Partisan gerrymandering is not a well-kept secret, nor is it always identifiable. In cases where it is identified, the disparity between the percentages of seats and votes won by a party often becomes the seed of public outrage that fuels gerrymandering claims. But claims based on seats-votes discrepancies imply a right to proportional representation which is not judiciable, and scientists are left with finding other ways to measure gerrymandering. In the 1986 gerrymandering case, Davis v. Bandemer, the Supreme Court ruled partisan gerrymandering claims were justiciable, yet no gerrymandering measurement standard presented at the time allowed the courts to act upon such claims. Almost 20 years later, the Vieth v. Jubelirer decision of 2004 effectively repeated that mantra, solidifying the Court’s reluctance to enter the political gerrymandering arena without that holy-grail of gerrymandering measurement techniques.

Possibly due to this relaxing of judicial pressure, redistricting after the 2010 census produced some of the most unbalanced plans seen in decades. Whatever the reason for the unbalance, lopsided election results soon followed, and public outcry, along with court cases, followed the election results. As these court cases progressed and decisions were issued, it became clear that our courts continue to search for a viable judicable gerrymandering standard.

This paper presents the WDM, a method of evaluating partisan gerrymandering. The WDM measures a state’s districting plan by weighting each district according to vote share. A district with a vote share beneficial to a party is rated higher by the WDM method while a district with a vote share harmful to the party is rated lower. The average of these weights is the WDM result, and is a measure of gerrymandering.

The WDM is an easily understood, compact method that will be shown to produce stable, accurate measurements. The goal of a gerrymander is to manipulate district
boundaries to produce safe seats for one party and packed districts for the other. It is this behavior that the WDM measures.

The Weighted Districts Method is similar to and will be compared to the Efficiency Gap method, which weights each district by its number of wasted votes. The Efficiency Gap was introduced in 2014 and since that time there have been a number of articles pointing out its flaws. The Weighted Districts Method essentially corrects the two most glaring flaws and suggests a correction for a third.

The first flaw, turnout-bias, arises from the use of actual votes in wasted votes calculations and is the reason the Efficiency Gap fails the Efficiency Principle. Turnout-bias is removed by using district vote percentages instead of district vote totals when calculating wasted votes.

The second and most glaring flaw, the discontinuity in the weighting of districts around 50% vote-share, is the source of the volatility in the Efficiency Gap results. The Weighted District Method avoids this flaw by deriving its weighting function via a harm-benefit analysis, and through this lens, the origin of the Efficiency Gap discontinuity is clarified.

The third flaw, the slope of 2 used in the Efficiency Gap calculations, is shown not to fit election data. It is suggested that the slope be changed to 3.

This paper also explains why the Efficiency Gap cannot be correctly plotted on a seats-votes curve.
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I. OVERVIEW

Gerrymandering cannot be measured using one singular method. Geography, neighborhoods, and cultures affect district boundaries while politics, incumbency, and race can affect redistricters’ decisions about where to place these boundaries. A gerrymandering measurement technique must focus on select areas when attempting to quantify a facet of elections and gerrymandering. The WDM method presented in this paper is a partisan gerrymandering measurement technique. It takes into account voting behavior in each district and combines the measure of each district to give an overall assessment of a state’s redistricting plan.

The WDM weights each district by vote share, which means it cannot be helped but to compare it to the EG method, which, via wasted votes, also weights each district by vote share. The EG has featured prominently in the latest volley of court cases involving gerrymandering. In the court’s opinion of the recent League of Women Voters v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania case, the EG is mentioned over 40 times. In the opinion of League of Women Voters v. Rucho in North Carolina, the EG is mentioned over 80 times. And in Wisconsin’s Whitford v. Gill, the lower court’s opinion mentions the EG over 200 times.

In an attempt to understand the EG more fully, this paper begins by clearing up common misconceptions about the EG. While the EG is in fact a measure of wasted votes, wasted votes are not the best descriptor of what the EG measures. Wasted votes calculations can be used to derive an equivalent EG seats-votes equation that illuminates bias in the EG results. A higher-turnout district produces more wasted votes and the final EG result reflects these higher-turnout districts more than lower-turnout districts. The EG equation gives a clear measure of this bias.

Turnout-bias is easily resolved by using the percentage of wasted votes per district instead of the number of wasted votes used by the EG. This is accomplished via the Equal Districts Efficiency Gap (EDEG).

Because the EG is based on the wasted votes concept, it is also susceptible to wide swings in output even for small shifts in voter behavior. Districts having close elections won by a party are weighted by the EG as the most valuable to that party and districts having close elections lost by a party are weighted as the least valuable to that party. This feature of the EG is contrary to intuition as close-election districts could go either way, offering little value, positive or negative, to either party.

The WDM weighting function is derived via a harm-benefit analysis which balances the interplay between districts being safer from flipping the farther they are above a 50% vote-share and districts so far above a 50% vote-share that they become packed with excess votes. Though the WDM is derived via this harm-benefit analysis and the EG is defined by wasted votes, the two methods are very similar in the sense that each weights each district in a redistricting plan by vote share. Because of this similarity, the harm-benefit analysis is helpful in illuminating the reasons for the wide swings in the EG output.

Gerrymanders tend to cluster districts in the sweet-spot where districts are not packed with votes, yet the seats are relatively safe from flipping. US Congressional
election results from Pennsylvania are used to give an example of this and show that not only does the WDM give a stable gerrymandering measure, but it also measures this clustering of districts.

In addition to honing the analysis down to one number indicating a degree of gerrymandering, the WDM produces graphs that allow one to view the response of an entire districting plan for each election.

A gerrymandering measurement tool is also helpful in comparing redistricting plans where one must account for voter variations between election cycles. Two Wisconsin Assembly plans presented in the Whitford v Gill gerrymandering trial are used to show the stability of the WDM method over a reasonable vote swing. This section then dives deeper into the slope of 2 used by the Efficiency Gap, how this slope provides a good match to gerrymandered data, and how a slope of 3 provides a good match to non-gerrymandered election data.

The reality that the EG is a measure of proportional representation and its results are volatile is well documented. In contrast, the WDM method does not reduce to proportional representation and its results are much more stable, especially when comparing redistricting plans where shifts in vote share affect both plans similarly.

The final section offers a state-by-state comparison of results from the 2012 US Congressional elections. The WDM again is shown to have more accurate results than the EG method and is able to show when the EG method goes astray. The WDM is also shown to be much less variable under shifts in voter behavior.

Three appendices are included. Appendix 1 derives the seats-votes equations for the EDEG and EG methods as alternatives to the wasted votes method. Appendix 2 clarifies the source of turnout-bias present in EG calculations, including a simple method for constructing a scenario where the Efficiency Gap fails the Efficiency Principle. Finally, seats-votes curves have been used in literature to explain the EG measurement. Appendix 3 plots the EDEG on a seats-votes curve along with its slope of 2 and explains why neither the EG point nor its line with a slope of 2 can be plotted on a seats-votes curve.

In the course of this paper, three separate Gaussian distributions are used to represent data. The first is used to provide a measure of variability in voter turnout from election to election for a single district. The second is used to represent a localized cluster of districts within a plan’s district vote-share distribution. And the third is used to represent a plan’s overall district vote-share distribution. The integral of a Gaussian is an erf (error function), which is referenced in all three cases.

II. THE EDEG AS A REPLACEMENT FOR THE EG

A. Turnout-Bias Revealed through EDEG and EG Seats-Votes Equations

In today’s literature, the wasted votes method is the most common way to calculate the Efficiency Gap. Wasted votes calculations use actual votes which prejudice the results toward higher-turnout districts. This is a form of turnout-bias.¹

The Equal Districts Efficiency Gap is void of turnout-bias as it uses district vote-shares instead of district vote totals when calculating a statewide wasted votes

The EDEG is the average percentage of wasted votes in a district, and as shown in Appendix 1, its wasted votes calculations can be reduced to the Equal Districts Efficiency Gap seats-votes equation.

\[
EDEG = (S - 50\%) - 2(D_{avg} - 50\%)
\] (1)

The Democratic average district vote-share is \(D_{avg}\), and \(S\) is the percentage of Democratic-won seats.

