

Computation and Bribery of Voting Power in Delegative Simple Games

Gianlorenzo D’Angelo¹, Esmail Delfaraz¹, and Hugo Gilbert²

¹Gran Sasso Science Institute, L’Aquila, Italy

²Université Paris-Dauphine, Université PSL, CNRS, LAMSADE, 75016 Paris, France

Abstract

Following Zhang and Grossi (AAAI 2021), we study in more depth a variant of weighted voting games in which agents’ weights are induced by a transitive support structure. This class of simple games is notably well suited to study the relative importance of agents in the liquid democracy framework. We first propose a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm to compute the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices for this class of game. Then, we study a bribery problem, in which one tries to maximize/minimize the voting power/weight of a given agent by changing the support structure under a budget constraint. We show that these problems are computationally hard and provide several parameterized complexity results.

1 Introduction

Weighted Voting Games (WVG) form a simple scheme to model situations in which voters must make a yes/no decision about accepting a given proposal [11]. Each voter has a corresponding weight and the proposal is accepted if the sum of weights of agents supporting the proposal exceeds a fixed threshold called the quota. In a WVG, weights of voters can represent an amount of resource and the quota represents the quantity of this resource which should be gathered to enforce the proposal. For instance, agents may be political parties and weights could be derived from the relative importance of each party in terms of number of votes received. There is a large literature to measure the relative importance of each agent in such a situation [11, 17]. Notably, the computational and axiomatic properties of two such measures, the Banzhaf measure of voting power and the Shapley-Shubik index [4, 35], have been extensively studied. The computational properties investigated obviously include the computational complexity of computing these measures for a given agent [13] but they also involve several manipulation problems [2, 17, 37, 38].

One possible limitation of WVGs is that they consider each agent as an indivisible entity and may not be able to represent agents who are composed of a complex structure. However, if agents are corporations or political parties, then they do have some inner structure which may have an impact on their relative strength.

Example 1. *Let us consider two political parties Π and Π' represented in Figure 1. Each party has a political leader (agents A and A' respectively) and different inner political trends with subleaders (agents B, C, D, E in Π and agents $B', C',$ and D' in Π'). Each leader and subleader have their own supporters which provide them some voting weights, written next to each agent in Figure 1. In each party, the different agents form a directed tree structure of support, where each arc represents the fact that an agent supports another agent. For instance, in party Π , agent D endorses agent B which herself endorses agent A . In this way, agent D implicitly supports agent A and puts at her disposal her voting weight. Note however that it may not be possible for agent D to directly endorse agent A . Indeed, if agent D represents the most left-wing sensibility of the party whereas agent A represents a more consensual political trend, it may be difficult for agent D to publicly support agent A without losing credibility in the eye of her supporters. By delegating to A through B , agent D indicates that her support to A is conditioned to the presence of agent B .*




Figure 1: Two political parties Π and Π' with two different inner structures.

The total weight accumulated by voters A and A' are respectively worth 12 and 11. Hence, the total weight gathered by A is greater than the one of A' . Could this indicate that agent A is at least as powerful as agent A' . The inner structures of parties Π and Π' suggest otherwise. Indeed, agent A receives a greater total weight and is endorsed (directly and indirectly) by more agents. However, agent A' receives direct support from all other subleaders of her party which is not the case of agent A . As a result, if agent B decides to secede and create her own party, then agent A would lose the support of agents D and E conceding a total weight loss of 5. Conversely, the most important weight loss that agent A' can suffer from the secession of another agent is worth 3. Hence, the inner structure of party Π' which supports candidate A' seems more robust than the one of candidate A .

Example 1 suggests to study a more complex model than the one of WVGs where agents are backed up by an internal support structure with transitive supports. Studying this kind of model has been recently initiated by Zhang and Grossi [36]. Indeed, the authors investigate how to measure the relative importance of voters in the framework of *Liquid Democracy* (LD) [6, 18]. LD is a collective decision paradigm in which agents can vote themselves or delegate their vote to another agent. One important feature, is that an agent who receives delegations can in turn delegate her vote and the ones that she has received to another agent which is exactly the kind of transitive support discussed in Example 1. In their work, Zhang and Grossi [36] define *Delegative Simple Games* (DSG), a variant of WVGs in which the capacity of a subset of agents to reach the quota does not only depend on their voting weights but also on their delegations. DSGs make it possible to take into account the support (delegation) structure underlying the game and to favor agents who receive more direct supports, compared to agents receiving more distant chains of support. The authors notably study axiomatically the Banzhaf measure of voting power applied to this kind of game which they term the *delegative Banzhaf measure of voting power*.¹

Our contribution. We obtain several results related to DSGs. We first study several properties, notably computational properties, of the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik measures of power. For instance, while the computation of these measures is computationally hard, we show that they can be calculated by a pseudo-polynomial dynamic programming algorithm similar to the one for Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik measures in WVGs. We then investigate a bribery problem where, given a delegation graph, the goal is to maximize/minimize the voting power/weight of an agent by changing at most a fixed number of delegations. We show that the problems related to bribing voting power are hard, and that the maximization problems are hard to approximate even when the social network is a tree. We then move to the conceptually simple bribery problems related to voting weight. On these problems, we obtain both hardness and tractability results by investigating the approximation and the parameterized complexity viewpoints.

2 Related Work

WVGs originated in the domain of cooperative game theory [10, 11] and are used to study the a-priori voting power of voters in an election [17]. Two well-known solutions to measure the importance of an agent

¹This measure was in fact termed, the delegative Banzhaf index. However, following Felsenthal and Machover [17], we reserve the term index for measures whose values sum up to one when considering all agents.

in a WVG are the Shapley-Shubik index and the Banzhaf measure of voting power [4, 35]. Computing these measures is #P-Complete [13, 33]. However, Matsui and Matsui [28] designed pseudopolynomial algorithms that can compute the Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf measures in time $O(n^3 w_{\max})$ and $O(n^2 w_{\max})$ respectively, where n is the number of agents and w_{\max} is the maximum weight of an agent. Other works have been dedicated to their computation, either to compute them exactly [9, 12, 21, 22], or approximately [3, 15, 26, 27, 30]. Moreover, several manipulation problems involving voting power measures have been investigated, as computing the quota maximizing or minimizing the importance of a specific voter [37, 38] or determining the impact of splitting an agent in two [2, 17, 25].

Several works have studied the measurement of voters' importance in an LD election [7, 8, 24, 36]. Boldi et al. [7, 8] proposed a way to measure the relative importance of each voter in a social network using a power index similar to PageRank. In their model, each voter can recommend one of her neighbor in the network. The recommendations of the voters are then transitively delegated but are attenuated by using a multiplicative damping factor. The authors term the resulting system a viscous democracy election as the voting power does not flow completely but rather meets some resistance. In this way, the model by Boldi et al. [7, 8] favors the voters who receive direct supports instead of more distant ones. Kling et al. [24] studied the behavior of voters using the LiquidFeedback software in the German Pirate Party. The authors studied the number and types of interactions with the software, the distribution in terms of number of delegations received per voter as well as the behavior of "super-voters" which receive a large number of delegations. The authors then applied several power measures (e.g., Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf) to analyze the power distribution in LD elections. This analysis led the authors to propose modifications to the existing power measures to fit better to the data they gathered. More precisely, the authors designed generalizations of these measures which allow to model non-uniform distributions of approval rates. Lastly, as detailed in the introduction, Zhang and Grossi [36] have recently proposed a formal way to measure the influence of voters in an LD election by introducing a variant of WVGs. This variant as well as the resulting power measures will be presented in Section 3.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Weighted voting games

A simple game is a tuple $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, \nu \rangle$, where $V = [n]$ is a set of n agents and $\nu : 2^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a characteristic function which only takes values 0 and 1. The notation $[i]$ and $[i]_0$ will denote the sets $\{1, \dots, i\}$ and $\{0, 1, \dots, i\}$ respectively. A subset $C \subseteq V$ will also be called a coalition. For any coalition $C \subseteq V$, C is said to be a winning (resp. losing) coalition if $\nu(C) = 1$ (resp. 0). An agent i is said to be a swing agent for coalition C if $\delta_i(C) := \nu(C \cup \{i\}) - \nu(C)$ equals 1.

In WVGs, there exists a quota q and each agent (also called voter) i is associated with a weight w_i . The characteristic function ν is then defined by $\nu(C) = 1$ iff $\sum_{i \in C} w_i \geq q$. Stated otherwise, a coalition is winning if the sum of weights of agents in the coalition exceeds the quota. Several ways of measuring the importance of an agent in WVGs have been studied. We recall two of the most well known:

Definition 3.1. *The Banzhaf measure $B_i(\mathcal{G})$ and Shapley-Shubik index $Sh_i(\mathcal{G})$ of a voter i in a simple game \mathcal{G} are defined as*

$$B_i(\mathcal{G}) := \sum_{C \subseteq V \setminus \{i\}} \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \delta_i(C),$$

$$Sh_i(\mathcal{G}) := \sum_{C \subseteq V \setminus \{i\}} \frac{1}{n} \frac{(n - |C| - 1)! |C|!}{(n - 1)!} \delta_i(C).$$

Hence, the Banzhaf measure and the Shapley-Shubik index provide two ways to measure the importance of a voter by quantifying her ability to be a swing agent. While both measures are worth investigation, they are quite different in nature as explained by Felsenthal and Machover [17]. Indeed, while the Shapley-Shubik index is better explained as the expected share that an agent should earn from the election, seen as a game, the Banzhaf measure computes (based on a probabilistic model) the extent to which an agent is able to control the outcome of the election. Note that the first (resp. second) kind of

measure is referred to as a notion of P-Power (resp. I-Power), where P stands for Prize (resp. I stands for Influence). As both measure have been extensively studied, we will study both in this paper.

3.2 A model of liquid democracy

In the sequel, while our introduction suggests that DSGs can be used in a broader setting, we will follow the LD paradigm which showcases an interesting application where transitive support structures play a key role. This will notably be convenient to use the notations from Zhang and Grossi [36].

A liquid democracy election. A finite set of agents $V = [n]$ will vote on a proposal. There is a weight function $\omega : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, assigning a positive weight $\omega(i) = w_i$ to each voter i . A special case of interest is the one where all voters have weight one. The rule used is a super-majority rule with quota $q \in (\frac{\sum_{i \in V} w_i}{2}, \sum_{i \in V} w_i] \cap \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.² Stated otherwise, the proposal is accepted if the total voting weight in favor of it is at least worth q .

We assume the election to follow the LD paradigm. Notably, voters are vertices of a Social Network (SN) modeled as a directed graph $D = (V, A)$. Each node in the SN corresponds to a voter $i \in V$ and a directed edge $(i, j) \in A$ corresponds to a social relation between i and j : it specifies that agent i would accept to delegate her vote to j or more generally speaking to endorse j . The set of out-neighbors of voter i is denoted by $\text{Nb}_{out}(i) = \{j \in V \mid (i, j) \in A\}$. Each agent i has two possible choices: either she can vote directly, or she can delegate her vote to one of her neighbors in $\text{Nb}_{out}(i)$. The information about delegation choices is formalized by a delegation function d , where $d(i) = j$ if voter i delegates to voter $j \in \text{Nb}_{out}(i)$, and $d(i) = i$ if voter i votes directly.

The delegation digraph $H_d = (V, E)$ resulting from d is the subgraph of D , where $(i, j) \in E$ iff $i \neq j$ and $d(i) = j$. We assume that this digraph is acyclic. More precisely, we assume H_d is a spanning forest of in-trees where all vertices have out-degree 1 except the roots which have out-degree 0. For any digraph D , $\Delta(D)$ denotes the set of all acyclic delegation graphs H_d that can be induced by delegation functions d on D . In H_d , we denote by $c_d(i, j)$ the delegation chain which starts with voter i and ends with voter j . Put another way, $c_d(i, j)$ is a sequence $((v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_{k-1}, v_k))$ of arcs such that $v_1 = i, v_k = j$ and $\forall l \in [k-1], d(v_l) = v_{l+1}$. By abuse of notation, we may also use this notation to denote the set $\{v_i, i \in [k]\}$ of voters in the chain of delegations from i to j . Moreover, we denote by $T_d(i)$ the directed subtree rooted in i in delegation graph H_d , where i has out-degree 0 and all other vertices have out-degree 1.

Delegations are transitive, meaning that if voter i delegates to voter j , and voter j delegates to voter k , then voter i indirectly delegates to voter k . If an agent votes, she is called the *guru* of the people she represents and has an *accumulated voting weight* equal to the total weight of people who directly or indirectly delegated to her. We denote by d_i^* the guru of voter i and by $Gu_d = \{i \in V \mid d(i) = i\}$ the set of gurus induced by d , i.e., the roots of the in-trees in H_d . If an agent delegates, she is called a *follower* and has an accumulated voting weight worth 0. Hence, the delegation function d induces an *accumulated weight function* α_d , such that $\alpha_d(i) = \sum_{j \in T_d(i)} w_j$ if $i \in Gu_d$ and 0 otherwise.

