

Condorcet Domains of Degree at most Seven

Dolice Akello-Egwell¹, Charles Leedham-Green², Alastair Litterick³,
Klas Markström⁴, and Søren Riis⁵

^{1,2,5}Queen Mary University of London

³University of Essex

⁴University of Umeå

December 13, 2023

Abstract

In this paper we give the first enumeration of all maximal Condorcet domains on $n \leq 7$ alternatives. This has been accomplished by developing a new algorithm for constructing Condorcet domains, and an implementation of that algorithm which has been run on a supercomputer.

We follow this up by a survey of the properties of all maximal Condorcet domains up to degree 7, with respect to many properties studied in the social science and mathematical literature. We resolve several open questions posed by other authors, both by examples from our data and theorems.

Finally we discuss connections to other domain types such as non-dictatorial domains and generalisations of single-peaked domains. All our data are made freely available for other researches via a new website.

1 Introduction

Since the seminal treatise on voting by Condorcet [dC85] it has been known that majority voting can lead to collective preferences which are cyclic, and hence does not identify a winner for the election. Specifically, Condorcet studied systems where each voter ranks a list of candidates A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n and a candidate A_j is declared the winner if, for any other candidate A_i , a majority of the voters prefers A_j over A_i ; here we assume that the number of voters is odd. The candidate A_j is what is now called a *Condorcet winner*. However, Condorcet showed, [dC85] pages 56 to 61, that there are collections of rankings for three candidates without a Condorcet winner; here the pairwise majorities lead to a cyclic ranking of the form $A_1 < A_2 < A_3 < A_1$.

In fact, each candidate loses to one other candidate by a two thirds majority. This is now often referred to as Condorcet's paradox, and the three candidates are said to form a Condorcet cycle. Ever since Condorcet's result one has worked to better understand both majority voting and more general voting systems.

Going in one direction, looking at which results a vote can actually lead to has been investigated in combinatorics. In order to describe an election result more fully one forms a directed graph T , with the set of candidates as its vertices, a directed edge from A_i to A_k if a majority of the voters rank A_k higher than A_i , and no edge if the two alternatives are tied. Condorcet's paradox demonstrates that T may contain directed cycles. McGarvey [McG53] proved that given any specified directed graph T , and a sufficient number of voters, there is a set of preferences for those voters which realise T by majority voting. Results by Erdős and Moser [EM64] and Stearns [Ste59] bounded the number of voters required for tournaments of a given size. Later Alon [Alo02] also determined how strong the pairwise majorities in such a realisation can be.

Going in the other direction, Black and Arrow [Bla48, Arr51] found that if the set of rankings is restricted in a non-trivial way, either directly or indirectly, e.g. by voters basing their ranking candidates positions on a common left-right political scale, there will always be a Condorcet winner, no matter how the votes are distributed over the set of allowed rankings. This motivated the general question: Which sets of rankings always lead to a Condorcet winner? A set of rankings is now called a *Condorcet domain* if, in a majority vote, it always leads to a linear order on the alternatives, or equivalently T is a transitive tournament. In the 1960's several equivalent characterisations of Condorcet domains were given by Inada [Ina64, Ina69], Sen [Sen66], Ward [War65], and others. In particular Ward [War65] proved that they can be characterised as exactly those sets which do not contain a copy of Condorcet's original example on three candidates.

Following these early works the focus shifted to understanding the possible structure and sizes of Condorcet domains. Blin [Bli72] gave some early examples with structure different from those by Black and Arrow. Raynaud [Ray81] showed that if the number of alternatives is at least 4 then there are maximal Condorcet domains of size just 4. In [Joh78] Johnson conjectured that the maximum possible size is 2^{n-1} . Abello and Johnson [AJ84] investigated the maximum possible size and proved that this is at least $3(2^{n-2}) - 4$, for $n \geq 5$ candidates, thereby disproving Johnson's conjecture for $n \geq 6$. They also noted that it was hard to give non-trivial upper bounds for the possible size of a Condorcet domain, and conjectured that the maximum is at most 2^n . That conjecture was disproved by Abello in [Abe91]. Later Fishburn [Fis92] showed that the maximum size grows at least as c^n for some $c > 2$, and Raz [Raz00] showed that that there is an upper bound of the same form. By now the maximum possible size has been determined

for $n \leq 8$ [LGMR23].

In addition to the size many different structural properties of Condorcet domains have been studied. Monjardet [Mon09] surveys many mathematical results on how Condorcet domains relate to the Weak Bruhat order on the set of permutations. More recent works have studied Condorcet domains [Sli19] with a specific local structure in terms of Sen's [Sen66] value restriction, symmetry properties [KS22], structure of median graphs [DK13] and extensions [PS19] of the original single-peaked property of Arrow and Black. In [Dit18] Dittrich produced the first full enumeration of all Condorcet domains on $n \leq 5$ alternatives. A recent survey can be found in [PS22]. Still, much remains unknown both regarding possible sizes and structures, with open questions motivated both by political science and new applications in computer science.

In this paper we extend the previous results significantly with the first explicit enumeration of all non-isomorphic Condorcet domains on $n \leq 7$ alternatives. This has been made possible by the combination of a new search algorithm developed by us, described in Section 3, and access to a supercomputer. After presenting basic statistics such as the number of maximal Condorcet domains of given size we go on to an in-depth investigation of the properties of all Condorcet domains on $n \leq 7$ alternatives. Here we give data on the number of domains with various well-studied properties, and we present answers to several open question from the research literature. Motivated by patterns in our data we present several conjectures on the behaviour of Condorcet domain for large numbers of alternatives. All our data have been made freely available to download for other researchers via a website which we intend to expand in future works.

1.1 Outline of the paper

In Section 2 we define terminology and discuss various background material. Section 3 describes our algorithm for generating Condorcet domains. In Section 4 we discuss of the results of our calculations for degrees $n \leq 7$, where we have complete enumerations. We also pose a number of questions and give conjectures motivated by the data and our theorems. In Section 5 we discuss connections to other, non-Condorcet, domain types.

2 Background material and Definitions

A *Condorcet Domain of degree n* is a set of linear orders on a set X of size n , satisfying the following definition. We take X to be the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, which we write as X_n when we wish to make n explicit.

Definition 2.1. A set $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_q\}$ of linear orders on X_n is a Condorcet domain if given any three of the linear orders s_i, s_j, s_k , and any three

of the elements a, b, c of X_n , when we create a table in which each row r is the three elements ordered according to the r :th permutation, that table is not a Latin square.

The definition states that the restriction to any three alternatives and any three of the linear orders must not be Condorcet's original example. This definition originates with Ward [War65] and is one in a long list of equivalent characterisations of Condorcet domains.

It is often convenient to equate a linear order $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_n$ on X with the permutation $\sigma(j) = i_j$, so a Condorcet Domain may be regarded as a subset of the symmetric group S_n . So the natural ordering $1 < 2 < \dots < n$ is equated with the identity map, and the reverse ordering $n < n - 1 < \dots < 1$, which we denote by u , is equated with the permutation $(1, n)(2, n - 1)(3, n - 2) \dots$, where we write permutations as products of disjoint cycles. We refer to an element of a Condorcet Domain as a permutation or as an ordering, as best fits the context. This switch of point of view is quite common in combinatorial algebra, though as demonstrated in [ABF20] the two are essentially different in terms of which properties they can describe in a simple way¹ and algorithmic complexity.

We will also make use of a second, equivalent, definition of a Condorcet domain, first given by Sen [Sen66]. Here, a Condorcet Domain A of degree 3 is defined to be a set of orderings of X_3 satisfying one of the 9 *never conditions*, denoted xNi , meaning that the element x of X_3 does not occur in the i -th position in any ordering in A . Thus $xN1$ means that x may never come first, and $xN3$ means that x may never come last. In order to keep our text shorter we will later in the paper use the term *law* as a shorter alternative for the term never condition. A Condorcet Domain of degree $n > 3$ is defined to be a set A of orderings of X_n with the property that the restriction of A to every subset of A of size 3 is a Condorcet Domain. In other words, for every triple $\{a, b, c\}$ of elements of X one of the nine laws xNi must be satisfied, where $x \in \{a, b, c\}$; so here $cN2$ would mean that c may not come between a and b in any of the orderings in A . It is convenient to take a Condorcet Domain of degree 2 to be any subset of S_2 .

