

KNOCKOUT TOURNAMENTS ADMITTING ALL CANDIDATES AS WINNERS

BERNARD DE BAETS AND EMILIO DE SANTIS

ABSTRACT. A set of 2^n candidates is presented to a commission. At every round, each member of this commission votes by pairwise comparison, and one-half of the candidates is deleted from the tournament, the remaining ones proceeding to the next round until the n -th round (the final one) in which the final winner is declared. The candidates are arranged on a board in a given order, which is maintained among the remaining candidates at all rounds. A study of the size of the commission is carried out in order to obtain the desired result of any candidate being a possible winner. For 2^n candidates with $n \geq 3$, we identify a voting profile with $4n - 3$ voters such that any candidate could win just by choosing a proper initial order of the candidates. Moreover, in the setting of a random number of voters, we obtain the same results, with high probability, when the expected number of voters is large.

Keywords: Majority graph, Manipulation.

AMS MSC 2010: 91B12, 91B14.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider a set of *candidates* (or competitors) that are involved in a knockout tournament. In the scientific literature, such tournaments, also called *single-elimination or sudden death tournaments*, are studied for different practical as well as theoretical purposes. There is a criticality in the use of knockout tournaments in the fact that the winner of the tournament could heavily depend on the initial order of the candidates (also called *bracket*). Therefore, such a tournament lends itself to being manipulated by the organizers. In fact, tournament organizers could favor a given candidate by selecting a particular initial order; see, e.g., [1, 10, 11] and references therein.

In our setting, there is a commission of voters and each voter ranks all candidates in a *preference list* (no ties allowed), i.e., each voter provides a permutation of all candidates. The candidates are arranged on a board in a given order, with the relative order between them maintained at all rounds. Running through this order, candidates are presented in pairs to the commission, which decides by majority which of the two candidates wins the challenge and is allowed to move on to the next round. To be precise, each voter only looks at her own preference list and votes for the candidate who precedes the other one in her *preference list*. It should be clear that the winner of the competition is a function of the preference lists of all voters, called *voting profile*, and the initial order of the candidates on the board.

The central question of this paper is the following one:

Q Does there exist a *voting profile*, i.e., a set of preference lists of a commission, that admits each candidate as winner, provided one chooses a proper initial order on the board?

We answer the question affirmatively while at the same time providing an upper bound on the minimal size of the commission to obtain this result. The construction proceeds as follows.

The solution is constructed in two steps. In the first step, we construct a sequence of *preference patterns* or *majority graphs*, denoted $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, which establishes the results of the challenges between two candidates. In the second step, we construct the voting profiles $(\tilde{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ such that \tilde{R}_n realizes G_n . Regarding the first step, we construct the majority graphs $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ recursively. The fundamental property of G_n is that, in a single-elimination tournament with 2^{n+3} candidates, any candidate can win given an appropriate initial order of the candidates on the board.

Moving to the second step, it is well known that any majority graph can be obtained by a simple majority decision of individuals with a suitable voting profile [7, 12, 16]. Thus, there exists a voting profile \tilde{R}_n associated with the majority graph G_n . For an effective construction of $(\tilde{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, we proceed by recursion. The initial voting profile \tilde{R}_0 is realized through Stearns' paper [16]. For the recursion, to pass from \tilde{R}_n to \tilde{R}_{n+1} , we make use of Lemma 2 below and Lemma 2 of [7]. Following our approach, the voting profile \tilde{R}_{n+1} equals the size of \tilde{R}_n plus 4. Since \tilde{R}_0 consists of nine preference lists, the voting profile \tilde{R}_n corresponds to $4n + 9$ voters.

In the last part of this paper, we consider the framework of a random number of voters (see, e.g., [3, 8, 9]). Under the hypothesis that the number of voters follows a Poisson distribution, we establish that the random voting profile behaves like the deterministic one, with high probability, if the Poisson parameter is sufficiently large.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we give some notations and definitions. In Section 3, we construct the majority graphs $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. Moreover, in Theorem 1, we show that a knockout tournament with 2^{n+3} candidates and a majority graph G_n can return any candidate as the winner of the tournament by choosing an appropriate initial order. In Section 4, we construct the voting profile \tilde{R}_n associated with the majority graph G_n , for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In Section 5, we study random voting profiles in the Poisson framework. Finally, in Section 6, we present some comments and possible future developments.

2. NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

We start this section by introducing some notations that will be used further on. Let $[m] := \{1, \dots, m\}$. We will consider only the case $m = 2^n$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\Pi(n)$ denote the set of permutations of the elements in $[2^n]$.

All 2^n candidates are initially arranged on a board in a given order (a permutation $\pi \in \Pi(n)$). Then, pairwise challenges are carried out, following the initial order to form the pairs. After the first round of the challenges, all winners are paired again, still respecting the initial order, and so on, until the winner of the competition is decreed at the n -th round. To determine the winner of a challenge between two candidates, there is a commission of $v \in \mathbb{N}$ voters in which each member assigns a vote to a candidate, the candidate getting the most votes being the winner of the challenge. Each member of the

commission has a fixed preference list in which all candidates are written in preference order (no ties are allowed). The preference list of a voter corresponds to a permutation in $\Pi(n)$. When two candidates $i, j \in [m]$ are paired, each voter gives her vote to the preferred candidate, that is, she votes for i if i precedes j in her preference list; otherwise she votes for j .

The collection of all the preference lists of the voters of the commission is commonly called the *voting profile*. Suppose that V is the set of candidates, typically $V = [m]$ and $[v]$ the set of voters then the voting profile is represented as a matrix $R = (r_{\ell,i} : \ell \in [v], i \in V)$, where $r_{\ell,\cdot}$ denotes the preference list of voter $\ell \in [v]$, i.e. the row $r_{\ell,\cdot}$ is a permutation on the elements of V .

