

Bargaining with transfers¹

Gregorio Curello² and Sam Jindani³

4 February 2025

We propose a solution to the problem of bargaining with transfers, along with an axiomatisation of the solution. Inefficient allocations in the bargaining set can influence the solution, but are discounted relative to more efficient ones. The key axioms are additivity and a property we call *inverse monotonicity*, which states that adding an allocation to the bargaining set that is worse for a given player than the initial solution cannot benefit that player.

1 Introduction

Consider the problem of bargaining when transfers are possible and players have quasilinear utility, first posed by Green (1983). To fix ideas, consider the following example. Two neighbouring municipalities collaborate on building a park. There are two possible locations; location A is closer to municipality 1 and location B is closer to municipality 2. Municipality 1 derives an estimated benefit of $x_1^A = 10$ in monetary units from location A and $x_1^B = 5$ from location B . Municipality 2 derives benefits of $x_2^A = 5$ and $x_2^B = 8$. The cost is 10 regardless of the location. The problem is which location to pick and how to split the cost. The payoffs from each location (before payment of costs) are represented in figure 1. Given the possibility of transfers, the set of feasible allocations is the light-grey area. Note that this problem does not fit well into Nash’s framework. If we take the light-grey area to be the bargaining set, then the players are symmetric and therefore must get the same payoff under the Nash bargaining solution (Nash 1950). In particular, x^B does not affect the solution so long as it is inefficient. However, if we take the bargaining set to be the set of feasible payoffs before transfers – that is, the dark-grey area – then the Nash solution is Pareto inefficient because it lies on the open segment between x^A and x^B .

¹ We thank Peyton Young for valuable comments.

² Department of Economics, University of Mannheim; gregorio.curello@uni-mannheim.de.

³ Department of Economics, National University of Singapore; sam.jindani@nus.edu.sg.




Figure 1: Building a park.

More generally, we are interested in any situation in which multiple agents must jointly agree on a course of action and transfers are feasible. Other examples include housemates allocating rooms, business partners dividing responsibilities and compensation, and legatees dividing an estate. In the literature, the problem is sometimes referred to as the quasi-linear bargaining problem or the problem of quasi-linear social choice.⁴

This paper defines and axiomatises a solution to the n -player bargaining problem with transfers. The solution is determined as follows: Each player makes a claim based on the allocations in the bargaining set that are most advantageous to her. Claims based on inefficient allocations are allowed, but are discounted according to an *inefficiency discount factor*. The solution then gives each player an equal share of total surplus adjusted by the difference between their claim and the average claim. In the park example, the solution for a discount factor of 1 is x^* in figure 1. After splitting the cost equally, player 1 receives a net payoff of 3.5 and player 2 receives a net payoff of 1.5. Player 1 receives a higher payoff than 2 and 2's payoff decreases in t and increases in x_2^B . Interestingly, 2's payoff also increases in x_1^B (intuitively, as B becomes a more credible option, 2's bargaining power increases). The solution is a generalisation of Green's (2005) solution for two-player problems.

The characterisation relies on six axioms. Efficiency, anonymity, and translation invariance are standard. Continuity is standard in spirit, although we use

⁴ See Moulin 1985a, 1985b, 1987; Chun 1986, 1989, 2000; Chambers 2005. An important set of applications are cost-allocation problems; see, e.g., Young 1994, 1995; Moulin 2002. For work on implementation, see Echenique and Núñez 2024 and the references therein.

a Lipschitz version that is stronger than typical. Additivity was introduced by Shapley (1953) in the context of coalitional games with transfers, and considered in our setting by Green (1983, 2005) and Chambers and Green (2005). Intuitively, it means that no player should gain or lose from considering two problems jointly rather than separately. Finally, we introduce a new axiom, called *inverse monotonicity*: if an allocation is added to the bargaining set that is worse than the initial solution for a given player, then the addition cannot benefit that player.⁵

The proof approach builds on the important contributions of Green (1983, 2005) and Chambers and Green (2005). Green (1983) showed that an additive and continuous solution on the set of n -player efficient bargaining problems can be characterised by a measure on the unit sphere. Chambers and Green (2005) established an analogous result for bargaining problems that include inefficient allocations. Green (2005) axiomatised a family of additive solutions on the set of two-player problems. A key axiom is recursive invariance, which is implied by inverse monotonicity. We use Chambers and Green's result to show that our axioms yield a unique generalisation of Green's two-player solution to the set of n -player bargaining problems.

