

# The Investment Management Game: Extending the Scope of the Notion of Core

Vijay V. Vazirani\*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of California, Irvine

## Abstract

The core is a dominant solution concept in economics and game theory. In this context, the following question arises, “How versatile is this solution concept?” We note that within game theory, this notion has been used for profit — equivalently, cost or utility — sharing only. In this paper, we show a completely different use for it: in an *investment management game*, under which an agent needs to allocate her money among investment firms in such a way that *in each of exponentially many future scenarios*, sufficient money is available in the “right” firms so she can buy an “optimal investment” for that scenario.

We study a restriction of this game to *perfect graphs* and characterize its core. Our characterization is analogous to Shapley and Shubik’s characterization of the core of the assignment game. The difference is the following: whereas their characterization follows from *total unimodularity*, ours follows from *total dual integrality*. The latter is another novelty of our work.

---

\*Supported in part by NSF grant CCF-2230414.

# 1 Introduction

The core is a dominant solution concept in economics and game theory. Its origins lie in the 19th century book of Edgeworth [Edg81], who used it for obtaining insights into competitive equilibria. In the 1950s, this notion was found to be useful in cooperative game theory for “fair” profit sharing. Since then, the stature of this solution concept grew considerably and today it is considered the gold standard for profit sharing and much more desirable than e.g., least core and nucleolus.

The following question arises, “How versatile is this solution concept?” Let us first consider this question in the context of Nash equilibrium, which is perhaps the most important solution concept in game theory. Even its special case, of bimatrix games, provides deep insights in a rich milieu of situations, each having its own character, e.g., Prisoner’s Dilemma, Matching Pennies, Battle of the Sexes and Rock-Paper-Scissor (this game is in fact zero-sum). Indeed, most “big” solution concepts tend to be similarly multi-faceted. In contrast, the core has been used for profit — equivalently, cost or utility — sharing only. In this paper, we show a completely different use for it — in an *investment management game*.

Definition 1 below gives a high-level description of this game<sup>1</sup>. A natural setting for this game is a graph, and this is described in Section 4. The main computational problem that arises in this game is that of finding a maximum weight independent set, which is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard in arbitrary graphs. Hence, this setting is too general – it not only disallows efficient computation, but as detailed below, it also does not offer any way of gaining insights into the core of the game. On the other hand, restricting the game to *perfect graphs* (Section 5) makes this possible.

Next we describe our results by drawing an analogy with the classic paper of Shapley and Shubik [SS71], which characterized the core of the assignment game by showing that it is precisely the set of optimal solutions to the dual of the LP-relaxation of the maximum weight matching problem in the underlying bipartite graph, see Section 3. At the heart of their proof lies the fact that the polytope defined by the constraints of this LP is integral, see Definition 2. In turn, integrality follows from the fact that the constraint matrix of this LP is *totally unimodular* (TUM), see Definition 6.

The maximum weight independent set problem is in  $\mathcal{P}$  for perfect graphs [GLS88]. Furthermore, the LP-relaxation of this problem has the property that the polytope defined by the underlying linear system is integral. Building on integrality, we show that core imputations of our game are precisely optimal solutions to the dual LP, thereby obtaining a characterization that is analogous to that of Shapley and Shubik.

Interestingly enough, for our game, integrality follows not from total unimodularity but from the more general technique of *total dual integrality* (TDI), see Definition 10. Our characterization of the core hinges on this fact. We note that ours appears to be the first work which uses TDI for characterizing the core of a game; previous characterizations were based on TUM, see Section 2.

Even though the basic definitions underlying the notion of a core, Definitions 3, 4 and 5, are used

---

<sup>1</sup>As stated in Section 6, our first formulation was purely graph-theoretic. The economic interpretation given in Definition 1 is clearly far from realistic. However, we note that our paper has little to do with immediate applicability — its purpose is to make a conceptual advance on a fundamental solution concept.

