}(k)^{\prime}= & \left(p_{2}^{3}(k+1), n_{2}^{2}(k)^{\prime}, m^{2}(k)^{\prime}, q_{2}(k+1)^{\prime}, n_{2}^{3}(k)^{\prime}, w(k)^{\prime},\right. \\
& m^{3}(k)^{\prime}, p_{2}^{2}(k+1)^{\prime}, n_{2}^{1}(k)^{\prime}, m^{1}(k)^{\prime}, p_{2}^{1}(k+1)^{\prime}, x_{2}(k)^{\prime}, \\
& \left.u^{1}(k)^{\prime}, u^{2}(k)^{\prime}, u^{3}(k)^{\prime}\right) \tag{3.2f}
\end{aligned}
$$

Using this new notation, the necessary conditions (2.5) can be rewritten as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{1}(k+1)=A_{11} x_{1}(k)+\bar{B}_{1} \bar{u}(k) \quad x_{1}(0)=x_{10}  \tag{3.3a}\\
& n_{1}^{1}(k+1)=A_{11} n_{1}^{1}(k)+\bar{B}_{2} \bar{u}(k) \quad n_{1}^{1}(0)=0  \tag{3.3b}\\
& n_{1}^{2}(k+1)=A_{11} n_{1}^{2}(k)+\bar{B}_{3} \bar{u}(k) \quad n_{1}^{2}(0)=0  \tag{3.3c}\\
& n_{1}^{3}(k+1)=A_{11} n_{1}^{3}(k)+\bar{B}_{4} \bar{u}(k) \quad n_{1}^{3}(0)=0  \tag{3.3d}\\
& p_{1}^{1}(k)=Q_{11}^{1} x_{1}(k)+A_{11}^{\prime} p_{1}^{1}(k+1)+\bar{S}_{3} \bar{u}(k) \\
& p_{1}^{1}(K)=Q_{11}^{1}(K) x_{1}(K)  \tag{3.3e}\\
& p_{1}^{2}(k)=Q_{11}^{2} x_{1}(k)+Q_{11}^{1} n_{1}^{1}(k)+A_{11}^{\prime} p_{1}^{2}(k+1)+\bar{S}_{4} \bar{u}(k) \\
& p_{1}^{2}(K)=Q_{11}^{2}(K) x_{1}(K)+Q_{11}^{1}(K) n_{1}^{1}(K)  \tag{3.3f}\\
& p_{1}^{3}(k)=Q_{11}^{3} x_{1}(k)+Q_{11}^{1} n_{1}^{2}(k)+Q_{11}^{2} n_{1}^{3}(k)+A_{11}^{\prime} p_{1}^{3}(k+1)+\bar{S}_{1} \bar{u}(k) \\
& p_{1}^{3}(K)=Q_{11}^{3}(K) x_{1}(K)+Q_{11}^{2}(K) n_{1}^{3}(K)+Q_{11}^{1}(K) n_{1}^{2}(K)  \tag{3.3~g}\\
& q_{1}(k)=Q_{11}^{1} n_{1}^{3}(k)+A_{11}^{\prime} q_{1}(k+1)+\bar{S}_{2} \bar{u}(k)  \tag{3.3h}\\
& q_{1}(K)=Q_{11}^{1}(K) n_{1}^{3}(K) \\
& 0=\bar{S}_{1}^{\prime} x_{1}(k)+\bar{S}_{2}^{\prime} n_{1}^{1}(k)+\bar{S}_{3}^{\prime} n_{1}^{2}(k)+\bar{S}_{4}^{\prime} n_{1}^{3}(k)+\bar{B}_{3}^{\prime} p_{1}^{1}(k+1) \\
& \quad+\bar{B}_{4}^{\prime} p_{1}^{2}(k+1)+\bar{B}_{1}^{\prime} p_{1}^{3}(k+1)+\bar{B}_{2}^{\prime} q_{1}(k+1)+\bar{R}^{33} \bar{u}(k) \tag{3.3i}
\end{align*}
$$

