

# A heuristic search algorithm for discovering large Condorcet domains

Bei Zhou <sup>\*1</sup> and Søren Riis <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1, 2</sup>*Queen Mary University of London*

## Abstract

The study of large Condorcet domains (CD) has been a significant area of interest in voting theory. In this paper, our goal is to search for large CDs that are hitherto unknown. With a straightforward combinatorial definition, searching for large CDs is naturally suited for algorithmic optimisations. For each value of  $n > 2$ , one can ask for the size of the largest CD, thus finding the largest CDs provides an important benchmark for heuristic-based combinatorial optimisation algorithms. Despite extensive research over the past three decades, the CD sizes identified in 1996 remain the best known for many values of  $n$ . When  $n > 8$ , conducting an exhaustive search becomes computationally unfeasible, thereby prompting the use of heuristic methods. To address this, we developed a novel heuristic search algorithm in which a specially designed heuristic function, backed by a lookup database, directs the search towards promising branches in the search tree. Our algorithm found new large CDs of size 1082 (surpassing the previous record of 1069) for  $n=10$ , and 2349 (improving the previous 2324) for  $n=11$ . Notably, these newly discovered CDs exhibit characteristics distinct from those of known CDs.

## 1 Introduction

In social choice theory, the study of preference aggregation and decision-making often grapples with majority rule. For each value of  $n$  (representing the number of candidates or alternatives), a Condorcet Domain (CD) is a collection of linear orders (permutations). Crucially, for a CD, every triple of candidates satisfies a specific never condition. This condition, often represented symbolically as  $xNy$ , stipulates certain forbidden rankings of candidates. This ensures that cyclical majorities, a situation where no candidate can emerge as a consistent winner in pairwise comparisons, are avoided.

The investigation of CDs, sets of linear orders with an acyclic pairwise majority relation, has been a subject of interest for mathematicians, economists, and mathematical social scientists since the 1950s (Danilov and Koshevoy, 2013; Fishburn, 2002). CDs also have applications in the Arrovian aggregation and social choice theory (Bruner and Lackner, 2014). In social choice theory, a Condorcet winner wins the majority of votes against each of the other candidates in a pairwise comparison (Monjardet, 2005). However, no such candidate exists, and this is where the CDs come into play.

In the 1970s and 1980s, researchers initiated studies into the potential magnitude of CDs (Fishburn, 1997). This exploration led to a significant breakthrough in 1996 when Fishburn discovered many of the largest CDs, a record that has remained unchallenged for nearly three decades. Since then, researchers have continued the quest to find large CDs (Danilov et al., 2012; Fishburn, 1997; Galambos and Reiner, 2008; Karpov and Slinko, 2022a; Monjardet, 2009; Leedham-Green et al., 2024), related to the goal of optimising personal preference freedom while adhering to the requirement of a transitive majority relationship (Raynaud, 1982; Puppe and Slinko, 2024). In operations search, it is a complex, unsolved combinatorial optimisation problem. Studying CDs has important implications for voting systems and democratic decision-making processes. By identifying large CDs, researchers can gain insights into the properties of voting systems that are more likely to produce outcomes that reflect the electorate's preferences, the strengths and weaknesses of different voting systems, and democratic

---

\*Corresponding author: bei.zhou@qmul.ac.uk

decision-making processes (Lackner and Lackner, 2017). Thus, a key effort in the literature is identifying large Condorcet domains with a paramount objective to uncover the largest CDs (Puppe and Slinko, 2024; Karpov, 2022; Leedham-Green et al., 2024). To this end, Fishburn (1996b) introduced the size function to record the largest CDs on  $n$  alternatives

$$f(n) = \max\{|D| : D \text{ is a Condorcet domain on a set of } n \text{ alternatives}\}.$$

Additionally, Karpov and Slinko (2023) introduced the following functions:

$$h(n) = \max\{|D| : D \text{ is a peak-pit Condorcet domain on a set of } n \text{ alternatives}\}.$$

One important class of large CDs is based on Fishburn’s alternating scheme, which involves alternating between two never rules 2N1 and 2N3 on 3-alternative subsets of candidates (commonly referred as triples) and has been used to construct many of the largest known CDs. The domains built by the alternating schemes are referred to as Fishburn domains (Leedham-Green et al., 2024) (see Sect. 2 for details). Subsequent research by Galambos and Reiner (2008); Danilov et al. (2012); Monjardet (2009) and Karpov and Slinko (2022b) extended and refined this work. Despite extensive work, these Fishburn domains and their design play a central role in constructing large CDs. For instance, the approach introduced in Karpov and Slinko (2022a) was built upon the Fishburn domains to construct new CDs of record-breaking CDs for  $n \geq 13$ , but it does not apply for  $n < 13$ . Karpov et al. (2023) introduced the set-alternating schemes that could construct CDs whose size is larger than the Fishburn domains on  $n \geq 16$ . Their new large CDs also improved the asymptotic lower bound for the size of the largest Condorcet domains (Karpov and Slinko, 2023; Karpov et al., 2023).

Another line of studies focuses on developing efficient search algorithms to generate CDs. Akello-Egwell et al. (2023) developed a custom search algorithm that generated all the maximal non-isomorphic CD on seven alternatives and found the largest CD on eight alternatives (Leedham-Green et al., 2024) but it does not scale to a larger number of alternatives. Markström et al. (2024) designed a depth-first search algorithm to generate non-isomorphic maximal Arrow’s single-peaks domains on 9 alternatives. On a higher number of alternatives, completing their search requires a prohibitively demanding amount of computation. In contrast with these existing search algorithms, our algorithm is universal in the sense that it is applicable to any number of alternatives, and it does not aim to compute a complete set of CDs but focuses on the large ones.

Given the fact that Fishburn domains are not the largest domain on eight alternative (Leedham-Green et al., 2024) and  $n \geq 13$  alternatives (Karpov and Slinko, 2023), it is a valid conjecture that for  $9 < n < 13$  they are also not the largest. However, existing search algorithms failed to find such CDs. One of our contributions is on the discovery of many CDs larger than the Fishburn domain on  $n = 10$  and 11 alternatives. It is worth noting that on  $n \geq 9$  alternatives, finding the largest Condorcet domain remains an open problem.

In this paper, we present a heuristic search algorithm for generating and discovering large CDs on  $n \geq 6$  alternatives. We first pinpoint the challenges associated with finding large CDs and demonstrate that these challenges pose significant obstacles for common learning algorithms applicable to tackle complex combinatorial optimization problems to find large CDs, especially when dealing with a substantial number of alternatives. This motivated us to develop a heuristic search algorithm tailored to overcome these challenges. Our search algorithm employs an efficient heuristic function that evaluates the goodness of partial CDs based on the size of restriction on 5 alternatives. This idea is grounded on our empirical finding that many locally large restricted CDs also tend to be large, indicating the existence of a linear relationship between the size of a CD and the size of its restriction. Our heuristic function exploits this property and uses a database that contains a complete set of pre-calculated CD restriction information on five alternatives. This idea resonates with the core concept in dynamic programming (Bellman, 1966) where a problem is broken into smaller, overlapping subproblems, and instead of solving each subproblem independently, solutions to these subproblems are pre-computed and then stored, so they can be reused when the same subproblem arises.

We further report on new record-breaking CDs on  $n = 10$  alternatives (size of 1082) and  $n = 11$  alternatives (size of 2349). This discovery has further improved the largest CD since 1996 and opens new directions for research in the theory of CDs, with implications for the theoretical study of voting systems.

The largest domains our search algorithm found on the number of alternatives ranging from 6 to 11 are presented in Table 1. It is worth noting that along with the new improved lower bound CDs on 10

and 11 alternatives, it also discovered some CDs whose size is larger than those of Fishburn domains for  $n = 10$  and  $n = 11$  that were the largest known CDs on these number of alternatives.

**Table 1** The largest domains discovered by our search algorithm. Our work found new improved lower bound CDs of size 1082 and 2349 on 10 and 11 alternatives, respectively and rediscovered the largest CD of size 224 on eight alternatives.

<b>n</b>	<b>Fishburn domain</b>	$f(n)$	$h(n)$
6	45	45	45
7	100	100	100
8	222	<u>224</u>	<u>224</u>
9	488	488	488
10	1069	<b>1082</b>	<b>1082</b>
11	2324	<b>2349</b>	<b>2349</b>

This paper is organised as follows. In Sect. 2 we provide the preliminary and background knowledge about Condorcet domains from the operations research perspectives, along with defining and explaining the notions and terminologies used throughout this paper. Sect. 3 illustrates the challenges facing a wide range of existing learning algorithms in finding large CDs and analyses their strengths and weaknesses in addressing this problem. Sect. 4 introduces a heuristic function and shows its effectiveness in establishing a linear relationship between a CD and restrictions, and further elaborates on integrating it into the heuristic search algorithm. In Sect. 5, we demonstrate the importance of the ordering of triples by which they are assigned and propose a new triple order that contributes partially to the success of the search algorithm. Its detailed configurations, along with an approach that enables it to run on thousands of CPU cores in parallel, are also discussed here. Sect. 6 contains a detailed analysis of the restrictions of the new large CDs we discovered on 10 and 11 alternatives, where we found Ramsey’s Theorem (Ramsey, 1930) applies. We conclude our work in Sect. 7.

## 2 Preliminaries and background

Let  $X_n = [n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  be a finite set of numbers, in which each element in the set is referred to as an *alternative* or candidate in voting theory. A linear order is a set of alternatives with an ordering, where the comparability and transitivity hold. Here the comparability property ensures that any pair of alternatives can be compared, and the transitivity property ensures that the ordering of alternatives is consistent. Let  $L(X_n)$  denote the set of all linear orders over  $X_n$ . In voting theory, voters have to make a collective choice of which alternative to choose. Each voter can be referred to as an agent. Given  $N$  agents, each agent  $i \in N$  has a preference order  $P_i$  in  $X_n$  (each preference order is a linear order and can also be viewed as a *permutation*). For brevity, we represent a preference order as a string, e.g.  $12\dots n$  means 1 is the most favoured alternative, and  $n$  is the least. Note that in this paper, we use preference order, linear order and permutation interchangeably.

A subset of preference orders  $D \subseteq L(X)$  is called a *domain* of preference orders or permutations. A domain  $D$  is a *Condorcet domain* if whenever the preferences of all agents belong to the domain, the majority relation of the preference profile with an odd number of agents is transitive. Thus a Condorcet domain is essentially a set of permutations where there is always a clear majority preference for any pair of alternatives.

