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ABSTRACT. We compare and contrast fourteen measures that have been proposed for the purpose of quantifying partisan gerrymandering. We consider measures that, rather than examining the shapes of districts, utilize only the partisan vote distribution among districts. The measures considered are two versions of partisan bias; the efficiency gap and several of its variants; the mean-median difference and the equal vote weight standard; the declination and one variant; and the lopsided-means test. Our primary means of evaluating these measures is a suite of hypothetical elections we classify from the start as fair or unfair. We conclude that the declination is the most successful measure in terms of avoiding false positives and false negatives on the elections considered. We include in an appendix the most extreme outliers for each measure among historical congressional and state legislative elections.

1. Introduction

A partisan gerrymander occurs when one political party illicitly draws electoral district lines to their own advantage. A number of measures that are based on how voters of each party are distributed among districts have been proposed as aids to identifying partisan gerrymanders. Unfortunately, there is no consensus as to which of these measures works the best.

There have been several efforts to compare some of the proposed measures. McGhee and Stephanopoulos [SM17] explore the extent to which each of a number of measures adheres to various desiderata. These analyses are performed by considering historical and simulated elections in the aggregate. In [BDK+17], Best et al. consider an overlapping set of measures, but do so with different evaluative criteria applied in the context of two specific elections. Nagle [Nag15, Nag17] also compares and contrasts a number of measures, both on theoretical grounds and in the context of a handful of specific elections. We refer the reader to [Tap18] for an expository review of many of the “wasted vote”-derived measures.

In this article we take a different tack to that taken in the aforementioned studies. Rather than focusing on just one or two elections or on elections in the aggregate, we focus on a dozen hypothetical elections, each selected so as to highlight various aspects of both fair and of unfair elections. Additionally, rather than evaluate elections based on abstract utility functions, we ground our evaluations in specific classes of elections that we believe should be considered either fair or unfair. Of course, our classification of each of these hypothetical elections is ultimately a subjective one: there is no gold standard to which we can appeal. Notwithstanding this unavoidable truth, we aim to present our results in a way that is illuminating even if the reader rejects both of the postulates upon which we base our classifications.

The measures we consider in this article are closely related in that they all look at the partisan vote by district. Most are closely tied to the seats-votes curve, that elusive function by which votes are turned into seats. But the measures vary widely in how much scrutiny they have been subjected to. The efficiency gap, explored extensively in [MS15], has achieved prominence through its usage in Whitford v. Gill [Wis] and has in many ways become the de facto standard for partisan gerrymandering measures. In spite of this success, or perhaps because of it, it has been the subject of numerous harsh critiques (see, e.g., [Gri, TC17, BD17]). On the other hand we have measures...
such as the winning efficiency, mentioned almost in passing in [TCT17], for which there has been essentially no study.

We come to several conclusions from our investigations of these measures. First, none of the “wasted-votes” variations of the efficiency gap appear to markedly improve upon it. Second, two of the other most widely cited measures, partisan bias and the mean-median difference, struggle in a number of ways. Third, the recently proposed declination measure performs robustly on the entire slate of elections we consider in this article and is therefore our recommendation for a general-purpose measure.

1.1. Issues not addressed in this article. Measures based on the vote distribution are far from being the only technique for quantifying or investigating partisan gerrymanders. Irregularly shaped districts have long been viewed as the sine qua non of gerrymanders. A number of compactness metrics have been developed to quantify these irregularities. Even though compactness metrics are undeniably important, we view them as a complementary class of measures and do not consider them in this article.

Computer simulations have proved to be increasingly useful in investigating gerrymandering. Much of this utility stems from the ability to generate a baseline for what properties a fair district plan should have. A baseline generated in this manner can take into account specifics such as local geography, county boundaries and how partisans are distributed geographically. Simulations can also be used to investigate measures themselves (see, e.g., [CDP+18]). As with the compactness measures, we consider computer simulations to be outside the scope of this article, in spite of their status as an important technique for quantifying gerrymandering.

We assume in this study that, for a given election, turnout is equal for each district. A more general analysis would consider the very real complication that turnout can vary widely. We have chosen for several reasons not to consider this more general setup. Primarily, we do so because equal turnout is the simplest case. If a measure doesn’t do a good job when turnout is equal, then we see no reason to suppose it will be useful in more taxing scenarios. There are also two practical reasons for our choice. First, not all of the measures we consider have been clearly defined for unequal turnout, although there are reasonable extensions for each of them. Second, we feel that considering multiple measures on multiple vote distributions with multiple variations in turnout is unmanageable for a single article. So, as much as unequal turnout is an important factor that requires further investigation, we defer it to another article.

Finally, we also limit our analysis to the realm of quantification of gerrymandering: We do not include any discussion of the legal aspects of the gerrymandering problem. Discussions such as those in [MSLK15] on the constitutional basis for supporting a given measure are beyond the scope of this article. Nor do we attempt to create a “manageable standard” that can be readily used by the courts (see, e.g., [MS15] or [Wan16b]). Such aspirations, while laudable, add a completely new dimension to the issue. Furthermore, quantitative measures of gerrymandering can prove useful outside of the courts. Even if a measure cannot directly serve as justification for the invalidation of a district plan on constitutional grounds, it can still serve as an aid to a redistricting commission evaluating submitted plans, for educational outreach, or for helping our understanding of issues such as the geographic distribution of partisans.

1.2. Outline of article. In Section 2 we explore what it means to be a partisan gerrymander. As part of this exploration, we present two postulates describing a class elections that should be evaluated as fair and another that should be evaluated as unfair. We introduce the measures we consider in this article in Section 3. In Section 4 we evaluate the measures on historical elections. In addition to their inherent interest as data, the distributions generated in this step are necessary for understanding how to interpret individual values of each measure. In Section 5 we move on to evaluating hypothetical elections in order to identify scenarios under which measures return false
positives or false negatives. Section 6 explores the sensitivity of each measure to statewide vote share. We close in Sections 7 and 8 with a discussion and our conclusions, respectively.

2. GERRYMANDERING, GERRYMANDERS AND PARTISAN ASYMMETRY

In order to evaluate gerrymandering measures, we need to describe carefully what it is we wish to measure. We will distinguish in the following way between the verb *gerrymandering* and the noun *gerrymander*. For us, gerrymandering is the process of attempting to create a map that illicitly favors one or more groups. The extent to which the gerrymanderers are successful in achieving their aims may have legal importance, but it does not affect their intent. In this sense, determining whether or not someone is gerrymandering is not, assuming full information, a difficult question: What are the motives for the choices they are making?

Defining a gerrymander is a trickier matter. It can’t *just* be the lines on a map — if all the residents of a state are avowed Democrats, then strange boundaries do not directly serve a partisan purpose of the sort we are interested in. On the other hand, we can’t expect a measure such as those we will discuss in this article to be able to know the intent of the map drawers. Since part of being a partisan gerrymander is, according to our definition, the fact that it has been drawn illicitly, no function based solely on the distribution of votes can definitively identify a district plan as a gerrymander. Our solution is to evaluate the proposed measures as measures of partisan asymmetry: Are the two parties treated equitably by the district plan? Any inequity that does occur may stem from geography, be accidental, or as the result of intentional gerrymandering; by itself, the measure can take no meaningful stand on the source of the inequity.