By a *Maximal Condorcet Domain* of degree n we mean a Condorcet domain of degree n that is maximal under inclusion among the set of all Condorcet Domains of degree n . By a *Maximum Condorcet domain* of degree n we mean a Condorcet domain of the largest possible cardinality among those of degree n . By a *Unitary Condorcet Domain* we mean one that contains the natural order, or the identity permutation depending on how the domain is represented. As we will see in the next subsection every Condorcet domain is isomorphic to some unitary Condorcet domain, so one can usually assume that a domain is unitary without loss of generality; but, as we will

¹Specifically which properties can be described in first-order logic

see later explicitly making this assumption also leads to various algebraic and algorithmic simplifications.

Henceforth we shall use the acronyms CD, MCD, UCD, and MUCD for the terms Condorcet Domain, Maximal Condorcet Domain, Unitary Condorcet Domain, and Maximal Unitary Condorcet Domain.

Returning to the case of degree 3 we see that there are nine Maximal Condorcet Domains of degree 3, corresponding to the nine different laws xNi . One checks at once that these nine Maximal Condorcet Domains all contain exactly four elements, of which, when regarded as permutations, two are odd, and hence are transpositions, and two are even, and hence are the identity or a 3-cycle. Since S_3 contains three even and three odd permutations exactly nine subsets of S_3 can be constructed from two even and two odd permutations, and these are the Maximal Condorcet Domains of degree 3, described as sets of permutations. Exactly six of these are unitary, since the laws 1N1, and 2N2, and 3N3 each rule out a UCD of degree 3.

2.1 Transformations and isomorphism of Condorcet domains

Given a permutation g and an integer i we let ig denote $g(i)$, and for a set A of integers, Ag is the set obtained by applying g to each element of A .

Now, if A is a CD, and $g \in S_n$ is any permutation, then Ag is also a CD; for if A satisfies the law xNi on a triple $\{a, b, c\}$ for some $x \in \{a, b, c\}$ then Ag satisfies the law $xgNi$ on the triple $\{ag, bg, cg\}$. We say that the CDs A and Ag are *isomorphic*. Thus two isomorphic CDs are identical apart from a relabelling of the elements of X_n . Every CD A is isomorphic to a UCD, since we can apply g^{-1} to A for any $g \in A$ and obtain an isomorphic UCD. Similarly we get this lemma, which follows since some element of the first UCD must be mapped to the identity order in the second UCD.

Lemma 2.1. *If two UCDs A and B are isomorphic then $Ag^{-1} = B$ for some g in A .*

The lemma leads to the following observation.

Proposition 2.2. *Isomorphism between two CDs of equal size can be tested in time which is polynomial in the size of the domain and n .*

Proof. Let A and B be two CDs. Form $A_1 = Ag^{-1}$ for some $g \in A$ and $B_1 = Bh^{-1}$ for some $h \in B$. Clearly A_1 and B_1 are unitary and isomorphic to A and B respectively, and A is isomorphic to B if and only if A_1 and B_1 are isomorphic.

In order to test isomorphism of A_1 and B_1 we simply need to check if $A_1g^{-1} = B_1$ for any $g \in B_1$. This requires at most $|B_1|$ tests, and each test can be done in time $O(|A_1|n)$ using the Radix sort-algorithm, assuming that the permutations are stored as strings of length n . \square

The run time given by the simple algorithm described here is not optimised for small domain sizes. For small domains the radix-sort step could be replaced by e.g. insertion sort.

Definition 2.2. The *core* of a UCD A is the set of permutations $g \in A$ such that $Ag = A$.

Since A is unitary the core of A is a group. We will study the properties of the core and other symmetries of a UCD, both for small n and in general, in a later paper.

When we speak of an isomorphism class of UCDs we mean the set of UCDs in an isomorphism class of CDs. So if A is a UCD of size m , with core of size k , then k divides m , and the isomorphism class of A , as a UCD, is of size m/k .

Definition 2.3. The *dual* of a CD A is the CD obtained by reversing each linear order in A .

Equivalently the dual is given by uA , when A is viewed as a set of permutations. Note that if A satisfies the law xNi on some triple then uA satisfies the law $xN(4-i)$ on the same triple. Thus $A^u = uAu$ is also a CD, and if A is a UCD then so is A^u .

Lemma 2.4. For every $n > 1$ the map $A \mapsto A^u$ permutes the set of isomorphism classes UCDs of degree n ,

Proof. Let A and $B = Ag^{-1}$ be UCDs of degree n , where $g \in A$. Then $B^u = (Ag^{-1})^u = A^u(g^{-1})^u$. But $(g^{-1})^u = (g^u)^{-1}$, and $g^u \in A^u$; so B^u is isomorphic to A^u , as required. \square

Definition 2.5. If E is an isomorphism class of UCDs such that $E^u = E$ we say that E is *reflexive*. If this is not the case we say that E and E^u are *twinned*.

If A and B are UCDs that are isomorphic, or in twinned isomorphism classes, we say that A and B are *isometric*. This is also known as being flip-isomorphic.

2.2 The weak Bruhat Order and Condorcet domains as posets

The weak Bruhat order is a partial order on the set of permutations S_n , and hence also on the the set of linear orders. A number of results on CDs have been proved using the structure of this linear order and we shall classify CDs according to some such properties.

Given a linear order σ , here seen as a permutation, an *inversion* is a pair $i < j$ such that $\sigma(i) > \sigma(j)$ and we let $Inv(\sigma)$ denote the set of all inversions for σ . The weak order is defined by saying that $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ if $Inv(\sigma_1) \subseteq Inv(\sigma_2)$. We say that σ_2 covers σ_1 if $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_3 \leq \sigma_2$ implies that σ_3 is equal to one of

σ_1 and σ_2 . By the *Hasse diagram* one means the directed graph with vertex set S_n and a directed edge from σ_1 to σ_2 if σ_2 covers σ_1 .

The weak order turns the set of linear orders, or equivalently the symmetric group S_n , into a partially ordered set known as the *permutohedron*. Since a CD A can be viewed as a subset of the permutohedron we also get an induced partial order on the elements of A . Note that the dual CD for A induces the dual, in the poset sense, partial order of A .

It was noted already by Blin [Bli72] that a maximal chain in the permutohedron is a Condorcet domain.

Definition 2.6. A CD A is Bruhat-self-dual if it is isomorphic to the dual of A .

Note that in terms of posets this means that A , as a poset, is isomorphic to the dual poset of A .

Definition 2.7. A CD A is connected if for any two $a, b \in A$ there exists sequence $a = \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k = b$, with each $\sigma_i \in A$, such that either σ_i covers σ_{i+1} , or $\sigma_i + 1$ covers σ_i in the permutohedron.

This definition states that A induces a weakly connected subgraph in the Hasse diagram of the permutohedron.

2.3 Bounds for the size of a MCD

Perhaps the main focus of research in this area has been the attempt to find reasonable bounds for $F(n)$, a function introduced by Fishburn [Fis96] to denote the maximum size of an MCD of given degree n . A lower bound for $F(n)$ is obtained by two recipes (the alternating scheme and replacement schemes), which we describe below.

The *alternating scheme*, discovered by P.C. Fishburn see [Fis96] and [Fis97], gives rise to the largest possible MCDs of degree up to 7, as we later prove with our calculations, but the replacement schemes can do better in degrees greater than 15, and perhaps for some smaller degrees. There are two isomorphic alternating schemes \mathcal{A}_n and \mathcal{B}_n of degree n ; \mathcal{A}_n is defined by the following laws. For every triple $a < b < c$ the law $bN1$ is imposed if b is even, and the law $bN3$ is imposed if b is odd. Similarly $\mathcal{B}_n = u\mathcal{A}_n$ is defined by the laws $bN3$ if b is even, and $bN1$ if b is odd. Clearly \mathcal{A}_n and \mathcal{B}_n are UCDs. Galambos and Reiner prove in [AGR08] that $|\mathcal{A}_n| = 2^{n-3}(n+3) - \binom{n-2}{n/2-1}(n-3/2)$ if $n > 3$ is even, and $|\mathcal{A}_n| = 2^{n-3}(n+3) - \binom{n-1}{(n-1)/2}(n-1)/2$ if $n > 2$ is odd, and also prove that these UCDs are maximal.

Fishburn's second method for constructing CDs is the *replacement scheme*, defined thus. Let A and B be CDs on the sets $Y = 1, 2, \dots, k+1$ and $Z = k+1, k+2, \dots, k+l$. Then a CD C on X_{k+l} is obtained by taking all the elements of Y , as orderings, and replacing all occurrences of $k+1$ by elements of Z . So C is a CD on X_{k+l} , and $|C| = |A||B|$. Here k and l may

be equal to 2, and one sees at once that the CD of degree 3 defined by the law 1N2 is a replacement scheme, with $k = l = 2$. Clearly if A and B are unitary then so is C , and if A and B are maximal then so is C .

