

Computing voting power in easy weighted voting games

Haris Aziz

Mike Paterson

Abstract

Weighted voting games are ubiquitous mathematical models which are used in economics, political science, neuroscience, threshold logic, reliability theory and distributed systems. They model situations where agents with variable voting weight vote in favour of or against a decision. A coalition of agents is winning if and only if the sum of weights of the coalition exceeds or equals a specified quota. The Banzhaf index is a measure of voting power of an agent in a weighted voting game. It depends on the number of coalitions in which the agent is the difference in the coalition winning or losing. It is well known that computing Banzhaf indices in a weighted voting game is NP-hard. We give a comprehensive classification of weighted voting games which can be solved in polynomial time. Among other results, we provide a polynomial ($O(k(\frac{n}{k})^k)$) algorithm to compute the Banzhaf indices in weighted voting games in which the number of weight values is bounded by k .

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation and Background

Weighted voting games (WVGs) are mathematical models which are used to analyze voting bodies in which the voters have different number of votes. In WVGs, each voter is assigned a non-negative weight and makes a vote in favour of or against a decision. The decision is made if and only if the total weight of those voting in favour of the decision is greater than or equal to some fixed quota. Since the weights of the players do not always exactly reflect how critical a player is in decision making, voting power attempts to measure the ability of a player in a WVG to determine the outcome of the vote. WVGs are also encountered in threshold logic, reliability theory, neuroscience and logical computing devices [15, 16]. Parhami [13] points out that voting has a long history in reliability systems dating back to von Neumann [17]. For reliability systems, the weights of a WVG can represent the significance of the components whereas the quota can represent the threshold for the overall system to fail. WVGs have been applied in various political and economic organizations [1, 2]. Voting power is also used in joint stock companies where each shareholder gets votes in proportion to the ownership of a stock [8].

The Banzhaf index is considered the most suitable power index by voting power theorists [11, 7]. The computational complexity of computing Banzhaf indices in WVGs is well studied. Prasad and Kelly [14] show that the problem of computing the Banzhaf values of players is #P-complete. It is even NP-hard to identify a player with zero voting power or two players with same Banzhaf indices [12]. Klinz and Woeginger [10] devised the fastest exact algorithm to compute Banzhaf indices in a WVG. In the algorithm, they applied a partitioning approach that dates back to Horowitz and Sahni [9]. However the complexity of the algorithm is still $O(n^2 2^{\frac{n}{2}})$. In this paper, we restrict our analysis to exact computation of Banzhaf indices instead of examining approximate solutions. We show that although computing Banzhaf indices of WVGs is a hard problem in general, it is

easy for various classes of WVGs, e.g., for WVGs with a bounded number of weight values, an important sub-class of WVGs.

1.2 Outline

Section 2 provides the preliminary definitions of terms used in the paper. The outline of the paper is as following. Section 3 identifies WVGs in which Banzhaf indices can be computed in constant time. In Section 4, we examine WVGs with a bounded number of weight values, and provide algorithms to compute the Banzhaf indices. Section 5 examines WVGs with special weight distributions. Section 6 considers WVGs with integer weights. We conclude with some open problems in the final section.

2 Preliminaries

We give definitions of key terms. The set of voters is $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Definitions 2.1. A *simple voting game* is a pair (N, v) with $v : 2^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ where $v(\emptyset) = 0$, $v(N) = 1$ and $v(S) \leq v(T)$ whenever $S \subseteq T$. A coalition $S \subseteq N$ is *winning* if $v(S) = 1$ and *losing* if $v(S) = 0$. A simple voting game can alternatively be defined as (N, W) where W is the set of winning coalitions.

Definition 2.2. The simple voting game (N, v) where $W = \{X \subseteq N, \sum_{x \in X} w_x \geq q\}$ is called a *weighted voting game*. A weighted voting game is denoted by $[q; w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]$ where w_i is the voting weight of player i . Usually, $w_i \geq w_j$ if $i < j$.

