

# Optimal majority rules and quantitative Condorcet properties of setwise Kemeny voting schemes

Xuan Kien Phung ✉ 

Département d'informatique et de recherche opérationnelle, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, H3T 1J4, Canada.

Sylvie Hamel ✉ 

Département d'informatique et de recherche opérationnelle, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec, H3T 1J4, Canada.

---

## Abstract

The important Kemeny problem, which consists of computing median consensus rankings of an election with respect to the Kemeny voting rule, admits important applications in biology and computational social choice [1, 2, 5, 6] and was generalized recently via an interesting setwise approach by Gilbert et. al. [9, 10]. Our first results establish optimal quantitative extensions of the Unanimity property and the well-known 3/4-majority rule of Betzler et al. [5] for the classical Kemeny median problem. Moreover, by elaborating an exhaustive list of quantified axiomatic properties (such as the Condorcet and Smith criteria, the 5/6-majority rule, etc.) of the 3-wise Kemeny rule where not only pairwise comparisons but also the discordance between the winners of subsets of three candidates are also taken into account, we come to the conclusion that the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme induced by the 3-wise Kendall-tau distance presents interesting advantages in comparison with the classical Kemeny rule. For example, it satisfies several improved manipulation-proof properties. Since the 3-wise Kemeny problem is NP-hard, our results also provide some of the first useful space reduction techniques by determining the relative orders of pairs of alternatives. Our works suggest similar interesting properties of higher setwise Kemeny voting schemes which justify and compensate for the more expensive computational cost than the classical Kemeny scheme.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Theory and algorithms for application domains; Applied computing → Law, social and behavioral sciences; Mathematics of computing → discrete mathematics

**Keywords and phrases** Kemeny problem, Kendall-tau distance, Kemeny rule, median permutation, computational social theory

**Funding** *Sylvie Hamel*: Supported by NSERC through an Individual Discovery Grant RGPIN-2016-04576

## 1 Introduction

In this article, by an election we mean a finite collection  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  of candidates (alternatives) together with a voting profile consisting of a finite number of votes which are not necessarily distinct. Here, a ranking or a vote is simply a complete and strict total ordering  $\pi: c_{\pi(1)} > c_{\pi(2)} > \dots > c_{\pi(n)}$  which we identify with a permutation of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  also denoted by  $\pi$ . The notation  $x > y$  means that  $x$  is ranked before  $y$ . Among several natural distances of the space of all rankings, the Kendall-tau distance, which is also the bubble-sort distance between two permutations, is one of the most prominent distances which counts the number of order disagreements between pairs of elements in two permutations. More generally, we have the more refined notion of  $k$ -wise Kendall-tau distance recently introduced in [10] (see Definition (1.1)) which moreover takes into consideration the disagreement between the winners of subsets of at most  $k$  candidates.

In the well-known Kemeny problem (cf. [11], [12], [18]), the objective is to determine the set of medians, i.e., permutations whose total distance to the voting profile is minimized.

Hence, for the classical Kemeny rule which is induced by the Kendall-tau distance, a median is simply a ranking that maximizes the number of pairwise agreements with the voting profile. One of the most important interpretations of the Kemeny rule is that it is a maximum likelihood estimator of the correct ranking (see [11]).

Motivated by the NP-hardness of the various Kemeny problems (see [8], [3], [10]), our main goal is to formulate new quantitative results concerning the majority rules in  $k$ -wise Kemeny voting schemes associated with the  $k$ -wise Kendall-tau distance introduced recently in [10], notably for  $k = 2, 3$ , which also provide some more refined space reduction techniques to the Kemeny problem than several existing techniques in the literature. Moreover, we establish several new properties of the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme such as a quantified version of the Condorcet criterion and more generally the Smith criterion and the Extended Condorcet criterion (Theorem 8, Theorem 16, Theorem 15). Recent results in [15] show that the well-known 3/4-majority rule of Betzler et al. [5] for the classical Kemeny rule, namely, the 2-wise Kemeny voting scheme, is only valid for small elections of no more than 5 candidates with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny scheme. In this paper, without restriction on the number of candidates, we establish a 5/6-majority rule (Theorem 29, Theorem 30) which serves as the 3-wise counterpart of the 2-wise 3/4-majority rule.

Our analysis provides strong quantified evidence which shows that the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme is more suitable than the classical Kemeny voting scheme in many aspects. In particular, by taking into account not only pairwise discordance but also the discordance between the winners of subsets of three candidates (see Definition (1.1) below), we show that the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme is more resistant to coalitional manipulation than the classical Kemeny rule. More specifically, we prove that it is much more difficult for a candidate to win an election or even to simply win another specific candidate in an election under the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme and almost all of the best-known space reduction techniques for the classical Kemeny rule fail for the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme (see, e.g., Table 1), including the powerful Major Order Theorems discovered in [14] and the Condorcet Criterion. For example, we show that even when a candidate wins the 2/3 majority in every duel with all other candidates, this candidate may still lose the election according to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme (see Theorem 25). This phenomenon is rather surprising when compared to the Condorcet criterion for the classical Kemeny scheme where a Condorcet winner, namely a candidate who is preferred by more voters than any other candidate, must be the unique winner of the election. However, it turns out that a candidate obtaining a 3/4 majority in every duel must be the unique winner in the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme (see Theorem 8).

### 1.1 The $k$ -wise Kemeny rule

Let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer and let  $C$  be a finite set of candidates. Let  $S(C)$  be the set of all rankings of  $C$ . Let  $\Delta^k(C) \subset 2^C$  be the collection of all subsets of  $C$  which contain no more than  $k$  elements. To take into consideration disagreements not only on pairs of candidates but also on all subsets of candidates of cardinality at most  $k$ , the  $k$ -wise Kendall-tau distance  $d_{KT}^k(\pi, \sigma)$  between two rankings  $\pi, \sigma$  of  $C$  is defined by (cf. [10]):

$$d_{KT}^k(\pi, \sigma) = \sum_{S \in \Delta^k(C)} (1 - \delta_{\text{top}_S(\pi), \text{top}_S(\sigma)}) \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\text{top}_S(\pi) \in S$  denotes the highest ranked element of the restriction  $\pi|_S$  of  $\pi$  to  $S$  and  $\delta_{x,y}$  denotes the Kronecker symbol which is equal to 1 if  $x = y$  and is equal to zero otherwise. The  $k$ -wise Kendall-tau distance between a ranking  $\pi$  of  $C$  and a collection of rankings  $A$  of

$C$  is defined as

$$d_{KT}^k(\pi, A) = \sum_{\sigma \in A} d_{KT}^k(\pi, \sigma). \quad (1.2)$$

Let  $V$  be the voting profile of the election. Then we say that a ranking  $\pi$  of  $C$  is a *median of the election with respect to the  $k$ -wise Kemeny rule* or simply a  *$k$ -wise median* if

$$d_{KT}^k(\pi, V) = \min_{\sigma \in S(C)} d_{KT}^k(\sigma, V).$$

It is clear that for  $k = 2$ , we recover the definition of the usual Kendall-tau distance  $d_{KT}^2 = d_{KT}$ . Moreover, it was shown in [10] that the decision variant of the  $k$ -wise Kemeny aggregation problem is NP-complete for every constant  $k \geq 3$ .

We shall pay particular attention to the cases  $k = 2$  and  $k = 3$ . Our results suggest that the 3-wise Kemeny rule is more suitable than the 2-wise Kemeny rule since it puts more weight on candidates who are more frequently ranked in top positions in the votes, which partially justifies the utility of the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme over the classical 2-wise Kemeny scheme. Indeed, the classical Kemeny rule puts equal weight on the head-to-head competition of two candidates  $x, y$  regardless of the absolute positions of  $x, y$  in each vote. Nevertheless, typical voters in real-world settings only pay attention to a shortlist of their favorite candidates and normally put a somewhat arbitrary order for the rest of the candidates or simply do not indicate any preference for such candidates. As shown by an example given in [15], such voting behavior creates undesirable noises which makes the 2-wise Kemeny rule vulnerable to manipulation that can alter the consensus ranking. Consequently, we should somehow reduce the weight of the duel wins among unfavorite candidates of each vote. A possible solution for this problem is to use the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme as the weight of the duel  $x$  vs  $y$  in a ranking  $x > A > y > B$  is multiplied by  $|B|$  as we count  $|B|$  subsets of the form  $\{x, y, z\}$  where  $z \in B$ . Note also that the above explained imperfection of the Kemeny rule motivated the notion of weighted Kendall tau distances introduced by Kumar and Vassilvitskii [13] as well as the notion of setwise Kemeny distance of Gilbert et. al. [10].

While the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme enjoys the above-mentioned desirable property as well as the Majority criterion (Lemma 9), we prove that it suffers several minor drawbacks compared to the classical Kemeny voting scheme. Notably, the 3-wise Kemeny scheme does not satisfy the Reversal symmetry (Lemma 13), the Condorcet criterion as well as the Condorcet loser criterion (Lemma 12).

## 1.2 The classical Kemeny voting scheme revisited

By applying our analysis technique to the case of the 2-wise Kemeny voting scheme, i.e., the classical Kemeny rule, we can strengthen various reduction techniques such as the Always theorem (which states that if a candidate is always preferred over another candidate then the same holds for every Kemeny median), and the 3/4-majority rule of Betlzer et al. [5]. Thus, our results extend the range of applications of the Condorcet method (see Theorem 4 and Theorem 3). Since the 3/4-majority rule and the Always theorem are particularly useful for data in real-life competitions where the orders of the candidates do not vary much among the votes, our results should find a wide range of meaningful applications in practice.

## 1.3 Summary

Table 1 gives a summary of our main results as well as the comparison of various space reduction criteria for the classical and 3-wise Kemeny voting schemes. Table 3 presents the

mean percentage of cases (over a total of 100 000 uniformly generated instances) to which the Always Theorem, the 2-wise and 3-wise Extended Theorems (Theorem 3, Theorem 21) are applicable.

■ **Table 1** Space reduction results for setwise Kemeny schemes

Criterion	Kemeny rule	3-wise Kemeny rule
Monotonicity	Yes	Gilbert et al. 2022 [10]
Condorcet loser criterion	Yes	No, Lemma 12
Reversal symmetry	Yes	No, Lemma 13
Majority criterion	Lemma 9	Lemma 9
Extended Always theorem (Pareto efficiency, unanimity)	Theorem 3	Theorem 21
Condorcet criterion	Condorcet 1785 [7]	No, Theorem 25
2/3-Condorcet criterion	Yes	No, Theorem 25
3/4-Condorcet criterion	Yes	Theorem 8
Smith criterion	Smith 1973 [16]	No, Theorem 25
2/3-Smith criterion	Yes	No, Theorem 25
3/4-Smith criterion	Yes	Theorem 16
3/4-Smith-IIA	Yes, even Smith-IIA	No, Example 20
Extended Condorcet criterion	Truchon 1990 [17]	No, Theorem 25
3/4-Extended Condorcet criterion	Yes	Theorem 15
3/4-majority rule	Betzler et al. 2014 [5]	Valid only for elections of 5 candidates or less, Phung-Hamel [15]
Extended $s$ -majority rule	Theorem 4, Corollary 6	Yes for $s \geq 5/6$ , see below
5/6-majority rule	Yes	Theorem 29, Theorem 30, Corollary 32
Major Order Theorems	Milosz-Hamel 2020 [14]	No, see Phung-Hamel [15]
3-wise Major Order Theorems		Phung-Hamel [15].