The next step is to define what we mean by partisan asymmetry. This in itself is a difficult matter as any precise definition is tantamount to defining a measure of the type we are trying to independently evaluate. We therefore take the indirect approach of articulating identifiable characteristics of fair district plans and of unfair ones. Once this is done, we will be in a position to label the various elections from Section 5 as either false positives or false negatives for individual measures. We aim in the below to take a minimal set of two postulates for identifying these characteristics. A different choice of postulates would, of course, lead to different conclusions regarding false positives/negatives.

**Postulate 1:** A linear vote distribution should be characterized as fair.

By “linear” we mean the Democratic vote fractions, when sorted in increasing order, lie approximately along a line. All slopes are considered equally appropriate. One notable property of these distributions is that when a uniform vote shift is applied to give each party equal statewide support, each party wins half of the seats. It is also worth mentioning that these distributions yield symmetric seats-votes curves. Finally, Postulate 1 is merely stating a sufficient condition on what it means to be fair; it does not place any restrictions on the other vote distributions that should also be considered fair.

The slope of such a linear vote distribution is usually expressed in terms of responsiveness or proportionality: \( m \)-proportionality occurs when \((50 + x)\)% of the statewide vote leads to \((50 + m \cdot x)\)% of the seats. Historically, elections often show between 2- and 3-proportionality (see [Tuf73]), but we intentionally do not enshrine any particular proportionality constant as the one correct value. The “correct” responsiveness, if there is one, is as suggested by [War18c, Fig. 2C & D], dependent on how partisans are distributed geographically. If the two groups are distributed homogeneously, we would expect all districts to have essentially the same vote split — this leads to very high responsiveness. Achieving low responsiveness, and the concomitant uncompetitive districts, would likely require contorted districts so as to string together local pockets where the majority party is slightly more dominant than the statewide average. By restricting our attention to vote distributions, we
are foregoing important geographic information that is crucial for illuminating what is or is not a partisan gerrymander. This is why it is better to view vote distribution-based measures as identifying asymmetry or inequity, rather than as a conclusive technique for ascribing an asymmetry to partisan gerrymandering.

**Postulate 2:** A vote distribution should be characterized as unfair if the average winning margin for the party winning a majority of the seats is less than the average winning margin for the opposition party.

Postulate 2 encodes the direct consequences of packing and cracking: The minority party wastes votes in a few overwhelming wins while the majority party efficiently wins a large number of relatively narrow victories. As additional support for Postulate 2, we observe that the 2012 North Carolina US House election has a distribution exactly of the form described. This district plan sets off alarm bells no matter how one looks at it: the district plan was drawn by one party [lev18]; a politician involved in the process is on record admitting that it was a partisan gerrymander [gan16]; the seats won by the Democrats are far below their statewide vote (4 of 13 seats with 50.60% of the total vote [wik18b]); and the proportion of seats won by Democrats is significantly less than what they won in 2010 even though their statewide support improved over 2010 (Democrats won 7 of 13 seats in 2010 with 45.24% of the total vote [wik18a]). A measure that doesn’t mark the 2012 North Carolina House election as an outlier is missing the closest thing we have to a universally acknowledged partisan gerrymander.

Absent from our two postulates is any mention of competitiveness. This is because our primary goal in this article is to evaluate measures of partisan asymmetry. While lack of competitiveness might be indicative of bipartisan (incumbency) gerrymandering, it has no direct bearing on partisan gerrymandering. Said another way, assessing a district plan according to whether it will aid or hinder competitiveness is a worthy goal. But we consider competitiveness as a confounding factor for our question and one that should not provide a strong signal to partisan-asymmetry measures. Other types of gerrymandering, such as racial gerrymandering, can, and often do, occur in concert with partisan gerrymandering, but we do not address them in this article either.

2.1. **Other criteria for judging measures.** Above we introduce what we see to be a minimal set of postulates that enable us to meaningfully identify false positives and negatives produced by the various measures. However, there are other approaches to evaluating measures. We briefly discuss two recent ones here.

In [mcg14](#) (see also [mcg17a](#)), McGhee introduces the Efficiency Principle:

**The Efficiency Principle:** Any measure of efficiency must indicate a greater advantage for (against) a party when the seat share for that party increases (decreases) without any corresponding increase (decrease) in its vote share.

He proposes this as a necessary principle that must be adhered to for any useful quantitative measure of partisan gerrymandering (see [veo18](#) for an exploration of the efficiency principle and the efficiency gap when equal turnout is not assumed). While we are generally supportive of the principle, we are more inclined to support something akin to Cover’s reworking of it [cov18](#).

Any measure of efficiency must indicate a greater advantage for (against) a party when the seat share for that party increases (decreases) without any corresponding increase (decrease) in its vote share **unless its expected seat share decreases (increases) under plausible variation in that vote share.**

In Figure [we illustrated](#) we illustrated the 1986 North Carolina House election along with a shifted 1994 Virginia House election. By “shifted” we mean that we have increased the Democratic support uniformly in each district so that the statewide averages match at 57.5%. This pair of elections
Figure 1. Example of two elections with the same statewide Democratic average. The buffered declination for the North Carolina election indicates a mildly pro-Republican advantage with the Republicans winning three seats while the (shifted) Virginia election indicates a mildly pro-Democratic advantage with the Republicans winning four seats.

illustrates how one of the measures we study, buffered declination (see Section 3.2), does not adhere to the Efficiency Principle: The Democrats win eight seats in the North Carolina election with the same statewide share of the vote that earns them only seven seats in the Virginia election. Yet, according to the buffered declination the North Carolina election has a pro-Republican bias whereas the shifted Virginia election has a pro-Democrat bias. However, we believe the buffered declination appropriately evaluates the relative security of the seats won in each election and does still adhere to Cover’s modified version of it: While the Democrats win one fewer seat in the shifted Virginia election, the seats they do win are much more secure.

Another quality of measures seen as desirable is stability under changing electoral climates. In fact, some authors argue that a gerrymander exists independently of the ebb and flow of partisan support and that measures should recognize the gerrymander for what it is regardless of how the statewide support for each party changes. We do not believe this is most efficacious point of view. If one party suddenly becomes wildly popular, it likely doesn’t matter at all how the lines are drawn: the opposing party isn’t going to win a single seat. A simple function, based only on the partisan vote distribution, isn’t going to be able to recognize gerrymandering that expected a completely different electoral climate. Less drastically, it seems reasonable, even preferable, that a measure return a maximum value of unfairness for a given level of partisan support and gradually reduce in value as support deviates from the expectation.

And while in an ideal world stability would be easily achievable, our position is that the primary goal should be to measure the quantity of interest. Stability is not, in of itself, an indicator that a given measure is good at measuring asymmetry. Some aspects of various types of gerrymanders may be more stable than others. For example, by their nature one would expect incumbency gerrymanders, by virtue of their lack of competitive races, to be relatively stable under electoral shifts. We would expect this to be slightly less true for partisan gerrymanders in which there is a more delicate trade-off between risk and reward.

