
The Smoothed Likelihood of Doctrinal Paradox

Ao Liu and Lirong Xia

Department of Computer Science, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
liua6@rpi.edu and xial@cs.rpi.edu

Abstract

When aggregating logically interconnected judgements from n agents, the result might be logically inconsistent. This phenomenon is known as the *doctrinal paradox*, which plays a central role in the field of judgement aggregation. Previous work has mostly focused on the worst-case analysis of the doctrinal paradox, leading to many impossibility results. Little is known about its likelihood of occurrence in practical settings, except for the study under certain distributions [21]. In this paper, we characterize the likelihood of the doctrinal paradox under a general and realistic model called *smoothed social choice framework* introduced in a NeurIPS 2020 paper [41]. In the framework, agents' ground truth judgements can be arbitrarily correlated, while the noises are independent. Our main theorem states that under mild conditions, the smoothed likelihood of the doctrinal paradox is either 0, $\exp(-\Theta(n))$, $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$ or $\Theta(1)$. This not only answers open questions by List [21] in 2005, but also draws clear lines between situations with frequent paradoxes and with vanishing paradoxes.

1 Introduction

The field of *judgement aggregation* studies the aggregation of agents' judgements (yes/no votes) on multiple logically interconnected propositions in a consistent way. For example, suppose a defendant is involved in a traffic accident where a victim is injured. A jury of n agents (jurors) are asked to make collective decisions on the following three propositions:

Proposition ω_1 : whether the injury is caused by the defendant.

Proposition ω_2 : whether the injury is serious enough.

Proposition ω_3 : whether the defendant is guilty.

Each agent is asked to provide a yes/no judgement to each proposition in a logically consistent way, i.e., her answer to ω_3 is Y if and only if her answers to both ω_1 and ω_2 are Y, or equivalently, $\omega_3 \leftrightarrow \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$ must hold. Then, agents' judgements, called a *profile*, are aggregated by a rule r .

One classical rule for judgement aggregation is *proposition-wise majority*, which performs majority voting on each proposition separately. Unfortunately, the output of proposition-wise majority can be logically inconsistent. This phenomenon is known as the *doctrinal paradox*, as shown in the following example.

Example 1 (Doctrinal paradox). Suppose there are three three agents ($n = 3$), whose judgements on ω_1 , ω_2 , and ω_3 are shown in Table 1. Notice that while every agent's judgements are consistent with the logic relationship $\omega_3 \leftrightarrow \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$, the output of proposition-wise majority is inconsistent with the logic.

Propositions	ω_1	ω_2	ω_3	$\omega_3 \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} \omega_1 \wedge \omega_2$
Agent 1	Y	N	N	True
Agent 2	N	Y	N	True
Agent 3	Y	Y	Y	True
Aggregation	Y	Y	N	False

Table 1: Doctrinal paradox.

In general, the doctrinal paradox can happen for $p \geq 1$ *premises* (logically independent propositions), plus one *conclusion*, whose value is determined by the values of the premises. The doctrinal paradox “*originated the whole field of judgement aggregation*” [16], and continued to play a central role since then [22, 16, 6]. A large body of literature has shown the negative effects of the doctrinal paradox in law [18, 17, 7], economics [29], computational social choice [4, 6], philosophy [38, 28] and psychology [5], etc. Unfortunately, the paradox is unavoidable under mild assumptions [23], and there is a large body of literature on impossibility theorems as well as ways for escaping from them [24, 16, 10].

Despite the mathematical impossibilities, it is unclear whether the doctrinal paradox is a significant concern in practice. Empirical studies have been limited by the lack of datasets, as many classical applications of judgement aggregations are in high-stakes, low frequent, privacy-sensitive domains, such as judicial systems. To embrace AI-powered e-democracy, we believe that it is now the right time to theoretically study the likelihood of the paradox under realistic models. A low likelihood is desirable, because it suggests that, despite the fact that the paradox exists in the worst case, it is likely not to be a big concern in practice. While this approach is highly popular in voting [33, 15, 9], it has not received due attention in judgement aggregation. The only known exception is the paper by List [21], who provided sufficient conditions for the likelihood of doctrinal paradox to converge to 1 and to 0, respectively, under some distributions for two or three premises. Therefore, the following research question remains largely open:

How likely does the doctrinal paradox occur under realistic models?

Successfully addressing this question faces two challenges. The first challenge is *modeling*, i.e., it is unclear what probabilistic models are realistic. A large body of literature in social choice focused on the i.i.d. uniform distribution, known as *Impartial Culture (IC)*, which has been widely criticized of being unrealistic [33]. The second challenge is the *technical hardness* in mathematically analyzing the likelihood. In fact, even characterizing the likelihood of doctrinal paradox under i.i.d. distributions is already highly challenging, and List’s 2015 work [21] left many i.i.d. distributions as open questions, including IC.

Our Model. We adopt the *smoothed social choice* framework [41] to address the modeling challenge. The framework was inspired by the celebrated smoothed complexity analysis [39], and is more realistic and general than i.i.d. distributions, especially IC. We consider the setting with $p \geq 1$ premises and one conclusion determined by the logical connection function f , where every agent’s vote is a random variable whose distribution is in a set Π over all 2^p judgements on premises. Then, given the aggregation rule r , a max-adversary aims at maxing the likelihood of doctrinal paradox by setting agents’ distributions from Π . This leads to the definition of the *max-smoothed likelihood* of doctrinal paradox as follows.

$$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n) \triangleq \sup_{\vec{\pi} \in \Pi^n} \Pr_{P \sim \vec{\pi}} (P \text{ is a doctrinal paradox}),$$

where $\vec{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in \Pi^n$ is the collection of the distributions of n agents chosen by the adversary, and profile P is the collection of n agents’ votes generated from $\vec{\pi}$. Similarly, the *min-smoothed likelihood* of doctrinal paradox is defined as follows.

$$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n) \triangleq \inf_{\vec{\pi} \in \Pi^n} \Pr_{P \sim \vec{\pi}} (P \text{ is a doctrinal paradox}).$$

Notice that in both definitions, agents’ “ground truth” preferences, represented by $\vec{\pi}$, are arbitrarily correlated. The max-(respectively, min-) smoothed likelihood corresponds to the worst-case (best-case) analysis. A low max-smoothed likelihood is positive news, because it states that the paradox is unlikely to happen regardless of the adversary’s choice. A high min-smoothed likelihood is strongly negative news, because it states that the paradox is likely to happen with non-negligible probability, regardless of agents’ ground truth preferences.

Our Contributions. In this paper, we prove the following general characterization of the smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox.

Theorem 1. (Smoothed Likelihood of Doctrinal Paradox, Informal.) *Under mild assumptions, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any quota rule r , and any logical connection f , $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ is either 0, $\exp(-\Theta(n))$, $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$ or $\Theta(1)$, and $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n)$ is either 0, $\exp(-\Theta(n))$, $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$ or $\Theta(1)$.*

The formal statement of the theorem also characterizes the condition for each case to happen. As commented above, the first three cases (0 , $\exp(-\Theta(n))$, and $\Theta(n^{-1/2})$) of $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ are positive news, because they state that the doctrinal paradox vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$, see e.g., Example 7. The last case ($\Theta(1)$) of $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n)$ is negative news. Notably, a direct corollary of Theorem 1 (Corollary 2) characterizes the likelihood of doctrinal paradox under i.i.d. distributions that are not covered by List [21], in particular the uniform distribution which naturally corresponds to IC in social choice. Experiments on synthetic data in Section 4 confirm our theoretical results.

Proof techniques. The proof of Theorem 1 addresses technical hardness in [21] by first converting the smoothed doctrinal paradox to a union of polyhedra, and then applying [42, Theorem 2]. Such applications can be highly non-trivial as commented in [42], which we believe to be the case of this paper and are our main technical contribution.

