

A new solution for cooperative game with public externalities: Analysis based on axiomatic method

Juanjuan Fan^a, Ying Wang^{b*}

^a School of Economics and Trade, Fujian Jiangxia University, Fuzhou 350108, Fujian, China

^b School of Finance, Fujian Jiangxia University, Fuzhou 350108, Fujian, China

Abstract

This paper introduces a new solution concept for the Cooperative Game with Public Externalities, called the w -value, which is characterized by three properties (axioms), namely Pareto-optimality (PO), Market-equilibrium (ME) and Fiscal-balance (FB). Additionally, the implementation mechanism for w -value is also provided. The w -value exists and is unique. It belongs to the core. And, more specifically, it belongs to the γ -core. Meanwhile, the computational cost of w -value is very low. Therefore, the w -value is a theoretically more compelling solution concept than the existing cooperation game solutions when analyzing cooperative games with public externalities. A numerical illustration shows the calculation steps of w -value. Meanwhile, the w -value well explains the reason why the mandatory emission reduction mechanism must be transformed into a "nationally determined contribution" mechanism in current international climate negotiations.

Keywords: Cooperative game with public externalities; Solution; Axiomatic method; Pareto-optimality; Market-equilibrium; Fiscal-balance

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: 2011008@fjxxu.edu.cn (Y. Wang).

1. Introduction

The root cause of the environmental pollution problem is the fact that emission of pollution brings immediate benefits to the emitting agent, but increases the stock of pollution which affects the present and future welfare of all agents, i.e., pollution emissions create public externalities. In the absence of any cooperation among the agents, each agent when deciding its emissions takes account of only its own benefits and costs. As a result, the total emissions from all agents are too high compared to the emissions that are efficient from a collective point of view [1]. The only way in which the agents can overcome this inefficiency, if at all, is for agents to form cooperative coalitions and jointly implement environmental policies to internalize the external costs of pollution emissions [2]. Existing literatures carry out in-depth research on the cooperation problem of pollution control based on the cooperative game theory [3].

Since von-Neumann and Morgenstern's seminal volume, cooperative game theory has been of great interest [4]. Nash [5] set a new entire research agenda that has been referred to as the Nash program for cooperative games, which is an attempt to bridge the gap between non-cooperative theory and cooperative game theory [6]. Since then, numerous papers have contributed to this program. So far, two complementary approaches, via the negotiation model or via the axioms, that each helps to justify and clarify the other, are proposed to derive the solution of the cooperative game. In the first, the cooperative game is reduced to a non-cooperative game [6]. To do this, one makes the players' steps in negotiations in the cooperative game become moves in the non-cooperative model. The second approach is by the axiomatic method. One state as axioms several properties that would seem natural for the solution to have, and then one discovers that the axioms actually determine the solution uniquely. Particular important solution concepts are the Nash solution, the Shapley value and the core. The Nash solution and the Shapley value are the most used single-valued solutions, while the core is the leading set-valued cooperative solution concept [6].

Nash [5,7] showed that there exists a unique solution for a two-player bargaining problem satisfying four axioms such as scale invariance, efficiency, symmetry and independent of "irrelevant" alternatives (IIA), and it is the one that assigns to each normalized bargaining problem the point that maximizes the product of the payoffs of all the two agents over all the set of feasible payoffs. Okada [8,9] presented a non-cooperative foundation for the Nash bargaining solution for an n-person cooperative game in strategic form based on the non-cooperative bargaining model that is based on a random-proposer model [8] that is a generalization of the Rubinstein's [10] alternating offers model. The Nash solution is for the convex bargaining problem, while Conley and Wilkie [11] proposed an interesting solution for non-convex problems, which is called Nash extension solution.

Shapley [12] proved that there is a unique single-valued solution to transferable utility (TU) games satisfying four axioms such as efficiency, symmetry, additivity and dummy. It is what today we call the Shapley value, which awards to each player the average of his marginal contributions to each coalition.

Gillies [13] rediscovered and introduced core to game theory, which is the set of payoff vectors that are feasible and cannot be improved upon by any coalition [14]. The origins of the core were not axiomatic. Rather, it's simple definition appropriately describes stable outcomes in a context of unfettered coalitional interaction. Core may be empty; however, if it is not empty, it is often multiple-valued. On the basis of the hypothesis of conjecture about the actions of the agents outside the proposed coalition,

a more specific "core" can be further defined [15]. So far, five main specific cores have been proposed, including α -core, β -core, r-core, Nash-core and γ -core. According to α -core and β -core conjectures [16], the members of a coalition compute their worth assuming that the outside players select their strategies so as to minimize the payoff of the coalition; the α -core and the β -core are then defined with respect to the resulting coalitional payoffs. By a theory of a solution's consistency that requires that the same arguments be applied to the "core" of the reduced game, Huang and Sjöström [17] and Kóczy [18] defined the notion of a recursive core (abbreviated by 'r-core'), and Okada [9] proposed the Nash core. Roughly, the recursive core of Nash core of a cooperative game with externality is a variant of the core defined by the assumption that when a coalition forms, its members predict an outcome in a core of the "reduced game" composed of other players. According to γ -core conjectures [3], it is assumed that the outsiders select individual best strategies, i.e., they form only singleton coalitions; the γ -core is then accordingly. Chander and Wooders [4] argued that γ -core is a theoretically more compelling core concept for games with positive externalities. Chander and Wooders [4] further proved that the extensive game of perfect information has a nonempty γ -core if and only if the characteristic function representation of the game is balanced.

However, γ -core is either empty or is often set-valued if it is not empty. Moreover, most of the literatures on cooperative game solutions only focus on mathematical abstract analysis. They ignore the fact that most of the cooperation needs certain policies to specifically regulate the behavior of agents to achieve, for instance, in terms of pollution control cooperation, it is necessary for each agent to jointly implement certain environmental policies, so as to internalize the external influence of pollution emission behaviors of each agent. Baumol and Oates [2] had proved that no matter implementing what environmental policies, such as pigovian tax or Cap and Trade, in essence, in order to render identical the competitive equilibrium and the Pareto-optimality, the reduction (increase) of a unit of pollution emissions must be subsidized, wherein the net subsidies must be equal the total marginal benefit offered by the unit of pollution to all other agents. In other words, it is a basic consensus that only by cooperation the parero optimal pollution control can be achieved. Therefore, all agents have a tendency to cooperate, and they seem to be more concerned about what policies they should implement together to achieve the Parero optimality and how they can gain more benefits from the cooperation, rather than the reaction of the remaining or residual agents after their own deviation. Therefore, it is worth in-depth discussion that what impact such policy implementation will have on the cooperative game of pollution control.

By analyzing the economic behavior of individual agents participating in the game with externalities, this paper reveals that from the mathematical dimension, we can decompose the cooperative game into two interrelated sub-games: sub-game 1 and sub-game 2. Sub-game 1 is the game that what price constraints should be imposed on agents for they "producing" or "consuming" pollution, while sub-game 2 is the allocation game of initial pollution emission permits of each agent. By analyzing the economic behavior of a coalition, this paper argues that a coalition behaves like a single agent before it is dissolved, i.e., a coalition becomes a single agent. This is also the premise of some literatures (see e.g., [4, 19]), but which have not proved the rationality of this premise mathematically. Therefore, the above mathematical proof in this paper makes up for the shortage of some existing literature.

Then, this paper analyzes the equilibrium of sub-game 1. We first we prove that the final equilibrium of the Cooperative game of pollution control must be the Pareto optimum of pollution emission. Secondly, we demonstrate that a unique net price constraint is required for the economic behavior of any agent to emit or reduce a unit of pollution to make the market equilibrium achieve Pareto optimum. This conclusion is consistent with the conclusion of Baumol and Oates [2]. Moreover, we have a new discovery that the total amount of subsidies that agents receive for emitting or reducing pollution should equal the total amount of taxes that agents pay for emitting or reducing pollution when implementing unique net price constraint to realize the Pareto optimum, then combining with the net price constraint we obtain the price constraints should be imposed on agents for they “producing” and “consuming” pollution, which we defined as optimal equilibrium prices. Sequently, we prove that all agents will adopt cooperative strategies to form a grass coalition to jointly deal with the pollution problem and finally realize the Pareto optimum of pollution control. A related literature has the similar conclusion (see e.g., [4,19-21]). Finally, we prove that optimal equilibrium prices are the solution of sub-game 1.

The core problem for agents to participate in the Cooperative game of pollution control is the competition for the initial pollution emission permits, that is, the problem to be solved in sub-game 2. To solve the problem, we define the concepts of w initial pollution emission permits allocation (w -IPA), w -IPA Pareto optimum of pollution emission, w -IPA welfare distribution, and w -value. We proved that w -value is the solution of cooperative game of pollution control under the assumptions that ① all agents seek to maximize their own welfare, ② the emission revenue functions are strictly increasing and strictly concave, and the damage functions, strictly increasing and convex. Moreover, the w -value is the subset of γ -core and has uniqueness, and is based on the market mechanism, considering the rules that make the market equilibrium achieve Pareto-optimality, i.e., we can easily set up a market mechanism to implement the w -value, so that it is a theoretically more compelling solution concept than γ -core for the cooperation game of pollution control. While in this paper we analyze the cooperative game of pollution control, our conclusion can extend to the cooperative game of other negative externality control and to the cooperative game of positive externality protection such as the good ecological environment protection.

The contents of the remaining part of the paper are as follows: on the basis of constructing the cooperative game model and discussing the essence of cooperative game from the mathematical dimension, Section 2 decomposes the cooperative game into two interrelated sub-games: sub-game 1 and sub-game 2. Section 3 analyzes the Equilibrium of sub-game 1, and Section 4 analyzes the Equilibrium of sub-game 2, consequently proving that w -value is the solution of cooperative game of pollution control under two assumptions. Section 5 argues that w -value is a theoretically more compelling core concept for the cooperation game of pollution control and can extend to the cooperative game of negative externality control or o the cooperative game of positive externality protection. Section 6 uses an example to illustrate the calculation steps and properties of w -value. Section 7 presents the conclusion.

