

THE SPOILER EFFECT IN MULTIWINNER RANKED-CHOICE ELECTIONS

DAVID MCCUNE AND JENNIFER WILSON

ABSTRACT. In the popular debate over the use of ranked-choice voting, it is often claimed that the method of single transferable vote (STV) is immune or mostly immune to the so-called “spoiler effect,” where the removal of a losing candidate changes the set of winners. This claim has previously been studied only in the single-winner case. We investigate how susceptible STV is to the spoiler effect in multiwinner elections, where the output of the voting method is a committee of size at least two. To evaluate STV we compare it to numerous other voting methods including single non-transferable vote, k -Borda, and the Chamberlin-Courant rule. We provide simulation results under three different random models and empirical results using a large database of real-world multiwinner political elections from Scotland. Our results show that STV is not spoiler-proof in any meaningful sense in the multiwinner context, but it tends to perform well relative to other methods, especially when using real-world ballot data.

1. INTRODUCTION

Multiwinner voting methods are used in a wide variety of settings, including elections of multi-seat districts or city councils, the selection of a short-list of job applicants, or the choice of webpages output by a search engine given an initial search query. The social choice literature often takes an axiomatic approach to evaluating such voting rules, articulating fairness criteria and identifying which methods satisfy which criteria. If a method fails a given criterion, various techniques are employed to estimate the frequency with which violations occur. In this article we focus on one fairness criterion—that of spoiler-proofness—and compare how frequently different multiwinner voting methods are susceptible to the presence of spoiler candidates. Our primary voting rule of interest is the method of single transferable vote (STV), which is the most commonly used voting method for multiwinner political elections in which voters cast preference ballots. We examine several other voting methods in order to provide context for the performance of STV regarding the spoiler effect. Our general finding is that STV performs well with respect to this criterion, although depending on how we generate ballot data other methods perform significantly better. Our study is of interest because the single-winner implementation of STV (known as instant runoff voting, the Hare method, the alternative vote, and colloquially, in the single-winner case, as “instant-runoff voting” or “ranked-choice voting”) is widely-touted as being *spoiler-proof* or virtually spoiler-proof. Previous work [27] has largely shown this to be the case; we show that the multiwinner picture is less clear.

The formal study of multiwinner voting rules is a relatively recent phenomenon in the field of social choice. The modern mathematical discussion around single-winner methods dates to the 18th century debate between Borda and Condorcet,

while the social-choice oriented study of multiwinner methods arguably did not truly begin until the late 20th century with studies such as [10], [11], [16], and [17]. The majority of recent articles which analyze properties of multiwinner voting rules focus on methods which are approval-based (i.e., voters cast approval ballots) [2, 8, 24, 20, 21, 33]. Since our work is motivated by the study of STV, we do not consider approval-based rules. Instead, we analyze methods which are preference-based, where voters cast preference ballots which express a (possibly partial) linear preference ranking of the candidates. In this setting, much of the previous work has studied various monotonicity properties [4, 14, 16, 26, 35], generalizations of the single-winner Condorcet criterion [3, 12, 17, 22, 19, 32], and axioms of proportional representation [4, 7, 11, 37].

As far as we are aware, this article provides the first formal study of the spoiler effect for multiwinner voting rules. The only work related to ours is [6], which analyzes the spoiler effect in the context of apportionment-based multi-district party elections. This work focuses on “spoiler parties” which can affect the apportionment of seats to stronger parties. The results are only tangentially related to our work, which focuses on spoiler candidates instead of parties. In this paper, we adopt the “standard” definition of a spoiler candidate [27] from the single-winner for the multiwinner setting: a candidate is a *spoiler* if they are not a winner and, if we remove the candidate from the election, then the winning committee changes. An election which contains a spoiler candidate under a given voting method is said to exhibit the *spoiler effect* for that method. In the U.S., the quintessential example of an election demonstrating the spoiler effect is the 2000 presidential election, where the presence of the third-party candidate, Ralph Nader, was seen as changing the election outcome from the Al Gore to the election winner, George W. Bush. Multiwinner elections are also susceptible to spoilers; the presence of losing candidates may cause changes to the winning committee.

The spoiler effect has received some attention in the single-winner setting. Depending on one’s definition of the spoiler effect, study of this topic dates to Arrow’s classical axiom of the independence of irrelevant alternatives (IIA) [1]. Miller [29] discusses the spoiler effect in the context of the consistency property and its relationship to Arrow’s IIA axiom. Susceptibility to spoilers has previously been studied by Tideman [36] with respect to clones. A *clone* is a candidate who is always just above or just below a fixed second candidate in all voters’ rankings. A voting method is *independent of clones* if the existence of a clone does not affect the outcome of the election. The drawback of analyzing the spoiler effect through this lens is that in real-world elections, particularly in the political context, clones do not exist. McCune and Wilson [27] use simulations and empirical analysis based on data from 170 municipal and statewide elections in the US to compare the susceptibility of instant runoff voting and plurality to the spoiler effect. They also analyze how frequently the spoiler is a “weak” candidate, defined as a Condorcet loser. (This analysis was supplemented in the note [30]). In this paper, we extend the work in [27] to the multiwinner setting, comparing STV to a number of other multiwinner voting methods. Using Monte Carlo simulations and data from 999 Scottish local government elections which used STV to elect a winning committee, we examine the frequency with which the spoiler effect occurs. We also measure how frequently weak candidates are spoilers based on two notions of weakness: plurality losers and top- k losers (candidates who appear in the fewest number of

voters' top- k rankings). Because partial ballots occur frequently in our database of real-world elections, we include comparisons assuming both complete and partial rankings.

Multiwinner voting methods for political elections fall loosely into two categories based on the purpose of the election: *excellence-based* (or *majoritarian*) and *proportional* [14, 23]. There is no standard criterion for defining a proportional method; proposed criteria include Dummett's proportionality for solid coalitions [11], Woodall's Droop proportionality criterion [37], Aziz's extended justified representation [2], and Brill and Peters' proportional justified representation [7]. In general, methods which are designed for greater diversity, such as STV and the Chamberlin-Courant method, are considered proportional. In contrast, methods which are designed to select similar candidates—those who perform well on the majority of voters' ballots—are considered excellence-based. These include single-winner voting methods which are applied repeatedly to generate multiple winners, such as k -Borda and sequential ranked-choice voting. In our analysis we include some methods that are proportional and some that are majoritarian to investigate if susceptibility to spoilers has any relationship to a method's categorization. We find that whether a method is proportional or majoritarian does not predict its tendency to exhibit the spoiler effect.

In what follows, we compare the behavior of STV and other multiwinner voting methods using both Monte Carlo simulations and empirical analysis. In Section 2 we provide notation and descriptions of the voting methods used in the analysis which include bloc, k -Borda, single non-transferable vote, sequential ranked-choice voting, a version of the Chamberlin-Courant rule (and a greedy approximation), and STV. In Section 3 we compare the likelihood of an election demonstrating a spoiler effect among these methods using three models of voter behavior: impartial culture (IC), independent anonymous culture (IAC), and a 1D-spatial model. We consider both complete and partial ballots. We also examine the likelihood for the spoiler candidates to be weak. In Section 4 we compare these methods empirically, based on their behavior on the database of Scottish elections. To more closely mirror the analysis in Section 3, we conduct the analysis twice: once using the ballots directly from the database (which includes a large number of partial ballots), and a second time, extrapolating from the voters' preferences to extend the lengths of the ballots and create preferences that are closer to complete. As with all such analyses, the results must be interpreted with caution: had methods other than STV been used in practice, it is possible that voters' preferences, as expressed through their ballots, would be different. In Section 5, we introduce two new methods, one which is related to STV and one which is inspired by the Condorcet criterion, which are almost spoiler-proof when tested against the Scottish database. We conclude in Section 6.

2. PRELIMINARIES

An election is a pair $E = (C, V)$ where $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$ is a set of candidates, $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is a set of voters endowed with a set \leq of linear orders $\{\leq_i\}_{i \in V}$ over the set of candidates. We assume, for each voter v_i , the order is strict for some $j < m$ candidates, and that the voter is indifferent among the remaining candidates, who do not appear on the voter's ballot. That is, we assume a framework in which partial ballots are allowed, and candidates left off a ballot are all ranked last by

the voter. A multiwinner voting rule F is a function that, for each election (C, V) and number of winners $k \leq m$, outputs a set of winning committees, $F(C, V, k) = \{S_1, \dots, S_\alpha\}$, each of size k . The voting rules we consider are generally *resolute*—that is, they output a single winning committee, multiple winning committees being a result of (infrequent) ties. When the voting rule is clear, we will denote the set of winning committees by $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_\alpha\}$, or when uniquely defined, S .

To define a spoiler candidate, let $C_{-i} = C \setminus C_i$ be the candidate set remaining after candidate C_i leaves the election, and let $F(C_{-i}, V)$ be the resulting set of winning committees under voting rule F . Then C_i is a *spoiler candidate* if C_i is not in any winning committee and $F(C, V) \neq F(C_{-i}, V)$. An election exhibits the *spoiler effect* under some voting method if there exists a spoiler candidate under that method. A voting method that is more likely to exhibit the spoiler effect is less desirable than one that isn't, particularly if the spoilers produced tend to be weak in some sense. (We prefer to avoid weak spoiler candidates because they suggest that the election outcome may be affected by the presence or absence of a candidate who in some sense is irrelevant to the election.) In this way, being susceptible to spoilers is similar to failing Arrow's famous IIA criterion. For single-winner voting methods, failure of IIA occurs if a winner can become a loser when a voter's preferences change without affecting their relative ranking of the winner and the loser (the ranking of a third candidate changes). In a spoiler situation, a winner becomes a loser when a non-winning third candidate is removed entirely from voters' preferences. As with the IIA criterion, spoiler-proofness is virtually impossible for reasonable voting methods to achieve. However, some voting methods are much more susceptible to the spoiler effect than others.