On the basis of the voting profile, we construct the *majority graph* (also called *preference pattern*). One has that R generates the oriented graph $G = (V, \vec{E})$ if and only if

1. any row of R is a permutation of the elements of V ;
2. for every $i, j \in V$ the arrow $(i, j) \in \vec{E}$ if and only if the rows of R where i precedes j are more than the rows of R where j precedes i .

Next, we provide some additional notations. For a sequence $(R_n)_{n \in [N]}$ of matrices with the same number of columns m , we denote by $(R_1, \dots, R_N)_V$ the *vertically glued matrix*, i.e., the matrix that has as rows all rows of matrices R_1, \dots, R_N . Note that if the matrices R_1, \dots, R_N are voting profiles on a common set of candidates, then $(R_1, \dots, R_N)_V$ represents a new voting profile on the same set of candidates, namely the collection of the preference lists of all the preference lists reported in the different matrices R_1, \dots, R_N . For a sequence $(v_n)_{n \in [N]}$ of (row) vectors we define *concatenated vector* (v_1, \dots, v_N) as the vector with all elements of v_1, \dots, v_N listed sequentially. Given a vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$, we denote by \bar{v} the vector $(v_n, v_{n-1}, \dots, v_1)$ with all components of v in the reverse order.

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

We have explained above how to construct the majority graph starting from a voting profile. The collection of finite-oriented graphs without loops and with at most one arrow between each pair of vertices is denoted by \mathcal{G} . It is well known that every $G \in \mathcal{G}$ can be generated by some voting profile R (see [12], [16] and [7], in historical order).

Therefore, for any $G = (V, \vec{E}) \in \mathcal{G}$, there exists a voting profile R that obtains the results prescribed by G , for all distinct pairs of candidates in V . Actually, in the following, we will consider preference patterns without ties, called *strict* preference patterns; such preference patterns are nothing else but complete oriented graphs. For the set of candidates $[2^n]$, the strict preference patterns (or majority graphs) are collected in the space $\mathcal{H}(n)$.

Note that given a voting profile R and the initial order $\pi \in \Pi(n)$, one can list all the challenges that will take place in the knockout tournament along with their outcomes. Furthermore, in order to reconstruct all the results of the knockout tournament, it is sufficient to know the initial order $\pi \in \Pi(n)$ and the majority graph $G \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ associated with R . In fact, even if G cannot provide the number of votes obtained by the two candidates in a challenge, it provides the result of the challenge itself. In particular, the

winner of the competition is a function of the majority graph $G \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ and of the initial order $\pi \in \Pi(n)$. Thus, we define the mapping

$$w_n : \mathcal{H}(n) \times \Pi(n) \rightarrow [2^n]$$

which returns the winner of the game with 2^n candidates, given the majority graph and the initial order of the candidates.

For any majority graph $G \in \mathcal{H}(n)$, we consider the image of $w_n(G, \cdot)$, i.e.,

$$w_n(G, \Pi(n)) = \{w_n(G, \pi) : \pi \in \Pi(n)\}.$$

We are interested in establishing for which values of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a majority graph $G \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ such that

$$w_n(G, \Pi(n)) = [2^n], \quad (1)$$

i.e., all the candidates can win just by changing the initial order on the board. Along the paper, the majority graphs and the initial orders of interest will be explicitly constructed.

We start by defining the majority graph $G_0 = (V_0, \vec{E}_0) \in \mathcal{H}(3)$ where $V_0 = [8]$ and all the arrows of \vec{E}_0 are listed below

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (1, 2), & (1, 3), & (1, 5), & (2, 3), & (2, 4), & (2, 6), & (2, 7), \\ (3, 4), & (3, 5), & (3, 6), & (3, 8), & (4, 1), & (4, 5), & (4, 8), \\ (5, 2), & (5, 6), & (5, 7), & (6, 1), & (6, 4), & (6, 7), & (6, 8), \\ (7, 1), & (7, 3), & (7, 4), & (7, 8), & (8, 1), & (8, 2), & (8, 5). \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Lemma 1. *Let $[8]$ be the set of candidates, then $w_3(G_0, \Pi(3)) = [8]$.*

Proof. Let us fix the initial orders of the candidates $\pi_i \in \Pi(3)$, for $i \in [8]$, as follows

$$\begin{array}{ll} \pi_1 = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), & \pi_2 = (2, 3, 4, 1, 6, 7, 8, 5), \\ \pi_3 = (3, 6, 4, 1, 8, 2, 5, 7), & \pi_4 = (4, 1, 8, 2, 5, 6, 7, 3), \\ \pi_5 = (5, 6, 7, 8, 2, 3, 4, 1), & \pi_6 = (6, 7, 8, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4), \\ \pi_7 = (7, 8, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 4), & \pi_8 = (8, 1, 5, 6, 2, 3, 7, 4). \end{array} \quad (3)$$

The reader can easily check that $w_3(G_0, \pi_k) = k$, for any $k \in [8]$. \square

Starting from the majority graph G_0 , defined in (2), we recursively construct the sequence of majority graphs

$$\left(G_n = ([2^{n+3}], \vec{E}_n) \in \mathcal{H}(n+3) \right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}.$$

Let establish all the arrows of \vec{E}_n :

1. if $i, j \in [2^{n+2}]$, then $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n \iff (i, j) \in \vec{E}_{n-1}$;
2. if $2^{n+2} + 1 \leq i, j \leq 2^{n+3}$, then $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n \iff (i - 2^{n+2}, j - 2^{n+2}) \in \vec{E}_{n-1}$;
3. if $i \in [2^{n+2}]$ and $j \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}]$ with $i + j$ even, then $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n$;
4. if $i \in [2^{n+2}]$ and $j \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}]$ with $i + j$ odd, then $(j, i) \in \vec{E}_n$.

