

Small One-Dimensional Euclidean Preference Profiles

Jiehua Chen

Sven Grottko

October 17, 2018

Abstract

We characterize one-dimensional Euclidean preference profiles with a small number of alternatives and voters. In particular, we show the following.

- Every preference profile with up to two voters is one-dimensional Euclidean if and only if it is single-peaked.
- Every preference profile with up to five alternatives is one-dimensional Euclidean if and only if it is single-peaked and single-crossing.

By [12], we thus obtain that the smallest single-peaked and single-crossing preference profiles that are *not* one-dimensional Euclidean consist of three voters and six alternatives.

JEL classification D81 D72

1 Introduction

The one-dimensional Euclidean preference domain (also known as the unidimensional unfolding domain) is a spatial model of structured preferences which originates from economics [16, 15], political sciences [20, 6, 4], and psychology [13, 5]. In this domain, the alternatives and the voters are points in a one-dimensional space, *i.e.* on the real line, such that the preference of each voter towards an alternative decreases as the Euclidean distance between their points increases.

One-dimensional Euclidean preferences are necessarily single-peaked [2] and single-crossing [19] as proven by Coombs [13], Doignon and Falmagne [14], Chen et al. [12]. The reverse, however, does not hold. In his work, Coombs [13] provided a sample preference profile with 16 voters and 6 alternatives that is single-peaked and single-crossing, but *not* one-dimensional Euclidean. This counterexample appears to be quite large for real world scenarios. For instance, in rank aggregation or winner determination elections, one typically either has few alternatives to begin with, or may consolidate first make a shortlist of only a few alternatives out of many, which will be considered for the final decision. There are also settings where only a few voters are involved, as for instance in a hiring committee or when planning holidays for a family. Hence, a natural question arising in the context of one-dimensional Euclidean preferences is whether for profiles with less than 16 voters or less than 6 alternatives, being single-peaked and single-crossing is sufficient to guarantee a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding. In other words, we are interested in the following question: Are there tight upper bounds on the number of alternatives or voters such that profiles within these bounds are one-dimensional Euclidean as long as they are single-peaked and single-crossing? Recently, Chen et al. [12] provided a single-peaked and single-crossing profile with three voters and six alternatives that is not one-dimensional Euclidean. In this paper, we show that this counterexample is indeed minimal in terms of the number of voters and the number of alternatives. In terms of the number of voters, we provide an algorithm that constructs a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding

for any single-peaked preference profile with two voters (see Algorithm 1). As for the number of alternatives, we show via computer program that all single-peaked and single-crossing preferences with up to five alternatives are one-dimensional Euclidean (see Theorem 3). We refer to the work of Bredereck et al. [8] and the literature cited there for further discussion of the single-peaked and the single-crossing preference domains.

Paper outline. In Section 2, we introduce necessary definitions, including single-peaked and single-crossing preferences, and the one-dimensional Euclidean representation. We also discuss some fundamental observations regarding these domain restrictions. In Section 3, we formulate our first main result in Theorems 1 and 2. We prove this result by providing an algorithm (see Algorithm 1) that constructs a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding for any two preference orders which are single-peaked. At the end of the section, we provide an example to illustrate Algorithm 1 (see Example 3). In Section 4, we provide our second main result by describing the computer program that finds all possible preference profiles with up to five alternatives that are both single-peaked and single-crossing, and uses the publicly available CPLEX solver to provide a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding for each of these profiles (see Theorem 3). The code and the embeddings for all produced profiles are available from <https://tubcloud.tu-berlin.de/s/rSNKkm8dtPkRKnE> and <https://tubcloud.tu-berlin.de/s/ArdQzFd8J6L5YFN>, respectively.

2 Definitions and notations

Let $\mathcal{A} := \{1, \dots, m\}$ be a set of alternatives. A *preference order* \succ over \mathcal{A} is a linear order over \mathcal{A} ; a linear order is a binary relation which is total, irreflexive, asymmetric, and transitive. Given a preference order \succ , we use \succeq to denote the binary relation which includes \succ and preserves the reflexivity, *i.e.* $\succeq := \succ \cup \{(a, a) \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. An alternative c is *the most preferred alternative in* \succ if for each alternative $b \in \mathcal{A}$ it holds that $a \succeq b$. For two distinct alternatives a and b , the relation $a \succ b$ means that a is strictly preferred to (or in other words, ranked higher than) b . The notion $\{a, b\} \succ_i c$ means that both a and b are strictly preferred to (or in other words, ranked higher than) c , but the preference relation between alternatives a and b is arbitrary but unique.

A *preference profile* \mathcal{P} specifies the preference orders of some voters over some alternatives. Formally, $\mathcal{P} := (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{R} := (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n))$, where \mathcal{A} denotes the set of m alternatives, \mathcal{V} denotes the set of n voters, and \mathcal{R} is a collection of n preference orders such that each voter $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ ranks the alternatives according to the preference order \succ_i on \mathcal{A} . We also assume that no two voters in a preference profile have the same preference orders.

2.1 Single-peaked preferences

The single-peaked property was introduced by Black [3] and has since been studied extensively.

Definition 1 (single-peaked property).

A preference order \succ on a set \mathcal{A} of alternatives is *single-peaked* with respect to a linear order \triangleright of the alternatives if for its most preferred alternative a^* and for each two distinct alternatives $b, c \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a^*\}$ it holds that

$$\text{if } c \triangleright b \triangleright a^* \text{ or } a^* \triangleright b \triangleright c, \text{ then } b \succ c.$$

A preference profile with voter set \mathcal{V} , is *single-peaked* if there is a linear order \triangleright of alternatives such that the preference order of each voter from \mathcal{V} is single-peaked with respect to \triangleright .

Slightly abusing the terminology, we say that two preference orders are *single-peaked* if there is a linear order with respect to which each of these two preference orders is single-peaked.

The single-peaked property can be characterized by two forbidden subprofiles, worst-diverse configurations and α -configurations [1]. The former is defined on three preference orders while the latter is defined on two preference orders. By the α -configuration, for two arbitrary preference orders \succ_1 and \succ_2 , we can observe the following.

