

Core-Stable Committees under Restricted Domains

Grzegorz Pierczyński
University of Warsaw
g.pierczynski@mimuw.edu.pl

Piotr Skowron
University of Warsaw
p.skowron@mimuw.edu.pl

We study the setting of committee elections, where a group of individuals needs to collectively select a given size subset of available objects. This model is relevant for a number of real-life scenarios including political elections, participatory budgeting, and facility-location. We focus on the core—the classic notion of proportionality, stability and fairness. We show that for a number of restricted domains including voter-interval, candidate-interval, single-peaked, and single-crossing preferences the core is non-empty and can be found in polynomial time. We show that the core might be empty for strict top-monotonic preferences, yet we introduce a relaxation of this class, which guarantees non-emptiness of the core. Our algorithms work both in the randomized and discrete models. We also show that the classic known proportional rules do not return committees from the core even for the most restrictive domains among those we consider (in particular for 1D-Euclidean preferences). We additionally prove a number of structural results that give better insights into the nature of some of the restricted domains, and which in particular give a better intuitive understanding of the class of top-monotonic preferences.

1 Introduction

We consider a model of committee elections, where the goal is to select a fixed-size subset of objects based on the preferences of a group of individuals. The objects and the individuals are typically referred to as the *candidates* and the *voters*, respectively, and we follow this convention in our paper. However, the candidates do not need to represent humans. For example, this model describes (1) the problem of locating public facilities—there the candidates correspond to possible physical locations where the facilities can be built [Farahani and Hekmatfar, 2009, Skowron et al., 2016], (2) the problem of presenting results by a search engine in response to a user query—there, the candidates are web-pages, and voters are potential users searching for a given query [Skowron et al., 2017], (3) the problem of selecting validators in the blockchain, where the candidates are the users of the protocol [Cevallos and Stewart, 2020, Burdges et al., 2020]. For more examples that fall into the category of committee elections we refer to the recent book chapter [Faliszewski et al., 2017] and to the recent survey [Lackner and Skowron, 2020].

In numerous applications that fit the model of committee elections it is critical to select a subset of candidates, hereinafter called a *committee*, in a fair and proportional manner. Proportionality is one of fundamental requirements of methods for selecting representative bodies, such as parliaments, faculty boards, etc. Yet, even in the context of facility location the properties

that corresponds to proportionality are desirable: more objects should be built in densely populated area, ideally ensuring that the distribution of the locations of the built facilities resembles the distribution of the locations of the potential users. In case of searching, the returned results should contain items that are interesting to different types of users, or—in other words—the preferences of each minority of users should be represented in the returned set of results. Finally, the validators in the blockchain should proportionally represent the protocol users in order to make validation robust against coordinated attacks of malicious users. In all these examples it is important to select a proportional committee, yet it is not entirely clear what does it mean that the committee proportionally reflects the opinions of the voters, yet alone how to find such a committee.

The problem of formalizing the intuitive idea of proportionality has been often addressed in the literature and a plethora of axioms have been proposed (see [Lackner and Skowron, 2020][Section 5] and [Faliszewski et al., 2017][Section 2.3.3]). Among them, the notion of the core is particularly interesting. This concept borrowed from the cooperative game theory [Osborne and Rubinstein, 1994, Chalkiadakis et al., 2011] can be intuitively described as follows. Assume our goal is to select a committee of k candidates based on the ballots submitted by n voters. Then, a group of n/k voters should intuitively have the right to select one committee member, and—analogously—a group of $\ell \cdot n/k$ voters should be able to decide about the ℓ members of the elected committee. This intuition is formalized as follows: we say that a committee W is in the core if no group S of $\ell \cdot n/k$ voters can propose a set of ℓ candidates T such that each voter from S prefers T over W .

The notion of the core is intuitively appealing, universal, and strong. It applies to different types of voters’ ballots, in particular to the *ordinal* and the *approval* ones. In the ordinal model the voters rank the candidates from the most to the least preferred one, while in the approval model, the voters only mark the candidates that they find acceptable—we say that the voters approve such candidates. Being in the core implies numerous other fairness-related properties, among them properties which are rather strong on their own. For example, in the approval model of voters’ preferences the core implies the properties of extended justified representation (EJR) [Aziz et al., 2017a], proportional justified representation (PJR) [Aziz et al., 2018], and justified representation (JR) [Aziz et al., 2017a]. For ordinal ballots, being in the core implies the properties of unanimity, consensus committee, and solid coalitions [Elkind et al., 2017a], as well as Dummett’s proportionality [Dummett, 1984] and proportionality for solid coalitions (PSC) [Aziz and Lee, 2020]. In Section 5.1 we will also explain that for ordinal ballots the core is equivalent to full local stability [Aziz et al., 2017b].

While core-stability—the property of a voting rule that requires that each elected committee should belong to the core—is highly desired, it is also very demanding. For the ordinal ballots there exists no core-stable rule, and for the approval ballots it is one of the major open problems in computational social choice to find whether the property is satisfiable. Given the property is so demanding, so far the literature focussed on its relaxed versions—either the weaker properties which we mentioned before, or the approximate [Jiang et al., 2020, Peters and Skowron, 2020] and the randomized [Cheng et al., 2019] variants of the core.

In our work we explore a different, yet related approach. Our point is that before we look at how a voting rule works in the general case, at the very minimum we shall ensure that it behaves well on well-structured preferences. Thus, the main question that we state in this paper is whether the core-stability can be satisfied for certain natural restricted domains of voters’ preferences, and what is the computational complexity of finding committees that belong to the core given elections where the voters’ preferences come from restricted domains. The idea to restrict the scope only to instances in which the preferences are somehow well-structured is not new [Elkind et al., 2017b], yet to the best of our knowledge it has never been considered in the

context of the core.

Our Contribution

Our work contributes to two areas of computational social choice. First, we prove a number of structural theorems that describe existing domain restrictions. In particular, our results give a more intuitive explanation of the class of top-monotonic preferences. The original definition of this class is somewhat cumbersome. We show two independent conditions that provide alternative characterisations of top-monotonic preferences provided the voters’ preference rankings have no ties. We also introduce two new domain restrictions which are natural, and which provide sufficient conditions for the existence of core-stable rules. One of our new classes generalizes voter-interval and candidate-interval domains [Elkind and Lackner, 2015], and the other class is a weakening of the domain of top-monotonic preferences; yet our class still includes single-peaked [Black, 1948] and single-crossing preferences [Mirrlees, 1971, Roberts, 1977].

Second, we prove the existence of core-stable rules under the assumption that the voters’ preferences come from certain restricted domains, in particular from domains of voter-interval, candidate-interval, single-peaked, and single-crossing preferences. Interestingly, we show a single algorithm that is core-stable for all four aforementioned domains. At the same time, we show that there exists no core-stable rule, even if we restrict our attention only to top-monotonic elections.

The idea of our algorithm is the following. We first find a fractional (randomized) committee that is in the core. We pick those candidates that have been selected with probability equal to one. We choose the remaining candidates using a variant of the median rule applied to the truncated instance of the original election. Thus, our results hold both in the discrete and in the probabilistic case.

2 Preliminaries

For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $[t] = \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$.

2.1 Elections, Preferences, and Committees

An *election* is a tuple $E = (N, C, k)$, where $N = [n]$ is a set of n *voters*, C is a set of m *candidates*, and k is the desired *committee size*. Each voter $i \in N$ submits her weak ranking \succsim_i over the candidates—for each $i \in N$ and $a, b \in C$, we say that voter i weakly prefers candidate a over candidate b if $a \succsim_i b$. We set $a \sim_i b$ if $a \succsim_i b$ and $b \succsim_i a$, and we write $a \succ_i b$ if $a \succsim_i b$ and $a \not\sim_i b$.

For a voter $i \in N$ and $j \in [m]$, by $\text{pos}_i(j)$ we denote the equivalence class of candidates ranked on the j -th position by voter i . Formally, a candidate c belongs to $\text{pos}_i(j)$ if there are $(j - 1)$ candidates a_1, \dots, a_{j-1} such that $a_1 \succ_i a_2 \succ_i \dots \succ_i a_{j-1} \succ_i c$ and if there exist no j candidates a_1, \dots, a_j for which $a_1 \succ_i a_2 \succ_i \dots \succ_i a_j \succ_i c$. By d_i we denote the number of the nonempty positions in the i -th voter’s preference list. For each $j \in [d_i]$, by $\text{pos}_i([j])$ we denote $\bigcup_{q \leq j} \text{pos}_i(q)$, and for convenience, we set $\text{top}_i = \text{pos}_i(1)$ and $\text{bot}_i = \text{pos}_i(d_i)$.

