

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

Weighted voting games is one of the most important classes of cooperative games. Recently, Zhang and Grossi [53] proposed a variant of this class, called *delegative simple games*, which is well suited to analyse the relative importance of each voter in liquid democracy elections. Moreover, they defined a power index, called the delegative Banzhaf index to compute the importance of each agent (i.e., both voters and delegators) in a delegation graph based on two key parameters: the total voting weight she has accumulated and the structure of supports she receives from her delegators.

We obtain several results related to delegative simple games. We first propose a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm to compute the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik values in delegative simple games. We then investigate a bribery problem where the goal is to maximize/minimize the voting power/weight of a given voter in a delegation graph by changing at most a fixed number of delegations. We show that the problems of minimizing/maximizing a voter’s power index value are strongly NP-hard. Furthermore, we prove that having a better approximation guarantee than $1 - 1/e$ to maximize the voting weight of a voter is not possible, unless $P = NP$, then we provide some parameterized complexity results for this problem. Finally, we show that finding a delegation graph with a given number of gurus that maximizes the minimum power index value an agent can have is a computationally hard problem.

1 Introduction

Weighted voting games form a simple scheme to model situations in which voters must make a yes/no decision about accepting a given proposal [14]. 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 also called the quota. In weighted voting game, 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 in cooperative game theory to measure the relative importance of each agent in such a situation. Notably, the computational and axiomatic properties of two power indices, the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices [4, 51], have been extensively studied. The computational properties investigated obviously include the computational complexity of computing the power index of a given agent [18] but they also involve several manipulation problems, as computing the quota maximizing or minimizing the power index of a specific voter [54, 55] or determining the impact of splitting an agent in two [2, 28, 40]. These are only few examples of the many questions that have been investigated in weighted voting games, despite the apparent simplicity of these cooperative games.

One possible limitation of weighted voting games is that they consider each agent as an indivisible entity. However, if the agents are corporations or political parties, then they do have some inner structure which may have an impact on the relative strength of each agent.

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




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

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.

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 that it may not be the case. 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 political 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 weighted voting games 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 [53]. Indeed, the authors investigate how to measure the relative importance of voters in the framework of *Liquid Democracy* (LD) [6, 29]. 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 [53] define *delegative simple games*, a variant of weighted voting games 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. Delegative simple games 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 index applied to this kind of game which they term the *delegative Banzhaf index*.

Our contribution. In this work, we study in more depth the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices. While the computation of these indices is computationally hard, we show that they can be calculated by a pseudo-polynomial dynamic programming algorithm similar to the one of standard Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices. Second, we study a bribery problem, in which one tries to maximize/minimize the voting power/weight of a given agent by changing at most k delegation choices. We show that these problems are NP-hard and provide several parameterized complexity results. Lastly, we investigate a power distribution problem in which one tries to find a delegation graph with a predefined number of gurus to maximize the minimum power index value of an agent. We show that this is an NP-hard problem

even when the weight of each voter is 1.

2 Related Work

Weighted voting games originated in the domain of cooperative game theory [13, 14]. Two well-known solutions to measure the voting power of an agent in a weighted voting game are the Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf indices [4, 51]. Both indices share several properties [20]. For instance, they both satisfy the well-known axioms *Dummy Player*, *Symmetry* and *Additivity*. Several works characterize both indices in different ways which emphasize their differences [5, 47, 51, 52]. Computing the Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf indices is #P-Complete [18, 49]. However, Matsui and Matsui [43] showed that there exists pseudopolynomial algorithms that can compute the Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf indices 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. Several other works have been dedicated to the computation of these power indices, either to compute them exactly [10, 17, 33, 34], or approximately [3, 25, 26, 41, 42, 45, 48]. Moreover, several manipulation problems involving power indices have been investigated, as computing the quota maximizing or minimizing the power index of a specific voter [54, 55] or determining the impact of splitting an agent in two [2, 28, 40].

Several works have studied the measurement of voters’ relative importance in an LD election [8, 9, 38, 53]. Boldi et al. [8, 9] 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 social 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 due to the damping factor. In this way, the model by Boldi et al. [8, 9] favors the voters who receive direct supports instead of more distant ones. Kling et al. [38] 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 apply several power indices from game theory (e.g., the Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf indices) to analyze the power distribution in liquid democracy elections. This analysis led the authors to propose modifications to the existing power indices to fit better to the real world data they gathered. More precisely, the authors designed generalizations of the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik power indices which allow to model non-uniform distributions of approval rates¹. Lastly, as detailed in the introduction, Zhang and Grossi [53] have very recently proposed a formal way to measure the influence of voters in an LD election by introducing a variant of weighted voting games. This variant as well as the resulting power indices will be presented in Section 3.

Other questions related to LD have been investigated. Several articles have investigated the stability of the delegation process in LD. This question was first studied by Bloembergen, Grossi and Lackner [7] and Escoffier, Gilbert and Pass-Lanneau [23, 24] by using standard concepts from game theory. Kavitha et al. [36] also studied this problem but using popularity as the stability criterion. Christoff and Grossi [15] studied other possible pitfalls of LD as delegation cycles or possible inconsistencies that can occur if voters should vote on different but connected issues. Brill and Talmon [11] investigated a setting called *pairwise liquid democracy*, in which each voter should provide a complete ranking over candidates. This work illustrated the difficulty of unraveling ballots arising from complex delegation processes, a problem that was tackled by Colley, Grandi and Novaro [16]. Kotsialou and Riley [39] attempted to incentive participation in the delegation/voting process in the LD setting using several delegation rules. The question of the expected accuracy of voters has been considered by Green-Armytage [32], Kahng, Mackenzie and Procaccia [35] as well as Caragiannis and Micha [12]. Lastly, several articles considered a potential pitfall of LD being that some gurus could accumulate an undesirably high voting power [19, 31, 38]. The authors proposed optimization problems to mitigate this problem and obtained approximation and parameterized complexity results.