*verbatim* for studying the investment management game, the new setting has a very different character than the previous uses of core in cooperative game theory. For this reason, new names are required for these terms; these are introduced in Section 4. Another novelty lies in the way we allocate the worth of the game among sub-coalitions, see Remark 1. In all previous works, this was done via a *bottom-up process* in which the worth of the game was distributed among agents and the profit of a sub-coalition was simply the sum of profits of agents in it. In contrast, we need to follow a *top-down process*: the worth of the game is distributed among investment firms and the money available in a sub-coalition is the sum of the money allocated to those firms which have a non-empty intersection with this sub-coalition.

**Definition 1.** The *investment management game* involves an agent, a set  $V$  of assets with a cost function  $w : V \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$ , and a set  $\mathcal{M}$  of investment firms. For concreteness, assume that assets are shares of specific companies, each worth a specific dollar amount; obviously, the number of shares in an asset changes according to the going price. Assume further that, much like a mutual fund, each investment firm specializes in holding shares of specific types of companies, e.g., Internet companies, software companies, computer hardware companies, automobile companies, etc. However, unlike in the case of a mutual fund, the agent can buy individual assets from a firm.

The assets sold by a specific firm  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  form a set  $Q_f \subseteq V$ . The same asset, such as “five thousand dollars worth of Microsoft”, may be sold by more than one firm; in this case, the asset may be sold by a firm specializing in Internet companies and a firm specializing in software companies. Each subset  $S \subseteq V$  of assets is called a *scenario*; hence there are exponentially many, namely  $2^{|V|}$ , scenarios.

Two or more assets which are sold by the same firm have obvious correlations and therefore do not constitute a low-risk investment. On the other hand, a set  $S$  of assets which picks at most one asset from any investment firm constitutes a *diversified portfolio* — it avoids correlations and is therefore considered a “healthy” investment from the viewpoint of future appreciation. An *optimal investment* for a scenario  $S$  is a largest possible diversified portfolio in it; formally, it is defined to be a maximum cost set  $S' \subseteq S$  which picks at most one asset from any investment firm.

The *total money*,  $T \in \mathbf{Q}_+$  of the agent is just sufficient to buy an optimal investment in scenario  $V$ ;  $T$  is also called the *worth* of the game. An allocation of money  $T$  to the firms is called an *imputation*. The money allocated to a firm  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  is available for use at any asset  $v \in Q_f$ . Therefore, the *money available in scenario  $S$*  is the sum of money allocated to all firms which have at least one asset in  $S$ .

The *game* is the following: Find an imputation such that when, at a certain time in the future, the agent determines a scenario  $S$  she needs to capitalize on, the money available in  $S$  is sufficient to buy an optimal investment in  $S$ . Such an imputation is said to be in the *core* of the game.

**Definition 2.** We will say that a *polytope is integral* if its vertices have all integral coordinates.

## 2 Related Works

Results characterizing cores of natural TU games are given below. First, we mention the stable matching game, defined by Gale and Shapley [GS62], in which preferences are ordinal. The only coalitions that matter in this game are ones formed by one agent from each side of the bipartition. A stable matching ensures that no such coalition has the incentive to secede and the set of such matchings constitute the core of this game. Vande Vate [Vat89] and Rothblum [Rot92] gave linear programming formulations for stable matchings; the vertices of their underlying polytopes are integral and are stable matchings. Interestingly enough, Kiraly and Pap [KP08] showed that the linear system of Rothblum is in fact TDI.

A core imputation has to ensure that *each* of the exponentially many sub-coalitions is “happy” — clearly, that is a lot of constraints. As a result, the core is non-empty only for a handful of games, some of which are mentioned below; total unimodularity plays a key role in these results.

A natural generalization of the assignment game is the  $b$ -matching game in bipartite graphs. Biro et al. [BKP12] showed that the core non-emptiness and core membership problems for the  $b$ -matching game are solvable in polynomial time if  $b \leq 2$  and are co-NP-hard even for  $b = 3$ . More recently, Vazirani [Vaz22] showed that if  $b$  is the constant function, then core imputations are precisely optimal solutions to the dual LP; this is analogous to the Shapley-Shubik theorem. Furthermore, Vazirani [Vaz22] showed that if  $b$  is arbitrary, then every optimal solution to the dual LP is a core imputation; however, there are core imputations that are not optimal solutions to the dual LP.