We view too much stability as a sign that the measure is not capturing the essence of a partisan gerrymander: the ability to turn votes into seats. Looking ahead to Section 5 Elections G and J.

\[1\text{For example: “Moreover, if a standard sometimes identifies the same set of districts as a gerrymander with respect to some elections and a non-gerrymander with respect to other elections, we know with assurance it is committing errors,” pg. 4, [BDK+17].}\]
in Figure 5 underscore the importance of returning different answers in different electoral environments. These two elections are uniform shifts of each other. But from a purely quantitative view, election G looks like a bipartisan gerrymander with a slight Democratic advantage while Election J looks like a strong partisan gerrymander. A measure such as the mean-median difference (see Section 3.3) evaluates these two elections exactly the same.

3. Gerrymandering measures

In this article we will view an election with $N$ districts as a triple consisting of two parties $P$ and $Q$ along with a sequence

$$p = 0 \leq p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \cdots \leq p_k \leq \frac{1}{2} < p_{k+1} \leq p_{k+2} \leq \cdots \leq p_N \leq 1,$$

where $p_i$ denotes the fraction of the two-party vote won by Party $P$ in district $i$. We display our elections by plotting the $p_i$ values along a vertical axis with districts indexed along the horizontal axis. Let $\bar{p}$ be the statewide fraction of the vote attained by Party $P$.

We have chosen to focus in this article only on those measures that depend solely on $p$. It is worth mentioning that there are other non-geographic measures that are excluded by this criterion. For example, in \cite{BGH+17}, the gerrymandering index and the representativeness index are defined as measures of gerrymandering. However, these measures utilize simulated district plans in their definitions in an integral manner. Fortunately, all of the measures we do consider in this article can be combined with computer simulations if so desired.

3.1. The efficiency gap and its variants. The first class of measures we consider all rely on the notion of a wasted vote. In the context of the original efficiency gap, a wasted vote is a vote for a losing candidate or a vote for a winning candidate that is in excess of the 50%+1 needed to win. Following others (see \cite{Cov18, Nag15, Nag17}) we define a slightly more general function that incorporates a parameter $\lambda$:

$$w^\lambda_P(i) = \begin{cases} p_i, & \text{if Party } P \text{ loses district } i, \\ \lambda \cdot (p_i - 1/2), & \text{if Party } P \text{ wins district } i. \end{cases}$$

Note that as defined, $w^\lambda_P(i)$ actually keeps track of the fraction of votes in district $i$ that are wasted rather than the total number of votes. For each district we define $w^\lambda_Q(i)$ analogously. The efficiency gap and its variants all work by comparing in some way the number of votes wasted by Party $P$ to the number wasted by Party $Q$. For general $\lambda$, we can define (after Nagle \cite{Nag17}) the weighted efficiency gap,

$$EG^\lambda = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}(w^\lambda_P(i) - w^\lambda_Q(i))}{N}. \tag{2}$$

The only values of $\lambda$ we know of that have been seriously considered in the literature are $\lambda \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, so we likewise restrict our attention to these. The efficiency gap \cite{McG14, MS15} is $EG^1$. It has been suggested in several places \cite{Gr, Cov18, Nag17} that wasted winning votes in a district should be relative to the losing party vote rather than to the 50% threshold. This can be achieved by considering $EG^2$. Also considered in \cite{Nag17} is the case in which only losing votes are counted as wasted. This leads to the use of $EG^0$.

Cho asserts in \cite{TC17} that winning and losing wasted votes should not be treated equally. She proposes a winning efficiency that does not include votes wasted towards losses at all:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^{N} w^1_P(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} w^1_Q(i)}{2N}.$$
It turns out that the winning efficiency reduces to the difference in statewide support between the two parties. As such, it considers an election to be fair if and only if the parties each garner 50% of the statewide vote. Statewide support is an environmental factor that is not, by itself, indicative of whether or not a gerrymander has been drawn. This makes it useless for quantifying partisan gerrymanders and we discuss it no more in this article.

Nagle [Nag17] and Cover [Cov18] each suggest comparing the fraction of democratic votes that are wasted to the fraction of Republican votes that are wasted. Given a parameter $\lambda$ we define

\[ EG^\lambda_v = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w^\lambda_P(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N p_i} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w^\lambda_Q(i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N (1 - p_i)}. \]

We consider here only the two “vote-centric” versions of the efficiency gap given by $EG^1_v$ and $EG^2_v$.

Finally, Warrington [War18c] introduces the $\tau$-Gap measure which weights votes according to a function parameterized by a non-negative real number $\tau$. The idea behind the definition is that votes close to the fifty-percent threshold are less wasted than those at either extreme. When $\tau = 0$, the $\tau$-Gap reduces to twice the efficiency gap. The precise definition for general $\tau$ requires an integral which we do not attempt to replicate here. We will restrict our attention in this article to the value of $\tau = 1$ and denote the measure by $EG^1_{\tau}$.

### 3.2. The declination and a variant.

The declination, introduced in [War18c] (see also [War18b]), is essentially an angle associated to the vote distribution. It can be thought of as a measure of differential responsiveness, albeit one that is anchored at the actual statewide level of support between the two parties rather than at 50%. It depends on four quantities: the average winning margin of parties $Q$ and $P$, respectively, as

\[ y = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (1/2 - p_i) \quad \text{and} \quad z = \frac{1}{k'} \sum_{i=k+1}^N (p_i - 1/2). \]

If $k = 0$ or $k' = 0$, the declination is undefined. Otherwise, we set $\theta_P = \arctan \left( \frac{2y}{k/k'} \right)$ and $\theta_Q = \arctan \left( \frac{2z}{k'/k} \right)$ and define the declination as $Dec = 2(\theta_P - \theta_Q)/\pi$. Note that the declination is not using the Democratic vote in the median district won by Democrats, but rather the mean of these values.
The buffered declination, $\text{Dec}'$, is computed analogously to the declination except that we introduce $m = \lceil N/20 \rceil$ districts with $p_i = 0.5$ and $m$ districts with $p_i = 0.5001$ into the election (so $k$ and $k'$ are each increased by $m$ in equation (3)). The modifications of $y$ and $z$ can be interpreted as adding $m$ evenly split districts to those the Democrats win and $m$ evenly split districts to those the Republicans win. The rationale for doing this is that it buffers the angle in cases for which one side wins a small fraction of the seats; this reduces the sensitivity to the exact vote fractions in the minority seats. When the sides are evenly matched, there is little effect besides an overall reduction in values.

3.3. Measures arising from the seats-votes curve. The mean-median difference, defined as $MM = \bar{p} - \text{median}(p)$, has been considered by a number of authors such as [Nag15, Wan16b]. Here $\bar{p}$ is the average of the $p_i$, or, assuming equal turnout in all districts, the statewide vote fraction for Party $P$. For $N$ odd, the median is $p_i(N-1)/2$; for $N$ even, the median is defined as the average of $p_iN/2$ and $p_i1+N/2$.

Partisan bias [GK94a] aims to evaluate the degree to which the two parties would win different fractions of the total seats for the same level of popular support. We consider two versions. The first compares the seat share each party would win if support were to be uniformly shifted to 50% for each party:

$Bias = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{N} \left| \{i : p_i > \bar{p}\} \right| .$

For the second share, we compare the seat share the Democrats hold at the level of $\bar{p}$ for statewide support with the seat share the Republicans would hold at the level of $1 - \bar{p}$ statewide support. The partisan bias at the observed level of support is then:

$Bias' = \frac{1}{2N} \left| \{i : p_i + 1 - 2\bar{p} < 1/2\} \right| - \left| \{i : p_i > 1/2\} \right| .$

This variant is referred to as the specific asymmetry in [BM17].

