

Participation Incentives in Online Cooperative Games

Haris Aziz¹, Yuhang Guo¹, and Zhaohong Sun^{2,3}

¹University of New South Wales

²Kyushu University

³CyberAgent

Abstract

This paper studies cooperative games where coalitions are formed online and the value generated by the grand coalition must be irrevocably distributed among the players at each timestep. We investigate the fundamental issue of strategic participation incentives and address these concerns by formalizing natural participation incentive axioms. Our analysis reveals that existing value-sharing mechanisms fail to meet these criteria. Consequently, we propose several new mechanisms that not only fulfill these desirable participation incentive axioms but also satisfy the early arrival incentive for general valuation functions. Additionally, we refine our mechanisms under superadditive valuations to ensure individual rationality while preserving the previously established axioms.

1 Introduction

In cooperative games, players often share common interests in achieving a specific goal. A key objective is to determine how to fairly allocate the overall value to each participant, ensuring that all players identify and establish common sense for the cooperation. Canonical cooperative games focus on how to distribute the value after the grand coalition has formed (see, e.g., [9, 14, 30]). However, in practice, players may join the coalition sequentially, and the value generated needs to be distributed irrevocably before the grand coalition is fully formed. For example, individuals with different roles might join a startup to contribute and collectively generate greater value. It is often impractical for all participants to join simultaneously and wait until everyone has arrived before sharing the value, and sometimes it is unclear whether everyone has joined. Some of these concerns were anticipated in the foundational work of game theory by von Neumann and Morgenstern [36]. Therefore, the game is more accurately modeled as an online scenario, where each newly arriving player contributes new value, which is then distributed among the players who have already arrived based on the current coalition.

A formal model for online cooperative games was first formally proposed by Ge *et al.* [21]. They consider a range of axioms, including incentives for existing players not to leave, incentives for players to join the coalition as early as possible, and a fair value-sharing property called *Shapley-Fairness*. They demonstrate that the classical Shapley value, when applied to the online setting, has a fundamental flaw: a player may have an incentive to leave the coalition as its total reward decreases over time. To deal with it, they consider a simple rule called *Distributing Marginal Contribution (DMC)*, where the new player receives all the marginal value created. However, the DMC rule has a serious limitation as well: players may have an incentive to join later rather earlier.

To address these issues, they propose a new mechanism called the *Rewarding First Critical Player (RFC)* rule, which rewards the first player who is critical in a specific sense.

In this paper, we highlight that the rules devised for the new setting of online cooperative games have significant drawbacks concerning various participation incentive axioms. One major aspect that has been overlooked in previous works is providing incentives for players to participate. Notice that for the RFC rule, if a new player or stakeholder joins the coalition and provides a marginal contribution but receives no benefit after her arrival, it could discourage players from participating. We capture this participation incentive and formalize it as an axiom called "*Incentive for Participation*" (PART): for each new joining player, if she creates some new marginal value for the current grand coalition, then she must gain positive instant benefit. The second property we look into is called "*Strong Incentive to STAY*" (S-STAY). S-STAY refines the online individual rationality axiom proposed by Ge *et al.* [21] which requires that each player's shared value is non-decreasing. The intuition is that for players who have already joined, if they create new marginal value with new arriving player, jointly, they should also share some value from the new created value. The third aspect is a classical participation incentive axiom known as *Individual Rationality* (IR). According to IR, if a new player joins the coalition but cannot secure a share of the value greater than what she could achieve on her own, she may be discouraged from participating in the coalition. Some other concepts regarding fairness of value-sharing are discussed in this paper later as well. The example below illustrates some of our concerns which motivates the design of new rules.

"Three students, Alice, Bob, and Carl, are eager to form a team to tackle a project. The journey begins with Alice, who initiates the work and creates an initial value of 1. Soon after, Bob joins the effort, and together they elevate the project's worth to 3. Finally, Carl comes on board, and the trio collectively completes the project, achieving a total value of 5. Individually, each student can generate a value of 1, while any pair working together can produce a value of 3. As new members join, it's crucial to allocate the total current value in real-time. This ensures that every team member stays fully motivated and is encouraged to join the project as early as possible."

To meet the individual rationality criterion, each student should receive a reward of at least 1. For the participation axiom in an online setting, each student must be rewarded immediately upon joining to encourage their participation. Notably, Alice contributes to the new marginal value both when Bob arrives and when Carl arrives. To provide a strong incentive for Alice to stay in the coalition, the value that Alice receives should be strictly increasing. From the lecturer's perspective, who wants three students to complete the project as soon as possible, the value-sharing rule should also incentivize them to join as early as possible. In this paper, we examine the following questions.

For the online cooperative game setting, what are the key participation incentive properties? How do the existing rules fare with respect to these properties? Can we design new rules that perform even better with respect to participation properties?

Our Contribution In this paper, we study various participation incentives in online cooperative games. We first propose new incentive axioms specifically for this setting, which represent our primary conceptual contribution. We then demonstrate the limitations of existing value-sharing rules, which fail to incentivize participation and do not satisfy many of the axioms we identify. This motivates us to devise value-sharing rules that fulfill all the participation incentives. Notably, key existing rules fail to meet the early arrival property. In contrast, our newly proposed rules satisfy the early arrival property for games with general valuations.

We further investigate the impossibility of achieving individual rationality in games with general valuations and modify our newly proposed rules to satisfy individual rationality in online coopera-

tive games with superadditive valuations. Additionally, our modified rules retain all the properties of the original rules for general valuation games.

Table 1 summarizes all the existing rules and our newly proposed rules with regard to their satisfaction of the various axioms. It demonstrates that our new rules offer a distinct advantage over existing rules in terms of key participation incentive properties.

Rules	IR	PART	EA	STAY	S-STAY	OD	SF	Poly-time
DMC	✓	✓	–	✓	–	✓	✓	✓
SV	✓	✓	✓	–	–	✓	✓	✓
eRFC	–	–	–	✓	–	✓	✓	– [†]
MES	–	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	–	✓
NDMES	–	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	– [‡]
ULMES	–	✓	–	✓	✓	✓	–	✓
eULMES	–	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	– [†]
IR-eULMES	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	–	– [†]

Table 1: Summary of results: we mark the satisfaction of all the axioms for each rule in general valuation domain, except for IR (only discussed within superadditive valuation). The rules in bold font are new rules presented in this paper. [†]: Poly-time in simple online cooperative games while [‡]: Poly-time with subadditive valuation function.

2 Related Work

Cooperative Games Cooperative game theory, originating from the last century [22, 34, 37], is a significant branch of game theory that studies scenarios where players can benefit by forming coalitions and making collective decisions. One of the key problems in this area is how to distribute the value created by coalitions among players, considering axiomatic characterizations (e.g., stability, consistency, etc.). The Shapley Value [34] initiated the research, laying the foundation for a series of subsequent works. Gillies [22] first proposed the core concept for cooperative games. In the context of transferable utility cooperative games, Shubik [35] studied market games, while Aumann and Maschler [2] investigated cooperative bargaining scenarios. Schmeidler [33] first introduced the concept of the nucleolus, and Roth and Sotomayor [32] bridged cooperative game theory with practical matching markets. There is also a line of research focusing on cooperative games with hedonic preferences [1, 3, 4, 10, 15]. Further details about classic cooperative game theory can be found in several books (see, e.g., [9, 13]).

Online cooperative games study the coalition game model in an online manner where agents arrive in a random order and the coalition formation decision should be made without any knowledge regarding the agents arriving in the future. Our paper is closely related to the work by Ge *et al.* [21], which was the first to study online cooperative games with consideration of strategic arrivals. Recently, Zhang *et al.* [38] explores the cost sharing game in the context of online strategic arrivals and propose the Shapley-fair shuffle cost sharing mechanisms. Another branch studying cooperative game in an online manner, mainly concerning on hedonic games, focuses on addressing approximation to the social welfare and stability [11, 18]. The biggest difference from the

aformentioned online cooperative game is that it typically assume that agents reveal their preferences truthfully without incentive to misreport. Further literature on dynamic mechanism design can be found in [6, 29]. With regard to cooperative games, Flammini *et al.* [18] studied the online coalition structure generation problem, while Bullinger and Romen [11] investigated online coalition formation with random arrival. An online or dynamic perspective has also been applied to matching and hedonic games (see, e.g., [8, 12, 16]).

Online Mechanism Design The online cooperative game model explored in this paper is closely related to online mechanism design, where each agent’s private information is their arrival time in the game. The primary objective is to design value-sharing rules that incentivize all agents to truthfully report their arrival times. Mechanism design in dynamic environments focuses on problems involving multiple agents with private information, where the goal is to elicit this private information while making decisions without knowledge of future events. Lavi and Nisan [26] initiated the study of truthful online auctions in dynamic environments. Later, Friedman and Parkes [19] coined the concept of online mechanism design. Some works [27, 28] discussed the state-of-the-art VCG mechanism in dynamic online settings. Online matching has also been a hot topic in dynamic algorithm design [17, 20, 24, 25]. Moreover, there is a wide literature on solutions for different sequential decision problems [7, 23, 31].

3 Preliminary

An online cooperative game (OCG) G is a triple (N, v, π) , where $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is a set of players, $v : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the valuation function mapping a subset of players to a non-negative real number, and $\pi \in \Pi(N)$ is a permutation of N representing the arrival order of all the players where $\Pi(N)$ denotes the set of all permutations. Given a subset $S \subseteq N$, S creates a coalition with value $v(S)$. In this paper, we focus on normalized and monotone general valuation function:

- *Normalized*: $v(\emptyset) = 0$;
- *Monotone*: $S \subseteq T \subseteq N, v(T) \geq v(S)$.

We then introduce several types of functions regarding the valuation set function. A valuation function $v : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *submodular* if for any S, T s.t. $S \subseteq T \subseteq N$, we have $v(S) + v(T) \geq v(S \cup T) + v(S \cap T)$; A valuation function $v : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *subadditive* if for any S, T s.t. $S \subseteq T \subseteq N$, $v(S) + v(T) \geq v(S \cup T)$; A valuation function $v : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *superadditive* if for any S, T s.t. $S \cap T = \emptyset$, $v(S) + v(T) \leq v(S \cup T)$.