Ran Raz proves in [Raz00] that there is an upper bound for $F(n)$ of the form c^n for some universal constant c . His proof covers a wider class of sets of linear orders than Condorcet domains, but looking at his parameters in the case of alternating schemes it is clear that his argument will not yield a realistic value for c in the case of CDs. Fishburn's schemes imply [Fis97] that $c > 2.17$ and Conjecture 3 of that paper would imply that $c \leq 3$.

2.4 Closed CDs and sets of laws

As a final general remark, there is a Galois type correspondence between subsets of S_n , or *permutation sets*, and sets of laws, in which a permutation set corresponds to the set of laws that are obeyed by every permutation in the set, and a set of laws corresponds to the set of permutation sets that satisfy these laws. This gives rise to the concepts of a *closed* set of laws, which is a set L of laws that contains all laws that are consequences of laws in L , and of a *closed* permutation set, which is a permutation set A that contains all permutations that satisfy all the laws satisfied by all the elements of A . Clearly all MCDs are closed, also the replacement scheme obtained from two closed permutation sets is clearly closed.

Call the set of elements of S_n that satisfy a given law a *principal* closed permutation set. These all have cardinality $2n!/3$, and the closed permutation sets are precisely the intersections of sets of principal permutation sets. In our algorithm to construct all MUCDs of a given degree we only consider closed permutation sets, and we are concerned with the closure of sets of laws. However, we do not have a good theoretical grip on these concepts. The only algorithm that we use for determining the closure of a set of laws is to go back to the definition, construct the set of permutations that obey these laws, and see what further laws these permutations all obey, and similarly for the closure of a permutation set. It may be that the lack of a theoretical insight into the nature of closure is related to the difficulty in proving theorems about CDs, and in particular about MCDs. For example, this prevents us from obtaining a good complexity analysis of our algorithm.

3 The Generation Algorithm

Next we will describe our algorithm for generating all MUCDs of a given degree n . We have implemented this algorithm in C, both in a serial version which is sufficient for degree $n \leq 6$, and a parallelized version which was used for $n = 7$.

Our first step is to arrange the $\binom{n}{3}$ triples of integers in X_n in some fixed order, and to construct and store all the principle closed subsets of S_n , as

defined in section 2.4. We also fix an ordering of the set of laws.

To a first approximation the algorithm operates in the *full Condorcet tree*, which is a homogeneous rooted tree of depth $\binom{n}{3}$, where every non-leaf has six descendants and every edge is labelled by a law. Each vertex of the tree will be assigned a closed permutation set. For the root vertex this is the set of all $n!$ permutations of X_n , and for lower vertices the set is constructed recursively from the set on its parent in the following manner. Every edge joining a vertex of depth t to a vertex of depth $t + 1$ is associated with one of the six laws that may be applied to the t -th triple, the numbering being organised in such a way that the root is associated with the first triple. Thus each edge is associated with a unique law. The permutation set associated with the vertex of depth $t + 1$ is inductively defined as the intersection of the permutation set associated with the vertex of depth t with the principle closed permutation set that is associated with the edge in question. Clearly every MUCD will appear at least once as the permutation set associated with some leaf of this tree. However, for degree 6 we have a tree with 6^{20} leaves, making the computation infeasible. Additionally, using this tree is very inefficient from a computational point of view since it actually contains all Condorcet domains, both maximal and non-maximal as well as all members of every isomorphism class of MUCDs, whereas we only need one such member.

In constructing our algorithm we restrict our search to a sub-tree of the full Condorcet tree such that only maximal domains are constructed, and each MUCD is constructed exactly once.. Doing this will lead to a tree in which every retained internal vertex of the Condorcet tree has 0, 1 or 6 descendants, depending on whether the permutation set at that vertex is non-maximal/redundant, has an implied law on the current triple, or is unrestricted by our application of laws to earlier triples.

3.1 Implied laws and redundancy

The first restriction on our search comes from implied laws. When we have applied laws to a sequence of triples it can happen that they imply a law on some triple. The latter triple can either be one of the triples we have already visited when applying laws or a triple we have not yet visited. Each of these two cases lead to a reduction of our search.

Let us first note that we can view a sequence of triples, coming in the order we have specified on the set of triples, together with the applied laws as a string over an alphabet of size 6, the number of laws. Since we have also defined an order on the set of laws we can sort any set of such string using their lexicographic order. Now in each isomorphism class of of MUCDs we only need to keep the one which is lexicographically largest, if our aim is to generate representatives for each isomorphism class. In our algorithm we do not go that far but we only keep vertices which correspond to a string which

is obviously not lexicographically maximal. This is done as follows.

Whenever a law is applied to a vertex v we compute the set of laws satisfied at each triple along the path from v to the root. At each such triple we know which law was applied and which laws are now implied. If one of the implied laws precedes the applied law, in our order on the set of laws, then the search at vertex v is abandoned, leading to 0 descendants. The reason is that there will be another path in the tree where the role of the implied and applied are switched, hence making that sequence lexicographically larger while leading to the same permutation set.

Our second case is that where we reach a new vertex v and find that this triple already has an implied law. In this case we only generate the single descendant which corresponds to the implied law. Any other descendant of v will hold a permutation set which is a strict subset of the one we actually generate and hence not maximal. At late stages in the search we often find that all remaining triples have implied laws and hence do not lead to branching of the search tree.

We call the tree resulting from these restrictions the *reduced Condorcet tree*.

3.2 Maximality

While the previous restrictions lead to a much smaller search tree they still leave many non-maximal UCDs in the tree. Our next step is to restrict the search to only permutation sets which can lead to a maximal UCD, and only MUCDs as the final leaves at depth $\binom{n}{3}$.

For any triple t , let us define a t -UCD to be a permutation set that satisfies some law for every triple $s < t$, and define a t -MUCD to be a maximal t -UCD permutation set, with respect to inclusion, so that every t -MUCD is a closed permutation set. If $t = \binom{n}{3}$ then a t -UCD is a UCD, and a t -MUCD is an MUCD.

We can now formulate the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $n > 3$, and let $1 \leq t \leq \binom{n}{3}$. Then every t -MUCD A is associated with a vertex in the reduced Condorcet tree whose parent is associated with a $(t - 1)$ -MUCD.*

Proof. Since every closed t -UCD occurs as the permutation set associated with a vertex in the full Condorcet tree it follows that every t -MUCD occurs as the permutation set associated with some vertex in the reduced Condorcet tree. Let A , as in the proposition, be associated with a vertex V in the reduced Condorcet tree, so that V is a child of a vertex W with corresponding triple $s < t$. The edge joining V to W is labelled by a law applied to the triple $t - 1$. Let B be the $(t - 1)$ -UCD associated with W , and let L be the law that labels the edge joining V to W . If B is not a $(t - 1)$ -MUCD then there is a vertex W' that is associated with a polynomial set B' that

contains B and that is a $(t-1)$ -MUCD. The child of W' defined by the law L is associated with a t -UCD A' that contains A . From the maximality of A it follows that $A = A'$, and the proposition is proved. \square

Using this proposition leads to a considerable improvement in the performance of the algorithm. We only process the subtree of the reduced Concorcet tree whose associated permutation sets are t -MUCDs for the appropriate t .

It remains to describe how we decide if a permutation set A satisfies this condition. This is achieved via the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let A be the permutation set associated with a vertex v at depth t , For every $s < t$ let L_s be the set of laws that A satisfies on the triple s , let M_s be the union of the corresponding principal closed permutation sets, and let B be the intersection of the sets M_s . Then A is a t -MUCD if and only if $A = B$.*

Proof. Since in any case A is contained in B , the condition $A = B$ is equivalent to the condition that B is contained in A . Suppose not, and let $b \in B \setminus A$. Then clearly $A \cup \{b\}$ is a t -UCD that properly contains A . Conversely, if A is not a t -MUCD then there is some $b \in A$ such that $A \cup \{b\}$ is a t -UCD. But then $b \in B$, and this completes the proof. \square

3.3 Final reduction, parallelisation, and implementation

The algorithm described produces a list which contains at least one representative for each isomorphism class of non-isomorphic MUCDs. However there are still repeated members from some classes. In order to produce the list of all non-isomorphic MUCDs we compute the isomorphism class of each leaf, using the observations before Proposition 2.2, and outputting the lexicographically maximal member of each such class. The list of such CDs is then sorted and duplicates removed in order to produce our final list. The isomorphism reduction was done by a separate program after the search, and was later also done with the independently coded CDL library [ZMR23] as an independent verification.