Theorem 1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

- (1) *if $n \leq 2$, for any $G \in \mathcal{H}(n)$, it holds that $w_n(G, \Pi(n)) \neq [2^n]$;*
- (2) *if $n \geq 3$, then $w_n(G_{n-3}, \Pi(n)) = [2^n]$.*

Proof. First we prove item (1). For $n = 1$, there are two candidates and a single challenge, so only one candidate will be the winner. For $n = 2$, hence $m = 4$, any candidate, in order to win the tournament, should be preferred in two challenges. For any $G \in \mathcal{H}(2)$, there are six possible challenges. Hence, only three of the candidates can win two challenges and there is at least one candidate which can win less than two challenges, and hence this candidate cannot be the winner of the tournament for any initial order on the board.

Now we prove item (2). Lemma 1 gives the solution for $n = 3$. For $n > 3$, we proceed by induction on n and we will show that

$$w_n(G_{n-3}, \Pi(n)) = [2^n] \implies w_{n+1}(G_{n-2}, \Pi(n+1)) = [2^{n+1}].$$

Let us consider $G_n = ([2^{n+1}], \vec{E}_n)$. For a given $i \in [2^{n+1}]$, we construct the initial order $\pi \in \Pi(n+1)$ such that $w_{n+1}(G_{n-2}, \pi) = i$. Let us consider the case of an even $i \in [2^n]$. We also choose an even number $k \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]$. The induction assumption states that there exist $\pi', \pi'' \in \Pi(n)$ such that

$$w_n(G_{n-3}, \pi') = i, \quad w_n(G_{n-3}, \pi'') = k - 2^n. \quad (4)$$

Let us define $\pi''' \in \Pi(n+1)$ as

$$\pi'''_\ell = \begin{cases} \pi'_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \in [2^n]; \\ \pi''_{\ell-2^n} + 2^n & , \text{ for } \ell \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

We now have that

$$w_{n+1}(G_{n-2}, \pi''') = i,$$

i.e., candidates $i \in [2^n]$ and $k \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]$ reach the final round. Moreover, i and k are even numbers, so, by construction, $i \in [2^n]$ wins from $k \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]$ because $i + k$ is also even; see step 3 in the recursive construction of G_n before this theorem. The other three cases are highly similar.

- (1) If $i \in [2^n]$ is an odd number and we want i to be the winner, then select an odd $k \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]$. Now construct π''' as in (4) and (5). Then $w_{n+1}(G_{n-2}, \pi''') = i$.
- (2) If $k \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]$ is an even number and we want k to be the winner, then select an odd $i \in [2^n]$. Now construct π''' as in (4) and (5). Then $w_{n+1}(G_{n-2}, \pi''') = k$.
- (3) If $k \in [2^{n+1}] \setminus [2^n]$ is an odd number and we want k to be the winner, then select an even $i \in [2^n]$. Now construct π''' as in (4) and (5). Then $w_{n+1}(G_{n-2}, \pi''') = k$.

We have therefore shown that, given an appropriate initial order of the candidates, each candidate can win the tournament. \square

The following remark could be seen as an alternative proof of Theorem 1. Interestingly, it gives some additional insight in the case where there are top seeds in the tournament who can only compete in the final round(s) of the tournament.

Remark 1. In this remark, we explicitly construct the initial order or permutation $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi(n)$ that allows a given player $j \in [2^n]$ to win the tournament. This will be done taking into account that the considered majority graph is $G_{n-3} = ([2^n], \vec{E}_n)$.

We will start from the permutations π_1, \dots, π_8 introduced in (3). For $i, j \in [8]$, let $\pi_{i,j}$ be the element in the j -th position of π_i . Divide the set $[2^n]$ into classes $(C_q : q \in [2^{n-3}])$ with eight elements such that $i \in C_q$ if $\lceil \frac{i}{8} \rceil = q$, that is, $[8] = C_1$, $[16] \setminus [8] = C_2$, and so on. We write $i \sim j$ when i and j belong to the same class. We also define $b_j := \lceil \frac{j}{8} \rceil - 1$.

For an even $i \in [2^n]$, we can define the initial order $\hat{\pi}$ such that $w_n(G_{n-3}, \hat{\pi}) = i$ as:

$$\hat{\pi}_\ell := \begin{cases} \pi_{i-8b_\ell, \ell-8b_\ell} + 8b_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \sim i; \\ \pi_{1, \ell-8b_\ell} + 8b_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \not\sim i \text{ with } \ell < i; \\ \pi_{2, \ell-8b_\ell} + 8b_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \not\sim i \text{ with } \ell > i. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Candidate i wins the first three rounds because until the third round, the structure of the majority graph is the same in all classes. Hence, the first line of (6) establishes this result. Moreover, all candidates of the form $8k+1$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and such that $8k+1 < i$, win the first three rounds, see the second line of (6). Finally, all players of the form $8k+2$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and such that $i < 8k+2 \leq 2^n$, win the first three rounds; see the third line of (6). By the definition of G_{n-3} , player i will win, after the third round, challenging all odd j players with $j < i$ and will win against all odd j players with $j > i$. Therefore, player i will be the winner of the tournament.

For an odd $i \in [2^n]$, we can define the initial order $\hat{\pi}$ $w_n(G_{n-3}, \hat{\pi}) = i$ as:

$$\hat{\pi}_\ell := \begin{cases} \pi_{i-8b_\ell, \ell-8b_\ell} + 8b_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \sim i; \\ \pi_{2, \ell-8b_\ell} + 8b_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \not\sim i \text{ with } \ell < i; \\ \pi_{1, \ell-8b_\ell} + 8b_\ell & , \text{ for } \ell \not\sim i \text{ with } \ell > i. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The permutations in (6) and (7) can be seen as compositions of permutations that individually act only on a single class C_q . In fact, since $\lceil \frac{\ell}{8} \rceil = \lceil \frac{\hat{\pi}_\ell}{8} \rceil$, the permutation is such that the class of ℓ is equal to the class of $\hat{\pi}_\ell$.