Related Work and Discussions. Our work extends the results by List [21] on i.i.d. distributions in three dimensions. First, we characterize the smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox, which is more general and realistic than i.i.d. distributions. Second, our theorem works for arbitrary number of premises and arbitrary logic connection function, while List [21]’s results only work for two or three premises and conjunctive and disjunctive functions. Third, our theorem works for arbitrary quota rules, which extends the proposition-wise majority rule in [21]. As discussed above, as our theorem is a full characterization, a straightforward corollary of our theorem addresses the likelihood of doctrinal paradox under all i.i.d. cases that are left open in [21].

The modern formulation of doctrinal paradox was due to Kornhauser and Sager [18], though a similar paradox was described by Poisson in 1937 [36] and by Vacca in 1921 [40], see [16]. The paradox is closely related to the more general *discursive dilemma* [35], where agents also “vote” on the logic relationship as in the last column in Table 1. List and Pettit [23] proved the first impossible theorem about doctrinal paradox, which has led to many followup impossibility theorems [34, 27, 8, 1, 29, 2, 26]. Methods to escape from the paradox have been explored [31, 37, 32, 25]. The connection between judgement aggregation and belief merging was established [13]. Computational and machine learning aspects of judgement aggregation have also been explored, see, e.g., [11, 43, 12, 3].

2 Preliminaries

Basics of Judgement Aggregation. Let $[n] \triangleq \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the set of n agents. Let p denote the number of premises. The binary judgement of agent j on the i -th premise is denoted by $\omega_{j,i} \in \{0, 1\}$, where $\omega_{j,i} = 1$ means “Yes” and $\omega_{j,i} = 0$ means “No”. The conclusion is often denoted by ϕ , and sometimes by ω_{p+1} for simplicity. Because all premises are binary, there are $m = 2^p$ different combinations of *judgements* on the premises. To better present the results, instead of asking the agents to submit their judgements $\vec{\omega}_j = (\omega_{j,1}, \dots, \omega_{j,p})$, equivalently, we ask each agent to submit an m -dimensional vector \vec{v}_j , called her *vote*, whose $\vec{\omega}_j$ -th component is 1 and all other components are 0’s. Let $\mathcal{V} \triangleq \{\vec{v} \in \{0, 1\}^m : m = 2^p \text{ and } \|\vec{v}\|_1 = 1\}$ denote the set of all votes. For example, in the setting of Example 1, we have $p = 2$, $m = 4$, and the four judgements are $((0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1))$. Agent 1’s judgements are $(1, 0)$, which means that her vote is $(0, 0, 1, 0)$, where the third component corresponds to the weight on judgements $(1, 0)$.

A probability distribution over the 2^p judgements is also called a *fractional vote*. Let $\mathcal{V}_{\text{fr}} \triangleq \{\vec{v} \in [0, 1]^m : \|\vec{v}\|_1 = 1\}$ denote the set of all fractional votes. Clearly, $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\text{fr}}$. For any fractional vote \vec{v} and any judgement $\vec{\omega}$, we let $\vec{v}(\vec{\omega})$ denote the weight (probability) on $\vec{\omega}$. For example, agent 2’s vote in Table 2 below is a fractional vote with 0.5 weight on each of $(1, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$.

Let $f : \{0, 1\}^p \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ denote the *logical connection* between the premises and the conclusion. That is, for any judgements $\vec{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^p$, $f(\vec{\omega})$ is the conclusion that is consistent with the logic. The domain of f can be naturally extended to (non-fractional) votes \mathcal{V} . That is,

$$\forall j \in [n], \phi_j = f(\vec{v}_j) = f(\vec{\omega}), \text{ where } \vec{v}(\vec{\omega}) = 1.$$

For example, in the setting of Example 1, the conclusion is 1 if and only if both premises are 1.

$$\text{Therefore, } f(\vec{v}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vec{v} = (0, 0, 0, 1) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq p + 1$, let Ω_i denote the set of all judgements whose i -th proposition is 1. That is,

$$\Omega_i \triangleq \begin{cases} \{\vec{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^p : \vec{\omega}(i) = 1\} & \forall i \in [p] \\ \{\vec{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^p : f(\vec{\omega}) = 1\} & \text{if } i = p + 1 \end{cases}.$$

For example, in the setting of Example 1, $\Omega_1 = \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$, $\Omega_2 = \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}$, and $\Omega_3 = \{(1, 1)\}$.

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $P = (\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n) \in (\mathcal{V}_{\text{frc}})^n$ denote a (*fractional*) *profile* of n agents. A (*judgement*) *aggregation rule* is a function $r : (\mathcal{V}_{\text{frc}})^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{p+1}$, which takes a profile as input and outputs binary values for all premises and the conclusion. For any (fractional) profile $P \in (\mathcal{V}_{\text{frc}})^n$, we define $\text{Hist}(P) \triangleq \sum_{j \in [n]} \vec{v}_j$ to be the *histogram* of P , which represents the total weight of each combination of judgements in P . We define fractional votes and fractional profiles to present conditions in the theorem. Notice that agents' votes are in \mathcal{V} , which means that they are non-fractional.

Quota Rules. A quota rule is a natural and well-studied generalization of proposition-wise majority rule with different thresholds. Formally, given any vector of *acceptance thresholds* (*threshold* in short), denoted by $\vec{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_{p+1}) \in [0, 1]^{p+1}$ and any vector of *tie-breaking criteria* (*breaking* in short), denoted by $\vec{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_{p+1}) \in \{0, 1\}^{p+1}$, we define the quota rule $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)$ as follows. For any profile $P \in (\mathcal{V}_{\text{frc}})^n$ and any $i \in [p + 1]$, we let $n_i = \sum_{\vec{\omega} \in \Omega_i} \text{Hist}(P)(\vec{\omega})$ denote the total weight of agents whose i -th judgement is 1, then apply the quota rule with threshold q_i and breaking d_i . That is,

$$\forall i \in [p + 1], r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)(i) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n_i > q_i \cdot n \\ d_i & \text{if } n_i = q_i \cdot n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

where $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)(i)$ is the i -th component of $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)$. We say that a profile P is *tied* in ω_i if $n_i = q_i \cdot n$.

Doctrinal Paradox. A profile P is said to be a doctrinal paradox under r , if $r(P)$ is inconsistent with f . Formally, we have the following definition.

Definition 1 (Doctrinal paradox). *Given any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any logical connection function f , and any quota rule r , a profile $P \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{frc}}^n$ is a doctrinal paradox, if $r(P)(p + 1) \neq f(r(P)(1), \dots, r(P)(p))$.*

The following example illustrates a fractional profile, a quota rule, and the aggregated judgements.

Example 2. A (*fractional*) *profile* P of three votes, a quota rule r (which uses the majority rule with the breaking in favor of 1 on both premises and in favor of 0 on the conclusion), and the aggregation is shown in Table 2. It can be seen from the table that $r(P) = (1, 1, 0)$, which is inconsistent w.r.t. f . Therefore, P is a doctrinal paradox.

	weight	ω_1	ω_2	ϕ	\vec{v}
Agent 1	1	1	0	0	(0, 0, 1, 0)
Agent 2	1	0	1	0	(0, 1, 0, 0)
Agent 3	0.5	1	0	0	(0, 0, 0.5, 0.5)
	0.5	1	1	1	
Hist(P)					(0, 1, 1.5, 0.5)
n_i		2	1.5	0.5	
Breaking \vec{d}		1	1	0	
Threshold \vec{q}		0.5	0.5	0.5	
$\vec{q} \cdot n$		1.5	1.5	1.5	
$r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)$		1	1	0	

Table 2: The profile, rule, and aggregation result for Example 2.