The parallel version of this algorithm first finds all vertices at a user specified distance from the root of the search tree and outputs them into a file. Next, independent copies of the program completes the search of the subtrees rooted at each of the vertices in the file. Finally the outputs from these searches are merged in the same way as for the serial version.

It remains to say something about the technical details of our implementation. The elements of S_n are enumerated, so that a subset of S_n may be represented as a bit-string of length $n!$. The principal closed permutation sets are computed as bit-strings in a pre-processing stage, and all further computations with sets of permutations are carried out using bit operations.

The correctness of our program was tested against full enumerations of MUCDs for small n generated by other programs, using brute force enumeration.

4 The MUCDS of degree at most 7 and their properties.

Using our algorithm we have made a complete enumeration of all MUCDs of degree $n \leq 7$. The total numbers for n from 3 to 7 are 3, 31, 1362, 256895, 171870480. Reducing further to flip-isomorphism classes we get 2, 18, 688, 128558, 85935807. Here the first four numbers in both cases agree with published results and the final one is new. The MUCDs are available for download [Web].

In the next subsections we will discuss our computational analysis of these MUCDs and their properties. We will provide counts for the number of MUCDs with certain well studied properties and the distribution of properties which have a range of values. We also test several conjectures from the existing literature and report on those results.

4.1 The sizes and numbers of MUCDs

In Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 we display the number of MUCDs of degree 4 to 7 listed according to various properties. In each table the column labelled Total gives the number of MUCDs with the size stated in the previous column.

Using our results we can settle a conjecture whose status has been uncertain for some time. In [Fis97] Fishburn conjectured that for $n = 6, 7$ a CD is maximum if and only if it is isomorphic to those constructed by his alternating scheme. He also proved that the same statement is true for $n = 4, 5$. In [Fis02] he provided a long, and according to himself partial, proof for the case $n = 6$. His caveat was not due to any uncertainty in the proof, but rather since the considerable length of the proof made him leave many details out of the published version. In [AGR08], Section 3.2, Galambos and Reiner stated that they verified the conjecture for $n = 7$, but gave no details regarding how this was done. The lack of a published proof led the recent survey [ELP22] to list even the maximum size for $n = 7$ as unknown. Using our data we now have a computational verification of Fishburn's proofs for $n = 4, 5, 6$ and a proof of his conjecture for $n = 7$.

Theorem 4.1. *For $n = 4, \dots, 7$ every maximum CD is isomorphic to a MUCD constructed by Fishburn's alternating scheme. In particular, the maximum size of a CD for $n = 7$ is 100.*

We also note, using [LGMR23], that for $n \leq 8$ the maximum CDs have size $\left\lceil 4 \times 5^{\frac{n-3}{2}} \right\rceil$. That such a simple form will continue to hold might be too




Figure 4.1: The number of MUCD classes as function of domains size for $n = 7$

much to hope for but the growth rate is compatible with known data and bounds.

Problem 4.2. Let $F(n)$ denote the size of a maximum CD on n alternatives. Prove or disprove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(F(n))}{n} = \sqrt{5}$$

Next, as we can see the total number sequence for a fixed degree is not unimodal, though roughly so. The sequence achieves its largest values at slightly more than half the size of the maximum MUCD for each degree, but it is strongly affected by parity and divisibility by larger powers of 2. In Figure 4.1 we display the size counts for $n = 7$. We can create a natural notion of a random MUCD by giving each isomorphism class equal probability and taking a random member of the chosen isomorphism class. The expected size of a MUCD under this distribution is for each small degree lower than 2^{n-1} but can be very well fitted to an exponential function.

Conjecture 4.3. Let Z_n be a random MUCD then $\log(\mathbb{E}(|Z|)) \sim n \log(q)$, for some constant $1 < q < 2$.

Fitting an exponential function to the four, admittedly few, values we have for $\mathbb{E}(|Z|)$ gives a very good fit to 0.59163×1.91324^n . Fitting the variance also give a good fit to an exponential growth of 4.663. The third moment is negative and gives a negative skewness which is growing in magnitude for our range of n . With all of this in mind it seems likely that a the size distribution converges after a proper normalisation but it is not clear what the asymptotic form will be.

Question 4.4. Let M_n and σ_n be the mean and standard deviation of $|Z_n|$ and define $Y_n = \frac{|Z_n| - M_n}{\sigma_n}$.

Does Y_n converge in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$? If so, what is the asymptotic distribution?

4.2 The structure of MUCDs

The first structural property which we will look at is whether or not a MUCD can be built from CDs of lower degree.

Definition 4.1. Given a MUCD C on a base set A we say that C is *reducible* if there exists a proper subset $B \subset A$, of size at least 2, such that the elements of B are consecutive in each of the linear orders in C . If C is not reducible we say that it is irreducible.

The motivation for this definition is that a reducible MUCD can be built from two CDs, C_1 on a set A' of size $1 + |A \setminus B|$ and C_2 on B , using a slight generalisation of Fishburn's replacement scheme. There we pick some element of A' and then replace that element in every member of C_1 with a permutation from C_2 . In the column labelled Reducible we display the number of MUCDs of each size which are reducible. Obviously reducibility is strongly affected by the factorisation of the size, since the size of a reducible MUCD is the product of the size of the factor CDs C_1 and C_2 , each of which must be maximal. Even though the number of reducible MUCDs increase with the degree we nonetheless expect them to asymptotically be outnumbered by the irreducible ones.

Conjecture 4.5. *MUCDs are asymptotically almost surely irreducible².*

Next we see that for each degree we find several MUCDs of size 4. The first such examples were found by Raynaud [Ray81] and Danilov and Koshvoy [DK13] proved that these exist for all degrees. These domains can be used to construct MUCDs for larger powers of 2 as well and we may ask for which fixed sizes we can find a MUCD for infinitely many, or all sufficiently large, degrees.

Question 4.6. *Are there infinitely many degrees for which a MUCD of size 9 exists? For which sizes t do there exist MUCDs for infinitely many degrees n ?*

We now look at the set of laws, or never conditions, a MUCD satisfies. A particularly nice subfamily of the MUCDs are those which satisfy exactly one law on each triple of alternatives. These MUCDs were named *copious* by Slinko [Sli19], the name alluding to the fact that a copious CD gives the maximum possible 4 orders when restricted to any triple of alternatives. In the column labelled Cop we show the number of copious MUCDs of each size. For $n \geq 5$ we find examples for CDs which are not copious. For $n = 5$ the restriction to a triple either has size 3 or 4. For $n = 6$ all MUCDs with size 9 or less have restrictions of size 2 or 4, thus being even further from

²That a property holds asymptotically almost surely, abbreviated a.a.s., means that as n goes to infinity the proportion of objects with the property goes to 1.

being copious. We also see that for $n \leq 7$ MUCDs which are close to the maximum size are always copious, and that for most of the range of sizes they make up the majority of all MUCDs. However, in order to be copious the restriction of a MUCD to a subset of the alternatives must be copious as well. That requirement could make copious MUCD less common for larger n .

Question 4.7. *What is the minimum size of a copious MUCD of degree n ? Are asymptotically almost all MUCDs not copious?*

In [KS22] Karpov and Slinko used the term *ample* to denote those CDs which, whenever restricted to two alternatives give both of the possible orderings for those alternatives and noted that a copious MUCD is ample. They asked if all MUCDs are ample and we can answer this question negatively:

Observation 4.8. *The smallest non-ample MUCD has degree 5 and size 12*

1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	4
2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	1	1	2	3
3	3	5	2	2	5	2	3	2	3	1	1
4	5	3	4	5	2	3	2	3	2	3	2
5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

Figure 4.2: The smallest non-ample MUCD

The number of non-ample MUCDs of each size is displayed in the column labelled Non-amp. For $n = 5$ there are only 3 non-ample MUCDs, but as the degree goes up they become more common. Note that for degree $n = 7$ all MUCDs of size 9 are non-ample. We also find surprisingly large examples of non-ample MUCDs for $n = 6$ with size 40, and $n = 7$ with size 93.

Question 4.9. *Is the maximum size of a non-ample MUCD $o(F(n))$?*

Being non-ample is not the only deviation from what one might at a first glance expect a maximal UCD to look like. Let us say that a UCD C is *fixing* if there exists a value from the base set which has the same position in every order in C . It is clear that if we take a Condorcet domain and insert a new alternative at a fixed position in every linear order we will get a new Condorcet domain, of the same size and degree one larger. One would typically not expect such a CD to be maximal, however it turns out that it is possible to construct MUCDs in this way.

Observation 4.10. *The smallest fixing MUCD has degree 5 and size 4.*

For degree 5 there is a unique fixing MUCD, and for degree there are 2, both with size 8. For degree 7, there are 6 with size 4, 3 of size 8, 4 of size 13 and 133 of size 16.

