

Separating and Collapsing Electoral Control Types¹

Benjamin Carleton Michael C. Chavrimootoo Lane A. Hemaspaandra
David E. Narváez Conor Taliencich Henry B. Welles

Department of Computer Science
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627

July 2, 2022

¹Work supported in part by NSF grant CCF-2006496 and CIFellows grant CIF2020-UR-36.

Abstract

It was recently discovered, for seven pairs (C_1, C_2) of seemingly distinct standard electoral control types, that C_1 and C_2 are in practice identical: For every input I and every election system \mathcal{E} , either I is a “yes” instance of both C_1 and C_2 , or of neither [HHM20]. It is surprising that this had gone undetected for so many years, even as the field was energetically score-carding how many standard control types various election systems were resistant to; various “different” cells on such score cards were, unknowingly, duplicate effort on the same issue. The unexpected identicalness of the control-class pairs naturally raises the worry that perhaps other pairs of control types are also identical, and so work still is being needlessly duplicated.

In this paper, we completely determine, for all standard control types, which pairs are, for elections whose votes are linear orderings of the candidates, always identical. In particular, we prove that no identical control pairs exist beyond the known seven. We also for three central election systems completely determine which control pairs are identical (“collapse”) with respect to those particular election systems, and we also explore containment and incomparability relationships between control pairs. For approval voting, which has a different “type” for its votes, [HHM20]’s seven collapses still hold (as we observe that their argument in fact applies to all election systems). However, we find 14 additional collapses that hold for approval voting but do not hold for some election systems whose votes are linear orderings of the candidates. We also find one additional collapse for veto elections. We prove that each of the three election systems mentioned have no collapses other than those inherited from Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] or added in the present paper. However, we show a number of new containment relationships that hold between some separating control pairs, and for each separating pair of standard types classify the nature of its separation in terms of either containment (always, and strict on at least some inputs) or incomparability.

Our work, for the general case and the specific cases of three particularly important election systems, clarifies the landscape of the 44 standard control types, for each pair either collapsing or separating them, and also providing finer-grained information on the nature of the separations.

1 Introduction

Suppose Professor Fou specializes in complexity classification, and for each problem that comes through the door, tries to prove it complete or not for Professor Fou’s pet list of classes: NP, coNP, and cocoNP. So on Monday, a problem P_1 from scheduling theory would come in the door and Fou might prove it complete for coNP and would give arguments suggesting NP-completeness and cocoNP-completeness are each unlikely. On Tuesday, a problem P_2 from computational social choice might come in the door and Fou might prove it complete for NP and cocoNP, and would give evidence suggesting coNP-completeness is wildly unlikely. And so on for many years.

Most CS academics would be horrified at the situation and would say: How can Fou not have stepped back and tried to see the big picture—and realized that NP and cocoNP are exactly the same class, and thus that Fou was doing duplicate work!

This seems at first a comic situation, yet a more subtle cousin of it has been in play in the computational social choice world for many years.

Let us explain what we mean by that. Control and manipulation are the two families of attack types that were the focus of the seminal papers of Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick on computational social choice [BTT89a,BTT89b,BTT92]. The various control attacks model different attempts to affect the outcome of elections by changes to their structure, namely, via adding, deleting, or partitioning voters or candidates. The control attack types also vary as to whether the goal is to make the focus candidate a winner (perhaps tied; this is known as the nonunique-winner (NUW) or cowinner setting), or to be a winner who is not tied with anyone else (this is known as the unique-winner (UW) setting), or to *not* win (again regarding one of those two variants regarding ties). Over time, there has been something of a race or contest in computational social choice to find election systems for which a very large number of control types have the property that it is NP-hard to determine on a given input whether that type of control can succeed (see the discussion in our Related Work section).

But what if two (compatible, i.e., having the same input type) control types were in fact the same? That is, what if for every election system (whose votes are linear orders over the candidates) and on every input, despite the control types seeming to model different actions, in fact either for both control types the answer is yes (i.e., for each of the two control types, there is a way to achieve the goal of making the focus candidate win (or lose)), or for both the answer is no (i.e., for each of the two control types, there is no way to achieve the goal of making the focused candidate win (or lose)). We will say that the types “collapse” in this case. Then the two types *for all practical purposes* are the same. In such a case, all research that separately studied the two types—for example to determine their computational complexity for some election system (over linear orders)—would be doing the same work twice. As our abstract mentioned, surprisingly, it has recently been observed by Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] that there are (at least) seven such collapsing pairs of control types. In fact, that paper shows that four control types all mutually collapse—so six pairs—and one other pair also collapses.

The natural question this raises is whether there are other undiscovered collapses—either ones that hold for all election systems or, failing that, ones that hold when our focus is limited to one of the most important election systems. We completely resolve that question, both as to whether any additional collapses beyond the seven hold in general—we show that the remaining hundreds of pairs all separate—and as to the major election systems plurality, veto, and approval—for two of which we do discover additional collapses (one additional collapsing pair for veto and 14 additional collapsing pairs for approval) and for all three of which we then separate all remaining pairs. The universe of control types we study is that of the 22 “standard” control types used by [HHM20] and other papers, each studied in both the NUW and the UW winner model; so 44 control types in total.

Why is this important? Collapses reveal that seemingly different control types are for all practical purposes the same ones in disguise. So general collapses give a clearer picture of the world of control types, and can help us avoid duplicate work. Separations on the other hand assure us that the types differ.

However, a general-case separation is existential over election systems, and as this paper itself shows, specific systems may have additional collapses. Thus it is important for the field, as to its understanding of control types, to find the collapse/separation behavior for important election systems, and we completely resolve this for three central ones: plurality, veto, and approval. We hope that future papers by others will study additional systems or, even better, will (as we do for some cases in Section 3.3) define sufficient conditions that in one fell swoop provide collapses that apply to groups of election systems.

Separations themselves can be refined, for two (compatible) control types, if on each input (except with no focus candidate specified in the input) we consider for each of the two control types the set of all candidates c such that if c is the focal candidate, the given control action can succeed. It might be the case that for the first control type on all inputs that set is a subset of that set for the second control type; or it could always be a superset; or neither of these cases could hold. Of course, if the first two cases hold simultaneously, that is the same as the two types collapsing. For *all* our control pairs that separate, we refine our separations into the three cases just described: “always \subseteq , and on some instance \subsetneq ”; “always \supseteq , and on some instance \supsetneq ”; and neither of the above (i.e., “incomparable”). We find, for various separating pairs, such containment relationships, and not all are UW and NUW variants of each other (though UW and NUW always have an obvious \subseteq or \supseteq relation; which one of those holds depends on whether the type is “constructive” (\subseteq holds) or “destructive” (\supseteq holds); we will refer back to this fact later as (**)).

As to proof techniques, for separations, since the number of pairs is huge, when we can we build examples that simultaneously yield many separations. Some of our separation constructions are obtained by computer-aided search. Some of our separation results on the “general-case” tables are obtained by inheritance from a specific-case table. As to new collapses, some are achieved by direct arguments that exploit some feature of the setting, and most are proven via an axiomatic-sufficient-condition approach (regarding Unique-WARP). Also, some of the collapse (equality) entries in our tables for specific election systems are inherited from the general-case tables.

Big picture, this paper completely resolves the extent to which control-type pairs collapse or fail to collapse, both in general (i.e., universally quantified over election systems) and with regard to plurality, veto, and approval elections.

2 Preliminaries

Some of the standard definitions that appear in this section are also taken from [HHM20].

An election comprises a finite set C of candidates (each identified uniquely by a name¹) and a finite multiset V of votes over C . Except in one section of the paper (Section 3.3, where we will study a system using a different vote type, known as approval vectors), we throughout this paper take the “type” of a vote as being a linear ordering over C (note: linear orderings—complete, transitive, antisymmetric binary relations—are inherently tie-free). A simple example of a 3-candidate, 4-voter election thus is $C = \{a, b, c\}$ and $V = \{a > b > c, a > b > c, a > c > b, b > c > a\}$.

As is standard in computational social choice, an election system maps an election (a pair (C, V)) to a (possibly nonstrict) subset of C (the set of winners). As is often done in computational social choice papers, we do not forbid the case of having no winners; see [HHM20, Footnote 3] for a discussion of why allowing that is very natural.

The study of electoral control from a computational perspective was initiated by Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick [BTT92]. Their notion, known as constructive control, focuses on making a particular candidate a winner by some “control” action. Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR07] define the natural variants of those where instead the goal is to *prevent* a particular candidate from winning. This is known as destructive control.

The control actions are: partition of voters, partition of candidates, run-off partition of candidates, deleting voters, deleting candidates, adding voters, and adding candidates (both limited and unlimited). For each partition-based control type, we have two subvariants to handle the outcome of the subelections: in the TE (ties eliminate) subvariant, a candidate proceeds to the final round exactly if that candidate is the unique winner of that subelection, and in the TP (ties promote) subvariant, every winner of a subelection (including nonunique winners) proceeds to the final round. Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] provide a short recommendation highlighting that it makes more sense to study the TE subvariant when dealing with the unique winner model and the TP subvariant when dealing with the nonunique winner model. In this paper, since our goal is to uncover all possible collapses and separations (within the standard control types and their variants), we consider both TE and TP subvariants, regardless of the winner model.

¹By allowing names we potentially allow the names to be nefariously exploited by election systems. However, that model as to the use of names in fact makes our collapses and containments *stronger* than if those results were in a model where (candidate-)neutrality is assumed/required (the same applies to all collapses from Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20], as those results are in this same with-names model). Although use of names would make our separations weaker, we address that by having ensured that every separation we establish in this paper is achieved via a (candidate-)neutral election system. (In contrast, the one separation proven in Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] uses a system that is not (candidate-)neutral, see the discussion in our Related Work section.)

We take the following definition from [HHM20] (which itself is taking parts from earlier papers) to help us define the (constructive) control problems (in the nonunique winner model) succinctly.²

Definition 2.1 (see [HHM20]) *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system.*

1. *In the control by adding candidates problem for \mathcal{E} (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-AC-NUW), we are given two disjoint sets of candidates C and A , V a collection of votes over $C \cup A$, a candidate $p \in C$, and a nonnegative integer k . We ask if there is a set $A' \subseteq A$ such that (i) $\|A'\| \leq k$ and (ii) p is a winner of \mathcal{E} election $(C \cup A', V)$.*
2. *In the control by unlimited adding candidates problem for \mathcal{E} (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-UAC-NUW), we are given two disjoint sets of candidates C and A , V a collection of votes over $C \cup A$, and a candidate $p \in C$. We ask if there is a set $A' \subseteq A$ such that p is a winner of \mathcal{E} election $(C \cup A', V)$.³*
3. *In the control by deleting candidates problem for \mathcal{E} (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-DC-NUW), we are given an election (C, V) , a candidate $p \in C$, and a nonnegative integer k . We ask if there is a set $C' \subseteq C$ such that (i) $\|C'\| \leq k$, (ii) $p \notin C'$, and (iii) p is a winner of \mathcal{E} election $(C - C', V)$.*
4. *In the control by adding voters problem for \mathcal{E} (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-AV-NUW), we are given a set of candidates C , two collections of votes, V and W , over C , a candidate $p \in C$, and a nonnegative integer k . We ask if there is a subcollection $W' \subseteq W$ such that (i) $\|W'\| \leq k$ and (ii) p is a winner of \mathcal{E} election $(C, V \cup W')$.*
5. *In the control by deleting voters problem for \mathcal{E} (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-DV-NUW), we are given an election (C, V) , a candidate $p \in C$, and a nonnegative integer k . We ask if there is a set $V' \subseteq V$ such that (i) $\|V'\| \leq k$ and (ii) p is a winner of \mathcal{E} election $(C, V - V')$.*
6. *In the control by partition of voters problem for \mathcal{E} , in the TP or TE tie-handling rule model (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-PV-TP-NUW or \mathcal{E} -CC-PV-TE-NUW, respectively), we are given an election (C, V) , and a candidate $p \in C$. We ask if there is a partition⁴ of V into V_1 and V_2 such that p is a winner of the two-stage election where the winners of subelection (C, V_1) that survive the tie-handling rule compete (with respect to vote*

²Note: Regarding the the partition-based control types, in the following definition and elsewhere in the paper we sometimes we will speak of elections whose candidate set is C' but whose votes, due to candidate partitioning and/or first-round candidate eliminations, are over a set $C \supseteq C'$. As is standard in the literature, in such cases we always take this to mean that the votes are each masked down to just the candidates in C' .