3.4. Conditioned measures. The measures of the previous three subsections provide quantitative measures, when defined, for any election. The following two proposals are partially tests, in the sense of McGhee [McG17b], rather than pure measures: The focus is not only on the numerical value associated to the election, but also on whether a given condition is satisfied and, hence, whether a threshold has been crossed that warrants remediation.

The lopsided means measure, $\text{Lop}$, proposed by Wang [Wan16b], computes the average winning margin of Party $P$ minus the average winning margin of Party $Q$. In the notation of (3), this is just $z - y$. While this can be used as its own, standalone measure, Wang argues for using this measure in conjunction with a Student $t$-test. Under this framework, the measure only indicates gerrymandering if the difference in margins is statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. For most of this article we will work with the measure alone, however in the discussion we explore some of the issues involved with invoking a statistical test in this context.

The equal vote weight standard [BDK+17, EVW], $\text{EVW}$, is equivalent to the mean-median measure, but subject to the constraint that a gerrymander is indicated exactly when the party winning a majority of the statewide vote wins a minority of the seats, i.e., an anti-majoritarian outcome. Because of the numerical equivalency with the mean-median measure, $\text{EVW}$ will not figure prominently in this article, however we will return to it in the discussion.

4. The measures on historical data

In Section 5 we will evaluate a number of hypothetical elections using the measures introduced above. However, the resulting values will be difficult to interpret without some understanding of the distribution of values we should expect to arise for each measure. (Does $EG_\nu^1 = 0.1$ indicate an
Table 1. Mean and standard deviation for the measures considered in this article applied to the 1166 elections in our data set with at least seven seats for which each party wins at least one seat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$EG^1$</th>
<th>$EG^2$</th>
<th>$EG^0$</th>
<th>$EG^1_v$</th>
<th>$EG^2_v$</th>
<th>$Dec$</th>
<th>$Dec'$</th>
<th>$MM$</th>
<th>$Bias$</th>
<th>$Bias'$</th>
<th>$Lop$</th>
<th>$EVW$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

outlier, or an election well within historical norms?) To this end, we first evaluate the measures on a large set of historical elections. With these data we can calculate a standard deviation for each measure. These deviations allow us to compute the extent to which each hypothetical is marked, or is not marked, as an outlier.

Our historical data set consists of state-level lower house elections since 1972 for which there are no multi-member districts, as well as US House elections since 1972. This data set, used in [War18c], is described in detail therein. Two points are worth mentioning here. First, we ignore third-party candidates: all $p_i$ represent fraction of the two-party vote. Second, in cases in which there are not candidates for both parties, we impute the vote fraction. Both issues are important for any application of these measures to real-world elections. In this article, however, we are focused on individual measures rather than identifying the particular states and years for which they find unfairness, so we do not dwell on these issues.

The partisan vote we assign to each district can come from either an actual election the district was used for or from exogenous election data such as a statewide gubernatorial race. Each approach has its staunch advocates (see, e.g., the conversation in [McG18] and [BDK+18]). In this article we use the endogenous, two-party vote share for the representative to the state lower house or US House, as appropriate. Using exogenous data would certainly change the particular elections that appear as extreme examples in Table 2, in the appendix, and the exact values in Table 3.

In Table 1, we record the mean and standard deviation for each measure on the collection of historical elections. Party P is identified with the Democrats while Party Q is identified with the Republicans. As a consequence, positive values indicate Republican advantages while negative values indicate Democratic advantages. In Section 5 we will be comparing how different hypothetical elections are evaluated by different measures. For this purpose it will be convenient to rescale each measure for the remainder of the article so it has standard deviation equal to 1. We will denote the rescaled version of measure $X$ by the roman (i.e., non-italic) notation $X = X/\sigma(X)$ where $\sigma(X)$ denotes the standard deviation of the historical distribution associated to measure $X$. So, for example, the rescaled version of $Dec'$ will be written $Dec'$. As we are exclusively interested in the relative, rescaled values in the remainder of the article, we do not expect the subtle difference in notation to lead to confusion.

In Figure 3 we display kernel density plots for each rescaled measure on the historical elections in our data set. The plot has been split into three to avoid clutter; there is no significance to which of the three subplots a given rescaled measure appears. Note that with these unitless rescaled measures, a value of (say) 2 denotes two standard deviations above the mean. Also note that we are not normalizing the measures — that is we are not shifting the mean to zero.

Even though most of the measures we discuss generate “approximately normal” distributions from our historical corpus in Figure 3, the standardization we apply does not depend in any way on an assumption of normality. It is perfectly meaningful to discuss standard deviations for non-normal distributions.

The next two subsections explore the aggregate data in more depth.

4.1. Correlations among measures. Before exploring how the measures described in Section 3 work on individual elections, it is first worth considering how they correlate in the aggregate (cf. [SMI7]). We show in Figure 4 scatter plots of various pairs of measures. For space reasons, we have omitted two measures we deem to be the least promising: $EG^0$ and $EG^1_v$ (see Section 7). Since $Dec$ and $Dec'$ differ materially only
for those elections for which one party wins almost all of the seats, we choose to omit Dec′ from the figure; Bias′ has similarly been omitted. Note for reference that the Pearson correlation between Dec and Dec′ is 0.95 and that between Bias and Bias′ is 0.92. Finally, EVW has also been omitted since it is numerically equivalent to MM.

As Dec is not defined when one party sweeps all seats, the thirteen such races have been omitted for consistency from all comparisons in the figure. Each scatter plot thereby consists of 1166 points. It is readily apparent from the figure that EG\textsuperscript{1}, EG\textsuperscript{2}, EG\textsubscript{1}, and Dec are all significantly correlated with each other, but only moderately correlated with the other measures. (The correlations among these four measures range from a low of 0.88 for EG\textsuperscript{1} and EG\textsubscript{1} to a high of 0.97 for EG\textsuperscript{2} and EG\textsubscript{1}.) The only other strong positive correlation is 0.91 between Lop and EG\textsuperscript{2}. The “bow tie” appearance of the scatter plot for MM and Bias arises from the fact, observed by McGhee and Stephanopoulos [SM17] and perhaps others, that MM yields Bias when multiplied by the responsiveness.

One additional observation is the low correlations (0.50 and 0.61, respectively) between the efficiency gap and two of the other most oft-referenced measures, MM and Bias. This is not automatically concerning — a priori it is possible that MM and Bias are simply capturing relatively independent aspects of partisan gerrymanders. However, given that both measures aim to quantify the extent by which the seats-votes curve misses the fifty-fifty mark, it is not clear why this should be the case.

4.2. Historical outliers. We close our summary of historical elections by recording in Table 2 the outliers for each measure among two different populations. For the first population, we restrict our attention to elections with at least seven seats in which each party holds statewide support between 45% and 55%. There are 647 of these “competitive” elections in our data set. (By this we don’t mean that the individual races are necessarily competitive, merely that the parties are competitive statewide.)