Generally, $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} w_i \leq q \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} w_i$ so that there can be no two disjoint winning coalitions. Such weighted voting games are termed *proper*.

Definitions 2.3. A player i is *critical* in a coalition S when $S \in W$ and $(S \setminus i) \notin W$. For each $i \in N$, we denote the number of coalitions in which i is critical in game v by $\eta_i(v)$. The *Banzhaf index* of player i in weighted voting game v is $\beta_i = \frac{\eta_i(v)}{\sum_{i \in N} \eta_i(v)}$. The *probabilistic Banzhaf index*, β'_i of player i in game v is $\eta_i(v)/2^{n-1}$. *Coleman's power of the collectivity to act*, A , is defined as the ratio of the number of winning coalitions w to 2^n : $A = w/2^n$.

The problem of computing the Banzhaf indices of a WVG can be defined formally as following:

Name: BI-WVG

Instance: WVG, $v = [q; w_1, \dots, w_n]$

Question: What are the Banzhaf indices of the players?

3 Extreme cases

If the WVG v is $[q; \underbrace{u, u, \dots, u}_n]$, then the Banzhaf indices β_1, \dots, β_n are equal to $1/n$. The Banzhaf

indices can be found in constant time, and the following theorem gives the actual number of swings for each player.

Theorem 3.1. *In a WVG with n equal weights, u , each player is critical in $\binom{n-1}{\lceil q/u \rceil - 1}$ coalitions. Moreover, the total number of winning coalitions w is $\sum_{i=\lceil q/u \rceil}^n \binom{n}{i}$.*

Proof. The minimum number of players needed to form a winning coalition is $\lceil q/u \rceil$. A player is critical in a coalition if there are exactly $\lceil q/u \rceil - 1$ other players in the coalition. There are $\binom{n-1}{\lceil q/u \rceil - 1}$ such coalitions. There are $\binom{n}{i}$ coalitions of size i and such a coalition is winning if $i \geq \lceil q/u \rceil$. \square \square

Also, in a WVG with n equal weights u , the probabilistic Banzhaf index of each player is then $\binom{n-1}{\lceil q/u \rceil - 1} / 2^{n-1}$. We can also compute Coleman's power of the collectivity to act, A , which is equal to $\frac{w}{2^n}$.

A *dictator* is a player who is present in every winning coalition and absent from every losing coalition. This means that the player 1 with the biggest weight is a dictator if and only if $w_1 \geq q$ and $\sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} w_i < q$. In that case, $\beta_1 = 1$ and $\beta_i = 0$ for all $i > 1$.

If $0 < q \leq w_n$ then the only minimal winning coalitions are all the singleton coalitions. So there are n minimal winning coalitions and every player is critical in one coalition. Thus, for all i , $\beta_i = 1/n$ and the Banzhaf indices can be found in constant time (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(1)$). Moreover, the probabilistic Banzhaf index $\beta'_i = 1/2^{n-1}$ for all i , and Coleman's power of collectivity to act $A = \frac{2^n - 1}{2^n}$.

If $q \geq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} w_i - w_n$, then the only minimal winning coalition is $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and it becomes losing if any player gets out of the coalition. Thus the weighted voting game acts like the unanimity game. Then for all i , $\beta_i = 1/n$. The Banzhaf indices can be found in constant time (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(1)$). Moreover, for all i , $\beta'_i = 1/2^{n-1}$ and $A = 1/2^n$.

4 Bounded number of weight values

In this section we estimate the time complexity of several algorithms. We start off with the case when all weights except one are equal and give exact formulas for the Banzhaf indices. We then use this as a warm up exercise to consider more general cases where there are 2 weight values and then k weight values.

4.1 All weights except one are equal

We start off with the case when all weights except one are equal.

