

# Values of Nondifferentiable Vector Measure Games

Omer Edhan

Received: date / Accepted: date

**Abstract** We introduce ideas and methods from distribution theory into value theory. This new approach enables us to construct new diagonal formulas for the Mertens value [5] and the Neyman value [6] on a large space of non-differentiable games. This in turn enables us to give an affirmative answer to the question, first posed by Neyman [6], whether the Mertens value and the Neyman value coincide “modulo Banach limits”? The solution is an intermediate result towards a characterization of values of norm 1 of vector measure games with bounded variation.

**Keywords** Nonatomic Games · Shapley value

## 1 Introduction

One of the most basic solution concepts of cooperative game theory is the Shapley value [8]. It was first introduced in the setting of  $n$ -players games, where it can be viewed as the players’ expected payoffs. It has a wide range of applications in various fields of economics and political science (e.g., [1, Chapters 32–34]). In many such applications it is necessary to consider games that involve a large number of “individually insignificant” players. Among the typical examples are voting among stockholders of a corporation and markets with perfect competition. In such cases it is fruitful to model the game as a cooperative game with an underlying standard nonatomic space of players,

---

This work is based on chapter 8 of the author’s Ph.D. thesis written at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem under the supervision of Professor Abraham Neyman. This research was supported in part by Israel Science Foundation grants 1123/06 and 1596/10.

---

O. Edhan

School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

Tel.: +972-74-7245386

Fax: +972-3-6409357

E-mail: edhan@post.tau.ac.il

i.e., as a nonatomic game. Aumann and Shapley [2] extended the definition of the value to nonatomic games. The value was defined using the axioms of additivity, efficiency, symmetry, and positivity.

Once a solution concept on a space of games is defined, it is natural to ask whether this solution exists and is unique. The core of a cooperative game, the nucleus, and the Shapley value are examples of solution concepts of cooperative games whose existence and uniqueness is guaranteed under certain conditions. Aumann and Shapley [2] proved that the value exists and is in fact unique on some spaces of “differentiable” nonatomic games.

However, the problem of existence of a value on spaces of “nondifferentiable” games remained open for a long time after many trials. An example is the space generated by all market games, and of special interest are the “ $n$ -gloves” games. Tauman [9] proved the uniqueness of the value on the space  $Q^n$ , i.e., the minimal symmetric space spanned by “ $n$ -gloves” games that are functions of finitely many nonatomic and mutually singular probability measures. Tauman [9] also proved that this value can be extended to the minimal symmetric space generated by  $Q^n$  and  $pNA$ , the space of games that are “smooth” functions of finitely many nonatomic measures. But it was still unknown whether there is a value on larger spaces, such as the space generated by market games. In fact, it was not even known whether there is a value on the space generated by the union of the  $Q^n$ -s.

Mertens [5] solved this problem and introduced a value on a very large space of games containing, among others, the space generated by market games. Neyman [6] introduced yet another value on the space spanned by games that are functions of finitely many measures.<sup>1</sup> It is straightforward, due to the use of Banach limits in Neyman’s construction, that the value is not unique on the space of games on which the Neyman value was constructed. Yet, Neyman [6] asked whether the value is unique “modulo Banach limits,” i.e., whether there is a unique value of norm 1 on the space of games for which the Neyman value exists without the use of a Banach limit. This problem has proven to be extremely difficult. Consequently, Neyman [6] introduced an intermediate problem, namely, do the Mertens value and the Neyman value coincide “modulo Banach limits.”

It is straightforward that the values coincide on subspaces of the intersection of their domains on which the value is known to be unique.<sup>2</sup> It is somewhat less obvious that these values coincide on the space generated by vector measure market games, as was proved by Neyman [6, Proposition 4]. In fact, Neyman [6, Proposition 5] proved that these values coincide on the space generated by games that are concave functions of finitely many nonatomic probability measures. However, the proof becomes extremely difficult for games that exhibit even the slightest singularities. For example, proving that these values coincide on the space  $LPS$  of piecewise smooth vector measure games

<sup>1</sup> That are also  $NA$ -continuous at the empty and the grand coalitions.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., the space of “differentiable” games  $pNA$ , and the space  $bv'NA$ .

(introduced by Neyman and Smorodinsky [7]) will immediately expose much of the difficulty inherent in the more general problem.

The main obstacle arises from the different methods used to construct both values. Essentially, Mertens' construction averages the marginal contribution of a coalition to some "infinitesimal" random perturbation of the diagonal s.t. the random perturbations are made to be independent of the computation of the marginal contribution. In contrast, Neyman's construction makes the random perturbations and the computation of the marginal contribution heavily dependent on each other. Another substantial difference is that while Mertens' construction takes the average over "infinitesimal" random perturbations, Neyman's construction considers an average on rather "large" perturbations. Thus, Neyman's [6] second question has an appealing interpretation. In effect, he asked whether the way in which the marginal contributions are computed and aggregated might influence the value. Nevertheless, the differences between the Mertens value and the Neyman value have the effect of turning even a rather simple exercise, like proving that the values coincide on the space  $LPS$  of piecewise smooth vector measure games, into a tedious and involved task. In fact, these major differences are the reason that the answer to Neyman's second question was assumed to be negative.

The present paper concentrates on Neyman's second question. Our approach to this problem is to develop "diagonal formulas" for games that lie in the intersection of the domains of both values, for which the Neyman value exists without the use of Banach limits. This task, which may seem hopeless at a first glance, is accomplished by an application of methods and ideas from distribution theory. As a consequence we prove the surprising result that the Mertens value and the Neyman value coincide "modulo Banach limits," which yields an affirmative answer to Neyman's second question. Our result may be considered to be a first step towards a general characterization of values of norm 1 on spaces consisting of vector measure games with bounded variation, namely, to Neyman's [6] first question.

## 2 Background and Basic Definitions

### 2.1 Basic Definitions.

Let  $(I, \mathcal{C})$  be a standard measurable space. The members of  $I$  are called *players* and the members of  $\mathcal{C}$  are called *coalitions*. A *game* is a real valued function  $v : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $v(\emptyset) = 0$ . A game  $v$  is:

- 1) *finitely additive* if it is bounded and  $v(S \cup T) = v(S) + v(T)$  whenever  $S, T$  are two disjoint coalitions. We denote the space of all finitely additive games by  $FA$ , and its subspace of all nonatomic and countably additive measures by  $NA$ ;
- 2) *monotonic* if  $v(T) \geq v(S)$  whenever  $S \subseteq T$ . It is of *bounded variation* if it is the difference between two monotonic games. We denote the space of all games of bounded variation by  $BV$ .

The *variation* of a game  $v \in BV$  is the supremum of the variation of  $v$  along all increasing chains  $S_0 \subseteq S_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq S_m$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , or equivalently

$$\|v\|_{BV} = \inf \{u(I) + w(I) : u, w \text{ are monotonic games s.t. } v = u - w\}.$$

$\|\cdot\|_{BV}$  is a norm on  $BV$ , under which  $BV$  is a Banach algebra (see [2]).

Denote by  $\Theta$  the group of measurable automorphisms of  $(I, \mathcal{C})$ ; i.e., bijections  $\theta : I \rightarrow I$  s.t. both  $\theta$  and  $\theta^{-1}$  are measurable. Each  $\theta \in \Theta$  induces a linear mapping  $\theta^*$  of  $BV$  onto itself by  $(\theta^*v)(S) = v(\theta S)$ . A set of games  $Q \subset BV$  is *symmetric* if  $\theta^*Q = Q$  for each  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Given a set of games  $Q$  we will denote by  $Q^+$  its subset containing all monotonic games, and by  $Q^1$  the subset  $\{v \in Q^+ : v(I) = 1\}$ .

Let  $Q$  be a symmetric space. A map  $\Psi : Q \rightarrow BV$  is called *positive* iff  $\Psi(Q^+) \subset BV^+$ . It is *symmetric* iff  $\theta^*\Psi = \Psi\theta^*$  for each  $\theta \in \Theta$ , and *efficient* iff  $\Psi(v)(I) = v(I)$  for each  $v \in Q$ .

**Definition 1** Let  $Q$  be a symmetric linear subspace of  $BV$ . A value on  $Q$  is a symmetric, positive, and efficient linear map  $\Psi : Q \rightarrow FA$ .