## 2 Preliminaries

► **Definition 1.** Let  $x, y$  be candidates in an election with voting profile  $V$  and let  $s \in [0, 1]$ . When  $x$  is ranked before  $y$  in a vote  $v \in V$ , we denote  $x >^v y$  or simply  $x > y$  when there is no possible confusion. We write  $x \geq_s y$ , resp.  $x >_s y$ , if  $x > y$  in at least, resp. in more than,  $s|V|$  votes.

The next lemma is a simple but useful observation which serves as a weak form of the transitivity property in the context of voting.

► **Lemma 2** (see [15]). Let  $x, y, z$  be three distinct candidates in an election with voting profile  $V$ . Suppose that  $x \geq_s y$  and  $x \geq_s z$  for some  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Then in at least  $(2s - 1)|V|$  votes, we have  $x > y, z$ , i.e.,  $x > y$  and  $x > z$ .

**Proof.** Let  $A, B \subset V$  be the sets of votes in which  $x > y$  and  $x > z$  respectively. Since  $x \geq_s y$  and  $x \geq_s z$ , we deduce that  $|A| \geq s|V|$  and  $|B| \geq s|V|$ . Consequently, from the set

inequality  $|A \cup B| \leq |A| + |B| - |A \cap B|$ , we obtain the following estimation

$$|A \cap B| \geq |A| + |B| - |A \cup B| \geq s|V| + s|V| - |V| = (2s - 1)|V|.$$

Since in every vote  $v \in A \cap B$ , we have  $x > y, z$ , the conclusion thus follows.  $\blacktriangleleft$

### 3 An optimal extension of the Always theorem for the Kemeny rule

We have the following optimal extended version of the Always theorem [?] (Unanimity property) for the Kemeny rule. The Always theorem states that if a candidate  $x$  is ranked before another candidate  $y$  in every vote then  $x$  must be ranked before  $y$  in every 2-wise median of the election. In essence, our result implies that  $x$  does not need to win  $y$  in every single vote in order to win  $y$  in 2-wise median rankings.

► **Theorem 3.** *Let  $x, y$  be candidates in an election with  $n \geq 2$  candidates. Suppose that  $x \geq_\alpha y$  for some  $1 - \frac{1}{n} < \alpha \leq 1$ . Then we have  $x > y$  in every Kemeny ranking of the election.*

For example, we can choose  $\alpha = 0.917$  when  $n = 12$  and any  $\alpha > 0.95$  when  $n = 20$ :

$n$	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	12	20
$1 - \frac{1}{n}$	0.5	0.667	0.75	0.8	0.833	0.875	0.9	0.917	0.95

Note that our result is optimal in the following sense: for every even  $n \geq 2$  and every  $0 \leq s \leq 1 - \frac{2}{n}$ , there exists by [14, Proposition 1] an election with  $n$  candidates together with a pair of candidates  $(x, y)$  such that  $x \geq_s y$  but  $x < y$  in every Kemeny ranking of the election.

**Proof.** Suppose on the contrary that there exists a Kemeny ranking  $r$  of the election in which  $x < y$ . Let  $K$  be the set of all candidates ranked between  $x$  and  $y$  in the ranking  $r$ . Then it follows that  $y > K > x$ . Let  $k = |K|$  then it is clear that  $k \leq n - 2$ .

Let  $V$  be the multiset of all votes and  $m = |V|$ . For every  $z \in K$ , we denote:

$$x_z = |\{v \in V : x >^v z\}|, \quad y_z = |\{v \in V : z >^v y\}|.$$

We claim that  $x_z + y_z \geq \alpha m$  for all  $z \in K$ . Indeed, observe that  $m - x_z$  is the number of votes in which  $z > x$ . Among these votes, there are at most  $(1 - \alpha)m$  votes in which  $x < y$  since  $x \geq_\alpha y$  by hypothesis. It follows from the transitivity in a ranking that  $z > y$  in at least  $m - x_z - (1 - \alpha)m$  votes. Consequently, we find that

$$y_z \geq m - x_z - (1 - \alpha)m = \alpha m - x_z$$

and the claim is thus proved.

Consider the ranking  $r^*$  which is obtained from  $r$  by replacing the block  $y > K > x$  by the block  $x > K > y$  where the order of the candidates in  $K$  is not modified. Let  $\Delta = d_{KT}(r^*, V) - d_{KT}(r, V)$  then it is clear from the definition of the Kendall-tau distance that only the pairs  $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, K)$ ,  $(y, K)$  can contribute to the Kemeny score difference  $\Delta$ .

Since  $x \geq_\alpha y$ , the pair  $(x, y)$  contributes at most  $(1 - 2\alpha)m$  to  $\Delta$ . Let  $z \in K$ , then the contribution to  $\Delta$  of the pair  $(x, z)$  is at most  $(m - x_z) - x_z = m - 2x_z$ . Similarly, for every  $z \in K$ , the pair  $(y, z)$  contributes at most  $m - 2y_z$  to  $\Delta$ .

Therefore, the score difference  $\Delta$  is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta &\leq (1 - 2\alpha)m + \sum_{z \in K} ((m - 2x_z) + (m - 2y_z)) \\
&= (1 - 2\alpha)m + 2 \sum_{z \in K} (m - (x_z + y_z)) \\
&\leq (1 - 2\alpha)m + 2 \sum_{z \in K} (m - \alpha m) \\
&= m(1 - 2\alpha + k(1 - \alpha)) \\
&\leq m(1 - 2\alpha + (n - 2)(1 - \alpha)) \tag{3.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the inequality  $x_z + y_z \geq \alpha m$  for every  $z \in K$  in the second inequality and the fact that  $1 - \alpha > 0$  and  $k \leq n - 2$  in the last inequality.

Now observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta < 0 &\iff 1 - 2\alpha + (n - 2)(1 - \alpha) < 0 \\
&\iff \frac{n - 1}{n} < \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\Delta < 0$  for such  $\alpha$  and we deduce that in this case,  $r$  cannot be a Kemeny ranking of the election. We thus obtain a contradiction and the proof is complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

#### 4 An optimal extension of the 3/4-majority rule for the Kemeny rule

Following [5], a *non-dirty pair of candidates* in an election with respect to a threshold  $s \in [0, 1]$  is a pair  $(x, y)$  such that either  $x$  is ranked before  $y$  in a proportion of at least  $100s\%$  of the votes, or  $y$  ranked before  $x$  in a proportion of at least  $100s\%$  of the votes. Then we say that a candidate is *non-dirty* if  $(x, y)$  is a non-dirty pair with respect to the threshold  $s$  for every other candidate  $y \neq x$ . An election with a certain voting rule satisfies the *s-majority rule* if for every non-dirty candidate  $x$  with respect to the threshold  $s$  and every other candidate  $y \neq x$ , the relative positions of the pair  $(x, y)$  in every median is determined by the *s-majority* head-to-head.

By well-known results in [5], we know that every election satisfies the 3/4-majority rule. Our optimal extension of the 3/4-majority rule (see Theorem 4, Corollary 6) implies that the *s-majority rule* holds for  $s = 0.725$ , resp.  $s = 0.74$ , resp.  $s = 0.744$  for elections consisting of at most 6, resp. 12, resp. 20, candidates.

Our extension of the 3/4-majority rule for the Kemeny voting scheme is the following. Note that our criterion is asymptotically optimal (see Corollary 6, Remark 5, Remark 7, and Table 2).

► **Theorem 4.** *Let  $s \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$  and let  $q = \frac{3}{2} - s + \varepsilon$ . Let  $x$  be a non-dirty candidate in an election with at most  $n \geq 3$  candidates with respect to the *s-majority rule* and suppose that:*

$$n \leq n(s) = \frac{\sqrt{(1-s)(7-9s)} + 4 - 5s}{3 - 4s}; \quad \varepsilon > \frac{s - 1}{n - 1}.$$

*Then for every candidate  $y$  such that  $x \geq_q y$ , resp.  $y \geq_q x$ , we have  $x > y$ , resp.  $y > x$ , in every Kemeny ranking of the election.*

For example, when  $n = 6$ , resp.  $n = 12$ , resp.  $n = 20$ , we can take  $(s, q) = (0.716, 728)$ , resp.  $(s, q) = (0.737, 0.74)$ , resp.  $(s, q) = (0.743, 0.744)$ . In particular, we deduce from

Theorem 4 that the  $s$ -majority rule holds (with respect to the Kemeny voting scheme) for  $s = 0.728$ , resp.  $s = 0.74$ , resp.  $s = 0.744$ , when  $n = 6$ , resp.  $n = 12$ , resp.  $n = 20$ . Hence, the result will find some meaningful applications for elections with a small number of candidates but with a large number of votes, e.g., presidential elections.

**Proof.** Let  $C$  be the set of all candidates in the election then  $n = |C|$  and let  $V$  be the set of all votes. Suppose on the contrary that there exists a Kemeny ranking  $r$  together with a candidate  $y$  and a non-dirty candidate  $x$  with respect to the  $s$ -majority rule such that  $x \geqslant_q y$  but  $y > x$ .

Let  $K$  be the set of all candidates ranked between  $x$  and  $y$  in  $r$ . It follows that  $y > K > x$  in  $r$ . Since  $x$  is non-dirty with ratio  $s$ , we have a partition  $K = L \sqcup R$  where

$$L = \{z: z \geqslant_s x\}, \quad R = \{z: z <_s x\}.$$

We are going to show in the sequel that the modified ranking  $r^*$  of  $r$  with  $L > x > y > R$  has lower Kemeny score than  $r$ . Indeed, the only pairs of candidates which can contribute to the score difference  $\Delta = d_{KT}(r^*, V) - d_{KT}(r, V)$  are  $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, R)$ ,  $(y, L)$ , and  $(L, R)$  where e.g.  $(x, R)$  means any pair  $(x, z)$  where  $z \in R$  and similarly for  $(y, L)$  and  $(L, R)$ .

Since  $x \geqslant_q y$ , the pair  $(x, y)$  contributes at most  $|V| - q|V|$  to  $d_{KT}(r^*, V)$  but contributes at least  $q|V|$  to  $d_{KT}(r, V)$ . Hence, the contribution of  $(x, y)$  to  $\Delta$  is at most

$$|V| - q|V| - q|V| = (1 - 2q)|V|.$$

Similarly, the contribution of the  $|R|$  pairs  $(x, L)$  to the difference  $\Delta$  is at most  $(1 - 2s)|V||R|$ .

For every  $z \in L$  and  $t \in R$ , we infer from the definition of  $R$  and  $L$  that  $z \geqslant_s x$  and  $x \geqslant_s t$ . Therefore,  $z > x > t$  and thus  $z > t$  in at least  $(2s - 1)|V|$  votes. It follows that the  $|R||L|$  pairs  $(R, L)$  contribute at most

$$(1 - 2(2s - 1))|V||R||L| = (3 - 4s)|V||R||L|.$$

Similarly, for every  $z \in L$ , we find that  $z > x > y$  and thus  $z > y$  in at least  $(q + s - 1)|V|$  votes. Consequently, the  $|L|$  pairs  $(L, y)$  contribute at most

$$(1 - 2(q + s - 1))|V||L| = (3 - 2(q + s))|V||L|$$

to the score difference  $\Delta$ .