³This control type only differs from the former in the limit imposed by k . Historically, this version was defined first, but the abovementioned one was introduced to be symmetric with the control types that follow in this definition.

⁴A partition of a multiset V is a pair of multisets V_1 and V_2 such that $V_1 \cup V_2 = V$, where \cup denotes multiset union. A partition of a set C is a pair of sets C_1 and C_2 such that $C_1 \cup C_2 = C$ and $C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset$, where \cup and \cap are standard set union and intersection.

collection V) against the winners of subelection (C, V_2) that survive the tie-handling rule. Each election (in both stages) is conducted using election system \mathcal{E} .

7. In the control by run-off partition of candidates problem for \mathcal{E} , in the TP or TE tie-handling rule model (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-RPC-TP-NUW or \mathcal{E} -CC-RPC-TE-NUW, respectively), we are given an election (C, V) , and a candidate $p \in C$. We ask if there is a partition of C into C_1 and C_2 such that p is a winner of the two-stage election where the winners of subelection (C_1, V) that survive the tie-handling rule compete (with respect to vote collection V) against the winners of subelection (C_2, V) that survive the tie-handling rule. Each election (in both stages) is conducted using election system \mathcal{E} .
8. In the control by partition of candidates problem for \mathcal{E} , in the TP or TE tie-handling rule model (denoted by \mathcal{E} -CC-PC-TP-NUW or \mathcal{E} -CC-PC-TE-NUW, respectively), we are given an election (C, V) , and a candidate $p \in C$. We ask if there is a partition of C into C_1 and C_2 such that p is a winner of the two-stage election where the winners of subelection (C_1, V) that survive the tie-handling rule compete (with respect to vote collection V) against all candidates in C_2 . Each election (in both stages) is conducted using election system \mathcal{E} .

There are 11 control “types” listed above (applied regarding generic election system \mathcal{E}). For each, we can change “is a winner” to “is an untied (i.e., unique) winner”; for those 11 variants, we change the “-NUW” into “-UW.” Thus we have 22 control types. Those 22 are all trying to make the focus candidate win. And so they are all spoken of as “constructive” control types (and so we will henceforward prefix them with that word in text—e.g., constructive control by adding candidates—and this in fact was foreshadowed by the use of “CC” as the prefix of their abbreviation strings above). Finally, for each of those now 22 control types, we can ask whether one can ensure that the focus candidate is *not* a winner or *not* a unique winner; those are known as the “destructive” control variants, and in the names of those, the CC is replaced by a DC. So DC-AC-UW would be the adding candidates control variant that has both those modifications made.

We thus have 44 total types of control, which we will view as the “standard” control types. We thus have $\binom{44}{2} = 946$ pairs of control types. Fortunately, 624 of those pairs are incompatible—the two control types have different input fields from each other⁵ and so comparing them would not even make sense—and so we will exclude them from our study. So we have “only” 322 pairs to focus on in our study. Table 2 shows the five compatibility equivalence classes that the 44 types partition into.

We often when speaking of control types will be speaking of the control model itself, and when doing so, we generally do not include the “ \mathcal{E} -” prefix. In some sense, we view,

⁵So for example CC-PC-TP-NUW and CC-RPC-TE-UW are compatible, but CC-PC-TP-NUW and CC-AV-NUW are not, since CC-AV-NUW has a nonnegative integer field k . Throughout this paper, whenever we speak of pairs of control types, we refer only to compatible pairs (even if that is not explicitly stated, although for emphasis we often do state it).

for example, CC-AC-NUW as a control type (model)—one among the 44 standard such models—and \mathcal{E} -CC-AC-NUW as the set of input strings that are “yes” instances, for election system \mathcal{E} , under that model of control.

Keeping that in mind, we now define precisely what we mean by two (compatible) control types collapsing or separating, and then introduce a function approach that will allow us to explore in a more refined way the nature of the separations. Let \mathcal{E} be an election system and let \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' be two (compatible) control types from our 44 standard ones. Then if $\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}'$ we say that the control types \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' collapse (for election system \mathcal{E}), and if $\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T} \neq \mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}'$ we say that the control types \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' separate (for election system \mathcal{E}). We will also use the terms collapse and separate for a more general case, namely, the one of quantifying universally over all election systems whose votes are linear orders. When speaking in that case, we will say that two (compatible) control types from among our 44 collapse if the two control types collapse for every election system \mathcal{E} whose vote type is linear orders, and otherwise we will say that the control types separate.

As an example, if we fix the election system \mathcal{E} to be plurality, we note that in the 3-candidate, 4-voter election example given at the beginning of this section a is a unique winner. Yet, we could make b a unique winner by deleting candidate a , hence we have $(C, V, b, 1) \in \text{Plurality-CC-DC-UW}$. Also, since a unique winner is a winner in the nonunique-winner model as well, we have $(C, V, b, 1) \in \text{Plurality-CC-DC-NUW}$. (In this paper we will not focus on encoding details, since they are not important to our study.)

Control types that separate can do so in different ways, some of which reflect containment relationships. In order to be able to seek such relationships, we define the three different ways that two (compatible) separating control types, \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , for \mathcal{E} can separate. To support this refinement, we introduce a function model. In particular, we will define functions that, for a given control type, map from inputs (that differ from the language case in *not* having a focus candidate specified) to the set of all candidates c such that if c is made the focus candidate for that input, successful control is possible. In a bit more detail: Each of our control types has certain inputs, and all include a focus candidate, c . Let us for any of our 44 control types, \mathcal{T} , refer to an input to it, except with the field containing the focus candidate removed, as the reduced form of that input; and if we wanted to add back the name of a particular candidate to be the focus candidate, we will say that is inflating the reduced input by that candidate. For any of our 44 control types, \mathcal{T} , and any election system \mathcal{E} , we define the function $f_{\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}}$ to be the function that, for a given reduced input \tilde{I} , outputs the set of all candidates c such that \tilde{I} inflated by c belongs to the set $\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}$. For example, given as input $(C, V, 3)$, the output of $f_{\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DV-NUW}}$ is the set of all candidates c that can by deleting less than or equal to three votes be prevented from being a winner.

Clearly, two (compatible) control types collapse exactly if their thus-defined functions are equal. But for two separating (compatible) control types, there are three different ways they can be separated. One way is if, for each reduced input \tilde{I} : (a) $f_{\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}) \subseteq f_{\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I})$ and (b) for some reduced input \tilde{I}' , $f_{\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}') - f_{\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I}') \neq \emptyset$. We will (in a slight abuse of notation) refer to the case where (a) holds as the “ \subseteq ” case, and the case where both (a) and (b) hold as the “ \subsetneq ” case. The “ \supseteq ” and “ \supsetneq ” cases are analogously defined. If the two

(compatible) types separate but neither the “ \subsetneq ” case nor the “ \supsetneq ” case holds, we will say the two types are incomparable: each will sometimes have successful focus candidates that the other does not. If both directions of noncontainment can be witnessed by the same reduced input, we will say the two types are strongly incomparable, i.e., there is a reduced input \tilde{I} such that $f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}) - f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I}) \neq \emptyset$ and $f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I}) - f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}) \neq \emptyset$. These notions are relative to each specific election system, \mathcal{E} .

For the general case—where our collapses are universally quantified over all election systems whose vote type is linear orders—we define three increasingly strong types of incomparability. The weakest incomparability notion is simply that for at least one such election system, \mathcal{E} , $f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}) - f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I}) \neq \emptyset$ holds, and for at least one such election system, \mathcal{E}' , $f_{\mathcal{E}'-\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I}) - f_{\mathcal{E}'-\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}) \neq \emptyset$ holds. (Note: We will state no weak incomparability results in this paper, since whenever we obtained a weak incomparability result we in fact were able to even establish incomparability.) We will call this being weakly incomparable. We will say the pair is incomparable if there is some election system, over linear orders, in which the pair is incomparable in the sense of the previous paragraph. And we will say the pair is strongly incomparable if there is some election system, over linear orders, in which the pair is strongly incomparable in the sense of the previous paragraph. For the general case, we will say “ \subseteq ” (resp., “ \supseteq ”) holds if for every election system \mathcal{E} whose vote type is linear orders, the “ \subseteq ” (resp., “ \supseteq ”) case for \mathcal{E} , as defined above, holds.

We now cover, and give brief reference labels to (though we at times may use these inheritances tacitly when the use is clear), some collapse, containment, and separation inheritances that hold. General-case collapse, \subseteq , and \supseteq results imply, for each election system over linear orders, resp., collapse, \subseteq , and \supseteq results (let us shorthand that fact as I1). If a given general case result of this type *happens* to in addition hold for every election system (not merely those over linear orders), we will refer to that as additionally being an I1⁺ case. Simply because their particular proofs do not ever draw on the vote types, the seven general-case collapses of [HHM20], and also our general containment results of Theorem 3.1, hold even as I1⁺ cases. As to separation inheritances, if for some election system \mathcal{E} over linear orders and some reduced input \tilde{I} we have that $f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}'}(\tilde{I}) - f_{\mathcal{E}-\mathcal{T}}(\tilde{I}) \neq \emptyset$ (as, crucially, is always the case if we have that for \mathcal{E} the \subsetneq relation holds between \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}') and we in addition happen to have that in the general case the \subseteq relation is known to hold between \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , then we may conclude that \subsetneq holds in our general case; the analogous claim holds for the \supsetneq case, and we will refer to either of these, when they hold, as an I2 inheritance case. Incomparability in an election system (over linear orders) implies general-case incomparability (we will refer to this as I3), and strong incomparability in an election system (over linear orders) implies general-case strong incomparability (I3*).

3 Results

In the following three subsections, for the general case and for the cases of plurality, veto, and approval voting, we completely determine which pairs of (compatible) standard control types collapse, and which separate. Beyond that, we refine every separation into one of the

three disjoint cases: \subsetneq , \supsetneq , and incomparability.