The second population considered is that of all elections with at least seven seats. There are 1179 such elections. In elections that are dominated by one party, the measures begin to break down in various ways. For example, in an election in which one party receives more than two thirds of the vote: the 3-proportionality of EG\textsuperscript{2} implies that it is automatically unfair as one party cannot win more than 100% of the seats; the declination will be undefined if one party sweeps all of the seats; and the counterfactuals required for the two versions of partisan bias become daunting. Fortunately, even if a measure does poorly for non-competitive elections, it may still have a role to play for competitive ones.

For the two declination variants and the lopsided-means test, elections in which the measures are undefined are omitted from Table 2. Similarly, for EVW only anti-majoritarian elections are considered; for Lop only elections in which the t-test indicates statistical significance are considered.

5. Hypothetical elections

In this section we introduce a number of hypothetical elections and evaluate our measures on them. By choosing a small set of hypothetical elections of various types, we are able to identify potential false positives and false negatives for each measure. These false positives/negatives are, of course, relative to the framework
Figure 4. Scatter plots corresponding to various pairs of measures. Each plot consists of the 1166 elections with at least seven districts and for which each party wins at least one seat.

of Section 2. This classification of fairness/unfairness might differ from the one made for an actual historical election once additional factors, such as the geographic distribution of partisans, are taken into account.

5.1. The twelve hypothetical elections. Below are brief descriptions of the twelve hypothetical elections considered in Figure 5; evaluations of the measures on these elections are provided in Table 3.

Our first four hypothetical elections should, according to Postulate 1, be evaluated as fair by a vote-distribution measure.

A 1-proportionality. For moderate uniform swings, this election is the ideal vote distribution according to $EG^0$ and $EG^1$. 

Table 2. Outliers listed as last two digit of year along with state abbreviation. The first group of ten corresponds to the population of the 647 most competitive elections. The second group of ten corresponds to the population of all 1179 elections. In each grouping, the most extreme outliers are listed first. An asterisk denotes a state, rather than US House, election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive elections</th>
<th>All elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>EG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA</td>
<td>10 MA 06 NY* 10 MA 10 MA 10 MA 10 MA 10 MA 10 MA 10 MA 10 MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA</td>
<td>78 WA 06 NY* 14 MA 14 MA 14 MA 14 MA 14 MA 14 MA 14 MA 14 MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 12 OH 06 MI 12 OH 12 OH 12 OH 12 OH 12 PA 12 OH 12 OH</td>
<td>92 WA 06 VA 80 VA 80 VA 80 VA 80 VA 80 VA 80 VA 80 VA 80 VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 12 PA 96 WA 14 NC 12 IN 12 PA 14 NC 12 PA 14 NC 12 PA 14 NC</td>
<td>94 WA 04 MA 94 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA 78 WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 94 MN 12 PA 12 IN 14 NC 94 MN 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA 94 WA</td>
<td>98 WA 12 MI 94 MN 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 96 WA 12 MI 94 MN 94 MN 14 NC 16 NC 12 VA 06 MI 12 MI 12 MI</td>
<td>12 NC 12 NC 72 KY 12 NC 12 NC 12 NC 12 NC 12 NC 12 NC 12 NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 12 NC 10 IL 16 NC 16 NC 12 VA 12 IN 16 NC 14 PA 06 AL 06 VA</td>
<td>96 WA 12 VA 12 PA 12 PA 16 PA 16 PA 16 PA 16 PA 16 PA 16 PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 12 VA 12 OH 12 PA 12 PA 96 WA 16 PA 16 PA 16 PA 16 PA 92 TX</td>
<td>12 NC 12 NC 14 NY 06 VA 10 IL 10 IL 10 IL 10 IL 10 IL 10 IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 14 NC 12 NC 12 VA 12 VA 12 NC 94 MN 72 KY 12 NC 08 GA 12 PA</td>
<td>14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC 14 NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 80 WA 06 OH 06 VA 06 VA 12 IN 12 VA 06 VA 10 IL 04 MO 16 PA</td>
<td>72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY 72 KY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Twelve hypothetical elections shown along with mean Democratic vote fraction. These elections are evaluated by the various scaled measures in Table 3.

B 2-proportionality. The ideal vote distribution according to EG^1.
C 3-proportionality. The ideal vote distribution according to EG^2.
D Sweep. Party P has swept the election with a statewide vote share of 64%. This particular election corresponds to a constant of proportionality equal to 5. This election is similar to many recent Massachusetts House elections. (see, e.g., Figure 8 in the appendix).
How the next four hypothetical elections should be evaluated is less straightforward. None are precisely linear, though the first two are very close to linear. These first two have been included due to the presence of a number of very competitive districts. Elections G and H, however, are notably uncompetitive. Neither of our two postulates is particularly pertinent for these latter two, although a measure should evaluate both similarly if it is to have low sensitivity to competitiveness.

E. **Competitive.** This election has a number of very competitive races that all have swung towards Party P.

F. **Competitive even.** Similar to the previous election, but with no districts in the “counterfactual window” (i.e., between the majority party’s statewide support and 50% — see [McG14]).

G. **Uncompetitive.** An uncompetitive election as might arise from a bipartisan gerrymander; average winning margins for Republicans and Democrats are 41 and 35 points, respectively.

H. **Very uncompetitive.** The previous election with average Republican and Democratic margins of victory increased by 30 and 20 points, respectively.

The next three elections are squarely covered by Postulate 2 and should be marked as asymmetric. Election L, a uniform shift of Election K, is more ambiguous. It certainly isn’t linear, so Postulate 1 is not applicable. Postulate 2 also does not apply as the average winning margin for the Democrats is smaller than the average winning margin for the Republicans. In fact, the Democrats’ margin is so much smaller that it suggests, if anything, a Democratic advantage. If this really were a Republican advantage, then in any reasonable electoral climate, it would make much more sense to accept slightly less comfortable wins for a chance to win three additional seats.

I. **Cubic.** This is a symmetric distribution shifted moderately to the Democrats’ favor.

J. **Anti-majoritarian.** This is election G subjected to a uniform swing in favor of the Republicans.

K. **Classic.** This distribution has all of the hallmarks of a partisan gerrymander: While the parties are evenly split statewide, the Republicans win a significant majority through having a number of narrow victories in contrast to their Democratic opponents whose few victories are overwhelming. This distribution is very similar to the 2014 North Carolina US House election.

L. **Inverted.** This is dual to Election K. While the Republicans win a significant majority of the vote, the Democrats are still able to win a significant portion of the seats through very narrow victories.

5.2. **Analysis of evaluations.** Hypothetical elections A–D are linear for anything but very large uniform shifts. According to Postulate 1, these should be evaluated as fair. Elections E and F are close to linear but have some distortions that lead to inequities when the statewide vote fraction shifts from even. Elections G and H, being generally uncompetitive, have some of the disparity described in Postulate 2, but only to a moderate degree. Three of the final four elections, I–K, all have one party winning much more efficiently than the other so, by Postulate 2, should be marked by a partisan gerrymander as unfair.

As seen in Table 3, the variants of the efficiency gap achieve mixed results on the linear distributions. Each of $E_G^1$, $E_G^2$ and $E_G^0$ sees one of the first three elections as essentially ideal while penalizing each of the other two according to how much its responsiveness differs. The measures $E_G^1$, $E_G^2$ and $E_G^1$ each view Election C as relatively unfair. While most of the evaluations are within two standard deviations of 0, generally speaking these evaluations are inconsistent with Postulate 1. The two versions of the declination, the two versions of partisan bias and the mean-median difference all evaluate these as fair. The lopsided-means test, however, views each as very far away from fair; these are borderline false positives.

