

Approximately Socially-Optimal Decentralized Coalition Formation with Application to P2P Energy Sharing

SID CHI-KIN CHAU, Australian National University, Australia

KHALED ELBASSIONI, Khalifa University, UAE

YUE ZHOU, Australian National University, Australia

The paradigm of P2P (peer-to-peer) economy has emerged in diverse areas. *P2P energy sharing* is a new form of P2P economy in the energy sector, which allows users to establish longer-term sharing arrangements of their local energy resources (e.g., rooftop PVs, home batteries) with joint optimized energy management. In such a P2P setting, a coalition of users is formed for sharing resources in a decentralized manner by self-interested users based on their individual preferences. A likely outcome of decentralized coalition formation will be a stable coalition structure, where no group of users could cooperatively opt out to form another coalition that induces higher preferences to all its members. Remarkably, there exist a number of fair cost-sharing mechanisms (e.g., equal-split, proportional-split, egalitarian and Nash bargaining solutions of bargaining games) that model practical cost-sharing applications with desirable properties, such as the existence of a stable coalition structure with a small strong price-of-anarchy (SPoA) to approximate the social optimum. In this paper, we provide general results of decentralized coalition formation: (1) We establish a logarithmic lower bound on SPoA, and hence, show several previously known fair cost-sharing mechanisms are the best practical mechanisms with minimal SPoA. (2) We show that the SPoA of egalitarian and Nash bargaining cost-sharing mechanisms to match the lower bound. (3) We derive the SPoA of a mix of different cost-sharing mechanisms. (4) We present a decentralized algorithm to form a stable coalition structure. (5) Finally, we apply our general results to P2P energy sharing and present an empirical study of decentralized coalition formation in a real-world project. We study the empirical SPoA, which is observed within 95% of the social optimal cost with coalitions of 2 and 3 users, via fair cost-sharing mechanisms.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Decentralized Coalition Formation, Approximately Socially Optimal, Strong Price of Anarchy

1 INTRODUCTION

People are increasingly empowered by peer-to-peer (P2P) interactions. Sharing economy is a prominent example, by which resources, services and facilities are shared dynamically among end-users in a peer-to-peer fashion. In diverse sharing economy scenarios, users often form coalitions for sharing activities, such as ridesharing/carpooling, parking/storage sharing, and various group buying activities. In this paper, we shed light on coalition formation in sharing activities and particularly apply the P2P sharing paradigm to the application of distributed energy sharing.

1.1 P2P Energy Sharing

In the era of smart energy grid, end users are expected to gain increasing control of their own energy services with enhanced autonomy and transparency. The trend of decentralized control leads to the notion of “transactive energy”, providing end users




Fig. 1. P2P energy trading vs. P2P energy sharing.

more choices and control of how energy is generated, delivered and utilized [25]. The paradigms of *P2P energy exchanges* [34] aim to empower transactive energy by enabling distributed coordination among local energy producers and consumers without centralized operators. The concept of P2P energy exchanges can be realized in two aspects (see Table 1 for a comparison):

- **Peer-to-peer Energy Trading:** A traditional approach to enable P2P energy flows among users is by a real-time trading process that matches local suppliers and customers instantaneously [12, 21]. Usually, a bidding or auction process is conducted to determine the trading parties. This will result in a one-time transaction for each exchange operation that operates over a short timescale (e.g., hours). Each party is designated as a buyer (i.e., energy importer) or a seller (i.e., energy exporter). There is no joint optimization of mutual energy management systems between the parties.
- **Peer-to-peer Energy Sharing:** In contrast with real-time P2P trading, another approach is to rely on a longer-term sharing arrangement of mutual local energy systems of users [9]. The involved parties will agree on how to exchange energy during the agreed period (e.g., over months or years) with specifications of cost-sharing and coordination mechanisms. The longer arrangement period allows joint optimization of long-term energy management operations, where the involved parties can be hybrid prosumers, as energy importers and exporters at different times. Consequently, users are able to coordinate their consumption usage to maximize the benefits of their distributed energy generation. Sharing arrangements can be established by a negotiation and matching process.

The concept of P2P energy sharing belongs to the paradigm of P2P sharing. Unlike the one-time energy trading, P2P energy sharing allows users to coordinate their usage and optimize their energy management. This not only creates incentives for renewable energy adoption but also improves long-term energy efficiency. P2P energy sharing can be realized in a community for co-located users, or via virtual net metering for geographically dispersed users. In this

Authors' addresses: Sid Chi-Kin Chau, sid.chau@anu.edu.au, School of Computing, Australian National University, Australia; Khaled Elbassioni, khaled.elbassioni@ku.ac.ae, Khalifa University, UAE; Yue Zhou, yue.zhou@anu.edu.au, School of Computing, Australian National University, Australia.

	P2P Energy Trading	P2P Energy Sharing
Time-scale	Short (e.g., hours)	Long (e.g., months/years)
Roles	Designated sellers/buyers	Hybrid prosumers
Operations	One-time operations	Multi-time operations
Mechanisms	Bidding & auction	Negotiation & matching
Joint optimization	No	Yes

Table 1. Comparison of P2P energy trading and sharing.

paper, we model coalition formation in sharing activities and apply the results to P2P energy sharing.

1.2 Modeling Decentralized Coalition Formation

In this paper, we first study a general framework of coalition formation by self-interested users, which is subsequently applied to P2P energy sharing. Traditional cooperative game theory [27] usually considers forming a grand coalition involving every user mediated by a centralized planner, whereas practical sharing economy is often populated by small-group coalition formation in a decentralized manner by self-interested users. A better model for understanding decentralized coalition formation can be represented by a *hedonic game* [4, 5, 13, 17], where participants aim to form coalitions among themselves according to certain preferences over the coalitions they may belong to. In such a setting, a likely outcome is a *stable* coalition structure of disjoint coalitions of participants, where no group of participants could cooperatively opt out to form another possible coalition that could induce higher preferences to all its members. However, a hedonic game with arbitrary preferences may not induce a desirable stable coalition structure.

In this paper, we adopt an approach from algorithmic game theory. We aim to devise practically useful mechanisms for decentralized coalition formation in a hedonic game that can lead to desirable stable coalition structures. In particular, we draw on our recent work [7] in studying decentralized coalition formation for the purpose of cost-sharing in sharing economy. We previously showed some remarkable properties of several fair cost-sharing mechanisms (e.g., equal-split, proportional-split, egalitarian and Nash bargaining solutions of bargaining games) for practical cost-sharing applications, such as the existence of a stable coalition structure and a small *strong price-of-anarchy* (SPoA). SPoA is a common metric in algorithmic game theory [26], by which one compares the worst-case social cost of a strong Nash equilibrium (that allows any group of users to deviate jointly to form a coalition) and the cost of a social optimum. A decentralized mechanism with a small SPoA will guarantee a good approximation of the social optimum, without relying on centralized planning.

Contributions: In this paper, we provide several new results of decentralized coalition formation:

- (1) We establish a logarithmic lower bound on SPoA for practical polynomial-time mechanisms, and hence, establish that several previously known fair cost-sharing mechanisms are the best practical mechanisms with minimal SPoA.

- (2) We improve the SPoA of egalitarian and Nash bargaining cost-sharing mechanisms from the previously known square-root bound on SPoA to match the logarithmic lower bound.
- (3) We consider a mix of different cost-sharing mechanisms. We derive a logarithmic bound on SPoA with respect to mixed cost-sharing mechanisms.
- (4) We present a decentralized algorithm to form a stable coalition structure under several fair cost-sharing mechanisms, based on the deferred-acceptance algorithm.
- (5) Finally, we apply our general results of decentralized coalition formation to P2P energy sharing. We present and analyze an empirical study of decentralized coalition formation in a real-world P2P energy sharing project. We study the empirical SPoA and its effect with respect to various parameters in P2P energy sharing.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Coalition Formation and Game Theory

Coalition formation has been studied in traditional cooperative game theory [27], which provides a foundation of forming a grand coalition, involving all the members, subject to certain axiomatic properties. For example, the notions of core, Shapley value, and nucleolus have been devised to construct proper transfer functions of utility among participants in a grand coalition [27]. However, such a setting is usually considered from the perspective of a centralized planner, who divides the benefits of a coalition among the members.

There are a number of studies about non-cooperative coalition formation. These coalition formation models belong to the topic of hedonic games and network cost-sharing games (e.g., [1–4, 14, 16, 17, 19, 29, 30]). A useful notion to model non-cooperative coalition formation is a *strong Nash equilibrium*. Unlike a typical Nash equilibrium that tolerates only unilateral strategic change by one participant at a time, a strong Nash equilibrium can tolerate collective strategic changes by any group of participants. Such collective strategic changes can model an alternate coalition formation from the existing coalition structure.