Denote by  $B(I, \mathcal{C})$  the space of bounded measurable real-valued functions on  $(I, \mathcal{C})$  and let  $B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C}) = \{f \in B(I, \mathcal{C}) : 0 \leq f \leq 1\}$  be the space of *ideal coalitions*. We endow  $B(I, \mathcal{C})$  with the supremum norm. A function  $\bar{v}$  on  $B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$  is a *constant sum* if  $\bar{v}(f) + \bar{v}(1 - f) = \bar{v}(1)$  for every  $f \in B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$ . It is *monotonic* if for every  $f, g \in B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$  with  $f \geq g$ ,  $\bar{v}(f) \geq \bar{v}(g)$ . It is *finitely additive* if it is bounded and for every  $f, g \in B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$  with  $f + g \leq 1$ ,  $\bar{v}(f + g) = \bar{v}(f) + \bar{v}(g)$ . It is of *bounded variation* if it is the difference between two monotonic functions, and its *variation norm*  $\|\bar{v}\|_{IBV}$  is the supremum of the variation of  $\bar{v}$  along all increasing sequences  $0 \leq f_1 \leq f_2 \leq \dots \leq f_m \leq 1$  in  $B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$ . The group  $\Theta$  acts on  $B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$  by  $(\theta^*f)(s) = f(\theta s)$ .

## 2.2 Cauchy Distributions

The Cauchy distribution with parameter  $\alpha > 0$  is the distribution on  $\mathbb{R}$  with density  $\frac{\alpha}{\pi(\alpha^2 + x^2)}$ . If  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent Cauchy random variables with parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  respectively and  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $a^2 + b^2 \neq 0$ , then  $aX + bY$  is a Cauchy random variable with parameter  $|a|\alpha + |b|\beta$ . The characteristic function of the Cauchy distribution with parameter  $\alpha$  is  $\psi(t) = \exp(-\alpha|t|)$ .

Recall that given a vector measure  $\mu \in (NA^1)^k$  we defined  $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i$ .

The  $\mu$  *semi-norm* of  $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$  is given by

$$\|y\|_{\mu} = \int \left| \sum_{i=1}^k (d\mu_i/d\bar{\mu}) y_i \right| d\bar{\mu}.$$

Denote the range of  $\mu$  by  $\mathcal{R}(\mu)$ , and denote the affine space generated by  $\mathcal{R}(\mu)$  by  $AF(\mu)$ . By [6, Lemma 1] the function  $\phi_{\mu} : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $\phi_{\mu}(y) =$

$\exp(-\|y\|_\mu)$  is the characteristic function of a probability distribution  $P_\mu$  on  $AF(\mu)$ ,  $P_\mu$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure on  $AF(\mu)$ , and its density  $\xi_\mu$  is a  $C_0(AF(\mu))$  function.

In [5] it is proved that the collection<sup>3</sup>  $\{P_\mu \circ \mu^{-1} : \mu \in (NA^1)^k, k \geq 1\}$  defines a cylindric set measure on  $B(I, \mathcal{C})$ . We denote this measure by  $P$ .

### 2.3 The Mertens Value

**Definition 2** *An extension operator is a linear and symmetric map  $\psi$  from a linear symmetric space of games to real-valued functions on  $B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$ , s.t.  $(\psi v)(\chi_S) = v(S)$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $(\psi v)(0) = 0$ ,  $(\psi v)(1) = v(I)$ ,  $\|\psi v\|_{IBV} \leq \|v\|$ ,  $\psi v$  is finitely additive whenever  $v$  is finitely additive, and  $\psi v$  is a constant sum whenever  $v$  is a constant sum.*

Mertens [5] proved the existence of an extension operator  $\phi_M$  on a large symmetric space  $EXT$ . The Mertens extension  $\phi_M(v)$  of the game  $v$  can be extended to a function  $\tilde{v}$  on the space  $B(I, \mathcal{C})$  by  $\tilde{v}(\chi) = \phi_M(v)(\max\{0, \min\{1, \chi\}\})$ . Notice that, indeed, for every  $\chi \in B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$  we have  $\tilde{v}(\chi) = \phi_M(v)(\chi)$ . In the same paper he defined a value on a large space of games  $Q_M$  in the following way:

- 1) Map every game  $v \in BV$  to the constant sum game  $\phi_C(v)(S) = \frac{1}{2}(v(S) - v(S^c) + v(I))$ .
- 2) Let  $Q$  be the space of all games with  $\phi_C(v) \in EXT$ . For  $v \in Q$  let  $\bar{v} = \phi_C(\psi(v))$ .
- 3) Define  $Q_D \subseteq Q$  as the space of all games  $v \in Q$  for which the following integral and limit exist:

$$(\Psi_D v)(\chi) = \lim_{\tau \searrow 0} \int_0^1 \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt.$$

- 4) For every  $w \in \Psi_D(Q_D)$  and every  $\xi, \chi \in B(I, \mathcal{C})$  let

$$[w]_\xi(\chi) = \lim_{\tau \searrow 0} \frac{w(\chi + \tau\xi) - w(\chi - \tau\xi)}{2\tau}.$$

Next, let  $Q_M$  be the closed symmetric space generated by all games  $v \in Q_D$  s.t. either  $\Psi_D(v) \in FA$  or  $\Psi_D(v)$  is a function of finitely many nonatomic measures.

**Theorem 1** [5, Section 2], *Let  $v \in Q_M$ . Then for every  $\xi \in B(I, \mathcal{C})$  the derivative  $[\Psi_D]_\xi(\chi)$  exists for  $P$  almost every  $\chi$  and is  $P$ -integrable in  $\chi$ . In particular the map  $\Psi_M : Q_M \rightarrow FA$  given by*

$$\Psi_M(v)(S) = \int [\Psi_D(v)]_S(\chi) dP(\chi),$$

*is a value of norm 1 on  $Q_M$ .*

<sup>3</sup> We extend the vector measure  $\mu$  to  $B(I, \mathcal{C})$  via  $\mu(\chi) = \int \chi d\mu$ .

## 2.4 The Neyman Value

Let  $Q(\mu)$  be the space of all bounded variation games of the form  $f \circ \mu$ , where  $\mu \in (NA^1)^k$  for some  $k \geq 1$ , and  $f$  is continuous at  $0_k$  and at  $\mu(I) = \mathbf{1}_k$ . For any  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued nonatomic measure  $\mu$  define a map  $\Psi_\mu^\delta$  from  $Q(\mu)$  to  $BV$  as follows. For  $\delta > 0$  let  $I_\delta(t) = I(3\delta \leq t < 1 - 3\delta)$ . For every sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ ,  $x \in AF(\mu)$  with  $\delta x \in 2\mathcal{R}(\mu) - \mu(I)$ , and  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ , let

$$F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) = \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x + \delta^3 \mu(S)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x)}{\delta^3} dt. \quad (1)$$

Let  $P_\mu^\delta$  be the restriction of  $P_\mu$  to the set  $B_\mu^\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : \delta x \in 2\mathcal{R}(\mu) - \mu(I)\}$ . The function  $x \mapsto F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S)$  is continuous and bounded (see [6, Lemma 5]), and, therefore,

$$\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) = \int_{AF(\mu)} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) dP_\mu^\delta \quad (2)$$

is well defined.

The space  $Q(\mu)$  is neither symmetric nor mappable by  $\Psi_\mu^\delta$  to  $FA$ ; its mapping is neither efficient nor symmetric, nor does its restriction to  $Q(\mu) \cap Q(\nu)$  necessarily coincide with  $\Psi_\nu^\delta$ . However, these violations of the value axioms diminish as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu) - \Psi_\nu^\delta(g \circ \nu) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$  whenever  $f \circ \mu = g \circ \nu$ . This remains true even if the limit exists only as some Banach limit  $\mathcal{L}$  (see [6, Section 3.2] for a detailed construction of  $\mathcal{L}$ ). Let  $Q_N = \bigcup Q(\mu)$ . Given the Banach limit  $\mathcal{L}$ , Neyman [6] defined

$$\Psi_N(f \circ \mu)(S) = \mathcal{L}(\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S)). \quad (3)$$

It turns out that  $\Psi$  is a value of norm 1 on  $Q_N$  (hence also on its closure; see [6, Proposition 1]).

The value on  $Q_N$  is obviously not unique, due to the use of Banach limits in Neyman's construction. However, Neyman [6] asked whether the value is unique "modulo Banach limits." Namely, let  $Q'_N$  be the linear space consisting of games  $v \in Q_N$  for which the limit on the right-hand side of Equation (3) exists in the usual sense. Neyman asked [6, Section 4.5] whether there is a unique value of norm 1 on  $Q'_N$  or even on a large subspace of it. This question was left unanswered. A natural question in this context is whether the Mertens and Neyman values coincide on  $Q'_N \cap Q_M$ . This question was also raised by Neyman [6, Section 5.2]. Yet, despite the fact that Neyman had obtained a positive answer for smaller subspaces [6, Propositions 4–5], the question remained open in general.