2. Public externality game model

2.1 Basic questions

There are I agents, indexed by i or \bar{i} . $-i$ denotes subset of agents except agent i . s_i , S_0 and $S=S_0 + \sum_i s_i \geq 0$ denote the amount of the polluting input used by agent i , the initial stock of pollution and the final stock of pollution, respectively, then $\frac{\partial S}{\partial s_i}=1$. Similarly, \bar{s}_i and $\bar{S}=\sum_i \bar{s}_i$ denote the quantity of initial pollution emission permits possessed by agent i and the total quantity of initial pollution emission permits, respectively. The price of unit of pollution emission (the price of pollution emission permits) is represented by t , and the subsidies assigned to agent i for per unit of pollution stock that exceeds \bar{S} is represented by T_i . Essentially, t is the price constrain to agents for “producing” unit of pollution, while T_i is the price constrain to the agent i for “consuming” unit of pollution. \bar{t}_i is the fixed tax on (or subsidy for) agent i that does not vary with the “producing” and “consuming” of pollution. t , T_i and \bar{t}_i constitute all the price constrain imposed on agent i for him “producing” or “consuming” pollution. While s_i are flow variables, S is a stock variable as formally defined below. We assume that using each unit of the polluting input emits one unit of pollution. Therefore, the variable s_i also denotes the amount of pollution emitted by agent i . Welfare of agent i is specified as $w_i(s_i, S) = u_i(s_i) - d_i(S)$. The function $u_i(s_i)$ and $d_i(S)$ are the emission revenue function and the damage function of agent i , respectively. Welfare is money for all of agents, therefore welfare is transferable among different agents, i.e., the game studied in this paper is Transferable Utility Game (TU Game).

In this paper, the value of variables with subscripts of "*" represent the Pareto optimal equilibrium value, while the value of variables with superscript of "~" represent the Nash equilibrium value.

There are two basic hypotheses involved in this study:

Hypothesis 1 Each agent pursues its own welfare maximization, and each coalition pursues the total welfare maximization of all member agents.

Hypothesis 2 Each emission revenue function $u_i(s_i)$ is assumed to be strictly increasing and strictly concave, and each damage function, $d_i(S)$, strictly increasing and convex, i.e., $u'_i(s_i) > 0$, $u''_i(s_i) < 0$, $d'_i(S) > 0$ and $d''_i(S) > 0$. Under these circumstances, as is well-known, the solution to the maximization problem that is about to be described, exists and is unique [1].

Under the above basic settings, the problems to be solved in this paper are as follows: **What is the solution of the cooperative game of pollution control?**

2.2 Basic model

2.2.1 Basic model of single agent

We can formulate the welfare maximization problem of agent i as model (1):

$$\max : u_i(s_i) - d_i(S) + T_i \cdot \left(\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}} - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \bar{s}_{\bar{i}} \right) + t \cdot (\bar{s}_i - s_i) - \bar{t}_i \quad (1)$$

The agent i in the model (1) is taken to maximize the revenue, through the optimal choice of s_i , \bar{s}_i , t , \bar{t}_i and T_i . We immediately obtain the Kuhn-Tucker conditions (2^c) given in the second column of Table 1.

Table 1

Kuhn-Tucker conditions for optimality with climate change

Variable	Pareto optimality	Market equilibrium	Prices
s_i	$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_i} = \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial s_i} \quad (2^o)$	$t - T_i = \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_i} - \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial s_i} \quad (2^c)$	$t - T_i = \sum_{\bar{i} \neq i}^I \left(\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial s_i} \right) \quad (2^e)$

Data source: Research consolidation

The optimal choices of s_i is determined in market transactions, that is, the optimal choices of s_i is determined by agent i according to the market price t , \bar{t}_i and T_i . The optimal choices of \bar{s}_i , t , \bar{t}_i and T_i are determined in the cooperative game, that is, the essence of cooperative game is to determine the equilibrium value of \bar{s}_i , t , \bar{t}_i and T_i mathematically. So from the mathematical dimension, we can decompose the cooperative game into two interrelated sub-games: sub-game 1 and sub-game 2. Sub-game 1 is the game that what price constraints should be imposed on agents for they “producing” or “consuming” pollution, that is Sub-game 1 is to determine t , \bar{t}_i and T_i . Sub-game 2 is the allocation game of initial pollution emission permits of each agent, that is Sub-game 2 is to determine \bar{s}_i .

2.2.2 Basic model of coalition

The strategies of agents participating in the game can be divided into non-cooperative strategies and cooperative strategies. Non-cooperation strategy refers to that when agents increase or reduce pollution emissions, they only consider the impact of the behavior on their own welfare and do not impose any constraints on their own pollution emission or reduction behavior. In essence, non-cooperation strategy means that each agent does not form a coalition with any other agent. Cooperative strategy refers to that when agents increase or reduce pollution emissions, they not only consider the impact of the behavior on their own welfare, but also consider the impact of the behavior on the welfare of other agents. In essence, the agent adopting cooperative strategy forms a coalition with at least one other agent. If all agents adopt a cooperative strategy, that is, agents form a grand coalition, then this scenario forms a full cooperative coalition structure; otherwise, the incomplete cooperative coalition structure will be formed. The incomplete cooperative coalition structure can be divided into partially cooperative coalition structure and totally uncooperative coalition structure. Among them, totally uncooperative coalition structure refers to the scenario where all countries adopt non-cooperative strategies, while other incomplete cooperative coalition structure is partially cooperative coalition structure.

I countries can form H coalition structures totally, using h as the index of the coalition structure. In coalition structure h , all the agents form J_h coalitions. There must be: $1 \leq J_h \leq I$; When $J_h = 1$, it means that all agents adopt cooperative strategy to form the grand coalition, which is the full cooperative coalition structure; When $J_h = I$, it means that all agents adopt non-cooperative strategy, which is the totally uncooperative coalition structure; When $1 < J_h < I$, the partially cooperative coalition structure is formed. C denotes a coalition and $C \setminus I$ denotes its complement, specifically, $C_{j,h}$ denoting coalition j in coalition structure h . Therefore, coalition structure h can be represented as $P_h = \{C_{1,h}, C_{2,h}, \dots, C_{J,h}\}$ which is a partition of I . There are $I_{j,h}$ member agents in

coalition j in coalition structure h , indexed by $i_{j,h}$, then $I_{j,h} \geq 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{J_h} I_{j,h} = I$.

$S_{j,h} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} s_{i_{j,h}}$ and $\bar{S}_{j,h} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \bar{s}_{i_{j,h}}$ denote the amount of the polluting input used by coalition j in coalition structure h , and the quantity of initial pollution emission permits possessed by coalition j in coalition structure h , respectively. Welfare of coalition j in coalition structure h is specified as $W_{j,h} = U_{j,h}(S_{j,h}) - D_{j,h}(S)$. The function $U_{j,h}(S_{j,h}) = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} u_{i_{j,h}}(s_{i_{j,h}})$ and $D_{j,h}(S)$ (resp.) are the emission revenue function and the damage function of coalition j in coalition structure h .

We can formulate the welfare maximization problem of coalition j in coalition structure h as model (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \max : & U_{j,h}(S_{j,h}) - D_{j,h}(S) \\ \text{s.t.} : & S_{j,h} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} s_{i_{j,h}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Model (3) maximizes the total welfare of all agents in coalition j in coalition structure h , subject to the requirements that the availability of pollution emissions ($S_{j,h} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} s_{i_{j,h}}$) are satisfied. So that in Lagrangian form the problem is to find the saddle value of

$$L_{j,h} = U_{j,h}(S_{j,h}) - D_{j,h}(S) - \lambda_{j,h} \cdot \left(\sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} s_{i_{j,h}} - S_{j,h} \right) \quad (4)$$

The Greek letters ($\lambda_{j,h}$) in (4) all represent Lagrange multipliers. Differentiating in turn with respect to the $s_{i_{j,h}}$, we obtain the equilibrium conditions for agent $i_{j,h}$ given as (5).

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}} - \sum_{\bar{i}_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}} = \lambda_{j,h} \quad (5)$$

According to (5), in equilibrium, all the member of the coalition has the same $u'_{i_{j,h}} = \frac{\partial u_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}$, which is equal to $\lambda_{j,h} + \sum_{\bar{i}_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}$. Then, we have

Lemma1 For each coalition that pursues the total welfare maximization of all member agents, there must be $U'_{j,h} = \frac{\partial U_{j,h}}{\partial S_{j,h}} > 0$, $U''_{j,h} = \frac{\partial U'_{j,h}}{\partial S_{j,h}} < 0$,

$$D'_{j,h} = \frac{\partial D_{j,h}}{\partial S} > 0 \text{ , and } D''_{j,h} = \frac{\partial D'_{j,h}}{\partial S} > 0 .$$

Proof: See Appendix A.

According to lemma 1, after a coalition is formed, it behaves like a single agent before it is dissolved. Therefore, in the following text, a coalition that is not dissolved is treated as an independent agent, i.e., a coalition becomes a single agent. This is also

the premise of some literatures (see e.g., [4,19]), but these literatures have not proved the rationality of this premise mathematically. Therefore, the above mathematical proof in this paper makes up for the shortage of some existing literature.

3. Analysis on Equilibrium of sub-game 1

It can be deduced that:

Lemma 2 The final equilibrium of the Cooperative game of pollution control must be the Pareto optimum of pollution control.

Proof: See Appendix B.

We can formulate the Pareto optimum problem as model (6):

$$\max : \sum_{i=1}^I [u_i(s_i) - d_i(S)] \quad (6)$$

Model (6) maximizes the total welfare of all agents. We obtain the Kuhn-Tucker conditions given in the first column of Table I.

Lemma 3 We can infer that price conditions (2^e) are the necessary and sufficient conditions to induce each agent to select Pareto optimum activity levels.

Proof: See Appendix C.