To define DSGs, Zhang and Grossi defined another weight function. Given a set $C \subseteq V$, let us denote by $T_d(i, C)$ the directed subtree rooted in i in the delegation graph $H_d[C]$. The subtree $T_d(i, C)$ contains each voter h such that $d_h^* = i$ and $c_d(h, i)$ only contains elements from C . Given a set $C \subseteq V$, we define the weight function $\gamma_{d,C}$, such that $\gamma_{d,C}(i) = \sum_{j \in T_d(i,C)} w_j$ if $i \in Gu_d$ and 0 otherwise. Moreover, we denote by $\gamma_d(C) = \sum_{i \in C} \gamma_{d,C}(i)$. The value $\gamma_d(C)$ represents the sum of weights of voters that have a guru in C and such that the chain of delegations leading to this guru is contained in C .

3.3 Delegative Simple Games

We call a Liquid Democracy Election (LDE) a tuple $\mathcal{E} = \langle D, \omega, d, q \rangle$ or $\mathcal{E} = \langle D, \omega, H_d, q \rangle$ (we may use H_d in place of d when convenient). DSGs are motivated by LDEs. In the DSG $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$ induced by an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D, \omega, d, q \rangle$, $v_{\mathcal{E}}(C) = 1$ iff $\gamma_d(C) \geq q$, i.e., a coalition C is winning whenever the sum of weights accumulated by gurus in C from agents in C meets the quota. This defines a new class of simple games which have a compact structure but different from the one of WVGs. In our case, the weights are not

²In this work, we restrict the values of weights w_i and q to $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$. This restriction can be motivated by a result by Muroga [31].

given in advance, but rather derived from a graph structure. The different power indices defined for simple games can of course be applied to this new class. It is worth noticing that in DSGs the power of each voter i does not only depend on the amount of delegations she receives through delegations, but also on the structure of the subtree rooted in her in the delegation graph. Notably, the more direct the supports of i are, the more important she is in the delegation graph (see Property 3 for a formal statement).

Definition 3.2 (Active Agent). *Consider a delegation function d and a coalition $C \subseteq V$. We say that voter $i \in C$ is active in C if $d^*(i) \in C$ and $c_d(i, d^*(i)) \subseteq C$; otherwise, i is called an inactive agent.*

Notice that according to the definition of DSGs, an active (resp. inactive) agent $i \in C$ contributes weight w_i (resp. 0) to the coalition C (see Example 2). Given a DSG $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$, let $DB_i(\mathcal{E})$ and $DS_i(\mathcal{E})$ denote the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik values of voter i in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$, respectively. When speaking about these indices, we drop parameter \mathcal{E} (or $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$) when it is clear from the context. Let us give an illustrative example to understand all aspects of our model.

Example 2. *Consider an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$, where $V = [8]$ is a set of 8 voters delegating through a SN with $d(1) = d(2) = d(3) = 3$, $d(4) = d(6) = 7$, $d(5) = 6$ and $d(7) = d(8) = 8$ as illustrated in Fig. 2 and $q = 3$. Each voter i has weight $\omega(i) = 1$. The set of gurus is $Gu_d = \{3, 8\}$, so, $\alpha_d(3) = \sum_{j \in T_d(3)} w_j = 3$, $\alpha_d(8) = \sum_{j \in T_d(8)} w_j = 5$, and for any $i \in V \setminus \{3, 8\}$, $\alpha_d(i) = 0$. Consider the set $C = \{3, 5, 7, 8\}$. $T_d(8, C)$ (resp. $T_d(3, C)$) is the subtree rooted in 8 (resp. 3) and composed of voters $\{7, 8\}$ (resp. $\{3\}$). Thus, $\gamma_{d,C}(3) = \sum_{j \in T_d(3,C)} w_j = 1$, $\gamma_{d,C}(8) = \sum_{j \in T_d(8,C)} w_j = 2$ and $\gamma_{d,C}(i) = 0$ for $i \in \{5, 7\}$, and then $\gamma_d(C) = \sum_{i \in C} \gamma_{d,C}(i) = 3$. Also, the set of active agents is $\{3, 7, 8\}$. Note that 5 is an inactive agent in C as $c_d(5, 8) \not\subseteq C$. Now we intend to compute DB_8 and DB_6 .*

We first compute DB_8 by counting the coalitions $C \subseteq V \setminus \{8\}$ for which 8 is a swing agent. Note that if $\{1, 2, 3\} \subseteq C$, then 8 cannot be a swing agent for C . Second, if $\{1, 2, 3\} \cap C \in \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$, then 8 will always be a swing agent for C . There are 32 such coalitions. Third, if $\{1, 2, 3\} \cap C = \{3\}$, then 8 will be a swing agent for C iff $7 \in C$. There are 8 such coalitions. Last, if $3 \notin (\{1, 2, 3\} \cap C)$, then 8 will be a swing agent for C iff $|C \cap \{4, 6, 7\}| \geq 2$. There are 24 such coalitions. Hence $DB_8(V) = \frac{1}{2^7} \times 64 = \frac{1}{2}$.

Now we compute DB_6 . Note that in order for 6 to be a swing agent in any coalition C , it is necessary that $\{7, 8\} \subseteq C$. Hence, the coalitions C for which 6 is a swing agent are of the form $C = \{7, 8\} \cup S$ where $S \subseteq \{1, 2, 5\}$. The number of such coalitions is 8. Hence, $DB_6 = \frac{1}{2^7} \times 8 = \frac{1}{16}$.




Figure 2: The delegation graph H_d (dotted arcs are the other arcs of $D = (V, A)$) with the set of gurus $Gu_d = \{3, 8\}$.

4 Properties of DB and DS

This section investigates properties of the delegative Banzhaf measure and the delegative Shapley-Shubik index. First we investigate if, these values can be computed efficiently.

Evaluating the “standard” Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik measures in WVGs is #P-complete [13, 33] and several decision problems related to their computation are NP-complete or coNP-complete [10, 29, 33]. As DSGs include WVGs as a subcase (consider the restriction when each voter votes herself), these hardness results also hold for DSGs. However, these measures can be computed by a pseudo-polynomial algorithm [29] in WVGs, that is an algorithm running in time $poly(n, w_{\max})$, where $w_{\max} := \max_{i \in V} \omega(i)$ is the maximal weight of an agent. We can extend this dynamic programming approach to compute the delegative Banzhaf measure and the delegative Shapley-Shubik index in pseudo-polynomial time.

Theorem 4.1. *Given a delegative simple game $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{E}$ induced by an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and a voter $i \in V$, DS_i and DB_i can be computed in $O(n^4 w_{\max}^2)$ and $O(n^2 w_{\max}^2)$, respectively.*

The description of the algorithm given in the Appendix is similar to the one used in WVGs but it carefully takes into account the delegation graph provided in the input. All missing or incomplete proofs can be found in the Appendix.

We now investigate how these measures evolve when the delegation structure of the LDE is slightly modified. The purpose for studying these properties is that they are notably relevant when studying bribery problems where one tries to modify the structure of the instance to increase (or decrease) the relative importance of a given agent, as will be done in Section 5. Possible modifications of the delegation structure can consist in adding a direct or indirect delegation from one agent to another.

We now present three properties. Let $v_\mathcal{E}$ be the characteristic function of a DSG $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{E}$ induced by an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$. In the following f denotes a generic delegative power measure and f_i is the delegative power measure value of agent i .

The following property states that if some voters delegate to a voter i directly, i should get more powerful.

Property 1 (Monotonicity w.r.t. Direct Delegations (**MDD**)). *Consider two LDEs $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d', q \rangle$ and two agents $i, j \in V$ such that $j \notin c_d(i, d_i^*)$, $d'(j) = i$ and $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$. Then, $f_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq f_i(\mathcal{E})$.*

Next, we introduce another property which says that if a voter receives some delegation (directly or indirectly), she should become more powerful.

Property 2 (Monotonicity w.r.t. Delegations (**MD**)). *Consider two LDEs $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d', q \rangle$ and three agents $i, j, k \in V$ s.t. $j \notin c_d(k, d_k^*)$, $i \notin c_d(j, d_j^*)$, $i \in c_d(k, d_k^*)$, $d'(j) = k$ and $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$. Then, $f_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq f_i(\mathcal{E})$.*

Consider a delegation graph H_d and two voters $i, j \in V$ such that $i \in c_d(j, d_j^*)$. We now introduce the last property stating that in a new delegation graph d' obtained from d in which all voters have the same delegation strategies as d except that j delegates to a voter $l \in c_d(j, d_j^*) \setminus c_d(i, d_i^*)$, i gets more powerful. In other words, this property says that if the voters who support a specific voter i through some intermediaries, support i through a smaller set of intermediaries, i gets more powerful.

Property 3 (Monotonicity w.r.t. Intermediaries (**MI**)). *Consider two LDEs $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d', q \rangle$ and three agents $i, j, k \in V$ such that $k \in c_d(j, d_j^*)$, $i \in c_d(k, d_k^*)$, $\forall l \in V \setminus \{j\}$, $d(l) = d'(l)$ and $d'(j) = k$. Then, $f_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq f_i(\mathcal{E})$.*

We now investigate which of these three properties are satisfied by the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik measures. Counter-intuitively, we first show that while these indices satisfy properties **MDD** and **MI**, it is not the case for property **MD**.

Proposition 4.2. *The delegative Banzhaf measure and the delegative Shapley-Shubik index satisfy property **MDD**.*

Proof. Consider two LDEs $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D' = (V, A), \omega', d', q' \rangle$ and two agents $i, j \in V$ such that $j \notin c_d(i, d_i^*)$, $D = D'$, $\omega = \omega'$, $q = q'$, $d'(j) = i$ and $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$. Let us consider a coalition $C \subseteq V \setminus \{i\}$ such that $v_\mathcal{E}(C \cup \{i\}) - v_\mathcal{E}(C) = 1$. This implies that $c_d(i, d_i^*) \subseteq C \cup \{i\}$. From $v_\mathcal{E}(C \cup \{i\}) = 1$, it is straightforward that $v_{\mathcal{E}'}(C \cup \{i\}) = 1$ as $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$, $d'(j) = i$ and $c_d(i, d_i^*) \subseteq C \cup \{i\}$. Moreover, from $v_\mathcal{E}(C) = 0$, it is also easy to see that $v_{\mathcal{E}'}(C) = 0$ as $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$, $d'(j) = i$ and $i \notin C$. Because this reasoning holds for any coalition for which i is a swing agent, we obtain that $DS_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq DS_i(\mathcal{E})$ and $DB_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq DB_i(\mathcal{E})$. \square

Proposition 4.3. *The delegative Banzhaf measure and the delegative Shapley-Shubik index do not satisfy property **MD**.*

Proof. Consider an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$, where $V = \{1, 2, 3\}$ is a set of 3 agents delegating through a complete SN D (A contain all possible arcs) with delegations $d(2) = d(1) = 1$ and $d(3) = 3$, all weights equal to one, and $q = 2$. In \mathcal{E} voter 1 is a swing agent for sets in $\{\{2\}, \{3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Now consider the LDE \mathcal{E}' which is identical to \mathcal{E} except that $d(3) = 2$. In \mathcal{E}' voter 1 is a swing agent for sets in $\{\{2\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Hence, $DS_1(\mathcal{E}') < DS_1(\mathcal{E})$ and $DB_1(\mathcal{E}') < DB_1(\mathcal{E})$. \square

Hence, Proposition 4.3 highlights a paradox for measures DB and DS : a voter who receives more voting power can become less powerful because of the delegation structure underlying the DSG. Hence, if one studies a bribery problem in which she wants to change some delegations to make an agent i^* more powerful, then she is on the safe side if she decides to add direct delegations to i^* but adding indirect delegations may be counterproductive.

Proposition 4.4. *The delegative Banzhaf measure and the delegative Shapley-Shubik index satisfy property MI.*

Proof. One may use the same argument as that of Proposition 4.2 to prove the proposition. \square

5 Bribery by Delegation Modifications

5.1 Power index modification by bribery

The support structure in DSGs induces the following natural question: which voters should one influence under a budget constraint to maximize/minimize the voting power of a given voter? This question leads to the following computational bribery problems.