Let us denote  $v = |V|$ ,  $k = |K|$ , and  $a = |R|$  then  $|L| = k - a$ . To summarize, we deduce by substituting  $q = \frac{3}{2} - s + \varepsilon$  from the above inequalities that  $\Delta$  is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta}{v} &\leq (1 - 2q) + (1 - 2s)a + (3 - 4s)a(k - a) + (3 - 2(q + s))(k - a) \\ &= (2s - 2 - 2\varepsilon) + (1 - 2s)a + (3 - 4s)a(k - a) - 2\varepsilon(k - a) \\ &= F(a) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where  $F(a) = (4s - 3)a^2 + (1 - 2s + 2\varepsilon + (3 - 4s)k)a + 2s - 2 - 2\varepsilon(k + 1)$ .

Observe that for fixed  $\varepsilon > \frac{s-1}{n-1}$ , we have  $F(0) = 2s - 2 - 2\varepsilon(k + 1) < 0$  since  $\frac{s-1}{n-1} \geqslant \frac{s-1}{k+1}$  as  $s - 1 < 0$  and  $0 < k + 1 \leqslant n - 1$ . On the other hand, the critical point of  $F$  is

$$a_0 = \frac{1 - 2s + 2\varepsilon + (3 - 4s)k}{2(3 - 4s)}.$$

Note that since  $3 - 4s > 0$ , we have  $a_0 \leq 0$  if and only if  $k \leq \frac{2s-1-2\varepsilon}{3-4s}$ . The latter condition is always satisfied if

$$n \leq \frac{2s-1-2\varepsilon}{3-4s} + 2 \leq \frac{2s-1+\frac{2-2s}{n-1}}{3-4s} + 2 \quad (4.2)$$

since  $k \leq |V| - 2 = n - 2$  and  $\varepsilon > \frac{s-1}{n-1}$ . As the leading coefficient of the quadratic function  $F$  is  $4s - 3 < 0$  and  $a \geq 0$ , we have for all such  $n$  that  $F(a) \leq F(0) < 0$ . Consequently,  $\Delta \leq vF(a) < 0$  and we conclude that  $d_{KT}(r^*, V) < d_{KT}(r, V)$ . This contradiction shows that  $r$  cannot be a Kemeny ranking of the election. In other words, if  $x \succ_q y$  then we must have  $x > y$  in every Kemeny ranking whenever (4.2) is satisfied. The case  $x \leq_q y$  is completely similar.

We will now solve the condition  $n \leq \frac{2s-1+\frac{2-2s}{n-1}}{2(3-4s)} + 2$  in (4.2). By setting  $u = n - 1 > 0$ , a straightforward algebra then shows that the inequality is equivalent to:

$$f(u) = (3 - 4s)u^2 - (2 - 2s)u - 2 + 2s \leq 0.$$

Observe that  $f(0) = -2 + 2s < 0$ . Hence, using again the fact that the leading coefficient of the quadratic function  $f$  is  $3 - 4s > 0$ , we obtain the following description of all the solutions  $n$  of (4.2):

$$n = u + 1 \leq n(s) = \frac{\sqrt{(1-s)(7-9s)} + 4 - 5s}{3 - 4s}$$

and the proof is complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Consequently, the Extended  $s$ -majority rule Theorem 4 shows essentially that the  $s$ -majority rule still holds if  $s \in [\frac{7}{10}, \frac{3}{4}[$  under the condition that we bound the number of the candidates.

► **Remark 5.** For every  $s \in ]\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{4}[$ , the counterexample to the  $s$ -majority rule given in [5, Proposition 1] requires  $\lceil l \rceil + 2$  candidates where

$$l = l(s) = \frac{3s}{3 - 4s} \quad (4.3)$$

which is linear in  $(1 - 4s/3)^{-1}$ . Note that  $l(0.72) = 18$ .

► **Corollary 6.** Let  $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}[$  and let us define:

$$n(t) = \frac{\sqrt{(1-t)(7-9t)} + 4 - 5t}{3 - 4t}, \quad s(t, n(t)) = \frac{3}{2} - t - \frac{1-t}{n(t)-1}. \quad (4.4)$$

Then for any  $s < s(t, n(t))$ , the  $s$ -majority rule holds for all elections with  $n$  candidates such that  $n \leq n(t)$ .

**Proof.** By the proof of Theorem 4 where

(i)  $\varepsilon = \frac{t-1}{n(t)-1}$ ,  $q = s(t, n(t))$ ,

(ii)  $t$  in our corollary plays the role of  $s$  in Theorem 4,

we deduce that for all

$$s < \max(t, q) = \max(t, s(t, n(t))),$$

the  $s$ -majority rule holds for all elections with  $n \leq n(t)$  candidates. Note that for  $\varepsilon = \frac{t-1}{n(t)-1}$  but  $s < \max(t, s(t, n(t)))$ , we still have  $F(0) < 0$  in the proof of Theorem 4.

On the other hand, a straightforward analysis of the function  $s(t, n(t))$  shows that  $s(t, n(t)) \geq t$  for all  $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}[$ . The conclusion thus follows.  $\blacktriangleleft$



► Remark 7. A direct computation shows that for every  $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}[$ , the functions  $l(s)$ ,  $n(t)$ , and  $s(t, n(t))$  (cf. (4.3) and (4.4)) satisfy:

$$4 < \frac{l(s(t, n(t))) + 2}{n(t)} < \frac{9}{2}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}} s(t, n(t)) = \frac{3}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}} \frac{l(s(t, n(t))) + 2}{n(t)} = \frac{9}{2}.$$

Consequently, by Remark 5 and Corollary 6, we can conclude that our extension of the  $s$ -majority rule Corollary 6 is indeed asymptotically optimal for the Kemeny rule. The following table 2 provides the first few values of the quadruples  $(t, s, n, l + 2)$  where

$$n = \lfloor n(t) \rfloor, \quad s = s(t, n(t)), \quad l = \lceil l(s(t, n(t))) \rceil.$$

■ **Table 2** Optimality of the Extended  $s$ -majority rule

<b>t</b>	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.71	0.72	0.73
<b>s</b>	0.691	0.7	0.721	0.729	0.725	0.735
<b>n</b>	2	3	4	5	6	8
<b>l + 2</b>	11	13	21	24	29	38
<b>t</b>	0.74	0.742	0.744	0.746	0.748	0.749
<b>s</b>	0.741	0.743	0.745	0.746	0.748	0.749
<b>n</b>	14	18	23	33	64	127
<b>l + 2</b>	67	81	104	151	292	573

## 5 3-wise Condorcet consistency and 3-wise Smith criterion

### 5.1 Condorcet criterion

While the classical Kemeny voting scheme satisfies the Condorcet criterion, the  $k$ -wise Kemeny voting scheme is not a Condorcet scheme whenever  $k \geq 3$  since a *Condorcet winner* might not be the winner in median rankings (see [10, Proposition 3]). Here, a candidate  $x$  is a Condorcet winner in an election if  $x \geq_{1/2} y$  for all other candidate  $y \neq x$ . However, we establish the following result which shows that if a candidate wins by a large enough margin (slightly less than 75%) in every duel, then it is necessarily the *unique winner* in every Kemeny ranking with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny rule.

► **Theorem 8.** *Let  $x$  be a candidate in an election with  $n \geq 2$  candidates. Suppose that  $x \geq_{\alpha} y$  for all candidate  $y \neq x$  where*

$$\alpha > f(n) = \frac{3n - 5}{4n - 6}.$$

*Then  $x$  is the winner in every median of the election with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny rule. In particular, if  $x \geq_{3/4} y$  for all candidate  $y \neq x$  then  $x$  is the winner in every 3-wise median.*

For example, the following table gives us several values of  $f(n)$ :

$n$	4	8	12	20	30	50
$f(n)$	0.7	0.731	0.738	0.743	0.746	0.747

**Proof.** Let  $C$  be the set of all candidates then  $|C| = n$ . Suppose on the contrary that there exists a Kemeny ranking  $r$  of the election with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  in which  $x$  is not the winner. Let  $y \neq x$  be the candidate which is ranked immediately before  $x$  and let  $L, R$  be respectively the ordered sets of all candidates ranked before  $y$  and after  $x$  in the ranking  $r$ . In other words, the ranking  $r$  can be written as  $L > y > x > R$ .

We consider the ranking  $r^*$  obtained from  $r$  by simply exchanging the positions of the candidates  $x$  and  $y$  while keeping the positions of all other candidates. Hence, the ranking  $r^*$  is  $L > x > y > R$ . We are going to show that  $\Delta = d_{KT}^3(r^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(r, V) < 0$  to obtain a contradiction.

When restricted to  $\Delta^2(C)$ , i.e., to subsets of  $C$  of cardinality at most 2, we infer from the definition of  $r^*$  and of the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  that only the subset  $\{x, y\}$  can contribute to the score difference  $\Delta$ . Since  $x \geq_\alpha y$ , we find that  $x > y$  in at least  $\alpha v$  votes. Therefore, it is clear that the subset  $\{x, y\}$  contributes at most

$$(v - \alpha v) - \alpha v = (1 - 2\alpha)v. \quad (5.1)$$

to the score difference  $\Delta$ .

Similarly, if we restrict to subsets of  $C$  of cardinality 3 then it is clear from the definition of  $r^*$  that only the subsets of the form  $S = \{x, y, z\}$ , where  $z \in C \setminus \{x, y\}$ , can contribute to  $\Delta$ . Let us fix  $z \in C \setminus \{x, y\}$ . If  $z \in L$  then  $\text{top}_S(r^*) = \text{top}_S(r) = z$  and the contribution of  $S$  to  $\Delta$  is thus zero.

Suppose that  $z \in R$ . Since  $x \geq_\alpha y$  and  $x \geq_\alpha z$ , the number of votes in which we have  $x > y$  and  $x > z$  is at least  $\alpha v - (v - \alpha v) = (2\alpha - 1)v$ . Let us fix such a vote  $\pi$ . Then observe that  $\text{top}_S(r^*) = \text{top}_S(\pi) = x$  while  $\text{top}_S(r) = y$  and the contribution of  $S$  to  $\Delta$  when computed with  $\pi$  is  $-1$ .

Consequently, the total contribution to  $\Delta$  of the subsets  $S = \{x, y, z\}$ , where  $z \in C \setminus \{x, y\}$ , is at most

$$|R|(v - 2(2\alpha - 1)v) = |R|(3 - 4\alpha)v. \quad (5.2)$$

To summarize, we obtain from (5.1) and (5.2) the following estimation on the 3-wise score difference  $\Delta$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &\leq (1 - 2\alpha)v + |R|(3 - 4\alpha)v \\ &= v(3|R| + 1 - \alpha(4|R| + 2)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $v > 0$ , we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta < 0 &\iff 3|R| + 1 - \alpha(4|R| + 2) < 0 \\ &\iff \alpha > \frac{3|R| + 1}{4|R| + 2} = \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{8|R| + 4}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Since  $|R| \leq n - 2$ , the inequality (5.3) is always satisfied if

$$\alpha > \frac{3}{4} - \frac{1}{8(n-2) + 4} = f(n).$$

Therefore, whenever  $\alpha > f(n)$ , we have  $\Delta < 0$  which implies that  $r$  cannot be a Kemeny ranking with respect to the 3-wise rule. We conclude that  $x$  must be the winner in every 3-wise median and the proof is complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 5.2 Setwise Majority criterion and application

A weaker property than the Condorcet criterion is the *Majority criterion* which says that if one candidate is ranked first by a majority (more than 50%) of votes, then that candidate must win the election. The following simple observation shows that the  $k$ -wise Kemeny voting scheme satisfies the Majority criterion for every  $k \geq 2$ .