Deng et al. [DIN99] distilled the ideas underlying the Shapley-Shubik Theorem to obtain a general framework which helps characterize the cores of several games that are based on fundamental combinatorial optimization problems, including maximum flow in unit capacity networks both directed and undirected, maximum number of edge-disjoint  $s$ - $t$  paths, maximum number of vertex-disjoint  $s$ - $t$  paths and maximum number of disjoint arborescences rooted at a vertex  $r$ .

Granot and Huberman [GH81, GH84] showed that the core of the minimum cost spanning tree game is non-empty and gave an algorithm for finding an imputation in it. Koh and Sanita [KS20] settle the question of efficiently determining if a spanning tree game is submodular; the core of such games is always non-empty. Nagamochi et al. [NZKI97] characterize non-emptiness of core for the minimum base game in a matroid; the minimum spanning tree game is a special case of this game.

## 3 Definitions and Preliminary Facts

This paper deals with *transferable utility (TU)* games, in which utilities of the agents are stated in monetary terms and side payments are allowed. For an extensive coverage of these notions, see the book by Moulin [Mou14].

**Definition 3.** A *TU coalitional game*  $(\mathcal{N}, v)$  consists of a set  $\mathcal{N}$  of agents or players and a *characteristic function*  $v : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$  giving the *worth* of the grand coalition  $\mathcal{N}$  and every sub-coalition  $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ .

**Definition 4.** An *imputation* gives a way of dividing the worth of the game,  $v(\mathcal{N})$ , among the agents. It can be viewed as a function  $x : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$ . For each sub-coalition  $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ , we will view  $x(S)$  as the *profit* of this sub-coalition.

**Definition 5.** An imputation  $x$  is said to be in the *core of the game* if for any sub-coalition  $S$ , the profit allocated to its agents is at least as large as the worth that they can generate by themselves, i.e.,  $\sum_{i \in S} x(i) \geq v(S)$ .

For completeness, we formally state the characterization of the core of the assignment game given by Shapley and Shubik [SS71]. The *assignment game*, consists of a bipartite graph  $G = (U, V, E)$  and a weight function  $w : E \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$ . The agents of this game are  $U \cup V$  and for each sub-coalition  $(S_u \cup S_v)$ , with  $S_u \subseteq U$  and  $S_v \subseteq V$ , its worth is defined to be the weight of a maximum weight matching in  $G(S_u \cup S_v)$ , where the latter is the subgraph of  $G$  induced on the vertices  $(S_u \cup S_v)$ .

Linear program (1) gives the LP-relaxation of the problem of finding such a matching. In this program, variable  $x_{ij}$  indicates the extent to which edge  $(i, j)$  is picked in the solution.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{(i,j) \in E} w_{ij} x_{ij} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_{ij} \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in U, \\
& \sum_{(i,j) \in E} x_{ij} \leq 1 \quad \forall j \in V, \\
& x_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j) \in E
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The constraint matrix of LP (1) is totally unimodular (TUM), see Definition 6, and therefore the polytope defined by its constraints is integral, e.g., see [LP86]. Taking  $u_i$  and  $v_j$  to be the dual variables for the first and second constraints of (1), we obtain the dual LP:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{i \in U} u_i + \sum_{j \in V} v_j \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & u_i + v_j \geq w_{ij} \quad \forall (i, j) \in E, \\
& u_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in U, \\
& v_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in V
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

**Theorem 1.** (Shapley and Shubik [SS71]) *The imputation  $(u, v)$  is in the core of the assignment game if and only if it is an optimal solution to the dual LP, (2).*

**Definition 6.** Let  $Ax \leq b$  be a linear system where  $A$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix and  $b$  an  $m$ -dimensional vector, both with integral entries.  $A$  is said to be *totally unimodular (TUM)* if every submatrix of  $A$  has determinant 0, 1 or  $-1$ . If so, the polytope of this linear system is integral.

## 4 The Investment Management Game Defined on a Graph

The investment management game is described at a high level in Definition 1. A natural setting for it is a graph, as described below. It is a coalitional game as introduced in Definition 3. The names given to some of the notions in Section 3 will be changed below; the former are consistent with traditional applications of core and the latter are more appropriate for our application.