We discover a number of previously unknown collapses (for two of the three specific systems) and also for many noncollapsing control-type pairs establish containments in one direction. Regarding the former, for veto we discover a new collapsing pair (Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW = Veto-DC-PV-TE-UW) and for approval we extend a four-control type collapse by Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] to a six-control type collapse, and we find five additional collapsing pairs, for a total of 14 new collapsing control-type pairs for approval.

Overall, we establish that, for the $4 \times 322 = 1,288$ cases we study (i.e., all compatible pairs for each of the four cases), no containments or collapses exist other than those provided by either Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] or this paper.

3.1 The General Case and Plurality

We show that the only (compatible) pairs that collapse in general (i.e., that collapse for every election system) are the seven found by Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20], namely, for every election system \mathcal{E} , \mathcal{E} -DC-RPC-TE-NUW = \mathcal{E} -DC-RPC-TE-UW = \mathcal{E} -DC-PC-TE-NUW = \mathcal{E} -DC-PC-TE-UW (six pairs) and \mathcal{E} -DC-RPC-TP-NUW = \mathcal{E} -DC-PC-TP-NUW (one pair). Surprisingly, we will be able to do so using just constructions about plurality elections, combined with uses of inheritance.

In a plurality election, for each vote where a particular candidate is ranked first, that candidate receives a point, and a winner is a candidate with the highest number of points among all the candidates (naturally, there can be multiple winners). The votes in plurality elections are linear orders. Recall that by the “general case,” we mean the general case with respect to elections where the votes are linear orders. Thus to separate two control types in the general case, it certainly suffices to show that they separate under plurality, as such separations inherit back to the general case via the I3 and I2 inheritance frameworks from our preliminaries.⁶ The reason we know that no separation for the general case is missed is that our results show that plurality has not a single \subsetneq , \supsetneq , or collapse result not also possessed by the general case; so our I2 cases are valid, and every general-case \subsetneq , \supsetneq , or incomparability (or even strong incomparability) that holds is yielded by our inheritances.

Let us now turn our attention to the two new general-case containments shown in this paper (these containments are in addition to the obvious ones, noted at location (**) of Section 1, about two control types that only differ in their winner model) and also argue that both are strict in the general case (by which, recall, we mean that there is at least one election system under which the containment is not an equality). The following two containments apply to all vote types (not just linear orders; and we argue in Section 3.3 that the collapses by Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] also apply to all vote types).

⁶We note that for some cases we achieve strong incomparability in our general-case results, always via I3*. In such cases, incomparability still holds, since strong incomparability is simply a specific subcase of incomparability.

Theorem 3.1 *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system. For each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{DC-RPC-TP-UW}, \text{DC-PC-TP-UW}\}$, $\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\text{-DC-RPC-TE-NUW}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{DC-RPC-TP-UW}, \text{DC-PC-TP-UW}\}$. We will show $\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\text{-DC-RPC-TE-NUW}$. Suppose $(C, V, p) \in \mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}$. Let (C_1, C_2) be a partition that witnesses (C, V, p) 's membership in $\mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}$. It holds that either p participates in and loses in a subelection, or p participates in and does not win uniquely in the final round. If the former holds, then the partition (C_1, C_2) suffices as p will be eliminated in a subelection and thus will not proceed to the final round. If the latter holds, then let D denote the set of candidates present during the final round. Clearly $p \in D$. Thus the partition $(D, C - D)$ witnesses (C, V, p) 's membership in $\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-RPC-TE-NUW}$ since p either loses in the first subelection (D, V) or ties in that subelection and is eliminated by the tie-handling rule. \square

For both containments above, Table 5 contains a pointer to a separation witness in Table 4 that shows that the containment is not an equality in the general case (i.e., that for some election system—in fact, plurality—the containment is strict). More generally, Table 5, for each compatible pairs of control types \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , gives us an election witnessing $\text{Plurality-}\mathcal{T} - \text{Plurality-}\mathcal{T}' \neq \emptyset$ if that holds, and gives an election witnessing $\text{Plurality-}\mathcal{T}' - \text{Plurality-}\mathcal{T} \neq \emptyset$ if that holds (and if both hold Table 5 gives witnesses for each).

Some of the constructions in Table 4 are quite simple. For example, with $C = \{a, b\}$ and $V = \{a > b\}$ (denoted by “Plur.3”) we get incomparability between all 144 pairs where one type of control is constructive and the other type is destructive. This is because in that election, a can be made a unique winner under any type of constructive control and b can never be made a winner under each type of destructive control. However, showing separations for every pair that can be separated is no trivial matter. Some of our examples are quite large, with up to 32 votes and up to nine candidates. The search for those examples was computer-aided and extensive.

3.2 Veto

In a veto election, for each vote where a particular candidate is not ranked last, that candidate receives a point, and a winner is a candidate with the highest number of points among all the candidates (naturally, there can be multiple winners). For example, if $C = \{a, b, c\}$ and $V = \{a > b > c, c > a > b\}$, then b and c each receive one point, and a receives two points and wins.

Theorem 3.2 $\text{Veto-DC-PV-TE-UW} = \text{Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$.

Proof. The \supseteq relationship is immediate. The approach that follows resembles closely that of Maushagen and Rothe [MR18]. Let $(C, V, p) \in \text{Veto-DC-PV-TE-UW}$. If there is a partition such that p is not a winner of the two-stage election, then $(C, V, p) \in \text{Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$. Otherwise, there is a partition and $c \in C$, $c \neq p$, such that p and c are both winners of the two-stage election. Suppose $\|C\| = 2$. Then p and c are both winners

of the election (C, V) . In this case, consider the partition (V, \emptyset) . Both candidates will tie and be eliminated, in both subelections. Suppose $\|C\| \geq 3$. Then there are two distinct candidates $d, e \in C - \{p\}$. Let V_1 denote the set of votes in which e is vetoed and let V_2 be the remaining votes. Now, consider the two-stage election with partition (V_1, V_2) . Since e is never vetoed in V_2 , p can at best tie with e in the subelection (C, V_2) . Finally, d is never vetoed in V_1 (since all votes there veto e), so p cannot be a unique winner of (C, V_1) . Thus p is eliminated in both first-round elections. \square

Theorem 3.3 *For each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{DC-PV-TP-UW}, \text{DC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$, $\text{Veto-}\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \text{Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{DC-PV-TP-UW}, \text{DC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$. Suppose $(C, V, p) \in \text{Veto-}\mathcal{T}$, and let (V_1, V_2) be a partition that witnesses this membership. Using the same technique as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can handle the case where $\|C\| \geq 3$ and thus we only need to consider the case where $\|C\| = 2$ in this proof. Let $C = \{c, p\}$. First, suppose that p is present in the final round. Then, since p is not a unique winner of the final round, all candidates in C are present in this round. Thus p is not a unique winner of the election (C, V) , and so the partition (V, \emptyset) witnesses (C, V, p) 's membership in Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW . Now, suppose that p is absent from the final round. Then p is not a winner of (C, V_1) or (C, V_2) , and so p receives strictly more vetoes than c in both V_1 and V_2 . Thus p receives more vetoes than c in V , so again, p is not a unique winner of (C, V) . A separation witness for the strict containment can be found in Table 7. \square

Theorem 3.4 *For each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{DC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{DC-RPC-TP-UW}, \text{DC-RPC-TP-NUW}, \text{DC-PC-TP-UW}\}$, $\text{Veto-}\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \text{Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{DC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{DC-RPC-TP-UW}, \text{DC-RPC-TP-NUW}, \text{DC-PC-TP-UW}\}$. Suppose $(C, V, p) \in \text{Veto-}\mathcal{T}$, and let (C_1, C_2) be a partition that witnesses this membership. As per the two preceding proofs (namely, of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3), we need only consider the case where $\|C\| = 2$. The case where p is present in the final round is handled as in Theorem 3.3, so suppose that p is absent from the final round. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $p \in C_1$. Then p is not a unique winner of (C_1, V) , so $C_1 = C$. Thus p is not a unique winner of (C, V) , and the partition (V, \emptyset) witnesses (C, V, p) 's membership in Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW . A separation witness for the strict containment can be found in Table 7. \square

3.3 Approval Voting

Approval voting differs from the other election systems discussed so far in this paper as to its vote type. In an approval election (C, V) , each vote is a bit-vector of length $\|C\|$, with each bit being associated with a candidate. If a candidate's bit is 1, then that candidate is

approved by that vote. In approval voting, the winner set is composed of each candidate c such that no other candidate is approved by strictly more votes than c is. We will sometimes speak of the “score” of a candidate in the rest of this section. In the context of approval voting, the score of a candidate in an election is the number of votes that approve that candidate (and as noted above, the set of winners are those candidates with maximal score).

Although the collapses shown by Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20] were stated for election systems where votes are linear orders, we note that in their proof they do not use the vote type and thus those collapses hold regardless of what the type of the votes the election system is over. Thus we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.5 (see [HHM20]) *1. Approval-DC-RPC-TE-UW = Approval-DC-RPC-TE-NUW = Approval-DC-PC-TE-NUW = Approval-DC-PC-TE-UW.*

2. Approval-DC-RPC-TP-NUW = Approval-DC-PC-TP-NUW.

In this section, we prove a number of collapses and inclusions that hold for approval voting. Some of these results draw on previously established immunity⁷ arguments that draw on axioms satisfied by approval voting, thereby allowing us to generalize our results. Other results are provided by direct arguments. Our direct arguments often rely on the fact that, since the votes are bit-vectors, a candidate’s score in an election is independent of the other candidates present in the election. We will start by discussing the results that draw on the aforementioned immunity arguments.

Let us first consider the “unique” version of the weak axiom of revealed preferences (Unique-WARP), which requires that p uniquely winning in an election (C, V) implies that p uniquely wins in each election (C', V) for which $p \in C' \subseteq C$. Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR07] note that any election system that satisfies Unique-WARP is immune to several types of control, namely to (i) destructive control by partition of candidates and run-off partition of candidates (under both TP and TE tie-handling rules) in the UW model, and (ii) destructive control by deleting candidates in both the UW and the NUW models.

Theorem 3.6 *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system that satisfies Unique-WARP. Then, \mathcal{E} -DC-RPC-TP-UW = \mathcal{E} -DC-PC-TP-UW = \mathcal{E} -DC-RPC-TE-UW = \mathcal{E} -DC-PC-TE-UW.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{E} is immune to control under all of the above four types, those sets each are comprised of exactly those inputs where the focus candidate is not already a unique winner. \square

⁷In the unique-winner model, we say an election system is immune to a particular type of control if the given type of control can never change a candidate from not uniquely winning to uniquely winning (if the control type is constructive) or change a candidate from uniquely winning to not uniquely winning (if the control type is destructive) ([HHR07], which clarified a slightly flawed immunity definition of [BTT92]). In the nonunique-winner model, we say an election system is immune to a particular type of control if the given type of control can never change a nonwinner to a winner (if the control type is constructive) or change a winner to a nonwinner (if the control type is destructive).