1	2	4	5
2	5	1	4
3	3	3	3
4	1	5	2
5	4	2	1

Figure 4.3: A fixing MUCD of order 5 and size 4.

Degree	Size	Total	Connected	Normal	Self-dual (Symmetric)	Non-ample	Reducible	Cop
4	4	1		1	1 (1)			1
4	7	4	2	4				4
4	8	25	7	16	3 (2)		8	25
4	9	1	1	1	1			1
<hr/>								
5	4	2		2	2 (2)			
5	8	12		8	2 (2)		2	12
5	11	28	2	18				26
5	12	41	16	32	1	1		36
5	13	52	2	32				44
5	14	279	26	118	1	1	20	236
5	15	212	42	58				208
5	16	573	57	141	7 (3)	1	100	572
5	17	106	20	34				106
5	18	43	6	19	1		5	43
5	19	12	8	6				12
5	20	2	2	2				2

Table 1: MUCDs of degree 4 and 5

Question 4.11. *How large can a fixing MUCD of degree n be? Is there a characterisation of the MUCDs which have an extension to a fixing MUCD with one more alternative?*

4.3 Connectivity and Peak-Pit domains

In this section we will consider several properties of a UCD which are directly connected to the view of a CD as a subset of the permutohedron.

At least since the 1960's it has been common to consider *connected* CDs, ie. a CD which induces a connected subgraph of the permutohedron. One attractive property of such domains is that it is possible to move between any two linear orders in the domain in step which only differ by an inversion.

Size	Total	Connected	Normal	Self-dual (Symmetric)	Non-ample	Reducible	Cop
4	8		8	8 (8)			
8	11		7	7 (7)	4	7	
9	26		18				
10	46		28				
11	8		6				
12	11		4	1	7		
13	106		38		4		90
14	80		32		2		76
15	66		34		2		54
16	1036	2	246	8 (6)	6	62	970
17	808	12	244				642
18	808	14	280		16		600
19	1399	76	537	3	40		1125
20	1734	144	664	4	45		1333
21	2156	124	708	2	114		1486
22	5072	100	1194		164	168	3876
23	4986	114	1378		108		3372
24	8617	246	1850	9	207	237	5964
25	9892	240	1624	2	156		7014
26	16629	491	2502	5	164	312	11345
27	17137	739	1756	3	138		12269
28	32708	883	3100	16	281	1604	27013
29	25453	1176	1760	5	168		21909
30	31310	1420	2289	6	188	1272	28820
31	22543	1099	1381	7	114		21159
32	38894	1022	2195	46 (6)	307	3127	37885
33	12168	548	821	24	84		11722
34	11554	490	1075	10	70	636	11332
35	4635	332	532	7	38		4573
36	3720	232	458	22	92		3620
37	1297	144	177	11	8		1283
38	1300	114	284	2	18	72	1282
39	366	79	70	2			366
40	192	35	41	2	5	8	187
41	50	22	16				50
42	57	31	15	7			57
43	7	5	2	1			7
44	4	4	2				4
45	1	1	1	1			1

Table 2: MUCDs of degree 6

Size	Total	Connected	Normal	Self-dual (Symmetric)	Non-ample	Reducible	Cop
4	46		46	46 (46)			
8	44		44	44 (44)		44	
9	24				24		
10	270		186		10		
11	188		120		2		
12	147		84	1	3		
13	176		72		4		
14	284		110	4	60		
15	548		188		112		
16	1626		452	26 (24)	228	60	59
17	2178		490		358		30
18	4435		794	1	283	182	14
19	9994		1248		358		1528
20	11864		1544	4	502	322	1630
21	7040		1274		702		1338
22	12688	2	2696	1	923	56	6536
23	18570	10	3378		1412		9080
24	25954	16	4204	14	2708	75	13046
25	44660	58	6940		3238		26674
26	81579	146	10266	17	4343	742	50698
27	94158	252	11072		4576		53522
28	132114	314	15864	16	5828	580	82028
29	159868	716	19754		7342		106586
30	194674	1198	24096	8	10630	462	127450
31	247692	1314	29790		12124		163450
32	404009	1982	38995	55 (15)	18441	7013	286060
33	356618	2822	40644		19194		221900
34	480195	2706	52546	5	24711	5656	304066
35	461900	3452	54328		30328		263654
36	609624	4342	66737	14	42359	5637	348343
37	678422	4484	66594		46796		374642
38	928441	5328	87391	11	61830	9793	536413
39	930304	5370	80096		60042		503650
40	1244522	6412	102038	32	75913	12104	692657
41	1273738	6612	94144		76780		668724
42	1739772	7870	118548	14	98608	15092	965212
43	1849074	8914	106920		93256		1012696
44	2701280	11736	141762	16	117140	35012	1583810
45	2644266	14948	118310		104706		1462180
46	3491780	16876	156358	14	132576	34902	1933530
47	3686966	20004	126586		126006		2060898
48	4911214	24830	167362	104	167322	59465	2895896
49	4790868	27420	128900		150198	64	2792242
50	6426642	34916	170856	12	184304	69244	4022222
51	6253444	40434	125366		168414		3932782
52	8174653	47116	177956	41	211246	115157	5384015
53	7497364	56266	119424		178664		5055996

Table 3: MUQDs of degree 7

Size	Total	Connected	Normal	Self-dual (Symmetric)	Non-ample	Reducible	Cop
54	9180598	67628	162730	26	209307	119959	6487399
55	8270608	72728	108716		173954		6107600
56	11160909	87290	161446	97	224096	223986	8766421
57	8540924	94064	95220		165036		6742858
58	10269782	97952	134214	10	204109	178171	8360889
59	7723932	94522	83966		149322		6345838
60	9606176	92548	120399	52	202072	214186	8260766
61	6518148	77586	68314		131766		5655112
62	7839946	69514	98479	22	159649	157801	6963611
63	5191166	55636	55530		108204	32	4642368
64	7728718	54052	85340	254 (11)	173910	260912	7162308
65	3436076	38238	42744		93546		3090834
66	3750621	34346	60993	39	112105	85176	3408640
67	2034070	29028	32490		60780		1836672
68	2440206	26152	49547	42	97782	78262	2221040
69	1152526	20140	24736		47074		1038388
70	1351871	19750	35886	11	65862	32445	1228087
71	671796	14742	17262		26368		616530
72	808375	12776	24520	49	53157	25136	732188
73	357970	9872	10936		21338		323602
74	405334	7714	15495	12	24711	9079	370471
75	186106	6120	7374		9364		171590
76	244369	4848	12120	7	16441	8798	223662
77	101268	3966	4818		5286		94074
78	116958	3086	6400	2	6592	2562	108916
79	48120	2456	2792		2274		45170
80	56464	1816	3719	2	3607	1294	52459
81	23402	1720	1490		1396	4	21864
82	25154	1208	1864		1506	350	23480
83	11344	1146	810		456		10806
84	14503	938	1271	7	686	399	13799
85	6108	1020	370		254		5834
86	4273	552	506	1	222	49	4049
87	2066	506	226		96		1970
88	2038	308	220		46	18	1992
89	1248	368	106		12		1236
90	647	154	75	1	24	7	623
91	214	66	22		4		210
92	274	98	46				274
93	106	66	6		4		102
94	76	36	10				76
95	18	10	2				18
96	36	30	8				36
97	16	14	4				16
98	4	4					4
100	2	2	2				2

Table 4: MUCDs of degree 7

This can be interpreted as saying that the set of opinions is in some sense a continuum. In the column labelled Connected we display the number of connected MUCDs of each size. Here two things stand out in the data. First, the majority of all MUCDs are not connected. For small sizes, relative to n , this is automatic but as we can see it seems to be the case for most sizes. Secondly, up to $n = 7$ the maximum MUCD is always connected. We believe that the first of these properties holds more generally:

Conjecture 4.12. *A.a.s. MUCDs are not connected.*

Question 4.13. *Are there always exactly 2 non-isomorphic connected MUCDs of size $\binom{n}{2} + 1$?*

In [PS22] Puppe and Slinko conjectured that a MUCD is connected if and only if it is a *peak-pit domain*. Peak-pit domains stem from the early works of Black and Arrow on single-peaked domains and are defined as CD which on every triple either satisfy a condition of either the form $xN1$ or $xN3$, for some x in the triple. We have tested this conjecture on our data.