We distinguish two specific types voters’ preferences.

Approval preferences. We say that the preferences are *approval*, if for each voter $i \in N$ it holds that $d_i \leq 2$. We say that i *approves* c if $c \in \text{top}_i$.

Strict preferences. The voters’ preferences are *strict*, if $d_i = m$ for each $i \in N$.

We call k -element subsets of C size- k *committees*, or in short committees, if the size k is clear from the context. We extend this notion to the continuous model as follows. A *fractional*

committee is a function $p: C \mapsto [0; 1]$ that assigns to each candidate from $c \in C$ a value $p(c)$ such that $0 \leq p(c) \leq 1$; intuitively $p(c)$ can be thought of as the probability that candidate c is a member of the selected committee. We extend this notation to sets, defining $p(T) = \sum_{c \in T} p(c)$ for each $T \subseteq C$. The value of $p(C)$ is the *size* of the fractional committee. If for a candidate c it holds that $p(c) = 1$, then we say that c is *elected*, otherwise she is *unelected*. If for an unelected candidate c it holds that $p(c) > 0$, then c is *partially elected*. If there are no partially elected candidates in p , then we say that p is a *discrete committee* (or simply a committee) and associate it with the subset of candidates $\{c \in C: p(c) = 1\}$.

A *voting rule* is an algorithm that takes as input an election, and returns a nonempty set of committees, hereinafter called winning committees.¹ A fractional voting rule is an algorithm that given an election returns a fractional committee.

The notion of a fractional committee is similar to several probabilistic concepts considered in the literature. For instance, in probabilistic social choice (see a book chapter by Brandt [Brandt, 2017]) we also assign fractional values to candidates. The main difference is that in probabilistic social choice, the whole value that we want to divide among the candidates can be assigned to fewer than k candidates; in particular it is feasible to set $p(c) = k$ for one candidate and $p(c') = 0$ for all $c', c' \neq c$. Thus, intuitively, in probabilistic social choice each candidate is divisible and appears in an unlimited quantity. Viewing from this perspective, probabilistic social choice extends the discrete model of approval-based apportionment [Brill et al., 2020]. Several works have considered axioms of proportionality for probabilistic social choice [Aziz et al., 2019, Fain et al., 2016], yet unfortunately their results do not apply to fractional committees.

Another concept related to fractional committees is where we assign probabilities to committees instead of individual candidates. The notions of proportionality in this setting have been considered, e.g., by Cheng et al. [Cheng et al., 2019]. It is worth noting that fractional committees can induce probability distributions over committees, e.g., by applying sampling techniques, such as dependent rounding [Srinivasan, 2001], that ensure we always select k candidates. Yet, there is no one-to-one equivalence between the two settings, thus the results of Cheng et al. [Cheng et al., 2019] do not apply to fractional committees.

2.2 The Core as a Concept of Proportionality

There are numerous axioms that aim at formalizing the intuitive idea of proportionality. In this paper we focus on one of the strongest such properties, the *core* Aziz et al. [2017a]. The idea behind the definition of the core is the following: a group of voters S shall be allowed to decide about a subset of candidates that is proportional to the size of S ; for example a group consisting of 70% of voters should have the right to decide about 70% of the elected candidates. The core prohibits situations where a group S can propose a proportionally smaller set of candidates T such that each voter from S would prefer T to the committee at hand.

Definition 1 (The core). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that a committee W is in the *core*, if for each $S \subseteq N$ and each subset of candidates T with $|T| \leq k \cdot |S|/n$ there is a voter $v \in S$ weakly preferring W to T .

In the above definition we still need to specify how the voters' compare committees, that is how their preferences over individual candidates can be extended to the preferences over committees. Specifically, for each voter $i \in N$ by \triangleright_i we denote the partial order over 2^C being the result of extending the preference relation of a voter i .

¹Typically a voting rule would return a single winning committee, but ties are possible.

Through the whole paper, except for [Section 5.1](#), we use the *lexicographic* extension:

$$\begin{aligned} W \triangleright_i T &\iff \exists \sigma \in [d_i]. |\text{pos}_i(\sigma) \cap W| > |\text{pos}_i(\sigma) \cap T| \\ &\text{and } \forall \varrho < \sigma. |\text{pos}_i(\varrho) \cap W| = |\text{pos}_i(\varrho) \cap T|. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Note that for approval preferences the lexicographic extension boils down to counting approved candidates in T and T' . Since in [Definition 1](#) $|W| \geq |T|$, a voter weakly prefers W over T whenever she approves at least as many candidates in W as in T .

Below we generalize the preference extension (1) to fractional committees:

$$\begin{aligned} p \triangleright_i p' &\iff \exists \sigma \in [d_i]. p(\text{pos}_i(\sigma)) > p'(\text{pos}_i(\sigma)) \\ &\text{and } \forall \varrho < \sigma. p(\text{pos}_i(\varrho)) = p'(\text{pos}_i(\varrho)). \end{aligned}$$

[Definition 1](#) naturally extends to fractional committees.

Definition 2 (The core (for fractional committees)). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that a fractional committee p is in the core, if for each $S \subseteq N$ and each fractional subset p' with $p'(C) \leq k \cdot |S|/n$, there exists a voter $i \in S$ such that i weakly prefers p over p' .

We say that a voting rule is core-stable if it always returns committees in the core.

3 Restricted domains

A voting rule specifies an outcome of an election independently of how the voters' preferences look like. Similarly, the core puts certain structural requirements on the selected committees that should be satisfied in every possible election. However, the space of all elections is reach and it might be too demanding to expect a voting rule to satisfy a strong property in each possible case. For example, this is the case for the core: there are elections with strict rankings where no committee belongs to the core [Fain et al. \[2018\]](#), [Cheng et al. \[2019\]](#); the question whether the core is always non-empty assuming approval preferences is still open. Instead, what is often desired is that a voting rule should satisfy strong notions of proportionality when the voters' preferences are in some sense logically consistent. This motivates focusing primarily on election instances where the voters' preferences are well-structured, or—in other words—come from certain restricted domains.

In this section we describe a few known and introduce one new preference domain. We show that the commonly known voting rules are not core-stable even for the most restricted preference domains. We also provide alternative conditions characterising some of the considered domains. These results will help us in our further analysis of voting methods, but are also interesting on their own.

3.1 Strict preferences

For strict ordinal preferences we start by recalling the definitions of the following two known preference classes.

Definition 3 (Single-crossing preferences). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has single-crossing preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over voters such that for each voters $x \sqsupset y \sqsupset z$ and candidates $a, b \in C$ such that $a \succ_y b$ we have that $b \succ_x a \implies a \succ_z b$.

Intuitively, we say that preferences are single-crossing if the voters can be ordered in such a way that for each pair of candidates, $a, b \in C$, the relative order between a and b changes at most once while we move along the voters.




Figure 1: An illustration of [Example 1](#). White and black points mean the positions of respectively the voters and the candidates.

Definition 4 (Single-peaked preferences). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has single-peaked preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over candidates such that for each voter $i \in N$ and candidates $a \sqsupset b \sqsupset c$ we have that $\text{top}_i = a \implies b \succ_i c$ and $\text{top}_i = c \implies b \succ_i a$.

Definition 5 (1D-Euclidean preferences). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has 1D-Euclidean preferences if there exists a 1D-Euclidean metric space in which both voters and candidates are located, such that each voter $i \in N$ prefers a candidate a to a candidate b if and only if a is closer to i than b .

Every 1D-Euclidean election is both single-peaked and single-crossing.

Known Voting Rules are not Core-Stable for 1D-Euclidean Preferences

To the best of our knowledge, none of the known voting rules is core-stable, even for 1D-Euclidean elections. We prove this for two archetypal proportional rules, the Monroe’s rule and STV.

Definition 6 (The Monroe Rule). Consider an election E with strict preferences and assume that n/k is integral. For a committee $T \subseteq C$, a *balanced matching* is a collection of subsets of voters $\{N_c\}_{c \in T}$ such that for every $c \in T$, $|N_c| = n/k$. The *value* of a matching is the sum $\sum_{c \in T} \sum_{i \in N_c} \text{pos}_i(\{c\})$. The matching $\{N_c\}_{c \in T}$ is minimal, if it has the minimal value among all matchings for T . The Monroe Rule returns the committee W minimizing the value of the minimal balanced matching.

Definition 7 (Single Transferable Vote (STV)). Consider an election E with strict preferences. STV proceeds sequentially: at each round we elect a candidate that is ranked top by at least $n/(k+1) + 1$ voters and remove any $n/(k+1) + 1$ of these voters from the election. If there are no such candidates, we remove from the election a candidate ranked top by the least number of voters.