Our study of decentralized coalition formation follows the approach of hedonic games [4, 16], where users form coalitions based on individual preferences over coalition formation. We characterize the properties of strong Nash equilibrium in specific settings of hedonic games. But typical hedonic games allow arbitrary preferences of coalitions, which can lead to the absence of a strong Nash equilibrium (or so-called a core-stable coalition structure). In this paper, we consider hedonic games specifically for cost-sharing applications, such that users aim to split the associated cost of a coalition. In this cost-sharing setting, the individual preferences over coalition formation are governed by a cost-sharing mechanism. Our previous work [7] showed that certain cost-sharing mechanisms can yield the existence of a strong Nash equilibrium.

2.2 P2P Energy

This paper explores P2P energy sharing. Relating to P2P energy sharing, there have been an extensive body of literature on P2P energy trading. For example, see an extensive survey in [34], and the references therein. Among these studies, P2P energy trading has

been applied to distributed energy resource management [21, 33, 41]. Moreover, the idea of shared pool of energy has been proposed in various energy sharing applications, such as virtual power plants [24], energy storage cloud [18, 22] and other multi-user energy systems [6, 20, 38]. P2P energy trading has been recently demonstrated in a real-world microgrid of the Brooklyn Microgrid Project [23]. However, a key difference between this work and previous studies is that we focus on economic mechanisms for energy sharing in the form of a long-term arrangement and coalition formation mechanisms of self-interested users.

Virtual net metering [15, 32] is a bill crediting system for community solar and shared energy storage without a common electricity meter. Originally, net metering allows a single user to earn credits of the net energy export from rooftop solar or energy storage as to offset the future energy consumption. Virtual net metering can be extended to a community scenario (of geographically dispersed users) with no physical grid connection to solar and energy storage systems. In this case, the utility operator will handle the credit transfer process from an energy generation source to a group of registered users with different electricity meters. Virtual net metering can also be applied to P2P energy sharing, where the users specify the credit transfer process according to a cost-sharing mechanism.

This paper extends our prior work [9, 42] in P2P energy sharing. But this work provides rigorous proofs of the theoretical results and extended simulation results. Previously, we have also conducted empirical studies of decentralized coalition formation for ride-sharing [8] and mobile edge computing [39, 40].

3 MODEL AND NOTATIONS

3.1 General Coalition Formation Model

First, we present a general model of decentralized coalition formation by self-interested participants, based on hedonic games [4, 17]. In Sec. 4, we will apply the model to P2P energy sharing.

In this model, there are a set of n self-interested participants \mathcal{N} . A coalition of participants is represented by a subset $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. A *coalition structure* represents a feasible state of coalition formation, which is denoted by a partition of \mathcal{N} as $\mathcal{P} \subset 2^{\mathcal{N}}$, such that $\bigcup_{G \in \mathcal{P}} G = \mathcal{N}$ and $G_1 \cap G_2 = \emptyset$ for any pair $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{P}$.

Each element $G \in \mathcal{P}$ is called a coalition (or a group). The set of singleton coalitions, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}} \triangleq \{\{i\} : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$, is called the *standalone coalition structure*, wherein no one forms a coalition with others. We consider K -coalition structures with at most K participants per coalition. In practice, K is often much less than n , which models small-group coalition formation. Let the set of partitions of \mathcal{N} be \mathcal{P} . Let $\mathcal{P}^K \triangleq \{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P} : |G| \leq K \text{ for each } G \in \mathcal{P}\}$ be the set of feasible coalition structures, such that each coalition consists of at most K participants. In general, a hedonic game is defined by a complete and transitive preference relation \succsim_i over the set $\{G \subseteq \mathcal{N} : i \in G\}$ of coalitions that participant i belongs to, but in this paper will consider only preferences defined by certain utility functions as given in the next subsection.

3.2 Stable Coalition Structures

Since participants are self-interested, they are motivated to join a coalition to maximize their own utility. Let $u_i(G)$ be the utility

function of user i when joining a coalition G , which maps G to a numerical benefit that i will perceive. For clarity, we set the standalone utility $u_i(\{i\}) = 0$ when i is alone.

Given a coalition structure $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}^K$, a coalition of participants G of size at most K is called a *blocking coalition* with respect to \mathcal{P} , if $G \notin \mathcal{P}$, and all participants in G can *strictly* increase their utilities when they form a coalition G instead of any coalition G' in \mathcal{P} , namely,

$$u_i(G) > u_i(G') \text{ for all } i \in G, G' \in \mathcal{P} \text{ where } i \in G' \quad (1)$$

A coalition structure is called a *stable coalition structure*, denoted by $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{P}^K$, if there exists no blocking coalition with respect to $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$. Note that a stable coalition structure is also a strong Nash equilibrium¹. In a stable coalition structure, the utility for every participant is always non-negative $u_i(G) \geq 0$. Otherwise, the participant will not join any coalition because of $u_i(\{i\}) = 0$. Note that there may or may not exist a stable coalition structure in a hedonic game. In general, determining the existence of a stable coalition structure is NP-hard [4, 16] (specifically, Σ_2^P -complete [37]).

3.3 Cost-Sharing Mechanisms

In this paper, we specifically consider coalition formation for cost-sharing, and the induced hedonic games by certain cost-sharing mechanisms. In such a setting, there is a non-negative cost function of each coalition G , denoted by $C(G)$. Also, denote by $C_i \triangleq C(\{i\})$ the *standalone* (or default) cost for participant i , when i is alone.

We note an important property called *cost monotonicity*, which holds intuitively in many cost-sharing applications:

$$C(H) \leq C(G), \quad \text{if } H \subseteq G. \quad (2)$$

Namely, a larger coalition should incur a larger cost.

By agreeing to form a coalition G , the participants in G are supposed to share the cost $C(G)$. A *cost-sharing mechanism* is characterized by a payment function $p_i(G)$, which is the shared cost of participant $i \in G$. A cost-sharing mechanism $p_i(\cdot)$ is said to be *budget balanced*, if $\sum_{i \in G} p_i(G) = C(G)$ for every $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$.

Given a coalition G , the utility function of participant $i \in G$ can be derived from the payment function as follows:

$$u_i(G) = C_i - p_i(G) \quad (3)$$

Namely, the utility function measures the surplus of joining coalition G , as compared with being alone.

In this paper, we consider the following simple well-defined cost-sharing mechanisms (denoted by different superscripts):

- (1) **Equal-split Cost-Sharing:** The cost is split equally among all participants:

$$p_i^{\text{eq}}(G) \triangleq \frac{C(G)}{|G|} \quad (4)$$

Namely, $u_i^{\text{eq}}(G) = C_i - \frac{C(G)}{|G|}$.

- (2) **Proportional-split Cost-Sharing:** The cost is split proportionally according to the participants' standalone costs:

$$p_i^{\text{pp}}(G) \triangleq \frac{C_i \cdot C(G)}{\sum_{j \in G} C_j} \quad (5)$$

¹A strong Nash equilibrium is a Nash equilibrium, in which no group of participants can cooperatively deviate in an allowable way that strictly benefits all of its members.




Fig. 2. Comparison of $u_i^{\text{ega}}(\{i, j\})$ (blue) and $u_i^{\text{pp}}(\{i, j\})$ (orange). If $C_j \geq C_i$, $u_i^{\text{ega}}(\{i, j\}) \geq u_i^{\text{pp}}(\{i, j\})$. Otherwise, $u_i^{\text{pp}}(\{i, j\}) \geq u_i^{\text{ega}}(\{i, j\})$.

Namely, $u_i^{\text{pp}}(G) = C_i \cdot \frac{(\sum_{j \in G} C_j) - C(G)}{\sum_{j \in G} C_j}$.

- (3) **Bargaining-based Cost-Sharing:** The cost-sharing problem can be formulated as a bargaining game [28], with a feasible set, and a disagreement point, to which the participants will fall back on when no coalition is formed. Under the bargaining game model, the feasible set is the set of utility values $(\hat{u}_i)_{i \in G}$, such that $\sum_{i \in G} \hat{u}_i \leq \sum_{i \in G} u_i(G)$ (equivalently, $\sum_{i \in G} p_i \geq C(G)$), and the disagreement point is $(\hat{u}_i = 0)_{i \in G}$ when each participant pays only the respective standalone cost. There are two common bargaining solutions in the literature [28]:

- (a) **Egalitarian-split Cost-Sharing** is given by:

$$p_i^{\text{ega}}(G) \triangleq C_i - \frac{(\sum_{j \in G} C_j) - C(G)}{|G|} \quad (6)$$

Namely, all participants $i \in G$ will receive the same utility as $u_i^{\text{ega}}(G) = \frac{(\sum_{j \in G} C_j) - C(G)}{|G|}$.