The Efficiency Gap is the average number of district wasted votes as a percentage of the average number of district total votes and can be reduced to an Efficiency Gap seats-votes equation.

\[
EG = (S_{weighted} - 50\%) - 2(D_{vote} - 50\%)
\] (2)

The Democratic statewide vote share, \(D_{vote}\), is the total statewide number of Democratic votes as a percentage of total statewide votes and is susceptible to turnout-bias. Even more susceptible to turnout-bias is the percentage of Democratic-won weighted seats, \(S_{weighted}\).

When calculating seat share, a won or lost seat is given a value of 1 or 0. These 1’s and 0’s are summed to give the total number of seats won by a party. Equation 2 must accommodate for the turnout-bias in the wasted votes method by weighting seats according to district vote-share. In a district with twice the average voter turnout, the number of wasted votes is twice average and its seat is given a weight of 2. Likewise, a seat in a district with half the average voter turnout is given a weight of 0.5. Lost seats have zero weight. The sum of these weighted seats as a percentage of total seats is \(S_{weighted}\). In the United States, more voters tend to show up in Republican-won districts, which means Democrats win their seats more efficiently, so it is usually the case that \(S_{weighted} < S\) and \(D_{vote} < D_{avg}\).

In many instances, turnout-bias affects \(D_{vote}\) by no more than a percentage point or two and can be ignored. But lower-turnout Democratic-won districts concentrate the bias in \(S_{weighted}\), and the bias in this term cannot be ignored. Because of this effect, it is overwhelmingly the case that \(EDEG > EG\) in real numbers.  

---


4 Their Fig. 3 gives a nice graph comparing Davg to Dvote. Kastellec, J., Gelman, A., & Chandler, J. (2008). Predicting and Dissecting the Seats-Votes Curve in the 2006 U.S. House Election, PS: Political Science & Politics, 41(1), 139-145. doi:10.1017/S1049096508080207

5 Their Figure 5 is a plot of EG v EDEG (The authors call it ‘full form’ v ‘simplified form’). By plotting a diagonal line on their Figure 5 from (-30,-30), to (30,30), one can see that most dots are above this line, confirming \(EDEG > EG\) in the majority of cases. Turnout-bias is the vertical distance from this line to the plotted point and represents the error in the EG measurement. Nicholas Stephanopoulos and Eric McGhee, “The Measure of a Metric: The Debate Over Quantifying Partisan Gerrymandering,” November 26, 2017, https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3077766. Stanford Law Review, Forthcoming.
**B. The EDEG as the True Measure of Wasted Votes**

Equation 2 provides the exact same results as the wasted votes method yet yields a better understanding of turnout-bias effects as it provides both a general turnout-bias term, $D_{\text{vote}}$, and a partisan turnout-bias term, $S_{\text{weighted}}$. When $S = S_{\text{weighted}}$, turnout-bias has no partisan component, and the higher the inequality, the greater the partisan bias. With this knowledge, it becomes a simple task to construct a scenario where the EG violates the Efficiency Principle\(^6\) (see Appendix 2).

Equation 1 gives the Equal Districts Efficiency Gap, which is not subject to turnout-bias, yet current scientific literature is more than lacking in its understanding of the EDEG. In present-day literature, the EDEG is referred to as a simplified form,\(^7\) a short-form,\(^8\) or an approximation\(^9\) to the EG equation. These characterizations are flatly incorrect, yet they persist because articles present the EG as a wasted votes calculation and the EDEG only as a simple seats-votes equation valid solely under hypothetical equal turnout conditions. Again, nothing could be further from the truth. The ‘Equal Districts’ part of the ‘Equal Districts Efficiency Gap’ neither implies nor assumes equal turnout districts. ‘Equal Districts’ indicates that each district has equal influence over the final result. The EDEG method stands on its own as a wasted votes measurement tool, producing results void of turnout-bias.

Both the EDEG and EG can be calculated via wasted votes. Both can be calculated via a seats-votes equation. Neither is simpler than the other, but as stated, the EG’s vulnerability to turnout-bias is less apparent when viewed through the wasted votes method.

This author hopes the differences between the EDEG and EG methods do not cause confusion, but this paper uses seats-votes curves, and the EG cannot be understood through a seats-votes curve (see Appendix 3).

While results vary between the EDEG and EG methods, general discussion in this paper applies to both methods unless specifically stated. For example, the EG $\pm 7\%$ gerrymandering threshold is valid for the EDEG and the EG results.

---


III. THE WEIGHTING FUNCTION AS A MEASURE OF GERRYMANDERING

A. The EDEG Weighting Function

Table 1
Wasted Votes Calculations in a Four District Hypothetical State
Unshifted Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party D</th>
<th>Party R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>D_dist</th>
<th>Party D</th>
<th>Party R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P_w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D_avg = 54.0%  
EDEG = -8%

Table 2
Wasted Votes Calculations in a Four District Hypothetical State
Uniform Vote Shift of +2 Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party D</th>
<th>Party R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>D_dist</th>
<th>Party D</th>
<th>Party R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P_w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D_avg = 56.0%  
EDEG = 13%

Table 1 shows election results for a state comprised of four districts where two Democrats are elected. From there, two votes per district are shifted from Party R to Party D to give Table 2 where three Democrats are elected. In districts where no seat flips, the change in wasted votes is 4. In the flipped district, the change in wasted votes is 96 and the flipped seat is the major influence on the EDEG’s jump from -8% to +13%.

The EDEG is the average district percentage of wasted votes, P_w. Since each district has an equal number of votes, the EDEG and EG results are the same. To calculate wasted votes in districts that elect a Party R representative, all of Party D votes are subtracted from half of Party R’s excess votes. In districts that elect a Party D representative, half of Party D’s excess votes are subtracted from all of Party R’s votes. The percentage of wasted votes, P_w, can be simplified to two equations.

\[
P_w = -50\% - 2(D_{dist} - 50\%) \quad D_{dist} < 50\% \quad (3)
\]

\[
P_w = 50\% - 2(D_{dist} - 50\%) \quad D_{dist} > 50\% \quad (4)
\]
Figure 1
The EDEG Weighting Function (cr = 25)

Figure 2
Gap Weighting Functions. The EDEG Line is Shown in Black

Figure 3
Gap Method Response to Uniform Vote Shift
Equations 3 and 4 are plotted in Figure 1.\textsuperscript{10} The vertical axis is the percentage of wasted votes, \( P_v \), and is best viewed as a weighting function as it weights each district according to vote-share. Except for the discontinuity at the 50\% vote-share mark, the slope of the weighting function is -2 and is referred to as the 2x slope. District weights from Tables 1 and 2 are plotted as squares and crosses, respectively. A constant, \( cr \), is introduced to represent the distance between a weighting function’s crossover points and the 50\% mark, so \( cr = 25 \) for the EDEG.

One can create a range of gap weighting functions by anchoring the weighting function at the 50\% vote-share mark and adjusting the slope to give different crossover points. This is equivalent to changing the definition of wasted votes. Figure 2 shows gap weighting functions for \( cr = 10, 15, 20, 25, \) and 30, where the EDEG weighting function becomes a special case.

A number of articles have suggested alternative definitions for wasted votes.\textsuperscript{11} The EDEG (and EG) defines the winner’s wasted votes as half of their excess votes, but the winner of an election does not need half of their excess votes. They need only more votes than their opponent. Changing the wasted votes definition to include all of the winner’s excess votes, the slope of the EDEG weighting function becomes -3, giving \( cr = 16.7 \). This definition of wasted votes is more intuitive and as will be shown in this paper, a 3x slope provides a better representation of actual election results. In order to compare WDM and EDEG results, the 2x slope is used in this paper.

Figure 3 is found by taking data from Table 1, uniformly shifting the vote-share, and plotting the gap results using each of the Figure 2 weighting functions. The black curve in Figure 3 is the EDEG response and the black squares are EDEG results of -8\% and +13\% from Tables 1 and 2.

Independent of which weighting function is used, the small vote-shift of 2 percentage points causes the results in Figure 3 to jump 21 points, three times the gerrymandering threshold of ±7\%. The cause of the jump is due to the flipped seat and the weighting function discontinuity at the 50\% mark.\textsuperscript{12}

From Table 1, the EDEG value of -8\% says the plan is gerrymandered to favor Republicans. From Table 2, the EDEG value of +13\% says the plan is gerrymandered to favor Democrats. Using wasted votes, it is difficult to determine with any accuracy which gap measurement is correct or whether the state is truly gerrymandered.