This fact of preserving the class allows for a simple but interesting observation. Suppose that there are some top-seeded candidates in the tournament who cannot be matched in the first rounds, then we can show that, despite this constraint in the choice of the initial order, any candidate can win the tournament (at least if n is large enough). We present only the case with two top seeds but the general case with 2^t top seeds has a similar solution. For a tournament having 2^n candidates, with $n \geq 4$, we set w.l.o.g. that candidate 1 is the first seed and candidate $(2^{n-1} + 1)$ is the second seed. Taking the initial orders in (6) and (7), we see that $\hat{\pi}_1 \in [8]$ and $\hat{\pi}_{2^{n-1}+1} \in [2^{n-1} + 8] \setminus [2^{n-1}]$; therefore candidates 1 and $(2^{n-1} + 1)$ could only meet in the final round.

4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE VOTING PROFILE

In this section, we construct, in an algorithmic way, a voting profile that generates the majority graph G_n , for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. McGarvey [12] proved that any majority graph can be achieved by a suitable voting profile. Several years later, Stearns [16] proved the same result by improving the number of voters needed to obtain any majority graph. In particular, Stearns shows that $m+2$ voters are sufficient to obtain any given majority graph on a set of m candidates when m is even. He also solved the case of an odd number m of candidates with $m+1$ voters. Erdős and Moser [7] construct an algorithm that, for m candidates, are enough $c_1 m / \log m$ voters to obtain any majority graph, where c_1 is a fixed positive constant. Therefore, the result of Erdős and Moser, at least for large m , uses a smaller number of voters than the one of Stearns. Our problem is related to these constructions, but we are interested only in producing a specific voting profile that generates G_n when there are $m = 2^{n+3}$ candidates competing in a knockout tournament. For the construction of the voting profile R_n that generates G_n we will use the solution

of Stearns [16], Erdős–Moser’s method and Lemma 2 below, which turns out to be a link between [7] and [16].

From now on, for a voting profile R , we will indicate the number of rows of R with $\#R$, i.e. $\#R$ denotes the number of preference lists that form R .

Lemma 2. *Let c be an integer larger than one. Suppose that the finite oriented graphs $(G^{(\ell)} = (V^{(\ell)}, \vec{E}^{(\ell)}) : \ell \in [c])$ have $V^{(i)} \cap V^{(j)} = \emptyset$, for any pair of distinct indices $i, j \in [c]$. Assume that $(R^{(\ell)} : \ell \in [c])$ are voting profiles with $\#R^{(\ell)} = 2r$, an even number, such that $R^{(\ell)}$ generates $G^{(\ell)}$, for each $\ell \in [c]$. Then there exists a voting profile R generating $G := (\bigcup_{\ell=1}^c V^{(\ell)}, \bigcup_{\ell=1}^c \vec{E}^{(\ell)})$ with $\#R = 2r$.*

Proof. We directly define the voting profile R that generates G as follows. For $s \in [2r]$, if s is odd, then the s -th row is defined as the concatenated vector

$$R_{s,\cdot} = (R_{s,\cdot}^{(1)}, R_{s,\cdot}^{(2)}, \dots, R_{s,\cdot}^{(c)});$$

while if s is an even number, then it is defined as

$$R_{s,\cdot} = (R_{s,\cdot}^{(c)}, R_{s,\cdot}^{(c-1)}, \dots, R_{s,\cdot}^{(1)}).$$

Let $i, j \in V^{(\bar{\ell})}$, for $\bar{\ell} \in [c]$. Let $s \in [2r]$, then i precedes j in $R_{s,\cdot}$ if and only if i precedes j in $R_{s,\cdot}^{(\bar{\ell})}$. Therefore, $R_{s,\cdot}$ and $R_{s,\cdot}^{(\bar{\ell})}$ give rise to the same number of votes for i and therefore also for j . Thus, in particular, $R_{s,\cdot}$ and $R_{s,\cdot}^{(\bar{\ell})}$ generate the same arrow between i and j or in both cases it is absent.

Now, let $\ell_1, \ell_2 \in [c]$ with $\ell_1 < \ell_2$. Take $i \in V^{(\ell_1)}$ and $j \in V^{(\ell_2)}$. For any odd $s \in [2r]$, i precedes j in $R_{s,\cdot}$; on the other hand, j precedes i in $R_{s,\cdot}$ for any even $s \in [2r]$. Hence, r times i precedes j and r times j precedes i . Therefore, in this case, the arrow between i and j is absent as requested, indeed, by hypothesis, the oriented graphs $G^{(\ell_1)}$ and $G^{(\ell_2)}$ are not connected. \square

The following remark takes the same framework as in the previous lemma.

Remark 2. Let us consider the same notation as in the previous lemma. We consider the same voting profile R constructed in the previous proof with the same meaning of voting profiles $R^{(1)}, \dots, R^{(c)}$. Let $i, j \in V^{(\ell)}$, for some $\ell \in [c]$. We have already noticed in the proof of Lemma 2 that

$$i \text{ precedes } j \text{ in } R_{s,\cdot} \iff i \text{ precedes } j \text{ in } R_{s,\cdot}^{(\ell)}$$

Then, the number of preference lists of R in which i precedes j is equal to the number of preference lists of $R^{(\ell)}$ in which i precedes j . From the point of view of the challenge between i and j we obtain that i (resp. j) obtains the same number of votes in the challenge between them when the set of candidates is $\bigcup_{r=1}^c V^{(r)}$ (resp. $V^{(\ell)}$) and the voting profile is R (resp. $R^{(\ell)}$).