► **Lemma 9.** *Let  $x$  be a candidate in an election such that  $x$  wins more than 50% of the votes. Then  $x$  is the winner in every  $k$ -wise median ( $k \geq 2$ ).*

**Proof.** Let  $V$  be the voting profile. Suppose on the contrary that there exists a  $k$ -wise median  $\pi: L > y > x > R$  where  $y$  is a candidate and  $L, R$  are (possibly empty) ordered sets of candidates. Consider the ranking  $\pi^*: L > x > y > R$  and let  $S$  be a subset of candidates. Then  $S$  can contribute to the score difference  $\Delta = d_{KT}^k(\pi^*, V) - d_{KT}^k(\pi, V)$  only if  $x, y \in S$  and  $L \cap S = \emptyset$ . Note that since  $k \geq 2$ , such a subset  $S$  always exists. Then we have  $x > S \cup \{y\}$  in more than  $|V|/2$  votes and thus  $y > S \cup \{x\}$  in less than  $|V|/2$  votes. Consequently, every subset of candidates  $S$  contributes to  $\Delta$  by an amount strictly less than

$$|V|/2 - |V|/2 = 0.$$

Hence, by summation over all subsets  $S$  of size at most  $k$ , we deduce that  $\Delta < 0$ , which contradicts the hypothesis that  $\pi$  is a  $k$ -wise median. ◀

We obtain the following application.

► **Corollary 10.** *Let  $\pi$  be a vote that appears in more than 50% of the total votes in an election. Then  $\pi$  is the unique median ranking of the election with respect to every  $k$ -wise Kemeny voting scheme for all  $k \geq 2$ .*

**Proof.** Fix an integer  $k \geq 2$  and a  $k$ -wise median  $\sigma$  of the election with voting profile  $V$ . Let us write  $\pi: x_1 > x_2 > \dots > x_n$  where  $C = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  is the set of all candidates and let  $V_p$  be the election where we eliminate the candidates  $x_1, \dots, x_p$  from the list of candidates and from all the votes.

Let  $\pi_1, \sigma_1$  be the induced rankings where we eliminate the candidate  $x_1$  from  $\pi$  and from  $\sigma$  respectively. By Lemma 9, the candidate  $x_1$  is the unique winner in every median thus in the ranking  $\sigma$  in particular. Therefore, it is clear from the definition of  $d_{KT}^k$  that every subset  $S \in \Delta^k(C)$  containing  $x_1$  contributes a constant amount to  $d_{KT}^k(r, V)$  for every  $k$ -wise median  $r$  of  $V$ . We deduce that  $\sigma$  is a  $k$ -wise median of the election  $V$  if and only if  $\sigma_1$  is a  $k$ -wise median in the election  $V_1$ .

Observe that  $\pi_1$  occurs in more than 50% of the votes in the election  $V_1$  since  $\pi$  appears in more than 50% of the votes in the original election  $V$ .

By repeating the above argument, we infer again from Lemma 9 that  $x_2$ , the winner of  $\pi_1$ , must be the winner of  $\sigma_1$ , etc. By induction, we obtain  $\sigma = \pi$  and the proof is thus complete. ◀

From the above result, we obtain counter-intuitive and extreme situations where in an election, a candidate may be the loser in every  $k$ -wise median despite winning almost half of the votes. More surprisingly, this candidate may even lose to another candidate who consistently occupies the last two positions in every vote.

► **Example 11.** Let  $m \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 0$ . Let  $V$  be the following voting profile in an election with  $n + 3$  candidates:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &: w > z_1 > \cdots > z_n > x > y && (m + 1 \text{ votes}) \\ \sigma_1 &: y > A_1 > x > w && (1 \text{ vote}) \\ \dots & && \\ \sigma_m &: y > A_m > x > w && (1 \text{ vote}). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  are arbitrary rankings of  $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ . Then by Corollary 10, the ranking  $\pi$  is the unique  $k$ -wise median of the election for every  $k \geq 2$ . In particular,  $y$  loses against  $x$  in every median despite the fact that  $y$  wins nearly half of the votes while  $x$  always finishes among the last two.

A generalization and stronger version of the majority criterion is the *mutual majority criterion* which says that if there exists a partition  $C = I \cup J$  of the set of candidates such that in more than half of the votes, we have  $x > y$  for all  $x \in I$  and  $y \in J$ , then the winner of the election must come from the set  $I$ . It is known that the 2-wise Kemeny voting scheme satisfies the mutual majority criterion.

### 5.3 3-wise Condorcet loser criterion and Reversal symmetry

We know that the 2-wise Kemeny voting scheme satisfies the Condorcet criterion as well as the *Condorcet loser criterion*. The latter means that if a candidate loses every duel in an election then the candidate cannot be the winner.

► **Lemma 12.** *The 3-wise Kemeny scheme does not satisfy the Condorcet loser criterion.*

**Proof.** Let  $C = \{x, y, z, t\}$  be a set of 4 candidates and consider the voting profile  $V$ :

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &: z > t > x > y \quad (5 \text{ votes}) \\ r_2 &: y > t > x > z \quad (2 \text{ votes}) \\ r_3 &: x > y > t > z \quad (2 \text{ votes}) \\ r_4 &: t > x > y > z \quad (2 \text{ votes}). \end{aligned}$$

A direct computation shows that  $z <_{1/2} x, y, t$ . Moreover, we have  $d_{KT}^3(r_1, V) = 48$  and  $r_1$  is the unique 3-wise Kemeny median of the election. It follows that while  $z$  is a Condorcet loser, it is the unique winner of the election with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny rule. Consequently, we conclude that the 3-wise Kemeny scheme does not satisfy the Condorcet loser criterion. ◀

The concrete example constructed in Lemma 12 also proves that the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme does not satisfy the *reversal symmetry* property which requires that if a particular candidate is a unique winner in every median, then in the mirrored election where the preferences in each vote are inverted, the candidate cannot be the winner in any median.

► **Lemma 13.** *The 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme does not satisfy the reversal symmetry.*

**Proof.** Consider again the set  $C = \{x, y, z, t\}$  of 4 candidates and the following voting profile  $V$  with  $z$  as the unique winner with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme as in Lemma 12. The voting profile  $V'$  of the mirrored election is then:

$$r'_1 : y > x > t > z \quad (5 \text{ votes})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
r'_2 &: z > x > t > y \text{ (2 votes)} \\
r'_3 &: z > t > y > x \text{ (2 votes)} \\
r'_4 &: z > y > x > t \text{ (2 votes)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since in  $V'$  the candidate  $z$  wins  $2 + 2 + 2 = 6$  votes out of 11 votes,  $z$  is the winner in more than 50% of the votes. Consequently, Lemma 9 implies that  $z$  must be the winner in every 3-wise median. Hence, the reversal symmetry property is not verified by the voting profile  $V$  with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. The proof is complete. ◀

#### 5.4 3-wise Smith criterion and 3-wise Extended Condorcet criterion

▶ **Definition 14.** *Given an election with the set of candidates  $C$ , its Smith set is defined as the smallest non-empty subset  $S \subset C$  such that every candidate in  $S$  is majority-preferred over every candidate in  $C \setminus S$ . It is clear that such a Smith set is well-defined. A voting scheme is said to satisfy the Smith criterion the winner in every consensus of an election belongs to the Smith set of that election [16].*

Observe that by definition, the Smith criterion implies the Condorcet criterion. More generally, in [17], Truchon studied the so-called *Extended Condorcet criterion* which says that if there is a partition of the set of candidates  $C = I \cup J$  such that for any  $x$  in  $I$  and any  $y$  in  $J$  the majority prefers  $x$  to  $y$  in the election, then in every median Kemeny ranking,  $x$  must be ranked above  $y$ .

For the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme, we obtain in this section the following similar space reduction result which extends notably Theorem 8.

▶ **Theorem 15.** *Let  $C$  be the set of candidates in an election. Suppose that  $C = I \cup J$  is a partition of  $C$  such that*

- (i) *for all  $x \in I$  and  $y \in J$ , we have  $x \succ_{3/4} y$ ,*
- (ii)  $0 < |I| \leq \frac{|J|+4}{2}$ .

*Then in every 3-wise median, we have  $x > y$  for all  $x \in I$  and  $y \in J$ .*

To establish Theorem 15, we shall first prove the following consequence of Theorem 15 which is an extension of the Smith criterion for the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme with respect to the 3/4-majority rule.

▶ **Theorem 16.** *Let  $C$  be the set of candidates in an election. Suppose that  $C = I \cup J$  is a partition of  $C$  such that*

- (i) *for all  $x \in I$  and  $y \in J$ , we have  $x \succ_{3/4} y$ ,*
- (ii)  $0 < |I| \leq \frac{|J|+4}{2}$ .

*Then the winner in every median of the election with respect to the  $d_{KT}^3$  distance must be a candidate in  $I$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $V$  be the voting profile of the election and let  $m = |V|$ . Note that  $I \neq \emptyset$  since  $|I| > 0$  by (ii). Therefore, we can suppose on the contrary that there exists a median  $\pi: y > A > x > B$  with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  such that

- (a)  $A \cup \{y\} \subset J$ ,
- (b)  $x \in I$ .

Consider the modified ranking  $\pi^*: x > y > A > B$  of the ranking  $\pi$ . We will show that

$$\Delta = d_{KT}^3(\pi^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(\pi, V) \leq 0.$$

Indeed, when restricted to subsets of 2 elements, the only pairs that can contribute to  $\Delta$  are  $(x, y)$  and  $(x, A)$ . For the pair  $(x, y)$ , note that  $x \geq_{3/4} y$  and thus  $y <_{1/4} x$ . Hence, the contribution of  $(x, y)$  is at most  $\frac{1}{4}m - \frac{3}{4}m = -\frac{1}{2}m$ . Similarly, since  $A \subset J$ , the contribution of each pair  $(x, z)$  where  $z \in A$  is at most  $-\frac{1}{2}m$ . Consequently, the total contribution of subsets of size 2 to  $\Delta$  is at most

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}|A|\right)m. \quad (5.4)$$

For subsets of size 3, observe that only subsets of the following forms can contribute to  $\Delta$ :

- (1)  $(x, y, A)$ ,
- (2)  $(x, y, B)$ ,
- (3)  $(x, A, A)$ ,
- (4)  $(x, A, B)$ .

We shall consider each case separately.