Theorem 3.7 *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system that satisfies Unique-WARP. Then,*

1. $\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DC-UW} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DV-UW}$.
2. $\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DC-NUW} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DV-NUW}$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 3.6. Since \mathcal{E} is immune to destructive control by deleting candidates in both winner models, the inclusions are immediate as $\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DC-UW}$ is comprised of those inputs where the focus candidate is already not a unique winner and $\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DC-NUW}$ is comprised of those inputs where the focus candidate is already not a winner. \square

Corollary 3.8 *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system that satisfies Unique-WARP. Then $\mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DC-NUW} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\text{-DC-DV-UW}$.*

Theorem 3.9 *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system that satisfies Unique-WARP. Then $\mathcal{E}\text{-CC-PC-TP-UW} = \mathcal{E}\text{-CC-RPC-TP-UW}$.*

Proof. Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR07] show that any election system that satisfies Unique-WARP is immune to constructive control by run-off partition of candidates and partition of candidates under the TP tie-handling rule in the unique winner model. Thus both $\mathcal{E}\text{-CC-PC-TP-UW}$ and $\mathcal{E}\text{-CC-RPC-TP-UW}$ are comprised of exactly those inputs where the focus candidate is already a unique winner. \square

We can use the immunity results established in the proofs of Theorem 3.9 to show additional containments.

Corollary 3.10 *Let \mathcal{E} be an election system that satisfies Unique-WARP. Then, for each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{CC-PC-TE-UW}, \text{CC-PC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-UW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TE-UW}, \text{CC-PV-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-UW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$, it holds that $\mathcal{E}\text{-CC-PC-TP-UW} = \mathcal{E}\text{-CC-RPC-TP-UW} \subseteq \mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Fix a $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{CC-PC-TE-UW}, \text{CC-PC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-UW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TE-UW}, \text{CC-PV-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-UW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$ and fix $(C, V, p) \in \mathcal{E}\text{-CC-PC-TP-UW}$. Since $\mathcal{E}\text{-CC-PC-TP-UW}$ is comprised of only those inputs where p is already a unique winner of the \mathcal{E} election (C, V) , the trivial partition (i.e., (\emptyset, C) if \mathcal{T} is about partitioning candidates and (\emptyset, V) if \mathcal{T} is about partitioning votes) is a witness that $(C, V, p) \in \mathcal{E}\text{-}\mathcal{T}$ as p will win at least one subelection in which it participates (if \mathcal{T} is about partitioning votes, then p participates in two subelections) and wins uniquely (because \mathcal{E} satisfies Unique-WARP). \square

Since approval voting satisfies Unique-WARP [HHR07], the above theorems and corollaries apply to approval voting. For each case where only the containment (and not the

collapse) is shown, the containment can be made strict under approval voting. See Table 9 for the separation witnesses.

Corollary 3.11 1. $\text{Approval-DC-RPC-TP-UW} = \text{Approval-DC-PC-TP-UW} = \text{Approval-DC-RPC-TE-UW} = \text{Approval-DC-PC-TE-UW} = \text{Approval-DC-RPC-TE-NUW} = \text{Approval-DC-PC-TE-NUW}$.

2. $\text{Approval-DC-RPC-TP-NUW} = \text{Approval-DC-PC-TP-NUW}$.

3. $\text{Approval-DC-DC-UW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-DC-DV-UW}$.

4. $\text{Approval-DC-DC-NUW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-DC-DV-NUW}$.

5. $\text{Approval-DC-DC-NUW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-DC-DV-UW}$.

6. $\text{Approval-CC-PC-TP-UW} = \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TP-UW}$.

7. For each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{CC-PC-TE-UW}, \text{CC-PC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-UW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TE-UW}, \text{CC-PV-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-UW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$, it holds that $\text{Approval-CC-PC-TP-UW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-}\mathcal{T}$.

Additionally, we prove the following immunity result about approval voting in the nonunique winner model; the analogous result for the unique winner model was obtained by [HHR07].

Theorem 3.12 *Approval is immune to constructive control by partition of candidates and run-off partition of candidates under the TP tie-handling rule in the nonunique winner model.*

Proof. We first show that a winner (possibly tied) of the two-stage approval election induced by partition of candidates under the TP tie-handling rule must be a winner without any control action (i.e., in the input's election). Fix an election (C, V) and let $p \in C$ be a candidate such that $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW}$. Thus it holds that p 's score is at least as high as the score of the other candidates present in the final round. Since no candidate is eliminated by the tie-handling rule, each candidate that is eliminated in the first round has score strictly less than some candidate that is present in the final round. It follows that p 's score is at least as high as the score of every other candidate in C . Thus p is a winner of the approval election (C, V) .

Essentially the same argument line can be used to show that for each $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TP-NUW}$, it holds that p is a winner of approval election (C, V) . \square

Theorem 3.13 $\text{Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW} = \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TP-NUW}$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.12, it holds that approval is immune to constructive control by partition of candidates and run-off partition of candidates under the TP tie-handling rule in the nonunique winner model. Thus Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW and Approval-CC-RPC-TP-NUW are comprised of exactly those inputs where the focus candidate is already a nonunique winner. \square

Corollary 3.14 *For each $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{CC-PC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$, it holds that $\text{Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-}\mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Fix $\mathcal{T} \in \{\text{CC-PC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-RPC-TE-NUW}, \text{CC-PV-TP-NUW}\}$ and fix $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW}$. By the proof of Theorem 3.12, we know that Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW is comprised of only those inputs where p is already a nonunique winner of the approval election (C, V) . In the first case, where \mathcal{T} is about partitioning candidates, then the partition $(\{p\}, C - \{p\})$ is a witness that $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-}\mathcal{T}$ as p will uniquely win the subelection it participates in and proceed to the final round. Regardless of which candidates proceed to the final round from the other subelection, they will not have score greater than p 's (or they would have defeated p in the (C, V) election) and so p is a winner of the two-stage election. In the second case, where \mathcal{T} is about partitioning votes (i.e., $\mathcal{T} = \text{CC-PV-TP-NUW}$), then the partition (\emptyset, V) suffices as everyone proceeds to the final round (because all the candidates tie in the subelection (C, \emptyset) and the tie-handling rule does not eliminate candidates) and since p is already a winner of the approval election (C, V) , they are a winner of the final round. The corresponding separation witness can be found in Table 9. \square

Finally, we provide direct arguments that yield additional collapses and containments.

Theorem 3.15 $\text{Approval-DC-PV-TE-UW} = \text{Approval-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$.

Proof. The \supseteq relationship is immediate.

\subseteq : Let $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-DC-PV-TE-UW}$ and let (V_1, V_2) be a vote partition that witnesses this membership. As the tie-handling rule is the TE rule, it must hold (since if p uniquely won both subelections it necessarily would uniquely win the second-round election) that either p is eliminated in both subelections (either by tying or by losing) or p uniquely wins one subelection, some other candidate d uniquely wins the other subelection, and p does not uniquely win the final round (thus d 's score must be at least as large as p 's score when using vote set V). This also tells us that $\|C\| \geq 2$. In the first case, the partition (V_1, V_2) witnesses $(C, V, p) \in \text{DC-PV-TE-NUW}$ since p will not proceed to the final round. In the second case, using the partition (V, \emptyset) suffices for the following reasons. In the subelection (C, V) , since d 's score is at least as large as that of p , either d uniquely wins the subelection or both p and d tie and are eliminated by the tie-handling rule. In the subelection (C, \emptyset) every candidate ties and so all candidates are eliminated by the tie-handling rule (since $\|C\| \geq 2$). Thus p is eliminated in both subelections, does not proceed to the final round, and so is not a final-round winner. \square

Theorem 3.16 Approval-CC-PC-TE-NUW = Approval-CC-RPC-TE-NUW.

Proof. The approach we take is a bit more tedious than would be needed to just prove Theorem 3.16, as we have structured the proof to also establish Corollary 3.17.

\subseteq : Let $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-PC-TE-NUW}$ and let (C_1, C_2) be a candidate partition that witnesses this membership. Consider the case where p uniquely wins the final round. If $p \in C_1$, then p uniquely wins (C_1, V) and in the final round defeats all candidates in C_2 . If $p \in C_2$, then in the final round p defeats the candidate (if any) that survives the TE tie-handling rule regarding the subelection (C_1, V) as well as all the candidates in $C_2 - \{p\}$. Regardless of which case holds, the partition (C_1, C_2) will witness $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TE-NUW}$ since p will uniquely win its subelection and then will defeat any candidate that moves forward from the other subelection. If p does not uniquely win the final round, then there is at least one other candidate that ties with p in the final round. If $p \in C_1$, then p must uniquely win in (C_1, V) and as (since (C_1, C_2) witnesses $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-PC-TE-NUW}$) no candidate in C_2 can have a score greater than p 's, the partition (C_1, C_2) suffices to witness $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TE-NUW}$. If $p \in C_2$, then under partition (C_1, C_2) p could first-round tie with a candidate and be eliminated (under run-off partition of candidates due to the TE rule). However, let T denote the (possibly empty) set of candidates (other than p) that tie with p in (C_2, V) . Then the partition $(C_1 \cup T, C_2 - T)$ witnesses $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TE-NUW}$, since p will uniquely win $(C_2 - T, V)$ and will either tie or defeat the winner (if any) of $(C_1 \cup T, V)$.

\supseteq : Let $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-RPC-TE-NUW}$ and let (C_1, C_2) be a candidate partition that witnesses this membership. Without loss of generality, assume that $p \in C_1$. Thus it holds that p uniquely wins (C_1, V) . If p uniquely wins the final round, then p also defeats the candidate (if any) that moves forward from (C_2, V) . Thus the partition (C_2, C_1) will also witness $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-PC-TE-NUW}$ (since p has strictly more approvals than any candidate other than itself). If p does not uniquely win the final round, then there is another candidate d , who is the unique winner of (C_2, V) and ties with p in the final round. Again the partition (C_2, C_1) suffices to witness $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-CC-PC-TE-NUW}$ since d proceeds to the final round and both p and d win there due to their numbers of approvals. \square

Corollary (to the Proof) 3.17 Approval-CC-PC-TE-UW = Approval-CC-RPC-TE-UW.

Proof. This is an immediate corollary to the above proof of Theorem 3.16, as the proof was intentionally structured to ensure that if the witness of one type made p a unique winner of the final round, then the constructed-above (sometimes different) partition for the other type also made p a unique winner of the final round under that other type of control. \square

We can additionally show the following three containments. Theorem 3.19 and Corollary 3.20 are surprising, since they are about partitioning different components of elections.

Theorem 3.18 Approval-DC-PV-TP-UW \subsetneq Approval-DC-PV-TE-NUW.

Proof. The proof is similar in flavor to that of Theorem 3.15. Let $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-DC-PV-TP-UW}$ and let (V_1, V_2) be a vote partition that witnesses this membership. If p is not a unique winner, then either p loses in both subelections or p wins in exactly one subelection (if p won both subelections it would also have won the final election) and there is another candidate d that also is a winner of a subelection such that d 's score is at least p 's score and d is a winner of the final round (thereby implying $\|C\| \geq 2$). In the first case, the partition (V_1, V_2) suffices to witness $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$ since p loses in both subelections. In the second case, the partition (V, \emptyset) witnesses $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$ as p will not proceed to the final round: p does not uniquely win subelection (C, V) (and thus ties with someone and is eliminated) and no one moves forward from subelection (C, \emptyset) (everyone ties and is eliminated). This shows the containment. The separation witness for the strict containment can be found in Table 9. \square

Theorem 3.19 $\text{Approval-DC-RPC-TE-NUW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-DC-PV-TP-UW}$.

