arXiv:2108.00542v2 [econ.TH] 19 Aug 2021

Stable Voting

Wesley H. Holliday† and Eric Pacuit‡

† University of California, Berkeley (wesholliday@berkeley.edu)
‡ University of Maryland (epacuit@umd.edu)

August 19, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new single-winner voting system using ranked ballots: Stable Voting. The motivating principle of Stable Voting is that if a candidate A would win without another candidate B in the election, and A beats B in a head-to-head majority comparison, then A should still win in the election with B included (unless there is another candidate A' who has the same kind of claim to winning, in which case a tiebreaker may choose between A and A'). We call this principle Stability for Winners (with Tiebreaking). Stable Voting satisfies this principle while also having a remarkable ability to avoid tied outcomes in elections even with small numbers of voters.

1 Introduction

Voting reform efforts in the United States have achieved significant recent successes in replacing Plurality Voting with Instant Runoff Voting (IRV) for major political elections, including the 2018 San Francisco Mayoral Election and the 2021 New York City Mayoral Election. It is striking, by contrast, that *Condorcet voting methods* are not currently used in any political elections.[1] Condorcet methods use the same ranked ballots as IRV but replace the counting of first-place votes with head-to-head comparisons of candidates: do more voters prefer candidate A to candidate B or prefer B to A? If there is a candidate A who beats every other candidate in such a head-to-head majority comparison, this so-called *Condorcet winner* wins the election.

As of July 2021, the Ranked Choice Voting Election Database maintained by FairVote[2] contains 149 IRV elections from the United States for which the existence of a Condorcet winner can be determined from public data; and in every election, there was a Condorcet winner. Thus, in all of these elections, a Condorcet method would settle the election simply by the identification of the Condorcet winner,[3] rather than the many rounds of iterative elimination of candidates and transferring of votes involved in some complicated IRV calculations. Moreover, in all but one of the

[1] The Condorcet voting method Nanson was used in Marquette, Michigan, in the 1920s (Hoag and Hallett 1926, p. 491). We know of no cities using Condorcet methods since then, but see the Condorcet Canada Initiative at `https://condorcet.ca`.

[2] We are grateful to Deb Otis at FairVote for granting us access to the database.

[3] Of course, had the official voting method been a Condorcet method, voters may have voted differently, perhaps leading to no Condorcet winner in one of these elections.

elections, IRV chose the Condorcet winner anyway. Indeed, proponents of IRV claim that one of its advantages is that it almost always selects the Condorcet winner (Dennis 2008, 2018). The one case in the database in which IRV did not elect the Condorcet winner—the 2009 Mayoral Election in Burlington, Vermont, discussed below—was a source of controversy (see, e.g., Gierzynski et al. 2009, Bouricius 2009). All of this raises the question: why not always simply elect the Condorcet winner?

The problem is that a Condorcet winner is not guaranteed to exist (see Example 3.2 below for a real election with no Condorcet winner). Thus, some backup plan must be in place for how to elect a winner when there is no Condorcet winner. Proponents of IRV argue that "The need for a backup plan has led to quite complicated Condorcet systems, perhaps the most popular being Schwartz Sequential Dropping,[4] which are ultimately more opaque and difficult to explain than IRV" (Dennis 2008) and that "If your voters are mathematically inclined, then consider Condorcet voting because it has some mathematical advantages but is more complicated to understand" (O'Neill 2021). There are at least two possible responses to these claims about Condorcet methods being more complicated. First, there are Condorcet methods that are simple—or at least simpler than IRV. Take the Minimax (or Simpson-Kramer) method: the winner is the candidate whose worst head-to-head loss is smallest. Second, even if the backup plan is more complicated than that, we must consider which of the following approaches is preferable: (1) deciding almost every election in a simple way—just elect the Condorcet winner—and rarely applying a more complicated backup plan, perhaps more complicated than IRV, or (2) deciding many elections with a fairly complicated iterative elimination of candidates and transferring of votes, which may cause controversy when failing to elect a candidate who beats every other?