**Case 1:** for every  $z \in A$ , we have  $x \geq_{3/4} z$ ,  $x \geq_{3/4} y$  thus  $x > y, z$  in at least  $m/2$  votes. Moreover, since  $y > x$  in at most  $m/4$  votes, we deduce that the set  $\{x, y, z\}$  contributes at most  $(m/4 - m/2) = -m/4$  to  $\Delta$ . Hence, the total contribution, in this case, is bounded from the above by:

$$-\frac{1}{4}|A|m. \quad (5.5)$$

**Case 2:** by a similar argument, we find that the total contribution, in this case, is at most

$$\left(\frac{1}{4}|B \cap I| - \frac{1}{4}|B \cap J|\right)m \quad (5.6)$$

since for each  $z \in B \cap I$ , we have  $y > x$  in at most  $m/4$  votes thus the term  $\frac{1}{4}|B \cap I|m$  and for each  $z \in B \cap J$ , we have  $x \geq_{3/4} y$ ,  $x \geq_{3/4} z$  thus  $x > y, z$  in at least  $m/2$  votes (which are of course different from the votes in which  $y > x$  which are at most  $m/2$  in number) whence the term

$$\frac{1}{4}|B \cap J|m - \frac{1}{2}|B \cap J|m = -\frac{1}{4}|B \cap J|m.$$

**Case 3:** similarly, the total contribution, in this case, is at most

$$\left(\frac{1}{4}|(A, A)| - \frac{1}{2}|(A, A)|\right)m = -\frac{1}{4}|(A, A)|m. \quad (5.7)$$

**Case 4:** the total contribution is bounded by

$$\left(\frac{1}{4}|(A, B \cap I)| - \frac{1}{4}|(A, B \cap J)|\right)m. \quad (5.8)$$

Let  $a = |A|$ ,  $b = |J \setminus (A \cup \{y\})| = |B \cap J|$ , and  $c = |I \setminus \{x\}| = |B \cap I|$  then

$$\begin{aligned} |(A, A)| &= \frac{a(a-1)}{2}, & |(A, B \cap J)| &= ab, & |(A, B \cap I)| &= ac, \\ |I| &= c + 1, & |J| &= |J \setminus (A \cup \{y\})| + |A| + 1 = a + b + 1. \end{aligned}$$

To summarize, we obtain from the bounds (5.4), (5.5), (5.6), (5.7), and (5.8) the following estimation:

$$\frac{\Delta}{m} \leq -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}a - \frac{1}{4}a + \frac{1}{4}c - \frac{1}{4}b - \frac{1}{4} \frac{a(a-1)}{2} - \frac{1}{4}ab + \frac{1}{4}ac. \quad (5.9)$$

Since  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $c + 1 = |I| \leq \frac{|J|+4}{2} = \frac{a+b+5}{2}$  thus  $c \leq \frac{a+b+3}{2}$  by hypothesis, we deduce from (5.9) that:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta}{m} &\leq -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}a - \frac{1}{4}a + \frac{1}{4}c - \frac{1}{4}b - \frac{1}{4} \frac{a(a-1)}{2} - \frac{1}{4}ab + \frac{1}{4}ac \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{5}{8}a - \frac{1}{8}a^2 - \frac{1}{4}b - \frac{1}{4}ab + \frac{1}{4}c + \frac{1}{4}ac \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{5}{8}a - \frac{1}{8}a^2 - \frac{1}{4}b - \frac{1}{4}ab + \frac{1}{4} \frac{a+b+3}{2} + \frac{1}{4}a \frac{a+b+3}{2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8}a - \frac{1}{8}b - \frac{1}{8}ab \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $d_{KT}^3(\pi^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(\pi, V) = \Delta < 0$  and we obtain a contradiction since  $\pi$  is a median by hypothesis. The proof is thus complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

We are now in position to prove Theorem 15.

**Proof of Theorem 15.** We suppose on the contrary that there exists a median  $\pi$  with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  which does not satisfy the conclusion of the theorem. As in the proof of Theorem 16, note that  $I \neq \emptyset$  by (ii). Hence, we can write  $\pi: K > y > A > x > B$  where

- (a)  $K \subset I$
- (b)  $A \cup \{y\} \subset J$ ,
- (c)  $x \in I$ .

In other words, we choose  $y \in J$  to be the candidate with the highest rank in  $\pi$  and  $x \in I$  is the highest-ranked candidate which is ranked after  $y$  in  $\pi$ .

By Theorem 16, the candidate  $y$  cannot be the winner of the median  $\pi$ . It follows that  $K \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\pi^*: K > x > y > A > B$ .

Let us consider the induced election  $V'$  where we eliminate all the candidates in  $K$  from the list of candidates and from all the votes while keeping the relative rankings of other candidates. Let  $I' = I \setminus K$  then  $I' \cup J$  is a partition of the set of candidates of the induced election  $V'$  such that  $z \geq_{3/4} t$  for all  $z \in I'$  and  $t \in J$  and

$$0 < |\{x\}| \leq |I'| = |I| - |K| \leq |I| \leq \frac{|J|+4}{2}.$$

Consequently, we infer from the proof of Theorem 16 that the rankings  $\sigma: y > A > x > B$  and  $\sigma^*: x > y > A > B$  satisfy

$$\delta_{KT}^3(\sigma^*, V') - \delta_{KT}^3(\sigma, V') < 0. \quad (5.10)$$

We deduce from the definitions of  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma^*$  and the relation (5.10) that

$$\delta_{KT}^3(\pi^*, V) - \delta_{KT}^3(\sigma, V) = \delta_{KT}^3(\sigma^*, V') - \delta_{KT}^3(\sigma, V') < 0$$

It follows that  $\pi^*$  cannot be a median of the original election  $V$  and we obtain a contradiction. The proof is thus complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

### 5.5 Smith-independence of irrelevant alternatives

The well-known independence of irrelevant alternatives property (IIA) requires that the relative ranking between  $x$  and  $y$  in every median should depend only on the relative rankings between  $x$  and  $y$  in every vote. The Arrow impossibility theorem (cf. [4]) tells us that every voting scheme satisfying the IIA property, universality (uniqueness of the complete median ranking), and unanimity must be a dictatorship.

The Smith-IIA property, or the Independence of Smith-dominated alternatives (ISDA), is a weaker and more reasonable voting criterion requiring that removing a candidate who is not a member of the Smith set (cf. Definition 14) will not change the winner of the election.

The Smith-IIA property is known to hold true for the classical Kemeny rule and it clearly implies the Smith criterion (cf. Definition 14), Condorcet criterion, and the mutual majority criterion. Generalizing the notion of Smith sets, we define the  $\alpha$ -Smith sets as follows.

► **Definition 17.** *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . The  $\alpha$ -Smith set of an election over the set of candidates  $C$  is the smallest non-empty subset  $S \subset C$  such that for all  $x \in S$  and  $y \in C \setminus S$ , we have  $x \succ_{3/4} y$ .*

*A voting scheme satisfies the  $\alpha$ -Smith IIA criterion if the winner in every consensus of an election belongs to the  $\alpha$ -Smith set even if we remove one or several candidates outside of the  $\alpha$ -Smith set.*

We have the following simple observations.

► **Lemma 18.** *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Then the  $\alpha$ -Smith set  $S_\alpha$  of an election  $V$  over a set of candidates  $C$  is unique. Moreover,  $S_\alpha$  is the intersection of all subsets  $S \subset C$  such that for all  $x \in S$  and  $y \in C \setminus S$ , we have  $x \succ_\alpha y$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $S, S' \subset C$  be such that for all  $x \in S$  and  $y \in C \setminus S$ ,  $x \succ_\alpha y$  and such that for all  $x \in S'$  and  $y \in C \setminus S'$ ,  $x \succ_\alpha y$ . Then it suffices to note that  $x \succ_\alpha y$  for all  $x \in S \cap S'$  and  $y \in C \setminus (S \cap S')$ . ◀

► **Lemma 19.** *Let  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq 1$ . If a voting scheme satisfies the  $\alpha$ -Smith IIA criterion then it also satisfies the  $\beta$ -Smith IIA criterion.*

**Proof.** Let  $S_\alpha$  and  $S_\beta$  be the  $\alpha$ -Smith set and the  $\beta$ -Smith set of the election. Then by definition, we clearly have  $S_\alpha \subset S_\beta$  (cf. Lemma 18). Suppose that a voting scheme satisfies the  $\alpha$ -Smith IIA criterion. Thus, if we remove one or several candidates outside of  $S_\alpha$ , the winner of the resulting election still belongs to  $S_\alpha$ . Since  $S_\alpha \subset S_\beta$ , the winner stays in  $S_\alpha$  and thus to  $S_\beta$  if we remove one or several candidates outside of  $S_\beta$ . Hence, the election also satisfies the  $\beta$ -Smith IIA criterion. ◀

While the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme satisfies the 3/4-Smith criterion (Theorem 16), the following example shows that the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme does not satisfy the 3/4-Smith-IIA property and thus fails the Smith-IIA property in particular (cf. Lemma 19 as  $3/4 > 1/2$ ).

► **Example 20.** Let  $A, B$  denote the blocks  $x_3 > x_4 > x_5$  and  $x_6 > x_7 > x_8$  respectively. Let us consider the following voting profile  $V$  consisting of 4 votes over 8 candidates  $x_1, \dots, x_8$ :

- $r_1 : B > x_2 > x_1 > A$  (1 vote)
- $r_2 : x_1 > A > x_2 > B$  (1 vote)
- $r_3 : A > x_2 > x_1 > B$  (1 vote)
- $r_4 : x_2 > x_1 > A > B$  (1 vote)



An exhaustive computation shows that the only 3-wise median of the election  $V$  is  $\pi^*: x_1 > A > x_2 > B$  whose 3-wise distance to  $V$  is 114. In particular,  $x_1$  is the unique winner of the election.

Note that  $x_2 \geq_{3/4} x_1$  and  $x_1 \geq_{3/4} x_i$  for all  $i = 3, 4, \dots, 8$ . Moreover, for every  $i = 3, 4, 5$ , the candidate  $x_2$  is ranked before  $x_i$  in exactly half of the votes. Consequently, it is not hard to see that the 3/4-Smith set of the election  $V$  is  $S = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ .

However, if we remove the candidates  $x_6, x_7, x_8$ , we obtain the following election:

$$\begin{aligned} r'_1 &: x_2 > x_1 > A && (1 \text{ vote}) \\ r'_2 &: x_1 > A > x_2 && (1 \text{ vote}) \\ r'_3 &: A > x_2 > x_1 && (1 \text{ vote}) \\ r'_4 &: x_2 > x_1 > A && (1 \text{ vote}) \end{aligned}$$

whose unique 3-wise Kemeny median is  $\sigma^*: x_2 > x_1 > x_3 > x_4 > x_5$  and thus we obtain a new unique 3-wise winner  $x_2 \neq x_1$ . We conclude that the 3/4-Smith-IIA property fails for the election  $V$  under the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme.

## 6 Unanimity and the unique winner property

The original Unanimity Theorem [10, Proposition 5] guarantees the relative ordering of a pair of candidates in every final  $k$ -wise ranking if all votes agree on the same preference of that pair. However, given  $k \geq 2$ , the Unanimity Theorem alone does not allow us to arrive at the same conclusion whenever there exist two votes which have different preferences on a specific pair of candidates  $(x, y)$ , even if  $x > y$  in virtually all votes.

In the case  $k = 3$ , we shall establish Theorem 21 in the next section to solve the above issue quantitatively and prove the possibility to manipulate the ordering of a pair of candidates in every election using the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme together with a simple strategy to achieve the desired manipulation. More specifically, suppose that in an election using the 3-wise Kemeny rule, we want to manipulate the relative preference of two candidates  $x, y$  so that  $x > y$  in every final ranking, it suffices to make sure that  $x > y$  in  $g(n) \times 100\%$  of the votes. Here,  $g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow ]0, 1[$  is an increasing function defined in Theorem 21.

### 6.1 3-wise Extended Pareto efficiency (Unanimity)

In the vein of the Extended Always theorem (Theorem 3), we have the following generalization of the unanimity property [10, Proposition 5] also known as the Pareto efficiency for the  $k$ -wise Kemeny rule when  $k = 3$ :

► **Theorem 21.** *Let  $x, y$  be candidates in an election with  $n \geq 2$  candidates. Suppose that  $x \geq_\alpha y$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  such that*

$$\alpha > g(n) = 1 - \frac{1}{n^2 - 3n + 4}.$$

*Then  $x > y$  in every median with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny rule.*

To illustrate, the following table gives us several values of  $g(n)$ :

$n$	2	3	4	5	6	8	10	12
$g(n)$	0.5	0.75	0.875	0.929	0.955	0.977	0.987	0.991

**Proof.** Let  $C$  be the set of all candidates then  $|C| = n$ . Suppose on the contrary that there exists a Kemeny ranking  $r$  of the election with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  in which  $x < y$ . Let  $L, K, R$  be respectively the ordered sets of all candidates ranked before  $y$ , between  $x$

and  $y$ , and after  $x$  in the ranking  $r$ . In other words, the ranking  $r$  can be written as  $L > y > K > x > R$ .

