

A composition of Condorcet domains

Dominic Keehan and Arkadii Slinko

Abstract

Inspecting known maximal Condorcet domains on 4 variables classified by Dittrich [2016] we find that 9 out of 18 of them are created using a certain composition of smaller domains. In this paper we describe this composition. We give sufficient conditions for the composition of two Condorcet domain to be a maximal Condorcet domain.

1 The composition \diamond

Let \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 be two domains of linear orders on sets $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\{2, \dots, n\}$ of alternatives, respectively. Then we define the nl -composition (*never-last composition*) of these domains as

$$\mathcal{D}_1 \diamond \mathcal{D}_2 = \{un \mid u \in \mathcal{D}_1\} \cup \{v1 \mid v \in \mathcal{D}_2\}.$$

Graphically this domain can be displayed as

$$\mathcal{D}_1 \diamond \mathcal{D}_2 = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} \mathcal{D}_1(1, \dots, n-1) & & & & \mathcal{D}_2(2, \dots, n) & & & & \\ n & n & \dots & n & n & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right],$$

where linear orders of the domain are displayed as columns.

We immediately see that some small domains are nl -compositions. For example, the unique domain $(1) \star (2) = \{12, 21\}$ (notation from Danilov and Koshevoy [2013]) can also be written as $(1) \diamond (2)$. There are three maximal domains on three alternatives

$$\mathcal{D}_{3,1} = \{123, 312, 132, 321\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{3,2} = \{123, 231, 132, 321\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_{3,3} = \{123, 213, 231, 321\}.$$

among which one is completely reducible using never-last joins, namely

$$\mathcal{D}_{3,3}(1, 2, 3) = ((1) \diamond (2)) \diamond ((2) \diamond (3)),$$

where (i) is a trivial linear order on the set of a single alternative i .

As was demonstrated in Slinko [2019] Arrow's single-peaked domain is always an nl -decomposition of two smaller Arrow's single-peaked domains. But as we will see the use of this construction is not restricted to Arrow's single-peaked domains.

Here we try to answer the following question: Can this composition help us to construct new maximal Condorcet domains and which domains it is possible to combine to obtain a new maximal Condorcet domain? To answer we need to introduce the following concept.

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{D} be a Condorcet domain. We say that in a linear order $w = \dots bc \dots a \dots \in \mathcal{D}$ alternative a is a right obstruction to the swap $bc \rightarrow cb$, if cba cannot be potentially in the restriction $\mathcal{D}|_{\{a,b,c\}}$ of \mathcal{D} onto $\{a, b, c\}$, that is the domain $\mathcal{D}|_{\{a,b,c\}} \cup \{cba\}$ is not Condorcet.

Proposition 1. Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A)$ be a Condorcet domain and $a, b, c \in A$. An alternative a is a right obstruction to the swap $bc \rightarrow cb$ if and only if $\mathcal{D}|_{\{a,b,c\}}$ satisfies either $cN_{\{a,b,c\}}1$ or $bN_{\{a,b,c\}}2$ (or both) and no other never condition.

Proof. If we allow bca but not cba in $\mathcal{D}|_{\{a,b,c\}}$ overall we might have four more linear orders listed as columns of the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} b & b & a & a & c \\ c & a & b & c & a \\ a & c & c & b & b \end{bmatrix}$$

Only the third and the fifth column being removed give us a Condorcet domain. These domains satisfy $cN_{\{a,b,c\}}1$ or $bN_{\{a,b,c\}}2$, respectively. Either of the two preclude order cba . \square

Theorem 1. If \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are Condorcet domains on $[n-1]$ and $[n] \setminus \{1\}$, respectively, such that $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{D}_1)_{-(n-1)} \cup (\mathcal{D}_2)_{-1}$ is also Condorcet. Suppose n is not a right obstruction in \mathcal{D}_2 and 1 is not a right obstruction in \mathcal{D}_1 . Then $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \diamond \mathcal{D}_2$ is also a Condorcet domain. Moreover, if \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are maximal and ample, then \mathcal{D} is also maximal and ample. If \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are copious, then \mathcal{D} is copious as well.

Proof. Let us prove \mathcal{D} is Condorcet. Let $i, j, k \in [n] \setminus \{1, n\}$. Then $\mathcal{D}|_{\{i,j,k\}}$ is Condorcet as \mathcal{E} is. If $i, j \in [n] \setminus \{1, n\}$, consider the triple $\{i, j, n\}$. Since n is not a right obstruction to both swaps $ij \rightarrow ji$ and $ji \rightarrow ij$ in \mathcal{D}_2 we have ijn and jin compatible with $\mathcal{D}_2|_{\{i,j,n\}}$, that is $\mathcal{D}_2|_{\{i,j,n\}} \cup \{ijn, jin\}$ is Condorcet. However, only these two orders can be additionally added from \mathcal{D}_1 with n at the bottom, that is $\mathcal{D}|_{\{i,j,n\}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2|_{\{i,j,n\}} \cup \{ijn, jin\}$ is Condorcet. If $i \in [n] \setminus \{1, n\}$, then the triple $\{1, i, n\}$ is Condorcet since it satisfies $iN_{\{1,i,n\}}3$.