Theorem 4.1. *Let v be a WVG, $[q; w_a, w_b, \dots, w_b]$, where there is w_a and m weights of value w_b , where $w_b < q$. Let x be $\lceil \frac{q-w_a}{w_b} \rceil$ and $y = \lceil q/w_b \rceil$. Then the total number of coalitions in which a player with weight w_b is critical is $\binom{m-1}{y-1} + \binom{m-1}{x}$. Moreover, the number of coalitions in which the player with weight w_a is critical is $\sum_{i=x}^{\text{Min}(y-1, m)} \binom{m}{i}$.*

Proof. A player with weight w_b is critical in 2 cases:

1. *It makes a winning coalition with other players with weight w_b only.* Let y be the minimum number of players with weight w_b which form a winning coalition by themselves. Thus $y = \lceil q/w_b \rceil$. The number of such coalitions in which a player with weight w_b can be critical is $\binom{m-1}{y-1}$.

2. It makes a winning coalition with the player with weight w_a and none or some players with weight w_b . Let x be the minimum number of players with weight w_b which can form a winning coalition with the inclusion of the player with weight w_a . Thus $x = \lceil \frac{q-w_a}{w_b} \rceil$. Then, the number of such coalitions in which a player with weight w_b can be critical is $\binom{m-1}{x}$.

The total number of swings for a player with weight w_b is thus $\binom{m-1}{y-1} + \binom{m-1}{x}$.

The player with weight w_a is critical if it forms a winning coalition with some players with weight w_b but the coalition becomes losing with its exclusion. The player with weight w_a can prove critical in coalition with varying number of players with weight w_b . The maximum number of players with weight w_b with which it forms a winning coalition and is also critical is $y - 1$ in case $y \leq m$ and m in case $y > m$. Therefore the total number of coalitions in which the player with weight w_a is critical is $\sum_{i=x}^{\text{Min}(y-1, m)} \binom{m}{i}$. \square \square

4.2 Only two different weight values

Unlike Theorem 4.1, we do not give a short formula for the Banzhaf values in the next theorem. However Theorem 4.2 considers a more general case than Theorem 4.1. As we shall we later Theorem 4.1 provides us with an idea to consider the case of k weight values.

Theorem 4.2. *For a WVG with n players and only two weight values, the Banzhaf indices and numbers of swings can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. We look at a WVG, $v = [q; w_a, \dots, w_a, w_b, \dots, w_b]$, where there are n_a players with weight w_a and n_b players with weight w_b . We analyse the situation when a player with weight w_a proves to be critical in a coalition which has i other players with weight w_a and the rest with weight w_b . Then the minimum number of players with weight w_b required is $\lceil \frac{q-(i+1)w_a}{w_b} \rceil$. Moreover the maximum number of players with w_b is $\lceil \frac{q-iw_a}{w_b} \rceil - 1$. Therefore j , the number of players with weight w_b , satisfies the following inequality: $x_1(i) = \lceil \frac{q-(i+1)w_a}{w_b} \rceil \leq j \leq \text{Min}(\lceil \frac{q-iw_a}{w_b} \rceil - 1, n_b) = x_2(i)$. Let $A_i = \binom{n_a-1}{i}$, and let $B_i = \sum_{j=x_1(i)}^{x_2(i)} \binom{n_b}{j}$. We define, the maximum possible number of extra players with weight a , to be $\text{max}_a = \text{Min}(\lceil q/w_a \rceil - 1, n_a - 1)$. Then the total number of swings of the player with weight w_a is $\sum_{i=0}^{\text{max}_a} A_i B_i$. The total number of swings for a player with weight w_b can be computed by a symmetric method. \square \square

We can devise an algorithm (Algorithm 2) from the method outlined in the proof.

Algorithm 1 SwingsFor2ValueWVG

Input: $v = [q; (n_a, w_a), (n_b, w_b)]$.