Since spoiler candidates are considered especially egregious when they have little chance of being among the winners, we identify two notions of weakness. The first is the *plurality loser*, which is the candidate with the fewest first-place votes. The second is the *top- k loser*, which is the candidate who ranks among the top k candidates in the fewest number of ballots.

2.1. Multiwinner voting rules. We now define the voting methods which we analyze in the paper. Initially we provide definitions which assume that every voter provides a complete ranking of the candidates; we address how to adapt definitions to partial ballots at the end of the section. Because ties are rare in our work, we do not discuss how to break ties as part of our definitions.

Single transferable vote (STV) refers to a family of related voting rules. We consider here the version used for the Scottish elections which uses the *droop quota* $q = \lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \rfloor + 1$ and transferal of fractional votes. The election proceeds in a series of rounds, in each of which either a candidate is eliminated or one or more candidates is selected to be part of the winning committee. In each round, the number of first-place votes for each candidate is determined. Any candidate receiving at least q votes is selected as a winner and the number of votes over the quota they receive (referred to as their *surplus*), is transferred to the candidates next on the voters' ballots in proportion to the votes those candidates receive (with the caveat that no previously eliminated or elected candidate can receive transferred votes). Specifically, if C_i is selected as a winner after receiving $x_i \geq q$ first-place votes, and if candidate C_j appears next in x_j of these ballots, then the number of fractional votes transferred to C_j is equal to $\frac{x_j - q}{x_i} x_j$. If no candidate receives at least q votes

then the candidate with the least first-placed votes is eliminated. This process continues until either k candidates have met the quota or until some number $k' < k$ candidates have been selected and there are only $k - k'$ candidates remaining who have not been eliminated (and hence are selected). A complete description of the STV ballot counting process as implemented in Scottish local government elections can be found at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/sdsi/2007/0110714245>.

Under the method of *single non-transferable vote* (SNTV), or k -plurality, the winning committee consists of the k candidates with the largest number of first-place votes.

Sequential ranked-choice voting (SRCV) works by sequentially filling seats using the single-winner implementation of STV. The first seat is given to the winner of the election when using STV but assuming $k = 1$. That is, we eliminate the candidate with the fewest first-place votes and transfer their ballots as if using STV, until a candidate earns a majority of the first-place votes. That candidate is then given the first seat, and is eliminated from the ballot data. We repeat the process, again using STV assuming $k = 1$, on the modified ballot data (where the first winner has been removed) to assign the second seat; the resulting winner is given the second seat and eliminated from the ballot data. This process continues until all k seats are filled. In other words, SRCV is equivalent to running k separate STV elections with $k = 1$, each time a seat is awarded to a candidate, eliminating that candidate from the ballot data so that the next iteration of STV is based on one fewer candidate. SRCV is used rarely and is little studied; [28] compares SRCV to STV, finding that its behavior is closer to excellence-based methods rather than proportional methods such as STV. We include SRCV in our study because it is a majoritarian method that has been used in real-world elections, most notably in city council elections for several small cities in the state of Utah in the US.

Under the k -*Borda rule* (Borda), candidates are assigned points based on their position on individual voter's ballots. After summing, the k candidates with the highest total Borda score form the winning committee. For a given ballot, a first-place ranking is worth $n - 1$ points, a second-place ranking is worth $n - 2$ points, and so on.

Under *Bloc voting* (Bloc), the winning committee consists of the k candidates receiving the highest k -approval score. The k -approval score is the number of voters who rank the candidate among their top k candidates.

There are a number of variants of the *Chamberlin-Courant rule* (Cham-Cour) [9]. In each variant, voters are "assigned" a member of the winning set. This assignment gives each voter a measure of individual satisfaction; these measures are combined to create a measure of social satisfaction and the winning committee is defined to be the set of candidates that maximizes this social satisfaction. The version of Cham-Cour we consider here is the original method proposed in [9] which uses the candidates' Borda score and its sum to determine the level of individual satisfaction and social satisfaction respectively. Formally, let r_{ic} denote the rank of candidate c on voter i 's ballot, so that this voter gives $m - r_{ic}$ points to c . For a fixed committee X of size k , let $V_c(X)$ denote the set of voters for whom candidate c is the most preferred candidate in the committee X for all voters in $V_c(X)$. Cham-Cour selects the committee X of size k which maximizes the value

$$\sum_{c \in X} \sum_{i \in V_c(X)} m - r_{ic}.$$

Cham-Cour is computationally difficult to implement. (Determining the winning committee is NP-hard; see, for instance, [25].) We thus also consider *greedy Chamberlin Courant* (greedy-CC) [25], which approximates the outcome of Cham-Cour. In the algorithm’s first step, the candidate with the highest Borda score is selected. At each succeeding step, given a winning committee of size $k - 1$, a k^{th} -candidate is selected which maximizes the increase in social satisfaction.

If voters cast partial ballots then we must state how partial preferences are handled by any method which uses Borda scores (for the other methods defined above, their adaptation to a setting with partial ballots is natural). We use two models of processing partial ballots, an optimistic and pessimistic model [5]. Suppose a partial ballot of voter i has length l , so that $l < m$ candidates are ranked on the ballot. Under the optimistic model (OM), if candidate c appears on the ballot then they receive $m - r_{ic}$ from voter i ; if c does not appear on the ballot then they receive $m - l - 1$ points from voter i . Under the pessimistic model (PM), if candidate c appears on the ballot then they receive $m - r_{ic}$ from voter i ; if c does not appear on the ballot then they receive zero points from voter i . When using a Chamberlin-Courant-based rule, the two models naturally extend when assigning points to subsets. Under OM (respectively PM), a fixed committee X receives $m - l - 1$ points (respectively zero points) from a voter if no candidate from X appears on that voter’s ballot.

Thus, for each of the three methods Borda, Cham-Cour, and greedy-CC, we have OM and PM versions when an election contains partial ballots.

3. SIMULATION RESULTS

To establish a theoretical baseline for the frequency of the spoiler effect, we ran Monte Carlo simulations under three different models of voter behavior. Under each model we generated ballot data at random and for each election we checked if the spoiler effect was demonstrated. In this section we describe our models and present and analyze the results of the simulations.

3.1. About the Models. We use three models to generate ballot data for our simulations: impartial culture (IC), independent anonymous culture (IAC), and a one-dimensional spatial model (1D-spatial). The IC and IAC models are used frequently to investigate voting method properties in the absence empirical information. These models are commonly used to provide *a priori* probability estimates when there is no real-world information available, and often the models provide theoretical upper bounds for probabilities of various phenomena in voting theory. The IC model assumes each voter’s preference is chosen independently and uniformly from among all possible rankings of the candidates. The IAC culture assumes that voters are anonymous (indistinguishable) and each voter profile occurs with equal probability. Because the voter profiles contained in the Scottish database are based on partisan elections, we also include a single-peaked 1D-spatial model that reflects voter preferences along a political spectrum. We assume candidates and voters are randomly assigned a point along \mathbb{R} using a standard normal distribution. Voters’ preferences are based on the Euclidean distance from their point to each of the candidates (see [13] for a similar 2D-spatial model).

In comparison to the database analyzed in Section 4, none of the simulation models appear to be strong predictors of voter behavior. One reason for this is that voter profiles are much less close (under any reasonable measure of “closeness”) in

the real-world election data than in any of the three models. The second reason is that partial ballots are extremely common in real-world data. In fact, partial ballots are prevalent in any database of real-world political ranked-choice elections (see the ballot data at [31], for example). In the Scottish case, only about 13.2% of the ballots in the database contain a complete ranking of the candidates. This is lower than the percentage of ballots which rank only a single candidate, 14.0%, and much lower than the percentage of ballots which rank fewer candidates than the number of available seats, 58.0%. That is, a “typical” voter in a Scottish local government does not even rank k candidates on their ballot. Thus, to better compare the simulations with the empirical results, we also consider simulations based on partial ballots. This is accomplished differently for each model. Under IC, each voter is assumed to select independently and uniformly from all possible partial ballots. Under the IAC model, voter profiles are chosen uniformly over all possible distributions of complete and partial rankings. Under the 1D-spatial model, each voter is assumed to decide independently and uniformly the number of candidates to rank, based on their individual preference order. Since a ballot which ranks m candidates conveys the same ranking information as a ballot which ranks $m - 1$ candidates, we omit ballots which rank m candidates to avoid double counting.

3.2. Analysis. Separate runs of 100,000 simulations were completed for each model with: (i) $m = 4$ and $k = 2$; (ii) $m = 5$ and $k = 2$; and (iii) $m = 5$ and $k = 3$. Due to limits of computation time, we did not run simulations for $m > 5$. For $m = 4$, $k = 2$, we have included results for both Cham-Cour (OM) and Cham-Cour (PM), as well as greedy-CC (OM) and greedy-CC (PM). Because of the computation time, for $m = 5$ only the greedy-CC methods have been simulated. Each simulation was conducted assuming 1001 voters. For comparison, we also ran some simulations using 601 and 801 voters and the results did not meaningfully change. This agrees with previous work in the single-winner case, where increasing the number of voters does not materially affect the results [27]. Thus, our results appear to be robust with respect to the number of voters as long as the number is sufficiently high. (We do not care about small electorate sizes since we are motivated by comparisons with actual elections.) Simulations resulting in a tie, either in the original election or in the resulting election when a candidate was removed, were thrown out. Since these occasions were few in number, they also do not materially affect the analysis.

The results are provided in Tables 10 through 18 in Appendix B. Each table indicates the probability (expressed as a percentage) that an election contains a single spoiler or multiple spoilers. We also indicate the percentage of elections with spoiler candidates involving either the plurality loser or the top- k loser. Probabilities are indicated for both complete ballots (left entry in each column) and partial ballots (right entry in each column).

Several observations can be drawn from the simulation results. Chief among them is that STV generally performs very well in comparison to other voting methods. Under the IC model, STV is the least susceptible to spoilers for either complete or partial ballots. STV is also least susceptible under the IAC model, with the exception of complete ballots for $m = 4$, $k = 2$, where SRCV returns the lowest probability. Interestingly, STV does not perform well under the 1D-spatial model, in some cases corresponding to the second-highest probability. Generally, though,

STV dramatically outperforms methods like greedy-CC or SNTV. Both SRCV and Borda also perform well under all models.