Problems: **BMinP**, **SMinP**, **BMaxP** and **SMaxP**
Input: An LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$, a voter $v^* \in V$, a budget $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and a threshold $\tau \in \mathbb{Q}_+$.
Feasible solution: A delegation function $d' \in \Delta(D)$ s.t. $|\{i \in V : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq k$ leading to an LDE $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D, \omega, d', q \rangle$.
Question: Can we find a feasible solution d' such that:

BMinP: $DB_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}') \leq \tau?$ **BMaxP:** $DB_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}') \geq \tau?$
SMinP: $DS_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}') \leq \tau?$ **SMaxP:** $DS_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}') \geq \tau?$

Stated otherwise, in the Banzhaf Minimization (resp. Maximization) Problem, **BMinP** (resp. **BMaxP**) for short, we wish to determine if we can make the Banzhaf measure of voter v^* lower (resp. greater) than or equal to a given threshold, by only modifying k delegations. This cardinality constraint can be justified by the fact that influencing each voter is costly. **SMinP** and **SMaxP** are similar problems corresponding to the Shapley-Shubik index. While **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** correspond to the constructive variant of the bribery problem, **BMinP** and **SMinP** correspond to its destructive variant. These bribery problems are natural in the setting of LD, where one voter could for instance try to get the delegations of several other voters to increase her influence on the election. Moreover, we believe these bribery problems are also relevant in more traditional elections where several politicians or political parties could seek which alliances to foster as to increase their centrality or to make an opponent powerless.

We first show several hardness and hardness of approximation results on these four problems.

Theorem 5.1. *The restriction of **BMinP** and **SMinP** to the case where all voters have weight 1, i.e., when $\forall i \in V, \omega(i) = 1$, is NP-complete. Moreover, under the same restriction, the minimization versions of problems **BMinP** and **SMinP** cannot be approximated within any factor in polynomial time if $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$.*

Sketch of proof. We use a reduction from the NP-complete Hamiltonian path problem [19] where the goal is to determine if there exists a path in an undirected graph that visits each vertex exactly once. From an instance of the Hamiltonian path problem with n vertices we create an instance of **BMinP** (or **SMinP**). The quota of this **BMinP** (or **SMinP**) instance is set such that a specific voter will have power index value 0 iff it is at the end of a delegation path of length n . The idea is that such a path necessarily consists

in a Hamiltonian path in the original instance. Hence, in the **BMinP** (or **SMinP**) instance a successful solution for the briber will consist in creating a delegation path along a Hamiltonian path (if one exists). The hardness of approximation result is then obtained from the fact that a polynomial-time algorithm with some multiplicative approximation guarantee would be able to distinguish between instances where we can make the agent dummy and the ones where we cannot. \square

Theorem 5.2. *Problems **BMinP** and **SMinP** are coNP-hard even if the SN is a tree.*

We move to problems **BMaxP** and **SMaxP**.

Theorem 5.3. *Problems **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** with voters' weights and the quota given in unary are NP-complete.*

Theorem 5.4. *The maximization versions of problems **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** cannot be approximated within any factor in polynomial time if $P \neq NP$ even if the SN is a tree.*

Proof. Consider the subset sum problem with positive integers. An instance J of this problem is composed of a set of positive integers $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and a target sum M : $J = \langle S, M \rangle$ is a Yes-instance iff there exists a subset $L \subseteq S$ such that $\sum_{a_i \in L} a_i = M$. We transform an instance $J = \langle S, M \rangle$ of the subset sum problem to an instance $I = \langle \mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle, v^*, k, \tau \rangle$ of **BMaxP** (resp. **SMaxP**). We create a tree D where:

- $V = V_1 \cup \{v, v', v^*\}$ with $V_1 = \{u_i : a_i \in S\}$.
- $A = \{(v_i, v) : v_i \in V \setminus \{v\}\}$.

Let $R = \sum_{a_i \in S} a_i$ and $q = R + 2M + 3$. The weight function ω is set as follows: $\omega(v') = R + M + 2$, $\omega(v^*) = 1$, $\omega(v) = M + 1$ and for any $u_i \in V_1$, $\omega(u_i) = a_i$. The initial delegation function d is set as follows: $d(v') = v'$, $d(v^*) = v^*$, $d(v) = v$ and for any $u_i \in V_1$, $d(u_i) = v$. As v^* is not swing in any coalition C for \mathcal{E} , $DB_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ (resp. $DS_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}) = 0$). First notice that all successful coalitions should contain voter v' and that v^* cannot be a swing agent in a coalition that contains both v and v' . In fact, to make v^* a swing for some coalition, one should select a subset U of voters from V_1 such that $\sum_{v \in U} \omega(v) = M$ and remove their delegations from v . Indeed, v^* is then a swing agent for the coalition $U \cup \{v'\}$.

Now, assume, for a contradiction, that there is a (not-necessarily constant) factor β ($0 < \beta \leq 1$) polynomial time approximation algorithm, \mathcal{A} , for **BMaxP** and **SMaxP**. Imagine using \mathcal{A} several times with $k = 1$ to $k = n$, where $n = |S|$ in the subset sum instance. Thus, if J is a Yes-instance, then there exists a set $L \subseteq S$ such that $\sum_{a_i \in L} a_i = M$. Consider, one of minimal size k_{min} . Then, for $k = k_{min}$, \mathcal{A} will necessarily output a delegation function to **BMaxP** (resp. **SMaxP**) for which $DB_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}') > 0$ (resp. $DS_{v^*}(\mathcal{E}') > 0$), and in which the set of delegations changed affects the voters $\{u_i : i \in L\}$. By investigating the solution, one can check in polynomial time if it indeed corresponds to a valid certificate for the subset sum problem. This concludes the proof. \square

More positively, when the input is a complete graph, we can provide more positive results on the approximation viewpoint. We detail an algorithm, called GAMW, standing for Greedy Algorithm with Maximum Weight, which works as follows.

If v^* is a guru. It iteratively picks a guru g (different from v^*) with maximum accumulated weight (if there are several gurus with the same accumulated weight, it selects one arbitrarily), set $d(g) = v^*$ and $k = k - 1$. This process continues until $k = 0$ or no guru remains to delegate to v^* .

If v^* is a follower. Let $Del_d(j) = c_d(j, d^*(j)) \setminus \{j\}$ be the set of voters to which j delegates to directly or indirectly. GAMW distinguishes two subcases: i) $k \geq 2$, it assumes that v^* is a guru and sets $d(v^*) = v^*$ and $k = k - 1$. It then proceeds as when v^* is a guru, ii) $k = 1$, GAMW checks if $q - \sum_{i \in Del_{d_1}(v^*)} \omega(i) > 0$ (i.e., otherwise she is a dummy player.), then it finds a voter among the gurus $g \neq d_{v^*}^*$ and the voters who delegate directly to $Del_d(j)$ with the highest accumulated weight and make her delegate to v^* , otherwise (i.e., $q - \sum_{i \in Del_{d_1}(v^*)} \omega(i) \leq 0$) it sets $d(v^*) = v^*$.

Theorem 5.5. *GAMW is a factor $\frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$ (resp. $\frac{1}{n!}$) approximation algorithm for **BMaxP** (resp. **SMaxP**) on complete graphs.*

Sketch of proof. The intuition is that, as GAMW assigns a set of subtrees with the highest weight to v^* among all algorithms respecting the budget constraint, if there is no coalition C' for which v^* is swing in after applying GAMW, no algorithm can result in a better solution. In particular, suppose that we are given a delegation graph H_d and a guru $g_{max} \in Gu_d$ with the highest accumulated weight. Consider any losing coalition $C \subseteq V \setminus T_d(g_{max})$ in H_d . If the coalition $C' = C \cup T_d(g_{max})$ is not a winning coalition, then no guru $g \in Gu_d$ can make C a winning coalition as $\alpha_d(g_{max}) \geq \alpha_d(g)$. In case $k = 1$ and v^* is a follower, we consider any losing coalition $C \setminus T_d(v^*)$, where $Del_d(j) \subseteq C$ and use a similar argument. \square

To conclude this subsection, we note that, as shown by Theorems 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4, problems **BMinP**, **SMinP**, **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** are hard. We also believe that these problems are complex in the sense that the power measures they rely on can be hard to grasp for people not used to solution concepts from cooperative game theory. In the next subsection, instead of maximizing a power measure, we study a problem with a conceptually simpler objective as surrogate.

5.2 Voting weight modification by bribery

In this subsection, we investigate if we can modify at most k delegation choices to make the accumulated weight of a given voter i^* greater than or equal to a given threshold τ . We term this optimization problem **WMaxP** for Weight Maximization Problem. It is clear that problem **WMaxP** is related to problems **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** in the sense that a greater voting weight may result in a greater power measure value. However, it is well known from the literature on WVGs that this relation is limited as voters with sensibly different weights may have the same relative importance in the election. Less intuitively, it is even possible that if the given voter receives too much weight, we may end up in a situation where the voter's delegative power gets decreased (see Proposition 4.3).

We now formally introduce **WMaxP**. As this problem does not require to know the quota, we define a Partial LDE (PLDE) as a tuple $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d \rangle$, i.e., an LDE without a quota value.

Problems: WMaxP

Input: A PLDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d \rangle$, a voter $i^* \in V$, a budget $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and a threshold $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$.

Feasible Solution: A delegation function $d' \in \Delta(D)$ s.t. $|\{i \in V : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq k$ leading to a PLDE $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D, \omega, d' \rangle$.

Question: Can we find a solution d' such that $\alpha_{d'}(i^*) \geq \tau$.

We first show that **WMaxP** is NP-complete and that **OWMaxP**, the optimization variant of **WMaxP**, where the goal is to maximize i^* 's weight, cannot be approximated in polynomial time with an approximation ratio better than $1 - 1/e$ if $P \neq NP$. The approximation preserving reduction used is from the maximum coverage problem.

Theorem 5.6. ***WMaxP** is NP-complete and **OWMaxP** cannot be approximated with an approximation ratio better than $1 - 1/e$ if $P \neq NP$, even when all voters have weight one.*

To obtain more positive results, we consider both the approximation and the parameterized complexity viewpoints.

An approximation algorithm point of view. Interestingly, a more general version of **OWMaxP**, called **DTO** (Directed Tree Orienteering), has been investigated by Ghuge and Nagarajan [20]. In **DTO**, we are given a directed graph $D = (V, A)$ with edge costs $c : A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, a root vertex $r^* \in V$, a budget $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and a weight function $p : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$. For any subgraph G' of a given (directed or undirected) graph G , let $V(G')$ and $E(G')$ represent the set of nodes and edges in G' . The goal is to find an out-directed arborescence T^* rooted at r^* maximizing $p(V(T^*)) = \sum_{v \in V(T^*)} p(v)$ such that $\sum_{e \in E(T^*)} c(e) \leq B$. Ghuge and Nagarajan [20] provided a quasi-polynomial time $O(\frac{\log n'}{\log \log n'})$ -approximation algorithm, where n' is the number of vertices in an optimal solution. The authors mentioned that this factor is tight for **DTO** in quasi-polynomial time. It is worth mentioning that Paul et al. [32] proposed a 2-approximation algorithm for the undirected version of **DTO**.

Here we show that any approximation algorithm for a restriction of problem **DTO** can also be used with **OWMaxP**, preserving the approximation factor. In particular, consider the particular instances $I' = \langle D' = (V', A'), r^*, c, p, B \rangle$ of **DTO**, where for any edge $e \in A'$, $c(e) = \{0, 1\}$. For any node $v \in V'$, there exists at most one incoming edge e of cost $c(e) = 0$. More importantly, there is no cycle C in D' with the total cost $\sum_{e \in E(C)} c(e) = 0$, i.e., there exists at least one edge $e \in C$ with $c(e) = 1$. We call **RDTO** this restriction.

Theorem 5.7. *Consider a parameter β , where $0 < \beta < 1$ (not-necessarily constant). The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *There is an β -approximation algorithm for **RDTO**.*
- (ii) *There is an β -approximation algorithm for **OWMaxP**.*

Proof. To prove that (i) implies (ii), we proceed as follows. Let $I = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, i^*, k \rangle$ be an instance of **OWMaxP**. We suppose that $d_{i^*} = i^*$; otherwise we define a new delegation graph d' such that $d'(i^*) = i^*$, $d'(i) = d(i)$ for any $i \in V \setminus \{i^*\}$ and $k = k - 1$. Indeed, i^* should be a guru to have a non-zero accumulated weight. Let $I' = \langle D' = (V', A'), r^*, c, p, B \rangle$ be an instance of **RDTO** obtained from I as follows. We set $V' = V$, $r^* = i^*$ and $A' = \{(i, j) : (j, i) \in A\}$, i.e., we reverse the edges. For any $e = (i, j) \in A'$ in I' , if $d(j) = i$ in I , $c(e) = 0$; $c(e) = 1$ otherwise. Lastly, $B = k$ and $p(v) = \omega(v)$ for any $v \in V'$. Consider a solution T^* to **RDTO** on I' . We can simply reverse the edges in T^* and obtain a subtree of D rooted in $i^* = r^*$ with cost $c(T^*) \leq B = k$ that induces a delegation graph d' . We conclude by noticing that any edge $e = (i, j) \in E(T^*)$ either costs 0 if $d(j) = i$ or 1 otherwise and $\alpha_{d'}(i^*) = p(V(T^*))$. This concludes the first direction.