2 Axioms and result

A subset X of \mathbb{R}^n is *comprehensive* if, for all $x \in X$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y \leq x$ implies $y \in X$; it is *bounded above* if there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $y \leq x$ for all $y \in X$. Let \mathcal{B} be the set of all nonempty, closed, convex, comprehensive, and bounded above subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , where $n \geq 2$, endowed with the Hausdorff metric. Given a bounded $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\text{comp}(X)$ denote its convex and comprehensive hull; that is, $\text{comp}(X)$ is the smallest set in \mathcal{B} that contains X . We interpret each element of \mathcal{B} as a bargaining set.⁶

Let $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a nonempty $S \subseteq N$, let $x_S = \sum_{i \in S} x_i$.⁷

A *solution* is a map $\psi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. We impose the following axioms.

Axiom 1 (Efficiency). *For every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in B$, $\psi_N(B) \geq x_N$.*

⁵ In this draft, we impose a seventh axiom, *responsiveness*; however, the axiom is relatively weak and we conjecture that it is not necessary for the characterisation.

⁶ In this draft, for the sake of simplicity we ignore the role of disagreement points and assume that there are no costs.

⁷ $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean distance in \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the vectors of zeroes and ones, respectively. By a slight abuse of notation, given $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $aX = \{ax : x \in X\}$ and $X + b = \{x + b : x \in X\}$. Given a permutation $\rho : N \rightarrow N$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\rho(x) = (x_{\rho(i)})_{i \in N}$ and $\rho(B) = \{\rho(x) : x \in B\}$.

Axiom 2 (Anonymity). *For every permutation $\rho : N \rightarrow N$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\psi(\rho(B)) = \rho(\psi(B))$.*

Axiom 3 (Translation invariance). *For every $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\psi(B + \{x\}) = \psi(B) + x$.*

Axiom 4 (Continuity). *ψ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric on \mathcal{B} .*

Axiom 5 (Additivity). *For every $B, C \in \mathcal{B}$, $\psi(B + C) = \psi(B) + \psi(C)$.*

Additivity states that solving two problems jointly should yield the same aggregate solution as if they were considered separately.⁸ Note that additivity, continuity, and translation invariance together imply the canonical invariance to affine transformations.

Axiom 6 (Inverse monotonicity). *For every $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $i \in N$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x_N \leq \psi_N(B)$ and $x_i \leq \psi_i(B)$, $\psi_i(\text{comp}(B \cup \{x\})) \leq \psi_i(B)$.*

Inverse monotonicity states that adding an allocation that is worse for a given player than the initial solution cannot benefit that player (provided the allocation doesn't change the feasible set). A number of monotonicity properties have been studied in the literature on cooperative game theory.⁹ Inverse monotonicity stands out in three respects. First, it is marginal, in the sense that it addresses the effect of the addition of a single allocation to the bargaining set. Second, it involves a comparison with the solution. Third, it is formulated negatively, in the sense that it specifies what should happen when the marginal allocation is bad rather than good for a player.

This last feature warrants some discussion. A positive monotonicity property might state that adding an allocation that a given player prefers to the initial solution should benefit that player. This is appealing, but deceptively so; to see why, consider the following example. Let $n = 3$ and $B = \text{comp}\{0, e^1\}$. Figure 2 illustrates in the L_0 plane. A reasonable solution for B would be a point between 0 and $e^1/2$; the proposed solution is $e^1/3$. Consider adding the allocation x , which gives the same as $e^1/3$ to player 1, but more to player 2. Positive monotonicity would impose that both player 1's and player 2's payoffs must weakly increase.

⁸ For further discussion see Roth 1979b; Perles and Maschler 1981; Myerson 1981; Peters 1986.

⁹ E.g., Kalai and Smorodinsky 1975; Roth 1979a; Thomson and Myerson 1980; Young 1985; Moulin 1988.




Figure 2: Monotonicity and inverse monotonicity.

However, one might think that the addition of x increases player 2's bargaining power but leaves player 1's unchanged; if so, it might be reasonable for player 1's payoff to decrease. At the least, it does not seem reasonable to rule this out axiomatically, as a positive monotonicity property would do. Inverse monotonicity does not suffer from this issue. In the above example, inverse monotonicity only requires that player 3's payoff should weakly decrease after the addition of x ; it does not require that 1 or 2's payoffs (or both) increase.¹⁰

Let $e^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given by

$$e_j^i = \begin{cases} n - 1 & \text{if } j = i \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Axiom 7 (Responsiveness). *There exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\psi(\text{comp}(\{\mathbf{0}, -\alpha e^i\})) \neq 0$ for each $i \in N$.*

Theorem 1. *A solution ψ satisfies axioms 1 to 7 if and only if there exists $t \geq 0$ such that*

$$\psi_i(B) = \frac{1}{n} \max_{x \in B} x_N + \max_{x \in B} (x_i + tx_N) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in N} \max_{x \in B} (x_j + tx_N) \quad (1)$$

for every $i \in N$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

¹⁰ Recall that in logic, the inverse is the contrapositive of the converse. Thus the inverse of the statement 'If the allocation benefits the player, then the player is better off' is the statement 'If the allocation does not benefit the player, then the player is not better off'.