Both the Monroe Rule and STV are not core-stable even for 1D-Euclidean instances, as shown in [Example 1](#) and [Example 2](#), respectively.

Example 1. Let $k = 2$. Voters’ preferences are the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 v_1: & b \succ a \succ c \succ d \succ e \\
 v_2: & c \succ b \succ d \succ a \succ e \\
 v_3: & c \succ d \succ b \succ e \succ a \\
 v_4: & d \succ e \succ c \succ b \succ a
 \end{aligned}$$

This instance is 1D-Euclidean as presented in [Figure 1](#).

Here the committee $\{b, d\}$ is elected by Monroe, but group S consisting of middle voters $\{2, 3\}$ and $T = \{c\}$ witness the core violation.




Figure 2: An illustration of [Example 2](#). Black points mean the positions of both candidates and groups of voters (ties can be broken arbitrarily).

Example 2. Let $n = 60$, $k = 2$. The value of the STV quota is $n/k+1+1 = 21$. Voters' preferences are divided into 5 groups:

G_1 (18 voters): $a \succ b \succ c \succ d \succ e$

G_2 (7 voters): $b \succ c \succ d \succ e \succ a$

G_3 (5 voters): $c \succ d \succ e \succ b \succ a$

G_4 (16 voters): $d \succ e \succ c \succ b \succ a$

G_5 (14 voters): $e \succ d \succ c \succ b \succ a$

This instance is 1D-Euclidean as presented in [Figure 2](#).

Here candidate c is eliminated at the first round and all votes for her are transferred to d . Second, candidate d is elected (in the second round she gains exactly 21 votes) and the votes from groups 3 and 4 are removed. Third, candidate b is eliminated and all votes for her are transferred to e . Fourth, candidate e is elected (gaining in the final round exactly 21 votes) and the committee $\{d, e\}$ is returned. However, 30 voters from the three first groups and candidate c witness the core violation.

Top Monotonic Preferences

We will now recall the definition of the *top monotonic* domain [[Barberà and Moreno, 2011](#)]. This domain is defined assuming the voters submit their preferences as weak orders. For strict preferences it generalizes both the single-peaked and single-crossing domains. We call all candidates that are ranked in the position by at least one voter top-candidates.

Definition 8 (Top monotonicity (TM)). Given an election $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has *top monotonic* preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over candidates such that the two following conditions hold:

- for each candidates a, b, c and voters i, j such that $a \in \text{top}_i$ and $b \in \text{top}_j$ it holds that:

$$(a \sqsupset b \sqsupset c \text{ or } c \sqsupset b \sqsupset a) \implies b \succsim_i c \text{ if } c \in \text{top}_i \cup \text{top}_j \\ b \succ_i c \text{ otherwise}$$

- the same implication holds also for each top candidates a, b, c and voters i, j such that $a \succsim_i b, c$ and $b \succsim_j a, c$.

The definition of top-monotonic preferences is complex and somewhat counterintuitive. We will first show that for strict orders this definition can be equivalently characterized by two much simpler and more intuitive conditions.

Definition 9 (Single-top-peaked (STP) preferences). Given an election $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has *single-top-peaked* preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over candidates such that for each candidates $a \sqsupset b \sqsupset c$ such that b is a top candidate, and a voter i it holds that $\text{top}_i = a \implies b \succ_i c$ and $\text{top}_i = c \implies b \succ_i a$.

Proposition 1. *In the strict model, single-top-peakedness is equivalent to top-monotonicity.*

Proof. Observe that the first condition in the definition of TM implies STP. Now, we will show the reverse implication. Consider an STP election. We will show that it satisfies the two conditions specified in [Definition 8](#).

Note that in the strict model if the premise of the first condition is satisfied, then $\text{top}_i = \{a\}$ and $\text{top}_j = \{b\}$ and $c \notin \text{top}_i \cup \text{top}_j$. Hence, the first condition follows from the condition for STP.

Consider now the second condition. If $a \succsim_i b, c$ and $b \succsim_j a, c$, then in the strict model it holds that $a \succ_i b, c$ and $b \succ_j a, c$. Let us consider two cases: first assume that $a \sqsupset b \sqsupset c$. We know that $\text{top}_i = \{d\}$ for some $d \in C \setminus \{b, c\}$. If $d \sqsupset b$, then $b \succ_i c$ follows from the definition of STC (for voter i and candidates d, b, c). Suppose now that $b \sqsupset d$. But then from the definition of STP (for voter i and candidates a, b, d) we obtain that $b \succ_i a$, a contradiction. The reasoning for the case when $c \sqsupset b \sqsupset a$ is analogous. \square

It is clear that the definition of STP is closely connected to the definition of single-peaked preferences (only the condition is partially weakened to the candidates that are ranked top by some voter). One could also consider the analogous weakening for single-crossing preferences.

Definition 10 (Single-top-crossing (STC) preferences). Given an election $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has *single-top-crossing* preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over voters such that for each voters $x \sqsupset y \sqsupset z$ and a candidate $a \in C$, we have that $a \succ_x \text{top}_y \implies \text{top}_y \succ_z a$.

Although the definitions of STC and STP look different, they are in fact equivalent.

Proposition 2. *In the strict model, single-top-peakedness is equivalent to single-top-crossingness.*

Proof. Consider an STC election E and a linear order \sqsupset over voters given by the definition of STC. We say that i precedes j if $j \sqsupset i$. We construct the linear order over candidates as follows:

1. Consider some $a, b \in C$ such that a is the top preference for some voter $i \in N$. From the definition of STC, we know that voters preferring b to a can all either succeed or precede i . If they succeed i , then we add constraint $b \sqsupset a$, otherwise we add constraint $a \sqsupset b$. If there are no voters preferring b to a , we add no constraint. We repeat this step for each pairs $a, b \in C$.
2. Finally, if after the previous step some pairs are still uncomparable, we complete the order in any transitive way.

We will show that the constraints placed during the first step of the procedure are transitive. Indeed, consider (for the sake of contradiction) three candidates a, b, c such that the procedure placed constraints $a \sqsupset b$, $b \sqsupset c$ and $c \sqsupset a$. Hence, we know that at least two out of these three candidates are top candidates. Assume without the loss of generality that a and b are top candidates. Let i_a, i_b be voters ranking top respectively a and b (naturally, $i_a \sqsupset i_b$). We know that all the voters preceding i_a prefer a to c and all the voters preceding i_b prefer c to b . There exists at least one voter i preferring c to b (as otherwise constraint $b \sqsupset c$ would not be added) and $i_b \sqsupset i$. By transitivity of the preference relation, we know that i prefers a over b . Consequently, i_a, i_b and i together with candidate a witness STC violation. The obtained contradiction shows that the order \sqsupset is indeed transitive.

We will now prove that such linear order \sqsupset over candidates satisfies the conditions of STP. Indeed, consider any three candidates $a \sqsupset b \sqsupset c$ such that b is a top candidate and a voter $i \in N$. Let $\text{top}_i = \{a\}$. As b is a top candidate, there exists a voter j such that $\text{top}_j = \{b\}$. As $a \sqsupset b$, it holds that $i \sqsupset j$. Then if we had that $c \succ_i b$, our procedure would place constraint $c \sqsupset b$, a contradiction. Hence $b \succ_i c$. The proof for the case $\text{top}_i = \{c\}$ is analogous.

Now we will prove the reverse implication. Let E be an STP election with a linear order \sqsupset over the candidates. Consider the following linear order \sqsupset over the voters: for each $i, j \in N$ we have that if $\text{top}_i \sqsupset \text{top}_j$ then $i \sqsupset j$. Now consider three voters x, y, z and a candidate a such that $a \succ_x \text{top}_y$. Suppose that $a \sqsupset \text{top}_y$. Then from the properties of top monotonicity and the fact that $\text{top}_y \sqsupset \text{top}_z$, we have that z has preference ranking $\text{top}_z \succ_z \text{top}_y \succ_z a$. Suppose now that $\text{top}_y \sqsupset a$. But since $\text{top}_x \sqsupset \text{top}_y \sqsupset a$, the fact that $a \succ_x \text{top}_y$ leads to the contradiction with the definition of top monotonicity, which completes the proof. \square

Recall that single-crossingness implies single-peakedness for narcissist domains, i.e., under the assumption that each candidate is ranked top at least once [Elkind et al. \[2020\]](#). Since for narcissist domains a single peaked profile is also single-top-peaked, we get a related result: that single-peakedness is equivalent to single-top-crossingness assuming narcissist preferences.