- (b) **Nash Bargaining Solution** is given by:

$$(p_i^{\text{ns}}(G))_{i \in G} \in \arg \max_{(\hat{p}_i)_{i \in G}} \prod_{i \in G} u_i(\hat{p}_i) \quad (7)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i \in G} \hat{p}_i = C(G)$$

It can be shown that $p_i^{\text{ega}}(G) = p_i^{\text{ns}}(G)$, and hence both egalitarian-split cost-sharing and Nash bargaining solution produce equivalent coalition structures² [7].

Remarks: While the equal-split cost-sharing mechanism distributes the cost equally to every user regardless of their standalone costs, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms distribute the cost with varying degrees. For example, $G = \{i, j\}$, we plot $u_i^{\text{ega}}(\{i, j\})$ and $u_i^{\text{pp}}(\{i, j\})$ according to C_i and C_j in Fig. 2, assuming $C(\{i, j\}) = 1$. If $C_j \geq C_i$, then $u_i^{\text{ega}}(\{i, j\}) \geq u_i^{\text{pp}}(\{i, j\})$. Otherwise, $u_i^{\text{pp}}(\{i, j\}) \geq u_i^{\text{ega}}(\{i, j\})$. Namely, egalitarian-split cost-sharing favors smaller standalone costs, whereas proportional-split cost-sharing favors larger ones.

²Furthermore, in egalitarian-split and Nash bargaining cost-sharing, non-positive payment (i.e., $p_i^{\text{ega}}(G) < 0$ or $p_i^{\text{ns}}(G) < 0$) is possible because it may need to compensate those with low standalone costs to reach equal utility among all participants. [7] also showed the equivalence of stable coalition structures in egalitarian-split and Nash bargaining cost-sharing with and without non-negative payment constraints.

Unlike general hedonic games, certain cost-sharing mechanisms can guarantee the existence of a stable coalition structure as given by the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3.1 ([7]). *There exist stable coalition structures under equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms, and Nash bargaining solution.*

Another cost-sharing mechanism called usage-based cost-sharing mechanism is also considered in [7], which does not always guarantee the existence of a stable coalition structure.

3.4 Strong Price-of-Anarchy

Given a coalition structure \mathcal{P} , let $u(G) \triangleq \sum_{i \in G} u_i(G)$ and $u(\mathcal{P}) \triangleq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{P}} u(G)$. We call $u(\mathcal{P})$ the social utility of \mathcal{P} . A *social optimum* is a coalition structure that maximizes the total social utility of all users: $\mathcal{P}^* = \arg \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}_K} u(\mathcal{P})$.

We define the utility-based *Strong Price of Anarchy* (SPoA) as the worst-case ratio between the social utility of a stable coalition structure and that of a social optimum over any instance of $u(\cdot)$ and its stable coalition structure:

$$\text{SPoA}_K^u \triangleq \max_{u(\cdot), \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{u(\mathcal{P}^*)}{u(\hat{\mathcal{P}})} \quad (8)$$

Specifically, the SPoA when using specific cost-sharing mechanisms is denoted by $\text{SPoA}_K^{u, \text{eq}}$, $\text{SPoA}_K^{u, \text{pp}}$, $\text{SPoA}_K^{u, \text{ega}}$, respectively. SPoA provides a metric of measuring social optimality.

We define the social cost of \mathcal{P} by $C(\mathcal{P}) \triangleq \sum_{G \in \mathcal{P}} C(G)$. For any budget balanced cost-sharing mechanism, $C(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i \in G, G \in \mathcal{P}} C_i - u(\mathcal{P})$ (which follows from Eqn. (3)). Hence, a social optimum equivalently minimizes the social cost of all users: $\mathcal{P}^* = \arg \min_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}_K} C(\mathcal{P})$.

For cost-sharing applications, we define the cost-based SPoA with respect to cost over any instance of $C(\cdot)$ and its stable coalition structure:

$$\text{SPoA}_K^C \triangleq \max_{C(\cdot), \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} \quad (9)$$

For arbitrary hedonic games and cost-sharing mechanisms, the SPoA can be as large as K : $\text{SPoA}_K^C = O(K)$ and $\text{SPoA}_K^u = O(K)$. Next, we will see that certain cost-sharing mechanisms can induce only logarithmic SPoA.

3.5 Mixed Cost-Sharing Mechanisms

Previously, we only considered one single cost-sharing mechanism in a stable coalition structure. In this section, we extend a stable coalition structure to consider multiple cost-sharing mechanisms. Equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms are called *pure* cost-sharing mechanisms. We then consider a mixed setting with these pure cost-sharing mechanisms. A *mixed* cost-sharing mechanism consists of a set of constituent pure cost-sharing mechanisms. For a coalition structure \mathcal{P} , the cost of $C(G)$, where $G \in \mathcal{P}$, is divided according to one of the constituent pure cost-sharing mechanisms for every participant $i \in G$. A stable coalition structure with respect to a mixed cost-sharing mechanism exists, if there is no blocking coalition induced by any constituent pure cost-sharing mechanism. Note that even if its constituent pure




Fig. 3. Variables of the energy management system.

cost-sharing mechanisms always guarantee the existence of stable coalition structures, a mixed cost-sharing mechanism may not guarantee the existence of a stable coalition structure.

4 APPLICATION TO P2P ENERGY SHARING

In this section, we apply decentralized coalition formation to the scenario of P2P energy sharing. We follow the model of P2P energy sharing in our prior work [9, 42]. Without sharing, each user will only use his local energy resources (e.g., rooftop PV and home battery) to satisfy local energy demand, in addition to acquiring energy from the grid. However, local energy resources may be underutilized or out of capacity. By sharing mutual energy resources in P2P energy sharing, the users can optimize the efficiency of their energy resources. In practice, energy importing and exporting among users can be achieved by “virtual net metering”, which is a billing process at the grid operator that allows the credits of energy export of one user to offset the debits of energy import of another.

We consider the scenario of allowing at most K users to establish a P2P energy sharing agreement in a coalition for an extended period of time. We limit the size K , as to reduce the control overhead of multiple energy resources. We first define the variables (Table 2) of a user’s energy management system, whose relationships are illustrated in Fig. 3:

- **Demand:** Each user $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is characterized by an energy demand function $a_i(t)$. The demand function can be estimated based on the prediction from historical data.
- **Rooftop PV:** Each user $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is equipped with rooftop PV, characterized by an energy supply function $r_i(t)$. The supply function $r_i(t)$ is divided into three feed-in rates: $r_i^a(t)$ is for local demand, $r_i^b(t)$ for charging battery, and $r_i^g(t)$ for electricity feed-in to the grid.
- **Home Battery:** Each user $i \in \mathcal{N}$ is equipped with a home battery, characterized by capacity B_i . The battery is constrained by charging efficiency $\eta_c \leq 1$ and discharging efficiency $\eta_d \geq 1$, charge rate constraint μ_c and discharge rate constraint μ_d . Let $b_i(t)$ be the current state-of-charge in the battery at time t , and $d_i^a(t)$ be the discharge rate for local

\mathcal{N}	The set of users
$a_i(t)$	Energy demand function of user i
$r_i(t)$	Energy supply function of user i
$r_i^a(t)$	Energy supply for local demand of user i
$r_i^b(t)$	Energy supply for battery charging of user i
$r_i^g(t)$	Energy supply for feed-in to the grid of user i
B_i	Battery capacity of user i
η_c, η_d	Charging and discharging efficiency
μ_c, μ_d	Charge and discharge rate constraints
$b_i(t)$	Current state-of-charge in the battery at time t
$d_i^a(t)$	Discharge rate for local demand of user i
$d_i^g(t)$	Discharge rate for feed-in to the grid of user i
C_g^+	Per-unit cost by the grid on electricity consumption
C_g^-	Per-unit compensation on electricity feed-in
$g_i^+(t)$	Electricity consumption rate of user i at time t
$g_i^-(t)$	Electricity feed-in rate of user i
$g_i^a(t)$	Consumption rate for local demand of user i
$g_i^b(t)$	Consumption rate for battery charging of user i

Table 2. Key notations of variables.

demand, whereas $d_i^g(t)$ be the discharge rate for electricity feed-in to the grid.

- **Grid:** Each user can also import electricity from the grid if his demand is not entirely satisfied. Further, rooftop PV and home battery can inject excessive electricity into the grid, when feed-in compensation is offered by a grid operator. Let C_g^+ be the per-unit cost by the grid on electricity consumption, and C_g^- be the per-unit compensation on electricity feed-in. Let $g_i^+(t)$ be the electricity consumption rate of the user i at time t , and $g_i^-(t)$ be the electricity feed-in rate. Let $g_i^a(t)$ be the consumption rate for local demand, and $g_i^b(t)$ be the consumption rate for charging a battery.