On the other end of the spectrum, Bloc voting is the most susceptible to the spoiler effect, followed by SNTV. This makes sense because both methods are similar in spirit to plurality elections: information about voters' preferences beyond the top k rankings is disregarded. The other methods fall somewhere in the middle. The exception to this is the 1D-spatial model, where Bloc actually returns the lowest probability. In fact, the zeros corresponding to complete ballots in Tables 16 and 18 are exact zeros, unlike the "0.0" for STV in Table 15, for instance, where the probability of a spoiler is vanishingly small. This is because it is not possible to have a spoiler under Bloc if voters express complete preferences when $m = 4$, $k = 2$ and $m = 5$, $k = 3$. Under the 1D-spatial model, a winning committee must be composed of candidates who are adjacent on the number line; if a non-winning candidate is eliminated, it is easy to see that the change in votes will not be sufficient to affect the winners. (This is not the case when $m = 5$, $k = 2$. If the winning committee consists of the two left-most candidates and the right-most candidate is eliminated, the left-most candidate may no longer be a winner.)

Overall, the simulation results suggest that immunity to spoilers is not directly linked to whether a method is proportional or excellence-based. Both SRCV and Borda are majoritarian methods, yet their susceptibility to the spoiler effect is wildly different. Similarly, STV, Cham-Cour and greedy CC can be categorized as proportional, and return much different spoiler probabilities.

In general, the probability of a spoiler increases with m and, for fixed m , decreases as k increases. This accords with intuition: we would expect the probability of a spoiler to rise with the number of candidates and, given a fixed number of candidates, to decrease when the number of potential spoilers (the number of non-winners $m - k$) is reduced. In addition, the probability of there being multiple spoilers is quite small. Of course, when m and k differ by only 2, an election will have more than one spoiler only if both non-winning candidates are spoilers which, based on the Tables 10 and 18, happens relatively infrequently except under Bloc or SNTV. The probabilities of multiple spoilers under all methods increase somewhat for $m = 5$ and $k = 2$ with the number of elections having multiple spoilers ranging from about one-sixth to about one-half of all the elections containing spoilers. Again, both Bloc and SNTV perform worse in this regard—with a higher proportion of elections with spoilers having multiple spoilers. STV, in contrast, almost never has multiple spoilers.

Weak Spoilers Overall, both SRCV and STV are very unlikely to experience weak spoilers—particularly spoilers that are plurality losers. For most voting methods, and under all models, the probability of the spoiler being a top- k loser is greater than the probability of the spoiler being a plurality-loser. (The exceptions are Cham Cour, greedy-CC and SNTV.) The differences are particularly strong under Bloc, in part because in comparison to a top- k loser, a plurality loser is much more likely to be in the winning set, and hence cannot be a spoiler. The reverse is true of SNTV, where the plurality loser is never a winner and hence has the potential to be a spoiler.

Complete versus Partial Rankings With a few exceptions, the probability that a voter profile is susceptible to the spoiler effect is less when partial ballots are allowed, although the differences are generally minor. The exception is Bloc, where the probability of having a spoiler drops with partial ballots under IC and IAC models. This is likely because if partial ballots are allowed, a significant number of them may rank fewer than k candidates. If a candidate not appearing on the ballot is eliminated, it will not change how the ballot is counted. Thus, it is less likely that an eliminated candidate changes the winning committee. This is not the case in the 1D-spatial model, because of the limitations of the kinds of ballots allowed. Note that unlike profiles containing only complete ballots, if partial ballots are allowed, spoilers are possible for all choice of m and k . (Because of bullet voting, for instance, the winning committee may consist of the left-most and right-most candidates. The elimination of a middle candidate may thus cause another middle candidate to become a winner.)

Probabilities for the spoiler effect also increase under partial ballots under the OM models for Borda, Cham-Cour, and greedy-CC. Note that under Borda (OM), the probability of a spoiler increases slightly with partial ballots, while under Borda (PM), the probability decreases slightly. This is to be expected; under Borda (OM), candidates left unranked on voters' ballots are assumed to be tied for the next open spot on the ballot. Thus they are assigned a higher weight than had the ballots been completed, and therefore are more likely to affect the outcome of the election if they leave. The reverse is true under Borda (PM), where unranked candidates are assigned minimal weight and thus are unlikely to be spoilers. The same rationale applies to the likelihood of a spoiler under complete and partial ballots for Cham-Cour (OM) and Cham-Cour (PM), as well as greedy-CC (OM) and greedy-CC (PM). In each case, the OM unranked candidates are assigned a relatively high weight under the OM version in comparison to that under the PM version. Thus, candidates removed from the election are likely to have a bigger impact on the overall society satisfaction levels, and hence be spoilers, under the OM version than the PM version.

The fact that the differences between spoiler susceptibility are so small for complete and partial ballots under STV, is likely due to the fact that STV the method as a whole is relatively immune to spoilers and because m and k are relatively close in our simulations.

Due to limits of computation time, we did not perform simulations with more than five candidates. If the difference between m and k were substantially larger, we would expect to see a larger difference between the partial ballot and complete ballot cases.

4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In this section we consider the likelihood of the spoiler effect using empirical data collected from 999 elections held in Scotland between 2007 and 2022 to fill council seats for local government elections. We first briefly describe the data and then present our results.

4.1. About the Database. For the purposes of local government, Scotland is partitioned into 32 council areas, each of which is governed by a council. The councils provide a range of public services that are typically associated with local governments, such as waste management, education, and building and maintaining

roads. The council area is divided into wards, each of which elects a set number of councilors to represent the ward on the council. The number of councilors representing each ward is determined primarily by the ward’s population, although other factors play a role. Every Scottish ward has used STV for local government elections since 2007 and council elections are held once every five years. We have access to the ballot data for 1100 Scottish elections, most of which come from the 2012, 2017, and 2022 election cycles (most of the data from 2007 is unavailable). The full dataset was collected by the first author for [26] and is available at <https://github.com/mggg/scot-elex>.

In the vast majority of wards, $k = 3$ or $k = 4$: thirty elections satisfy $k = 1$, five satisfy $k = 2$, 554 satisfy $k = 3$, 508 satisfy $k = 4$, and three satisfy $k = 5$. Because the spoiler effect cannot occur under any voting method if $m = k + 1$, not all 1100 elections are useful for our analysis. If for each election we use the same k value as was used in the actual election, there are 999 elections which satisfy $m > k + 1$ and $k > 1$. These are the elections on which the results of this section are based. Across these 999 elections, partial ballots are extremely common. Approximately 57.6% of voters rank fewer than k candidates on their ballots. Only 12.0% of ballots provide a complete ranking¹, which is lower than the percentage of ballots with only a single candidate ranked, 13.6%. The median number of candidates for these elections is seven (with a maximum of fourteen), and thus our ballot data is missing a significant amount of ranking information.

4.2. Analysis. The results of the spoiler analysis are presented in Table 1. The columns are organized in the same way as in Section 3: the first number is the estimated probability (as a percentage) using (almost) complete ballots, and the second is the estimated probability using partial ballots. In this case, the second number represents the “actual” result—the result obtained from using the actual ballots. The first number represents a spoiler probability obtained from ballot data in which we have “filled in” in voter preferences so that the ballots are “less partial;” we discuss these more hypothetical results, as well as how the ballots were completed, at the end of the section.

Based on the results corresponding to the actual ballot data (the second number in each column), the probability of a spoiler occurring under all voting methods is distinctly lower than under any of the simulations, suggesting that the simulations provide only an upper bound for the likelihood of the spoiler effect occurring. SRCV behaves the best, with only a total of 28 elections susceptible to a single spoiler. Similarly effective are STV and Borda (PM). Even Bloc and SNTV, which appeared highly susceptible to spoilers under the IC and IAC models, appear moderately robust. As with the results in Section 3, the OM versions of Borda, Cham-Cour and greedy-CC all behave worse than the PM versions. This is to be expected since the OM versions assume candidates not appearing on partial ballots are assumed to be higher on the ballot and hence have greater impact on election results when eliminated.

¹By “complete ranking” we mean that a ballot ranks m or $m - 1$ candidates.

TABLE 1. Likelihood of a Spoiler in the Scottish Election Database

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	30.3, 7.0	18.1, 4.5	12.0, 4.2	16.2, 4.2
Borda (OM)	19.0, 16.6	6.2, 4.1	7.0, 6.6	8.4, 5.7
Borda (PM)	11.2, 4.4	3.9, 1.8	3.9, 1.8	7.1, 2.2
Cham-Cour (OM)	12.2, 10.2	4.9, 4.5	6.4, 4.9	3.0, 3.8
Cham-Cour (PM)	10.4, 6.4	4.1, 3.5	5.6, 4.8	3.2, 4.1
Greedy-CC (OM)	14.0, 10.5	5.6, 4.5	6.7, 4.8	3.9, 3.7
Greedy-CC (PM)	12.8, 7.0	5.0, 3.3	6.2, 4.9	4.3, 4.2
SRCV	14.5, 2.8	0.2, 0	0, 0.1	2.7, 0.4
SNTV	12.9, 11.0	5.4, 5.0	4.0, 3.3	3.6, 3.0
STV	10.6, 4.9	2.0, 0.9	1.4, 0.9	2.4, 1.0

In general, the elections in which there are multiple spoilers were closely contested. We illustrate this with an analysis of the 2022 election in Ward 5 of the City of Edinburgh Council Area in which 10 candidates ran to fill 4 seats and all 6 losing candidates were spoilers.