\textsuperscript{12} See Bernstein, supra note 7. Discusses the erratic behavior of the EG.
B. Derivation of The WDM Weighting Function

In deriving the Weighted Districts Method weighting function in Figure 4, it is helpful to split the analysis into two components, harm and benefit.

The benefit function measures how safe a seat is from flipping. To include election to election variations in voter turnout, the turnout in a singular district is represented by a Gaussian distribution with a standard deviation of 6.1. In a district where Democrats win an average of 50% of the votes from election to election, Democrats have a 50% chance of winning the next election, and that district offers them zero benefit. In a district one standard deviation above 50%, Democrats win an average of 56.1% of the votes and have an 84% chance of winning an election. The benefit of such a district is positive. In districts three standard deviations above 50%, Democrats win an average of 68.3% of the votes and have a 99.9% chance of winning each election. At this point, the benefit curve is past the point of diminishing returns and has effectively reached its maximum.

The benefit function is shown in Figure 4 as the light gray erf curve. Its range has been adjusted to ±50 to match the ±50 range of the EDEG method.

Defining harm as excess votes, the difference in excess votes between districts with a 55% and 65% vote-share is the same as the difference in excess votes between districts with an 80% and 90% vote-share, and the harm function should be linear.

One could easily derive a slope for such a line, but such a definition is irrelevant in this derivation because the vertical axis of the WDM weighting term remains undefined and in fact needs no definition. Scaling the weighting function has no effect on the analysis because WDM results are compared to each other.

---


14 There are harms other than vote share. For instance, when a district is packed, competition is lowered, and weaker candidates can be chosen by the few who show up at caucus with no fear of that candidate losing the election. This gives the vast majority of citizens no say in who gets elected. Such harms are ignored in this analysis.

15 It will be shown in the section on US Congressional comparisons that the EDEG, when multiplied by 0.7, is comparable to the WDM results.
weighting function, the only two variables needed are the cr-value and the standard deviation of the benefit function. The standard deviation of the benefit function has been defined, and the crossover points occur where the harm and benefit functions offset each other. A harm function slope of -2 gives cr = 25 crossover points and a slope of -3 gives cr = 16.7 crossover points,\(^{16}\) nicely matching the EDEG method’s slopes and crossover points.

Of course, one must be careful not to associate the slopes of the EDEG and WDM weighting functions as they are defined in different ways and measure different aspects of excess votes. Assumptions made for determining an accurate crossover point are discussed in the Wisconsin section. The gray line in Figure 4 is the harm function with a slope of -2 to match the EDEG method. Adding the harm and benefit functions, the WDM weighting function is plotted in Figure 4 and shown here as Equation 5.

\[
WDM\ district\ weight = 50 \cdot \text{erf}\left(\frac{D_{\text{dist}} - 50\%}{\sqrt{2} \sigma}\right) - \frac{50}{cr} \left( D_{\text{dist}} - 50\% \right) \quad (5)
\]

Greater variability in voter turnout increases the standard deviation, lowers the slope of the benefit function near the 50% vote-share, and lowers the peak value of the weighting function. Less variability in voter turnout brings stability and the peak value increases, reflecting the added benefit of stable election results. Notice the similarities between the WDM weighting function of Equation 5 and the EDEG weighting function of Equations 3 and 4.

The WDM and EDEG weighting functions overlap at the tails, diverge nearer the WDM peaks, and at the 50% vote-share mark, they are entirely disparate. Because of this overlap, the WDM and EDEG analyses produce similar results when a state’s near-50% districts are symmetrical around 50% or when few or no districts are near 50%.

As the standard deviation of the benefit curve approaches zero, the erf function approaches +1 for \(D_{\text{dist}} > 50\%\) and -1 for \(D_{\text{dist}} < 50\%\). For \(cr = 25\), Equation 5 reduces to the EDEG weighting function of Equations 3 and 4, and the first and second terms of these equations can now be seen to represent EDEG benefit and harm functions. The EDEG harm function is the same as the WDM harm function and while the WDM benefit function is an erf, the EDEG benefit function is binary at weights of ±50%. This explains the gap in the EDEG weighting function. According to the EDEG method, a 51% vote-share district provides a benefit of +50 and a harm of -2 while a 2% vote-share district provides a benefit of -50 and a harm of +98. Both give a total weight of +48 and both are seen to be among the most valuable districts to the party, which in reality, is not the case.

One can draw a weighting function of any form, but in general, there are four points of contention: the peak values, the tail values, the crossover points, and the center point.

---

\(^{16}\) These crossover points can also be created by holding the slope steady and adjusting the range of the benefit function.


C. Four Points of Contention

The Peaks

A district vote-share near the peaks is far enough from 50% to be relatively safe from being flipped yet not packed enough to cause harm, providing an overall benefit to the party.

The Tails

The tails in Figure 4 have values of ±50. At twice the weight of the peaks, fully packed districts are deemed twice as beneficial/harmful as safe districts. Realistically, few districts fall close to 100% packed so the value assigned to the tails is rarely reached. Democratic voters have a greater propensity than Republicans to pack themselves into like-minded neighborhoods, so the choice of the weighting at the tails has greater influence over Democratic-won districts.

The Crossover Points

Crossover points represent a balance between safe and packed districts. These districts are nearly invisible to analysis as they add zero to the overall weight while taking up a seat. The EG has been questioned over these crossover points, but people tend to agree that a 60% district is favorable to a party while a 90% district is unfavorable. Between these values, there must be a vote-share deemed neutral.

The Center Point

In states evenly split between the two parties, few will argue against a 50% center point. But in states where one party has a statewide vote-share far above or below 50%, an argument can be made to shift the center point in the direction of the dominant party. Because of the asymmetric distribution of Democratic and Republican voters across most states, it is often easier to carve out a packed Democratic district than a packed Republican district, and a 50% center point may not measure that state correctly. This paper anchors the center point at 50%.

---

17 See Bernstein, supra note 7. At 4.; See Cho, supra note 11. At 16.
Broadening the WDM analysis to provide a full view of its behaviors, a wide range of peak, crossover point, and tail values is created by adjusting the slope of the harm function. Figure 5 shows WDM weighting functions for \( cr = 10, 15, 20, 25, \) and 30. These crossover points match the crossover points of the Figure 2 gap weighting functions.

Using the weighting functions in Figure 4, the results of a uniform vote-shift analysis performed on Table 1 are plotted in Figure 6 and can be compared to the EDEG shift analysis in Figure 3. The response curves show no jumps and the \( cr = 25 \) curve at zero shift gives the WDM result of \( W = 3.3 \), indicating the plan slightly favors Democrats. The slope of 0.9 at the measurement point shows a relatively stable measurement under vote-shifts.

As with the gap methods in Figure 3, Figure 6 shows a wide range of possible results. The \( cr = 10 \) curve may represent too narrow of a weighting function as the peaks
are only ~ 10 percentage points apart while \( cr = 30 \) may represent too broad of a weighting function. As stated, this paper uses the \( cr = 25 \) curve as the tails of the WDM weighting function overlap with the EDEG weighting function.

The \( cr = 20 \) curve gives a zero-slope inflection point, indicating the WDM has found some sort of balancing point in the data. This is further explored in the next section.