For the set [8], Stearns’ algorithm [16] allows us to determine a voting profile that generates $G_0 = ([8], \vec{E}_0)$. By direct analysis of all the 28 pairs $\{i, j\}$ with $i \neq j \in [8]$ one can easily check that R_0 generates G_0 . Moreover, in every challenge between two candidates belonging to [8], the winner gets six votes and the loser gets four votes.

$$R_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 8 & 1 & 5 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 6 & 7 \\ 2 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & 5 & 8 \\ 2 & 7 & 3 & 6 & 4 & 5 & 8 & 1 \\ 4 & 1 & 3 & 8 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 2 \\ 3 & 5 & 2 & 6 & 7 & 1 & 4 & 8 \\ 6 & 8 & 4 & 1 & 5 & 7 & 2 & 3 \\ 6 & 7 & 3 & 4 & 8 & 1 & 2 & 5 \\ 8 & 5 & 2 & 7 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 6 \\ 7 & 8 & 5 & 6 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

Now, let us introduce a notation for the construction carried out in the proof of the previous lemma for two graphs only. Let $G^{(1)} = (V^{(1)}, \vec{E}^{(1)})$ and $G^{(2)} = (V^{(2)}, \vec{E}^{(2)})$ be two oriented graphs such that $V^{(1)} \cap V^{(2)} = \emptyset$. Let $R^{(1)}$ (resp. $R^{(2)}$) be a voting profile that generates $G^{(1)}$ (resp. $G^{(2)}$) and such that $\#R^{(1)} = \#R^{(2)} = 2r$, an even number. We now define the voting profile $R^{(1)} \bowtie R^{(2)}$ on the set of candidates (or vertices) $V^{(1)} \cup V^{(2)}$.

For $s \in [2r]$ with s an odd number, the s -th row is the concatenated vector

$$(R^{(1)} \bowtie R^{(2)})_{s,\cdot} = (R_{s,\cdot}^{(1)}, R_{s,\cdot}^{(2)});$$

whereas for an even $s \in [2r]$, the s -th row is

$$(R^{(1)} \bowtie R^{(2)})_{s,\cdot} = (R_{s,\cdot}^{(2)}, R_{s,\cdot}^{(1)}).$$

In particular $\#(R^{(1)} \bowtie R^{(2)}) = \#R^{(1)} = \#R^{(2)} = 2r$.

We also define the matrix $\mathbf{1}$ formed of all ones. When we write $R + 2^n \cdot \mathbf{1}$, we mean that each element of R has been increased by 2^n .

Now we define four vectors associated with the set of candidates $[2^{n+3}]$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^{(n)} &= (u \in [2^{n+2}] : u \text{ is odd}) = (1, 3, \dots, 2^{n+2} - 1), \\ B_1^{(n)} &= (u \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}] : u \text{ is odd}) = (2^{n+2} + 1, 2^{n+2} + 3, \dots, 2^{n+3} - 1), \\ A_2^{(n)} &= (u \in [2^{n+2}] : u \text{ is even}) = (2, 4, \dots, 2^{n+2}), \\ B_2^{(n)} &= (u \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}] : u \text{ is even}) = (2^{n+2} + 2, 2^{n+2} + 4, \dots, 2^{n+3}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the elements of the vectors are in increasing order.

Now, let us define the preference lists on the set of candidates $[2^{n+3}]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{(n)} &= (A_1^{(n)}, B_1^{(n)}, A_2^{(n)}, B_2^{(n)}), \\ v_2^{(n)} &= (\bar{A}_2^{(n)}, \bar{B}_2^{(n)}, \bar{A}_1^{(n)}, \bar{B}_1^{(n)}), \\ v_3^{(n)} &= (B_1^{(n)}, A_2^{(n)}, B_2^{(n)}, A_1^{(n)}), \\ v_4^{(n)} &= (\bar{B}_2^{(n)}, \bar{A}_1^{(n)}, \bar{B}_1^{(n)}, \bar{A}_2^{(n)}). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we recursively define

$$R_n = \left(v_1^{(n)}, v_2^{(n)}, v_3^{(n)}, v_4^{(n)}, [R_{n-1} \bowtie (R_{n-1} + 2^{n+2} \cdot \mathbf{1})] \right)_V.$$

In particular, this construction shows that $\#R_{n+1} = \#R_n + 4$, therefore $\#R_n = 4n + \#R_0 = 4n + 10$. We also define the voting profile \tilde{R}_n that is identical to R_n except for the last row that is deleted. Thus, $\#\tilde{R}_n = 4n + 9$.

Theorem 2. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the voting profile R_n and the voting profile \tilde{R}_n generate $G_n = ([2^{n+3}], \vec{E}_n)$. Moreover, if $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n$ then i precedes j in $(2n + 6)$ preference lists of R_n while j precedes i in $(2n + 4)$ preference lists of R_n .

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction. For $n = 0$, we have already discussed that the voting profile R_0 generates G_0 (see (8)). Consider $G_n = ([2^{n+3}], \vec{E}_n)$. Now, we show that

$$R_n \text{ generates } G_n \implies R_{n+1} \text{ generates } G_{n+1}$$

Consider $G_{n+1} = ([2^{n+4}], \vec{E}_{n+1})$. First we observe that, by applying Lemma 2 of [7], one obtains that $v_1^{(n+1)}, v_2^{(n+1)}$ generate all and only the arrows of \vec{E}_{n+1} pointing from the vertices of $[2^{n+3}]$ to the vertices of $[2^{n+4}] \setminus [2^{n+3}]$, that is, there is an arrow from $i \in [2^{n+3}]$ to $j \in [2^{n+4}] \setminus [2^{n+3}]$ if and only if $i + j$ is even. Similarly, one obtains that $v_3^{(n+1)}, v_4^{(n+1)}$ generate all and only the arrows of \vec{E}_{n+1} pointing from the vertices in $[2^{n+4}] \setminus [2^{n+3}]$ to the vertices in $[2^{n+3}]$.

If we eliminate all the arrows already generated by the first four preference lists, then we get two disconnected oriented graphs that are isomorphic to G_n . The first graph coincides with G_n and the second, called $G'_n = ([2^{4+n}] \setminus [2^{3+n}], \vec{E}'_n)$, is obtained from G_n by mapping any vertex $i \in [2^{3+n}]$ to $i + 2^{n+3}$. Now, by our Lemma 2, one obtains that $[R_n \bowtie (R_n + 2^{n+3} \cdot \mathbf{1})]$ generates all the arrows of the two isomorphic oriented graphs G_n and G'_n .