If the following matrices are defined

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{A}=\operatorname{diag}\left(A_{11}, A_{11}, A_{11}, A_{11}\right) \quad \bar{R}=\bar{R}^{33}  \tag{3.4a}\\
& \bar{B}^{\prime}=\left(\bar{B}_{1}^{\prime} \bar{B}_{2}^{\prime} \bar{B}_{3}^{\prime} \bar{B}_{4}^{\prime}\right)  \tag{3.4b}\\
& \bar{S}^{\prime}=\left(\bar{S}_{1}^{\prime} \bar{S}_{2}^{\prime} \bar{S}_{3}^{\prime} \bar{S}_{4}^{\prime}\right) \tag{3.4c}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\bar{Q}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
Q_{11}^{3} & & Q_{11}^{1} & Q_{11}^{2}  \tag{3.4d}\\
0 & 0 & 0 & Q_{11}^{1} \\
Q_{11}^{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
Q_{11}^{2} & Q_{11}^{1} & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

then the system (3.3) can be written in the compact form

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{x}(k+1)=\bar{A} \bar{x}(k)+\bar{B} \bar{u}(k) \quad \bar{x}(0)^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
x_{10}^{\prime} & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right)  \tag{3.5a}\\
& \bar{p}(k)=\bar{Q} \bar{x}(k)+\bar{A}^{\prime} \bar{p}(k+1)+\bar{S} \bar{u}(k) \quad \bar{p}(K)=\bar{Q}(K) \bar{x}(K)  \tag{3.5b}\\
& 0=\bar{S}^{\prime} \bar{x}(k)+\bar{B}^{\prime} \bar{p}(k+1)+\bar{R} \bar{u}(k) \tag{3.5c}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\bar{x}(k)$ and $\bar{p}(k)$ are defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \bar{x}(k)^{\prime}=\left(x_{1}(k)^{\prime}, n_{1}^{1}(k)^{\prime}, n_{1}^{2}(k), n_{1}^{3}(k)^{\prime}\right)  \tag{3.5d}\\
& \bar{p}(k)^{\prime}=\left(p_{1}^{3}(k)^{\prime}, q_{1}(k)^{\prime}, p_{1}^{1}(k)^{\prime}, p_{1}^{2}(k)^{\prime}\right) \tag{3.5e}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, the two-point boundary value probem (3.5) is solved in the usual way by defining the linear transformation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{p}(k)=P(k) \bar{x}(k) \tag{3.6a}
\end{equation*}
$$

then, from (3.5a), we can get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{p}(k+1)=P(k+1) \bar{A} \bar{x}(k)+P(k+1) \bar{B} \bar{u}(k) \tag{3.6b}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting this into (3.5c) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\bar{R}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}\right] \bar{u}(k)=-\left[\bar{S}^{\prime}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{A}\right] \bar{x}(k) \tag{3.6c}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation may not have an exact solution; however, a least-square (normminimizing) solution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{u}(k)=-\left[\bar{R}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}\right]^{-1}\left[\bar{S}^{\prime}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{A}\right] \bar{x}(k) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (3.6) and (3.7) into (3.5b), and assuming that it is true for $\bar{x}(k)$, we can obtain that $P(k)$ must satisfy the matrix Riccati equation

$$
\begin{align*}
& P(k)=\bar{Q}+\bar{A}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{A}-\left[\bar{S}+\bar{A}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}\right]^{-1}\left[\bar{R}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}\right] \\
& \quad\left[\bar{S}^{\prime}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{A}\right]  \tag{3.8a}\\
& P(K)=\bar{Q}(K) \tag{3.8b}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting (3.7b) into (3.5a) gives

$$
\bar{x}(k+1)=\bar{Z}(k) \bar{x}(k) \quad \bar{x}(0)^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{llll}
x_{10}^{\prime} & 0 & 0 & 0 \tag{3.9a}
\end{array}\right)
$$

with $\bar{Z}(k)$ being defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{Z}(k)=\bar{A}-\bar{B}\left[\bar{R}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}\right]^{-1}\left[\bar{S}^{\prime}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{A}\right] \tag{3.9b}
\end{equation*}
$$

Up to now, norm-minimizing open-loop Stackelberg solutions $u^{1}(k), u^{2}(k)$ and $u^{3}(k)$ have been derived, which are 13th, 14th and 15th subvectors of $\bar{u}(k)$, respectively, according to (3.2f). In fact, if $\left[R+B^{\prime} P(k+1) B\right]$ is nonsingular for $k=K-1, K-2, \ldots, 0$, then, from (3.6c) it follows that the solution is unique.