Lemma 1. *Two preference orders, denoted as \succ_1 and \succ_2 , on the set \mathcal{A} are single-peaked if and only if for all four distinct alternatives $x, y, z, w \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x \succ_1 y \succ_1 z$ and $z \succ_2 y \succ_2 x$ it holds that $y \succ_1 w$ or $y \succ_2 w$.*

2.2 Single-crossing property

Single-crossing profiles date back to the seventies, when Mirrlees [18] and Roberts [19] observed that voters voting on income taxation may form a linear order such that between each two tax rates, the voters along the order either all agree on the relative positions of both rates, or there is one spot where the voters switch from preferring one rate to preferring the other rate.

Definition 2 (single-crossing property).

A linear order of voters is *single-crossing with respect to a pair $\{a, b\}$ of alternatives*, if there is at most one voter in this order such that all voters ordered ahead of this voter strictly prefer a to b , and all voters *not* ordered ahead of this voters strictly prefer b to a .

A linear order of voters is a *single-crossing order*, if it is single-crossing with respect to every possible pair of alternatives. A preference profile is *single-crossing* if it allows a single-crossing order of the voters.

The single-crossing property can be characterized by two forbidden subprofiles, γ -configurations and δ -configurations [7].

2.3 One-dimensional Euclidean representation

Definition 3 (one-dimensional Euclidean representation).

Let $\mathcal{P} := (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V} := \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}, \mathcal{R} := (\succ_1, \dots, \succ_n))$ be a preference profile. Let $E: \mathcal{A} \cup V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an embedding of the alternatives and the voters into the real line where each two distinct alternatives $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ have different values, that is, $E(a) \neq E(b)$. A voter $v_i \in V$ is *one-dimensional Euclidean* with respect to E if for each two distinct alternatives $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ voter v_i strictly prefers the one closer to him, that is,

$$\text{if } a \succ_i b, \text{ then } |E(a) - E(v_i)| < |E(b) - E(v_i)|.$$

An embedding E of the alternatives and voters is a *one-dimensional Euclidean representation* of profile \mathcal{P} if each voter in V is *one-dimensional Euclidean* with respect to E .

A profile is *one-dimensional Euclidean* if it has a one-dimensional Euclidean representation.

The one-dimensional Euclidean definition implies the following.

Observation 1 ([12]). *A voter $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ is one-dimensional Euclidean with respect to an embedding E of the alternatives and voters if and only if for each two distinct alternatives a and b with $a \succ_i b$ it holds that if $E(a) < E(b)$ then $E(v_i) < \frac{1}{2}(E(a) + E(b))$; otherwise $E(v_i) > \frac{1}{2}(E(a) + E(b))$.*

The following observation regarding the relation between single-peaked and single-crossing profiles and the one-dimensional Euclidean representation is also known from the literature [13, 14, 12].

Observation 2. *If a profile is one-dimensional Euclidean, then it is also single-peaked and single-crossing.*

Proof. It is straight-forward to see that if there is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation E of a given profile, then this profile is single-peaked with respect to the order induced by ordering the alternatives according to their values in E . Moreover, it is single-crossing with respect to the order induced by ordering the voters according to their values in E . \square

3 Single-peaked profiles with two voters are one-dimensional Euclidean

In this section, we formulate and prove our first main result.

Theorem 1. *Given a profile with two voters v_1 and v_2 whose preference orders \succ_1 and \succ_2 are single-peaked, Algorithm 1 returns a one-dimensional Euclidean representation of this profile.*

We can conclude the following from Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *A profile \mathcal{P} with two voters is one-dimensional Euclidean if and only if it is single-peaked.*

Proof. The “only if” part follows from Observation 2 and the “if” part follows from Theorem 1. \square

In the remainder of this section, we show the correctness of Theorem 1.

3.1 Algorithm 1 and some technical results

The general idea behind the algorithm in Theorem 1 is to first embed all *inner* alternatives that are ranked by both voters v_1 and v_2 between a_1 and b_1 , and embed voter v_1 (resp. v_2) to the left of alternative a_1 (resp. to right of alternative b_1). Then, the algorithm extends the embedding by successively embedding some appropriately selected alternatives to the left or to the right of the already embedded alternatives so as to obtain an extended embedding with respect to which one of the voters is one-dimensional Euclidean. The single-peaked property, according to Lemma 1, guarantees that the extension by these alternatives remains a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for the other voter.

We introduce the following notion.

Definition 4 (Inner alternatives). Let \succ_1 and \succ_2 be two preference orders, and let a_1 and b_1 be the most preferred alternatives of \succ_1 and \succ_2 , respectively. The *set of inner alternatives of \succ_1 and \succ_2* , denoted as $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, is the set of all alternatives that are ranked between a_1 and b_1 by both \succ_1 and \succ_2 :

$$\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2) := \{c \mid c \succeq_1 b_1 \wedge c \succeq_2 a_1\}.$$

Example 1. Consider two preference orders \succ_1 and \succ_2 with $1 \succ_1 2 \succ_1 3 \succ_1 4$ and $3 \succ_2 4 \succ_2 1 \succ_2 2$. The set of inner alternatives by \succ_1 and \succ_2 is $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2) = \{1, 3\}$.