If a group of users $G \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ form a coalition to share their energy resources and to minimize their total operational cost, then $C(G)$ can be defined as the minimum cost of the energy management optimization. We formulate the energy management optimization problem in (EP), with the constraints of variables captured in Fig. 3.

In (EP), there is a per-unit service fee C_s charged by the grid operator for virtual net metering. Let $s_i^+(t)$ and $s_i^-(t)$ be the consumption rate and the feed-in rate under virtual net metering for user i , respectively. We assume $C_s < C_g^-$. Otherwise, there is no need for energy sharing.

Remarks: The Service fee C_s is an important factor to the viability of coalition-based optimization. A high service fee C_s will deter coalition formation in P2P energy sharing. As long as $C_s < C_g^+ - C_g^-$, it is viable to transfer PV energy via virtual net metering, because the price difference $C_g^+ - C_g^-$ (that represents simultaneous importing and exporting electricity) is still higher than virtual net metering at the cost C_s . Even though $C_s > C_g^-$, when C_g^+ is sufficiently large, we still have $C_s < C_g^+ - C_g^-$. We assume that all users are energy consumers rather than energy producers. Hence, the standalone cost C_i is always positive for all users.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{EP}) \quad C(G) &\triangleq \min \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i \in G} (C_g^+ g_i^+(t) - C_g^- g_i^-(t) + C_s s_i^+(t)) \\
\text{s.t. } b_i(t+1) - b_i(t) &= \eta_c (r_i^b(t) + g_i^b(t)) \\
&\quad - \eta_d (d_i^a(t) + d_i^g(t)), \quad (10) \\
0 \leq b_i(t) &\leq B_i, b_i(0) = 0, \quad (11) \\
g_i^b(t) + r_i^b(t) &\leq \mu_c, \quad (12) \\
d_i^a(t) + d_i^g(t) &\leq \mu_d, \quad (13) \\
d_i^a(t) + g_i^a(t) + r_i^a(t) &= a_i(t), \quad (14) \\
r_i^a(t) + r_i^b(t) + r_i^g(t) &= r_i(t), \quad (15) \\
g_i^a(t) + g_i^b(t) &= g_i^+(t) + s_i^+(t), \quad (16) \\
d_i^g(t) + r_i^g(t) &= g_i^-(t) + s_i^-(t), \quad (17) \\
\sum_{i \in G} s_i^+(t) &= \sum_{i \in G} s_i^-(t) \quad (18) \\
\text{var. } b_i(t) \geq 0, d_i^a(t) \geq 0, d_i^g(t) \geq 0, &\forall t \in [1, T], \forall i \in G \\
r_i^a(t) \geq 0, r_i^b(t) \geq 0, r_i^g(t) \geq 0, &\forall t \in [1, T], \forall i \in G \\
g_i^a(t) \geq 0, g_i^b(t) \geq 0, s_i^+(t) \geq 0, &s_i^-(t) \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

5 OUTLINE OF RESULTS

We present the theoretical results of the general coalition formation model. The full proofs can be found in the Appendix.

The cost-based SPoA has been studied in our prior work [7]. We can relate utility-based SPoA to cost-based SPoA by Theorem 1.

THEOREM 1. Consider a budget balanced cost-sharing mechanism $p_i(\cdot)$. For the cost-based and utility-based strong prices of anarchy SPoA_K^C and SPoA_K^u , respectively, we have

$$\text{SPoA}_K^u \geq \frac{K-1}{K - \text{SPoA}_K^C}; \quad \text{SPoA}_K^C \leq K - \frac{K-1}{\text{SPoA}_K^u} \quad (19)$$

There are some known results on the cost-based SPoA:

PROPOSITION 5.1 ([7]). The SPoA of equal-split and proportional-split cost-sharing mechanisms with cost monotonicity are both logarithmically bounded: $\text{SPoA}_K^{C,\text{eq}} = O(\log K)$ and $\text{SPoA}_K^{C,\text{pp}} = O(\log K)$.

PROPOSITION 5.2 ([7]). The SPoA of egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanism and Nash bargaining solution with cost monotonicity is upper bounded by $\text{SPoA}_K^{C,\text{ega}} = \text{SPoA}_K^{C,\text{ns}} = O(\sqrt{K} \log K)$.

In this paper, we are able to improve the bound of SPoA of egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanism by Theorem 2.

THEOREM 2. For egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanism and Nash bargaining solution with cost monotonicity, the SPoA is upper bounded by

$$\text{SPoA}_K^{C,\text{ega}} = \text{SPoA}_K^{C,\text{ns}} = O(\log K) \quad (20)$$

Remarks: Hence, we can conclude that equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms and Nash bargaining solution share the same logarithmic order of magnitude in

SPoA. Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}}$ be the stable coalition structures for equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms, respectively. Because of the benchmark against the social optimum in Propositions 5.1-5.2 and Theorem 2, we can also bound the worst-case ratio of stable coalition structures among different cost-sharing mechanisms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}}, C(\cdot)} \max \left\{ \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}})}{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}})}, \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}})}{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}})} \right\} &= O(\log K) \\
\max_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}}, C(\cdot)} \max \left\{ \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}})}{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}})}, \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}})}{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{pp}})} \right\} &= O(\log K) \\
\max_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}}, C(\cdot)} \max \left\{ \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}})}{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}})}, \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{eq}})}{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{\text{ega}})} \right\} &= O(\log K)
\end{aligned}$$

Namely, the costs of these cost-sharing mechanisms are not far from each other.

We next provide a logarithmic lower bound on SPoA for practical polynomial-time mechanisms in Theorem 3. Hence, it shows that equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms and Nash bargaining solution are the best practical mechanisms with minimal SPoA.

THEOREM 3. For any cost-sharing mechanism, such that a stable coalition structure can be found in polynomial-time, its SPoA is lower bounded by $\Omega(\log K)$, under the assumption that $P \neq NP$.

We can also derive the SPoA for a mixed cost-sharing mechanism as the the upper bound of the SPoA of its constituent pure cost-sharing mechanisms in Theorem 4.

THEOREM 4. For a mixed cost-sharing mechanism of a constant number of constituent pure cost-sharing mechanisms, if the SPoA of each constituent pure cost-sharing mechanism is $O(f(K))$, then the SPoA of the mixed cost-sharing mechanism is also $O(f(K))$.

6 DECENTRALIZED COALITION FORMATION ALGORITHM

In this section, we present a decentralized coalition formation algorithm. In our previous paper [7], we have presented a centralized coalition formation algorithm, which is based on sequential steps of pruning the transition graph of states, which can be very slow in practice if there are many states in coalition formation. This decentralized coalition formation process is based on the classical deferred-acceptance algorithms (e.g., the Gale-Shapley algorithm for the stable marriage problem and the Irving algorithm for the stable roommates problem). We extend the deferred-acceptance algorithm to coalition formation with more than 2 participants per coalition. The deferred-acceptance algorithm allows parallelization, such that multiple users can propose coalitions to each other simultaneously.

We first define some notations. For each participant $i \in \mathcal{N}$, let $\mathcal{G}_i \triangleq \{G \subseteq \mathcal{N} : i \in G \text{ and } G \in \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}^K\}$ be the set of feasible coalitions that include participant i . Note that \mathcal{G}_i also includes the standalone coalition $\{i\}$. Each participant i has a preference over \mathcal{G}_i , defined by $u_i(\cdot)$. Denote participant i 's preference by an ordered sequence $\text{Pref}_i = (G_1, G_2, \dots, \{i\})$ such that $u_i(G_{t-1}) \geq u_i(G_t)$. For brevity, we only consider the coalition G in i 's preference where

$u_i(G) > 0 = u_i(\{i\})$. We define two operations that enumerate the preference PREF_i :

- (1) $\text{TOP}(\text{PREF}_i)$ returns the topmost preferred coalition from PREF_i .
- (2) $\text{REMOVE}(\text{PREF}_i, G)$ removes G from PREF_i .

During the process of decentralized coalition formation, each participant i carries a tuple of variables:

$$\langle \text{PROPS}_i, H_i, \text{SUSPEND}_i \rangle$$

- $\text{PROPS}_i \subseteq \mathcal{G}_i$ is a set of proposed coalitions received by i . For each $G \in \text{PROPS}_i$, we define a function $\text{PROPOSER}(G) \mapsto G$ that indicates its proposer.
- $H_i \in \mathcal{G}_i$ is a coalition that is currently held for consideration by i .
- SUSPEND_i is a boolean variable, indicating if i is suspended from proposing the next-top preferred coalition to other participants.

