

Multi-votes Election Control by Selecting Rules

Fengbo Wang^{1,2}, Aizhong Zhou^{1,3} (✉), and Jianliang Xu^{1,4}

¹ Ocean University of China, Qingdao, Shandong, China

² wfb@stu.ouc.edu.cn

³ zhouaizhong@ouc.edu.cn

⁴ xjl9898@ouc.edu.cn

Abstract. We study the election control problem with multi-votes, where each voter can present a single vote according different views (or layers, we use “layer” to represent “view”). For example, according to the attributes of candidates, such as: education, hobby or the relationship of candidates, a voter may present different preferences for the same candidate set. Here, we consider a new model of election control that by assigning different rules to the votes from different layers, makes the special candidate p being the winner of the election (a rule can be assigned to different layers). Assuming a set of candidates C among a special candidate “ p ”, a set of voters V , and t layers, each voter gives t votes over all candidates, one for each layer, a set of voting rules R , the task is to find an assignment of rules to each layer that p is acceptable for voters (possible winner of the election). Three models are considered (denoted as sum-model, max-model, and min-model) to measure the satisfaction of each voter. In this paper, we analyze the computational complexity of finding such a rule assignment, including classical complexity and parameterized complexity. It is interesting to find out that 1) it is NP-hard even if there are only two voters in the sum-model, or there are only two rules in sum-model and max-model; 2) it is intractable with the number of layers as parameter for all of three models; 3) even the satisfaction of each vote is set as dichotomous, 1 or 0, it remains hard to find out an acceptable rule assignment. Furthermore, we also get some other intractable and tractable results.

Keywords: Multi-votes · Computational complexity · Control.

1 Introduction

Elections are a commonly used mechanism to achieve preference aggregation and have applications in multi-agent settings and political domains. This problem also plays a fundamental role in artificial intelligence and social choice [1,2]. Most cases studied are set to find out a single winner, voting can also be used to select a fixed-size set of winners (multi-winner), called committee.

The first innovation of our work is that we consider the condition where each voter can present multi-votes. The traditional election only allows each voter to provide a single vote, which is insufficient in many real applications. For

example, a single person has different attributes in different scenes, such as, he is a husband when he accompanies with his wife, and is a teacher when he faces to the students. It is natural for us to present different preferences among agents from the different viewpoints. Such as, from a romantic perspective, giving rose to others is better than a candy, while from a perspective of filling the stomach, we often prefer candy to rose. The conditions where each voter is allowed to present multi-votes studied in Aziz et al. [3], Chen et al. [4], Miyazaki and Okamoto [5] and Robert Bredereck et al. [25]. Wen et al. [6] studied the multi-preference model of matching. A related work of Jain and Talmon [7] studied committee selection with multi-modal preferences, which assuming a set of candidates A , a set of voters V , and ℓ layers, where each voter $v \in V$ has ordinal preferences over the alternatives for each layer separately, the task is to select an acceptable committee $S \subset A$ of size k .

We also consider the election with uncertainty, which is another hot topic in the research of social choice. In the context of winner determination, perhaps the most prominent problem in this category is vote uncertainty, the possible/necessary winner problem [8], where the voting rule is public information, but for each voter, only a partial order over the candidates is known; the goal is to determine if a candidate wins the election for some way (the possible winner) or for every way (the necessary winner) of completing the voters' preferences; a probabilistic variant of this problem has been considered [9]. Kocot considered if there is a committee that meets or exceeds the respective lower bound with respect to each of the rules [10]. Uncertainty about the voting rules has been recently investigated by Baumeister et al. [11], who also consider the situation where the voting rule will be chosen from a fixed set. Maciej Kocot et al. [10] has studied winner determination and voting manipulation under uncertainty. Edith Elkind and Gábor Erdélyi [12] studied the complexity of manipulation for the setting where there is uncertainty about the voting rule: the manipulator(s) know that the election will be conducted using a voting rule from a given list, and need to select their votes so as to succeed no matter which voting rule will eventually be chosen. A similar work has been in Conitzer et al [13]. We follow this line and continue to consider the scene where the voting rules are uncertain, and our work is to find a set of satisfying rules assigned to each layer.

Another contribution of this paper is that we consider a new model of election control where assigning rules to each layer to determine the election winner (the satisfaction of the vote is achieved by the assigned rule). It can be seen as an attack to control the winner of the election. The computational complexity of elections under attacks has been studied extensively, since Bartholdi et al. [14] introduced the usage of computational complexity as a barrier to protect elections against different manipulative actions. The common attacks among manipulation, control, and bribery. See the book chapters [15,16] for recent surveys of related results. Here, we focus on the control attacks on elections, where an election chair attempts by doing some operations to make a special candidate win the election, the *constructive control* model [14], or lose the election, the *destructive control* model [17]. The common operations include adding candidates,

adding votes, deleting candidates, deleting votes, partition of candidates, and partition of votes et al. Complexity results of control problems have been obtained for many election systems such as Plurality, Condorcet, Approval Voting, Copeland, Schulze Voting and Borda [15,18,19,20]. Operations such as partitioning the candidates or votes have also been consider [20,21]. Furthermore, control problems have also been studied in connection to some special vote structures such as single-peaked or single-dived [22]. In this paper, we consider another operation that by selecting rules to different votes to make a special candidate being the winner of the election (the constructive control case). Considering the computational complexity of this new model of election control can reduce the impact on the fairness of election and ensure the rationality of the winner.

In summary, our work combines the characteristic of multi-votes, uncertainty and control together, and studies the computational complexity of the problem, called *Multi-votes Election Control By Selecting Rules*, *MECSR* for short. The multi-votes election provides rule uncertainty with a well existence opportunity. When each voter provides a single vote, only a rule is applied to this voter. So, the task is to chose a rule from the rule set or to determine which vote is applied with the chosen rule. However, when each voter provides multi-votes, it presents a possibility that multi-votes are applied with different rules, and the task is to achieve a satisfying rule assignment (the satisfaction of voters is enough) to different rules. To measure the satisfaction of each voter, we consider three models, *Sum-Model*, *Max-Model*, and *Min-Model*, and find out that the MECSR problem is NP-hard for all of the three models. We continue to study the parameterized complexity with the three models, and get some tractable and intractable results (shown in table.1). It is interesting to find out that 1) it is NP-hard even if there are only two voters in sum-model, or two rules in sum-model or max-model, 2) it is intractable with the number of layers as parameter for all of the three rules, 3) even the satisfaction of each vote is set as dichotomous, 1 or 0, it is still hard to find out an acceptable rule assignment. In the following of this paper, we first present the preliminaries in section 2, and show the details of classical and parameterized complexity results in section 3. Finally, we summarize our work and present some interesting future work in section 4.