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a graph whose vertices are *assets*; let  $|V| = n$ . The function  $w : V \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$  defines the *cost* of each asset. Every *maximal clique* in  $G$  is an *investment firm*; let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the set of all firms. For each firm  $f \in \mathcal{M}$ , the assets sold by  $f$  are represented by the vertices in its clique,  $Q_f \subseteq V$ . As stated in Definition 1, each investment firm specializes in holding shares of a specific type of companies. As a result, two or more assets held by the same firm may have obvious correlations.

We now explain why investment firms are defined to be cliques, via the following analogy. Consider all the ATMs in the US of a certain bank. Since the money deposited in this bank, or in an ATM of this bank, can be withdrawn from any of its ATMs, the set of all ATMs of this bank can be viewed as a clique, interconnected via a network. Similarly, since the money allocated to an investment firm is available for use at any of its assets, as stated in Definition 1, we have defined the investment firm to be a clique — over its assets. Maximality helps us avoid redundancy; clearly, an investment firm defined by a sub-clique  $Q'$  of a clique  $Q$  is redundant.

Every set  $S \subseteq V$  is called a *scenario*. Let  $G(S)$  denote the subgraph of  $G$  induced on vertices in  $S$ . As required by Definition 1, the *optimal investment* in scenario  $S$  is defined to be any maximum cost independent set<sup>2</sup> in  $G(S)$ . Observe that this is a diversified investment, since it picks at most one asset from any investment firm. Let  $O_S \subseteq S$  denote such an investment and define

$$\text{cost}(S) := \sum_{v \in O_S} w_v.$$

The function  $\text{cost} : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$  plays the same role as the characteristic function in Definition 3, and the coalitional game we have defined is  $(V, \text{cost})$ . The *total money* of the agent, also called the *worth* of the game, is defined to be  $T = \text{cost}(V)$ , i.e., just sufficient to buy an optimal investment in  $G$ .

By Definition 4, a function  $y : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$  where  $\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{M}} y_Q = T$  is called an *imputation*. Thus an imputation is a way of distributing  $T$  money among the investment firms. For any scenario  $S$ , the *money available* for buying assets in  $S$  is defined to be the sum of money in all investment firms which contain at least one asset from  $S$ , i.e.,

$$\text{money}(S) := \sum_{Q \in G(S): Q \cap S \neq \emptyset} y_Q,$$

where “ $Q \in G(S)$ ” is short for “clique  $Q$  in  $G(S)$ ”. Strictly speaking, the summation should be over maximal cliques, but since for a non-maximal clique  $Q$ ,  $y_Q$  can be assumed to be zero, this distinction can be dropped. Notice that  $\text{money}(S)$  is analogous to the *profit* of  $S$ , as defined in Definition 4.

---

<sup>2</sup>An independent set is also called a stable set, see Definition 9.

By Definition 5, an imputation  $y$  is said to be in the *core* of this game if every scenario  $S$  has enough money to buy an optimal investment in  $S$ , i.e.,

$$\forall S \subseteq V, \text{ money}(S) \geq \text{cost}(S).$$

#### 4.1 Limitations of this Model, and Desired Properties

The problem of computing a maximum cost independent set in an arbitrary graph is NP-hard, even if all vertex costs are unit. This NP-hardness also indicates that the game defined above lacks structural properties that could lead to an understanding of its core. In sharp contrast, the assignment game is in  $\mathcal{P}$  and its LP-relaxation supports integrality of the underlying polytope, therefore leading to a characterization of its core. Hence, the model defined above, on an arbitrary graph, is too general to be useful.

To be useful, the model should allow for:

1. A characterization of the core; in particular, determine if the core is non-empty.
2. Efficient computation of  $T$ , and  $\text{cost}(S)$  for any scenario  $S$ .
3. An efficient algorithm for computing an imputation in the core.

In the next section, we show that restricting the game to perfect graphs gives all these properties.