If \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are maximal, we cannot add to \mathcal{D} an order ending with 1 or n . Let $1 < j < n$. Then due to ampleness of \mathcal{D}_1 orders $1jn, j1n$ are contained in \mathcal{D} and due to ampleness of \mathcal{D}_2 orders $jn1, nj1$ are contained in \mathcal{D} , hence \mathcal{D} is copious and satisfies $jN_{\{1,j,n\}}3$. Hence adding to \mathcal{D} an order with j as its last alternative, would violate $iN_{\{1,i,n\}}3$.

Suppose \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are copious. If $\{i, j, k\} \subset [n-1]$, then $|\mathcal{D}|_{\{i,j,k\}}| = 4$ as \mathcal{D}_1 is copious. Similarly, $|\mathcal{D}|_{\{i,j,k\}}| = 4$ if $\{i, j, k\} \subset [n] \setminus \{1\}$. If $\{i, j, k\} \supset \{1, n\}$, then $|\mathcal{D}|_{\{i,j,k\}}| = 4$ as we have seen already. This proves the theorem. \square

This theorem gives us only a sufficient set of conditions. As we will see the nl -composition can be maximal without \mathcal{D}_1 or \mathcal{D}_2 being maximal. This, in particular, means that nl -joins construction does not always produce a Condorcet domain.

2 Domains on four alternatives obtained by never-last joins

We illustrate the result using the classification by Dittrich [2016], this paper will be referred as TD. He determined all 18 maximal Condorcet domains on four alternatives up to an isomorphism and flip-isomorphism. Using the order given by Table 2 in their paper we denote those maximal domains as $\mathcal{D}_{4,1}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{4,18}$. We will show that nine out of 18 domains in that list are obtained by using *nl*-composition. These domains are: $\mathcal{D}_{4,4}$ (The Single Peaked); $\mathcal{D}_{4,5}$ (The Crab); $\mathcal{D}_{4,6}$ (The Sun); $\mathcal{D}_{4,7}$ (The Half-Crab-Half-Sun); $\mathcal{D}_{4,11}$ (Boring I), $\mathcal{D}_{4,16}$ (Boring VI), $\mathcal{D}_{4,17}$ (Boring VII); $\mathcal{D}_{4,2}$ (The Snake); $\mathcal{D}_{4,3}$ (The Broken Snake).¹

Example 1 (The Single-peaked in TD). *Let us consider a unique maximal single-peaked domain $\mathcal{SP}(\triangleleft, A)$ on four alternatives with $A = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ relative to spectrum $1 \triangleleft 2 \triangleleft 3 \triangleleft 4$:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 3 \\ 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

whose graph is presented on Figure 1.




Figure 1: Graph of the single-peaked domain $\mathcal{SP}(\triangleleft, A)$ on four alternatives

We have $\mathcal{SP}(\triangleleft, A) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$, where

$$\mathcal{N} = \{bN_{\{a,b,c\}}\mathfrak{3}, bN_{\{a,b,d\}}\mathfrak{3}, cN_{\{a,c,d\}}\mathfrak{3}, cN_{\{b,c,d\}}\mathfrak{3}\}.$$

This domain will also be denoted as $\mathcal{D}_{4,1}$. We have

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,4} = \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(1, 2, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(2, 3, 4).$$

Example 2 (The Crab in TD). *Let us consider an Arrow's single-peaked maximal Condorcet domain $\mathcal{D}_{4,5}$ on four alternatives:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 2 \\ 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

¹The names of the domains are far from being optimal.

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,5} = \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(1, 2, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(3, 2, 4).$$

whose graph is presented on Figure 2. We have $\mathcal{D}_{4,2} = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$, where

$$\mathcal{N} = \{2N_{\{1,2,3\}}3, 2N_{\{1,2,4\}}3, 3N_{\{1,3,4\}}3, 2N_{\{2,3,4\}}3\}$$

and $\mathcal{D}_{4,2}$ is copious. This domain is not single-peaked (for example, because it does not have two completely reversed orders).




Figure 2: Graph of an Arrow's single-peaked domain $\mathcal{D}_{4,5}$.

Example 3 (The Sun in TD). *Let us consider the following maximal Condorcet domain on four alternatives:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

It is defined by the following complete set of never-conditions:

$$1N_{\{1,2,3\}}1, \quad 2N_{\{1,2,4\}}3, \quad 3N_{\{1,3,4\}}3, \quad 4N_{\{2,3,4\}}1.$$

It is copious but does not have maximal width. The median graph of this domain is here:




Figure 3: Graph of $\mathcal{D}_{4,6}$.