2 Preliminaries

A traditional election denoted as $E = (C, V)$ among m candidates in C and n votes in V from n voters. The aim of the election is to select a single satisfied candidate c from C to be the winner, according to the votes in V . Here, we analyse a special model of election where each voter gives t votes over all candidates C from in t layers, such as experience or education, with each vote corresponding to one layer. The vote set V contains n subset $V_i (1 \leq i \leq n)$, where each subset corresponds to a voter, $V = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i$; and each subset V_i contains t votes $v_i^j (1 \leq j \leq t)$, each vote corresponds to a layer of the voter, $V_i = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq t} v_i^j$. The vote v_i^j is presented by the i -th voter from the j -th layer. To measure the satisfaction of vote v with the chosen winner c being the winner,

Table 1. In this table, we summarize our results including classical and parameterized complexity. The n denotes the number of voters, t denotes the number of votes presented by each voter (the number of layers), ℓ denotes the number of rules, and α denotes the number of satisfied voters. It is trivially in P when there is only one voter, one layer, or one rule. And when all of the voters all voters accept the winner with min-model ($n = \alpha$), we can obviously find out an acceptable rule assignment in polynomial-time. Therefore, it is FPT of MECSR problem with the number of voters as parameter. All of the results shown in this table are reached, even if the satisfaction of each vote is set as dichotomous, 0 or 1.

Model	Classical Complexity	Parameterized Complexity			
		n	t	ℓ	α
Sum	NP-hard [Theorem 1]	$n \leq t$: W[2]-hard $n > t$: FPT [Theorem 4]	W[2]-hard [Theorem 1]	$\ell = 2$: NP-hard [Theorem 2]	W[1]-hard [Theorem 3]
Max	NP-hard [Theorem 5]	$n \leq t$: W[2]-hard $n > t$: FPT [Theorem 8]	W[2]-hard [Theorem 5]	$\ell = 2$: NP-hard [Theorem 7]	W[1]-hard [Theorem 6]
Min	NP-hard [Theorem 9]	FPT	W[1]-hard [Theorem 9]	$\ell \leq t$: W[1]-hard $\ell > t$: FPT [Theorem 10]	W[1]-hard [Theorem 9]

we often think about the rules (such as: Borda) which can calculate a value, $\text{Sat}(c, v, r)$ with rule. The satisfaction of a voter $\text{Sat}(V)$ is obtained according to the t vote satisfactions $\text{Sat}(c, v, r)$ with $v \in V$. When $\text{Sat}(V)$ reaches a given threshold d , we call the voter *accepts* the winner c , otherwise, we call the voter *rejects* the winner c . The satisfaction of each voter is determined by combination of his t votes and the chosen winner c . Hereby, we consider the condition called as *Multi-votes Election Control By Selecting Rules (MECSR)* that given a set of rules $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_\ell\}$, the satisfaction threshold d and a special candidate $p \in C$, is there an assignment of rules to each layer to make sure that the satisfaction of each voter is at least d with p being the winner? There are some notes about our work described as follows: 1). Same layers of different voters share common rules, and a single rule can be assigned to different layers; 2). We do not require p to be the unique winner, which means the rule assignment may potentially result in another candidate being the winner, such an outcome is acceptable; 3). Here, we consider the rules which can calculate $\text{Sat}(c, v)$ in polynomial time with given candidate c and vote v ; 4). Although we just consider the special candidate p being the winner here, our work can be applied to the committee election with the rules which can get a value of each candidate from the votes directly, such as Borda, plurality or veto.

2.1 Problem Definition

Here, We define the central problem of this paper.

Multi-votes Election Control By Selecting Rules (MECSR)

Input: An election $E = (C, V, R, t)$, each voter provides t votes over all

candidates in C where each vote for each layer, a set R of rules, a special candidate $p \in C$, and two positive integers d and α .

Question: Is there an assignment of rules in R for each layer that the at least α voters accept the winner p ($\text{Sat}(V) \geq d$)?

Since the special candidate $p \in C$, each vote $v \in V$, and each rule $r \in R$ are part of the input, we can calculate $\text{Sat}(p, v, r)$ in polynomial time, denoted as $\text{Sat}(v, r)$. Therefore, we can consider $\text{Sat}(v, r)$ as part of the input directly, without specifying the formats of each vote v and each rule r .

In this paper, we investigate three models of calculating voter satisfaction, which have also been studied by Aziz et al. [3]:

- Sum-Model: The satisfaction of each voter is the total satisfaction of all t layers, $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j=1}^t \text{Sat}(v_i^j)$;
- Max-Model: The satisfaction of each voter is the maximal satisfaction among the t layers, $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \max\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j) | 1 \leq j \leq t\}$;
- Min-Model: The satisfaction of each voter is the minimal satisfaction among the t layers, $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \min\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j) | 1 \leq j \leq t\}$.

The sum-model measures the total satisfaction of a voter and does not consider the individual satisfaction of each vote; in the max-model, voters accept the chosen candidate when the satisfaction is enough from at least one vote; and for the min-model, voters accept the chosen candidate only if the satisfaction is enough from all votes.

2.2 Parameterized Complexity

Parameterized complexity allows us to give a more refined analysis of computational problems and in particular, can provide a deep exploration of the connection between the problem complexity and various problem-specific parameters. A fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) problem admits an $O(f(k) \cdot |I|^{O(1)})$ -time algorithm, where I denotes the whole input instance, k is the parameter, and f can be any computable function. Fixed-parameter intractable problems can be classified into many complexity classes, where the most fundamental ones are $W[1]$ and $W[2]$. A problem is para-NP-hard with respect to parameter k , when the problem remains NP-hard even if k is a fixed constant. For more details on parameterized complexity, we refer to [23,24].