As the price conditions (2^e) are the necessary and sufficient condition for the market equilibrium to achieve Pareto optimum, for calculating subsidies or taxes on the pollution emissions, Eq. (2^e) needs to be satisfied and that is

$$t - T_i = \sum_{\bar{i} \neq i} (\lambda_{\bar{i}} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S}) \quad (7)$$

Subject to Eq. (7), to achieve Pareto optimum pollution emissions, the reduction (increase) of a unit of pollution emissions must be subsidized, wherein the net subsidies must be equal the total marginal welfare offered by the unit of pollution to all other agents. If the total marginal welfare is positive, then the net subsidy would be positive, and vice versa, that is, where the net subsidy is negative, levying taxes would be required for that agent.

Moreover, it can be further obtained:

Lemma 4 In the process of implementing the rules of lemma 3 to realize the Pareto optimum, the total amount of subsidies that agents receive for emitting or reducing pollution should equal the total amount of taxes that agents pay for emitting or reducing pollution.

Proof: See Appendix D.

We can formulate the Lemma 4 as Eq. (8)

$$\sum_{i=1}^I [T_i \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) + t \cdot (\bar{s}_i - s_i) - \bar{t}_i] = 0 \quad (8)$$

According to Esq. (7) and (8), we can obtain the solution of t , \bar{t}_i and T_i (refer to Appendix E for the derivation process) described in table 2:

Table 2

solution of t , \bar{t}_i and T_i

Type of price constraint	value
price constraint I	$t = \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S}) = \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S}) \quad (9)$
	$T_i = \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S} \quad (10)$

	$\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i \neq 0 \quad (11)$
	$\bar{t}_i = 0 \quad (\forall i) \quad (12)$
price constraint II	t , \bar{t}_i and T_i that satisfy Esq. (7) and (8) except price constraint I

In Table II, $\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S}$ specifies the marginal damage caused by per unit stock of pollution to agent i , $\sum_{i=1}^I (\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S})$ measures the total marginal damage caused by per unit stock of pollution. We define t , \bar{t}_i and T_i satisfying price constraint I or price constraint II as optimal equilibrium prices.

Then, it can be deduced that:

Lemma 5 In order to make market equilibrium achieve Pareto optimum, the financial balance of public externalities governance must be taken into account, then, t , \bar{t}_i and T_i must be the optimal equilibrium prices.

Proof: See Appendix E.

If agents adopt the non-cooperation strategy, there is no constraint on the pollution emissions of all countries, that is $t = \bar{t}_i = T_i = 0$. Then, by (2^c), we obtain the equilibrium conditions under no emission constraint scenario, described as (13).

$$\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_i} = \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial s_i} \quad (13)$$

By comparing Esq. (2^o) and (13), it can be seen that, as long as one agent adopts the non-cooperation strategy, the game equilibrium cannot achieve the Pareto optimum of pollution control. Then, according to Lemma 2, we have

Lemma 6 The final equilibrium of the cooperative game must be that all agents adopt cooperative strategies to form the grand coalition.

It's necessary to note that the following lemma 9 can also lead to the conclusion of lemma 6. Several studies have drawn similar conclusions to **Lemma 6**, see [1, 20, 21] among others. It should be noted that, under the premise of hypothesis 3, γ -core defined by Chander [1, 4] is nonempty, and according to Chander 's proof [1, 4], lemma 5 and lemma 6 will also result. The detailed argument is as follows: In the concept of γ -core defined by Chander [1, 4], each deviating coalition C presumes the resulting coalition structure after the deviation to be $\{C, \{i\}_{i \in C^c}\}$, i.e., the players outside C do not form a coalition and remain separate as singletons. We define the coalition structure of $\{C, \{i\}_{i \in C^c}\}$ as γ -core coalition structure. The γ -core of the game is nonempty if there exists a welfare allocation $(w_{1,\gamma\text{-core}}, w_{2,\gamma\text{-core}}, \dots, w_{I,\gamma\text{-core}})$,

such that ① $W^* = \sum_{i=1}^I w_{i,\gamma\text{-core}}$, and ② $\sum_{i \in C} w_{i,\gamma\text{-core}} > \sum_{i \in C} \tilde{w}_{i, \{C, \{i\}_{i \in C^c}\}}$ for each coalition

C . The welfare is money for all of the agents, therefore welfare is transferable among different agents. The total welfare of the Pareto optimum can be distributed among countries in any amount, including γ -core welfare allocation.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that:

Proposition 1: The equilibrium of Sub-game 1 is that, in order to realize Pareto optimum of the public externalities governance which is the final equilibrium of the Cooperative game of pollution control, all agents will form the grass coalition to implement the prices constraint t 、 \bar{t}_i and T_i must be the optimal equilibrium prices.

4. Analysis on Equilibrium of sub-game 2

Firstly, It can be derived that:

Lemma 7 Regardless of the initial allocation of pollution emission permits, the final equilibrium total welfare of the Cooperative game of pollution control remains unchanged, which is equal to the total welfare of the Pareto optimum. Pareto optimal total welfare distribution in any agent can be realized by applying the price constraint I on the basis of a specific initial pollution emission permits distribution scheme, and the welfare of each agent is directly proportional to the number of initial pollution emission permits it has and inversely proportional to the number of pollution gas emission permits other agents have.

Proof: See Appendix F.

In essence, Agents engaged in the Cooperative game of pollution control is to strive for the optimal setting of \bar{s}_i 、 t 、 \bar{t}_i 、 T_i in order to maximize their own welfare. The equilibrium solution of t 、 \bar{t}_i and T_i , according to conclusion 1, is either the price constraint I or the price constraint II. Therefore, sub-game 2 is either the initial pollution emission permits allocation game under price constraint I or the initial pollution emission permits allocation game under price constraint II. According to Lemma 7, any Pareto optimal total welfare distribution, including the welfare allocation realized by applying the price constraint II on the basis of a specific initial pollution emission permits distribution scheme, can be achieved by implementing the price constraint I on the basis of a specific initial pollution emission permits allocation scheme. Therefore, when analyzing sub-game 2, we only need to analyze the initial pollution emission permits allocation game under price constraint I. On the one hand, according to price constraint I, the rule for determining t 、 \bar{t}_i and T_i is set, on the other hand, according to Lemma 7, the welfare of each agent is directly proportional to the number of initial pollution emission permits it has and inversely proportional to the number of pollution gas emission permits other agents have, so that the core problem for agents to participate in the Cooperative game of pollution control is the competition for the initial pollution emission permits, that is, the problem to be solved in sub-game 2.

For the further analysis, we need introduce the following definitions.

Definition 1: The Nash equilibrium pollution emissions from an incomplete cooperative coalition structure form an initial pollution emission permits allocation scheme, based on which, all agents work together to implement the price constraint I to achieve the Pareto optimum of pollution emission, and then form the category I welfare distribution scheme.

Definition 2: Distribution schemes other than the category I welfare distribution scheme are category II welfare distribution scheme.

Definition 3: the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions from the totally uncooperative coalition structure form an initial pollution emission permits

allocation scheme which we call as w initial pollution emission permits allocation (abbreviated by ' w-IPA ').

Definition 4: based on w-IPA, all agents work together to implement the price constraint I to achieve the Pareto optimum of pollution emission which we call w-IPA Pareto optimum of pollution emission.

Definition 5: we call the welfare distribution under the w-IPA Pareto optimum of pollution emission as w-IPA welfare distribution.

Definition 6: we call agent i's welfare under the w-IPA welfare distribution as agent i's w-value.

According to the above definition, the w-IPA welfare distribution is a special category I welfare distribution scheme. The market mechanism, in which all agents work together to implement the price constraint I to achieve the Pareto optimum of pollution emission based on w-IPA, can easily implement the w-value, and seem to be more operable than the market mechanism proposed by Serrano [22].

By successively proving the following five statements of (I - V), we can prove the conclusion 2.

Conclusion 2: Suppose that the final equilibrium of the Cooperative game of pollution control must be Pareto optimum of pollution control, and t , \bar{t}_i and T_i must conform to the price constraint I to make market equilibrium to achieve Pareto optimum are anticipated, then, the final welfare of each agent must be its w-value.

(I) if agents do not form the grand coalition, that is, a fully cooperative coalition structure, then the equilibrium of the game of pollution control will only be a Nash equilibrium under an incomplete cooperative coalition structure.

(II) Only when all countries adopt cooperative strategies to form a grand coalition and then achieve Pareto optimum is the equilibrium of the game, while any Nash equilibrium under an incomplete cooperative coalition structure will not be the equilibrium of the game of pollution control.

(III) Of all two welfare distribution schemes, the category I welfare distribution scheme may become the equilibrium of the game of pollution control.

(IV) Of all of category I welfare distribution scheme, only w-IPA welfare distribution can be the equilibrium of the game of pollution control.

(V) Compared to w-IPA welfare distribution, none of the category II welfare distribution scheme is the equilibrium of the game of pollution control.

The conclusion of (I) is clear and needs no further proof.

The Nash equilibrium pollution emissions from an incomplete cooperative coalition structure, on the one hand, is the amount of pollution emission freely chosen by agents to pursue their own interests maximization, and is the amount of pollution that agents are willing and able to emit. On the other hand, because agents can only form an incomplete cooperative coalition structure when they fail to form a fully cooperative coalition structure, if agents fail to form a fully cooperative coalition, the amount of pollution that agents can emit can only be the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions under a non-cooperative cooperative coalition. Therefore, under the incomplete cooperative coalition structure, the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions of each agent can naturally form an allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent, which is the distribution scheme that each agent is willing to accept and can only accept.

The conclusion of (II) can be drawn from lemma 6 or from lemma 9 below. Meanwhile, lemma 9 can further lead to the conclusion of (III). But in order to obtain lemma 9, we have to prove lemma 8 firstly.

Lemma 8: Under any initial coalition structure, if some agents adopt cooperative strategies, the total Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will be reduced, and for agents that adopt non-cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions and welfare will increase, while for agents that adopt cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will decrease and their welfare changes are ambiguous.

Proof: See Appendix G.

Lemma 9: Under any incomplete coalition structure, based on the initial pollution emission permits allocation scheme which is naturally formed from the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions from the incomplete coalition structure, if agents work together to implement the price constraint I, Pareto optimum of pollution control will eventually be achieved and the welfare of each agent will improve.