Sen (1966) proved that for each Condorcet domain, restriction of it to each triple of alternatives satisfies a never condition  $iNj$ ,  $i, j \in [3]$ . A never condition is also called a never rule or simply a rule. A triple consists of 3 alternatives  $(x, y, z)$  where  $x < y < z$  and  $x, y, z \in [n]$ .  $iNj$  dictates that  $i^{th}$  alternative from the triple does not fill in  $j^{th}$  place within this triple in each order from the domain.  $i$  takes on the value 1, 2, or 3, representing the smallest, middle, or largest alternatives in the triple, respectively. Similarly, the  $j$  can be the value 1, 2, or 3, corresponding to the first, second, or last position in the triple. For instance, triple (3, 4, 5) on five alternatives with rule 1N3 dictates that the smallest alternative, 3, cannot present at the last position, forbidding the permutation [4, 2, 5, 1, 3] from presenting in the resulting CD. There are, in total, nine never rules (1N3, 3N1, 2N1, 2N3, 1N2, 3N2, 1N1, 2N2, 3N3).

A CD's size is defined by the number of permutations contained within it. For any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$  alternatives, a CD is associated with a set of  $m = \binom{n}{3}$  triples, all of which must be assigned with one of the nine rules. A domain is not a CD if there are unassigned triples from which it is created, and we instead call it a *partial* CD. To avoid repetition, we use the acronym TRS to refer to a list of triples and their assigned rule. A TRS produces a CD if all its triples are assigned with a rule. Otherwise, it is a partial CD.

A domain which satisfies a never condition of the form  $xN3$  for every triple is called *Arrow's single-peaked domain* (Arrow, 1963). A domain  $D$  is a *peak-pit* domain if, for each triple of alternatives, the restriction of the domain to this triple is either single-peaked (satisfying never rules  $iN3$ ) or single-dipped (satisfying never rules  $iN1$ ). A Condorcet domain  $D$  is *unitary* if it contains order  $123 \dots n$ . Since the focus of most of the studies is on unitary CDs, it is sufficient to consider the six rules 1N3, 3N1, 2N1, 2N3, 1N2, and 3N2.

Furthermore, using the complete set of maximal unitary CDs on four to seven alternatives from Akello-Egwell et al. (2023), we calculated the size of the largest CDs where one of their triples uses one of these six rules and the results are displayed in Table 2. It shows that applying the rule 1N2 or 3N2 typically leads to poor results in the sense that none of the triples in the largest CDs satisfy either of these two rules. Besides, the largest CDs on 8 alternatives whose size is 224 also do not use any of these two rules. Thus, we narrow the available rules in our search down to four, which are 1N3, 3N1, 2N1, and 2N3 in our construction. Unless specified, the CDs we will discuss in the following sections are constructed by these four rules. These CDs are by definition peak-pit domains.

**Table 2** The size of the largest CDs with at least one of its triples satisfying each specified rule, on the number of alternatives ranging from 4 to 7.

n	Rules					
	1N3	3N1	2N3	2N1	1N2	3N2
4	9	9	8	8	8	8
5	20	20	20	20	19	19
6	45	45	45	45	42	42
7	100	100	100	100	97	97

Two CDs are isomorphic if the alternatives can be re-enumerated in a way that they consist of the same set of permutations (Leedham-Green et al., 2024). Given two linear orders  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , a transformation  $\pi$  is the application of a mapping that converts  $P_1$  to  $P_2$ , denoted as  $P_2 = \pi(P_1)$ . Given a permutation  $P \in D$ , a transformation  $\pi_P$  converts it to its identity form, i.e.  $123 \dots n$  and we use  $\pi_P(D)$  to denote a domain obtained from converting all the permutations in  $D$  by the transformation  $\pi_P$ .

Any non-empty CD  $D$  is isomorphic to a unitary CD because we can always select a permutation  $P \in D$  and then enumerate the alternatives according to the transformation  $\pi_P$  such that the permutation  $P$  becomes the identity permutation. Thus, we do not lose any generality by assuming all the CDs we discussed in this paper are unitary.

To further illustrate the concept of isomorphism on CDs, here we provide an example. Table 3 presents 6 CDs on three alternatives. Three alternatives can only construct one triple, and thus, each rule assigned to it corresponds to a CD. Three pairs of them are isomorphic. For instance,  $D_1 = \{123, 132, 213, 312\}$  and  $D_2 = \{123, 213, 231, 321\}$  are isomorphic because if we define  $\pi_{132}$  that maps 132 to the identity permutation 123 (i.e.  $\pi_{132}(1) = 1, \pi_{132}(2) = 3, \pi_{132}(3) = 2$ ), then  $\pi_{132}(D_1) = D_2$ , thus  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are isomorphic.

**Table 3** The Condorcet domains for three alternatives. Each rule assigned to the triple (1, 2, 3) is associated with a CD. The resulting CDs fall into three isomorphic classes.

Triple	Rule assigned	Condorcet domains				
(1, 2, 3)	1N3	123	132	213	312	} isomorphic
	2N3	123	213	231	321	
	3N1	123	132	213	231	} isomorphic
	2N1	123	132	312	321	
	1N2	123	132	231	321	} isomorphic
	3N2	123	213	312	321	

The *restriction* of a domain  $D$  to a subset  $A \subset X$  is a domain with the set of linear orders from  $L(A)$  obtained by restricting each linear order from  $D$  to  $A$  (Karpov et al., 2024). Given  $k \in [3, n - 1]$  alternatives, a CD on  $n$  alternatives can have restrictions on  $k$  alternatives by removing the alternatives in every linear order (permutation) within the CD that are not these  $k$  alternatives and retaining only one of the duplicated resulting linear orders. The resulting restrictions contain the linear orders that only contain these  $k$  alternatives.

Analogously, given  $k \in [3, n - 1]$  alternatives, a TRS for  $n$  alternatives can also be restricted to  $k \in [3, n - 1]$  subset triples by retaining the triples that are included in these  $k$  alternatives, which is equivalent to removing the triples that include least one of  $(n - k)$  alternatives that are not in these  $k$  alternatives. The rules are transferred from the original triples to the subset triples. A set of triples for  $n$  alternative, when restricted to  $k$  alternatives subset, produces  $\binom{n}{k}$  sets of subset triples, each of which corresponds to one combination of  $k$  alternatives from  $n$  alternatives. For example, a set of 11 alternatives produces 10 sets of subset triples when restricted to 10 alternative subsets and 55 sets of subsets when restricted to 9 alternative subsets.

Before our results, the largest CDs for 10 and 11 alternatives were Fishburn domains. A domain  $D$  is called *Fishburn domain* if it satisfies the alternating scheme (Fishburn, 1996a): there exists a linear ordering of alternatives  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  such that for all  $i, j, k$  with  $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$  the restriction of the domain to the set  $\{a_i, a_j, a_k\}$  is single-peaked if  $j$  is even (odd), and it is single-dipped if  $j$  is odd (even). The alternating scheme explicitly uses the parity function. When applying the alternating scheme to the list of triples  $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$ , it dictates that if the middle alternative  $y_i$  in a triple is even, it is assigned with rule 2N1, otherwise 2N3. Despite its simplicity, it turned out that the list of generated rules built large CDs that had held the records for almost three decades until recent studies discovered some new large CDs on eight alternatives (Leedham-Green et al., 2024) and  $n \geq 13$  alternatives (Karpov and Slinko, 2022a).

CDs on five alternatives are constructed on 10 triples, as demonstrated in Table 4, where their rules are assigned by applying the alternating scheme. The resulting Fishburn domain on five alternatives has size 20. The permutations inside the CD are presented in Table 5. It is the largest CD on five alternatives.

**Table 4** The list of triples for five alternatives and their rules are assigned according to the alternating scheme.

Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules
(1, 2, 3)	2N3	(1, 4, 5)	2N3
(1, 2, 4)	2N3	(2, 3, 4)	2N1
(1, 2, 5)	2N3	(2, 3, 5)	2N1
(1, 3, 4)	2N1	(2, 4, 5)	2N3
(1, 3, 5)	2N1	(3, 4, 5)	2N3

The Fishburn domain on five alternatives has five restrictions on four alternatives, whose sizes are 9, 9, 8, 9, 9 as demonstrated in Table 6 where each restriction has one alternative removed from the

**Table 5** The Fishburn domain on five alternatives. It consists of 20 permutations built from the triples and rules in Table 4.


Fishburn domain on five alternatives			
12453	12435	12345	54321
45321	54231	45231	42531
24531	54213	45213	42513
42153	42135	24513	24153
24135	21453	21435	21345

original CD. For example, the restriction on four alternatives produced by removing alternative one from these 20 permutations in this Fishburn domain contains nine permutations.


**Table 6** The 4 alternative restrictions from the Fishburn domain on 5 alternatives.

Removed alternative	Restrictions				
1	4253	4523	5432	2345	5423
	2453	4532	4235	2435	
2	4531	5413	4513	5431	4135
	1453	4153	1345	1435	
3	4521	4215	2145	2415	1245
	4251	5421	2451		
4	1235	2513	2153	2135	2531
	1253	5213	5231	5321	
5	2143	2134	1234	2431	4213
	4231	2413	1243	4321	

There is a positive correlation between the size of a CD and the size of its restrictions (Karpov et al., 2024), and to illustrate we use the lattice structure to show the size of a Fishburn domain on five alternatives and the sizes of their restrictions when restricted to 4 alternatives in Fig. 1. The number sitting aside the arrows is an alternative and indicates that the restriction is built by eliminating that alternative from permutations in the original CD. The largest CD on four alternatives is of size 9. Four restrictions are of the maximum size for four alternatives, and only one CD is of size 8. To make a comparison, we also show in Fig. 2 a CD on five alternatives of size 17 and its restriction sizes on 4 alternatives. Two of the restrictions are of size 7. It is evident that, in this case, a larger CD leads to a set of larger restrictions. We further discovered that this holds true for many CDs in general. Based on this finding, we constructed a heuristic function that captures this correlation. We show in Sect. 4 that this heuristic function establishes a nearly linear relationship between the size of a CD and a value calculated from an aggregation of its five alternative restriction sizes.