Output: Total swings of a player with weight w_a .

```
1: swingsa ← 0
2: maxa ← Min( $\lceil q/w_a \rceil - 1, n_a - 1$ )
3: for  $i = 0$  to maxa do
4:    $x_1(i) \leftarrow \lceil \frac{q - (i+1)w_a}{w_b} \rceil$ 
5:    $x_2(i) \leftarrow \text{Min}(\lceil \frac{q - i(w_a)}{w_b} \rceil - 1, n_b)$ 
6:    $A_i \leftarrow \binom{n_a - 1}{i}$ 
7:   if  $x_1(i) > n_b$  then
8:      $B_i \leftarrow 0$ 
9:   else if  $x_2(i) < 0$  then
10:     $B_i \leftarrow 0$ 
11:   else
12:     $B_i \leftarrow 0$ 
13:    for  $j = x_1(i)$  to  $x_2(i)$  do
14:       $B_i \leftarrow B_i + \binom{n_b}{j}$ 
15:    end for
16:   end if
17:   swingsa = swingsa +  $A_i B_i$ 
18: end for
19: return swingsa
```

Algorithm 2 BIsFor2ValueWVG

Input: $v = [q; (n_a, w_a), (n_b, w_b)]$.

Output: Banzhaf indices, $\beta = (\beta_a, \beta_b)$.

```
1: swingsa = SwingsFor2ValueWVG( $v$ )
2:  $v' = [q; (n_b, w_b), (n_a, w_a)]$ 
3: swingsb = SwingsFor2ValueWVG( $v'$ )
4: totalswings =  $n_a \text{swings}_a + n_b \text{swings}_b$ 
5:  $\beta_a = \frac{\text{swings}_a}{\text{totalswings}}$ 
6:  $\beta_b = \frac{\text{swings}_b}{\text{totalswings}}$ 
7: return  $(\beta_a, \beta_b)$ 
```

The algorithm for 2 weight values serves as warm-up for the general case of k weight values in the next section.

4.3 k weight values

Theorem 4.3. *The problem of computing Banzhaf indices of a WVG with k possible values of the weights is solvable in $O(n^k)$.*

Proof. We can represent a WVG v with k weight classes as follows:

$$[q; (n_1, w_1), (n_2, w_1), \dots, (n_k, w_k)]$$

where n_i is the number of players with weights w_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Here, we extend Algorithm 2 to Algorithm 4 for k weight classes.

We can write v' as $[q; (1, w_0), (n_1 - 1, w_1), \dots, (n_k, w_k)]$ where $w_0 = w_1$. This makes it simpler to write a recursive function to compute the number of swings of player with weight w_0 . Let A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m} be the number of swings for w_0 where there are i_j players with weight w_j in the coalition for $1 \leq j \leq m$.

Then

$$A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k} = \begin{cases} \binom{n_1 - 1}{i_1} (\prod_{j=2}^k \binom{n_j}{i_j}) & \text{if } q - w_0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^k i_j w_j < q \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now for $1 \leq m \leq k$,

$$A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m-1}} = \sum_{i_m} A_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m}.$$

Here the summation is taken over all values of i_m for which the contribution is non-zero. Explicitly, this range is given by

$$\text{Max}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{q - w_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} i_j w_j - \sum_{j=m+1}^k n_j w_j}{w_m} \right\rfloor, 0\right) \leq i_m \leq \text{Min}\left(\left\lfloor \frac{q - \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} i_j w_j}{w_m} \right\rfloor - 1, n_m\right).$$

The total number of swings of the player with weight w_0 is then A_ϵ .

□

Algorithm 3 SwingsForWVG

Input: $v = [q; (n_1, w_1), (n_1, w_1), \dots, (n_k, w_k)]$.

Output: Total number of swings, swings_0 , of a player with weight w_1 .

- 1: $w_0 = w_1$
 - 2: $v' = [q; (1, w_0), (n - 1, w_1), \dots, (n_k, w_k)]$
 - 3: $\text{swings}_0 = A_\epsilon$
 - 4: **return** swings_0
-

Algorithm 4 BIsFor-k-ValueWVG

Input: $v = [q; (n_1, w_1), (n_1, w_1), \dots, (n_k, w_k)]$.

Output: Banzhaf indices, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$.

