

# On the Non-Emptiness of the Core of a Cooperative Fuzzy Game

David Bartl<sup>1</sup>

Department of Informatics and Mathematics, School of Business Administration in  
Karviná, Silesian University in Opava, Univerzitní náměstí 1934/3, 733 40 Karviná,  
Czechia

bartl@opf.slu.cz, david.bartl@post.cz

**Abstract.** We introduce the concept of a fuzzy coalition structure on a finite set of players. Then, we propose a new model of a cooperative fuzzy game with transferable utility: an existing coalition is assumed to endeavour in a branch of industry, and a deviation of a new coalition from the coalition structure is seen as an opportunity of the coalition. Based on these premisses, we introduce the concept of the core of the cooperative fuzzy TU-game with respect to a general fuzzy coalition structure. Finally, we define the concept of balancedness and formulate a generalization of the Bondareva-Shapley Theorem.

**Keywords:** Cooperative fuzzy TU-game · Core · Balanced game · Bondareva-Shapley theorem.

## 1 Introduction

Consider a classical cooperative game of  $n$  players with transferable utility. The *coalition* is any subset of the set  $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  of the players, and the potency set  $\mathcal{P}(N) = \{K : K \subseteq N\}$  of the set  $N$  is the collection of all coalitions  $K \subseteq N$  that can potentially emerge. Finally, if a coalition  $K \subseteq N$  emerges, then it will achieve its total profit of  $v(K)$  units of some transferable utility (e.g. money); it is assumed that  $v(\emptyset) = 0$ . In other words, the cooperative game is given by its *coalition function*, which is a mapping  $v: \mathcal{P}(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $v(\emptyset) = 0$ .

The *coalition structure* is any partition of the set  $N$  of the players; that is, the coalition structure is any collection  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$  of coalitions such that  $\bigcup_{p=1}^r S_p = N$  and  $S_p \cap S_q = \emptyset$  whenever  $p \neq q$  for  $p, q = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and also  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{S}$ .

Assume that a coalition structure  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$  has crystallized. It means that the coalitions  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r$  have emerged, they exist now, and they will achieve the profits  $v(S_1), v(S_2), \dots, v(S_r)$ , respectively. Now, the purpose is that the players within each coalition  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r$  divide the total profit of their coalition among themselves. The division of the profit among the players is described by the payoff vector.

The *payoff vector* is any vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $a_i$  is the profit apportioned to the  $i$ -th player for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . It is usual to require that

the payoff vector belongs to a certain solution concept of the cooperative game. Informally speaking, the solution concept is a mapping that assigns a certain set of payoff vectors (i.e. a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) to the coalition function  $v: \mathcal{P}(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and to the coalition structure  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$ . The core [8, 6, 7] is an example of the solution concept.

The *core* of the cooperative game with transferable utility (TU-game) given by the coalition function  $v$  with respect to the coalition structure  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i \in S} a_i = v(S) \text{ for } S \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \sum_{i \in K} a_i \geq v(K) \text{ for } K \in \mathcal{P}(N) \setminus \mathcal{S} \right\},$$

see [1]. In words, the core is the set of all the payoff vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfy the conditions of feasibility ( $\sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq v(S)$  for  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ ), efficiency or group rationality ( $\sum_{i \in S} a_i \geq v(S)$  for  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ ), and group stability ( $\sum_{i \in K} a_i \geq v(K)$  for  $K \in \mathcal{P}(N) \setminus \mathcal{S}$ ). Now, the key question is whether the core is non-empty.

The next classical result provides an answer to the question:

**Bondareva-Shapley Theorem** [3, 9]. *The core  $\mathcal{C}$  of the cooperative TU-game given by the coalition function  $v$  with respect to the coalition structure  $\mathcal{S} = \{N\}$  is non-empty if and only if the game is balanced.*

As we can see, the classical Bondareva-Shapley Theorem provides the answer in the special case when the coalition structure consists of the grand coalition ( $\mathcal{S} = \{N\}$ ) only. We ask whether we can define the concept of balancedness with respect to a general coalition structure  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$  and prove the respective generalization of the Bondareva-Shapley Theorem. Regarding the generalization in the case of cooperative crisp TU-games, see [2]. Now, our purpose is to extend the results further to the case of cooperative fuzzy TU-games.