## 5 The Investment Management Game on Perfect Graphs

In this section, we will study the restriction of the investment management game to perfect graphs. In Section 5.1 we give the required definitions and facts from the (extensive) theory of perfect graphs. We will not credit individual papers for these facts; instead, we refer the reader to Chapter 9 of the book [GLS88] as well as the remarkably clear and concise exposition of this theory, presented as an “appetizer” by Groetschel [Grö99]. In Section 5.2 we will use these facts to characterize the core of this game.

### 5.1 Definitions and Preliminaries

**Definition 7.** Given a graph  $G = (V, E)$ ,  $\omega(G)$  denotes its *clique number*, i.e., the size of the largest clique in it and  $\chi(G)$  denotes its *chromatic number*, i.e., the minimum number of colors needed for its vertices so that the two endpoints of any edge get different colors.

**Definition 8.** A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is said to be *perfect* if and only if the clique number and chromatic number are equal for each vertex-induced subgraph of  $G$ , i.e.,

$$\forall S \subseteq V, \omega(G(S)) = \chi(G(S)).$$

Let  $\bar{G}$  denote the *complement* of  $G$ , i.e.,  $\bar{G} = (V, \bar{E})$ , where  $\bar{E}$  is the complement of  $E$ , with  $\forall u, v \in V, (u, v) \in E$  if and only if  $(u, v) \notin \bar{E}$ . A central fact about perfect graphs is that  $G$  is perfect if and only if  $\bar{G}$  is perfect.

**Definition 9.** Set  $S \subseteq V$  is said to be a *stable set* in  $G$ , also sometimes called an *independent set*, if no two vertices of  $S$  are connected by an edge, i.e.,  $\forall u, v \in S, (u, v) \notin E$ . Let  $w : V \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_+$  be a weight function on the vertices of  $G$ .

Let  $G$  be an arbitrary graph. Clearly any clique in  $G$  can intersect a stable set in at most one vertex, and therefore the constraint in LP (3) is satisfied by every stable set; note that variable  $x_v$  indicates the extent to which  $v$  is picked in a fractional stable set. LP (3) contains such a constraint for each clique in  $G$  and is an LP-relaxation of the maximum weight stable set problem in  $G$ . However, LP (3) has exponentially many constraints, one corresponding to each clique in  $G$ ; moreover, it is NP-hard to solve in general [GLS88].

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{v \in V} w_v x_v \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(Q) \leq 1 \quad \forall \text{ clique } Q \text{ in } G, \\ & x_v \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in V \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The situation is salvaged in case  $G$  is a perfect graph: with the help of the Lovasz theta function, one can show that LP (3) can be solved in polynomial time using the ellipsoid algorithm [GLS88, Grö99].

Below is the dual LP, which is obtain by taking  $y_Q$  to be the dual variable for the constraint of LP (3). The dual LP is solving a clique covering problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{\text{clique } Q \text{ in } G} y_Q \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{Q \ni v} y_Q \geq w_v \quad \forall v \in V, \\ & y_Q \geq 0 \quad \forall \text{ clique } Q \text{ in } G \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

A key fact for our purpose is that the linear system of LP (3) is totally dual integral (TDI), see Definition 10, for perfect graphs [GLS88, Grö99]. We provide a proof sketch below.

By Definition 7, if  $G$  is perfect,  $\omega(G) = \chi(G)$ . Next, consider the complement of  $G$ , namely  $\bar{G}$ ; two vertices are adjacent in  $G$  if and only if they are not adjacent in  $\bar{G}$ . Denote by  $\alpha(G)$  and  $\bar{\chi}(G)$  the size of the largest stable set and the minimum number of disjoint cliques needed to cover all vertices of  $G$ , respectively. Clearly,  $\omega(G) = \alpha(\bar{G})$  and  $\chi(G) = \bar{\chi}(\bar{G})$ . Furthermore, since the complement of a perfect graph is also perfect, we get that for a perfect graph  $G$ ,  $\alpha(G) = \bar{\chi}(G)$ .

Consider LP (3) and its integer programming formulation for the case that the weight function  $w \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , and let  $L_p(w)$  and  $I_p(w)$  denote their optimal objective function values. For the same restriction on  $w$ , let  $L_d(w)$  and  $I_d(w)$  denote the optimal objective function values of LP (4) and its integer programming formulation. Now,

$$I_p(w) \leq L_p(w) = L_d(w) \leq I_d(w),$$

where the equality follows from the LP-duality theorem, and the inequalities follow from the relation between integral and fractional solutions.