¹Stated otherwise, the assumption that voters vote with equal probability in favour or against a proposal is not made.

3 Preliminaries

In this section, we formalize delegative simple games [53] and specify our setting.

3.1 Weighted voting games and power indices

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. Moreover, a subset $C \subseteq V$ will also be called a coalition. For any coalition $C \subseteq V$, C is said to be a winning coalition if $\nu(C) = 1$, otherwise, it is said to be a losing coalition. An agent i is said to be a swing agent for coalition C if $\delta_i(C) := \nu(C \cup \{i\}) - \nu(C)$ is equal to 1.

Weighted voting games are particular simple games which admit a compact representation. In weighted voting games, there exists a quota q and each agent (also called voter) i is associated with a weight w_i . The characterization 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 threshold. Several power indices have been studied to measure the relative importance of an agent in weighted voting games. We recall two of the most well known power indices:

Definition 3.1. *The Banzhaf index of a voter i in a simple game $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as*

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

Definition 3.2. *The Shapley-Shubik voting index of a voter i in a simple game $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as*

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

In words, the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices of an agent i measure how likely it is that i is a swing agent for specific probability distributions on coalitions $C \subseteq V \setminus \{i\}$. For the Banzhaf index, each such coalition is equally likely. For the Shapley-Shubik index, the coalitions are drawn as follows: one first selects u.a.r. a number s in $[n - 1]_0$; then one selects a coalition $C \subseteq V \setminus \{i\}$ u.a.r. within coalitions of size s .

In a weighted voting game, voters debate on a given proposal and their weights can be seen as amounts of resource related to the proposal at hand. A coalition is then successful if it can gather enough of this resource to realize the proposal. For instance, voters may be heads of political parties and the weights could be derived from the relative importance of each party. However, as explained in the introduction, this simple intuition neglects the inner structure of each agent, which could be of importance. Zhang and Grossi followed this intuition and defined delegative simple games, a variant of weighted voting games [53] which makes it possible to take into account this structure. Delegative simple games are motivated by liquid democracy elections.

3.2 Liquid democracy elections

A finite set of agents $V = [n]$ will vote on a proposal. Each agent is associated with a weight w_i , i.e., there is a weight function $\omega : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, assigning a positive weight w_i to every agent i . In LD elections a special case of interest is the one where every voter has 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, we assume voters to be vertices of a Social Network (SN) modeled as a directed graph $D = (V, A)$, i.e., each node in the graph corresponds to a voter $i \in V$ and a directed edge $(i, j) \in A$ corresponds to a social relation between i and j . More precisely, it specifies the fact that agent i would accept to delegate her vote to j or more generally speaking to endorse

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 [46].

j . The set of out-neighbors (resp. in-neighbors) of voter i is denoted by $\text{Nb}_{out}(i) = \{j \in V | (i, j) \in A\}$ (resp. $\text{Nb}_{in}(i) = \{j \in V | (j, i) \in A\}$). Each agent i has two possible choices: either she can vote directly, or she can delegate her vote to one of her neighbors in $\text{Nb}_{out}(i)$. As usual in LD, 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 a *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. If she delegates, she is called a *follower* and has an accumulated voting weight worth 0. The information about delegation choices is formalized by a delegation function d , where

- $d(i) = j$ if voter i delegates to voter $j \in \text{Nb}_{out}(i)$,
- $d(i) = i$ if voter i votes directly.

We write $d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ to denote a *delegation profile*, representing each voter's delegation choice, i.e., $d_i = d(i)$ for any $i \in [n]$. The delegation digraph $H_d = (V, E)$ resulting from d is the subgraph of D , where $(i, j) \in E$ iff $d(i) = j$. We assume that this digraph is acyclic. More precisely, we assume H_d is a spanning forest of directed trees where all vertices have out-degree exactly one except the roots which have out-degree 0. In H_d , we denote by $c_d(i, j)$ the delegation chain between voters i and j , 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 . For any digraph D , we write $\Delta(D)$ to denote the set of all acyclic delegation graphs H_d that can be induced by delegation functions d on D .

3.3 Delegative Simple Games

Consider a social network $D = (V, A)$ and a delegation graph $H_d = (V, E) \in \Delta(D)$. Let $T_d(i)$ be 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. Let $Gu_d = \{i \in V | d_i = i\}$ be the set of gurus induced by d , i.e., the roots of the directed trees in H_d . The voter who votes on behalf of voter i is called the *guru* of i and denoted by d_i^* in H_d . 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. We define another weight function. Given a set $C \subseteq V$, we 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 $\alpha_{d,C}$, such that $\alpha_{d,C}(i) = \sum_{j \in T_d(i, C)} w_j$ if $i \in Gu_d$ and 0 otherwise. Moreover, we denote by $\alpha_d(C) = \sum_{i \in C} \alpha_{d,C}(i)$.

