

A comparative analysis of rank aggregation methods for the partial label ranking problem

 Jiayi Wang^{1,2*},  Juan C. Alfaro^{3,4} and  Viktor Bengs^{1,2}

¹Chair of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning,
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, 80799, Germany.

²Munich Center for Machine Learning, Munich, Germany.

³Departamento de Tecnologías y Sistemas de la Información, Universidad
de Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, 13071, Spain.

⁴Laboratorio de Sistemas Inteligentes y Minería de Datos, Universidad de
Castilla-La Mancha, Albacete, 02071, Spain.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): Jiayi.Wang@campus.lmu.de;
Contributing authors: JuanCarlos.Alfaro@uclm.es; Viktor.Bengs@ifi.lmu.de;

Abstract

The *label ranking* problem is a supervised learning scenario in which the learner predicts a *total order* of the class labels for a given input instance. Recently, research has increasingly focused on the *partial label ranking* problem, a generalization of the label ranking problem that allows *ties* in the predicted orders. So far, most existing learning approaches for the partial label ranking problem rely on approximation algorithms for rank aggregation in the final prediction step. This paper explores several alternative aggregation methods for this critical step, including scoring-based and probabilistic-based rank aggregation approaches. To enhance their suitability for the more general partial label ranking problem, the investigated methods are extended to increase the likelihood of producing ties. Experimental evaluations on standard benchmarks demonstrate that scoring-based variants consistently outperform the current state-of-the-art method in handling incomplete information. In contrast, probabilistic-based variants fail to achieve competitive performance.

Keywords: Preference learning, Optimal bucket order problem, Rank aggregation problem, Label ranking problem, Partial label ranking problem

1 Introduction

The rapid proliferation of *large language models* has significantly heightened interest in *preference learning*. This field explores preference information in various forms, including *absolute* nature such as utility scores, binary, or ordinal data, as well as *relative* nature like total orders, top-k lists, or partial orders. This attentiveness arises from the significant contributions of preference learning techniques to optimizing the fine-tuning process of large language models, as discussed in recent surveys on the subject by Kaufmann et al. (2024). This renewed interest encompasses a broad range of topics, from fundamental areas such as *statistical preference models* (Firth et al., 2019; Henderson, 2024) to advanced domains like *preference-based bandits* (Bengs et al., 2021) or *preference-based reinforcement learning* (Wirth et al., 2017).

Another important area within this range is *label ranking*, which focuses on the instance-dependent prediction of *total orders* over a set of predefined class labels (Hüllermeier et al., 2008). For example, consider predicting the order of movies (class labels) based on their popularity for a specific user (instance). The learner’s objective is to learn a mapping from the user’s features to a total order over the available movies, ensuring alignment with the user’s preferences.

Although there is extensive literature on this learning problem, its applicability to real-world scenarios remains limited. For example, when predicting movie popularity, label ranking methods inherently produce a total ordering of movies. However, it is questionable whether every user can consistently classify each pair of movies as being either more or less preferred. This limitation is not restricted to typical recommendation system domains like movies or music; it also arises in broader scenarios involving human preferences. A notable example is the preferences among different responses generated by a large language model to a user’s prompt.

A straightforward solution to the problem of predicting a total order is introducing a third type of relation between class labels: *equally preferred*. This concept is central to the *partial label ranking* problem, which employs a *bucket order* as its prediction object instead of total orders (Alfaro et al., 2021a; Alfaro et al., 2023a). In a bucket order, class labels can be partially ordered, with one or more class labels grouped into a *bucket* to represent *equal preference*.

In the label ranking problem, as in the example above, the learning process typically emphasizes the relationships between pairs of class labels. Specifically, the pairwise probability that one label is more or less preferred than another often serves as the learning objective in many partial label ranking methods. These pairwise probabilities must then be aggregated into a well-defined prediction object, either a total or bucket order. This distinction represents the primary difference between most label ranking approaches and the more general partial label ranking problem. The transformation is achieved through *rank aggregation* methods, which have a long tradition in preference learning and offer a range of established techniques to perform this task effectively.

Interestingly, the variety of aggregation methods employed in partial label ranking remains limited, primarily relying on the *optimal bucket order* problem (Aledo et al., 2017, 2019). The optimal bucket order problem is a generalization of the *Kemeny consensus*, widely used in label ranking problems (Kemeny, 1959). This reliance is surprising because both are NP-hard problems, often requiring complex approximation

techniques. Naturally, this complexity influences the learning and inference processes of all methods built around these rank aggregation approaches.

This paper aims to reintroduce various rank aggregation methods to the research community, as outlined in Section 4, and systematically assess their suitability for partial label ranking problems. The range of methods investigated spans from simple, *scoring-based* approaches to more advanced, *probabilistic-based* methods. A key contribution of this work is adapting certain ranking aggregation methods to address partial label ranking scenarios effectively. Our experimental evaluation, presented in Section 5 and conducted using standard benchmarks, reveals that scoring-based variants generally outperform the current state-of-the-art when dealing with incomplete information. In contrast, probabilistic-based methods are found to be less competitive. As a side product, we also propose a technique to obtain suitable hyperparameters for the extensions of the suggested simple aggregation methods based on metadata of the dataset. The paper begins with a brief review of related literature in the next section, followed by a concise introduction to the basics of the partial label ranking problem in Section 3.

2 Related work

Rank aggregation is undoubtedly one of the most prevalent yet perhaps one of the most underappreciated topics in preference learning. Its ubiquity stems from its foundational role, as many concepts and techniques of rank aggregation are integral to framing either the learning problem or the learning methodology across all areas of preference learning. This importance is somewhat analogous to measures of central tendency in classical probability theory, where measures like the mean or expected value serve as core principles. Moreover, rank aggregation is critical in numerous machine learning problems, often without being the primary focus, despite its fundamental impact on the overall learning framework.

Similar to how the mean or expected value often serves as a gold standard in classical probability theory, the Kemeny consensus plays a similar role in learning problems involving preferences without ties (Brinker & Hüllermeier, 2006; Jiao et al., 2016; Korba et al., 2018). When ties are permitted, the optimal bucket order problem becomes the corresponding standard, as it remains the primary rank aggregation problem used for partial label ranking algorithms (Alfaro et al., 2021a, 2021b; Alfaro et al., 2023a, 2023b, 2023c), except for the approach by Thies et al. (2024). This preference for the optimal bucket order problem and the Kemeny consensus largely stems from their natural definitions: both aim to identify the object, whether a total order or bucket order, that minimizes the distance to the underlying data among all possible objects.

However, this straightforward formulation has a significant drawback: computing a Kemeny consensus is NP-hard (Bartholdi et al., 1989), as is solving the optimal bucket order problem (Lorena et al., 2021). To address these computational challenges, several approximation algorithms have been developed (Aledo et al., 2017, 2019, 2021). An alternative strand of research in preference learning investigates the use of other aggregation methods for the underlying learning problem (Bengs et al., 2021; Hüllermeier & Słowiński, 2024). These methods generally fall into two categories:

- *Scoring-based* approaches, such as the *Borda* method (Black, 1976) or *Copeland* scores (Copeland, 1951).
- *Probabilistic-based* approaches, which include *parametric* approaches like *maximum likelihood estimator* or *Bayes estimator* of an assumed parametric probabilistic model (Cheng et al., 2010), as well as *non-parametric* methods such as *Markov chain-based* approaches (Dwork et al., 2001) or modified *von-Neumann winner* concepts (Dudík et al., 2015).

Recently, two approaches, both with label ranking as the main application, were suggested that do not belong in one of the two categories above: Adam et al. (2024) used imprecise probabilities as the main mathematical tool for rank aggregation, while Zhou et al. (2024) considered heuristic search methods for that purpose.

3 Preliminaries

This section provides an overview of the foundational framework for the partial label ranking problem, introducing key concepts such as rankings and the optimal bucket order problem.

3.1 Ranking

A *ranking* represents a *preference relation* among a set of items $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Following standard conventions in preference learning, the pairwise preference relations between two items $u, v \in \mathcal{I}$ are denoted as $u \succ v$ if u is preferred over v , $u \prec v$ if v is preferred over u , and $u \sim v$ if there is no preference between u and v .

Rankings can be distinguished along two important dimensions: *completeness* and the *presence of ties*. Regarding completeness, a ranking can be categorized as either *complete* or *incomplete*, depending on whether a preference relation exists for each pair of items $u, v \in \mathcal{I}$. Similarly, concerning the presence of ties, rankings can be categorized as either *with* or *without ties*.