Given a permutation π , for any pair of players $i, j \in N$, let $i \prec_\pi j$ denote that player i arrives earlier than player j , according to the permutation π . An *online value-sharing rule* ϕ maps the game $G = (N, v, \pi)$ to an n -tuple $\phi(G) = (\phi(G, 1), \dots, \phi(G, n))$, where $\phi(G, i)$ denotes the value assigned to agent i . For any agent $i \in N$, we assume $\phi(G, i) \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i \in N} \phi(G, i) = v(N)$.

We next introduce two significant definitions for our design of axioms and algorithms. The first definition is called “prefix sub-game”. Before introducing these concepts, we first define the prefix of any permutation $\pi = (\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(n))$. For any coalition $S = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(|S|)\} \subseteq N$, we say S is a prefix of π and denote it as $S \sqsubseteq \pi$. A prefix sub-game G^S , which is defined over a set $S \subseteq N$. Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ and a prefix $S \sqsubseteq \pi$, we define the *prefix sub-game* for the first $|S|$ arriving players as $G^S = (S, v_{|S}, \pi_{|S})$. Here, $v_{|S}$ is the valuation function for any coalition $C \subseteq S$ and $\pi_{|S} = (\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(|S|))$. For any arriving agent i , we define $N_{\pi|i} = \{\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, i\}$ as the prefix agents set (including agent i).

We then define a *Simple Online Cooperative Game* (SOCG) with a restrictive 0-1 valuation function. In an SOCG, there is a *pivotal* player such that, upon her arrival, the value of the coalition increases from 0 to 1. Given that the valuation function is monotone, the grand coalition value remains at 1 after all players have arrived, i.e., $v(N) = 1$. Formally, an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ is an SOCG if the valuation function $v(\cdot)$ satisfies: $\forall S \subseteq N, v(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $v(\emptyset) = 0, v(N) = 1$.

After the definition of games, we next revisit some existing axioms introduced by Ge *et al.* [21]. The first property is called *Incentive to Stay*.¹

Definition 1 (Incentive to Stay (STAY)). *An online value-sharing rule ϕ_G satisfies incentive for stay (STAY) if given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any two prefix sub-games $G^S = (S, v|_S, \pi|_S)$ and $G^T = (T, v|_T, \pi|_T)$, where $T \subseteq S$, and $T, S \sqsubseteq \pi$, every player $q \in T$ satisfies $\phi(G^T, q) \leq \phi(G^S, q)$.*

STAY guarantees that each player’s shared value is non-decreasing as more players arrive. This encourages the arrived players staying in the grand coalition for more rewards, which can be viewed as a participation incentive property. Next, we revisit another participation incentive axiom called *Incentive for Early Arrival* proposed by Ge *et al.* [21].

Definition 2 (Incentive for Early Arrival (EA)). *An online value-sharing rule $\phi(G)$ incentivizes early arrival (EA) if, for any two OCGs $G = (N, v, \pi)$ and $G' = (N, v, \pi')$, for each player i , it always holds $\phi(G, i) \geq \phi(G', i)$ whenever $\pi|_{N \setminus \{i\}} = \pi'|_{N \setminus \{i\}}$ and $N_{\pi|i} \subset N_{\pi'|i}$.*

For each agent in the game, the arrival time is treated as private information, and an agent may choose to delay her arrival to gain additional benefits. The axiom of EA requires that for every agent i , when fixing the arrival order of all other players, arriving as early as possible is the dominant strategy for agent i .

Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for each player $i \in N$, we define the *marginal contribution* of i to a coalition S in G as $\text{MC}(G, S, i) = v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S)$.

Definition 3 (Shapley Value [34] (SV)). *Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, each player i ’s Shapley Value is $\text{SV}(G, i) = \frac{1}{|N|!} \sum_{S \subseteq N \setminus \{i\}} |S|! \cdot (|N| - |S| - 1)! \cdot \text{MC}(G, S, i)$.*

The Shapley value assigns to each player their average marginal contribution across all possible coalitions. It ensures that players are rewarded fairly based on how much they add to the value of any coalition they join. A follow-up definition, termed *Shapley-Fairness* extends the Shapley Value in online cooperative games.

Definition 4 (Shapley-Fairness (SF)). *Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, an online value-sharing rule $\phi(G)$ satisfies Shapley-Fair (SF) if for each player $i \in N$, $\frac{1}{|N|!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(N)} \phi(G, i) = \text{SV}(G, i)$.*

Ge *et al.* [21] showed that there is no value-sharing rule satisfying STAY, EA, and SF simultaneously. Therefore, in this paper, we will forego SF with the goal of satisfying EA and STAY and other properties. Intuitively, SF implies that for any given OCG G , if all the arrival orders of the players are equally likely then the expected value (or, payoff) of any agent i is her Shapley value. This is a fairness axiom which is alternately referred to as “random arrival” (see, e.g., [5]).

¹In the original paper [21], this property is referred to as Online Individual Rationality (OIR). However, it differs from the classic notion of individual rationality. As discussed in Section 4, we revisit the axiom of individual rationality (IR) that aligns with the classic notion.

4 Desirable Participation Incentive Axioms

In this section, we introduce some new characterizations that describe players' participation incentives in online cooperative games. To illustrate these new axioms, we first introduce a notion for players who create a new positive marginal contribution upon their arrival. A similar idea has been studied by Ge *et al.* [21] which they refer to as “critical player” in the simple game with 0-1 valuation. The definition of critical player is slightly different from the definition of contributitional player, which is defined on the newly arrived player.

Definition 5 (Contributitional Player). *Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for each player i in arriving order π , if $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\})$, then player i is called a contributitional player under permutation π in G .*

Contributitional players are those whose arrival generates new positive marginal contributions. Based on this concept, we introduce new participation incentive axioms. The first is termed *Strong Incentive to Stay* (S-STAY), which refines the *STAY* axiom with a more stringent criterion.

Definition 6 (Strong Incentive to Stay (S-STAY)). *An online value-sharing rule $\phi(G)$ satisfies Strong Incentive to Stay (S-STAY) if, given any OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, it satisfies the *STAY* axiom and additionally meets the condition: for every player i , if i is a contributitional player and there exists a player $j \prec_{\pi} i$ such that $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, then for player j , $\phi(G^i, j) > \phi(G^j, j)$ ².*

Intuitively, S-STAY not only requires each player's cumulative shared value is non-decreasing, but also stipulates that if an already arrived player j contributes to the new marginal value created by an arriving contributitional player i , then player j must share a fraction of this new marginal value. S-STAY offers stronger incentives for each arriving player to remain within the grand coalition, as it enables them to potentially benefit from future cooperation with newly arriving agents.

We term the second axiom *Incentive for Participation* (PART), underlying an instant value sharing for each arriving player if the new player is a contributitional player.

Definition 7 (Incentive for Participation (PART)). *An online value-sharing rule $\phi(G)$ satisfies Incentive for Participation (PART) if, given any OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for every player i , if i is a contributitional player, then $\phi(G^i, i) > 0$.*

For an OCG G , PART depicts that for every contributitional player i in G , i gets some instant shared value after joining the coalition.

The third axiom is *Individual Rationality* (IR), consistent with the definition in classic cooperative games.

Definition 8 (Individual Rationality (IR)). *Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, an online value-sharing rule ϕ is individual rational (IR) if for each player $i \in N$, $\phi(G, i) \geq v(\{i\})$.*

Regarding fairness characterization, we introduce a concept called *Online-Dummy* (OD) to evaluate the fairness of value-sharing rules. The Online-Dummy concept is defined within each prefix sub-game G^i , where any *dummy player* in G^i shares no fraction of the marginal value $MC(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$. Consequently, Online-Dummy implies the Dummy axiom in classic cooperative games. We begin by defining what constitutes a *dummy player*.

Definition 9 (Dummy Player). *Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for player i , if $v(S \cup \{i\}) = v(S)$ for any $S \subseteq N$, then player i is a dummy player in G .*

²Whenever the prefix sub-game is clear from the context, we simplify the notation of $G^{N_{\pi|i}} = (N_{\pi|i}, v_{N_{\pi|i}}, \pi_{N_{\pi|i}})$ by $G^i = (N_{\pi|i}, v_{\pi|i}, \pi_{\pi|i})$.

Based on the definition of dummy player, the dummy axiom in classic cooperative game requires that every dummy player never obtains positive sharing value. We extend it into the Online Dummy axiom as follows.

Definition 10 (Online Dummy (OD)). *An online value-sharing rule ϕ satisfies Online-Dummy if for each prefix sub-game $G^i = (N_{|i}, v_{|i}, \pi_{|i})$, for any dummy player j in game G^i , $\phi(G^i, j) = 0$.*

In the context of fairness notions within online cooperative games, it is noteworthy that Shapley-Fairness (SF) implies the classical Dummy axiom but not the Online Dummy axiom.

Proposition 1. *SF implies Dummy axiom but not Online Dummy axiom.*

5 Limitation of Existing Rules

In this section, we revisit three existing online value-sharing rules: the Distribute Marginal Contribution (DMC) rule, the Shapley Value (SV) rule, and the extended RFC (eRFC) rule [21] and highlight their shortcomings with respect to the participation axioms.

Distribute Marginal Contribution (DMC) Rule

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$
 $\forall i \in N$, initialize $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow 0$.
 For each player i in arriving order π ,
 $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$.
Output: $\phi(G)$.

Proposition 2 (Ge et al. [21]). *DMC rule satisfies STAY and SF. It satisfies EA if and only if $v(\cdot)$ is submodular.*

The second rule is the Shapley Value (SV) Rule, which computes the Shapley value for each agent in each prefix sub-game and distribute the values among all the attending agents.

Proposition 3 (Ge et al. [21]). *SV rule satisfies EA and SF, but does not satisfy STAY.*

To overcome the disadvantages of DMC and SV rules, Ge et al. [21] proposed a novel rule called ‘Reward the First Critical Player’ (RFC) rule for SOCGs.

Reward First Critical Player (RFC) Rule

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$
 $\forall i \in N$, initialize $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow 0$;
 For each player i in arriving order π ,
 $S_i \leftarrow \{j \mid j \in N_{\pi|i}, v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})\}$;
 $j^* \leftarrow$ first arrived player in S_i ;
 $\phi(G, j^*) \leftarrow \phi(G, j^*) + \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$;
Output: $\phi(G)$.

For general valuation functions, Ge et al. [21] introduced a greedy monotone (GM) decomposition method and extended RFC rule into eRFC rule by decomposing an OCG into multiple SOCGs and summing up the results of RFC rule in decomposed SOCGs.

