

The net-outdegree social choice correspondence*

Daniela Bubboloni

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica U.Dini
Università degli Studi di Firenze
viale Morgagni 67/a, 50134 Firenze, Italy
e-mail: daniela.bubboloni@unifi.it
tel: +39 055 2759667

Michele Gori

Dipartimento di Scienze per l'Economia e l'Impresa
Università degli Studi di Firenze
via delle Pandette 9, 50127, Firenze, Italy
e-mail: michele.gori@unifi.it
tel: +39 055 2759707

November 15, 2022

Abstract

In a variable electorate framework, we introduce and study the net-outdegree social choice correspondence (SCC), a procedure that allows to determine some alternatives among the ones in a given set for any given preference profile, that is, a complete description of the individual preferences of a group of voters. No property is in principle required to individual preferences. We show that well-known voting rules, i.e. the Borda rule, the Approval Voting, the Plurality rule, the anti-Plurality rule, coincide with the restriction of the net-outdegree SCC to suitable sets of preference profiles. We prove then that, when a set of preference profiles satisfies suitable conditions, the restriction of the net-outdegree SCC to that set is the unique SCC satisfying four properties, among which the well-known property of consistency. That allows to get as consequences Young's characterization of the Borda rule and Fishburn's characterization of the Approval Voting as well as other characterization results present in the literature. Such results are all based on a preliminary analysis and a general characterization theorem of the so-called net-outdegree network solution.

Keywords: Network; Net-outdegree; Axiomatic method; Social choice theory; Voting; Borda rule; Approval voting.

JEL classification: D71.

MSC classification: 91B14, 05C20.

1 Introduction

Consider a set A of alternatives and a countable set V of potential voters whose preferences are modelled as binary relations on A . A preference profile is a function from a nonempty and finite subset of V to the set $\mathbf{R}(A)$ of the binary relations on A . Given a subset \mathbf{D} of the set $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ of all the preference profiles, a social choice correspondence (SCC) on \mathbf{D} is a function from \mathbf{D} to the set of nonempty subsets of A . A SCC on \mathbf{D} is then a procedure that allows to select some alternatives in A on the basis of the preferences of some voters in V . The set \mathbf{D} is usually determined by imposing that voters' preferences satisfy some properties like, for instance, being orders, linear orders or dichotomous orders on A .

In this paper we introduce and study a SCC on $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ that we call net-outdegree SCC and denote by O . Such a SCC associates with any preference profile p the set $O(p)$ of elements of A maximizing the integer valued function defined, for every $x \in A$, by

$$\sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c_p(x, y) - \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c_p(y, x),$$

where, for every pair of distinct alternatives x and y , $c_p(x, y)$ counts the number of voters in the domain of p who think that x is at least as good as y . That function appears in Young (1974) as an alternative way to define the Borda scores of alternatives when voters' preferences are linear orders on A . In the same paper, the author also suggests the

*Daniela Bubboloni was partially supported by GNSAGA of INdAM.

possibility to use that function to define the Borda scores of the alternatives when voter's preferences are orders or partial orders. Here we extend that idea to define a SCC on $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$. The net-outdegree SCC is then a procedure that works whatever the preference relations of voters are.

We prove a number of remarkable facts about the net-outdegree SCC. First of all, we show that O coincides with classic and well-known SCCs when its domain is restricted to special subsets of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$. Indeed, O coincides with the Borda rule when voters' preferences are linear orders; with the generalized Borda rule¹ when voters' preferences are orders; with the Approval Voting when voters' preferences are dichotomous orders²; with the Plurality rule when voters' preferences are dichotomous orders with a single alternative better than all the others; with the anti-Plurality rule when voters' preferences are dichotomous orders with a single alternative worse than all the others; with the Partial Borda rule³ when voters' preferences are partial orders; with the Averaged Borda rule⁴ when voters' preferences are top truncated orders. Thus, the net-outdegree SCC can be seen as the common root of all the aforementioned SCCs.