Example 1. *In the original election, the winning set consisted of Bandel, Mitchell, Nicolson and Osler. Bandel wins a seat in the last round because Nicolson surpasses quota by a wide margin, allowing for a large transfer of surplus votes to Bandel as shown in Table 2 (TOP). If Herring is eliminated, Nicolson does not have nearly as many surplus votes to transfer, and Wood replaces Bandel in the winner set as shown in Table 2 (MIDDLE). The result is the same (with different numbers of surplus votes) if any other candidate besides Wood is eliminated. If Wood is eliminated, Munro-Brian replaces Bandel in the winner set as shown in Table 2 (BOTTOM).*

Example 1 demonstrates that multiwinner elections can demonstrate different spoiler dynamics under STV than single-winner elections. If $k = 1$ then it is not possible for all losing candidates to be spoiler candidates under STV, since the plurality loser cannot be a spoiler in this case.

Weak Spoilers The results in Table 1 also indicate that many of the spoilers are weak—being either plurality or top- k losers. As with the simulation results, both SRCV and STV are very unlikely to experience weak spoilers. With the exception of Borda (PM), the probability of a spoiler being a plurality loser is greater than the probability of a spoiler being a top- k -loser spoiler. Among the other methods, the PM versions of Borda, Cham-Cour and greedy CC are all more likely to have weak spoilers (either plurality-losers or top- k -losers) than their OM counterparts. Since they are less likely to have spoilers overall, this means that the proportion of weak spoilers among all spoilers under the PM methods is much higher than the similar proportion under OM models. This pattern differs from the simulation results and is likely due the large number of partial ballots in the data. Hence the weak candidates are likely to be very weak. Under the PM model, they have a minimal chance to be a winner and hence have more potential to be a spoiler.

<i>Actual Election, Quota = 2684</i>										
<i>Candidate</i>	<i>Votes by Round</i>									
<i>Bandel</i>	1714	1740.1	1740.1	1741.4	1751.5	1767.8	2221.6	2379.8	2383.7	2959.0
<i>Herring</i>	853	863.1	863.1	867.1	889.3					
<i>Holden</i>	96	97.4	98.4	109.4						
<i>Laird</i>	53	53.6	53.6							
<i>McNamara</i>	17	17.3								
<i>Mitchell</i>	1836	1877.5	1878.7	1883.8	1896.8	2643.6	2767.6			
<i>Munro-Brian</i>	1684	1713.0	1715.0	1721.0	1736.2	1755.3				
<i>Nicolson</i>	2641	2657.3	2659.3	2663.3	2668.4	2683.4	2936.8			
<i>Osler</i>	3117									
<i>Wood</i>	1405	1700.6	1702.7	1711.7	1725.3	1765.1	2275.5	2303.0	2337.8	

<i>Herring Removed, Quota = 2677</i>										
<i>Candidate</i>	<i>Votes by Round</i>									
<i>Bandel</i>	1728	1757.5	1757.5	1759.8	1760.4	1773.6	2331.8	2336.0		
<i>Holden</i>	108	110.0	111.0	124.0	124.0					
<i>Laird</i>	60	60.8	60.8							
<i>McNamara</i>	18	18.3								
<i>Mitchell</i>	2530	2585.3	2586.5	2595.6	2595.7	2635.8	2768.4			
<i>Munro-Brian</i>	1698	1730.7	1732.7	1741.7	1741.9	1760.0				
<i>Nicolson</i>	2654	2672.1	2674.1	2678.1						
<i>Osler</i>	3168									
<i>Wood</i>	1418	1754.0	1757.2	1767.2	1767.2	1783.9	2344.7	2382.5	3342.3	

<i>Wood Removed, Quota = 2681</i>										
<i>Candidate</i>	<i>Votes by Round</i>									
<i>Bandel</i>	1726	1991.3	2036.3	2036.3	2041.6	2059.6	2082.9	2108.4		
<i>Herring</i>	886	1028.8	1029.3	1029.7	1035.5	1061.0				
<i>Holden</i>	98	113.9	114.6	115.6	129.2					
<i>Laird</i>	53	64.1	64.4	65.8						
<i>McNamara</i>	17	21.4	21.5							
<i>Mitchell</i>	1845	2227.4	2228.8	2230.6	2238.2	2257.4	3151.1			
<i>Munro-Brian</i>	1706	2054.3	2065.7	2068.7	2077.7	2101.9	2128.2	2218.0	3436.0	
<i>Nicolson</i>	2645	2756.1								
<i>Osler</i>	4447									

TABLE 2. (Top) The votes in each round for each candidate in the 2022 election in Ward 5 of the City of Edinburgh Council Area.
(Middle) How the election would unfold if Herring were removed.
(Bottom) How the election would unfold if Wood were removed.

Stability under Spoilers Despite the large number of spoilers in Example 1, the analysis suggests a certain degree of stability: the elimination of each of these 6 candidates results in only two alternate winning committees. Moreover Osler, Nicolson and Mitchell are in the winning sets in both the original election and in the alternate winning sets. This is perhaps excepted under STV, since candidates

that easily surpass the quota will do so regardless of who drops out. In fact, this stability occurs under several voting methods.

Table 3 compares the stability of the winning sets of the different voting methods. Columns 2 and 3 indicate the number of elections with a spoiler and with more than one spoiler respectively. Column 4 identifies the maximum number of spoilers in a single election. Column 5 indicates the number of elections with multiple spoilers in which there was more than one alternate winning set (depending on which candidate was eliminated). Column 6 indicates the largest number of alternate different winning sets in a single election. SRCV, of course, had no instances of multiple spoilers and hence the single spoiler resulted in only one alternate winning set. SNTV stands out for the large number of elections resulting in multiple alternate winning sets. (Again, the OM versions of Borda, Cham-Cour and greedy-CC behave worse in this respect than their PM versions). Overall, the maximum number of alternate winning committees in column 6 is not large. Even for Borda (OM), under which one voter profile was susceptible to different 7 spoilers (the 2017 election in the 4th Ward of the East Renfrewshire Council Area), the elimination of these spoilers resulted in only 3 alternate winning sets. The fact that the number of alternate winning committees is not generally correlated to the number of spoilers under any voting method is likely due to the lack of closeness in most of the elections in the database.

Omitted from Table 3 are three elections in which the result was a tie. In the 2017 election of the 8th Ward of the Moray Council Area, there were 7 candidates running for 4 seats. Under both Cham-Cour (OM) and greedy-CC (OM), the result is a tie in which all candidates are potential spoilers. The same is true of the 2017 election in the 7th Ward of the Glasgow City Council Area and the 2022 election in the 4th Ward of the Clackmannanshire Council Area, in which all 9 (resp. 7) candidates running for 4 seats resulted in a tie under Cham-Cour (OM) (resp. Cham-Cour (PM)). Unsurprisingly, in these instances, there were a larger number of alternate winning sets depending on which candidate was eliminated.

TABLE 3. Numbers of Spoiler Elections and numbers of different winning sets in the Scottish Election Database

Method	Spoilers. (Num.)	Mult. (Num.)	Greatest Num. Sp.	Num. Mult. Winning sets	Greatest Num. Winning Sets
Bloc	70	45	5	13	2
Borda (OM)	166	41	7	13	3
Borda (PM)	44	18	3	4	2
Cham-Cour (OM)	102	45	5	7	2
Cham-Cour (PM)	64	35	5	3	2
Greedy-CC (OM)	106	45	5	9	2
Greedy-CC (PM)	70	33	3	5	2
SRCV	28	0	1	1	1
SNTV	110	50	5	32	3
STV	49	9	6	2	2

A closer analysis of the impact of spoilers in the database yields one more measure of stability. With only two exceptions, the alternate winning committees under

all voting methods differed from the actual winning committees by only one candidate. These exceptions both involved Cham-Cour: under Cham-Cour (PM), the 2012 election in the 3rd ward of the Aberdeenshire Council Area demonstrated an alternate winner set which differed from the actual winner set by more than one candidate; similarly for greedy-CC (OM) in the 2022 election in the 13th ward of the Glasgow City Council Area. This result is somewhat surprising, since the theoretical maximum number of candidates that could be effected by a single spoiler is certainly greater than 1. This result is likely again due to the fact that most of the elections in the database were not close and suggests that in practice, spoilers are less likely to have as big an impact as is theoretically possible.

(Almost) Complete versus Partial Rankings The results in Table 1 also include the likelihood of a spoiler based on rankings that are almost complete. These rankings were obtained through a process of extrapolation in which the partial ballots were filled in proportionally based on the distribution of existing similar but longer ballots. See Appendix B for a more detailed description of this process. This resulted in rankings in which 71.5% of ballots were complete and only 1.2% of ballots ranked fewer than k candidates. None of the ballots ranked only a single candidate. We note that we do not claim that our methodology for extending ballots is “best” or “most natural” in any sense. It would be a good avenue for future work to investigate and compare other ways of approximating more complete preferences from actual data as a way of better understanding the spoiler effect and other voting anomalies in multiwinner voting methods

The frequency of spoilers under the different voting methods using these more complete ballots is indicated by the first number in each entry of Table 1. As with the simulations, the probability of a spoiler or a mutual spoiler is greater with the more complete rankings. The differences under Bloc are particularly large. With a couple of exceptions (SRCV and Cham-Cour (OM)), the probability of a weak spoiler is also greater under the more complete rankings.

Significant differences remain between the likelihood of spoilers under OM and PM versions of Borda, Cham-Cour and greedy-CC under the more complete rankings. This is a consequence of the fact that not all ballots were completed, leading to different results in the OM and PM versions. Of course, if we were able to extend each ballot completely then the differences between OM and PM versions of the same method would disappear.

Comparison to the Single-Winner Case. The most comprehensive empirical analyses of the spoiler effect for single-winner ranked-choice elections occur in [18] and [27]. Both articles study single-winner elections in which no candidate earns an initial majority of first-place votes (that is, the elections considered all went to at least a second round). In [27], 2 out of 170 elections demonstrated the spoiler effect under STV, while 4 out of 185 exhibited this effect in [18]. Thus, estimated frequencies for the spoiler effect when $k = 1$ for STV are on the order of 1-2%, and this percentage would decrease dramatically if those studies were to include elections with majority candidates. None of these elections returned multiple spoiler candidates.