Proposition 4 (Ge et al. [21]). *eRFC rule satisfies STAY, SF, but does not satisfy EA in general.*

The following impossibility result is implied from the results by Ge et al. [21].

Proposition 5 (Impossibility Ge et al. [21]). *There is no value-sharing rule satisfying STAY, EA, and SF simultaneously.*

In light of the associated impossibility result, we neglect the SF axiom and instead focus on exploring how well the EA axiom and the newly proposed participation incentive axioms can be satisfied by value-sharing rules. Unfortunately, existing rules fail to meet these newly introduced participation incentive axioms, and we outline these shortcomings as follows.

Proposition 6. *eRFC rule does not satisfy PART.*

Proof. Consider the following SOCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, where $N = \{1, 2\}$, $\pi = (1, 2)$ and $v(\{1\}) = v(\{2\}) = 0$, $v(\{1, 2\}) = 1$. Firstly, player 1 arrives with no value, then player 2 arrives and the grand coalition value is 1. eRFC rule allocates the entire value 1 to player 1, who is the first arrived player and contributes to the grand coalition. However, player 2, as a contributitional player, receives zero shared value, thereby violating the PART axiom. \square

Proposition 7. *DMC, SV, and eRFC rules do not satisfy S-STAY.*

Proof. Since SV rule fails to satisfy STAY, it does not satisfy S-STAY. For DMC and eRFC rules, consider an SOCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ where $N = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\pi = (1, 2, 3)$, and $v(\{1\}) = v(\{2\}) = v(\{3\}) = v(\{1, 2\}) = v(\{1, 3\}) = v(\{2, 3\}) = 0$, $v(\{1, 2, 3\}) = 1$. DMC allocates the value 1 to player 3 because 3's arrival creates the new marginal value 1, i.e., $\phi(G, 1) = \phi(G, 2) = 0$, $\phi(G, 3) = 1$. It does not satisfy S-STAY for player 1 and 2 as they both contribute to the grand coalition after player 3's arrival, in which S-STAY requires player 1 and 2 should receive some positive value. With regard to eRFC rule, value 1 will be wholly allocated to player 1, i.e., $\phi(G, 1) = 1$, $\phi(G, 2) = \phi(G, 3) = 0$. Note that player 2, who is essential for creating the value 1, however, gets 0 in G . This violates S-STAY which requires that $\phi(G, 2) > 0$. \square

Remarkably, these three existing value-sharing rules fail to meet our newly proposed participation axioms. Moreover, they do not satisfy the EA axiom effectively: both DMC and eRFC rules fail to satisfy EA for general valuations, while SV rule's satisfaction of EA is trivial because its value-sharing is entirely independent of the arrival order. Consequently, a pressing issue is whether we can devise improved value-sharing rules that not only satisfy EA for general valuation functions but also adhere to these new participation incentive properties.

6 New Desirable Rules

In the previous section, we highlighted the failure of existing rules to satisfy the EA axiom and participation incentive axioms. Motivated by these concerns, we propose three new online value-sharing rules: Marginal Equal Share (MES) rule, Non-Dummy Marginal Equal Share (NDMES) rule, and Upward Lexicographic Marginal Equal Share (ULMES) rule, all designed to meet aforementioned axioms. Owing to space constraints, some of the proofs in this section are relegated in the appendix.

6.1 Initial Attempts: MES and NDMES

Recall that eRFC rule distributes the entire value to the first player who contributes to the new marginal value. Instead of assigning the entire value to a single player, a more intuitive approach is to equally distribute the new marginal value among all existing players. This principle underpins our first rule: Marginal Equal Share (MES) rule.

Marginal Equal Share (MES) Rule

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$
 For each player i in arriving order π ,
 Initialize $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow 0$.
 For each agent $j \in N_{\pi|i}$,
 Update $\phi(G, j) \leftarrow \phi(G, j) + \frac{1}{|N_{\pi|i}|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$.
Output: $\phi(G)$.

Theorem 1. *MES rule satisfies S-STAY, EA, and PART.*

Unlike DMC and eRFC rules, which allocate the marginal value to a single player, MES rule adopts an egalitarian approach by distributing the value equally among all members of the grand coalition. It satisfies several desirable properties, including S-STAY, EA, and PART. Please refer to the appendix for proof details.

However, MES rule fails to satisfy the fairness axiom, i.e, Online-Dummy (OD). The value assignment might be perceived unfair as some players could be the “free-riders”, i.e., some dummy players share the value as well. To deal with it, we refine MES rule into the Non-Dummy Marginal Equal Share (NDMES) rule.

Non-Dummy Marginal Equal Share (NDMES) Rule

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$
 For each player i in arriving order π ,
 Initialize $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow 0$.
 Let $D_i \leftarrow$ dummy players in G^i and $S_i \leftarrow N_{\pi|i} \setminus D_i$.
 For each player j in S_i :
 $\phi(G, j) \leftarrow \phi(G, j) + \frac{1}{|S_i|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$.
Output: $\phi(G)$.

Theorem 2. *NDMES satisfies S-STAY, EA, PART, and OD.*

By identifying all the dummy players in each prefix sub-game and equally sharing the value among non-dummy players, NDMES satisfies OD axiom and maintains all other properties: S-STAY, EA, and PART.

The primary challenge of NDMES lies in the computation: identifying all the dummy players in each sub-game takes exponential time. However, for the subadditive valuation functions, we show that NDMES is polynomial-time computable.

Proposition 8. *Given an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, if the valuation function $v(\cdot)$ is subadditive, NDMES runs in poly-nominal time.*

Proof. To identify all the dummy players in each prefix sub-game G^i , for every player $j \in N_{\pi|i}$, it is necessary to check every subset $S \subseteq N_{\pi|i}$ whether $v(S \cup \{j\}) = v(S)$. When the valuation function is subadditive, we show j is a dummy player in G^i *if and only if* $v(\{j\}) = 0$.

(\implies) Since $v(\cdot)$ is subadditive, for any subset S , $v(S \cup \{j\}) \leq v(S) + v(\{j\}) = v(S)$. As $v(\cdot)$ is monotone, it means $v(S \cup \{j\}) \geq v(S)$. Therefore, $v(S \cup \{j\}) = v(S)$ for any subset S , i.e., j is a dummy player.

(\impliedby) Assume j is a dummy player, taking $S = \emptyset$, we have $v(\{i\}) = v(\emptyset) = 0$.

So, the computation of dummy players in each sub-game G^i is solvable in polynomial time as we only need to check whether $v(\{j\}) = 0$ for every $j \in N_{\pi|i}$. \square

6.2 Desirable Rules: ULMES and eULMES

In light of the computational challenges associated with NDMES rule, we devise a polynomial-time computable value-sharing rule, which we term it ‘‘Upward Lexicographic Marginal Equal Share’’ (ULMES) rule.

Upward Lexicographic Marginal Equal Share (ULMES) Rule

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$

For each player i in arriving order π :

Initialize $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow 0$, $S_i \leftarrow N_{\pi|i}$, $\ell \leftarrow |S_i|$.

While $\ell > 0$

If $v(S_i \setminus \{\pi(\ell)\} \cup \{i\}) = v(N_{\pi|i})$:

Update $S_i \leftarrow S_i \setminus \{\pi(\ell)\}$

$\ell \leftarrow \ell - 1$

For $j \in S_i$,

$\phi(G, j) \leftarrow \phi(G, j) + \frac{1}{|S_i|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$.

Output: $\phi(G)$.

For a prefix sub-game G^i , rather than distributing the value among all non-dummy players as in NDMES rule, ULMES allocates the value only to those non-dummy players who contribute to the new marginal value created by the newly arriving player.

ULMES determines a set of non-dummy players S_i to share the marginal value as follows: Initialize S_i to be $N_{\pi|i}$. Check all agents in $N_{\pi|i}$ in an upward lexicographic order. Starting from player i (i.e., $\pi(\ell)$), for player $\pi(\ell)$, if the coalition $S_i \setminus \{\pi(\ell)\} \cup \{i\}$ provides the same value as the grand coalition $N_{\pi|i}$, then agent $\pi(\ell)$ is considered dispensible for creating the marginal value and player $\pi(\ell)$ is removed from S_i . Repeat this procedure with $\ell \leftarrow \ell - 1$ until the list is exhausted. Intuitively, when player i arrives, there can be multiple coalitions can provide the same marginal value and ULMES selects **the player set S_i such that the last arriving player is the earliest** among all such coalitions providing the same marginal value in G^i . ULMES is polynomial-time computable as the computation of S_i is in polynomial time. Also, it satisfies axioms including S-STAY, PART and OD in general.

Theorem 3. *ULMES satisfies S-STAY, PART, and OD.*

Unfortunately, ULMES does not satisfy EA in general. The following proposition explains why it fails to meet the EA criterion with general valuation functions.

Proposition 9. *ULMES does not satisfy EA in general.*

Proof. In the following example, ULMES fails to satisfy EA, $G_1 = (N, v, \pi_1)$, $N = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\pi = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $G_2 = (N, v, \pi_2)$ where $\pi_2 = (1, 2, 4, 3)$. The coalition valuations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} v(\{1\}) &= v(\{2\}) = v(\{3\}) = v(\{4\}) = 0; \\ v(\{1, 2\}) &= v(\{1, 4\}) = v(\{2, 4\}) = v(\{1, 2, 4\}) = 0; \\ 0 &\leq v(\{1, 3\}) \leq v(\{2, 3\}) < v(\{1, 2, 3\}) = x \ (x > 0); \\ v(\{3, 4\}) &= v(\{1, 3, 4\}) = v(\{2, 3, 4\}) = v(\{1, 2, 3, 4\}) = y; \end{aligned}$$

Let $y > x$, now we focus on the valued shared by player 3 in G_1 and G_2 . For G_1 , when player 3 arrives, player 1, 2, 3 share x equally, $\phi(G_1, 3) = \frac{x}{3}$, when player 4 comes, the new marginal value $y - x$ is shared by 3 and 4: $\phi(G_1, 3) = \frac{x}{3} + \frac{y-x}{2}$. However, in G_2 , when 3 delays her arrival, 1, 2, 4 share no value as $v(\{1, 2, 4\}) = 0$. When 3 arrives in π_2 , the value y is only shared by 3 and 4, in which $\phi(G_2, 3) = \frac{y}{2}$. In this case, $\phi(G_2, 3) = \frac{y}{2} > (\frac{x}{3} + \frac{y-x}{2}) = \phi(G_1, 3)$. ULMES fails to satisfy EA. \square

Intuitively, ULMES fails to satisfy EA in general because a player might choose to delay their arrival to become a contributitional player who shares a larger marginal value with fewer players. Although this player might forfeit some shared value from previous timesteps, the potential gain from the new marginal value can outweigh the losses, thereby undermining the EA property.