**Fig. 1** The restriction sizes for the Fishburn domain on five alternatives when restricted to 4 alternatives.



**Fig. 2** The size of 5 restrictions on 4 alternatives from a five alternative CD of size 17.

### 3 Suboptimality of existing learning algorithms

The search for large CDs is a challenging discrete combinatorial optimisation problem that requires significant effort and faces several challenges where many common learning algorithms struggle. While learning algorithms like reinforcement learning algorithms, genetic algorithms, and local search algorithms have proven their effectiveness in solving some combinatorial optimisation problems (Fawzi et al., 2022; Mankowitz et al., 2023; Radhakrishnan and Jeyakumar, 2021; El-Shorbagy and Hassanien, 2018; Lauri et al., 2023), they encounter immense difficulty in finding large CDs for  $n \geq 8$  alternatives. We tested a range of algorithms that can solve discrete combinatorial optimisation problems on finding large CDs. All the programs we used are publicly available<sup>1</sup> and their execution was terminated when no improvement was seen after a reasonable amount of time. The large CDs they found on four to eight alternatives are presented in Table 7. Apart from the simple hill climbing algorithm, all the tested learning algorithms found the largest CD on four and five alternatives. But on seven and eight alternatives, none of them found the largest known CDs. This indicates that while these algorithms can find large CDs, there are challenges for them in finding higher lower bounds for CDs on a higher number of alternative alternatives. We summarize these challenges as follows.

The most prominent difficulty facing them is the exponential growth of the search space. As the number of alternatives increases, the number of potential solutions expands exponentially, making exhaustive exploration impractical or computationally infeasible for  $n \geq 6$  (Leedham-Green et al., 2024). To overcome this issue, prior works have designed search algorithms capable of significantly reducing the search space. Akello-Egwell et al. (2023) released complete sets of isomorphic CDs on  $4 \leq n \leq 7$  alternatives, which were obtained from a search algorithm they developed that produces all the maximum CDs on a given number of alternatives whose size is larger than or equal to a cutoff value. Using a paralleled version of this algorithm on a supercomputer, Leedham-Green et al. (2024) found the largest CDs on eight alternatives. However, their algorithms are not practically applicable to finding the maximal CD for  $n \geq 9$  as the search tree that the algorithm needs to build is too large. For a full peak-pit CD of 9 alternatives, there are 84 triples, and thus, when each of them is assigned a rule chosen from a list of 4 never rules, it results in a search space of size  $4^{84}$ . In practice, though their algorithm can reduce the search space, it is still impossible to search through the reduced search space exhaustively. Additionally, although many structures in the search space could be exploited (Puppe and Slinko, 2024), greedy strategies that reduce the search space by narrowing the search to focus solely on large partial CDs failed miserably.

Consequently, these algorithms often use approximate methods to navigate the vast solution space efficiently. However, the intricate interdependencies among these triples exacerbate the problem. The presence of complex relationships significantly restricts the feasible search space, making it challenging for algorithms to explore all potential solutions effectively. A mistake at any step is likely to spoil the whole solution.

The existence of many local optima corresponding to suboptimal solutions poses another significant hurdle for these algorithms. Local search algorithms and evolutionary techniques, including genetic algorithms, are particularly prone to getting trapped in local maxima due to their reliance on iterative refinement processes. Escaping these local optima and effectively exploring the entire solution space to converge to the global optimum is a challenging task. From a general understanding of the complete set of CDs on seven alternatives (Akello-Egwell et al., 2023), many large domains have sizes that are close to the maximum possible, but they represent different local optima. Thus, many learning algorithms get trapped in the swamp of the large domains, making it hard to escape and find the largest domain.

<sup>1</sup>GitHub. <https://github.com/sagebei/cdl/tree/main/algorithms/benchmarking>

Calculating the size of the CD on the large number of alternatives is computationally heavy and time-consuming (Zhou et al., 2023), leading to another major issue where it is computationally demanding to compute the resulting CD sizes millions of times needed for the learning algorithms to improve on the feedback.

**Table 7** The largest CDs found by a range of learning algorithms. Common learning algorithms are vulnerable to local traps and victims of huge search space in finding large CDs. (DQN: Deep Q learning; PPO: Proximal Policy Optimisation; A2C: Advantage Actor-Critic; EC: Evolutionary Computation; GA: Genetic Algorithms; ES: Evolutionary Strategies; PSO: Particle Swarm Optimisation; HC: Hill Climbing; SA: Simulated Annealing).

n	Largest size	Deep RL			EC			Local Search	
		DQN	PPO	A2C	GA	ES	PSO	HC	SA
4	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
5	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	16	20
6	45	44	45	41	44	41	45	41	45
7	100	86	94	85	96	81	92	71	97
8	224	180	199	181	194	162	182	145	216

Finding large CDs can be naturally cast as a reinforcement learning problem where it can be modelled as a single-player game. The game starts with an initial position, a list of empty triples with no rule assigned. In each game step, the player assigns a rule to the next triple in the sequence. It ends when all the triples are assigned. There are no intermediate rewards, and the final reward is in proportion to the size of the constructed Condorcet game at the end of the game. In this setting, an RL agent sequentially assigns a rule to the list of ordered triples and gets a reward.

Deep reinforcement learning (DRL) algorithms, while powerful, still have limitations when it comes to solving hard combinatorial optimisation problems (Mazyavkina et al., 2021; Barrett et al., 2020). Deep Q learning algorithms (Mnih et al., 2015), Proximal Policy Optimisation algorithms (Schulman et al., 2017) and Advantage Actor-Critic algorithms (Mnih et al., 2016) in their original form are prone to converge to local optima as Barrett et al. (2020) described. In our experiments, they all failed at finding the largest CDs on  $n \geq 7$  alternatives.

Given these identified challenges, we analyze the following factors contributing to this issue. One of the main limitations is the curse of dimensionality, which refers to the exponential increase in the number of possible solutions as the problem size grows, which is the exact problem facing finding the largest CDs. This can make it difficult for DRL algorithms to search through all possible solutions and find the optimal one in a reasonable amount of time. Another limitation is the presence of local optima, which traps the algorithm in a sub-optimal solution. This is particularly true in our case where the reward function is sparse (*i.e.* a reward is given only at the end of the game), making it difficult to differentiate between good and bad solutions. While the size of the partial CDs is a good choice for intermediate rewards, they do not strongly correlate with the size of the resulting full CD and sometimes can be misleading. DRL algorithms also require a lot of computational power, memory, and data to train effectively, which can be a challenge for working with large alternative CDs. Additionally, finding the set of rules that constructs a large CD requires a high degree of precision, which is difficult to achieve with reinforcement learning algorithms. Despite these limitations, DRL algorithms have shown promising results in various applications, and researchers are working to overcome these challenges to improve their performance on hard combinatorial optimisation problems (Mazyavkina et al., 2021; Bello et al., 2016).

The AlphaZero-style algorithms, one of the deep reinforcement learning algorithms, has achieved remarkable success on board games like Chess and Go by utilizing a value function<sup>2</sup> that evaluates the current board position without waiting for the game’s completion, as described by Silver et al. (2018). The AlphaZero algorithm and its variations do not only apply to board games but are also applicable to solving combinatorial optimisation problems (Latterre et al., 2018). For example, Fawzi et al. (2022) applied a variation of AlphaZero called AlphaTensor to improve the best-known matrix multiplication algorithms, and Mankowitz et al. (2023) developed AlphaDev that found fast sorting

<sup>2</sup>Note that AlphaZero algorithms also use policy function to cut off poor branches, but it is out of the scope of this paper to discuss the details

algorithms, further showcasing the algorithm’s potential on tackling hard combinatorial optimisation problems.

Conceptually, the value function, commonly denoted as  $V_\pi(s)$  where  $s$  is the state the agent is visiting, specifies how good it is in that state when following the policy  $\pi$ . During the tree search, the search space can be reduced by discarding the branches regarded as unfavourable by the value function.

However, training or building an accurate optimal value function is challenging. A recent study has shown that when the estimations of the value function are not accurate, *i.e.*, it fails to predict the precise optimal value of states, the direction of the search could be misled to the points where the algorithm fails to learn to play the child game of Nim, one of the classic impartial games (Zhou and Riis, 2022). That and some of the literature it referred to also show that modelling parity function by neural networks on long bitstrings is a non-trivial task. To some extent, the parity issue that characterizes the challenge of learning Nim-like games also arises in CDs. Their study also highlights the difficulty of modelling the parity function using neural networks on long bitstrings, which characterizes the challenges of learning Nim-like games and CDs. As discussed in Sect. 2 all previously known CDs have utilized the alternating scheme, which explicitly employs the parity function.

Overcoming this fundamental difficulty for neural networks is crucial to improve their performance in such domains. While the potential of reinforcement learning algorithms like AlphaZero is promising, the challenges of training accurate value functions must be carefully considered. Our search algorithm circumvents these challenges by applying a handcrafted heuristic (value) function.

Evolutionary algorithms, including genetic algorithms (GA), evolutionary strategies (ES), and particle swarm optimisations (PSO), though they have achieved notable success in solving combinatorial optimisation problem (Radhakrishnan and Jeyakumar, 2021; Oliveto et al., 2007; Papadrakakis et al., 1998; Calégari et al., 1999; Casas et al., 2022), also face specific challenges when applied to finding large CDs. While genetic algorithms (GAs) are a popular optimisation technique, they too have limitations when it comes to solving hard combinatorial optimisation problems (Khuri et al., 1994). GAs are prone to converge prematurely, meaning the search may stop before the optimal solution is found. This can happen when the search space is too large and the population is not diverse enough (Elsayed et al., 2014). GAs also require several parameters to be set, such as the population size, crossover probability, and mutation rate. Finding the right set of parameters can be difficult, and small changes in these parameters can significantly affect the quality of the solutions. GAs can struggle with scalability when the problem size grows too large. As the search space expands, the time required to evaluate each solution increases, and the population size required to obtain diverse solutions increases exponentially.

Evolutionary strategy algorithms are often used to solve continuous optimisation problems. Still, they can also be applied to solve discrete combinatorial optimisation problems by optimizing the weights of a neural network that generates the solutions (Salimans et al., 2017; Papadrakakis et al., 1998). To this end, they are strong alternatives to reinforcement learning algorithms (Salimans et al., 2017; Majid et al., 2023). Particle swarm optimisation algorithms are also designed to solve optimisation problems whose solution space is continuous (El-Shorbagy and Hassanien, 2018; Tchomt e and Gourgand, 2009; Selvi and Umarani, 2010), but this limitation can be overcome by using a neural network.