A complete ranking with ties is represented by a *bucket order*. A bucket order \mathcal{B} over \mathcal{I} is defined as an ordering of k disjoint subsets $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$, referred to as *buckets*, where $1 \leq k \leq n$ and $\cup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{I}$. The notations $\succ_{\mathcal{B}}$, $\prec_{\mathcal{B}}$, and $\sim_{\mathcal{B}}$ are used to describe the preference relations between buckets. Specifically, for two buckets $\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{B}_j \in \mathcal{B}$, the notation $\mathcal{B}_i \succ_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{B}_j$ indicates that \mathcal{B}_i precedes \mathcal{B}_j in the bucket order \mathcal{B} .

The characteristics of a bucket order can facilitate the determination of pairwise preference relations. For $u \in \mathcal{B}_i$, the bucket \mathcal{B}_i is referred to as the bucket of u . Within each bucket \mathcal{B}_i , all items are assumed to be *tied* or *incomparable*, expressed as $u \sim v$ for $u, v \in \mathcal{B}_i$. Consequently, given $u \in \mathcal{B}_i$ and $v \in \mathcal{B}_j$, with $\mathcal{B}_i \succ_{\mathcal{B}} \mathcal{B}_j$, it follows that $u \succ v$.

3.2 Optimal bucket order problem

Let us introduce some concepts before delving into the *optimal bucket order* problem. A *bucket matrix* B is an $n \times n$ square matrix associated with a bucket order \mathcal{B} . Each entry $B(u, v)$, for $u, v \in \mathcal{I}$, is defined based on the preference relation in \mathcal{B} as follows: $B(u, v) = 1$ if $u \succ_{\mathcal{B}} v$, $B(u, v) = 0.5$ if $u \sim_{\mathcal{B}} v$, and $B(u, v) = 0$ if $u \prec_{\mathcal{B}} v$.

A *pair order matrix* C is an $n \times n$ square matrix used to represent *pairwise preference relations* numerically. For items $u, v \in \mathcal{I}$, the entry $C(u, v)$ quantifies the probability of $u \succ v$, where $C(u, v) \in [0, 1]$. This pairwise relation adheres to *symmetry* and *reflexivity* properties: for all $u, v \in \mathcal{I}$ with $u \neq v$, $C(u, v) + C(v, u) = 1$, and $C(u, u) = 0.5$.

The pairwise order matrix encodes pairwise preferences, each of which being an intuitive and obvious prediction object. However, the entire pairwise order matrix does not directly correspond to a bucket order over all items and, therefore, is not readily usable for predictions in the partial label ranking problem. To address this, a *rank aggregation* problem must be solved to transform the pair order matrix into a *consensus bucket order*. The most prominent solution methods consider the *optimal bucket order* problem.

In the optimal bucket order problem, the objective is to compute the bucket matrix B that best captures the data represented in the pair order matrix C ; in other words, to find a bucket matrix B that is closest to the pair order matrix C . Formally, given a pair order matrix C , the goal is to find a bucket matrix B which minimizes the L^1 distance $D(B, C)$ between them. This distance is defined as:

$$D(B, C) = \sum_{u, v \in \mathcal{I}} |B(u, v) - C(u, v)|.$$

Since the optimal bucket order problem is NP-hard, several approximation methods have been proposed to tackle it (Aledo et al., 2017, 2019, 2021; Gionis et al., 2006; Ukkonen et al., 2009). A foundational approach is the *bucket pivot* algorithm (Gionis et al., 2006; Ukkonen et al., 2009). Building on this method, Aledo et al. (2017) proposed the *least indecision assumption* algorithm. This approach refines the pivot selection by choosing the item in \mathcal{I} with the lowest degree of imprecision and incorporates enhancements such as *two-stage* and *multi-pivot* strategies. This technique has become the current state-of-the-art method for the optimal bucket order problem, striking a balance between accuracy and computational efficiency, with a complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$.

3.3 Partial label ranking problem

The *partial label ranking* problem can be framed as a *non-standard supervised classification* problem, in which a *preference model* is trained on a labeled dataset and subsequently used to map instances to bucket orders (Vembu & Gärtner, 2010). Fig. 1 illustrates the complete learning and inference process in the partial label ranking problem.

In the initial phase, a training dataset is provided, typically collected by asking individuals to rank a set of items based on specific, predefined criteria. Each instance in this dataset represents a distinct entity characterized by a set of attributes. Alongside these attributes, each instance conveys a preference for the items, expressed as a (possibly incomplete) ranking with ties. In the next step, a partial label ranking algorithm is selected to train a preference model, referred to as a *partial label ranker*. Given an input instance, this preference model predicts a pair order matrix, which is then processed by a rank aggregation algorithm. This produces the consensus bucket order, which serves as the prediction and constitutes the final step in the inference phase.




Fig. 1 Example of the complete learning and inference process in the partial label ranking problem

In the existing partial label ranking literature, the optimal bucket order problem is typically solved to obtain the consensus bucket order. For this purpose, the current state-of-the-art method, as described in Section 3.2, is employed. Consequently, this algorithm is used as a baseline for comparing the performance of alternative aggregation techniques.

Formally, the partial label ranking problem involves a finite set of n items to be ranked $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a set of N training pairs $\mathcal{D} = \{(x^i, \pi^i)\}_{i=1}^N \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\geq, \text{inc}}$. Here, \mathcal{X} denotes the instance space (typically a subset of \mathbb{R}^m) and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{I}}^{\geq, \text{inc}}$ denotes the set of (possibly incomplete) partial rankings defined over \mathcal{I} . Each pair $(x^i, \pi^i) \in \mathcal{D}$, consists of a configuration of values over m predictive features, i.e., $x^i = (x_1^i, \dots, x_m^i)$, and a (possibly incomplete) ranking with ties of the values in \mathcal{I} , i.e., π^i . Given these, a partial label ranking algorithm learns a preference model, which is then utilized to assign a bucket order \mathcal{B} to any input instance $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

4 Alternative rank aggregation algorithms

This section explores alternative rank aggregation methods designed to address the partial label ranking problem, providing different approaches to enhance the prediction of consensus bucket orders.

4.1 Scoring-based

In *scoring-based* aggregation algorithms, the primary focus is on the values within the given pair order matrix C . Specifically, a scoring function $S : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ assigns a score $S(u)$ to each item u . For most scoring functions, the score $S(u)$ is a value that depends on the pairwise preference relations between an item u and every other item in \mathcal{I} .

Once the scores for each item have been calculated, the items are ranked according to their respective scores, following a clear value-based ranking criterion. Items are ranked in decreasing order of their scores. For instance, if the score of one item u is larger than that of another item v , i.e., $S(u) > S(v)$, then u is ranked ahead of v , i.e., $u \succ v$. On the other hand, if the values are the same, i.e., $S(u) = S(v)$, then u and v are considered tied, i.e., $u \sim v$, and are placed in the same bucket within the bucket

order. The value-based ranking criteria are precise, ensuring no ambiguous rankings and guaranteeing that a bucket order is always present in the results.

Scoring-based aggregation algorithms are often preferred for rank aggregation due to their ability to balance accuracy and computational efficiency. Next, we describe two well-known scoring-based aggregation algorithms: *Copeland* and *Borda*.

Copeland

The *Copeland* aggregation algorithm (also known as *Copeland ranking*) defines its scoring function S based on the total number of wins for each item in pairwise comparisons (Copeland, 1951). Specifically, an item u receives one point for winning a pairwise comparison against v if $C(u, v) > 0.5$. Nevertheless, a key drawback of this approach is that it does not account for the margin of victory. To be more precise, even when $C(u, v) - C(v, u) \approx \epsilon$ for a small $\epsilon > 0$, u still receives a full point for winning over v .

To address this issue, we introduce a hyperparameter $\beta \geq 0$ to control the threshold for determining a clear winner. Algorithm A.1 provides a detailed step-by-step procedure for implementing this adaptation of the Copeland aggregation method. With the introduction of β , u earns one point for winning a pairwise comparison against v only if $C(u, v) > 0.5 + \beta$. In cases where the scores are very close, resulting a draw within the range $0.5 - \beta \leq C(u, v) \leq 0.5 + \beta$, u earns half a point. Conversely, u receives no points if $C(u, v) < 0.5 - \beta$.

Formally, the scoring function S for an item u in our adaptation of the Copeland algorithm is computed as:

$$S(u) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}: v \neq u} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C(u, v) > 0.5 + \beta, \\ 0.5 & \text{if } 0.5 + \beta \geq C(u, v) \geq 0.5 - \beta, \\ 0 & \text{if } C(u, v) < 0.5 - \beta. \end{cases}$$

Note that introducing the hyperparameter increases the likelihood of producing ties or buckets with the modified Copeland aggregation method. This, in turn, enhances its suitability for the more general partial label ranking problem.