Algorithm 1: Algorithm for computing a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding for two preference orders, one with $a_1 \succ_1 a_2 \succ_1 \dots \succ_1 a_m$ and the other $b_1 \succ_2 b_2 \succ_2 \dots \succ_2 b_m$.

```

Input:
   $a_1 \succ_1 a_2 \succ_1 \dots \succ_1 a_m$  — voter  $v_1$ 's preference order
   $b_1 \succ_2 b_2 \succ_2 \dots \succ_2 b_m$  — voter  $v_2$ 's preference order
Output: Embeddings  $E: \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \cup \{v_1, v_2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 

1 Embed( $\succ_1, \succ_2$ ):
   /* Initialize the embedding by starting with the voters and the 'inner' alternatives. */
2   Let  $p \leftarrow 1$ 
3   for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  do
4     if  $b_i \succeq_1 b_1 \wedge b_i \succeq_2 a_1$  then
5       |  $E(b_i) = p$ 
6       |  $p \leftarrow p + 1$ 
7    $E(v_2) = 0$ 
8    $E(v_1) = p$ 
9   repeat
10     $s_1 \leftarrow \text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$ 
11     $s_2 \leftarrow \text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$ 
12    if  $s_1 = \text{false} \wedge s_2 = \text{false}$  then
13      | Fallback()
14  until  $E(c)$  defined for all alternative  $c$ 
   /* Refine positions for preference order  $\succ$  */
15 Refine( $\succ: c_1 \succ \dots \succ c_m, v \in \{v_1, v_2\}$ ):
16    $j \leftarrow \arg \min\{x \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \mid E(c_x) = \text{undefined}\}$ 
17    $i \leftarrow \arg \min\{x \in \{j + 1, j + 2, \dots, m\} \mid E(c_x) = \text{defined}\}$ 
18   if  $i$  exists then
19     |  $\text{dist}(j - 1) \leftarrow |E(v) - E(c_{j-1})|$ 
20     |  $\text{dist}(i) \leftarrow |E(v) - E(c_i)|$ 
21     | for  $k = j, j + 1, \dots, i - 1$  do
22       | if  $v = v_1$  then
23         | |  $E(c_k) \leftarrow E(v_1) + \text{dist}(j - 1) + \frac{\text{dist}(i) - \text{dist}(j-1)}{i - j + 1} \cdot (k - j + 1)$ 
24         | else
25         | |  $E(c_k) \leftarrow E(v_2) - \text{dist}(j - 1) - \frac{\text{dist}(i) - \text{dist}(j-1)}{i - j + 1} \cdot (k - j + 1)$ 
26       | return true
27   else
28     | return false
   /* Refine fall back */
29 Fallback():
30    $j \leftarrow \arg \min\{x \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \mid E(a_x) = \text{undefined}\}$ 
31   if  $j$  exists then
32     |  $E(a_j) \leftarrow E(v_1) + |E(v_1) - E(a_{j-1})| + 1$ 

```

We observe the following properties concerning the inner alternatives of two single-peaked preferences.

Lemma 2. Consider two preference orders \succ_1 and \succ_2 .

- (1) For each $r \in \{1, 2\}$, the most preferred alternative of \succ_r belongs to $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$.
- (2) For each two distinct inner alternatives $x, y \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ and for an arbitrary alternative z distinct from x and y it holds that if $z \succ_1 x$ and $z \succ_2 x$, then $z \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$.
- (3) If \succ_1 and \succ_2 are single-peaked, then for each two distinct inner alternatives $x, y \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ it holds that $x \succ_1 y$ if and only if $y \succ_2 x$.

Proof. The first statement follows from the definition of `inner`.

As to the second statement, since $x \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, if $z \succ_1 x$ and $z \succ_2 x$, then by the transitivity of preference orders, it follows that $z \succeq_1 b_1$ and $z \succeq_2 a_1$. By the definition of `inner`, we immediately have that $z \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$.

It remains to show the last statement. If $a_1 = b_1$, then by the definition of `inner` it holds that $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2) = \{a_1\} = \{b_1\}$, and the second statement holds immediately since $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ has only one alternative. Thus, let us assume that $a_1 \neq b_1$ so that $|\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)| \geq 2$. Let \succ_1 and \succ_2 be single-peaked. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there are two distinct alternatives $x, y \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ with $x \succ_1 y$ and $x \succ_2 y$ —the case with $y \succ_1 x$ and $y \succ_2 x$ works analogously. Since $a_1 \succ_1 b_1$ and $b_1 \succ_2 a_1$, it follows that $x, y \notin \{a_1, b_1\}$. By the definition of a_1 and b_1 and since $x, y \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, this implies that $a_1 \succ_1 x \succ_1 y \succ_1 b_1$ and $b_1 \succ_2 x \succ_2 y \succ_2 a_1$ —a contradiction to Lemma 1. \square

Now, we are ready to describe Algorithm 1. It consists of two parts, the initialization and the main loop. In the initialization, we embed all inner alternatives (see Lines 2–6) in such a way that the left-to-right (resp. the right-to-left) order corresponds to the preferences of v_2 (resp. v_1). By Lemma 2 (3), it follows that the most preferred alternative of v_1 , denoted as a_1 , is the right-most alternative, while the most preferred alternative of v_2 , denoted as b_1 , is the left-most alternative. Then, in Lines 7–8 we embed voter v_2 (resp. v_1) to the left of a_1 (resp. to the right of b_1). Summarizing, we observe the following about the initialization step.

Proposition 1. *Let E be the embedding constructed by the end of the initialization phase (Lines 2–8) of Algorithm 1. Let c_1, \dots, c_x be the embedded alternatives with $E(c_1) < \dots < E(c_x)$. The following holds.*

- (1) $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2) = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_x\}$ with $c_x = a_1$ and $c_1 = b_1$.
- (2) Voter v_2 prefers $c_1 \succ_2 c_2 \succ_2 \dots \succ_2 c_x$.
- (3) $E(v_1) - E(v_2) = |\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)| + 1$.
- (4) $E(v_2) < E(c_1)$ and $E(c_x) < E(v_1)$.
- (5) If \succ_1 and \succ_2 are single-peaked, then voter v_1 prefers $c_x \succ_1 c_{x-1} \succ_1 \dots \succ_1 c_1$.

Proof. The first three statements follow directly from Lines 3–6 and from the definition of $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$. Moreover, it holds that $E(c_1) = 1$, $E(c_x) = |\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)|$, $E(v_2) = 0$, and $E(v_1) = |\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)| + 1$. This implies the fourth statement.