An interpretation of the solution is as follows. Each player makes a claim based on the allocations in the bargaining set that are most advantageous to her. If the player selects some inefficient x , then her claim is discounted because of the term tx_N . The parameter t is the *inefficiency discount factor*. The player makes her best claim given this discounting. The solution then gives each player an equal share of total surplus plus the difference between the player's discounted claim and the average discounted claim.

Note that the solution may be outside the bargaining set even if the set is efficient (in the language of Green 1983, the solution does not satisfy *selection*). This may be reasonable. For example, consider the park example, but now suppose that there are three municipalities. Municipality 1 gets 10 from location A and 5 from location B ; municipality 2 gets 5 from A and 10 from B ; and municipality 3 gets 10 from both. Suppose A is chosen. Since municipality 2 does not benefit much from A , it seems reasonable for it to pay a smaller share of the cost. Selection would imply that any decrease in 2's cost must be borne entirely by 1. However it might be reasonable for 3 to take on a higher share of the cost as well as 1. The proposed solution does precisely this.

3 Proof that the solution satisfies the axioms

Suppose ψ is given by (1) for some $t \geq 0$; we now verify that ψ satisfies the axioms. Axiom 1 is immediate. Axiom 2 holds since, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $i \in N$ and permutation ρ ,

$$\max_{x \in \rho(B)} x_i + tx_N = \max_{x \in B} x_{\rho(i)} + tx_N.$$

For axioms 4 and 5, note that $\max_{x \in B} x_N$ is Lipschitz continuous in B and $\max_{x \in B} x_i + tx_N$ is additive in B .¹¹ For axiom 3, note that $\psi(\text{comp}(x)) = x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and invoke axiom 5. For axiom 6, fix $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $i \in N$, and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x_N \leq \psi_N(B)$ and $x_i \leq \psi_i(B)$. Choose

$$x^j \in \arg \max_{y \in B} (y_j + ty_N)$$

for each $j \in N$ and fix any $x^* \in B$ such that $x_N^* = \max_{y \in B} y_N$. Note that $x_N \leq \psi_N(B) = \max_{y \in B} y_N = x_N^*$, where the first equality follows from axiom 1.

¹¹ A map $f : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *additive* if $f(B + C) = f(B) + f(C)$ for all $B, C \in \mathcal{B}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_i + tx_N &\leq \psi_i(B) + tx_N^* = \left(\frac{1}{n} + t\right)x_N^* + x_i^i + tx_N^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in N} (x_j^j + tx_N^j) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{n} + t\right)x_N^* + x_i^i + tx_N^i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in N} (x_j^* + tx_N^*) = x_i^i + tx_N^i, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $x_i \leq \psi_i(B)$. Hence

$$\max_{y \in B \cup \{x\}} (y_j + ty_N) \geq \max_{y \in B} (y_j + ty_N)$$

for each $j \in N$, with equality for $j = i$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_i(\text{comp}(B \cup \{x\})) &= \frac{1}{n} \max_{y \in B} y_N + \max_{y \in B \cup \{x\}} (y_i + ty_N) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in N} \max_{y \in B \cup \{x\}} (y_j + ty_N) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \max_{y \in B} y_N + \max_{y \in B} (y_i + ty_N) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in N} \max_{y \in B} (y_j + ty_N) = \psi_i(B), \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds since $x_N \leq \max_{y \in B} y_N$.