For  $w \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , let  $G'$  be the subgraph of  $G$  induced on vertices  $v$  for which  $w_v = 1$ . Since  $G'$  is also perfect,  $I_p(w) = \alpha(G')$  and  $I_d(w) = \bar{\chi}(G')$ . Since  $\alpha(G') = \bar{\chi}(G')$ , we get that  $I_p(w) = I_d(w)$  and hence equality holds for all four programs defined above.

To show that LP (3) is TDI we must show that for every weight function  $w \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$ , the optimal objective function value of the dual is integral. Since  $L_d(w) = I_d(w)$ , this is the case if  $w \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Finally, the results of Fulkerson [Ful72] and Lovasz [Lov72] show that this integrality implies integrality of the optimal dual even if  $w \in \mathbf{Z}_+^n$ . Therefore the linear system of LP (3) is TDI and hence the polytope defined by it is integral; the vertices of this polytope are stable sets.

**Definition 10.** Let  $Ax \leq b$  be a linear system where  $A$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix and  $b$  an  $m$ -dimensional vector, both with rational entries. We will say that this linear system is *totally dual integral (TDI)* if for any integer-valued vector  $c^T$  such that the linear program

$$\max\{cx : Ax \leq b\}$$

has an optimum solution, the corresponding dual linear program has an *integer* optimal solution. If so, the polytope of this linear system is integral.

Note that TDI is a more general condition than TUM for integrality of polyhedra. If  $A$  is TUM then the polyhedron of the linear system  $Ax \leq b$  is integral for every integral vector  $b$ . However, even if  $A$  is not TUM, for specific choices of an integral vector  $b$ , the polytope of the linear system  $Ax \leq b$  may be integral, and TDI may apply in this situation. It is important to remark that TDI is not a property of the polytope but of the particular linear system chosen to define it. See [GLS88, Sch86] for further details.

## 5.2 Characterizing the Core of the Game

Since the firms in the investment management game are *maximal* cliques, we first restrict constraint in LP(3) to maximal cliques only to obtain LP (5). Observe that if  $Q$  is a clique in  $G$  and  $Q'$  is a sub-clique of  $Q$ , then the constraint in LP (3) corresponding to  $Q'$  is redundant and can be removed, since it is implied by the constraint corresponding to  $Q$ . Continuing in this manner, we are left with constraints corresponding to maximal cliques only. Therefore, the two LPs are equivalent.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{v \in V} w_v x_v \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(Q) \leq 1 \quad \forall \text{ maximal clique } Q \text{ in } G, \\ & x_v \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in V \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The dual of LP (5) is given below.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{\text{clique } Q \text{ in } G} y_Q \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{Q \ni v} y_Q \geq w_v \quad \forall v \in V, \\
& y_Q \geq 0 \quad \forall \text{ maximal clique } Q \text{ in } G
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We next show that the linear system of LP (5) is also TDI. This is not immediate, since as stated after Definition 10, TDI is not a property of the polytope but of the particular linear system chosen to define it.

**Lemma 1.** *The linear system of LP (5) is TDI.*

*Proof.* Since the linear system of LP (3) is TDI, for any integer-valued cost vector  $w$  such that the linear program (3) has an optimum solution, the dual linear program (4) has an *integer* optimal solution. We will use this fact to show that the same holds for LPs (5) and (6) as well.

Let  $w$  be an integer-valued cost vector such that the linear program (3) has an optimum solution and let  $y$  be the corresponding integer optimal solution to LP (4). Since the two primal LPs given above are equivalent, LP (5) also has an optimum solution for  $w$ .

Use  $y$  to construct a dual solution  $y'$  for LP (6) using the following operation: Suppose  $y_{Q'} > 0$ , where  $Q'$  is not a maximal clique. Let  $Q$  be any maximal clique of which  $Q'$  is a sub-clique. Now subtract  $y_{Q'}$  from  $y_{Q'}$  and add it to  $y_Q$ . Observe that new dual obtained is integral, its objective value remains unchanged and it is feasible for LP (4) since for each vertex  $v$ ,  $\sum_{Q \ni v} y_Q$  remains unchanged.