We follow and slightly adapt some notations from Zhang and Grossi [53]. We call a Liquid Democracy Election (LDE) a tuple $\mathcal{E} = \langle D, \omega, d, q \rangle$ or $\mathcal{E} = \langle D, \omega, H_d, q \rangle$ (by abuse of notation, we may use H_d in place of d when it is convenient). For $C \subseteq V$, we denote by $d_C^*(h) = j$ the fact that j is the guru of h and that $c_d(h, j)$ only contains elements from C . We write $\hat{D}(C) = \{j \in C | \exists k \in C, d_C^*(j) = k\}$ the set of voters that have a guru in C and such that the chain of delegations leading to this guru is contained in C . In a delegation graph H_d , a voter i is called a *distant agent* if $\alpha_d(c_d(i, d_i^*) \setminus \{i\}) \geq q$.

In the delegative simple game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$ induced by an LDE $\mathcal{E}$, $v_{\mathcal{E}}(C) = 1$ iff $\alpha_d(C) \geq q$, 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 weighted games. In our case, the weights are not 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 this new class of simple games 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.

Definition 3.3 (Active Agent). *Consider a delegation graph d and a coalition $C \subseteq V$. We say that a voter $i \in C$ is an active agent in C , if $i \in \hat{D}(C)$; otherwise, i is called an inactive agent.*

Notice that according to the definition of delegative simple game, an active (resp. inactive) agent $i \in C$ contributes weight w_i (resp. 0) to the coalition C (see Example 2). Given a delegative simple game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$, let $DB_i(\mathcal{E})$ and $DS_i(\mathcal{E})$ denote the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik values of voter i in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$, respectively. Sometimes we may write $B_i(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}})$ (resp. $S_i(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}})$) instead of $DB_i(\mathcal{E})$ (resp. $DS_i(\mathcal{E})$). When speaking about these indices, we drop parameter $\mathcal{E}$ (or $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$) when it is clear from the context. These values are referred to as the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices of voter i . Let us give an illustrative example to understand all aspects and notations 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 social network with delegation profile $d = (3, 3, 3, 7, 6, 7, 8, 8)$ illustrated in Fig. 2 and $q = 3$. Each voter i has weight $\omega(i) = 1$. The set of gurus is $Gu = \{3, 8\}$, 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 $i \in V \setminus \{3, 8\}$, $\alpha_d(i) = 0$ (as i is a follower). 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, $\alpha_{d,C}(3) = \sum_{j \in T_d(3,C)} w_j = 1$, $\alpha_{d,C}(8) = \sum_{j \in T_d(8,C)} w_j = 2$ and $\alpha_{d,C}(i) = 0$ for $i \in \{5, 7\}$, and then $\alpha_d(C) = \sum_{i \in C} \alpha_{d,C}(i) = 3$. Also, $d_C^*(3) = 3$, $d_C^*(7) = 8$, $d_C^*(8) = 8$ and $\hat{D}(C) = \{3, 7, 8\}$ as for any $i \in \{3, 7, 8\}$, $c_d(i, d_C^*(i)) \subseteq C$. Note that $5 \notin \hat{D}(C)$ 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 $Gu_d = \{3, 8\}$.

In the upcoming section, we address the computational problem of computing the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices of a given voter i .

4 Pseudo-Polynomial Algorithm for DB and DS

In weighted voting games, evaluating the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices is computationally challenging. Indeed, computing each of them in weighted voting games is #P-complete [18, 49] and several decision problems related to their computation are NP-complete or coNP-complete [13, 44, 49]. As delegative simple games include weighted voting games as a subcase (consider the restriction when each voter votes herself), these hardness results also hold for delegative simple games.

However, it is known that these indices can be computed by a pseudo-polynomial algorithm [44] in weighted voting games, that is an algorithm running in time $\text{poly}(n, w_{\max})$, where $w_{\max} := \max_{i \in V} \omega(i)$ is the maximal weight of an agent. In what follows, we provide a similar dynamic programming approach to compute the delegative Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf indices 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 $i \in V$, DB_i and DS_i can be computed in $O(n^2 w_{\max} \max\{n, w_{\max}\})$ and $O(n^4 w_{\max}^2)$, 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., $\alpha_{d,C}(8) = 1$), 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 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 $DB_8(\mathcal{E})$. 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. 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 $\alpha_d(Del(j) \cup C) = \alpha_d(Del(j)) + w$, 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 $w > \sum_{l=1}^j w_l$. 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 $\alpha_d(Del(j) \cup C) = \alpha_d(Del(j)) + w$. 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 $Del(n) \subseteq C$. 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 $H_d[V \setminus Del(n)]$. Moreover, in this case N_s is obtained by a different formula. Let $C_\delta = Del(n)$, then we use the formula:

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

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

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 $O(n^3 w_{\max})$. 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 leads to a complexity of $O(n^2 w_{\max} \max\{n, w_{\max}\})$ for computing the Banzhaf index. $\square$

5 Bribery by Delegation Modifications

5.1 Power index modification by bribery

The support structure in delegative simple games 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 $u \in V$, a budget $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and a threshold $\tau \in \mathbb{Q}_+$.