As to the last statement, consider an arbitrary embedded alternative c_j with $j \in \{1, \dots, x-1\}$. Then, by the second statement, we have that $c_j \succ_2 c_{j+1}$. By Lemma 2(3), we have that $c_{j+1} \succ_1 c_j$. \square

After having embedded all inner alternatives, the main loop (Lines 9–14) extends the embedding by alternately placing alternatives that should be embedded to the right of the existing embedding and alternatives that should be embedded to the left of the existing embedding. The corresponding procedure is called `Refine()` (Lines 15–28) and is used for both voters v_1 and v_2 . It searches through the alternatives along the preference order of v_1 (resp. v_2), finds the first not-yet-embedded alternative(s) that are ranked between two consecutive embedded alternatives by v_1 (resp. v_2), and embeds them to the right (resp. left) of the right-most (resp. left-most) alternative. `Fallback()` in Line 13 guarantees that at least one alternative is embedded during each iteration, thus ensuring that the algorithm terminates.

In the following, we prove that our constructed embedding is indeed a one-dimensional Euclidean representation by showing that whenever the embedding at the beginning of an iteration of the main loop is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation with regard to the already embedded alternatives, the embedding at the end of the iteration is also a one-dimensional Euclidean representation. To this end, let $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_w\}$ be the alternatives that are embedded at the beginning of an iteration (Line 9) with $E(d_1) < E(d_2) < \dots < E(d_w)$, and assume that E is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for all alternatives from D . We introduce the following notation regarding the concept of a worst alternative among a given set of alternatives. Let $\text{worst}(D, v_1)$ (resp. $\text{worst}(D, v_2)$) denote the alternative from D that is least preferred by voter v_1 (resp. v_2) *i.e.*

$$\text{worst}(D, v_1) \in D \text{ with } (D \setminus \{a^*\}) \succ_1 a^*, \text{ and } \text{worst}(D, v_2) \in D \text{ with } (D \setminus \{b^*\}) \succ_2 b^*.$$

Example 2. Consider the following preferences of voters v_1 and v_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} v_1: & 1 \succ_1 4 \succ_1 2 \succ_1 3 \succ_1 5 \succ_1 6 \succ_1 7 \succ_1 8, \\ v_2: & 3 \succ_2 2 \succ_2 1 \succ_2 5 \succ_2 6 \succ_2 4 \succ_2 8 \succ_2 7. \end{aligned}$$

If $D = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then $\text{worst}(D, v_1) = 3$ and $\text{worst}(D, v_2) = 4$.

We introduce another notion called *no later than*.

Definition 5 (No later than). For two distinct alternatives x and y , we say that x is embedded no later than y if one of the following holds.

- (1) Alternatives x and y are both embedded during initialization.
- (2) They are both embedded in the same call to `Refine()`.
- (3) When y is to be embedded, $E(x)$ is already defined.

To show that each iteration (Lines 9–14) maintains the one-dimensional Euclidean property of the embedding, we observe the following useful properties.

Lemma 3. *Let x and y be two distinct alternatives with $x \succ_1 y$ and $x \succ_2 y$. Then, Algorithm 1 embeds x no later than y .*

Proof. If $y \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, then by Lemma 2 (2), it follows that $x \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, meaning that x and y are both embedded during the initialization, and that x is embedded no later than y .

Now, let us assume that $y \notin \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$. Consider the step when y was embedded. There are three cases.

If y has been embedded in Line 21 in a call to `Refine`(\succ_1, v_1), then let j and i be the indices as defined in that call such that $a_j \succeq_1 y \succ_1 a_i$. If $E(x)$ was defined, *i.e.* x has already been embedded, then by the definition of “no later than”, x is embedded no later than y . If $E(x)$ was not defined, then since a_j was defined as the first alternative that is not yet embedded, it follows that $a_j \succeq_1 x$. Since $x \succ_1 y$, it follows that $a_j \succ_1 x \succ_1 y \succ_1 a_i$, implying that x is embedded in the same call to `Refine` () as y . Thus, x is embedded no later than y .

Using a reasoning similar to the previous case, we can infer that x is also embedded no later than y when y has been embedded in call to `Refine`(\succ_2, v_2) because $x \succ_2 y$.

If y has been embedded in the subprocedure `Fallback`() in Line 13, meaning that it is also the only alternative that is embedded during that iteration, then line 30 guarantees that $E(x)$ was already defined, and thus, x is embedded no later than y . \square

The next lemma ensures that each alternative not from $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ is embedded by exactly one of the three subroutines— $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$, $\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$, or $\text{Fallback}()$.

Lemma 4. *Let \succ_1 and \succ_2 be two single-peaked preference orders. Consider an arbitrary not-yet-embedded alternative x , i.e. $x \notin D$. Then, $\text{worst}(D, \succ_1) \succ_1 x$ or $\text{worst}(D, \succ_2) \succ_2 x$.*

Proof. Let $a^* = \text{worst}(D, \succ_1)$ and $b^* = \text{worst}(D, \succ_2)$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that \succ_1 and \succ_2 are single-peaked but x is an alternative with $x \notin D$ such that

$$x \succ_1 a^* \text{ and } x \succ_2 b^*. \quad (1)$$

This implies that

$$a_1 \neq a^* \text{ and } b_1 \neq b^*, \quad (2)$$

as $a_1 \succ_1 x$ and $b_1 \succ_2 x$; recall that a_1 (resp. b_1) is the alternative most preferred by voter v_1 (resp. v_2). By Lemma 3 and since x is not yet embedded, the assumption (1) also implies that

$$v_1: b^* \succ_1 x \succ_1 a^* \text{ and } v_2: a^* \succ_2 x \succ_2 b^*, \text{ and thus,} \quad (3)$$

$$a^* \neq b^*. \quad (4)$$

By the definitions of a_1 and b_1 , we further infer that

$$v_1: a_1 \succeq_1 b^* \succ_1 x \succ_1 a^* \text{ and } v_2: b_1 \succeq_2 a^* \succ_2 x \succ_2 b^*. \quad (5)$$

We distinguish between two cases, in each case aiming to obtain $x \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ which is a contradiction to $x \notin D$ as $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2) \subseteq D$.