Here we propose a new Condorcet voting method—hence a new backup plan when there is no Condorcet winner—that we call Stable Voting. Rather than aiming for the simplest possible backup plan, Stable Voting aims to generalize the following special property of Condorcet winners to all winners:

- if a candidate A would be the Condorcet winner without another candidate B in the election, and A beats B in a head-to-head majority comparison, then A is still the Condorcet winner in the election with B included.

This is a kind of *stability* property of Condorcet winners: you cannot dislodge a Condorcet winner A by adding a new candidate B to the election if A beats B in a head-to-head majority vote. For example, although the 2000 U.S. Presidential Election in Florida did not use ranked ballots, it is plausible (see Magee 2003) that Al Gore (A) would have won without Ralph Nader (B) in the election, and Gore would have beaten Nader head-to-head. Thus, Gore should still have won with Nader included in the election. Indeed, Gore was plausibly the Condorcet winner with and without Nader in the election. Infamously, however, Plurality Voting chose George W. Bush when Nader was included.

The most obvious generalization of the special property of Condorcet winners above to all winners selected by some voting method is what we call *Stability for Winners*[5]:

- if a candidate A would be a winner without another candidate B in the election, and A beats

[4] Also known as the Schulze or Beat Path method (Schulze 2011), discussed below.

[5] This principle, studied in Holliday and Pacuit 2020, is almost the same as a principle mentioned in passing by Bordes [1983]: "you cannot turn x into a loser by introducing new alternatives to which x does not lose in duels" (p. 125).

B in a head-to-head majority comparison, then A should still be a winner in the election with B included.

The problem with Stability for Winners as a generalization of the special property of Condorcet winners above is that it is incompatible with the practical requirement of tiebreaking to select a *single* winner. The reason is that there may be more than one candidate with the same claim to winning as A has in the statement of Stability for Winners, i.e., there may be another A' who also would have won without some candidate B' in the election whom A' beats head-to-head.[6] But this does not mean we should give up on the idea of stability. The fact that a candidate A would have won without another candidate B in the election whom A beats head-to-head is a prima facie reason that A should win in the election with B. That reason can be undercut if—and only if, we argue—there is another candidate A' who has the same kind of claim to winning; in this case, it is legitimate for a tiebreaker to choose between A and A' and any other candidates with the same kind of claim to winning.

Thus, we propose the modified *Stability for Winners with Tiebreaking*:

- if a candidate A would be a winner without another candidate B in the election, and A beats B in a head-to-head majority comparison, then A should still be a winner in the election with B included, unless there is another candidate A' with the same kind of claim to winning, in which case a tiebreaker may choose between A and A' and any other candidates with the same kind of claim to winning.

In particular, in our view there is one situation in which there is a straightforward justification for why A loses with B in the election, given that A wins without B and that A beats B head-to-head: there are candidates A' and B' such that A' wins without B', A' beats B' head-to-head, and *the margin by which A' beats B' is larger than the margin by which A beats B.*

The voting method that we propose in this paper, Stable Voting, satisfies Stability for Winners with Tiebreaking by design. It also has a remarkable ability to avoid tied outcomes in elections. We define Stable Voting in Section 2 and compare its performance to that of other voting methods in several example elections in Section 3. In Section 4, we discuss what we take to be some of the benefits of Stable Voting, and in Section 5, we discuss some of its costs. We conclude in Section 6 with open questions for future work. For a computer implementation of Stable Voting, verification of the examples in this paper, and additional examples, see https://github.com/epacuit/stablevoting.

2 Stable Voting defined

In an election with ranked ballots, given candidate A and B, the *margin of* A vs. B is the number of voters who rank A above B minus the number who rank B above A. For example, if 7 voters rank A above B and 3 rank B above A, then the margin of A vs. B is 4, and the margin of B vs. A is -4.[7]

[6] Although the proof is beyond the scope of this paper, we have the following impossibility theorem: there is no anonymous and neutral voting method that both satisfies Stability for Winners and selects a unique winner in any election in which there are no ties in the margins of victory in head-to-head majority comparisons (see the beginning of Section 4).