Feasible solution: A delegation function 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:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{BMinP:} & DB_u(\mathcal{E}') \leq \tau? \quad \mathbf{BMaxP:} & DB_u(\mathcal{E}') \geq \tau? \\ \mathbf{SMinP:} & DS_u(\mathcal{E}') \leq \tau? \quad \mathbf{SMaxP:} & DS_u(\mathcal{E}') \geq \tau? \end{array}$$

Stated otherwise, in the Banzhaf Minimization (resp. Maximization) Problem, **BMinP** (resp. **BMaxP**) for short, we wish to determine if we can make the Banzhaf index of voter u 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 show that all four problems are NP-hard. Note that computing the delegative Banzhaf or Shapley-Shubik indices in these problems is already intractable unless the voters' weights are given in unary. However, our hardness results hold even if voters' weights are given in unary (resp. even if all voters have weight one) for **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** (resp. for **BMinP** and **SMinP**).

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.*

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 [30]. 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 $D = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ where $\tilde{V} = V \cup \{u\}$ is obtained from V by adding an additional vertex and $\tilde{E} = \{(i, j), (j, i) : \{i, j\} \in E\} \cup \{(u, i) : i \in V\}$ 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., $\forall i \in \tilde{V}, d(i) = i$. We set $w_i = 1$, for every voter $v_i \in \tilde{V}$. 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 an 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. ***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) [30]. 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 $\tilde{N} = 3nm + 3$, $3mn$ 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^1} 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) $N + \tilde{N} > q$, 2) $3n\tilde{N} + 3nm + 1 < q$, 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. $\square$

5.2 Problem WMaxP

As shown by Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, problems **BMinP**, **SMinP**, **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** are NP-hard. We also believe that these problems are complex in the sense that the power indices they rely on can be hard to grasp for people not used to solution concepts from cooperative game theory. In this subsection, instead of maximizing the power index of a voter, we study a problem with a related but conceptually simpler objective. Indeed, we investigate if we can modify at most k delegation choices to make the accumulated weight of a given voter i^* (i.e., the size of the delegation tree rooted in her) greater than or equal to a given threshold τ . Possible interesting values for τ can be q or $\sum_{i \in V} \omega(i) - q + 1$. In the first case, i^* and her supporters do not need the support of anyone else to reach the election quota. In the second case, i^* is sure that she has enough weight to veto the election. We term this optimization problem **WMaxP** for Weight Maximization Problem. It is clear that problems **WMaxP**, **BMaxP** and **SMaxP** are related in the sense that a greater voting weight may result in a greater power index value. However, it is well known from the literature in weighted voting games that this relation is limited as voters with sensibly different weights may have the same relative importance in the election. It is worth mentioning that if the given voter receives too much weight, we may end up in a situation where the voter's power gets decreased (see Observation 3).

We now formally introduce the **WMaxP** problem. Note that this problem does not require to know the quota of the election. Hence, 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' 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 feasible solution d' such that $\alpha_{d'}(i^*) \geq \tau$.

We first show that **WMaxP** is NP-complete and that the optimization variant of the problem cannot be approximated with an approximation ratio better than $1 - 1/e$ if $P \neq NP$.

Theorem 5.3. ***WMaxP** is NP-complete and the optimization variant of the problem 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 $1 - 1/e$ [27].

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 $\bar{k} = (n + 1)k + n$.

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. $\square$

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

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

We study the parameterized complexity of **WMaxP** with respect to these two parameters. It can indeed be expected that the problem becomes easier if one of them is small. If req 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 parameterized complexity results (Theorems 5.4 and 5.7). These two parameters seem to be opposite from one another. Indeed a small value for parameter req (resp. req) indicates that reaching the threshold τ is probably hard (resp. easy). Parameter req could




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 $(v_{S^1}, v_{S^2}, \dots, v_{S^{n+1}}, v^*)$.

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 req .

Theorem 5.4. ***WMaxP** is in XP with respect to parameter req .*

To prove this theorem we first show that **WMaxP** can be solved in polynomial time if $\text{req} = 0$.

Lemma 5.5. ***WMaxP** can be solved in polynomial time if $\text{req} = 0$.*

Proof sketch. Let $I = (\langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, k \rangle, i^*, k, \tau)$ be an instance of **WMaxP** where $\text{req} = 0$. 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 $\bar{D}$ [21] 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 . $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.4. 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 req . One can hence guess the

set C of voters that are not required with $|C| \leq \text{req}$. Indeed, the number of possible guesses is bounded by $\frac{|V|^{\text{req}+1} - |V|}{|V| - 1}$. 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 $\text{req} = 0$. Hence, it can be solved in polynomial time by Lemma 5.5. $\square$

Hence, interestingly **WMaxP** can be solved in polynomial time if req is bounded by a constant. However, unfortunately, **WMaxP** is $W[1]$ -hard w.r.t. req and hence is unlikely to be FPT for this parameter.

Theorem 5.6. ***WMaxP** is $W[1]$ -hard with respect to req , 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 Independent 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, $\text{req} = k$. 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. $\square$

Let us now consider parameter req . Interestingly, **WMaxP** is FPT with respect to req .

Theorem 5.7. ***WMaxP** is FPT with respect to req .*

Proof. Let $I = (\langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, k \rangle, i^*, k, \tau)$ 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 $\text{req} + 1$ 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 $\text{req} + 1$ colors. If the tree that we are looking for is present in graph D , it will be colored with the $\text{req} + 1$ 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, 50]. $\square$

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 [53],

Fact 6.1 (Fact 2 in [53]). *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 $\min_{i \in \text{Leaves}(H_d)} f_i^{H_d}$ 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 [37]. 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 $NS(v_x) = \{(c_d(v_x, d_{v_x}^*) \setminus \{x\}) \cup S : S \subseteq (V_Y \setminus \{d_{v_x}^*\}) \cup (V_X \setminus \{v_x\})\}$. 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 Axiomatic Properties of DS

In this section, we provide further properties of the delegative Shapley-Shubik index. We follow notations and techniques from several other papers in the literature [5, 13, 22, 47, 51, 53]. Let $v_{\mathcal{E}}$ be the characteristic function of a delegative simple game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}}$ 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 index value of agent i .