3 Classical and parameterized complexity

In this section, we show the computational complexity of MECSR problem with sum-model, max-model, or min-model. It is trivial MECSR problem is in P when there is only one rule, one layer, or one voter. Otherwise, MECSR problem is NP-hard for all of the three models. Furthermore, we achieve some intractable results and two tractable results. For ease of the description, we use $j \in [n]$ to represent $1 \leq j \leq n$, use $j \in [n_1, n_2]$ to represent $n_1 \leq j \leq n_2$, where j is a non-negative integer; use $N[v]$ to represent the neighborhood set of v , which includes the vertex v itself along with its adjacent vertices.

3.1 Complexity with Sum model

In this section, we present the complexity results for the MECSR problem with sum-model. In sum-model, the satisfaction of each voter is calculated by the sum of satisfactions from all t layers, denoted as $\mathbf{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j=1}^t \mathbf{Sat}(v_i^j)$. We achieve 1) MECSR problem with sum-model is NP-hard even when there are only two rules; 2) it is W[2]-hard with respect to the number of layers t ; 3) it is W[1]-hard with the number of satisfied voters α as the parameter.

Theorem 1. *The MECSR problem with sum-model is NP-hard and is W[2]-hard with respect to the number of layers t .*

Proof. We prove the theorem by reducing from DOMINATING SET problem, which given a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and an integer k' where $|\mathcal{V}| = m'$ and $|\mathcal{E}| = n'$, asks for a size- $\leq k'$ vertex subset $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ where $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}, \exists v' \in \mathcal{V}', v \in N[v']$. It is known that DOMINATING SET problem is NP-hard and is W[2]-hard with respect to the size of \mathcal{V}' [24]. We construct an MECSR instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ from $(\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), k')$ as follows.

For each vertex $v_i \in \mathcal{V}, i \in [m']$, we construct a voter V_i and a rule $r_i, V = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m'} V_i, R = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m'} r_i$. There are k' layers in total, $t = k'$. For each voter $V_i, i \in [m']$, we construct k' votes, $V_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k'} v_i^j$. The satisfaction of vote $v_i^j (j \in [k'])$ with rule r_k is set to 1, if the corresponding vertices v_i and v_k satisfy $v_i \in N[v_k]$ in \mathcal{G} , $\mathbf{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k) = 1$; otherwise, the satisfaction is set to 0, $\mathbf{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k) = 0$.

$$\mathbf{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k) = \begin{cases} 1, & v_i \in N[v_k], \\ 0, & v_i \notin N[v_k]. \end{cases}$$

Note that all $t = k'$ votes of one voter are the same. Let $d := 1, \alpha := n'$. Now we prove that there is a size- k' dominating set in \mathcal{G} if and only if there is a rule assignment solution of MECSR problem with sum-model.

“ \implies ”: If there is a size- $\leq k'$ dominating set DS in \mathcal{G} , $|DS| \leq k'$ and $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}, \exists v' \in DS, v \in N[v']$. Let R' be the set of rules corresponding to the vertices in DS , $|R'| \leq k'$, that is, $\forall v_i \in DS, r_i \in R'$. For each vertex $v_i \in DS$, r_i is assigned to one layer. It means each rule in R' is assigned to one layer. Since all the k' votes of one voter are same, the assignment order of the chosen k' rules has no effect on the satisfaction of each voter. Since each vertex $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ is adjacent to at least one vertex $v_k \in DS$, it means for each voter the satisfaction of at least one layer with the rule r_k is 1, that is $\exists r_k \in R', \mathbf{Sat}(p, v_i^j, r_k) = 1$. So, for each voter V_i , the total satisfaction of V_i is at least $d = 1$:

$$\mathbf{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{k'} \mathbf{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{j'}) \geq \mathbf{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k) = 1.$$

Therefore, the MECSR instance has a rule assignment to make p being the possible winner of the election.

“ \Leftarrow ”: Suppose there is a rule assignment of MECSR, where the satisfaction of each voter V_i is at least $d = 1$. Let R' be the set of rules of the rule assignment, $|R'| \leq k'$ and $r_{j'} \in R'$ is the rule assigned to j -th layer. Then, for each voter V_i , it must hold $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{k'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{j'}) \geq d = 1$. Since the satisfaction for a voter of each layer can only be 1 or 0, there must be a layer where the satisfaction is 1 with the assigned rule $r_{j'}$. It means:

$$\exists r_{j'} \in R', \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{j'}) = 1.$$

So, for each voter V_i , the corresponding vertex v_i must hold $v_i \in [v_{j'}]$ with satisfying $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{j'}) = 1$. Therefore, the set of vertices corresponding to the rules in R' is a size- $\leq k'$ dominating set of \mathcal{G} . This completes the proof of this theorem.

Theorem 2. *The MECSR problem with sum-model is NP-hard even if there are only two rules.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by reducing from DOMINATING SET problem. We construct an MECSR instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ from $(\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), k')$ as follows.

For each vertex $v_i \in \mathcal{V} (i \in [m'])$, we construct a voter V_i . We also construct another voter $V_{m'+1}$, $V = \bigcup_{i \in [m'+1]} V_i$. There are two rules, r_1 and r_2 , $R = \{r_1, r_2\}$, and $2m'$ layers, $t = 2m'$. The satisfaction of each vote is set as follows:

- For the j -th layer with $j \in [m']$:
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = 1$, $i \in [m']$ and $v_i \in N[v_j]$;
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = 0$, $i \in [m']$ and $v_i \notin N[v_j]$;
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 0$, $i \in [m']$;
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = 0$, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 1$, $i = m' + 1$.
- For the j -th layer with $j \in [m' + 1, 2m' - 1]$:
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 1$, $i \in [m']$;
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 1$, $i = m' + 1$ and $j \in [m' + 1, m' + k']$;
 - $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 0$, $i = m' + 1$ and $j \in [m' + k' + 1, 2m' - 1]$;
- For the j -th layer with $j = 2m'$:
 - $\text{Sat}(p, v_i^{2m'}, r_1) = \text{Sat}(p, v_i^{2m'}, r_2) = 0$, $i \in [m' + 1]$.

Let $\alpha := m' + 1$, $d := m'$. Now, we show that the DOMINATING SET instance has a size- $\leq k'$ dominating set if and only if there is a rule assignment of r_1 and r_2 of MECSR instance with sum-model such that $\forall i \in [m' + 1]$, $\sum_{j=1}^{2m'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j) \geq m'$.