Although ULMES fails to satisfy the EA property in general, we next show that it adheres to the EA axiom within every simple online cooperative games (SOCG).

Lemma 1. *ULMES satisfies EA for every SOCG.*

Proof. Consider an SOCG $G_1 = (N, v, \pi_1)$ where $\pi_1 = (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i, i+1, \dots, n)$. Let q denote the pivotal player in G_1 , that is, in sub-game G^q , $v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{q\}) = 0$ and $v(N_{\pi_1|q}) = 1$. Let $G_2 = (N, v, \pi_2)$, where $\pi_2 = (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j, i, \dots, n)$ represents the arriving order in which all other players' arriving orders are fixed and i delays her arrival. For i , there are three cases: $q \prec_{\pi_1} i$, $q = i$ and $i \prec_{\pi_1} q$.

Case 1: $q \prec_{\pi_1} i$. If a coalition with value 1 has formed before i 's arrival in π_1 , i shares no value in both π_1 and π_2 and $\phi(G_1, i) = \phi(G_2, i) = 0$.

Case 2: $q = i$. If i is the pivotal player in G_1 , there are two possible cases if i delays her arrival.

(a). i loses her pivotal role in π_2 , i.e., some player in $\{i+1, i+2, \dots, j\}$ becomes the pivotal player. Then, $\phi(G_1, i) > \phi(G_2, i) = 0$. Player i has no incentive to delay.

(b). i remains to be pivotal in π_2 . Let S_i^1 be the player set sharing value 1 in G_1 . When i delays in π_2 , there will be no change of $S_i^1 \setminus \{i\}$ which creates the new marginal value along with i . Thus, ULMES will eliminate all the players in $\{i+1, \dots, j\}$ (because of the existence of $S_i^1 \setminus \{i\}$) in G_2 . Hence, players in S_i^1 still share the value 1 in G_2 . Player i receives the same value in G_1 and G_2 . Therefore, i has no incentive to delay in case 2.

Case 3: $i \prec_{\pi_1} q$ Denote S_q^1 as the set of players among whom the value 1 is shared. There are two possible cases.

(a). $i \notin S_q^1$, i.e., $\phi(G_1, i) = 0$. $i \notin S_q^1$ is either because there exists no coalition including i along with q creating value 1 or because i is in some coalition creating value 1 with q , however, eliminated by ULMES rule. In the former case, **i)** i delays between $i+1$ and q , there is still no coalition including i can creating value 1 with q ; **ii)** i delays after q 's arrival, which makes no change for the value sharing as i 's delay does not influence S_q^1 ; For the latter case, it implies that among players $\{1, 2, \dots, i, \dots, q-1\}$, there are multiple coalitions with q creating value 1 and i is in one of these coalitions, denoting it by \bar{S}_q^1 . However, \bar{S}_q^1 is eliminated because of the existence of S_q^1 . Since $i \notin S_q^1$, i 's any delay strategy in π_2 has no effect on S_q^1 , keeping $\phi(G_2, i) = \phi(G_1, i) = 0$.

(b). $i \in S_q^1$, i.e., $\phi(G_1, i) = \frac{1}{|S_q^1|}$. There are two different situations: **i)** S_q^1 is the unique coalition creating value 1 in G^q . If i delays between $i + 1$ and q , it does not change value sharing in π_2 and $\phi(G_2, i) = \phi(G_1, i) = \frac{1}{|S_q^1|}$; If i delays the arrival after q , one case is some players in π_2 between q and i , along with some players in $\{1, 2, \dots, i - 1, i + 1, \dots, q\}$ construct a coalition with value 1, then $\phi(G_2, i) = 0$; the other case is that after i 's delay, i becomes the pivotal player. However, i will still share the value in S_q^1 as all the other such coalitions creating value 1 will be eliminated by ULMES because of the existence of S_q^1 . Therefore, $\phi(G_2, i) = \phi(G_1, i) = \frac{1}{|S_q^1|}$. **ii)** there are multiple coalitions including some players in $\{1, 2, \dots, q - 1\}$ creating value 1 with q and S_q^1 is the coalition survives in ULMES rule. If i delays her arrival between $i + 1$ and q , it could be either S_q^1 is still the coalition to share the value ($\phi(G_2, i) = \phi(G_1, i) = \frac{1}{|S_q^1|}$) or because of i 's delay, S_q^1 get eliminated in ULMES rule, making some other coalition survives ($\phi(G_1, i) > \phi(G_2, i) = 0$); If i delays her arrival after q , $\phi(G_2, i) = 0$ as there exists some other coalition creating and sharing the value 1. \square

As previously mentioned, the greedy monotone (GM) decomposition method proposed by Ge *et al.* [21] extends RFC to eRFC without compromising axiomatic satisfaction. By leveraging the GM decomposition, we extend our ULMES to a new rule called eULMES. Details of the GM decomposition are provided in the appendix

extended ULMES (eULMES) Rule

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$
 $\forall i \in N$, initialize $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow 0$.
Decomposition $D(G) \leftarrow \text{GM Decomposition}(G)$.
For each component (c, \bar{G}) in $D(G)$:
 $(\phi(\bar{G}, 1), \dots, \phi(\bar{G}, n)) \leftarrow \text{ULMES}(\bar{G})$
 For each player $i \in N$:
 $\phi(G, i) \leftarrow \phi(G, i) + c \cdot \phi(\bar{G}, i)$.
Output: $\phi(G)$.

GM decomposition method takes the OCG G as input and outputs a linear combination of component, denoted as $D(G)$. For each component $\{(c, \bar{G})\}$, c is the coefficient while \bar{G} is an SOCG. eULMES runs ULMES in each SOCG and aggregates the weighted outcomes of ULMES as the output.

Theorem 4. *eULMES satisfies S-STAY, EA, PART, and OD.*

To better compare ULMES and eULMES rules, we introduce the following example with 4 players in which ULMES rule fails to satisfy EA while eULMES rule satisfies the axiom.

Example 1 (ULMES and eULMES rules). *Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ where $N = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\pi = (1, 2, 3, 4)$. For the valuation function $v(\cdot)$, all the coalition valuation are enumerated in the first row of Table 2.*

Under the ULMES rule, during the first two timesteps, players 1 and 2 arrive but generate no value. When player 3 joins, the coalition $\{1, 2, 3\}$ generates a value of 2, and no other sub-coalition achieves this value. Consequently, the three agents share the total value equally, each receiving $\frac{2}{3}$. Upon the arrival of player 4, the grand coalition achieves a total value of 3, with a marginal contribution of 1. To determine S_4 , we start from player 4. Removing player 4 reduces the value to 2, indicating that player 4 must be included in S_4 . Similarly, player 3 must also be in S_4 since $v(\{1, 2, 4\}) = 0$. Conversely, player 1 and 2 are excluded from S_4 since $v(\{1, 3, 4\}) = v(\{3, 4\}) = 3$. Hence, the marginal contribution

Coalition	Coef	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{1,2}	{1,3}	{1,4}	{2,3}	{2,4}	{3,4}	{1,2,3}	{1,2,4}	{1,3,4}	{2,3,4}	{1,2,3,4}
Valuation		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	2	0	3	3	3
$\bar{v}_1(\cdot)$	$c_1 = 1$	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
$\bar{v}_2(\cdot)$	$c_2 = 1$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1
$\bar{v}_3(\cdot)$	$c_3 = 1$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1

Table 2: Coalition valuation and decomposition of the OCG G with 3 components $(1, \bar{G}_1), (1, \bar{G}_2), (1, \bar{G}_3)$.

value of 1 is evenly distributed between player 3 and 4, each receiving $\frac{1}{2}$. The final value distribution is $\phi(G) = (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{6}, \frac{1}{2})$. Now consider the OCG G' , where player 3 delays her arrival, changing the arriving order from $\pi = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ to $\pi' = (1, 2, 4, 3)$. In this scenario, player 3 strategically delays her arrival to ensure that she shares the entire value of 3 solely with player 4, resulting in each receiving $\frac{3}{2}$. Table 3 summarizes the outcomes of ULMES rule under G and G' , illustrating a case where ULMES rule fails to satisfy the EA axiom.

$\phi(G, i)$	1	2	3	4
$\pi = (1, 2, 3, 4)$	2/3	2/3	7/6	1/2
$\pi' = (1, 2, 4, 3)$	0	0	3/2	3/2

Table 3: ULMES rule outcome in G and G'

Regarding eULMES rule, firstly, since the GM decomposition is independent with the arriving order, OCG G and G' share the same game decomposition components shown in Table 2, i.e., decomposing G into three components $D(G) = \{(1, \bar{G}_1), (1, \bar{G}_2), (1, \bar{G}_3)\}$ with three distinct valuation functions $\bar{v}_1(\cdot), \bar{v}_2(\cdot)$, and $\bar{v}_3(\cdot)$. After the decomposition, we run ULMES rule in each decomposed component in G and G' , respectively. Taking G as the example, under the arriving order $\pi = (1, 2, 3, 4)$, for \bar{G}_1 , player 1 and 2 arrive with no value sharing, when player 3 comes, we compute $S_3 = \{1, 3\}$ since $\bar{v}_1(\{1, 3\}) = 1$, then player 1 and 3 each shares $\frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, we can compute the value distribution in \bar{G}_2 and \bar{G}_3 . The results are demonstrated in Table 4.

$\phi(G, i)$	1	2	3	4
\bar{G}_1	1/2	0	1/2	0
\bar{G}_2	1/3	1/3	1/3	0
\bar{G}_3	0	0	1/2	1/2
G	5/6	1/3	4/3	1/2

Table 4: eULMES rule outcome in G

When player 3 delays her arrival in G' , eULMES rule outputs the following results shown in Table 5. For the three components with \bar{G}_1, \bar{G}_2 , and \bar{G}_3 , we omit the coefficient for each SOCG as their coefficients are all the same 1 in this example. It is not hard to see that player 3 has no incentive to delay her arrival when we apply eULMES rule.