Repeat this operation until  $y_Q > 0$  only if  $Q$  is a maximal clique. Call the resulting dual  $y'$ . Clearly,  $y'$  is an integral optimal dual for LP (6). Therefore LP (5) is TDI.  $\square$

In our setting, an optimal dual distributes the worth of the game among the maximal cliques of  $G$ . However, dividing the money  $y_Q$ , given to clique  $Q$ , among the vertices in the clique is not very meaningful, see Example 1 for a detailed explanation. As described in Theorem 2, in our game, the money available to a *any sub-coalition* is defined via a different process, see also Remark 1.

**Example 1.** The  $3 \times 3$  Paley graph, which is a perfect graph, is shown in Figure 1. It has three disjoint maximum stable sets of size three each, one of each color, and three disjoint maximal cliques, one of which is shown in bold. Under unit cost for each asset, the worth of the investment management game on this graph is 3 and the optimal dual assigns 1 to each of the three cliques. Consider three scenarios, each consisting of a maximum stable set. The optimal investment in each scenario is to buy all three of its assets, requiring 3 units of money. If the cliques were to distribute their unit money to the assets, then at most one of these scenarios can be satisfied: by each clique allocating its money to a different colored asset of the *same* scenario. Therefore, the dual on a clique cannot be distributed among its vertices.




Figure 1: The  $3 \times 3$  Paley graph for Example 1

**Theorem 2.** *An imputation  $y$  is in the core of the stable set game over a perfect graph if and only if it is an optimal solution to the dual LP(6).*

*Proof.* ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Let  $y$  be an optimal solution to the dual LP(6). By Lemma 1, the linear system of LP(5) is TDI and therefore a maximum cost stable set in  $G$  is an optimal solution to this LP. This fact together with the LP-duality theorem give us

$$T = \text{cost}(V) = \sum_{Q \in G} y_Q = \text{money}(V).$$

Therefore  $y$  is an imputation.

Consider a scenario  $S \subseteq V$ . By Definition 4,

$$\text{money}(S) := \sum_{Q \in G: Q \cap S \neq \emptyset} y_Q.$$

Clearly  $Q \cap S$  is a clique in  $G(S)$ . Next, we will distribute  $\text{money}(S)$  on cliques in  $G(S)$  via function  $z$  as follows: For a clique  $Q'$  in  $G(S)$ , define

$$z_{Q'} := \sum_{Q \in G: Q \cap S = Q'} y_Q.$$

Since each clique  $Q$  of  $G$  which has a non-empty intersection with  $S$  will contribute to exactly one clique in  $G(S)$ , namely  $Q \cap S$ , we get

$$\text{money}(S) = \sum_{Q' \in G(S)} z_{Q'}.$$

Next, we observe that  $z$  is a feasible solution to the restriction of LP (4) to  $G(S)$  because

$$\forall v \in S : \sum_{Q' \in G(S): Q' \ni v} z_{Q'} = \sum_{Q \in G: Q \ni v} y_Q \geq w_v.$$

Since the subgraph of a perfect graph is also perfect,  $G(S)$  is a perfect graph and the restriction of LP (3) to  $G(S)$  satisfies TDI. Therefore a maximum cost stable set in  $G(S)$  is an optimal solution to the latter LP. This fact together with weak duality give us

$$\text{cost}(S) \leq \sum_{Q \in G(S)} z_Q = \text{money}(S).$$

Therefore  $y$  is a core imputation.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) Next, assume that  $y$  is a core imputation of the investment management game over a perfect graph  $G$ .

For  $v \in V$ , consider the scenario  $S = \{v\}$ . Since  $y$  is in the core, by Definition 5,

$$\text{money}(S) = \sum_{Q \in G: Q \cap S \neq \emptyset} y_Q \leq \text{cost}(S) = w_v.$$

Therefore,  $y$  is a feasible solution for LP(6).