IV. PENNSYLVANIA 2012 US CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS

A. Plotting the Pennsylvania Elections on a Seats-Votes Curve

Table 3
Pennsylvania Congressional Elections of 2012
Districts Ordered by \( D_{\text{dist}} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( D_{\text{dist}} )</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>( D_{\text{vote}} )</th>
<th>( S_{\text{weighted}} )</th>
<th>( \text{EG} )</th>
<th>( D_{\text{avg}} )</th>
<th>( S )</th>
<th>( \text{EDEG} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179,563</td>
<td>179,563</td>
<td>94,227</td>
<td>273,790</td>
<td>34.42%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>-23.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>-23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216,727</td>
<td>216,727</td>
<td>122,146</td>
<td>338,873</td>
<td>36.04%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>-23.1%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181,603</td>
<td>181,603</td>
<td>104,643</td>
<td>286,246</td>
<td>36.56%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177,740</td>
<td>177,740</td>
<td>104,725</td>
<td>282,465</td>
<td>37.08%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169,177</td>
<td>169,177</td>
<td>105,128</td>
<td>274,305</td>
<td>38.33%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209,942</td>
<td>209,942</td>
<td>143,509</td>
<td>353,451</td>
<td>40.60%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166,967</td>
<td>166,967</td>
<td>118,231</td>
<td>285,198</td>
<td>41.46%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156,192</td>
<td>156,192</td>
<td>111,185</td>
<td>267,377</td>
<td>41.58%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165,826</td>
<td>165,826</td>
<td>123,933</td>
<td>289,759</td>
<td>42.77%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191,725</td>
<td>191,725</td>
<td>143,803</td>
<td>335,528</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168,960</td>
<td>168,960</td>
<td>128,764</td>
<td>297,724</td>
<td>43.25%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199,379</td>
<td>199,379</td>
<td>152,859</td>
<td>352,238</td>
<td>43.40%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175,352</td>
<td>175,352</td>
<td>163,589</td>
<td>338,941</td>
<td>48.26%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 7
Histogram of Pennsylvania Election Data with Overlapping Gaussian
The Pennsylvania elections of 2012 produced huge disparities between seat and vote percentages. As shown in Table 3, Democrats won only 5 of the 18 US congressional seats while claiming a 50.5% average vote share. The histogram in Figure 7 shows Democrats with 3 or 4 packed districts to the Republican’s zero. Meanwhile, Republicans have a cluster of ten-plus districts in the sweet spot while Democrats have one. This histogram shows the classic signature of a partisan gerrymander.

The corresponding classic signature of a partisan gerrymander on a seats-votes curve is where the curve passes to one side of the 50-50 mark with a large increase in slope to that side, and the Pennsylvania data plotted as a seats-votes curve in Figure 8 shows this signature. Figure 7 has a Gaussian distribution outline with a standard deviation of \( \sigma = 7.9 \), representing the clustering of districts near the 40.5% vote-share. This standard deviation is represented by the dark gray line with a slope of 5.1 on the seats-votes curve in Figure 8 (the WDM finds these values in the analysis below).

The Pennsylvania example was chosen because the difference between \( D_{\text{avg}} \) and \( D_{\text{vote}} \) is only 0.3 percentage points and \( S = S_{\text{weighted}} \), indicating little turnout-bias with no partisan component, thus EDEG and EG results are similar. With only one district between 45% and 55% vote-share, the WDM response will agree to some extent with the EDEG response, though the EDEG weights of districts between 40% and 50% vote-share will cause the EDEG result to be lower than the WDM. The EDEG of -23% (EG = -24%) indicates the state was heavily gerrymandered.

The EDEG point is plotted on the seats-votes curve as a black square and the EG point cannot be plotted on this curve (see Appendix 2). The EDEG value of -23 is the vertical distance from the 2x line to this point.

---

19 Pennsylvania Election Returns, Pennsylvania Department of State. Web site: http://www.electionreturns.pa.gov/General/OfficeResults?OfficeID=11&ElectionID=27&ElectionType=G&IsActive=0
20 The max-slope line in Figure 8 goes through the EDEG point by coincidence only.
Figure 9 is found by performing a uniform vote-shift on Table 3 and plotting the gap results for the corresponding weighting functions. The EDEG line in black can also be found by subtracting the seats-votes curve in Figure 8 from the 2x line. In Table 3, the first districts above the 50% vote-share mark are at 60% and 69% vote-share, so only these two seats flip on the LHS of Figure 9. A global minima occurs on the RHS of the figure around the +6 vote-shift mark, just before a number of seats begin flipping. Each seat flip is $\frac{1}{18^{th}}$, or 5.6% of the total seats, and the four seats flipping at the vote-shift of +7 gives a jump of over 20 points. The EDEG measurement of -23.1% is plotted as a black square.

Figure 10 shows WDM uniform vote-shift curves for $cr = 10-30$ at increments of 1. The curves overlap at $D_{avg}$, so the measurement of $W = -16.7$ on the $cr = 25$ curve

---

21 In fact, all of the vote-shift curves in Figure 9 can be understood through the seats-votes curve. For example, the slope of the $cr = 20$ line is $50/20 = 2.5$, and its curve in Figure 9 is the seats-votes curve subtracted from a 2.5x line.
is ~0.5 percentage points from this overlap. The slope at the measurement point gives an indication of the variability of the measurement under reasonable vote-shifts and the slope of -0.2 here indicates a stable measurement.

B. Gaussian Approximation of District Vote-share Clusters

Pennsylvania’s cluster of districts near 40% matches well with the negative peak of the \( cr = 25 \) weighting function, producing a local minima in Figure 10. As vote-shares shift negative, the cluster moves to the tail of the weighting function and the \( cr = 25 \) curve rises. As vote-shares shift positive, the cluster is eventually moved below the positive peak of the weighting function, producing a local maxima.

The small black squares mark zero-slope points. As \( cr \)-values are lowered, the zero-slope points move closer until they are closest on the \( cr = 13 \) curve, shown as a dashed line. Zooming into this area, Figure 11 is found.

![Figure 11](image)

Figure 11 shows the WDM results for \( cr \)-values from 12.0 to 14.0 at increments of 0.1. The \( cr = 12.5 \) curve has a zero-slope inflection point, indicating the WDM has found a balancing point in the data. Performing the same WDM analysis on a pure Gaussian vote-share distribution with a standard deviation of \( \sigma = 7.9 \) also produces a zero-slope inflection point on a \( cr = 12.5 \) curve. This is the Gaussian outline used in Figure 7 to represent the localized cluster of districts.

A purely Gaussian district vote-share distribution produces a seats-votes curve in the shape of an erf with a max-slope of 39.89/\( \sigma \), and a cluster of districts in a non-uniform vote distribution will produce a localized rise in the slope of a seats-votes curve. The Gaussian outline in Figure 7 is represented in Figure 8 as a max-slope line with a slope of 39.89/7.9 = 5.1. This is not a measure of the most extreme slope of the seats-votes curve, but a measure of the tightness of the cluster in relation to the entire vote-share distribution.

---

22 When \( D_{avg} = 50\% \), the harm function in Equation 5 is zero and the WDM value is \( 50*\text{erf} \left( \frac{D_{avg} - 50}{\sigma*\text{sqrt} 2} \right) \) for all \( cr \)-values. Similarly, for the gap methods, at \( D_{vote} = 50\% \), all gap values are \( (S_{weighted} - 50) \). In this case, \( D_{avg} \) is reached at a -0.5 point vote shift and \( D_{vote} \) is reached at a -0.8 point vote shift.

23 The max-slope of an erf is \( \left[ 2 / \sqrt{\pi} \right] \ast \left[ \frac{1}{\sigma * \sqrt{2}} \right] \). The seats-votes curve scales this number by 50 to give max-slope = 39.89 / \( \sigma \).
The vote-shift of 9.5 points at the zero-slope inflection-point shows how far the cluster is from the 50% vote-share mark. Districts in this cluster are safe from flipping yet not so far from 50% to be packed.

While the local standard deviation of 7.9 and the max-slope of 5.1 represent a bunching of districts, the overall standard deviation of the Pennsylvania district vote-share distribution is $\sigma = 17.8$ which corresponds to an overall max-slope of 2.2 in the seats-votes curve. This value reflects an overall behavior such that if the Pennsylvania vote distribution were represented as a pure Gaussian distribution, a vote-shift of 1% would produce a seat-shift of 2.2%. This is the basis of the $2x$ slope used in the EDEG (and EG) analysis and the Pennsylvania data fits this method well.

The difference between the local and overall max-slope is a measure of how far a state’s overall vote-share distribution is from being symmetrical and is in itself a good indicator of partisan gerrymandering.

The minima found in Figure 11 was hinted at by the EDEG measurement in Figure 9 and the WDM has found relevant data there. The WDM value of $W = -26.2$ at the zero-slope inflection point is not a direct measure of gerrymandering but gives a general indication of the influence of the cluster on the entire vote-share distribution and can be compared from election to election.