Now, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and under hypothesis $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n$, we show that i precedes j in $2n + 6$ preference lists of R_n . Let us analyze three possible cases.

- If $i \in [2^{n+2}]$ and $j \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}]$ with $i + j$ even. Then i precedes j in $v_1^{(n)}$ and in $v_2^{(n)}$. The other preference lists of R_n are equally divided between those in which i precedes j and those in which, vice versa, j precedes i .
- If $i \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}]$ and $i \in [2^{n+2}]$, with $i + j$ odd. Then i precedes j in $v_3^{(n)}$ and in $v_4^{(n)}$. The other preference lists of R_n are equally divided between those in which i precedes j and those where, vice versa, j precedes i .
- If both $i, j \in [2^{n+2}]$ or both $i, j \in [2^{n+3}] \setminus [2^{n+2}]$ with $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n$. Then, between $v_1^{(n)}, v_2^{(n)}, v_3^{(n)}$, and $v_4^{(n)}$, there are two preference lists where i precedes j and two preference lists where j precedes i . Clearly, $\# [R_{n-1} \bowtie (R_{n-1} + 2^{n+2} \cdot \mathbf{1})] = 2n + 4$. By Remark 2 and by induction, the preference lists of $[R_{n-1} \bowtie (R_{n-1} + 2^{n+2} \cdot \mathbf{1})]$ in which i precedes j are $(2n + 4)$ while the remaining $(2n + 2)$ preference lists have j preceding i . Therefore, the total number of preference lists where i precedes j are $(2n + 6)$ in R_n .

Now we prove that \tilde{R}_n generates G_n . We have seen that for any $i, j \in [2^{n+3}]$ there is a difference of two preference lists in R_n in favor of the winner of the challenge. Therefore, R_n and \tilde{R}_n give rise to the same result for any challenge. \square

Example 1. We now construct the voting profile R_1 that generates $G_1 = ([2^4], \vec{E}_1)$ starting from R_0 . We recall that

$$R_1 = \left(v_1^{(1)}, v_2^{(1)}, v_3^{(1)}, v_4^{(1)}, [R_0 \bowtie (R_0 + 2^3 \cdot \mathbf{1})] \right)_V.$$

By applying Lemma 2 of [7] to

$$A_1 = (1, 3, 5, 7), B_1 = (9, 11, 13, 15), A_2 = (2, 4, 6, 8), B_2 = (10, 12, 14, 16),$$

one obtains, associated with two voters, the following preference lists

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{(1)} &= (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16) \\ v_2^{(1)} &= (8, 6, 4, 2, 16, 14, 12, 10, 7, 5, 3, 1, 15, 13, 11, 9). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} v_3^{(1)} &= (9, 11, 13, 15, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 1, 3, 5, 7) \\ v_4^{(1)} &= (16, 14, 12, 10, 7, 5, 3, 1, 15, 13, 11, 9, 8, 6, 4, 2). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now, by eliminating from G_1 all the arrows already generated with the first four voters, we obtain two graphs that are isomorphic to G_0 . Hence, by applying our Lemma 2, one can construct the remaining preference lists of ten voters to complete the voting profile. Hence, the voting profile R_1 is formed by the following rows (or preference lists):

$$\begin{aligned} v_1^{(1)} &= (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16) \\ v_2^{(1)} &= (8, 6, 4, 2, 16, 14, 12, 10, 7, 5, 3, 1, 15, 13, 11, 9) \\ v_3^{(1)} &= (9, 11, 13, 15, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 1, 3, 5, 7) \\ v_4^{(1)} &= (16, 14, 12, 10, 7, 5, 3, 1, 15, 13, 11, 9, 8, 6, 4, 2) \\ v_5^{(1)} &= (8, 1, 5, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 16, 9, 13, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15) \\ v_6^{(1)} &= (10, 15, 14, 12, 9, 11, 13, 16, 2, 7, 6, 4, 1, 3, 5, 8) \\ v_7^{(1)} &= (2, 7, 3, 6, 4, 5, 8, 1, 10, 15, 11, 14, 12, 13, 16, 9) \\ v_8^{(1)} &= (12, 9, 11, 16, 13, 14, 15, 10, 4, 1, 3, 8, 5, 6, 7, 2) \\ v_9^{(1)} &= (3, 5, 2, 6, 7, 1, 4, 8, 11, 13, 10, 14, 15, 9, 12, 16) \\ v_{10}^{(1)} &= (14, 16, 12, 9, 13, 15, 10, 11, 6, 8, 4, 1, 5, 7, 2, 3) \\ v_{11}^{(1)} &= (6, 7, 3, 4, 8, 1, 2, 5, 14, 15, 11, 12, 16, 9, 10, 13) \\ v_{12}^{(1)} &= (16, 13, 10, 15, 9, 12, 11, 14, 8, 5, 2, 7, 1, 4, 3, 6) \\ v_{13}^{(1)} &= (7, 8, 5, 6, 3, 4, 1, 2, 15, 16, 13, 14, 11, 12, 9, 10) \\ v_{14}^{(1)} &= (9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) \end{aligned}$$

5. RANDOM SIZE OF THE COMMISSION

In many practical situations, the number of voters is random, such as the viewers of a television program or the electorate in a political election (see, e.g., [8, 9, 3]). In the context of a random number of voters, the Poisson framework has become the natural and standard assumption. In the following, we will make use of the well-known thinning property of the Poisson random variable (see, e.g., [2]).