3 Characterization of Smoothed Likelihood of Doctrinal Paradox

Intuition. Before formally present the theorem, we first take a high-level and intuitive approach to introduce the idea behind the characterization and highlight the challenges. Take the max part $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\max}(n)$ for example. Suppose the (max-)adversary has chosen $\vec{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in \Pi^n$. Let $\hat{\pi} = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi_j / n$ denote the center of $\vec{\pi}$. Intuitively, various multivariate central limit theorems imply that the histogram of the profile P generated from $\vec{\pi}$ falls in an $\Theta(n^{-0.5})$ neighborhood of $n\hat{\pi}$, denoted by $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$, with high probability. As an approximation and relation, for now we allow the max-adversary to choose any $\hat{\pi}$ in the convex hull of Π (denoted by $\text{CH}(\Pi)$). Then, we can focus on the likelihood of doctrinal paradox in $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$, which leads to the following four cases.

Case 1. If no profile of n votes is a doctrinal paradox, then $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n) = 0$ by definition.

Case 2. Otherwise, if for all $\hat{\pi} \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$, $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$ does not contain a doctrinal paradox, then $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ is small. Notice that $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ is not zero, because there is a small (exponential) probability that $\text{Hist}(P)$ is not in $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$.

Case 3. Otherwise, if the adversary can only choose $\hat{\pi} \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$ that corresponds to a “non-robust” instance of doctrinal paradox, in the sense that $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$ includes some but not too many doctrinal paradoxes. Then, $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ should be larger than that in the previous case. This is the most challenging case, because it is unclear how to characterize conditions for it to happen, and how large the likelihood is. While standard techniques may lead to an $O(n^{-0.5})$ upper bound, it is unclear if $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ can be lower.

Case 4. Otherwise, the adversary can choose $\hat{\pi} \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$ that corresponds to a “robust” instance of doctrinal paradox, such that $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$ contains many paradoxes. In this case, $\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ is large.

Case 1 is trivial. It turns out that Case 2 and Case 3 can be characterized by properties of distributions in the convex hull of Π . We first define *effective refinements* of distributions to reason about aggregated judgements in $\mathcal{N}_{n\hat{\pi}}$.

Definition 2 ((Effective) Refinements). For any distribution π over \mathcal{V} , any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and any quota rule r , we say that a vector $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{p+1}) \in \{0, 1\}^{p+1}$ is an effective refinement of π (at n), if the following two conditions hold:

- (1) $\forall i \in [p+1]$ such that π is not tied in ω_i , $\alpha_i = r(\pi)(i)$, and
- (2) $\exists P \in \mathcal{V}^n$ such that $r(P) = \vec{\alpha}$.

If condition (1) holds, then we call $\vec{\alpha}$ a refinement of π . Let \mathcal{E}_π denote the set of all effective refinements of π .

In words, condition (1) requires $\vec{\alpha}$ to match the aggregated judgements on all non-tied propositions. Condition (2) requires the existence of a profile of n votes, whose outcome under r is $\vec{\alpha}$.

Example 3. In the setting of Example 2, $\pi = (0.3, 0.2, 0, 0.5)$ is tied in the first premise (ω_1) and the conclusion. There are four refinements of π : $(0, 1, 0)$, $(0, 1, 1)$, $(1, 1, 0)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$. $(0, 1, 1)$ is not effective, because no profile can make conclusion $\phi = 1$ while keeping ω_1 to be 0. The other three refinements are effective when $n \geq 3$. For example, $(1, 1, 1)$ is effective because it is the aggregation of the profile where all agents have 1 judgements on both premises.

Recall that $\text{CH}(\Pi)$ denotes the convex hull of Π . Next, we define four conditions (κ_1 to κ_4) to present Theorem 1. While their formal definitions may appear technical, we believe that they have intuitive explanations as discussed right afterward. In fact, κ_1 , κ_2 , and κ_4 correspond to case 1,2,3 discussed in the beginning of this section, respectively. κ_3 is defined for min-smoothed likelihood.

Definition 3 (Conditions κ_1 to κ_4). Given p premises, a logical connection function f , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and a quota rule $r_{\vec{q},\vec{d}}$ we define the following conditions.

κ_1 : $\forall P \in \mathcal{V}^n$, P is not a doctrinal paradox.

κ_2 : $\forall \pi \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$, $\forall \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}_\pi$, $\vec{\alpha}$ is consistent (according to f).

κ_3 : $\exists \pi \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$ such that $\forall \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}_\pi$, $\vec{\alpha}$ is consistent (according to f).

κ_4 : $\exists i \in [m]$ such that “ $\omega_{p+1} \leftrightarrow \omega_i$ and $q_{p+1} = q_i$ ” or “ $\omega_{p+1} \leftrightarrow \neg \omega_i$ and $q_{p+1} = 1 - q_i$ ”.

Intuitively, κ_1 requires that no profile of n votes is a doctrinal paradox. κ_2 requires that the output of $r_{\vec{q},\vec{d}}$ of every distribution π in $\text{CH}(\Pi)$ is “far away” from any inconsistent judgements, in the sense that all judgements in \mathcal{E}_π are consistent. κ_3 is weaker than κ_2 , because κ_3 only requires that the condition in κ_2 holds for *some* $\pi \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$. κ_4 says that the conclusion only relies on one premise and the thresholds are consistent with the relationship between the conclusion and the premise.

Example 4 (Conditions κ_1 - κ_4). Let f and r be the same as in Example 2. Let $\Pi = \{\pi_1 = (0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25), \pi_2 = (0.04, 0.32, 0.32, 0.32)\}$. When $n = 1$, the paradox does not hold by definition. In the rest of this example, we assume $n \geq 2$.

κ_1 is false. When $n = 2$, $P = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ is the only doctrinal paradox. When $n \geq 3$, $P = (n+1 - 2\lfloor n/3 \rfloor - \lceil n/3 \rceil, \lfloor n/3 \rfloor, \lfloor n/3 \rfloor, \lceil n/3 \rceil - 1)$ is a doctrinal paradox.

κ_2 is false. $CH(\Pi) = \{\pi = a \cdot \pi_1 + (1-a) \cdot \pi_2 : a \in [0, 1]\}$. When $a \neq 0$, π is a doctrinal paradox and contains no ties. When $a = 0$, we have $\pi = \pi_1$, and it is tied in conclusion and both premises. Its effective refinement $\vec{\alpha} = (1, 1, 0)$ is a doctrinal paradox.
 κ_3 is false. π_2 is a doctrinal paradox and contains no ties.
 κ_4 is false according to the definitions of f and r .

We say that a distribution π is *strictly positive*, if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $\vec{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^p$, $\pi(\vec{\omega}) \geq \epsilon$. A set of distributions Π is *strictly positive*, if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that every $\pi \in \Pi$ is strictly positive (by ϵ). Being strictly positive is a mild requirement for judgement aggregation (c.f. the argument for voting [41]). Π is *closed* if it is a closed set in \mathbb{R}^m . We now present the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 1 (Smoothed Likelihood of Doctrinal Paradox). *Given any closed and strictly positive set Π of distributions over \mathcal{V} , any logical connection function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and any quota rule r . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\widetilde{DP}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\max}(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \kappa_1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_2 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(n^{-1/2}) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_4 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\widetilde{DP}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\min}(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \kappa_1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_3 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(n^{-1/2}) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_4 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Notice that both max and min smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox have four cases: the 0 case, the exponential case, the polynomial case, and the constant case. The first three cases are good news, particularly in the max part, which states that the doctrinal paradox vanishes when the number of agents is large. The last case is bad news, in particular for the min part, which states that the doctrinal paradox does not vanish.

We believe that Theorem 1 is quite general as exemplified in the next subsection, because it works for any $p \geq 1$, any logical connection function, any quote rule, and only makes mild assumptions on Π . We believe that asymptotic studies as done in Theorem 1 is important, because first, n is large in some classical applications such as combinatorial voting [19]. Second, even though n is typically small in some classical applications such as jury systems, we believe that modern technology will revolutionize such applications in the near future and promote them to the larger scale and broader applications. To be prepared for the future, Theorem 1 allows us to analyze the practical relevance of the paradox, and provides a mathematical basis for choosing the best (quote) rule to minimize the likelihood of the paradox.