## 2.5 Statement of the Main Results

The present paper concentrates on Neyman's second question, i.e., whether the Mertens and Neyman values coincide on the space  $Q_0 = Q_M \cap Q'_N$ . Although there are many reasons to suspect that the Mertens and Neyman values do not coincide on  $Q_0$ , we prove the following surprising theorem:

**Main Theorem**  $\Psi_M = \Psi_N$  on  $Q_0$ .

Our solution utilizes ideas and methods from distribution theory. This is a new approach to the study of the value, and especially to the study of the notion of the derivative of a game. We consider games to be “distributions” *à la* Schwartz, and think of the derivative of the games as a *directional derivative* in the sense of distributions. The proof is then obtained by devising “diagonal formulas” for the Mertens and Neyman values on  $Q_0$ .

Unrigorously, we prove that for every game  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$  with  $\mu$  of full dimension  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and every coalition  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is a family of infinitely differentiable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a compact support  $(\xi_\mu^\delta)_{\delta>0}$  and a family of measures  $(\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S)))_{\delta>0}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that are interpreted as follows: every function  $\xi_\mu^\delta$  is approximately (depending on  $\delta$ ) the density of the averaging measure  $P_\mu$  appearing in the Neyman value, and every measure  $\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  is the average “distributional” directional derivative of the game  $f \circ \mu$  in the direction of the coalition  $S$  in some small neighborhood (depending on  $\delta$ ) of the diagonal. As a result we get the following formulas for the values:

**Proposition I** *The Neyman value admits the following representation on games  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$  with  $\mu$  of full dimension:*

$$\Psi_N(f \circ \mu)(S) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x), \quad (4)$$

and

**Proposition II** *The Mertens value admits the following representation on games  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$  with  $\mu$  of full dimension:*

$$\Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x). \quad (5)$$

As every  $v \in Q_0$  can be represented as  $v = f \circ \mu$  with  $\mu$  of full dimension, the Main Theorem is easily deduced.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Some Distributional Calculus

Denote by  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  the space of *test functions* (i.e., infinitely differentiable functions with compact support) on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and by  $\lambda = \lambda^n$  the Lebesgue measure.

For every test function  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denote the directional derivative of  $\phi$  in the direction  $z$  by  $\partial_z \phi$ . Now let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be some function and assume that its directional derivative  $f'_z$  in direction  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  exists  $\lambda$ -a.e. For every  $\eta > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denote  $F_\eta(x; z) = \frac{f(x+\eta z) - f(x)}{\eta}$ . Denote by  $T_y$  the translation operator (i.e.,  $(T_y g)(x) = g(x+y)$ ).

**Lemma 1** *Let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Suppose that  $f'_z$  exists and  $f$  is bounded  $\lambda$ -a.e. on  $\text{supp}(\phi)$ , and that  $F_\eta(\cdot; z)$  is uniformly bounded  $\lambda$ -a.e. on  $\text{supp}(\phi)$  for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$  (i.e., there are some  $C = C(\text{supp}(\phi)) > 0$  and  $\eta_0 > 0$  s.t. for each  $0 < \eta < \eta_0$  we have  $\lambda(\{x \in \text{supp}(\phi) : |F_\eta(x, z)| > C\}) = 0$ ). Then*

$$\int f'_z(x) \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = - \int f(x) \partial_z \phi(x) d\lambda(x).$$

*Proof* Denote  $K = \text{supp}(\phi)$  and let  $\|\cdot\|_K$  be the  $L^\infty(\lambda)$  norm on  $K$ . By our assumptions there exist some  $C = C(K) > 0$  and  $\eta_0 > 0$  s.t. for each  $0 < \eta < \eta_0$   $\|F_\eta(\cdot; z)\|_K \leq C$ . Thus

$$|F_\eta(x; z) \phi(x)| \leq C |\phi(x)|$$

for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in K$  for every sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$ . As  $f'_z(x) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} F_\eta(x; z)$  for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in K$  and  $C|\phi| \in L^1(K, \lambda)$  we deduce, by applying the dominated convergence theorem, that

$$\int f'_z(x) \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int F_\eta(x; z) \phi(x) d\lambda(x). \quad (6)$$

By the additivity of the integral and a change of variables  $x \mapsto x + \eta z$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int F_\eta(x; z) \phi(x) d\lambda(x) &= \int \frac{f(x + \eta z) - f(x)}{\eta} \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = \\ &= \int f(x) \frac{\phi(x - \eta z) - \phi(x)}{\eta} d\lambda(x), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int F_\eta(x; z) \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \int f(x) \frac{\phi(x - \eta z) - \phi(x)}{\eta} d\lambda(x). \quad (7)$$

But as  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  we have  $\frac{\phi(x - \eta z) - \phi(x)}{\eta} = - \int_0^1 \partial_z \phi(x - s\eta z) ds$ , and hence  $\left| \frac{\phi(x - \eta z) - \phi(x)}{\eta} \right| \leq \|\partial_z \phi\|_\infty$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Together with our assumption on the a.e. boundedness of  $f$  on  $K$ , we deduce that for every sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\left| f(x) \cdot \frac{\phi(x - \eta z) - \phi(x)}{\eta} \right| \leq \|f\|_K \|\partial_z \phi\|_\infty < \infty$$



for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in K$ . Notice that  $\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi(x-\eta z) - \phi(x)}{\eta} = -\partial_z \phi(x)$  and that for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$  the integration on the right-hand side of Equation (7) is supported on the compact set  $K + B(0, \eta \|z\|)$ . Thus by applying the dominated convergence theorem to Equation (7) and combining that with Equation (6), we obtain

$$\int f'_z(x) \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = - \int f(x) \partial_z \phi(x) d\lambda(x),$$

and the lemma follows.  $\square$

Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . A function  $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *directional distributional derivative of  $f$  in the direction  $z$*  iff for each  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , we have

$$\int f(x) \partial_z \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = - \int g(x) \phi(x) d\lambda(x).$$

Thus Lemma 1 actually proves that if  $f$  is  $\lambda$ -a.e.-bounded on any compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , if the directional derivative  $f'_z$  in the direction  $z$  exists and is bounded  $\lambda$ -a.e. on any compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and if  $F_\eta(\cdot; z)$  is uniformly bounded for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$  on any compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $f$  has a distributional directional derivative in the direction  $z$ , and this distributional directional derivative equals  $\lambda$ -a.e. to  $f'_z$ . We shall denote this distributional directional derivative by  $\partial_z f$ .

**Lemma 2** *For each  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  the distributional directional derivative of  $T_y f$  in the direction  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $T_y \circ \partial_z f$ .*

*Proof* We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \partial_z (T_y \circ f), \phi \rangle &= - \langle T_y f, \partial_z \phi \rangle = - \int (T_y f)(x) \partial_z \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = \\ &= - \int f(x+y) \partial_z \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = - \int f(x) \partial_z \phi(x-y) d\lambda(x) = \\ &= \int f'_z(x) \phi(x-y) d\lambda(x) = \int f'_z(x+y) \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = \langle T_y \circ \partial_z f, \phi \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma follows.  $\square$

### 3.2 A Smooth Approximation with Compact Support of the Measures $P_\mu$

Recall that  $P_\mu$  is the measure on  $AF(\mu)$  whose Fourier transform is  $\phi_\mu = \exp(-\|y\|_\mu)$ . We shall from now on suppose that  $\mu$  is of full dimension<sup>4</sup>; hence  $AF(\mu) = \mathbb{R}^n$ . Denote by  $\xi_\mu$  the density of  $P_\mu$  w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure. It is well known that  $\xi_\mu \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^n)$  (see [6]). We wish to approximate  $P_\mu$  by measures  $Q_\mu^\epsilon$  with densities in  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Our first step is the following lemma:

<sup>4</sup> This is assumed in Propositions I and II.