$\phi(G', i)$	1	2	4	3
\bar{G}'_1	1/2	0	0	1/2
\bar{G}'_2	1/3	1/3	0	1/3
\bar{G}'_3	0	0	1/2	1/2
G'	5/6	1/3	1/2	4/3

Table 5: eULMES rule outcome in G'

7 Individual Rationality and Superadditivity

In the previous sections, we explored participation incentives in terms of EA, S-STAY, and PART. Now, we turn our attention to the individual rationality (IR) axiom. The IR axiom captures the participation incentive by stipulating that a player will only join the grand coalition if the value they receive from the coalition exceeds their singleton valuation.

We first present an impossibility result regarding the satisfaction of the IR axiom in online cooperative games.

Proposition 10 (Impossibility). *There is no value sharing rule satisfying IR for OCG with general valuation.*

Proof. Consider the following example, $G = (N, v, \pi)$, $N = \{1, 2\}$, $v(\{1\}) = 2$, $v(\{2\}) = 3$, $v(\{1, 2\}) = 4$, $\pi = (1, 2)$. In order to satisfy IR, when player 1 comes, $v(\{1\}) = 2$ should be allocated to player 1, however, when player 2 joins the coalition, the largest value that can be shared by player 2 is $4 - 2 = 2 < v(\{2\})$, violating IR. \square

In view of this impossibility result, we restrict the valuation to *superadditive* domain. For an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, we say G is a superadditive OCG if the valuation function is superadditive. Next, we focus on superadditive OCGs. We begin by verifying that DMC and SV satisfy IR, while eRFC does not. We then introduce an IR refinement paradigm to modify all three new rules while preserving all other axiomatic satisfaction.

Proposition 11. *In OCGs with superadditive valuations, DMC and SV satisfy IR while eRFC does not.*

For MES, NDMES, and eULMES rules, we propose the following IR refinement paradigm to modify these rules.

IR Refinement Paradigm

Input: $G = (N, v, \pi)$, value-sharing rule ϕ
 $\forall i \in N$, initialize $\hat{\phi}(G, i) \leftarrow 0$.
For i in arriving order π :
 $\hat{\phi}(G, i) \leftarrow v(\{i\})$.
 Compute S_i by the value-sharing rule ϕ .
 For each player $j \in S_i$:
 $\hat{v}_i \leftarrow \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\})$.
 $\hat{\phi}(G, i) \leftarrow \hat{\phi}(G, i) + \frac{1}{|S_i|} \hat{v}_i$.
Output: $\hat{\phi}(G)$.

Denote the refined rules with an IR prefix, for example: from eULMES to IR-eULMES rule. This refinement ensures that the IR axiom is satisfied while preserving all other axioms, including S-STAY, EA, PART, and OD.

Theorem 5. *IR-MES, IR-NDMES, and IR-eULMES rules satisfy the IR axiom while preserving the satisfaction of all axioms held before the refinement.*

8 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose new participation incentive axioms for the emerging online cooperative games, including PART, S-STAY, and IR. We demonstrate that existing value-sharing rules fail to meet these properties and often cannot satisfy EA for general valuations. In contrast, our newly devised value-sharing rules successfully satisfy these axioms. An immediate open question is whether there exist polynomial-time sharing rules that simultaneously satisfy EA, PART, S-STAY, OD, and IR. Additionally, as with classical cooperative game theory, achieving a characterization of rules with respect to axiomatic properties remains an intriguing challenge. Exploring cost-sharing games or hedonic games in an online context could also be a promising direction for future research.

References

- [1] José Alcalde and Pablo Revilla. Researching with whom? stability and manipulation. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 40(8):869–887, 2004.
- [2] Robert J Aumann and Michael Maschler. The bargaining set for cooperative games. *Advances in game theory*, 52(1):443–476, 1964.
- [3] Haris Aziz and Florian Brandl. Existence of stability in hedonic coalition formation games. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems-Volume 2*, pages 763–770, 2012.
- [4] Haris Aziz and Rahul Savani. *Hedonic Games*, page 356–376. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [5] H. Aziz. Computation of the random arrival rule for the bankruptcy problem. *Operations Research Letters*, 41(4):499–502, 2013.
- [6] Dirk Bergemann and Juuso Välimäki. Dynamic mechanism design: An introduction. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(2):235–274, 2019.
- [7] Allan Borodin and Ran El-Yaniv. *Online computation and competitive analysis*. cambridge university press, 2005.
- [8] F. Brandt, M. Bullinger, and A. Wilczynski. Reaching individually stable coalition structures. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation*, 11(1-2):1–65, 2023.
- [9] Rodica Branzei, Dinko Dimitrov, and Stef Tijs. *Models in cooperative game theory*, volume 556. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [10] Michel Le Breton, Ignacio Ortuno-Ortin, and Shlomo Weber. Gamson’s law and hedonic games. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(1):57–67, 2008.

- [11] Martin Bullinger and René Romen. Online coalition formation under random arrival or coalition dissolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16965*, 2023.
- [12] M. Bullinger and R. Romen. Stability in online coalition formation. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference*, pages 9537–9545. AAAI Press, 2024.
- [13] Georgios Chalkiadakis, Edith Elkind, and Michael Wooldridge. *Computational aspects of cooperative game theory*. Springer Nature, 2022.
- [14] I. Curiel. *Cooperative game theory and applications*. Theory and Decision Library. Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1997.
- [15] Andreas Darmann, Edith Elkind, Sascha Kurz, Jérôme Lang, Joachim Schauer, and Gerhard Woeginger. Group activity selection problem. In *Internet and Network Economics: 8th International Workshop, WINE 2012, Liverpool, UK, December 10-12, 2012. Proceedings 8*, pages 156–169. Springer, 2012.
- [16] L. Doval. Dynamically stable matching. *Theoretical Economics*, 17(2):687–724, 2022.
- [17] Jon Feldman, Aranyak Mehta, Vahab Mirrokni, and Shan Muthukrishnan. Online stochastic matching: Beating $1-1/e$. In *2009 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 117–126. IEEE, 2009.
- [18] Michele Flammini, Gianpiero Monaco, Luca Moscardelli, Mordechai Shalom, and Shmuel Zaks. On the online coalition structure generation problem. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 72:1215–1250, 2021.
- [19] Eric J Friedman and David C Parkes. Pricing wifi at starbucks: issues in online mechanism design. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 240–241, 2003.
- [20] Buddhima Gamlath, Michael Kapralov, Andreas Maggiori, Ola Svensson, and David Wajc. Online matching with general arrivals. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 26–37. IEEE, 2019.
- [21] Yaoxin Ge, Yao Zhang, Dengji Zhao, Zhihao Gavin Tang, Hu Fu, and Pinyan Lu. Incentives for early arrival in cooperative games. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 651–659, 2024.
- [22] Donald B Gillies. Solutions to general non-zero-sum games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 4(40):47–85, 1959.
- [23] Pascal Van Hentenryck and Russell Bent. *Online stochastic combinatorial optimization*. The MIT Press, 2006.
- [24] Bala Kalyanasundaram and Kirk R Pruhs. An optimal deterministic algorithm for online b-matching. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 233(1-2):319–325, 2000.
- [25] Richard M Karp, Umesh V Vazirani, and Vijay V Vazirani. An optimal algorithm for on-line bipartite matching. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 352–358, 1990.
- [26] Ron Lavi and Noam Nisan. Competitive analysis of incentive compatible on-line auctions. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 233–241, 2000.

- [27] David C Parkes and Satinder Singh. An mdp-based approach to online mechanism design. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 16, 2003.
- [28] David C Parkes, Dimah Yanovsky, and Satinder Singh. Approximately efficient online mechanism design. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 17, 2004.
- [29] David C Parkes. *Online mechanisms*, page 411–439. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [30] B. Peleg and P. Sudhölter. *Introduction to the Theory of Cooperative Games*. 2nd edition, 2007.
- [31] Ryan Porter. Mechanism design for online real-time scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 61–70, 2004.
- [32] Alvin E Roth and Marilda Sotomayor. Two-sided matching. *Handbook of game theory with economic applications*, 1:485–541, 1992.
- [33] David Schmeidler. The nucleolus of a characteristic function game. *SIAM Journal on applied mathematics*, 17(6):1163–1170, 1969.
- [34] Lloyd S Shapley. A value for n-person games. In *Contributions to the Theory of Games II*, pages 307–317. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1953.
- [35] Martin Shubik. Edgeworth market games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 4:267–278, 1959.
- [36] J. von Neumann and O. Morgenstern. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press, 1944.
- [37] John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern. Theory of games and economic behavior: 60th anniversary commemorative edition. In *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton university press, 2007.
- [38] Junyu Zhang, Yao Zhang, Yaoxin Ge, Dengji Zhao, Hu Fu, Zhihao Gavin Tang, and Pinyan Lu. Incentives for early arrival in cost sharing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18586*, 2024.

Appendix

8.1 Omitted Proofs For Section 6

8.1.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. (S-STAY). MES rule directly satisfies STAY as each agent's sharing value is non-decreasing. For S-STAY, now consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game G^i with arriving player i and i is a contributitional player, for every player $j \in N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}$ such that $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, we have $\phi(G^j, j) = \frac{1}{|N_{\pi|j}|} \text{MC}(G^j, N_{\pi|j} \setminus \{j\}, j)$ and

$$\phi(G^i, j) = \phi(G^j, j) + \sum_{k=j+1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{|N_{\pi|k}|} \text{MC}(G^k, N_{\pi|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) + \frac{1}{|N_{\pi|i}|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i).$$

Since i is a contributitional player for G^i , i.e., $\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$, we can see $\phi(G^i, j) > \phi(G^j, j)$, implying MES rule satisfies S-STAY.