3.1 Applications of Theorem 1

In this subsection, we present a few examples of applications of Theorem 1. The first example illustrates the $\Theta(1)$ case.

Example 5 ($\Theta(1)$ case). *Recall that in the setting of Example 4, we have:*

$$(\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) = \begin{cases} (\text{true}, \text{false}, \text{false}, \text{false}) & \text{if } n = 1 \\ (\text{false}, \text{false}, \text{false}, \text{false}) & \text{if } n \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

According to Theorem 1, the max and min smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox are $\Theta(1)$, as shown in Table 3. A numerical verification can be found in Figure 2(a) in Section 4.

Smoothed likelihood	$n = 1$	$n \geq 2$ (Ex. 5)	$n \geq 2$ (Ex. 6)
$\widetilde{DP}_{\Pi, r_{\vec{q}, \vec{a}}, f}^{\max}(n)$	0	$\Theta(1)$	$\exp(-\Theta(n))$
$\widetilde{DP}_{\Pi, r_{\vec{q}, \vec{a}}, f}^{\min}(n)$	0	$\Theta(1)$	$\exp(-\Theta(n))$

Table 3: Smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox in Example 5 and 6.

The second example illustrates the exponential case, which is positive news.

Example 6 (Exponentially small case). *Let us consider the same quota rule and the same logical connection as in Example 2 and 4. Let $\Pi = \{\pi_1 = (0.12, 0.12, 0.12, 0.64), \pi_2 = (0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.7)\}$.*

Following a similar reasoning as in Example 4, we have:

$$(\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) = \begin{cases} (\text{true}, \text{false}, \text{false}, \text{false}) & \text{if } n = 1 \\ (\text{false}, \text{true}, \text{true}, \text{false}) & \text{if } n \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

According to Theorem 1, the max and min smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox are $\exp(-\Theta(n))$, as shown in Table 3. A numerical verification can be found in Figure 2(b).

The following example is also positive news because the doctrinal paradox vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$, though not as fast as in Example 6 w.r.t. the max-adversary. Notice that the max and min smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox are asymptotically different.

Example 7 ($\Theta(n^{-1/2})$, $\exp(-\Theta(n))$ and 0 cases). Let the logical connection be $\phi \leftrightarrow \omega_1$, $\Pi = \{\pi_1 = (0.9, 0.1), \pi_2 = (0.3, 0.7)\}^1$ and quota rule $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}$ where $q_1 = q_3 = 0.5$, $d_1 = 1$, and $d_3 = 0$. We have: $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4) = \begin{cases} (\text{true}, \text{false}, \text{false}, \text{true}) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ (\text{false}, \text{false}, \text{true}, \text{true}) & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$.

According to Theorem 1, the max and min smoothed likelihood are presented in Table 4. Also see Figure 2(c) in Section 4 for a numerical verification.

Smoothed likelihood	n is odd	n is even
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}, f}^{\max}(n)$	0	$\Theta(n^{-1/2})$
$\text{DP}_{\Pi, r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}, f}^{\min}(n)$	0	$\exp(-\Theta(n))$

Table 4: Smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox in Example 7.

The following corollary of Theorem 1 with $\Pi = \{\pi\}$ address the open questions in [21] about the probabilities of doctrinal paradox under all i.i.d. distributions, all q , all quota rules, and all logical connection functions.

Corollary 2 (Likelihood of doctrinal paradox under i.i.d. distributions as in [21]). Given any strictly positive distribution π over \mathcal{V} , any logical connection function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and any quota rule r . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Pr_{P \sim (\pi)^n} (P \text{ is a doctrinal paradox}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \kappa_1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if all } \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}_\pi \text{ are consistent,} \\ \Theta(n^{-1/2}) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_4 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

In particular, when π is the uniform distribution over \mathcal{V} and the aggregation rule is the majority, the likelihood of doctrinal paradox is either $\Theta(1)$ or 0 depending on the logical connection function f .

3.2 Proof Sketch of Theorem 1

The proof proceeds in three steps. In **Step 1**, we model doctrinal paradox as unions of polyhedra. In **Step 2**, we apply [42, Theorem 2] to obtain a characterization. In **Step 3**, we close the gap between Step 2 and Theorem 1 by translating conditions and degree of polynomial in Step 2 to their counterparts in Theorem 1.

Step 1: Polyhedra Presentation. We show that the region of doctrinal paradox can be presented by a set of polyhedra, each of which is in the m -dimensional Euclidean space with the form $\mathcal{H} = \{\vec{x} : \mathbf{A} \cdot \vec{x} \leq \vec{b}\}$. For any $i \in [p+1]$, we first define vector $\vec{c}_i \in \{q_i - 1, q_i\}^m$ as follows:

$$\vec{c}_i(\vec{\omega}) \triangleq \begin{cases} q_i - 1 & \text{if } \vec{\omega} \in \mathbf{\Omega}_i \\ q_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (2)$$

For any profile P , it is not hard to verify that the sign of $\vec{c}_i \cdot \text{Hist}(P)$ is closely related to the aggregation result by the quota rule. We define sign function $\text{sign}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ as follows,

$$\text{sign}(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{1}(\kappa) \triangleq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \kappa \text{ is true} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

¹Because the doctrinal paradox only depends on the votes to premise ω_j (or conclusion ϕ), we use the marginal distribution on ω_i to simplify notations. Here, $\pi = (\text{pr}, 1 - \text{pr})$ mean $\omega_i = 0$ with probability pr while $\omega_i = 1$ with probability $1 - \text{pr}$.

Then, we define $\mathbf{A}_{\vec{\alpha}} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \text{sign}(\alpha_1) \cdot \vec{c}_1^\top \\ \vdots \\ \text{sign}(\alpha_{p+1}) \cdot \vec{c}_{p+1}^\top \end{pmatrix}$ and $\vec{b}_{\vec{\alpha}} \triangleq \begin{pmatrix} \text{sign}(\alpha_1) \cdot d_1 - \mathbb{1}(\alpha_1 = 1) \\ \vdots \\ \text{sign}(\alpha_{p+1}) \cdot d_{p+1} - \mathbb{1}(\alpha_{p+1} = 1) \end{pmatrix}$.

Let $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}} = \{\vec{x} : \mathbf{A}_{\vec{\alpha}} \vec{x} \leq \vec{b}_{\vec{\alpha}}\}$ denote the polyhedra and let $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}, \leq 0} = \{\vec{x} : \mathbf{A}_{\vec{\alpha}} \vec{x} \leq \vec{0}\}$ denote its *characteristic cone*. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}} : \vec{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{p+1} \text{ is inconsistent}\}$ denote the set of all polyhedra corresponding to doctrinal paradox. The following example visualizes a polyhedron and its characteristic cone for doctrinal paradox.

Example 8 (Polyhedra representation of doctrinal paradox). We consider a system with one premise ω_1 . The logical connection between conclusion ϕ and premise ω_1 is $\phi \leftrightarrow \omega_1$. The parameters for quota rule are $(q_1, q_2) = (0.25, 0.65)$ and $(d_1, d_2) = (1, 1)$.