In the previous section, associated with 2^{n+3} candidates, we have defined the voting profile R_n consisting of $4n + 10$ preference lists, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Now, we assume that the number of voters is a random variable following a Poisson distribution $\text{Poi}(\lambda_n)$, and each voter selects a preference list independently and uniformly at random from R_n . By the thinning property, in this way, we obtain $4n + 10$ independent Poisson distributions with the same expectation $\lambda_n/(4n + 10)$, say $(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)})$, where $W_\ell^{(n)}$ is the number

of voters who have selected the ℓ -th row of R_n . We denote by $\hat{R}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)})$ the random voting profile having $W_\ell^{(n)}$ rows (preference lists) equal to the ℓ -th row of R_n , for every $\ell \in [4n+10]$. The (random) majority graph generated by $\hat{R}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)})$ is denoted by

$$\widehat{G}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)}) = \left([2^{n+3}], \vec{E}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)}) \right).$$

We are interested in understanding when, with high probability, the behavior of the random model will be the same as the deterministic one. Then, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we will study the following events

$$F_n^{(\lambda_n)} = \left\{ \widehat{G}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)}) \neq G_n \right\},$$

where $\sum_{\ell=1}^{4n+10} W_\ell^{(n)} \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda_n)$.

Now we need a little interlude regarding large deviations. Let $X \sim \text{Poi}(\lambda)$ and $Y \sim \text{Poi}(\mu)$ with $\lambda > \mu > 0$. The rate function I_{X-Y} of the r.v. $X - Y$ calculated at zero is

$$I_{X-Y}(0) := \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ -\ln \left(\mathbb{E}(e^{t(X-Y)}) \right) \right\} = \sup_{t \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda + \mu - \lambda e^t - \mu e^{-t} \right\} = \lambda + \mu - 2\sqrt{\lambda\mu}. \quad (13)$$

In the next theorem, we consider 2^{n+3} candidates with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a random number of voters following a Poisson distribution $\text{Poi}(\lambda_n)$, each voter randomly selects a preference list independently and uniformly from R_n . If λ_n is larger than $16(\ln(2) + \epsilon)n^3$, with $\epsilon > 0$, then $\mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)})$ decreases exponentially to zero when n grows to infinity.

We are ready to state the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *Consider the sequence of events $(F_n^{(\lambda_n)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. If*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda_n}{n^3} > 16 \ln 2 \quad (14)$$

then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\ln \mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)})}{n} > 0.$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)}, i.o.) = 0$.

Proof. In the deterministic case the voting profile R_n generates $G_n = ([2^{n+3}], \vec{E}_n)$. We recall that $\#R_n = 4n + 10$. Let $i, j \in [2^{n+3}]$, w.l.o.g., we suppose that $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n$, therefore among the $4n + 10$ preference lists, there are $2n + 6$ preference lists in which i precede j , see Theorem 2. W.l.o.g., we also suppose that the first $2n + 6$ preference lists of R_n are in favor of i , while the remaining $2n + 4$ preference lists are in favor of j .

Let $X^{(n)} := \sum_{k=1}^{2n+6} W_k^{(n)}$ and $Y^{(n)} := \sum_{k=2n+7}^{4n+10} W_k^{(n)}$. Under the previous assumption, $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)})$ if and only if $X^{(n)} - Y^{(n)} > 0$. The random variables $X^{(n)}$ and $Y^{(n)}$ are independent and Poisson-distributed as $\text{Poi}\left(\frac{(2n+6)\lambda_n}{4n+10}\right)$ and $\text{Poi}\left(\frac{(2n+4)\lambda_n}{4n+10}\right)$, respectively.

Then the rate function in (13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} I_{X^{(n)}-Y^{(n)}}(0) &= \lambda_n - 2\sqrt{\left(\frac{\lambda_n}{2} + \frac{\lambda_n}{4n+10}\right)\left(\frac{\lambda_n}{2} - \frac{\lambda_n}{4n+10}\right)} = \lambda_n \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(2n+5)^2}}\right) \\ &= \lambda_n \left(\frac{1}{2(2n+5)^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{(2n+5)^4}\right)\right) > c(2n+5) + O\left(\frac{1}{2n+5}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for some $c > \ln 2$ and n large enough. The last equality follows by Taylor expansion, and the inequality follows by hypothesis in (14).

The random voting profile does not obtain $(i, j) \in \vec{E}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)})$ if and only if $X^{(n)} - Y^{(n)} \leq 0$. Hence, by the Chernoff bound, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((i, j) \notin \vec{E}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)})) &= \mathbb{P}(X^{(n)} \leq Y^{(n)}) \\ &\leq \exp\{-I_{X^{(n)}-Y^{(n)}}(0)\} \leq \exp\left\{-c(2n+5) + O\left(\frac{1}{(2n+5)}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

as before, for some $c > \ln 2$ and n large enough. The number of arrows in \vec{E}_n is $2^{n+2}(2^{n+3} - 1) < 2^{2n+5}$. Therefore, by the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)}) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\hat{R}_n(W_1^{(n)}, \dots, W_{4n+10}^{(n)}) \text{ does not generate } G_n\right) \\ &\leq 2^{2n+5} \exp\left\{-c(2n+5) + O\left(\frac{1}{(2n+5)}\right)\right\} \\ &= \exp\left\{(\ln 2 - c)(2n+5) + O\left(\frac{1}{(2n+5)}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\ln \mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)})}{n} \geq 2(c - \ln 2) > 0$. Hence, there exists a positive constant K such that

$$\mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)}) < K e^{-(c - \ln 2)n},$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By the previous inequality and by the first Borel–Cantelli lemma one has $\mathbb{P}(F_n^{(\lambda_n)}, \text{ i.o.}) = 0$. \square

Remark 3. Theorem 3 claims that the result of the deterministic voting profile and the randomly generated one yield the same majority graph with high probability, when λ_n is large. Therefore, even in the random case, one could predict, with high probability, the outcome of the knockout tournament only by knowing the initial order of the candidates. We also highlight that similar results could be obtained for other distributions through the Chernoff bounds, for instance, for the multinomial distribution. In this last case, the number of voters should be fixed, and the distribution over the preference lists is multinomial with identical class probabilities, again corresponding to uniform selection from the deterministic voting profile R_n .