Borda

The fundamental concept of the *Borda* aggregation algorithm (also known as *Borda ranking*) is, roughly speaking, by ranking items by their average probability of being preferred over another uniformly at randomly chosen item (Black, 1976). Formally, the scoring function S in Borda is thus defined as:

$$B(u) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}: v \neq u} C(u, v).$$

For the sake of convenience, we will omit the normalizing factor $1/n-1$, as this does not change the ordering.

The main problem with this approach lies in the sorting procedure: items are assigned the same rank if and only if they have the exact same score. This strict criterion makes it unlikely for items to be grouped in the same bucket, even when their scores are close, often resulting in bucket orders that are nearly total orders. To mitigate this issue, we once again introduce a hyperparameter $\beta \geq 0$ for this issue in order to relax the grouping criterion. The idea is to place items in the same bucket if the difference between their scores falls within the range defined by β . Specifically, for two items u and v , if $S(u) - S(v) \in [-\beta, \beta]$, then $u \sim v$. This mechanism naturally extends to multiple items through a *cascading effect*, ensuring that items with closely related scores are consistently placed into the same bucket. Algorithm A.2 illustrates the detailed step-by-step implementation of this approach.

It is worth pointing out that the computational complexity for scoring from the pair order matrix is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ for both scoring-based algorithms. On the other hand, they exhibit $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ complexity in the sorting phase. Finally, it is worth mentioning that both classical variants of the Copeland or the Borda aggregation methods can be recovered by setting the introduced hyperparameter β to zero.

4.2 Probabilistic-based

Markov chain

Four variations of the *Markov chain* algorithms have been developed to address the rank aggregation problem (Dwork et al., 2001). The primary objective of these algorithms is to generate an aggregated ranking that minimizes the influence of items that are spuriously ranked highly in only a minority of lists.

The algorithms begin by representing a Markov chain with undirected edges. Each Markov chain is defined by an $n \times n$ *transition matrix* P , where $P(u, v)$ represents the transition probabilities from state u to state v . The transitioning mechanism varies across the different algorithms; that is, the pattern of state transitions in the constructed Markov chain is not uniform. In particular, upon reaching state u , the next state v is selected as follows:

- in *Markov chain 1*, uniformly at random from the set of items ranked at least as high as u in at least one input ranking;
- in *Markov chain 2*, by first picking a random input ranking and then choosing v uniformly at random from the set of items ranked at least as high as i in that ranking;
- in *Markov chain 3*, by choosing a random item v from a random input ranking;
- in *Markov chain 4*, uniformly at random

One limitation of the first three Markov chain algorithms is that their transition matrix computations rely on a set of rankings and cannot be derived directly from the pair order matrix (see Algorithms A.3, A.4, and A.5 for the details). In contrast, Markov chain 4 (Algorithm A.6) allows the direct computation of each entry $P(u, v)$ in

the transition matrix from a given pair order matrix C , using the following formulation:

$$P(u, v) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} & \text{if } u \neq v \wedge C(u, v) \leq 0.5, \\ 0 & \text{if } u \neq v \wedge C(u, v) > 0.5, \\ 1 - \sum_{w:w \neq u} P(u, w) & \text{if } u = w. \end{cases}$$

This direct computation provides an advantage for Markov chain 4 when only a pair order matrix is available (Alfaro et al., 2023b, 2023c). To evaluate these algorithms, we employed a partial label ranker capable of predicting both, the pair order matrix and the subset of (possibly incomplete) partial rankings required to derive it.

Once the Markov chain with the transition matrix is constructed, the algorithms will run on this chain until convergence. Subsequently, the last step is to find the stationary distribution x of this Markov chain that satisfies

$$x = xP.$$

After getting the stationary distribution

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \dots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix},$$

the items are ranked in decreasing order of their value in x , with equal values resulting in tied items. As stated by Dwork et al. (2001), all Markov chain methods take about $\Theta(n^2N + n^3)$ time. However, in practice, it can be reduced to $\mathcal{O}(n^2N)$ if the transition matrix is explicitly computed.

Maximal lottery

The *maximal lottery* algorithm is inspired by the concept introduced by Fishburn (1984). In this *game-theoretic* model, the set of items \mathcal{I} is treated as a set of alternatives. Let

$$\Delta(\mathcal{I}) = \left\{ p \in [0, 1]^{\mathcal{I}} : \sum_{x \in \mathcal{I}} p(x) = 1 \right\}$$

be the set of all lotteries over alternatives, where $p(x)$ corresponds to the probability of selecting the alternative x . The pair order matrix C is converted into a comparison matrix M by assigning $M(u, v) = C(u, v)$, for all $u, v \in \mathcal{I}$ where $u \neq v$; and setting $M(u, u) = 0$, for all $u \in \mathcal{I}$. The comparison matrix M then induces a skew-symmetric matrix defined as

$$\widetilde{M} = M - M^T.$$

In game theory, \widetilde{M} can be interpreted as a symmetric zero-sum game.

According to the *minimax* theorem (von Neumann, 1928), there exists a lottery

$$p_{max} = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 \\ \dots \\ p_n \end{pmatrix},$$

that performs at least as well as any other lottery, meaning:

$$\exists p_{max} \in \Delta(\mathcal{I}) : p_{max}^T \widetilde{M} \geq 0.$$

This lottery, p_{max} , is referred to as the maximal lottery. After computing p_{max} , the items are ranked in decreasing order of their values in p_{max} , with ties occurring if the values are equal. Algorithm A.7 presents the pseudocode for developing this algorithm.

The problem of finding the maximal lottery can be expressed as *linear programming* task (von Neumann, 1928). To address this efficiently, researchers have developed various strategies to solve the problem effectively (Daskalakis et al., 2009).

5 Experimental evaluation

This section presents an empirical evaluation of the alternative rank aggregation algorithms, focusing on assessing their performance in addressing the partial label ranking problem.

5.1 Methodology

The metric of interest is the τ_X *rank correlation coefficient* (Emond & Mason, 2002). Similar to how *Kendall's τ* is used for label ranking (Cheng et al., 2009), τ_X is specifically designed to deal with tied rankings. As a result, it is a valuable and widely adopted metric for evaluating partial label ranking performance (Alfaro et al., 2021a). The algorithms were evaluated using five repetitions of a ten-fold (5×10) cross-validation method. To assess their robustness against incomplete information, 0%, 30%, and 60% of class label positions were randomly omitted. These percentages are standard values used for label and partial label ranking problems (Alfaro et al., 2021a; Alfaro et al., 2023a; Cheng et al., 2010). Finally, the results were analyzed following the procedure outlined in (Demšar, 2006; García & Herrera, 2008) using the **exreport** software tool (Arias & Cózar, 2015). Initially, a *Friedman test* (Friedman, 1940) was conducted to evaluate the null hypothesis that all algorithms exhibit equal performance. Upon rejection of this hypothesis, a post-hoc analysis employing *Holm's procedure* (Holm, 1979) was carried out to compare each algorithm against the top-ranked one identified by the Friedman test. The Friedman test and the post-hoc analysis were performed at a 5% significance level.

5.2 Datasets

Table 1 provides an overview of the datasets included in the experimental evaluation and their respective properties. The datasets above the dashed line are synthetic and

Table 1 Description of the datasets

Dataset	Identifier	#of instances	#of features	#of classes	Unique #of rankings	Mean #of buckets
authorship	42835	841	70	4	47	3.063
blocks	42836	5472	10	5	116	2.337
breast	42838	109	9	6	62	3.925
ecoli	42844	336	7	8	179	4.140
glass	42848	214	9	6	105	4.089
iris	42871	150	4	3	7	2.380
letter	42853	20000	16	26	15014	7.033
libras	42855	360	90	15	356	6.889
pendigits	42857	10992	16	10	3327	3.397
satimage	42858	6435	36	6	504	3.356
segment	42860	2310	18	7	271	3.031
vehicle	42864	846	18	4	47	3.117
vowel	42866	528	10	11	504	5.739
wine	42872	178	13	3	11	2.680
yeast	42870	1484	8	10	1006	5.929

algae	45755	316	18	7	316	4.877
movies	45738	260	64	15	260	3.046

derived by transforming multi-class datasets from the UCI repository (Kelly et al., n.d.) into partial label ranking data using the procedure outlined in (Alfaro et al., 2021a). In contrast, the datasets below the dashed line represent real-world scenarios (Kelly et al., n.d.; Maxwell & Konstan, 2016) and originate from natural partial label ranking problems.

The columns display the following information: Identifier; which corresponds to the unique identifier of the dataset in the `OpenML` repository (Vanschoren et al., 2014), #of instances; representing the total number of instances in the dataset; #of features, indicating the number of input variables describing each instance; #of classes, specifying the total number of class labels included in the ranking problem; Unique #of rankings, which denotes the number of distinct partial label rankings present in the dataset; and Mean #of buckets, representing the average number of buckets within each ranking.