**Lemma 3** For each  $\mu$  we have  $\xi_\mu \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

*Proof* For  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  let  $\widehat{h}$  be its Fourier transform, whenever it is defined. For each multi-index  $\alpha$ , the function  $g_\mu^\alpha(y) = 2\pi i \cdot y^\alpha \phi_\mu(y)$  is in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$ . Thus by [3, Theorem 8.22] and the Fourier inversion theorem ([3, Theorem 8.26]) we have

$$\partial^\alpha \xi_\mu = \widehat{g_\mu^\alpha} \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and the lemma follows.  $\square$

Recall that  $B_\mu^\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon} (2\mathcal{R}(\mu) - \mu(I))$ . Our next step is to prove that  $\xi_\mu$  can be approximated in the  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$  norm by nonnegative functions  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that coincide with  $\xi_\mu$  on some open sets  $U_\mu^\epsilon \subset B_\mu^\epsilon$  whose diameter tends to infinity as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  and which satisfy  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon \leq \xi_\mu$ .

**Lemma 4** For any sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  there are open sets  $U_\mu^\epsilon, V_\mu^\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\overline{U_\mu^\epsilon} \subset V_\mu^\epsilon \subset B_\mu^\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a function  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon$  s.t.  $\text{diam}(U_\mu^\epsilon), \text{diam}(V_\mu^\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \infty$ ,  $\text{supp}(\xi_\mu^\epsilon) \subset V_\mu^\epsilon$ ,  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \xi_\mu(x)$  for each  $x \in U_\mu^\epsilon$ ,  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon \leq \xi_\mu$ , and  $\|\xi_\mu - \xi_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} 0$ .

*Proof* For sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  choose open sets  $U_\mu^\epsilon, V_\mu^\epsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\overline{U_\mu^\epsilon} \subset V_\mu^\epsilon \subset B_\mu^\epsilon$  s.t.  $d(U_\mu^\epsilon, (B_\mu^\epsilon)^c), d(V_\mu^\epsilon, (B_\mu^\epsilon)^c) \in (\sqrt{n}\epsilon, 2\sqrt{n}\epsilon)$ . First notice that indeed  $\text{diam}(U_\mu^\epsilon), \text{diam}(V_\mu^\epsilon) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \infty$ . Also, by the smooth Urisson Lemma ([3, Lemma 8.18]) there is a function  $h_\mu^\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  s.t.  $\text{supp}(h_\mu^\epsilon) \subset V_\mu^\epsilon$ ,  $0 \leq h_\mu^\epsilon \leq 1$ , and  $h_\mu^\epsilon|_{U_\mu^\epsilon} = 1$ . Define  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon = \xi_\mu h_\mu^\epsilon$ . Then  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \xi_\mu(x)$  for each  $x \in U_\mu^\epsilon$ ,  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon \leq \xi_\mu$ , and

$$\|\xi_\mu - \xi_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 = \int_{(U_\mu^\epsilon)^c} |(\xi_\mu - \xi_\mu^\epsilon)(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq 2 \int_{(U_\mu^\epsilon)^c} |\xi_\mu(x)| d\lambda(x) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} 0,$$

and the lemma follows.  $\square$

Denote by  $Q_\mu^\epsilon$  the measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , whose Radon–Nikodym derivative w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure is  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon$ .

**Corollary 1**  $\|P_\mu - Q_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} 0$ .

### 3.3 The Measures $\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$

Here we introduce a family of measures that will be used in the proof of our Main Theorem. We begin with a lemma that is an analogue to [6, Lemma 4].

**Lemma 5** Suppose that  $\mu$  is of full dimension. Let  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\omega \in \mathcal{B}(I, \mathcal{C})$ , and  $0 < \eta \leq 1$ . Then there exist  $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon, \|\omega\|)$  s.t. for every  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ , and  $\gamma \geq \delta \|\omega\|$ ,

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu^\epsilon} \left| \int I_\gamma(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta x + \delta\eta\mu(\omega)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta x)}{\delta\eta} dt \right| \leq \|f \circ \mu\| (\|\omega_+\| + \|\omega_-\|).$$

**Remark 1** It is sufficient to prove the lemma only for  $\omega \geq 0$ . Let  $\omega = \omega_+ - \omega_-$ . If  $\gamma \geq \delta \|\omega\|$ , then  $\gamma \geq \delta \|\omega_\pm\|$ , and thus by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int I_\gamma(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta x + \delta\eta\mu(\omega)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta x)}{\delta\eta} dt \right| \leq \\ & \left| \int I_\gamma(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta x + \delta\eta\mu(\omega_+)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta x)}{\delta\eta} dt \right| + \\ & \left| \int I_\gamma(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta(x + \eta\mu(\omega)) + \delta\eta\mu(\omega_-)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta(x + \eta\mu(\omega)))}{\delta\eta} dt \right|. \end{aligned}$$

As  $B_\mu^\epsilon + \eta\mu(\omega) \subset B_\mu^{\epsilon/(1+\eta\|\mu(\omega)\|)}$ , the claim follows.

Furthermore, if we take  $\delta' = \frac{\delta}{\epsilon}$ ,  $\omega' = \epsilon\omega$ ,  $x' = \epsilon x$ , and  $\gamma' = \epsilon\gamma$ , it will be sufficient to prove that if  $\omega' \geq 0$ , then there is some  $\delta'_0 = \delta'_0(\|\omega'\|) > 0$  s.t. for every  $0 < \delta' \leq \delta'_0$ ,

$$\sup_{x' \in B_\mu^1} \left| \int I_{\gamma'}(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta'x' + \eta\delta'\mu(\omega')) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta'x')}{\delta'\eta} dt \right| \leq \|f \circ \mu\| \|\omega'\|.$$

We return now to the proof of Lemma 5.

*Proof* Following Remark 1, choose  $\delta_0(\|\omega\|) > 0$  s.t. for every  $3\delta_0 \|\omega\| < t < 1 - 3\delta_0 \|\omega\|$  we have

$$t\mu(I) + \delta_0(1 + \|\mu(\omega)\|_\mu)B_\mu \subset \mathcal{R}(\mu).$$

Thus for every  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ ,  $\gamma \geq \delta \|\omega\|$ ,  $3\gamma < t < 1 - 3\gamma$ , and  $0 < \eta \leq 1$ , we have

$$t\mu(I) + \delta(1 + \eta \|\mu(\omega)\|_\mu)B_\mu^1 \subset \mathcal{R}(\mu).$$

Let  $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$ ,  $\gamma \geq \delta \|\omega\|$ , and let  $M$  be the smallest integer s.t.  $3\gamma + M\delta \|\eta\omega\| > 1 - 3\gamma$ . For every  $1 \leq m \leq M$  define  $I_\delta^m : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$I_\delta^m(t) = 3\gamma + \mathbb{I}([(m-1)\delta\eta \|\omega\|, m\delta\eta \|\omega\|]).$$

Let  $\xi \in B_+^1(I, \mathcal{C})$  be s.t.  $2\mu(\xi) - \mu(I) = x$ . For every  $s \in [0, \delta\eta \|\omega\|]$  and every integer  $0 \leq m \leq 2M$  consider the increasing chain of ideal coalitions  $g_m^s$ ,

where  $g_0^s = 3\gamma + s + \delta(2\xi - 1)$ ,  $g_{2m+1}^s = g_{2m}^s + \delta\eta\omega$ , and  $g_{2m}^s = g_0^s + m\delta\eta\|\omega\|$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int I_\gamma(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta x + \delta\mu(\eta\omega)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta x)}{\delta\eta} dt \right| \leq \\ & \frac{1}{\delta\eta} \int_0^1 \left( \sum_{m=1}^M I_\delta^m(t) |f(t\mu(I) + \delta x + \delta\mu(\eta\omega)) - f(t\mu(I) + \delta x)| \right) dt = \\ & \frac{1}{\delta\eta} \int_0^{\delta\eta\|\omega\|} \left( \sum_{m=1}^M |f(\mu(g_{2m-1}^t)) - f(\mu(g_{2(m-1)}^t))| \right) dt \leq \\ & \frac{1}{\delta\eta} \int_0^{\delta\eta\|\omega\|} \|f \circ \mu\| dt = \|f \circ \mu\| \|\omega\|. \end{aligned}$$