According to Equation (2), we have $\vec{c}_1 = (q_1, q_1 - 1)^\top$ and $\vec{c}_2 = (q_2, q_2 - 1)^\top$. Then, the aggregation results of $\vec{\alpha} = (1, 0)$ and $\vec{\alpha} = (0, 1)$ are both inconsistent. Thus, $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{H}_{(1,0)}, \mathcal{H}_{(0,1)}\}$. $\mathcal{H}_{(1,0)}$ is represented by $\mathbf{A}_{(1,0)}$ and $\vec{b}_{(1,0)}$ defined as follows.

$$\mathbf{A}_{(1,0)} = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 & q_1 - 1 \\ -q_2 & 1 - q_2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \vec{b}_{(1,0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

It is not hard to verify that for any profile P of n agents, $\mathbf{A}_{(1,0)} \cdot \text{Hist}(P) \leq \vec{b}_{(1,0)}$ if and only if

$$n_1 \geq q_1 \cdot n \text{ and } n_1 \leq q_2 \cdot n - 1$$

where n_1 represents the number of votes for $\omega_1 = 1$ in P . Figure 1 illustrates the regions corresponding to $\mathcal{H}_{(1,0)}$ and its characteristic cone.




Figure 1: $\mathcal{H}_{(1,0)}$ in Example 8. The characteristic cone $\mathcal{H}_{(1,0), \leq 0}$ is the combination of $\mathcal{H}_{(1,0)}$ and the region between $n_1 = q_2 \cdot n - 1$ and $n_1 = q_2 \cdot n$.

Consequently, the smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradox is equivalent to the smoothed probability for the histogram of the randomly generated profile (which is a *Poisson multivariate variable (PMV)*) to be in \mathcal{C} . Therefore, in Step 2 we apply [42, Theorem 2] to obtain a characterization for the PMV-in- \mathcal{C} problem. However, the results are too technical and generic to be informative in judgement aggregation context (see Lemma 5 in Appendix B). Step 3 aims at obtaining the characterization as stated in Theorem 1 based on Lemma 5, which involves non-trivial calculations and simplifications. The full proof can be found in Appendix B. \square

3.3 Computational Verifications of Conditions in Theorem 1

In practice, κ_1 - κ_4 may not be easy to verify by hand. In this subsection, we briefly discuss algorithms for checking κ_1 - κ_4 under any quota rule $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}$ with rational threshold \vec{q} w.r.t. any Π that consists of finitely many distributions whose probabilities are rational numbers. The runtime of these algorithms is polynomial in m (as well as $\log n$ for κ_1). While $m = 2^p$ may seem exponentially large, notice that the input size (e.g., Π and the truth-table representation of f) can also be large, i.e., $\Theta(m)$.

Suppose $\Pi = \{\pi^1, \dots, \pi^\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^m$. κ_1 - κ_4 can be verified as follow, by combining the results of multiple (ILP) whose variables are $\vec{y} = (y^1, \dots, y^\ell)$ that represent the multiplicity of π^ℓ .

κ_1 holds for any given n if and only if there exists an inconsistent $\vec{\alpha} \in \{0, 1\}^{p+1}$ such that the following ILP is feasible.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\vec{\alpha}} \cdot ((\pi^1)^\top, \dots, (\pi^\ell)^\top) \\ \vec{1} \\ -\vec{1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot (\vec{y}) \leq \begin{pmatrix} \vec{b}_{\vec{\alpha}} \\ n \\ -n \end{pmatrix}, \text{ where } \vec{y} \text{ are integers.} \quad (3)$$

Following Lenstra's theorem [20], when ℓ is viewed as a constant (and q and n are variables), the runtime of each ILP is polynomial in q and $\log n$. Therefore, the overall complexity of checking κ_1 is polynomial in m ($= 2^p$) and $\log n$. Let $A_n \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{p+1}$ denote the set of all inconsistent α such that (3) has a feasible (non-negative integer) solution, which will be used later.

κ_2 and κ_3 can be verified by similar algorithms. Notice that \mathcal{E}_π only depends on whether each component of $r(\pi)$ is positive, 0, or negative. Therefore, we can naturally define $\mathcal{E}_{\vec{\beta}}$ for every $\vec{\beta} \in \{+, 0, -\}^{p+1}$. Let B_n denote the set of all $\vec{\beta}$, for each of which there exists $\alpha \in A_n$ that refines it. Then, for every $\vec{\beta} \in B_n$, we define $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$, whose variables are $\vec{y} \geq \vec{0}$ that do not need to be integers, to verify whether there exists $\pi \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$ such that $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{a}}(\pi) = \vec{\beta}$. More precisely, for every $j \leq p+1$,

- 1° if $\beta_j = +$, then $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$ contains a linear constraint $\vec{c}_j^\top \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^\ell y_j (\vec{\pi}^j)^\top) \leq -1$;
- 2° if $\beta_j = -$, then $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$ contains a linear constraint $-\vec{c}_j^\top \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^\ell y_j (\vec{\pi}^j)^\top) \leq -1$;
- 3° if $\beta_j = 0$, then $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$ contains two linear constraints $\vec{c}_j^\top \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^\ell y_j (\vec{\pi}^j)^\top) \leq 0$ and $-\vec{c}_j^\top \cdot (\sum_{j=1}^\ell y_j (\vec{\pi}^j)^\top) \leq 0$.

Therefore, κ_2 is true if for every $\vec{\beta} \in B_n$, $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$ is not feasible. κ_3 is true, if there exists $\vec{\beta} \notin B_n$ such that $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$ is feasible. Notice that ℓ is viewed as a constant, which means that $\text{LP}_{\vec{\beta}}$ can be solved in time that is polynomial in m .

κ_4 can be verified by enumerating all inputs of f , which takes time that is polynomial in m .

4 Experiments

We conduct numerical experiments to verify the results in Theorem 1. The first three experiments (Figure 2) follows the same setting as Example 5, 6, 7 respectively. In Figure 2, DP_{Π}^{\max} and DP_{Π}^{\min} (the blue circles and red stars) represent the estimated max-smoothed likelihood and the min-smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradoxes. The dot curves illustrate the fittings of the estimated smoothed probabilities. The expressions and fitness of all fitting curves are presented in Appendix C. Recalling the notations used in our definition of $\widehat{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\max}(n)$, we say $\vec{\pi} \in \Pi^n$ is one kind of *distribution assignment*. We run one million (10^6) independent trials to estimate the probability of doctrinal paradoxes under each distribution assignment. Then, DP_{Π}^{\max} (or DP_{Π}^{\min}) takes the maximum (or the minimum) probability of doctrinal paradoxes among all distribution assignments.




Figure 2: A numerical verification of Theorem 1. Note that the plot for Example 6 is in log-scale.

It is easy to see that the results are consistent with Theorem 1. For example, Figure 2(a) shows that both the max-smoothed likelihood and the min-smoothed likelihood of doctrinal paradoxes are $\Theta(1)$, which matches the result in Table 3. Two additional sets of experiments, whose results are presented in Figure 3(b) in Appendix C, study a more complex setting of three premises.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

We made a first step towards understanding the likelihood of doctrinal paradox in the smoothed analysis framework. There are many immediate open questions. For example, can we characterize the smoothed likelihood of the paradox for general, more complicated propositions (sometimes called *agendas*)? Can we remove the strict positiveness assumption on Π ? Can we prove smoothed impossibility theorems that extend the quantitative impossibility theorems under i.i.d. uniform distributions [30, 14]? More generally, we believe that building a comprehensive picture of the smoothed properties of aggregation rules in judgement aggregation is a promising (yet challenging) direction in theory and in practice.