Proof. Let $(C, V, p) \in \text{Approval-DC-RPC-TE-NUW}$ and let (C_1, C_2) be a candidate partition that witnesses this membership. Then, with respect to that partition, p is eliminated either in its subelection (either by tying or by losing) or in the final round. In both cases, this must happen because there is another candidate d such that p 's score is at most d 's score (using vote set V). By using the partition (\emptyset, V) , we know that every candidate will proceed to the final round (everyone ties in (C, \emptyset) and proceeds to the final round) and in that final round, either d will tie p or d will defeat p . In either case, p is not a unique winner. This shows the containment. The separation witness for the strict containment can be found in Table 9. \square

As an immediate corollary to Theorems 3.18 and 3.19, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.20 $\text{Approval-DC-RPC-TE-NUW} \subsetneq \text{Approval-DC-PV-TE-NUW}$.

4 Related Work

Electoral control attacks were introduced and studied by Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick in a tremendously influential 1992 paper [BTT92]. They defined a set of attacks based on adding/deleting/partitioning candidates and voters, and those attacks have been studied ever since.

Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick studied only the goal of making a particular focus candidate be an untied winner of the election (i.e., constructive control in the unique winner model). Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR07] introduced “destructive control” versions of each constructive control type: The goal is to prevent (via the given control action) the focus candidate from becoming a unique winner. Later papers often additionally, or only, used the nonunique-winner model, in which the goal is to make the focus candidate

be (or, for the destructive case, not be) a winner. As far as we know, the first example of this was a study of Llull and Copeland elections by Faliszewski et al. [FHHR07, FHHR09] that studied both winner models, and Hemaspaandra, Lavaee, and Menton [HLM16] (see also [HHM20, Footnote 5]) argue that the nonunique-winner model is a better model to study than the unique-winner model.

Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR07] clarified the ways of handling ties in the first-round elections of the (two-round) “partition” control types of Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick, naming the two approaches “ties promote” and “ties eliminate;” they did this because although tie-handling had previously been suggested as being unimportant, their paper establishes that, for example, for plurality the choice between those two rules spells the difference between being NP-complete and belonging to P. The “adding candidates” control attack of Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick was anomalously defined, and Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR09] kept the original notion but renamed it “unlimited adding of candidates,” and introduced, under the thus-available name “adding candidates,” the version that is analogous to the other Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick add/delete types, and the subsequent papers have followed that notational shift.

Altogether, the Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick control attack set, under the above clarifications and enrichments, yields a set of eleven constructive control attacks and eleven destructive control attacks. As mentioned earlier, this in some sense forms a “standard” benchmark set of attacks (though some papers use subsets of that collection, and other papers have taken control in additional directions, e.g., resolute control [YW17, GRSZ22]). For example, the excellent survey chapter [FR16] on control and bribery, by Faliszewski and Rothe, uses precisely those 22 control attacks, as does the recent paper on search versus decision of Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20]. Since the field has not yet resolved whether nonunique-winner or unique-winner is the right standard—indeed, the two just-cited sources make different choices—and because discovering cases when a control type in one of those models turns out to be identical to a control type in the other is itself interesting, in this paper we covered both models, and thus $2 \times (11 + 11) = 44$ control types.

Of the $\binom{44}{2} = 946$ pairs (322 of them compatible) of those control types, seven were proven to collapse in Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Menton [HHM20]. That is the paper that most strongly inspired the present paper. It also separates one pair: DC-RPC-TP-UW and DC-PC-TP-UW. However, it does so using an election system that is not (candidate)-neutral. In our present paper, regarding that separation and all separations, we obtain all of them directly in or by inheritance from systems that are (candidate)-neutral.

The additional, different control types known as resolute control [YW17, GRSZ22] are quite interesting. Resolute control asks whether there is some action (from a certain range of actions) that keeps every one of a certain collection of candidates from being a winner. This might seem to be the same as our function model for the case of (nonunique-winner) destructive control, but it is not. In our function model for nonunique-winner destructive control, we are speaking of the collection of candidates who can individually be prevented from winning by some control action. But even if two or more candidates belong to our function’s output, they could be put into that output by different control actions, and

there might be no single action that blocks both simultaneously. In brief, resolute control is focused on blocking whole groups, and our function model in contrast is a refinement of set separations and focuses on individual candidates to let us identify new containment patterns between control types.

Collapsing or separating control types is not *directly* about complexity. However, doing so is highly relevant to complexity, as the types were defined as natural benchmarks whose complexity could be studied. In fact, there has been something of a race to find natural systems in which very many control attacks are NP-hard to carry out.⁸ Among the many systems that have done well or very well in that race are, along with some of the key papers that analyzed the complexity of each, Schulze elections [PX12,MS13], ranked-pair elections [PX12], SP-AV elections [ENR09], normalized range voting [Men13], fallback elections [ER10,EPR11] (see also [EFRS15]), and Bucklin elections [EPR11] (see also [EFRS15]). Faliszewski and Rothe [FR16, Table 7.3] provide a lovely table, for the 22 unique-winner control cases, of what is known for twelve voting systems. Regarding the three important systems we spotlight in the present paper, plurality’s control was explored by Bartholdi, Tovey, and Trick [BTT92] and Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra, and Rothe [HHR07], veto has been studied by Lin [Lin12] and Maushagen and Rothe [MR18] (see also [ERY19, Table 1]), and approval has been studied by [HHR07] (see also [BEH⁺10]).

5 Conclusions and Open Problems

Table 1 summarizes our results. We established that in the general (universally quantified) case there are no collapsing pairs (by which we always mean among the standard 44 control types) other than the seven collapsing pairs identified by Hemaspaandra, Hemaspaandra,

⁸We mention in passing that, as mentioned earlier, a benefit of collapsing compatible types (especially when we do so in the general case) is that doing so automatically establishes that the control complexity of the types is the same, rather than having to separately determine the control complexity of each of the types. This can save work.

Regarding the “race” to find systems that are resistant to a large number of control types, one might ask whether it still is fair to count it as multiple strengths if the elements of collapsing pairs (or larger equivalence classes) are resistant (and so NP-hard), or to count it as multiple weaknesses if the the elements of collapsing pairs (or larger equivalence classes) are vulnerable (and thus in P). In some sense, one could argue that this is unfair, as it is putting extra weight on the “same” type.

However, one could also argue that having a collapsing control type foursome count as four is fair and natural, since the actual mechanisms of the four are different, and so one either is fighting off attacks through NP-completeness, or is vulnerable to multiple attack lines.

In any case, if one focuses solely on number of resistances, one is implicitly saying that all control types are equally important, and we do not think that saying that is correct. Rather, what is most important is that the field knows, for the full palette of control types, which ones are resistant and which ones are vulnerable with respect to a given election system. That will allow the people choosing which election system to use in a given setting to choose an election system that is resistant to as many as possible of the attacks that they expect are the most likely within the setting. And for that, there is no doubt that avoiding duplicate work through exploiting collapses is helpful.

Finally, we mention that merging collapsed types on each system’s “score card” would be problematic, since different elections have different collapses, and so different election systems’ score cards would not even have the same number of entries.

Table 1: Summary of separations and collapses. **Blue** indicates results due to or inherited from [HHM20]. **Red** indicates results due to the present paper. The general-case line shows when collapses occur for all election systems over linear orders.

Election System	Set Classification			Subclassification of Separations		
	Separations	Collapses	Open	“ \subsetneq ”/“ \supsetneq ”	Incomparable	Open
General Case	1 + 314 = 315 [†]	7	0	38	287	0
Plurality	315	7	0	38	287	0
Veto	314	7 + 1 = 8	0	58	256	0
Approval Voting	301	7 + 14 = 21	0	88	213	0

[†] Or **0** + **315** for the pure social choice approach to candidate names (see Footnote 1 and the discussion in the Related Work section).

and Menton [HHM20], and that plurality has no collapsing pairs beyond those seven. For veto and approval voting we discovered additional collapsing pairs beyond those inherited seven, but we also established that veto and approval voting, after our work, have no remaining undiscovered collapsing pairs.

Our work helps clarify the landscape of which control pairs do or do not collapse, both in the general (universally quantified) case, and for plurality, veto, and approval voting.

We also refined all our separations, and in doing so uncovered containment relationships—even some surprising ones that do not follow from the relationship between the nonunique-winner model and the unique-winner model.

A number of interesting open directions are suggested by our work. One is, for important concrete election systems other than plurality, veto, and approval voting, to completely classify the collapses and separations that hold for those specific systems. Another direction—building on the results of Section 3.3—is to find sufficient conditions (or, better still, necessary-and-sufficient conditions) for many control-pair collapses in terms of axiomatic properties of election systems. Though our goal for separations was to subclassify each separation into exactly one of the three cases “ \subsetneq ”, “ \supsetneq ”, or incomparability, in our tables we have also noted those cases where our constructions establish strong incomparability; one could for the cases where we list incomparability try to establish strong incomparability. An additional open direction is to see whether already-studied control types beyond the 44 investigated here collapse with each other or with some of the 44, either in general or for important concrete election systems.

Finally, control types are defined as sets. When a pair of control types collapses, those sets are equal and thus certainly are of the same complexity. However, it would be interesting to see whether for collapsing control types, their complexities as *search* problems are or are not polynomially related. Our in-progress work in that direction is in preparation and should appear soon.

References

- [BEH⁺10] D. Baumeister, G. Erdélyi, E. Hemaspaandra, L. Hemaspaandra, and J. Rothe. Computational aspects of approval voting. In J. Laslier and M. Sanver, editors, *Handbook on Approval Voting*, pages 199–251. Springer, 2010.
- [BTT89a] J. Bartholdi, III, C. Tovey, and M. Trick. The computational difficulty of manipulating an election. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 6(3):227–241, 1989.
- [BTT89b] J. Bartholdi, III, C. Tovey, and M. Trick. Voting schemes for which it can be difficult to tell who won the election. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 6(2):157–165, 1989.
- [BTT92] J. Bartholdi, III, C. Tovey, and M. Trick. How hard is it to control an election? *Mathematical and Computer Modeling*, 16(8–9):27–40, 1992.
- [EFRS15] G. Erdélyi, M. Fellows, J. Rothe, and L. Schend. Control complexity in Bucklin and fallback voting: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 81(4):632–660, 2015.
- [ENR09] G. Erdélyi, M. Nowak, and J. Rothe. Sincere-strategy preference-based approval voting fully resists constructive control and broadly resists destructive control. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 55(4):425–443, 2009.
- [EPR11] G. Erdélyi, L. Piras, and J. Rothe. The complexity of voter partition in Bucklin and fallback voting: Solving three open problems. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 837–844. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, May 2011.
- [ER10] G. Erdélyi and J. Rothe. Control complexity in fallback voting. In *Proceedings the 16th Australasian Theory Symposium*, pages 39–48. Australian Computer Society, January 2010.
- [ERY19] G. Erdélyi, C. Reger, and Y. Yang. Towards completing the puzzle: Solving open problems for control in elections. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 846–854. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2019.
- [FHHR07] P. Faliszewski, E. Hemaspaandra, L. Hemaspaandra, and J. Rothe. Llull and Copeland voting broadly resist bribery and control. In *Proceedings of the 22nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 724–730. AAAI Press, July 2007.
- [FHHR09] P. Faliszewski, E. Hemaspaandra, L. Hemaspaandra, and J. Rothe. Llull and Copeland voting computationally resist bribery and constructive control. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 35:275–341, 2009.