[7] In our view, it is important to measure the sizes of wins and losses in terms of *margin*. Another approach agrees that A beats B head-to-head if and only if the margin of A over B is positive, but it says that the size of A's win over B is measured solely in terms of the number of voters who rank A above B, ignoring the number of voters who rank B above A. E.g., if 51 voters rank A above B, 49 rank B above A, 50 rank X above Y, and 50 are indifferent

If there is a Condorcet winner in an election, Stable Voting selects that Condorcet winner, so no further calculations are necessary. But Stable Voting also works when there is no Condorcet winner. Given a set of ranked ballots, Stable Voting selects a winner as follows:

- If only one candidate A appears on all ballots, then A wins.
- Otherwise list all head-to-head matches of the form A vs. B in order from the largest to smallest margin of A vs. B. Find the first match A vs. B in the list such that A wins according to Stable Voting *after B is removed from all ballots*; this A is the winner for the original set of ballots.[8]

3 Stable Voting applied

With only two candidates, Stable Voting is the same as Majority Voting. For if A beats B head-to-head, then A vs. B (with positive margin) appears on the list of matches by descending margin before B vs. A (with negative margin), and A wins after B is removed from all ballots, as A is the only candidate left.

With more than two candidates, Stable Voting becomes more interesting.[9]

Example 3.1. In the 2009 Mayoral Election in Burlington, Vermont, the progressive candidate Bob Kiss was elected using IRV. However, checking the head-to-head matches of the candidates revealed that the Democrat Andy Montroll beat Bob Kiss and every other candidate head-to-head, as shown on the left of Figure 1.[10] Thus, Montroll was the Condorcet winner and hence the Stable Voting winner. Had the Republican, Kurt Wright, who lost the IRV election not been included in the election, then (other things equal) the IRV winner would have been Montroll. Thus, Wright's inclusion in the IRV election spoiled the election for Montroll. For further discussion of this spoiler effect for IRV, see `https://www.electionscience.org/library/the-spoiler-effect`.

Example 3.2. For an example with no Condorcet winner, we consider the 2007 Glasgow City Council election for Ward 5 (Govan), available in the Preflib database (Mattei and Walsh 2013). Each voter submitted a linear order of some subset of the eleven candidates, which we convert to a strict weak order with all unranked candidates tied at the bottom (as in Footnote 10 and Preflib's file ED-00008-00000009.toc). The election was run using Single-Transferable Vote to elect four candidates.[11] However, we can also run single-winner voting methods on these ballots. Plurality and Instant Runoff Voting select Allison Hunter, while Plurality with Runoff selects John Flanagan.[12]

between X and Y, the alternative approach says that A's win over B is a bigger win than X's (Pareto-dominating) win over Y. We reject this alternative approach.

[8] Such an A is guaranteed to exist (see Section 4). If there are two matches A vs. B and A' vs. B' with the same margins such that A wins after B is removed from the ballots, and A' wins after B' is removed from the ballots, then A and A' are tied Stable Voting winners for the original set of ballots.

[9] Although it will not affect the following examples, if so desired, one can modify Stable Voting with the rule that if there is a unique candidate with no losses, called a *weak Condorcet winner*, then we elect that candidate; and if there are several, then we apply the Stable Voting procedure but only to matches A vs. B where A is a weak Condorcet winner, thereby guaranteeing that the winner will be among the weak Condorcet winners.

[10] For the purposes of this Condorcet analysis, when a voter submits a linear order of a proper subset of the candidates, we regard this ballot as a strict weak order of the entire set of candidates by placing all unranked candidates in a tie below all ranked candidates. This is also the methodology adopted by FairVote for their Condorcet analyses.

[11] See `https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2007_Glasgow_City_Council_election`.

[12] For Plurality with Runoff, Hunter and Flanagan advance to the runoff, and then Flanagan beats Hunter by 86 votes.




Figure 1: Left: head-to-head results for the 2009 Burlington Mayoral Election. An arrow from candidate A to candidate B indicates that A beat B head-to-head. The arrow is labeled with A's margin of victory vs. B. Right: head-to-head results for candidates in the Smith set of the 2007 Glasgow City Council election for Ward 5 (Govan).

In this election, there is no Condorcet winner. The *Smith set*—the smallest set of candidates each of whom beats each candidate outside the set head-to-head—consists of three candidates, Stephen Dornan, Flanagan, and Hunter, as shown on the right of Figure 1, in a *majority cycle*: Dornan beats Flanagan by 602, Flanagan beats Hunter by 86, and Hunter beats Dornan by 21.