With the full scope of this analysis underfoot, one can step back to Figure 10 and visualize the 2016 Pennsylvania elections in one graph. Pictured is the WDM gerrymandering measurement, the slope at the measurement point (its variability under vote shifts), the cluster of districts at 50% - 9.5% = 40.5%, and the tightness of the cluster. The beauty of Figure 10 is most appreciated when a string of ten or twenty past elections are put into video form. One can watch the makeup of the congressional districts change along with shifts in voter behavior.
V. WISCONSIN 2012 GENERAL ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS

A. Plotting Act 43 and the Demonstration Plan on a Seats-Votes Curve

Table 4
Wisconsin Act 43 and Demonstration Plan Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Act 43 Plan</th>
<th>Demonstration Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D_{avg}</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEG</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12
Act 43 and Demonstration Plan Histograms, top
WDM and EDEG Weighting Functions, bottom
Originally brought before the Wisconsin courts before being heard by the US Supreme Court, the Whitford v. Gill gerrymandering case asserts that Wisconsin’s Act 43 redistricting plan was gerrymandered to favor Republicans. As part of the testimony, an expert took the Act 43 plan and moved district boundaries to come up with a fairer plan he called the Demonstration Plan.\(^\text{24}\) For the Wisconsin General Assembly elections of 2012, the Act 43 plan has an EDEG of \(-11.2\%\) (EG = \(-12.1\%\)), flagging it as gerrymandered. The Demonstration Plan’s EDEG of \(-2.1\%\) (EG = \(-2.7\%\)) indicates a more neutral plan.

This section finds that while the EDEG (and EG) measures the Act 43 plan as surely gerrymandered and the Demonstration Plan as fair, differences between the two plans come mainly from shifting districts near the 50% mark. The WDM method weights these districts near-zero as they provide limited benefit and inflict little harm to a party. The EDEG method weights these middle districts at near maximum in magnitude.

The Figure 12 histogram shows the vote-distribution for both plans. Act 43 is in black, the Demonstration Plan is in light gray, and where distributions overlap, namely, where neither the WDM nor the EDEG method measure any difference between the plans, the bars are shaded medium gray. To get from Act 43 to the Demonstration Plan, districts are moved from black to light gray, and the majority of the shift is from the large black spike in the 40-45% bin being moved to the light gray spike in the 50-55% bin. Placing districts so close to the 50% mark makes them vulnerable, and as will be shown, a small change in voter behavior can flip a substantial portion of the 50-55% bin to the other side of 50%, eliminating any gains achieved by the Demonstration Plan.

The weighting functions below the histogram in Figure 12 show that outlier districts are measured equally by the WDM and EDEG methods and do not become a factor when comparing methods. Therefore, any differences between the WDM and EDEG measurements come from districts between the 35% and 65% vote-share marks.

From Act 43 to the Demonstration plan, the EDEG jumps 9.2 percentage points while the WDM sees a more modest difference between the plans and jumps only 4.4 points.

B. The Efficiency Gap 2x Slope

The seats-votes curves in Figure 13 show Act 43 in black and the Demonstration Plan in gray. One can see the Act 43 districts being shifted to the middle of the graph to get to the Demonstration Plan. The standard deviation of the entire district vote-share distribution for either Act 43 or the Demonstration Plan is about 14.7, yielding an overall max-slope of \( \frac{39.89}{14.7} = 2.7 \). This is not plotted but calls into question the 2x slope used by the EDEG (and EG).

The authors of the EG derived the 2x slope from wasted votes and have presented it as a rough representation of historical seats-votes averages. A slope of 2 derived from historical averages represents a vote-shift response of a particular vote-share distribution. A Gaussian district vote-share distribution with a standard deviation of 20 gives an overall max-slope of \( \frac{39.89}{20} = 2 \) on a seats-votes curve, matching the 2x slope on which the EG and EDEG methods are based. With district vote-shares limited to values between 0 and 100, a standard deviation of 20 represents an unnaturally wide distribution and in the few states that have such a high standard deviation, their distributions are either severely skewed (like Pennsylvania’s) or saddle-shaped (suggesting a partisan gerrymander).

The majority of states’ congressional district vote-share distributions are in the range of \( \sigma = 12 \) – 18. An overall max-slope of 3 on a seats-votes curve in the shape of an erf gives \( \sigma = 13.3 \), indicating that a 3x slope better fits the data. As shown above, the overall max-slope of the Wisconsin state assembly is more in line with the 3x slope theory.

In the EDEG weighting function, the \( cr = 25 \) crossover points come directly from the 2x slope. A 3x slope gives \( cr = 16.7 \). One can get a better feel for where these crossover points should be by solely using the vote distribution. If a party’s gaussian vote share distribution is centered at 50%, that party wins approximately 50% of the seats from election to election. Moving the distribution to the right under a uniform vote shift, \( D_{avg} \) increases and the party picks up more seats. The greater the shift, the more seats they pick up. When \( D_{avg} \) has shifted one standard deviation to the right of 50%, the maximum slope of the gaussian distribution is at 50%, and past this point, further vote shifts gain marginally fewer seats while picking up consistently more excess votes. One would expect the balance between gained seats and lost votes to equalize soon after

---

25 See Alexeev, supra note 18. In Figure 13, both plans have larger tails on the LHS of the curve, supporting the impossibility theorem, and is a sign of natural packing. The author of the Demonstration Plan indicated some difficulty in getting the Demonstration Plan to zero EG, and natural packing may be the cause as these outlier districts barely budged in his redrawing of the districts.

26 See McGhee, supra note 5. His Figure 7 data is used to justify a slope of 2, but the plotted data suggests a slope greater than 2, possibly closer to 3.


28 The seats-votes relationship can also be presented as a bilogit function, at 1254. The erf function for \( \sigma = 13.3 \) is a near-exact match to the \( \rho = 3 \) logit function which is the basis of the cube law. King, Gary, and Robert X. Browning. 1987. Democratic representation and partisan bias in congressional elections. American Political Science Review 81:1251–73.
this point, giving a cr-value somewhere between 1 and 1.5 standard deviations. This can also be measured. In this range, the breakeven-point where a 1% vote shift wins 1% more of the total seats occurs. Beyond this range, a 1% vote shift will return fewer than 1% of the total seats and harm overtakes benefit. This is not a hard-and-true analysis as the harm and benefit of votes and seats can be debated, but it gives a good feel for where to place the crossover points.

For \( \sigma = 20 \), this gives a cr-value between 20 and 30, agreeing nicely the value of cr = 25 used in the EDEG (and EG) analysis. For \( \sigma = 13.3 \), this gives a cr-value between 13.3 and 20. This agrees well with the value of cr = 16.7 given by the EDEG analysis for a 3x slope.

Looking at actual data, most states suspect of gerrymandering have district clusters centered just under ten points from the 50% mark, so one would place the peak of the WDM weighting function near this point. Assuming a crossover point twice the distance from 50% as the peak, we get cr = 18, give or take, agreeing again with the 3x slope analysis.

When considering crossover points, the argument that the EDEG (and EG) should use a 3x slope is the same as the argument that the WDM should use \( \sigma = 13.3 \). Both produce \( \text{cr} = 16.7 \) crossover points.

It must be clarified that for the EDEG, the response of a distribution function with \( \sigma = 13.3 \) gives a max-slope on a seats-votes curve of 3, but the WDM cannot be reduced to proportional representation and the slope used for the WDM weighting function cannot be translated to a line on a seats-votes curve.

\[ \text{C. Gerrymandering Bias and Historical Data} \]

Gerrymandering tends to move districts away from the 50% mark to a safe vote-share or even farther away to a packed vote-share. Safe and packed districts will also produce more uncontested elections, possibly further skewing the data. If gerrymandering did not exist, one would expect clusters to loosen and outliers to move inward, allowing the distribution to settle around the average district vote-share, producing more of a bell-shaped distribution, and lowering the standard deviation. The end result would be data more closely supporting a 3x slope.

The author of the Demonstration Plan started with Act 43 and moved districts from just above a 40% vote-share to just above a 50% vote-share, effectively lowering the standard deviation. But outlier districts were moved farther into the wings, so the overall standard deviation did not change from one plan to the other. The Pennsylvania plan in the previous example has been determined by the courts to be a gerrymander. If under redistricting, the vote-share percentages of the packed districts are lowered and the cluster of districts is loosened, the standard deviation of the overall data set will decrease, moving the overall max-slope closer to 3.