4 Proof that a solution satisfying the axioms admits the desired representation

It remains to prove that the axioms imply the characterisation in theorem 1. We rely on an intermediate result (lemma 1 below), which is a simple consequence of theorem 1 of Chambers and Green (2005). Let \mathcal{B}_0 be the collection of sets $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\max_{x \in B} x_N = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| = 1\}, \\ S^+ &= (S \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n) \setminus \{\mathbf{1}/\sqrt{n}\}, \text{ and} \\ S^0 &= \{x \in S : x_N = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1. *Let ψ be a solution satisfying axioms 1 and 3 to 5. Then, there exists a finite Borel measure μ on S^+ and a μ -integrable $h : S^+ \rightarrow S^0$ such that*

$$\psi(B) = \int \left(\max_{x \in B} x \cdot v \right) h(v) d\mu(v) \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{B}_0. \quad (2)$$

The rest of the argument is organised in three lemmas. To state the first,

denote by $B^+(v, r) = \{w \in S^+ : \|w - v\| \leq r\}$ the (closed) ball in S^+ centred at $v \in S^+$ and of radius $r > 0$. Recall that, given a finite Borel measure μ on S^+ and a μ -integrable $f : S^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $v \in S^+$ is a μ -Lebesgue point of f if $v \in \text{supp}(\mu)$ and

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{\int_{B^+(v, r)} \|f(w) - f(v)\| d\mu(w)}{\mu(B^+(v, r))} = 0.$$

The Lebesgue differentiation theorem ensures that μ -almost every $v \in S^+$ is a μ -Lebesgue point of f (Federer 1969, 2.9.9).¹² Given an integrable $h : S^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, let L_h^μ be the set of all $v \in S^+$ such that (i) v is a Lebesgue point of the map $w \mapsto w_i h(w)$ for each $i \in N$, and (ii) so is $\rho(v)$ for any permutation $\rho : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\rho(v) \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. (Clearly, almost every $v \in S^+$ lies in L_h^μ .)

Lemma 2. *Let ψ be a solution satisfying axioms 1 to 5 and let μ and h satisfy the conditions of lemma 1. Then, for any $v \in L_h^\mu$ and permutation $\rho : N \rightarrow N$, $h(\rho(v)) = \rho(h(v))$ and $\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \mu(B^+(\rho(v), r)) / \mu(B^+(v, r)) = 1$. (In particular, $\rho(v) \in L_h^\mu$.)*

To prove this and other results, let

$$S^- = \text{comp} \left(S - \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

and note that $S^- \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Given $v \in S^+$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq \sqrt{n}/v_N - 1$, let

$$\xi^\alpha(v) = (1 + \alpha)v - \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\sqrt{n}},$$

noting that $\xi_N^\alpha(v) \leq 0$.

Proof of lemma 2. Fix v and ρ . Let $B^\alpha = \text{comp}(S^- \cup \{\xi^\alpha(v)\}) \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and

$$D^\alpha = \left\{ w \in S^+ : \xi^\alpha(v) \in \arg \max_{x \in B^\alpha} x \cdot w \right\}$$

for all $0 < \alpha < \sqrt{n}/v_N - 1$. Note that $D^\alpha = \{w \in S^+ : v \cdot w \geq 1/(1 + \alpha)\}$ so that D^α is a non-empty closed ball in S^+ centred at v , and its radius vanishes with α .

¹² Hereafter we suppress the dependence on μ .

Note also that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\alpha}\psi(B^\alpha) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\max_{x \in B^{\alpha+\varepsilon}} x \cdot w - \max_{x \in B^\alpha} x \cdot w \right) h(w) d\mu(w) \\ &= \int_{D^\alpha} (v \cdot w) h(w) d\mu(w)\end{aligned}$$

where $d/d\alpha$ denotes the right derivative, the first equality follows from (2), and the second by the bounded convergence theorem. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\rho \left(\int_{D^\alpha} (v \cdot w) h(w) d\mu(w) \right) &= \rho \left(\frac{d}{d\alpha} \psi(B^\alpha) \right) \\ &= \frac{d}{d\alpha} \psi(\rho(B^\alpha)) = \int_{\rho(D^\alpha)} (\rho(v) \cdot w) h(w) d\mu(w),\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from axiom 2. Rearranging, we obtain

$$\rho \left(\sum_{i \in N} v_i \frac{\int_{D^\alpha} w_i h(w) d\mu(w)}{\mu(D^\alpha)} \right) = \frac{\mu(\rho(D^\alpha))}{\mu(D^\alpha)} \sum_{i \in N} \rho_i(v) \frac{\int_{\rho(D^\alpha)} w_i h(w) d\mu(w)}{\mu(\rho(D^\alpha))}.$$

Since v is a Lebesgue point of $w \mapsto w_i h(w)$ for each $i \in N$, the left-hand side converges to $\rho(h(v))$ as α vanishes. Since $h(v) \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have $\rho(v) \in \text{supp}(\mu)$. Then $\rho(v)$ is a Lebesgue point of $w \mapsto w_i h(w)$ for each $i \in N$, so that letting α vanish yields

$$\rho(h(v)) = h(\rho(v)) \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(\rho(D^\alpha))}{\mu(D^\alpha)}.$$

Since $\|\rho(h(v))\| = \|h(\rho(v))\| = 1$, it must be the case that

$$\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \frac{\mu(\rho(D^\alpha))}{\mu(D^\alpha)} = 1$$

and $h(\rho(v)) = \rho(h(v))$. □

Define

$$S^i = \{v \in S : v \cdot e^j \leq 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i\}$$

for each $i \in N$.