Observation 4.14. *For degrees $n \leq 7$ a MUCD is connected if and only if it is a peak-pit domain.*

4.4 Normal, symmetric, and self-dual MUCDS

Two further classes of often-studied CDs are the *normal* and the *symmetric* CDs. The terminology in the literature varies a bit here but we will say that a CD is normal if it isomorphic to a CD which contains both the standard order α and the reverse order u . This is sometimes instead called normalisable, with normal then meaning that the CD actually contains α and u , and sometimes called being of maximal width. Being symmetric on the other hand means that for every order β in the domain C the reversed order $u\beta$ also belongs to C . In the columns labelled Normal and (Symmetric) we give the number of normal and symmetric MUCDs. As we can see, the number of normal MUCDs is substantially smaller than the total number, and we believe that this patterns will continue.

Conjecture 4.15. *A.a.s. MUCDs are not normal.*

We also note that for degree $n \leq 7$ the maximum MUCD is always normal. However, in [LGMR23] the maximum MUCD of degree 8 was found and it is not normal. Here one may ask if normality implies a strong restriction on the size of a MUCD.

Question 4.16. *Is the maximum size of a normal MUCD $o(F(n))$?*

The symmetric MUCDs form a subfamily of the *self-dual* MUCDs.

Definition 4.2. A MUCD C is self-dual if the dual MCD uC is isomorphic to C

Note that if we demand that the dual is equal, instead of isomorphic, to the original MUCD we get a symmetric MUCD. The number of self-dual MUCD are given in the column labelled Self-dual. Here we see that while the number of possible sizes for a self-dual MUCD is much larger than for the symmetric ones the total number of self-dual MUCDs is still a small proportion of the total. However, we also note that for odd n the maximum MUCD are all self-dual for $n \leq 7$.

Question 4.17. *Are maximum MUCDs self-dual for odd n ? If not, which is the smallest n for which the maximum MUCD is not self-dual?*

A second observation is that for odd n we have only seen self-dual MUCDs with even size.

Question 4.18. *Do all self-dual MUCDs have even size if n is odd?*

Both normality and being symmetric can be seen as properties of the intersection between a domain C and the dual domain uC . A domain is normal if the intersection is non-empty and symmetric if the intersection is equal to the entire domain. Note that, since the β is never equal to $u\beta$, the intersection will always have even size. In Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 we give the number of MUCDs of each degree and size with a given size for the intersection. As one might expect the two most common intersection sizes are 0 and 2. Having intersection size 4 is possible for many sizes and from degree 7 is no longer connected to having an even domain size, as sizes 49, 63 and 81 show. Also note that for domains of size 8 the proportion of symmetric domains increases with n and for $n = 7$ all MUCDs of size 8 are symmetric.

Question 4.19. *Are all MUCDs of size 8 symmetric for $n \geq 7$?*

Both normality and being symmetric can be seen as properties of the intersection between a domain C and the dual domain uC . A domain is normal if the intersection is non-empty and symmetric if the intersection is equal to the entire domain. Note that, since the β is never equal to $u\beta$, the intersection will always have even size. In Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 we give the number of MUCDs of each degree and size with a given size for the intersection. As one might expect the two most common intersection sizes are 0 and 2. Having intersection size 4 is possible for many sizes and from degree 7 is no longer connected to having an even domain size, as sizes 49, 63 and 81 show. Also note that for domains of size 8 the proportion of symmetric domains increases with n and for $n = 7$ all MUCDs of size 8 are symmetric.

Question 4.20. *Are all MUCDs of size 8 symmetric for $n \geq 7$?*

Note that up to $n = 7$ the intersections always have a power of 2 as its size. This is true in general as we will now show. Additionally, in [KS22] the problem of determining the possible sizes for symmetric MUCDs was raised, after noting that all known constructions give, all, powers of 2 as size. This question was in fact implicitly solved already in [DK13] and it also follows from our theorem.

Theorem 4.21. *Let I denote the intersection of a MUCD C and its dual. Then the size of I is 2^k , for an integer k , and if C contains the reversed order u then I induces a Boolean sublattice of the weak Bruhat order.*

Proof. First we note that I is by definition the largest symmetric, meaning equal to its dual, subset of C , and we can assume that it contains α and u . Now, as shown in [DK13] C induces a distributive sublattice of the weak Bruhat order. Taking two elements $\sigma, \tau \in I$ it follows that $(\sigma \wedge \tau)^\circ = \sigma^\circ \vee \tau^\circ$, where the \circ denotes the reversed order $\tau^\circ = u\tau$. That is, the reverse of the meet of any pair of orders in I is the join of their reverses. So if we add the meet of any two orders from I and the join of their reverses we get a symmetric set. But since I is the maximum symmetric subset it must be closed under taking meets and joins.

Next let us note that in this lattice the meet and join of an order β and its reverse β° are α and u respectively. This follows since the set of inversions of β° is the complement of the set of inversions of β . This means that the reverse β° satisfies the conditions for being a *complement* of β in the lattice-theoretic sense. Since the lattice is distributive it also follows that β° is the unique complement for β .

So our domain C induces a finite, distributive, complemented lattice and by e.g. Theorem 16, Chapter 10, in [Bir48] all such lattices are isomorphic to a Boolean lattice, and hence have size 2^k for some integer $k \geq 0$. \square

By our proof the intersection sets I are Condorcet domains which are closed under meets and joins in the Bruhat order, however they are typically not maximal Condorcet domains.

5 Relation to other domain types

The main motivation for studying Condorcet domains has been to better understand majority voting, as in Condorcet's original work. However, today domains of linear orders are studied much more broadly, both in connection with other classical voting systems and regarding where well-behaved voting systems or choice rules can be constructed. The work of Dasgupta and Maskin [DM08] shows that Condorcet domains are the largest domains where any voting system satisfies a specific list of axioms for a well-behaved

Degree	Size	0	2	4	8	16
4	4			1		
4	7		4			
4	8	9	8	6	2	
4	9		1			
5	4			2		
5	8	4	6		2	
5	11	10	18			
5	12	9	32			
5	13	20	32			
5	14	161	98	20		
5	15	154	58			
5	16	432	78	44	16	3
5	17	72	34			
5	18	24	14	5		
5	19	6	6			
5	20		2			

Table 5: Size of the intersection between C and the reverse of C

voting system. So, in this broader context Condorcet domains stand out in this sense, but many authors focus on weaker axioms and we will here briefly comment on how the Condorcet domains for small n relate to two such lines of investigation.

Recall that a voting systems is *strategy-proof*, or non-manipulable, if the best option for each voter is to present a ranking which agrees with their actual preferences. The classical Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem [Gib73, Sat75] states that if the domain consists of all, unrestricted, linear orders then the only strategy-proof deterministic voting system is dictatorial, i.e. the outcome depends only on one voter. On the other hand, majority voting on Condorcet domains is not only strategy-proof but even proof against strategic voting by coalitions of voters, see Lemma 10.3 of [Mou88]. A number of papers have investigated either how much a domain can be restricted while retaining the conclusion from the Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem or how large a domain can be while allowing non-dictatorial choice functions. In [ACS03] Aswal, Chatterji and Sen introduced the *unique seconds property*, abbreviated USP, and showed that any domain with the USP has a non-trivial strategy-proof choice function. A domain has the USP if there exists a pair of alternatives A and B such that whenever A is ranked first in a linear order B is ranked second. The property has turned out to be quite fruitful and recently [CZ23] showed that in a certain well-connected

Degree	Size	0	2	4	8	16	32
6	4			8			
6	8	4			7		
6	9	8	18				
6	10	18	28				
6	11	2	6				
6	12	7	4				
6	13	68	38				
6	14	48	32				
6	15	32	34				
6	16	790	202	32	6	6	
6	17	564	244				
6	18	528	280				
6	19	862	537				
6	20	1070	664				
6	21	1448	708				
6	22	3878	1086	108			
6	23	3608	1378				
6	24	6767	2166	184			
6	25	8268	1624				
6	26	14127	2310	192			
6	27	15381	1756				
6	28	29608	2416	620	64		
6	29	23693	1760				
6	30	29021	1941	348			
6	31	21162	1381				
6	32	36699	1450	536	163	40	6
6	33	11347	821				
6	34	10479	871	204			
6	35	4103	532				
6	36	3262	350	92	16		
6	37	1120	177				
6	38	1016	248	36			
6	39	296	70				
6	40	151	33	8			
6	41	34	16				
6	42	42	15				
6	43	5	2				
6	44	2	2				
6	45	0	1				