Now we show that (ii) implies (i). Let $I' = \langle D' = (V', A'), r^*, c, p, B \rangle$ be an instance of **RDTO**. Let $I = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, i^*, k \rangle$ be an instance of **OWMaxP** obtained from I' as follows. We set $V' = V$, $r^* = i^*$ and $A = \{(i, j) : (j, i) \in A'\}$, i.e., reversing edges. For any voter $i \in V \setminus \{i^*\}$ if there exists an incoming edge $e = (j, i) \in A'$ with cost $c(e) = 0$, we set $d(i) = j$; $d(i) = i$ otherwise. We set $d(i^*) = i^*$. For any $v \in V$, let $\omega(v) = p(v)$. Lastly, we set $k = B$. As there exists no cycle $C \in D'$ with $\sum_{e \in C} c(e) = 0$ and for any $i \in V'$ there is at most one incoming edge e with cost $c(e) = 0$, the resulting delegation graph H_d is feasible. Now consider another delegation graph $H_{d'}$ such that $|\{i \in V : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq k$. By reversing the edges in subtree rooted at i^* in $H_{d'}$ we get an arborescence T^* in D' that is rooted at r^* with $p(V(T^*)) = \alpha_{d'}(i^*)$. \square

We now present a polynomial-time approximation algorithm for **OWMaxP** to achieve a trade-off between the violation of budget constraint and the approximation factor. Given an undirected graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$, a distinguished vertex $r \in V(G)$ and a budget B , where each vertex $v \in V(G)$ is assigned with a prize $p'(v)$ and a cost $c'(v)$. A graph G is called B -proper for the vertex r if the cost of reaching any vertex from r is at most B . Consider a subtree $T = (V(T), E(T))$ of G , where $V(T) \subseteq V(G)$ and $E(T) \subseteq E(G)$. Let $c'(T) = \sum_{v \in V(T)} c'(v)$ and $p'(T) = \sum_{v \in V(T)} p'(v)$. Let $\gamma = \frac{p'(T)}{c'(T)}$ be the prize-to-cost ratio of T . Bateni, Hajiaghayi and Liaghat [5] proposed a trimming process that leads to the following.

Lemma 5.8 (Lemma 3 in [5]). *Let T be a subtree rooted at r with the prize-to-cost ratio γ . Suppose the underlying graph is B -proper for r and for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ the cost of the tree is at least $\frac{\varepsilon B}{2}$. One can find a tree T^* containing r with the prize-to-cost ratio at least $\frac{\varepsilon \gamma}{4}$ such that $\varepsilon B / 2 \leq c'(T^*) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)B$.*

We show that Lemma 5.8 can be applied to our case. Given an instance $I = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, i^* \in V, k \rangle$ of **OWMaxP**. We create an edge-cost directed graph $D_d = (V_d, A_d)$ respecting the delegation function d as follows: $V_d = V$, $A_d = A$, each vertex $v \in V_d$ is associated with a weight $\omega(v)$ and each edge $e = (i, j) \in A_d$ is associated with a cost $c(e) = 0$ if $d(i) = j$, $c(e) = 1$ otherwise. D_d is called the d -edge-cost graph of D . Let V' be all vertices in V_d such that the cost of reaching from any node $v' \in V'$ to i^* is at most k . We call subgraph $D' = (V', A')$ of D_d k -appropriate for i^* where $A' = V' \times V' \cap A_d$ (we make this definition to avoid confusions between the undirected and directed cases). Consider a subtree T of D' . Let $\omega(T) = \sum_{v \in V'(T)} \omega(v)$ and $c(T) = \sum_{e \in A'(T)} c(e)$. Let $\gamma = \frac{\omega(T)}{c(T)}$ be the weight-to-cost ratio of T .

Lemma 5.9. *Given an instance $I = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, i^*, k \rangle$ of **OWMaxP**. Consider the d -edge-cost graph D_d which is k -appropriate for i^* . Let T be a subtree of D_d rooted at i^* with the weight-to-cost ratio γ . Suppose that for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ $c(T) \geq \frac{\varepsilon B}{2}$. One can find a tree T^* containing i^* with the weight-to-cost ratio at least $\frac{\varepsilon \gamma}{4}$ such that $\varepsilon B/2 \leq c'(T^*) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)B$.*

Proof. Let $V(T)$ and $A(T)$ be the set of vertices and edges of T . Now we create another subtree $T' = (V'(T), A'(T))$ as follows:

- $V(T') = V(T) \cup V_1$ with $V_1 = \{v_e : e \in A(T)\}$.
- $A(T') = \{(i, v_e), (v_e, j) : e = (i, j) \in A(T)\}$.

Each vertex $v \in V(T') \cap V(T)$ (resp. $v_e \in V(T') \cap V_1$) is assigned with a prize $p'(v) = \omega(v)$ (resp. $p'(v_e) = 0$) and a cost $c'(v) = 0$ (resp. $c'(v_e) = c(e)$). Lemma 5.8 can be applied to the subtree $T' = (V(T'), A(T'))$, as the trimming process by Bateni, Hajiaghayi and Liaghat [5] only removes some subtrees of T' to reach the guarantees mentioned in Lemma 5.8. This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to propose our approximation algorithm for **OWMaxP**, called VBAMW. Given an instance of **OWMaxP** $I = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, i^*, k \rangle$, VBAMW first creates the d -edge-cost graph $D_d = (V_d, A_d)$ which is also maximal inclusion-wise k -appropriate graph for i^* . Now VBAMW finds a spanning arborescence $T = (V(T), A(T))$ of D_d with minimum cost $c(T)$, using Edmonds' algorithm [14]. If $c(T) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$, we are done. Suppose it is not the case. Let $\gamma = \frac{\omega(T)}{c(T)}$ be the weight-to-cost ratio of tree T . By Lemma 5.9, from tree T , VBAMW finds another subtree $T^* \subseteq T$ of the cost at most $(1 + \varepsilon)k$ and the weight-to-cost ratio $\frac{\varepsilon \gamma}{4}$.

Theorem 5.10. *VBAMW is a $\frac{\varepsilon^2 k}{8n}$ approximation algorithm with the cost at most $(1 + \varepsilon)k$ for **OWMaxP**.*

Proof. Let T be the spanning arborescence returned by Edmonds' algorithm [14] with weight-to-cost ratio γ . It is clear that $\omega(T) \geq OPT$, where OPT is the optimum weight to **OWMaxP**. By Lemma 5.9, VBAMW will find another subtree T^* of cost $\varepsilon k/2 \leq c(T^*) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)k$ and weight-to-cost ratio:

$$\frac{\omega(T^*)}{c(T^*)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon \gamma}{4} \geq \frac{\varepsilon \omega(T)}{4c(T)} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4c(T)} OPT \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4n} OPT.$$

As $c(T^*) \geq \varepsilon k/2$, we have $\omega(T^*) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2 k}{8n} OPT$, concluding the proof. \square

Remark 1. *VBAMW is a $\frac{\varepsilon^2 B}{8B'}$ approximation algorithm with the cost at most $(1 + \varepsilon)B$ for **DTO**, where B' is the minimum cost a spanning tree of the given graph can have. To the best of our knowledge, VBAMW is the first polynomial-time approximation algorithm for **DTO**.*

A parameterized complexity point of view. We now define the two following parameters:

- We denote by $\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}\text{q} = \sum_{i \in V} \omega(i) - \tau$ the amount of voting weight that i^* does not need to reach the threshold τ ;
- We denote by $\text{r}\text{e}\text{q} = \tau - \alpha_d(i^*)$ the amount of additional voting weight that i^* needs to reach the threshold τ .

We study the parameterized complexity of **WMaxP** w.r.t. these two parameters. It can indeed be expected that the problem becomes easier if one of them is small. If $\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}\text{q}$ is small, then the combinations of voters that may not delegate to i^* in a solution d , such that $\alpha_d(i^*) \geq \tau$, are probably limited. Conversely, if req is small, then the number of voters that i^* needs an additional support of to reach τ is small. These intuitions indeed yield positive results (Theorems 5.11 and 5.14). These two parameters seem to be opposite from one another. Indeed a small value for parameter $\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}\text{q}$ (resp. req) indicates that reaching the threshold τ is probably hard (resp. easy). Parameter $\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}\text{q}$ could for instance be small if $\tau = q$ and the election is conservative (i.e., q is close to $\sum_{i \in V} \omega(i)$). Meanwhile, parameter req can be small if i^* has already a large voting power.

We start with parameter $\text{r}\hat{\text{e}}\text{q}$.

Theorem 5.11. *WMaxP is in XP with respect to parameter $r\bar{e}q$.*

To prove this theorem we first show that **WMaxP** can be solved in polynomial time if $r\bar{e}q = 0$. In this case, the problem can be solved by computing a directed spanning tree rooted in i^* maximizing some weight function which can be achieved efficiently using Edmond's algorithm [14].

Lemma 5.12. *WMaxP can be solved in polynomial time if $r\bar{e}q = 0$.*

Using Lemma 5.12, we prove Theorem 5.11.

Proof of Theorem 5.11. As voters' weights are positive integers, the maximum number of voters that i^* does not necessarily need the support of to reach the threshold is bounded by $r\bar{e}q$. One can hence guess the set C of voters that are not required with $|C| \leq r\bar{e}q$. Indeed, the number of possible guesses is bounded by $\frac{|V|^{r\bar{e}q+1}-|V|}{|V|-1}$. Let $X \subset V$ be one such guess. Once these voters are removed from the instance, we obtain another instance of **WMaxP** in which (if the guess is correct) i^* should obtain the support of all other voters. This amounts to solving an instance of **WMaxP** where $r\bar{e}q = 0$. Hence, it can be solved in polynomial time by Lemma 5.12. \square

Hence, interestingly **WMaxP** can be solved in polynomial time if $r\bar{e}q$ is bounded by a constant. Unfortunately, **WMaxP** is W[1]-hard w.r.t. $r\bar{e}q$ and hence is unlikely to be FPT for this parameter.

Theorem 5.13. *WMaxP is W[1]-hard with respect to $r\bar{e}q$, even when all voters have weight one.*

Proof. We design a parameterized reduction from the independent set problem. In the independent set problem, we are given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer k and we are asked if there exists an independent set of size k . The independent set problem is W[1]-hard parameterized by k . From an instance $I = (G = (V, E), k)$ of the independence set problem, we create the following **WMaxP** instance. We create a digraph $D = (\bar{V}, \bar{A})$ where:

- $\bar{V} = U \cup W \cup \{i^*\}$ with $U = \{u_v : v \in V\}$ and $W = \{w_e, w_e^1, \dots, w_e^k : e \in E\}$.
- $\bar{A} = \{(u_v, i^*) : v \in V\} \cup \{(w_e, u_v) : e \in E, v \in V, v \in e\} \cup \{(w_e^1, w_e), \dots, (w_e^k, w_e) : e \in E\}$.

All voters have weight one. The initial delegation function is such that $d(x) = x$ for $x \in U \cup \{i^*\} \cup \{w_e : e \in E\}$ and $d(w_e^j) = w_e$ for each $j \in [k]$ and $e \in E$. The budget $\bar{k} = |E| + |V| - k$ and τ is set to $(k+1)|E| + |V| - k + 1$. Hence, $r\bar{e}q = k$. We show that the instance of the independent set problem is a yes instance iff the instance of the **WMaxP** problem is a yes instance. To reach the threshold of τ , i^* necessarily needs the delegations of all voters w_e . This requires spending a budget of $|E|$ to make all voters w_e delegate to some voters in U (which should then delegate to i^*). Then, there only remains a budget $|V| - k$ to make these voters in U delegate to i^* . Hence, we can reach the threshold τ iff we can make all voters in $\{w_e : e \in E\}$ delegate to less than $|V| - k$ voters in U . This is possible iff I is a yes instance. \square

Interestingly, **WMaxP** is FPT with respect to req .

Theorem 5.14. *WMaxP is FPT with respect to req .*

Proof sketch. Let $I = (\langle D = (V, A), \omega, d \rangle, i^*, k, \tau)$ be an instance of **WMaxP**. As voters' weights are positive integers, the maximum number of additional voters that i^* needs the support of to reach the threshold is bounded by req . We first note that one can collapse the tree $T_d(i^*)$ in one vertex with weight $\alpha_d(i^*)$. Let us consider a delegation function d' such that $|\{i : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq k$, and $\alpha_{d'}(i^*) \geq \tau$ (assuming such a solution exists). A subtree of $T_{d'}(i^*)$ rooted in i^* with at most $req+1$ voters accumulates a voting weight greater than or equal to τ . Our FPT algorithm guesses the shape of this tree and then looks for this tree in D by adapting the color coding technique [1]. The idea is to color the graph randomly with $req+1$ colors. If the tree that we are looking for is present in graph D , it will be colored with the $req+1$ colors (i.e., one color per vertex) with some probability only dependent of req . We say that such a tree is colorful. One can then resort to dynamic programming to find the best colorful tree rooted in i^* in D and which contains at most k arcs not in H_d . This algorithm can then be derandomized using families of perfect hash functions [1, 34]. \square

6 Power Distribution

The structure of a delegation graph has a considerable impact on the power distribution among agents. In this section, we aim to find a delegation graph with a fixed number of gurus to maximize the minimum power an agent can have. Such delegation graph could for instance be useful to determine a committee within the set of voters in such a way that all voters feel important. Ensuring that all voters have a “high” relative importance incentives participation and prevents some voters to accumulate too much power.