Stable Voting determines the winner by going down the list of matches:

1. Dornan vs. Flanagan: margin of 602.
   Dornan loses (to Hunter) after removing Flanagan. Continue to next match:
2. Flanagan vs. Hunter: margin of 86.
   Flanagan loses (to Dornan) after removing Hunter. Continue to next match:
3. Hunter vs. Dornan: margin of 21.
   Hunter loses (to Flanagan) after removing Dornan. Continue to next match:
4. Dornan vs. Hunter: margin of -21.
   Dornan wins (against Flanagan) after removing Hunter. **Dornan is elected**.
5. Hunter vs. Flanagan: margin of -86.
6. Flanagan vs. Dornan: margin of -602.

We have greyed out the Hunter vs. Flanagan and Flanagan vs. Dornan matches, because we never reach these matches in calculating the Stable Voting winner.


That Stable Voting elects Dornan in Example 3.2 is a consequence of the following characterization of when a candidate is a Stable Voting winner in an election with three candidates. For the sake of space, we omit the easy proof.

Proposition 3.3. In any election with exactly three candidates, a candidate A is a Stable Voting winner if and only if one of the following holds:

1. A has no head-to-head losses, and A's maximal margin against another candidate is maximal among all margins between a candidate with no losses and another candidate;

2. each candidate has one head-to-head loss, and the margin by which another candidate beats A head-to-head is minimal among all margins.

Example 3.4. Next we consider a hypothetical election with four candidates and no Condorcet winner. The head-to-head margins are shown on the left in Figure 2. The arrow from A to B labeled by 6 indicates that the margin of A vs. B is 6 and hence the margin of B vs. A is -6. The arrow from B to C labeled by 4 indicates that the margin of B vs. C is 4, and so on.



Stable Voting winner: A
Beat Path winner: A
Ranked Pairs winner: A

Stable Voting winner: A
Beat Path winner: B
Ranked Pairs winner: C

Figure 2: head-to-head results for elections in Examples 3.4 and 3.5

Stable Voting determines the winner of the election by going down the list of matches (recall from Proposition 3.3 that in a three-candidate election in which each candidate has one loss, the candidate with the smallest loss wins):

- A vs. D: margin of 12.
  A loses (as C wins) after removing D. Continue to next match:
- D vs. C: margin of 10.
  D loses (as A wins) after removing C. Continue to next match:
- C vs. A: margin of 8.
  C loses (as D wins) after removing A. Continue to next match:
- A vs. B: margin of 6.
  A wins after removing B. A **is elected.**

For those familiar with Beat Path (Schulze 2011) and Ranked Pairs (Tideman 1987), we note that they also elect A for the election on the left in Figure 2.

Example 3.5. We now modify the election from Example 3.4 by adding another candidate E, as shown on the right of Figure 2. Stable Voting determines the winner of the election by going down the list of matches:

- A vs. E: margin of 20.
  A wins after removing E (see Example 3.4). A **is elected**.

By contrast, when the loser E whom A beats head-to-head joins the election, Beat Path and Ranked Pairs change their choices to B and C, respectively, thereby violating Stability for Winners with Tiebreaking (see Definition 4.2).

4 Benefits of Stable Voting

In this section, we demonstrate some of the beneficial properties of Stable Voting. A *profile* $\mathbf{P}$ is an assignment to each voter in an election of a ranking (possibly incomplete) of the candidates in the election. A profile is *uniquely weighted* if there are no distinct matches A vs. B and A' vs. B' with the same margin. Given a candidate B in $\mathbf{P}$, let $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$ be the profile obtained from $\mathbf{P}$ by removing B from all rankings. We use 'SV' to abbreviate 'Stable Voting'.

Proposition 4.1. Any profile $\mathbf{P}$ has at least one SV winner. Moreover, if $\mathbf{P}$ is uniquely weighted, then there is only one SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$.