Definition 7.1 (Dummy Agent). *An agent $i \in V$ is called a dummy agent if for any $C \subseteq V$, $v_{\mathcal{E}}(C) = v_{\mathcal{E}}(C \setminus \{i\})$.*

Put another way, when a voter i cannot contribute anything to any coalition of V , she is said to be a dummy agent. For instance, an agent is dummy when she is a distant agent. In Example 2, voter 5 is a distant agent, so she is dummy.

Definition 7.2 (Efficient Index Power). *An index power f is said to be efficient if $\sum_{i \in V} f_i(\mathcal{E}) = v_{\mathcal{E}}(V)$.*

Definition 7.3 (Symmetric Agents). *Two agents i and j are said to be symmetric if for any coalition $C \subseteq V \setminus \{i, j\}$, $v_{\mathcal{E}}(C \cup \{i\}) = v_{\mathcal{E}}(C \cup \{j\})$.*

That is, two voters are symmetric if they both are pivotal for the same coalitions of V . For example, voters 1 and 2 are symmetric in Example 2 as they are pivotal for the same coalitions. We borrow the following two definitions from Zhang and Grossi [53].

Definition 7.4 (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 $\sum_{i \in \hat{D}(C \cap V_1)} \omega_1(i) \geq q_1$ and (resp. or) $\sum_{i \in \hat{D}(C \cap V_2)} \omega_2(i) \geq q_2$.

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 7.4 does not consider the case where voters abstain, which is the only difference between Definition 7.4 and the one given by Zhang and Grossi [53].

Definition 7.5 (Bloc formation). Given $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and for any $i, j \in V$ such that $d(i) = j$ or $i, j \in Gu_d$, $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D' = (V', A'), \omega', d', q' \rangle$ is called the bloc LDE joining i and j into a bloc ij , where

- $V' = V \cup \{ij\} \setminus \{i, j\}$;
- Let $E_{ij} = \{(a_1, i), (i, a_2), (j, b_1), (b_2, j) | a_1 \in Nb_{in}(i), a_2 \in Nb_{out}(i), b_1 \in Nb_{out}(j), b_2 \in Nb_{in}(j)\}$. Let $A'' = \{(ij, a), (b, ij) | a \in Nb_{out}(i) \cup Nb_{out}(j) \setminus \{i, j\} \text{ and } b \in Nb_{in}(i) \cup Nb_{in}(j) \setminus \{i, j\}\}$. Then, $A' = A \cup A'' \setminus E_{ij}$.
- for d' , for any $a \in V \setminus \{i, j\}$, such that $d(a) = i$ or $d(a) = j$, $d'(a) = ij$; if $d(i) = j$, and $j \notin Gu_d$, then $d'(ij) = d(j)$, else $d'(ij) = ij$.
- $\omega'(ij) = \omega(i) + \omega(j)$.

When two voters i and j are adjacent or they are both gurus, i.e., $i, j \in Gu_d$, a bloc LDE joins i and j , and considers them as a new agent ij .

We are now in position to present several axioms.

Axiom 1 (Dummy Player (DP)). If i is a dummy player, then $f_i(\mathcal{E}) = 0$.

Axiom 2 (Efficient Index (EI)). For any LDE $\mathcal{E}$, $\sum_{i \in V} f_i(\mathcal{E}) = v_{\mathcal{E}}(V)$.

Axiom 3 (Symmetric Agents (SA)). If agents i and j are symmetric, $f_i(\mathcal{E}) = f_j(\mathcal{E})$.

Axiom 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 7.4, $f_i(\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2) + f_i(\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2) = f_i(\mathcal{E}_1) + f_i(\mathcal{E}_2)$.

Axiom 5 (Bloc Principle (BP)). For any two agents $i, j \in V$ such that $d(i) = j$, or $i, j \in Gu_d$, let $\mathcal{E}'$ be the bloc LDE obtained by joining i and j into bloc ij . Then $f_{ij}(\mathcal{E}') = f_i(\mathcal{E}) + f_j(\mathcal{E})$.

Axiom 6 (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 $j \notin c_d(i, d_i^*)$, $D = D'$, $\omega = \omega'$, $q = q'$, $d'(j) = i$ and $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$. Then, $f_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq f_i(\mathcal{E})$.

Axiom 7 (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 $i, j, k \in V$ such that $j \notin c_d(k, d_k^*)$, $i \notin c_d(j, d_j^*)$, $i \in c_d(k, d_k^*)$, $D = D'$, $\omega = \omega'$, $q = q'$, $d'(j) = k$ and $d(l) = d'(l)$ for $l \neq j$. Then, $f_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq f_i(\mathcal{E})$.