Local search algorithms are also good candidates for solving hard combinatorial optimisation problems (Johnson et al., 1988). One of the typical local search algorithms is Simple Hill Climbing (SHL), where the current solution is iteratively modified by making small changes. If the modified solution is better than the current solution, it is accepted as the new current solution. This process continues until no further improvement can be made. It is not hard to see that it is susceptible to getting stuck in local optima. Random Restart Hill Climbing overcomes the limitation by performing multiple hill-climbing searches from different random starting points. Each search is run until it reaches a local optimum, and the best solution among all searches is selected as the final result.

Simulated annealing is a variant of hill climbing that allows for occasional ”downhill” moves to avoid getting trapped in local optima (Kirkpatrick et al., 1983). It uses a temperature parameter that controls the probability of accepting worse solutions at the beginning of the search but reduces this probability as the search progresses. This allows the algorithm to explore a wider search space before converging to the optimal solution. Simulated annealing can be computationally expensive, and the time required to evaluate each solution increases as the problem size grows. As a result, SA can struggle with scalability when the problem size becomes too large.

We experimented with these two local search algorithms, random-restart Hill Climbing and Simulated Annealing with Restarts. As expected, they struggled. On four, five, and six alternatives, the latter found the maximal size of 9, 20, and 45 (both when searching with the four pit-peak rules and all six rules). For seven alternatives, the largest CD size it found was 97, and for eight alternatives, it found a CD of size 216. A major issue is that it is computationally demanding to compute CD sizes the millions of times needed for the algorithm to get enough feedback to efficiently explore the search space and escape from the local trap to reach the global optima.

The fact that the GA and SA found relatively larger CD for seven and eight alternatives in comparison with other algorithms shows that focusing on a small population of good solutions and further exploring them is a good strategy, and on the contrary, striving to build a good solution from scratch tends to end up in local traps. The utility of value functions in RL algorithms in solving mathematical problems (Fawzi et al., 2022) and combinatorial optimisation problems (Mazyavkina et al., 2021), along with the benefit of focusing on a set of good candidate solutions as in GA and SA inspired our heuristic search method in which we designed a handcrafted heuristic function to calculate a value estimating the goodness of a set of partially assigned triples, and the search further explores the ones that have high evaluations.

## 4 The algorithm

Using the partial CD size as a measure to evaluate it leads to two issues. Calculating the size of a partial CD on a large number of alternatives entails prohibitively costly computation. More importantly, there is no guarantee that a large partial CD could lead to a large full CD, which is why the greedy algorithms stumble, indicating that using the size of a partial CD as a measurement to rank them is erroneous. This promotes the need to develop heuristic functions to evaluate them. A best heuristic function establishes a strong linear relationship between the size of a CD and its value for all the CDs where for any two CDs,  $A$  and  $B$  if the size of  $A$  is larger than that of  $B$ , the value of  $A$  is also higher than that of  $B$ . However, training or building a best heuristic function is challenging. In this section, we present a search algorithm that applies a manually designed heuristic function using a database that could capture the positive relationship.

### 4.1 Database construction

The fact the size of a CD and the sizes of its restrictions are linearly correlated suggests that the sizes of the restrictions of two CDs can be utilised to measure their relative size. To extrapolate, the largest full CD size reachable from a partial CD is also correlated with the sizes of the largest full restrictions reachable from its restrictions. On a small number of alternatives, we designed an efficient algorithm to find out the size of the largest CD any partial CD can end up with, and store them in a database to enable fast look-up.

The database contains a set of precomputed (key: value) pairs where the keys are the states of fully and partially assigned triples for all combinations of rule assignment on five alternatives and their corresponding value is the largest possible full CD size obtainable from a partial CD or the actual CD size for a full CD. The TRS state conception was proposed in Zhou et al. (2023), which refers to the string representation of the rules assigned to a list of triples in an order. This database enables swiftly obtaining the largest possible size of any five alternative CDs given their state by simply looking it up. An efficient algorithm that constructs the database on  $3 \leq n \leq 5$  is given in Algorithm 1. Considering the exponentially growing computation complexity of building the database as  $n$  grows larger and the memory needed to store the dataset, it is impractical to construct it on  $n \geq 6$  alternatives.

---

**Algorithm 1** Construct the database

---

**Input:** The number of alternatives  $n$  where  $n \geq 3$

A set of rules  $R$ : 2N1, 2N3, 1N3, 3N1 by default

**Output:** A key-value database  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $n$  alternatives

Add  $|R|^m$  pairs of (state of full TRS with  $R$  : their resulting CD size) to  $\mathcal{D}$

**for**  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m - 1$  **do**

$j \leftarrow m - i$

$k \leftarrow \binom{j}{m}$

$\mathbf{R}_j \leftarrow$  Cartesian product of  $\underbrace{R \times R \times \dots \times R}_j$

$\mathbf{TRS} \leftarrow$  a list of  $k$  TRSs each with  $j$  triples assigned with 3N1

    ▷ *This rule can be any.*

**for** each TRS in  $\mathbf{TRS}$  **do**

$T_i \leftarrow$  unassigned triples in TRS

$T_j \leftarrow$  assigned triples in TRS

**for** each  $R_j$  in  $\mathbf{R}_j$  **do**

            Reassign  $R_j$  to  $T_j$  for TRS

            largest\_size  $\leftarrow 0$

**for** each unassigned triple  $t$  in  $T_i$  **do**

**for** each rule  $r$  in  $R$  **do**

                    Assign  $r$  to  $t$  for TRS

                    size  $\leftarrow$  look up TRS state in  $\mathcal{D}$

**if** size > largest\_size **then:**

                        largest\_size  $\leftarrow$  size

                    Assign empty rule to  $t$  for TRS

                    ▷ *leave  $t$  unassigned*

            Add (TRS state : largest\_size) pair to  $\mathcal{D}$

---

## 4.2 The heuristic function

The main objective of a heuristic function is evaluating partial CDs. For a partial CD, the heuristic function should calculate a value in proportion to the largest possible full CD size obtainable from it. That is, for any given CD, the heuristic function should establish a trend in which the larger the full CD that a partial CD can be, the larger its value. Given that all the CDs for  $n \leq 7$  have been studied, we aim to develop the heuristic function that applies to the CDs on  $n \geq 8$  alternatives.


For any TRS on  $n$  alternatives where  $n \geq 6$ , the heuristic function given in Equation (1) takes as input a set complete set of  $s (= \binom{n}{5})$  subset states and look them up in the database to fetch their values  $\mathbf{v} = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s]$  where  $v_i \in [1, 20]$ . They are then aggregated to obtain a single value estimating the goodness of this TRS. The aggregation is a linear weighted combination of the number of occurrences of the size of each of the five alternative CDs.

$$f(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } \min(\mathbf{v}) \leq 15 \\ \sum_{i=16}^{20} m_i \cdot w_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$


where  $m_i$  denotes the number of occurrences for five alternative CDs of size  $i$ , and  $w_i$  is its corresponding weight. To lead the search to find the largest CDs possible, the heuristic function does not account for the 5 alternative restrictions whose size is less than 16 because the size of the 5 alternatives restrictions on the largest CDs on  $n \leq 8$  alternatives is larger than or equal to 16 (Karpov et al., 2024; Leedham-Green et al., 2024). We conjecture that this also applied for  $n > 8$ . Considering that the larger CDs should, in general, contain more number of larger restrictions, we set the weights with increment values  $[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]$ , i.e  $w_{16} = 1, w_{17} = 2, w_{18} = 3, w_{19} = 4, w_{20} = 5$ .

Akelo-Egwell et al. (2023) released two complete sets of unitary non-isomorphic CDs for six and seven alternatives. These CDs enabled us to evaluate the heuristic functions by examining the relationship they give rise to between their sizes and their values. Using these CDs, we show in Fig. 3 two scatter plots for six and seven alternatives, demonstrating the relationship between the size of the CDs and their values from our heuristic function. It is conspicuous that for  $n = 6$  CDs whose size is larger than 28 and for  $n = 7$  CDs whose size is larger than 44, the heuristic function builds a linear

relationship between the size and the values of CDs. The fact that the correlation is not strong on small CDs is not problematic as this issue can be resolved by the prioritisation strategy employed in the search algorithm that could rule them out. Overall, our heuristic function, though not perfect, can serve its purpose well.



(a) The values of all the  $n=6$  non-isomorphic CDs on the heuristic function (1)



(b) The values of some the  $n=7$  non-isomorphic CDs for every size on the heuristic function (1)

**Fig. 3** The correlation between the sizes of domains and their values evaluated by the value function for six and seven alternative CDs. Plot (a) includes all the six alternative isomorphic CDs; plot (b) uses 100000 randomly sampled  $n = 7$  CDs for each size if the number of CDs is too many.

### 4.3 The heuristic search algorithm

In the selection phase of genetic algorithms, solutions in the population are evaluated using a fitness function, which measures how well they solve the problem and the ones that perform have higher fitness are more likely to be selected for the next generation. Owing to its effectiveness, we employ the same strategy in ruling out inferior TRSs that are not likely to end up producing a large CD.

An exhaustive search algorithm that builds an entire search tree begins with a root node corresponding to an empty TRS where the triples are all unassigned. The root node is expanded by adding four child nodes, representing 4 TRSs where the first triple is assigned to one of the four rules, 2N1, 2N3, 1N3, and 3N1. Each child node will then be expanded, and this process continues iteratively until all the triples are assigned. To avoid building an enormous search tree, at each search step our heuristic search algorithm keeps  $N$  high-ranking nodes for the next step. The heuristic search algorithm that uses the heuristic function with access to the database is given in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2** The heuristic search algorithm

---

**Input:** The number of alternatives  $n$  where  $n \geq 6$   
A set of rules  $R$ : 2N1, 2N3, 1N3, 3N1 by default  
The number of top TRSs kept in the search  $N$  where  $N \geq 1$   
The heuristic function  $f$

**Output:**  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$  ( $N$  full TRSs with the highest values)

Create an empty list  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$   
Initiate a TRS where all the triples are unassigned and added it to  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$   
 $T \leftarrow$  a list of  $m$  triples  
**for** each triple  $t$  in  $T$  **do**  
    **for** each TRS in  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$  **do**  
        **for** each rule  $r$  in  $R$  **do**  
            Assign  $r$  to  $t$  for TRS  
            Add TRS to  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$   
        Assign an empty rule to  $t$  for TRS  
    Calculate the value for every TRS in  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$  using heuristic function  $f$   
    Remove the TRSs from  $\mathbf{TRS}_N$  on which the heuristic function returns -1  
     $\mathbf{TRS}_N \leftarrow$  Top  $N$  TRSs with the highest values

---

Choosing a larger value of  $N$  may not always lead to better search results. In fact, due to the nonmonotonicity of the heuristic function, increasing  $N$  with the same heuristic function can sometimes result in worse search results. This happens because, at the early stage of the search, many TRSs with higher values that lead to smaller CDs outcompete the ones with lower values that could construct larger CDs. Thus, retaining more TRSs could potentially introduce more inferior TRSs.