More formally, given a digraph D , and a delegation graph $H \in \Delta(D)$, we denote by f_i^H the power index of voter i in H . The value of f_i^H may be computed using the delegative Banzhaf index or the delegative Shapley-Shubik-index. Hence, the weakest agents in H have a power index worth:

$$(\text{weakest}) \mu(H) := \min_{i \in V} f_i^H.$$

The goal here is to organize the delegations in H to maximize $\mu(H)$. We term this problem the MaxiMin Weight Problem (**MMWP** for short). Formally,

MMWP

Input: A graph D , a weight function ω , a quota q and an integer k .

Feasible Solution: A delegation graph $H = (V, E) \in \Delta(D)$ with k gurus.

Measure for MMWP: $\mu(H)$ to maximize, where $\mu(H)$ can be computed using either the delegative Banzhaf value or the delegative Shapley-Shubik value.

Consider the following observation from Zang and Grossi [36],

Fact 6.1 (Fact 2 in [36]). *For any pair of agents $i, j \in V(D)$, such that $d_i = j$, $DB_i \leq DB_j$.*

Let us assume that f_i^H is computed using the delegative Banzhaf value. Hence, using Fact 6.1, it is worth noting that to give an optimal solution to **MMWP**, we only need to find a delegation graph H_d in which $\min_{l \in \text{Leaves}(H_d)} f_l^{H_d}$ is maximized where $\text{Leaves}(H_d)$ is the set of all leaves in H_d . In the following, we will show that **MMWP** is NP-hard.

Theorem 6.2. *Problem MMWP is NP-hard.*

To prove Theorem 6.2, we will give a reduction from the NP-complete 3D-Matching problem [23]. This problem is defined as follows. Let X, Y , and Z be finite, disjoint sets, and $T \subseteq X \times Y \times Z$ be a set of ordered triples. That is, T consists of triples (x, y, z) such that $x \in X, y \in Y$, and $z \in Z$. Now $M \subseteq T$ is a 3D-Matching if the following holds: for any two distinct triples $(x_1, y_1, z_1) \in M$ and $(x_2, y_2, z_2) \in M$, we have $x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2$, and $z_1 \neq z_2$. In an instance $I = (T, k)$ of 3D-Matching, the goal is to find a 3D-Matching $M \subseteq T$ of size $|M| = k$. The resulting decision problem is NP-complete even when $|X| = |Y| = |Z| = k$.

From an instance $I = (T, k)$ of 3D-Matching, we create an instance $I' = (D, \omega, q, k')$ of **MMWP** as follows. For any $x \in X, y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$, we create voters v_x, v_y and v_z , respectively. We let $V_X := \{v_x : x \in X\}, V_Y := \{v_y : y \in Y\}$ and $V_Z := \{v_z : z \in Z\}$ respectively. For any triple $(x, y, z) \in T$, we create two directed edges: one from $v_x \in V_X$ to $v_y \in V_Y$, and the other one from $v_y \in V_Y$ to $v_z \in V_Z$. We set the budget k' to k and the quota q to 3. All voters have voting weight 1. The power index which is used is the delegative Banzhaf index.

We need the following observation to prove Theorem 6.2.

Observation 1. *Given an instance $I' = (D, \omega, q, k')$ resulting from our reduction, $\mu(H_d) \geq 2^{-k-1}$ iff for any subtree T of H_d rooted in a vertex in V_Z , $|T| = 3$.*

Proof. Since $k' = |Z|$, in a solution of **MMWP**, all voters $v_z \in V_Z$ should vote and all other voters $v_y \in V_Y$ and $v_x \in V_X$ should delegate to voters in V_Z (directly or indirectly). Let $NS(v_x)$ be the set of coalitions C that v_x is a swing agent in. As $q = 3$, any voter v_x is a swing agent for a coalition C iff:

- $(c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*) \setminus \{x\}) \subseteq C$, where $d_{v_x}^* \in V_Z$. ;
- the other voters of C in $V_X \setminus c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*)$ and $V_Y \setminus c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*)$ are inactive agents in C ;

- the coalition C does not include another voter from V_Z than $d_{v_x}^*$.

Hence for any v_x , $|NS(v_x)| \leq 2^{2k-2}$ as $NS(v_x) \subseteq \{(c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*) \setminus \{x\}) \cup S : S \subseteq (V_Y \setminus \{d_{v_x}\}) \cup (V_X \setminus \{v_x\})\}$. Moreover, for any v_x , $|NS(v_x)| = 2^{2k-2}$ if $NS(v_x) = \{(c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*) \setminus \{x\}) \cup S : S \in (V_Y \setminus \{d_{v_x}\}) \cup (V_X \setminus \{v_x\})\}$. Stated otherwise, all voters in $V_X \setminus \{v_x\}$ and $V_Y \setminus \{d_{v_x}\}$ are always inactive agents in a coalition containing $c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*)$ and no other voters in V_Z than $d_{v_x}^*$. It is easy to realize that this condition is met in a delegation graph H_d iff all subtrees rooted in a vertex of V_Z in H_d have size equal to 3. This proves the observation as the delegative Banzhaf index of a voter $v_x \in V_X$ is then equal to $|NS(v_x)|/2^{n-1} = 2^{-k-1}$ which proves the observation. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 6.2.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. Let $I = (T, k)$ be an instance of 3D-Matching, and $I' = (D, \omega, q, k')$ be the instance of **MMWP** resulting from our reduction. We want to show that I is a yes instance iff we can find a solution H_d in I' such that $\mu(H_d) \geq 2^{-k-1}$. For the first direction, suppose that we have a 3D-Matching $M \subseteq T$ of size $k = |X| = |Y| = |Z|$. Consider the delegation graph, where for any $(x, y, z) \in M$, x delegates to y and y delegates to z , respectively. Hence, in the resulting delegation graph H_d , all subtrees rooted in a vertex of V_Z are of size equal to 3. Using Observation 1, we obtain the desired conclusion. Let H_d be a solution in I' such that $\mu(H_d) \geq 2^{-k-1}$. Using Observation 1, we obtain that all subtrees rooted in a vertex of V_Z are of size equal to 3. Notably, each of these subtrees necessarily contain one element of V_X , one element of V_Y and one element of V_Z . There are k of them and they do not share any vertex. Hence, they correspond to a 3D-Matching of size k . \square

7 Conclusion

Following a recent work by Zhang and Grossi [36], we investigated delegative simple games, a variant of weighted voting games in which agents' weights are derived from a transitive support structure. We proposed a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm to compute the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik measures for this class of cooperative games and investigated several of their properties highlighting that they could lead to manipulations, e.g., by changing the delegation structure underlying the game. From this observation, we investigated a bribery problem in which we aim to maximize/minimize the power/weight of a given voter. We showed that these problems are NP-hard to solve and provided some more positive results (from the algorithmic viewpoint) by resorting to approximation algorithms and parameterized complexity.

Several directions of future work are conceivable. First, for both destructive and constructive bribery problems, designing some algorithms with tighter approximation guarantees under some conditions is one direction. Second, it would be interesting to study bribery problems related to alternative, maybe finer power measures. For instance, it is known that the Banzhaf index can be decomposed into two parts (the Coleman measures), one that measures the ability to initiate action, and one other to prevent it [17].

References

- [1] Noga Alon, Raphael Yuster, and Uri Zwick. Color-coding. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 42(4):844–856, 1995.
- [2] Haris Aziz, Yoram Bachrach, Edith Elkind, and Mike Paterson. False-name manipulations in weighted voting games. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 40:57–93, 2011.
- [3] Yoram Bachrach, Evangelos Markakis, Ariel D. Procaccia, Jeffrey S. Rosenschein, and Amin Saberi. Approximating power indices. In Lin Padgham, David C. Parkes, Jörg P. Müller, and Simon Parsons, editors, *7th International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2008)*, Estoril, Portugal, May 12–16, 2008, Volume 2, pages 943–950, Estoril, 2008. IFAAMAS.
- [4] John F Banzhaf III. Weighted voting doesn't work: A mathematical analysis. *Rutgers L. Rev.*, 19:317, 1964.

- [5] Mohammad Hossein Bateni, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, and Vahid Liaghat. Improved approximation algorithms for (budgeted) node-weighted steiner problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 47(4):1275–1293, 2018.
- [6] J. Behrens, A. Kistner, A. Nitsche, and B. Swierczek. *The principles of LiquidFeedback*. Interaktive Demokratie, Berlin, 2014.
- [7] Paolo Boldi, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, and Sebastiano Vigna. Voting in social networks. In David Wai-Lok Cheung, Il-Yeol Song, Wesley W. Chu, Xiaohua Hu, and Jimmy Lin, editors, *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2009, Hong Kong, China, November 2-6, 2009*, pages 777–786, Hong Kong, 2009. ACM.
- [8] Paolo Boldi, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, and Sebastiano Vigna. Viscous democracy for social networks. *Commun. ACM*, 54(6):129–137, 2011.
- [9] Steven J Brams and Paul J Affuso. Power and size: A new paradox. *Theory and Decision*, 7(1-2):29–56, 1976.
- [10] Georgios Chalkiadakis, Edith Elkind, and Michael J. Wooldridge. *Computational Aspects of Cooperative Game Theory*. Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2011.
- [11] Georgios Chalkiadakis and Michael J. Wooldridge. Weighted voting games. In Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jérôme Lang, and Ariel D. Procaccia, editors, *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, pages 377–396. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [12] Vincent Conitzer and Tuomas Sandholm. Computing shapley values, manipulating value division schemes, and checking core membership in multi-issue domains. In Deborah L. McGuinness and George Ferguson, editors, *Proceedings of the Nineteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, July 25-29, 2004, San Jose, California, USA*, pages 219–225, California, 2004. AAAI Press / The MIT Press.
- [13] Xiaotie Deng and Christos H Papadimitriou. On the complexity of cooperative solution concepts. *Mathematics of operations research*, 19(2):257–266, 1994.
- [14] Jack Edmonds. Optimum branchings. *Journal of Research of the national Bureau of Standards B*, 71(4):233–240, 1967.
- [15] Shaheen S Fatima, Michael Wooldridge, and Nicholas R Jennings. An approximation method for power indices for voting games. In *Innovations in Agent-Based Complex Automated Negotiations*, pages 179–194. Springer, Berlin, 2010.
- [16] Uriel Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(4):634–652, 1998.
- [17] Dan S. Felsenthal and Moshé Machover. *The Measurement of Voting Power*. Number 1489 in Books. Edward Elgar Publishing, Bodmin, 01 1998.
- [18] Bryan Ford. A liquid perspective on democratic choice, 2020.
- [19] M. R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman, United States, 1979.
- [20] Rohan Ghuge and Viswanath Nagarajan. Quasi-polynomial algorithms for submodular tree orienteering and other directed network design problems. In Shuchi Chawla, editor, *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2020, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, January 5-8, 2020*, pages 1039–1048, Salt Lake City, 2020. SIAM.