$\delta_0(\|\omega\|)$  is independent of the particular choice of  $x$ ; therefore, the lemma follows by taking the supremum over  $B_\mu^1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2** Notice that by Lemma 5, for any sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  the function  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) f(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x) dt$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $B_\mu^\delta$  whose Lipschitz constant<sup>5</sup> can be bounded by some  $K(f, \mu) > 0$  that is independent of the choice of the sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . Indeed, notice that  $B_\mu^1 + B_\mu^1 = B_\mu^{1/2}$ . By Lemma 5 there is  $\delta_0 > 0$  s.t. for every  $w \in B(I, \mathcal{C})$  with  $\|w\| = 2$ ,  $\delta < \delta_0$ , and  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  (taking  $\gamma = \delta$  there)

$$\sup_{z \in B_\mu^{1/2}} \left| \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) \frac{f\left(t\mu(I) + \frac{\delta z}{2} + \frac{\eta\delta}{2}\mu(w)\right) - f\left(t\mu(I) + \frac{\delta z}{2}\right)}{\delta\eta} dt \right| \leq \quad (8)$$

$$2 \|f \circ \mu\|.$$

For any choice of  $x \neq y \in AF(\mu)$  take  $w = w(x, y) \in B(I, \mathcal{C})$  with  $\|w\| = 2$ , s.t.  $\mu(w) \in \partial B_\mu^{1/2}$  has the same direction as  $y - x$  and define  $q(x, y) > 0$  by  $y - x = q(x, y)\mu(w)$ . If  $\delta < \delta_0$  and  $x \neq y \in B_\mu^\delta$ , then  $\delta q(x, y) = \frac{\|\delta(y-x)\|_2}{\|\mu(w)\|_2} \leq 1$  since  $\delta(y-x) \in B_\mu^{1/2}$  has the same direction as  $\mu(w) \in \partial B_\mu^{1/2}$ . Thus, by setting  $\eta = \delta q(x, y)$ ,  $z = \delta(x + y) \in B_\mu^{1/2}$ , and  $w = w(x, y)$  in Equation (8) we obtain

$$\left| \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 y) - f(t\mu(I) + \frac{\delta^2(x+y)}{2})}{\delta^2} dt \right| \leq 2q(x, y) \|f \circ \mu\|. \quad (9)$$

Now  $q(x, y) \leq \left( \max_{z \in \partial B_\mu^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\|z\|_2} \right) \|y - x\|_2 = \left( \max_{z \in \partial B_\mu^1} \frac{1}{2\|z\|_2} \right) \|y - x\|_2$ . Thus, the remark follows, with  $K(f, \mu) \leq \max_{z \in \partial B_\mu^1} \frac{2\|f \circ \mu\|}{\|z\|_2}$ , by exploiting the symmetry of  $y$  and  $x$  in Equation (9) and combining it with the triangle inequality.

<sup>5</sup> W.r.t. the Euclidian norm.

**Remark 3** By assumption, the affine space generated by  $B_\mu^\delta$  is  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus, by combining Remark 2 with the McShane-Whitney extension theorem (e.g., [4, Theorem 1]), for any sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  we may extend the function  $x \mapsto \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) f(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x) dt$ ,  $x \in B_\mu^\delta$ , to a Lipschitz continuous function  $G_\delta$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a Lipschitz constant bounded by  $K(f, \mu)$ .

**Proposition 1** For every game  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$  with  $\mu \in (NA^1)^n$  and  $AF(\mu) = \mathbb{R}^n$ , every sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , and every  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is a measure  $\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n (= AF(\mu))$  that is uniquely determined by  $f$  and  $\mu(S)$  s.t.

$$\int G_\delta(x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = - \int \phi(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$$

for every  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

*Proof* Consider the following linear functional on  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ :

$$A_\delta(f, \mu(S))(\phi) = \int G_\delta(x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \phi(x) d\lambda(x).$$

This functional is well defined. As  $\frac{\phi(x + \epsilon\mu(S)) - \phi(x)}{\epsilon}$  is bounded for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\|\partial_{\mu(S)} \phi\|_\infty$  for any sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ , an application of the dominated convergence theorem yields

$$A_\delta(f, \mu(S))(\phi) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int G_\delta(x) \frac{\phi(x + \epsilon\mu(S)) - \phi(x)}{\epsilon} d\lambda(x).$$

Thus, by a change of variable  $x \mapsto x + \epsilon\mu(S)$ , we obtain

$$A_\delta(f, \mu(S))(\phi) = - \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int \frac{G_\delta(x) - G_\delta(x - \epsilon\mu(S))}{\epsilon} \phi(x) d\lambda(x). \quad (10)$$

Consider  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ . By Remark 3, for any sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  the function  $G_\delta$  is Lipschitz continuous with a Lipschitz constant bounded by  $K(f, \mu)$  (w.r.t. the Euclidian norm). Thus, for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\left| \frac{G_\delta(x) - G_\delta(x - \epsilon\mu(S))}{\epsilon} \right| \leq K(f, \mu) \|\mu(S)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n} K(f, \mu).$$

Therefore for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have

$$\left| \frac{G_\delta(x) - G_\delta(x - \epsilon\mu(S))}{\epsilon} \phi(x) \right| \leq \sqrt{n} K(f, \mu) |\phi(x)|,$$

and thus the family of functions  $\left( x \mapsto \frac{G_\delta(x) - G_\delta(x - \epsilon\mu(S))}{\epsilon} \phi(x) \right)_{\epsilon \in (0,1]}$  is uniformly integrable on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  w.r.t.  $\lambda$ . Hence by applying first Fatou's lemma and then Hölder's inequality to Equation (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |A_\delta(f, \mu(S))(\phi)| &\leq \int \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \frac{G_\delta(x) - G_\delta(x - \epsilon\mu(S))}{\epsilon} \right| |\phi(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq \\ &\left\| \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \frac{G_\delta(\cdot) - G_\delta(\cdot - \epsilon\mu(S))}{\epsilon} \right| \right\|_\infty \|\phi\|_1 \leq \sqrt{n} K(f, \mu) \|\phi\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $A_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  is a bounded linear functional on  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$  of norm at most  $\sqrt{n}K(f, \mu)$ . As  $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a dense subspace of  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$  (see [3, Proposition 8.17]), it follows that  $A_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  can be uniquely extended to a bounded linear functional  $\tilde{A}_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  on  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$  whose norm is at most  $\sqrt{n}K(f, \mu)$ . Hence there is a function  $H_\delta(f, \mu(S)) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$ , uniquely determined up to a set of Lebesgue measure 0, that represents  $\tilde{A}_\delta(f, \mu(S))$ , and we may write  $\tilde{A}_\delta(f, \mu(S))(g) = \int g(x)H_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x)d\lambda(x)$  for each  $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$ . Define  $d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S)) = H_\delta(f, \mu(S))d\lambda$  and we are done.  $\square$

Recall that in Section 3.2, the density  $\xi_\mu$  of  $P_\mu$  was approximated by some  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  (see Lemma 4) and the measure  $Q_\mu^\epsilon$  was defined as the measure whose Radon–Nikodym density w.r.t the Lebesgue measure is  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon$ . It is well known that  $\xi_\mu(x) = \xi_\mu(-x)$ . The following lemma gives a similar approximate result for the densities  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon$  and also proves a symmetry result for the distributional derivative of  $G_\delta$ :

**Lemma 6** *The following hold for any sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ :*

- (i)  $|\int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(-x)d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) - \int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x)d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x)| = o(1)$ , as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .
- (ii)  $\forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $\int G_\delta(-x)\partial_{\mu(S)}\phi(x)d\lambda(x) = \int \phi(-x)d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x)$ .

*Proof* The measure  $\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  is well defined for every sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  for every  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ .

- (i) Recall that  $\xi_\mu = \frac{dP_\mu}{d\lambda^n}$  and  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon = \xi_\mu h_\mu^\epsilon$  for some  $h_\mu^\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with values in  $[0, 1]$  (see Section 3.2). As  $dP_\mu(x) = dP_\mu(-x)$ , we deduce that  $\xi_\mu(-x) = \xi_\mu(x)$ , and hence  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon(-x) = \xi_\mu(x)h_\mu^\epsilon(-x)$ . Denote  $g_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \xi_\mu^\epsilon(-x) - \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) = \xi_\mu(x)(h_\mu^\epsilon(-x) - h_\mu^\epsilon(x))$ . Hence, for every sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , we have for every  $S \in \mathcal{C}$

$$\left| \int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(-x)d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) - \int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x)d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) \right| = \left| \int g_\mu^\epsilon(x)d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) \right| \leq \sqrt{n}K(f, \mu) \|g_\mu^\epsilon\|_1.$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 &= \int |\xi_\mu(x)(h_\mu^\epsilon(-x) - h_\mu^\epsilon(x))|d\lambda(x) = \\ &= \int_{U_\mu^\epsilon} |\xi_\mu(x)(h_\mu^\epsilon(-x) - h_\mu^\epsilon(x))|d\lambda(x) + \int_{(U_\mu^\epsilon)^c} |\xi_\mu(x)(h_\mu^\epsilon(-x) - h_\mu^\epsilon(x))|d\lambda(x) \leq \\ &= 2 \int_{(U_\mu^\epsilon)^c} |\xi_\mu(x)|d\lambda(x) = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .

(ii) By a change of variable  $x \mapsto -x$  we obtain

$$\int G_\delta(-x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \phi(x) d\lambda(x) = \int G_\delta(x) (\partial_{\mu(S)} \phi)(-x) d\lambda(x).$$

Now if we set  $\psi(x) = \phi(-x)$ , then  $\partial_{\mu(S)} \psi(x) = -(\partial_{\mu(S)} \phi)(-x)$ , and hence by combining Lemma 1 with the definition of  $\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  we get that

$$\int G_\delta(x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \phi(-x) d\lambda(x) = \int \phi(-x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x),$$

which proves the lemma.  $\square$

#### 4 Proof of the Main Theorem

We are now ready to prove the Main Theorem. This is done in the following subsections. We will actually do more than prove the theorem; we shall prove “diagonal formula” representations for the Neyman and Mertens values, namely, prove Propositions I and II.

Recall that  $P_\mu$  is the measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with Fourier transform  $\exp(-\|y\|_\mu)$  and density  $\xi_\mu$ , the measure  $P_\mu^\delta$  is its restriction to  $B_\mu^\delta$ , and the measure  $Q_\mu^\delta$  is an approximate measure to  $P_\mu$  with density<sup>6</sup>  $\xi_\mu^\delta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

##### 4.1 Proof of Proposition I

The main difficulty in the computation and application of the Neyman value is that it lacks a good representation formula. Neyman [6, Lemma 10] proved the following representation formula for the Neyman value for games<sup>7</sup> in  $Q_N \cap AC$ :

**Lemma 7** [6, Lemma 10] *If  $f \circ \mu \in Q_N \cap AC$ , then for every  $y \in \mathcal{R}(\mu)$  the directional derivative  $f'_y$  exists a.e. in the relative interior of  $\mathcal{R}(\mu)$ , and for every sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  and every coalition  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ ,*

$$\psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) = \int \int I_\delta(t) f'_{\mu(S)}(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x) dt dP_\mu^\delta(x)$$

is well-defined and

$$|\psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) - \Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S)| \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0+} 0.$$

<sup>6</sup>  $\mu$  is assumed to be of full dimension.

<sup>7</sup>  $AC$  is the space of games that are absolutely continuous w.r.t. some  $NA^1$  measure.

Proposition I is a generalization of Lemma 7. First, notice that  $Q_N \cap AC \subset Q_0$ . Now, according to Lemma 7, if  $f \circ \mu \in AC \cap Q_N$ , then

$$\Psi_N(f \circ \mu)(S) = \int \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) f'_{\mu(S)}(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x) dt dP_\mu^\delta(x) + o(1),$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ . Notice that  $d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) = \left( \int_0^1 I_\delta(t) f'_{\mu(S)}(t\mu(I) + \delta^2 x) dt \right) d\lambda(x)$ , and that  $\|P_\mu^\delta - Q_\mu^\delta\|_1 = o(1)$ , as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$  (see Corollary 1). Thus we obtain

$$\Psi_N(f \circ \mu)(S) = \int \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) + o(1),$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ .

We shall now return to the proof of Proposition I.

**Proof of Proposition I:** Recall that  $T_y$  is the translation operator by a vector  $y$  (see Section 3.1). Recall that<sup>8</sup>

$$\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) = \int F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) dP_\mu^\delta(x).$$

By the definition of  $\xi_\mu$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) &= \int_{B_\mu^\delta} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) \xi_\mu(x) d\lambda(x) = \\ &= \int_{B_\mu^\delta} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\lambda(x) + \int_{B_\mu^\delta} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) (\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)) d\lambda(x) = \\ &= \int_{B_\mu^\delta} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\lambda(x) + \int_{B_\mu^\delta} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) (\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)) d\lambda(x). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In line (11) above no confusion should result from the omission of  $B_\mu^\delta$  in the first summand, as the integrand is supported on an open subset of  $B_\mu^\delta$ .

Consider now the second summand in line (11). Recall that for a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  we denoted by  $\|\cdot\|_K$  the  $L^\infty(\lambda)$  norm on  $K$  (see the proof of Lemma 1). By applying first Hölder's inequality and then Lemma 5, and keeping in

---

<sup>8</sup> For the definition of  $F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S)$  and  $\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu)$  see Equations (1) and (2) respectively.



mind that  $\xi_\mu(x) = \xi_\mu^\delta(x)$  for every  $x \in U_\mu^\delta$  and that  $0 \leq \xi_\mu^\delta \leq \xi_\mu$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{B_\mu^\delta} F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S)(\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)) d\lambda(x) \right| \leq \\ & \|F_{f,\mu}(\delta, \cdot, S)\|_{B_\mu^\delta} \int_{B_\mu^\delta} |\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq \|f \circ \mu\| \int_{B_\mu^\delta} |\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)| d\lambda(x) = \\ & \|f \circ \mu\| \int_{B_\mu^\delta \setminus U_\mu^\delta} |\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq \|f \circ \mu\| \cdot \int_{(U_\mu^\delta)^c} |\xi_\mu(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)| d\lambda(x) \leq \\ & 2 \|f \circ \mu\| \int_{(U_\mu^\delta)^c} |\xi_\mu(x)| d\lambda(x) = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ . Thus

$$\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) = \int F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\lambda(x) + o(1) \quad (12)$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ .

Recall that there is an open set  $V_\mu^\delta \subset B_\mu^\delta$  s.t.  $\text{supp}(\xi_\mu^\delta) \subset V_\mu^\delta$  and  $\text{diam}(V_\mu^\delta) \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \infty$  (see Lemma 4). Notice that<sup>9</sup> for each  $x \in V_\mu^\delta$  we have  $x + \delta\mu(S) \subset B_\mu^\delta$ . Thus for each  $x \in \text{supp}(\xi_\mu^\delta)$  we obtain by the definition of the function  $G_\delta$  (see Remark 2)

$$F_{f,\mu}(\delta, x, S) = \frac{G_\delta(x + \delta\mu(S)) - G_\delta(x)}{\delta}; \quad (13)$$

hence by Equations (12)–(13) we obtain

$$\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) = \int \left( \frac{G_\delta(x + \delta\mu(S)) - G_\delta(x)}{\delta} \right) \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\lambda(x) + o(1), \quad (14)$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ . By a change of variable  $x \mapsto x + \delta\mu(S)$  in the right-hand side of Equation (14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) &= \int G_\delta(x) \frac{\xi_\mu^\delta(x - \delta\mu(S)) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)}{\delta} d\lambda(x) + o(1) = \\ &= - \int G_\delta(x) \left( \int_0^1 \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\delta(x - s\delta\mu(S)) ds \right) d\lambda(x) + o(1) = \\ &= - \int \int_0^1 G_\delta(x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\delta(x - s\delta\mu(S)) ds d\lambda(x) + o(1) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

---

<sup>9</sup> By the choice of  $V_\mu^\delta$  we have  $d(V_\mu^\delta, (B_\mu^\delta)^c) > \sqrt{n}\delta$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ . By applying first Fubini's theorem and then Proposition 1 in line (15) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) &= \int_0^1 \left( - \int G_\delta(x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\delta(x - s\delta\mu(S)) d\lambda(x) \right) ds + o(1) = \\ &\int_0^1 \int \xi_\mu^\delta(x - s\delta\mu(S)) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) ds + o(1) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ . As  $\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \|\xi_\mu^\delta - T_{-s\delta\mu(S)} \circ \xi_\mu^\delta\|_1 \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0$  and as, by Proposition 1, the measure  $\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))$  induces a bounded linear functional<sup>10</sup> on  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \lambda)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_0^1 \int (T_{-s\delta\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\delta(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) ds \right| \leq \\ &\int_0^1 \left| \int (T_{-s\delta\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\delta(x) - \xi_\mu^\delta(x)) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) \right| ds \leq \\ &\sqrt{n}K(f, \mu) \sup_{s \in [0,1]} \|\xi_\mu^\delta - T_{-s\delta\mu(S)} \circ \xi_\mu^\delta\|_1 \xrightarrow{\delta \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

By combining Equations (16)–(17) we obtain

$$\Psi_\mu^\delta(f \circ \mu, S) = \int \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) + o(1)$$

as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ , which proves Proposition I.