(EA). Consider any player $i \in N$ and two OCGs $G_1 = (N, v, \pi_1)$ and $G_2 = (N, v, \pi_2)$ with two different arriving orders π_1 and π_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, \mathbf{i}, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, j+1, \dots, n), \\ \pi_2 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, \mathbf{i}, j+1, \dots, n). \end{aligned}$$

In π_2 , player i delays her arrival between player j and $j+1$. Next, we show that i has no incentive to delay her arrival. For each prefix sub-game G_1^i within G_1 , the value shared by i can be represented as

$$\phi(G_1, i) = \sum_{k=i}^n \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_1|k}|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k). \quad (1)$$

In G_2 , the value shared by i can be represented as

$$\phi(G_2, i) = \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|i}|} \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i}, i) + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|k}|} \text{MC}(G_2^k, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k). \quad (2)$$

Starting from player $(j+1)$'s arrival, we know that $N_{\pi_1|q} = N_{\pi_2|q}$ for every agent $q \prec_{\pi_1} j, q \in N$. That is, for agent i , $\sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_1|k}|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) = \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|k}|} \text{MC}(G_2^k, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k)$. So the difference between $\phi(G_1, i)$ and $\phi(G_2, i)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) &= \sum_{k=i}^j \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_1|k}|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|i}|} \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|i}|} \sum_{k=i}^j \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|i}|} \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) \\ &= \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|i}|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) - \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that $N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\} = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j\} = N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}$. Therefore, $\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = v(N_{\pi_2|i}) - v(N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}) = v(N_{\pi_2|i}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) = v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\})$. After substituting the above expression,

$$\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) = \frac{1}{|N_{\pi_2|i}|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) \right) \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

The last inequality holds because of the monotonicity of valuation function. Since $N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\} = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j\}$ and $N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\} = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}$, we have $N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\} \subset N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}$, which implies $v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \geq v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\})$. Hence, MES rule satisfies EA axiom.

(PART) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for each player i in the arriving order π and the prefix sub-game G^i , if i is a contributitional player, then $\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$, implying $\phi(G^i, i) = \frac{1}{|N_{\pi|i}|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$. Hence, agent i receives a positive shared value immediately after her arrival, in accordance with the PART axiom. \square

8.1.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. **(S-STAY)** Firstly, STAY directly gets satisfied as each agent's shared value is non-decreasing under NDMES rule. For S-STAY, now consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game G^i with arriving player i and i is a contributitional player, for every player $j \in N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}$ such that $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, then j is non-dummy in the sub-game G^i , which implies that j is included in S_i and share the value $\frac{1}{|S_i|} \text{MC}(N_{\pi|i}, i) > 0$, i.e., for any j satisfying $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, we have $\phi(G^i, j) > \phi(G^j, j)$. Therefore, NDMES rule satisfies S-STAY.

(EA) Consider two OCGs $G_1 = (N, v, \pi_1)$ and $G_2 = (N, v, \pi_2)$ where π_1 and π_2

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, \mathbf{i}, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, j+1, \dots, n), \\ \pi_2 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, \mathbf{i}, j+1, \dots, n).\end{aligned}$$

According to the role of agent i under π_1 and π_2 , we consider the following four cases.

Case 1. For both π_1 and π_2 , player i 's contributes zero marginal value upon arrival. For the shared value after player $j+1$'s arrival, it is the same for this two orders. The only difference is that player i might gain some shared-value when i is not a dummy player for sub-games from G^{i+1} to G^j . Therefore, the value shared by player i in π_1 will always at least as that in π_2 .

Case 2. For π_1 , player i is a contributitional player while for π_2 , player i is not. Then, for π_1 , i will never be a dummy player in all sub-games after her arrival, thus i shares all the marginal value from i to n . However, in π_2 , player i only shares marginal value from player $j+1$ to player n .

Case 3. For both π_1 and π_2 , player i are a contributitional players. In the OCG G_1 , the value shared by player i can be represented as

$$\phi(G_1, i) = \frac{1}{|S_i^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^i, N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) + \sum_{k=i+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k). \quad (5)$$

Here S_i^1 represents the player set S_i for player i in OCG G_1 . In the OCG G_2 , the value shared by player i can be represented as

$$\phi(G_2, i) = \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^2|} \text{MC}(G_2^k, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k). \quad (6)$$

Here S_i^2 represents the player set S_i for player i in OCG G_2 . Also, after player j 's arrival, for any player $k, j \prec_{\pi_1} k$, we have $|S_k^1| = |S_k^2|$ as the prefixes $N_{\pi_1|k}$ and $N_{\pi_2|k}$ become exactly the same in π_1 and π_2 . Then, the difference between $\phi(G_1, i)$ and $\phi(G_2, i)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}& \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_i^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|i}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \right) + \sum_{k=i+1}^j \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|k}) - v(N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}) \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j-1} \setminus \{i\}) \right).\end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

For any arriving order π , by the definition of the dummy player, if a player is non-dummy in sub-game G^i , then the player is non-dummy for the later sub-games $G_j, i \prec_\pi j$, thus the number of player set sharing the value is non-decreasing with the increasing number of arrived players, i.e., $S_i \subseteq S_j, \forall i \prec_\pi j$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|S_i^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|i}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \right) + \sum_{k=i+1}^j \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|k}) - v(N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}) \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left[\sum_{k=i}^j \left(v(N_{\pi_1|k}) - v(N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}) \right) \right] = \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Another observation is that $S_j^1 = S_i^2$ as they both represent the set of non-dummy players within the player set $\{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i, i+1, \dots, j\}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\}) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The last step is from the monotone valuation function as $N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\} = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j\} \supset \{1, 2, \dots, i-1\} = N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}$ implies that $v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\}) \geq v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\})$.

Case 4. For π_1 , player i is not a contributonal player while for π_2 , player i is a contributonal player. In this case, we consider the following two scenarios. **i).** Player i arrives as a dummy player and keeps to be dummy until the player j comes (i cannot be dummy after j 's arrival as we assume i is a contributonal player in π_2). Then, the player i 's shared value in G_1 and G_2 can be represented as the

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ & = \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^j, N_{\pi_1|j}, j) + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k}, k) \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^2|} \text{MC}(G_2^k, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Still, we have $S_j^1 = S_i^2$ and player i shares the same value in all the sub-games after agent j 's arrival. Then the difference between $\phi(G_1, i)$ and $\phi(G_2, i)$ can be written as

$$\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) = \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}) \right). \quad (11)$$

Since player i is a dummy player in all sub-games before j 's arrival, we have $v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}) = v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\})$. Hence,

$$\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) = \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\}) \right) \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

ii). Player i is dummy before some player $(i+q)$'s arrival, in this case, $\phi(G_1, i)$ can be represented as

$$\phi(G_1, i) = \sum_{k=i+q}^{j-1} \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) + \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^j, N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}, j). \quad (13)$$

By leveraging the same reduction technique in Case 3,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(G_1, i) &= \sum_{k=i+q}^{j-1} \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) + \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \text{MC}(G_1^j, N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}, j) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i+q} \setminus \{i+q\}) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

Furthermore, the difference between $\phi(G_1, i)$ and $\phi(G_2, i)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i+q} \setminus \{i+q\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i+q} \setminus \{i+q\}) \right) \quad (\because |S_j^1| = |S_i^2|) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i+q} \setminus \{i, i+q\}) \right) \quad (\because i \text{ is dummy before } i+q \text{'s arrival}) \\ &\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that it still holds $S_j^1 = S_i^2$. Also, we know that $v(N_{\pi_1|i+q} \setminus \{i+q\}) = v(N_{\pi_1|i+q} \setminus \{i, i+q\})$ as player i is dummy for all the sub-games before player $(i+q)$'s arrival. We conclude that NDMES rule satisfies EA axiom based on the discussion of aforementioned four cases.

(PART) PART holds for NDMES rule as for each arriving player i , when i is a contributitional player, i.e., $\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$, i is not a dummy player and is included in the sharing set S_i . Hence, player i immediately shares $\frac{1}{|S_i|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i)$ upon her arrival.

(OD) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for every prefix sub-game G^i , NDMES rule eliminates all the dummy players in G^i , aligning directly with the definition of Online-Dummy. \square

8.1.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. **(S-STAY)** ULMES rule satisfies STAY as each player's shared value is non-decreasing. To show ULMES rule satisfies S-STAY, consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any player $j \in N$ and any prefix sub-game G^i where $j \prec_{\pi} i$, assume i is a contributitional player, if j satisfies $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, then j must be in the final S_i after the elimination process of ULMES rule. The proof is as follows. Denote S_i^j as the tentative S_i when checking whether player j should be eliminated or not. Recall the valuation function is monotone and $S_i^j \subseteq N_{\pi|i}$. It means $v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\}) \geq v(S_i^j \setminus \{j\})$. Since $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, then we have $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(S_i^j \setminus \{j\})$, which implies j must be kept in S_i^j . Then, j will share $\frac{1}{|S_i^j|} \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$. Therefore, ULMES rule satisfies S-STAY.

(PART) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game G^i with arriving player i , if i is a contributitional player, then i is kept in S_i as $\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = v(N_{\pi|i}) - v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}) > 0$.

(OD) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game G^i with an arriving contributitional player i , we show that ULMES rule never assigns positive value to dummy players in G^i . Prove by contradiction. Assume that there exists some dummy player j in G^i who gets assigned positive value, then j must survive in the elimination of S_i , however, by the definition of dummy player, for any subset $T \subseteq N_{\pi|i}$, $v(T) = v(T \cup \{j\})$. Denote S_i^j as the tentative S_i for the time-step when j is checked whether she should be eliminated from S_i . According to ULMES rule, $j \in S_i^j$ and $v(S_i^j) = v(N_{\pi|i})$, let $T = S_i^j \setminus \{j\}$, we have $v(S_i^j \setminus \{j\}) = v(S_i^j) = v(N_{\pi|i})$, meaning j must be

eliminated from S_i^j . Hence, j should not survive in the final sharing set S_i to share the value, contradicting to the assumption that j gets some positive sharing value in G^i . \square

8.1.4 Greedy Monotone (GM) Decomposition

We revisit the greedy monotone (GM) decomposition algorithm proposed by Ge *et al.* [21]. GM decomposition maps a general OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ into a linear combination of multiple SOCGs. The detailed procedures of GM decomposition is provided in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Greedy Monotone (GM) Decomposition

Input: An OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$.