Initially, set $H_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ and $\text{SUSPEND}_i \leftarrow \text{FALSE}$, $\text{PROPS}_i \leftarrow \emptyset$. We define a decentralized process, COLN-FORM, consisting of multiple rounds with three stages per each round as follows:

- (1) **Proposing Stage:** First, if participant i is not suspended (i.e., $\text{SUSPEND}_i = \text{FALSE}$), then i will propose the next topmost preferred coalition $G = \text{TOP}(\text{PREF}_i)$, when G is better than H_i , the current one held for consideration (i.e., $u_i(G) > u_i(H_i)$). Otherwise, i is paused from proposing. Once i has proposed G to all $j \in G \setminus \{i\}$, G is removed from the preference by $\text{REMOVE}(\text{PREF}_i, G)$.
- (2) **Evaluation Stage:** Then, each participant j collects the set of proposed coalitions PROPS_j that were received from the proposing stage. If any proposed coalition $G \in \text{PROPS}_j$ is not better than the current one held for consideration (i.e., $u_j(H_j) > u_j(G)$), then G will be rejected, and $\text{PROPOSER}(G)$ and other members in G will be notified. The rejected coalition G will be removed from the members' proposed coalition sets PROPS_k for all $k \in G$.
- (3) **Selection Stage:** The remaining proposed coalitions in PROPS_j of each j are not rejected by any members and are better than the ones currently held for consideration. Next, each participant j picks the topmost preferred³ coalition H from PROPS_j and notifies the other members in H . If all members $k \in H$ (except $\text{PROPOSER}(H)$) also pick H as their most preferred coalition from the respective lists of proposed coalitions PROPS_k , then H will be held for consideration by all members H , and the previous held coalition H_k will be replaced by H . The members in the previous held coalition $\ell \in H_k$ will be notified and their current held coalition will be replaced by \emptyset . The previous proposer $\text{PROPOSER}(H_k)$ will resume to propose in the next round (i.e., $\text{SUSPEND}_i \leftarrow \text{FALSE}$). But the proposer $\text{PROPOSER}(H)$ will be suspended from proposing (i.e., $\text{SUSPEND}_i \leftarrow \text{TRUE}$).
- (4) **Termination Stage:** If some participants are not in any coalition held for consideration, then the process proceeds to the

next round and repeats the proposing, evaluation and selection stages. Otherwise, the coalition formation process will terminate.

6.1 Convergence to Stable Coalition Structure

We define a *cyclic preference* as sequences (i_1, \dots, i_t) and (G_1, \dots, G_t) , where $i_k \in G_k \cap G_{k+1}$ for all $k \leq t-1$, and $i_t \in G_t \cap G_1$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_{i_1}(G_2) &> u_{i_1}(G_1), \\ u_{i_2}(G_3) &> u_{i_2}(G_2), \\ &\vdots \\ u_{i_t}(G_1) &> u_{i_t}(G_t) \end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 6.1 ([7]). *There exists no cyclic preference under equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms, and Nash bargaining solution.*

THEOREM 5. *If there exists no cyclic preference, then COLN-FORM will converge to a stable coalition structure in time $O(n^K)$.*

By Proposition 6.1 and Theorem 5, COLN-FORM will converge to a stable coalition structure under equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms, and Nash bargaining solution. If COLN-FORM is executed sequentially when one participant follows another, then the running time is $O(n^K)$. However, COLN-FORM can also be executed in parallel among the participants, and the actual running time is less than $O(n^K)$.

7 EVALUATION STUDY

We present an empirical study of decentralized coalition formation in a real-world P2P energy sharing project. A field trial has been conducted on Bruny Island, Tasmania in Australia [31], where approximately 31 batteries were installed with solar PV systems at the homes of selected residents of the island. The batteries include customized management software that allows programmable control of the battery management operations. The participating households provide energy data for empirical studies. Next, we evaluate the outcomes of coalition formation under different cost-sharing mechanisms with 31 households. The evaluation is based on the default parameters in Table 3.

Battery capacity (B_i)	9.8 kWh
Consumption tariff (C_g^+)	\$0.20/kWh
Feed-in tariff (C_g^-)	\$0.10/kWh
Settlement service fee (C_s)	\$0.00/kWh
Charging efficiency (η_c)	0.95
Discharging efficiency (η_d)	1.05
Charge rate (μ_c)	5
Discharge rate (μ_d)	5

Table 3. Default parameters used in evaluation.

The coalition structures for $K = 2$ and 3 are visualized in Figs. 4-5. The mechanisms successfully form 8-15 non-singleton coalitions (when $K = 2$) and 8-10 non-singleton coalitions (when $K = 3$).

³We assume that there is a deterministic tie-breaking for each participants, such that when a pair of coalitions are ranked equally by two participants, they will always carry out tie-breaking in a consistent manner, for example, using the same tie-breaking rule.




Fig. 4. Coalition structures (when $K = 2$) under different cost-sharing mechanisms and social optimum.




Fig. 5. Coalition structures (when $K = 3$) under different cost-sharing mechanisms and social optimum.

When $K = 2$, the social optimum has social cost \$1594.4 and social utility \$325.2, whereas the egalitarian-split cost-sharing has social cost \$1672.1 and social utility \$247.5. When $K = 3$, the social optimum has social cost \$1206.4 and social utility \$713.2, whereas the egalitarian-split cost-sharing has social cost \$1306.1 and social utility \$613.5. In both cases, the egalitarian-split cost-sharing is very close to the social optimum. Also, equal-split cost-sharing gives the most social cost and the least social utility among the three cost-sharing mechanisms.

Although the theoretical SPoA are in the same logarithmic order of magnitude for equal-split, proportional-split and egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanisms, there are observable differences in empirical evaluation. From Figs. 6-8, egalitarian-split cost-sharing is observed to have the closest approximation to the social optimum, whereas equal-split cost-sharing is the furthest from the social optimum, among the three cost-sharing mechanisms. Overall, we observe the measured SPoA is within 95% of the social optimal cost with coalitions of 2 and 3 users, via three fair cost-sharing mechanisms. Next, we vary the parameters to compare the outcomes of different cost-sharing mechanisms.

7.1 Consumption Tariffs

The consumption tariff is the cost per kWh of energy imported from the grid. The results in Fig. 6 suggest an increase in the consumption tariff causes an increase in the social cost. Nonetheless, the relative differences among these cost-sharing mechanisms are preserved under different consumption tariffs.

7.2 Battery Capacities

Different battery capacities were considered to assess their impact on decentralized coalition formation. The results in Fig. 7 suggest that larger batteries can result in greater social utilities. The largest and smallest batteries have the capacities of 13.2 kWh and 4.5 kWh, respectively. Despite the larger battery having almost three times the capacity, it has less than twice the utility. This suggests that battery capacity has a lesser impact than consumption tariff. Also, the relative differences among the cost-sharing mechanisms are preserved under different battery capacities.

7.3 Service Fees

Different service fees also affect the outcomes of coalition formation. We observe that there is no decentralized coalition formed if the




Fig. 6. Evaluation results under different settings of consumption tariffs.




Fig. 7. Evaluation results under different settings of battery capacities.




Fig. 8. Evaluation results under different settings of service fees.

service fee C_s is higher than $C_{g}^{+} - C_{g}^{-}$. The results in Fig. 8 suggest that when C_s is greater than \$0.15/kWh, there is no decentralized coalition formed – the users would rather have standalone energy management without sharing energy with other users.

7.4 Performance of Decentralized Coalition Formation Algorithm

In this section, we compare the performance of the decentralized algorithm for coalition formation and the centralized algorithm in [7]. We observe that the running time of the decentralized one is much faster in practice in Fig. 9. The result shows a significant improvement of running time over the centralized algorithm as the number of users increased, on the contrary, the running time of the decentralized algorithm rises moderately. The decentralized algorithm is up to 2.7 times faster than the centralized algorithm with 10 users to around 8000 times faster with 16 users. The running time of the decentralized algorithm has a significant advantage when the number of users reaches more than 12.