Case 1: If $a_1 = b^*$, then the preferences given in (5) are equivalent to

$$v_1: a_1 \succ_1 x \succ_1 a^* \text{ and } v_2: b_1 \succeq_2 a^* \succ_2 x \succ_2 a_1. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, $b_1 \neq a^*$ as otherwise $x \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ —a contradiction. Consequently, the preferences given in (6) imply that

$$v_1: a_1 \succ_1 x \succ_1 a^* \text{ and } v_2: b_1 \succ_2 a^* \succ_2 x \succ_2 a_1. \quad (7)$$

Since \succ_1 and \succ_2 are single-peaked, by Lemma 1 and by (7), we must have that $x \succ_1 b_1$. However, this implies that $x \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ since $x \succ_2 a_1$ —a contradiction.

Case 2: If $a_1 \neq b^*$, then the preferences given in (5) imply that

$$v_1: a_1 \succ_1 b^* \succ_1 x \succ_1 a^* \text{ and } v_2: b_1 \succeq_2 a^* \succ_2 x \succ_2 b^*. \quad (8)$$

Since \succ_1 and \succ_2 are single-peaked, by Lemma 1 and by (8), we must have that $x \succ_2 a_1$ and $x \succ_1 b_1$, implying that $x \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$ —a contradiction. \square

For two distinct alternatives that have not been embedded, we observe the following.

Lemma 5. *Let \succ_1 and \succ_2 be two single-peaked preference orders. Let x and y be two distinct alternatives that have not been embedded, i.e. $x, y \notin D$ with $x \neq y$. For each $r \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that if $x \succ_r y \succ_r \text{worst}(D, \succ_r)$, then $\text{worst}(D, \succ_s) \succ_s x \succ_s y$, where $s \in \{1, 2\} \setminus \{r\}$.*

Proof. Assume that $x \succ_r y \succ_r \text{worst}(D, \succ_r)$ holds. Let $\text{best}(\succ_r)$ be the most preferred alternative in the preference order \succ_r . Then, we have that

$$\text{best}(\succ_r) \succ_r x \succ_r y \succ_r \text{worst}(D, \succ_r). \quad (9)$$

By Lemma 4, it follows that $\text{worst}(D, \succ_s) \succ_s \{x, y\}$. Thus, it remains to show that $x \succ_s y$. Towards a contradiction, suppose that $y \succ_s x$. By the definition of $\text{worst}(D, \succ_s)$, voter v_s must have preferences

$$\{\text{best}(\succ_r), \text{worst}(D, \succ_r)\} \succeq_s \text{worst}(D, \succ_s) \succ_s y \succ_s x. \quad (10)$$

Together with (9), we have

$$\text{best}(r) \succ_r x \succ_r y \succ_r \text{worst}(D, \succ_r), \text{ and } \{\text{best}(r), \text{worst}(D, \succ_r)\} \succ_s y \succ_s x,$$

a contradiction to Lemma 1. \square

We observe the following for the subprocedure $\text{Refine}(\succ, v)$.

Lemma 6. *Let j and i be as defined in a call to $\text{Refine}(\succ, v)$. If E is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for the alternatives c_{j-1} and c_i and for the voter v so that the 1-Euclidean property is satisfied, then $|E(c_{j-1}) - E(v)| < |E(c_j) - E(v)| < \dots < |E(c_{i-1}) - E(v)| < |E(c_i) - E(v)|$.*

Proof. By the definitions of j and i , since the 1-Euclidean property is maintained for voter v , it holds that

$$\text{dist}(j-1) = |E(c_{j-1}) - E(v)| < |E(c_i) - E(v)| = \text{dist}(i), \quad (11)$$

Note that $\text{dist}(j-1)$ and $\text{dist}(i)$ are defined in Lines 19–20. From Lines 23–25, it is straightforward to verify that for each c_k with $j-1 \leq k \leq i$,

$$|E(c_k) - E(v)| = \text{dist}(j-1) + \frac{\text{dist}(i) - \text{dist}(j-1)}{i-j+1} \cdot (k-j+1) \quad (12)$$

Combining (12) with (11), we obtain the chain of inequalities in the lemma. \square

3.2 Correctness of Theorem 1

From Lemma 6, we know that $\text{Refine}(\succ, v)$ ensures the one-dimensional Euclidean property for voter v with regard to the already embedded and the newly added alternatives. Together with Lemmas 3 to 5, we are ready to show the correctness of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let \succ_1 and \succ_2 be single-peaked. First of all, by Proposition 1, the initialization phase computes a one-dimensional Euclidean representation of the two preference orders \succ_1 and \succ_2 when restricted to the inner alternatives $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$. Thus, to prove the correctness, we only need to show that each iteration of the main loop (Lines 9–14) returns an extended embedding that is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation of the embedded alternatives. To achieve this, we need to show that the procedures $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$, $\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$, and Lines 31–32 extend the existing one-dimensional Euclidean representation to one that is one-dimensional Euclidean with respect to the alternatives that have already been embedded and also with respect to those which are newly embedded. To this end, let D be the alternatives that are embedded at the beginning of an iteration, and assume that E is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for all alternatives

in D . Let $a^* = \text{worst}(D, v_1)$ (resp. $b^* = \text{worst}(D, v_2)$) denote the alternative from D that is least preferred by voter v_1 (resp. v_2). Let C be the set of alternatives that are to be embedded.

We distinguish between three cases.