5.3 Learning methods

We utilized the *partial label ranking trees* algorithm with the *entropy* criterion (Alfaro et al., 2021a) as the base learning method. This configuration ensures that all aggregation techniques share the same decision tree structure, learned independently of the consensus bucket order. The differences lie solely in the bucket orders assigned to the leaf nodes during the learning phase, which are determined by the respective aggregation technique. In other words, the focus here is explicitly on the aggregation step (see Fig. 1), enabling a targeted investigation into the influence of the chosen aggregation method.

As explained in Section 4.1, the Borda and Copeland algorithms incorporate a β hyperparameter to manage the items ranked in the same position. This occurs when their respective scores fall within the overlap range defined by β . As expected, this hyperparameter has a significant impact on the performance of the methods.




Fig. 2 Average τ_X score across datasets for varying β values, comparing the algorithms at different percentages of missing class label positions

To investigate this, we conducted a preliminary experiment to analyze its effect. In particular, we tested β values ranging from 0 to 2 on the synthetic datasets to identify the value that achieves the best average performance across these datasets. Note that real-world datasets were not used in this analysis, as a different procedure, outlined in Section 5.4.2, will be employed to determine the β value for those datasets.

Fig. 2 illustrates the impact of the β hyperparameter on the τ_X score for the Borda and Copeland algorithms. Notably, the optimal β value is 0.9 for Borda and 0.4 for Copeland, irrespective of the percentage of missing class label positions. Indeed, as the β value increases, the techniques become more prone to grouping items into the same bucket, with the extreme case being all items placed in a single bucket. For Copeland, this critical point occurs at $\beta = 0.5$ because the scoring function assigns all items a score of 0.5. This occurs because all values in the pair order matrix fall within the range $[0.5 - \beta, 0.5 + \beta] = [0, 1]$, which coincides with the full range of the pair order matrix, as described in Section 3.2.

5.4 Results

This section presents the results of our experimental evaluation on both synthetic and real-world datasets. The aggregation methods described in Section 4 are denoted by their respective name. In contrast, the representative aggregation method for the optimal bucket order problem is the bucket pivot algorithm (see Section 3.2) and consequently denoted by *Bucket pivot* in the upcoming figures.

5.4.1 Synthetic datasets

Table 2 summarizes the statistical test outcomes, where boldfaced values denote the algorithms that are not statistically significantly different from the one ranked first

Table 2 Friedman’s and Holm’s tests with varying miss probability

Missing percentage: 0%						Missing percentage: 30%						Missing percentage: 60%					
Friedman p-value: 5.431×10^{-18}						Friedman p-value: 2.033×10^{-18}						Friedman p-value: 1.043×10^{-13}					
Holm results						Holm results						Holm results					
Method	Rank	P-value	Win	Tie	Loss	Method	Rank	P-value	Win	Tie	Loss	Method	Rank	P-value	Win	Tie	Loss
Bucket pivot	1.53	-	-	-	6	Borda	1.44	-	-	-	4	Borda	1.35	-	-	-	0
Borda	2.03	5.52×10^{-1}	10	1	6	Bucket pivot	2.09	4.41×10^{-1}	12	1	4	Copeland	2.88	1.37×10^{-1}	15	0	2
Copeland	2.68	3.44×10^{-1}	14	1	2	Copeland	2.82	2.00×10^{-1}	15	0	2	Bucket pivot	2.88	1.35×10^{-1}	14	0	3
Markov chain 3	4.82	2.65×10^{-4}	17	0	0	Markov chain 3	4.38	1.40×10^{-3}	17	0	0	Markov chain 3	4.26	1.59×10^{-3}	17	0	0
Markov chain 1	5.26	3.50×10^{-5}	17	0	0	Markov chain 2	5.09	5.68×10^{-5}	17	0	0	Markov chain 2	5.76	6.25×10^{-7}	17	0	0
Markov chain 2	5.44	1.61×10^{-5}	17	0	0	Markov chain 1	5.71	1.93×10^{-6}	17	0	0	Markov chain 1	5.79	6.25×10^{-7}	17	0	0
Markov chain 4	6.59	1.04×10^{-8}	17	0	0	Markov chain 4	7.06	1.37×10^{-10}	17	0	0	Maximal lottery	6.47	6.72×10^{-9}	16	0	1
Maximal lottery	7.65	2.31×10^{-12}	17	0	0	Maximal lottery	7.41	8.34×10^{-10}	16	0	1	Markov chain 4	6.59	3.24×10^{-9}	17	0	0

according to the Friedman test. The columns are as follows: Rank, indicating the average rank position assigned by the Friedman test; P-value, showing the p -value adjusted using the Holm’s procedure; and Win, Tie, and Loss, representing the number of times that the control algorithm wins, ties and loses to the respective algorithm. Additionally, Appendix B contains the complete results of the cross-validation study for scenarios with 0%, 30%, and 60% of missing class label positions. In these tables, the underlined values indicate the algorithm(s) that achieved the highest τ_X score. Boldfaced values, meanwhile, denote algorithms whose confidence intervals, defined by their mean and standard deviation, overlap with the interval of the best-performing algorithm.

This analysis reveals that the scoring-based methods perform remarkably well in all the scenarios. Moreover, with incomplete rankings, the Borda algorithm outperforms the bucket pivot method when 30% of missing class label positions are missing. As the percentage of missing class label positions increases, both Borda and Copeland demonstrate greater robustness compared to other methods, consistently ranking ahead of the bucket pivot method. This trend is particularly evident with 60% of missing data, where Borda and Copeland exhibit significantly better performance, as shown in Fig. 3. In contrast, the probabilistic-based methods exhibit significantly weaker performance across all scenarios, consistently ranking lower than the scoring-based algorithms.

The accuracy metric (i.e., the τ_X rank correlation coefficient) penalizes in two specific scenarios: (i) when items that are ranked ahead or tied in the true ranking are placed behind in the predicted ranking, and (ii) when items ranked behind in the true ranking are tied in the predicted ranking. Based on this, we hypothesized that the algorithms either produce too few buckets, which prevents them from correctly identifying tied items or generate too many buckets, making it difficult to determine whether one item is ranked behind another accurately. Both scenarios lead to penalties in the scoring metric. To investigate this, we measured the discrepancy between the number of buckets in the predicted and true bucket orders, as illustrated in Fig. 4, where the x-axis is arranged based on the datasets’ mean number of buckets. Notably, the probabilistic-based methods exhibit more pronounced deviations compared to scoring-based algorithms. Specifically, Markov chain 1, 2, and 3 methods tend to produce bucket orders with excessive buckets in datasets with a higher number of class labels (e.g., yeast, libras, and letter), essentially approximating total orders. On the other hand, Markov chain 4 and the maximal lottery algorithm often generate bucket orders with too few buckets, typically resulting in one clearly defined top bucket while grouping the remaining items into a small number of broader, less refined buckets. In




Fig. 3 Average τ_X score across datasets for varying percentages of missing class label positions, comparing the algorithms

other scenarios, all probabilistic-based methods tend to produce bucket orders with fewer buckets overall.

Regarding computational complexity, the training times (in seconds) are presented in Table 3. Only the scoring-based algorithms and the bucket pivot method are included due to the low accuracy of the probabilistic-based methods and their significantly higher computational demands. Additionally, prediction times are not included because they are identical across all algorithms. This is because the underlying decision tree structure is the same for all the methods, as explained in Section 5.3. In general, the Borda and Copeland methods are approximately twice as fast as the bucket pivot algorithm, despite the latter having a lower computational complexity, as stated in Sections 3.2 and 4.1. This discrepancy can likely be attributed to the recursive nature of the bucket pivot method, which introduces additional overhead, thereby increasing its practical runtime.

5.4.2 Real-world datasets

The preliminary analysis regarding the β hyperparameter in Section 5.3 has shown that the selected value is crucial for the performance of the scoring-based algorithms. While the analysis suggests that a fixed value might be suitable across all datasets, it is compelling to establish a criterion for selecting appropriate values when addressing real-world datasets. This section introduces a recommendation system based on the experimental results with the synthetic datasets.