Table 6: Size of the intersection between C and the reverse of C

Size	0	2	4	8	16	32	64
4			46				
8				44			
9	24						
10	84	186					
11	68	120					
12	63	84					
13	104	72					
14	174	110					
15	360	188					
16	1174	410		18	24		
17	1688	490					
18	3641	668	126				
19	8746	1248					
20	10320	1348	196				
21	5766	1274					
22	9989	2654	42				
23	15192	3378					
24	21750	4176	28				
25	37720	6940					
26	71313	10000	266				
27	83086	11072					
28	116250	15629	224	20			
29	140114	19754					
30	170578	23858	238				
31	217902	29790					
32	365014	37322	1472	152	34	15	
33	315974	40644					
34	427649	50838	1708				
35	407572	54328					
36	542887	64778	1954	5			
37	611828	66594					
38	841050	83632	3759				
39	850218	80086					
40	1142484	97396	4642				
41	1179594	94144					
42	1621224	113592	4956				
43	1742104	106970					
44	2559518	133512	7854	396			
45	2525956	118310					
46	3335422	146712	9646				
47	3560380	126586					
48	4743852	154626	12064	672			
49	4661968	128836	64				
50	6255786	159488	11368				
51	6128078	125366					
52	7996697	160682	16570	704			
53	7377940	119424					

Table 7: Size of the intersection between C and the reverse of C for degree 7

Size	0	2	4	8	16	32	64
54	9017868	150438	12292				
55	8161892	108716					
56	10999463	140374	18444	2444	184		
57	8445704	95220					
58	10135568	121894	12320				
59	7639966	83966					
60	9485777	104754	14369	1276			
61	6449834	68314					
62	7741467	88812	9667				
63	5136516	55498	32				
64	7646022	71024	11378	2314	515	98	11
65	3393332	42744					
66	3689628	55246	5747				
67	2001580	32490					
68	2391499	42232	6567	748			
69	1127790	24736					
70	1315985	32162	3724				
71	654534	17262					
72	783855	21414	2680	380	46		
73	347034	10936					
74	389839	14256	1239				
75	178732	7374					
76	232249	10174	1814	132			
77	96450	4818					
78	110558	5910	490				
79	45328	2792					
80	52745	3446	245	28			
81	21912	1486	4				
82	23290	1752	112				
83	10534	810					
84	13232	1166	105				
85	5738	370					
86	3767	492	14				
87	1840	226					
88	1818	212	8				
89	1142	106					
90	572	68	7				
91	192	22					
92	228	46					
93	100	6					
94	66	10					
95	16	2					
96	28	8					
97	12	4					
98	4						
100		2					

Table 8: Size of the intersection between C and the reverse of C for degree 7

class of domains the USP is in fact equivalent to the existence of non-trivial strategy-proof choice functions.

Given that we already know that CDs are strongly strategy-proof we may ask how they fit in the wider landscape of strategy-proof domains, and in particular if they have the USP. It turns out that among the CDs for small n many do in fact have the USP, but far from all do. In Table 9 we show the number of CDs with the USP for degree 4 and 5. Since the USP is not invariant under reversal of orders it can happen that a CD does not have the USP but its dual does, and this is quite common. Therefore we also show the number of domains such that neither the domain nor its dual has the USP. These provide examples of strategy-proof domains which are not covered by USP condition for strategy-proofness, and as we find such examples close to the maximum size for CDs of these degrees. If we simply demand that the domain does not have the USP then one of the two maximum CDs for $n = 5$ is also an example³.

Another line of work, which intertwines with strategy-proofness, concerns generalisations of Black’s single-peaked MUCD. For each n there is up to isomorphism one Black’s single-peaked domain, of size 2^{n-1} . This is a particularly well-behaved MUCD arising from preferences based on positions on a linear axis, which can be characterised in various ways [BH11, Pup18]. This MUCD was first generalised by Arrow into what is now known as Arrow’s single-peaked domains. These domains are also MUCDs but unlike Black’s version there are several non-isomorphic examples for each n . Put briefly a MUCD is Arrow’s single-peaked if every triple (i, j, k) satisfies a never condition of the form $xN3$, where x is a member of the triple. In Slinko’s study of these domains [Sli19] he enumerated them for $n = 4, 5$ and from our data we can extend this:

Observation 5.1. *The number of non-isomorphic Arrow’s single-peaked MUCDs for $n = 4, \dots, 7$ is 2, 6, 40, 560.*

Stepping outside the class of Condorcet domains Demange [Dem82] defined the class of domains which are *single-peaked on a tree*. Here a domain D on X_n is said to be single-peaked on a tree T with n vertices if we can label the vertices in T with the alternatives from X_n so that the restriction of D to the labels of any maximal path in T is a Black’s single peaked domain. These domain are often not CDs but they have the weaker property of guaranteeing that pairwise majorities selects a single winner, while there may be cycles among lower-ranked alternatives. For Black’s single-peaked domain Moulin [Mou80] has identified all strategy-proof choice functions and Danilov [Dan94] extended this to domains which are single-peaked on a tree. In particular these domains always have a strategy-proof choice function and so ties in with the already mentioned works on strategy-proofness.

³Data for $n = 6, 7$ can be found in the online appendix.

Degree	Size	Total	USP	NUSPD		SPT	Star	
4	4	1	1					
4	7	4	2					
4	8	25	16	3		3	2	
4	9	1	1					
5	4	2	2					
5	8	12	10			1	1	
5	11	28	12	4				
5	12	41	19	5				
5	13	52	33	2				
5	14	279	155	46		3	1	
5	15	212	96	44				
5	16	573	380	49		18	10	
5	17	106	87	2				
5	18	43	31	4				
5	19	12	9					
5	20	2	1					

Table 9: The column NUSPD counts MUCDs such that neither the domain nor its dual has the USP. The column SPT counts MUCDs which are single-peaked for a tree.

Recently these domains have also been the focus for development of efficient algorithms, see [PYCE22] and references therein.

Here it becomes natural to ask how common it is for Condorcet domains to be single-peaked on a tree and it turns out to be a rare property for MUCDs. In Table 9 we give both the total number of MUCDs which are single-peaked on a tree and those which are single-peaked on a star⁴.

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted using the resources of High Performance Computing Center North (HPC2N). We would like to thank Alexander Karpov for useful comments on the first version of the manuscript.

References

- [Abe91] James Abello. The weak Bruhat order of S_Σ consistent sets, and Catalan numbers. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 4(1):1–16, 1991.

⁴Data for $n = 6, 7$ can be found in the online appendix.

- [ABF20] Michael Albert, Mathilde Bouvel, and Valentin Feray. Two first-order logics of permutations. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 171:105158, 2020.
- [ACS03] Navin Aswal, Shurojit Chatterji, and Arunava Sen. Dictatorial domains. *Economic Theory*, 22(1):45–62, 2003.
- [AGR08]  Galambos and Victor Reiner. Acyclic sets of linear orders via the bruhat orders. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30:245–264, 2008.
- [AJ84] James Abello and Charles Johnson. How large are transitive simple majority domains? *SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 5(4):603–618, 1984.
- [Alo02] Noga Alon. Voting paradoxes and digraphs realizations. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 29(1):126–135, 2002.
- [Arr51] Kenneth Arrow. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Wiley: New York, 1951.
- [BH11] Miguel A. Ballester and Guillaume Haeringer. A characterization of the single-peaked domain. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 36(2):305–322, 2011.
- [Bir48] Garrett Birkhoff. *Lattice Theory*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. 25. American Mathematical Society, New York, N. Y., revised edition, 1948.
- [Bla48] Duncan Black. On the rationale of group decision-making. *Journal of Political Economy*, 56(1):23–34, 1948.
- [Bli72] Jean-Marie Blin. The General Concept of Multidimensional Consistency: Some Algebraic Aspects of the Aggregation Problem. Discussion Papers 12, Northwestern University, Center for Mathematical Studies in Economics and Management Science, September 1972.
- [CZ23] Shurojit Chatterji and Huaxia Zeng. A taxonomy of non-dictatorial unidimensional domains. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 137:228–269, 2023.
- [Dan94] Vladimir Danilov. The structure of non-manipulable social choice rules on a tree. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 27(2):123–131, 1994. SPECIAL ISSUE.
- [dC85] Le Marquis de Condorcet. *Essai sur l’application de l’analyse  la probabilit des dcisions rendues  la pluralit des voix*. L’Imprimerie Royale, Paris, 1785.