Case 1: C has been embedded in a call to $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$. By the procedure $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$, the two embedded alternatives that the algorithm identifies are a_j and a_i such that $C = \{a_j, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$ and

$$a_j \succ_1 a_{j+1} \succ_1 \dots a_{i-1} \succ_1 a_i \succeq_1 a^*. \quad (13)$$

By assumption, the embedding E is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voters v_1 and v_2 and for the alternatives from D . By Lemma 6, it follows that E is also a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voter v_1 and for all alternatives from $D \cup C$. In particular, it holds that,

$$\forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}: |E(a_k) - E(v_1)| < |E(a_{k+1}) - E(v_1)|. \quad (14)$$

It remains to show that E is also a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voter v_2 and for all alternatives from $D \cup C$. Using Lemma 5 on the preferences in (13), voter v_2 must have preferences $b^* \succ_2 a_j \succ_2 a_{j+1} \succ_2 \dots \succ_2 a_{i-1}$. By the embedding of the alternatives from C (Line 23), for each alternative a_k with $j \leq k \leq i-1$ it holds that

$$E(v_2) < E(v_1) < E(a_k) < E(a_{k+1}), \quad (15)$$

implying that $|E(a_k) - E(v_2)| < |E(a_{k+1}) - E(v_2)|$. Thus, to show that E remains a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voter v_2 regarding the alternatives from $D \cup C$, we only need to show that $|E(b^*) - E(v_2)| < |E(a_j) - E(v_2)|$. Now, if we can show that

$$b^* \succeq_1 a_{j-1}, \quad (16)$$

then we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} |E(b^*) - E(v_2)| &\leq |E(b^*) - E(v_1)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(16)}{<} |E(a_{j-1}) - E(v_1)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(14)}{<} |E(a_j) - E(v_1)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(15)}{=} |E(a_j) - E(v_2)|, \end{aligned}$$

which is what we needed to show.

Thus, the only task remained is to show that (16) holds. We distinguish between two cases. If $b^* \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, then $b^* \succeq_2 a_1$. By the definition of b^* , this implies $b^* = a_1$, and thus $b^* \succeq_1 a_{j-1}$ as a_1 is the first alternative in \succ_1 .

If $b^* \notin \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, then b^* was embedded during a previous iteration of the main loop. Let us consider this iteration where b^* was embedded. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $a_{j-1} \succ_1 b^*$. By the definition of a_j , it follows that $a_j \succ_1 a_{j+1} \succ_1 \dots \succ_1 a_{i-1} \succ_1 b^*$. Since a_j will be embedded later than b^* , it follows that $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$ returned false. However, $\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$ also returned false since no alternative $b_{i'}$ exists that is embedded before b^* such that $b^* \succ_2 b_{i'}$. Finally, the subprocedure $\text{Fallback}()$ in Line 13 could not have applied since there a_j remained unembedded during this iteration but $a_j \succ_1 b^*$. Thus, there is no way b^* could have been embedded — a contradiction. Summarizing, we have shown that $b^* \succeq_1 a_{j-1}$. This completes the proof for the first case.

Case 2: C has been embedded in a call to $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$. The reasoning is very similar to the one for Case 1. The two embedded alternatives identified by the algorithm are b_j and b_i such that $C = \{b_j, b_{j+1}, \dots, b_{i-1}\}$ and

$$b_j \succ_2 b_{j+1} \succ_2 \dots b_{i-1} \succ_2 b_i \succeq_2 b^*. \quad (17)$$

By assumption, the embedding E is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voters v_1 and v_2 and for the alternatives from D . By Lemma 6, it follows that E is also a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voter v_2 and for all alternatives from $D \cup C$. In particular, it holds that,

$$\forall k \in \{1, 2, \dots, i-1\}: |E(b_k) - E(v_1)| < |E(b_{k+1}) - E(v_1)|. \quad (18)$$

It remains to show that E is also a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voter v_1 and for all alternatives from $D \cup C$. Using Lemma 5 on the preferences in (17), voter v_1 must have preferences $a^* \succ_1 b_j \succ_1 b_{j+1} \succ_1 \dots \succ_1 b_{i-1}$. By the embedding of the alternatives from C (Line 23), for each alternative b_k with $j \leq k \leq i-1$ it holds that

$$E(b_{k'}) < E(b_k) < E(v_2) < E(v_1), \quad (19)$$

implying that $|E(b_k) - E(v_1)| < |E(b_{k'}) - E(v_1)|$. Thus, to show that E remains a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for voter v_1 regarding the alternatives from $D \cup C$, we only need to show that $|E(a^*) - E(v_1)| < |E(b_j) - E(v_1)|$.

Now, if we can show that

$$a^* \succeq_2 b_{j-1}, \quad (20)$$

then we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} |E(a^*) - E(v_1)| &\leq |E(a^*) - E(v_2)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(20)}{<} |E(b_{j-1}) - E(v_2)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(18)}{<} |E(b_j) - E(v_2)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(19)}{=} |E(b_j) - E(v_1)|, \end{aligned}$$

which is what we needed to show.

Thus, the only task remaining is to show that (20) holds. We distinguish between two cases. If $a^* \in \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, then $a^* \succeq_1 b_1$. By the definition of a^* , this implies $a^* = b_1$, and it follows that $a^* \succeq_2 b_{j-1}$ as b_1 is the first alternative in \succ_2 .

If $a^* \notin \text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2)$, then a^* was embedded during a previous iteration of the main loop. Let us consider the iteration where a^* was embedded. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $b_{j-1} \succ_2 a^*$. By the definition of b_j , it follows that $b_j \succ_2 b_{j+1} \succ_2 \dots \succ_2 b_{i-1} \succ_2 a^*$. Since a^* is the embedded alternative least preferred one v_1 , it follows that $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$ returned false. However, when $\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$ was called, all alternatives preferred to a^* by v_2 must not be embedded later than a^* —a contradiction since b_j will be embedded later than a^* . Summarizing, we have shown that $a^* \succeq_2 b_{j-1}$. This completes the proof of the second case.

Case 3: C has been embedded in a call to $\text{Fallback}()$. Thus, it must hold that

$$D \succ_1 C \text{ and } D \succ_2 C. \quad (21)$$

We infer that $C = \{a_j\}$ where $j = |D| + 1$, and that

$$E(v_1) < E(a_j). \tag{22}$$

To show the one-dimensional Euclidean property, we only need to show that $|E(a^*) - E(v_1)| < |E(a_j) - E(v_1)|$ and $|E(b^*) - E(v_2)| < |E(a_j) - E(v_2)|$. By Lines 30-32, it holds that $a^* = a_{j-1}$. Thus, we infer that

$$|E(a^*) - E(v_1)| = |E(a_j) - E(v_1)| - 1 < |E(a_j) - E(v_1)|. \tag{23}$$

By the definition of a^* and b^* voter v_1 has preferences

$$b^* \succeq_1 a^*. \tag{24}$$

Since E is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation for the voter v_2 and for the alternatives in d , this implies the following.