References

- [1] Edmond Awad, Richard Booth, Fernando Tohmé, and Iyad Rahwan. Judgement aggregation in multi-agent argumentation. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 27(1):227–259, 2017.
- [2] Eyal Baharad, Zvika Neeman, and Anna Rubinchik. The rarity of consistent aggregators. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 108:146–149, 2020.
- [3] Dorothea Baumeister, Gabor Erdelyi, Olivia J. Erdelyi, Jörg Rothe, and Ann-Kathrin Selker. Complexity of control in judgment aggregation for uniform premise-based quota rules. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 112:13–33, 2020.
- [4] Jean-Francois Bonnefon. Behavioral evidence for framing effects in the resolution of the doctrinal paradox. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 34:631–641, 2010.
- [5] Jean-Francois Bonnefon. The doctrinal paradox, a new challenge for behavioral psychologists. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 19(5):617–623, 2011.
- [6] Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jerome Lang, and Ariel D. Procaccia, editors. *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [7] Adam Chilton and Dustin Tingley. The doctrinal paradox & international law. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 34(67), 2012.
- [8] Franz Dietrich and Christian List. Judgment aggregation without full rationality. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 31(1):15–39, 2008.
- [9] Mostapha Diss and Vincent Merlin, editors. *Evaluating Voting Systems with Probability Models*. Studies in Choice and Welfare. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [10] Ulle Endriss. Judgment Aggregation. In *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, chapter 17. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [11] Ulle Endriss, Umberto Grandi, and Daniele Porello. Complexity of Judgment Aggregation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 45:481–514, 2012.
- [12] Ulle Endriss, Ronald de Haan, Jerome Lang, and Marija Slavkovic. The Complexity Landscape of Outcome Determination in Judgment Aggregation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 69:687–731, 2019.
- [13] Patricia Everaere, Sebastien Konieczny, and Pierre Marquis. An Introduction to Belief Merging and its Links with Judgment Aggregation. In *Trends in Computational Social Choice*, chapter 7, pages 123–143. AI Access, 2017.
- [14] Yuval Filmus, Noam Lifshitz, Dor Minzer, and Elchanan Mossel. AND testing and robust judgement aggregation. In *Proceedings of STOC*, 2020.
- [15] William V. Gehrlein and Dominique Lepelley. *Voting Paradoxes and Group Coherence: The Condorcet Efficiency of Voting Rules*. Springer, 2011.
- [16] Davide Grossi and Gabriella Pigozzi. *Judgment Aggregation: A Primer*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2014.
- [17] Cheryl Hanna. The paradox of progress: Translating evan stark’s coercive control into legal doctrine for abused women. *Violence Against Women*, 15(2):1458–1476, 2009.
- [18] Lewis A. Kornhauser and Lawrence G. Sager. Unpacking the Court. *The Yale Law Journal*, 96(1):82–117, 1986.
- [19] Jérôme Lang and Lirong Xia. Voting in Combinatorial Domains. In Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jérôme Lang, and Ariel Procaccia, editors, *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, chapter 9. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [20] Hendrik Willem Lenstra. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 8:538–548, 1983.

- [21] Christian List. The probability of inconsistencies in complex collective decisions. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 24:3–32, 2005.
- [22] Christian List. The theory of judgment aggregation: an introductory review. *Synthese*, 187: 179–207, 2012.
- [23] Christian List and Philip Pettit. Aggregating sets of judgments: An impossibility result. *Economics and philosophy*, 18(1):89–110, 2002.
- [24] Christian List and Ben Polak. Introduction to judgment aggregation. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 145(2):441–466, 2010.
- [25] Aidan Lyon and Eric Pacuit. The wisdom of crowds: Methods of human judgement aggregation. In *Handbook of human computation*, pages 599–614. Springer, 2013.
- [26] Alexandru Marcoci and James Nguyen. Judgement aggregation in scientific collaborations: The case for waiving expertise. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 84:66–74, 2020.
- [27] Philippe Mongin. Factoring out the impossibility of logical aggregation. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 141(1):100–113, 2008.
- [28] Philippe Mongin. The doctrinal paradox, the discursive dilemma, and logical aggregation theory. *Theory and decision*, 73(3):315–355, 2012.
- [29] Philippe Mongin. The Present and Future of Judgement Aggregation Theory. A Law and Economics Perspective. In *The future of economic design*, pages 417–429. Springer, 2019.
- [30] Ilan Nehama. Approximately classic judgement aggregation. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 68:91–134, 2013.
- [31] Klaus Nehring and Marcus Pivato. The median rule in judgement aggregation. *Economic Theory*, 2021.
- [32] Klaus Nehring and Clemens Puppe. Consistent judgement aggregation: the truth-functional case. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 31(1):41–57, 2008.
- [33] Hannu Nurmi. *Voting Paradoxes and How to Deal with Them*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.
- [34] Marc Pauly and Martin Van Hees. Logical constraints on judgement aggregation. *Journal of Philosophical logic*, 35(6):569–585, 2006.
- [35] Philip Pettit. Deliberative democracy and the discursive dilemma. *Philosophical Issues*, 11: 268–299, 2001.
- [36] Siméon Denis Poisson. *Recherches sur la probabilité des jugements en matière criminelle et en matière civile*, 1837.
- [37] Iyad Rahwan and Fernando Tohmé. Collective argument evaluation as judgement aggregation. In *Proceedings of AAMAS*, 2010.
- [38] Roy Sorensen. *A Brief History of the Paradox: Philosophy and the Labyrinths of the Mind*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [39] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Smoothed Analysis: An Attempt to Explain the Behavior of Algorithms in Practice. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(10):76–84, 2009.
- [40] R. Vacca. Opinioni individuali e deliberazioni collettive. *Rivista Internazionale di Filosofia del Diritto*, 52(52–59), 1921.
- [41] Lirong Xia. The Smoothed Possibility of Social Choice. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [42] Lirong Xia. How Likely Are Large Elections Tied? In *Proceedings of ACM EC*, 2021.
- [43] Hanrui Zhang and Vincent Conitzer. A PAC Framework for Aggregating Agents’ Judgments. In *Proceedings of AAAI*, 2019.

Supplementary Material for The Smoothed Likelihood of Doctrinal Paradox

A Detailed Settings for Section 2 (Preliminary)

A.1 Vectorized indexing for votes or histogram

We fix the judgement of $\vec{\omega} = \vec{\ell} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p)$ to correspond to the $(\overline{\ell_1 \cdots \ell_p} + 1)$ -th component of \vec{v} , where $\overline{\ell_1 \cdots \ell_p}$ is the binary number taking ℓ_i as the i -th digit. For example, if $\omega_{j,1} = 1$ and $\omega_{j,2} = 0$, we will have $\vec{v}_j(\overline{10} + 1) = \vec{v}_j(3) = 1$ while all other components of \vec{v}_j are zero.

A.2 Properties of Quota Rules

The properties of quota rules include :

Anonymity: each pair of agents play interchangeable roles.

Neutrality: each pair of propositions are interchangeable.

Independence: the aggregation of a certain proposition only depends on agents' judgement on this proposition.

Monotonicity: adding vote to the current winner will never change the winner

B Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 (Smoothed Likelihood for Doctrinal Paradox). *Given any strictly positive set Π of distributions over \mathcal{V} , any logic function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, and any quota rule r . For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\max}(n) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \kappa_1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_2 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(n^{-1/2}) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_4 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\min}(n) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \kappa_1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_3 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(n^{-1/2}) & \text{otherwise, if } \kappa_4 \text{ is true} \\ \Theta(1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We present the full proof for Step 3 discussed in the sketch in the main text.

Step 1: Polyhedra Representation. We prove the following lemma on the connection between \mathcal{C} and the doctrinal paradox.