Proof. By induction on the number of candidates. Consider any candidate B in $\mathbf{P}$. In $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, there is some SV winner A by the inductive hypothesis. Hence A vs. B is a head-to-head match in $\mathbf{P}$ such that A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. Since there is some head-to-head match such that the first candidate wins after removing the second, there is an earliest (i.e., first or tied for first) such head-to-head match in the list of matches by descending margin. Hence there is at least one SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$. If $\mathbf{P}$ is uniquely weighted, there is a *unique* first such head-to-head match in the list, so there is only one SV winner. □

The second part of Proposition 4.1 significantly undersells the power of SV to pick a unique winner. Figure 3 shows computer simulation results estimating the percentage of all linear profiles[13] for a fixed number of candidates and voters in which a given voting method declares a tie between multiple winners, before any randomized tiebreaking. SV does much better than the other methods[14] at selecting a unique winner for profiles with around 5,000 voters or fewer. Moreover, for many other voting methods, for a fixed number of voters, the percentage of profiles producing a tie increases as we increase the number of candidates. Remarkably, for SV, the opposite happens: the percentage of profiles with a tie *decreases* as we increase the number of candidates.

Next we prove that Stable Voting satisfies the motivating principle discussed in Section 1: Stability for Winners with Tiebreaking.

Definition 4.2. Given a voting method M and profile $\mathbf{P}$, a candidate A is *stable for* M *in* $\mathbf{P}$ if there is some B in $\mathbf{P}$ whom A beats head-to-head such that A wins according to M in the profile $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. We say that M satisfies *stability for winners with tiebreaking* if for every profile $\mathbf{P}$, if there is a candidate who is stable for M in $\mathbf{P}$, then some candidate who is stable for M in $\mathbf{P}$ wins in $\mathbf{P}$.[15]

[13] A linear profile is a profile in which each voter submits a linear order of the candidates, disallowing ties. Simulations for non-linear profiles are of course also possible, as are simulations using non-uniform probability distributions on the set of profiles for a given number of candidates and voters. We will report on such simulation results in future work.

[14] For the version of IRV used in our simulations, see Footnote 17. We also tried a less standard version of IRV where if there are multiple candidates tied for the fewest first-place votes, *all* are eliminated (unless this would eliminate all candidates). This leads to fewer ties than the more standard version of IRV, but SV still outperforms this version of IRV.

[15] In light of the possibility of ties, one could strengthen this to: if there is a candidate who is stable for M in $\mathbf{P}$, then every candidate who wins in $\mathbf{P}$ is stable for M in $\mathbf{P}$. By contrast, M satisfies *stability for winners* (Holliday and Pacuit 2020) if for every profile $\mathbf{P}$, every candidate who is stable for M in $\mathbf{P}$ wins in $\mathbf{P}$. As discussed in Section 1, the practical requirement of selecting a single winner moves us from stability for winners to stability for winners with tiebreaking, as there can be multiple stable winners in a profile.




Figure 3: estimates of the percentage of linear profiles for a given number of candidates and voters in which a given voting method selects multiple tied winners. For each data point, we randomly sampled 25,000 profiles for the even number of voters and 25,000 profiles for the odd number. We also obtained data for Minimax, but its graph coincides with that of Beat Path. We did not include Ranked Pairs due to the difficulty of computing (the anonymous, neutral version of) Ranked Pairs in non-uniquely-weighted profiles (Brill and Fischer 2012).

Proposition 4.3. SV satisfies stability for winners with tiebreaking.

Proof. If some candidate A is stable for SV in $\mathbf{P}$, this means there is a match A vs. B with a *positive* margin such that A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. It follows that if X is any SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$, then the match X vs. Y that witnesses this fact also has a positive margin. This implies that X is stable for SV in $\mathbf{P}$. □

Other methods that satisfy stability for winners with tiebreaking include Top Cycle (also known as GETCHA, as in Schwartz 1986), Banks (Banks 1985), and Split Cycle (see Holliday and Pacuit 2020), though these methods differ from Stable Voting in not guaranteeing a single winner in each uniquely-weighted profile (recall Proposition 4.1). By contrast, Plurality, IRV, Minimax, Beat Path, and Ranked Pairs all violate the axiom. That Beat Path and Ranked Pairs violate it can be seen by their choices of winners in Figure 2.