Proof: See Appendix H.

According to Lemma 9, under any incomplete coalition structure, any agent(coalition) can achieve further welfare improvement in Nash equilibrium. This shows that incomplete coalition structure will not be the final equilibrium of the cooperative game, only the full cooperative coalition structure will be the final equilibrium of the cooperative game, i.e., lemma 9 can also draw the conclusion of lemma 6. Furthermore, lemma 9 can also give some specific allocation scheme of pollution emission permits under the fully cooperative coalition structure, i.e., the initial pollution emission permits allocation formed by the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions from an incomplete cooperative coalition structure. Based on the initial pollution emission permits allocation, all agents work together to implement the price constraint I to achieve the Pareto optimum of pollution emission and the corresponding welfare distribution that obviously is the category I welfare distribution scheme described above. According to lemma 9, under the category I welfare distribution scheme, the welfare of each coalition will be improved, so that coalitions are willing to accept this welfare improvement, thus leading to the conclusion of (III).

Conclusion of (IV) can be drawn from the following lemma 10.

Lemma 10 Suppose that all agents anticipate that the final equilibrium of the Cooperative game of pollution control must be the Pareto optimum of pollution control, and in order to make market equilibrium to achieve Pareto optimum, t , \bar{t}_i and T_i must conform to the price constraint I, so that among all the category I welfare distribution scheme, only w-IPA welfare distribution can be the equilibrium of the cooperative game of pollution control.

Proof: See Appendix I.

According to Lemma 10, among all of category I welfare distribution scheme, only w-IPA welfare distribution can be the equilibrium of the game with public externalities, which is the conclusion of (IV).

The Pareto optimal total welfare of the Cooperative game of pollution control is constant. So in any category II welfare distribution scheme, at least one agent's welfare is less than that under w-IPA welfare distribution, saying agent 1. Under the category II welfare distribution scheme, Agent 1 will think that, firstly, if he takes non-cooperative strategy to quit the welfare distribution scheme, then some kind of

incomplete cooperative coalition structure will be formed; secondly, according to Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, or according to (II), incomplete coalition structure will not be the final equilibrium of the cooperative game, only the full cooperative coalition structure and Pareto optimum will be the final equilibrium of the cooperative game, i.e., the final allocation of welfare can only be category I welfare distribution scheme or category II welfare distribution scheme; thirdly, if a category II welfare distribution scheme is formed again, there are at least one other agent, saying agent 2, whose welfare is less than that under w-IPA welfare distribution and he will repeat the choice of agent 1, thus the game returning to the first step, i.e., making the game a repeat game; fourthly, if a category I welfare distribution scheme is formed, according to (IV), Of all the category I welfare distribution scheme, only w-IPA welfare distribution can be the equilibrium of the game with public externalities, i.e., the final welfare of each agent must be its w-value. So far, we've come to conclusion 2.

5. Discussion

We argue below that w-value is a theoretically more compelling core concept for the cooperation game of pollution control, under the assumptions that ① all countries seek to maximize their own welfare, ② the emission revenue functions are strictly increasing and strictly concave, the damage functions are strictly increasing and convex .

The w-value is the subset of γ -core. Firstly, according to the definition of w-value, it can be known that it must meet the condition ① of the definition of γ -core. Secondly, let $w\text{-value}_i$ denote w-value of agent i , and let $\tilde{w}_{i,\{C,\{i\}_{i \in CV}\}}^*$ denote the welfare of agent i in the Pareto equilibrium of the implementation of the price constraint I based on $\tilde{s}_{i,\{C,\{i\}_{i \in CV}\}} \forall i$ as initial pollution emission permits allocation.

According to lemma 9, we have $\sum_{i \in C} \tilde{w}_{i,\{C,\{i\}_{i \in CV}\}}^* > \sum_{i \in C} \tilde{w}_{i,\{C,\{i\}_{i \in CV}\}}$, and according to lemma 7 and lemma 8 we have $\sum_{i \in C} w_{i,w\text{-core}} > \sum_{i \in C} \tilde{w}_{i,\{C,\{i\}_{i \in CV}\}}^*$, thus we have

$\sum_{i \in C} w_{i,w\text{-core}} > \sum_{i \in C} \tilde{w}_{i,\{C,\{i\}_{i \in CV}\}}$, i.e., w-value satisfies the condition ② of the definition of

γ -core. Therefore, the w-value is the subset of γ -core. Moreover, the w-value is based on the market mechanism, considering the rules that make the market equilibrium to achieve Pareto-optimality, existence and uniqueness, so that it is a theoretically more compelling solution concept than γ -core for cooperative game of pollution control.

While in this paper we analyze the cooperative game of pollution control, our conclusion can extend to the other cooperative game of negative externality control and to the cooperative game of positive externality protection such as the good ecological environment protection. Let G denote the final stock of good with positive externality, g_i denote the amount of good with positive externality produced by agent i . The function $r_i(G)$ and $f_i(g_i)$ are the revenue function and production function of agent i . Similarly, we can prove that w-value is also the solution of cooperative game of positive externality protection under the assumptions that ① all agents seek to maximize their own welfare, ② each revenue function $r_i(G)$ is assumed to be strictly increasing and strictly concave, and each production function,

$f_i(g_i)$, strictly increasing and convex, i.e., $r_i'(G) > 0$ 、 $r_i''(G) < 0$ 、 $f_i'(g_i) > 0$ 、 $f_i''(g_i) > 0$.

6. An illustrative example

6.1 Calculation steps of w-value

Calculation steps of w-value can be described as following:

① Calculate the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions of each agent (\tilde{s}_i) under the totally uncooperative coalition structure according to (13), and set them as the initial pollution emission permits of each agent, i.e., $\bar{s}_i = \tilde{s}_i$.

② Calculate the pareto optimal pollution emissions of each agent (s_i^*) according to (2°) in **Table I**.

③ Substituting the values of $\bar{s}_i = \tilde{s}_i$ 、 s_i^* and S^* into (9) and (10), Calculate the price constraint t^* and T_i^* .

④ Substituting the values of $\bar{s}_i = \tilde{s}_i$ 、 s_i^* 、 S^* 、 t^* and T_i^* into (1), Calculate the w-value.

6.2 An illustrative example of w-value

Supposing a cooperative game of pollution control, in which $I = 4$ and other setting in Table 3.

Table 3

Revenue functions and Damage functions

Agents (i)	Revenue functions	Marginal revenue functions	Damage functions	Marginal damage functions
1	$u_1(s_1) = 10 + 6s_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$3s_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$d_1(S) = S^2$	$2S$
2	$u_2(s_2) = 6 + 2s_2^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$s_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$u_2(S) = 2S^2$	$4S$
3	$u_3(s_3) = 5 + 3s_3^{\frac{1}{3}}$	$s_3^{-\frac{2}{3}}$	$u_2(S) = 3S^2$	$6S$
4	$u_4(s_4) = 8 + 4s_4^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$2s_4^{-\frac{1}{2}}$	$u_2(S) = S^3$	$3S^2$

According to the basic Settings in Table 3, it is easily seen that $\tilde{s} = (\tilde{s}_1=1.182, \tilde{s}_2=0.033, \tilde{s}_3=0.067, \tilde{s}_4=0.110)$, $s^* = (s_1^*=1.182, s_2^*=0.033, s_3^*=0.067, s_4^*=0.110)$, $t^* = 19.156$, and $T^* = (T_1^*=0.904, T_2^*=1.807, T_3^*=2.711, T_4^*=0.613)$. Therefore, the w-value of each agent are $w_{1,w-core} = 29.851$, $w_{2,w-core} = 4.349$, $w_{3,w-core} = 2.606$, $w_{4,w-core} = 8.911$, which are 15.231, 1.794, 2.273 and 2.136 more than the welfare of agents under the Nash equilibrium of totally uncooperative coalition structure, respectively.

Table 4

Result of the illustrative example

Agents (i)	t^*	T_i^*	s_i^*	$\tilde{s}_i(\bar{s}_i)$	w-value ($w-value_i$)	the welfare of agents under the Nash equilibrium	Welfare improvement ($w-value_i -$
-------------------	-------	---------	---------	--------------------------	----------------------------	---	---

)	of totally uncooperative coalition structure ($\tilde{W}_{i,\{[1],\dots,[I]\}}$)	$\tilde{W}_{i,\{[1],\dots,[I]\}}$)
1	19.156	0.904	0.247	1.182	29.851	14.620	15.231
2		1.807	0.027	0.033	4.349	2.556	1.794
3		2.711	0.067	0.042	2.606	0.333	2.273
4		0.613	0.110	0.123	8.911	6.775	2.136
Sum		6.035	0.452	1.380	45.717	24.284	21.433

According to Table 5, the equilibrium welfare of deviating coalition under γ -core coalition structure is always less than that in w-IPA welfare distribution, thus proves that w-value is subset of γ -core.

Table 6 lists the pollution emissions of all agents under all possible coalition structures. It can be seen that under any initial coalition structure, if some agents adopt cooperative strategies, the total Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will be reduced, and for agents that adopt non-cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions and welfare will increase, while for agents that adopt cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will decrease and their welfare changes are ambiguous, which is the conclusion of Lemma 8.

Table 7 shows the Nash equilibrium welfare of all agents under all possible coalition structures and corresponding category I welfare distribution scheme. It can be seen that under any incomplete coalition structure, based on the initial pollution emission permits allocation scheme which is naturally formed from the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions from the incomplete coalition structure, if agents work together to implement the price constraint I, Pareto optimum of pollution control will eventually be achieved and the welfare of each agent will improve, which is the conclusion of Lemma 9.