“ \Rightarrow ”: Suppose that there exists a size- $\leq k'$ dominating set \mathcal{V}' in \mathcal{G} . For $j \in [m']$, r_1 is assigned to the k' layers corresponding to the vertices in \mathcal{V}' , while r_2 is assigned to the other layers. For example, if v_2 is in \mathcal{V}' , r_1 is assigned to the second layer; otherwise, v_2 is not in \mathcal{V}' , r_2 is assigned to the second layer. For $j \in [m' + 1, 2m']$, the allocation of r_1 and r_2 is random. Since k' layers corresponding to the vertices in \mathcal{V}' are assigned with rule r_1 , and $m - k'$ layers are assigned with rule r_2 , it holds:

- When $j \in [m']$:
 - $\sum_{v_j \in V'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = \sum_{v_j \in V'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) + \sum_{v_j \notin V'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) \geq 1 + 0 = 1, i \in [m'];$
 - $\sum_{v_j \in V'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = \sum_{v_j \in V'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) + \sum_{v_j \notin V'} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 0 + (m' - k') = m' - k', i = [m' + 1].$
- When $j \in [m' + 1, 2m']$:
 - $\sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = \sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m'-1]} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) + \text{Sat}(v_i^{2m'}, r) = m' - 1 + 0 = m' - 1, i \in [m'];$
 - $\sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = \sum_{j \in [m'+1, m'+k]} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) + \sum_{j \in [m'+k'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = k' + 0 = k', i = m' + 1.$
- For the j -th layer with $j = 2m'$:
 - $\text{Sat}(p, v_i^{2m'}, r_1) = \text{Sat}(p, v_i^{2m'}, r_2) = 0, i \in [m' + 1].$

Note that, the satisfaction v_i^j remains constant regardless of the r_1 or r_2 is assigned to j -th layer, when $j \in [m' + 1, 2m']$. So, we can get:

- $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j \in [m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) + \sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) \geq 1 + m' - 1 = m' = d,$
 $i \in [m']$
- $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j \in [m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) + \sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) \geq 1 + m' - 1 = m' = d,$
 $i = [m' + 1]$

Therefore, the total satisfaction of v_i^j is at least m' for all $i \in [m' + 1], j \in [m' + 1, 2m']$.

“ \Leftarrow ”: Suppose there is a rule assignment of MECSR, where the satisfaction of each voter V_i is at least m' . According to the votes of $V_{m'+1}$, the total satisfaction of $v_{m'+1}^j$ is always k' regardless of r_1 or r_2 is assigned to the j -th layer, $j \in [m' + 1, 2m']$. That is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_{m'+1}^j, r_1) &= \sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_{m'+1}^j, r_2) \\
 &= \sum_{j \in [m'+1, m'+k']} \text{Sat}(v_{m'+1}^j, r_1) + \sum_{j \in [m'+k'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_{m'+1}^j, r_2) \\
 &= k' + 0 = k'.
 \end{aligned}$$

$\text{Sat}(p, v_{m'+1}^j, r_1) = \text{Sat}(p, v_{m'+1}^j, r_2)$. To reach the threshold $d = m'$, for the j -th layer, $j \in [m']$, at most k' layers can be assigned with r_1 . For the voters of $V_i, i \in [m']$, it always holds:

- $\sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) + \sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m'-1]} \text{Sat}(v_i^{2m'}, r) = m' - 1, i \in [m']$
- $\sum_{j \in [m'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = \sum_{j \in [m'+1, m'+k']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) + \sum_{j \in [m'+k'+1, 2m']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = k' + 0 = k', i = [m' + 1]$

Therefore, for each j -th layer with $j \in [m']$, at least one layer is assigned with r_1 to receive the satisfaction of 1 for $V_i (i \in [m'])$, and at most k' layers can be assigned with r_1 to ensure that the total satisfaction $\sum_{j \in [m']} \text{Sat}(v_{m'+1}^j, r) \geq m' - k'$. Since the j -th layer ($j \in [m']$) corresponds to the vertex v_j in the graph \mathcal{G} , we have $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = 1$ only when the corresponding vertex $v_i \in N[v_j]$, where $N[v_j]$ represents the neighborhood set of v_j . Therefore, the instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ has a solution of rule assignment if and only if the graph $(\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), k')$ has a size- $\leq k'$ dominating set.

Theorem 3. *The MECSR problem with sum-model is W[1]-hard with respect to the number of satisfied voters α .*

Proof. We prove this theorem by giving a reduction from 3-SET PACKING, which given a set of elements X , $X = \bigcup_{i \in [m']} x_i$, a set of sets \mathcal{S} , $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_{i \in [n']} \mathcal{S}_i$, where $\forall i \in [n'], \mathcal{S}_i \subset X$, $|\mathcal{S}_i| = 3$, and asks for a size- k' subset \mathcal{S}' of \mathcal{S} that $\forall \mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{S}_{i'} \in \mathcal{S}'$, $\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_{i'} = \emptyset$. It is known that 3-SET PACKING is NP-hard and is W[1]-hard with respect to k' . We construct an MECSR instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ from $((X, \mathcal{S}), k')$ where $|X| = m'$ and $|\mathcal{S}| = n'$ as follows:

For each element $x_i \in X$, we construct a voter V_i , $V = \bigcup_{i \in [m']} V_i$. There are totally k' layers, $t = k'$, $V_i = \bigcup_{j \in [k']} v_i^j$. For each set $\mathcal{S}_i \in \mathcal{S}$, we construct a rule r_k , $R = \bigcup_{k \in [n']} \{r_k\}$. For each vote $v_i^j (j \in [k'])$ and rule r_k , if the corresponding element $x_i \in \mathcal{S}_k$, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k)$ is set to 1; otherwise, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k)$ is set to 0.

$$\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k) = \begin{cases} 1, & x_i \in \mathcal{S}_k, \\ 0, & x_i \notin \mathcal{S}_k. \end{cases}$$

Note that the k' votes of one voter are all the same. Let $\alpha := 3k'$, $d := 1$. Now we prove that there is a size- k' subset \mathcal{S}' if and only if there is a solution of MECSR instance with sum-model.