The class of top monotonic preferences (TM) puts a focus on the top positions in the voters' preference rankings. For example, an election in which the voters unanimously rank a single candidate as their most preferred choice is top-monotonic, independently of how the other candidates are ranked. This suggests that TM offers a combinatorial structure that might be useful in the analysis of single-winner elections, but which might not help to reason about committees. Indeed, below we define a new class which is a natural strengthening of TM. In [Section 4](#) we show that the core is always nonempty for elections belonging to our newly defined class, and we show that this is not the case for the original class of TM.

Definition 11 (Recursive single-top-crossing (r-STC) preferences). Given an election $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has *recursive single-top-crossing* preferences if every subinstance of E obtained by removing some candidates from E is STC.

Although r-STC is stricter than STC, it still contains both single-peaked and single-crossing preferences. This follows from the fact that both single peaked and single-crossing preferences are top monotonic [\[Barberà and Moreno, 2011\]](#), and that single-peakedness and single-crossingness is preserved under the operation of removing candidates from the election.

3.2 Approval elections

In the approval model we first recall the definitions of two classic domain restrictions, the voter-interval and the candidate-interval models [Elkind and Lackner \[2015\]](#).

Definition 12 (Voter-interval (VI) preferences). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has *voter-interval* preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over N such that for all voters $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in N$ and for each candidate $c \in \text{top}_{v_1} \cap \text{top}_{v_3}$, we have that $v_1 \sqsupset v_2 \sqsupset v_3 \implies c \in \text{top}_{v_2}$. Intuitively, each candidate is approved by a consistent interval of voters.

Definition 13 (Candidate-interval (CI) preferences). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has *candidate-interval* preferences if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over C such that for each voter $i \in N$ and all candidates $a, c \in \text{top}_i, b \in C$ we have that $a \sqsupset b \sqsupset c \implies b \in \text{top}_i$. Intuitively, each voter approves a consistent interval of candidates.

Known Voting Rules are not Core-Stable for VI nor CI Preferences

As in the case of strict preferences, we first show that two known proportional voting rules are not core stable even if the preferences come from the above restricted domains. We focus on known rules that satisfy extended justified representation (EJR) [Aziz et al. \[2017a\]](#), one of the strongest proportionality axioms that are known to be satisfiable in general.

Definition 14 (Proportional Approval Voting (PAV) Thiele [1895]). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we elect a committee W maximizing the value of the following expression:

$$\sum_{i \in N} H(|W \cap \text{top}_i|) \quad \text{where} \quad H(i) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{i}.$$

Definition 15 (Rule X Peters and Skowron [2020]). We assume that each voter is given 1 dollar at the beginning. Every candidate needs to be paid n/k dollars to be elected. The algorithm is sequential. At each round, we iterate over candidates and for each candidate c we compute the value ϱ_c —the lowest value such that the voters approving c can afford her election (i.e., can afford to pay n/k dollars in total) provided each voter pays at most ϱ_c . Then we elect the affordable candidate minimising ϱ_c , decrease the voters' budgets and repeat the procedure until there are no affordable candidates.

Both these rules are not core-stable even for elections belonging to the intersection of VI and CI classes, as shown in [Example 3](#) and [Example 4](#).

Example 3. Let $n = 3$, $k = 8$. Voters' preferences are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &: \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, a\} \\ v_2 &: \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, c\} \\ v_3 &: \{d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4\} \end{aligned}$$

Assuming

$$v_1 \sqsupset v_2 \sqsupset v_3$$

and

$$a \sqsupset b_1 \sqsupset \dots \sqsupset b_4 \sqsupset c \sqsupset d_1 \sqsupset \dots \sqsupset d_4,$$

it is clear that the instance is both VI and CI.

Here PAV elects candidates $\{b_1, \dots, b_4, d_1, \dots, d_4\}$. However, this committee does not belong to the core, which is witnessed by the groups $S = \{v_1, v_2\}$ and $T = \{a, b_1, \dots, b_4, c\}$.

Example 4. Let $n = 42$, $k = 14$. Voters' preferences are divided into the following groups:

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 \text{ (1 voter):} & \quad \{c_1, c_2, c_3, x_1, x_2\} \\ G_2 \text{ (8 voters):} & \quad \{c_1, c_2, c_3, x_1, x_2, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\} \\ G_3 \text{ (12 voters):} & \quad \{c_1, c_2, c_3, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, e_1, e_2\} \\ G_4 \text{ (12 voters):} & \quad \{d_1, d_2, d_3, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4, a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, e_1, e_2\} \\ G_5 \text{ (8 voters):} & \quad \{d_1, d_2, d_3, y_1, y_2, b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\} \\ G_6 \text{ (1 voter):} & \quad \{d_1, d_2, d_3, y_1, y_2\} \end{aligned}$$

Assuming

$$G_1 \sqsupset G_2 \sqsupset \dots \sqsupset G_6 \text{ (the voters within each group can be ordered arbitrarily)}$$

and

$$x_1 \sqsupset x_2 \sqsupset c_1 \sqsupset c_2 \sqsupset c_3 \sqsupset a_1 \sqsupset \dots \sqsupset a_4 \sqsupset e_1 \sqsupset e_2 \sqsupset b_1 \sqsupset \dots \sqsupset b_4 \sqsupset d_1 \sqsupset d_2 \sqsupset d_3 \sqsupset y_1 \sqsupset y_2$$




Figure 3: An illustration of the definition of LC.

it is clear that the instance is both VI and CI.

At the beginning each voter has 1 dollar and the price for candidates is $p = n/k = 3$. First we elect candidates $a_1, \dots, a_4, b_1, \dots, b_4$; for each of them 32 out of 40 middle voters pay (each of them pays $3/32$). Second, we elect candidates e_1 and e_2 , and the middle 24 voters run out of money; indeed, each of them pays $8 \cdot 3/32 + 2 \cdot 3/24 = 1$ for the so far elected candidates. Next we elect candidates x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 . We have elected the committee $\{a_1, \dots, a_4, b_1, \dots, b_4, e_1, e_2, x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$ which is not even Pareto-optimal as the committee $\{a_1, \dots, a_4, b_1, \dots, b_4, c_1, c_2, c_3, d_1, d_2, d_3\}$ is better for every voter. Thus, in particular the elected committee does not belong to the core.

Linearly consistent (LC) preferences

Below we introduce a new class that generalizes both CI and VI domains. In [Section 4.2](#) we will prove that the core is always nonempty if preferences come from our new restricted domain.

Definition 16 (Linearly consistent (LC) preferences). Given an election instance $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E has linearly consistent preferences, if there exists a linear order \sqsupseteq over $N \cup C$ such that for each voters $i, j \in N$ ($i \sqsupseteq j$) and candidates $a, b \in C$ ($a \sqsupseteq b$), if $a \in \text{top}_j$, then $a \succsim_i b$. In words, if i approves b and j approves a , then i approves a (this intuition is depicted in [Figure 3](#)).

Proposition 3. *Each VI election is LC. Each CI election is LC.*

Proof. The case of voter-interval preferences. Let \sqsupseteq be a linear order over N that witnesses that preferences are voter-interval. Let us sort N by this order. For each candidate c , by first_c we denote $\min\{i \in N : c \in \text{top}_i\}$. Let us now associate each candidate c to first_c (breaking the tie between c and first_c arbitrarily). If two candidates a, b are associated to the same point, we also break the tie between them arbitrarily. In such a way we obtained an order \sqsupseteq over $N \cup C$. For simplicity, for each $x, y \in N \cup C$ by $x \sqsupseteq y$ we denote " $x \sqsupseteq y$ or $x = y$ ".

Consider two voters, i and j , with $i \sqsupseteq j$, and two candidates, a and b , with $a \sqsupseteq b$. Assume i approves b and j approves a . We will prove that i approves a . Since $a \sqsupseteq b$, by our definition $\text{first}_a \sqsupseteq \text{first}_b$. Since i approves b , $\text{first}_b \sqsupseteq i$, and so $\text{first}_a \sqsupseteq i$. If $i = \text{first}_a$, then i approves a . Otherwise, $\text{first}_a \sqsupseteq i$. Consequently, first_a, i , and j are three voters, such that $\text{first}_a \sqsupseteq i \sqsupseteq j$. Since the preferences are voter-interval we infer that i approves a .