Next we turn to the Condorcet criterion and a strengthening of it.

Proposition 4.4. SV satisfies the *Condorcet criterion*: if A is a Condorcet winner in a profile $\mathbf{P}$, then A is the unique SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$.

Proof. By induction on the number of candidates. Let A be a Condorcet winner in $\mathbf{P}$, so for $B \neq A$, the margin of A vs. B is positive. A is also a Condorcet winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, so by the inductive

hypothesis, A is the SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. It follows that if X vs. Y is an earliest match in the list of matches by descending margin for which X is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-Y}$, the margin of X vs. Y is positive. Hence $Y \neq A$. Moreover, in $\mathbf{P}_{-Y}$, A is a Condorcet winner, so by the inductive hypothesis, A is the unique winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-Y}$. Hence $X = A$. □

Recall that the Smith set $Smith(\mathbf{P})$ of a profile $\mathbf{P}$ is the smallest set of candidates such that each candidate in the set beats each candidate outside the set head-to-head. The following proposition strengthens Proposition 4.4.

Proposition 4.5. SV satisfies the *Smith criterion*: if A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$, then A belongs to the Smith set in $\mathbf{P}$.

Proof. We use a preliminary lemma about the Smith set, which is easy to check: if $A \in Smith(\mathbf{P}_{-B})$, and B is not a Condorcet winner in $\mathbf{P}$, then $A \in Smith(\mathbf{P})$. Now we prove the proposition by induction on the number of candidates. Suppose A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$ as witnessed by A vs. B, so A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. Since A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$, it follows by Lemma 4.4 that B is not a Condorcet winner. Since A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, by the inductive hypothesis, $A \in Smith(\mathbf{P}_{-B})$, so by the lemma, $A \in Smith(\mathbf{P})$. □

One consequence of Proposition 4.5 is that there is an alternative implementation of Stable Voting that only lists those head-to-head matches A vs. B where A belongs to the Smith set.[16] Another consequence is the following.

Corollary 4.6. SV satisfies the *Condorcet loser criterion*: if A loses head-to-head to every other candidate in $\mathbf{P}$, then A is not an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$.

Of the voting methods discussed in this paper, only Plurality, Plurality with Runoff, and Minimax violate the Condorcet loser criterion.

Finally, a voting method satisfies Independence of Smith Dominated Alternatives (ISDA) if removing a candidate outside the Smith set does not change who wins. Stable Voting satisfies ISDA for any uniquely-weighted profile, but in non-uniquely-weighted profiles, Stable Voting may use candidates outside the Smith set to break ties. For example, suppose that A, B, and C form a perfectly symmetrical cycle: A beats B by 1, B beats C by 1, and C beats A by 1. Further suppose that A beats D by 3, whereas B and C only beat D by 1. Stable Voting will elect A in this case, whereas if we were to first restrict to the Smith set by removing D, then there would be a tie between A, B, and C.

Proposition 4.7. If $\mathbf{P}$ is uniquely weighted, and B is not in the Smith set of $\mathbf{P}$, then A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$ if and only if A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$.

Proof. By induction on the number of candidates.

First suppose A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$, as witnessed by A vs. C, i.e., this is an earliest match in the list of matches by descending margin such that the first candidate in the match wins after removing the second, so A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-C}$. If $B = C$, we are done, so suppose $B \neq C$. Then we claim that A vs. C witnesses A being an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, i.e., A vs. C is an earliest match in

[16] A related voting method, based on the Split Cycle method studied in Holliday and Pacuit 2020, Forthcoming, is *Split Cycle with Stable Tiebreaking*: run the Stable Voting procedure but only listing matches A vs. B where A is undefeated according to Split Cycle. In our simulations, this method almost always agrees with Stable Voting.