- [Dem82] Gabrielle Demange. Single-peaked orders on a tree. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 3(4):389–396, December 1982.
- [Dit18] Tobias Dittrich. *Eine vollständige Klassifikation von Condorcet Domains für kleine Alternativenmengen*. PhD thesis, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT), 2018.
- [DK13] Vladimir Danilov and Gleb Koshevoy. Maximal condorcet domains. *Order*, 30:181–194, 2013.
- [DM08] Partha Dasgupta and Eric Maskin. On the robustness of majority rule. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6(5):949–973, 2008.
- [ELP22] Edith Elkind, Martin Lackner, and Dominik Peters. Preference restrictions in computational social choice: A survey, 2022.
- [EM64] P. Erdős and L. Moser. On the representation of directed graphs as unions of orderings. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 9:125–132, 1964.
- [Fis92] Peter Fishburn. Notes on craven’s conjecture. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 9(3):259–262, 1992.
- [Fis96] Peter C. Fishburn. Decision theory and discrete mathematics. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 68(3):209–221, 1996.
- [Fis97] Peter C. Fishburn. Acyclic sets of linear orders. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 14:113–124, 1997.
- [Fis02] Peter C. Fishburn. Acyclic sets of linear orders: A progress report. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 19(2):431–447, 2002.
- [Gib73] Allan Gibbard. Manipulation of voting schemes: A general result. *Econometrica*, 41(4):587–601, 1973.
- [Ina64] Ken-ichi Inada. A note on the simple majority decision rule. *Econometrica*, 32(4):525–531, 1964.
- [Ina69] Ken-Ichi Inada. The simple majority decision rule. *Econometrica*, 37(3):490–506, 1969.
- [Joh78] R.C. Johnson. Remarks on mathematical social choice. Technical report, Dept. Economics and Institute for Physical Science and Technology, Univ. Maryland, 1978.
- [KS22] Alexander Karpov and Arkadii Slinko. Symmetric maximal condorcet domains. *Order*, 09 2022.

- [LGMR23] Charles Leedham-Green, Klas Markström, and Søren Riis. The largest condorcet domains on 8 alternatives, 2023.
- [McG53] David McGarvey. A theorem on the construction of voting paradoxes. *Econometrica*, 21:608–610, 1953.
- [Mon09] Bernard Monjardet. Acyclic domains of linear orders: A survey. In *The mathematics of preference, choice and order*, Stud. Choice Welf., pages 139–160. Springer, Berlin, 2009.
- [Mou80] H. Moulin. On strategy-proofness and single peakedness. *Public Choice*, 35(4):437–455, 1980.
- [Mou88] Hervé Moulin. *Axioms of cooperative decision making*, volume 15 of *Econometric Society Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988. With a foreword by Amartya Sen.
- [PS19] Clemens Puppe and Arkadii Slinko. Condorcet domains, median graphs and the single crossing property. *Economic Theory*, 67, 02 2019.
- [PS22] Clemens Puppe and Arkadii Slinko. Maximal condorcet domains. a further progress report. *Working Paper Series in Economics 159, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)*, 2022.
- [Pup18] Clemens Puppe. The single-peaked domain revisited: A simple global characterization. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 176:55–80, 2018.
- [PYCE22] Dominik Peters, Lan Yu, Hau Chan, and Edith Elkind. Preferences Single-Peaked on a Tree: Multiwinner Elections and Structural Results. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 73:231–276, January 2022.
- [Ray81] Herve Raynaud. Paradoxical results from inada’s conditions for majority rule. Technical report, Stanford univ. ca. inst. for mathematical studies in the social sciences, 1981.
- [Raz00] Ran Raz. VC-dimension of sets of permutations. *Combinatorica*, 20(1):1–15, 2000.
- [Sat75] Mark Allen Satterthwaite. Strategy-proofness and arrow’s conditions: Existence and correspondence theorems for voting procedures and social welfare functions. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 10(2):187–217, 1975.
- [Sen66] Amartya Sen. A possibility theorem on majority decisions. *Econometrica*, 34(2):491–499, 1966.

- [Sli19] Arkadii Slinko. Condorcet domains satisfying arrow's single-peakedness. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 84:166–175, 2019.
- [Ste59] Richard Stearns. The voting problem. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 66:761–763, 1959.
- [War65] Benjamin Ward. Majority voting and alternative forms of public enterprise. In *The public economy of urban communities*, pages 112–126. Routledge, 1965.
- [Web] Maximal condorcet domains.
<http://abel.math.umu.se/~klasm/Data/CONDORCET/>.
- [ZMR23] Bei Zhou, Klas Markström, and Søren Riis. Cdl: A fast and flexible library for the study of permutation sets with structural restrictions, 2023.

Online Appendix

Here we present additional data for Section 5 of our paper.

Size	Total	USP	NUSPD	SPT	Star
4	8	8			
8	11	10		1	1
9	26	20			
10	46	40		1	
11	8	7			
12	11	8	1		
13	106	67	4		
14	80	61			
15	66	53			
16	1036	719	64	11	7
17	808	413	140		
18	808	379	128		
19	1399	670	207		
20	1734	839	258		
21	2156	1118	289		
22	5072	2561	876	8	2
2 23	4986	2677	682		
24	8617	4565	1386	14	3
25	9892	4804	2164		
26	16629	8823	3129	29	9
27	17137	8460	3717		
28	32708	17428	5864	100	30
29	25453	13241	4709		
30	31310	17213	4752	44	10
31	22543	12761	3498		
32	38894	26102	3242	288	126
33	12168	8872	710		
34	11554	8385	788	8	6
35	4635	3429	282		
36	3720	2698	270	10	8
37	1297	897	73		
38	1300	930	90	1	1
39	366	270	8		
40	192	147	1	1	1
41	50	36	2		
42	57	36	6		
43	7	4	1		
44	4	3			
45	1	1			

Table 10: MUCDs of degree 6

Size	Total	USP	NUSPD	SPT	Star
4	46	46			
8	44	44			
9	24	21			
10	270	204		1	
11	188	158			
12	147	132	1	2	
13	176	152			
14	284	225		3	
15	548	356	28		
16	1626	1147	54	8	5
17	2178	1715	26		
18	4435	3579	18	5	3
19	9994	7595	204		
20	11864	9416	308	39	3
21	7040	5334	268		
22	12685	7880	1046	3	
23	18570	10502	2382		
24	25954	13337	4083	3	1
25	44660	21440	8310		
26	81579	41554	15134	55	19
27	94158	48104	16490		
28	132114	70626	20418	38	24
29	159868	86275	24034		
30	194674	109741	24592	20	14
31	247692	135543	36242		
32	404009	232859	55893	547	294
33	356618	187736	58636		
34	480195	241879	84736	141	80
35	461900	232880	77574		
36	609624	306168	104774	132	41
37	678422	332654	126548		
38	928441	468659	169820	201	48
39	930304	462464	177382		
40	1244522	622926	245049	263	88
41	1273738	635695	257562		
42	1739772	868016	357082	423	117
43	1849074	891637	413856		
44	2701280	1341710	560391	959	223
45	2644266	1274294	598920		
46	3491780	1717713	766557	754	196
47	3686966	1743701	901630		
48	4911214	2396695	1117169	1547	433
49	4790868	2276175	1168420		
50	6426642	3155872	1445139	1173	314
51	6253444	2975189	1527476		
52	8174653	4077249	1795796	2935	1067
53	7497364	3595819	1801242		

Table 11: MUCDs of degree 7

Size	Total	USP	NUSPD	SPT	Star
54	9180598	4590919	1975335	2018	693
55	8270608	4045313	1893692		
56	11160909	5810955	2141477	6714	2185
57	8540924	4321308	1759986		
58	10269782	5566271	1761191	2637	1345
59	7723932	4138772	1393850		
60	9606176	5482135	1410202	5002	1953
61	6518148	3653765	1029668		
62	7839946	4675901	996210	2821	1180
63	5191166	3074071	697030		
64	7728718	5147199	683048	12934	5762
65	3436076	2292393	315782		
66	3750621	2596227	302273	1238	870
67	2034070	1387336	177286		
68	2440206	1737293	182585	1891	1209
69	1152526	793497	100214		
70	1351871	965314	99595	492	356
71	671796	465452	58322		
72	808375	584378	55400	805	523
73	357970	248428	29754		
74	405334	294744	25405	142	108
75	186106	131071	13680		
76	244369	180642	12648	272	180
77	101268	72371	6398		
78	116958	86951	5556	34	25
79	48120	33469	3434		
80	56464	41434	2637	70	52
81	23402	16423	1498		
82	25154	17915	1568	10	6
83	11344	7570	1058		
84	14503	10183	954	12	8
85	6108	4061	516		
86	4273	3094	257		
87	2066	1419	164		
88	2038	1524	76	2	2
89	1248	865	98		
90	647	486	24		
91	214	170	14		
92	274	209	16		
93	106	77	8		
94	76	59	6		
95	18	10	4		
96	36	27	2		
97	16	12	36		
98	4	2			
100	2	1			

Table 12: MUCDs of degree 7