Let  $V$  be the multiset of all votes and  $v = |V|$ . We consider the ranking  $r^*$  obtained from  $r$  by simply exchanging the positions of the candidates  $x$  and  $y$  while keeping the positions of all other candidates. Hence, the ranking  $r^*$  is  $L > x > K > y > R$ . In the sequel, we are going to show that  $\Delta = d_{KT}^3(r^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(r, V) < 0$  to obtain a contradiction.

By the inequality (3.1) in the proof of Theorem 3, the contribution to the score difference  $\Delta$  between  $r^*$  and  $r$ , when restricted to  $\Delta^2(C)$ , namely, subsets of  $C$  of cardinality at most 2, is bounded by:

$$(1 - 2\alpha + (n - 2)(1 - \alpha))v. \quad (6.1)$$

We next consider subsets  $S$  of  $C$  of cardinality 3. Since  $r$  and  $r^*$  are identical when restricted to  $C \setminus \{x, y\}$ , the restriction to  $S$  can contribute to  $\Delta$  only if  $\text{top}_S(r) \neq \text{top}_S(r^*)$ , which can happen only if  $S$  contains  $x$  or  $y$ , i.e.,  $S \cap \{x, y\} \neq \emptyset$ . We thus distinguish three possibilities.

**Case 1:**  $x, y \in S$ . Then we can write  $S = \{x, y, z\}$  for some  $z \in C \setminus \{x, y\} = L \cup K \cup R$ . If  $z \in L$  then  $\text{top}_S(r) = \text{top}_S(r^*) = z$  and thus  $S$  contributes nothing to  $\Delta$ . If  $z \in K \cup R$  then  $\text{top}_S(r) = y$  and  $\text{top}_S(r^*) = x$ . In this case,  $S$  also contributes at most 0 to  $\Delta$  when computed with at least  $\alpha v$  votes where  $x > y$ . We conclude that the total contributions to  $\Delta$  of the subsets  $S$  of the form  $\{x, y, z\}$ , where  $z \in C \setminus \{x, y\}$ , is at most

$$(|K| + |R|)(v - \alpha v) \leq (n - 2)(1 - \alpha)v. \quad (6.2)$$

**Case 2:**  $x \in S$  and  $y \notin S$ . Then we can write  $S = \{x, z, t\}$ . Let  $\pi \in V$  be a vote such that  $x > y$  in  $\pi$  and such that the contribution of  $S$  to  $\Delta$  when computed with  $\pi$  is one. We can suppose without loss of generality that  $z > t$  in  $\pi$ . Then it follows from the definition of  $r^*$  that  $z, t \notin L$  and  $\text{top}_S(\pi) = \text{top}_S(r) = z$ . Consider the set  $T(S) = \{y, z, t\}$ . Then the contribution of  $T(S)$  to  $\Delta$  when computed with  $\pi$  is  $-1$  since  $\text{top}_{T(S)}(\pi) = \text{top}_{T(S)}(r^*) = z$  while  $\text{top}_{T(S)}(r) = y \neq z$ . Note that  $T(S)$  and  $S$  are distinct and uniquely determine each other and the combined contribution of  $S$  and  $T(S)$  to  $\Delta$  when computed with  $\pi$  is zero.

Since there exist at most  $(1 - \alpha)v$  votes  $\pi$  where we do not have  $x > y$  and since there are at most  $\frac{(n-2)(n-3)}{2}$  subsets  $S$  in Case 2, we conclude that the total contribution to  $\Delta$  of the subsets  $S$  in this case is at most

$$\frac{(n-2)(n-3)}{2}(1 - \alpha)v. \quad (6.3)$$

**Case 3:**  $y \in S$  and  $x \notin S$ . Then  $S = \{y, z, t\}$  for some  $z, t \in C \setminus \{x, y\}$ . Fix a vote  $\pi \in V$  in which  $x > y$  and such that the contribution of  $S$  to  $\Delta$  when computed with  $\pi$  is one. We can suppose that  $z > t$  in  $r$  and  $r^*$ . Observe that  $z, t \notin L$ ,  $\text{top}_S(\pi) = \text{top}_S(r) = y$  and  $\text{top}_S(r^*) = x$ . As in Case 2, let  $T(S) = \{x, z, t\}$ . As  $x > y$  in  $\pi$ , the contribution of  $T(S)$  to  $\Delta$  when computed with  $\pi$  is  $-1$  since we have  $\text{top}_{T(S)}(\pi) = \text{top}_{T(S)}(r^*) = x$  while  $\text{top}_{T(S)}(r) = z \neq x$ . Therefore, we deduce from the same argument as in Case 2 that the total contribution to  $\Delta$  of the subsets  $S$  in Case 3 is at most

$$\frac{(n-2)(n-3)}{2}(1 - \alpha)v. \quad (6.4)$$

To summarize, we conclude from (6.1), (6.2), (6.3), and (6.4) the following estimation on the 3-wise Kemeny score difference:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta}{v} &\leq 1 - 2\alpha + 2(n-2)(1 - \alpha) + (n-2)(n-3)(1 - \alpha) \\ &= n^2 - 3n + 3 - \alpha(n^2 - 3n + 4) \end{aligned}$$

As  $v > 0$ , we deduce the following implication:

$$\alpha > \frac{n^2 - 3n + 3}{n^2 - 3n + 4} = g(n) \implies \Delta < 0.$$

Therefore, whenever  $\alpha > g(n)$ , we have  $\Delta < 0$  which implies that  $r$  cannot be a Kemeny ranking with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny rule. Hence, we must have  $x > y$  in every 3-wise Kemeny ranking.  $\blacktriangleleft$

## 6.2 Optimality

In the following question, we try to find the best sufficient condition under which the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme guarantees the uniqueness of the winner of an election.

► **Question 1.** What is the smallest number  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  such that if  $x \geq_{\alpha} y$  for all candidates  $y \neq x$  in an election then  $x$  is the unique winner in every median with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny rule?

By Theorem 8, we know that  $\alpha$  exists and must be smaller than or equal to  $3/4$ . Moreover, we know by [10, Proposition 3] that  $\alpha > 1/2$ . Hence,  $\alpha \in ]1/2, 3/4]$ . With only three candidates, we have the following lemma which shows that  $\alpha > 3/5$ .

► **Lemma 22.** *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  be the smallest number such that if  $x \geq_{\alpha} y$  for all candidates  $y \neq x$  in an election with three candidates then  $x$  is the winner in every median in the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. Then  $\alpha \in ]3/5, 3/4]$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $C = \{x, y, z\}$  be a set of 3 candidates and consider the following election with voting profile:

- $r_1 : z > x > y$  (4 votes)
- $r_2 : y > x > z$  (4 votes)
- $r_3 : x > y > z$  (1 vote)
- $r_4 : x > z > y$  (1 vote).

Then we can check by a direct computation that  $x \geq_{3/5} y$  and  $x \geq_{3/5} z$ . Moreover, we have:

$$d_{KT}^3(r_1, V) = d_{KT}^3(r_2, V) = d_{KT}^3(r_3, V) = d_{KT}^3(r_4, V) = 21,$$

and  $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4$  are all the 3-wise medians of the election. It follows that  $x$  is not the unique winner of the election with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme.  $\blacktriangleleft$

For elections with four candidates, we can prove the following improved lower bound  $5/8$ .

► **Lemma 23.** *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  be the smallest number such that if  $x \geq_{\alpha} y$  for all candidates  $y \neq x$  in an election with four candidates then  $x$  is the winner in every median in the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. Then  $\alpha \in ]5/8, 3/4]$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $C = \{x, y, z, t\}$  be a set of 4 candidates. Consider the following voting profile  $V$ :

- $r_1 : z > t > x > y$  (3 votes)
- $r_2 : y > x > t > z$  (3 votes)
- $r_3 : t > z > x > y$  (2 votes)

We can verify by a direct computation that  $r_1$  and  $r_3$  are the only 3-wise medians of the election  $V$  and

$$d_{KT}^3(r_1, V) = d_{KT}^3(r_3, V) = 36.$$

In particular,  $t$  is not the unique winner of the election  $V$  while we have  $t \succ_{5/8} x, y, z$  in  $V$ . The proof is complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

► **Example 24.** Let  $V$  be a voting profile of an election with 9 candidates  $\{1, 2, \dots, 9\}$  as follows:

$$r_1 : x_3 > x_4 > x_1 > x_2 > x_5 > x_6 > x_7 > x_8 > x_9 \quad (15 \text{ votes})$$

$$r_2 : x_9 > x_8 > x_7 > x_6 > x_5 > x_2 > x_1 > x_4 > x_3 \quad (15 \text{ votes})$$

$$r_3 : x_4 > x_3 > x_1 > x_2 > x_5 > x_6 > x_7 > x_8 > x_9 \quad (13 \text{ votes})$$

A direct computation shows that  $\pi^* = r_1$  is the unique 3-wise median of the election and  $d_{KT}^3(\pi^*, V) = 1904$ . Therefore, the candidate  $x_4$  wins the head-to-head competition over every other candidate by the ratio  $28/43 = 0.6511$  but loses the election to the candidate  $x_3$ .

In general, we establish the following estimation which implies a surprising phenomenon: in contrast to the Condorcet criterion for the classical 2-wise Kemeny scheme, even the  $2/3$  majority in every duel is not enough to guarantee that a candidate will win the election according to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. Consequently, it is harder to win an election with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme than the 2-wise Kemeny voting scheme.

► **Theorem 25.** *Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  be the smallest number such that if  $x \succ_{\alpha} y$  for all candidates  $y \neq x$  in an election then  $x$  is the winner in every median in the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. Then  $\alpha \in [2/3, 3/4]$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $0 < \beta < 2/3$  be an arbitrary real number and let us fix an integer  $n \geq 33$  such that

$$n > \frac{8 - 8\beta}{2 - 3\beta} \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \frac{2n - 8}{3n - 8} > \beta. \quad (6.5)$$

Let  $C = \{x, y, z, t, p_1, p_2, p_3, u_1, \dots, u_n\}$  be a set of  $n + 7$  candidates and consider the following voting profile  $V$ :

$$r_1 : z > t > x > y > u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_n > p_1 > p_2 > p_3 \quad (n \text{ votes})$$

$$r_2 : u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_n > y > x > t > z > p_1 > p_2 > p_3 \quad (n \text{ votes})$$

$$r_3 : t > z > x > y > u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_n > p_1 > p_2 > p_3 \quad (n - 8 \text{ votes})$$

We claim that  $r_1$  is the unique 3-wise median of the election  $V$ . Indeed, let  $\pi$  be a 3-wise median of the election then by Theorem 21, we have  $u_1 > u_2 > \dots > u_n > p_1 > p_2 > p_3$  in  $\pi$  and  $p_1, p_2, p_3$  occupy the last three positions in  $\pi$ .

Let us show that in  $\pi$ , we have  $x, y, z, t > u_i$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Suppose on the contrary that for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the candidate  $u_i$  is ranked immediately before a candidate  $s \in \{x, y, z, t\}$  in  $\pi$ . We choose  $u_i$  such that it has the lowest rank among such  $u_i$ . Hence,  $\pi$  is of the form

$$\pi : A > u_i > s > K > B > p_1 > p_2 > p_3$$

where  $K \subset \{s, y, z, t\} \setminus \{s\}$  and  $B \subset \{u_1, \dots, u_n\} \setminus \{u_i\}$ .