the list for $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$ such that the first candidate wins after removing the second, so A wins in $(\mathbf{P}_{-B})_{-C}$. Since $(\mathbf{P}_{-B})_{-C} = (\mathbf{P}_{-C})_{-B}$, we show that A wins in $(\mathbf{P}_{-C})_{-B}$. Since $B \notin Smith(\mathbf{P})$ and C is not a Condorcet winner in $\mathbf{P}$ (by Lemma 4.4), $B \notin Smith(\mathbf{P}_{-C})$ (cf. the proof of Proposition 4.5), in which case the fact that A wins in $\mathbf{P}_{-C}$ and the inductive hypothesis together imply that A wins in $(\mathbf{P}_{-C})_{-B}$. To see that A vs. C satisfies the "earliest" claim in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, suppose there is a match X vs. Y in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$ with a larger margin than A vs. C such that X wins in $(\mathbf{P}_{-B})_{-Y}$ and hence in $(\mathbf{P}_{-Y})_{-B}$. Since $B \notin Smith(\mathbf{P})$, and Y is not a Condorcet winner in $\mathbf{P}$ (by Lemma 4.4), $B \notin Smith(\mathbf{P}_{-Y})$. It follows by the inductive hypothesis that X wins in $\mathbf{P}_{-Y}$. This contradicts our assumption that A vs. C is one of the earliest matches in the list for $\mathbf{P}$ such that the first candidate wins after removing the second.

Now suppose A is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. Since $\mathbf{P}$ is uniquely weighted, so is $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, so by Lemma 4.1, there is a unique SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. Hence it is A. Now let A' be any SV winner in $\mathbf{P}$. Then by the same reasoning as in the previous paragraph, A' is an SV winner in $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$, so $A' = A$. □

Corollary 4.8. For any uniquely-weighted profile $\mathbf{P}$, $SV(\mathbf{P}) = SVS(\mathbf{P})$, where SVS is the voting method that first eliminates all candidates outside the Smith set and then runs SV on the restricted profile.

In light of Corollary 4.8, if a profile is uniquely weighted, we can more efficiently compute SV winners by only listing pairs A vs. B where both A and B belong to the Smith set. Even if the profile is not uniquely weighted, one could use SVS at the expense of sacrificing some of the tiebreaking power of SV.

5 Costs of Stable Voting

In this section, we briefly discuss some of the costs of Stable Voting.

One is the cost of computing SV winners using the definition in Section 2, which is an example of a *recursive definition*: computing the SV winners in $\mathbf{P}$ involves computing the SV winners in simpler profiles of the form $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$. IRV also has a recursive definition: A is an IRV winner in $\mathbf{P}$ if A is the only candidate in $\mathbf{P}$ or there is some candidate B with the minimal number of first-place votes in $\mathbf{P}$ such that A is an IRV winner in the profile $\mathbf{P}_{-B}$.[17] However, the recursion for IRV typically terminates faster (since the recursion tree is typically not as wide as for SV). Our current computer implementation of SV can comfortably handle elections with up to 10 candidates in the Smith set, but beyond that, calculating winners may take a long time. This should be no problem for political elections, voting in faculty search committees, etc., since we do not expect even 10 candidates in the Smith set in these contexts, but it does preclude the current use of Stable Voting for some large-scale internet applications where the Smith set could exceed 10 candidates.

Another cost of SV is some violations—in an extremely small fraction of profiles—of voting criteria satisfied by some other voting methods. The most important to discuss is *monotonicity*. This criterion states that if A wins in a profile $\mathbf{P}$, and $\mathbf{P}'$ is obtained from $\mathbf{P}$ by moving A up one position in some voter's ranking, then A should still win in $\mathbf{P}'$. Like IRV, SV can violate monotonicity. For

[17] This is the "parallel universe" version of IRV (see Wang et al. 2019). Many cities that use IRV prescribe that if there are multiple candidates with the minimal number of first-place votes, the candidate to be eliminated is determined by lottery (we thank Deb Otis for sharing FairVote's database of IRV rules). Then what we call an "IRV winner" in the text is a candidate with nonzero probability of being elected by the lottery-based version of IRV.

SV, the basic reason is that moving A up one position also means moving some other candidate B *down* one position, and moving B below A may benefit another candidate C whose closest competitor in some subelection is B, whereas moving B below A might not meaningfully benefit A at all.

Figure 4 shows the estimated percentages of linear profiles for 6 candidates and up to 51 voters in which IRV, a Condorcet-consistent variant of IRV known as Smith IRV (first restrict the profile to the Smith set and then apply IRV to the restricted profile), and SV violate monotonicity, meaning that there is *some candidate* A and *some voter* i in the profile such that moving A up one position in i's ranking causes A to go from winner to loser. Although the frequency with which SV violates monotonicity is not actually zero, it is minuscule compared to the frequencies for IRV and Smith IRV.