- 1: $\text{swings}_1 = \text{SwingsForWVG}(v)$
 - 2: $\text{totalswings} \leftarrow 0$
 - 3: **for** $i = 2$ to k **do**
 - 4: $v = \text{Swap}(v, (n_1, w_1)(n_i, w_i))$
 - 5: $\text{swings}_i = \text{SwingsForWVG}(v)$
 - 6: $\text{totalswings} \leftarrow \text{totalswings} + n_i \text{swings}_i$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **for** $i = 1$ to k **do**
 - 9: $\beta_i = \frac{\text{swings}_i}{\text{totalswings}}$
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **return** $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$
-

We note that the exact computational complexity of BI-WVG for a WVG with k weight values is $\mathcal{O}(k(\frac{n}{k})^k)$ where $(\frac{n}{k})^k \geq n_1 \cdots n_k$. None of the algorithms presented for WVGs with bounded weight values extends naturally for multiple weighted voting games.

5 Distribution of weights

5.1 Geometric sequence of weights, and unbalanced weights

Definition 5.1. An r -geometric WVG $[q; w_1, \dots, w_n]$ is a WVG where $w_i \geq r w_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

We observe that in a 2-geometric WVG (such as $[q; 2^n, 2^{n-1}, \dots, 1]$), for any target sum of a coalition, we can use a greedy approach, trying to put bigger weights first, to come as close to the target as possible. This greedy approach was first identified by Chakravarty, Goel and Sastry [6] for a broader category of weighted voting games in which weights are *unbalanced*:

Definition 5.2. An *unbalanced WVG* is a WVG such that, for $1 \leq j \leq n$, $w_j > w_{j+1} + w_{j+2} + \dots + w_n$.

Example 5.3. The game $[22; 18, 9, 4, 2, 1]$ is an example of an unbalanced WVG where each weight is greater than the sum of the subsequent weights.

Chakravarty, Goel and Sastry [6] showed that the greedy approach for unbalanced WVG with integer weights can help to compute all Banzhaf indices in $\mathcal{O}(n)$. We notice that the same algorithm can be used for an unbalanced WVG with real weights without any modification. In fact it is this property of ‘geometric weights’ being unbalanced which is the reason that we can find suitable coalitions for target sums so efficiently. We characterise those geometric sequences which give unbalanced WVGs:

Theorem 5.4. *If $r \geq 2$ then every r -geometric WVG is unbalanced.*

Proof. Let v be an r -geometric WVG. We prove by induction that $w_j > w_{j+1} + \dots + w_n$. This is true for $j = n$. Suppose it is true for all i , $j+1 \leq i \leq n$. Since v is r -geometric, $w_j \geq 2w_{j+1}$. But, $2w_{j+1} = w_{j+1} + w_{j+1} > w_{j+1} + w_{j+2} + \dots + w_n$. Therefore v is unbalanced. \square \square

Corollary 5.5. *For an r -geometric WVG v where $r \geq 2$, the Banzhaf indices of players in v can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time.*

Proof. Since the condition of $r \geq 2$ makes v an unbalanced WVG, then we can use the greedy algorithm from [6] which computes the Banzhaf indices in $\mathcal{O}(n)$. \square \square

Definition 5.6. A WVG is a k -unbalanced WVG if, for $1 \leq j \leq n$, $w_j > w_{j+k} + \dots + w_n$. So an unbalanced WVG is ‘1-unbalanced’.

Note that an r -geometric WVG is 2-unbalanced when $r \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.61803\dots = \varphi$, the golden ratio, since then

$$\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{r^3} + \dots < \frac{1}{r(r-1)} \leq 1 \text{ since } r(r-1) \geq \varphi(\varphi-1) = 1.$$

We check whether 2-unbalanced WVGs have properties similar to those of unbalanced WVGs.

Example 5.7. Consider a WVG v with $2m$ players and weights

$$3^{m-1}, 3^{m-1}, \dots, 3^j, 3^j, \dots, 3, 3, 1, 1.$$

It is easy to see that $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} 2 \cdot 3^i < 3^j$, so the game is 2-unbalanced.