We prove then, as the main result of the paper, that if a subset \mathbf{D} of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ satisfies some technical but mild conditions, then O restricted to \mathbf{D} can be characterized by four properties, namely, neutrality, consistency, cancellation and outstar network faithfulness (Theorem 38). The first three properties are well-established in social choice theory and originate by Young (1974). Outstar network faithfulness is instead a new property. A SCC F satisfies neutrality if alternative names are immaterial; consistency⁵ if, given two preference profiles p_1 and p_2 referring to disjoint groups of voters and for which F selects two subsets of A with nonempty intersection, then F selects that intersection when computed at the preference profile obtained by combining p_1 and p_2 ; cancellation if F selects the whole set A of alternatives on those preference profiles for which, for every pair of distinct alternatives x and y , the number of voters who think that x is at least as good as y is the same as the number of voters who think that y is at least as good as x ; outstar network faithfulness if, for every alternative x , there exists a preference profile having a special structure and for which F selects x as unique outcome. Outstar network faithfulness is a mild property somehow related to the well-known faithfulness property introduced by Young (1974) and Fishburn (1979).

Properly qualifying the set \mathbf{D} of preference profiles, Theorem 38 allows to obtain many known characterization theorems. Indeed, we deduce the characterizations of the Borda rule by Young (1974, Theorem 1), of the Partial Borda rule by Cullinan (2014, Theorem 2), of the Averaged Borda rule by Terzopoulou and Endriss (2021, Theorem 6), of the Approval Voting by Fishburn (1979, Theorem 4), of the Plurality rule by Sekiguchi (2012, Theorem 1), of the anti-Plurality rule by Kurihara (2018, Theorem 1). Those characterizations appear in the paper as Theorems 64, 69, 73, 80, 84 and 85, respectively. We also prove that neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness characterize the generalized Borda rule on order profiles, as stated by Young (1974). Many further characterization results are proposed along the paper and many others seem to be at hand due to the strength of the result.

Theorem 38 is obtained as a (not immediate) consequence of a theorem about network solutions, our second main result. In order to present such a theorem let us first recall the concepts of network and network solution.

A network on a set A is a triple $N = (A, A_*^2, c)$, where A is called the set of vertices of N , $A_*^2 = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : x \neq y\}$ is called the set of arcs of N and c is a function from A_*^2 to \mathbb{Q} called the capacity associated with N . Networks can be used to represent a variety of situations. For instance, they can be used to mathematically represent competitions. Indeed, assume to have a set of teams which played a certain number of matches among each other and to know, for every team, the number of matches it won against any other team. Then we can represent that competition by a network $N = (A, A_*^2, c)$, where A is the set of teams and, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, $c(x, y)$ counts the number of matches in which x beat y (assuming that ties are not allowed). As another example assume that A is a set of alternatives. A network $N = (A, A_*^2, c)$ can represent a special type of information about the alternatives. Indeed, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, $c(x, y)$ can be thought as a numerically evaluation of the strength of the statement “ x is at least as good as y ”. That strength might stem by considering several criteria to assess alternatives, assigning a suitable numerical weight to each criteria, and summing the weights of the criteria for which x is at least as good as y . That strength can also be computed by counting the number of voters/experts in a given panel declaring that x is at least as good as y . Of course, that leads to a very natural way to associate a network on A with any preference profile and, in the paper, we adopt that idea.

¹Mas-Colell et al. (1997, Example 21.C.1); Vorsatz (2008).

²Brams and Fishburn 1978. Note that Vorsatz (2008, Proposition 1) already notices that the generalized Borda rule coincides with the Approval Voting when restricted to dichotomous orders.

³Cullinan et al. (2014).

⁴Dummett (1997).

⁵Some authors use the term “reinforcement” instead of “consistency” (see, for instance, Moulin, 1988; Young, 1988; Myerson, 1995).