- [FR16] P. Faliszewski and J. Rothe. Control and bribery in voting. In F. Brandt, V. Conitzer, U. Endriss, J. Lang, and A. Procaccia, editors, *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, pages 146–168. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [GRSZ22] S. Gupta, S. Roy, S. Saurabh, and M. Zehavi. Resolute control: Forbidding candidates from winning an election is hard. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 915:74–89, 2022.
- [HHM20] E. Hemaspaandra, L. Hemaspaandra, and C. Menton. Search versus decision for election manipulation problems. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory*, 12(#1, Article 3):1–42, 2020.
- [HHR07] E. Hemaspaandra, L. Hemaspaandra, and J. Rothe. Anyone but him: The complexity of precluding an alternative. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(5–6):255–285, 2007.
- [HHR09] E. Hemaspaandra, L. Hemaspaandra, and J. Rothe. Hybrid elections broaden complexity-theoretic resistance to control. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 55(4):397–424, 2009.
- [HLM16] L. Hemaspaandra, R. Lavaee, and C. Menton. Schulze and ranked-pairs voting are fixed-parameter tractable to bribe, manipulate, and control. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 77(3–4):191–223, 2016.
- [Lin12] A. Lin. *Solving Hard Problems in Election Systems*. PhD thesis, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY, 2012.
- [Men13] C. Menton. Normalized range voting broadly resists control. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 53(4):507–531, 2013.
- [MR18] C. Maushagen and J. Rothe. Complexity of control by partitioning veto elections and of control by adding candidates to plurality elections. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 82(4):219–244, 2018.
- [MS13] C. Menton and P. Singh. Control complexity of Schulze voting. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 286–292. AAAI Press, August 2013.
- [PX12] D. Parkes and L. Xia. A complexity-of-strategic-behavior comparison between Schulze’s rule and ranked pairs. In *Proceedings of the 26th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1429–1435. AAAI Press, August 2012.
- [YW17] Y. Yang and J. Wang. Anyone But Them: The Complexity Challenge for A Resolute Election Controller. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 1133–1141, May 2017.

A Compatible Control Types

Table 2 shows how the 44 standard control types partition into five compatibility equivalence classes. Every other (distinct) pair among the 44 is not a compatible pair.

Table 2: The 44 types of control and a description of which components are part of the input for each one. The input type thus partitions the control types into five equivalence classes as to compatibility of inputs.

Control Type	Candidates	Votes	Focus Candidate	Spoiler Candidates	Spoiler Votes	Limit (Natural Number)
CC-PV-TE-UW CC-PV-TE-NUW CC-PV-TP-UW CC-PV-TP-NUW CC-PC-TE-UW CC-PC-TE-NUW CC-PC-TP-UW CC-PC-TP-NUW CC-RPC-TE-UW CC-RPC-TE-NUW CC-RPC-TP-UW CC-RPC-TP-NUW DC-PV-TE-UW DC-PV-TE-NUW DC-PV-TP-UW DC-PV-TP-NUW DC-PC-TE-UW DC-PC-TE-NUW DC-PC-TP-UW DC-PC-TP-NUW DC-RPC-TE-UW DC-RPC-TE-NUW DC-RPC-TP-UW DC-RPC-TP-NUW	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
CC-AC-UW CC-AC-NUW DC-AC-UW DC-AC-NUW	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
CC-DC-UW CC-DC-NUW CC-DV-UW CC-DV-NUW DC-DC-UW DC-DC-NUW DC-DV-UW DC-DV-NUW	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
CC-AV-UW CC-AV-NUW DC-AV-UW DC-AV-NUW	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
CC-UAC-UW CC-UAC-NUW DC-UAC-UW DC-UAC-NUW	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

B Tables

Tables 4, 6, and 8 list each of the elections (identified by a candidate set C and a vote set V) used to show separations and incomparability. Each line of these tables also has some columns that may have no entries (denoted by “-”). These columns are S (to denote additional candidates when the control type is about adding candidates), U (to denote additional votes when the control type is about adding votes), and k (to denote the limit imposed on a particular control, e.g., limited adding of candidates, or deleting candidates/voters).

We assign an ID to each election and use those IDs from Tables 4, 6, and 8 in Tables 5, 7, and 9 to identify which tool is a separation witness. The obvious containments (that are about UW and NUW variants of the same control type, see location (**)) in Section 1) are implicit in this table and thus we do not explicitly mark when they are used.

Additionally, we color code Tables 5, 7, and 9 in a specific manner: The entries that have the same (nonwhite) background color form an equivalence class. Each entry that is not colored (i.e., that has a white background) is an equivalence class of size one, and we will not color such entries. Table 3 provides a summary of the equivalence classes and their corresponding colors.

Each boldfaced entry indicates the canonical element of its equivalence class. Those are also indicated in Tables 5, 7, and 9. Having canonical elements helped make the proof process more economical. If we separate \mathcal{T} from \mathcal{T}' , we implicitly have separated \mathcal{T} from all members of the equivalence class of \mathcal{T}' , and in the proof process we focused on separations regarding only two canonical elements (where we view each singleton type as a stand-alone canonical element of its size-one equivalence class, though we don't boldface those).

Table 3: Equivalence classes and their respective colors. Each boldfaced entry indicates the canonical element of its equivalence class.

Class	Color
Plurality-DC-RPC-TE-NUW , Plurality-DC-RPC-TE-UW, Plurality-DC-PC-TE-UW, Plurality-DC-PC-TE-NUW	
Plurality-DC-RPC-TP-NUW , Plurality-DC-PC-TP-NUW	
Veto-DC-RPC-TE-NUW , Veto-DC-RPC-TE-UW, Veto-DC-PC-TE-UW, Veto-DC-PC-TE-NUW	
Veto-DC-RPC-TP-NUW , Veto-DC-PC-TP-NUW	
Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW , Veto-DC-PV-TE-NUW	
Approval-DC-PV-TE-NUW , Approval-DC-PV-TE-UW	
Approval-DC-RPC-TE-NUW , Approval-DC-RPC-TE-UW, Approval-DC-PC-TE-UW, Approval-DC-PC-TE-NUW, Approval-DC-RPC-TP-UW, Approval-DC-PC-TP-UW	
Approval-DC-RPC-TP-NUW , Approval-DC-PC-TP-NUW	
Approval-CC-RPC-TP-UW , Approval-CC-PC-TP-UW	
Approval-CC-RPC-TP-NUW , Approval-CC-PC-TP-NUW	
Approval-CC-RPC-TE-UW , Approval-CC-PC-TE-UW	
Approval-CC-RPC-TP-NUW , Approval-CC-PC-TE-NUW	

Table 4: List of separation witnesses in plurality.

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Plur.1	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, b > a > c, c > a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.2	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b, b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.3	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.4	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, c > a > b, c > a > b, c > a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.5		-		-	-
Plur.6	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > c > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.7	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, c > d > a > b, d > b > a > c\}$	-	-
Plur.8	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.9	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, a > b > c > d, a > b > c > d, b > c > d, b > a > c > d, c > b > a > d, d > b > a > c\}$	-	-
Plur.10	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, b > a > c, c > a > b\}$	-	-

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Plur.11	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{c > b > a > d > e, c > d > e > a > b, a > d > b > c > e, c > d > b > e > a, c > b > e > d > a, d > e > b > c > a, d > b > e > c > a, a > b > d > e > c, e > c > b > d > a, c > a > b > d > e, b > e > a > c > d, a > d > b > e > c, d > a > c > e > b, a > b > c > e > d, c > d > e > b > a, e > d > c > a > b, e > d > a > b > c\}$	-	-
Plur.12	$\{a\}$	-	$\{a\}$	-	-
Plur.13	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b, b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.14	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b, a > c, b > a, c > a\}$	-	-
Plur.15	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, b > a > c, c > a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.16	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > c > b, b > c > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.17	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b, a > c, b > c, b > c, b > c, c > b, c > b, c > b\}$	-	-
Plur.18	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > c > b, b > a > c, b > c > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.19	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > c > b, b > a > c, b > c > a, c > a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.20	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > c > b, b > a > c, b > c > a, c > a > b, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.21	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, b > c > a, b > c > a, c > b > a, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.22	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b, a > b, a > b, b, c > b, d > b\}$	-	-
Plur.23	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > c, b > a, b > a, c > b, d > c > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.24	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, a > b > c > d, b > c > a > d, b > c > a > d, c > d > b > a\}$	-	-
Plur.25	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, b > c > d, c > b > d, d > a > c, d > b > c, d > b > c\}$	-	-
Plur.26	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.27	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, b > a > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, c > b > a, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Plur.28	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > a > d > c, b > a > d > c, b > a > d > c, b > a > d > c, b > a > d > c, c > a > b > d, c > a > b > d, c > a > b > d, c > a > b > d, d > a > b > c, d > a > b > c\}$	-	-
Plur.29	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b, b > a, b > a, c > a, c > a, c > a, c > a\}$	-	-
Plur.30	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{b > c > d > a > e, c > b > a > e > d, d > e > a > b > c, d > e > a > b > c, e > c > d > a > b, e > d > c > a > b, d > b > a > e > c, d > a > b > c > e, e > b > c > d > a, e > b > a > c > d, e > a > c > d > b\}$	-	-
Plur.31	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{c > e > a > b > d, a > b > e > c > d, c > a > d > e > b, b > c > a > e > d, e > d > b > a > c, d > c > a > e > b, e > c > b > a > d, e > c > d > b > a, e > c > a > d > b\}$	-	-
Plur.32	$\{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$	-	$\{b > e > c > d > a > f, f > e > a > b > c > d, b > d > f > c > a > e, d > c > e > b > f > a, d > e > b > a > f > c, b > f > e > c > a > d, a > c > e > f > d > b, b > d > c > e > a > f, c > f > d > e > b > a, d > e > f > c > b > a, b > f > d > c > e > a\}$	-	-
Plur.33	$\{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$	-	$\{d > a > c > f > b > e, d > c > e > f > a > b, a > f > b > c > e > d, b > f > c > e > d > a, b > c > d > f > a > e, b > a > c > e > f > d, b > a > e > c > f > d, e > f > b > d > c > a, d > a > f > b > e > c, e > f > a > d > c > b, b > e > d > c > f > a\}$	-	-
Plur.34	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{d > c > a > b > e, e > b > c > d > a, a > c > d > e > b, a > b > c > e > d, d > a > b > e > c, a > c > e > d > b, d > e > a > b > c, d > c > a > b > e\}$	-	-

