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#### Abstract

In this note we present a cardinally convex game (Sharkey, 1981) with empty core. Sharkey assumes that $V(N)$ is convex, we do not do so, hence we do not contradict Sharkey]s result.
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A cooperative game with non-transferable utility $V$ (game for short) on a non-empty, finite player set $N$ is a family of sets $V=\{V(S)\}_{S \in 2^{N}}$ satisfying the following assumptions:
$V(\emptyset)=\emptyset$,
$V(S)=V(S)_{S} \times \mathbb{R}^{N \backslash S}$, for all $S \subseteq N$,
$0^{N} \in V(S)$ for all $S \subseteq N, S \neq \emptyset$,
$V(S)$ is closed for all $S \subseteq N$,
comprehensiveness: if $x \in V(S), y \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, y_{S} \leq x_{S}$, then $y \in V(S)$,
the sets $V(S)_{S} \cap\left(x^{S}+\mathbb{R}_{+}^{S}\right)$ are bounded for all $S \subseteq N$ and $x^{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{S}$,
where $\operatorname{Set}_{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{S}$ is the coordinate projection of set Set by the coordinates of $S$. Notice that we do not assume that $V(N)$ is convex, so we are more general than Sharkey (1981).

[^0]The core of a game $V \in \mathcal{G}^{N}$ consists of those elements $x \in V(N)$ for which it holds that there exist no $S \subseteq N$ and no $y \in V(S)$ such that $x_{S} \ll y_{S}$.

For a game $V \in \mathcal{G}^{N}$ and a coalition $S \subseteq N, S \neq \emptyset$, let $V^{\circ}(S)=\{x \in$ $V(S): x_{i}=0$ for all $\left.i \in N \backslash S\right\}$, and let $V^{\circ}(\emptyset)=\left\{0^{N}\right\}$. A game $V \in \mathcal{G}^{N}$ is cardinally convex (Sharkey, 1981) if for all $S, T \subseteq N$ we have

$$
V^{\circ}(S)+V^{\circ}(T) \subseteq V^{\circ}(S \cup T)+V^{\circ}(S \cap T)
$$

The following example is our main result.
Example 1. Let $N=\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}, \mathcal{K}=\{\{1,2\},\{3,5\},\{4,6\}\}$, and
$V(\{i\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x_{i} \leq 0\right\}, i \in N$
$V(\{i, j\})= \begin{cases}\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: \exists y \in[-10,10],\left(x_{i}, x_{j}\right) \leq(y,-y)\right\}, & \text { if }\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{K} \\ \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x_{i}, x_{j} \leq 0\right\} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}$
$V(\{i, j, k\})= \begin{cases}\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{i, j\}) \text { and } x_{k} \leq 0\right\}, & \text { if }\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{K} \\ \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x_{i}, x_{j}, x_{k} \leq 0\right\} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}$
$V(\{1,2,3,4\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{1,2\}) \cap V(\{3,4\})\right.$ or $\left.x_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \leq(1,1,2,2)\right\}$
$V(\{1,2,5,6\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{1,2\}) \cap V(\{5,6\})\right.$ or $\left.x_{\{1,2,5,6\}} \leq(2,2,1,1)\right\}$
$V(\{3,4,5,6\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{3,4\}) \cap V(\{5,6\})\right.$ or $\left.x_{\{3,4,5,6\}} \leq(1,1,2,2)\right\}$
$V(\{i, j, k, l\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{i, j\}) \cap V(\{k, l\})\right\},\{i, j\} \in \mathcal{K},\{k, l\} \notin \mathcal{K}$
$V(\{i, j, k, l, m\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{i, j, k, l\})\right.$ and $\left.x_{m} \leq 0\right\},\{i, j\},\{k, l\} \in \mathcal{K}$
$V(\{i, j, k, l, m, n\})=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{6}: x \in V(\{i, j, k, l\}) \cap V(\{m, n\})\right.$ or $\exists\{g, h\} \in \mathcal{K}$,
$\exists y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left(x_{g}, x_{h}\right) \leq\left(y-1,-y 100^{-\operatorname{sgn} y}-1\right)$ and $\left.x_{N \backslash\{g, h\}} \leq 100\right\}$