The measures come to very different conclusions regarding Election D. The variants of the efficiency gap other than $E_G^2$ consider it to be exceedingly unfair while MM, Bias and Bias’ consider it perfectly fair. The declination and lopsided-means are undefined since the Republicans do not win any seats.

The competitive Election E produces false positives for every version of the efficiency gap as well as for Bias’. This is problematic given how tenuous the wins are in each of the districts — the Democrats certainly do not enjoy any robust advantage in this election. Results for Election F are similar except that this time it is Bias rather than Bias’ that suffers from a false positive. For both of these two elections, Dec, Dec’, MM and Lop all correctly evaluate the plan as relatively fair, as required by Postulate 1.

Elections G and H are somewhat inconclusive in that Postulate 1 doesn’t apply and Postulate 2 applies only to a limited extent. What is notable, however, is how differently MM evaluates these two elections. Not only is Election G unfair, but Election H is exceedingly unfair. This discrepancy underscores the strong
Table 3. Values of scaled measures on hypothetical elections from Figure 5. Column $N$ provides the number of districts in each election while the statewide Democratic vote share is indicated in the Mean column. The equal vote weights measure is not given its own column since it’s numerically equivalent to MM; the only anti-majoritarian election is I. The $t$-test for Lop was not statistically significant for any of the elections. Bold entries indicate false positives/negatives (as determined by a threshold of a somewhat arbitrary cutoff of two standard deviations from the mean).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>EG$^1$</th>
<th>EG$^2$</th>
<th>EG$^0$</th>
<th>EG$^1$</th>
<th>EG$^2$</th>
<th>EG$^1$</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Dec'</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Bias'</th>
<th>Lop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We finally come to the elections that are unfair according to Postulate 2. The measures MM, Bias and Bias’ all produce false negatives for Election I. Indeed, the seats-votes curve for this election is symmetric. However, for the depicted Democratic statewide support, the Democrats are much more efficient in their average winning margins. The fact that they win overwhelmingly in two districts is softened by the much more efficient wins in six other districts. However, the Republicans do not win any districts beyond the two they win overwhelmingly. The remaining measures evaluate the election appropriately as one with a significant Democratic advantage.

Elections J and K should also be evaluated as ones that are strongly unfair. Most measures do this correctly, but there are a few notable exceptions. The measures Bias and Bias’ treat Election J as somewhat fair. This is especially notable given that this is an anti-majoritarian result. Similarly, MM treats Election K as moderately fair. We consider these three evaluations to be false negatives. The EG$^1$ marks Elections I, J and K as unfair, but only moderately so and as such we categorize these as false negatives.

Election L is, as mentioned, rather unusual. The measures come to very different conclusions ranging from seeing it as strongly favoring the Democrats to strongly favoring the Republicans. As discussed above, we believe it is correct to conclude that the election strongly favors the Democrats. The measure Bias comes to the surprising conclusion that it is strongly in favor to the Republicans. The mean-median difference comes to the same conclusion, though less strongly, while EG$^0$, EG$^1_v$ and EG$^1_{v'}$ find the election to be fair.

6. Sensitivity

As explored in Section 3, it only makes sense to pronounce a district plan as fair or not in the context of a given electoral environment. As the electoral tide ebbs and flows, so will the performance of the plan. As such, we fully expect the valuations of a plan to change from election to election. Nonetheless, moderate swings should typically lead to moderate valuation changes. Or, if not, we should at least be able to characterize when a given measure is particularly volatile so as to interpret the results accordingly.
In Figure 6 we illustrate the sensitivity of each measure to variations in the statewide vote share for four of the hypothetical elections used in Section 5. For each election, we apply a series of uniform shifts ranging between -5% and +5% and record the valuation of each measure at each shift. This particular range has been chosen so as to correspond with the generally accepted range for competitive elections as being those polling between 45% and 55% for each party. The standardized measure values corresponding to no shift, -5% and +5% are marked by plus signs, orange circles and purple squares, respectively. The equal vote weights standard is omitted since it is numerically equivalent to the mean-median difference. We include Bias and MM for reference even though it is immediate from their definitions that they are completely insensitive to uniform vote swings. We note that similar sensitivity analyses have been conducted for various measures using historical election results — see, for example, [War18c, MS15, BDK+17]. Also, it is worth mentioning that an alternative approach to sensitivity would be to add in random noise to the Democratic vote in each district.

Most measures are relatively stable for Election B (2-proportionality). The first exception is Lop, which expects the Democrats’ average winning margin to go down as their statewide increases. Similarly, when the Democratic support increases, $EG^2$ views the election as becoming more unfair as proportionality drifts further from 3. The measures $EG^1$ and $EG^0$ have similar issues.

Election E (competitive) highlights the incredible sensitivity the efficiency-gap variants have to the number of seats won. The measure $Bias'$ runs into similar trouble that can be traced back to the fact that vote shares are not distributed evenly across the relevant vote shifts that are considered.

**Figure 6.** Exploration of the sensitivity of measures to variation in statewide vote share from -5% to +5% for four hypothetical elections.
There is a fair amount of sensitivity for Election F (uncompetitive). We see this as appropriate. As the statewide vote shifts, this election ranges from one that can be construed as reasonably fair to one in which the Democrats unquestionably have a strong advantage. The measure Bias’ remains completely stable as no districts are flipped under the vote shifts considered.

The sensitivities for Election K (classic) are similar to that for the uncompetitive election. Again we see moderate sensitivity as appropriate given the range from an election in which the Republicans have much narrower winning margins on average to one in which the difference is much more moderate.

7. Discussion

The investigations of the previous two sections serve to illuminate various strengths and weaknesses of each measure. We now proceed to summarize what we have learned. From Table 2, it is clear that for the elections chosen, Dec and Dec’ perform the best. These measures are undefined for Election D, but have neither false positives nor false negatives on the remainder. We also believe Election L is evaluated appropriately by both. The other measures all have at least three instances of being undefined, having a false positive, or having a false negative among the twelve elections. Looking beyond the two versions of the declination, if one is wishes to minimize false positives, then MM or Bias is probably the best, at least when the statewide vote is close to even. As MM and Bias look at particular parts of the seats-votes curve, they may also work better when you have a competitive state in which the gerrymandering is localized; the other measures, by averaging in various ways over many districts, are less likely to pick up on gerrymandering in just one or two districts. If one wishes to minimize false negatives, then EG\textsuperscript{1} is a good choice.

In Section 2 we argue that some sensitivity to statewide vote share is desirable. Both Bias and MM lack this. On the other hand the variants of the efficiency gap are all prone to extreme sensitivity to vote share when there are a large number of competitive races. The declination and buffered declination both have moderate sensitivity in the elections considered. This is true of the Lop and Bias’ as well. So on sensitivity grounds as well we view these four as the best performers.

We now discuss the pros and cons of each measure in more detail.