Lemma 3. *Let ψ be a solution satisfying axioms 1 to 7, and let μ and h satisfy the conditions of lemma 1. Then, for any $v \in L_h^\mu$, there exists $i \in N$ such that $\{v, h(v)\} \subset S^i$.*

Proof. Fix $v \in L_h^\mu$ and note that $v \cdot e^i > 0$ for some $i \in N$. It suffices to show that $h_j(v) \leq 0$ for each $j \neq i$, as this implies that $h_i(v) > 0$ and, hence, that $v \cdot e^j \leq 0$

for each $j \neq i$. To this end, fix $j \neq i$ and let

$$D^\alpha = \left\{ w \in S^+ : w \cdot v \geq \frac{1}{1+\alpha} \right\}$$

for every $\alpha > 0$. Since $v \cdot e^i > 0$, there exists $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ such that $w \cdot e^i > 0$ for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ and $w \in D^\alpha$. Let

$$B^\alpha = \text{comp}(\{\alpha w : w \in S^- \setminus \xi^0(D^\alpha)\} \cup \{\alpha \xi^0(v), -e^i\})$$

for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$, and note that

$$\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \psi(B^\alpha) = \psi(\text{comp}(\{\mathbf{0}, -e^i\})) = -\gamma e^i$$

for some $\gamma > 0$, where the first equality follows from axiom 4 and the second from axioms 1, 2 and 5 to 7. Thus, after reducing $\bar{\alpha}$ if necessary, we may assume that

$$\alpha \xi_j^\beta(v) \leq \psi_j(B^\alpha) \quad (3)$$

for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ and $\beta \in [0, \alpha)$. Assume further that $\bar{\alpha} < \sqrt{n}/v_N - 1$ and define

$$B^{\alpha\beta} = \text{comp}(B^\alpha \cup \{\alpha \xi^\beta(v)\}) \text{ and}$$

$$D^{\alpha\beta} = \left\{ w \in S^+ : \alpha \xi^\beta(v) \in \arg \max_{x \in B^{\alpha\beta}} x \cdot w \right\}$$

for every $\alpha \in (0, \bar{\alpha})$ and $\beta \in [0, \alpha)$, noting that $B^{\alpha\beta} \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and $D^{\alpha\beta} \downarrow D^{\alpha 0}$ as $\beta \downarrow 0$.¹³ Since $w \cdot e^i > 0$ for all $w \in D^\alpha$, $D^{\alpha 0} = B^+(v, r_\alpha) \subset D^\alpha$ for some $r_\alpha > 0$ that vanishes with α . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \lim_{\beta \downarrow 0} \frac{\psi_j(B^{\alpha\beta}) - \psi_j(B^\alpha)}{\alpha\beta\mu(D^{\alpha\beta})} \\ &= \lim_{\beta \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\alpha\beta\mu(D^{\alpha\beta})} \int_{D^{\alpha\beta}} \left(\alpha \xi^\beta(v) \cdot w - \max_{x \in B^{\alpha\beta}} x \cdot w \right) h_j(w) d\mu(w) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mu(D^{\alpha 0})} \int_{D^{\alpha 0}} (v \cdot w) h_j(w) d\mu(w) \\ &\rightarrow h_j(v) \quad \text{as } \alpha \text{ vanishes,} \end{aligned}$$

¹³ This means that $D^{\alpha\beta} \subseteq D^{\alpha\beta'}$ whenever $0 \leq \beta \leq \beta' < \alpha$ and $\bigcap_{\beta \in (0, \alpha)} D^{\alpha\beta} = D^{\alpha 0}$.

where the inequality follows from axiom 6 and (3), the first equality from (2), the second from the bounded convergence theorem since $D^{\alpha\beta} \downarrow D^{\alpha 0}$ and $\max_{x \in B^\alpha} x \cdot w = \alpha \xi^0(v)$ for every $w \in D^{\alpha 0}$, and the limit from the fact that $v \in L_h^\mu$. \square