Before proceeding, we note that there are different ways in which the Shapley value of an agent can be expressed. We recall the following one. Let $\Pi[n]$ (or Π when the value n is clear from the context) be all possible permutations of voters in $[n]$. For any $\pi \in \Pi$, let $C_\pi(i)$ denote the set of all voters preceding i in π . Let $m_\pi^{v_E}(i)$ be the marginal contribution of voter i with respect to $\pi \in \Pi$ which is defined as follows:

$$m_\pi^{v_E}(i) := v_E(C_\pi(i) \cup \{i\}) - v_E(C_\pi(i)). \quad (6)$$

When v_E is clear from the context, we write $m_\pi(i)$ instead of $m_\pi^{v_E}(i)$. It is well known that the Shapley value of voter i can be rewritten as follows:

$$DS_i = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} m_\pi(i). \quad (7)$$

Recall that in a delegative simple game $\mathcal{G}_E$, $v_E(C) = 1$ iff $\sum_{i \in \hat{D}(C)} \omega(i) \geq q$, where $\hat{D}(C)$ represents the set of all active voters in C .

Lemma 7.6. *The delegative Shapley-Shubik value satisfies **DP**, **EI**, **SA**, **SP** and **MDD**.*

Proof. Note that axioms **DP**, **EI**, **SA** have nothing specific to delegative simple games and hence the standard proof to show that the Shapley-Shubik index satisfies them apply. For completeness, we recall these proofs. Consider an arbitrary permutation π . By definition, for any dummy agent i , we have $v_E(C_\pi(i)) = v_E(C_\pi(i) \cup \{i\})$, and hence $m_\pi(i) = 0$. Since this holds for any permutation π , DS satisfies axiom **DP**.

To show that DS satisfies axiom **EI**, we proceed as follows. First note that the sum of marginal contributions of voters with respect to $\pi \in \Pi$ is $v_E(V)$. More formally, let a_i be the i th player in π , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in V} m_\pi(i) &= v_E(\{a_1\}) - v_E(\emptyset) + v_E(\{a_1, a_2\}) - v_E(\{a_1\}) + \dots \\ &\quad + v_E(\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) - v_E(\{a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}\}) = v_E(\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) = v_E(V). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in V} DS_i &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} m_\pi(i) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{i \in V} m_\pi(i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} v_E(V) = v_E(V). \end{aligned}$$

To prove axiom **SA**, we proceed as follows. Consider a permutation $\pi \in \Pi$, let $\pi(k)$ denote the position of the k^{th} voter in π . We now create a permutation π' as follows: $\pi'(i) = \pi(j)$, $\pi'(j) = \pi(i)$ and for any $k \neq i, j$, $\pi'(k) = \pi(k)$. In words, π' is obtained from π by swapping agents i and j . Now, we show that $m_\pi(i) = m_{\pi'}(j)$ by distinguishing two cases.

1. i precedes j in π . So, we have $C_\pi(i) = C_{\pi'}(j)$. Let $S = C_\pi(i) = C_{\pi'}(j)$. We have

$$m_\pi(i) = v_E(S \cup \{i\}) - v_E(S) \text{ and } m_{\pi'}(j) = v_E(S \cup \{j\}) - v_E(S).$$

Since i and j are symmetric agents, i.e., $v_E(S \cup \{i\}) = v_E(S \cup \{j\})$, $m_\pi(i) = m_{\pi'}(j)$ in this case.

2. j precedes i in π . Let $S = C_\pi(i) \setminus \{j\}$. We have

$$m_\pi(i) = v_E(S \cup \{i, j\}) - v_E(S \cup \{j\}) \text{ and } m_{\pi'}(j) = v_E(S \cup \{i, j\}) - v_E(S \cup \{i\}).$$

Again by symmetry, we have $v_E(S \cup \{i\}) = v_E(S \cup \{j\})$, which results in $m_\pi(i) = m_{\pi'}(j)$ in this case.

As this holds for any permutation, DS satisfies axiom **SA**.

To show that DS satisfies axiom **SP**, we recall that for any $C \subseteq V_1 \cup V_2$, $v_{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}(C) = 1$ (resp. $v_{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}(C) = 1$) 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., $P_i^{\mathcal{E}_j} = \{\pi \in \Pi_j : m_{\pi}^{v_{\mathcal{E}_j}}(i) = 1\}$, 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:

$$|P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1 \vee \mathcal{E}_2}| = \frac{n!}{n_1!} |P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1}| + \frac{n!}{n_2!} |P_i^{\mathcal{E}_2}| - |P_i^{\mathcal{E}_1 \wedge \mathcal{E}_2}|. \quad (8)$$

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 8 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.

Last, we turn to axiom **MDD**. Consider two LDEs $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$ and $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D', \omega', d', q' \rangle$ 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 $DS_i(\mathcal{E}') \geq DS_i(\mathcal{E})$. $\square$

In the following we aim to show that DS does not satisfy axiom **BP** nor **MD**.

Observation 2. DS does not satisfy axiom **BP**.

Proof. Consider an LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$, where $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ is a set of 4 agents delegating through a social network with delegation profile $d = \langle 2, 2, 4, 4 \rangle$ illustrated in Fig. 4, all voting weights being equal to one and $q = 3$. To compute $DS_4(\mathcal{E})$, for $s = 2$, $N_s = 2$ (two sets $\{2, 1\}$ and $\{2, 3\}$) and for $s = 3$, $N_s = 1$ (one set $\{1, 2, 3\}$). Obviously, $N_s = 0$, when $s = 0, 1, 4$. Thus, $DS_4(\mathcal{E}) = DS_2(\mathcal{E}) = \frac{5}{12}$.