## 2 The core and balancedness of fuzzy TU-games

Consider again a cooperative game of  $n$  players with transferable utility. Now, the *fuzzy coalition* is any fuzzy subset  $\tilde{K}$  of the set  $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  of the players; we denote this fact by writing  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$ . Recall that any fuzzy subset  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$  is given by its *membership vector*  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in [0, 1]^N$ , which is here understood as a row vector  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa_1 \ \kappa_2 \ \dots \ \kappa_n)$  with  $0 \leq \kappa_i \leq 1$  for  $i \in N$ . Notice that if the membership vector is restricted so that  $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ ; that is,  $\kappa_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i \in N$ , then it corresponds to the crisp coalition  $K \subseteq N$ , with  $i \in K$  if and only if  $\kappa_i = 1$  for  $i \in N$ . The membership vector corresponding to the empty coalition  $\emptyset$  and to the grand coalition  $N$  is  $\boldsymbol{\chi}^\emptyset$  and  $\boldsymbol{\chi}^N$ , with  $\chi_i^\emptyset = 0$  and  $\chi_i^N = 1$ , respectively, for  $i \in N$ .

The collection  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(N) = \{ \tilde{K} : \tilde{K} \subseteq N \}$  of all fuzzy subsets of the set  $N$  contains all the fuzzy coalitions  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$  that can potentially emerge. This collection is identified with the aforementioned set  $[0, 1]^N$  of all the membership vectors  $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ .

The *fuzzy coalition structure* is any indexed collection  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$  of fuzzy coalitions  $\tilde{S}_p \subseteq N$  with membership vectors  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_p \in [0, 1]^N$  for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  is an index set, such that  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{R}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_p = \boldsymbol{\chi}^N$  and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_p \neq \boldsymbol{\chi}^\emptyset$  for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . Notice that,

even though the set  $N$  of the players is finite, the index set  $\mathcal{R}$  may be infinite and a fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{S} \subseteq N$  may be present several times in the fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ ; that is, we may have  $\tilde{S}_p = \tilde{S}_q$  for distinct  $p, q \in \mathcal{R}$ . Moreover, if the membership vectors are restricted so that  $\sigma_p \in \{0, 1\}^N$ , then the index set  $\mathcal{R}$  is finite, let  $\mathcal{R} = \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ , say, and the fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  reduces to the crisp coalition structure  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_r\}$  with  $S_p = \{i \in N : (\sigma_p)_i = 1\}$  for  $p = 1, 2, \dots, r$ . We obviously have  $\bigcup_{p=1}^r S_p = N$  and  $S_p \cap S_q \neq \emptyset$  iff  $p = q$  for  $p, q = 1, 2, \dots, r$ .

Assume that a fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$  has crystallized. It means that the fuzzy coalitions  $\tilde{S}_p \subseteq N$ , for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ , have emerged and exist. We interpret the fact that  $0 \leq (\sigma_p)_i \leq 1$  for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$  so that the player  $i$  is involved in the coalition  $\tilde{S}_p$  for “part-time job” in general; that is, the player is not involved in the coalition at all if  $(\sigma_p)_i = 0$ , the player is involved for “full-time job” if  $(\sigma_p)_i = 1$ , and the player is involved for “part-time job” in the remaining cases. Moreover, we understand the fact that formally the same coalition  $\tilde{S}_p = \tilde{S}_q$ , for  $p, q \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $p \neq q$ , can be present several times in the coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  so that the coalitions  $\tilde{S}_p$  and  $\tilde{S}_q$  are actually *distinct* and they endeavour in different branches of industry in general. Given this interpretation, it follows that the total profits achieved by the distinct coalitions  $\tilde{S}_p$  and  $\tilde{S}_q$ , both of which exist at the same time, may be distinct too in general.

Based on these considerations, we propose a new model of cooperative fuzzy game with transferable utility. We propose that the cooperative fuzzy game is given by a pair of functions  $V: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $v: [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $v(\chi^\emptyset) = 0$ . The first function  $V$  assigns the total profit of  $V(p)$  units of some transferable utility to any fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{S}_p$  of the present fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ ; that is, the total profit  $V(p)$  is assigned to any coalition  $\tilde{S}_p$  that presently exists and is active and endeavouring in some branch of industry. (This approach loosely resembles that of Thrall and Lucas [10].) Now, a new fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$  may take the opportunity and form, leave the present coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ , and start to endeavour in a new branch of industry. This is the reason why we consider the second function  $v$ . It assigns the total profit of  $v(\kappa)$  units of the transferable utility to the fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$  that decides to take the opportunity and leave the present coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ .

(We remark that the above model can easily be adapted to include the case of restricted cooperation: Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0, 1]^N$  be the collection of the membership vectors that correspond to the feasible fuzzy coalitions. We then define the function  $v$  on the collection  $\mathcal{A}$  only ( $v: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ) and adapt the below given considerations accordingly.)

Now, again, the purpose is that the players within each fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{S}_p$  divide the total profit  $V(p)$  of their coalition among themselves for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . The division of the profit will be described by the *payoff matrix* which is any matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \mathcal{R}}$ , where  $a_{ip}$  is the profit apportioned to player  $i$  in coalition  $\tilde{S}_p$  for  $i \in N$  and for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . Moreover, we set  $a_{ip} := 0$  for  $i \in N$  and for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $(\sigma_p)_i = 0$ ; that is, the player  $i$  is not involved in the fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{S}_p$  at all. (The total profit of player  $i$  achieved via all the player’s involvements in the coalitions

is the row sum  $\pi_i = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{R}} a_{ip}$  for  $i \in N$ .) Our purpose is to extend the classical concept of the core to the present setting. Thus, consider a payoff matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \mathcal{R}}$ . We agree that, if  $\mathbf{A}$  belongs to the core, then the equations  $\sum_{i \in N} a_{ip} = V(p)$ , which express the feasibility and efficiency or group rationality, must hold for all  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . Regarding the group stability, assume that a fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$  with membership vector  $\kappa \in [0, 1]^N$  takes the opportunity and deviates from the present coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ . Then the coalition  $\tilde{K}$  endeavouring in a new branch industry will achieve its total profit of  $v(\kappa)$  units of the utility. We stipulate that each player  $i \in N$  must have left some coalitions so that the sum of the players “part-time jobs” exceeds  $\kappa_i$ . Mathematically speaking, we stipulate that there exists an index subset  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sigma_p \geq \kappa$ . Though the index subset  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  could be infinite in general, we shall assume that the index subset  $\mathcal{K}$  is finite to obtain a simple definition of balancedness below. Then the inequalities which prevent the fuzzy coalition  $\tilde{K} \subseteq N$  from the deviation from the coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  are  $\sum_{i \in N} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} a_{ip} \geq v(\kappa)$  for every finite  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sigma_p \geq \kappa$ .

To conclude, we define the *core* of the cooperative fuzzy TU-game given by its fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$ , the coalition of this fuzzy coalition structure function  $V: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and the fuzzy coalition function  $v: [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $v(\chi^0) = 0$  to be the set

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \mathcal{R}} : \begin{aligned} &(\sigma_p)_i = 0 \implies a_{ip} = 0 && \text{for } i \in N \text{ and for } p \in \mathcal{R}, \\ &\sum_{i \in N} a_{ip} = V(p) && \text{for } p \in \mathcal{R}, \\ &\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{i \in N} a_{ip} \geq v(\kappa) && \text{for } \kappa \in [0, 1]^N \text{ and} \\ &\text{for finite } \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{R} \text{ such that } \sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sigma_p \geq \kappa \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Notice that, if  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ , then each of the variables  $a_{ip}$  is bounded below and above for  $i \in N$  and for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . Indeed, if  $i \in N$  and  $p \in \mathcal{R}$  are such that  $(\sigma_p)_i = 0$ , then  $a_{ip} = 0$ . Consider now  $i \in N$  and  $p \in \mathcal{R}$  are such that  $(\sigma_p)_i > 0$ . Take the membership vector  $\kappa \in [0, 1]^N$  such that  $\kappa_i = (\sigma_p)_i$  and  $\kappa_j = 0$  for  $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ . Then  $a_{ip} \geq v(\kappa)$ , which is a lower bound. Let  $\underline{a}_{ip}$  be a lower bound of  $a_{ip}$  for  $i \in N$  and for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . Consider again  $i \in N$  and  $p \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $(\sigma_p)_i > 0$ . We then have  $a_{ip} + \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} \underline{a}_{jp} \leq \sum_{j \in N} a_{jp} = V(p)$ , whence  $a_{ip} \leq V(p) - \sum_{j \in N \setminus \{i\}} \underline{a}_{jp}$ , which is an upper bound. Let  $\bar{a}_{ip}$  be an upper bound of  $a_{ip}$  for  $i \in N$  and for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Let us suppose wlog that  $\underline{a}_{ip} \leq \bar{a}_{ip}$  for  $i \in N$  and for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . (Should we have  $\underline{a}_{ip} > \bar{a}_{ip}$ , then let  $\underline{a}_{ip} := \bar{a}_{ip}$ , say.) Then the closed interval  $[\underline{a}_{ip}, \bar{a}_{ip}]$ , endowed with the usual Euclidean topology, is compact, therefore the product  $\mathcal{X} = \prod_{i \in N} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{R}} [\underline{a}_{ip}, \bar{a}_{ip}]$ , endowed with the product topology, is a compact topological space by Tychonoff’s Theorem. Notice that the core  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ .

It is easy to see that the core  $\mathcal{C}$  is non-empty if and only if the following system of linear inequalities, where  $a_{ip}$  are variables, has a solution:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in N, (\sigma_p)_i > 0} a_{ip} &\leq V(p) && \text{for } p \in \mathcal{R}, \\ -\sum_{i \in N, (\sigma_p)_i > 0} a_{ip} &\leq -V(p) && \text{for } p \in \mathcal{R}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{i \in N, (\sigma_p)_i > 0} a_{ip} &\leq -v(\kappa) \quad \text{for } \kappa \in [0, 1]^N \text{ and} \\
 &\text{for finite } \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{R} \text{ such that } \sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sigma_p \geq \kappa.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Notice that there is a finite number of variables on the left-hand side of each inequality in (1)–(2). Moreover, it is easy to see that, for any finite subset  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq N \times \mathcal{R}$  and for any constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , the halfspace  $F = \{ \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \mathcal{R}} : \sum_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{I}} a_{ip} \leq c \}$  is a closed set in the product topology of the space  $\mathcal{X}$ . It follows that the core  $\mathcal{C}$  is the intersection of (possibly infinitely many) closed halfspaces. Since the space  $\mathcal{X}$  is compact, we conclude that the core  $\mathcal{C}$  is non-empty if and only if every finite subsystem of (1)–(2) has a solution; that is, for any natural numbers  $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ , for any  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r \in \mathcal{R}$ , for any  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_s \in [0, 1]^N$  and for any finite  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \dots, \mathcal{K}_s \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}_q} \sigma_p \geq \kappa_q$  for  $q = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , the following system of linear inequalities, where  $a_{ip}$  are variables, has a solution:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i \in N, (\sigma_{p_\rho})_i > 0} a_{ip} &\leq V(p_\rho) \quad \text{for } \rho = 1, 2, \dots, r, \\
 -\sum_{i \in N, (\sigma_{p_\rho})_i > 0} a_{ip} &\leq -V(p_\rho) \quad \text{for } \rho = 1, 2, \dots, r, \\
 -\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}_q} \sum_{i \in N, (\sigma_p)_i > 0} a_{ip} &\leq -v(\kappa_q) \quad \text{for } q = 1, 2, \dots, s.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The following result is useful:

**Gale’s Theorem of the alternative** [4, 5]. *Let  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  be a matrix and let  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  be a vector. Then there exists a solution  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  to the system of linear inequalities*

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \tag{4}$$

*if and only if*

$$\forall \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times m}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \geq \mathbf{0}^T: \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}^T \implies \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \mathbf{b} \geq 0. \tag{5}$$

By identifying system (4) with (3), the condition (5) and some calculations yield the concept of balancedness of the cooperative fuzzy TU-game.

It will be useful to introduce the operation of rounding up. A number  $\sigma \in [0, 1]$  is rounded up as follows: we let  $\lceil \sigma \rceil = 0$  if  $\sigma = 0$ , and  $\lceil \sigma \rceil = 1$  if  $\sigma > 0$ . Given a row membership vector  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in [0, 1]^N$ , the operation  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  is applied to the vector componentwise; that is, we have  $\lceil \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rceil \in \{0, 1\}^N$  and  $\lceil \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rceil_i = 0$  or  $\lceil \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rceil_i = 1$  if  $\sigma_i = 0$  or  $\sigma_i > 0$ , respectively, for  $i \in N$ .