As we have shown, the situation is different for the multiwinner case. The spoiler effect rate of 4.9% for STV is significantly larger than what we see in the single-winner case, and the multiwinner setting produces several elections which demonstrate multiple spoilers. *A priori*, it is not clear why the multiwinner case should produce such different results. There could be a number of factors pushing the spoiler rate higher. We suspect that the main reason it is easier to observe spoiler effects is that it is “easier” to register a spoiler hit when there are multiple winners. In the single-winner case we must replace the entire winner set, while in the multiwinner case we need merely knock one of the current winners out of the committee. We note that all elections analyzed [18] and [27] occurred in the United States, so it is also possible that the spoiler effect might have different frequencies in different jurisdictions. In particular, American elections do not have the multi-party flavor of most Scottish local government elections. Future research could more thoroughly explore if we should expect a much higher rate of the spoiler effect when $k > 1$.

4.3. The issue of “vote splitting”. In the popular discourse concerning ranked-choice voting and the spoiler effect, the terms “spoiler effect” and “vote-splitting” are often used interchangeably [27]. One reason for this is because of their frequent co-occurrence under plurality voting (the method of SNTV with $k = 1$). Discussions of the spoiler effect under plurality often involve examples such as that shown in Table 4 where Candidate A is the plurality winner, but only because W and S “split the vote.” If S were not in the election, W would easily win. Such examples motivate Tideman’s definition of “clone candidates” [36] and its relationship to the spoiler effect. In this example, W and S are clones because they appear in adjacent rankings on every ballot.

TABLE 4. Example of a spoiler under plurality due to vote-splitting

Num Voters	100	90	40
1st choice	A	W	S
2nd choice	W	S	W
3rd choice	S	A	A

In this section we investigate the extent to which the spoiler effect can be identified with the notions of clones and vote splitting. We use the 999 Scottish elections with the real k values to examine if spoiler candidates are “clone-like” with respect to the candidate they are preventing from being a winner under different voting methods. To be precise, for each voting method we identify all triples of the form (A, W, S) where A is a candidate who was a member of the winning committee and W is a “would-be winner” who would win a seat if spoiler candidate S were removed from the election. In all but two cases, when a spoiler effect occurred under any voting method the winner set changed by only one candidate; we ignore these two outlier cases. To measure “clone-ness”, for each such triple, we count the number of ballots on which A (respectively W) and S were ranked consecutively and both candidates appear on the ballot; denote this count B_{AS} (resp. B_{WS}). We say that S is more similar to A if $B_{AS} > B_{WS}$; similarly, S is more similar to W if $B_{AS} < B_{WS}$. In the classic vote-splitting scenario, W is not a winner because S is more similar to W .

The results are summarized in Table 5. The entries under the $B_{AS} > B_{WS}$ column indicate the number of elections in which the spoiler S was closer to A than to B ; the entries under the $B_{AS} < B_{WS}$ are the reverse. To make comparison between methods easier, we also include the values of the ratio $\frac{B_{AS} < B_{WS}}{B_{AS} > B_{WS}}$. Methods where this ratio is less than 1 can be thought of as slightly “clone-friendly.” In these cases, it is more likely that the spoiler candidate S is closer to the winning candidate A than the would-be winner W . So the presence of S allows A to win. Methods where this ratio is great than 1 can be thought of as slightly “clone-averse.” In these cases, the spoilers are more frequently closer to W than to A and thus we see more evidence of a traditional notion of vote-splitting.

As with previous spoiler results, we do not see any strong correlation between a method’s categorization as proportional or excellence-based and the method’s tendency to be clone-averse or clone-friendly. Proportional methods based on Cham-Cour tend to produce clone-friendly spoiler results while STV tends to produce results that are clone-averse. This is interesting in the case of STV because some proponents of STV claim that it mitigates vote-splitting. In terms of raw frequency this claim is largely borne out, but in the rare cases that the spoiler effect occurs under STV this effect seems more akin to vote-splitting than something like clone-friendliness.

Voting methods with ratio less than 1 include Borda (OM), Cham-Cour (OM) and (PM) and greedy CC (OM) and (PM); for the more-complete ballots, the list also includes Borda (PM). To better understand the Borda results, first consider the data from the real ballots which contain many partial rankings. Suppose that a voter ranked only A and S . Under the OM model, all the remaining candidate receive almost as many points as S ; without S , all the candidates aside from A are treated equally. Thus the presence of S on the ballot creates a larger difference in point totals between A and the other candidates. Under Borda (PM), however, since unranked candidate receive 0 points, their point totals are not materially affected by the elimination of S in such a ballot. Under the more-complete ballots, the difference between OM and PM is much smaller, since the ballots are longer. Hence their ratios are more similar.

TABLE 5. Measure of similarity between A and S and between W and S in the Scottish database under different voting methods

Method	More Complete Ballots			Actual Ballots		
	$B_{AS} > B_{WS}$	$B_{AS} < B_{WS}$	$\frac{B_{AS} < B_{WS}}{B_{AS} > B_{WS}}$	$B_{AS} > B_{WS}$	$B_{AS} < B_{WS}$	$\frac{B_{AS} < B_{WS}}{B_{AS} > B_{WS}}$
Bloc	161	449	2.789	53	63	1.189
Borda (OM)	241	24	0.1	214	10	0.047
Borda (PM)	105	63	0.6	19	49	2.579
Cham-Cour (OM)	159	38	0.239	151	20	0.132
Cham-Cour (PM)	146	31	0.212	85	35	0.412
Greedy-CC (OM)	180	50	0.278	157	23	0.146
Greedy-CC (PM)	172	47	0.273	89	36	0.404
SRCV	4	145	36.25	1	27	27
SNTV	8	180	22.5	4	155	38.75
STV	36	96	2.667	30	36	1.2

4.4. Using Candidate Subsets to Generate 4 and 5 candidate elections.

Our simulations in Section 3 examined elections with $m \in \{4, 5\}$. To investigate how closely real-world data might compare to the simulations, we use the Scottish database to generate tens of thousands of 4-and 5-candidate elections and check them for the spoiler effect. To do this, for each $t \in \{4, 5\}$ and each Scottish election with $m \geq t$, we generated all candidate subsets of size t . For each such subset, we used the preference data from the original ballots and from the more-complete ballots to generate a preference profile for only the candidates in the subset. This allowed us to create tables similar to those we analyzed in Section 3 (see Tables 19, 20, and 21 from Appendix C), essentially treating the real-world data as its own model for $m = 4, k = 2$; $m = 5, k = 2$; and $m = 5, k = 3$. There may be limited utility in generating such sub-elections and using a k -value that is often different than what was used in the actual election from which the preferences are pulled, but such an exercise can provide some direct comparison to the theoretical results predicted by the models used in our simulations.

Unsurprisingly, the probabilities obtained from these sub-elections tend to be much smaller than the probabilities predicted by the theoretical models. The only exception are the probabilities for Bloc when compared to the probabilities for the 1D-spatial model; these results strongly suggest that the real-world sub-elections cannot be modeled by such a 1D model.

5. TOWARDS SPOILER-PROOFNESS

None of the methods considered so far are immune to the spoiler effect. This raises the question: is there a reasonable voting method which is immune? The answer depends on one’s notion of “reasonable.” For example, a dictatorship is spoiler-proof. For a more acceptable example, consider this method: first truncate all ballots to length $k - 1$ so that any preference data past the $(k - 1)$ st ranking is discarded, and then use bloc voting. This method is spoiler-proof and not as unreasonable as a dictatorship, but still probably does not warrant serious consideration. In this section we consider two reasonable (in our view) voting methods which are virtually spoiler-proof in practice, meaning that the methods almost never exhibit the spoiler effect when using the real-world data from Section 4. The first method is based on the notion of a *Condorcet committee* as defined in [22] and [32], and would be used in a majoritarian setting. That is, the first method does not attempt to achieve proportional representation. By contrast, the second method arguably belongs in the family of proportional representation methods.

To find these two methods we investigated many ranked-choice methods beyond those previously explored, and these performed the best with respect to the spoiler effect with the Scottish data. It is an open question if there exists a reasonable voting method for either the proportional or non-proportional context that would return no instances of the spoiler effect in our real-world data.

5.1. A Virtually Spoiler-Proof Majoritarian Method. The first method is based on the notion of a Condorcet committee, which is a multiwinner generalization of the single-winner Condorcet winner.

Definition 1. ([22] and [32]) *A subset of candidates \mathcal{C} is a **Condorcet committee** if for each pair of candidates (A, B) where $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and $B \notin \mathcal{C}$, more voters prefer A to B than prefer B to A .*

If an election contains a Condorcet committee of size k then any voting method which selects the Condorcet committee cannot demonstrate the spoiler effect in the election, as eliminating candidates who are not in the Condorcet committee does not affect the committee’s composition. Thus, to define a voting method immune to spoilers, it is reasonable to select the Condorcet committee of size k if it exists; if one does not exist, we can start with a Condorcet committee of size greater than k and remove candidates in a reasonable way until we reach a committee of size k . In theory, we could modify Condorcet committees that are too small by adding candidates, but we find it simpler to do the reverse because every profile has at least one Condorcet committee of size at least k , the set of all candidates, but not every profile has a Condorcet committee of size smaller than k .

Definition 2. Let $k' \geq k$ be the smallest number of seats for which there exists a Condorcet committee of size k' ; denote this committee \mathcal{C} . For each pair of candidates (A, B) where $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, let $PW(A, B)$ denote the number of voters who rank A above B minus the number of voters who rank B above A . Let $\text{score}(A) = \min_{B \neq A} PW(A, B)$.

Under the **Minimax Condorcet Committee (MCC) method**, eliminate the $k' - k$ candidates from \mathcal{C} with the lowest scores; the resulting set of size k is the winner committee.

Observe that if an election contains a Condorcet committee of size k or size $k + 1$ then the MCC method is not susceptible to the spoiler effect. In fact, any voting method which selects the Condorcet committee if one exists and otherwise eliminates candidates from the smallest Condorcet committee larger than k is immune to the spoiler effect when there is a Condorcet committee of size k or $k + 1$.