- [21] Samuel Yeung and Yoav Shoham. Marginal contribution nets: a compact representation scheme for coalitional games. In John Riedl, Michael J. Kearns, and Michael K. Reiter, editors, *Proceedings 6th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2005), Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 5-8, 2005*, pages 193–202, Vancouver, 2005. ACM.
- [22] Samuel Yeung and Yoav Shoham. Multi-attribute coalitional games. In Joan Feigenbaum, John C.-I. Chuang, and David M. Pennock, editors, *Proceedings 7th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC-2006), Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, June 11-15, 2006*, pages 170–179, Michigan, 2006. ACM.
- [23] Jon M. Kleinberg and Éva Tardos. *Algorithm design*. Addison-Wesley, 2006.
- [24] Christoph Carl Kling, Jérôme Kunegis, Heinrich Hartmann, Markus Strohmaier, and Steffen Staab. Voting behaviour and power in online democracy: A study of liquidfeedback in germany’s pirate party. In Meeyoung Cha, Cecilia Mascolo, and Christian Sandvig, editors, *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Web and Social Media, ICWSM 2015, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK, May 26-29, 2015*, pages 208–217, Oxford, 2015. AAAI Press.
- [25] Annick Laruelle and Federico Valenciano. A critical reappraisal of some voting power paradoxes. *Public Choice*, 125(1-2):17–41, 2005.
- [26] Dennis Leech. Computing power indices for large voting games. *Management Science*, 49(6):831–837, 2003.
- [27] Irwin Mann and Lloyd S. Shapley. *Values of Large Games, IV: Evaluating the Electoral College by Monte Carlo Techniques*. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1960.
- [28] Tomomi Matsui and Yasuko Matsui. A survey of algorithms for calculating power indices of weighted majority games. *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, 43(1):71–86, 2000.
- [29] Yasuko Matsui and Tomomi Matsui. Np-completeness for calculating power indices of weighted majority games. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 263(1-2):305–310, 2001.
- [30] Samuel Merrill III. Approximations to the banzhaf index of voting power. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 89(2):108–110, 1982.
- [31] S. Muroga. *Threshold Logic and Its Applications*. Wiley-Interscience, 1971.
- [32] Alice Paul, Daniel Freund, Aaron M. Ferber, David B. Shmoys, and David P. Williamson. Budgeted prize-collecting traveling salesman and minimum spanning tree problems. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 45(2):576–590, 2020.
- [33] Kislaya Prasad and Jerry S Kelly. Np-completeness of some problems concerning voting games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 19(1):1–9, 1990.
- [34] Jeanette P Schmidt and Alan Siegel. The spatial complexity of oblivious k-probe hash functions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 19(5):775–786, 1990.
- [35] Lloyd S Shapley. A value for n-person games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 2(28):307–317, 1953.
- [36] Yuzhe Zhang and Davide Grossi. Power in liquid democracy. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pages 5822–5830, Vancouver, 2021. AAAI Press.
- [37] Yair Zick, Alexander Skopalik, and Edith Elkind. The shapley value as a function of the quota in weighted voting games. In Toby Walsh, editor, *IJCAI 2011, Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, July 16-22, 2011*, pages 490–496, Barcelona, 2011. IJCAI/AAAI.
- [38] Michael Zuckerman, Piotr Faliszewski, Yoram Bachrach, and Edith Elkind. Manipulating the quota in weighted voting games. *Artificial Intelligence*, 180:1–19, 2012.

Appendix

8 Deferred proofs from Section 4

Theorem 4.1. *Given a delegative simple game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$ induced by an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and a voter $i \in V$, DS_i and DB_i can be computed in $O(n^4 w_{\max}^2)$ and $O(n^2 w_{\max}^2)$, respectively.*

Proof. Consider a coalition $C \subseteq V$. Observe first that when a coalition C does not include voter j , a subset S of j 's followers (i.e., $S \subseteq T_d(j) \setminus \{j\}$) could join C only as inactive agents and are not able to increase the total weight of C . For instance in Example 2, in the case voter 7 does not join a coalition C (i.e., $\gamma_{d,C}(8) = 1$), all of her followers could join C as inactive agents.

By relabeling the vertices we can make the assumption that the vertex we consider is voter n . We first show how to compute the delegative shapely value. We decompose the proof in two sub-cases :

Case 1: voter n is a guru. We run a depth-first search of H_d starting from voter n . Let π_d be the ordering of voters in H_d such that voters are sorted in decreasing order of their discovering times in the depth first search. As n is first visited in the depth first search, it is the last voter in the ordering π_d . In Example 2, voters are sorted in such a way (i.e., $\pi_d = \langle 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 \rangle$), when computing $DB_8(\mathcal{E})$. Consider a guru n with accumulated weight $\alpha_d(n)$. Recall that w_n is the initial weight that voter n is endowed with before starting the delegation process and $\alpha_d(n)$ is the total weight that voter n receives through delegations in H_d .

Let N_s denote the number of coalitions C of size s for which n is a swing agent. Then DS_n can be rewritten as follows.

$$DS_n = \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} \frac{s!(n-s-1)!}{n!} N_s. \quad (1)$$

Let $t_j = |T_d(j)|$, i.e., the size of the tree $T_d(j)$ rooted in a vertex j . Moreover, let $Del(j) = c_d(j, d^*(j)) \setminus \{j\}$ be the set of voters to which j delegates to directly or indirectly (not to be confused with the guru of j). To compute DS_n efficiently, we use a dynamic programming approach. Given a forest \mathcal{F} with n vertices, we define a table $F_{\mathcal{F}}$ where $F_{\mathcal{F}}[j, w, s]$ is the number of sets $C \subset \{1, \dots, j\}$ such that $|C| = s$ and $\gamma_d(Del(j) \cup C) = \gamma_d(Del(j)) + w$, where j and s range from 0 to n and w ranges from 0 to $\sum_{i \in V} w_i$. In words, we count the number of s -element subsets in $\{1, \dots, j\}$ who will contribute a weight w when added to a coalition containing all elements of $Del(j)$ (this ensures that j will be an active agent). These table entries will be filled as follows.

First, for $j = 0$, we have

$$F_{\mathcal{F}}[0, w, s] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w = 0 \text{ and } s = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

More generally, $F_{\mathcal{F}}[j, w, s] = 0$ if $s > j$ or $w > \sum_{i=1}^j w_i$. Second, if $s = 0$, then $F_{\mathcal{F}}[j, w, s] = 0$ if $w > 0$ and 1 otherwise. Third, in the special case $w = 0$, and $j \geq s > 0$, we have

$$F_{\mathcal{F}}[j, 0, s] = \sum_{x=0}^{t_j-1} \binom{t_j-1}{x} F_{\mathcal{F}}[j-t_j, 0, s-x]. \quad (2)$$

Indeed, in this case j cannot be part of the coalition as she would contribute a positive weight. Conversely, as j is not part of the coalition, any subset of vertices in $T_d(j) \setminus \{j\}$ may be part of the coalition as a set of inactive agents. We consider each possible cardinality (variable x) for such a subset before moving to the next tree rooted in $j - t_j$.

Now for $j = 1, \dots, n$, $s = 1, \dots, j$, and $w = 1, \dots, q - w_n$, $F[j, w, s]$ will be computed as follows.

$$F_{\mathcal{F}}[j, w, s] = \sum_{x=0}^{t_j-1} \binom{t_j-1}{x} F_{\mathcal{F}}[j-t_j, w, s-x] + F_{\mathcal{F}}[j-1, w-w_j, s-1] \quad (3)$$

We recall that $F_{\mathcal{F}}[j, w, s]$ is the number of sets $C \subset \{1, \dots, j\}$ such that $|C| = s$ and $\gamma_d(\text{Del}(j) \cup C) = \gamma_d(\text{Del}(j)) + w$. Here, the two summands correspond to the cases $j \notin C$ and $j \in C$ respectively. Note that in the first case, voters in $T_d(j)$ can only join C as inactive agents. Hence in the first summand, we consider all possible ways of adding to C inactive agents from the tree rooted in j before moving to the next subtree (rooted in $j - t_j$).

We use this dynamic programming equations considering two forests $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{T_d(n)\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 = H_d - T_d(n)$ of sizes t_n and $n - t_n$, respectively. We conclude by noticing that:

$$N_s = \sum_{k=0}^s \sum_{w=0}^{q-1} F_{\mathcal{F}_2}[n-t_n, w, k] \left(\sum_{w'=q-w}^{\alpha_d(n)} F_{\mathcal{F}_1}[t_n, w', s-k+1] \right). \quad (4)$$

Case 2: voter n is a delegator. If n is a delegator, then n can only be a swing agent for coalition C if $\text{Del}(n) \subseteq C$. Hence, we should count only coalitions which meet this condition. To take this fact into account we use our dynamic programming approach on the delegation graph $H_d[V \setminus \text{Del}(n)]$ (the new roots are now considered as voting agents). Moreover, in this case N_s is obtained by a different formula. Let $C_\delta = \text{Del}(n)$, then we use the formula:

$$N_s = \sum_{k=0}^{s_\delta} \sum_{w=0}^{q_\delta-1} F_{\mathcal{F}_2}[n-t_n, w, k] \times \left(\sum_{w'=q_\delta-w}^{\alpha_d(n)} F_{\mathcal{F}_1}[t_n, w', s_\delta - k + 1] \right), \quad (5)$$

where $s_\delta = s - |C_\delta|$ and $q_\delta = q - \gamma_d(C_\delta)$.

We move to the complexity analysis. The running time of this algorithm is bounded by the time required to fill out the tables $F_{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $F_{\mathcal{F}_2}$. The size of each table is bounded by $n \times n w_{\max} \times n$ and Equation 3 can be computed in $O(n)$ operations (if values $\binom{n}{k}$ are precomputed). This leads to a complexity of $O(n^4 w_{\max})$ for computing tables $F_{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $F_{\mathcal{F}_2}$. As Equations 4 and 5 can be computed in $O(n^3 w_{\max}^2)$, computing all values N_s can be performed with $O(n^4 w_{\max}^2)$ operations. Last, we compute the Shapley value which requires $O(n)$ operations.

For the Banzhaf index, we can simply adapt the dynamic program and omit the third index s . Thus, the complexity to fill out both adapted tables $F_{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $F_{\mathcal{F}_2}$ in this case will be upper bounded by $O(n^2 w_{\max})$, as the size of each table is bounded by $n^2 w_{\max}$ and each cell can be filled out by $O(1)$ operations. To compute the Banzhaf index of each agent n , we need to find the number of subsets $N \setminus T_d(n)$ having weight at least $q - \alpha_d(n)$ and at most $q - 1$. This can be done in $O(n^2 w_{\max}^2)$ times as both q and $\alpha_d(n)$ are bounded by $n w_{\max}$. This leads to a complexity of $O(n^2 w_{\max}^2)$ for computing the Banzhaf index. \square

We now investigate an additional axiom compared to what is provided in the main text. We borrow the following definition from Zhang and Grossi [36].

Definition 8.1 (Composition). *Let two LDEs $\mathcal{E}_1 = \langle D_1 = (V_1, A_1), \omega_1, d^1, q_1 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \langle D_2 = (V_2, A_2), \omega_2, d^2, q_2 \rangle$, such that for any $i \in V_1 \cap V_2$, if $d^1(i) = j$ (resp. $d^2(i) = j$), then $j \in V_2$ (resp. $j \in V_1$) and $d^2(i) = j$ (resp. $d^1(i) = j$), and $\omega_1(i) = \omega_2(i)$. We define two new delegative simple games $\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2 = \langle D_{1 \wedge 2}(V_1 \cup V_2, A_1 \cup A_2), \omega_{1 \wedge 2}, d_{1 \wedge 2}, q_1 \wedge q_2 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2 = \langle D_{1 \vee 2}(V_1 \cup V_2, A_1 \cup A_2), \omega_{1 \vee 2}, d_{1 \vee 2}, q_1 \vee q_2 \rangle$, where:*

- for any $i \in V_1$ (resp. $i \in V_2$), $\omega_{1 \vee 2}(i) = \omega_{1 \wedge 2}(i) = \omega_1(i)$ (resp. $\omega_{1 \vee 2}(i) = \omega_{1 \wedge 2}(i) = \omega_2(i)$);
- for any $i \in V_1 \setminus V_2$ (resp. $V_2 \setminus V_1$), $d_{1 \vee 2}(i) = d_{1 \wedge 2}(i) = d^1(i)$ (resp. $d_{1 \vee 2}(i) = d_{1 \wedge 2}(i) = d^2(i)$), and for any $i \in V_1 \cap V_2$, as $d^1(i) = d^2(i)$ by initial conditions, then $d_{1 \vee 2}(i) = d_{1 \wedge 2}(i) = d^1(i) = d^2(i)$;

- $q_1 \wedge q_2$ (resp. $q_1 \vee q_2$) is met iff $\sum_{i \in \text{CN}V_1} \gamma_{d, \text{CN}V_1}(i) \geq q_1$ and (resp. or) $\sum_{i \in \text{CN}V_2} \gamma_{d, \text{CN}V_2}(i) \geq q_2$.

Put another way, when two LDEs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 coincide in their intersection, by composing \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , we obtain two new LDEs $\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2$. Let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}$ (resp. $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}$) be the delegative simple game induced by $\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2$). In $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}$ (resp. $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}$), a coalition $C \subseteq V_1 \cup V_2$ wins if C wins in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1}$ or (resp. and) $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_2}$. Note that according to our setting, Definition 8.1 does not consider the case where voters abstain, which is the only difference between Definition 8.1 and the one given by Zhang and Grossi [36].

We now investigate an additional axiom from Zhang and Grossi [36].

Property 4 (Sum Principle (**SP**)). *For any two LDEs \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , such that any $i \in V_1 \cup V_2$ satisfies the condition in Definition 8.1, $f_i(\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2) + f_i(\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2) = f_i(\mathcal{E}_1) + f_i(\mathcal{E}_2)$.*

Zhang and Grossi [36] showed that the delegative Banzhaf index satisfies axiom *SP*. We show that it is also the case of the delegative Shapley-Shubik index.