#### 4.2 Proof of Proposition II

Recall that the Mertens value of a game with an extension  $v$  is given by (see Section 2.3):

$$\Psi_M(v)(S) = \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt \right]_S dP(\chi).$$

It was already proved by Mertens [5] that if  $v = f \circ \mu$ , then for every  $S \in \mathcal{C}$ ,

$$\Psi_M(v)(S) = \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]_{\mu(S)}' dP_\mu(x).$$

The following proposition offers a variation of this result. The methods of the proof are quite standard and the idea stems from the proof in [5].

<sup>10</sup> Of norm  $\leq \sqrt{n}K(f, \mu)$ .

**Proposition 2** For every  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$ ,

$$\Psi_M(v)(S) = \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} dP_\mu(x).$$

*Proof* For each  $\chi \neq 0$  in  $B(I, \mathcal{C})$ , every  $0 < \tau < 9\|\chi\|^{-2}$ , and every  $t \in (3\sqrt{\tau}, 1 - 3\sqrt{\tau})$  we have  $0 < t \pm \tau\chi < 1$ ; thus  $\max\{0, \min\{1, t \pm \tau\chi\}\} = t \pm \tau\chi$ . As for every  $\chi \in B_1^+(I, \mathcal{C})$  we have  $\bar{v}(\chi) = \frac{1}{2}(f(\mu(\chi)) - f(\mu(1 - \chi)) + f(\mu(1)))$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_D(v)(\chi) &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \left( \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau\mu(\chi)) - f(\mu(t) - \tau\mu(\chi))}{4\tau} dt + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(1-t) - \tau\mu(\chi)) - f(\mu(1-t) + \tau\mu(\chi))}{4\tau} dt + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt + \int_{1-3\sqrt{\tau}}^1 \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

By a change of variable  $t \mapsto (1 - t)$  in line (18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_D(v)(\chi) &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \left( \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau\mu(\chi)) - f(\mu(t) - \tau\mu(\chi))}{2\tau} dt + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt + \int_{1-3\sqrt{\tau}}^1 \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt \right). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Notice that it is sufficient to prove that the sum in line (19) diminishes to 0 as  $\tau \rightarrow 0^+$  for each  $\chi$ ; if this is true then the substitution  $x = \mu(\chi)$  proves the lemma. Denote this sum by  $S_\tau(\chi)$ . Then by a change of variable  $t \mapsto 1 - t$  in the second summand we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_\tau(\chi) &= \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{2\tau} dt + \\ &\quad \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{\bar{v}(1 - (t - \tau\chi)) - \bar{v}(1 - (t + \tau\chi))}{2\tau} dt = \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi)}{\tau} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\chi = \chi_+ - \chi_-$  where  $\chi_{\pm} \geq 0$ . Then

$$S_{\tau}(\chi) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} [(\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t + \tau\chi_+)) + (\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi_+) - \bar{v}(t)) + (\bar{v}(t) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi_-)) + (\bar{v}(t - \tau\chi_-) - \bar{v}(t - \tau\chi))] dt. \quad (20)$$

Consider the first summand in Equation (20). Let  $m(\tau)$  be the minimal integer s.t.  $m\tau \|\chi\| \geq 3\sqrt{\tau}$ . Then

$$\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} (\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t + \tau\chi_+)) dt \right| \leq \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{i=0}^{m(\tau)-1} \int_{i\tau\|\chi\|}^{(i+1)\tau\|\chi\|} |\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t + \tau\chi_+)| dt = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{\tau\|\chi\|} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m(\tau)-1} |\bar{v}(t + i\tau\|\chi\| + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t + i\tau\|\chi\| + \tau\chi_+)| \right) dt. \quad (22)$$

Denote by  $V(\tau, \chi)$  the supremum of the variation of  $\bar{v}$  along all finite chains  $\Omega : g_0 \leq g_1 \leq \dots \leq g_{2\ell-2} \leq g_{2\ell-1} \leq 3\sqrt{\tau}$  s.t.:

- (a)  $g_{2i} = t_i + \gamma_i \chi$ , and
- (b)  $g_{2i+1} = g_{2i} + \gamma_i \chi_-$ , where for every  $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ 
  - (i)  $0 < \gamma_i \leq \gamma_{i+1} \leq \tau$ , and
  - (ii)  $t_{i+1} - t_i \geq \gamma_{i+1} \|\chi\|$ .

Thus, lines (21) and (22) above yield

$$\left| \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^{3\sqrt{\tau}} (\bar{v}(t + \tau\chi) - \bar{v}(t + \tau\chi_+)) dt \right| \leq V(\tau, \chi).$$

We shall prove that  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} V(\tau, \chi) = 0$ . Suppose, by contradiction, that we find some  $c > 0$  and a decreasing sequence of positive integers  $\tau_n \searrow 0^+$  s.t.  $V(\tau_n, \chi) \geq c$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Choose  $n_1 = 1$  and given  $\tau_{n_1} = \tau_1$  choose an increasing chain  $\Omega_1 : g_0^1 \leq g_1^1 \leq \dots \leq g_{2\ell_1-2}^1 \leq g_{2\ell_1-1}^1 \leq 3\sqrt{\tau_{n_1}}$  of the form  $g_{2i}^1 = t_i^1 + \gamma_i^1 \chi$ ,  $g_{2i+1}^1 = g_{2i}^1 + \gamma_i^1 \chi_-$ , where  $t_i^1$  and  $\gamma_i^1$  satisfy the conditions (i) and (ii) above for each  $1 \leq i \leq \ell_1$ , and s.t. the variation  $V_1$  of  $\bar{v}$  along this chain is at least  $\frac{c}{2}$ . Notice that  $g_3^1 > t_1 > 0$ ; thus we may choose  $n_2 > n_1$  s.t.  $3\sqrt{\tau_{n_2}} \leq t_1 \leq g_3^1$ . Continue in this manner to choose an increasing sequence of integers  $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$  s.t. for each  $k \geq 1$  there is an increasing chain  $\Omega_k : g_0^k \leq g_1^k \leq \dots \leq g_{2\ell_k-1}^k \leq 3\sqrt{\tau_{n_k}}$  of the form  $g_{2i}^k = t_i^k + \gamma_i^k \chi$ ,  $g_{2i+1}^k = g_{2i}^k + \gamma_i^k \chi_-$ , where  $t_i^k$  and  $\gamma_i^k$  satisfy conditions (i) and (ii) above

for each  $1 \leq i \leq \ell_k$ , the variation  $V_k$  of  $\bar{v}$  along this chain is at least  $\frac{c}{2}$ , and  $g_3^k \geq 3\sqrt{\tau_{n_{k+1}}}$ . Consider now the variation  $V'_k$  of  $\bar{v}$  along the increasing chain  $\Omega'_k : 3\sqrt{\tau_{n_{k+1}}} \leq g_3^k \leq g_4^k \leq \dots \leq g_{2\ell_k-1}^k \leq 3\sqrt{\tau_{n_k}}$ . Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V'_k = 0$ , as otherwise we may use the sequence of increasing chains  $\{\Omega_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$  to construct<sup>11</sup> a sequence of increasingly long chains along which the variation of  $\bar{v}$  is unbounded, which yields a contradiction. Thus

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^3 |\bar{v}(g_i^k) - \bar{v}(g_{i-1}^k)| = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (V_k - V'_k) \geq \frac{c}{2} > 0,$$

which contradicts the continuity of  $\bar{v}$  at 0, and hence  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} V(\tau, \chi) = 0$ . Applying the same reasoning to the rest of the summands that constitute  $S_\tau(\chi)$  yields

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} S_\tau(\chi) = 0,$$

which proves the proposition.  $\square$

We are now ready to begin the proof of Proposition II. We start with the following lemma, a version of a lemma from [5] which we specialize to suit our own needs. The proof of the specialized version is a straightforward corollary of the proof given in [5] together with Proposition 2. Nevertheless, we give the proof here for the benefit of the reader.