Definition 2 does not take into account ties, leaving open the possibility of more than one winning set. Such ties are rare in practice, and thus we ignore this possibility in our empirical analysis of the MCC method.

To investigate how well the MCC method performs with respect to the spoiler effect in practice, we analyzed its performance using the Scottish data in a couple of ways. We first determined the number of instances the spoiler effect occurred under MCC using the actual value of k among the 999 elections with $m > k + 1$. Then we repeated the process using fixed a value of $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ across all the elections. As with all such hypothetical comparisons, we should be careful not to assign too much weight to the results since voter and candidate behavior might have been different for a different value of k . However, given the large number of voter profiles in the database, we argue that such results are still useful. In fact, for $k = 2$, the size of the database is larger since we can check for the spoiler effect among the 1068 elections with $m \geq 4$.

The results are shown in Table 6. When using the actual number of seats from the real elections (row 1), only four elections (0.4% of the elections processed) return a spoiler effect of any kind, and in only one election is the plurality loser and the top- k loser a spoiler candidate. The reason for such a low number of potential spoilers is that all but four elections contain a Condorcet committee of size k or $k + 1$. The election in which the plurality loser (who is also the top- k loser) is a spoiler candidate under the MCC method is an outlier in the database in terms of “closeness”, which seems to be the reason for its unique spoiler behavior. This election is the 2022 election of the Mid-Formartine Ward of the Aberdeenshire Council Area, in which $n = 6$ and $k = 4$ (see Table 7). The election contains no

Condorcet committee of size 4 or 5. Table 7 indicates the number of first-place votes and the number of top four rankings for each candidate. Note that the top and bottom-ranked candidates under both measures are separated by a very small margin; such small margins are rarely observed in real-world elections.

When we set $k = 3$ or $k = 4$ across the database we obtain similarly low rates for the spoiler effect as when using the actual value of k . When we set $k = 2$, there is a jump in the number of elections affected by a spoiler, although the overall rate of $14/1068 = 1.3\%$ is still quite low. The likely cause of this increase is that very few of the elections actually corresponded to $k = 2$, and thus the voter profile is perhaps not indicative of how voters and parties would behave in an election with fewer seats.

Overall, the results suggest the MCC method is virtually spoiler-proof. We note that if we run the MCC method on the Scottish elections with the preferences filled in, the spoiler effect rate of the method increases to 2.5%. This is much smaller than the rates for the other methods in this setting, but this rate perhaps does not qualify as “spoiler-proof.”

TABLE 6. Spoiler effect results for the MCC method in the Scottish data.

k	Num. Elections	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoilers	Plurality Loser	Top- k Loser
Actual	999	4	0	1	1
2	1068	14	0	1	2
3	1032	7	0	0	0
4	922	3	0	1	1

TABLE 7. The first-place vote totals and the mentions in the top 4 rankings for the candidates in the 2022 election of the Mid-Formartine Ward of the Aberdeenshire Council Area

Candidate	Hassan	Hutchison	Johnston	Nicol	Powell	Ritchie
First-Place Votes	752	728	916	971	803	876
Top 4 Mentions	2837	2147	2790	2238	2170	2246

Further analysis of the MCC method could be obtained through simulations. However, given the large percentage of voter profiles from the database that have Condorcet committees of size k or $k + 1$, it is likely that results obtained using IC, IAC or the 1d-spatial model would be more indicative of the lack of Condorcet committees of either of these sizes in the generated profiles. This inference is supported by the large differences in the probability of a spoiler under all voting methods using any of these models in comparison to the empirical analyses, suggesting that these models do a poor job of replicating actual voter behavior.

The MCC method, while virtually spoiler-proof in real-world elections, achieves majoritarian-based outcomes and thus would not tend to produce winner sets which achieve proportionality.

5.2. A Virtually Spoiler-Proof Proportional Method. The next method chooses the top k ranked candidates by the single-winner version of STV, referred to as instant-runoff voting, the plurality elimination rule, the alternative vote, etc., in the single-winner literature.

Definition 3. *Under the **top- k instant runoff voting (top- k IRV)** method the election proceeds in rounds. In a given round we eliminate the candidate with the fewest first-place votes and transfer those votes to the next candidate on the ballot who has not been previously eliminated. Continue until there are k candidates remaining, and declare these candidates the winning committee.*

As with MCC, this definition does not take into account ties. For the purposes of analysis we break a tie as follows: if in some round there is a tie for the candidate with the fewest first-place votes, we eliminate the candidate who comes first alphabetically. (Other ways of breaking such a tie are probably more sensible.) Since ties occur very rarely in the data, the choice of tie-breaking mechanism almost never affects the eventual winner committee.

It is not clear from the description of top- k IRV that the method should be classified as one which achieves proportional representation. In particular, top- k IRV does not satisfy classical proportional representation axioms such as Dummett’s proportionality for solid coalitions [11]. However, we argue that this method generally achieves proportional representation in practice for three reasons. First, no winning committees selected under top- k IRV in the database violates the proportionality for solid coalitions axiom. (This is not as strong a statement as it may seem because the ballots are so highly truncated [26], but it is noteworthy nonetheless.) Second, of the 1070 multiwinner elections in our Scottish database, top- k IRV chooses the same winner set as STV in 863 of them. Thus, in approximately 81% of real elections top- k IRV produces the same outcome as the method that is most associated with proportional representation. (We note that other methods previously discussed do not agree with STV at nearly as high a rate. For example, SRCV produces the same winner set as STV in 55% of the Scottish elections.) Second, of the 207 elections in which top- k IRV and STV disagree, the number of parties represented in the winning committee selected by top- k IRV is at least as great as the number of parties represented in the winner committee selected by STV: the number of parties under both methods are equal in 91 elections and the number of parties under top- k IRV is greater in 98 elections. (By contrast, when a majoritarian method like SRCV disagrees with STV, the number of parties represented in the winning committee under SRCV is generally less than the number of parties represented in the winning committee under STV.) Thus, even though top- k IRV fails to be proportional from an axiomatic standpoint, in practice it belongs in the family of methods designed for proportional representation.

TABLE 8. Spoiler effect results for the top- k IRV method in the Scottish data.

k	Num. Elections	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoilers	Plurality Loser	Top- k Loser
Actual	999	4	0	0	0
2	1068	30	2	0	0
3	1032	8	0	0	0
4	922	4	0	0	0

We analyze the behavior of top- k IRV with respect to spoilers in the same way as for MCC. The results are indicated in Table 8. When using the actual value of k , there are only four instances of the spoiler effect and no instances of multiple

spoilers. When we set $k = 2$ across all elections then we observe a sizable increase, just as we did for the MCC method. This large jump disappears when we increase to $k = 3$ or $k = 4$ for all elections. By construction, the plurality loser cannot be a spoiler candidate under top- k IRV, and thus the zeroes in that column are to be expected. In addition, however, top- k IRV never results in a spoiler who is a top- k loser. As with MCC, we omit further analysis using simulations because the method is perhaps not worth formal study.

6. CONCLUSION

Our results suggest that STV and SRCV perform the best with respect to susceptibility to spoilers overall while bloc and SNTV perform the worst. This result is unsurprising: previous work has shown that a voting method like plurality produces the spoiler effect at a relatively high rate. Furthermore, because the definition of a spoiler candidate involves the removal of a candidate from an election, it is unsurprising that methods such as STV and SRCV (which, by design, remove candidates as an election unfolds) are more resilient to spoilers. Our empirical results, in particular, demonstrate that STV is not especially susceptible to the spoiler effect in real-world elections.

It is worth repeating that the empirical must be interpreted cautiously since the elections from which the data was collected were run under STV and not any other method. It is not clear what the conclusions would be had it been possible to collect a similar number of voter profiles from elections using these other methods. The simulations, however, do confirm these overall conclusions. While the differences in spoiler frequencies between simulated and real voter profiles suggest that the IAC, IC and 1D-spatial assumptions are poor models for actual voter behavior, the simulation results do indicate a kind of upper bound for the likelihood of spoilers under the different methods. The real data, being so much less close than the simulated data, suggest that overall, spoiler frequencies are lower than predicted: good news for STV given its prevalence in actual elections around the world. More importantly, these results largely hold up using both partial and more complete ballots.

This analysis also raises some interesting questions to explore further. The two methods suggested in Section 5 are meant to be taken as suggestive rather than proscriptive and arise from consideration of the actual database. Neither one has been systematically studied or used (as far as we are aware). In theory, basing a voting method on the existence of a Condorcet committee of size k is intuitively appealing, but theoretical models tend to produce elections without such committees at fairly high rates. In practice, it is interesting that Condorcet committees of correct size occur so frequently. The fact that both MCC and top- k IRV are so spoiler-proof in practice, suggests that both methods are worth further study. Indeed it may be, as more ranked data becomes available, that the relative desirability of different multiwinner voting methods shifts as researchers gain a better understanding of voter behavior using these methods.