By exchanging the positions of  $u_i$  and  $s$  in  $\pi$ , we obtain the following ranking:

$$\pi^*: A > s > u_i > K > B > p_1 > p_2 > p_3$$

We will show that  $\Delta = d_{KT}^3(\pi^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(\pi, V)$ . The only subsets of at most 3 elements that can contribute to  $\Delta$  are of the form  $\{u_i, s\}$ ,  $\{u_i, s, u\}$  where  $u \in K \cup B \cup \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ . By comparing with the rankings  $r_1, r_2, r_3$  respectively, we deduce that the contribution of  $(u_i, s)$  to  $\Delta$  is

$$-n + n - (n - 8) = 8 - n. \quad (6.6)$$

Let  $u \in B \cup \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ . Then by comparing  $\pi^*$  and  $\pi$  with  $r_1, r_2, r_3$  respectively, the contribution of  $(u_i, s, u)$  to  $\Delta$  is at most

$$-n + n - (n - 8) = 8 - n. \quad (6.7)$$

Similarly, we find that the contribution of each subset  $\{u_i, x, u\}$ , where  $u \in K$ , to  $\Delta$  is at most

$$0 + n + 0 = n. \quad (6.8)$$

Combining the bounds (6.6), (6.7), (6.8) and notices that  $n \geq 33$ ,  $|K| \leq 3$ , we deduce the following estimation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &\leq 8 - n + (8 - n)(|B| + 3) + n|K| \\ &\leq 8 - n + 3(8 - n) + 3n \\ &\leq 32 - n < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $d_{KT}^3(\pi^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(\pi, V) = \Delta < 0$ , which contradicts the hypothesis that  $\pi$  is a 3-wise median. Therefore, we must have  $x, y, z, t > u_i$  in  $\pi$ . Consequently, every median  $\pi$  is of the form

$$\pi: D > u_1 > \dots > u_n > p_1 > p_2 > p_3.$$

where  $D$  is a permutation of  $\{x, y, z, t\}$ . We claim that  $z$  is the winner of  $\pi$ . Otherwise, let  $s \in \{x, y, t\}$  be the candidate which precedes  $z$  in  $\pi$ . Let  $\pi^{**}$  be the ranking obtained from  $\pi$  where we exchange the positions of  $s$  and  $z$ . Let  $\delta = d_{KT}^3(\pi^{**}, V) - d_{KT}^3(\pi, V)$  then the only subsets that can contribute to  $\delta$  are  $\{z, s\}$ ,  $\{z, s, u\}$  where  $u \in C \setminus \{s, z\}$ . By comparing with  $r_1, r_2$ , and  $r_3$  respectively, the contribution of  $\{s, x\}$  to  $\delta$  is at most:

$$-n + n + n - 8 = n - 8. \quad (6.9)$$

Similarly, the total contribution to  $\delta$  of all the subsets of the form  $\{z, s, u\}$  with  $u \in C \setminus \{s, z\}$  is at most:

$$-(n + 3)n + 5n + (n + 5)(n - 8) = -n - 40. \quad (6.10)$$

In (6.10), the term  $-(n + 3)n$  results from the the comparison with  $n$  votes of the same ranking  $r_1$  and the  $(n + 3)$  subsets  $\{z, s, u\}$  where  $u \in C \setminus \{x, y, z, t\}$ . The second term  $5n$  results from the  $n$  votes  $r_2$  and at most 5 subsets of the form  $\{x, z, u\}$  where  $u \in \{x, y, z, t, p_1, p_2, p_3\} \setminus \{z, s\}$ . Likewise, the third term  $(n + 5)(n - 8)$  results from  $(n - 8)$  votes of the same ranking  $r_3$  and  $(n + 5)$  subsets  $\{z, s, u\}$  with  $u \in \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ .

In summary, we can bound  $\delta$  using (6.9) and (6.10) as follows:

$$d_{KT}^3(\pi^{**}, V) - d_{KT}^3(\pi, V) = \delta \leq n - 8 - n - 40 = -48 < 0,$$

which is a contradiction since  $\pi$  is a 3-wise median. We conclude that  $z$  must be the unique winner of the election with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme.

On the other hand, a direct computation shows that  $t > u$ , for all candidate  $u \in C \setminus \{t\}$ , in at least  $2n - 8$  out of  $3n - 8$  votes, thus in a fraction at least

$$\frac{2n - 8}{3n - 8} > \beta$$

of the votes (see (6.5)). Therefore, we have constructed an election in which a candidate  $t$  satisfies  $t >_\beta u$  for every other candidate  $u \neq t$  but  $t$  is not the winner in any 3-wise median of the election. The proof is thus complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$

► **Remark 26.** Lemma 22 seems to suggest that for a candidate, it is particularly more meaningful to win several votes and lose all other votes (e.g. rank last) than to be in the middle of almost all votes. A distant but maybe related situation is the pointing system in football where three draws (3 points) equal to one win (3 points) and two loses (0 points).

## 7 Remarks on 3-wise 3/4-majority rule for elections with few candidates

By [15], the 3/4-majority rule holds only for elections of at most 5 candidates for the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. Nevertheless, for elections with 6 candidates, we have the following weak form of the 3-wise 3/4-majority rule.

► **Theorem 27** ([15]). *Let  $C$  be a set of 6 candidates. Suppose that in an election over  $C$ , we have a partition  $C = A \cup \{x\} \cup B$  where  $|A| \leq 2$  such that  $y \geq_{3/4} x$  for all  $y \in A$  and  $x \geq_{3/4} z$  for all  $z \in B$ . Then the election satisfies the 3-wise 3/4-majority rule.*

Recall that by Theorem 8, the 3-wise 3/4-majority holds for all non-dirty candidates who win every duel by the ratio 3/4. For non-dirty candidates who lose the head-to-head competition to exactly one other candidate, we have the following useful results. When there is no possible confusion, we drop the  $>$  symbol in a ranking for simplicity.

► **Lemma 28** ([15]). *Let  $C = \{x, z\} \cup J$  be a partition of the set of candidates of an election  $V$  such that  $z \geq_{3/4} x$  and  $x \geq_{3/4} y$  for all  $y \in J$ . Then the following properties hold:*

(a) *For all partitions  $J = A \cup B \cup C$  where  $A, B, C$  are ordered sets such that  $B \neq \emptyset$ , we have:*

$$d_{KT}^3(AzBxC, V) > d_{KT}^3(AzxBC, V).$$

(b) *For all partitions  $J = A \cup B$  where  $A, B$  are ordered sets with  $A \neq \emptyset$ , we have:*

$$d_{KT}^3(AzxB, V) > d_{KT}^3(zxAB, V).$$

(c) *For all partitions  $J = A \cup B \cup C$  where  $A, B, C$  are ordered sets such that  $|B \cup C| = 5$  and  $|B| \leq 2$ , we have:*

$$d_{KT}^3(AxBzC, V) > d_{KT}^3(AzxBC, V)$$

## 8 The 5/6-majority rule for the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme

We first establish the following weak 5/6-majority rule for the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme which in a sense extends the 3/4-majority rule for the classical Kemeny voting scheme. Notably, our result is particularly useful when we know that by other space reduction techniques, every median of the election must be of some special form.

► **Theorem 29.** *Let  $x$  be a non-dirty candidate in an election with respect to the 5/6-majority rule and let  $I = \{z \neq x : z \geq_{5/6} x\}$ . Let  $r$  be a median with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  such that  $z > x$  in  $r$  for all  $z \in I$ . Suppose that*

$$|I|(|I| - 4) \leq 3|\{z : x > z \text{ in } r\}|. \quad (8.1)$$

*Then for every candidate  $y \neq x$  with  $x \geq_{5/6} y$ , we have  $x > y$  in  $r$ .*

We also obtain below another version of our 5/6-majority rule for the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme which complements the range of applications of Theorem 29 including applications in multi-winner voting systems.

► **Theorem 30.** *Let  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $s \geq \frac{5\lambda+1}{6\lambda+1}$ . Let  $x$  be a non-dirty candidate in an election with respect to the  $s$ -majority rule. Let  $r$  be a median with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$  such that if  $z \geq_s x$  then  $z > x$  in  $r$ . Suppose that*

$$|\{z : x > z \text{ in } r\}| \geq \lambda|\{z \neq x : z \geq_s x\}|. \quad (8.2)$$

*Then for every candidate  $y \neq x$  with  $x \geq_s y$ , we have  $x > y$  in  $r$ .*

The conditions (8.1) and (8.2) are easily satisfied when  $x$  is a strong candidate in the election or when for example by our extension of the Always theorem (cf. Theorem 21) we know that  $x$  wins against a significant number, says,  $N$  candidates in every median so that the quotient  $N/|\{z : z \geq_s x\}|$  is large enough. Another simple but important method to obtain (8.1) or (8.2) for large  $\lambda$  is the "dilution method" which consists of introducing a large enough number of weak candidates to the election. This strategy reflects the *dependence of irrelevant alternatives* of  $k$ -wise Kemeny voting schemes as already observed in [10], i.e., the relative orders of two candidates in a median can depend on the presence of other candidates.

**Proof of Theorem 29.** Let  $C$  be the set of all candidates in the election. Let  $V$  be the set of all votes and  $m = |V|$ . Suppose on the contrary that there exists a candidate  $y \neq x$  such that

(C)  $x \geq_s y$  but  $y > x$  in the ranking  $r$  where  $s = 5/6$ .

We can moreover suppose without loss of generality that  $y$  is the lowest-ranked candidate among all candidates satisfying Condition (C).

In the ranking  $r$ , let  $A$ ,  $K$ ,  $B$  be respectively the ordered set of all candidates ranked before  $x$ , between  $x$  and  $y$ , and after  $y$ . Therefore, we can write the ranking  $r$  as  $A > y > K > x > B$ . Since  $x$  is a non-dirty candidate with ratio  $s$ , we have a partition  $K = L \sqcup R$  where

$$L = \{z \in K : z \geq_s x\} \subset I, \quad R = \{z : z <_s x\}$$

and the relative orders of candidates in  $L$  and  $R$  are induced by the relative orders in  $K$ . Observe also that  $x \geq_s z$  for every candidate  $z \in B$  and that by the choice of  $y$ , we must have  $R = \emptyset$  (otherwise, we can replace  $y$  by any candidate  $t \in R$  which will have a lower rank than  $y$  in  $r$ ).

Consider the modified ranking  $r^*$  in which  $A > L > x > y > B$ . When restricted to  $\Delta^2(C)$ , the only pairs of candidates which can contribute to the score difference  $\Delta = d_{KT}^3(r^*, V) - d_{KT}^3(r, V)$  are  $(x, y)$ ,  $(y, L)$ , where  $(y, L)$  means any pair  $(y, z)$  with  $z \in L$ . By the proof of Theorem 4 (where in the inequality (4.1), we take  $q = \varepsilon = 5/6$ ,  $s = 3/2$ , and  $a = |R| = 0$ ), such contribution is strictly negative.

For the contribution to the score difference  $\Delta$  of subsets  $S$  of exactly three candidates, we distinguish three cases with possibly non-trivial contribution:

- (i)  $S = (x, y, L \cup B)$ ;
- (ii)  $S = (y, L, L \cup B)$ .