We trained a linear regression model using the following meta-features of the datasets as predictors for the new datasets: the number of instances, the number of features, the number of classes, the average number of buckets, and the average proportion of missing class labels. Thus, each row in the training dataset represents a unique combination of a dataset and a specific percentage of missing class label




Fig. 4 Difference in the number of buckets between the true and predicted bucket orders for each algorithm and dataset with varying percentages of missing class label positions

Table 3 Average training times (mean and standard deviation, in seconds) for the scoring-based algorithms (Borda and Copeland) and the bucket pivot method across datasets with missing class label positions

Dataset	0%			30%			60%		
	Bucket pivot	Borda	Copeland	Bucket pivot	Borda	Copeland	Bucket pivot	Borda	Copeland
authorship	0.678 ± 0.024	0.341 ± 0.013	0.341 ± 0.013	0.537 ± 0.021	0.294 ± 0.019	0.282 ± 0.009	0.317 ± 0.022	0.186 ± 0.013	0.186 ± 0.010
blocks	1.232 ± 0.050	0.697 ± 0.034	0.695 ± 0.031	1.142 ± 0.065	0.638 ± 0.038	0.646 ± 0.043	0.852 ± 0.061	0.480 ± 0.034	0.481 ± 0.036
breast	0.027 ± 0.003	0.014 ± 0.002	0.014 ± 0.002	0.023 ± 0.002	0.012 ± 0.002	0.013 ± 0.001	0.018 ± 0.002	0.009 ± 0.001	0.010 ± 0.001
ecoli	0.045 ± 0.004	0.027 ± 0.002	0.028 ± 0.003	0.041 ± 0.003	0.025 ± 0.002	0.025 ± 0.002	0.032 ± 0.003	0.020 ± 0.003	0.020 ± 0.002
glass	0.051 ± 0.004	0.024 ± 0.003	0.024 ± 0.002	0.047 ± 0.004	0.022 ± 0.003	0.023 ± 0.002	0.034 ± 0.004	0.017 ± 0.002	0.017 ± 0.002
iris	0.007 ± 0.002	0.005 ± 0.002	0.005 ± 0.002	0.005 ± 0.001	0.004 ± 0.001	0.004 ± 0.001	0.004 ± 0.001	0.004 ± 0.002	0.003 ± 0.001
letter	18.073 ± 0.119	17.501 ± 0.134	17.554 ± 0.137	14.820 ± 0.104	14.454 ± 0.100	14.517 ± 0.112	9.771 ± 0.107	9.409 ± 0.112	9.539 ± 0.088
libras	2.121 ± 0.063	1.640 ± 0.047	1.685 ± 0.044	2.004 ± 0.080	1.536 ± 0.059	1.589 ± 0.059	1.521 ± 0.047	1.135 ± 0.044	1.183 ± 0.036
pendigits	4.848 ± 0.060	3.433 ± 0.044	3.434 ± 0.049	4.810 ± 0.061	3.498 ± 0.049	3.512 ± 0.052	3.553 ± 0.036	2.578 ± 0.043	2.662 ± 0.082
satimage	3.527 ± 0.063	2.050 ± 0.039	2.053 ± 0.039	3.151 ± 0.058	1.895 ± 0.039	1.887 ± 0.030	2.235 ± 0.035	1.409 ± 0.028	1.424 ± 0.033
segment	1.300 ± 0.033	0.682 ± 0.017	0.689 ± 0.021	1.199 ± 0.038	0.635 ± 0.017	0.640 ± 0.020	0.932 ± 0.036	0.493 ± 0.015	0.499 ± 0.017
vehicle	0.228 ± 0.013	0.118 ± 0.009	0.122 ± 0.009	0.192 ± 0.010	0.101 ± 0.007	0.104 ± 0.008	0.122 ± 0.006	0.068 ± 0.004	0.069 ± 0.004
vowel	0.338 ± 0.012	0.230 ± 0.009	0.234 ± 0.011	0.331 ± 0.013	0.215 ± 0.009	0.224 ± 0.008	0.268 ± 0.009	0.171 ± 0.007	0.178 ± 0.007
wine	0.041 ± 0.004	0.018 ± 0.002	0.020 ± 0.006	0.030 ± 0.003	0.015 ± 0.003	0.014 ± 0.002	0.018 ± 0.002	0.009 ± 0.002	0.009 ± 0.002
yeast	0.256 ± 0.011	0.161 ± 0.010	0.162 ± 0.008	0.256 ± 0.016	0.166 ± 0.012	0.167 ± 0.009	0.191 ± 0.009	0.123 ± 0.006	0.125 ± 0.004

Table 4 τ_X score (mean and standard deviation) of algorithms for the real-world datasets

Algorithm	algae			movies		
	0%	30%	60%	0%	30%	60%
Bucket pivot	0.419 ± 0.064	0.381 ± 0.049	0.285 ± 0.052	0.439 ± 0.032	0.433 ± 0.032	0.433 ± 0.029
Borda	0.435 ± 0.064	0.389 ± 0.057	0.326 ± 0.055	0.401 ± 0.033	0.380 ± 0.030	0.373 ± 0.039
Borda*	0.437 ± 0.064	0.395 ± 0.059	0.330 ± 0.054	0.437 ± 0.027	0.440 ± 0.028	0.442 ± 0.025
Copeland	0.414 ± 0.065	0.362 ± 0.055	0.283 ± 0.052	0.265 ± 0.038	0.192 ± 0.032	0.180 ± 0.037
Copeland*	0.420 ± 0.065	0.361 ± 0.056	0.286 ± 0.053	0.443 ± 0.028	0.443 ± 0.028	0.443 ± 0.028
Markov chain 1	0.390 ± 0.060	0.344 ± 0.058	0.294 ± 0.065	0.179 ± 0.036	0.135 ± 0.032	0.126 ± 0.036
Markov chain 2	0.384 ± 0.059	0.348 ± 0.056	0.293 ± 0.069	0.180 ± 0.036	0.145 ± 0.032	0.136 ± 0.038
Markov chain 3	0.394 ± 0.058	0.355 ± 0.057	0.300 ± 0.067	0.179 ± 0.036	0.147 ± 0.032	0.138 ± 0.038
Markov chain 4	0.364 ± 0.057	0.339 ± 0.064	0.275 ± 0.053	0.385 ± 0.028	0.250 ± 0.041	0.165 ± 0.039
Maximal lottery	0.348 ± 0.055	0.328 ± 0.055	0.299 ± 0.057	0.411 ± 0.025	0.398 ± 0.025	0.377 ± 0.033

positions, with percentages ranging from 0 to 60 in increments of 10. These averages were computed from the 5×10 cross-validation method carried out. The target variable for the model was β , which represents the β value that achieved the best average results.

Table 4 shows the results obtained from the cross-validation study, where * indicates that the results correspond to the best identified for the respective algorithm during the cross-validation. In contrast, Table 5 compares the best β values with those predicted by the linear regression model. For the algae dataset, the Borda algorithm outperforms the bucket pivot method and achieves results similar to Borda*, as the predicted β value is very close to the best one. In the case of the Copeland algorithm, although it does not surpass the bucket pivot method, the predicted β value remains close to the best one. On the other hand, the probabilistic-based algorithms fail to produce competitive results. For the movies dataset, neither Borda nor Copeland delivers competitive results, as their predicted β values are not close to their respective best values. Interestingly, the maximal lottery algorithm performs better than Borda and Copeland, yet it still fails to achieve the performance achieved by bucket pivot.

Table 5 Comparison of the best and predicted β values for the scoring-based algorithms across different datasets and levels of missing class label positions

Algorithm		algae			movies		
		0%	30%	60%	0%	30%	60%
Borda	Best	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.9	2.0	2.0
	Predicted	0.677 ± 0.002	0.652 ± 0.002	0.634 ± 0.002	1.145 ± 0.001	1.063 ± 0.003	0.993 ± 0.003
Copeland	Best	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5
	Predicted	0.303 ± 0.00	0.266 ± 0.001	0.229 ± 0.001	0.273 ± 0.000	0.226 ± 0.001	0.181 ± 0.001

6 Conclusions

This paper has explored alternative rank aggregation methods for the partial label ranking problem. Specifically, we investigated two popular classes, scoring-based and probabilistic-based, and modified the former to reduce its tendency to produce overly stringent total orders. Our experiments demonstrated that scoring-based methods are competitive with the current state-of-the-art algorithm when using complete rankings and outperform it with incomplete rankings. Conversely, probabilistic-based algorithms failed to achieve competitive performance. Regarding computational efficiency, scoring-based algorithms are generally twice as fast as the current state-of-the-art approach, primarily due to the latter’s recursive nature. For future work, we aim to enhance the probabilistic-based methods. Moreover, we plan to improve the recommendation model for the β hyperparameter by incorporating more useful meta-characteristics from the datasets.

Declarations

Funding. This work is partially funded by the following projects: SBPLY/21/180225/000062 (Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha and ERDF A way of making Europe), PID2022-139293NB-C32 (MICI-U/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and ERDF, EU), and 2022-GRIN-34437 (Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha and ERDF A way of making Europe).