This is what happened in Florida, where its US Congressional districts were deemed gerrymandered and districts were redrawn in 2015 under court order. In 2012, before redistricting, Democrats won 10 of 27 seats with a 47.7% average district vote-share. In 2016, after redistricting, Democrats won 11 seats with a 47.5% average district vote-share.\(^{29}\) Seats and votes changed little between these two elections, but due to a

lack of, or at least diminished gerrymandering effects, the standard deviation of the state’s district vote-share distribution lowered from 19.1 in 2012 to 14.2 in 2016. The corresponding overall max-slopes are 2.1 for the gerrymandered plan, closely matching the 2x theory, and 2.8 for the bipartisan plan, closely matching the 3x theory.

For an example of how to measure gerrymandering bias in the US Congressional election results, we turn to presidential election data from 2012. At the county level, the standard deviation of the presidential Democratic vote-share is \(\sigma = 15.8\). At the state level, the standard deviation of the presidential vote-share is \(\sigma = 12.1\). This is expected. As counties are gathered into states, the sample population increases, variability between these populations decreases, and the standard deviation should decrease.

Though congressional districts do not follow exact county lines, the same logic holds that, if drawn from the same data, the sample population of congressional districts is greater than county populations and less than state populations, therefore the standard deviation of congressional districts should fall between the standard deviations of the state and county data. But at the congressional level, the standard deviation of presidential vote-share for the 2012 election is \(\sigma = 17.4\), which is much higher than either the county or state numbers. One can only conclude that the shapes of these districts skew the data by pulling districts away from the 50% vote share mark to create safe or packed districts, thus creating the higher standard deviations. This case also highlights the difficulty in asserting that a pure 2x or 3x slope should be universally applied to the EDEG, the EG, or the WDM harm function. But as the measurement input changes from 50 state data points to 4,000 county data points, the standard deviation varies only from 12.1 to 15.8, and considering the amount of noise in election measurements, the 3x slope is well within tolerances.

For an additional reference, the 2012 US Senate elections give a vote-share standard deviation of \(\sigma = 13.4\) for its un-gerrymandered state-level ‘districts.’ This is just another weight to pile onto the abundance of data in this area that insists on the 3x slope.

While an analysis like this can be interesting or informative, such gerrymandering effects are disconcerting, especially when gerrymandered historical data is being used to define a ‘normal’ by which present-day gerrymandering is evaluated.

The vote-shifts in this paper are achieved in the most simplistic way, by uniformly shifting the vote-shares of each district. This method is intuitive as the same percentage shift is applied to all districts. Under this method, a 20 point shift moves a 90% district to 110%, which is obviously unattainable. Since results obtained via vote-shifts are valid for only a few percentage points, the shifting method is relatively inconsequential as beyond a small shift the curves represent only the general behavior of the data.

A more realistic method keeps percentages within the 0-100% range by shifting votes according to the vote-share of the district. This type of shift keeps the 2x line and vertical axis intact while compressing the seats-vote curves along the horizontal

---

30 County, congressional district, and state data is from states with three or more districts.
31 At 67, the authors make a point in noting the possibility of adjusting the slope, state-by-state, as determined by the seats-vote curve. Of course, this brings us full circle as many of these curves are drawn from gerrymandered data, and how does one parse through that mess? McGann, A.J., Smith, C.A., Latner, M., Keena, A. (2016). Gerrymandering in America: The House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, and the Future of Popular Sovereignty. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. At 67xxx

22
axis. The net effect is an increase in the slope of a seats-votes curve, further supporting a 3x slope and an adjustment to the wasted votes definition.

\[ \text{D. WDM and EDEG Measurements on a Vote-Shift Graph} \]

Figure 14 shows WDM and EDEG uniform vote-shift results for Wisconsin’s Act 43 and Demonstration plans. The opening between the two EDEG curves is the same as the opening in the middle of the seats-votes curves and gives a good visual of vote-shares being moved across the 50% line to get from the Act 43 plan to the Demonstration Plan. The steep slope of the Demonstration Plan EDEG measurement at the -2 point shift shows a good number of districts flipping. As mentioned above, these Demonstration Plan districts started in the 50-55% bin, a small shift flipped these seats, and to the left of the -2 point shift, the EDEG method measures no difference between the Act 43 and Demonstration plans.

The WDM shows a smooth measurement with a slope close to 1 at zero-shift, indicating a stable measurement. More importantly, a key goal in gerrymandering analysis is to accurately compare redistricting plans within the same state. For each plan, the WDM curve reacts similarly to vote-shifts. Within a ±5 percentage point vote-shift, the WDM measures the difference between the Act 43 and Demonstration plans to be between 2.5 and 4.5. These numbers tell us that the difference between the plans is noticeable but not substantial. Within the same vote-shift range, the EDEG measures the difference between the Act 43 and Demonstration plans to be somewhere between -1.0% and 14.2%, a difference of 15.2 percentage points. Considering again that the threshold for gerrymandering is ±7 percentage points and variations in voting behavior naturally occur from election to election, the EDEG result is of little use as one is forced to make assumptions in order to come up a final EDEG number. In this vein, the WDM provides by far a more stable, and arguably a more accurate measurement.
VI. US CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS OF 2012

A. Effects of Vote-shifts on WDM and EDEG Results

Figure 15
The Effect of a ± 2 Percentage Point Shift on the WDM and EDEG Results for the 2012 US Congressional Elections. States Ranked by Number of Districts.

WDM and EDEG measurements of the 2012 US Congressional elections are shown in Figure 15.33 The data is raw and uncontested elections are assigned either an 80% or 20% vote-share for Democratic-won or lost districts. The black lines show the WDM and EDEG measurements while the gray lines show the measurements after vote-share shifts of ± 2 percentage points. Shifted and unshifted WDM results are relatively stable and discrepancies occur mainly for two reasons. First, the light gray bars in the middle of Figure 15 indicate states with $D_{avg}$ more than 13 points from 50%. These partisan states are highly skewed either Democratic or Republican, making the measurement more difficult.

Second, the black bars in Figure 15 are under Texas, Georgia, Tennessee, Missouri, and Louisiana. These states have saddle shaped histograms where few districts are near 50% vote-share and most districts are either 15 or more percentage points above or below 50%. It is not surprising then that these five states have the highest congressional vote-share standard deviations of all states, averaging over 21. Such distributions are highly distorted and may be better suited for a bi-partisan gerrymander analysis than the partisan analysis here.

The results are less stable in these two situations, but even in these more difficult cases, the WDM results are as or more stable than the EDEG measurement and its 2x slope variance.

---

33 See supra note 27.
For the EDEG measurement, the spacing between the black and gray lines is 4 percentage points except where a seat has flipped. While the slope of the WDM curve gives an indication of the variability of the result under vote-shifts, the 2x slope of the EDEG response is an inherent component of the calculations, not an indication of variability. One is never sure when a seat will flip, and this uncertainty undermines confidence in the results.

**B. Comparison of WDM and EDEG Results**

**Figure 16**
Comparison of WDM and EDEG (x0.7) Results

Figure 16 compares the unshifted WDM and EDEG measurements of Figure 15. Since the WDM weights middle districts near-zero, WDM results are on average lower in magnitude than EDEG results. To offset this difference, all EDEG results in Figure 16 have been multiplied by 0.7 to match the WDM data set as best as possible in order to provide a good visual of the similarities and differences between the WDM and EDEG results. This implies that a ± 5 gerrymandering threshold fits the WDM method. Overall, the data sets share a 0.89 correlation coefficient but it cannot be predicted where the two methods will agree. When disparities exist, one must ask what is being measured.

When a seat flips, the EDEG jumps according to the number of districts in the state. In the first example in this paper, Table 1 gives EDEG = -8%, indicating the plan is gerrymandered to favor Republicans. A small vote-shift causes a seat to flip, and Table 2 gives EDEG = +13%, indicating the plan is gerrymandered to favor Democrats. For the given vote-shares, there is no seat-makeup where the EDEG does not measure the state as gerrymandered. This scenario can occur in any state of 7 districts or less.