8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied decentralized coalition formation under certain cost-sharing mechanisms (e.g., equal-split, proportional-split, egalitarian and Nash bargaining solutions of bargaining games). We applied our decentralized coalition formation results to the application of P2P energy sharing, being corroborated by an empirical




Fig. 9. Compare the running time of centralized and decentralized coalition formation algorithms under different numbers of users.

study. We provide several new results of decentralized coalition formation: (1) We established a logarithmic lower bound on SPoA, and hence, showed several previously known fair cost-sharing mechanisms are the best practical mechanisms with minimal SPoA. (2) We improved the SPoA of egalitarian and Nash bargaining cost-sharing mechanisms to match the lower bound. (3) We derived the SPoA of a mix of different cost-sharing mechanisms. (4) We presented a decentralized algorithm to form a stable coalition structure. In the future work, we will implement the decentralized coalition formation in decentralized blockchain framework to enable transparent and verifiable computation of the cost-sharing mechanisms. Note that we recently applied the cost-sharing mechanisms in this work to privacy-preserving energy storage sharing with blockchain [35, 36] and decentralized group purchasing for retail energy plans [10, 11]. Furthermore, the current energy sharing model does not

consider the real-time power flow constraints (e.g., voltage constraints in the grid). It will be considered in a more advanced model that incorporates realistic power flow constraints.

REFERENCES

- [1] Susanne Albers. 2009. On the value of coordination in network design. *SIAM J. on Computing* 38 (2009), 2273–2302. Issue 6.
- [2] Elliot Anshelevich, Anirban Dasgupta, Jon Kleinberg, Eva Tardos, Tom Wexler, and Tim Roughgarden. 2009. The price of stability for network design with fair cost allocation. *SIAM J. on Computing* 38 (2009), 1602–1623. Issue 4.
- [3] Elliot Anshelevich, Anirban Dasgupta, Eva Tardos, and Tom Wexler. 2008. Near-optimal network design with selfish agents. *Theory of Computing* 4 (2008), 77–109. Issue 1.
- [4] Haris Aziz and Florian Brandl. 2012. Existence of Stability in Hedonic Coalition Formation Games. In *Proc. of AAMAS*.
- [5] Anna Bogomolnaia and Matthew O. Jackson. 2002. The Stability of Hedonic Coalition Structures. *Games and Economic Behavior* 38, 2 (2002), 201–230.
- [6] T Carpenter, S Singla, P Azimzadeh, and S Keshav. 2012. The impact of electricity pricing schemes on storage adoption in Ontario. In *Proc. of ACM Intl. Conf. on Future Energy Systems (e-Energy)*.
- [7] Chi-Kin Chau and Khaled Elbassioni. 2018. Quantifying Inefficiency of Fair Cost-Sharing Mechanisms for Sharing Economy. *IEEE Trans. Control of Network System* 5 (Dec 2018), 1809–1818. Issue 4. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.05270>.
- [8] Sid Chi-Kin Chau, Shuning Shen, and Yue Zhou. 2020. Decentralized Ride-Sharing and Vehicle-Pooling Based on Fair Cost-Sharing Mechanisms. *IEEE Trans. on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2020).
- [9] Sid Chi-Kin Chau, Jiajia Xu, Wilson Bow, and Khaled Elbassioni. 2019. Peer-to-Peer Energy Sharing: Effective Cost-Sharing Mechanisms and Social Efficiency. In *Proc. of ACM e-Energy*.
- [10] Sid Chi-Kin Chau and Yue Zhou. 2021. Sharing Economy Meets Energy Markets: Group Purchasing of Energy Plans in Retail Energy Markets. In *Proc. of ACM BuildSys*.
- [11] Sid Chi-Kin Chau and Yue Zhou. 2022. Blockchain-Enabled Decentralized Privacy-Preserving Group Purchasing for Retail Energy Plans. In *Proc. of ACM e-Energy*.
- [12] Sijie Chen and Chen-Ching Liu. 2017. From demand response to transactive energy: state of the art. *J. Mod. Power Syst. Clean Energy* (2017).
- [13] J. H. Dr  ze and J. Greenberg. 1980. Hedonic Coalitions: Optimality and Stability. *Econometrica* 48, 4 (1980), 987–1003.
- [14] Amir Epstein, Michal Feldman, and Yishay Mansour. 2009. Strong Equilibrium in Cost Sharing Connection Games. *Games and Economic Behavior* 67 (2009), 51–68. Issue 1.
- [15] Pacific Gas and Electric Company. 2018. Understanding the Virtual Net Energy Metering Program A guide for statements and bills. (2018).
- [16] Martin Hoefer. 2013. Strategic cooperation in cost sharing games. *Intl. J. of Game Theory* 42, 1 (2013), 29–53.
- [17] Martin Hoefer, Daniel Vaz, and Lisa Wagner. 2015. Hedonic Coalition Formation in Networks. In *AAAI*. 929–935.
- [18] D. Kalathil, K. Poolla C. Wu, and P. Varaiya. 2017. The sharing economy for the electricity storage. *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid* (2017).
- [19] Max Klimm and Daniel Schmand. 2015. Sharing Non-anonymous Costs of Multiple Resources Optimally. In *Proc. of Intl. Conf. on Algorithms and Complexity (CIAC)*.
- [20] Stephen Lee, Prashant Shenoy, Krithi Ramamritham, and David Irwin. 2018. vSolar: Virtualizing Community Solar and Storage for Energy Sharing. In *Proc. of ACM Intl. Conf. on Future Energy Systems (e-Energy)*.
- [21] W. Lee, L. Xiang, R. Schober, and V. W. S. Wong. 2014. Direct electricity trading in smart grid: A coalitional game analysis. *IEEE J. of Selected Areas in Communications* 32 (Jul 2014), 1398–1411. Issue 7.
- [22] J Liu, N Zhang, C Kang, D S Kirschen, and Q Xia. 2017. Decision-Making Models for the Participants in Cloud Energy Storage. *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid* 9 (Jul 2017). Issue 6.
- [23] E. Mengelkamp, J. Garttner, K. Rock, S. Kessler, L. Orsini, and C. Weinhardt. 2018. Designing microgrid energy markets—A case study: The Brooklyn microgrid. *Applied Energy* 210 (Jan 2018), 870–880.
- [24] A Mnatsakanyan and S W Kennedy. 2015. A novel demand response model with an application for a virtual power plan. *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid* 6 (Jan 2015). Issue 1.
- [25] C. Nguyen. 2017. *Transactive Energy: An Overview*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- [26] Noam Nisan, Tim Roughgarden, Eva Tardos, and Vijay V. Vazirani. 2007. *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Bezalel Peleg and Peter Sudh  lter. 2007. *Introduction to the Theory of Cooperative Games*. Springer-Verlag.
- [28] Alvin E. Roth. 2005. *Game-Theoretic Models of Bargaining*. Cambridge University Press.
- [29] Tim Roughgarden and Okke Schrijvers. 2014. Network cost sharing without Anonymity. In *Algorithmic Game Theory, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. 134–145.
- [30] Tim Roughgarden and Mukund Sundararajan. 2009. Quantifying inefficiency in cost sharing mechanisms. *J. ACM* 56, 4 (2009).
- [31] Paul Scott, Dan Gordon, Evan Franklin, Laura Jones, and Sylvie Thi  baux. 2019. Network-Aware Coordination of Residential Distributed Energy Resources. *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid* 7 (2019).
- [32] Damian Shaw-Williams and Connie Susilawati. 2020. A techno-economic evaluation of Virtual Net Metering for the Australian community housing sector. *Applied Energy* 261 (2020).
- [33] W. Tushar, B. Chai, C. Yuen, S. Huang, D. B. Smith, H. V. Poor, and Z. Yang. 2016. Energy storage sharing in smart grid: A modified auction-based approach. *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid* 7 (May 2016). Issue 3.
- [34] Wayes Tushar, Chau Yuen, Hamed Mohsenian-Rad, Tapan Saha, H. Vincent Poor, and Kristin L. Wood. 2018. Transforming Energy Networks via Peer-to-Peer Energy Trading. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* (Jul 2018).
- [35] Nan Wang, Sid Chi-Kin Chau, and Yue Zhou. 2021. Privacy-Preserving Energy Storage Sharing with Blockchain. In *Proc. of ACM e-Energy*.
- [36] Nan Wang, Sid Chi-Kin Chau, and Yue Zhou. 2021. Privacy-Preserving Energy Storage Sharing with Blockchain and Secure Multi-Party Computation. *ACM SIGEnergy Energy Informatics Review* (Nov 2021).
- [37] Gerhard Woeginger. 2013. A hardness result for core stability in additive hedonic games. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 65, 2 (03 2013), 101–104.
- [38] C Wu, D Kalathil, K Poolla, and P Varaiya. 2016. Sharing electricity storage. In *Proc. of Conf. on Decision and Control (CDC)*.
- [39] Zichuan Xu, Lizhen Zhou, Sid Chi-Kin Chau, Weifa Liang, Qiufen Xia, and Pan Zhou. 2020. Collaborate or Separate? Distributed Service Caching in Mobile Edge Clouds. In *Proc. of IEEE Infocom*.
- [40] Zichuan Xu, Lizhen Zhou, Sid Chi-Kin Chau, Weifa Liang, Qiufen Xia, and Pan Zhou. 2022. Near-Optimal and Collaborative Service Caching in Mobile Edge Clouds. *IEEE Trans. on Mobile Computing* (2022).
- [41] C. Zhang, J. Wu, M. Cheng, Y. Zhou, and C. Long. 2016. A bidding system for peer-to-peer energy trading in a gridconnected microgrid. *Energy Procedia* 103 (Dec 2016), 147–152.
- [42] Yue Zhou and Sid Chi-Kin Chau. 2020. Multi-User Coalition Formation for Peer-to-Peer Energy Sharing. In *Proc. of ACM e-Energy*.