Example 2. In this example, we determine the values of λ_3 that guarantee $\mathbb{P}(F_3^{(\lambda_3)}) \leq \frac{1}{100}$.

By (13), for $n = 3$, one obtains

$$I_{X-Y}(0) = \lambda_3 \left(1 - \frac{1}{5} \sqrt{24} \right).$$

By the Chernoff bound and the union bound, one has

$$\mathbb{P}(F_3^{(\lambda_3)}) \leq 28 \cdot e^{-I_{X-Y}(0)} = 28 \cdot e^{-\lambda_3(1-\frac{1}{5}\sqrt{24})}.$$

Hence, $\lambda_3 \geq 393.86$ implies $\mathbb{P}(F_3^{(\lambda_3)}) \leq \frac{1}{100}$.

6. CONCLUSION

In this article we have shown that for any knockout tournaments having 2^n candidates, with $n \geq 3$ there exists a voting profile (of a judging commission) that admits any candidate as the winner of the tournament. In fact, all the candidates, under the judgment of the commission, can be the winner of the competition by adjusting the order in which the candidates are initially marked on the board.

We highlight that the majority graphs $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, the voting profiles $(\tilde{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $(\tilde{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and the brackets, necessary to obtain the result, are explicitly constructed, see Theorem 1, Remark 1 and Theorem 2. Moreover, all these constructions require a few steps and could easily be implemented into an actual program on a computer. Note that the voting profile \tilde{R}_{n-3} , acting on the set of candidates $[2^n]$ has $\#\tilde{R}_{n-3} = 4n - 3$, which means that the size of the commission increases logarithmically with the number of the candidates present in the knockout tournament.

In the previous section, we face the same problem but in the framework of a Poisson random number of voters. By Chernoff bounds we obtain that the behavior of the deterministic and the random voting profile is, with high probability, the same if the expected value of the number of voters is larger than Cn^3 , with $C > 16 \ln 2$, see Theorem 3.

As already noted, all these results can be achieved in a simple way. In any case, it seems quite unnatural that a single voter could order a huge number of candidates. For this reason we think that, in future work, it could be considered that each preference list does not mention the candidates that it ranks, in its opinion, after the k -th position.

All these models are potentially interesting for establishing how much, in real life, different tournaments could be manipulated just by deciding the initial position of the candidates.

Another interesting problem could be to see if in a single elimination tournament all pairs of candidates can be determined as finalists.

Finally, we mention that the majority graph can also be associated with sets of random variables, see e.g. [13, 17, 15]. Recently, it was shown that the restricted and particular class of hitting times for Markov chains is a class able to obtain any majority graph; see [4]. Furthermore, in the scientific literature, the concept of majority graph has been generalized to ranking pattern that is the collection of all the ranking for all the candidates in A , where A is a subset of the set of all the candidates $[m]$. In this context, it was also proved that any ranking pattern can be achieved using a single voting profile; see [5, 6, 14]. This last result could be useful for studying non-knockout tournaments and trying to see if they can be manipulated.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Aziz, S. Gaspers, S. Mackenzie, N. Mattei, P. Stursberg, and T. Walsh. Fixing balanced knockout and double elimination tournaments. *Artificial Intelligence*, 262:1–14, 2018.
- [2] P. Brémaud. *Markov chains—Gibbs fields, Monte Carlo simulation and queues*, volume 31 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2020. Second edition [of 1689633].
- [3] R. Cominetti, M. Scarsini, M. Schröder, and N. Stier-Moses. Approximation and convergence of large atomic congestion games. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 48(2):784–811, 2023.
- [4] E. De Santis. Ranking graphs through hitting times of Markov chains. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 59(2):189–203, 2021.
- [5] E. De Santis and F. Spizzichino. Construction of aggregation paradoxes through load-sharing models. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 55(1):223–244, 2023.
- [6] E. De Santis and F. Spizzichino. Construction of voting situations concordant with ranking patterns. *Decis. Econ. Finance*, 46(1):129–156, 2023.
- [7] P. Erdős and L. Moser. On the representation of directed graphs as unions of orderings. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 9:125–132, 1964.
- [8] T. J. Feddersen and W. Pesendorfer. Abstention in elections with asymmetric information and diverse preferences. *American Political science review*, 93(2):381–398, 1999.
- [9] M. Makris. Complementarities and macroeconomics: Poisson games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 62(1):180–189, 2008.
- [10] P. Manurangsi and W. Suksompong. Fixing knockout tournaments with seeds. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 339:21–35, 2023.
- [11] E. Marchand. On the comparison between standard and random knockout tournaments. *The Statistician*, 51(2):169–178, 2002.
- [12] D. C. McGarvey. A theorem on the construction of voting paradoxes. *Econometrica*, 21:608–610, 1953.
- [13] I. Montes, M. Rademaker, R. Pérez-Fernández, and B. De Baets. A correspondence between voting procedures and stochastic orderings. *European J. Oper. Res.*, 285(3):977–987, 2020.
- [14] D. G. Saari. A dictionary for voting paradoxes. *J. Econom. Theory*, 48(2):443–475, 1989.
- [15] A. Sah and M. Sawhney. The intransitive dice kernel: $\frac{1_{x>y}-1_{x<y}}{4} - \frac{3(x-y)(1+xy)}{8}$. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 189(3-4):1073–1128, 2024.
- [16] R. Stearns. The voting problem. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 66:761–763, 1959.
- [17] H. Steinhaus and S. Trybula. On a paradox in applied probabilities. *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci*, 7(67-69):108, 1959.

KERMIT, DEPARTMENT OF DATA ANALYSIS AND MATHEMATICAL MODELLING, GHENT UNIVERSITY, COUPURE LINKS 635, GHENT 9000, BELGIUM

Email address: `bernard.debaets@ugent.be`

SAPIENZA UNIVERSITY OF ROME, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS PIAZZALE ALDO MORO, 5, 00185, ROME, ITALY

Email address: `desantis@mat.uniroma1.it`