Lemma 3 (Polyhedra representation of doctrinal paradox). *Given any profile $P \in \mathcal{V}^n$ and any distribution π on \mathcal{V} , any quota rule r and any logical connection function f , we have the following two statements for doctrinal paradox,*

- (1) $\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}, \text{Hist}(P) \notin \mathcal{H} \Leftrightarrow P \text{ is not a doctrinal paradox.}$
- (2) $\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}, \pi \notin \mathcal{H}_{\leq 0} \Leftrightarrow \text{all refinements of } \pi \text{ are consistent.}$

Proof. According to the definition of \mathcal{C} , we only need to prove the following statement for polyhedra:

Statement 4. *For any profile $P \in \mathcal{V}^n$ and any distribution π on \mathcal{V} , any quota rule $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}$ and any logical connection function f ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hist}(P) \in \mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}} &\Leftrightarrow r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P) = \vec{\alpha} \quad \text{and} \\ \pi \in \mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}, \leq 0} &\Leftrightarrow \vec{\alpha} \text{ is a refinement of } \pi. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\vec{\omega}_{\vec{\ell}}$ be the corresponding type of vote when the vote on premises is $\vec{\ell}$. Mathematically, $\vec{\omega}_{\vec{\ell}} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\vec{\omega}_{\vec{\ell}}(\vec{\ell}) = 1$. For all $i \in [p+1]$, the characterization vector \vec{c}_i can be written as, $\vec{c}_i = (q_i - 1) \cdot \left(\sum_{\vec{\ell} \in \Omega_i} \vec{\omega}_{\vec{\ell}} \right) + q_i \cdot \left(\sum_{\vec{\ell} \notin \Omega_i} \vec{\omega}_{\vec{\ell}} \right)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \text{Hist}(P) &= \vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \left(\sum_{\vec{\ell}} \text{Hist}(P)(\vec{\ell}) \cdot \vec{\omega}_{\vec{\ell}} \right) \\ &= (q_i - 1) \cdot \left(\sum_{\vec{\ell} \in \Omega_i} \text{Hist}(P)(\vec{\ell}) \right) + q_i \cdot \left(\sum_{\vec{\ell} \notin \Omega_i} \text{Hist}(P)(\vec{\ell}) \right) \\ &= n \cdot q_i - \underbrace{\sum_{\vec{\ell} \in \Omega_i} \text{Hist}(P)(\vec{\ell})}_{\text{number of votes for } \omega_i = 1} \end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of quota rule, we know that,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \text{Hist}(P) \leq d_i - 1 &\Leftrightarrow r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)(i) = 1 \text{ and} \\ -\vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \text{Hist}(P) \leq -d_i &\Leftrightarrow r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P)(i) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the first part of Statement 4 follows by the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}}$. Follow similar procedure as above, we have,

$$\vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \pi = q_i - \sum_{\vec{\ell} \in \Omega_i} \pi(\vec{\ell})$$

Thus, for any distribution π over \mathcal{V} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \pi \leq 0 &\Leftrightarrow \exists \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}_\pi \text{ such that } \vec{\alpha}(i) = 1 \text{ and} \\ -\vec{c}_i^\top \cdot \pi \leq 0 &\Leftrightarrow \exists \vec{\alpha} \in \mathcal{E}_\pi \text{ such that } \vec{\alpha}(i) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then, the second part of Statement 4 follows by the definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}, \leq 0}$. \square

Step 2: Apply [42, Theorem 2]. Following [42], for any distribution π over \mathcal{V} and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the *active dimension* of \mathcal{H} is formally defined as:

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}, n}(\pi) \triangleq \begin{cases} \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}) & \text{if } \pi \in \mathcal{H}_{\leq 0} \text{ and } \exists P \in \mathcal{V}^n \text{ such that } \text{Hist}(P) \in \mathcal{H} \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We say a polyhedra is active (to π at n) if and only if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}, n}(\pi) \neq -\infty$. In words, an active polyhedron requires (1) there exists a profile of n votes, whose histogram is in the polyhedron, and (2) π is in the characteristic cone of the polyhedron. In the next lemma, we reveal a relationship between the active dimensions of polyhedra in \mathcal{C} and the smoothed probability of the doctrinal paradox.

Lemma 5 (Active Dimension \rightarrow Smoothed Probability, a direct application of Theorem 2 in [42]). *Given any closed and strictly positive set Π of distributions over \mathcal{V} , any logical connection function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and any quota rule r . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\max}(n) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } C1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if } C2 \text{ is true} \\ \max_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}} \Theta \left(n^{(\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\pi) - m)/2} \right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\min}(n) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } C1 \text{ is true} \\ \exp(-\Theta(n)) & \text{otherwise, if } C3 \text{ is true} \\ \min_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}} \Theta \left(n^{(\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\pi) - m)/2} \right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $C1$ is: $\forall P \in \mathcal{V}^n$, P is not doctrinal paradox.
 $C2$ is: $\forall \pi \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$ and $\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\pi) = -\infty$
 $C3$ is: $\exists \pi \in \text{CH}(\Pi)$ and $\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\pi) = -\infty$.

Note that C1 is the same as κ_1 in Theorem 1. By Lemma 3, we know that κ_2 (or κ_3) is very similar with C2 (or C3), which says that all (or some) distributions in CH(Π) are “far” from all active polyhedra of doctrinal paradoxes.

Step 3: Closing the Gap between Lemma 5 and Theorem 1. The only gap left between Lemma 5 and Theorem 1 is that the active dimension $\dim_{\mathcal{H},n}(\pi)$ is still unknown, which will be characterized in Step 3.1 and 3.2 as follows.

Step 3.1: determine $\dim(\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0})$ (the dimensionality of characteristic cones).

Step 3.1.1: the linear independence of $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_p\}$. We first show that $\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_p$ are linearly independent by contradiction. For any $i \in [p]$, we assume that $\vec{c}_i = \sum_{i' \neq i} a_{i'} \cdot \vec{c}_{i'}$, where $a_{i'}$ are real valued coefficients. Because \vec{c}_i is not a zero vector and different with any $\vec{c}_{i'}$, there must exist a pair of $i'_1, i'_2 \in [p] \setminus \{i\}$ such that $a_{i'_1} \neq 0$ and $a_{i'_2} \neq 0$. Let $\vec{c}_i(\ell_1, \ell_2, \vec{0})$ to be the coordinate of \vec{c}_i corresponds to $\omega_{i'_1} = \ell_1, \omega_{i'_2} = \ell_2$ and all other premises are 0. Because \vec{c}_i has the same value in all components that $\omega_i = 0$. We should have $\vec{c}_i(0, 0, \vec{0}) = \vec{c}_i(1, 0, \vec{0}) = \vec{c}_i(1, 1, \vec{0})$, which is contradict with the observation that

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{c}_i(0, 0, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1} \cdot q_{i'_1} + a_{i'_2} \cdot q_{i'_2} + \sum_{i' \notin \{i'_1, i'_2\}} a_{i'} \cdot q_{i'} \\ \vec{c}_i(1, 0, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1}(q_{i'_1} - 1) + a_{i'_2} \cdot q_{i'_2} + \sum_{i' \notin \{i'_1, i'_2\}} a_{i'} \cdot q_{i'} \\ \vec{c}_i(1, 1, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1}(q_{i'_1} - 1) + a_{i'_2}(q_{i'_2} - 1) + \sum_{i' \notin \{i'_1, i'_2\}} a_{i'} \cdot q_{i'} \quad \text{and thus} \\ \vec{c}_i(0, 0, \vec{0}) - \vec{c}_i(1, 0, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1} \neq 0 \\ \vec{c}_i(1, 0, \vec{0}) - \vec{c}_i(1, 1, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_2} \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Step 3.1.2: the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ when κ_4 is true. When κ_4 is true, the logical connection can be denoted as either $\phi \leftrightarrow \omega_i$ or $\phi \leftrightarrow \neg \omega_i$. For both cases, we have $\text{sign}_{0 \rightarrow -1}(\alpha_{p+1}) \cdot \vec{c}_{p+1} = -\text{sign}_{0 \rightarrow -1}(\alpha_i) \cdot \vec{c}_i$. When κ_4 is true, we will have, the following equation must hold in $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}, \leq 0}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{x}^T \cdot (\text{sign}_{0 \rightarrow -1}(\alpha_{p+1}) \cdot \vec{c}_{p+1}) \\ = \vec{x}^T \cdot (\text{sign}_{0 \rightarrow -1}(\alpha_i) \cdot \vec{c}_i) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when κ_4 is not true, we draw the conclusion that

$$\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}) = m - 1 \quad \text{when } \kappa_4 \text{ is true.}$$