Lemma 4. *Let ψ be a solution satisfying axioms 1 to 7, and let μ and h satisfy the conditions of lemma 1. Then $L_h^\mu \cap S^i$ is a singleton for each $i \in N$.*

Proof. Set

$$V^i = L_h^\mu \cap S^i$$

for each $i \in N$. Note that L_h^μ is not empty by (2) and axiom 3, that $L_h^\mu = \bigcup_{i \in N} V^i$ by lemma 3 and, hence, that $V^i = \rho^i(V^1)$ for each $i > 1$ by lemma 2, where $\rho^i : N \rightarrow N$ is the permutation swapping 1 and i only. Then, seeking a contradiction, suppose that $|V^1| \geq 2$. Define

$$x^{\alpha v} = (v_N + \alpha)v - \mathbf{1}$$

for any $v \in S^+$ and $0 < \alpha < n/v_N - v_N$, noting that $x_N^{\alpha v} < 0$ and $x^{\alpha v} \cdot v = \alpha$. Let R^1 be the set of all permutations that fix 1. Consider two cases.

Case 1. *There is no $v \in V^1$ such that $V^1 = \{\rho(v) : \rho \in R^1\}$.* Let

$$B^{\alpha v} = \text{comp}(\{\mathbf{0}\} \cup \{\rho(x^{\alpha v}) : \rho \in R^1\})$$

for all $v \in V^1$ and $0 < \alpha < n/v_N - v_N$, noting that $B^{\alpha v} \in \mathcal{B}_0$ since $x_N^{\alpha v} < 0$. Since $L_h^\mu = \bigcup_{i \in N} V^i$ and $V^i = \rho^i(V^1)$ for each $i > 1$, we may pick $v \in V^1$ such that $v_N - \inf_{w \in L_h^\mu} w_N$ is arbitrarily close to 0. Then, by the hypothesis of this case, we may choose distinct $v, w \in V^1$ such that, given α sufficiently small,

$$\max_{x \in B^{\alpha v}} x \cdot u = 0$$

for all $u \in \{w\} \cup (L_h^\mu \setminus V^1)$. Then, fixing one such α ,

$$\psi(B^\alpha) \cdot e^1 = \int_{V^1} \left(\max_{x \in B^\alpha} x \cdot u \right) (h(u) \cdot e^1) d\mu(u) > 0,$$

where the equality follows from (2) since $S^+ \setminus L_h^\mu$ is μ -null, and the inequality holds since $h(u) \cdot e^1 > 0$ for all $u \in V^1$, by lemma 3. Then $\psi(B^\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha e^1$ for some $\lambda_\alpha > 0$ by axiom 2, so that $\psi(B^\alpha) \cdot u \leq 0$ for all $u \in L_h^\mu \setminus V^1$, and $\psi(B^\alpha) \cdot w > 0$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & (\psi(\text{comp}(B^\alpha \cup \psi(B^\alpha))) - \psi(B^\alpha)) \cdot e^1 \\ &= \int_{V^1} \max \left\{ \psi(B^\alpha) \cdot u - \max_{x \in B^\alpha} x \cdot u, 0 \right\} (h(u) \cdot e^1) d\mu(u) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

contradicting axiom 6.

Case 2. $V^1 = \{\rho(v) : \rho \in R^1\}$ for some $v \in V^1$. In this case, V^1 is finite and $\text{supp}(\mu) = L_h^\mu = \{\rho(v) : \rho \in R\}$ where R is the set of all permutations $\rho : N \rightarrow N$. Fix $\alpha > 0$ sufficiently small so that $x^{\alpha v} \cdot w \leq 0$ for all $w \in \text{supp}(\mu) \setminus \{v\}$, set $B = \text{comp}(\{\mathbf{0}, x^{\alpha v}\})$ and note that $\psi(B) = \alpha\mu(\{v\})h(v)$.

Note that

$$S^i \cap S^0 = \{w \in S^0 : w_j \leq 0 \text{ for all } j \neq i\}$$

for each $i \in N$. Then letting $u^{ij} \in S^i \cap S^0$ be such that

$$u_k^{ij} = \begin{cases} 1/\sqrt{2} & \text{for } k = i \\ -1/\sqrt{2} & \text{for } k = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all distinct $i, j \in N$, we have¹⁴

$$\arg \min_{w \in S^i \cap S^0} w_i = \{u^{ij} : j \neq i\}.$$

Hence

$$\arg \min \left\{ u \cdot w : (u, w) \in (S^1 \cap S^0)^2 \right\} = \{(u^{1i}, u^{1j}) : 1 \neq i \neq j \neq 1\}$$

and

$$\arg \max \{u \cdot w : (u, w) \in (S^1 \cap S^0) \times (S^i \cap S^0)\} = \{(u^{1j}, u^{ij}) : 1 \neq j \neq i\}$$