Table 5
Comparison between w-value and γ -core

Serial number	γ -core coalition structure	Nash equilibrium welfare γ -core coalition structure					w-value					Nash equilibrium welfare of deviating coalition C		
		Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Sum	Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Sum	γ -core coalition structure	w-value	(w-value) - (γ -core coalition structure)
1	[1], [2], [3], [4]	14.620	2.556	0.333	6.775	24.284	17.583	4.279	2.940	8.743	33.544	[14.620, 2.556, 0.333, 6.775]	[17.583, 4.279, 2.940, 8.743]	[2.962, 1.723, 2.607, 1.968]
2	[3], [4], [1,2]	12.285	4.569	3.585	10.148	30.587						16.854	21.861	5.0072
3	[2], [4], [1,3]	11.609	4.860	3.580	10.393	30.442						15.189	20.522	5.3330
4	[2], [3], [1,4]	13.485	4.954	3.887	9.187	31.513						22.672	26.325	3.6533
5	[1], [4], [2,3]	14.740	2.427	0.234	6.898	24.299						2.661	7.218	4.5574
6	[1], [3], [2,4]	14.920	2.594	0.671	6.338	24.523						8.932	13.021	4.0889
7	[1], [2], [3,4]	14.945	2.800	0.459	6.209	24.413						6.668	11.682	5.0144
8	[4], [1,2,3]	10.946	4.657	3.625	10.806	30.034						19.228	24.801	5.5734
9	[3], [1,2,4]	13.051	5.538	5.245	9.268	33.102						27.857	30.604	2.7469
10	[2], [1,3,4]	12.657	6.090	5.128	9.122	32.997						26.907	29.265	2.3582
11	[1], [2,3,4]	15.079	2.626	0.475	6.137	24.317						9.238	15.961	6.7229
12	[1,2,3,4]	12.778	5.923	5.609	9.233	33.544						33.544	33.544	0.0000

Table 6
Nash equilibrium emission under all possible coalition structures

Serial number	All possible coalition structures	Nash equilibrium emission					Nash equilibrium welfare				
		Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Sum	Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Sum
1	[1], [2], [3], [4]	1.182	0.033	0.042	0.123	1.380	14.620	2.556	0.333	6.775	24.284
2	[1], [2], [3, 4]	1.259	0.035	0.020	0.022	1.337	14.945	2.800	0.459	6.209	24.413
3	[1], [2, 3], [4]	1.210	0.005	0.020	0.129	1.364	14.740	2.427	0.234	6.898	24.299
4	[1], [2, 4], [3]	1.253	0.009	0.044	0.035	1.340	14.920	2.594	0.671	6.338	24.523
5	[1], [2, 3, 4]	1.292	0.003	0.013	0.012	1.320	15.079	2.626	0.475	6.137	24.317
6	[1, 2], [3], [4]	0.280	0.031	0.074	0.559	0.944	12.285	4.569	3.585	10.148	30.587
7	[1, 2], [3, 4]	0.481	0.053	0.070	0.116	0.721	13.644	5.424	4.679	8.986	32.733
8	[1, 3], [2], [4]	0.167	0.074	0.050	0.626	0.918	11.609	4.860	3.580	10.393	30.442
9	[1, 3], [2, 4]	0.304	0.059	0.079	0.237	0.680	12.848	5.563	4.900	9.634	32.945
10	[1, 4], [2], [3]	0.511	0.078	0.080	0.227	0.896	13.485	4.954	3.887	9.187	31.513

11	[1, 4], [2, 3]	0.564	0.013	0.039	0.251	0.868	13.755	4.725	3.760	9.350	31.590
12	[1, 2, 3], [4]	0.082	0.009	0.029	0.756	0.876	10.946	4.657	3.625	10.806	30.034
13	[1, 2, 4], [3]	0.335	0.037	0.129	0.149	0.651	13.051	5.538	5.245	9.268	33.102
14	[1, 3, 4], [2]	0.254	0.170	0.069	0.113	0.606	12.657	6.090	5.128	9.122	32.997
15	[1, 2, 3, 4]	0.247	0.027	0.067	0.110	0.452	12.778	5.923	5.609	9.233	33.544

Table 7

Comparison between Nash equilibrium welfare and Equilibrium welfare under category I welfare distribution scheme

Serial number	All possible coalition structures	Nash equilibrium welfare				Equilibrium welfare under category I welfare distribution scheme				(Equilibrium welfare under category I welfare distribution scheme) - (Nash equilibrium welfare)			
		Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4	Agent 1	Agent 2	Agent 3	Agent 4
1	[1], [2], [3], [4]	14.620	2.556	0.333	6.775	17.583	4.279	2.940	8.743	2.962	1.723	2.607	1.968
2	[1], [2], [3,4]	14.945	2.800	0.459	6.209	18.086	4.369	2.926	8.163	3.140	1.569	2.467	1.954
3	[1], [2,3], [4]	14.740	2.427	0.234	6.898	17.765	4.142	2.849	8.788	3.025	1.714	2.616	1.890
4	[1], [2,4], [3]	14.920	2.594	0.671	6.338	18.046	4.204	3.058	8.235	3.125	1.610	2.388	1.898
5	[1], [2,3,4]	15.079	2.626	0.475	6.137	18.301	4.207	2.925	8.110	3.222	1.581	2.450	1.974
6	[1,2], [3], [4]	12.285	4.569	3.585	10.148	12.534	5.055	4.314	11.641	0.249	0.486	0.729	1.493
7	[1,2], [3,4]	13.644	5.424	4.679	8.986	13.950	5.594	4.896	9.104	0.306	0.170	0.217	0.118
8	[1,3], [2], [4]	11.609	4.860	3.580	10.393	11.874	5.363	4.242	12.065	0.264	0.503	0.662	1.673
9	[1,3], [2,4]	12.848	5.563	4.900	9.634	12.918	5.703	5.059	9.863	0.070	0.141	0.159	0.229
10	[1,4], [2], [3]	13.485	4.954	3.887	9.187	13.968	5.425	4.483	9.668	0.482	0.472	0.595	0.481
11	[1,4], [2,3]	13.755	4.725	3.760	9.350	14.317	5.086	4.311	9.830	0.563	0.361	0.550	0.479
12	[1,2,3], [4]	10.946	4.657	3.625	10.806	11.396	5.046	4.230	12.872	0.450	0.389	0.605	2.066
13	[1,2,4], [3]	13.051	5.538	5.245	9.268	13.131	5.622	5.442	9.348	0.080	0.084	0.197	0.080
14	[1,3,4], [2]	12.657	6.090	5.128	9.122	12.681	6.505	5.199	9.158	0.024	0.415	0.071	0.036
15	[1,2,3,4]	12.778	5.923	5.609	9.233	12.778	5.923	5.609	9.233	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

7. Conclusion

This paper introduces a new solution concept, called the w-value, for the cooperative game of pollution control. We proved that w-value is the solution of the cooperative game of negative externality control under the assumptions that ① all agents seek to maximize their own welfare, ② the emission revenue functions are strictly increasing and strictly concave, the damage functions are strictly increasing and convex, and is also the solution of the cooperative game of positive externality protection under the assumptions that ① all agents seek to maximize their own welfare, ② each revenue function is assumed to be strictly increasing and strictly concave, and each production function strictly increasing and convex. Furthermore, the w-value is the subset of γ -core and has uniqueness, and we can easily set up a market mechanism to implement it, so that it is a theoretically more compelling solution concept than γ -core for the cooperative game of pollution control.

This paper lays down the foundations for a theory of the cooperative game of negative externality control or positive externality protection. Future research should address the two assumptions that were made to focus on the game theoretic aspects of the problem. One particularly important extension of our model is the scenario where the assumption, the emission revenue functions are strictly increasing and strictly concave, the damage functions (production function) are strictly increasing and convex, is not satisfied.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Fujian Research Center for Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era (Grant No. FJ2023XZB054).

Appendix A Proof of Lemma 1

According to Hypothesis 2, we have

$$D'_{j,h} = \frac{\partial D_{j,h}}{\partial S} = \frac{\partial \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} d_{i_{j,h}}(S)}{\partial S} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} d'_{i_{j,h}} > 0 \quad (\text{A.1})$$

By (A.1) and Hypothesis 2, we have

$$D''_{j,h} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} d''_{i_{j,h}} > 0 \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Then, we have

$$U'_{j,h} = \frac{\partial U_{j,h}}{\partial S_{j,h}} = \frac{\partial \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} u_{i_{j,h}}(s_{i_{j,h}})}{\partial S_{j,h}} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} (u'_{i_{j,h}} \frac{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}}) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Subsequently, by (5), for agent $i_{j,h}$ we have

$$u'_{i_{j,h}} = \frac{\partial u_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}} = \sum_{\bar{i}_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}} + \lambda_{j,h} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

According to (A.4), we learn that all the member of the coalition has the same

$u'_{i_{j,h}} = \frac{\partial u_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}$ in equilibrium. Then we have

$$U'_{j,h} = u'_{i_{j,h}} \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \left(\frac{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}} \right) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Because of $S_{j,h} = \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} s_{i_{j,h}}$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \left(\frac{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}} \right) = \frac{\partial \sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}} = 1 \quad (\text{A.6})$$

By (A.5) and (A.6), we have

$$U'_{j,h} = u'_{i_{j,h}} > 0 \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Subsequently, we have

$$U''_{j,h} = u''_{i_{j,h}} \frac{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Supposing

$$U''_{j,h} \geq 0 \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}} \leq 0 \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Then, we infer

$$\sum_{i_{j,h}=1}^{I_{j,h}} \left(\frac{\partial s_{i_{j,h}}}{\partial S_{j,h}} \right) \leq 0 \quad (\text{A.11})$$

(A.6) and (A.11) contradict each other, so there are:

$$U''_{j,h} < 0 \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By (A.1), (A.2), (A.7) and (A.12), we have proved **Lemma1**. ■

Appendix B : Proof of Lemma 2

Suppose that the game of pollution control reaches a final equilibrium state but not Pareto optimum of pollution control. We describe the final equilibrium state as state 1. Therefore, there is a pareto improvement in state 1, that is at least one agent can achieve welfare improvements without reducing the welfare of any agent. Assume that an agent $i = 1, \dots, \bar{I} (1 \leq \bar{I} \leq I)$ can achieve maximum welfare improvements $\Delta w_i > 0 (i = 1, \dots, \bar{I})$ without reducing the welfare of any agent. In state 1, agent i can perfectly distribute Δw_i among all agents in a reasonable way, so that the welfare of all agents can be improved, thus improving state 1 to the Pareto optimum, that is, agent i can design a benefit transfer scheme: transfer $\phi_{\bar{i}} \bullet \Delta w_i$ to agent \bar{i} , where $\phi_{\bar{i}}$ satisfies $\sum_{\bar{i}} \phi_{\bar{i}} = 1$ and $\phi_{\bar{i}} > 0 (\forall \bar{i})$.