The game $V$ is cardinally convex: Take coalitions $S$ and $T$ such that neither $S \subseteq T$ nor $T \subseteq S$, otherwise the proof is obvious. We discuss two cases: First, there does not exist $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $K \subseteq S \cap T$. Then for each $i \in S \cap T$ either $V(S)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$or $V(T)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$. Furthermore, if $V(S)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$, then we can substitute $V^{\circ}(S \backslash\{i\})$ for $V^{\circ}(S)$, and similarly if $V(T)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$, then we can substitute $V^{\circ}(T \backslash\{i\})$ for $V^{\circ}(T)$. Therefore, after substituting as above we get two disjoint coalitions $S^{*} \subseteq S$ and $T^{*} \subseteq T$, where $S^{*}$ and $T^{*}$ are the substitutes for $S$ and $T$ respectively. Then we have $V^{\circ}(S)+V^{\circ}(T)=V^{\circ}\left(S^{*}\right)+V^{\circ}\left(T^{*}\right) \subseteq V^{\circ}\left(S^{*} \cup T^{*}\right)=V^{\circ}(S \cup T)$.

Otherwise, let $K \in \mathcal{K}$ be a coalition that $K \subseteq S \cap T$. If $S \cup T \neq N$, then $|S \cap T| \leq 3$, so there is only one $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $K \subseteq S \cap T$.

If $S \cap T=K$, then either $|S|=3$ or $|T|=3$. W.l.o.g. we can assume that $|S|=3$. Then for $j \in S \backslash T, V(S)_{j} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$, hence $V^{\circ}(T)+V^{\circ}(S) \subseteq$ $V^{\circ}(T \cup\{j\})+V^{\circ}(S \backslash\{j\})=V^{\circ}(S \cup T)+V^{\circ}(S \cap T)$.

If $|S \cap T|=3$, then for $i \in(S \cap T) \backslash K$ either $V(S)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$or $V(T)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$. W.l.o.g. we can assume that $V(S)_{i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$, then for $j \in S \backslash T, j \neq i$ (actually there is at most one such player), $V(S)_{j} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{-}$either. Then $V^{\circ}(T)+V^{\circ}(S) \subseteq$ $V^{\circ}(T \cup\{j\})+V^{\circ}(S \backslash\{j\})=V^{\circ}(S \cup T)+V^{\circ}(S \cap T)$.

If $S \cup T=N$, then for each $x \in V(S)+V(T), x_{K} \leq(4,4)$ or $x_{K} \notin \mathbb{R}_{+}^{2}$, and $x_{N \backslash K} \leq 20^{N \backslash K}$. Moreover, $(6,-6),(-6,6) \in V(K)_{K}$ and there exist $y, z \in V(N)$ such that $y_{K}=(-2,99), z_{K}=(99,-2)$ and $y_{N \backslash K}=z_{N \backslash K}=$ $100^{N \backslash K}$, therefore $V^{\circ}(S)+V^{\circ}(T) \subseteq V(N)+V^{\circ}(S \cap T)$.

The game $V$ has empty core: If $x \in V(\{i, j, k, l\}) \cap V(\{m, n\})$, then either there exists $g \in N$ such that $x_{g}<0$ or $x_{\{m . n\}}=0^{\{m, n\}}$. In the first case $x$ is blocked via coalition $\{g\}$, in the second case $x$ is blocked via either coalition $\{1,2,3,4\}(\{i, j, k, l\}=\{3,4,5,6\})$ or coalition $\{1,2,5,6\}$ $(\{i, j, k, l\}=\{1,2,3,4\})$ or coalition $\{3,4,5,6\} \quad(\{i, j, k, l\}=\{1,2,5,6\})$.

If there exist $y \in \mathbb{R},\{g, h\} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $\left(x_{g}, x_{h}\right) \leq\left(y-1,-y 100^{-\operatorname{sgn} y}-\right.$ $1)$, then either $x_{g}<0$ or $x_{h}<0$, so $x$ is blocked either via coalition $\{g\}$ or coalition $\{h\}$.
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