¹⁴ To see why, note that for any $w \in S^i \cap S^0$, $1 - w_i^2 = \sum_{j \neq i} w_j^2 \leq w_{N \setminus \{i\}}^2 = w_i^2$, where the first and last equalities hold since $w \in S$ and $w \in S^0$, respectively, and the inequality is strict unless $w_k = 0$ for all but one $k \in N \setminus \{i\}$.

for all $i > 1$,¹⁵ so that

$$\min\{u \cdot w : (u, w) \in (S^1 \cap S^0)^2\} = \max\{u \cdot w : (u, w) \in (S^1 \cap S^0) \times (S^i \cap S^0)\},$$

for each $i > 1$. Because $|V^1| \geq 2$, $h(v) \in S^1 \cap S^0$ by lemma 3, $w_N = v_N$ for all $w \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, and $\text{supp}(\mu) \subset \bigcup_{i \in N} S^i$, it follows that

$$\max_{w \in V^1 \setminus \{v\}} h(v) \cdot w \geq \max_{w \in \bigcup_{i \neq 1} V^i} h(v) \cdot w, \quad (4)$$

where the inequality is strict unless $h(v) = (v - v_N \mathbf{1}) / \|v - v_N \mathbf{1}\| = u^{1i}$ for some $i > 1$. We consider each sub-case in turn.

Sub-case 2.a. (4) holds strictly. By the hypothesis of this sub-case, there exists $t \geq 0$ and $w \in V^1 \setminus \{v\}$ such that, setting $x = \psi(B) - t\mathbf{1}$, we have $x \cdot w > 0$ and $x \cdot u \leq 0$ for all $u \in \text{supp}(\mu) \setminus V^1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & (\psi(\text{comp}(B \cup \{x\})) - \psi(B)) \cdot e^1 \\ &= \sum_{u \in V^1} \mu(\{u\}) \max\left\{x \cdot u - \max_{y \in B} y \cdot u, 0\right\} (h(u) \cdot e^1) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting axiom 6, where the inequality holds since $h(u) \cdot e^1 > 0$ for all $u \in V^1$.

Sub-case 2.b. $h(v) = (v - v_N \mathbf{1}) / \|v - v_N \mathbf{1}\| = u^{1i}$ for some $i > 1$. In this case, $h(w) = (w - w_N \mathbf{1}) / \|w - w_N \mathbf{1}\|$ for all $w \in \text{supp}(\mu)$, by lemma 2. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (\psi(\text{comp}(B \cup \{\psi(B)\})) - \psi(B)) \cdot \psi(B) \\ &= \sum_{w \in V^1} \mu(\{w\}) \max\left\{\psi(B) \cdot w - \max_{y \in B} y \cdot w, 0\right\} (h(w) \cdot \psi(B)) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

contradicting axiom 6, where the inequality holds since (i) $|V^1| \geq 2$ and $w \cdot \psi(B) > 0$ and $h(w) \cdot \psi(B) > 0$ for all $w \in V^1$ and (ii) $h(w) \cdot \psi(B) \geq 0$ for every $w \in \text{supp}(\mu) \setminus V^1$ such that $w \cdot \psi(B) \geq 0$. \square

To complete the proof of theorem 1 using lemma 4, note that if $L_h^\mu \cap S^i$ is a

¹⁵ For the minimum note that, for any $u, w \in S^1 \cap S^0$, $1/2 \leq u_1 w_1 \leq u \cdot w$ where the first inequality is strict unless $u = u^{1i}$ and $w = u^{1j}$, for some $i, j > 1$, and the second inequality is strict unless $i \neq j$. For the maximum, let $N' = N \setminus \{1, i\}$ and note that, for any $u \in S^1 \cap S^0$ and $w \in S^i \cap S^0$, $u \cdot w \leq \sum_{j \in N'} u_j w_j \leq \max\{\sum_{j \in N'} u_j^2, \sum_{j \in N'} w_j^2\} \leq \max\{1 - u_1^2, 1 - w_i^2\} \leq 1/2$, where the last inequality is strict unless $u = u^{1j}$ for some $j \neq 1$ or $w = u^{ij}$ for some $j \neq i$ and, restricting attention to such (u, w) pairs, the second inequality is strict unless $u = u^{1j}$ and $w = u^{ij}$ for some $1 \neq j \neq i$.