The case of candidate-interval preferences. Let \sqsupseteq be a linear order on C witnessing the candidate-interval property. Let us sort C by this order. We associate each voter $i \in N$ with $(\min \text{top}_i)$, again breaking all the ties arbitrarily. Consider two voters, i and j with $i \sqsupseteq j$, and

two candidates a and b , with $a \sqsupset b$. Further, assume that i approves b and j approves a . Since $i \sqsupset j$, we get that $(\min \text{top}_i) \sqsupseteq (\min \text{top}_j)$, and since j approves a , we have $(\min \text{top}_j) \sqsupseteq a$. Consequently, $(\min \text{top}_i) \sqsupseteq a$. If $(\min \text{top}_i) = a$, then i approves a . Otherwise, $(\min \text{top}_i)$, a and b are three candidates, such that $(\min \text{top}_i) \sqsupset a \sqsupset b$. Given that preferences are candidate-interval, and that i approves b , we get that i approves a . \square

Let us now compare the domain of linearly consistent preferences with the one of *seemingly single-crossing (SSC)* preferences [Elkind et al., 2017b]—another known class that generalizes VI and CI domains. We say that preferences are seemingly single-crossing if there is a linear order over voters such that for each $a, b \in C$, the voters approving a and not b either all succeed or all precede the voters approving b and not a .² Observe that LC implies SSC. The reverse implication does not hold, as we show in Example 5 below.

Example 5. Consider the election instance with 3 voters and the following preferences:

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &: \{a, c\} \\ v_2 &: \{a, b\} \\ v_3 &: \{b, c\} \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that these preferences are SSC for all pairs of candidates and any linear order over voters.

Suppose that this election instance is LC and let \sqsupset be the required linear order over $N \cup C$. Without the loss of generality, let $a \sqsupset b$. Then we have that $v_1, v_2 \sqsupset 3$ (otherwise, LC would be violated for voter v_3 , a voter $j \in \{v_1, v_2\}$ such that $v_3 \sqsupset j$, and candidates a, b).

Further, suppose that $b \sqsupset c$. Then, voters v_1 and v_3 together with candidates b, c witness the violation of LC, a contradiction. Hence, $c \sqsupset b$. But then, voters v_2 and v_3 together with candidates b, c witness the violation of LC. The obtained contradiction completes the proof.

4 Finding Core-Stable Committees for Restricted Domains

In this section, we describe an algorithm for finding committees that takes as input preferences represented as weak orders. We will show that if the preferences are approval linearly consistent (LC), or strict recursive single-top-crossing (r-STC), then the returned committee belongs to the core. Our algorithm works in polynomial time. As a corollary of this result, we get that the core is always nonempty for the following classic domain restrictions: (1) voter-interval, (2) candidate-interval, (3) single-peaked, and (4) single-crossing preferences.

Hereinafter we assume that the fraction n/k is integral. It does not limit the scope of the work due to the following observation:

Observation 1. Consider an election E and the instance E' obtained from E by multiplying each voter k times. If a committee W is not in the core for E , then it is not in the core for E' .

The algorithm, which we call COMMITTEECORE, consists of two phases: first we construct a fractional committee and then we discretize it. The first phase (further called the BESTREPRESENTATIVE algorithm) is the following: imagine that each voter has an equal probability portion k/n to distribute, and that we want to choose one candidate (her *representative*) who gets this

²There is also another class, generalising both VI and CI—namely, the class of *possibly single-crossing* (PSC) preferences. This is the class of approval preferences that can be obtained from some strict single-crossing ones (assuming that every voter approves a consistent prefix of her ranking). Interestingly, PSC is equivalent to the class of seemingly single-crossing preferences Elkind et al. [2017b].

portion. Initially, the fractional committee p is empty. We iterate over the set of voters, sorted according to the relation \sqsupset . Let us denote by P_i the set of unelected candidates at the moment of considering voter $i \in N$. The representative of i is defined as a candidate $r_i \in P_i$ such that for each $c \in P_i$ it holds that either $r_i \succ_i c$ or that $r_i \sim_i c$ and $r_i \sqsupset c$. Next, $p(r_i)$ is increased by k/n . Note that, as n/k is integral, the election probability of each candidate does not exceed 1.

In [Section 4.1](#) we prove that after this phase the obtained fractional committee p is in the core for all strict elections and all LC approval elections. Denote by W_1 the set of candidates c such that $p(c) = 1$. Before the second phase of the algorithm, remove candidates from W_1 from the election together with the voters who are represented by them, obtaining a smaller election E_2 . By k_2 we denote $k - |W_1|$ (remaining seats in the committee) and by n_2 we denote $n - |W_1| \cdot n/k$ (remaining voters). Renumerate the voters so that they are numbers from $[n_2]$ (and in case of r-STC elections, resort them so that E_2 is still r-STC). Note that by definition $n_2/k_2 = (n - |W_1| \cdot n/k) / (k - |W_1|) = n \cdot (1 - |W_1|/k) / (k - |W_1|) = n/k$.

The second phase (further called the MEDIANRULE algorithm) is simple: for each $q \in [k_2]$ denote by m_q the voter $(q - 1) \cdot n/k + 1$. Further we will refer to these voters as *median voters*. Then elect committee $W_2 = \{r_{m_q} : q \in [k_2]\}$.

Finally, we return the committee $W = W_1 \cup W_2$. In [Section 4.2](#) we show that the final committee W belongs to the core for LC and r-STC preferences.

4.1 Core Stability for Fractional Committees

In this subsection we prove that the committee elected by BESTREPRESENTATIVE is always in the core for LC approval elections and for all elections with strict preferences. The proof is the same for those two models; we will refer only to the following property:

Definition 17. Given an election $E = (N, C, k)$, we say that E is *well-ordered*, if there exists a linear order \sqsupset over $N \cup C$ such that for each voters $i, j \in N$ ($i \sqsupset j$) and candidates $a, b \in C$ ($a \sqsupset b$), if $a \sim_j b$ and $a, b \notin \text{bot}_j$, then $a \succ_i b$.

It is clear that every strict election is well-ordered for every order \sqsupset (the premise is never satisfied). For approval elections this definition is a weakening of [Definition 16](#) (because for approval elections $a, b \notin \text{bot}_j \implies a \in \text{top}_j$), hence every LC election is well-ordered.

For convenience, for $i \in N$ by p_i we denote the fractional committee p after considering voter i . Let $\sigma_i \in [m]$ be the number such that $r_i \in \text{pos}_i(\sigma_i)$. From how the algorithm BESTREPRESENTATIVE works, we have that for every voter $i \in N$ and a candidate $c \in \text{pos}_i([\sigma_i - 1])$ it holds that $p_{i-1}(c) = 1$ (and also $p_j(c) = 1$ for every $j \geq i$).

Before proving that BESTREPRESENTATIVE returns committees belonging to the core, let us start from the following observation.

Observation 2. For each $i \in N$ and $c \in C$, there exists $q \in [n/k]$ such that $p_i(c) = q \cdot k/n$. In particular, q is the number of voters for whom c is a representative,

Theorem 1. *Each fractional committee elected by BESTREPRESENTATIVE belongs to the core for well-ordered elections.*

Proof. We will prove the following invariant: for each $i \in N$, p_i satisfies the condition of the fractional core (see [Definition 2](#)) with the additional restriction that $S \subseteq [i]$. We will prove the invariant by induction.

For the first voter the invariant is clearly true. Assume, there exists $i \in N$ satisfying the invariant. We will prove that the invariant holds also for voter $(i + 1)$.

For the sake of contradiction suppose that there exists a group $S \subseteq [i + 1]$ and a fractional committee p'_{i+1} such that for each $v \in S$ we have that v prefers lexicographically p'_{i+1} to p_{i+1} .

First, note that if $(i + 1) \notin S$, then the invariant does not hold also for i , a contradiction. This is the case because the election probability of no candidate is decreased during a loop iteration. Hence, $(i + 1) \in S$.

By the definition of BESTREPRESENTATIVE we have that for each $\varrho < \sigma_{i+1}$ and $c \in \text{pos}_{i+1}(\varrho)$ it holds that $p_{i+1}(c) = 1$. From that, in particular we have the following equation:

$$\forall \varrho < \sigma_{i+1}. p'_{i+1}(\text{pos}_{i+1}(\varrho)) \leq |\text{pos}_{i+1}(\varrho)| = p_{i+1}(\text{pos}_{i+1}(\varrho))$$

Hence, as $(i + 1)$ prefers lexicographically p' to p :

$$\forall \varrho < \sigma_{i+1}. p'_{i+1}(\text{pos}_{i+1}(\varrho)) = p_{i+1}(\text{pos}_{i+1}(\varrho)) \quad (2)$$

It also needs to hold that:

$$p'_{i+1}(\text{pos}_{i+1}([\sigma_{i+1}])) > p_{i+1}(\text{pos}_{i+1}([\sigma_{i+1}])) \quad (3)$$

We can conclude that $\sigma_{i+1} < d_{i+1}$, as otherwise voter $(i + 1)$ could not prefer p'_{i+1} over p_{i+1} . Consequently:

$$r_{i+1} \notin \text{bot}_{i+1} \quad (4)$$

Suppose that $p'_{i+1}(r_{i+1}) = 0$. From (3) and the fact that for all $c \in \text{pos}_{i+1}(\sigma_{i+1})$ with $c \sqsupset r_{i+1}$ we have $p(c) = 1$, we infer that there exists $a \in \text{pos}_{i+1}(\sigma_{i+1})$ such that $r_{i+1} \sqsupset a$ and $p'_{i+1}(a) > 0$. From **Observation 2** we have that $p'_{i+1}(a) \geq k/n$. Now we modify p'_{i+1} by moving the fraction of k/n from a to r_{i+1} . By **Definition 17** and (4) we have that for every $v \in S$ (naturally, $v \sqsupset (i + 1)$) it holds that $r_{i+1} \succsim_v a$. Thus, after the change p'_i still witnesses core violation for S .