Lastly, the results about stability are also interesting. Despite the relative frequency of spoilers (or mutual spoiler) under several different voting methods, it remains the case that the number of alternative winning committees is relatively small as is the number of winning candidate affected in those committees. It would

be useful to determine theoretical bounds on these numbers under the different voting methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Arrow. (1963). *Social Choice and Individual Values*. 2nd edition, Wiley.
- [2] H. Aziz, M. Brill, V. Conitzer, E. Elkind, R. Freeman, and T. Walsh. Justified representation in approval-based committee voting. *Social Choice and Welfare* 48(2):461–485. 2017 H. Aziz, E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, M. Lackner, and P. Skowron
- [3] H. Aziz, E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, M. Lackner and P. Skowron, The Condorcet Principle for Multiwinner Elections: From Shortlisting to Proportionality, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* Pages 84-90. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/13>
- [4] H. Aziz and B. Lee. (2020). The expanding approvals rule: improving proportional representation and monotonicity. *Social Choice and Welfare* **54**: 1-45.
- [5] D. Baumeister, P. Faliszewski, J. Lang, & J. Rothe. (2012). Campaigns for Lazy Voters: Truncated Ballots. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS'12), 57–584.
- [6] D. Boratyn, W. Stomczynski, D. Stolicki and S. Stanislaw, Spoiler Susceptibility in Multi-District Party Elections, arXiv:2202.05115 [cs.GT]
- [7] M. Brill and D. Peters. (2023). Robust and Verifiable Proportionality Axioms for Multiwinner Voting, arXiv:2302.01989 [cs.GT]
- [8] M. Brill, P. Gözl, D. Peters, U. Schmidt-Kraepelin, and K. Wilker. (2022). Approval-based apportionment. *Mathematical Programming*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-022-01852-1>.
- [9] J. Chamberlin and P. Courant. (1983). Representative Deliberations and Representative Decisions: Proportional Representation and the Borda Rule, *The American Political Science Review*, **77** (3): 718-733.
- [10] B. Debord. (1993). Prudent k -choice functions: properties and algorithms. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, **26**: 63-77.
- [11] M. Dummett. *Voting Procedures*. Oxford Clarendon Press, (1984).
- [12] E. Elkind, J. Lang and A. Saffidine, Condorcet winning sets, *Soc Choice and Welf* (2015) 44:493-517 DOI 10. 1007/s00355-0 14-0853-4.
- [13] E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, J-F. Laslier, P. Skowron, A. Slinko, and N. Talmon. (2017). What Do Multiwinner Voting Rules Do? An Experiment Over the Two-Dimensional Euclidean Domain. In *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, **31** (1): 494-501.
- [14] E. Elkind, P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, and A. Slinko. (2017). Properties of Multiwinner Voting Rules, *Social Choice and Welfare*, **48** (3): 599-632.
- [15] Faliszewski, P., Lackner, M., Peters, D., & Talmon, N. (2018). Effective Heuristics for Committee Scoring Rules. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11459>
- [16] D.S. Felsenthal and Z. Maoz. (1992). Normative properties of four single-stage multi-winner electoral procedures. *Behavioral Science*, **37**: 109-127.
- [17] P. Fishburn. (1981). An analysis of simple voting systems for electing committees. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, **41** (3): 499-502.
- [18] A. Graham-Squire and D. McCune. (2023). An Examination of Ranked-Choice Voting in the United States, 2004-2022. *Representation*, DOI: 10.1080/00344893.2023.2221689.
- [19] E. Kamwa, Stable Rules for Electing Committees and Divergence on Outcomes, *Group Decis Negot* 26, 547–564 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10726-016-9504-8>
- [20] L. Sánchez-Fernández and J.A, Fisteus, Monotonicity Axioms in Approval-based Multiwinner Voting, *Proc. of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2019)*, N. Agmon, M. E. Taylor, E. Elkind, M. Veloso (eds.), May 13–17, 2019.
- [21] L. Sánchez-Fernández, N. Fernández-García, J.A, Fisteus, and M. Brill. The maximin support method: an extension of the D'Hondt method to approval-based multiwinner elections. *Math. Program.* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-022-01805-8>
- [22] W. Gehrlein. (1985). The Condorcet criterion and committee selection. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, **10** (3): 199-209.

- [23] P. Faliszewski, P. Skowron, A. Slinko and N. Talmon. (2017) Multiwinner Voting: A New Challenge for Social Choice Theory in *Trends in Computational Social Choice*, ed. U. Endriss, AI Access, p.27-48.
- [24] M. Lackner and P. Skowron. (2019). Consistent approval-based multi-winner rules. Preprint: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.02453>.
- [25] T. Lu and C. Boutilier. (2011). Budgeted social choice: From consensus to personalized decision making. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-11*, pages 280–286.
- [26] D. McCune and A. Graham-Squire. Monotonicity Anomalies in Scottish Local Government Elections. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17741>.
- [27] D. McCune and J. Wilson. (2023). Ranked-choice voting and the spoiler effect. *Public Choice*, **196**: 19-50.
- [28] D. McCune, E. Martin, G. Latina and K. Simms, A Comparison of Sequential Ranked-Choice Voting and Single Transferable Vote. arXiv:2306.17341 [econ.GN]
- [29] N.R. Miller. (2019). Reflections on Arrow’s theorem and voting rules. *Public Choice*, **179**: 113-124.
- [30] N.R. Miller. (2023). Ranked-choice voting and the spoiler effect: a supplementary note. *Public Choice*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-023-01116-2>.
- [31] D. Otis. (2022). Single winner ranked choice voting CVRs. Harvard Dataverse. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/AMK8PJ>.
- [32] T. Ratliff. (2003). Some startling inconsistencies when electing committees, *Social Choice and Welfare*, **21** (3): 433-454.
- [33] P. Speroni di Fenzio and D. A. Gewurz, The space of all proportional voting systems and the most majoritarian among them, *Soc. Choice and Welfare*, 52, 663–683 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00355-018-1166-9>
- [34] C. Sonar, S. Suri and J. Xue, Multiwinner Elections under Minimax Chamberlin-Courant Rule in Euclidean Space. *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-22)*
- [35] M. Staring. (1986). Two paradoxes of committee elections. *Mathematics Magazine*, **59**: 158-159.
- [36] Tideman, T. (1987). Independence of clones as a criterion for voting rules. *Soc Choice Welfare*, **4**(3), 105-206.
- [37] D. R. Woodall. (1994). Properties of preferential election rules. *Voting matters*, **3**.

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF TECHNIQUE TO COMPLETE BALLOTS FROM SCOTTISH ELECTIONS

In this appendix, we describe the process for extending the partial ballots in the Scottish data to more complete rankings.

The process involves a series of steps, each time extending partial ballots of length k' to length $k' + 1$ based on the probability distribution of ballots which agree on the first k' entries. To be more precise, suppose there are 10 ballots of the form ABC . To increase these ballots by length 1, we consider all ballots of the form $ABC*$ which have length at least 4. Suppose there are 38 such ballots as shown in Table 9. We extend the ballots of the form ABC proportionally, (column 3) and round to a whole number using Hamilton’s apportionment method (column 4).

TABLE 9. Extending ballots of length 3 to length 4

Ballot	Number	Prop.	Num. ballots
ABCD	9	$(9/38) \cdot 10 = 2.368$	2
ABCE	12	$(12/38) \cdot 10 = 3.158$	3
ABCF	17	$(17/38) \cdot 10 = 4.474$	5
Total	38	10	10

In theory, this process can be iterated to create complete ballots, assuming a sufficient set of complete ballots. In practice, however, it does not make sense to do so if the number of ballots of length at least $k' + 1$ is not sufficiently large in comparison to the number of ballots of length k' . Thus, each ballot was extended until either the ballots were complete or the number of ballots of length $k' + 1$ was less than 10% of the number of ballots of length k' . This provided a fuller set of voter profiles that, while not complete, allowed for a better comparison with the simulated data.

APPENDIX B: TABLES OF SIMULATION RESULTS

TABLE 10. Likelihood of a spoiler for IC when $m = 4$ and $k = 2$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	49.7, 40.0	11.6, 7.3	24.7, 20.3	38.9, 32.2
Borda (OM)	21.2, 21.1	0.1, 0.4	11.0, 10.4	13.2, 13.7
Borda (PM)	21.2, 18.4	0.1, 0.3	11.0, 10.4	13.2, 12.8
Cham-Cour (OM)	25.5, 25.4	0.3, 0.4	17.1, 17.2	14.1, 14.4
Cham-Cour (PM)	25.5, 18.5	0.3, 0.2	17.1, 11.7	14.1, 10.8
Greedy-CC (OM)	23.5, 23.8	0.5, 0.6	14.7, 15.5	13.5, 13.6
Greedy-CC (PM)	23.5, 17.1	0.5, 0.4	14.7, 10.1	13.5, 9.8
SRCV	18.4, 16.3	0.4, 0.3	2.9, 2.6	6.9, 6.6
SNTV	37.9, 36.4	4.9, 4.7	29.8, 28.8	18.4, 18.3
STV	15.6, 14.4	0.3, 0.4	0.3, 0.5	6.4, 5.8

TABLE 11. Likelihood of a spoiler for IC when $m = 5$ and $k = 2$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	65.5, 63.1	33.2, 31.1	33.1, 31.7	42.9, 41.2
Borda (OM)	32.3, 33.9	6.5, 7.0	13.8, 14.5	15.8, 16.7
Borda (PM)	32.3, 29.8	6.5, 6.0	13.8, 12.6	15.8, 14.8
Greedy-CC(OM)	36.0, 36.6	7.7, 8.3	16.1, 17.0	17.2, 18.1
Greedy-CC (PM)	36.0, 30.2	7.7, 5.1	16.1, 13.0	17.2, 13.7
SRCV	33.6, 31.7	6.6, 6.3	3.1, 2.8	7.9, 7.7
SNTV	59.7, 59.1	23.9, 23.4	35.7, 35.4	28.0, 27.9
STV	29.4, 28.0	5.3, 4.9	0.1, 0.1	7.9, 7.4

TABLE 12. Likelihood of a spoiler for IC when $m = 5$ and $k = 3$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	59.9, 47.1	17.6, 10.5	23.6, 18.2	47.1, 38.4
Borda (OM)	19.9, 20.7	0.1, 0.4	9.2, 10.0	11.8, 12.1
Borda (PM)	19.9, 18.1	0.1, 0.3	9.2, 8.4	11.8, 11.5
Greedy-CC (OM)	27.9, 28.4	1.2, 1.3	17.0, 17.0	11.1, 11.9
Greedy-CC (PM)	27.9, 23.9	1.2, 0.9	17.0, 13.7	11.1, 9.7
SRCV	22.7, 21.1	0.8, 0.7	4.2, 4.0	9.1, 8.8
SNTV	40.7, 40.4	5.6, 5.6	32.3, 32.1	14.9, 15.0
STV	16.6, 16.2	0.5, 0.5	0.5, 0.7	5.0, 5.0