Proposition 8.2. *The delegative Shapley-Shubik index satisfies axiom **SP**.*

Proof. To show that *DS* satisfies axiom **SP**, we recall that for any $C \subseteq V_1 \cup V_2$, $v_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}(C) = 1$ (resp. $v_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}(C) = 1$) iff $v_{\mathcal{E}_1}(C \cap V_1) = 1$ and (resp. or) $v_{\mathcal{E}_2}(C \cap V_2) = 1$. Let $P_i^{\mathcal{E}_j}$ (with $j \in \{1, 2\}$) be the set of permutations for which agent i is a swing agent in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_j}$, i.e., $P_i^{\mathcal{E}_j} = \{\pi \in \Pi_j : m_{\pi}^{\mathcal{E}_j}(i) = 1\}$, where Π_j is the set of all permutations of V_j . Let $n_1 = |V_1|$, $n_2 = |V_2|$ and $n = |V_1 \cup V_2|$. Consider a permutation π of V_j ($j \in \{1, 2\}$). Let π'_π be a permutation of $V_1 \cup V_2$ in which voters in V_j has the same order as in π . The number of such permutations π'_π is $\frac{n!}{n_j!}$.

Given a permutation π of $V_1 \cup V_2$, we will denote by $\pi[V_1]$ (resp. $\pi[V_2]$) the restriction of π to V_1 (resp. V_2). We will now count the permutations for which i is a swing in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}$. Note that a necessary condition for i to be swing in π for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}$ or $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}$ is that i should be a swing in $\pi[V_1]$ for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1}$ or i should be a swing in $\pi[V_2]$ for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_2}$.

Given a permutation $\pi \in V_1$, for which i is a swing agent in π for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1}$, then π can be extended in $\frac{n!}{n_1!}$ permutations π'_π such that $v_{\mathcal{E}_1}(C_{\pi'_\pi}(i) \cup \{i\} \cap V_1) = 1$ and $v_{\mathcal{E}_1}(C_{\pi'_\pi}(i) \cap V_1) = 0$. For such a permutation π'_π , i will be swing for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}$ if $v_{\mathcal{E}_2}(C_{\pi'_\pi}(i) \cap V_2) = 0$. Moreover i will then be a swing in π'_π for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}$ if $v_{\mathcal{E}_2}(C_{\pi'_\pi}(i) \cap V_2) = 1$ or if i is also a swing in $\pi'_\pi[V_2]$ for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_2}$. Hence, note that if i is not a swing for π'_π in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}$, then i is a swing for π'_π in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}$.

A symmetric analysis can be applied for permutations $\pi \in V_2$, for which i is a swing agent in π for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_2}$. From this analysis, we can derive the following formula:

$$|P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}| = \frac{n!}{n_1!} |P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1}| + \frac{n!}{n_2!} |P_i^{\mathcal{E}_2}| - |P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}|. \quad (6)$$

As a last comment to justify the formula, note that if a permutation $\pi \in \Pi[n]$ is counted twice in the two first summands because i is both a swing in $\pi[V_1]$ for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1}$ and a swing in $\pi[V_2]$ for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_2}$, then this is corrected by the fact that i is also a swing in π for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}$.

Now if we divide each side of Equation 6 by $n!$, then we have

$$\frac{|P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}|}{n!} = \frac{|P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1}|}{n_1!} + \frac{|P_i^{\mathcal{E}_2}|}{n_2!} - \frac{|P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}|}{n!}$$

This implies that for any $i \in V_1 \cup V_2$, we have $DS_i(\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2) + DS_i(\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2) = DS_i(\mathcal{E}_1) + DS_i(\mathcal{E}_2)$ and the proof is complete. \square

9 Deferred proofs from Section 5.1

Before giving the proof of Theorem 5.1, we introduce the concept of a distant agent. In delegation graph H_d , a voter i is called a *distant* agent if $\gamma_d(c_d(i, d_i^*) \setminus \{i\}) \geq q$.

Theorem 5.1. *The restriction of **BMinP** and **SMinP** to the case where all voters have weight 1, i.e., when $\forall i \in V, \omega(i) = 1$, is NP-complete. Moreover, under the same restriction, the minimization versions of problems **BMinP** and **SMinP** cannot be approximated within any factor in polynomial time if $P \neq NP$.*

Proof. The membership in NP is implied by Theorem 4.1. For the hardness part, we use a reduction from the NP-complete Hamiltonian path problem [19]. Recall that in the Hamiltonian path problem, the goal is to determine if there exists a path in an undirected graph that visits each vertex exactly once. Consider an instance $I = (V, E)$ of the Hamiltonian path problem, where V is the set of vertices and E is the set of edges. We create the following instance from I which is the same for both **SMinP** and **BMinP**. We create a digraph $D = (\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ where $\bar{V} = V \cup \{u\}$ is obtained from V by adding an additional vertex and $\bar{E} = \{(i, j), (j, i) : \{i, j\} \in E\} \cup \{(u, i) : i \in V\}$ is obtained from E by adding an arc from u to every other vertex (and making the graph directed). Now consider the delegation graph $H_d \in \Delta(D)$, where all voters vote directly, i.e., $\forall i \in \bar{V}, d(i) = i$. We set $w_i = 1$, for every voter $v_i \in \bar{V}$. Also, we set $k = |V|$, $q = |V|$ and $\mathcal{E} = \langle D, \omega, d, q \rangle$. Suppose that the goal is to modify d (yielding another delegation function d') in order to make u a distant agent. Indeed, note that $DB_u(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}'}) = 0$ (resp. $DS_u(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}'}) = 0$) iff u is a distant agent. We can make u a distant agent in \mathcal{E}' iff there exists a Hamiltonian path in I . Indeed, if there exists a Hamiltonian path (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n) in G we can make u a distant agent by adding delegations $d'(v_i) = v_{i+1}, \forall i \in [n-1]$ and making u delegate to v_1 . Conversely, if we can make u a distant agent, then u is at the end of a simple path of length $|V|$ implying that there exists a Hamiltonian path in I . \square

Theorem 5.2. *Problems **BMinP** and **SMinP** are coNP-hard even if the SN is a tree.*

Proof. Consider a weighted voting game $\mathcal{G} = \langle V', v, q' \rangle$, where $V' = [n]$ is a set of n agents. An agent i is said to be a dummy player if for any coalition $C \subseteq V' \setminus \{i\}$, $\delta_i(C) := v(C \cup \{i\}) - v(C) = 0$. In the Dummy Player problem, the goal is to find out that whether i is a dummy player in \mathcal{G} . The Dummy Player problem is known to be a coNP-complete problem [11]. We transform an instance $J = \langle V', v, q', i \rangle$ of the Dummy Player problem to an instance $I = \langle \mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle, v^*, k, \tau \rangle$ of **BMinP** (resp. **SMinP**). We create a tree D where:

- $V = V' \cup \{v\}$.
- $A = \{(v_j, v) : v_j \in V' \setminus \{v\}\}$.

Let $R = \sum_{v' \in V'} w(v')$, where $w(v_j)$ is v_j 's weight in J . We set $q = R + q'$, $v^* = i$, $k = 0$ and $\tau = 0$ for both **BMinP** and **SMinP**, where $N = |V|$. The weight function ω is set as follows. $\omega(v') = w(v')$ for any $v' \in V'$ and $\omega(v) = R$. The initial delegation function d is set as follows. $d(v_j) = v_j$ for any $v_j \in V'$.

Note that v should be in any winning coalition C' in I . Suppose that J is a “yes”-instance then i is not a swing agent for any coalition $C \subseteq V'$. This implies that v^* is not a swing agent for any coalition $C' = C \cup \{v\}$ in I . Conversely, suppose that I is a “yes”-instance, meaning that after changing at most k delegations in I there is no coalition C' for which v^* is a winning coalition, implying that no coalition $C = C' \setminus \{v\}$ in J for which i is a winning coalition. This concludes the proof. \square

Theorem 5.3. *Problems **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** with voters' weights and the quota given in unary are NP-complete.*

Proof. Membership in NP is induced by Theorem 4.1. For the hardness part, we make a reduction from the NP-complete exact cover by 3-sets problem (X3C) [19]. In the X3C problem, we are given a universe $U = \{x_1, \dots, x_{3n}\}$ of $3n$ elements and a collection $T = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \subset U^3$ of m subsets of U , each containing 3 elements. The question asked is to determine if there exists a subcollection of T which covers each element of U exactly once.

Given an instance (U, T) of X3C, with $|U| = 3n$ and $|T| = m$, we create the following instance which is the same (up to the threshold τ) for problems **BMaxP** and **SMaxP**. The voter set $V = \{v^*, v_d\} \cup V_U \cup V_T$ is composed of one voter v_d with weight $N = 9n^2m + 9n$, $3n$ element voters $V_U = \{v_x : x \in U\}$ with weight $\bar{N} = 3nm + 3$, $3mn$ set voters $V_T = \{v_{S_i} : S \in T, i \in [3n]\}$ with weight 1, and one voter v^* with weight 1. Remark that weights depend only polynomially on n . The digraph $D = (V, A)$ has the following arcs. We have arcs from each element voter v_x to each set voter v_{S_i} for which $x \in S$, one arc from each set voter

v_{S^i} to set voter $v_{S^{i+1}}$ for $i \in [3n-1]$ and one arc from each set voter $v_{S^{3n}}$ to v^* . The initial delegation graph has no delegations, i.e., $\forall i \in V, d(i) = i$. The quota q is set to $9n^2m + 3nm + 9n + 2$. This value is chosen such that 1) $N + \bar{N} > q$, 2) $3n\bar{N} + 3nm + 1 < q$, and 3) $N + 3nm + 1 < q$. Lastly, the budget k is set to $3n + 3n^2$.

Let us first observe that a coalition C will be successful iff it includes v_d and at least one element voter as active voters. Hence, if v^* is a swing agent for a coalition C then first $v_d \in C$, second no element voter is active in C , and third C should contain an element voter and a path from this element voter to v^* through a path $(v_{S^1}, v_{S^2}, \dots, v_{S^{3n}}, v^*)$ for some set $S \in T$.

Let $H = (V, L)$ be a delegation graph which is a feasible solution in the **BMaxP** (resp. **SMaxP**) instance resulting from the reduction. We will say that the S -path is active in H , if $(v_{S^i}, v_{S^{i+1}}) \in L$ for $i \in [3n-1]$, and $(v_{S^{3n}}, v^*) \in L$. Note that the number of active paths in H is at most n (we do not consider the only feasible solution H with $n+1$ active paths, as v^* is never a swing agent for this solution). For a set $S \in T$, we denote by $E_H(S)$ the set of element voters v_x such that $(v_x, v_{S^1}) \in L$.

Let us assume that there exists an exact cover by 3 sets $\{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_n}\}$. Note that by relabeling the indices we can assume that $\{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_n}\} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ and $T_i = \{x_{3(i-1)+1}, x_{3(i-1)+2}, x_{3i}\}$. We create the following delegation graph H . We make all voters v_{x_i} delegate to $v_{T_{i/3}^1}$ for $i \in [3n]$, all voters $v_{T_i^j}$ delegate to $v_{T_i^{j+1}}$ for $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [3n-1]$ and all voters $v_{T_i^{3n}}$ for $i \in [n]$ to v^* . Note that (up to the relabeling) H does not depend on the specific exact cover by 3 set. However, such a solution H is feasible only if the X3C instance is a yes instance. Let us show that such a solution H achieves the highest possible delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices for agent v^* . Indeed, let us consider another feasible solution H' and let $\{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_t}\}$ be the sets in T whose paths are active in H' . By relabeling, we can assume that $\{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_t}\} \subseteq \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ and $E_{H'}(T_i) \subseteq \{x_{3(i-1)+1}, x_{3(i-1)+2}, x_{3i}\}$. The claim then follows by noticing that the set of coalitions for which v^* is a swing agent in H' is a subset of the set of coalitions for which v^* is a swing agent in H and is even a proper subset if $H \neq H'$ (after relabeling).

We conclude by noticing that the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices of a solution H corresponding to an exact cover by 3-set can be easily computed. Indeed, this is simply implied by Theorem 4.1.

Banzhaf value. Given such a solution H , v^* will be a swing agent for all coalitions that contain an element voter x and an S -active path such that $x \in E_H(S)$. The number of such coalitions is

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n}{k} (2^{3n} - 1)^{n-k} 2^{3n(m-n)} (2^{3k} - 1) 2^{3(n-k)}.$$

Let us explain this formula. We count coalitions which include k active-paths out of the n active paths of H , and sum the obtained values for k ranging from 1 to n . For a given k , these coalitions cannot include completely any of the $n-k$ other active paths. Hence, the number of possible intersections with the set of elements in these $n-k$ paths is of $(2^{3n} - 1)^{n-k}$. Conversely there is no constraint on set elements $v_{T_i^j}$ for $i \notin [n]$. Hence, the number of possible intersections with these set elements is worth $2^{3n(m-n)}$. The k active paths in the coalition makes it possible to connect $3k$ element voters to v^* . As at least one of them should be included in the coalition, this leaves $(2^{3k} - 1)$ possibilities. There are no constraints on the $3(n-k)$ other element voters explaining the last $2^{3(n-k)}$ term. This induces the Banzhaf value of voter i^* for solution H .