“ \implies ”: Suppose that there is a size- k' subset $\mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{S}$, where $\forall \mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{S}_{i'} \in \mathcal{S}'$, $\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_{i'} = \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{S}' = \{\mathcal{S}_{\beta_1}, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_2}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{\beta_{k'}}\}$. For the j -th layer, the rule r_{β_j} is assigned. Let R' be the set of rules corresponding to the sets in \mathcal{S}' . In this way, $\forall x_i \in \mathcal{S}_{\beta_j} \subset \mathcal{S}' (j \in [k'])$, the satisfaction of vote v_i^j with rule r_{β_j} is 1, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{\beta_j}) = 1$. So, the satisfaction of the voter V_i which corresponds to the element x_i in \mathcal{S}' is at least 1, that is, $\text{Sat}(p, V_i) \geq \text{Sat}(p, v_i^j, r_{\beta_j}) \geq 1 = d$. There are exactly $3k'$ elements in the set of \mathcal{S}' , because each two sets in \mathcal{S}' do not share a common element and each set contains exactly 3 elements, $|\mathcal{S}_i| = |\mathcal{S}_{i'}| = 3$. That is, there are at least $\alpha = 3k'$ voters whose satisfaction is at least $d = 1$. Therefore, if $((X, \mathcal{S}), k')$ has a size- k' subset \mathcal{S}' of \mathcal{S} satisfying $\forall \mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{S}_{i'} \in \mathcal{S}'$, $\mathcal{S}_i \cap \mathcal{S}_{i'} = \emptyset$, MECSR instance has a solution of rule assignment R' .

“ \impliedby ”: Suppose that there is an assignment of rules for each layer in which there are at least $\alpha = 3k'$ voters whose satisfaction is at least $d = 1$. Let $r_{\gamma_j} \in R$ be the rule assigned to j -th layer, $j \in [k']$. For each satisfied voter V_i , it must hold $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \sum_{j \in [k']} \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{\gamma_j}) \geq 1 = d$. It means that there are at least one

vote v_i^j satisfying $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_{\gamma_j}) = 1$. Without loss of generality, let the j' -th layer satisfies $\text{Sat}(v_i^{j'}, r_{\gamma_{j'}}) = 1$, ($j' \in [k']$). In this way, the corresponding element x_i must be in the set $S_{\gamma_{j'}}$. Since there are k' layers and at least $\alpha = 3k'$ satisfied voters, the corresponding elements must be in the k' corresponding sets. Because each set S_i contains exactly 3 elements, $\forall i \in [n'], |S_i| = 3$. So, there are exactly $3k'$ elements in exact k' sets, denote the set of the k' sets as S' . Therefore, if MECSR instance has a solution of rule assignment, $((X, \mathcal{S}), k')$ has a size- k' subset \mathcal{S}' of \mathcal{S} satisfying $\forall S_i, S_{i'} \in \mathcal{S}', S_i \cap S_{i'} = \emptyset$. This completes the proof of this theorem.

Next, we continue consider the parameterized complexity of MECSR with sum-model with the number of voters n as parameter. When the satisfaction of each vote is set dichotomous, 0 or 1, according to the proof of Theorem 1, we can do some modifications on the constructions of layers and get an intractable result when $n \leq t$. The other condition when $n > t$, we get a tractable result by constructing an ILP. Otherwise, we find out that even there are only two votes, it is NP-hard to find out an acceptable rule assignment. So, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *The MECSR problem with sum-model is NP-hard even if there are only 2 voters, $n = 2$. When the satisfaction of each vote is set dichotomous, 0 or 1, the MECSR problem with sum-model is W[2]-hard when $n \leq t$, and is FPT when $n > t$, with the number of voter n as parameter.*

Proof. We firstly prove the result that MECSR problem with sum-model is NP-hard even if there are only 2 voters, $n := 2$, by reducing PARTITION problem to MECSR. Given a set X of n' elements, where each element $x_i \in X$ is associated with a value $s_i \in S$, the problem asks for a partition of elements in X into two disjoint subsets X_1 and X_2 , $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$, such that the sum of values assigned to the elements in X_1 is equal to the sum of values assigned to the elements in X_2 , $\sum_{x_i \in X_1} s_i = \sum_{x_{i'} \in X_2} s_{i'}$. It is well-known that PARTITION problem is NP-hard [26]. We construct an MECSR instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ from (X, S) as follows:

We construct two voters V_1, V_2 and two rules r_1, r_2 , $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, $R = \{r_1, r_2\}$. There are n' layers in total, $t := n'$. For each layer of voter V_1 , the satisfaction of vote v_1^j ($j \in [n']$) with r_1 is set to s_j , and the satisfaction of vote v_1^j with r_2 is set to 0. For each layer of voter V_2 , the satisfaction of vote v_2^j with rule r_1 is set to 0, and the satisfaction of vote v_2^j with rule r_2 is set to s_j .

$$\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_k) = \begin{cases} s_i, & i = 1, r_k = r_1, j \in [k'], \\ 0, & i = 1, r_k = r_2, j \in [k'], \\ 0, & i = 2, r_k = r_1, j \in [k'], \\ s_i, & i = 2, r_k = r_2, j \in [k']. \end{cases}$$

Note that for the j -th layer, if the rule r_1 is chosen, then the satisfaction of V_1 is improved by s_j ; otherwise, the rule of r_2 is chosen, and the satisfaction of V_2

is improved by s_j . We set $\alpha := 2$, $d := \frac{1}{2}N = \sum_{x_i \in X} s_i$. It means each layer can be assigned with r_1 or r_2 , corresponding to the assignment of elements to either X_1 or X_2 ; and V_1 and V_2 are both satisfied with a value $d = \frac{1}{2}N$, corresponding to partition X into X_1, X_2 , and the total value of elements in X_1 and X_2 are both $d = \frac{1}{2}N$. Therefore, there is a partition for (X, S) if and only if there is a solution of $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$.

Next, we show the reason of why MECSR problem is W[2]-hard with respect to the number of voter n when $n \leq t$. According to the proof of Theorem 1, when $n = m'$ (m' is the number of vertex) and $t = k'$ (k' is the size of dominating set), MECSR problem is w[2]-hard with respect to the number of layers t . We can do the following modifications to the proof in Theorem 1:

- Add λ layers for each voter ($\lambda \geq m' - k'$);
- Set the satisfaction of vote v_i^j with each rule is 0, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = 0, i \in [m'], j \in [k' + 1, k' + \lambda], r \in R$.