Now consider a fractional committee p'_i obtained from p'_{i+1} by decreasing the probability portion of r_{i+1} by k/n . We will show that p'_i together with $S \setminus \{(i + 1)\}$ witness the core violation for p_i . Indeed, the election probability of no candidate except r_{i+1} changed, and the election probability of r_{i+1} changed in the same way: in p_{i+1} and p'_{i+1} it is higher by k/n than in p_i and p'_i , respectively. Hence, if for a voter $v \in S$ it holds that $p'_{i+1} \triangleright_v p_{i+1}$, then also $p'_i \triangleright_v p_i$. Besides, we have that $p'_i(C) \leq k \cdot |S-1|/n$, so we obtain a contradiction with our inductive assumption. \square

4.2 Core Stability for Discrete Committees

We will now prove our main results: that the committee W elected by COMMITTEECORE is in the core for approval LC preferences and for strict r-STC preferences. The algorithm for these two restricted domains is the same, but the proof techniques used for these models differ significantly.

Core Stability for Approval LC Elections

Let us start with the following observation.

Observation 3. Consider an approval LC election E and two voters i, j who were not removed from the election after the first phase, such that $i \sqsupset j$. Then either $r_i = r_j$ or $r_i \sqsupset r_j$.

Proof. Towards a contradiction assume that $r_j \sqsupset r_i$. From LC we have that i approves r_j and r_j should be i 's representative. \square

Second, we prove that algorithm COMMITTEECORE elects exactly k candidates.

Lemma 1. COMMITTEECORE for an approval LC election E elects exactly k candidates.

Proof. We will show that MEDIANRULE elects exactly k_2 candidates. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there are two median voters i, j in E_2 such that $r_i = r_j$. Without loss of generality assume $i \sqsupset j$. Consider now any voter v between these median voters. If $r_v \sqsupset r_i$ then from the definition of LC, i approves r_v , and so r_v should be selected as i 's representative, a contradiction. If $r_j = r_i \sqsupset r_v$, then from the definition of LC, v approves r_j , and so r_j should be selected as v 's representative, a contradiction. Hence, $r_v = r_i$. But then we have that after running BESTREPRESENTATIVE, r_i was a representative for at least n/k voters and was not elected, a contradiction. \square

Note that every LC election remains LC for the same order \sqsupset after removing any number of voters and candidates.

Finally, we are ready to prove the main technical lemma together with the main result.

Lemma 2. For each voter $i \in N$ it holds that $|W \cap \text{top}_i| + 1 > p(\text{top}_i)$.

Proof. Consider a voter $i \in N$. Define part_i as $p(\text{top}_i) - |W_1 \cap \text{top}_i|$. As W_1 contains all candidates c such that $p(c) = 1$, then part_i is intuitively the joint sum of election probabilities of partially elected candidates in top_i . From [Observation 2](#) we have that:

$$\text{part}_i = q \cdot k/n \tag{5}$$

where q is the number of voters for whom a candidate from $\text{top}_i \setminus W_1$ is a representative. Naturally, such voters could not be removed from the election after the execution of BESTREPRESENTATIVE.

We will prove that $\text{part}_i < |W_2 \cap \text{top}_i| + 1$. From the fact that $W = W_1 \cup W_2$ and $W_1 \cap W_2 = \emptyset$, it will imply the desired statement. We will now focus on upper-bounding q from (5).

Consider three voters v_1, v_2, v_3 such that $v_1 \sqsupset v_2 \sqsupset v_3$ and $r_{v_1}, r_{v_3} \in \text{top}_i$. We will prove that then also $r_{v_2} \in \text{top}_i$. Indeed, from [Observation 3](#) we have that either $r_{v_2} \in \{r_{v_1}, r_{v_3}\}$ (and the statement is true) or $r_{v_1} \sqsupset r_{v_2} \sqsupset r_{v_3}$. First, consider the case, when $v_2 \sqsupset i$. Since i approves r_{v_1} by LC applied to voters v_2, i and candidates r_{v_1} and r_{v_2} , we get that also v_2 approves r_{v_1} , a contradiction with [Observation 3](#). Second, we look at the case when $i \sqsupset v_2$. From LC applied to v_2, i and candidates r_{v_2} and r_{v_3} and by the fact that i approves r_{v_3} we get that i also approves r_{v_2} , which is what we wanted to prove.

Hence, these q voters from (5) need to form a consistent interval among all non-removed voters. Besides, we know that there is no more than $|W_2 \cap \text{top}_i|$ median voters inside this interval and that between each two median voters there is $n/k - 1$ non-removed voters. Hence:

$$q \leq (|W_2 \cap \text{top}_i| + 1) \cdot (n/k - 1) + |W_2 \cap \text{top}_i| = (|W_2 \cap \text{top}_i| + 1) \cdot n/k - 1$$

and:

$$\text{part}_i = q \cdot k/n < (|W_2 \cap \text{top}_i| + 1) \cdot n/k \cdot k/n = |W_2 \cap \text{top}_i| + 1$$

which completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2. For approval LC elections, COMMITTEECORE elects committees from the core.

Proof. We know that fractional committee p elected by BESTREPRESENTATIVE belongs to the core. Suppose now that W is not in the core. Hence, there exists a nonempty set $S \subseteq N$ and a committee T of size $|S| \cdot k/n$ such that $|W \cap \text{top}_i| < |T \cap \text{top}_i|$ for each $i \in S$ —alternatively, $|W \cap \text{top}_i| + 1 \leq |T \cap \text{top}_i|$.

From [Lemma 2](#) we know that for each voter $i \in S$ we have $p(\text{top}_i) < |W \cap \text{top}_i| + 1 \leq |T \cap \text{top}_i|$. Let us define a fractional committee p' such that $p'(c) = 1$ for $c \in T$ and $p'(c) = 0$ otherwise. Hence, S and p' witness also the violation of the core for p , which is contradictory with [Theorem 1](#). \square

Core Stability for Strict r-STC Elections

We will now assume that E is a strict r-STC election. Similarly as in case of approval preferences, we start by proving that the COMMITTEECORE algorithm elects exactly k candidates.

Lemma 3. COMMITTEECORE for strict r-STC election E elects exactly k candidates

Proof. We need to show that MEDIANRULE elects exactly k_2 candidates. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there are two median voters i, j in E_2 such that $r_i = r_j$. From STC it follows that $r_v = r_i$. But this means that after running BESTREPRESENTATIVE, r_i was a representative for at least n/k voters and was not elected, a contradiction. \square

Now we prove a general statement about the application of MEDIANRULE to STC elections.

Lemma 4. Consider an STC election $E = (N, C, k)$ and apply MEDIANRULE to E to obtain the committee W . If $|W| = k$, then W is in the core.

Proof. Towards a contradiction suppose that the statement of the lemma is not true. Without loss of generality, assume that E is an election with the smallest k among those for which the statement of the lemma does not hold. Let S and T be subsets of voters and candidates, respectively, that witness that the committee returned by the median rule does not belong to the core.

Observe that there are at least two candidates from W that do not belong to T . Indeed, if there were only one such candidate, we would have that $|T| = |W|$ (as $T \setminus W$ is nonempty) and $|S| = n$. In particular, in such a case all median voters would belong to S . Consequently, the most preferred candidates of the median voters would belong to T , hence $W \subseteq T$, a contradiction.

Let us fix a candidate $a \in W \setminus T$ that is elected by the greatest median voter ($i \cdot n/k + 1$). In particular, $i \neq 0$. For a candidate $b \in T$ by $S_b \subseteq S$ we denote the subset of voters in S preferring b to a . Since E is single-top-crossing, it holds that either $S_b \subseteq [i \cdot n/k]$ or $S_b \subseteq N \setminus [i \cdot n/k]$.