Author contributions. Conceptualization, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.; Data curation, J.W. and J.C.A. Formal analysis, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.; Investigation, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.; Methodology, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.; Software, J.W. and J.C.A.; Supervision, J.C.A. and V.B.; Validation, J.W. and J.C.A.; Visualization, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.; Writing—original draft, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.; Writing—review and editing, J.W., J.C.A., and V.B.

Data availability. The datasets used in this study are publicly available at <https://www.openml.org>.

Code availability. The authors provide open-access code for the methods, which can be accessed online at <https://github.com/JiayiWang-LMU/scikit-lr-aggregation>.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval. Not applicable.

Consent to participate. Not applicable.

Consent for publication. Not applicable.

References

- Adam, L., Van Camp, A., Destercke, S., & Quost, B. (2024). Inferring from an imprecise plackett–luce model: Application to label ranking. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, *482*, 108908. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2024.108908>
- Aledo, J. A., Gámez, J. A., & Rosete, A. (2017). Utopia in the solution of the bucket order problem. *Decision Support Systems*, *97*, 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2017.03.006>
- Aledo, J. A., Gámez, J. A., & Rosete, A. (2021). A highly scalable algorithm for weak rankings aggregation. *Information Sciences*, *570*, 144–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2021.04.034>
- Aledo, J. A., Gámez, J. A., & Molina, D. (2019). Approaching the rank aggregation problem by local search-based metaheuristics. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, *354*, 445–456. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2018.03.014>
- Alfaro, J. C., Aledo, J. A., & Gámez, J. A. (2021a). Learning decision trees for the partial label ranking problem. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, *36*, 890–918. <https://doi.org/10.1002/int.22325>
- Alfaro, J. C., Aledo, J. A., & Gámez, J. A. (2021b). Mixture-based probabilistic graphical models for the partial label ranking problem. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Data Engineering and Automated Learning*, 277–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-91608-4_28
- Alfaro, J. C., Aledo, J. A., & Gámez, J. A. (2023a). Ensemble learning for the partial label ranking problem. *Mathematical Methods in the Applied Sciences*, *46*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mma.8489>
- Alfaro, J. C., Aledo, J. A., & Gámez, J. A. (2023b). Multi-dimensional Bayesian network classifiers for partial label ranking. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, *160*, 108950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2023.108950>
- Alfaro, J. C., Aledo, J. A., & Gámez, J. A. (2023c). Pairwise learning for the partial label ranking problem. *Pattern Recognition*, *140*, 109590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2023.109590>
- Arias, J., & Cózar, J. (2015). Exreport: Fast, reliable and elegant reproducible research. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/exreport/index.html>
- Bartholdi, J. J., Tovey, C. A., & Trick, M. A. (1989). The computational difficulty of manipulating an election. *Social Choice and Welfare*, *6*, 227–241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00295861>
- Bengs, V., Busa-Fekete, R., El Mesaoudi-Paul, A., & Hüllermeier, E. (2021). Preference-based online learning with dueling bandits: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *22*, 1–108.
- Black, D. (1976). Partial justification of the Borda count. *Public Choice*, *28*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01718454>

- Brinker, K., & Hüllermeier, E. (2006). Case-based label ranking. *Proceedings of the 17th European Conference on Machine Learning and Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, 566–573. https://doi.org/10.1007/11871842_53
- Cheng, W., Dembczynski, K., & Hüllermeier, E. (2010). Label ranking methods based on the Plackett-Luce model. *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 215–222.
- Cheng, W., Hühn, J., & Hüllermeier, E. (2009). Decision tree and instance-based learning for label ranking. *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, 161–168. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1553374.1553395>
- Copeland, A. H. (1951). A reasonable social welfare function. *Seminar on Applications of Mathematics to Social Sciences*.
- Daskalakis, C., Goldberg, P. W., & Papadimitriou, C. H. (2009). The complexity of computing a nash equilibrium. *Communications of the ACM*, 52, 89–97. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1461928.1461951>
- Demšar, J. (2006). Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7, 1–30.
- Dudík, M., Hofmann, K., Schapire, R. E., Slivkins, A., & Zoghi, M. (2015). Contextual dueling bandits. *Proceedings of the 28th Conference on Learning Theory*, 563–587.
- Dwork, C., Kumar, R., Naor, M., & Sivakumar, D. (2001). Rank aggregation methods for the Web. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 613–622. <https://doi.org/10.1145/371920.372165>
- Emond, E. J., & Mason, D. W. (2002). A new rank correlation coefficient with application to the consensus ranking problem. *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 11, 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mcda.313>
- Firth, D., Kosmidis, I., & Turner, H. (2019). Davidson-Luce model for multi-item choice with ties [arXiv:1909.07123]. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07123>
- Fishburn, P. C. (1984). Probabilistic social choice based on simple voting comparisons. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 51, 683–692. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2297786>
- Friedman, M. (1940). A comparison of alternative tests of significance for the problem of m rankings. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 11, 86–92.
- García, S., & Herrera, F. (2008). An extension on “Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets” for all pairwise comparisons. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9, 2677–2694.
- Gionis, A., Mannila, H., Puolamäki, K., & Ukkonen, A. (2006). Algorithms for discovering bucket orders from data. *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 561–566. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1150402.1150468>
- Henderson, D. A. (2024). Modelling and analysis of rank ordered data with ties via a generalized Plackett-Luce model. *Bayesian Analysis*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1214/24-ba1434>
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 6, 65–70.

- Hüllermeier, E., Fürnkranz, J., Cheng, W., & Brinker, K. (2008). Label ranking by learning pairwise preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*, *172*, 1897–1916. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2008.08.002>
- Hüllermeier, E., & Słowiński, R. (2024). Preference learning and multiple criteria decision aiding: Differences, commonalities, and synergies—part I. *4OR*, *22*, 179–209. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10288-023-00560-6>
- Jiao, Y., Korba, A., & Sibony, E. (2016). Controlling the distance to a Kemeny consensus without computing it. *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2971–2980.
- Kaufmann, T., Weng, P., Bengs, V., & Hüllermeier, E. (2024). A survey of reinforcement learning from human feedback [arXiv:2312.14925]. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.14925>
- Kelly, M., Longjohn, R., & Nottingham, K. (n.d.). The UCI Machine Learning Repository. <http://archive.ics.uci.edu>
- Kemeny, J. G. (1959). Mathematics without numbers. *Daedalus*, *88*(4), 577–591.
- Korba, A., Garcia, A., & d’Alché-Buc, F. (2018). A structured prediction approach for label ranking. *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 9008–9018.
- Lorena, L. H. N., Lorena, L. A. N., & Chaves, A. A. (2021). A biased random-key genetic algorithm with a local search component for the optimal bucket order problem. *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, 375–382. <https://doi.org/10.1109/cec45853.2021.9504985>
- Maxwell, F., & Konstan, J. A. (2016). The MovieLens datasets: History and context. *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems*, *5*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2827872>
- Thies, S., Alfaro, J. C., & Bengs, V. (2024). More-plr: Multi-output regression employed for partial label ranking. *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Discovery Science*.
- Ukkonen, A., Puolamäki, K., Gionis, A., & Mannila, H. (2009). A randomized approximation algorithm for computing bucket orders. *Information Processing Letters*, *109*, 356–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2008.12.003>
- Vanschoren, J., van Rijn, J. N., Bischl, B., & Torgo, L. (2014). OpenML: Networked science in machine learning. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, *15*, 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2641190.2641198>
- Vembu, S., & Gärtner, T. (2010). Label ranking algorithms: A survey. In *Preference Learning* (pp. 45–64). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14125-6_3
- von Neumann, J. (1928). Zur theorie der gesellschaftsspiele. *Mathematische Annalen*, *100*, 295–320. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01448847>
- Wirth, C., Akrou, R., Neumann, G., & Fürnkranz, J. (2017). A survey of preference-based reinforcement learning methods. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, *18*, 1–46.
- Zhou, Y., Hao, J., & Li, Z. (2024). Heuristic search for rank aggregation with application to label ranking. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, *36*, 308–326. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoc.2022.0019>

Appendix A Aggregation algorithms

Algorithm A.1 Copeland

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Pair order matrix C ; Hyperparameter $\beta \geq 0$

Output: Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

```
1: Initialize scores  $S(u) \leftarrow 0$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{I}$ 
2: for each  $u \in \mathcal{I}$  do
3:   for each  $v \in \mathcal{I}$  do
4:     if  $u \neq v$  then
5:       if  $C(u, v) > 0.5 + \beta$  then
6:          $S(u) \leftarrow S(u) + 1$ 
7:       else if  $0.5 - \beta \leq C(u, v) \leq 0.5 + \beta$  then
8:          $S(u) \leftarrow S(u) + 0.5$ 
9:       end if
10:    end if
11:  end for each
12: end for each
13: Compute bucket order  $\mathcal{B}$  according to the rules:
```

$$\begin{aligned} u \succ v & \text{ if } S(u) > S(v), \\ u \sim v & \text{ if } S(u) = S(v), \\ u \prec v & \text{ if } S(u) < S(v). \end{aligned}$$

```
14: return  $\mathcal{B}$ 
```