Let $R' := R, d' := d, t' = t + \lambda \geq m'$, and $(E' = (C', V', R', t'), \alpha', d')$ be the modified MECSR instance. It holds $n = m' \leq k' + \lambda = t'$. Since the added layers have no influence on the the solution of this problem (the satisfaction of each added layers is 0). So, the modified instance $(E' = (C', V', R', t'), \alpha', d')$ has a solution if and only if the original instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ has a rule assignment solution. This means MECSR is w[2]-hard with respect to the number of t when $n \leq t$. Since if a problem is FPT with respect to n , this problem must be FPT with respect to t when $n \leq t$. Therefore, MECSR problem is W[2]-hard with respect to the number of n when $n \leq t$.

In the following, we show the FPT result when $n > t$. Firstly, we can enumerate all conditions whose satisfaction achieve the threshold d . The number of all conditions is 2^n , and we consider the conditions of voters when the number of satisfied voter is at least α . For each of this condition, we construct an ILP formulation. Let V' be the set of voter whose satisfaction is at least d . We say two rules are of the same type if they can make the same voters satisfied in j -th layer ($j \in [t]$). Let RT be the set of all rule types. There are n voters and t layers in total, so there are at most $2^n \times t$ different rule types, $|RT| \leq 2^n \times t$. For each rule type $rt \in RT$, let n_{rt} be the number of rules in R of type rt . Let $f(j, rt)$ be the set of index of the voters whose satisfaction of vote v_i^j is 1 with the rule r of type rt , $i \in f(j, rt), \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = 1$. If $i \in f(j, rt)$, we define $h(i, j, rt) = 1$; otherwise $h(i, j, rt) = 0$. In the following, we define the variables of ILP. For each rule type rt , we define an integer variable $x_{j,rt}$, where $x_{j,rt} \in \{0, 1\}$ that $x_{j,rt} = c$ means there are c rules of type rt assigned to j -th layer. The ILP instance consists of the following constraints:

1. $\sum_{rt \in RT} x_{j,rt} = 1, j \in [t]$;
2. $\sum_{rt \in RT} \sum_{j \leq [t]} x_{j,rt} \times h(i, j, rt) \geq d, \forall v_i \in V'$;
3. $x_{j,rt} = 0, 1, j \in [t], \forall rt \in RT$.

The first equality guarantees that for each layer, there is exactly one rule assigned to this layer. The second inequality means the chosen rules can make all voters in V' satisfied. Therefore, the solution of the ILP instance gives a rule assignment to make all voter in V' satisfied. The number of the variable is in $O(2^n \times t \times t)$. For each condition, we construct such an ILP and there are totally 2^n conditions. Since $n > t$, we can solve this problem in $O^*(2^n \times 2^n \times n \times n)$. Therefore, the MECSR problem is FPT with respect to n when $n > t$. This completes the proof of this theorem.

3.2 Complexity with Max-model

In this section, we show the complexity results of MECSR problem with max-model. In max-model, the satisfaction of a voter is the maximal satisfaction from all t votes, $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \max\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j)\}(j \in [t])$. Therefore, by comparing the satisfaction value s of each vote to the threshold d , we can assign the satisfaction value as follows: if $s \geq d$, the satisfaction value is set to 1; if $s < d$, the satisfaction value is set to 0. Here, we set $d = 1$. Therefore, according to Theorem 1 and Theorem 3, we can directly obtain the following results: When the satisfaction of each vote is set to either 1 or 0, and the threshold d is set to 1, the MECSR problem with the max-model has a solution if and only if the MECSR problem with the sum-model has a solution.

Theorem 5. *The MECSR problem with max-model is NP-hard, is $W[2]$ -hard with respect to the number of layers t .*

Theorem 6. *The MECSR problem with max-model is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to the number of satisfied voters α .*

In the following, we continue to analyze the effect of the number of rules ℓ , the number of α , the number of voters n on the complexity of MECSR problem with max-model, and get the following result.

Theorem 7. *The MECSR problem with max-model is NP-hard even if there are only two rules.*

Proof. We prove this theorem by giving a reduction from 3-SAT problem, which given a set of boolean variables X and a set of clauses \mathcal{C} where each clause $\mathcal{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}$ is of the form: $\mathcal{C}_i = x_j \vee x_{j'} \vee x_{j''}$ with $x_j, x_{j'}, x_{j''} \in \{x, \bar{x}\}(x \in X)$, and asks for an assignment of all variables to makes all clauses true. It is well-known that 3-SAT problem is NP-hard. We construct an MECSR instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ from (X, \mathcal{C}) where $|X| = m'$ and $|\mathcal{C}| = n'$ as follows.

For each clause $\mathcal{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}(i \in [n'])$, we construct a voter V_i , $V = \bigcup_{i \in [n']} V_i$. There are m' layers in total, $t := m'$. For each voter V_i , we construct m' votes $V_i^j(j \in [m'])$, which are corresponding to m' boolean variable $x_j \in X$ one by one. There are two rules r_1 and r_2 , $R = \{r_1, r_2\}$. For each vote v_i^j , if the boolean variable x_j occurs in clause \mathcal{C}_i , the satisfaction of v_i^j is set to 1 with r_1 and is set to 0 with r_2 , if the boolean variable \bar{x}_j occurs in clause \mathcal{C}_i , the satisfaction

of v_i^j is set to 0 with r_1 and is set to 1 with r_2 , if neither of x_j and \bar{x}_j occur in \mathcal{C}_i , the satisfaction of v_i^j is set to 0 with r_1 or r_2 .

$$\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r) = \begin{cases} 1, & r = r_1, x_j \in \mathcal{C}_i \text{ or } r = r_2, \bar{x}_j \in \mathcal{C}_i, \\ 0, & r = r_1, \bar{x}_j \in \mathcal{C}_i \text{ or } r = r_2, x_j \in \mathcal{C}_i, \\ 0, & x_j \notin \mathcal{C}_i \text{ and } \bar{x}_j \notin \mathcal{C}_i. \end{cases}$$

It means that if setting x_j to true makes \mathcal{C}_i true, then $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = 1$, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 0$; if setting x_j to false makes \mathcal{C}_i true, then $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 1$, $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = 0$; if the value of x_j have no influence on \mathcal{C}_i , then $\text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_1) = \text{Sat}(v_i^j, r_2) = 0$. Let $d := 1$, $\alpha := n'$. Now we prove that there is an assignment of each boolean variable in X to make all clauses in \mathcal{C} true for (X, \mathcal{C}) if and only if there is a rule assignment of MECSR with max-model.