$$\begin{aligned} |E(b^*) - E(v_2)| &\leq |E(b^*) - E(v_1)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(24)}{\leq} |E(a^*) - E(v_1)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(23)}{<} |E(a_j) - E(v_1)| + |E(v_1) - E(v_2)| \\ &\stackrel{(22)}{=} |E(a_j) - E(v_2)|. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we have shown that in each case the algorithm extends the embedding so that the resulting embedding is a one-dimensional Euclidean representation of both voters and of the alternatives already embedded as well as the newly embedded alternatives. Thus, our algorithm indeed computes a one-dimensional Euclidean representation of two voters whose preferences are single-peaked. \square

Example 3. We illustrate our algorithm using the profile from Example 2, with two voters and eight alternatives:

$$\begin{aligned} v_1: & 1 \succ_1 4 \succ_1 2 \succ_1 3 \succ_1 5 \succ_1 6 \succ_1 7 \succ_1 8, \\ v_2: & 3 \succ_2 2 \succ_2 1 \succ_2 5 \succ_2 6 \succ_2 4 \succ_2 8 \succ_2 7. \end{aligned}$$

It is single-peaked with respect to the order \triangleright with $8 \triangleright 6 \triangleright 3 \triangleright 2 \triangleright 1 \triangleright 4 \triangleright 7$, and also with respect to the reverse of \triangleright . Given this profile as input, our algorithm will return a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding which is depicted in the following line.



First of all, our algorithm embeds the inner alternatives $\text{inner}(\succ_1, \succ_2) = \{1, 2, 3\}$ between voter v_1 at 4 and voter v_2 at 0.

In iteration 1, alternative 4 is embedded to the right of voter v_1 , as it is the first not-yet-embedded alternative in the preferences of v_1 and there is an embedded alternative, namely 2, such that v_1 prefers 4 to 2.

After alternative 4 has been embedded, alternatives 5 and 6 are embedded to the left of the left-most alternative, namely 3. This is because v_1 prefers each embedded alternative to each not-yet-embedded alternative (*i.e.* $\text{Refine}(\succ, v_1)$ would return false). Alternatives 5 and 6 are the first

not-yet-embedded alternatives in the preference order of v_2 , and there is an embedded alternative, namely 4, such that v_2 prefers $\{5, 6\}$ to 4.

In iteration 2, that is, after alternatives 5 and 6 have been embedded, neither $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$ nor $\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$ return true. Alternative 7 is the first not-yet-embedded alternative in the preference order of v_1 . Thus, the $\text{Fallback}()$ function embeds 7 to the right of v_1 so that it becomes the right-most alternative.

Finally, in iteration 3, $\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$ returns false. Then, in $\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$, alternative 8 is embedded to the left of the left-most alternative, namely 6, as 8 is the first not-yet-embedded alternative in the preferences of v_2 and there is an embedded alternative, namely 7, such that v_2 prefers alternative 8 to 7.

The following table summarizes how the algorithm proceeds with the above profile as input. More precisely, row one shows the iteration in increasing order; row two shows which subprocedure in the specific iteration has embedded some alternatives (row three). For each alternative in row three, the embedding of this alternative is depicted in the last row.

Iteration	0			1			2	3
Call	Initialization			$\text{Refine}(\succ_1, v_1)$	$\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$		$\text{Fallback}()$	$\text{Refine}(\succ_2, v_2)$
Embedded alt.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Position	3	2	1	$\frac{11}{2}$	$-\frac{23}{6}$	$-\frac{28}{6}$	$\frac{41}{3}$	$-\frac{115}{12}$

4 Single-peaked and single-crossing profiles with up to five alternatives

In this section, we state and prove our second main result concerning preference profiles with up to five alternatives.

Theorem 3. *Each preference profile with up to five alternatives is one-dimensional Euclidean if and only if it is single-peaked and single-crossing.*

Proof. As already discussed in the introduction, a one-dimensional Euclidean profile necessarily is single-peaked and single-crossing. Thus, to show the theorem, it suffices to show that every single-peaked and single-crossing preference profile with up to five alternatives is also one-dimensional Euclidean. We achieve this by using a computer program that exhaustively searches for all possible single-peaked and single-crossing profiles with up to five alternatives and provide a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding for each of them. We did some optimization to shrink our search space extensively. First of all, we only consider profiles with at least two alternatives and at least two voters who have pairwise *distinct* preference orders as two voters with the same preference order can be embedded at the same position without losing the one-dimensional Euclidean property. Since the relevant profiles in consideration must be single-crossing, by [14, Lemma 1] and [7, Section 2.1], our program only searches for profiles with at most $\binom{m}{2}$ distinct preference orders, where m is the number of alternatives, $3 \leq m \leq 5$. The minimum number of voters we need to consider is three as by Theorem 2 all single-peaked and single-crossing preference profiles with two voters are one-dimensional Euclidean.

Second, we assume that one of the preference orders in the sought profile is $1 \succ 2 \succ \dots \succ m$. We denote this order as the canonical preference order.

Third, using the monotonicity of the single-peaked property, we consider adding a preference order (there are $m! - 1$ many) to form a potential relevant single-peaked and single-crossing profile

m \ n	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
3	5	6	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	19	69	108	90	39	7	-	-	-	-
5	69	567	2124	4810	7185	7273	4969	2196	570	66

Table 1: For each number m of alternatives stated in the first column and for each number n of voters stated in the first row, $3 \leq m \leq 5$ and $2 \leq n \leq \binom{m}{2} + 1$, we summarize the number of single-peaked and single-crossing preference profiles we have produced that contain the canonical preference order $1 \succ 2 \succ \dots \succ m$ and no two voters that have the same preference orders. For instance, when $m = 3$ and $n = 4$, the number of sought preference profiles is 2, as indicated in row two and column four.

only if it is single-peaked with the canonical one. By [17, Theorem 12(i)], among all $m! - 1$ preference orders other than the canonical one, there are $\binom{2m-2}{m-1} - 1$ preference orders that are single-peaked with the canonical one. Note that for $m = 5$, the number of potentially single-peaked profiles with $n = \binom{5}{2} + 1 = 11$ voters would be reduced from $\binom{m!-1}{n} = \binom{119}{11}$ to $\binom{\binom{2m-2}{m-1}-1}{11} = \binom{69}{11}$.