Algorithm A.2 Borda

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Pair order matrix C ; Hyperparameter $\beta \geq 0$

Output: Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

- 1: Initialize scores $S(u) \leftarrow 0$ for all $u \in \mathcal{I}$
- 2: **for each** $u \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 3: **for each** $v \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 4: **if** $u \neq v$ **then**
- 5: $S(u) \leftarrow S(u) + C(u, v)$
- 6: **end if**
- 7: **end for each**
- 8: **end for each**
- 9: Compute bucket order \mathcal{B} according to the rules:

$$\begin{aligned} u \succ v & \text{ if } S(u) - S(v) > \beta, \\ u \sim v & \text{ if } S(u) - S(v) \in [-\beta, \beta] \\ u \prec v & \text{ if } S(u) - S(v) < -\beta. \end{aligned}$$

- 10: **return** \mathcal{B}
-

Algorithm A.3 Markov chain 1

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Set of (possibly incomplete) partial rankings $\mathbf{\Pi} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\}$

Output: Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

- 1: Initialize transition matrix $P \leftarrow 0$
- 2: **for each** $u \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 3: **for each** $v \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 4: $y_{uv} \leftarrow \left| \{i : \pi_i(v) \leq \pi_i(u)\}_{i=1}^N \right|$ {Number of rankings where v is ranked higher or equal to u }
- 5: $z_u \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^N |\{w : \pi_i(w) \leq \pi_i(u)\}|$ {Number of items ranked higher or equal to u in each ranking π_i }
- 6: $P(uv) \leftarrow \frac{y_{uv}}{z_u}$
- 7: **end for each**
- 8: **end for each**
- 9: Find stationary distribution that satisfies $x = xP$
- 10: Compute bucket order \mathcal{B} based on x :

$$\begin{aligned} u \succ v & \text{ if } x_u > x_v \\ u \sim v & \text{ if } x_u = x_v \\ u \prec v & \text{ if } x_u < x_v \end{aligned}$$

- 11: **return** \mathcal{B}
-

Algorithm A.4 Markov chain 2

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Set of (possibly incomplete) partial rankings $\mathbf{\Pi} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\}$ **Output:** Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

- 1: Initialize transition matrix $P \leftarrow 0$
- 2: **for each** $u \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 3: **for each** $v \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 4: **for each** $\pi_i \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ **do**
- 5: $y_{ui} = |\{w : \pi_i(w) \leq \pi_i(u)\}|$ {Number of items ranked higher or equal to u in π_i }
- 6: $P(u, v) \leftarrow \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{\pi_i(v) \leq \pi_i(u)\}}}{y_{ui}}$
- 7: **end for each**
- 8: **end for each**
- 9: **end for each**
- 10: Find stationary distribution that satisfies $x = xP$
- 11: Compute bucket order \mathcal{B} based on x :

$$u \succ v \text{ if } x_u > x_v$$

$$u \sim v \text{ if } x_u = x_v$$

$$u \prec v \text{ if } x_u < x_v$$

- 12: **return** \mathcal{B}
-

Algorithm A.5 Markov chain 3

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Set of (possibly incomplete) partial rankings $\mathbf{\Pi} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\}$ **Output:** Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

- 1: Initialize transition matrix $P \leftarrow 0$
- 2: **for each** $u \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 3: **for each** $v \in \mathcal{I}$ **do**
- 4: **if** $u = v$ **then**
- 5: $y_{uv} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^N n - |\{w : \pi_i(w) \leq \pi_i(u)\}| + 1$
- 6: **else**
- 7:
- 8: $y_{uv} \leftarrow \left| \{i : \pi_i(v) \leq \pi_i(u)\}_{i=1}^N \right|$ {Number of rankings where v is ranked higher or equal to u }
- 9: **end if**
- 10: $P(u, v) \leftarrow \frac{y_{uv}}{kn}$
- 11: **end for each**
- 12: **end for each**
- 13: Find stationary distribution that satisfies $x = xP$
- 14: Compute bucket order \mathcal{B} based on x :

$$u \succ v \text{ if } x_u > x_v$$

$$u \sim v \text{ if } x_u = x_v$$

$$u \prec v \text{ if } x_u < x_v$$

- 15: **return** \mathcal{B}
-

Algorithm A.6 Markov chain 4

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Pair order matrix C **Output:** Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

```
1: Initialize the transition matrix  $P \leftarrow 0$ 
2: for each  $u \in \mathcal{I}$  do
3:   for each  $v \in \mathcal{I}$  do
4:     if  $u \neq v$  then
5:       if  $C(u, v) \leq 0.5$  then
6:          $P(u, v) = \frac{1}{n}$ 
7:       else if  $C(u, v) > 0.5$  then
8:          $P(u, v) = 0$ 
9:       end if
10:    end if
11:  end for each
12: end for each
13: for each  $u \in \mathcal{I}$  do
14:    $P(u, u) \leftarrow 1 - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{I}: v \neq u} P(u, v)$ 
15: end for each
16: Find stationary distribution that satisfies  $x = xP$ 
17: Compute bucket order  $\mathcal{B}$  based on  $x$ :
```

$$u \succ v \text{ if } x_u > x_v$$

$$u \sim v \text{ if } x_u = x_v$$

$$u \prec v \text{ if } x_u < x_v$$

```
18: return  $\mathcal{B}$ 
```

Algorithm A.7 Maximal lottery

Input: Set of items \mathcal{I} ; Pair order matrix C **Output:** Consensus bucket order \mathcal{B}

```
1: Initialize comparison matrix  $M \leftarrow C$ 
2:  $M(u, u) \leftarrow 0$  for all  $u \in \mathcal{I}$ 
3: Compute the skew-symmetric matrix  $\widetilde{M} \leftarrow M - M^T$ 
4: Find maximal lottery  $p_{max}$  that satisfies  $p_{max}^T \widetilde{M} \geq 0$ 
5: Compute bucket order  $\mathcal{B}$  based on  $p_{max}$ :
```

$$u \succ v \text{ if } p_u > p_v$$

$$u \sim v \text{ if } p_u = p_v$$

$$u \prec v \text{ if } p_u < p_v$$

```
6: return  $\mathcal{B}$ 
```

Appendix B Complete accuracy results

Table B1 τ_X score (mean and standard deviation) of algorithms with 0% of missing class label positions for the synthetic datasets

Dataset	Bucket pivot	Borda	Copeland	Markov chain 1	Markov chain 2	Markov chain 3	Markov chain 4	Maximal lottery
authorship	0.780 ± 0.024	0.779 ± 0.022	0.776 ± 0.021	0.670 ± 0.024	0.670 ± 0.024	0.670 ± 0.024	0.659 ± 0.022	0.657 ± 0.023
blocks	0.944 ± 0.004	0.941 ± 0.005	0.943 ± 0.004	0.915 ± 0.006	0.915 ± 0.006	0.915 ± 0.006	0.904 ± 0.007	0.903 ± 0.007
breast	0.769 ± 0.059	0.769 ± 0.055	0.762 ± 0.060	0.693 ± 0.071	0.693 ± 0.070	0.695 ± 0.069	0.507 ± 0.054	0.504 ± 0.055
ecoli	0.763 ± 0.033	0.756 ± 0.033	0.739 ± 0.030	0.632 ± 0.026	0.631 ± 0.027	0.632 ± 0.026	0.558 ± 0.035	0.551 ± 0.034
glass	0.760 ± 0.036	0.747 ± 0.036	0.760 ± 0.038	0.615 ± 0.038	0.615 ± 0.037	0.614 ± 0.037	0.485 ± 0.031	0.480 ± 0.031
iris	0.915 ± 0.043	0.918 ± 0.046	0.919 ± 0.045	0.854 ± 0.059	0.854 ± 0.059	0.854 ± 0.059	0.848 ± 0.064	0.845 ± 0.061
letter	0.669 ± 0.005	0.663 ± 0.004	0.661 ± 0.005	0.601 ± 0.006	0.600 ± 0.006	0.603 ± 0.006	0.525 ± 0.007	0.523 ± 0.007
libras	0.575 ± 0.026	0.601 ± 0.025	0.571 ± 0.026	0.552 ± 0.024	0.548 ± 0.024	0.555 ± 0.024	0.317 ± 0.026	0.307 ± 0.024
pendigits	0.813 ± 0.006	0.797 ± 0.005	0.790 ± 0.006	0.740 ± 0.006	0.740 ± 0.006	0.741 ± 0.006	0.717 ± 0.007	0.716 ± 0.007
satimage	0.846 ± 0.006	0.841 ± 0.005	0.837 ± 0.007	0.707 ± 0.009	0.707 ± 0.009	0.707 ± 0.009	0.659 ± 0.009	0.656 ± 0.009
segment	0.849 ± 0.009	0.892 ± 0.009	0.889 ± 0.009	0.792 ± 0.013	0.792 ± 0.013	0.792 ± 0.013	0.764 ± 0.013	0.762 ± 0.013
vehicle	0.791 ± 0.020	0.788 ± 0.021	0.790 ± 0.021	0.656 ± 0.025	0.656 ± 0.025	0.656 ± 0.026	0.582 ± 0.022	0.572 ± 0.023
vowel	0.679 ± 0.023	0.682 ± 0.024	0.661 ± 0.025	0.591 ± 0.028	0.591 ± 0.027	0.595 ± 0.028	0.368 ± 0.024	0.358 ± 0.021
wine	0.821 ± 0.049	0.815 ± 0.051	0.815 ± 0.050	0.737 ± 0.049	0.737 ± 0.051	0.737 ± 0.049	0.739 ± 0.048	0.734 ± 0.051
yeast	0.775 ± 0.010	0.772 ± 0.009	0.765 ± 0.010	0.591 ± 0.018	0.591 ± 0.018	0.593 ± 0.019	0.370 ± 0.009	0.366 ± 0.010