In general, for a given vote-share in a state of 7 or fewer districts, a maximum of only one seat-makeup can exist that is not deemed gerrymandered. In states of 14 districts or less, there are no more than two seat-makeup not deemed gerrymandered for a given vote distribution. If used, there should be a defined cutoff for the viability of the EDEG (and EG) method as these limits are quite constraining.

Finally, limiting analysis to states with higher district counts has political implications. As shown in Table 5, higher district states tend to vote more Democratic.

---

34 2x slope times the 2 percentage point shift
35 See Cho, supra note 11. At 6, discusses different gap ranges.
36 When a seat flips in a state of 7 districts, the EDEG jumps 14.3 percentage points. In a state of 14 districts, the jump is 7.1 points.
The WDM and EDEG results also tend to be more negative in these states, possibly due to natural packing. If analysis concentrates on the easier to measure data, some Republican-leaning states may be left out, possibly skewing the national conversation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Districts ≥ 6</th>
<th>WDM Average</th>
<th>EDEG Average</th>
<th>D_{avg}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Districts ≥ 2</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ≥ # Districts ≥ 2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Nationwide WDM and EDEG Averages
According to the Number of Districts in a State

VII. DISCUSSION

As presented in the introduction, our courts have signaled their openness to viable gerrymandering measurement standard, but no such standard has come forth either as a singular measurement or as part of a complimentary group of measurements. To have value, a gerrymandering measurement technique must be explicit, comprehensible, and produce consistent results. The Weighted Districts Method is obvious to what it measures, is easily understood, and produces stable results that match intuition.

The Efficiency Gap is a weighting function that weights a district by its number of wasted votes. This wasted votes method is the least revealing and least intuitive approach to understanding the EG, yet, to date, wasted votes is the only viewpoint the public has been offered. This gives the average reader a false impression of what is being measured. It would be encouraging if those who present the EG to the public would present Equation 2 as it contains transparent, objective descriptions of the measurement variables.

The Equal Districts Efficiency Gap is the true method for measuring wasted votes and needs to be understood past the ‘simplistic’ form in which it has been so far presented. It should also be understood that the EDEG and EG methods do not measure gerrymandering. They are measures of proportional representation.

The WDM method is a stable measure of gerrymandering. It contains a clear understanding of the weighting process as districts beneficial to a party receive positive weights and districts harmful to a party receive negative weights. The most efficient gerrymander will locate districts where the WDM weights them positive, and the gerrymander will show in the WDM result.

While gerrymandering analysis should not be relegated to one method, each method should stand on its own. The theory behind the WDM and the results presented are both well founded and consistent. The weighting functions are adaptable, and the weighting of districts brings clarity to what is being measured.

---

37 Natural packing in this paper refers to Democrats living in neighborhoods consisting of a high percentage of Democrats. While this natural packing is correlated with high-density cities, the cause is not the density; See McGann, supra note 31. Natural packing and its consequences are discussed at 101-105.
APPENDIX 1: DERIVATION OF THE EDEG AND EG SEATS-VOTES EQUATIONS

The Equal Districts Efficiency Gap (EDEG)

Dividing a state into two columns, column i containing all Democratic-won districts and column j containing all Republican-won districts, let $S_w$ be the total number of seats won by Democratic candidates and $S_{TOT}$ be total number of seats in the state.

Expressed as a fraction, the Equal Districts Efficiency Gap is defined as the average of the fraction of wasted votes from each district,

$$EDEG = \frac{\sum W_k}{S_{TOT}} = \frac{1}{S_{TOT}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{S_w} \frac{W_i}{T_i} + \sum_{j=S_w+1}^{S_{TOT}} \frac{W_j}{T_j} \right],$$

Where $W_k$ is the number of wasted votes and $T_k$ is the total number of votes in district $k$. In a Democratic-won district, the number of wasted votes is defined as,

$$W_i = -\frac{D_i - R_i}{2} + R_i,$$

where $D_i$ and $R_i$ are the number of Democratic and Republican votes in district $i$, and in a Republican-won District, the number of wasted votes is,

$$W_j = -D_j + \frac{R_j - D_j}{2}$$

Combining the above three equations,

$$EDEG = \frac{S_w}{S_{TOT}} - \frac{2}{S_{TOT}} \sum_{k=1}^{S_{TOT}} \frac{D_k}{T_k} + \frac{1}{2},$$

where the summation term sums the percent of Democratic votes, district by district. Expressed as a percentage, this reduces to Equation 1 in the paper,

$$EDEG = (S - 50\%) - 2(D_{avg} - 50\%),$$

Where $S$ is the percent of seats won by Democrats, and $D_{avg}$ is the average percentage of Democratic vote-share for all districts.
The Efficiency Gap (EG)

The Efficiency Gap is defined as the total number of statewide wasted votes as a fraction of the total number of statewide votes,

\[ EG = \frac{W_{TOT}}{T_{TOT}} = \frac{1}{T_{TOT}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{s_w} W_i + \sum_{j=S+1}^{S_{TOT}} W_j \right], \]

which, when combined with the wasted votes definitions, becomes,

\[ EG = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \frac{T_i}{T_{TOT}} - 2 \frac{D_{TOT}}{T_{TOT}} + \frac{1}{2}. \]

Expressed as a percentage, this reduces to Equation 2 in the paper,

\[ EG = (S_{\text{weighted}} - 50\%) - 2 (D_{\text{vote}} - 50\%), \]

where \( S_{\text{weighted}} \) is the sum of Democratic-won weighted seats as a percentage of total seats and \( D_{\text{vote}} \) is the total number of statewide Democratic votes as a percentage of the total number of statewide votes.
APPENDIX 2: TURNOUT-BIAS IN THE EG AND ITS VIOLATION OF THE EFFICIENCY PRINCIPLE

Table A1
Wasted Votes Calculations in a Four District Hypothetical State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>D_{dist}</th>
<th>D_{vote}</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-48%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ D_{vote} = 54.0\% \]

\[ EG = -8\% \]

\[ D_{avg} = 54.0\% \]

\[ EDEG = -8\% \]

Table A2
Turnout-Bias Exemplified By Doubling District 3 Total Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>D_{dist}</th>
<th>D_{vote}</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-139.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-55.5</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ D_{vote} = 54.0\% \]

\[ EG = -9\% \]

\[ D_{avg} = 57.6\% \]

\[ EDEG = 10\% \]

Table A3
Violation of the Efficiency Principle by Manipulating District 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>D_{dist}</th>
<th>D_{vote}</th>
<th>Seat</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-139.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-55.5</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ D_{vote} = 54.0\% \]

\[ EG = -9\% \]

\[ D_{avg} = 57.6\% \]

\[ EDEG = 10\% \]
**EG Turnout-Bias**

Table A1 is the same as Table 1. Table A2 doubles the total vote count in Table A1’s District 3 to get the EG to 0%. Table A3 performs a vote-shift on Table A1 to give Democrats a third seat then manipulates District 1 to violate the Efficiency Principle. The final column in each table shows seat weights.

In wasted votes calculations, the total number of wasted votes between both parties is always half the district total. Starting with Table A1, doubling the number of votes in District 3 doubles the number of wasted votes in that district without changing the vote-share or the percentages of wasted votes and we arrive at Table A2. The state’s political makeup has not changed between Tables A1 and A2 and D_dist remains the same for each district. But because of the increased turnout in District 3, the EG jumped from -8% to 0%, turning a gerrymandered state into a fair state.

The effects of turnout-bias are obvious in this simple wasted votes example, but in real-life examples where bias is often spread out between districts, turnout-bias is best understood through a seats-votes equation. Table A1 gives,

\[ EG = (50\% - 50\%) - 2 (54\% - 50\%) = -8\% . \]

Table A2 gives,

\[ EG = (60\% - 50\%) - 2 (55\% - 50\%) = 0\% . \]

In Table A2, the difference between D_vote and D_avg is only 1 percentage point, indicating a low overall turnout-bias, but the 10 percentage point difference between S and S_weighted shows that turnout-bias contains a strong political component, and is the main reason for the change in the EG value.

Turnout-bias would be more palatable if the EG biased results in the correct direction, but it does quite the opposite in this case. Doubling the number of voters in District 3 benefits Republicans as it packs more Democrats into the district. Yet the EG result moves in the positive direction, signaling that the doubling of voters has benefited Democrats.