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Plur.35	$\{a, b, c, d, e, f\}$	-	$\{f > b > e > a > c > d, f > d > c > e > b > a, c > a > e > f > d > b, e > b > a > f > c > d, e > c > a > d > b > f, a > e > f > b > d > c, b > e > f > d > c > a, f > e > b > a > d > c, d > a > f > e > c > b, f > b > e > c > d > a\}$	-	-
Plur.36	$\{a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h\}$	-	$\{e > c > b > g > h > f > a > d, d > h > b > g > f > e > c > a, c > d > h > b > g > a > e > f, d > e > a > c > h > g > f > b, d > a > h > f > b > c > g > e, h > a > d > g > e > b > f > c, f > c > g > e > a > h > b > d, g > e > h > c > b > d > a > f, a > d > g > b > h > f > e > c\}$	-	-
Plur.37	$\{a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h\}$	-	$\{f > c > e > h > d > g > b > a, g > b > a > f > h > d > c > e, g > e > a > c > d > h > b > f, a > h > c > d > e > f > b > g, e > f > h > c > d > a > g > b, h > d > c > b > g > f > a > e, g > e > d > b > h > f > c > a, g > e > d > a > b > f > h > c, a > c > g > b > e > f > d > h\}$	-	-
Plur.38	$\{a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h\}$	-	$\{h > d > a > g > e > b > f > c, b > f > h > c > a > e > d > g, b > d > a > h > e > g > c > f, b > f > h > g > d > e > c > a, f > e > a > g > b > d > h > c, h > b > f > a > d > g > c > e, e > g > a > h > b > c > f > d, a > g > h > c > f > d > e > b, b > c > e > h > d > g > f > a\}$	-	-
Plur.39	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{c > b > a\}$	-	1
Plur.40	$\{a, b\}$		$\{a > b\}$	$\{a > b\}$	1
Plur.41	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{a > c > b\}$	-	1
Plur.42	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b, a > b\}$	-	0
Plur.43	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{b > c > d > a, b > c > d > a, a > b > c > d\}$	-	2
Plur.44	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{b > c > d > a, b > c > d > a, a > b > c > d\}$	-	2

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Plur.61	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{b > c > a > d > e, b > c > a > d >$ $e, b > c > a > d > e, b > c > a >$ $d > e, c > b > a > d > e, c > b >$ $a > d > e, c > b > a > d > e, c >$ $b > a > d > e, a > b > c > d >$ $e, a > b > c > d > e, a > b > c >$ $d > e, a > b > c > d > e, a > b >$ $c > d > e, d > a > b > c > e, d >$ $a > b > c > e, d > a > b > c >$ $e, d > a > b > c > e, d > a > b >$ $c > e, e > a > b > c > d, e > a >$ $b > c > d, e > a > b > c > d, e >$ $a > b > c > d, e > a > b > c > d\}$	-	-
Plur.62	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{d > a > c > b, a > d > c > b, c >$ $b > a > d, d > a > c > b, b > d >$ $a > c, a > c > d > b, b > c > d > a\}$	-	-
Plur.63	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{a > b > d > c > e, a > d > b > c >$ $e, b > a > d > c > e, b > a > d >$ $e > c, b > a > e > d > c, b > a >$ $e > d > c, b > c > a > e > d, b >$ $d > a > e > c, b > d > c > a >$ $e, b > e > c > d > a, c > a > b >$ $d > e, c > a > b > e > d, c > a >$ $b > e > d, c > b > e > d > a, c >$ $e > a > d > b, c > e > b > d >$ $a, d > a > b > c > e, d > a > c >$ $e > b, d > a > e > b > c, d > a >$ $e > c > b, d > b > a > c > e, d >$ $b > c > a > e, d > e > a > c >$ $b, d > e > a > c > b, d > e > b >$ $c > a, e > a > b > c > d, e > a >$ $b > c > d, e > b > d > a > c, e >$ $d > c > a > b\}$	-	-

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Plur.64	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{a > b > d > c > e, a > b > e > c >$ $d, a > d > b > c > e, a > e > c >$ $b > d, a > e > c > b > d, a > e >$ $c > d > b, b > a > c > d > e, b >$ $a > c > e > d, b > c > a > e >$ $d, b > c > a > e > d, b > c > d >$ $e > a, b > d > c > e > a, c > a >$ $b > e > d, c > a > e > b > d, c >$ $b > a > e > d, c > b > e > a >$ $d, c > d > a > b > e, c > d > e >$ $a > b, c > d > e > b > a, c > d >$ $e > b > a, c > e > a > b > d, d >$ $a > e > b > c, d > b > c > a >$ $e, d > b > e > a > c, d > c > b >$ $e > a, d > e > a > c > b, e > a >$ $d > c > b, e > c > a > d > b, e >$ $c > b > d > a, e > c > d > b >$ $a, e > d > b > a > c, e > d > c >$ $a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.65	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > d > c, b > d > c > a, c >$ $a > b > d, d > b > a > c, d > c >$ $a > b\}$	-	-
Plur.66	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{a > c > b > e > d, a > c > e > b >$ $d, a > e > b > d > c, a > e > c >$ $d > b, b > d > a > c > e, b > d >$ $a > e > c, c > a > b > e > d, d >$ $a > b > e > c, d > e > b > c >$ $a, e > d > b > a > c\}$	-	-
Plur.67	$\{a, b, c, d, e\}$	-	$\{a > c > e > d > b, a > e > c > d >$ $b, b > a > c > e > d, b > e > a >$ $c > d, c > d > a > b > e, c > d >$ $e > a > b, d > a > b > e > c, d >$ $a > c > e > b, d > b > e > c >$ $a, d > e > c > b > a, e > a > d >$ $c > b\}$	-	-
Plur.68	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b, a > b, a > c, a > c, b > a, b >$ $a, b > a, c > a, c > a, c > a\}$	-	-

Table 5: Table of separations and collapses (here denoted by EQ) in plurality voting. The Classification column partitions each separation into one of the three cases, \subsetneq , \supsetneq , and INCOMP. (For cases of INCOMP for which we happen to have established that the separation holds with strong incomparability, we have noted that with a “*” superscript.)

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.2
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.1 + Plur.66
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.59
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.1 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.1 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.67
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.17 + Plur.65
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.24
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.15 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.15 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.18 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.28
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.28

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.23 + Plur.27
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.2
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.61
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.57
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.25 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.60
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.57
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.61
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.58
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.60
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.18 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.60
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.6 + Plur.58
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.13
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.21 + Plur.61
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.7 + Plur.60
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.57
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.6 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.60
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.8 + Plur.63
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.2
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.20 + Plur.61
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.2 + Plur.57
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.62
CC-PC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.6 + Plur.64
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.13
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Plur.26
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	\supseteq	Plur.9
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.14 + Plur.36
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.36
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.10 + Plur.31 + [HHM20](?)
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.10 + Plur.31
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.19 + Plur.38
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.37
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.10 + Plur.31 + [HHM20](?)
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.10 + Plur.31 + [HHM20](?)
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.16 + Plur.38
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.37 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.22 + Plur.10
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.35
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.22 + Plur.10
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.22 + Plur.10
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.19 + Plur.38
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.32
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.22 + Plur.10
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.22 + Plur.10
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.22 + Plur.10
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.32 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	\supseteq	Plur.13
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.68 + Plur.30 + [HHM20]

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.68 + Plur.30
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.16 + Plur.34
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.33
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.68 + Plur.30 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.68 + Plur.30 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.16 + Plur.34
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.33 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.68
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.68 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.68
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.18 + Plur.68
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.68 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.68 + [HHM20]
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.13 + Plur.68
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.18 + Plur.68 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16 + From proof of Theorem 3.1 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16 + [HHM20] + From proof of Theorem 3.1
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Plur.19 + Plur.11
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + [HHM20]
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.16 + From proof of Theorem 3.1 + [HHM20]
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Plur.13 + Theorem 3.1 + [HHM20]

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Plur.16 + From proof of Theorem 3.1 + [HHM20]
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\neq	Plur.13 + Theorem 3.1 + [HHM20]
DC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Plur.13
CC-AC-UW	CC-AC-UW	\subsetneq	Plur.50
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.46 + Plur.39
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.46 + Plur.39
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.46 + Plur.39
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.46 + Plur.39
DC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	\supsetneq	Plur.50
CC-DC-UW	CC-DC-UW	\subsetneq	Plur.51
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.54 + Plur.43
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.54
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.43
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.54 + Plur.43
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	CC-DV-UW	\subsetneq	Plur.51
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.47 + Plur.42
DC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	\supsetneq	Plur.51
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.55 + Plur.45
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.44
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.51 + Plur.45
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.56 + Plur.45
DC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	\supsetneq	Plur.51
CC-AV-UW	CC-AV-UW	\subsetneq	Plur.52
CC-AV-UW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.52 + Plur.40
CC-AV-UW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.48 + Plur.40

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-AV-NUW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Plur.48 + Plur.40
CC-AV-NUW	DC-AV-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.48 + Plur.40
DC-AV-UW	DC-AV-NUW	\supsetneq	Plur.52
CC-UAC-UW	CC-UAC-NUW	\subsetneq	Plur.53
CC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.53 + Plur.41
CC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.49 + Plur.41
CC-UAC-NUW	DC-UAC-UW	INCOMP	Plur.49 + Plur.41
CC-UAC-NUW	DC-UAC-NUW	INCOMP	Plur.49 + Plur.41
DC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-NUW	\supsetneq	Plur.53

Table 6: List of separation witnesses in veto.

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Veto.1	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b, b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.2	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c\}$	-	-
Veto.3	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, c > a > b, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.4	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c\}$	-	-
Veto.5	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b\}$	-	-
Veto.6	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.7	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > c > b, b > c > a, b > c > a\}$	-	-
Veto.8	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, c > a > b, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.9	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, a > b > c > d, b > d > c > a\}$	-	-
Veto.10	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > c > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.11	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > a > c\}$	-	-
Veto.12	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, b > c > d > a, c > a > d > b\}$	-	-
Veto.13	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, c > a > b, c > a > b, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.14	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{c > d > a > b, c > d > a > b, d > b > a > c\}$	-	-
Veto.15	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, a > b > c > d, b > c > a > d, c > a > b > d, c > d > b > a\}$	-	-

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Veto.16	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, b > a > c > d, b > a > c > d, b > a > c > d, c > b > a > d, d > c > a > b, d > c > a > b, d > c > a > b, d > c > b > a, d > c > b > a\}$	-	-
Veto.17	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > c > b\}$	-	-
Veto.18	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > a > c, c > a > b\}$	-	-
Veto.19	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, a > b > c, a > b > c, a > c > b, a > c > b, a > c > b, b > c > a, b > c > a\}$	-	-
Veto.20	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{a > b > c > d, b > d > a > c, c > d > a > b\}$	-	-
Veto.21	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, c > a > b\}$	-	-
Veto.22	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{c > a > b > d, c > b > a > d, b > a > c > d, c > b > a > d, b > a > d > c, d > a > b > c, a > c > b > d, d > b > c > a\}$	-	-
Veto.23	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{b > a > c\}$	-	1
Veto.24	$\{a, b, c\}$	$\{d\}$	$\{b > a > c\}$	-	1
Veto.25	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{a > b > c\}$	-	1
Veto.26	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{b > c > a, c > b > a\}$	-	1
Veto.27	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{d > c > a > b\}$	-	1
Veto.28	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b > c, c > b > a\}$	-	1
Veto.29	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > c > b, a > c > b\}$	-	1
Veto.30	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{c > a > b, c > a > b\}$	-	1
Veto.31	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b\}$	-	1
Veto.32	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{d > c > a > b\}$	-	1
Veto.33	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{c > b > a, c > a > b, b > a > c\}$	-	1
Veto.34	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > c > b, a > c > b, a > c > b, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	1
Veto.35	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > c > b, a > c > b, a > c > b, c > b > a, c > b > a\}$	-	1
Veto.36	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{c > b > a, a > b > c, a > c > b\}$	-	2
Veto.37	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{b > c > a, b > c > a, b > a > c, b > a > c, a > c > b\}$	-	2
Veto.38	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{c > b > a, c > b > a, b > c > a\}$	-	1
Veto.39	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{a > b\}$	$\{a > b\}$	1
Veto.40	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{c > a > b\}$	$\{c > a > b\}$	1
Veto.41	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{a > b\}$	$\{a > b\}$	1
Veto.42	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{b > a\}$	$\{b > a\}$	1
Veto.43	$\{a, b, c\}$	$\{d\}$	$\{d > c > a > b\}$	-	-

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Veto.44	$\{a, b, c\}$	$\{d\}$	$\{d > c > a > b\}$	-	-
Veto.45	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{a > c > b, a > b > c\}$	-	-
Veto.46	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{c > b > a\}$	-	-

Table 7: Table of separations and collapses (here denoted by EQ) in veto voting. The Classification column partitions each separation into one of the three cases, \subsetneq , \supsetneq , and INCOMP. (For cases of INCOMP for which we happen to have established that the separation holds with strong incomparability, we have noted that with a “*” superscript.)