In such cases, adjusting the parameters in the heuristic function to build a stronger correlation may be necessary. However, our aim is to provide a new paradigm to search for large CDs and we do not presume the heuristic function we developed is optimal. To find better parameters, simply testing out various weight combinations does not help significantly as our experiences indicate. We instead propose to utilise machine learning techniques to find better parameters using the data in (Akello-Egwell et al., 2023). Another example suggesting the non-monotonic property is that the search algorithm using a heuristic function calculating the value from restrictions on 6 alternatives did not find any larger CDs than the Fishburn domains. Here, as it is prohibitively impractical to build the dataset for 6 alternatives, we computed the largest possible restriction sizes using the process described in Algorithm 1.

Searching for large CDs entails a significant amount of computation, especially on CDs with many alternatives. One of the advantages of our algorithms is that the computation needed to evaluate each partial CD by the value function is much less than calculating its actual size, and the overhead of working with a larger number of alternatives only increases slightly. While our search algorithms have discovered new unknown large CDs for 10 and 11 alternatives, we conjecture there are larger CDs for  $n = 9$  that our search algorithms have not found, indicating that there is still some room for further improvement. The heuristic function we developed, based on the 5 alternative restriction sizes, is practically accurate, but it is by no means perfect. Its success shows a strong correlation between the actual CD size and its corresponding subset sizes, and exploiting this feature in more innovative ways opens a door for future research. At least, given the current construction, many other weight combinations can also be tested out.

## 5 Experiments

All our experiments were built on top of the CDL library (Zhou et al., 2023) which provides a wide range of functionalities for CD-related calculations. This library was initially developed to support this work. It has underpinned some research studies (Karpov et al., 2023; Akello-Egwell et al., 2023; Karpov et al., 2024; Markström et al., 2024) since its initial release due to its flexibility and fast execution speed. The fast computation enabled by this library contributes significantly to the success of our algorithm. Especially, the `subset_states` function it provided, which converts a TRS to its subset states for  $n \geq 6$  alternatives, facilitated the implementation of our search algorithms.

Our search algorithm found the largest CD for  $n = 6$  within a second, as shown in Table 8. As the number of alternatives increased, the time it took to find a large CD skyrocketed not only because the search space was growing exponentially but because more high-value nodes were needed to participate in the search to get good results. It is worth noting that this heuristic search algorithm has been integrated into the CDL library. The codes are available at the CDL GitHub repository<sup>3</sup>.

**Table 8** The time consumption of our method on rediscovering the known largest CD for  $n \leq 9$  on a Macbook Air with 1.1 GHz Dual-Core Intel Core i3 and 8 Gigabyte memory.

n	Size of largest CDs found	Time Consumption
6	45	0.605 second
7	100	1.31 second
8	222	93 seconds
9	488	31 minutes

On more than nine alternatives, the order of the triples by which they are assigned with a rule is crucial and has a non-negligible impact on the CDs found by our search algorithm. A well-chosen ordering helps cut off unfruitful branches at the early search stage. To verify this, we developed an approach that selects the next triple to be assigned a rule dynamically, aiming to find the triple among all the unassigned ones that reduce the size of the CD the most once assigned. This approach records the size of a partial CD for each unassigned triple when assigned with one of the 4 rules that maximize the size of this partial CD and choose the one with the lowest value. Dynamically selecting the next triple gives good results, but it requires a large amount of calculation to access all the unassigned triples, and it is prohibitively expensive to employ this strategy when working on  $n \geq 8$  alternatives.

We experimented with different static triple orders where the triples were listed randomly or sorted, and the order was fixed throughout the search once determined. One of our special static orders based on various mathematical heuristics and proprieties stood out and led to the discovery of record-breaking CDs. The ordering of the triples we used is a type of static ordering and is defined such that triple  $(x_1, y_1, z_1)$  is before  $(x_2, y_2, z_2)$  if  $x_1 < x_2$  or  $(x_1 = x_2$  and  $z_1 < z_2)$  or  $(x_1 = x_2$  and  $z_1 = z_2$  and  $y_1 < y_2)$ . This choice of triple order is a contributing factor that enables our method to find the existing large CDs constructed by alternating schemes quickly. We call this ordering RZ-ordering, where RZ is the authors' initials.

One major benefit brought by RZ-order is that the order of the list of triples in a TRS on  $n \geq 6$  alternatives when restricted to five alternatives remains unchanged, which is to say that when the triples in the five alternatives database are in RZ-order, for  $n \geq 6$  alternatives the restricted triples to five alternatives are also in RZ-order, meaning that they can be looked up in that database without reordering. However, for other orders of triples that do not hold this property, like the lexicographic order, many of the orders of triples restricted to five alternatives are not in lexicographic order. They have to be reordered before being able to be looked up in the dataset where triples are also in lexicographic order, incurring extra cost of computation.

In the experiments where the new CDs are found, we kept the top  $N = 200000$  and  $N = 100000$  high-value nodes for 10 and 11 alternatives, respectively. Table 9 displays the size and their counts of the CDs that are larger than the Fishburn domains which are the largest known CDs on 10 and 11 alternatives. The largest CDs we found on 10 alternatives have size 1082, while the size of other smaller CDs ranges from 1070 to 1079. On 11 alternatives, there are CDs of 5 different sizes larger than the Fishburn domain discovered by the search algorithm, with the largest one being 2349.

It is sensible to claim that the larger the size of CDs, the harder they are to be discovered. However, our method found more (isomorphic) CDs of size 1072 than those of size 1071 for 10 alternatives and more CDs of size 2337 than those of size 2334 for 11 alternatives. This reflects one of the challenges mentioned above in the search where designing a successful heuristic function that prioritizes the large CD is challenging. It also insinuates that the heuristic function we crafted, although with significant efforts, is imperfect. We see it as an open research problem to design an efficient and effective heuristic

<sup>3</sup>GitHub. <https://github.com/sagebei/cdl/tree/main/python>

function that distinguishes the CDs of different sizes with a large margin such that the unpromising partial CDs can be ruled out with high confidence.

**Table 9** The sizes and counts of new large CDs on 10 and 11 alternatives, discovered by the heuristic search algorithm.

n		New large CD sizes and their count						
10	size	1070	1071	1072	1074	1078	1079	1082
	count	80	29	70	37	13	8	5
11	size	2328	2329	2334	2337	2349		
	count	330	16	8	67	122		

This search algorithm, though relying on access to a database, can be scaled to run on thousands of CPU cores on parallel, each of which independently starts a search on a partial CD. We experimented with this technique by starting 1000 searches on 1000 CPU cores on QMUL HPC machine (King et al., 2021), and found CDs whose size is 224 for eight alternatives, the largest CD for  $n = 8$  (Leedham-Green et al., 2024).

The whole search was split into two stages. In the first stage, the search began with a TRS with no rule assigned and stopped after a given triple (the 15th triple in our experiment) in TRSs was assigned, resulting in a large collection of TRSs where the top triples above that triple (the first 15 triples in our case) were all assigned. The first stage ended with evenly splitting the list of TRSs into 1000 chunks. They were shuffled before splitting to ensure that the TRSs in one chunk were not similar. In the second stage, we resumed the search on 1000 CPU cores with the  $N$ , the number of high-value CDs kept being 10000, each of which searched for a chunk independently. When they were finished, the size of all the CDs found by the search was calculated, and we found 17 CDs of size 224.

Paralleling the search algorithm in this way undoubtedly accelerates the computation by engaging in many CPU cores, but it has one drawback. As the list of TRSs is segregated into isolated blocks, and the search is conducted within each block, each block is only aware of the values of the TRSs in itself.

## 6 Analysis on discovered new large CDs

As the restrictions of a CD reveal its inner local structure and their application plays a central role in the heuristic function employed in the search algorithm, we use the size of restrictions and their counts as a measure of the CD structure. On 11 alternatives, the search algorithms found five CDs of different sizes larger than the Fishburn domain. Table 10 shows that each of these large CDs when restricted to 10 alternative subsets, produces at least one restriction larger than the Fishburn domain. Still, they were all found by our method, indicating our method is consistent across different numbers of alternatives. It is also worth pointing out that none of the restrictions is identical to the Fishburn domain, showing that the inner structure of these new CDs differs fundamentally from that of the Fishburn domain.

**Table 10** The 10 alternative restriction sizes of these  $n = 11$  CDs larger than the Fishburn domain. Each contains at least one  $n=10$  CD larger than the Fishburn domain when restricted to some 10 alternatives. These CD sizes are highlighted in bold.

CD size for n=11	Restriction sizes on 10 alternatives									
2328	1003	1005	1022	1043	1053	<b>1072</b>	<b>1074</b>	<b>1079</b>		
2329	1013	1028	1039	1040	1041	1044	1057	1058	1063	<b>1079</b>
2334	1021	1030	1035	1039	1043	1057	1063	1064	<b>1078</b>	
2337	1017	1022	1031	1045	1053	1062	<b>1072</b>	<b>1074</b>		
2349	1021	1026	1035	1045	1053	1068	<b>1074</b>	<b>1078</b>		

On 10 and 11 alternatives, the Fishburn domains had the largest size before our results. Here we compare the largest CDs found by the search algorithms with them. We calculated the restriction

sizes for the largest CD we found on  $n = 10$  and 11 alternatives when restricted to a range of 4 to  $n - 1$  alternatives. Their sizes and counts are listed in Table 11 and Table 12 for 10 and 11 alternatives respectively. At least one of the restrictions on the 10 alternative Fishburn domain is also a Fishburn domain. However, for the largest CD on 10 alternatives our algorithm found, the size of the largest restriction on nine alternatives is 485, which is smaller than the Fishburn domain. We thus speculate that the chance that it is not the largest is high. It provides an improved low bound, but there is no evidence showing that it is the high bound on the domain size.

Furthermore, the restrictions from Fishburn domains generally have a larger number of large CDs than the ones from the CD of size 1082. For example, when restricted to eight alternatives, only one restriction is of size 222, in contrast to the ones from the Fishburn domain, which contain 15 restrictions whose size is 222. This shows that larger CDs do not always produce larger restrictions or a higher number of larger restrictions compared to those from smaller CDs. This aligns with the conclusion in Karpov et al. (2024) that suggests CDs that have the largest restriction might not be the largest.