Shapley-Shubik value. We introduce the Table Λ where $\Lambda[i, j]$ counts the number of ways we can choose i elements in a set of the form $\{v_{S^l}, l \in [j], t \in [3n]\}$ without taking all $3n$ elements $\{v_{S^t}, t \in [3n]\}$ of a same set S . Table Λ can be computed efficiently using the following dynamic programming equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda[i, 1] &= \binom{3n}{i} \text{ if } i < 3n \text{ and } 0 \text{ otherwise} \\ \Lambda[i, j > 1] &= \sum_{\substack{l=0 \\ l \leq i}}^{3n-1} \binom{3n}{l} F[i-l, j-1]. \end{aligned}$$

The Shapley value of voter i^* for a solution H corresponding to an exact cover by 3 set can then be derived by the following formula:

$$N_S = \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ 3nk \leq S-2}}^n \binom{n}{k} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ 3nk+i \leq S-1}}^{3k} \binom{3k}{i} \sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ 3nk+i+j \leq S-1}}^{3(n-k)} \binom{3(n-k)}{j} \\ \sum_{\substack{l=0 \\ 3nk+i+j+l \leq S-1}}^{3n(m-n)} \binom{3n(m-n)}{l} \Lambda[S-1-3nk-i-j-l, n-k]$$

Let us explain this formula. We are counting the number of coalitions $C \subset V$ of size S for which i^* is a swing voter. A necessary condition is that $v_d \in C$. Hence, the complement is composed of only $S-1$ voters. We distinguish these coalitions by the number of active paths that they fully include, each such path adds $3n$ voters and at list one should be fully contained. Let us consider coalitions that include k active paths. Then, this makes it possible for v^* to be reachable by $3k$ element voters. We count the number of coalitions that include i such voters (at least one must be included). The rest of voters in the coalition may be arbitrary voters in the rest of element voters, arbitrary voters in paths $\{v_{S^t}, t \in [3n]\}$ for $S \notin \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ or other voters in paths corresponding to sets $S \in \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ given that a full path is not taken. □

10 Deferred proofs from Section 5.2

Theorem 5.6. *WMaxP is NP-complete and OWMMaxP cannot be approximated with an approximation ratio better than $1 - 1/e$ if $P \neq NP$, even when all voters have weight one.*

Proof. The membership in NP is straightforward. Let us prove the approximation hardness result (the NP-hardness result can be proved by a similar reduction).

We design a reduction from the maximum coverage problem. In the maximum coverage problem, we are given a universe $U = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of n elements, a collection $P = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$ of m subsets of U , and an integer k . The goal is to pick at most k sets S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k} such that $|\bigcup_{j=1}^k S_{i_j}|$ is maximized. Stated otherwise, we want to cover the maximum number of elements in U . This problem is known to be hard to approximate better than $1 - 1/e$ [16].

The reduction. From an instance $I = (U, P, k)$ of the maximum coverage problem, we create the following instance I' of the optimization variant of **WMaxP**. As illustrated in Figure 3, the graph $D = (V, A)$ is compounded of the following elements:

- For each element $x \in U$, we create a voter v_x . These voters will be called element voters or element vertices in the following.
- For each set $S \in P$, we create $(n+1)$ voters $v_{S^1}, \dots, v_{S^{(n+1)}}$. We create an arc from v_{S^i} to $v_{S^{(i+1)}}$ for $i \in [n]$. These voters will be called set voters or set vertices in the following.
- For every $x \in U$ and $S \in P$, we create an arc from v_x to v_{S^1} if $x \in S$.
- We create a voter v^* . For every $S \in P$, we create an arc from $v_{S^{(n+1)}}$ to v^* .
- For every $x \in U$, we create a set \mathcal{V}_x with $M-1$ vertices where $M := ((n+1)m+1)T$ and T is a constant the value of which will be discussed later on. We create an arc from each vertex in \mathcal{V}_x to element voter v_x .
- We define a budget $\bar{k} = (n+1)k + n$.




Figure 3: An example of digraph D resulting from the reduction. For every $x \in U$, each set \mathcal{V}_x includes $M - 1$ vertices, where there exists an arc from each vertex in \mathcal{V}_x to the element voter v_x . For each $S \in P$, there exists a directed path $(v_{S^1}, v_{S^2}, \dots, v_{S^{n+1}}, v^*)$.

All voters have weight equal to one. In the initial delegation function, we have that $\forall x \in U, d(v_x) = v_x$, $\forall S \in P, \forall i \in [n + 1], d(v_{S^i}) = v_{S^i}$, and $d(v^*) = v^*$. Last, we have that $\forall x \in U$, and $\forall u \in \mathcal{V}_x, d(u) = v_x$.

Let us consider a delegation function d' , such that $|\{i \in V : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq \bar{k}$. We say that the S -path is active for d' if $d'(v_{S^i}) = v_{S^{(i+1)}}$ for $i \in [n]$ and $d'(v_{S^{(n+1)}}) = v^*$. Note that the budget only allows k S -paths to be active and we denote by $\mathcal{S}(d')$ the set of sets S such that the S -path is active for d' . Moreover, we will say that an element x is covered by d' if $d'(v_x) = v_{S^1}$ for some set $S \in P$ such that the S -path is active for d' . We denote by $\mathcal{U}(d')$ the set of elements covered by d' .

It is easy to notice that $|\mathcal{U}(d')|M \leq \alpha_{d'}(v^*) \leq |\mathcal{U}(d')|M + M/T$ (we assume that delegations from voters in sets \mathcal{V}_i do not change as this can only be counter-productive for the problem at hand). Let us assume we have a c -approximation algorithm for **WMaxP**. Let d' be the solution returned by this algorithm and d^* be the optimal solution. Then, $(|\mathcal{U}(d')| + 1/T)M \geq \alpha_{d'}(v^*) \geq c\alpha_{d^*}(v^*)$.

Let OPT be the optimal value of the maximum coverage instance and X^* be an optimal solution. Consider the delegation function d_{X^*} obtained from d by making each S -path for which $S \in X^*$ active and making each element voters v_x delegate to v_{S^1} if x is covered by S in solution X^* (the choice of S can be made arbitrarily if several sets cover x in X^*). It is clear that d_{X^*} is a valid solution such that $|\mathcal{U}(d_{X^*})| = OPT$. Hence, $\alpha_{d^*}(v^*) \geq \alpha_{d_{X^*}}(v^*) \geq |\mathcal{U}(d_{X^*})|M = OPT \cdot M$. Hence, we obtain that $|\mathcal{U}(d')| + 1/T \geq cOPT$. We conclude by noticing that $\mathcal{S}(d')$ provides a solution in the maximum coverage instance covering the elements in $\mathcal{U}(d')$ and that by making $1/T$ tend towards 0, we would obtain a $c(1 - \varepsilon)$ approximation algorithm for the maximum coverage problem with ε as close to 0 as wanted. \square

Lemma 5.12. *WMaxP can be solved in polynomial time if $\text{r}\bar{\text{e}}\text{q} = 0$.*

Proof sketch. Let $I = (\langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, k \rangle, i^*, k, \tau)$ be an instance of **WMaxP** where $\text{r}\bar{\text{e}}\text{q} = 0$. Note that to reach the threshold in this case, we should make all voters delegate to i^* by modifying at most k delegations.

Let us consider a delegation function d' such that $|\{i : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq k$, and $\alpha_{d'}(i^*) = \tau$ (assuming such a solution exists). Even if i^* is not a guru in d , notice that i^* is necessarily a guru in d' . Indeed, i^* needs the delegations of every other voters including the ones in $c_d(i^*, d_{i^*}^*)$, and we should not have a cycle in d' . Hence, we can assume that i^* is a guru in d , decreasing the budget k by one if it is not the case. Now consider the weighted digraph $\bar{D} = (V, \bar{A}, \lambda)$, where

- \bar{A} is obtained from A by removing the outgoing edges from i^* and then reversing all the other edges;
- $\lambda((u, v)) = n + 1$ if $d(v) = u$ and $\lambda((u, v)) = n$, otherwise.

A branching b of \bar{D} is a set of edges such that (i) if $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ are distinct edges of b then $y_1 \neq y_2$ (nodes have in-degree at most one); and (ii) b does not contain a cycle. An optimum branching b of \bar{D} is one that maximizes $\sum_{e \in b} \lambda(e)$. We run Edmond's algorithm on \bar{D} [14] to find an optimum branching b . Let $\Gamma(b)$ be the number of edges in b , and $\Omega(b)$ be the number of edges (u, v) in b such that $d(v) = u$. It is clear that $\sum_{e \in b} \lambda(e) = \Gamma(b)n + \Omega(b)$. As $\Omega(b) \leq n-1$, an optimum branching lexicographically maximizes the value of Γ and then the one of Ω . We claim that I is a yes instance iff $\Gamma(b) = n-1$, and $\Omega(b) \geq n-1-k$. Indeed, notice that one obtains a one to one correspondence between branchings and delegation graphs by simply reversing the arcs. Having $\Gamma(b) = n-1$, implies that there is only one root in the branching, i.e., only one vertex with no incoming edge, and hence only one guru in the corresponding delegation function. As we have removed possible delegations of i^* , this guru is necessarily i^* . Additionally, $\Omega(b) \geq n-1-k$ implies that at most k delegations choices are changed w.r.t. d . \square

Theorem 5.14. *WMaxP is FPT with respect to req.*

Proof. Let $I = (\langle D = (V, A), \omega, d \rangle, i^*, k, \tau)$ be an instance of **WMaxP**. As voters' weights are positive integers, the maximum number of additional voters that i^* needs the support of to reach the threshold is bounded by req. We first note that one can collapse the tree $T_d(i^*)$ in one vertex with weight $\alpha_d(i^*)$. Moreover, note that if i^* is not a guru, we then decreases k by one and remove her delegation: she should be a guru if we want her accumulated weight to be different from 0. Let us consider a delegation function d' such that $|\{i : d(i) \neq d'(i)\}| \leq k$, and $\alpha_{d'}(i^*) \geq \tau$ (assuming such a solution exists). A subtree of $T_{d'}(i^*)$ rooted in i^* with at most req+1 voters accumulates a voting weight greater than or equal to τ . We denote this tree simply by T . One can guess the shape of T and then look for this tree in D . Note that T should be a directed tree with all vertices delegating directly or indirectly to i^* . This can be done in FPT time by adapting a color coding technique [1]. The idea is to color the graph randomly with req + 1 colors. If the tree that we are looking for is present in graph D , it will be colored with the req + 1 colors (i.e., one color per vertex) with some probability only dependent of req. We say that such a tree is colorful. Let r be an arbitrary vertex in T . In $O(2^{O(\text{req})} k^2 |A|)$ time, we find, for each vertex $v \in V$, all color sets that appear on colorful copies of T in G in which v plays the role of r . More precisely, for each colorset C , we do not only keep one element but rather at most $k+1$ elements. Indeed, two trees T_C and T'_C rooted in r with colors C are not equivalent in the sense that one may have a higher accumulated weight than the other; we use $\alpha(T_C)$ to denote this weight in tree T_C . Moreover T_C may only be part of a valid solution for **WMaxP** if $|(u, v) \in T_C, d(u) \neq v| \leq k$; we use $\delta(T_C)$ to denote $|(u, v) \in T_C, d(u) \neq v|$. Hence, for each color set C , we keep at most $k+1$ elements: For each $i \in [k]_0$, we keep the tree T_C with highest value $\alpha(T_C)$ for $\delta(T_C) = i$. This is done by dynamic programming. If T contains only a single vertex, this is trivial. Otherwise, let $e = (r, r')$ be an arc in T . The removal of e from T breaks T into two subtrees T' and T'' . We recursively find, for each vertex $v \in V$, the color sets that appear on colorful copies of T' in which v plays the role of r , and the color sets that appear on colorful copies of T'' in which v plays the role of r' . For every arc $e = (u, v) \in A$, if C' is a color set that appears in u 's collection corresponding to T' and $(\alpha(T_{C'}), \delta(T_{C'}))$ is one of the $k+1$ elements recorded for C' , if C'' is a color set that appears in v 's collection (corresponding to T''), and $(\alpha(T_{C''}), \delta(T_{C''}))$ is one of the $k+1$ elements recorded for C'' . If $C' \cap C'' = \emptyset$ and $\delta(T_{C'}) + \delta(T_{C''}) + 1_{d(u)=v} \leq k$, then $C' \cup C''$ is added to the collection of u (corresponding to T) with pair $(\alpha(T_{C'}) + \alpha(T_{C''}), \delta(T_{C'}) + \delta(T_{C''}) + 1_{d(u) \neq v})$. Note that if an element already exists for $\delta(T_{C'}) + \delta(T_{C''}) + 1_{d(u) \neq v}$ and color set $C' \cup C''$, then this one only replaces it if it has a higher accumulated weight. The algorithm succeeds with guess T if one obtains in i^* the complete set C of req colors with an element T_C with $\alpha(T_C) \geq \tau$. This algorithm can then be derandomized using families of perfect hash functions [1, 34]. \square