7.1. Variants of the efficiency gap. A few of the measures are unusable as measures of partisan gerrymandering. EG\textsuperscript{0}, EG\textsuperscript{1} and EG\textsuperscript{2} are all measures of proportionality that do not comport with the historical “winner’s bonus” that is seen in actuality. It is unreasonable to adhere to a measure of fairness for which the majority of historical plans are automatically given to be far from fair. The final variant of the efficiency gap, EG\textsuperscript{2} is perhaps the most promising, though its evaluation of Election C is a mark in its disfavor. Given its general concurrence with other efficiency gap variants, especially EG\textsuperscript{1} itself, there are not clear reasons, from the point of view of this article, to consider it separately. (We allow, however, that there may be legal reasons that make it more attractive.)

7.2. Mean-median difference and partisan bias. As noted previously, MM and Bias are closely related. Neither takes into account the fraction of seats won by each party. This aids in the stability of the measures under uniform vote swings, but misses one of, if not the, primary goals of partisan gerrymandering. As shown in the appendix, the outlier elections for MM are heavily skewed towards ones with few competitive races. Among hypothetical elections it does reasonably well in that it marks the proportional and competitive elections as fair. But it only views the classic gerrymander and inverted gerrymander as moderately unusual. As discussed in [War18c] and elsewhere, packing and cracking can occur in such a way as to be completely missed by MM when the statewide Democratic support deviates even moderately from 50%. It is generally acknowledged that this measure is not useful when statewide support of the two parties is unequal.

Partisan bias, in both its variants, performs similarly to MM. Bias badly misvalues the partisan advantage in Election E (competitive), but gives what we view as reasonable answers for the other hypothetical elections. Bias’ performs similarly, except that it is Election F (competitive even) that it badly misjudges. The large uniform shift required for elections in which statewide support is far from even causes issues for Bias and, even moreso, for Bias’.

7.3. Efficiency gap. The efficiency gap has as both a strength and a weakness the fact that it enshrines a historical average as an ideal. By its very definition, any election that deviates far from this ideal is a good subject for further investigation. As shown in the appendix (see Figures 7 and 8), the elections it
tends to flag as outliers are unusual in some respect (e.g., a large number of very competitive seats). Yet there are also valid reasons for proportionality to deviate from 2-proportionality (e.g., a large number of very competitive seats) and EG$^1$ is not able to account for these.

7.4. Declination. We see the declination and buffered declination as robust measures. A major advantage of them, in our view, is that they are agnostic about the slope of the seats-votes curve. They just ask for the differential responsiveness to be low. As a further point of support, Dec provably increases in absolute value under packing and cracking, as shown in [War15c]. Disadvantages of Dec and Dec$'$ are their inability to provide an evaluation when one party sweeps the election and their sensitivity when one party wins only one or two seats, although this latter property is less true by design for Dec$'$.

7.5. Lopsided means. The lopsided means measure is predicated on the notion that unequal average winning vote shares are indicative of unfairness. This is true when the two parties have exactly equal support statewide: In this case, having a higher average winning vote share is equivalent to winning fewer seats. However, the logic behind this test fails even for moderate swings in statewide support. Average winning margins are very relevant to the matter of partisan asymmetry, but they must be interpreted in the context of seats won, as the declination does. Given the similarities in definition between Lop and Dec and the superior results of the latter, we see no reason to use the lopsided-means measure, especially not in conjunction with the Student $t$-test (see Section 7.6).

7.6. Lopsided-means test. The lopsided-means test claims to ascertain in a statistically rigorous manner whether the winning margins of each party could have reasonably arisen by chance. But the application of this test is highly problematic. While the venerable $t$-test is a workhorse of statistics, we do not believe that it is appropriately applied in the lopsided-means test.

Here, for example, is an instance in which a uniform shift in the direction of one party causes the average winning vote share of the new majority party goes up. Begin with evenly matched parties in a state with 25 districts and with district-level Democratic support ranging linearly from 0.3 to 0.7. The Democrats and Republicans each have average winning vote shares equal to 0.61. If there is a uniform swing of +5% in the Democrats favor, we end up with district-level Democratic support ranging linearly from 0.35 to 0.75:

$$0.35, 0.366, 0.383, 0.416, \ldots, 0.733, 0.75.$$  

The Democrats now win 15 seats (60%) with an average winning vote share of 0.63 while the Republicans win 10 seats with an average winning vote share of 0.58. The Student $t$-test results in a $z$-value of 2.16 and a $p$-value of approximately 0.04. As this is less than 0.05, according to the lopsided-means test, this is statistically significant and indicative of gerrymandering. But it is hard to see how this linear vote distribution, shifted only five points, could suddenly be strongly unfair, especially since the responsiveness has a historically reasonable value of two. As such, we view this as a false positive. Similar examples can be constructed in which a symmetric distribution is shifted slightly in the Democrats’ favor, yet in which their average winning margin decreases.

Nor is it difficult to construct examples that are false negatives. Consider now a hypothetical district plan with Democratic support among 15 districts given by

$$0.4, 0.41, 0.42, 0.43, 0.44, 0.45, 0.46, 0.47, 0.48, 0.49, 0.52, 0.55, 0.58, 0.61, 0.64.$$  

Democratic support statewide is 0.49, yet the Democrats win only one third of the seats in this scenario. The average winning shares in this case are 0.585 (Democrats) and 0.55 (Republicans). The $t$-test returns a $z$-value of 1.25 with a $p$-value of 0.23. Yet Postulate 2 applies. While this vote distribution is less unfair than recent House distributions for Pennsylvania or North Carolina, it is certainly reminiscent of them.

Another issue with the lopsided means test arises when it is applied to an election with imputed vote values. While any measure will vary according to the imputation strategy, the $t$-test claims a precision that does not capture the true uncertainty involved. As an example, we consider recent Wisconsin state assembly elections as considered in Wang [Wan16a, Fig. 5A]. For the 2010 election, for instance, Wang indicates a difference in average winning vote share of about one percent that is not statistically significant according to the $t$-test ($t$-statistic of $-0.56$ and $p$-value of 0.57). This value is computed using imputed vote shares of 0.75 and 0.25 for the winner and loser, respectively in each uncontested district. But since a significant fraction of the races in the election were uncontested in 2010 — 31 out of 99 — a different imputation
strategy can yield markedly different results. For instance, when we impute vote shares for uncontested races using a hierarchical model as in [War18c], the difference in winning vote shares becomes about 3% and the \( t \)-statistic is computed as \(-2.15\) which is statistically significant with a \( p \)-value of 0.03. For elections with few uncontested seats, the exact imputation strategy implied will be of minor importance. But when this is not the case, the imputed support, depending on how it is done, can lead to more confidence that a difference is statistically significant than is warranted.

7.7. **Equal vote weights test.** The equal vote weights test is a reasonable proposal assuming the validity of the mean-median measure. It takes a conservative-sounding approach of restricting its attention to only elections that are anti-majoritarian. As its creators acknowledge [BDK+17], this restricts its applicability. Fundamentally, though, it does not appear to flag particularly interesting elections (see Figure 13 in Appendix). An anti-majoritarian outcome is unquestionably a red flag, but it is not clear how the inclusion of the mean-median difference improves our ability to identify likely gerrymanders. If one wishes to only impose an anti-majoritarian requirement, we believe it would be more effectively done — on a quantitative level — with the declination rather than with the mean-median difference. We also note that with the endogenous data we use in this article, only about ten percent of elections with at least seven districts result in an anti-majoritarian outcome. This measure is probably best used in elections for which both parties enjoy equal statewide support and for which any gerrymandering is local in nature. Another scenario in which it is more likely to be useful is when there are many seats.