Let  $z \in L$ . Then as  $z \geq_s x$  and  $x \geq_s y$ , we deduce that  $z > x, y$  in at least  $(2s - 1)m$  votes as well as in the ranking  $r^*$ . Since  $y > z, x$  in  $r$ , it follows that the (unordered) subset  $S = (x, y, z)$  contributes at most  $m - (2s - 1)m = (2 - 2s)m$  to  $d_{KT}^3(r^*, V)$ . On the other hand, since  $x >_s y$  but  $y > x, z$  in  $r$ , the set  $S = (x, y, z)$  contributes at least  $sm$  to  $d_{KT}^3(r, V)$ . Consequently, the total contribution of subsets of the form  $S = (x, y, L)$  to the score difference  $\Delta$  is at most

$$(2 - 2s - s)m|L| = (2 - 3s)m|L|.$$

Since  $x \geq_s z$  for all  $z \in B$ , a similar argument as above shows the subsets of the form  $S = (x, y, B)$  contribute to  $\Delta$  at most  $(2 - 3s)m|B|$ . Therefore, in case (i), the total contribution of  $S = (x, y, L \cup B)$  to  $\Delta$  is no more than

$$(2 - 3s)m|L \cup B| = -\frac{1}{2}m|L \cup B| \leq 0. \quad (8.3)$$

For case (ii), let  $z \in L$  and  $t \in L \cup B$ . Then since  $x \geq_s y$  and  $z \geq_s x$ , we have  $z > y$  in at least  $(2s - 1)m$  votes. Consequently,  $y > z$  in at most  $m - (2s - 1)m = (2 - 2s)m$  votes and thus the total contribution of subsets  $S = (y, L, L \cup B)$  to  $d_{KT}^3(r^*, V)$  is at most

$$(2 - 2s)m|(L, L \cup B)|. \quad (8.4)$$

On the other hand, suppose that  $t \in B$ . Then  $z \geq_{2s-1} t$  since  $z \geq_s x$  and  $x \geq_s t$ . Similarly,  $z \geq_{2s-1} y$  as  $z \geq_s x$ ,  $x \geq_s y$ . Consequently, we deduce that  $z > y, t$  in at least  $(2(2s - 1) - 1)m = (4s - 3)m$  votes and thus the total contribution of subsets  $S = (y, L, B)$  to  $d_{KT}^3(r, V)$  is at least

$$(4s - 3)m|(L, B)|. \quad (8.5)$$

To summarize, we deduce from the inequalities (8.3), (8.4), (8.5), and the fact  $s = 5/6$  that  $\Delta$  is bounded from the above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta}{m} &< (2 - 3s)|L \cup B| + (2 - 2s)|(L, L \cup B)| - (4s - 3)|(L, B)| \\ &= (2 - 3s)|L \cup B| + (2 - 2s)|(L, L)| + (5 - 6s)|(L, B)| \\ &= (2 - 3s)(|L| + |B|) + (2 - 2s)\frac{|L|(|L| - 1)}{2} + (5 - 6s)|L| \cdot |B| \\ &= \frac{|L|(|L| - 4)}{6} - \frac{|B|}{2} \quad (\text{as } s = 5/6) \\ &\leq 0 \quad (\text{by hypothesis}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

Hence,  $\Delta < 0$  and it follows that  $d_{KT}^3(r^*, V) < d_{KT}^3(r, V)$ , which is a contradiction to the hypothesis that  $r$  is a median with respect to the distance  $d_{KT}^3$ . The proof is thus complete.  $\blacktriangleleft$



To illustrate, we will formulate several  $5/6$ -majority rules for elections with a small number of candidates with respect to the 3-wise Kemeny voting scheme. More specifically, we obtain the following stronger results than Theorem 30 for small elections. The results might also be useful in the case when Theorem 21 and Theorem 8 cannot be applied (note that  $g(6) = 0.995 > 5/6$  in Theorem 21).

► **Corollary 31.** *Let  $x$  be a non-dirty candidate with respect to the  $5/6$ -majority rule in an election with at most 6 candidates. Let  $r$  be a median with respect to the 3-wise Kendall-tau distance such that if  $z \geq_{5/6} x$  then  $z > x$  in  $r$ . Then for every  $y \neq x$  with  $x \geq_{5/6} y$ , we have  $x > y$  in  $r$ .*

**Proof.** We adopt the proof by contradiction of Theorem 29. By substituting  $s = 5/6$  in the third line in the inequality (8.6), we deduce that

$$\frac{\Delta}{m} < \frac{|L|(|L| - 4)}{6} - \frac{|B|}{2} \leq 0$$

since  $|B| \geq 0$  and  $|L| \leq |C \setminus \{x, y\}| \leq 6 - 2 = 4$ . Therefore, we also have  $\Delta < 0$  which is again contradictory as in the proof of Theorem 30. ◀

By a similar argument, we obtain the following more general consequence.

► **Corollary 32.** *Let  $b, n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n \geq 3$  and  $(n - b - 2)(n - b - 6) \leq 3b$ . Consider an election with  $\leq n$  candidates. Let  $x$  be a non-dirty candidate with respect to the  $5/6$ -majority rule. Let  $r: A > x > B$  be a median with respect to  $d_{KT}^3$  such that  $|B| \geq b$  and  $z \in A$  whenever  $z \geq_{5/6} x$ . Then for every  $y \neq x$  with  $x \geq_{5/6} y$ , we have  $x > y$  in  $r$ .* ◀

► **Example 33.** In Corollary 32, we can take the following values for  $(n, b)$ :

$n$	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20
$b$	0	2	3	4	6	7	9	11

The above reduction results are meaningful since the search space is already very large when  $n = 14$  as  $14! \simeq 8.7 \times 10^{10}$ . The proof of Theorem 30 is also a simple modification of the proof of Theorem 29.

**Proof of Theorem 30.** We adopt again the proof by contradiction of Theorem 29. We deduce from the hypothesis (8.2) that  $|B| \geq \lambda|L|$ . Therefore, as  $s > 5/6$ , we find that

$$(5 - 6s)|L||B| \geq (5 - 6s)|L|\lambda|L|.$$

Consequently, we obtain from the third line in the inequality (8.6) that:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta}{m} &< (2 - 3s)(|L| + |B|) + (2 - 2s)\frac{|L|(|L| - 1)}{2} + (5 - 6s)|L||B| \\ &\leq (2 - 3s)(|L| + |B|) + (1 - s)|L|(|L| - 1) + (5 - 6s)|L|\lambda|L| \\ &= (5\lambda + 1 - (6\lambda + 1)s)|L|^2 + (1 - 2s)|L| + (2 - 3s)|B| \\ &\leq 0 \quad \left( \text{as } s \geq \frac{5\lambda + 1}{6\lambda + 1} > \frac{5}{6} \right). \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction as in the proof of Theorem 30. The proof is thus complete. ◀

## References

- 1 P. Andrieu, B. Brancotte, L. Bulteau, S. Cohen-Boulakia, A. Denise, A. Pierrot, and S. Vialette. Efficient, robust and effective rank aggregation for massive biological datasets. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 124:406–421, 2021.
- 2 K. Arrow, A. Sen, and K. Suzumura. *Handbook of Social Choice and Welfare*, volume 1. Elsevier, 2002.
- 3 K.J. Arrow. k-majority digraphs and the hardness of voting with a constant number of voters. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 105:130–157, 2019.
- 4 G. Bachmeier, F. Brandt, C. Geist, P. Harrenstein, K. Kardel, D. Peters, and H.G. Seedig. A Difficulty in the Concept of Social Welfare. *Journal of Political Economy*, 58(4):328–346, 1950. doi:10.1086/256963.
- 5 N. Betzler, R. Bredereck, and R. Niedermeier. Theoretical and empirical evaluation of data reduction for exact Kemeny Rank Aggregation. *Auton Agent Multi-Agent Syst*, 28:721–748, 2014. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10458-013-9236-y.
- 6 B. Brancotte, B. Rance, A. Denise, and S. Cohen-Boulakia. ConQuR-Bio: Consensus ranking with query reformulation for biological data. *Data Integration in the Life Sciences*, pages 128–142, 2014.
- 7 Marquis de Condorcet. Essai sur l’application de l’analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix. *Imprimerie Royale, Paris (1785)*. Translated in English in I. McLean and E. Hewitt, eds., *Condorcet: Foundations of Social Choice and Political Theory (Edward Elgar, Aldershot, England) pp. 120–158 (1994)*.
- 8 C. Dwork, R. Kumar, M. Naor, and D. Sivakumar. Rank aggregation methods for the web. *WWW ’01: Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web, May 2001*, pages 613–622. doi:https://doi.org/10.1145/371920.372165.
- 9 H. Gilbert, T. Portoleau, and O. Spanjaard. Beyond Pairwise Comparisons in Social Choice: A Setwise Kemeny Aggregation Problem. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(02):1982–1989, 2020. doi:https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v34i02.5569.
- 10 H. Gilbert, T. Portoleau, and O. Spanjaard. Beyond pairwise comparisons in social choice: A setwise Kemeny aggregation problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 904:27–47, 2022. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2021.07.004.
- 11 J. Kemeny. Mathematics without numbers. *Daedalus*, 88:577–591, 1959.
- 12 J. Kemeny and L. Snell. *Mathematical Models in the Social Sciences*. Ginn, Boston, 1960.
- 13 R. Kumar and S. Vassilvitskii. Generalized distances between rankings. in: *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2010, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, April 26-30, 2010*, pages 571–580, 2010.
- 14 R. Milosz and S. Hamel. Space reduction constraints for the median of permutations problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 280:201–213, 2020. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2018.03.076.
- 15 X.K. Phung and S. Hamel. Space reduction techniques for the 3-wise Kemeny problem. *Preprint*, 2023.
- 16 J. H. Smith. Aggregation of preferences with variable electorate. *Econometrica*, 41:1027–1041, 1973.
- 17 M. Truchon. An Extension of the Condorcet Criterion and Kemeny orders. *Technical report, cahier 98–15 du Centre de Recherche en Économie et Finance Appliquées, Université Laval, Québec, Canada*.
- 18 H.P. Young. Condorcet’s Theory of Voting. *American Political Science Rev.*, 82(4):1231–1244, 1988.

## A Simulations with uniform data

■ **Table 3** Applicability of the Always Theorem (AT), the 2-wise Extended Always Theorem 3 (2AT) and the 3-wise Extended Always Theorem 21 (3AT) over 100 000 random instances uniformly generated with python seed(1) generator

n	m	AT	2AT	3AT
3	3	52.993%	52.993%	52.993%
-	4	29.916%	93.208%	29.916%
-	7	3.452%	80.354%	30.407%
-	10	0.419%	67.896%	27.414%
-	13	0.058%	57.042%	23.558%
-	16	0.005%	47.087%	5.88%
-	19	0.0%	39.294%	5.453%
-	22	0.0%	32.635%	4.765%
-	25	0.0%	26.871%	4.09%
-	28	0.0%	22.35%	1.079%
4	5	28.159%	89.767%	28.159%
-	9	1.713%	62.494%	18.92%
-	13	0.139%	38.778%	1.935%
-	17	0.007%	22.962%	1.244%
-	21	0.001%	13.341%	0.119%
-	25	0.0%	7.652%	0.104%
5	6	23.712%	84.405%	23.712%
-	11	0.973%	42.36%	0.973%
-	16	0.031%	17.053%	0.531%
-	21	0.0%	6.425%	0.03%
10	11	4.038%	33.935%	4.038%
-	15	0.282%	4.013%	0.282%
-	21	0.007%	0.95%	0.007%
15	16	0.327%	4.872%	0.327%
20	21	0.017%	0.394%	0.017%