Table B2 τ_X score (mean and standard deviation) of algorithms with 30% of missing class label positions for the synthetic datasets

Dataset	Bucket pivot	Borda	Copeland	Markov chain 1	Markov chain 2	Markov chain 3	Markov chain 4	Maximal lottery
authorship	0.733 ± 0.031	0.741 ± 0.028	0.737 ± 0.028	0.640 ± 0.026	0.639 ± 0.026	0.640 ± 0.026	0.632 ± 0.028	0.634 ± 0.030
blocks	0.928 ± 0.007	0.933 ± 0.006	0.926 ± 0.007	0.906 ± 0.007	0.906 ± 0.007	0.906 ± 0.007	0.896 ± 0.007	0.901 ± 0.007
breast	0.715 ± 0.074	0.727 ± 0.064	0.702 ± 0.060	0.591 ± 0.081	0.593 ± 0.076	0.594 ± 0.076	0.503 ± 0.061	0.475 ± 0.065
ecoli	0.730 ± 0.032	0.738 ± 0.031	0.698 ± 0.037	0.613 ± 0.040	0.613 ± 0.040	0.616 ± 0.038	0.556 ± 0.038	0.548 ± 0.036
glass	0.714 ± 0.046	0.730 ± 0.040	0.727 ± 0.042	0.551 ± 0.043	0.553 ± 0.042	0.556 ± 0.042	0.484 ± 0.041	0.460 ± 0.037
iris	0.903 ± 0.046	0.896 ± 0.047	0.902 ± 0.044	0.851 ± 0.060	0.853 ± 0.060	0.851 ± 0.061	0.846 ± 0.058	0.842 ± 0.064
letter	0.665 ± 0.005	0.659 ± 0.005	0.626 ± 0.005	0.580 ± 0.007	0.587 ± 0.007	0.590 ± 0.007	0.526 ± 0.007	0.524 ± 0.007
libras	0.564 ± 0.027	0.589 ± 0.025	0.549 ± 0.024	0.517 ± 0.027	0.519 ± 0.026	0.528 ± 0.027	0.339 ± 0.031	0.304 ± 0.018
pendigits	0.797 ± 0.006	0.787 ± 0.006	0.736 ± 0.007	0.728 ± 0.008	0.729 ± 0.008	0.730 ± 0.008	0.703 ± 0.008	0.714 ± 0.007
satimage	0.817 ± 0.009	0.825 ± 0.008	0.807 ± 0.009	0.678 ± 0.010	0.678 ± 0.010	0.679 ± 0.010	0.654 ± 0.011	0.652 ± 0.010
segment	0.876 ± 0.011	0.878 ± 0.011	0.855 ± 0.012	0.780 ± 0.015	0.780 ± 0.014	0.781 ± 0.014	0.758 ± 0.014	0.760 ± 0.014
vehicle	0.734 ± 0.025	0.750 ± 0.025	0.743 ± 0.029	0.593 ± 0.025	0.594 ± 0.023	0.594 ± 0.025	0.563 ± 0.024	0.549 ± 0.028
vowel	0.658 ± 0.023	0.669 ± 0.024	0.631 ± 0.023	0.537 ± 0.025	0.538 ± 0.026	0.544 ± 0.026	0.381 ± 0.029	0.353 ± 0.020
wine	0.811 ± 0.055	0.807 ± 0.053	0.814 ± 0.054	0.729 ± 0.058	0.730 ± 0.057	0.728 ± 0.063	0.724 ± 0.057	0.721 ± 0.066
yeast	0.752 ± 0.012	0.759 ± 0.010	0.734 ± 0.010	0.528 ± 0.017	0.528 ± 0.016	0.531 ± 0.017	0.383 ± 0.010	0.365 ± 0.010

Table B3 τ_X score (mean and standard deviation) of algorithms with 60% of missing positions for the synthetic datasets

Dataset	Bucket pivot	Borda	Copeland	Markov chain 1	Markov chain 2	Markov chain 3	Markov chain 4	Maximal lottery
authorship	0.676 ± 0.035	0.694 ± 0.030	0.693 ± 0.027	0.610 ± 0.036	0.610 ± 0.035	0.611 ± 0.035	0.606 ± 0.034	0.606 ± 0.034
blocks	0.895 ± 0.010	0.915 ± 0.008	0.896 ± 0.010	0.893 ± 0.009	0.892 ± 0.009	0.894 ± 0.008	0.873 ± 0.011	0.894 ± 0.008
breast	0.548 ± 0.092	0.623 ± 0.082	0.593 ± 0.095	0.473 ± 0.087	0.471 ± 0.091	0.478 ± 0.088	0.482 ± 0.078	0.419 ± 0.068
ecoli	0.566 ± 0.048	0.668 ± 0.040	0.578 ± 0.033	0.565 ± 0.043	0.562 ± 0.041	0.567 ± 0.040	0.503 ± 0.039	0.528 ± 0.040
glass	0.545 ± 0.090	0.632 ± 0.056	0.627 ± 0.055	0.449 ± 0.053	0.447 ± 0.055	0.453 ± 0.052	0.474 ± 0.053	0.404 ± 0.055
iris	0.820 ± 0.097	0.819 ± 0.099	0.838 ± 0.078	0.799 ± 0.100	0.799 ± 0.099	0.799 ± 0.100	0.799 ± 0.092	0.808 ± 0.097
letter	0.633 ± 0.005	0.637 ± 0.004	0.545 ± 0.006	0.559 ± 0.009	0.570 ± 0.009	0.575 ± 0.009	0.514 ± 0.010	0.526 ± 0.007
libras	0.470 ± 0.039	0.535 ± 0.033	0.490 ± 0.031	0.422 ± 0.028	0.431 ± 0.029	0.440 ± 0.030	0.392 ± 0.034	0.302 ± 0.025
pendigits	0.730 ± 0.008	0.758 ± 0.006	0.633 ± 0.008	0.711 ± 0.009	0.712 ± 0.008	0.714 ± 0.008	0.598 ± 0.010	0.705 ± 0.008
satimage	0.728 ± 0.013	0.779 ± 0.009	0.748 ± 0.010	0.648 ± 0.012	0.647 ± 0.011	0.651 ± 0.012	0.628 ± 0.012	0.643 ± 0.010
segment	0.797 ± 0.017	0.836 ± 0.011	0.779 ± 0.016	0.756 ± 0.014	0.755 ± 0.016	0.758 ± 0.015	0.711 ± 0.021	0.752 ± 0.015
vehicle	0.627 ± 0.034	0.663 ± 0.033	0.661 ± 0.033	0.524 ± 0.041	0.524 ± 0.043	0.525 ± 0.042	0.514 ± 0.045	0.497 ± 0.042
vowel	0.521 ± 0.031	0.603 ± 0.024	0.556 ± 0.026	0.426 ± 0.039	0.429 ± 0.038	0.434 ± 0.038	0.436 ± 0.023	0.334 ± 0.024
wine	0.684 ± 0.103	0.680 ± 0.103	0.701 ± 0.100	0.627 ± 0.088	0.628 ± 0.088	0.628 ± 0.088	0.624 ± 0.098	0.612 ± 0.099
yeast	0.578 ± 0.021	0.710 ± 0.012	0.676 ± 0.012	0.428 ± 0.019	0.430 ± 0.019	0.432 ± 0.019	0.484 ± 0.017	0.362 ± 0.011