Output: A decomposition $D(G)$.

```

1: Initialize  $D(G) \leftarrow \emptyset$ ,  $v_1(\cdot) \leftarrow v(\cdot)$  and  $k \leftarrow 1$ ;
2: while  $\max_{T \subseteq N} \{v_k(T)\} > 0$  do
3:    $S \leftarrow \arg \min_{T \subseteq N, v(T) > 0} v_k(T)$ ;
4:   Coefficient  $c_k \leftarrow v_k(S)$ ;
5:   Initialize component SOCG  $\bar{G}_k = (N, \bar{v}_k, \pi)$ ;
6:   for  $T \subseteq N$  do
7:     if  $v_k(T) > 0$  then
8:        $\bar{v}_k(T) \leftarrow 1$ ;
9:     else
10:       $\bar{v}_k(T) \leftarrow 0$ ;
11:    end if
12:    Update  $v_k(T) \leftarrow v_k(T) - c_k \bar{v}_k(T)$ ;
13:  end for
14:  Add component SOCG  $(c_k, \bar{G}_k)$  into  $D(G)$ ;
15:  Update  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
16: end while

```

Ge *et al.* [21] proved the following properties of the GM decomposition method,

- GM decomposition outputs the $D(G)$ satisfying for each $T \subseteq N$, $v(T) = \sum_k c_k \bar{v}_k(T)$ and $\bar{v}_k(\cdot)$ is 0-1 valued monotone functions.
- Given a decomposition $D(G)$, for any player i in π with sub-game G^i , the decomposition of $D(G^i)$ is consistent with $D(G)$ within players in $N_{|i}$ (Consistency between the global game and prefix sub-games).

8.1.5 Omitted Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. (S-STAY) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game G^i with an arriving contributonal player i , for every player j satisfying $j \prec_\pi i$ and $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$. According to the GM decomposition $D(G)$, the valuation is decomposed into linear combinations. Since $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, there exists at least one component in $D(G)$ such that $\bar{v}(N_{\pi|i}) > \bar{v}(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$ and i is a contributonal player in \bar{G}^i . For this component (c, \bar{G}) , according to Theorem 3, ULMES rule satisfies S-STAY, meaning in \bar{G}^i , $\phi(\bar{G}^i, j) > 0$. Due to the consistency of $D(G)$ and $D(G^i)$, we have $\phi(G^i, j) = \sum_k c_k \phi(\bar{G}_k^i, j) > 0$. eULMES rule satisfies S-STAY.

(PART) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game G^i with an arriving contributitional player i . In the decomposition $D(G)$ of G , there exists at least one component (c, \bar{G}) such that i is still a contributitional player in \bar{G} . Prove by contradiction, assume there is no component such that i is a contributitional player. By the linearity and consistency of $D(G)$ regarding the valuation function, i is not a contributitional player in G , contradicting i is the contributitional player in G^i . For \bar{G} , as ULMES rule is PART, meaning i get positive value in \bar{G}^i : $\phi(\bar{G}^i, i) > 0$. So i has positive shared value in G^i as the value $c \cdot \phi(\bar{G}^i, i)$ will be added into $\phi(G^i, i)$. Then eULMES rule satisfies PART.

(OD) Notice that ULMES rule satisfies OD, assigning no value to dummy players for each component (c, \bar{G}) of the decomposition $D(G)$. Also, consider any OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any player i , if i is dummy in G , then for SOCG \bar{G} , in each component of $D(G)$, i is still a dummy player. Thus, for eULMES rule which outputs the weighted sum of ULMES rule's output over each component, it never assigns a positive value to dummy players in G . So, eULMES rule satisfies the OD axiom.

(EA) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, according to Lemma 1, ULMES rule satisfies EA for every SOCG. It means ULMES rule satisfies EA for every SOCG in each component (c, \bar{G}) of $D(G)$. For any player i in arriving order π , assume i delays her arrival and changes the order into π' w.r.t. the OCG $G' = (N, v, \pi')$. Notice that the GM decomposition only depends on the valuation function and is unrelated with the arriving order. Thus, for player i , for each component $(c, \bar{G} = (N, \bar{v}, \pi))$ and $(c, \bar{G}' = (N, \bar{v}, \pi'))$, ULMES rule satisfies the EA axiom implies $\phi(\bar{G}, i) \geq \phi(\bar{G}', i)$. Furthermore, $\phi(G, i) = \sum_k c_k \cdot \phi(\bar{G}_k, i) \geq \sum_k c_k \cdot \phi(\bar{G}'_k, i) = \phi(G', i)$. So i has no incentive to delay her arrival, meaning eULMES rule satisfies the EA axiom. \square

8.2 Omitted Proof in Section 7

8.2.1 Omitted Proof of Proposition 11

Proof. Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, DMC rule satisfies the IR axiom since for each player $i \in N$, $\phi(G, i) = \text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) \geq v(\{i\})$ with superadditive valuation function. For SV rule, it degenerates to the classic cooperative game in which the Shapley Value satisfies IR in games with superadditive valuation functions. Next, we show that eRFC rule does not satisfy the IR property with superadditive valuation function by the following example. Consider a game $G = (N, v, \pi)$ where $N = \{1, 2\}$, $\pi = (1, 2)$, and $v(\{1\}) = 1, v(\{2\}) = 2, v(\{1, 2\}) = 5$. According to eRFC rule by Ge *et al.* [21], G will be decomposed into $D(G) = \{(1, \bar{G}_1), (1, \bar{G}_2), (3, \bar{G}_3)\}$. The decomposed valuation function is provided in Table 6.

Coalition	Coef	{1}	{2}	{1, 2}
Valuation		1	2	5
$\bar{v}_1(\cdot)$	$c_1 = 1$	1	1	1
$\bar{v}_2(\cdot)$	$c_2 = 1$	0	1	1
$\bar{v}_3(\cdot)$	$c_3 = 3$	0	0	1

Table 6: Coalition valuation and game decomposition of G

For each decomposed SOCG, the value shared by 1 and 2 within the order $\pi = (1, 2)$ are shown in Table 7. Finally, for the original game G , $\phi(G, 1) = 4$ and $\phi(G, 2) = 1$. Note that $v(\{2\}) = 2 > \phi(G, 2) = 1$. Thus, eRFC rule does not satisfy the IR property. \square

eRFC Rule Outcomes in G			
$\phi(G, i)$	Coef	Player 1	Player 2
\bar{G}_1	1	1	0
\bar{G}_2	1	0	1
\bar{G}_3	3	1	0
G		4	1

Table 7: eRFC rule outcomes in G

8.2.2 Omitted Proof of Theorem 5

Proof. For the IR-MES rule, IR-NDMES rule, and IR-eULMES rule, all three rules satisfy the IR axiom. For any OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, each rule first assigns the value $v(\{i\})$ to any arriving player i in the order π . The superadditive valuation function ensures the validity of this allocation.

Next, we show each rule maintains to satisfy all the axioms before the refinement.

We first clarify S-STAY is incompatible with IR if there exists some player i , $\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = v(\{i\}) > 0$. Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ where $N = \{1, 2\}$, $\pi = (1, 2)$, and $v(\{1\}) = v(\{2\}) = 1$, $v(\{1, 2\}) = 2$. According to IR, it must be $\phi(G, 1) = \phi(G, 2) = 1$. However, this value distribution does not satisfy S-STAY axiom. Therefore, we next mainly focus on the superadditive valuation where for any OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, $\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > v(\{i\})$ for each arriving player i when discussing the S-STAY axiom.

We first show that IR-MES satisfies S-STAY, PART, EA axioms as follows.

(S-STAY) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$ with arriving order $\pi = (1, 2, \dots, n)$. For the prefix sub-game G^i with arriving player i , $\phi(G^i, i) = \frac{1}{|S_i|} (\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}))$. For any other prefix sub-game G^j where $i \prec_{\pi} j$, $\phi(G^j, i) = \frac{1}{|S_j|} (\text{MC}(N_{\pi|i}, i) - v(\{i\})) + \sum_{k=i+1}^j (\text{MC}(N_{\pi|k}, k) - v(\{k\})) \geq \phi(G^i, i)$. IR-MES rule satisfies STAY. Furthermore, if in G^j , $\text{MC}(N_{\pi|j}, j) > v(\{j\})$, then $\phi(G^j, i) > \phi(G^i, i)$, satisfying S-STAY.

(PART) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any arriving player i , the value shared immediately by i is $\phi(G^i, i) = v(\{i\}) + \frac{1}{|S_i|} (\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\})) \geq 0$. Hence, IR-MES rule satisfies PART.

(EA) Consider any player $i \in N$ and two OCGs $G_1 = (N, v, \pi_1)$ and $G_2 = (N, v, \pi_2)$ with two different arriving orders π_1 and π_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, j+1, \dots, n), \\ \pi_2 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, i, j+1, \dots, n). \end{aligned}$$

For each prefix sub-game $G_1^i(G_2^i)$ within $G_1(G_2)$, denote the player set sharing the marginal value by $S_i^1(S_i^2)$ in IR-MES rule. Then, the value shared by i in G_1 can be represented as

$$\phi(G_1, i) = v(\{i\}) + \sum_{k=i}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} (\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\})). \quad (15)$$

The value shared by player i in G_2 can be written as

$$\phi(G_2, i) = v(\{i\}) + \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} (\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i}, i) - v(\{i\})) + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^2|} (\text{MC}(G_2^k, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\})). \quad (16)$$

For every player k who arrives after player j , we have $N_{\pi_1|k} = N_{\pi_2|k}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\
&= \sum_{k=i}^j \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|j} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}) \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \sum_{k=i}^j \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|j} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}) \right) \quad (17) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i}^j v(\{k\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|j} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\} = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j\} = N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\} \cup \{i+1, \dots, j\}$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i}^j v(\{k\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|j} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) \right) \quad (18) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(\{i+1, \dots, j\}) - \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) \right) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last two steps are from superadditivity, we have $v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \geq v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) + v(\{i+1, \dots, j\})$ and $v(\{i+1, \dots, j\}) \geq \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\})$.

Next, we show that **IR-NDMES** satisfies **S-STAY**, **PART**, **OD**, and **EA** axioms as follows.

(S-STAY) Obviously, **IR-NDMES** rule satisfies **STAY** as every player's shared value is non-decreasing. Next, we show the satisfaction of **S-STAY**. Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, for any player j , consider any prefix sub-games G^i , ($j \prec_{\pi} i$) and i is a contributinal player, if j satisfies $v(N_{\pi|i}) > v(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, then j is non-dummy in G^i . So, j is included in S_i and share the value $\frac{1}{|S_i|} (\text{MC}(G^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\})) > 0$. Hence, for player j , $\phi(G^i, j) > \phi(G^j, j)$, satisfying **S-STAY** axiom.