In the unbalanced game, for each target coalition sum, there is either one corresponding coalition or none. This does not hold for 2-unbalanced WVGs. In Example 5.7 with target total $1 + 3 + \dots + 3^{m-1} = \frac{1}{2}(3^m - 1)$, there are exactly 2^m coalitions which give this target, namely those coalitions with exactly one player out of each equal pair.

We prove that even for the class of 2-unbalanced (instead of simply unbalanced WVGs) the problem of computing Banzhaf indices becomes NP-hard.

Theorem 5.8. *BI-WVG is NP-hard for the class of 2-unbalanced WVGs .*

Proof. We will use a reduction from the following NP-hard problem:

Name: *SUBSET SUM*

Instance: $z_1, \dots, z_m, T \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Are there x_j s in $\{0, 1\}$ so that $\sum_{j=1}^m x_j z_j = T$?

For the reduction from SUBSET SUM, we scale and modify the weights from the WVG v of Example 5.7. For any instance $I = \{z_1, \dots, z_m, T\}$ of SUBSET SUM, we will define a game v_I with $2m + 1$ players. Let $Z = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m z_j$, and we may assume that $T < Z$. Whereas v had pairs of weights $3^j, 3^j$ for $0 \leq j \leq m - 1$, in v_I there is one “unit player” with weight 1 and $2m$ pairs of players with weights $3^j Z, 3^j Z + z_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq m - 1$. The quota for v_I is $\frac{1}{2}(3^m - 1)Z + T + 1$. The unit player has nonzero Banzhaf index if and only if there exists a coalition among the other $2m$ players with weight exactly $\frac{1}{2}(3^m - 1)Z + T$. We will show that to determine this is equivalent to answering the SUBSET SUM instance I , and so even this special case of BI-WVG is NP-hard.

In Example 5.7, it was necessary (and sufficient) for achieving the target total of $\frac{1}{2}(3^m - 1)$ to take exactly one player from each pair. In game v_I , since $\sum_{j=1}^m z_j < Z$, this is still a necessary condition for achieving the total of $\frac{1}{2}(3^m - 1)Z + T$, and whether or not there is such a selection achieving the total is exactly the condition of whether there is a subset of the z_j s which sums to T . $\square \square$

5.2 Sequential weights

Definition 5.9. The set of weights $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$ is *sequential* if

$$w_n | w_{n-1} | w_{n-2} \dots | w_1,$$

i.e. each weight is a multiple of the next weight.

Example 5.10. $[32; 20, 10, 10, 5, 1, 1, 1]$ is an example of a WVG with sequential weights.

Chakravarty, Goel and Sastry [6] show that Banzhaf indices can be computed in $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time if the weights are sequential and they satisfy an additional dominance condition. The dominance conditions states that a weight in one weight class should be more than the sum of weights of any subsequent weight class.

Definition 5.11. Let $d_1 > d_2 > \dots > d_r$ be the distinct values of weights w_1, \dots, w_n of a sequential set. Then $d_k = m_k d_{k+1}$ where $m_k > 1, \forall k, 1 \leq k < r$. Let $N_k = \{i \mid w_i = d_k\}$ and $n_k = |N_k|$. Then the *dominance condition* holds if $m_k > n_{k+1} \forall k, 1 \leq k < r$.

We now define the alternative dominance condition for WVGs.

Definition 5.12. Let $d_1 > d_2 > \dots > d_r$ be the distinct values of weights w_1, \dots, w_n of a sequential set. Let $N_k = \{i \mid w_i = d_k\}$ and $n_k = |N_k|$. Then the *alternative dominance condition* holds if $\forall j \in N_k, 1 \leq k < r, w_j > \sum\{w_p \mid p \in N_i, i > k\}$.

We provide an alternative dominance condition for weights which are not necessarily sequential. It is easy to see that a 2-unbalanced WVG does not necessarily satisfy the alternative dominance condition.