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.2 + Veto.3
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.3
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.2
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.7
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.2
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.2

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.2
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.2
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PV-TP-UW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.9
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.8

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.9
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.11 + Veto.9
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.9
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.9
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.12 + Veto.8
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.13
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.10
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.12 + Veto.14
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.15
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.13
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.10
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.13
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.13
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.14

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.11 + Veto.15
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.13
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.11
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.12
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.15
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.12 + Veto.14
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.15
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.10
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.15
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.14
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.11 + Veto.15
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.13
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.10
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.16
CC-PC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.10 + Veto.16
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.5 + Veto.6
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	EQ	Theorem 3.2
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.3
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.3
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.3
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.3
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	$\not\subseteq$	Theorem 3.4

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	$\not\supsetneq$	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Theorem 3.4
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.1
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.18 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.18 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.4 + Veto.21
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.20
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.18 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.18 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.21 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.20
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.11 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Veto.1 + Veto.19
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.11 + Veto.19
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Veto.4
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\supsetneq$	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Veto.18
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\supsetneq$	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Veto.4
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	$\not\supsetneq$	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Veto.18
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\supsetneq$	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	\subsetneq	Veto.4
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.4
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\subsetneq	Veto.4
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.1

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\subsetneq	Veto.1
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	[HHM20]
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Veto.18
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\supseteq$	Veto.1
DC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Veto.18
DC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.1
DC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	$\not\supseteq$	Veto.1
CC-AC-UW	CC-AC-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.24
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.24 + Veto.26
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.23 + Veto.25
CC-AC-NUW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.25 + Veto.26
CC-AC-NUW	DC-AC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.23 + Veto.25
DC-AC-UW	DC-AC-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.24
CC-DC-UW	CC-DC-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.32
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.29 + Veto.33
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.32 + Veto.34
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.32
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.32
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DC-NUW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.29 + Veto.33
CC-DC-NUW	CC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.28 + Veto.34
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DV-UW	CC-DV-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.29
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.32
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.30
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.32
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.27 + Veto.38
DC-DC-UW	DC-DC-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.29
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.31 + Veto.35
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.29 + Veto.36
DC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.29 + Veto.35

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.30 + Veto.37
DC-DV-UW	DC-DV-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.29
CC-AV-UW	CC-AV-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.39
CC-AV-UW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.41 + Veto.42
CC-AV-UW	DC-AV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.41 + Veto.42
CC-AV-NUW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Veto.41 + Veto.42
CC-AV-NUW	DC-AV-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.41 + Veto.42
DC-AV-UW	DC-AV-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.40
CC-UAC-UW	CC-UAC-NUW	\subsetneq	Veto.43
CC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.43 + Veto.45
CC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.45 + Veto.46
CC-UAC-NUW	DC-UAC-UW	INCOMP	Veto.45 + Veto.46
CC-UAC-NUW	DC-UAC-NUW	INCOMP	Veto.43 + Veto.46
DC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-NUW	\supsetneq	Veto.44

Table 8: List of separation witnesses in approval voting.

[‡] This example can also be found on page 220 of the Handbook of Approval Voting [BEH⁺10].

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Appr.1	$\{a, b\}$	-	{10}	-	
Appr.2	$\{a, b\}$	-	{10, 01}	-	
Appr.3	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	{101, 110}	-	
Appr.4	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	{110, 110, 010, 101, 101, 001}	-	
Appr.5	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	{100, 011, 011}	-	
Appr.6	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	{100, 110, 011, 011}	-	
Appr.7 [‡]	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	{100, 100, 100, 100, 100, 110, 010, 010, 010, 010, 001, 001, 001, 001, 001, 001, 001}	-	
Appr.8	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	{100, 100, 100, 100, 010, 010, 010, 010, 010, 001, 001, 001}	-	
Appr.9	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	{1001, 1001, 1001, 1000, 0100, 0100, 0100, 0100, 0100, 0010, 0010, 0010, 0010, 0010}	-	
Appr.10	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	{0100, 0100, 0100, 0100, 0100, 0100, 1001, 1001, 1001, 1001, 0010, 0010, 0010, 1010}	-	
Appr.11	$\{a\}$	$\{b\}$	{11}	-	1
Appr.12	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	{111}	-	1
Appr.13	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	{010}	-	1
Appr.14	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	{100}	-	1

ID	C	S	V	U	k
Appr.15	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{1111\}$	-	1
Appr.16	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{11\}$	-	1
Appr.17	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{011\}$	-	1
Appr.18	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{011, 011\}$	-	1
Appr.19	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{100, 111\}$	-	1
Appr.20	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{100, 011\}$	-	1
Appr.21	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{10, 01, 01, 01\}$	-	1
Appr.22	$\{a, b, c, d\}$	-	$\{1000, 0111, 0111\}$	-	2
Appr.23	$\{a, b, c\}$	-	$\{111, 011, 011, 011\}$	-	2
Appr.24	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{10, 10, 01\}$	-	2
Appr.25	$\{a\}$	-	$\{1\}$	-	1
Appr.26	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{01, 10\}$	-	1
Appr.27	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{0, 10\}$	-	1
Appr.28	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{01, 01\}$	-	1
Appr.29	$\{a, b\}$	-	$\{10, 01\}$	-	1
Appr.30	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{010\}$	-	-
Appr.31	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{110\}$	-	-
Appr.32	$\{a, b\}$	$\{c\}$	$\{100\}$	-	-

Table 9: Table of separations and collapses (here denoted by EQ) in approval voting. The Classification column partitions each separation into one of the three cases, \subsetneq , \supsetneq , and INCOMP. (For cases of INCOMP for which we happen to have established that the separation holds with strong incomparability, we have noted that with a “*” superscript.)

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Appr.5 + Appr.10
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.6 + Appr.9
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.6 + Appr.9
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.6
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.9
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.9
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.6 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.9
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.6 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.5
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PV-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.5 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.7 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.5 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.7 + Appr.8

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PV-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.5 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.7 + Corollary 3.14
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.5 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Appr.8
CC-PV-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.7 + Corollary 3.14
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.10
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.17
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.10
CC-RPC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.10
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.14
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	Theorem 3.16
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.10
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.14
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-RPC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-UW	\subsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.10
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.10
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.11
CC-RPC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.14
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.11
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.10
CC-PC-TE-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.5
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.10
CC-PC-TE-NUW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.5 + Corollary 3.14

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	CC-PC-TP-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
CC-PC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.1
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TE-NUW	EQ	Theorem 3.15
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.18
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Theorem 3.18

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Theorem 3.20 + Corollary 3.5
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Theorem 3.20 + Corollary 3.5
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.18
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Theorem 3.18
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Theorem 3.20 + Corollary 3.5
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.3 + Theorem 3.20
DC-PV-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Theorem 3.20 + Corollary 3.5
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PV-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Theorem 3.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Theorem 3.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Theorem 3.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.14
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Theorem 3.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Theorem 3.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Theorem 3.19
DC-PV-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.14
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Corollary 3.14
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	INCOMP	Appr.2 + Appr.8
DC-PV-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.4 + Corollary 3.14
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TE-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5 + Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.5

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5 + Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-RPC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5 + Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.5 + Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.11
DC-RPC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-UW	\subsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	\subsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-RPC-TP-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.5
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TE-NUW	EQ	Corollary 3.5
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5 + Corollary 3.11
DC-PC-TE-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-UW	EQ	Corollary 3.5 + Corollary 3.11
DC-PC-TE-NUW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.2 + Corollary 3.5
DC-PC-TP-UW	DC-PC-TP-NUW	\supsetneq	132.2 + Corollary 3.5
CC-AC-UW	CC-AC-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.12
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.14 + Appr.12/Appr.13
CC-AC-UW	DC-AC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.14 + Appr.13
CC-AC-NUW	DC-AC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.14 + Appr.13
CC-AC-NUW	DC-AC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.14/Appr.11/Appr.12 + Appr.13
DC-AC-UW	DC-AC-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.11/Appr.12
CC-DC-UW	CC-DC-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.15
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.16/Appr.21 + Appr.20
CC-DC-UW	CC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.21 + Appr.15
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
CC-DC-UW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.16
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
CC-DC-UW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.16
CC-DC-NUW	CC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.15 + Appr.22
CC-DC-NUW	CC-DV-NUW	INCOMP*	Appr.17
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.17
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15

\mathcal{T}	\mathcal{T}'	Classification	Justification(s)
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.17
CC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
CC-DV-UW	CC-DV-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.15
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
CC-DV-UW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.17
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
CC-DV-UW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.17
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.18
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.18
CC-DV-NUW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.25 + Appr.15
DC-DC-UW	DC-DC-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.15
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-UW	\subsetneq	[HHR07] + Appr.19
DC-DC-UW	DC-DV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.15 + Appr.24
DC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-UW	\subsetneq	[HHR07] + Appr.19
DC-DC-NUW	DC-DV-NUW	\subsetneq	[HHR07] + Appr.20
DC-DV-UW	DC-DV-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.15
CC-AV-UW	CC-AV-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.26
CC-AV-UW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.27 + Appr.26
CC-AV-UW	DC-AV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.27 + Appr.26
CC-AV-NUW	DC-AV-UW	INCOMP	Appr.27 + Appr.28
CC-AV-NUW	DC-AV-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.27 + Appr.28
DC-AV-UW	DC-AV-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.28
CC-UAC-UW	CC-UAC-NUW	\subsetneq	Appr.30
CC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.31 + Appr.29
CC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.31 + Appr.29
CC-UAC-NUW	DC-UAC-UW	INCOMP	Appr.31 + Appr.29
CC-UAC-NUW	DC-UAC-NUW	INCOMP	Appr.31 + Appr.29
DC-UAC-UW	DC-UAC-NUW	\supsetneq	Appr.30