The EDEG is void of turnout-bias and its value does not change from Table A1 to Table A2.

**Violation of The Efficiency Principle**

The Efficiency Principle states that an efficiency measure must increase if seat share increases while vote-share remains constant.\(^{38}\)

Equation 2 is written again.

\[ EG = (S_{weighted} - 50\%) - 2 (D_{vote} - 50\%) \]

It is clear from this equation that when D_vote remains constant, the EG becomes dependent only on S_weighted, and if Democrats pick up a seat while S_weighted decreases, the Efficiency Principle is violated.

Moving from Table A1 to Table A3,\(^{39}\) Democrats have picked up a seat but voter turnout in District 1 is higher than voter turnout in Districts 2, 3, and 4 combined, making S_weighted less than 50%. Since S_weighted decreases from Table 1 to Table 3 while D_vote remains constant, the EG moves lower, from -8% to -9%, and the EG violates the Efficiency Principle.

---

\(^{38}\) See McGhee, *supra* note 5, at 4.

\(^{39}\) Table A3 is Table 2 with district 1 adjusted.
To put this into perspective, Table A3 shows a state where Democrats were elected to 75% of the seats with 54% of the statewide vote-share, and though this plan obviously favors Democrats, the EG has determined that the state not only favors Republicans, but favors Republicans so greatly that the state is measured to be gerrymandered in their favor. The error is entirely due to turnout-bias.

With only four districts, a flipped seat causes the EG to jump 25 points, and district 1 needs to be heavily manipulated to produce an Efficiency Principle violation. In the Wisconsin example, a seat-flip causes the EG to jump 1 point and an Efficiency Principle violation is an easier task.

The problem here is, we have a mixture of variables. The EDEG is defined by S and D_avg, the EG is defined by S_{weighted} and D_{vote}, and mixing the terms of the EG and EDEG equations, the Efficiency Principle is defined by S and D_{vote}. One can imagine that any measure of gerrymandering that is not solely a measure of S and D_{vote} can be manipulated to violate the Efficiency Principle. Conversely, since it is essentially an insistence on proportional representation, any measurement that satisfies the Efficiency Principle is unlikely to be accepted by the courts.

In order to create a gerrymandering measure that does not violate the Efficiency Principle, the author of the EG reverse-engineered Equation 2 to make it a function of only S and D_{vote}. And in fact, his engineered equation does not violate the Efficiency Principle, but it turns out that this modified equation is the same as Tufte’s seminal seats-votes equation from 1973. Since Tufte’s equation is written in terms of S and D_{vote}, it is the only gerrymandering measure to date that does not violate the Efficiency Principle.

It should not be lost on the reader that nearly every Efficiency Gap result presented in a scholarly article, produced in a court case, or written about in the national press over the past few years can be calculated through either the EDEG or the EG seats-votes equation. These equations are but simple variations of Tufte’s nearly half-century-old formula, which makes one question how far we have come in our ongoing quest to measure gerrymandering.

---

40 See Wallin supra note 2. At 16, the mini-state example clarifies the mixture of variables in the EG and EDEG measurements and explains that each equation is drawn from a different fundamental basis. The Efficiency Principle mixes these bases.

41 At 24, McGhee’s equation 4 is the same as Equation 2 in this paper but he separates S_{weighted} into S and a second component. He then redefines wasted votes to negate the second component in order to get his modified equation of S and D_{vote}. Eric McGhee, “Measuring Efficiency in Redistricting,” Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy 16, no. 4 (December 2017): 417–42, https://doi.org/10.1089/elj.2017.0453.

42 At 542, Tufte’s equation is S = b*V +c. Setting b=2 and c=EG, the equation becomes the modified Efficiency Gap equation and his Figure 2 becomes a graph of the EG 2x line where the bias is measured horizontally, so it is ½ the EG value. Edward R. Tufte, “The Relationship between Seats and Votes in Two-Party Systems,” American Political Science Review 67, no. 02 (June 1973): 540–54, https://doi.org/10.2307/1958782.
APPENDIX 3: THE ERR IN PLOTTING AN EG POINT ON A SEATS-VOTES CURVE

Table A4
Ohio 2016 Congressional Election Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>D_dist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,392</td>
<td>244,599</td>
<td>344,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94,722</td>
<td>230,784</td>
<td>325,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88,707</td>
<td>214,048</td>
<td>302,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119,490</td>
<td>258,044</td>
<td>377,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98,947</td>
<td>210,261</td>
<td>309,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,450</td>
<td>209,103</td>
<td>309,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114,009</td>
<td>222,798</td>
<td>336,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115,355</td>
<td>224,924</td>
<td>340,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115,454</td>
<td>221,148</td>
<td>336,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119,759</td>
<td>225,865</td>
<td>345,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131,001</td>
<td>219,268</td>
<td>350,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144,754</td>
<td>210,034</td>
<td>354,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208,673</td>
<td>99,331</td>
<td>308,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199,721</td>
<td>91,630</td>
<td>291,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194,007</td>
<td>88,391</td>
<td>282,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224,906</td>
<td>59,780</td>
<td>302,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,188,346</td>
<td>3,030,009</td>
<td>5,218,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A1
2016 Ohio Congressional Elections

Figure A2
Expanded Region of Figure A1

The data set for the Ohio 2016 US Congressional elections is shown in Table A4. The Democratic seats-votes curve is the black curve in Figure A1. A seats-votes curve is a hypothetical empirical distribution function created by plotting the EDEG point, performing vote-shifts on all districts, and plotting the corresponding seat percentages. From a more practical viewpoint, The black curve was plotted by integrating a reversed histogram of the Ohio elections and shifting it $D_{avg} - 50 = -7.3$ percentage points.
A seats-votes curve typically displays the percentage of seats won by Democrats for a given Democratic average district vote-share. Each step in the seats-votes curve is 1/16, or 6.25% of the total. When the reverse curve is plotted, shown here in gray, it represents seats and votes for the Republican Party.

The EDEG points (actual and reversed) are shown as black squares and each falls on a curve. The EDEG value of -10.5 is the vertical distance from the 2x line to the EDEG point on the Democratic curve. The EG value of -11.2 is the vertical distance from the 2x line to the lower EG point, but this point is not on a curve. The zoomed in area in Figure A2 shows the EDEG point (Davg, S) and EG point (Dvote, Sweighted). These points correspond to the values used in Equations 1 and 2.

However, there is a problem with this representation. The horizontal axis in Figures A1 and A2 is Davg while the EG is plotted using Dvote, so even though the point is the correct distance from the 2x line, it is incorrect to plot the EG point in Figure A1.

By changing the horizontal axis to Dvote, the EG point can be plotted on a seats-votes curve at (Dvote, S), (41.9%, 62.5%), but this point has no meaning. The vertical distance between it and a 2x line on such a plot is closer to -9 and no longer represents the EG measurement. According to Equation 2, to properly plot the EG point in relation to a 2x line, the vertical axis must be Sweighted, a rather useless scale.

In today’s literature, the EG point can be found plotted as (Dvote, S) in relation to a 2x line, but these plots are incorrect. As shown in this paper, there is no relationship between Dvote and S in the EG method. The EG point can be plotted in relation to a 2x line under the hypothetical assumption of equal-turnout districts, but equal-turnout districts are void of turnout-bias which makes the horizontal axis Davg and the vertical axis S. Such a graph corresponds to Equation 1 and a plotted point on such a graph is the EDEG point.

To summarize, whenever a 2x line appears in literature, it either represents the EDEG 2x seats-votes relationship, it is plotted wrong, or it is simply a line having nothing to do with an Efficiency Gap analysis. When an EG point is plotted on a seats-votes curve in literature, the point is either the EDEG point, the point is incorrectly plotted, or the point is just a reference point unassociated with a 2x line.

A red flag should be raised when words like simplified or approximation are used with an EG analysis. Seats-votes curves do not have to use simplified data or approximations. Real data from any election can be used to create a seats-votes curve with seat-share (S) and average district vote-share (Davg). In this light, the EDEG is the true measure and the EG is a close approximation (not always) of the EDEG.

---

43 See Nagle, supra note 32. At 351, uses Dvote, acknowledging it holds a slight turnout bias.