Now we shall conclude the above discussion with a theorem which gives conditions under which the necessary conditions in the section 2 admit a unique solution.

Theorem 1 Under the assumptions (a) the matrix $E$ has the form (3.1a); (b) the matrices $L(k)=\bar{R}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}$ are all nonsingular for $k=0, \ldots, K-1$, the necessary conditions (2.5), i.e. (3.5), admit a unique solution which is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{u}(k)=-\left[\bar{R}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{B}\right]^{-1}\left[\bar{S}^{\prime}+\bar{B}^{\prime} P(k+1) \bar{A}\right] \bar{x}(k) \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $P(k)$ and $\bar{x}(k)$ being given by (3.8) and (3.9), respectively.
Proof: The statement of Theorem 3.1 has already been verified in the discussion prior to Theorem 3.1.

## 4. Illustrative example

Let the system and the cost functions for a three-level Stackelberg problem be

$$
\begin{gathered}
{\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}(k+1) \\
x_{2}(k+2)
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x_{1}(k) \\
x_{2}(k)
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
1
\end{array}\right] u^{1}(k)} \\
+\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
1
\end{array}\right] u^{2}(k)+\left[\begin{array}{l}
1 \\
1
\end{array}\right] u^{3}(k) \\
x_{1}(0)=x_{10} \\
J_{j}=\sum_{k=0}^{2}\left\{1 / 2 x(k)^{\prime} x(k)+1 / 2\left[u^{j}(k)\right]^{2}\right\}+1 / 2 x(3)^{\prime} x(3) \quad j=1,2,3
\end{gathered}
$$

where $x(k)^{\prime}=\left[x_{1}(k), x_{2}(k)\right]$.
After developing a computer program, the matrices $L(k)$ being invertible for $k=0,1,2$, and the following results were obtained.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
u^{1}(0)=-x_{10} & u^{1}(1)=0.2590284 x_{1}(1) & u^{1}(2)=3.650466 x_{1}(2) \\
u^{2}(0)=0 & u^{2}(1)=0.1244947 x_{1}(1) & u^{2}(2)=1.002068 x_{1}(2) \\
u^{3}(0)=0 & u^{3}(1)=-1.383523 x_{1}(1) & u^{3}(2)=-5.652534 x_{1}(2)
\end{array}
$$

## 5. Conclusion

This paper develops explicit expressions for three-level open-loop Stackelberg strategies for sequential decision making problems characterized by linear dis-crete-time descriptor system and quadratic cost function. The results of the note can be extended in a straightforward manner to multi-level Stackelberg problems. But the burden of computing multi-level open-loop Stackelberg strategies will be considerably increased, and so will the time of computation.
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## Trzypoziomowe strategie Stackelberga w linio-wo-kwadratowych systemach deskryptorowych

W artykule rozwija się strategie Stackelberga w deterministycznych sekwencyjnych zadaniach podejmowania decyzji dla liniowych systemów deskryptorowych z czasem dyskretnym kwadratową funkcją kosztu. Wyprowadzono warunki konieczne istnienia strategii Stackelberga bez pamiętania. Rozwiązania minimalizujące Stacke'berga są wyznaczane z warunków koniecznych i podano warunki istnienia jednoznacznego rozwiązania dla warunków koniecznych. Przytoczono przykład ilustrujący wyniki zawarte w artykule.

## Трехуровневая стратегия Стакельберга в линейноквадратных дескрипторных системах

В статье рассматривается стратегия Стакельберга в детерминированных последовательных задачах принятия решения для линенных дескрипторных систем, дискретных по времени, с квадратной функцией затрат. Формулируются необходимые условия существования незамкнутой стратегии Стакельберга. Решения Стакельберга по минимизации определяются из необходимых условий и приводятся условуя существования однозначного решения для необходимых условий. Дается пример иллюстрирующий результаты приведенные в статье.