Step 3.1.3: the dimension of $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ when κ_4 is not true. We first show the linear independence between \vec{c}_{p+1} and $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_p\}$ when κ_4 is false. We assume that $\vec{c}_{p+1} = \sum_{i' \in [p]} a_{i'} \cdot \vec{c}_{i'}$, where $a_{i'}$ are real valued coefficients. Because \vec{c}_{p+1} is not a zero vector and different with any $\vec{c}_{i'}$ when κ_4 is not true, there must exist a pair of $i'_1, i'_2 \in [p] \setminus \{i\}$ such that $a_{i'_1} \neq 0$ and $a_{i'_2} \neq 0$. Let $\vec{c}_{p+1}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \vec{0})$ to be the coordinate of \vec{c}_{p+1} corresponds to $\omega_{i'_1} = \ell_1, \omega_{i'_2} = \ell_2$ and all other premises are 0. Thus, we have the following observations:

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{c}_{p+1}(0, 0, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1} \cdot q_{i'_1} + a_{i'_2} \cdot q_{i'_2} + \sum_{i' \notin \{i'_1, i'_2\}} a_{i'} \cdot q_{i'} \\ \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 0, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1}(q_{i'_1} - 1) + a_{i'_2} \cdot q_{i'_2} + \sum_{i' \notin \{i'_1, i'_2\}} a_{i'} \cdot q_{i'} \\ \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 1, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1}(q_{i'_1} - 1) + a_{i'_2}(q_{i'_2} - 1) + \sum_{i' \notin \{i'_1, i'_2\}} a_{i'} \cdot q_{i'} \quad \text{and thus} \\ \vec{c}_{p+1}(0, 0, \vec{0}) - \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 0, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_1} \neq 0 \\ \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 0, \vec{0}) - \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 1, \vec{0}) &= a_{i'_2} \neq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Case 3.1.3.1: $\vec{c}_{p+1}(0, 0, \vec{0}) - \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 1, \vec{0}) = a_{i'_1} + a_{i'_2} \neq 0$. For this case, there must exist at least three different values in \vec{c}_i , which contradict with the fact that $\vec{c}_{p+1} \in \{q_{p+1} - 1, q_{p+1}\}^m$.

Case 3.1.3.2: $\vec{c}_{p+1}(0, 0, \vec{0}) - \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 1, \vec{0}) = a_{i'_1} + a_{i'_2} = 0$. we note that any nonzero value of $a_{i'_1} + a_{i'_2}$ already results in contradiction according to *Case 1.1.1*. Then, the above relationship of $a_{i'_1} + a_{i'_2} = 0$ must holds for all nonzero $a_{i'}$ s, which implies that there cannot exists more than three non-zero values for $a_{i'}$. Now, the only case left is $\vec{c}_i = a(\vec{c}_{i'_1} - \vec{c}_{i'_2})$, where a is a nonzero real number. According to the observations in Inequalities 4, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{c}_{p+1}(0, 0, \vec{0}) &= a(q_{i'_1} - q_{i'_2}) \\ \vec{c}_{p+1}(1, 0, \vec{0}) &= a(q_{i'_1} - q_{i'_2} - 1) \\ \vec{c}_{p+1}(0, 1, \vec{0}) &= a(q_{i'_1} - q_{i'_2} + 1),\end{aligned}$$

which says that \vec{c}_{p+1} has at least three different values and contradict with the fact that $\vec{c}_{p+1} \in \{q_{p+1} - 1, q_{p+1}\}^m$.

Thus, when κ_4 is not true, we draw the conclusion that

$$\forall \mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}, \dim(\mathcal{H}_{\leq 0}) = m \text{ when } \kappa_4 \text{ is false.}$$

Step 3.2: determine whether the polyhedra is active.

Given the first part of Lemma 3, we know that $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{V}^n \neq \emptyset$ is equivalent to the statement of " $\exists P \in \mathcal{V}^n$ such that $r_{\vec{q}, \vec{d}}(P) = \vec{\alpha}$ ". Given the first part of Lemma 3, we know that $\pi \in \mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}, \leq 0}$ is equivalent to the statement of " $\vec{\alpha}$ is a refinement of π ". Combining the above two statements. We know that polyhedra $\mathcal{H}_{\vec{\alpha}}$ is active if and only if $\vec{\alpha}$ is an effective refinement of π . Then, we know that all polyhedra in \mathcal{C} is not active if and only if π has no effective refinements of doctrinal paradoxes. Thus, we know that C2 (and C3) in Lemma 5 is equivalent to κ_2 (and κ_3) in Theorem 1. \square

C Additional Numerical Results

In Figure 3(b), we present the numerical result for the complex setting introduced in Section 4. The common settings for the two additional experiments are:

Logical connection: conclusion $\phi = 1$ if $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (1, 1, 0)\}$ and $\phi = 0$ otherwise.

Breaking criteria: $\vec{d} = (1, 0, 1, 0)$.

Other settings and the results are shown in the Table 5.

Name of setting	Majority	Quota
Threshold \vec{q}	(0.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5)	(0.2, 0.2, 0.2, 0.2)
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, \vec{q}, \vec{d}, f}^{\max}(n)$	$\exp(-\Theta(n))$	$\Theta(1)$
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, \vec{q}, \vec{d}, f}^{\min}(n)$	$\exp(-\Theta(n))$	$\exp(-\Theta(n))$

Table 5: Settings and results for the experiments with three premises

In Table 6 - Table 10, we present the expressions of the asymptotic curves under different settings. Root mean square error (RMSE) and coefficient of determination r^2 shows the fitness between the asymptotic curves and the data points (simulated smoothed probability of doctrinal paradox).

Smoothed Probability	Expressions of the asymptotic curves	RMSE	r^2
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\max}(n)$	$1 - 0.82227 \cdot \exp(-0.05941 \cdot n)$	9.850×10^{-3}	0.99883398
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi, r, f}^{\min}(n)$	$0.25 - 0.27476 \cdot \exp(-0.18796 \cdot n)$	8.337×10^{-4}	0.99977090

Table 6: The asymptotic curves in Figure 2(a) for Example 5




Figure 3: A Numerical verification for the complex setting of three premises. Note that (a) is plotted in log-scale.

Log-Smoothed Probability	Expressions of the asymptotic curves	RMSE	r^2
$\ln(\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n))$	$-0.04904 \cdot n - 1.0349$	3.191×10^{-2}	0.99922895
$\ln(\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n))$	$-0.09964 \cdot n - 1.0708$	5.838×10^{-2}	0.99937469

Table 7: The asymptotic curves in Figure 2(b) for Example 6

Smoothed Probability	Expressions of the asymptotic curves	RMSE	r^2
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$ when n is even	$0.96124 \cdot (n + 0.12519)^{-1/2}$	3.501×10^{-3}	0.99949065
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n)$ when n is even	$0.65588 \cdot \exp(-0.64539 \cdot n)$	7.508×10^{-4}	0.99989252

Table 8: The asymptotic curves in Figure 2(c) for Example 7

Smoothed Probability	Expressions of the asymptotic curves	RMSE	r^2
$\ln(\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n))$	$-0.02326 \cdot n - 0.90777$	0.01964	0.99967488
$\ln(\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n))$	$-0.05555 \cdot n - 0.94285$	0.06556	0.99936553

Table 9: The asymptotic curves in Figure 3(a) for the majority setting of three premises

Smoothed Probability	Expressions of the asymptotic curves	RMSE	r^2
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\max}(n)$	$1 - 0.41700 \cdot \exp(-0.07436 \cdot n)$	5.528×10^{-4}	0.99833417
$\widetilde{\text{DP}}_{\Pi,r,f}^{\min}(n)$	$0.25484 \cdot \exp(-0.10890 \cdot n)$	1.5780×10^{-5}	0.99996718

Table 10: The asymptotic curves in Figure 3(b) for the quota setting of three premises