**Table 11** The restriction sizes and their count for the 10 alternative CD of size 1082 when restricted to 4 to 9 alternative subsets.

Subset n		Restriction sizes and their count										
4	size	8	9									
	count	90	120									
5	size	16	17	18	19	20						
	count	6	30	6	162	48						
6	size	36	39	40	41	42	43	44	45			
	count	6	6	2	44	86	40	6	20			
7	size	87	89	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	100
	count	6	2	4	16	22	18	8	16	6	16	6
8	size	200	204	205	209	211	212	214	216	218	219	222
	count	2	4	4	4	3	2	7	10	4	4	1
9	size	473	481	485								
	count	4	2	4								

We observed a similar pattern with the restrictions on the 11 alternative CD of size 2349. As shown in Table 12, some of these restrictions on the 5, 6, and 7 alternatives, have the same size as the the Fishburn domains. But it also has relatively small restrictions, especially on seven alternatives where the size of the smallest restriction is 74. All the restrictions on 9 alternatives are smaller than Fishburn domains.

We also noticed that these new large CDs have some relatively small restrictions of sizes 8 and 16 when restricted to four and five alternatives, respectively. This was not a surprise to us as it generally follows Ramsey’s Theorem (Ramsey, 1930), which in the context of graph colouring states that given a positive integer  $k$  there exists a complete graph with  $n(n > k)$  coloured edges where a subset of  $k$  connected edges have the same colour. We will show that Ramsey’s Theorem also applies to analysing the pattern of the rules assigned to the triples for the restrictions of a CD. We state that:

**Corollary.** *For any positive integer  $k$ , there exists a positive integer  $n(n > k)$ , such that any CD on  $n$  alternatives has a restriction to  $k$  alternatives where the rules on them are the same.*

**Proof (outline).** *The proof comes with a direct application of Ramsey’s Theorem if we consider the triples as edges of a graph and the rule assigned to them as their colour.*

**Corollary.** *For any positive integer  $k$ , there exists a positive integer  $n(n > k)$ , such that any CD on  $n$  alternatives has a restriction to  $k$  alternatives of size  $2^{k-1}$ .*

**Proof (outline).** *A CD on  $n$  alternatives created by a list of triples where all the rules assigned to them are the same, i.e. all 1N3, 3N1, 2N3, 2N1, 1N2 or 3N2 has size  $2^{n-1}$  (Raynaud, 1981).*

Our finding here shows that on this  $n = 10$  CD there exist restrictions on 4 and 5 alternatives with size 8 and 16 respectively, meaning that for  $k$  values of 4 and 5,  $n$  value of 10 already satisfies the

**Table 12** The restriction sizes and their count for the 11 alternative CD of size 2349 when restricted to 4 to 10 alternative subsets.

Subset n		Restriction sizes and their count											
4	size	<b>8</b>	9										
	count	143	187										
5	size	<b>16</b>	17	18	19	20							
	count	28	46	5	279	104							
6	size	<b>32</b>	35	36	39	40	41	42	43	44	45		
	count	3	10	9	35	2	73	164	79	35	52		
7	size	74	79	85	86	87	88	89	91	92	93	94	95
	count	3	3	12	3	9	3	15	19	44	39	12	16
	size	96	97	98	100								
	count	39	52	42	19								
8	size	179	184	187	192	194	196	200	201	202	204	205	207
	count	3	1	1	1	3	8	3	2	8	6	2	7
	size	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	222
	count	10	3	12	17	11	2	8	13	2	30	8	4
9	size	415	426	431	448	451	452	457	460	466	468	470	473
	count	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	4	2	2	4
	size	475	478	479	480	481	484	485					
count	3	4	3	4	11	4	4						
10	size	1021	1026	1035	1045	1053	1068	<b>1074</b>	<b>1078</b>				
	count	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2				

condition. On the 11 alternatives CD of size 2349, the condition for  $k = 6$  is satisfied on the largest CD we discovered on  $n = 11$  alternatives where some of the restrictions on 6 alternatives have size 32.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we present a heuristic search algorithm capable of generating large CDs on any number of alternatives, which also has the potential to discover unknown larger CDs. This is evidenced by the fact that the large CDs it found on the 10 and 11 alternatives improved the existing lower bounds. The success of our algorithm lies chiefly in its utilisation of human domain knowledge on this subject which existing learning algorithms for general combinatorial optimisation problems have no apparent way to assimilate. Our results were obtained without applying any statistic planning approaches, like Monte Carlo Tree Search, but by traversing the tree using a purely manually designed heuristic function to guide the search. The way we traversed the search tree only used a pure heuristic function but did not explicitly use any reinforcement learning techniques like Q-learning (Watkins and Dayan, 1992). Despite having access to limited computational resources, our algorithm found many new large CDs.

Although the application of the database does cut away a large part of the search tree at a cheap cost, it has certain limitations. With a reasonable amount of computations, the algorithm could not find a new lower bound for CDs on 12 alternatives, suggesting that the CDs with a larger number of alternatives have more non-local implications, and the upper bound given by the database will more often differ from the actual size of the local restriction.

Finding the largest CDs is a challenging yet unsolved problem. Many existing algorithms can be applied to finding large CDs. We tested various standard approaches, including reinforcement learning algorithms, evolutionary algorithms and local search algorithms. In our preliminary experiments, they only managed to find local maxima solutions and had great difficulties in finding the largest known domains for low values of  $n$ , such as  $n = 7$  and  $n = 8$ . The new CDs we report suggest that there may be more complex mathematical patterns underlying the CDs than previously thought. Our results indicate that the maximal size of CDs on  $n \geq 8$  alternatives can serve as a benchmark for heuristic search algorithms. The problems are challenging because the search space is enormous on large alternatives, and there are no obvious, simple criteria for searching. Still, at the same time, there

are a lot of structures in the CD as the restrictions to each subset of alternatives also form a CD. An efficient search algorithm should be able to exploit this rich underlying structure to guide the search.

## Declarations

**Conflict of interest** The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests that could potentially compromise the integrity, impartiality, or credibility of the research presented in this paper.

## Acknowledgements

Bei Zhou was funded by the China Scholarship Council (CSC). This research utilised Queen Mary’s Apocrita HPC facility (King et al., 2021), supported by QMUL Research-IT.

## References

- Dolica Akello-Egwell, Charles Leedham-Green, Alastair Litterick, Klas Markström, and Søren Riis. Condorcet domains of degree at most seven. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15993*, 2023.
- Kenneth J Arrow. *Social choice and individual values*, volume 12. Yale university press, second edition, 1963.
- Thomas Barrett, William Clements, Jakob Foerster, and Alex Lvovsky. Exploratory combinatorial optimization with reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 3243–3250, 2020.
- Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming. *science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- Irwan Bello, Hieu Pham, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, and Samy Bengio. Neural combinatorial optimization with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09940*, 2016.
- Marie-Louise Bruner and Martin Lackner. The likelihood of structure in preference profiles. In *MPREF@ AAAI*. Citeseer, 2014.
- Patrice Calégari, Giovanni Coray, Alain Hertz, Daniel Kobler, and Pierre Kuonen. A taxonomy of evolutionary algorithms in combinatorial optimization. *Journal of Heuristics*, 5:145–158, 1999.
- Francisco Casas, Claudio E Torres, and Ignacio Araya. A heuristic search based on diversity for solving combinatorial problems. *Journal of Heuristics*, 28(3):287–328, 2022.
- Vladimir I Danilov and Gleb A Koshevoy. Maximal condorcet domains. *Order*, 30:181–194, 2013.
- Vladimir I Danilov, Alexander V Karzanov, and Gleb Koshevoy. Condorcet domains of tiling type. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160(7-8):933–940, 2012.
- Mohammed A El-Shorbagy and Aboul Ella Hassanien. Particle swarm optimization from theory to applications. *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis (IJRSDA)*, 5(2):1–24, 2018.
- Saber M Elsayed, Ruhul A Sarker, and Daryl L Essam. A new genetic algorithm for solving optimization problems. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 27:57–69, 2014.
- Alhussein Fawzi, Matej Balog, Aja Huang, Thomas Hubert, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatin, Alexander Novikov, Francisco J R Ruiz, Julian Schrittwieser, Grzegorz Swirszcz, et al. Discovering faster matrix multiplication algorithms with reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 610(7930):47–53, 2022.
- Peter Fishburn. Acyclic sets of linear orders. *Social choice and Welfare*, 14(1):113–124, 1996a.
- Peter Fishburn. Acyclic sets of linear orders. *Social choice and Welfare*, pages 113–124, 1997.
- Peter C. Fishburn. Acyclic sets of linear orders. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 14(1):113–124, 1996b.