“ \implies ”: Suppose there is an assignment of all variables which makes all clauses true. For the j -th layer ($j \in [m']$), if the corresponding boolean variable x_j is set to true (or 1), r_1 is assigned to this layer; otherwise, if the corresponding variable x_j is set to false (or 0), r_2 is assigned to this layer. The rule assignment is denoted as R' . Since the assignment of X can make all clause true, for each clause $\mathcal{C}_i = x_j \vee x_{j'} \vee x_{j''}$ ($x_j, x_{j'}, x_{j''} \in \{x, \bar{x}\}, x \in X$), at least one of x_j , $x_{j'}$ and $x_{j''}$ is true. Without of generality, we say x_k ($k \in \{j, j', j''\}$) is true. If x_k is in the form of x , Then, the rule r_1 is assigned to this layer, and the satisfaction of v_i^k must be 1. Otherwise, if x_k is true with the form of \bar{x} , then the rule r_2 is assigned to this layer, and the satisfaction of v_i^k is 1 as well. Since all clause are true according to the assignment of X , for each voter V_i (corresponding to each clause), it holds:

$$\text{Sat}(V_i) = \max\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j)\} \geq \text{Sat}(v_i^k, r) = 1 = d.$$

Therefore, R' is a solution of MECSR with max-model.

“ \impliedby ”: Supposed there is a rule assignment R' of MECSR. Since $\alpha = n' = |V|$, the satisfaction of each voter is at least $d = 1$. It means, for each voter V_i , it holds $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \max\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j)\} \geq d = 1$. For the j -th layer ($j \in [m']$), if r_1 is assigned to this layer in R' , the corresponding boolean variable x_j is set to true; otherwise, r_2 is assigned to this layer in R' , the corresponding boolean variable is set to false. Let X' be the boolean variables assignment. Since it holds $\text{Sat}(p, V_i) = \max\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j)\} \geq d = 1$, there are at least one layer j' , the satisfaction of $v_i^{j'}$ is 1. For each voter V_i , whose corresponding clause is $\mathcal{C}_i = x_j \vee x_{j'} \vee x_{j''}$ ($x_j, x_{j'}, x_{j''} \in \{x, \bar{x}\}, x \in X$), only the j -th, j' -th, and j'' -th layers can receive a satisfaction of value 1. Without of generality, we set the satisfaction of vote v_i^k ($k \in \{j, j', j''\}$) to 1. That is:

- If the satisfaction of vote v_i^k with the rule r_1 is 1, then x_k is the form of x and x_k is true, so the clause \mathcal{C}_i must be true;
- If the satisfaction of vote v_i^k with the rule r_2 is 1, x_k is the form of \bar{x} and x_k is false, therefore the clause \mathcal{C}_i must be true. .

So, the corresponding clause \mathcal{C}_i of voter V_i must be true. Therefore, X' is a solution of (X, \mathcal{C}) to make all clause true. This completes the proof of this theorem.

Next, we continue consider the parameterized complexity of MECSR with max-model with the number of voters n as parameter. According to the proof of theorem 4, we can change the second inequality to $\sum_{rt \in RT} \sum_{j \leq [t]} x_{j,rt} \times h(j, rt) \geq 1, \forall v_i \in V'$, to make all voters in V' satisfied. So, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 8. *The MECSR problem with max-model is $W[2]$ -hard when $n \leq t$, and is FPT when $n > t$, with the number of voter n as parameter.*

3.3 Complexity with Min-model

In this section, we show the complexity results of MECSR problem with min-model. In min-model, the satisfaction of a voter is the minimal satisfaction from all t votes, $\text{Sat}(V_i) = \min\{\text{Sat}(v_i^j)\}, j \in [t]$. When all voters accept the winner with min-model ($\alpha = n$), we can obviously find out an acceptable rule assignment in polynomial-time, that is, examining all ℓ rules to check whether the rule can make the satisfaction of all votes reach d . It runs in $O(n \times t \times \ell)$ time. So, MECSR problem with min-model is in P when $\alpha = n$. So, we continue consider the condition where $\alpha < n$. For the parameterized complexity with the number of voters n as parameter, we can enumerate all conditions which voters are satisfied. There are totally $O(2^n)$ conditions. For each condition, we just need to make the satisfaction of each votes reach d . So, we can get a rule assignment or there is no such acceptable rule assignment in $O(2^n \times n \times t \times \ell)$ time. Therefore, MECSR is FPT with the number of voters n as parameter. In the following, we show the details of intractable and tractable results when with the number of satisfied voters α , the number of layers t , or the number of rules ℓ as parameter.

Theorem 9. *The MECSR problem with min-model is NP-hard when $\alpha \leq n$, and is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to the number of satisfied voters α and the number of layers t .*

Proof. We prove this theorem by reducing from MULTI-COLOR CLIQUE problem, in which we are given a multi-color graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where each vertex is assigned with a color. The graph \mathcal{G} has a total of k' colors, and q vertices with the same color. Additionally, no two vertices with the same color are adjacent in the graph. The aim is to find out a size- k' clique CL that each two vertices in CL are adjacent. It is known that MULTI-COLOR CLIQUE problem is NP-hard and is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to the clique size k' . We construct an MECSR instance $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$ from $(\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), k')$ where each vertex is denoted as $v_{i,i'}$ meaning the i' -th vertex with the i -th color, $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{i \in [k'], i' \in [q]} v_{i,i'}$, $|\mathcal{V}| = q \times k'$ and $|\mathcal{E}| = n'$.

The main ideals of the constructions are as follows:

- Construct a voter for each vertex;

- Construct a layer for each color;
- Construct a rule for the index of each vertex of a color.

Now, we show the detail of the constructions. For each vertex $v_{i,i'} \in V (i \in [k'], i' \in [q])$, we construct a voter V_σ with $\sigma = q \times (i - 1) + i'$, $V = \bigcup_{\sigma=1}^{k' \times q} V_i$. There are q rules in total, $R = \bigcup_{i \in [q]} r_i$. There are k' layers in total, $t := k'$. For each voter V_σ , we construct k' votes, $V_\sigma = \bigcup_{j \in [k']} v_\sigma^j$. For each vote v_σ^j and rule r_k with $\sigma = q \times (i - 1) + i'$, if the corresponding vertices $v_{i,i'}$ and $v_{j,k}$ satisfy $v_{i,i'} \in N[v_{j,k}]$, then $\text{Sat}(v_\sigma^j, r_k)$ is set to 1; otherwise, the $\text{Sat}(v_\sigma, r_k)$ is set to 0.

$$\text{Sat}(v_\sigma^j, r_k) = \begin{cases} 1, & v_{i,i'} \in N[v_{j,k}], \\ 0, & v_{i,i'} \notin N[v_{j,k}]. \end{cases}$$

Let $\alpha := k'$, $d := 1$. At most one rule can be assigned to each layer, corresponding to at most one vertex can be chosen for each color in \mathcal{G} ; at least $\alpha = k'$ votes are needed to be satisfied, corresponding to at least k' vertices be chosen to constitute a clique; the minimal satisfaction value of each votes for the satisfied voters is at least $d = 1$, corresponding to each two chosen vertices are adjacent in \mathcal{G} . Therefore, there is a size- k' clique in \mathcal{G} if and only if there is a rule assignment solution of $(E = (C, V, R, t), \alpha, d)$.