Recall that the fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$  consists of fuzzy coalitions  $\tilde{S}_p \subseteq N$  with membership vectors  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_p \in [0, 1]^N$  for  $p \in \mathcal{R}$ . We say that a collection  $\{\tilde{K}_1, \tilde{K}_2, \dots, \tilde{K}_s\}$  of fuzzy coalitions  $\tilde{K}_1, \tilde{K}_2, \dots, \tilde{K}_s \subseteq N$  with membership vectors  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_s \in [0, 1]^N$  along with a collection  $\{\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \dots, \mathcal{K}_s\}$  of finite index sets  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \dots, \mathcal{K}_s \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}_q} \sigma_p \geq \kappa_q$  for  $q = 1, 2, \dots, s$  is *balanced* with respect to the fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$  if and only if

$$\sum_{q=1}^s \sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}_q} \lambda_q \lceil \sigma_p \rceil = \sum_{\rho=1}^r \mu_{p_\rho} \lceil \sigma_{p_\rho} \rceil$$

for some balancing weights  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s \geq 0$ , for some natural number  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , for some indices  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r \in \mathcal{R}$ , and for some  $\mu_{p_1}, \mu_{p_2}, \dots, \mu_{p_r} \geq 0$  such that  $\mu_{p_1} + \mu_{p_2} + \dots + \mu_{p_r} = 1$ .

Finally, we say that the given cooperative fuzzy TU-game is *balanced* with respect to the fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$  if and only if

$$\sum_{q=1}^s \sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}_q} \lambda_q v(\kappa_q) \leq \sum_{\rho=1}^r \mu_{p_\rho} V(p_\rho)$$

for every balanced collection  $\{\tilde{K}_1, \tilde{K}_2, \dots, \tilde{K}_s\}$  of fuzzy coalitions along with the corresponding collection  $\{\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2, \dots, \mathcal{K}_s\}$  of the finite index sets.

By combining all the facts together, we come to the main result of this paper:

**Bondareva-Shapley Theorem, generalized version.** *Let a fuzzy cooperative TU-game; that is, a fuzzy coalition structure  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (\tilde{S}_p)_{p \in \mathcal{R}}$ , a function  $V: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the coalition of this fuzzy coalition structure and a fuzzy coalition function  $v: [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $v(\chi^\emptyset) = 0$  be given. Then the core  $\mathcal{C} = \{ \mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times \mathcal{R}} : \sum_{i \in N} a_{ip} = V(p) \text{ for } p \in \mathcal{R}, \text{ and } \sum_{p \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{i \in N} a_{ip} \geq v(\kappa) \text{ for } \kappa \in [0, 1]^N, \text{ and also } a_{ip} = 0 \text{ if } (\sigma_p)_i = 0 \text{ for } i \in N \text{ and for } p \in \mathcal{R} \}$  is non-empty if and only if the game is balanced.*

## Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation under grant number GAČR 21-03085S.

## References

1. Aumann, R. J., Dreze, J. H.: Cooperative Games with Coalition Structures. *International Journal of Game Theory* **3**(4), 217–237 (1974)
2. Bartl, D.: On the Non-Emptiness of the Core of a Cooperative Game. In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Mathematical Methods in Economics 2007*, pp. 9–11. Ostrava: VŠB–Technical University of Ostrava. Faculty of Economics (2007) ISBN 978-80-248-1457-5
3. Bondareva, O. N.: Some Applications of Linear Programming Methods to the Theory of Cooperative Games (in Russian). *Problemy Kybernetiki* **10**, 119–139 (1963)
4. Fan, K.: On Systems of Linear Inequalities. In: Kuhn, H. W., Tucker, A. W. (eds.) *Linear Inequalities and Related Systems*, *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, vol. 38, pp. 99–156. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1956)
5. Gale, D.: *The Theory of Linear Economic Models*. New York: McGraw-Hill (1960)
6. Gillies, D. B.: Solutions to General Non-zero-sum Games. In: Tucker, A. W., Luce, R. D. (eds.) *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, Vol. IV, *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, vol. 38, pp. 47–85. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1959)
7. Kannai, Y.: The Core and Balancedness. In: Aumann, R. J., and Hart, S. (eds.) *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*, Vol. I, pp. 591–667. Amsterdam: North-Holland (1992)
8. Shapley, L. S.: *Markets as Cooperative Games*. RAND Corporation Paper P-629 (1955)
9. Shapley, L. S.: On Balanced Sets and Cores. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* **14**, 453–460 (1967)
10. Thrall, R. M., Lucas, W. F.: *N-person games in partition function form*. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* **10**, 281–298 (1963)