Definition 5.13. Let $d_1 > d_2 > \dots > d_r$ be the distinct values of weights w_1, \dots, w_n of a sequential set. Let $N_k = \{i \mid w_i = d_k\}$ and $n_k = |N_k|$. Then the *alternative dominance condition* holds if $\forall j \in N_k, 1 \leq k < r, w_j > \sum\{w_p \mid p \in N_i, i > k\}$.

Proposition 5.14. *Suppose a WVG v satisfies the alternative dominance condition. Then for v , BI-WVG has time complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 10 in [6] where the proof is for a sequential WVG which obeys the dominance condition. However we notice that since the argument in the proof can be made for any WVG which satisfies the alternative dominance condition, the proposition holds for v . \square \square

6 Integer weights

When all weights are integers, other methods may become applicable.

6.1 Moderate sized integer weights

Matsui and Matsui [12] prove that a dynamic programming approach provides a pseudo-polynomial algorithm to compute Banzhaf indices of all players with time complexity $\mathcal{O}(n^2q)$. Since q is less than $\sum_{i \in N} w_i$, the Banzhaf indices can be computed in polynomial time if the weight sizes are moderate.

6.2 Polynomial number of coefficients in the generating function of the WVG

A generating function is a formal power series whose coefficients encode information about a sequence. Bilbao et al. [4] observe, for a WVG $v = [q; w_1, \dots, w_n]$, that if the number of coalitions for which a player i is critical is $b_i = |\{S \subset N : v(S) = 0, v(S \cup \{i\}) = 1\}| = \sum_{k=q-w_i}^{q-1} b_k^i$, where b_k^i is the number of coalitions which do not include i and with total weight k , then the generating functions of the numbers $\{b_k^i\}$ are given by $B_i(x) = \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^n (1 + x^{w_j}) = 1 + b_1^i x + b_2^i x^2 + \dots + b_{W-w_i}^i x^{W-w_i}$. This was first pointed out by Brams and Affuso [5].

Example 6.1. Let $v = [6; 5, 4, 1]$ be a WVG.

- $B_1(x) = (1 + x^4)(1 + x^1) = 1 + x + x^4 + x^5$

The coalitions in which player 1 is critical are $\{1, 2\}$, $\{1, 3\}$, $\{1, 2, 3\}$. Therefore $\eta_1 = 3$.

- $B_2(x) = (1 + x^5)(1 + x^1) = 1 + x + x^5 + x^6$ The coalition in which player 2 is critical is $\{1, 2\}$. Therefore $\eta_2 = 1$.

- $B_3(x) = (1 + x^5)(1 + x^4) = 1 + x^4 + x^5 + x^9$

The coalition in which player 3 is critical is $\{1, 3\}$. Therefore $\eta_3 = 1$.

Consequently, $\beta_1 = 3/5$, $\beta_2 = 1/5$ and $\beta_3 = 1/5$.

The generating function method provides an efficient way of computing Banzhaf indices if the voting weights are moderate integers. Bilbao et al. [4] prove that the computational complexity of computing Banzhaf indices by generating functions is $\mathcal{O}(n^2C)$ where C is the number of non-zero coefficients in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + x^{w_i})$. We note that C can be bounded by the sum of the weights but the bound is not tight. C can be relatively small even if the weight values are exponential in n . Therefore if a *WVG* has a generating function in which the number of non-zero terms is polynomial in n , then the computational complexity of computing the Banzhaf indices is in P .

7 Open problems & conclusion

Table 1 contains a summary of the algorithms or complexity results for different classes of *WVGs*. A&P refers to Aziz and Paterson. In this paper we have classified *WVGs* for which Banzhaf indices can be computed in polynomial time. It would be interesting to identify further important classes of *WVGs* which have less than exponential time complexity. The extensive literature on the SUBSET-SUM problem should offer guidance here. It appears an interesting question to analyse the expected number of terms in the generating function for sequential *WVGs*. Another challenging open problem is to devise an algorithm to compute exactly the Banzhaf indices of a general *WVG* in time complexity which is less than $\mathcal{O}(n^2 2^{\frac{n}{2}})$.