We summarize the number of single-peaked and single-crossing profile with up to $m = 5$ alternatives and up to $n = \binom{m}{2} + 1$ in Table 1. Note that we include profiles which have two voters although by Theorem 1 all single-peaked and single-crossing preference profile with two voters are one-dimensional Euclidean.

We implemented a program which, for each of these produced profiles, uses the IBM ILOG CPLEX optimization software package to check and find a one-dimensional Euclidean embedding. The results can be found in <https://tubcloud.tu-berlin.de/s/ArdQzFd8J6L5YFN> and can be verified via the program given in <https://tubcloud.tu-berlin.de/s/rSNKkm8dtPkRKnE>. \square

5 Conclusion and outlook

We have shown that for profiles with at most five alternatives or at most two voters, being single-peaked and single-crossing suffices for being one-dimensional Euclidean. Our research leads to some interesting follow up questions. First of all, using our computer program from Section 4 we can produce all single-peaked and single-crossing profiles and all one-dimensional Euclidean profiles. A natural question is to count the number of structured (*e.g.* single-peaked, single-crossing, one-dimensional Euclidean) preference profiles and provide a closed formula in terms of the number m of alternatives and the number n of voters, in a similar spirit as recent work by Lackner and Lackner [17] and Chen and Finnendahl [11].

Second, both the single-peaked and the single-crossing property can be characterized by a few small forbidden subprofiles [1, 7]. However, this is not the case for the one-dimensional Euclidean property [12]. Thus we ask: is it possible to characterize *small* one-dimensional Euclidean preference profiles via a few forbidden subprofiles? Chen [10, Chapter 4.11] provided a generic construction and showed that there are at least $n!$ single-peaked and single-crossing profiles with $n = m/2$ voters and m alternatives that are not one-dimensional Euclidean. For $m = 6$, this number would be 6. However, through our computer program we found that for $m = 6$ and $n = 3$, out of 4179 single-peaked and single-crossing preference profiles, there are 48 ones which are *not* one-dimensional Euclidean, which is more than 6.

Last but not least, for $d \geq 2$, d -dimensional Euclidean profiles are not necessarily single-peaked

nor single-crossing [4]. In other words, the forbidden subprofiles that are used to characterize single-peaked or single-crossing profiles are not of use to characterize d -dimensional Euclidean profiles. This leads to the question of sufficient and necessary conditions for profiles to be d -dimensional Euclidean. Bogomolnaia and Laslier [4] answered this question for profiles that may contain ties. Bulteau and Chen [9] used a computer program to verify that all preference profiles with up to seven alternatives and up to three voters are 2-dimensional Euclidean.

Acknowledgment

We thank Laurent Bulteau (Laboratoire d'Informatique Gaspard Monge in Marne-la-Vallée, France) for his insight and helpful comments on this work while Jiehua Chen was visiting him in March 2016; the visit was funded by Laboratoire d'Informatique Gaspard Monge in Marne-la-Vallée, France.

References

- [1] M. Á. Ballester and G. Haeringer. A characterization of the single-peaked domain. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 36(2):305–322, 2011. 3, 14
- [2] D. Black. On the rationale of group decision making. *Journal of Political Economy*, 56(1): 23–34, 1948. 1
- [3] D. Black. *The Theory of Committees and Elections*. Cambridge University Press, 1958. 2
- [4] A. Bogomolnaia and J.-F. Laslier. Euclidean preferences. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 43(2):87–98, 2007. 1, 15
- [5] I. Borg, P. J. Groenen, and P. Mair. *Applied Multidimensional Scaling and Unfolding*. Springer, 2018. 1
- [6] S. J. Brams, M. A. Jones, and D. M. Kilgour. Single-peakedness and disconnected coalitions. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 14(3):359–383, 2002. 1
- [7] R. Bredereck, J. Chen, and G. J. Woeginger. A characterization of the single-crossing domain. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 41(4):989–998, 2013. 3, 13, 14
- [8] R. Bredereck, J. Chen, and G. J. Woeginger. Are there any nicely structured preference profiles nearby? *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 79:61–73, 2016. 2
- [9] L. Bulteau and J. Chen. Embedding preferences into Euclidean space of small dimensions, 2018. Working paper. 15
- [10] J. Chen. *Exploiting structure in computationally hard voting problems*. PhD thesis, Technical University of Berlin, Germany, 2016. 14
- [11] J. Chen and U. P. Finnendahl. On the number of single-peaked narcissistic or single-crossing narcissistic preferences. *Discrete Mathematics*, 341(5):1225–1236, 2018. 14
- [12] J. Chen, K. Pruhs, and G. J. Woeginger. The one-dimensional Euclidean domain: Finitely many obstructions are not enough. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(2):409–432, 2017. 1, 3, 4, 14
- [13] C. H. Coombs. *A Theory of Data*. John Wiley and Sons, 1964. 1, 4

- [14] J. Doignon and J. Falmagne. A polynomial time algorithm for unidimensional unfolding representations. *Journal of Algorithms*, 16(2):218–233, 1994. [1](#), [4](#), [13](#)
- [15] A. Downs. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. Harper and Row, 1957. [1](#)
- [16] H. Hotelling. Stability in competition. *Economic Journal*, 39(153):41–57, 1929. [1](#)
- [17] M. Lackner and M. Lackner. On the likelihood of single-peaked preferences. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(4):717–745, 2017. [14](#)
- [18] J. A. Mirrlees. An exploration in the theory of optimal income taxation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 38:175–208, 1971. [3](#)
- [19] K. W. Roberts. Voting over income tax schedules. *Journal of Public Economics*, 8(3):329–340, 1977. [1](#), [3](#)
- [20] D. E. Stokes. Spatial models of party competition. *American Political Science Review*, 57:368–377, 1963. [1](#)