Through such a benefit transfer mechanism, the welfare of all agents will be improved compared with state 1. As benefit maximizers, all agents will accept the new equilibrium state which is the Pareto optimum of pollution control.

Therefore, as long as state 1 is not the Pareto optimum of pollution control, state 1 will eventually improve to the Pareto optimum of pollution control, that is, state 1 is not the final equilibrium of the game with public externalities, thus contradicting the hypothesis. ■

Appendix C: Proof of Lemma 3

Substituting the value of T_i and t from (2^c) into (2^c), we see that the system of inequalities and equations determining the competitive equilibrium becomes identical with the system of inequalities and equations that determine the Pareto optimum solution— s_i^o . Thus, these systems will have the same solutions, so that if they are unique, then we have $s_i^o = s_i^c$.

We may ask whether conditions (2^c) are absolutely required for achieving optimality. The answer is that they are.

To deal with this issue, the uniqueness of the prices solution (2^c), we must assume that there is a set of prices that yield equality between the market and Pareto optimum activity levels (i.e., that there exists $s_i^o = s_i^c$, $S^o = S^c$). Subsequently, we ask what values of the t and T_i are consistent with these relationships.

By (2^o) and (2^c), we have

$$t - T_i = \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial s_i} - \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial s_i} = \sum_{\bar{i} \neq i}^I \left(\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial s_i} \right) \quad (\text{C.1})$$

By (C.1), we have proved that the price conditions (2^c) are necessary and sufficient conditions to render identical the competitive equilibrium and the Pareto optimality conditions. ■

Appendix D: Proof of Lemma 4

Under the Pareto optimum, the total net welfare of all agents is

$$W^* = \sum_{i=1}^I [u_i(s_i^*) - d_i(S^*)] \quad (\text{D.1})$$

At market equilibrium, the net welfare of agent i is

$$w_i^c = u_i(s_i) - d_i(S) + T_i \cdot \left(\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}} - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \bar{s}_{\bar{i}} \right) + t \cdot (\bar{s}_i - s_i) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Subsequently, at market equilibrium, the total net welfare of all agents is

$$W^c = \sum_{i=1}^I w_i^c = \sum_{i=1}^I [u_i(s_i) - d_i(S)] + \sum_{i=1}^I [T_i \cdot \left(\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}} - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \bar{s}_{\bar{i}} \right) + t \cdot (\bar{s}_i - s_i) - \bar{t}_i] \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Implementing the rules of lemma 1 is aim to realize the Pareto optimum which is unique, therefore we have

$$W^c = W^* \quad (\text{D.4})$$

According to (D.4), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^I [T_i \cdot \left(\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}} - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \bar{s}_{\bar{i}} \right) + t \cdot (\bar{s}_i - s_i) - \bar{t}_i] = 0 \quad (\text{D.5})$$

That is the total net subsidies to all agents for emitting or reducing pollution should equal zero. ■

Appendix E : Proof of Lemma 5

According to Lemma 3, t and T_i must satisfy Eq. (7), and according to Lemma 4, t and T_i must satisfy Eq. (8).

The Eq. (8) $\sum_{i=1}^I [T_i * (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) + t * (\bar{s}_i - s_i) - \bar{t}_i] = 0$ can be expanded as follows:

$$t \bullet \bar{S} - t \bullet \sum_{i=1}^I s_i + \sum_{i=1}^I T_i * (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Summarizing Eq. (7) for all agents, we obtain:

$$t \bullet I - \sum_{i=1}^I T_i = \sum_{i=1}^I [\sum_{\bar{i} \neq i} (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S})] \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Both sides of Eq. (E.2) are multiplied by $\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i$ and subtracted by Eq. (E.1). We obtain:

$$t \bullet (I-1) \bullet (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) = (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) \bullet \sum_{i=1}^I [\sum_{\bar{i} \neq i} (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S})] - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i \quad (\text{E.3})$$

We have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^I [\sum_{\bar{i} \neq i} (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S})] = (I-1) \sum_{i=1}^I (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S}) \quad (\text{E.4})$$

Based on Eq. (E.3) and (E.4), we have

$$t \bullet (I-1) \bullet (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) = (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i) \bullet (I-1) \sum_{i=1}^I (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S}) - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Based on Eq. (E.5), when $\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i = 0$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i = 0 \quad (\text{E.6})$$

Based on Eq. (E.5), when $\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i = 0$, we have

$$t = \sum_{i=1}^I (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S}) \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Based on Eq. (E.7) and (7), when $\sum_{i=1}^I s_i - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_i \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i = 0$, we have

$$T_i = \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S} \quad (\text{E.8})$$

$\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i = 0$ can only be Eq. (E.9) or (E.10).

$$\bar{t}_i = 0 \quad (\forall i) \quad (\text{E.9})$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{t}_i = 0 \text{ and } \bar{t}_i \neq 0 \quad (\exists i) \quad (\text{E.10})$$

In consequence, the price constraint I of (E.7), (E.8), (E.9) and is one of the solutions to the Esq. (7) and (8). ■

Appendix F : Proof of Lemma 7

According to Lemma 5, the final equilibrium of the cooperative game must be the Pareto optimum of pollution control which is unique. Therefore, the total welfare of the final equilibrium of the cooperative game is equal to the total welfare of the Pareto optimum. The conclusion can be further proved mathematically.

n or \bar{n} represents the index of initial pollution emission permits allocation scheme.

Under the Pareto optimum of pollution control, the total welfare of all agents is

$$W^* = \sum_{i=1}^I [u_i(s_i^*) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^I s_i^*)] \quad (F.1)$$

Under any initial pollution emission permits allocation scheme n , when the market is in equilibrium, the welfare of the first agent i is

$$w_{i,n} = u_i(s_{i,n}) - d_i(S_n) + T_{i,n} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,n} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,n} \right) + t_n \cdot (\bar{s}_{i,n} - s_{i,n}) \quad (F.2)$$

Then, in the market equilibrium, the welfare of all agents is

$$W_n = \sum_{i=1}^I [u_i(s_{i,n}) - d_i(S_n)] + \sum_{i=1}^I [T_{i,n} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,n} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,n} \right) + t_n \cdot (\bar{s}_{i,n} - s_{i,n})] \quad (F.3)$$

According to Lemma 1, the final equilibrium of the cooperative game of pollution control must be the Pareto optimum of pollution control, and according to Lemma 2, the condition to induce each agent to select Pareto optimum activity levels is unique. So there must be¹:

$$s_{i,n} = s_i^* \quad (F.4)$$

$$t_n - T_{i,n} = \sum_{\bar{i} \neq i}^I \left(\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial s_i^*} \right) \quad (F.5)$$

$$S_n = S_0 + \sum_i s_{i,n}^* \quad (F.6)$$

In addition, according to Lemma 3, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^I [T_{i,n} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,n} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,n} \right) + t_n \cdot (s_{i,n} - \bar{s}_{i,n})] = 0 \quad (F.7)$$

By(F.1)、(F.3)and(F.4)—(F.6), we have

$$W^* = W_n = \sum_{i=1}^I w_{i,n} \quad (F.8)$$

That is the total welfare of the final equilibrium of the Cooperative game of pollution control is equal to the total welfare of the Pareto optimum.

Suppose that any welfare distribution scheme, say scheme \bar{n} . That is

$$W^* = \sum_{i=1}^I w_{i,\bar{n}} \quad (F.9)$$

Where, the welfare of the agent i is

$$w_{i,\bar{n}} = u_i(s_{i,\bar{n}}) - d_i(S_{\bar{n}}) + T_{i,\bar{n}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,\bar{n}} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}} \right) + t_{\bar{n}} \cdot (\bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}} - s_{i,\bar{n}}) \quad (F.10)$$

Since the price constraint I is applied, there must be:

¹ In essence, there needs to be a hypothesis that no matter any initial GHG emission right allocation scenario, the same goods are used as the standard of value measurement. In appendix B, commodity 1 is arbitrarily set as the measure of value, that is, $p_{1,h} = p_1 = \omega_k$.

$$T_{i,\bar{n}} - t_{\bar{n}} = \sum_{\bar{i}=1, \bar{i} \neq i}^I (\lambda_{\bar{i}} \frac{\partial U_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S^*}) \quad (F.11)$$

$$s_{i,\bar{n}} = s_i^* \quad (F.12)$$

$$S_{\bar{n}} = S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,\bar{n}} = S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^I s_i^* = S^* \quad (F.13)$$

According to (F.11)—(F.13), when applying the price constraint I, the agent i 's welfare component, $u_i(s_{i,\bar{n}}) - d_i(S_{\bar{n}}) = u_i(s_i^*) - d_i(S^*)$, must be constant. So, the welfare of the agent

i is mainly adjusted by the part of $T_{i,\bar{n}} \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,\bar{n}} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}}) + t_{\bar{n}} \cdot (\bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}} - s_{i,\bar{n}})$ which is determined by $\bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}}$ and $\bar{S}_{\bar{n}}$ because of $s_{i,\bar{n}} = s_i^*$. Set $\bar{S}_{\bar{n}}$ to be fixed, then $t_{\bar{n}}$ and $T_{i,\bar{n}}$ are fixed. Therefore, under the welfare distribution of $w_{i,\bar{n}}$ and applying the price constraint I, the agent i 's sole initial allocation of GHG emission permits is

$$\bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}} = \frac{w_{i,\bar{n}} + d_i(S^*) - u_i(s_i^*) - T_{i,\bar{n}} \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i^* - \bar{S}_{\bar{n}})}{t_{\bar{n}}} + s_i^* \quad (F.14)$$