(PART) For each arriving player i , if i is a contributinal player, i.e., $\text{MC}(N_{\pi|i}, i) > 0$, i is not a dummy player and will be included in S_i . Then, i immediately gets $\frac{1}{|S_i|} (\text{MC}(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\})) > 0$, satisfying the **PART** axiom.

(OD) Consider an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$. For every prefix sub-game G^i , the **IR-NDMES** rule eliminates all the dummy players in G^i , just like the **NDMES** rule, aligning directly with the definition of **Online-Dummy**.

(EA) Consider two OCGs $G_1 = (N, v, \pi_1)$ and $G_2 = (N, v, \pi_2)$ with two different orders π_1 and π_2 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_1 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, \mathbf{i}, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, j+1, \dots, n) \\
\pi_2 &: (1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j-1, j, \mathbf{i}, j+1, \dots, n)
\end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For any player $i \in N$, we discuss the satisfaction of the **EA** axiom in the following four cases.

Case 1. $\text{MC}(G_1^i, N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = 0$. The shared value after player $j+1$'s arrival remains the same for these two orders. The only difference is that player i might gain some shared value when i is not a dummy player in sub-games from G^{i+1} to G^j . Therefore, the value shared by player i in π_1 will always be at least as much as in π_2

Case 2. $\text{MC}(G_1^i, N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0, \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = 0$. For π_1 , i will never be a dummy player in all sub-games after her arrival, thus i shares all the marginal value from i to n . However, in π_2 , player i only shares marginal value from player $j + 1$ to player n .

Case 3. $\text{MC}(G_1^i, N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = 0, \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$. In this case, we discuss cases concerning whether i is dummy or not. The first situation is that i keeps to be dummy (No shared value from i to $j - 1$) until j 's arrival (This is because i has some positive marginal value in π_2).

$$\phi(G_1, i) = v(\{i\}) + \sum_{k=j}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^i, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right). \quad (20)$$

$$\phi(G_2, i) = v(\{i\}) + \sum_{k=j}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right). \quad (21)$$

Let S_j^1 be the set of players who share the value from j 's participation in π_1 . $S_j^1 = S_i^2$ because they both represent the set of non-dummy players in players $\{1, 2, \dots, j\}$. Another observation is that starting from player $j + 1$'s participation, the value shared by player i in π_1 and π_2 will be the same. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left((\text{MC}(G_1^j, N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}, j) - v(\{j\})) - (\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\})) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Note that player i creates no new marginal valuation with $N_{\pi_1|i}$ and she is a dummy player for all sub-games before j 's arrival in this situation, thus we have $v(\{i\}) = 0$ and $v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}) = v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{j\}) - v(\{j\}) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\}) + v(j) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i, j\}) - v(j) \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The other situation is that player i is not dummy after some player q 's arrival where $i \prec_{\pi_1} q \prec_{\pi_1} j$, in this case, $\phi(G_1, i)$ can be written as

$$\phi(G_1, i) = v(\{i\}) + \sum_{k=q}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right). \quad (24)$$

Note that $v(\{i\}) = 0$ because of the super-additivity. Also, denote $\sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} (\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}))$ by Δ for simplicity. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(G_1, i) &= \sum_{k=q}^j \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right) + \Delta \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} - v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{q\})) - \sum_{k=q}^j v(k) \right) + \Delta. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

For the game G_2 , $\phi(G_2, i)$ can be written as

$$\phi(G_2, i) = v(\{i\}) + \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(i) \right) + \Delta = \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) + \Delta. \quad (26)$$

where $\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\})$. Further,

$$\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) = \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{q\}) - \sum_{k=q}^j v(\{k\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) \right). \quad (27)$$

For every player k who arrives after player j , we have $N_{\pi_1|k}$ and $N_{\pi_2|k}$. That is $|S_j^1| = |S_i^2|$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) &= \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{q\}) - \sum_{k=q}^j v(\{k\}) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{i, q\}) + \sum_{k=q}^j v(k) - v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{q\}) - \sum_{k=q}^j v(\{k\}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{i, q\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|q} \setminus \{i, q\}) \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The penultimate inequality follows from superadditivity and the last step is because i is a dummy player of prefix $N_{\pi_1|q} = \{1, 2, \dots, i, \dots, q\}$.

Case 4. $\text{MC}(G_1^i, N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) = 0$, $\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) > 0$ For G_1 , $\phi(G_1, i)$ can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(G_1, i) &= v(\{i\}) + \sum_{k=i}^j \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

For G_2 , $\phi(G_2, i)$ can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(G_2, i) &= v(\{i\}) + \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{1}{|S_k^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^k, N_{\pi_2|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Still, we have $S_j^1 = S_i^2$, and from the arrival of player $j+1$ to the last player, the value shared by player i in G_1 and G_2 remains the same. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \\ &= \sum_{k=i}^j \frac{1}{|S_k^1|} \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right) - \frac{1}{|S_i^2|} \left(\text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - v(\{i\}) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{|S_j^1|} \left(\sum_{k=i}^j \left(\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\}) \right) - \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) + v(\{i\}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

To show $\phi(G_1, i) - \phi(G_2, i) \geq 0$, we next show $\sum_{k=i}^j (\text{MC}(G_1^k, N_{\pi_1|k} \setminus \{k\}, k) - v(\{k\})) - \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) + v(\{i\}) \geq 0$. We first rewrite the equation as

$$v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) - \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}, i). \quad (32)$$

Notably, $N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\} = \{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, j\}$ and the valuation function v is superadditive, then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & v(N_{\pi_1|j}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) - \text{MC}(G_2^i, N_{\pi_2|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) \\ &= v(N_{\pi_1|j} \setminus \{i\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) \\ &\geq v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) + \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) - v(N_{\pi_1|i} \setminus \{i\}) - \sum_{k=i+1}^j v(\{k\}) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

From Case 1 to Case 4, for any player i , i has no incentive to delay her arrival under the IR-NDMES sharing scheme. Thus, the IR-NDMES rule satisfies the EA axiom.

Finally, we show that IR-eULMES satisfies S-STAY, PART, OD, and EA. Recall IR-eULMES rule runs as follows. For an OCG $G = (N, v, \pi)$, we first decompose G into $D(G)$ by Algorithm 1. For each SOCG component (c, \bar{G}) , we run the IR refinement paradigm, that is, first assign $v(\{i\})$ for each arriving player i ; then compute S_i in \bar{G} and equally share the value $\text{MC}(\bar{G}^i, N_{\pi|i}) - v(\{i\})$.

(S-STAY) It is obviously that IR-eULMES rule satisfies the STAY axiom as each player shared value is the linear combination (positive coefficient) of the outputs of SOCGs, in which the shared value is non-decreasing. Next we show for each component SOCG \bar{G} , the rule satisfies S-STAY. Consider an SOCG $\bar{G} = (N, \bar{v}, \pi)$. For any prefix sub-game \bar{G}^i , since we assume that $\text{MC}(\bar{G}^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - \bar{v}(\{i\}) > 0$, then for any player j who satisfies $\bar{v}(N_{\pi|i}) > \bar{v}(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{j\})$, j must be included in S_i in \bar{G} (The same proof procedures of the S-STAY axiom for ULMES rule in Theorem 3). Then j must get a positive fraction $\frac{1}{|S_i|}$ of $(\text{MC}(\bar{G}^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - \bar{v}(\{i\})) > 0$, satisfying S-STAY.

(PART) Since IR-eULMES rule outputs the linear combination of IR-ULMES rule in each decomposed component SOCG \bar{G} , we show that the PART axiom is satisfied in each \bar{G} . Consider an SOCG $\bar{G} = (N, \bar{v}, \pi)$, for any prefix sub-game \bar{G}^i with arriving player i , if i is a contributitional player, $\bar{v}(N_{\pi|i}) > \bar{v}(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\})$, then i is kept in S_i as $\bar{v}(N_{\pi|i}) - \bar{v}(N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}) > 0$. Further, we have $\phi(\bar{G}, i) = \bar{v}(\{i\}) + \frac{1}{|S_i|} (\text{MC}(\bar{G}^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - \bar{v}(\{i\}))$. If $\bar{v}(\{i\}) > 0$, then $\phi(\bar{G}, i) > 0$ as $\text{MC}(\bar{G}^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - \bar{v}(\{i\}) \geq 0$. When $\bar{v}(\{i\}) = 0$, $\phi(\bar{G}, i) = \frac{1}{|S_i|} (\text{MC}(\bar{G}^i, N_{\pi|i} \setminus \{i\}, i) - \bar{v}(\{i\})) > 0$. Therefore, IR-eULMES rule satisfies PART.

(OD) The proof of satisfaction of the Online-Dummy axiom directly holds as the IR refinement does not affect the selection of S_i for any OCG G . Thus the proof of the OD axiom directly follows the proof in Theorem 4.

(EA) To show IR-eULMES rule satisfies EA, it is sufficient to show that IR-ULMES rule satisfies EA in each decomposed component SOCG \bar{G} . The reason is that if player i has no incentive to delay her arrival in every decomposed SOCG \bar{G} , then i can not change the shared value by delaying her arrival because the GM decomposition does not depend on the arrival order π . Now we focus on the EA property of IR-ULMES rule in SOCG $\bar{G} = (N, \bar{v}, \pi)$. Notice that in SOCG with superadditive

valuation function, there could be at most one player with singleton value 1. We discuss the following two cases: (1). There is no player with singleton value 1 in \bar{G} . In this case, IR-ULMES rule degenerates to ULMES rule. This means IR-ULMES rule satisfies EA as well as we have proved that ULMES rule satisfies EA in SOCGs in Lemma 1. (2). The other situation is that there exists some player q satisfying $\bar{v}(\{q\}) = 1$. In this case, as we know IR-ULMES rule satisfies IR, it means that in such an SOCG with $\bar{v}(\{q\}) = 1$, the value 1 is wholly allocated to player q . Then, firstly q has no incentive to delay her arrival as it does not change the outcome. Secondly, for any other player $i \neq q$, i cannot delay her arrival to share some part of the value 1 because IR property guarantees IR-ULMES rule distributes the value 1 to player q . This completes the proof of the EA satisfaction of IR-ULMES rule. Therefore, we have IR-eULMES rule satisfies the EA axiom. \square