- Peter C Fishburn. Acyclic sets of linear orders: A progress report. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 19: 431–447, 2002.
- Adám Galambos and Victor Reiner. Acyclic sets of linear orders via the bruhat orders. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(2):245–264, 2008.
- David S Johnson, Christos H Papadimitriou, and Mihalis Yannakakis. How easy is local search? *Journal of computer and system sciences*, 37(1):79–100, 1988.
- A. Karpov and A. Slinko. Constructing large peak-pit condorcet domains. *Theory and Decision*, 94(1):97–120, 2023.
- Alexander Karpov and Arkadii Slinko. Constructing large peak-pit condorcet domains. *Theory and Decision*, pages 1–24, 2022a.
- Alexander Karpov and Arkadii Slinko. Symmetric maximal condorcet domains. *Order*, pages 1–21, 2022b.
- Alexander Karpov, Klas Markström, Søren Riis, and Bei Zhou. Set-alternating schemes: A new class of large condorcet domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02817*, 2023.
- Alexander Karpov, Klas Markström, Søren Riis, and Bei Zhou. Local diversity of condorcet domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11912*, 2024.
- AV Karpov. Structured preferences: A literature survey. *Automation and Remote Control*, 83(9): 1329–1354, 2022.
- Sami Khuri, Thomas Bäck, and Jörg Heitkötter. An evolutionary approach to combinatorial optimization problems. In *ACM Conference on Computer Science*, pages 66–73, 1994.
- T King, Simon Butcher, and Lukasz Zalewski. Apocrita—high performance computing cluster for queen mary university of london; 2017. *Accessed February*, 5, 2021.
- Scott Kirkpatrick, C Daniel Gelatt Jr, and Mario P Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *science*, 220(4598):671–680, 1983.
- Marie-Louise Lackner and Martin Lackner. On the likelihood of single-peaked preferences. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48:717–745, 2017.
- Alexandre Laterre, Yunguan Fu, Mohamed Khalil Jabri, Alain-Sam Cohen, David Kas, Karl Hajjar, Torbjorn S Dahl, Amine Kerkeni, and Karim Beguir. Ranked reward: Enabling self-play reinforcement learning for combinatorial optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01672*, 2018.
- Juho Lauri, Sourav Dutta, Marco Grassia, and Deepak Ajwani. Learning fine-grained search space pruning and heuristics for combinatorial optimization. *Journal of Heuristics*, pages 1–35, 2023.
- Charles Leedham-Green, Klas Markström, and Søren Riis. The largest condorcet domain on 8 alternatives. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 62(1):109–116, 2024.
- Amjad Yousef Majid, Serge Saaybi, Vincent Francois-Lavet, R Venkatesha Prasad, and Chris Verhoeven. Deep reinforcement learning versus evolution strategies: a comparative survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- Daniel J Mankowitz, Andrea Michi, Anton Zhernov, Marco Gelmi, Marco Selvi, Cosmin Paduraru, Edouard Leurent, Shariq Iqbal, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Alex Ahern, et al. Faster sorting algorithms discovered using deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 618(7964):257–263, 2023.
- Klas Markström, Søren Riis, and Bei Zhou. Arrow’s single peaked domains, richness, and domains for plurality and the borda count. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12547*, 2024.
- Nina Mazyavkina, Sergey Sviridov, Sergei Ivanov, and Evgeny Burnaev. Reinforcement learning for combinatorial optimization: A survey. *Computers & Operations Research*, 134:105400, 2021.

- Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fiedjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- Volodymyr Mnih, Adria Puigdomenech Badia, Mehdi Mirza, Alex Graves, Timothy Lillicrap, Tim Harley, David Silver, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Asynchronous methods for deep reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1928–1937. PMLR, 2016.
- Bernard Monjardet. Social choice theory and the “centre de mathématique sociale”: some historical notes. *Social choice and Welfare*, 25:433–456, 2005.
- Bernard Monjardet. Acyclic domains of linear orders: a survey. *The Mathematics of Preference, Choice and Order: Essays in Honor of Peter C. Fishburn*, pages 139–160, 2009.
- Pietro S Oliveto, Jun He, and Xin Yao. Time complexity of evolutionary algorithms for combinatorial optimization: A decade of results. *International Journal of Automation and Computing*, 4:281–293, 2007.
- Manolis Papadrakakis, Nikos D Lagaros, and Yiannis Tsompanakis. Structural optimization using evolution strategies and neural networks. *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, 156(1-4):309–333, 1998.
- Clemens Puppe and Arkadii Slinko. Maximal condorcet domains a further progress report. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 2024.
- Anisha Radhakrishnan and G Jeyakumar. Evolutionary algorithm for solving combinatorial optimization—a review. *Innovations in Computer Science and Engineering: Proceedings of 8th ICICSE*, pages 539–545, 2021.
- F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s2-30(1):264–286, 1930. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1112/plms/s2-30.1.264>. URL <https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1112/plms/s2-30.1.264>.
- H. Raynaud. *Paradoxical results from Inada’s conditions for majority rule*. Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Stanford University, 1981.
- Hervé Raynaud. *The individual freedom allowed by the value restriction condition*. Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, 1982.
- Tim Salimans, Jonathan Ho, Xi Chen, Szymon Sidor, and Ilya Sutskever. Evolution strategies as a scalable alternative to reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03864*, 2017.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- V Selvi and R Umarani. Comparative analysis of ant colony and particle swarm optimization techniques. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 5(4):1–6, 2010.
- A. K. Sen. A Possibility theorem on majority decisions. *Econometrica*, 34(2):491–499, 1966.
- David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai, Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dhharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, et al. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through self-play. *Science*, 362(6419):1140–1144, 2018.
- Sylverin Kemmoé Tchomté and Michel Gourgand. Particle swarm optimization: A study of particle displacement for solving continuous and combinatorial optimization problems. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 121(1):57–67, 2009.
- Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8:279–292, 1992.
- Bei Zhou and Søren Riis. Impartial games: A challenge for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12787*, 2022.
- Bei Zhou, Klas Markström, and Søren Riis. Cdl: A fast and flexible library for the study of permutation sets with structural restrictions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06306*, 2023.

# Appendix

## The triples and their rule for the n=10 CD of size 1082

**Table 13** The TRS that led to the CD of size 1082 on 10 alternatives. The ordering of the triples displayed is another static ordering that differs from the ordering used in the search algorithm and is defined such that  $(x_1, y_1, z_1)$  is before  $(x_2, y_2, z_2)$  if  $x_1 \leq x_2$  and  $y_1 \leq y_2$  and  $z_1 \leq z_2$  out of consideration for the ease of looking up the table manually. There are 1082 isomorphic versions of this CD. The 10 alternative CD built by these rules is presented in Sect. 7.

Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules
(1, 2, 3)	2N3	(1, 7, 8)	1N3	(2, 7, 10)	1N3	(4, 6, 7)	3N1
(1, 2, 4)	2N3	(1, 7, 9)	1N3	(2, 8, 9)	1N3	(4, 6, 8)	3N1
(1, 2, 5)	1N3	(1, 7, 10)	1N3	(2, 8, 10)	1N3	(4, 6, 9)	1N3
(1, 2, 6)	1N3	(1, 8, 9)	2N1	(2, 9, 10)	3N1	(4, 6, 10)	3N1
(1, 2, 7)	1N3	(1, 8, 10)	2N1	(3, 4, 5)	1N3	(4, 7, 8)	3N1
(1, 2, 8)	3N1	(1, 9, 10)	3N1	(3, 4, 6)	1N3	(4, 7, 9)	1N3
(1, 2, 9)	2N3	(2, 3, 4)	2N3	(3, 4, 7)	1N3	(4, 7, 10)	3N1
(1, 2, 10)	2N3	(2, 3, 5)	1N3	(3, 4, 8)	1N3	(4, 8, 9)	1N3
(1, 3, 4)	2N3	(2, 3, 6)	1N3	(3, 4, 9)	1N3	(4, 8, 10)	3N1
(1, 3, 5)	1N3	(2, 3, 7)	1N3	(3, 4, 10)	1N3	(4, 9, 10)	1N3
(1, 3, 6)	1N3	(2, 3, 8)	1N3	(3, 5, 6)	3N1	(5, 6, 7)	3N1
(1, 3, 7)	1N3	(2, 3, 9)	3N1	(3, 5, 7)	3N1	(5, 6, 8)	1N3
(1, 3, 8)	3N1	(2, 3, 10)	3N1	(3, 5, 8)	3N1	(5, 6, 9)	2N1
(1, 3, 9)	3N1	(2, 4, 5)	1N3	(3, 5, 9)	1N3	(5, 6, 10)	1N3
(1, 3, 10)	3N1	(2, 4, 6)	1N3	(3, 5, 10)	3N1	(5, 7, 8)	1N3
(1, 4, 5)	1N3	(2, 4, 7)	1N3	(3, 6, 7)	3N1	(5, 7, 9)	2N1
(1, 4, 6)	1N3	(2, 4, 8)	1N3	(3, 6, 8)	3N1	(5, 7, 10)	1N3
(1, 4, 7)	1N3	(2, 4, 9)	3N1	(3, 6, 9)	1N3	(5, 8, 9)	2N1
(1, 4, 8)	3N1	(2, 4, 10)	3N1	(3, 6, 10)	3N1	(5, 8, 10)	2N1
(1, 4, 9)	3N1	(2, 5, 6)	3N1	(3, 7, 8)	3N1	(5, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 4, 10)	3N1	(2, 5, 7)	3N1	(3, 7, 9)	1N3	(6, 7, 8)	2N1
(1, 5, 6)	3N1	(2, 5, 8)	3N1	(3, 7, 10)	3N1	(6, 7, 9)	2N1
(1, 5, 7)	3N1	(2, 5, 9)	1N3	(3, 8, 9)	1N3	(6, 7, 10)	2N1
(1, 5, 8)	1N3	(2, 5, 10)	1N3	(3, 8, 10)	3N1	(6, 8, 9)	2N1
(1, 5, 9)	1N3	(2, 6, 7)	3N1	(3, 9, 10)	1N3	(6, 8, 10)	2N1
(1, 5, 10)	1N3	(2, 6, 8)	3N1	(4, 5, 6)	3N1	(6, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 6, 7)	3N1	(2, 6, 9)	1N3	(4, 5, 7)	3N1	(7, 8, 9)	2N1
(1, 6, 8)	1N3	(2, 6, 10)	1N3	(4, 5, 8)	3N1	(7, 8, 10)	2N1
(1, 6, 9)	1N3	(2, 7, 8)	3N1	(4, 5, 9)	1N3	(7, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 6, 10)	1N3	(2, 7, 9)	1N3	(4, 5, 10)	3N1	(8, 9, 10)	3N1

## The triples and their rule for the n=11 CD of size 2349

**Table 14** The TRS that constructed CD of size 2349 on 11 alternatives. The 11 alternative CD built by these rules is presented in Sect. 7.

Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules	Triples	Rules
(1, 2, 3)	1N3	(1, 9, 10)	3N1	(3, 4, 8)	3N1	(4, 8, 11)	2N1
(1, 2, 4)	2N3	(1, 9, 11)	3N1	(3, 4, 9)	1N3	(4, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 2, 5)	2N3	(1, 10, 11)	2N1	(3, 4, 10)	3N1	(4, 9, 11)	2N3
(1, 2, 6)	2N3	(2, 3, 4)	1N3	(3, 4, 11)	1N3	(4, 10, 11)	2N1
(1, 2, 7)	3N1	(2, 3, 5)	1N3	(3, 5, 6)	3N1	(5, 6, 7)	2N1
(1, 2, 8)	1N3	(2, 3, 6)	1N3	(3, 5, 7)	3N1	(5, 6, 8)	2N1
(1, 2, 9)	1N3	(2, 3, 7)	3N1	(3, 5, 8)	3N1	(5, 6, 9)	2N1
(1, 2, 10)	1N3	(2, 3, 8)	3N1	(3, 5, 9)	1N3	(5, 6, 10)	2N1
(1, 2, 11)	1N3	(2, 3, 9)	2N3	(3, 5, 10)	3N1	(5, 6, 11)	2N1
(1, 3, 4)	1N3	(2, 3, 10)	3N1	(3, 5, 11)	1N3	(5, 7, 8)	2N1
(1, 3, 5)	1N3	(2, 3, 11)	2N3	(3, 6, 7)	3N1	(5, 7, 9)	2N1
(1, 3, 6)	1N3	(2, 4, 5)	3N1	(3, 6, 8)	3N1	(5, 7, 10)	2N1
(1, 3, 7)	1N3	(2, 4, 6)	3N1	(3, 6, 9)	1N3	(5, 7, 11)	2N1
(1, 3, 8)	3N1	(2, 4, 7)	1N3	(3, 6, 10)	3N1	(5, 8, 9)	2N1
(1, 3, 9)	2N3	(2, 4, 8)	1N3	(3, 6, 11)	1N3	(5, 8, 10)	2N1
(1, 3, 10)	3N1	(2, 4, 9)	1N3	(3, 7, 8)	3N1	(5, 8, 11)	2N1
(1, 3, 11)	2N3	(2, 4, 10)	1N3	(3, 7, 9)	1N3	(5, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 4, 5)	3N1	(2, 4, 11)	1N3	(3, 7, 10)	3N1	(5, 9, 11)	2N3
(1, 4, 6)	3N1	(2, 5, 6)	3N1	(3, 7, 11)	1N3	(5, 10, 11)	2N1
(1, 4, 7)	3N1	(2, 5, 7)	1N3	(3, 8, 9)	1N3	(6, 7, 8)	2N1
(1, 4, 8)	1N3	(2, 5, 8)	1N3	(3, 8, 10)	3N1	(6, 7, 9)	2N1
(1, 4, 9)	1N3	(2, 5, 9)	1N3	(3, 8, 11)	1N3	(6, 7, 10)	2N1
(1, 4, 10)	1N3	(2, 5, 10)	1N3	(3, 9, 10)	1N3	(6, 7, 11)	2N1
(1, 4, 11)	1N3	(2, 5, 11)	1N3	(3, 9, 11)	3N1	(6, 8, 9)	2N1
(1, 5, 6)	3N1	(2, 6, 7)	1N3	(3, 10, 11)	1N3	(6, 8, 10)	2N1
(1, 5, 7)	3N1	(2, 6, 8)	1N3	(4, 5, 6)	3N1	(6, 8, 11)	2N1
(1, 5, 8)	1N3	(2, 6, 9)	1N3	(4, 5, 7)	1N3	(6, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 5, 9)	1N3	(2, 6, 10)	1N3	(4, 5, 8)	1N3	(6, 9, 11)	2N3
(1, 5, 10)	1N3	(2, 6, 11)	1N3	(4, 5, 9)	2N1	(6, 10, 11)	2N1
(1, 5, 11)	1N3	(2, 7, 8)	2N1	(4, 5, 10)	1N3	(7, 8, 9)	2N1
(1, 6, 7)	3N1	(2, 7, 9)	2N1	(4, 5, 11)	2N1	(7, 8, 10)	2N1
(1, 6, 8)	1N3	(2, 7, 10)	2N1	(4, 6, 7)	1N3	(7, 8, 11)	2N1
(1, 6, 9)	1N3	(2, 7, 11)	2N1	(4, 6, 8)	1N3	(7, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 6, 10)	1N3	(2, 8, 9)	2N1	(4, 6, 9)	2N1	(7, 9, 11)	2N3
(1, 6, 11)	1N3	(2, 8, 10)	2N1	(4, 6, 10)	1N3	(7, 10, 11)	2N1
(1, 7, 8)	1N3	(2, 8, 11)	2N1	(4, 6, 11)	2N1	(8, 9, 10)	3N1
(1, 7, 9)	1N3	(2, 9, 10)	3N1	(4, 7, 8)	2N1	(8, 9, 11)	2N3
(1, 7, 10)	1N3	(2, 9, 11)	3N1	(4, 7, 9)	2N1	(8, 10, 11)	2N1
(1, 7, 11)	1N3	(2, 10, 11)	2N1	(4, 7, 10)	2N1	(9, 10, 11)	1N3
(1, 8, 9)	2N1	(3, 4, 5)	3N1	(4, 7, 11)	2N1		
(1, 8, 10)	2N1	(3, 4, 6)	3N1	(4, 8, 9)	2N1		
(1, 8, 11)	2N1	(3, 4, 7)	3N1	(4, 8, 10)	2N1		

## The Condorcet domains

The large Condorcet domains we discovered for 10 and 11 alternatives are demonstrated here. We use hexadecimal numbers A and B to represent the domain's decimal numbers 10 and 11.

### The Condorcet domain of size 1082 on 10 alternatives

123456789A 12345678A9 123456798A 12345679A8 123456978A 12345697A8 1234569A78 1234569A87 123459678A 12345967A8  
1234596A78 1234596A87 123459A678 123459A687 123459A867 123459A876 123495678A 12349567A8 1234956A78 1234956A87  
123495A678 123495A687 123495A867 123495A876 123496578A 12349657A8 1234965A78 1234965A87 123496758A 12349675A8  
12349A5678 12349A5687 12349A5867 12349A5876 12349A8567 12349A8576 123546789A 12354678A9 123546798A 12354679A8  
123546978A 12354697A8 1235469A78 1235469A87 123549678A 12354967A8 1235496A78 1235496A87 123549A678 123549A687  
123549A867 123549A876 123564789A 12356478A9 123564798A 12356479A8 123564978A 12356497A8 1235649A78 1235649A87  
123567489A 12356748A9 123567498A 12356749A8 123567849A 12356784A9 1235678A49 123945678A 12394567A8 1239456A78 1239456A87  
1239456A87 123945A678 123945A687 123945A867 123945A876 123946578A 12394657A8 1239465A78 1239465A87 123946758A  
12394675A8 12394A5678 12394A5687 12394A5867 12394A5876 12394A8567 12394A8576 125346789A 12534678A9 125346798A  
12534679A8 125346978A 12534697A8 1253469A78 1253469A87 125349678A 12534967A8 1253496A78 1253496A87 125349A678  
125349A687 125349A867 125349A876 125364789A 12536478A9 125364798A 12536479A8 125364978A 12536497A8 1253649A78 1253649A87







3912B4A8756 3912B4A8765 3912B4A8774 3912B4A8783 3912B4A8792 3912B4A8801 3912B4A8810 3912B4A8819 3912B4A8828 3912B4A8837 3912B4A8846 3912B4A8855 3912B4A8864 3912B4A8873 3912B4A8882 3912B4A8891 3912B4A8900 3912B4A8909 3912B4A8918 3912B4A8927 3912B4A8936 3912B4A8945 3912B4A8954 3912B4A8963 3912B4A8972 3912B4A8981 3912B4A8990 3912B4A8999 3912B4A9008 3912B4A9017 3912B4A9026 3912B4A9035 3912B4A9044 3912B4A9053 3912B4A9062 3912B4A9071 3912B4A9080 3912B4A9089 3912B4A9098 3912B4A9107 3912B4A9116 3912B4A9125 3912B4A9134 3912B4A9143 3912B4A9152 3912B4A9161 3912B4A9170 3912B4A9179 3912B4A9188 3912B4A9197 3912B4A9206 3912B4A9215 3912B4A9224 3912B4A9233 3912B4A9242 3912B4A9251 3912B4A9260 3912B4A9269 3912B4A9278 3912B4A9287 3912B4A9296 3912B4A9305 3912B4A9314 3912B4A9323 3912B4A9332 3912B4A9341 3912B4A9350 3912B4A9359 3912B4A9368 3912B4A9377 3912B4A9386 3912B4A9395 3912B4A9404 3912B4A9413 3912B4A9422 3912B4A9431 3912B4A9440 3912B4A9449 3912B4A9458 3912B4A9467 3912B4A9476 3912B4A9485 3912B4A9494 3912B4A9503 3912B4A9512 3912B4A9521 3912B4A9530 3912B4A9539 3912B4A9548 3912B4A9557 3912B4A9566 3912B4A9575 3912B4A9584 3912B4A9593 3912B4A9602 3912B4A9611 3912B4A9620 3912B4A9629 3912B4A9638 3912B4A9647 3912B4A9656 3912B4A9665 3912B4A9674 3912B4A9683 3912B4A9692 3912B4A9701 3912B4A9710 3912B4A9719 3912B4A9728 3912B4A9737 3912B4A9746 3912B4A9755 3912B4A9764 3912B4A9773 3912B4A9782 3912B4A9791 3912B4A9800 3912B4A9809 3912B4A9818 3912B4A9827 3912B4A9836 3912B4A9845 3912B4A9854 3912B4A9863 3912B4A9872 3912B4A9881 3912B4A9890 3912B4A9899 3912B4A9908 3912B4A9917 3912B4A9926 3912B4A9935 3912B4A9944 3912B4A9953 3912B4A9962 3912B4A9971 3912B4A9980 3912B4A9989 3912B4A9998 3912B4A10000

9B31254A867 9B31254A876 9B31256478A 9B3125647A8 9B312564A78 9B312564A87 9B312A45678 9B312A45687 9B312A45867  
9B312A45876 9B312A48567 9B312A48576 9B312A48756 9B312A48765 9B312A84567 9B312A84576 9B312A84756 9B312A84765  
9B312A87456 9B312A87465 9B31A245678 9B31A245687 9B31A245867 9B31A245876 9B31A248567 9B31A248576 9B31A248756  
9B31A248765 9B31A284567 9B31A284576 9B31A284756 9B31A284765 9B31A287456 9B31A287465 9B31A287476 9B31A824567 9B31A824576  
9B31A824756 9B31A824765 9B31A827456 9B31A827465 9B31A872456 9B31A872465 9B31A872476 9B31A872486 9B31A1245678 9B31A1245687 9B31A1245867  
9B3A1245876 9B3A1248567 9B3A1248576 9B3A1248756 9B3A1248765 9B3A1284567 9B3A1284576 9B3A1284756 9B3A1284765  
9B3A1287456 9B3A1287465 9B3A1824567 9B3A1824576 9B3A1824756 9B3A1824765 9B3A1827456 9B3A1827465 9B3A1872456  
9B3A1872465 9B3A8124567 9B3A8124576 9B3A8124756 9B3A8124765 9B3A8127456 9B3A8127465 9B3A8172456 9B3A8172465