In addition, the total amount of initial pollution emission permits for all agents is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I [w_{i,\bar{n}} + d_i(S^*) - u_i(s_i^*)]}{t_{\bar{n}}} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I [t_{\bar{n}} \cdot s_i^* - T_{i,\bar{n}} \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i^* - \bar{S}_{\bar{n}})]}{t_{\bar{n}}} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I [t_{\bar{n}} \cdot s_i^* - T_{i,\bar{n}} \cdot (\sum_{i=1}^I s_i^* - \bar{S}_{\bar{n}})]}{t_{\bar{n}}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I (t_{\bar{n}} \cdot \bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}})}{t_{\bar{n}}} = \bar{S}_{\bar{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (F.15)$$

Thus, (F.14) describes the agent i 's sole initial allocation of pollution emission permits under the welfare distribution of $L_{i,\bar{n}}$ and applying the price constraint I. That is **Pareto optimal total welfare distribution in any agent can be realized by applying the price constraint I on the basis of a specific initial pollution emission permits distribution scheme.**

In addition, according to (F.9), we have

$$\frac{\partial w_{i,\bar{n}}}{\partial \bar{s}_{i,\bar{n}}} = t_{\bar{n}} - T_{i,\bar{n}} = \sum_{\bar{i} \neq i}^I (\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S_i}) > 0 \quad (F.16)$$

$$\frac{\partial w_{i,\bar{n}}}{\partial \bar{S}_{\bar{n}}} = -T_{i,\bar{n}} = -\frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S} < 0 \quad (F.17)$$

That is **the welfare of each agent is directly proportional to the number of initial pollution emission permits it has and inversely proportional to the number of pollution gas emission permits other agents have.**

■

Appendix G: Proof of Lemma 8

Supposing that under any a given initial coalition structure, saying coalition structure 1, some agents adopt cooperative strategies and then coalition structure 2 are formed. For simplicity, we assume that in coalition structure 2, coalition $j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}$ ($1\leq\bar{J}\leq J_2$) adopt non-cooperative strategies, while other coalitions adopt cooperative strategies who adopt non-cooperative strategies in coalition structure 1, i.e., there are $I_{j,2}=1$ ($j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}$) and $I_{j,2}>1$ ($j=\bar{J}+1,\bar{J}+2,\dots,J$).

Under coalition structure 2, the equilibrium conditions are

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,2}}} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_2} (\forall i_j, j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.1})$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,2}}} = \sum_{\bar{i}_j=1}^{I_j} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}_j}}{\partial S_2} (\forall i_j, j=\bar{J}+1,\bar{J}+2,\dots,J) \quad (\text{G.2})$$

Under coalition structure 1, the equilibrium conditions are

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,1}}} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} (\forall i_j, j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.3})$$

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,1}}} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} (\forall i_j, j=\bar{J}+1,\bar{J}+2,\dots,J) \quad (\text{G.4})$$

We can proof $S_1 > S_2$ by contradiction. If $S_1 > S_2$ is not true, then only $S_1 = S_2$ and $S_1 < S_2$.

Supposing $S_1 = S_2$, according to (G.1) and (G.3), we have

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,2}}} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_2} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} = \frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,1}}} (\forall i_j, j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.5})$$

Subsequently, we have

$$s_{i_{j,2}} = s_{i_{j,1}} (\forall j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.6})$$

When $S_1 = S_2$, according to (G.2) and (G.4), we have

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,2}}} = \sum_{\bar{i}_j=1}^{I_j} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}_j}}{\partial S_2} > \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} = \frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,1}}} (\forall i_j, j=\bar{J}+1,\bar{J}+2,\dots,J) \quad (\text{G.7})$$

According to hypothesis 2 and Lemma 1, then we obtain

$$s_{i_{j,2}} < s_{i_{j,1}} (\forall i_j, j=\bar{J}+1,\bar{J}+2,\dots,J) \quad (\text{G.8})$$

By (G.6) and (G.8), we have

$$S_2 = S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{J}} \sum_{i_j=1}^{I_j} s_{i_{j,2}} > S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{J}} \sum_{i_j=1}^{I_j} s_{i_{j,1}} = S_1 \quad (\text{G.9})$$

(G.9) and $S_1 = S_2$ contradict each other, so $S_1 = S_2$ is not true.

Supposing $S_1 < S_2$, according to (G.1) and (G.3), we have

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,2}}} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_2} > \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} = \frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_{j,1}}} (\forall i_j, j=1,2,\dots,\bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.10})$$

Subsequently, we have

$$s_{i_j,2} < s_{i_j,1} (\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.11})$$

When $S_1 < S_2$, according to (G.2) and (G.4), we have

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_j,2}} = \sum_{\bar{j}=1}^{I_j} \frac{\partial d_{\bar{j}}}{\partial S_2} > \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} = \frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_j,1}} (\forall i_j, j = \bar{J}+1, \bar{J}+2, \dots, J) \quad (\text{G.12})$$

According to hypothesis 2 and Lemma 1, then we obtain

$$s_{i_j,2} < s_{i_j,1} (\forall i_j, j = \bar{J}+1, \bar{J}+2, \dots, J) \quad (\text{G.13})$$

By (G.11) and (G.13), we have

$$S_2 = S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i_j=1}^{I_j} s_{i_j,2} < S_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{i_j=1}^{I_j} s_{i_j,1} = S_1 \quad (\text{G.14})$$

(G.14) and $S_1 < S_2$ contradict each other, so $S_1 < S_2$ is not true. In conclusion, we have

$$S_1 > S_2 \quad (\text{G.15})$$

According to (G.15), we infer

$$\frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_j,2}} = \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_2} < \frac{\partial d_{i_j}}{\partial S_1} = \frac{\partial u_{i_j}}{\partial s_{i_j,1}} (\forall i_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.16})$$

Subsequently, we have

$$s_{i_j,2} > s_{i_j,1} (\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{J}) \quad (\text{G.17})$$

According to (G.15) and (G.17), we infer

$$\sum_{j=\bar{J}+1}^J \sum_{i_j=1}^{I_j} s_{i_j,2} < \sum_{j=\bar{J}+1}^J \sum_{i_j=1}^{I_j} s_{i_j,1} \quad (\text{G.18})$$

By (G.17) and (G.18), we prove that **Under any initial coalition structure, if some agents adopt cooperative strategies, the total Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will be reduced, and for agents that adopt non-cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will increase, while for agents that adopt cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will decrease.**

According to (G.17) and $u' > 0$, for agents $i_j (j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{J})$ who adopt non-cooperative strategy, there are

$$u_{i_j}(s_{i_j,2}) > u_{i_j}(s_{i_j,1}) \quad (\text{G.19})$$

According to (G.15) and $d' > 0$, for agents $i_j (j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{J})$ who adopt non-cooperative strategy, there are

$$d_{i_j}(S_2) < d_{i_j}(S_1) \quad (\text{G.20})$$

By (G.19) and (G.20), for agents $i_j (j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{J})$ who adopt non-cooperative strategy, there are

$$u_{i_j}(s_{i_j,2}) - d_{i_j}(S_2) > u_{i_j}(s_{i_j,1}) - d_{i_j}(S_1) \quad (\text{G.21})$$

It means that **for agents that adopt non-cooperative strategy, their Nash equilibrium pollution emissions will increase.**

According to (G.15) and $d' > 0$, for agents $(\forall i_j, j = \bar{J}+1, \bar{J}+2, \dots, J)$ who adopt cooperative strategy, there are

$$D_j(S_2) < D_j(S_1) \quad (\text{G.22})$$

But according to (G.18) and $u' > 0$, for agents $(\forall i_j, j = \bar{J}+1, \bar{J}+2, \dots, J)$ who adopt cooperative strategy, we don't know what the relationship is between $\sum_{j=\bar{J}+1}^J U_j(S_{j,2})$ and $\sum_{j=\bar{J}+1}^J U_j(S_{j,1})$, and then we also don't know what the relationship is between $\sum_{j=\bar{J}+1}^J [U_j(S_{j,2}) - D_j(S_2)]$ and $\sum_{j=\bar{J}+1}^J [U_j(S_{j,1}) - D_j(S_1)]$. It means that **for agents that adopt cooperative strategy, their welfare change is ambiguous. ■**

Appendix H: Proof of Lemma 9

\tilde{s}_i denotes Nash equilibrium pollution emissions of agent i . Set $\bar{s}_i = \tilde{s}_i$.

If the price constraint I is not implemented, the welfare of agent i is

$$u_i(\tilde{s}_i) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}}) \quad (\text{H.1})$$

S^* denotes Pareto optimal pollution stock, while. Substituting S^* into Eq. (9) and (10), we obtain the price required to implement the price constraint I:

$$t^* = \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \left(\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S^*} \right) \quad (\text{H.2})$$

$$T_i^* = \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S^*} \quad (\text{H.3})$$

Under such an environmental policy, the equilibrium pollution emissions of agent i is s_i^* , and its welfare is as follows:

$$u_i(s_i^*) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}^*) + T_i^* \cdot \left(\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}^* - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}} \right) + t^* \cdot (\tilde{s}_i - s_i^*) \quad (\text{H.4})$$

Let

$$f_i(s_1, \dots, s_I) = u_i(s_i) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}) + T_i^* \cdot \left(\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}} - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}} \right) + t^* \cdot (\tilde{s}_i - s_i) \quad (\text{H.5})$$

The partial derivative of $f_i(s_1, \dots, s_I)$ with respect to $s_{\bar{i}}$ ($\bar{i} \neq i$) is

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial s_{\bar{i}}} = T_i^* - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}) = \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S^*} - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}) \quad (\text{H.6})$$

Because of $d'' > 0$, within the scope of $S^* = S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}^* \leq S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}$, there is

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial s_{\bar{i}}} < 0 \quad (\text{H.7})$$

The partial derivative of $f_i(s_1, \dots, s_I)$ with respect to s_i is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial s_i} &= u'_i(s_i) - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}) + T_i^* - t^* = u'_i(s_i) - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}) - \sum_{\bar{i}=1, \bar{i} \neq i}^I (d'_i(S^*)) \\ &= u'_i(s_i) - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}) - (u'_i(s_i^*) - d'_i(S^*)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.8})$$

$$= u'_i(s_i) - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1, \bar{i} \neq i}^I s_{\bar{i}}^* + s_i) - (u'_i(s_i^*) - d'_i(S^*)) + d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1, \bar{i} \neq i}^I s_{\bar{i}}^* + s_i) - d'_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}})$$