Now we split E into two smaller elections $E_{\text{low}} = ([i \cdot n/k], C, i)$ and $E_{\text{grt}} = (N \setminus [i \cdot n/k], C, k - i)$. By W_{low} and W_{grt} we denote the committees elected by the median rule for E_{low} and E_{grt} , respectively. Observe that $W_{\text{low}} \sqcup W_{\text{grt}} = W$.

Let us also split S and T into two parts, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{low}} &= S \cap [i \cdot n/k], & S_{\text{grt}} &= S \cap (N \setminus [i \cdot n/k]), \\ T_{\text{low}} &= \{c \in T : S_c \subseteq [i \cdot n/k]\}, & T_{\text{grt}} &= \{c \in T : S_c \subseteq N \setminus [i \cdot n/k]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $S_{\text{low}} \cup S_{\text{grt}} = S$ and $T_{\text{low}} \cup T_{\text{grt}} = T$. Hence, if we had that both $|T_{\text{low}}| > |S_{\text{low}}| \cdot n/k$ and $|T_{\text{grt}}| > |S_{\text{grt}}| \cdot n/k = (|S| - |S_{\text{low}}|) \cdot n/k$, then we would have also $|T| > |S| \cdot n/k$, a contradiction. Hence, for at least one of the pairs $(S_{\text{low}}, T_{\text{low}})$, $(S_{\text{grt}}, T_{\text{grt}})$ the opposite inequality holds. Without the loss of generality, assume that $|T_{\text{low}}| \leq |S_{\text{low}}| \cdot n/k$.

We claim that the pair $(S_{\text{low}}, T_{\text{low}})$ witnesses the core violation for E_{low} and committee W_{low} .

Consider a voter $j \in S_{\text{low}}$. We know that there exists a candidate $c \in T \setminus W$ such that $c \succ_j W \setminus T$. First observe that W_{low} and T_{grt} are disjoint—indeed, for every candidate $b \in T_{\text{grt}}$ we have that $S_b \subseteq N \setminus [i \cdot n/k]$. As a result, there is no median voter in $[i \cdot n/k]$ who prefers b to a , hence $b \notin W_{\text{low}}$. From this fact we conclude that $W_{\text{low}} \setminus T_{\text{low}} = W_{\text{low}} \setminus T \subseteq W \setminus T$. Consequently, $c \succ_j W_{\text{low}} \setminus T_{\text{low}}$.

Further, observe that $c \in T_{\text{low}}$. Indeed, voter j prefers c to $W \setminus T$, thus in particular j prefers c to a . Consequently, $j \in S_c$, and thus $S_c \subseteq S_{\text{low}}$, from which we get that $c \in T_{\text{low}}$. Since $c \in T_{\text{low}}$ and $c \succ_j W_{\text{low}} \setminus T_{\text{low}}$, we get that j prefers lexicographically T_{low} to W_{low} .

Finally, we obtain that if the core was violated for E , it also needs to be violated for E_{low} , which is contradictory to our assumption that E minimizes the value of k . \square

Corollary 1. *In COMMITTEECORE algorithm, the committee W_2 is in the core for election E_2 .*

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem in this subsection:

Theorem 3. *Committees elected by COMMITTEECORE are in the core.*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction suppose that the statement of the theorem is not true. Then there exist a set $S \subseteq N$ and a set $T \subseteq C$ witnessing the violation of the condition of the core. For every candidate $c \in C$, by $R(c)$ we denote set $\{i \in N : r_i = c\}$. Note that for a candidate $c \in W_1$ and a voter $i \in S$ such that $i \in R(c)$, we have $c \in T$. Hence,

$$S \cap \bigcup_{c \in T \cap W_1} R(c) = S \cap \bigcup_{c \in W_1} R(c).$$

Consider now sets $S \cap N_2$ and $T \cap C_2$ (recall that $E_2 = (N_2, C_2, k_2)$ is the instance obtained after the first step of our algorithm). It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} |T \cap C_2| &= |T| - |T \cap W_1| \leq |S| \cdot k/n - \left| \bigcup_{c \in T \cap W_1} R(c) \right| \cdot k/n \leq |S| \cdot k/n - \left| S \cap \bigcup_{c \in T \cap W_1} R(c) \right| \cdot k/n \\ &\leq |S \setminus \bigcup_{c \in W_1} R(c)| \cdot k/n = |S \cap N_2| \cdot k/n = |S \cap N_2| \cdot k_2/n_2. \end{aligned}$$

Further, for each voter $i \in S \cap N_2$ we have that:

$$T \triangleright_i W \implies (T \setminus W_1) \triangleright_i (W \setminus W_1) \implies (T \cap C_2) \triangleright_i W_2.$$

Consequently, $S \cap N_2$ and $T \cap C_2$ witness the violation of the core condition for committee W_2 , which is contradictory to [Corollary 1](#). \square

Corollary 2. *The core is always nonempty and can be found in polynomial time for the following classes of voters' preferences: (1) voter-interval, (2) candidate-interval, (3) single-peaked, and (4) single-crossing preferences.*

In [Theorem 4](#) below we show that the condition of recursiveness in the definition of the class of r-STC preferences is necessary for the existence of the core. Thus, in a way [Theorem 3](#) gives a rather precise condition on the existence of the core for strict voters' preferences. For approval preferences one cannot easily argue that the conditions are precise, since it is still a major open question whether a core-stable committee exists in each approval election.

Theorem 4. *There is a top-monotonic election with strict preferences, where the core is empty.*

Proof. Let A be a Condorcet cycle consisting of $r = 100$ candidates:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &\succ a_2 \succ \dots \succ a_r \\ a_2 &\succ a_3 \succ \dots \succ a_r \succ a_1 \\ &\dots \\ a_r &\succ a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \dots \succ a_{r-1} \end{aligned}$$

Now let B, C, D, E and F be five clones of A . Thus in $A \cup B \cup \dots \cup F$ we have $6r = 600$ candidates. We add two more candidates, namely g and h .

Consider the following profile with 600 voters:

$$\begin{aligned}
&g \succ A \succ B \succ C \succ D \succ E \succ F \succ h \\
&g \succ B \succ C \succ A \succ E \succ F \succ D \succ h \\
&g \succ C \succ A \succ B \succ F \succ D \succ E \succ h \\
&h \succ D \succ E \succ F \succ A \succ B \succ C \succ g \\
&h \succ E \succ F \succ D \succ B \succ C \succ A \succ g \\
&h \succ F \succ D \succ E \succ C \succ A \succ B \succ g
\end{aligned}$$

For example, the first two votes in this profile are:

$$\begin{aligned}
&g \succ a_1 \succ a_2 \succ \dots \succ a_r \succ b_1 \succ b_2 \succ \dots \succ b_r \succ \dots \succ f_1 \succ f_2 \succ \dots \succ f_r \succ h \\
&g \succ a_2 \succ a_3 \succ \dots \succ a_1 \succ b_2 \succ b_3 \succ \dots \succ b_1 \succ \dots \succ f_2 \succ f_3 \succ \dots \succ f_1 \succ h
\end{aligned}$$

The above profile is single-top-crossing since there are only two top-candidates, g and h , and each of them crosses with each other candidate only once.

Let $k = 7$, and consider a committee W . We will show that W does not belong to the core. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $g, h \in W$, as there exists more than $600/7$ voters who rank each of these candidates as their favourite one. Further, since the profile is symmetric, without loss of generality we can also assume that it contains at most two candidates from $A \cup B \cup C$. If the two candidates belong to the same clone, say A , then we take a candidate $c \in C$, and observe that 200 voters (the second and the third group) prefer $\{c, g\}$ over W . Otherwise, if the two candidates are from two different clones, say A and B (the situation is symmetric), then we take the clone which is preferred by the majority (in this context A) and select the candidate $a \in A$ that is preferred by $r - 1$ voters to the member of $W \cap A$. There are $2r - 2 = 198$ voters who prefer $\{g, a\}$ to W . Thus, W does not belong to the core. \square

5 Extensions, Discussion and Open Questions

In this work we have determined the existence of core-stable committees for a number of restricted domains both in the approval and in the ordinal models of voters' preferences. We have shown a polynomial time algorithm that returns committees belonging to the core for a subdomain of top-monotonic preferences, which includes single-peaked and single-crossing domains, and for a new class of voters' preferences which includes voter-interval and candidate-interval domains. At the same time we have shown top-monotonic ordinal elections in which no committee belongs to the core. We have additionally presented a number of results that give better insights into the structures of the known domains. In particular, our results give a better understanding of the class of top-monotonic preferences.