8. **Conclusion**

This article has focused on measures that attempt to ascertain how consistent a given vote distribution is with that produced by a partisan gerrymander. We conclude that the declination, \( \text{Dec} \), and buffered declination, \( \text{Dec}' \), are the most successful at avoiding false positives and false negatives among the elections considered. Their only failing is that they are undefined on elections in which one party does not win any seats. They also appear to be relatively robust with regards to sensitivity. And while \( \text{Dec}' \) may perform better when one party wins only a seat or two, for simplicity, \( \text{Dec} \) is probably the best choice overall.

As noted in detail in the discussion, each of the other measures has serious drawbacks. When there are few competitive elections, \( \text{EG}^1 \) and \( \text{EG}^2 \) might be useful. However, when statewide support is evenly split, \( \text{MM} \) and \( \text{Bias} \) might be useful, especially when any alleged gerrymandering is localized to only a few districts. When one is particularly interested in anti-majoritarian outcomes, \( \text{EVW} \) might be a good choice. We do not see any scenario in which \( \text{EG}^2 \), \( \text{EG}^0 \), \( \text{EG}^1 \), \( \text{EG}^2 \tau \) or \( \text{Lop} \) is worth employing.

The framework we employ is a narrow one that intentionally ignores many of the complexities arising in the partisan gerrymandering problem. By limiting the scope of what we ask of our measures, we can do a better job of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each measure as well as what election characteristics are likely to lead to false positives and false negatives. Such errors are inevitable and must be well understood to be dealt with. Once these quantitative issues are carefully addressed, it becomes easier to create reliable ensemble measures (see [CCLZ18] for a related discussion in the context of computer simulations) or to tackle the much larger task of creating a manageable standard for gerrymandering.

For most of the measures we consider, perturbations to the statewide vote translate into changes in the evaluations of the measures, as shown in Section 6. But too much sensitivity can cause trouble when one is trying to ascertain whether a particular value is meaningful. McGann [MSLK16] uses a measure of partisan symmetry proposed in [GK94b] that averages the bias over a range of Democratic vote shares between 45% and 55% (see discussion in [Nag15]). Similar averaging procedures are an obvious way to increase confidence that a slight change in statewide support wouldn’t lead to a drastically different evaluation by any given measure. Such techniques could easily be implemented for most of the measures we consider in this article.

There are many other future directions for study. An obvious direction is to focus more directly on historical data (as is done briefly in Table 2 and the appendix). By pronouncing certain historical district plans as fair or not fair, one could perform an analysis similar to the one we have performed in this paper. For example, if the elections in Table 2 were independently classified as fair or unfair, we would have additional evidence regarding the utility of the measures considered. Such an analysis, especially one that took into account unequal turnout among districts, would bring even more confidence in the applicability of any conclusions to future elections. A better understanding of how measures react to different numbers of
districts would also be helpful. Many state legislatures have more than one hundred seats. The seats-votes curve in such a situation is much closer to a continuous curve than to the step function it typically is for congressional elections. Analyses that focus on local district plans or that consider how these measures might apply to multi-member districts would also be useful. Beyond that we broaden into matters such as how partisans are distributed geographically. Such issues are central to how we should interpret the valuations we get as we move towards making real-world decisions using these measures. Inherent advantages from geography, for example, appear to be very real [CR13], but if they are modest, then it may be possible in most cases to take extreme values of a given measure at face value.

While we believe quantitative partisan gerrymandering measures to be important for solving the partisan gerrymandering problem, they form only one piece of the puzzle. In particular, we expect computer simulations (such as found in [BGH+17]) and compactness metrics to continue to play a central role. Combining all of these techniques into a single robust tool would be of great benefit. Of course, exactly how such a tool would be used is still an open question. The US Supreme Court’s recent opinion in Gill v. Whitford [Gil] did little to clarify whether partisan gerrymanders are unconstitutional. If they are, then it is reasonable to suppose that partisan-gerrymandering measures will provide supporting evidence even if they are not the basis of the constitutional claim itself. And, as we have already mentioned, we expect these measures to be useful for many different groups during any redistricting process. The better choice we make for which measures to use, the more useful they will be.

9. DATA COLLECTION AND STATISTICAL METHODS

The US state legislature election data up through 2010 comes from [KBC+11]. We only included data on the lower house of the state legislature when two houses exist. The US congressional data through 2014 was provided by [Jac17]. Data for 2016 congressional races were taken from Wikipedia [Wik17]. See [War18c] for details of data and imputation strategy.

The election data was analyzed using the python-based SageMath [S+16]. All non-library code may be found at [War18a]. Python packages employed were pyStan [Tea16] for implementing a multilevel model to impute votes in uncontested races; Matplotlib [Hun07] and Seaborn [WBH+] for plotting and visualization; and SciPy [JOP+] for statistical methods. The data reported in this article are archived at [War18a].

10. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#429570). The author is especially indebted to Gary C. Jacobson for sharing his data on US Congressional elections. The author thanks Jeff Buzas for helpful conversations.

REFERENCES


11. Appendix

In this section we collect plots of two different collections of elections. The first set consists of the most extreme outliers for each measure, both for all elections in our historical data set as well as for the subset consisting of those for which the statewide Democratic support is between 45% and 55%. The second set collects those elections for which the measures disagree most strongly. In this second set we only consider the measures $\text{Dec}'$, $\text{MM}$, $\text{Bias}$ and $\text{EG}^1$.

11.1. Outliers.

![Figure 7](image-url)

**Figure 7.** Most extreme outliers among competitive elections for $\text{EG}^2$, $\text{EG}^1$, $\text{EG}^0$, $\text{EG}_v^1$, and $\text{EG}_v^2$. In this and later figures, values of measures listed are for the rescaled versions.

![Figure 8](image-url)

**Figure 8.** Most extreme outliers among all elections for $\text{EG}^2$, $\text{EG}^1$, $\text{EG}^0$, $\text{EG}_v^1$, and $\text{EG}_v^2$. 
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Figure 9. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for $\text{EG}_1^\tau$.

Figure 10. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for the declination, Dec.
Figure 11. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for the buffered declination, Dec'.

Figure 12. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for the mean-median difference, MM.

Figure 13. Most extreme outliers among all elections for EVW. The same three elections are identified among the subpopulation of competitive elections.
Figure 14. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for partisan bias, Bias.

Figure 15. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for partisan bias, Bias'.

Figure 16. Most extreme outliers among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row) for the lopsided-means test, Lop. Elections shown are restricted to those for which the Student $t$-test implies significance.
11.2. Greatest pairwise disagreements.

Figure 17. Greatest pairwise disagreements between Dec and Bias among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row).

Figure 18. Greatest pairwise disagreements between Dec and MM among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row).
Figure 19. Greatest pairwise disagreements between EG^{1} and Dec among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row).

Figure 20. Greatest pairwise disagreements between EG^{1} and Bias among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row).
Figure 21. Greatest pairwise disagreements between EG\textsuperscript{1} and MM among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row).

Figure 22. Greatest pairwise disagreements between MM and Bias among competitive elections (top row) and all elections (bottom row).
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