Because of $u'' < 0$, $d'' > 0$ and $u'' - d'' < 0$, within the scope of $s_{\bar{i}}^* \leq s_{\bar{i}}$, there are

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial s_i} < 0 \quad (\text{H.9})$$

Substituting \tilde{s}_i and \tilde{s}_{-i} into (H.5), we obtain

$$f_i(\tilde{s}_i, \tilde{s}_{-i}) = u_i(\tilde{s}_i) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^J \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}}) \quad (\text{H.10})$$

Substituting s_i^* and s_{-i}^* into (H.5), we obtain

$$f_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^*) = u_i(s_i^*) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^I s_i^*) + T_i^* \cdot (\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}^* - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}}) + t^* \cdot (\tilde{s}_i - s_i^*) \quad (\text{H.11})$$

According to Lemma 8, we have

$$\tilde{s}_i \leq s_i^* \quad (\text{H.12})$$

then, we have

$$f_i(\tilde{s}_i, \tilde{s}_{-i}) \leq f_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^*) \quad (\text{H.13})$$

i.e.

$$u_i(\tilde{s}_i) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}}) \leq u_i(s_i^*) - d_i(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^I s_i^*) + T_i^* \cdot (\sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I s_{\bar{i}}^* - \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i}}) + t^* \cdot (\tilde{s}_i - s_i^*) \quad (\text{H.14})$$

That is Pareto optimum of pollution control will eventually be achieved and the welfare of each agent will improve. ■

Appendix I : Proof of Lemma 10

Any arbitrarily chosen partially cooperative coalition structure, say coalition structure 1 $P_1 = \{C_{1,1}, C_{2,1}, \dots, C_{J,1}\}$, and the equilibrium amount of pollution emitted by agent i under P_1 are $\tilde{s}_{i,1}$. $C_{\bar{j},1}$ denotes a coalition with more than one member in P_1 , i.e., $I_{\bar{j},1} > 1$. If at least one member of $C_{\bar{j},1}$ adopts the non-cooperative strategy, resulting in the decomposition of P_1 and the formation of coalition structure 2 P_2 , then the total equilibrium amount of pollution emitted by agent i under P_2 are $\tilde{s}_{i,2}$. As mentioned above, under the structure of incomplete cooperative coalition, the Nash equilibrium pollution emissions of each agent can naturally form an allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent. If the Nash equilibrium emission of P_1 is chosen as allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent, then the amount of initial pollution emission permits obtained by $C_{\bar{j},1}$ is equal to the equilibrium amount of pollution emitted by $C_{\bar{j},1}$ under P_1 , i.e., $\tilde{S}_{\bar{j},1} = \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},1}} \tilde{s}_{i,1}$. If the Nash equilibrium emission of P_2 is chosen as allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent, then the amount of initial pollution emission permits obtained by $C_{\bar{j},1}$ is equal to the equilibrium amount of pollution emitted by $C_{\bar{j},1}$ under P_2 , i.e., $\tilde{S}_{\bar{j},2} = \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},1}} \tilde{s}_{i,2}$. According to Lemma 9,

we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,1} = \bar{S}_1 = \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i},1} < \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \tilde{s}_{\bar{i},2} = \bar{S}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,2} \quad (\text{I.1})$$

$$\bar{S}_{\bar{j},1} = \tilde{S}_{\bar{j},1} < \tilde{S}_{\bar{j},2} = \bar{S}_{\bar{j},2} \quad (\text{I.2})$$

$$\sum_{i=1, i \notin C_{\bar{j},1}}^I \bar{s}_{i,2} = \sum_{i=1, i \notin C_{\bar{j},1}}^I \tilde{s}_{i,2} < \sum_{i=1, i \notin C_{\bar{j},1}}^I \tilde{s}_{i,1} = \sum_{i=1, i \notin C_{\bar{j},1}}^I \bar{s}_{i,1} \quad (\text{I.3})$$

When the Nash equilibrium emission of P_1 is chosen as allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent, the total welfare of all members in $C_{\bar{j},1}$ can be described as follows

$$W_{\bar{j},1} = \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},1}} u_{i_{\bar{j},1}} - \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},1}} d_{i_{\bar{j},1}} + T_{i,1} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,1} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,1} \right) + t_1 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},1}} \bar{s}_{i_{\bar{j},1}} - \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},1}} s_{i_{\bar{j},1}} \right) \quad (\text{I.4})$$

When the Nash equilibrium emission of P_2 is chosen as allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent, the total welfare of all members in $C_{\bar{j},1}$ can be described as follows

$$W_{\bar{j},2} = \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},2}} u_{i_{\bar{j},2}} - \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},2}} d_{i_{\bar{j},2}} + T_{i,2} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I s_{i,2} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,2} \right) + t_2 \cdot \left(\sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},2}} \bar{s}_{i_{\bar{j},2}} - \sum_{i \in C_{\bar{j},2}} s_{i_{\bar{j},2}} \right) \quad (\text{I.5})$$

S^* and s_i^* denote pollution stock and the equilibrium emissions of agent i under the Pareto optimum, respectively. Substituting S^* and s_i^* into (9) and (10), we have

$$t_1 = \sum_{\bar{i}=1}^I \left(\frac{\partial d_{\bar{i}}}{\partial S^*} \right) = t_2 \quad (\text{I.6})$$

$$T_{i,1} = \frac{\partial d_i}{\partial S^*} = T_{i,2} \quad (\text{I.7})$$

According to Lemma 5, (I.6) and (I.7) can make market equilibrium to achieve Pareto optimum. Then, we have

$$s_{i,1} = s_i^* \quad (\text{I.8})$$

$$s_{i,2} = s_i^* \quad (\text{I.9})$$

By (I.1)- (I.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\bar{j},1} - W_{\bar{j},2} &= T_{i,1} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,2} - \sum_{i=1}^I \bar{s}_{i,1} \right) + t_1 \cdot (\bar{S}_{\bar{j},1} - \bar{S}_{\bar{j},2}) \\ &= T_{i,1} \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1, i \notin C_{\bar{j},1}}^I \bar{s}_{i,2} - \sum_{i=1, i \in C_{\bar{j},1}}^I \bar{s}_{i,1} \right) + (t_1 - T_{i,1}) \cdot (\bar{S}_{\bar{j},1} - \bar{S}_{\bar{j},2}) < 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.10})$$

As a welfare maximize, compared to P_1 , all members in $C_{\bar{j},1}$ will prefer the Nash equilibrium emission of P_2 chosen as allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent. Therefore, at last, only the Nash equilibrium emission of totally uncooperative coalition structure chosen as allocation scheme of initial pollution emission permits of each agent is the equilibrium choice of each agent, i.e., **only w-IPA welfare distribution can be the equilibrium of the game with public externalities.**

■

References

- [1] P. Chander, Subgame-perfect cooperative agreements in a dynamic game of climate change, *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.*, 84 (2017) 173-188.
- [2] W. J. Baumol, W. E. Oates, *The theory of environmental policy*, second ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [3] P. Chander, H. Tulkens, The core of an economy with multilateral environmental externalities, *Int. J. Game Theory*, 26 (3) (1997) 379-401.
- [4] P. Chander, M. Wooders, Subgame perfect cooperation in an extensive game, Vanderbilt Working Paper, (2010) No. 10-W08.
- [5] J. F. Nash, Two person cooperative games, *Econometrica*, 21 (1953) 128-140.
- [6] R. Serrano, Fifty years of the Nash program, 1953-2003, *Investigaciones Economicas*, 29 (2005) 219-258.
- [7] J. F. Nash, The bargaining problem, *Econometrica* 18 (1950) 155-162.
- [8] A. Okada, A noncooperative coalitional bargaining game with random proposers, *Games Econ. Behav.* 16 (1) (1996) 97-108.
- [9] A. Okada, Non-cooperative bargaining and the incomplete information core, *J. Econ. Theory* 147 (3) (2012) 1165-1190.
- [10] A. Rubinstein, Perfect equilibrium in a bargaining model, *Econometrica* 50 (1982) 97-100.
- [11] J. P. Conley, S. Wilkie, An extension of the nash bargaining solution to nonconvex problems, *Games Econ. Behav.* 13 (1) (1996) 26-38.
- [12] L. S. Shapley, A value for n-person games, in: A.W. Tucker and R.D. Luce (eds.), *Contributions to the Theory of Games IV*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1953, pp. 307-317.
- [13] D. B. Gillies, Solutions to general non-zero-sum games, in: A.W. Tucker and R.D. Luce (eds.), *Contributions to the Theory of Games IV*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1959, 47-85.
- [14] R. Serrano, Nash program, in: Steven N. Durlauf and Lawrence Blume (eds.), *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics (2nd Edition)*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2008.
- [15] P. V. Lekeas, G. Stamatopoulos, Cooperative oligopoly games with boundedly rational firms, *Ann. Oper. Res.* 223(1) (2014) 255-272.
- [16] R. Aumann, Acceptable points in general cooperative n-person games, in: Tucker, Luce (eds.), *Contributions to the theory of games IV*, *Annals of Mathematics Studies* 40, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1959.
- [17] C. Y. Huang, T. Sjöström, Consistent solutions for cooperative games with externalities, *Games Econ. Behav.* 43 (2003) 196-213.
- [18] L. Kóczy, A recursive core for partition function form games. *Theory Decis.* 63 (2007) 41-51.
- [19] P. Chander, The gamma-core and coalition formation, *Int J. Game Theory* 35 (4) (2007) 539-556.
- [20] E. Maskin, Bargaining, coalitions and externalities, Presidential Address to the Econometric Society, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 2003.
- [21] G. De Clippel, R. Serrano (2008). Marginal contributions and externalities in the value. *Econometrica* 76 (6) (2008) 1413-1436.
- [22] R. Serrano, A market to implement the core, *J. Econ. Theory* 67 (1) (1995) 285-294.