By Definition 4,

$$\text{money}(V) = \sum_{Q \in G} y_Q = T = \text{cost}(V).$$

Therefore by the TDI of LP(5), the objective function value of  $y$  is the same as that of the optimal value of the primal. This together with the feasibility of  $y$  establishes that  $y$  is an optimal solution to the dual LP(6).  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *The core of the stable set game over a perfect graph is non-empty.*

**Remark 1.** The contrast between the way allocations are made to sub-coalitions in the assignment game and in our game can be summarized as follows: Whereas the former follows a *bottom-up process*, we follow a *top-down process*. To the best of our knowledge, all previous works characterizing cores of games follow a bottom-up process, similar to the assignment game.

## 6 Discussion

A simple way of defining the game presented in this paper would use the graph-theoretic language of stable sets and cliques. There is no doubt that the economic interpretation given in this paper, as the investment management game, falls short of providing a solution concept for a realistic economic situation. However, that was not the intent of this paper. We simply wanted to provide evidence that the beautiful solution concept of core is more versatile than previously envisaged. We hope other researchers will be able to build on this viewpoint and discover formulations which do have novel applications in real economic situations.

## 7 Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Martin Bullinger, Gerard Cornuejols, Federico Echenique, Naveen Garg, Martin Groetschel, Ruta Mehta, Joseph Root, Thorben Trobst and Richard Zeckhauser for several valuable discussions.

## References

- [BKP12] Péter Biró, Walter Kern, and Daniël Paulusma. Computing solutions for matching games. *International journal of game theory*, 41(1):75–90, 2012.
- [DIN99] Xiaotie Deng, Toshihide Ibaraki, and Hiroshi Nagamochi. Algorithmic aspects of the core of combinatorial optimization games. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 24(3):751–766, 1999.
- [Edg81] Francis Ysidro Edgeworth. *Mathematical psychics: An essay on the application of mathematics to the moral sciences*, volume 10. CK Paul, 1881.
- [Ful72] Delbert R Fulkerson. Anti-blocking polyhedra. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 12(1):50–71, 1972.
- [GH81] Daniel Granot and Gur Huberman. Minimum cost spanning tree games. *Mathematical programming*, 21(1), 1981.
- [GH84] Daniel Granot and Gur Huberman. On the core and nucleolus of minimum cost spanning tree games. *Mathematical programming*, 29(3):323–347, 1984.
- [GLS88] M. Grotschel, L. Lovasz, and A. Schrijver. *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*. Springer-Verlag, 1988.
- [Grö99] Martin Grötschel. My favorite theorem: characterizations of perfect graphs. 1999.
- [GS62] David Gale and Lloyd S Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.
- [KP08] Tamás Király and Júlia Pap. Total dual integrality of rothblum’s description of the stable-marriage polyhedron. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(2):283–290, 2008.
- [KS20] Zhuan Khye Koh and Laura Sanità. An efficient characterization of submodular spanning tree games. *Mathematical Programming*, 183(1):359–377, 2020.
- [Lov72] László Lovász. Normal hypergraphs and the perfect graph conjecture. *discrete Mathematics*, 2(3):253–267, 1972.
- [LP86] L. Lovász and M.D. Plummer. *Matching Theory*. North-Holland, Amsterdam–New York, 1986.
- [Mou14] Hervé Moulin. *Cooperative microeconomics: a game-theoretic introduction*, volume 313. Princeton University Press, 2014.

- [NZKI97] Hiroshi Nagamochi, Dao-Zhi Zeng, Naohiisa Kabutoya, and Toshihide Ibaraki. Complexity of the minimum base game on matroids. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 22(1):146–164, 1997.
- [Rot92] Uriel G Rothblum. Characterization of stable matchings as extreme points of a polytope. *Mathematical Programming*, 54(1):57–67, 1992.
- [Sch86] A. Schrijver. *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, 1986.
- [SS71] Lloyd S Shapley and Martin Shubik. The assignment game I: The core. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 1(1):111–130, 1971.
- [Vat89] John H Vande Vate. Linear programming brings marital bliss. *Operations Research Letters*, 8(3):147–153, 1989.
- [Vaz22] Vijay V Vazirani. New characterizations of core imputations of matching and  $b$ -matching games. In *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, 2022.