singleton for each $i \in N$, then

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = L_h^\mu = \left\{ \frac{e^i + t'\mathbf{1}}{\|e^i + t'\mathbf{1}\|} : i \in N \right\}$$

for some $t' \geq 1$, by lemmas 2 and 3. Then, by lemma 2, μ assigns the same mass $p \geq 0$ to all elements in its support and $h\left(\frac{e^i + t'\mathbf{1}}{\|e^i + t'\mathbf{1}\|}\right) = e^i / \sqrt{n(n-1)}$ for each $i \in N$. Hence, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(B) &= \sum_{i \in N} p \max_{x \in B} \left(x \cdot \frac{e^i + t'\mathbf{1}}{\|e^i + t'\mathbf{1}\|} \right) \frac{e^i}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} \\ &= p \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}} \sum_{i \in N} \max_{x \in B} (x_i + tx_N) e^i \\ &= pn \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}} \left(\max_{x \in B} (x_i + tx_N) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \in N} \max_{x \in B} (x_j + tx_N) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $t = (t' - 1)/n \geq 0$. Finally, axiom 3 implies $pn \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}} = 1$, and that (1) holds for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$.

References

- Chambers, C. P. 2005. ‘Multi-utilitarianism in two-agent quasilinear social choice’. *International Journal of Game Theory* 33: 315–334.
- Chambers, C. P., and J. R. Green. 2005. ‘Additive rules for the quasi-linear bargaining problem’. Working paper.
- Chun, Y. 1986. ‘The solidarity axiom for quasi-linear social choice problems’. *Social Choice and Welfare* 3: 297–310.
- . 1989. ‘Monotonicity and independence axioms for quasi-linear social choice problems’. *Seoul Journal of Economics* 2: 225–244.
- . 2000. ‘Agreement, separability, and other axioms for quasi-linear social choice problems’. *Social Choice and Welfare* 17: 507–521.
- Echenique, F., and M. Núñez. 2024. ‘Price and choose’. Working paper.
- Federer, H. 1969. *Geometric measure theory*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Green, J. R. 1983. ‘A theory of bargaining with monetary transfers’. Working paper.

- . 2005. ‘Compensatory transfers in two-player decision problems’. *International Journal of Game Theory* 33: 159–180.
- Kalai, E., and M. Smorodinsky. 1975. ‘Other solutions to Nash’s bargaining problem’. *Econometrica* 43: 513–518.
- Moulin, H. 1985a. ‘Egalitarianism and utilitarianism in quasi-linear bargaining’. *Econometrica* 53: 49–67.
- . 1985b. ‘The separability axiom and equal-sharing methods’. *Journal of Economic Theory* 36: 120–148.
- . 1987. ‘The pure compensation problem: Egalitarianism versus laissez-fairism’. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 102: 769–783.
- . 1988. *Axioms of cooperative decision making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2002. ‘Axiomatic cost and surplus sharing’. Chap. 6 in *Handbook of social choice and welfare*, edited by K. J. Arrow, A. K. Sen, and K. Suzumura, 1: 289–357. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Myerson, R. B. 1981. ‘Utilitarianism, egalitarianism, and the timing effect in social choice problems’. *Econometrica* 49: 883–897.
- Nash, J. F. 1950. ‘The bargaining problem’. *Econometrica* 18: 155–162.
- Perles, M. A., and M. Maschler. 1981. ‘The super-additive solution for the Nash bargaining game’. *International Journal of Game Theory* 10: 163–193.
- Peters, H. 1986. ‘Simultaneity of issues and additivity in bargaining’. *Econometrica* 54: 153–169.
- Roth, A. E. 1979a. ‘An impossibility result concerning n -person bargaining games’. *International Journal of Game Theory* 8: 129–132.
- . 1979b. *Axiomatic models of bargaining*. Vol. 170. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Shapley, L. S. 1953. ‘A value for n -person games’. Chap. 17 in *Contributions to the theory of games*, edited by H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker, 2: 307–317. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thomson, W., and R. B. Myerson. 1980. ‘Monotonicity and independence axioms’. *International Journal of Game Theory* 9: 37–49.

- Young, H. P. 1985. 'Monotonic solutions of cooperative games'. *International Journal of Game Theory* 14: 65–72.
- Young, H. P. 1994. 'Cost allocation'. Chap. 34 in *Handbook of game theory with economic applications*, edited by R. J. Aumann and S. Hart, 2: 1193–1235. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- . 1995. *Equity: In theory and practice*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.