**Lemma 8** *For every  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$  and  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,*

$$\left| \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} \right| \leq \|f \circ \mu\|.$$

*Proof* By Proposition 2 and [5, Theorem 2]  $\left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)}$  exists for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (as  $P_\mu \ll \lambda$ ). Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  s.t. the directional derivative above exists and  $0 < \eta \leq 1$ . Then by the triangle inequality we obtain for any

<sup>11</sup> By simply concatenating them.

sufficiently small  $\tau > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2\tau\eta} \left| \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) (f(\mu(t) + \tau x + \eta\tau\mu(S)) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x - \eta\tau\mu(S)) - \right. \\
& \quad \left. f(\mu(t) + \tau x) + f(\mu(t) - \tau x)) dt \right| \leq \\
& \frac{1}{2\tau\eta} \left| \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) (f(\mu(t) + \tau x + \eta\tau\mu(S)) - f(\mu(t) + \tau x)) dt \right| + \\
& \frac{1}{2\tau\eta} \left| \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) (f(\mu(t) - \tau x - \eta\tau\mu(S)) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)) dt \right| \leq \quad (23) \\
& \|f \circ \mu\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in line (23) follows for any sufficiently small  $\tau > 0$ , which may be chosen independently of  $\eta$ , by setting  $\epsilon = \inf_{\alpha \in [-1, 1]} \frac{1}{1+2\|x+\alpha\mu(S)\|_\mu}$  in Lemma 5. Hence, taking first  $\tau \rightarrow 0^+$  and then  $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$  proves the lemma.  $\square$

Recall that the density  $\xi_\mu$  of  $P_\mu$  was approximated by functions  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and that  $Q_\mu^\epsilon$  was the measure whose density is  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon$  (see Section 3.2). Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . We first replace  $P_\mu$  in Proposition 2 by its approximated measure  $Q_\mu^\epsilon$  and prove that the error term diminishes to 0 as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ :

**Lemma 9** *For every game  $f \circ \mu \in Q_0$  and every coalition  $S \in \mathcal{C}$*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = \\
& \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} dQ_\mu^\epsilon(x) + o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$

*Proof* Recall that by Proposition 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = \\
& \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} dP_\mu(x).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8 we have  $\left| \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} \right| \leq \|f \circ \mu\|$  for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and by Corollary 1  $\|P_\mu - Q_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 = o(1)$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Hence,

as  $P_\mu, Q_\mu^\epsilon \ll \lambda$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) &= \\ \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} dP_\mu(x) &= \\ \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} dQ_\mu^\epsilon(x) + \\ \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} (dP_\mu(x) - dQ_\mu^\epsilon(x)) &= \\ \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} dQ_\mu^\epsilon(x) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10** For every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is some  $V(f \circ \mu, \epsilon) > 0$  s.t.

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu^\epsilon} \left| \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2\tau} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) (f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)) dt \right| \leq V(f \circ \mu, \epsilon).$$

*Proof* Let  $x \in B_\mu^\epsilon$  and let  $\omega \in B(I, \mathcal{C})$  be s.t.  $\mu(\omega) = 2x$  and  $\|\omega\| \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right| = \\ & \frac{1}{2} \left| \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau(-x) + \tau\mu(\omega)) - f(\mu(t) + \tau(-x))}{\tau} dt \right| \leq \quad (24) \\ & \frac{1}{2} \|f \circ \mu\| (\|\omega_+\| + \|\omega_-\|) \leq \|f \circ \mu\| \|\omega\| \leq \frac{2\|f \circ \mu\|}{\epsilon} \doteq V(f \circ \mu, \epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality in line (24) follows for any sufficiently small  $\tau$  (whose choice depends on  $f \circ \mu$ ,  $\|w\|$ , and  $\epsilon$ ) by applying Lemma 5 (with  $\eta = 1$ ). By taking  $\tau \rightarrow 0^+$  and then the supremum we are done.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition II:** Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . By Lemma 9 and the definition of  $Q_\mu^\epsilon$  and  $\xi_\mu^\epsilon$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) &= \quad (25) \\ \int \left[ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(\mu(t) + \tau x) - f(\mu(t) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt \right]'_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\lambda(x) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . For convenience, let  $F(\tau, x) = \int_0^1 I_{\sqrt{\tau}}(t) \frac{f(t\mu(I) + \tau x) - f(t\mu(I) - \tau x)}{2\tau} dt$  and  $F(x) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} F(\tau, x)$ . By Lemma 8 we have

$$\left| F'_{\mu(S)}(x) \right| \leq \|f \circ \mu\|$$

for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in B_\mu^\epsilon$ . By Lemma 10 we have

$$|F(x)| \leq V(f \circ \mu, \epsilon)$$

for  $\lambda$ -a.e.  $x \in B_\mu^\epsilon$ . By Lemma 5 and the triangle inequality we have

$$\sup_{x \in B_\mu^\epsilon} \left| \frac{F(x + \eta\mu(S)) - F(x)}{\eta} \right| \leq 2\|f \circ \mu\|$$

for every sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$ . Thus  $F$  and  $F'_{\mu(S)}$  are bounded  $\lambda$ -a.e. on  $\text{supp}(\xi_\mu^\epsilon) \subset B_\mu^\epsilon$  and  $\frac{F(x + \eta\mu(S)) - F(x)}{\eta}$  is uniformly bounded  $\lambda$ -a.e. for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$  on  $\text{supp}(\xi_\mu^\epsilon) \subset B_\mu^\epsilon$ . Hence by applying Lemma 1 to Equation (25) we obtain

$$\Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = - \int F(x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\lambda(x) + o(1) \quad (26)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Using first the  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  boundedness of  $\partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon$  and then applying Lemma 10 we obtain

$$|F(\tau, x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x)| \leq |F(\tau, x)| \cdot \|\partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon\|_\infty \leq 2V(f \circ \mu, \epsilon) \cdot \|\partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon\|_\infty$$

for any small enough  $\tau$ , say  $\tau < \epsilon^2$ , for every  $x$ . Thus, by applying the dominated convergence theorem to the right-hand side of Equation (26) we obtain

$$\Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = - \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \int F(\tau, x) \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\lambda(x) + o(1) \quad (27)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . As the integration is supported on  $B_\mu^\epsilon$  and we assume that  $\tau < \epsilon^2$ , then by the definition of  $G_{\sqrt{\tau}}$  (see Remark 2) we can substitute

$$F(\tau, x) = G_{\sqrt{\tau}}(x) - G_{\sqrt{\tau}}(-x)$$

in Equation (27). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = & \quad (28) \\ \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int G_{\sqrt{\tau}}(-x) \cdot \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\lambda(x) - \int G_{\sqrt{\tau}}(x) \cdot \partial_{\mu(S)} \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\lambda(x) \right] + o(1) \end{aligned}$$



as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Set  $\delta = \sqrt{\tau}$ . By applying part (ii) of Lemma 6 to the first summand in Equation (28) and Proposition 1 to the second summand in Equation (28) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = \\ \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) + \int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(-x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) \right] + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Thus by part (i) of Lemma 6,

$$\Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) + o(1)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . But

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \left| \int (\xi_\mu^\delta(x) - \xi_\mu^\epsilon(x)) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) \right| &\leq \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \sqrt{n} K(f, \mu) \|\xi_\mu^\delta - \xi_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 = \\ &\sqrt{n} K(f, \mu) \|\xi_\mu - \xi_\mu^\epsilon\|_1 = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Therefore

$$\Psi_M(f \circ \mu)(S) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int \xi_\mu^\delta(x) d\zeta_\delta(f, \mu(S))(x) + o(1)$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ , which proves Proposition II, and our Main Theorem follows.

**Acknowledgements** The author would like to thank his Ph.D. advisor Professor Abraham Neyman for his support and guidance and to Professor Dov Monderer for his valuable comments. The author is also grateful to an anonymous subeditor and an anonymous referee for their illuminating comments.

## References

1. R.J. Aumann and S. Hart., *Handbook of Game Theory, with Economic Applications*, Vol. III, North-Holland, 2002.
2. R.J. Aumann and L.S. Shapley, *Values of Non-Atomic Games*, Princeton University Press, 1974.
3. G.B. Folland, *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications*, Wiley-Interscience, 1999.
4. E. J. McShane, *Extension of range of functions*, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 40:837–842, 1934.
5. J.F. Mertens, *The Shapley value in the non-differentiable case*, *International Journal of Game Theory*, 17:1-65, 1988.
6. A. Neyman, *Values of non-atomic vector measure games*, *Israel J. Math*, 124:1-27, 2001.
7. A. Neyman and R. Smorodinsky, *Asymptotic values of vector measure games*. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 29:739–775, 2004.
8. L.S. Shapley, *A value for n-person games*, in *H.W. Kuhn and A.W. Tucker, editors, Contributions to the Theory of Games*, Vol. II, pages 307-317, Princeton University Press, 1953.
9. Y. Tauman, *Value on a class of non-differentiable market games*, *International Journal of Game Theory*, 10:155-162, 1981