Let $\mathcal{E}' = \langle D' = (V', A'), \omega', d', q \rangle$ be the bloc LDE joining 2 and 4 into a new agent 24 with weight $\omega'(24) = 2$. So, $V' = \{1, 3, 24\}$ and $d' = \langle 24, 24, 24 \rangle$ illustrated in Fig. 4. We can easily find that $DS_{24}(\mathcal{E}') = \frac{2}{3}$. Therefore, $DS_{24}(\mathcal{E}') < DS_2(\mathcal{E}) + DS_4(\mathcal{E})$, which implies that DS does not satisfy axiom **BP**. $\square$

Observation 3. DS does not satisfy axiom **MD**.



Figure 4: The LDE $\mathcal{E} = \langle D = (V, A), \omega, d, q \rangle$, where $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $q = 3$ and $Gu_d = \{2, 4\}$ (left) and the bloc LDE V' that joins 2 and 4 and makes a new agent 24 with weight $\omega'(24) = 2$ (right).

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 social network D (A contain all possible arcs) with delegations $d(2) = d(1) = 1$ and $d(3) = 3$, all weights equal to one, and $q = 3$. 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, $DS_1(\mathcal{E}') < DS_1(\mathcal{E})$. $\square$

Hence, Observation 3 shows that while the delegative Shapley-Shubik index satisfies axiom **MDD** it does not satisfy axiom **MD**. A similar observation can be made for the delegative Banzhaf index. This is a paradox for these indices, a voter who receives more voting power can become less powerful because of the delegation structure underlying the delegative simple game.

8 Conclusion

Following a recent work by Zhang and Grossi [53], we investigated the delegative Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices. We proposed a pseudo-polynomial time algorithm to compute these power indices. Moreover, we investigated a bribery problem in which we aim to maximize/minimize the power index or the voting power of a given voter. We showed that the destructive problem where one attempts to decrease the voter's power is NP-hard even when the weights of all voters are identical to one. In the constructive version, we proved that maximizing the agent's power is NP-hard even when voters' weights and the quota are given in unary. These hardness results comes from the fact that an agent's power does not only depend on the voting weight distribution, but also on the structure of the supports she receives from her followers. So, we considered a seemingly easier version of the constructive problem, where the goal is to maximize the voting weight of the agent. For this problem, we were able to show that designing an approximation algorithm with approximation ratio better than $1 - 1/e$ is not possible, unless $P=NP$ and we also provided some parameterized complexity results. Lastly, we proved that finding a delegation graph with a certain number of gurus that maximizes the minimum power an agent can have is an NP-hard problem.

Several directions of future work are conceivable. First, for both destructive and constructive problems, designing some algorithms that would provide approximation guarantees under some conditions is one direction. It would be interesting to investigate problems related to distribution of power among agents as finding a delegation graph with a fixed number of gurus that maximizes the minimum power a guru has.

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 *Proceedings of the 7th international joint conference on Autonomous agents and multiagent systems-Volume 2*, pages 943–950, 2008.

- [4] John F Banzhaf III. Weighted voting doesn't work: A mathematical analysis. *Rutgers L. Rev.*, 19:317, 1964.
- [5] Rana Barua, Satya R. Chakravarty, and Sonali Roy. A new characterization of the banzhaf index of power. *IGTR*, 7(4):545–553, 2005.
- [6] J. Behrens, A. Kistner, A. Nitsche, and B. Swierczek. *The principles of LiquidFeedback*. Interaktive Demokratie, 2014.
- [7] Daan Bloembergen, Davide Grossi, and Martin Lackner. On rational delegations in liquid democracy. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 1796–1803, 2019.
- [8] Paolo Boldi, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, and Sebastiano Vigna. Voting in social networks. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2009, Hong Kong, China, November 2-6, 2009*, pages 777–786, 2009.
- [9] Paolo Boldi, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, and Sebastiano Vigna. Viscous democracy for social networks. *Commun. ACM*, 54(6):129–137, 2011.
- [10] Steven J Brams and Paul J Affuso. Power and size: A new paradox. *Theory and Decision*, 7(1-2):29–56, 1976.
- [11] Markus Brill and Nimrod Talmon. Pairwise liquid democracy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2018, July 13-19, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden.*, pages 137–143, 2018.
- [12] Ioannis Caragiannis and Evi Micha. A contribution to the critique of liquid democracy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 116–122, 2019.
- [13] 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.
- [14] Georgios Chalkiadakis and Michael J Wooldridge. *Handbook of computational social choice*, chapter Weighted Voting Games. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [15] Zoé Christoff and Davide Grossi. Binary voting with delegable proxy: An analysis of liquid democracy. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge, TARK 2017, Liverpool, UK, 24-26 July, 2017*, pages 134–150, 2017.
- [16] Rachael Colley, Umberto Grandi, and Arianna Novaro. Smart voting. In *To appear in Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-PRICAI 2020, Yokohama, Japan, July 11-17, 2020*, 2020.
- [17] Vincent Conitzer and Tuomas Sandholm. Computing shapley values, manipulating value division schemes, and checking core membership in multi-issue domains. In *AAAI*, volume 4, pages 219–225, 2004.
- [18] Xiaotie Deng and Christos H Papadimitriou. On the complexity of cooperative solution concepts. *Mathematics of operations research*, 19(2):257–266, 1994.
- [19] Palash Dey, Arnab Maiti, and Amatya Sharma. On parameterized complexity of liquid democracy. *CoRR*, abs/2011.14192, 2020.
- [20] Pradeep Dubey and Lloyd S. Shapley. Mathematical properties of the banzhaf power index. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 4(2):99–131, 1979.
- [21] Jack Edmonds. Optimum branchings. *Journal of Research of the national Bureau of Standards B*, 71(4):233–240, 1967.