TABLE 13. Likelihood of a spoiler for IAC when $m = 4$ and $k = 2$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	39.4, 33.0	8.5, 5.7	18.4, 16.1	29.9, 26.4
Borda (OM)	19.6, 19.7	0.1, 0.3	10.7, 11.4	13.3, 13.4
Borda (PM)	19.6, 18.0	0.1, 0.3	10.7, 10.0	13.3, 12.8
Cham-Cour (OM)	22.2, 22.8	0.3, 0.3	16.7, 17.1	11.2, 12.1
Cham-Cour (PM)	22.2, 17.5	0.3, 0.3	16.7, 12.1	11.2, 9.8
Greedy-CC (OM)	23.4, 25.1	0.6, 0.7	16.8, 17.7	12.6, 14.0
Greedy-CC (PM)	23.4, 18.6	0.6, 0.3	16.8, 12.3	12.6, 10.6
SRCV	16.9, 14.45	0.2, 0.1	3.3, 2.6	5.6, 5.6
SNTV	27.1, 28.3	3.7, 3.7	20.5, 22.0	12.8, 14.0
STV	17.4, 12.0	1.1, 0.0	4.9, 0.0	7.8, 4.8

TABLE 14. Likelihood of a Spoiler for IAC when $m = 5$ and $k = 2$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	61.8, 60.2	29.7, 28.3	29.7, 29.5	38.6, 38.0
Borda (OM)	31.8, 33.2	6.5, 6.9	13.7, 14.8	15.9, 16.8
Borda (PM)	31.8, 29.1	6.5, 5.7	13.7, 12.4	15.9, 14.6
Greedy-CC (OM)	37.8, 39.3	8.7, 9.1	18.4, 19.6	18.1, 19.1
Greedy-CC (PM)	37.8, 33.6	8.7, 6.8	18.4, 15.2	18.1, 15.8
SRCV	33.0, 30.7	6.1, 5.6	3.5, 3.2	7.0, 7.1
SNTV	53.0, 54.3	20.7, 21.1	30.0, 31.6	24.2, 25.3
STV	28.7, 26.7	4.5, 4.1	0.5, 0.0	7.6, 7.0

TABLE 15. Likelihood of a Spoiler for IAC when $m = 5$ and $k = 3$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	55.1, 44.3	15.3, 9.4	21.4, 17.3	43.0, 35.8
Borda (OM)	19.7, 20.4	0.2, 0.4	9.0, 9.8	12.0, 12.1
Borda (PM)	19.7, 17.9	0.2, 0.3	9.0, 8.5	12.0, 11.8
Greedy-CC (OM)	28.1, 29.5	1.3, 1.5	18.4, 19.2	10.6, 11.9
Greedy-CC (PM)	28.1, 25.5	1.3, 1.1	18.4, 15.5	10.6, 10.6
SRCV	22.0, 19.7	0.6, 0.3	4.3, 3.8	8.7, 8.2
SNTV	34.5, 35.6	4.7, 4.8	27.2, 38.6	12.3, 13.3
STV	19.7, 14.4	1.3, 0.0	5.7, 0.0	7.1, 4.4

TABLE 16. Likelihood of a Spoiler for the 1D-spatial model for $m = 4$ and $k = 2$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	0, 1.4	0, 1.0	0, 1.1	0, 1.2
Borda (OM)	12.7, 11.6	0.0, 0.4	6.1, 5.9	12.7, 10.9
Borda (PM)	12.7, 7.4	0.0, 0.6	6.1, 2.6	12.7, 6.9
Cham-Cour (OM)	18.4, 16.7	0.0, 0.1	15.2, 13.8	6.1, 5.9
Cham-Cour (PM)	18.4, 6.5	0.0, 0.0	15.2, 5.4	6.1, 2.2
Greedy-CC (OM)	32.0, 22.2	1.6, 0.8	21.0, 17.5	11.1, 8.9
Greedy-CC (PM)	32.0, 9.2	1.6, 0.1	21.0, 7.5	11.1, 4.3
SRCV	9.5, 6.8	0.0, 0.0	0.0, 0.1	7.0, 5.7
SNTV	27.9, 19.3	11.1, 6.0	21.1, 16.0	21.1, 14.3
STV	20.6, 9.7	0.3, 0.5	1.7, 2.0	12.1, 6.2

TABLE 17. Likelihood of a Spoiler for the 1D-spatial model for $m = 5$ and $k = 2$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	36.5, 24.1	36.5, 22.7	13.7, 11.0	30.0, 20.4
Borda (OM)	21.0, 23.7	4.1, 5.2	4.8, 8.4	8.5, 8.1
Borda (PM)	21.0, 11.6	4.1, 3.3	4.8, 3.6	8.5, 5.8
Greedy-CC (OM)	56.4, 45.0	12.8, 11.8	25.6, 22.5	14.9, 14.6
Greedy-CC (PM)	56.4, 16.5	12.8, 4.1	25.6, 9.0	14.9, 7.3
SRCV	22.5, 15.4	1.5, 0.7	0.6, 0.4	5.3, 2.8
SNTV	43.4, 33.4	24.1, 14.8	20.9, 16.1	24.4, 18.3
STV	37.3, 21.4	2.2, 2.2	1.1, 1.7	12.0, 8.0

TABLE 18. Likelihood of a Spoiler for the 1D-spatial model for $m = 5$ and $k = 3$

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	0, 0.5	0, 0.2	0, 0.3	0, 0.4
Borda (OM)	12.6, 12.1	0.0, 0.4	4.7, 4.5	12.6, 11.3
Borda (PM)	12.6, 7.0	0.0, 0.6	4.7, 1.6	12.6, 6.4
Greedy-CC (OM)	19.4, 20.2	0.5, 1.1	14.0, 15.3	6.7, 6.2
Greedy-CC (PM)	19.4, 9.7	0.5, 0.3	14.0, 7.1	6.7, 3.3
SRCV	6.1, 7.0	0.03, 0.04	0.01, 0.05	4.6, 6.2
SNTV	26.9, 20.9	13.5, 8.7	21.5, 17.7	15.0, 11.8
STV	23.7, 11.9	0.6, 0.7	2.6, 2.5	13.4, 7.0

APPENDIX C: TABLES OF RESULTS FROM SCOTTISH SUB-ELECTIONS

TABLE 19. Likelihood of a Spoiler for $m = 4$ and $k = 2$ using sub-elections from the Scottish data. Num elections 75405

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	14.4, 5.6	2.8, 0.7	8.0, 4.2	12.6, 5.3
Borda (OM)	7.2, 5.3	0.1, 0.3	5.1, 4.2	6.7, 5.1
Borda (PM)	6.1, 3.9	0.4, 0.4	4.4, 3.2	5.8, 3.8
Cham Cour (OM)	5.7, 3.9	0.1, 0.1	5.2, 3.7	4.0, 3.3
Cham Cour (PM)	4.7, 2.4	0.1, 0.1	4.2, 2.2	3.3, 2.0
Cham Cour greedy (OM)	7.5, 4.5	0.2, 0.1	6.6, 4.2	5.4, 3.7
Cham Cour greedy (PM)	5.9, 2.5	0.1, 0.1	5.1, 2.3	4.4, 2.1
SRCV	3.9, 0.8	0.0, 0.0	0.4, 0.2	2.9, 0.6
SNTV	7.2, 4.5	2.3, 1.3	6.7, 4.3	5.0, 3.3
STV	2.8, 1.2	0.1, 0.1	1.2, 0.7	1.8, 1.0

TABLE 20. Likelihood of a Spoiler for $m = 5$ and $k = 2$ using sub-elections from the Scottish data. Num elections 79428

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	16.5, 6.3	9.1, 2.8	9.6, 3.3	9.5, 3.2
Borda (OM)	13.3, 10.4	1.9, 2.1	6.7, 5.0	6.4, 4.4
Borda (PM)	7.8, 4.4	2.6, 2.1	4.9, 2.8	5.5, 2.8
Cham Cour greedy (OM)	11.2, 8.2	2.1, 1.6	6.1, 4.4	5.4, 4.0
Cham Cour greedy (PM)	7.7, 2.7	1.8, 1.2	4.7, 1.9	4.4, 1.9
SRCV	5.8, 1.4	0.1, 0.0	0.2, 0.1	0.4, 0.1
SNTV	11.6, 7.6	5.1, 3.4	4.4, 2.7	4.1, 2.4
STV	4.0, 1.9	0.6, 0.5	0.6, 0.5	1.1, 0.7

TABLE 21. Likelihood of a Spoiler for $m = 5$ and $k = 3$ using sub-elections from the Scottish data. Num elections 79428

Method	Spoiler Effect	Multiple Spoiler Effect	Plurality Loser	Top- k loser
Bloc	10.2, 3.8	1.2, 0.4	4.7, 2.8	9.1, 3.6
Borda (OM)	6.2, 4.7	0.1, 0.2	3.9, 3.6	5.0, 4.3
Borda (PM)	5.1, 2.9	0.2, 0.2	3.3, 2.3	4.4, 2.7
Cham Cour greedy (OM)	6.8, 4.3	0.2, 0.2	6.3, 4.1	3.6, 3.1
Cham Cour greedy (PM)	6.1, 3.2	0.2, 0.1	5.3, 2.9	3.2, 2.1
SRCV	3.8, 0.9	0.0, 0.0	0.5, 0.2	3.1, 0.7
SNTV	5.4, 3.6	1.2, 0.7	5.4, 3.5	3.2, 2.6
STV	3.2, 1.2	0.1, 0.0	1.5, 0.8	1.8, 0.8

DAVID MCCUNE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND DATA SCIENCE, WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE, 500 COLLEGE HILL, LIBERTY, MO, 64068

Email address: `mccuned@william.jewell.edu`

JENNIFER WILSON, THE NEW SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS, 66 WEST 12TH STREET NEW YORK, NY 10011

Email address: `wilsonj@newschool.edu`