Figure 4: estimated percentages of linear profiles witnessing monotonicity violations for IRV, Smith IRV, and SV. For each data point, we randomly sampled 25,000 profiles. More than 51 voters required too much computation time. The percentage of profiles with a single-voter monotonicity violation goes to zero for all methods as the number of voters increases.

6 Conclusion

We have introduced Stable Voting and discussed some of its benefits and costs. Many open questions remain. Are there ways of calculating SV winners that are more efficient in practice (cf. the shortcuts in Section 4)? What is the computational complexity of this problem? How does SV perform in simulations using other probability models on profiles (spatial models, the IAC model, urn models, Mallow's models, etc.)? How do voters react to the use of SV in elections? What are their incentives for strategic voting? These are only a few of the questions that must be addressed for a full assessment of Stable Voting.

Acknowledgements

For helpful discussions of voting theory, we thank Felix Brandt, Yifeng Ding, Jobst Heitzig, Mikayla Kelley, Xavier Mora, Klaus Nehring, Chase Norman, Markus Schulze, Warren D. Smith, Nicolaus Tideman, Saam Zahedian, and Bill Zwicker. We are grateful to Nicolaus Tideman for providing the stimulus for us to write this paper.

References

J. S. Banks. Sophisticated voting outcomes and agenda control. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 1(4): 295–306, 1985.

Georges Bordes. On the possibility of reasonable consistent majoritarian choice: Some positive results. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 31(1):122–132, 1983.

Terry Bouricius. Response to faulty analysis of Burlington IRV election. Accessed 7/22/2021, 2009. URL `https://www.fairvote.org/response-to-faulty-analysis-of-burlington-irv-election`.

Markus Brill and Felix Fischer. The price of neutrality for the ranked pairs method. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-12)*, pages 1299–1305. AAAI Press, 2012.

Greg Dennis. Why I prefer IRV to Condorcet, 2008. URL `http://archive3.fairvote.org/articles/why-i-prefer-irv-to-condorcet`. Accessed 7/22/2021.

Greg Dennis. How is RCV better than approval, score or Condorcet voting methods?, 2018. URL `https://www.fairvote.org/how_is_rcv_better_than_approval_score_or_condorcet_voting_methods`. Accessed 7/22/2021.

Anthony Gierzynski, Wes Hamilton, and Warren D. Smith. Burlington Vermont 2009 IRV mayor election. Accessed 7/22/2021, 2009. URL `https://rangevoting.org/Burlington.html`.

Clarence Hoag and George Hallett. *Proportional Representation*. Macmillan, New York, 1926.

Wesley H. Holliday and Eric Pacuit. Split Cycle: A new Condorcet consistent voting method independent of clones and immune to spoilers. arXiv:2004.02350, 2020.

Wesley H. Holliday and Eric Pacuit. Axioms for defeat in democratic elections. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, Forthcoming. arXiv:2008.08451.

Christopher S. P. Magee. Third-party candidates and the 2000 presidential election. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(3):29–35, 2003.

Nicholas Mattei and Toby Walsh. Preflib: A library of preference data. In *Proceedings of Third International Conference on Algorithmic Decision Theory*, pages 259–270. Springer, 2013.

Jeff O'Neill. Recommended voting methods, 2021. URL `https://www.opavote.com/methods/recommended`. accessed 7/22/2021.

Markus Schulze. A new monotonic, clone-independent, reversal symmetric, and condorcet-consistent single-winner election method. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 36:267–303, 2011.

Thomas Schwartz. *The Logic of Collective Choice*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1986.

T. Nicolaus Tideman. Independence of clones as a criterion for voting rules. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 4:185–206, 1987.

Jun Wang, Sujoy Sikdar, Tyler Shepherd Zhibing Zhao, Chunheng Jiang, and Lirong Xia. Practical algorithms for multi-stage voting rules with parallel universes tiebreaking. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-19)*. AAAI Press, 2019.