- [22] Ezra Einy and Ori Haimanko. Characterization of the shapley-shubik power index without the efficiency axiom. *Games Econ. Behav.*, 73(2):615–621, 2011.
- [23] Bruno Escoffier, Hugo Gilbert, and Adèle Pass-Lanneau. The convergence of iterative delegations in liquid democracy in a social network. In *Algorithmic Game Theory - 12th International Symposium, SAGT 2019, Athens, Greece, September 30 - October 3, 2019, Proceedings*, pages 284–297, 2019.
- [24] Bruno Escoffier, Hugo Gilbert, and Adèle Pass-Lanneau. Iterative delegations in liquid democracy with restricted preferences. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020, Proceedings*, pages 1926–1933, 2020.
- [25] Shaheen S Fatima, Michael Wooldridge, and Nicholas R Jennings. A linear approximation method for the shapley value. *Artificial Intelligence*, 172(14):1673–1699, 2008.
- [26] 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, 2010.
- [27] Uriel Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(4):634–652, 1998.
- [28] Dan S Felsenthal, Moshé Machover, et al. The measurement of voting power. *Books*, 1998.
- [29] Bryan Ford. A liquid perspective on democratic choice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.12393*, 2020.
- [30] Michael R Garey and David S Johnson. Computers and intractability. *A Guide to the theory of NP-Completeness*, 1979.
- [31] Paul Gözl, Anson Kahng, Simon Mackenzie, and Ariel D. Procaccia. The fluid mechanics of liquid democracy. In *Web and Internet Economics - 14th International Conference, WINE 2018, Oxford, UK, December 15-17, 2018, Proceedings*, pages 188–202, 2018.
- [32] James Green-Armytage. Direct democracy by delegable proxy. DOI= http://fc.antioch.edu/~james_greenarmytage/vm/proxy.htm, 2005.
- [33] Samuel Ieong and Yoav Shoham. Marginal contribution nets: A compact representation scheme for coalitional games. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 193–202, 2005.
- [34] Samuel Ieong and Yoav Shoham. Multi-attribute coalitional games. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, pages 170–179, 2006.
- [35] Anson Kahng, Simon Mackenzie, and Ariel D. Procaccia. Liquid democracy: An algorithmic perspective. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018, Proceedings*, pages 1095–1102, 2018.
- [36] Telikepalli Kavitha, Tamás Király, Jannik Matuschke, Ildikó Schlotter, and Ulrike Schmidt-Kraepelin. Popular branchings and their dual certificates. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 223–237. Springer, 2020.
- [37] Jon M. Kleinberg and Éva Tardos. *Algorithm design*. Addison-Wesley, 2006.
- [38] 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 *Proceedings of the 9th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media(ICWSM)*, pages 208–217, 2015.
- [39] Grammateia Kotsialou and Luke Riley. Incentivising participation in liquid democracy with breadth-first delegation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, AAMAS ’20, Auckland, New Zealand, May 9-13, 2020, Proceedings*, pages 638–644, 2020.

- [40] Annick Laruelle and Federico Valenciano. A critical reappraisal of some voting power paradoxes. *Public Choice*, 125(1-2):17–41, 2005.
- [41] Dennis Leech. Computing power indices for large voting games. *Management Science*, 49(6):831–837, 2003.
- [42] Irwin Mann and LS Shapley. Values for large games, iv: Evaluating the electoral college by monte carlo techniques. the rand corporation. *Research Memorandum*, 2651, 1960.
- [43] 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.
- [44] Yasuko Matsui and Tomomi Matsui. Np-completeness for calculating power indices of weighted majority games. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 263(1-2):305–310, 2001.
- [45] Samuel Merrill III. Approximations to the banzhaf index of voting power. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 89(2):108–110, 1982.
- [46] Saburo Muroga. Threshold logic and its applications. 1971.
- [47] Abraham Neyman. Uniqueness of the shapley value. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 1(1):116–118, 1989.
- [48] Guillermo Owen. Multilinear extensions of games. *The Shapley Value. Essays in Honor of Lloyd S. Shapley*, pages 139–151, 1988.
- [49] Kislaya Prasad and Jerry S Kelly. Np-completeness of some problems concerning voting games. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 19(1):1–9, 1990.
- [50] Jeanette P Schmidt and Alan Siegel. The spatial complexity of oblivious k-probe hash functions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 19(5):775–786, 1990.
- [51] Lloyd S Shapley. A value for n-person games. *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, 2(28):307–317, 1953.
- [52] René van den Brink. An axiomatization of the shapley value using a fairness property. *Int. J. Game Theory*, 30(3):309–319, 2002.
- [53] Yuzhe Zhang and Davide Grossi. Power in liquid democracy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07070*, 2020.
- [54] Yair Zick, Alexander Skopalik, and Edith Elkind. The shapley value as a function of the quota in weighted voting games. In *IJCAI*, 2011.
- [55] Michael Zuckerman, Piotr Faliszewski, Yoram Bachrach, and Edith Elkind. Manipulating the quota in weighted voting games. *Artificial Intelligence*, 180:1–19, 2012.