We conclude with one interesting observation and one important open question.

5.1 Core and (Full) Local Stability

Aziz et al. [2017b] proposed the concept of *full local stability*, which is equivalent to the definition of core-stability for ordinal preferences. Interestingly, while the concept of the core has been studied before in the context of ordinal committee elections, the equivalence of the two concepts has never been claimed so far. Yet, most of the results in the work of Aziz et al. [2017b] are formulated for the concept of *local stability*. Interestingly, this concept is also equivalent to the core-stability, but for a different preference extension: we say that voter i weakly prefers W over T according to \triangleright^{\max} preference extension if and only if she ranks her most preferred candidate

in W as high as her most preferred candidate in T . In words, according to the \triangleright^{\max} extension we focus only on the single top preferred candidate in the committee and do not break ties lexicographically.

Definition 18 (Local stability). Consider an election E and a value $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. A committee W violates local stability for quota q if there exists a group $S \subseteq N$ with $|S| \geq q$ and a candidate $c \in C \setminus W$ such that each voter from S prefers c to each member of W .

Proposition 4. *Local stability for quota $\lceil n/k \rceil$ is equivalent to core stability for the \triangleright^{\max} preference extension.*

Proof. The fact the core stability with \triangleright^{\max} implies local stability is straightforward—local stability is a special case of the core condition for $|T| = 1$. Now consider any election E and a committee W that is not core stability with \triangleright^{\max} . Let $S \subseteq N$ and $T \subseteq C$ be the witness that W is not in the core. For a candidate $c \in T$ let $R_c \subseteq S$ denote a set of voters i such that $c \succ_i W$. Since for every $i \in S$ there exists $c \in T$ with $i \in R_c$:

$$|S| \leq \sum_{c \in T} |R_c|$$

Hence, there exists a candidate $c \in T$ such that $|R_c| \geq |S|/|T| \geq n/k$. Yet, R_c together with the candidate c witness the violation of local stability, which completes the proof. \square

5.2 Open Questions

In [Section 3](#) we have shown that the classic committee election rules that are commonly considered proportional are not core-stable even if the voters' preferences come from certain restricted domains. Since these domains are natural and can be intuitively explained, one would expect a good rule to behave well for such well-structured elections. On the other hand, we often require a rule which is well-defined for all preference profiles. This leads us to the following important open question.

Question 1. *Is there a natural voting rule that satisfies the strongest axioms of proportionality, and which at the same time satisfies the core for restricted domains.*

The requirement that a rule should be “natural” says in particular that its definition cannot conditionally depend on whether the election at hand comes from a restricted domain or not. [Question 1](#) is valid for both approval and ordinal voters' preferences.

Additionally, it would be interesting to check how often the classic rules violate the core, especially in the case of restricted domains. One can make such a quantitative comparison via experiments. This however raises the algorithmic questions of how hard it is to verify if a given committee (in our case the committee returned by the particular rule) belongs to the core. This question is easy for the \triangleright^{\max} preference extension.

Proposition 5. *There exists a polynomial-time algorithm for deciding whether a given committee belongs to the core for the \triangleright^{\max} preference extension.*

Proof. Given a committee W it is sufficient to iterate over all candidates $c \in C \setminus W$ and check if the number of voters who prefer c over W is no-greater than $\lceil n/k \rceil$. \square

However, for the lexicographic preference extension the question is much less obvious.

Question 2. *What is the computational complexity of deciding whether a given committee belongs to the core (assuming the standard lexicographic preference extension)?*

This question is interesting in the general case, and as well as for each preference domain studied in this work.

Acknowledgments

Grzegorz Pierczyński and Piotr Skowron were supported by Poland’s National Science Center grant UMO-2019/35/B/ST6/02215.

References

- H. Aziz and B. Lee. The expanding approvals rule: improving proportional representation and monotonicity. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 54(1):1–45, 2020.
- H. Aziz, M. Brill, V. Conitzer, E. Elkind, R. Freeman, and T. Walsh. Justified representation in approval-based committee voting. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(2):461–485, 2017a.
- H. Aziz, E. Elkind, S. Huang, M. Lackner, L. Sánchez-Fernández, and P. Skowron. On the complexity of extended and proportional justified representation. In *Proceedings of the 32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2018)*, pages 902–909, 2018.
- H. Aziz, A. Bogomolnaia, and H. Moulin. Fair mixing: the case of dichotomous preferences. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation (EC-2020)*, pages 753–781, 2019.
- Haris Aziz, Edith Elkind, Piotr Faliszewski, Martin Lackner, and Piotr Skowron. The condorcet principle for multiwinner elections: From shortlisting to proportionality. pages 84–90, 08 2017b. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2017/13.
- S. Barberà and B. Moreno. Top monotonicity: A common root for single peakedness, single crossing and the median voter result. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 73(2):345–359, 2011.
- D. Black. On the rationale of group decision-making. *Journal of Political Economy*, 56(1):23–34, 1948.
- F. Brandt. Rolling the dice: Recent results in probabilistic social choice. In U. Endriss, editor, *Trends in Computational Social Choice*, chapter 1, pages 3–26. AI Access, 2017.
- M. Brill, P. Gözl, D. Peters, U. Schmidt-Kraepelin, and K. Wilker. Approval-based apportionment. In *Proceedings of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2020)*, pages 1854–1861, 2020.
- Jeff Burdges, Alfonso Cevallos, Peter Czaban, Rob Habermeier, Syed Hosseini, Fabio Lama, Handan Kiliç Alper, Ximin Luo, Fatemeh Shirazi, Alistair Stewart, and Gavin Wood. Overview of Polkadot and its design considerations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13456*, 2020.
- Alfonso Cevallos and Alistair Stewart. A verifiably secure and proportional committee election rule. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12990*, 2020.
- Georgios Chalkiadakis, Edith Elkind, and Michael Wooldridge. Computational aspects of cooperative game theory. *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, 5(6): 1–168, 2011.
- Y. Cheng, Z. Jiang, K. Munagala, and K. Wang. Group fairness in committee selection. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 263–279, 2019.
- M. Dummett. *Voting Procedures*. Oxford University Press, 1984.

- E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, and A. Slinko. Properties of multiwinner voting rules. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(3):599–632, 2017a.
- E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, and P. Skowron. A characterization of the single-peaked single-crossing domain. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 54:167–181, 2020.
- Edith Elkind and Martin Lackner. Structure in dichotomous preferences. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-2015)*, pages 2019–2025, 2015.
- Edith Elkind, Martin Lackner, and Dominik Peters. Structured preferences. *Trends in computational social choice*, pages 187–207, 2017b.
- B. Fain, A. Goel, and K. Munagala. The core of the participatory budgeting problem. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Web and Internet Economics (WINE-2016)*, pages 384–399, 2016.
- B. Fain, K. Munagala, and N. Shah. Fair allocation of indivisible public goods. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 575–592, 2018. Extended version arXiv:1805.03164.
- P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, A. Slinko, and N. Talmon. Multiwinner voting: A new challenge for social choice theory. In U. Endriss, editor, *Trends in Computational Social Choice*, pages 27–47. AI Access, 2017.
- F. Zanjirani Farahani and M. Hekmatfar, editors. *Facility Location: Concepts, Models, and Case Studies*. Springer, 2009.
- Z. Jiang, K. Munagala, and K. Wang. Approximately stable committee selection. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 463–472, 2020.
- M. Lackner and P. Skowron. Approval-based committee voting: Axioms, algorithms, and applications. Technical Report arXiv:2007.01795 [cs.GT], arXiv.org, 2020.
- J. Mirrlees. An exploration in the theory of optimal income taxation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 38:175–208, 1971.
- J. M. Osborne and A. Rubinstein. *A Course in Game Theory*, volume 1 of *MIT Press Books*. The MIT Press, 1994.
- D. Peters and P. Skowron. Proportionality and the limits of welfarism. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 793–794, 2020. Extended version arXiv:1911.11747.
- K. W. S. Roberts. Voting over income tax schedules. *Journal of Public Economics*, 8(3):329–340, 1977.
- P. Skowron, P. Faliszewski, and J. Lang. Finding a collective set of items: From proportional multirepresentation to group recommendation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 241:191–216, 2016.
- P. Skowron, M. Lackner, M. Brill, D. Peters, and E. Elkind. Proportional rankings. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-2017)*, pages 409–415, 2017.

- A. Srinivasan. Distributions on level-sets with applications to approximation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS-2001)*, pages 588–597, 2001.
- T. N. Thiele. Om flerfoldvalg. In *Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Forhandlinger*, pages 415–441. 1895.