In terms of nl-joins

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,6} = \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 1, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 4, 3).$$

Example 4 (Half Crab half Sun domain in TD). *Let us consider the following maximal Condorcet domain on four alternatives:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

It is defined by the following complete set of never-conditions:

$$3N_{\{1,2,3\}}1, \quad 1N_{\{1,2,4\}}3, \quad 1N_{\{1,3,4\}}3, \quad 2N_{\{2,3,4\}}3.$$

It is copious but does not have maximal width.




Figure 4: Graph of $\mathcal{D}_{4,7}$.

In terms of nl-joins

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,7} = \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 1, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 3, 4).$$

Example 5 (Boring I in TD). *Let us consider the following maximal Condorcet domain for $m = 4$ alternatives:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

which satisfies never-conditions

$$2N_{\{1,2,3\}}3, \quad 2N_{\{1,2,4\}}3, \quad 3N_{\{1,3,4\}}3, \quad 4N_{\{2,3,4\}}2.$$

In terms of nl-joins

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,11} = \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(1, 2, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,2}(4, 2, 3).$$

Figure 5 shows the graph of this domain.




Figure 5: Graph of $\mathcal{D}_{4,11}$.

Example 6 (Boring VI in TD). *Let us consider the following maximal Condorcet domain for $m = 4$ alternatives:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 2 \\ 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

which satisfies never-conditions

$$1N_{\{1,2,3\}}2, \quad 2N_{\{1,2,4\}}3, \quad 3N_{\{1,3,4\}}3, \quad 4N_{\{2,3,4\}}2.$$

Figure 6 shows the median graph of the domain. In terms of nl-joins

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,16} = \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(1, 2, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,2}(4, 2, 3).$$




Figure 6: Graph of $\mathcal{D}_{4,16}$.

Example 7 (Boring VII in TD). *Let us consider the following maximal Condorcet domain for $m = 4$ alternatives:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 4 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ 3 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

which satisfies never-conditions

$$1N_{\{1,2,3\}}1, \quad 2N_{\{1,2,4\}}3, \quad 3N_{\{1,3,4\}}3, \quad 4N_{\{2,3,4\}}2.$$

Figure 7 shows the median graph of the domain. In terms of nl -joins

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,17} = \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 1, 3) \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,2}(4, 2, 3).$$

Figure 7 shows the median graph of the domain. In terms of nl -joins




Figure 7: Graph of $\mathcal{D}_{4,17}$.

However, the converse of Theorem 1 is not correct as the following example shows.

Example 8 (The snake in TD). *Let us consider a single-crossing maximal domain $\mathcal{D}_{4,2}$ whose orders are represented as columns of the following matrix*

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|cccc} 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ 3 & 3 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

We see that

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,2} = \mathcal{E} \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 3, 4),$$

where $\mathcal{E} = \{123, 213, 231\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{3,3}(1, 2, 3) \cap \mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 3, 1)$. and \mathcal{D}_1 is not maximal. This happens due to 4 being an obstruction to swap $23 \rightarrow 32$ in $\mathcal{D}_{3,1}(2, 3, 4)$ hence we cannot add order 321 or 132 to \mathcal{D}_1 to make it maximal.

The graph of the single-crossing domain is a line graph shown on a Figure 8.



Figure 8: Graph of single-crossing domain SC_4 on four alternatives

One other such example.

Example 9 (The broken snake in TD). *Let us consider the maximal domain $\mathcal{D}_{4,3}$ whose orders are represented as columns of the following matrix*

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|cccc} 1 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

We see that

$$\mathcal{D}_{4,3} = \mathcal{E} \diamond \mathcal{D}_{3,2}(3, 2, 4),$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = \{132, 312, 321\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_2 = \{123, 132, 231, 321\}.$$

and \mathcal{E} is not maximal. This happens due to 4 being an obstruction to swap $32 \rightarrow 23$ in $\mathcal{D}_{3,2}(3, 2, 4)$ hence we cannot add order 123 or 231 to \mathcal{E} to make it maximal.




Figure 9: Graph of $\mathcal{D}_{4,3}$.

References

- V.I. Danilov and G.A. Koshevoy. Maximal Condorcet domains. *Order*, 30(1):181–194, 2013.
- T. Dittrich. All Condorcet domains on $n \leq 4$ alternatives. Technical report, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, 2016.

- C. Puppe and A. Slinko. Condorcet domains, median graphs and the single-crossing property. *Economic Theory*, 67(1):285–318, 2019.
- A. Slinko. Condorcet domains satisfying Arrow’s single-peakedness. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 84:166–175, 2019.