APPENDIX

A PROOFS OF THEORETICAL RESULTS

A.1 Preliminaries

LEMMA A.1 ([7]). Recall that $\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}} \triangleq \{\{i\} : i \in \mathcal{N}\}$. A social optimum is denoted by $\mathcal{P}^* = \arg \max_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}_K} u(\mathcal{P})$. Then we obtain $K \cdot C(\mathcal{P}^*) \geq C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})$. A stable coalition structure is denoted by $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{P}_K$. Consider a budget balanced cost-sharing mechanism $p_i(\cdot)$. Then we obtain $C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}}) \geq C(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$. Hence, the cost-based strong price of anarchy $\text{SPoA}_K^C \leq K$.

THEOREM 1. Consider a budget balanced cost-sharing mechanism $p_i(\cdot)$. Denote the cost-based and utility-based strong prices of anarchy by SPoA_K^C and SPoA_K^u , respectively. Then

$$\text{SPoA}_K^u \geq \frac{K-1}{K - \text{SPoA}_K^C} \quad (21)$$

$$\text{SPoA}_K^C \leq K - \frac{K-1}{\text{SPoA}_K^u} \quad (22)$$

PROOF. Since $p_i(\cdot)$ is budget balanced, we obtain $C(\mathcal{P}^*) = C(\mathcal{P}^*)$, where \mathcal{P}^* is a utility-based social optimum and \mathcal{P}^* is a cost-based social optimum. Consider a worst-case stable coalition structure $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$.

Then

$$\text{SPoA}_K^u \geq \frac{\sum_{G \in \mathcal{P}^*} \sum_{i \in G} u_i(p_i(G))}{\sum_{G \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \sum_{i \in G} u_i(p_i(G))} \quad (23)$$

$$= \frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}}) - C(\mathcal{P}^*)}{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}}) - C(\hat{\mathcal{P}})} = \frac{\frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} - 1}{\frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} - \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)}} \quad (24)$$

$$= \frac{\frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} - 1}{\frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} - \text{SPoA}_K^C} \quad (25)$$

Since $\frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} \leq K$ (by Lemma A.1) and $\text{SPoA}_K^C \geq 1$, the minimum is attained when $\frac{C(\mathcal{P}_{\text{self}})}{C(\mathcal{P}^*)} = K$. \square

Given an order of users $\mathcal{N} = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ and cost-sharing mechanism $p_i(\cdot)$, we define

$$\alpha(p_i(\cdot)) \triangleq \max_{\substack{C(\cdot), G \in \mathcal{P}_K \\ \forall s=1, \dots, k: p_{i_s}(H_s(G)) \geq 0}} \frac{\sum_{s \in \{1, \dots, n\}: i_s \in G} p_{i_s}(H_s(G))}{C(G)}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$H_s(G) \triangleq \begin{cases} G \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_{s-1}\}, & \text{if } i_s \in G, \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } i_s \notin G \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

In the following, we made a slight but critical modification of a Lemma in [7], which allows us to improve the bound SPoA_K^C for egalitarian-split cost-sharing. The crucial observation is that it suffices to consider payment functions which assume non-negative values on the coalitions belonging to a stable coalition structure. Such non-negativity requirement is necessary in the proof of the following lemma and was guaranteed in [7] for every coalition structure at the cost of losing a factor of \sqrt{K} in the total cost. However as seen in the proof of the following lemma, it suffices to have non-negativity of payments only on coalitions belonging to a stable coalition structure, a property that is guaranteed to hold of all stable coalition structures under Nash bargaining solution by Lemma A.4.

LEMMA A.2. Consider any budget balanced cost-sharing mechanism $p_i(\cdot)$, which assumes a non-negative value on any coalition belonging to a stable coalition structure. Given a stable coalition structure $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ and any coalition structure $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}_K$, we have the upper bound:

$$\frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}})}{C(\mathcal{P})} \leq \alpha(p_i(\cdot)) \quad (28)$$

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{G_1, \dots, G_h\}$. Define $H_1^1 \triangleq G_1$. Then there exists a user $i_1^1 \in H_1^1$ and a coalition $\hat{G}_1^1 \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_K$, such that $i_1^1 \in \hat{G}_1^1$ and $p_{i_1^1}(H_1^1) \geq p_{i_1^1}(\hat{G}_1^1) \geq 0$; otherwise, all the users in H_1^1 would form a coalition H_1^1 to strictly reduce their payments, which contradicts the fact that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_K$ is a stable coalition structure.

Next, define $H_2^1 \triangleq H_1^1 \setminus \{i_1^1\}$. Note that H_2^1 is a feasible coalition, because arbitrary coalition structures with at most K users per coalition are allowed in our model. By the same argument, there exists $i_2^1 \in H_2^1$ and a coalition $\hat{G}_2^1 \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_K$, such that $i_2^1 \in \hat{G}_2^1$ and $p_{i_2^1}(H_2^1) \geq p_{i_2^1}(\hat{G}_2^1) \geq 0$.

Let $G_t = \{i_1^t, \dots, i_{K_t}^t\}$, for any $t \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. Continuing this argument, we obtain a collection of sets $\{H_s^t\}$, where each $H_s^t \triangleq \{i_s^t, \dots, i_{K_t}^t\}$ satisfies the following condition:

For any $t \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, K_t\}$, there exists $\hat{G}_s^t \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_K$, such that $i_s^t \in \hat{G}_s^t$ and $p_{i_s^t}(H_s^t) \geq p_{i_s^t}(\hat{G}_s^t) \geq 0$.

Because of budget balance, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^h \sum_{s=1}^{K_t} p_{i_s^t}(\hat{G}_s^t) = C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_K) \quad (29)$$

Hence, the SPoA, SPoA_K^C , with respect to $\{p_i(\cdot)\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}$ is upper bounded by

$$\frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_K)}{C(\mathcal{P})} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^h \sum_{s=1}^{K_t} p_{i_s^t}(\hat{G}_s^t)}{\sum_{t=1}^h C(G_t)} \quad (30)$$

$$\leq \frac{\sum_{t=1}^h \sum_{s=1}^{K_t} p_{i_s^t}(H_s^t)}{\sum_{t=1}^h C(H_1^t)} \quad (31)$$

$$\leq \max_{t \in \{1, \dots, h\}} \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{K_t} p_{i_s^t}(H_s^t)}{C(H_1^t)} \leq \alpha(\{p_i(\cdot)\}_{i \in \mathcal{N}}) \quad (32)$$

because $\alpha(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing in K . \square

A.2 Egalitarian-split Cost-Sharing

Given cost function $C(\cdot)$, we define a truncated cost function $\tilde{C}(\cdot)$ as follows:

$$\tilde{C}(G) \triangleq \begin{cases} C(G), & \text{if } C(G) \leq \sum_{j \in G} C_j \\ \sum_{j \in G} C_j, & \text{if } C(G) > \sum_{j \in G} C_j \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Note that $\tilde{C}(G) \leq \sum_{j \in G} C_j$ for any G .

As mentioned earlier, egalitarian-split cost-sharing is equivalent to Nash bargaining solution. Thus,

$$\text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ega}} = \text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ns}}$$

LEMMA A.3 ([7]). For egalitarian and Nash bargaining solutions, we have

$$\text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ega}}(C(\cdot)) = \text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ega}}(\tilde{C}(\cdot)) \quad (34)$$

LEMMA A.4 ([7]). For Nash bargaining solution, given a stable coalition structure $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{P}_K$ and $G \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$, then every user has non-negative payment: $p_i^{\text{ns}}(G) \geq 0$ for all $i \in G$.