Next, we continue consider the parameterized complexity of MECSR with min-model with the number of rules ℓ as parameter. According to the proof of theorem 9, we can do some modifications on the constructions of layers and get an intractable result when $\ell < t$. The other condition when $\ell \geq t$, we get a tractable result. So, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 10. *The MECSR problem with min-model is $W[1]$ -hard when $\ell < t$, and is FPT when $\ell \geq t$, with the number of rules ℓ as parameter.*

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the *Multi-votes Election Control By Selecting Rules* problem, which allows each voter to present different votes in each layers among the set of candidates. We study the computational complexity of this problem from the viewpoint of constructive control by assigning rules to each layer to make a special candidate p being an acceptable winner of the election. We find out that this problem is NP-hard for sum-model, max-model, or min-model. Furthermore, we get the results that it is NP-hard even if there are only two voters in sum-model, or there are only two rules in sum-model or max-model; it is intractable with the number of layers as parameter for all of the three models, and even the satisfaction of each voter is set as dichotomous, either 1 or 0, it remains hard to find out an acceptable rule assignment. We also get some other tractable and intractable results, including fixed-parameter tractable, $W[1]$ -hard and $W[2]$ -hard.

For the future work, at first, we just consider the constructive cases here, the destructive control case may be a meaningful work. And, it is interesting to analyze the complexity of making special candidate p being the unique winner of the election. This work needs to consider the satisfaction of each candidate and the format of votes, which are ignored in this paper. And, it is also interesting to make a fixed-size set of candidates being an acceptable committee with other rules, such as PAV, CCAV, and SAV for approval voting. Another promising directing for future work is to embed the uncertainty rules to other models, such as the iterative elections.

References

1. Brams, S. J. and Kilgour, D. M.: Satisfaction approval voting. In *Voting Power and Procedures*, 323–346 (2014)
2. Conitzer, V.: Making decisions based on the preferences of multiple agents. *Communications of the ACM* **53**(3), 84–94 (2010)
3. Aziz, H., Biró, P., Gaspers, S., de Haan, R., Mattei, N., and Rastegari, B.: Stable matching with uncertain linear preferences. *Algorithmica*, **82**(5), 1410–1433 (2020)
4. Chen, J., Niedermeier, R., and Skowron, P.: Stable marriage with multi-modal preferences. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pp. 269–286. Ithaca, NY, USA (2018)
5. Miyazaki, S. and Okamoto, K.: Jointly stable matchings. *J. Comb. Optim.* **38**(2): 646–665 (2019)
6. Wen, Y., Zhou, A., and Guo, J.: Position-based matching with multi-modal preferences. In: *21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 1373–1381, AAMAS, pp. 1373–1381 (2022)
7. Jain, P. and Talmon, N.: Committee selection with multimodal preferences. In: *2020 - 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Including 10th Conference on Prestigious Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 123–130. (2020)
8. Konczak, K. and Lan, J.: Voting procedures with incomplete preferences. In: *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pp. 124–129. (2010)
9. Bachrach, Y., Betzler, N., and Faliszewski, P.: Probabilistic possible winner determination. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 1436–1444. (2010)
10. Kocot, M., Kolonko, A., Elkind, E., Faliszewski, P., and Talmon, N. Multigoal committee selection. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 385–391. (2019)
11. Baumeister, D., Roos, M., and Rothe, J. Computational complexity of two variants of the possible winner problem. In: *10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2011)*, pp. 853–860. Taipei, Taiwan (2011)
12. Elkind, E. and Erdelyi, G.: Manipulation under voting rule uncertainty. In: *International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2012)*, pp. 627–634. (2012)
13. Conitzer, V., Walsh, T., and Xia, L.: Dominating manipulations in voting with partial information. In: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2011)*, pp. 45–50. (2011)
14. Bartholdi, J., Tovey, C., and Trick, M.: How hard is it to control an election? *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 27–40(1992)
15. Faliszewski, P. and Rothe, J.: Control and bribery in voting. *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, 146–168 (2016)
16. Baumeister, D. and Rothe, J.: Preference aggregation by voting. *Economics and Computation*, 197–325 (2016)
17. Hemaspaandra, E., Hemaspaandra, L., and Rothe, J.: Anyone but him: The complexity of precluding an alternative. *Artificial Intelligence*, 255–285
18. Russell, N.: Complexity of control of Borda count elections. Master’s thesis, Rochester Institute of Technology (2007)
19. Hemaspaandra, E. and Schnoor, H.: Dichotomy for pure scoring rules under manipulative electoral actions. In: *ECAI*, pp. 1071–1079. (2016)

20. Neveling, M. and Rothe, J. Solving seven open problems of offline and online control in Borda elections. In *AAAI*, pp. 3029–3035. (2017)
21. Menon, V. and Larson, K.: Computational aspects of strategic behaviour in elections with top-truncated ballots. In: *AAMAS*, pp. 1506–1547. (2017)
22. Yang, Y.: On the complexity of Borda control in single-peaked elections. In: *AA-MAS*, pp. 1178–1186. (2017)
23. Cygan, M., Fomin, F. V., Kowalik, L., Lokshtanov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., and Saurabh, S. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer (2015)
24. Downey, R. G. and Fellows, M. R. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer. (1999)
25. Robert Brederick, Till Fluschnik, Andrzej Kaczmarczyk: When Votes Change and Committees Should (Not). *IJCAI 2022*: 144-150
26. Richard M. Karp: Reducibility Among Combinatorial Problems. *50 Years of Integer Programming 2010*: pp. 219-241(2010)