Table 1: Complexity of *WVG* classes

WVG Class	R/Z	Complexity Class	Time	Remarks
General	R/Z	NP-Hard	$\mathcal{O}(n^2 1.415^n)$	[10]
Unbalanced	R/Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	[6]
k-Unbalanced ($k \geq 2$)	R/Z	NP-Hard		A&P [3]
Sequential with dominance	R/Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n^2)$	[6]
Alternative dominance	R/Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	A&P [3] + [6]
Bounded(k) #(weight values)	R/Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n^k)$	A&P [3]
r-geometric	R/Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n)$	A&P [3] + [6]
Moderate integer weights	Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n^2 q)$	[12]
Moderate GF	Z	P	$\mathcal{O}(n^2 C)$	[5], [4]

References

- [1] E. Algaba, J. M. Bilbao, and J. R. Fernandez. The distribution of power in the *European Constitution*. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 176(3):1752–1755, 2007.
- [2] H. Aziz, M. Paterson, and D. Leech. Efficient algorithm for designing weighted voting games. *Multitopic Conference, 2007. INMIC 2007. IEEE International*, pages 1–6, Dec. 2007.
- [3] H. Aziz and Mike Paterson. Classification of computationally tractable weighted voting games. *Lecture Notes in Engineering and Computer Science, World Congress on Engineering*, 1:129–134, 2008.
- [4] J. M. Bilbao, J. R. Fernandez, A. Jimenez Losada, and J. J. Lopez. Generating functions for computing power indices efficiently. *citeseer.ist.psu.edu/452269.html*, 2000.
- [5] S. F. Brams and P. J. Affuso. Power and size: A new paradox. *Theory and Decision*, 7:29–56, 1976.
- [6] N. Chakravarty, A. M. Goel, and T. Sastry. Easy weighted majority games. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 40(2):227–235, September 2000.
- [7] D. Felsenthal and M. Machover. *The Measurement of Voting Power*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK, 1998.
- [8] G. Gambarelli. Power indices for political and financial decision making: A review. *Annals of Operations Research*, 51:1572–9338, 1994.
- [9] E. Horowitz and S. Sahni. Computing partitions with applications to the knapsack problem. *J. ACM*, 21(2):277–292, 1974.
- [10] B. Klinz and G. J. Woeginger. Faster algorithms for computing power indices in weighted voting games. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 49(1):111–116, 2005.
- [11] D. Leech. An empirical comparison of the performance of classical power indices. *Political Studies*, 50(1):1–22, 2002.
- [12] T. Matsui and Y. Matsui. A survey of algorithms for calculating power indices of weighted majority games. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, 43(7186), 2000.
- [13] B. Parhami. Voting: A paradigm for adjudication and data fusion in dependable systems. In H. B. Diab and A. Y. Zomaya, editors, *Dependable Computing Systems: Paradigms, Performance Issues, & Applications*, pages 87–114. Wiley, 2005.
- [14] K. Prasad and J. S. Kelly. NP-completeness of some problems concerning voting games. *Int. J. Game Theory*, 19(1):1–9, 1990.
- [15] A. Taylor and W. Zwicker. *Simple Games: Desirability Relations, Trading, Pseudoweightings*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey, first edition edition, 1999.
- [16] A. B. Urken. Social choice theory and distributed decision making. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOIS and IEEECS TC-OA 1988 Conference on Office Information Systems*, pages 158–168, New York, NY, USA, 1988. ACM Press.

- [17] J. von Neumann. Probabilistic logics and synthesis of reliable organisms from unreliable components. In C. Shannon and J. McCarthy, editors, *Automata Studies*, pages 43–98. Princeton University Press, 1956.

HARIS AZIZ

*Department of Computer Science, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.
haris.aziz@warwick.ac.uk.*

MIKE PATERSON

*Department of Computer Science, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.
msp@dcs.warwick.ac.uk.*