LEMMA A.5 ([7]). Let $b_s \triangleq C(H_s)$. Consider the following maximization problem:

$$(M1) \ y^*(K) \triangleq \max_{\{C_s, b_s\}_{s=1}^K} \sum_{s=1}^K \left(C_s - \frac{(\sum_{t=s}^K C_t) - b_s}{K - s + 1} \right) \quad (35)$$

subject to

$$b_s \leq \sum_{t=s}^K C_t, \text{ for all } s = 1, \dots, K-1, \quad (36)$$

$$0 \leq C_s \leq b_s \leq b_{s+1} \leq 1, \text{ for all } s = 1, \dots, K, \quad (37)$$

$$b_1 + KC_s - \sum_{t=1}^K C_t \geq 0, \text{ for all } s = 1, \dots, K \quad (38)$$

The maximum of $(M1)$ is upper bounded by $y^*(K) \leq 1 + \mathcal{H}_{K-1} = O(\log K)$.

THEOREM 2. For egalitarian-split cost-sharing mechanism and Nash bargaining solution with cost monotonicity, the SPoA is upper bounded by

$$\text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ega}} = \text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ns}} = O(\log K) \quad (39)$$

PROOF. First, by Lemma A.3, it suffices to consider egalitarian bargaining (or Nash bargaining) solution with a cost function satisfying $C(G) \leq \sum_{j \in G} C_j$ for any G .

Next, by Lemma A.4, for any stable coalition structure $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$, we have $p_i^{\text{ns}}(G) \geq 0$ for all $i \in G \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$. Hence, by Lemma A.2, $\text{SPoA}_K^{C, \text{ega}} \leq \alpha(\{p_i^{\text{ega}}(\cdot)\})$.

Let $H_s = \{i_s, \dots, i_K\}$, with the default costs denoted by $\{C_s, \dots, C_K\}$. Recall that egalitarian bargaining solution is given by

$$p_{i_s}^{\text{ega}}(H_s) = C_s - \frac{(\sum_{t=s}^K C_t) - C(H_s)}{K - s + 1}$$

subject to $C(H_1) \geq \dots \geq C(H_K)$ and $C(H_s) \geq \max\{C_s, \dots, C_K\}$ (by monotonicity), and $C(H_s) \leq \sum_{t=s}^K C_t$ (by Lemma A.3). Finally, it follows that $\text{SPoA}_K^{\text{eqa}} = O(\log K)$ by Lemma A.5. \square

A.3 Lower Bound on SPoA

THEOREM 3. Under the assumption that $P \neq NP$, for any cost-sharing mechanism, such that a stable coalition structure can be found in polynomial-time, its SPoA is lower bounded by $\Omega(\log K)$.

PROOF. We first model the set cover problem as a coalition formation problem in the following way. Given a collection of sets $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ of size at most K and the corresponding costs $\{c(S_1), \dots, c(S_m)\}$, we define a cost function over any subset $G \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^m S_j$ as follows:

$$C(G) = \begin{cases} \min_{j|G \subseteq S_j} c(S_j), & \text{if there exists } S_j \supseteq G \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Note that $C(\cdot)$ obeys cost monotonicity (but $C(\emptyset) > 0$).

We consider coalition formation with the set of participants defined by $\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{j=1}^m S_j$. Given a social optimum $\mathcal{P}^* = \arg \min_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{P}_K} C(\mathcal{P})$, it has to be formed by only coalitions that are subsets of the S_j 's. Namely, $G \in \mathcal{P}^*$, there exists $S_j \supseteq G$. For each $G \in \mathcal{P}^*$, we take the minimum-cost set $S_j \supseteq G$ and will obtain a set cover \mathcal{S} over \mathcal{N} with exactly the same cost by using $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ instead. Namely,

$$\mathcal{S} \triangleq \left\{ S_j \mid S_j \supseteq G, C(G) = \min_{j|G \subseteq S_j} c(S_j), G \in \mathcal{P}^* \right\}$$

Note that \mathcal{S} is a minimum-cost set cover over \mathcal{N} . Otherwise, \mathcal{P}^* is not a social optimum; there is another minimum-cost set cover that can induce a coalition structure with the lower social cost than \mathcal{P}^* . This shows the reduction of the set cover problem to the coalition formation problem.

The set cover problem is known to be inapproximable within an approximation ratio better than $\Omega(\log(K))$ in polynomial-time, unless $P=NP$. Hence, in any cost-sharing mechanism, such that a stable coalition structure can be found in polynomial time, its SPoA is lower bounded by $\Omega(\log K)$. \square

A.4 Mixed Cost-Sharing Mechanisms

THEOREM 4. For a mixed cost-sharing mechanism of a constant number of constituent pure cost-sharing mechanisms, if the SPoA of each constituent pure cost-sharing mechanism is $O(f(K))$, then the SPoA of the mixed cost-sharing mechanism is also $O(f(K))$.

PROOF. Suppose that the mixed cost-sharing mechanism consists of M constituent pure cost-sharing mechanisms. Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ be a stable coalition structure induced by the mixed cost-sharing mechanism. We can partition the set of coalitions of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ into M subsets $\{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m\}_{m=1}^M$, where each $G \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_m$ is divided by the m -th pure cost-sharing mechanism. We write $C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m)$ as the social cost considering the participants in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m$.

Given a subset of participants $x \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, let $\text{OPT}(X)$ be a social optimum considering only X . We denote the social cost of $\text{OPT}(X)$ by $C(\text{OPT}(X))$. Note that $C(\text{OPT}(X)) \leq C(\text{OPT}(Y))$, if $X \subseteq Y$, because the cost function $C(\cdot)$ is monotone and non-negative.

The SPoA of a mixed cost-sharing mechanism can be expressed as $\max_{C(\cdot), \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m)}{C(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{N}))}$. Next, we can bound the SPoA as follows:

$$\max_{C(\cdot), \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m)}{C(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{N}))} \quad (41)$$

$$\leq \max_{C(\cdot), \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m)}{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M C(\text{OPT}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m))} \quad (42)$$

$$\leq M \cdot \sum_{m=1}^M \max_{C(\cdot), \hat{\mathcal{P}}} \frac{C(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m)}{C(\text{OPT}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_m))} \quad (43)$$

$$\leq M^2 \cdot O(f(K)) \quad (44)$$

Therefore, the SPoA of the mixed cost-sharing mechanism is also $O(f(K))$, as M is a constant. \square

A.5 Convergence to Stable Coalition Structure

THEOREM 5. If there is no cyclic preference, then COLN-FORM will converge to a stable coalition structure in $O(n^K)$.

PROOF. First, we prove that COLN-FORM will terminate in finite time if there is no cyclic preference. We note at each round, one of the participants must make a proposed coalition, which has not been proposed before. Otherwise, the process would have terminated, because every participant is either suspended (i.e., $\text{SUSPEND}_i = \text{TRUE}$) or having the proposed coalition not better than the current one held for consideration (i.e., $u_i(H_i) > u_i(\text{TOP}(\text{PREF}_i))$). Since every participant i 's preference PREF_i is a finite sequence, this process must terminate.

Next, we show that COLN-FORM terminates with a stable coalition structure. We prove by contradiction. Suppose $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is a coalition structure outcome by COLN-FORM, and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is not stable. Namely, there exists a blocking coalition $G_1 \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, where $|G_1| \leq K$, and $u_i(G_1) > u_i(G)$ for all $i \in G'$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}_i \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. However, G_1 must be a proposed coalition during the process of COLN-FORM and was rejected. Otherwise, G' would be an outcome of COLN-FORM, because all participants in G_1 should accept G_1 , as it is strictly better than the ones in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. This implies that there exists

a participant $i_1 \in G_1$, such that there exists $G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{i_1}$, which was proposed during the process of COLN-FORM and is more preferred than G_1 by i_1 , (i.e., $u_{i_1}(G_2) > u_{i_1}(G_1)$).

If G_2 is not in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$, then we can similarly find another participant $i_2 \in G_2$, such that there exists $G_3 \in \mathcal{G}_{i_2}$, which was proposed during the process of COLN-FORM and is more preferred than G_2 by i_2 (i.e., $u_{i_2}(G_3) > u_{i_2}(G_2)$). We repeat this argument until we find a coalition $G_t \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ and is more preferred than G_{t-1} by i_{t-1} (i.e., $u_{i_{t-1}}(G_t) > u_{i_{t-1}}(G_{t-1})$). Also, we should be able to find G_t such that $G_t \cap G_1 \neq \emptyset$ because some participants in G_1 must be in a coalition in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. Recall that $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is not stable, and G_1 is a blocking coalition with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. Namely, there exists $i_t \in G_t \cap G_1$ such that $u_{i_t}(G_1) > u_{i_t}(G_t)$.

This creates a cyclic preference, which is a contradiction to the condition of the theorem. Hence, COLN-FORM should terminate with a stable coalition structure. The total running time is $O(n^K)$, because each $|\mathcal{G}_i| = O(n^{K-1})$ and there are total $O(n^K)$ number of coalitions in all preferences of participants. Each coalition must be proposed once only. The total running time is $O(n^K)$. \square