Given a subset \mathcal{D} of the set $\mathcal{N}(A)$ of all the networks on A , a network solution on \mathcal{D} is a function from \mathcal{D} to the set of nonempty subsets of A , a network method on \mathcal{D} is instead a function from \mathcal{D} to the set of binary relations of A . Typically, network solutions [methods] are defined by associating a score to each vertex of a network and considering the vertices maximizing the score [the complete and transitive relation on the vertices consistent with the scores]. If now A is a set of teams and \mathcal{D} is the set of networks that represent a complete description of wins and losses in a potential competition among the teams in A , we can see a network solution [method] on \mathcal{D} as a procedure that allows to determine, for any conceivable competition involving teams in A , the set of winners [a social preference on A]. If instead A represents a set of alternatives and \mathcal{D} is the set of networks that can be thought as a possible description of the numerical evaluations of the strength of all the statements of the type “ x is at least as good as y ” for all $(x, y) \in A_{\ast}^2$, we can see a network solution [method] as a procedure to determine, for any conceivable pairwise evaluation of the elements of A , the best alternatives [a social preference on A].

Many network solutions and network methods are considered and studied in the literature. Langville and Meyer (2012) describe lots of ranking procedures used in different contexts (like social choice, voting, sport competitions, web search engines, psychology and statistics) that can be formalized as network methods. Laslier (1997, Chapters 3 and 10) presents an extensive survey of network solutions defined on the set of tournaments⁶ and on the set of balanced networks⁷.

One of the simplest network solution [method], considered by Brans et al. (1986) and Bouyssou (1992), is obtained by associating with each vertex of a network the score given by the difference between its outdegree and its indegree and then selecting the vertices maximizing the score value [ranking the vertices according to the scores]. More precisely, given $N = (A, A_{\ast}^2, c) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, the score of $x \in A$ is defined as

$$\delta^N(x) = \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) - \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x).$$

Such a network solution [method], which is defined on $\mathcal{N}(A)$, is called here net-outdegree network solution [method].⁸ As already said, we are mainly interested in the net-outdegree network solution, here denoted by \mathcal{O} .

It is worth noting that the net-outdegree network solution [method] coincides with the classic Copeland solution [method] when applied to the 0-1-networks corresponding to complete relations and then, in particular, corresponding to tournaments; with the flow network solution [method] proposed by Gvozdk (1987) and deepened by Belkin and Gvozdk (1989) and Bubboloni and Gori (2018) when applied to balanced networks with capacity whose values are nonnegative integers; with the outflow network solution [method] by van den Brink and Gilles (2009) when applied to balanced networks. Moreover, some characterization results for suitable restrictions of the net-outdegree network solution [method] are available in the literature. Indeed, the net-outdegree network method restricted to tournaments is characterized by Rubenstein (1980); the net-outdegree network method [solution] restricted to complete relations is characterized by Henriot (1985); the net-outdegree network method restricted to the set of networks whose capacity has values in $[0, 1]$ is characterized by Bouyssou (1992). All those characterizations involve a monotonicity property.

Our main result about the net-outdegree network solution states that if a subset \mathcal{D} of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ satisfies some special conditions, then \mathcal{O} restricted to \mathcal{D} can be characterized by four properties called consistency, neutrality, cancellation and outstar network faithfulness whose meaning is similar as the one of the properties by the same name introduced for social choice correspondences (Theorem 22). Indeed, a network solution \mathcal{F} satisfies neutrality if the names of the elements of A are immaterial; consistency if, every time the outcomes of \mathcal{F} at two networks have nonempty intersection, then that intersection must be the outcome of \mathcal{F} at the sum of the two networks; cancellation if \mathcal{F} selects all the vertices when applied to reversal symmetric networks, namely those networks such that, for every arc (x, y) , the capacity of the arc (x, y) equals the capacity of the arc (y, x) ; ourstar network faithfulness if, for every $x \in A$, there exists in \mathcal{D} a network having a special structure such that the network solution selects only x when applied to that network. As a consequence of the Theorem 22, we obtain, in particular, that a network solution on \mathcal{D} satisfying consistency, neutrality, cancellation and outstar network faithfulness coincides with \mathcal{O} restricted to \mathcal{D} , provided that \mathcal{D} is the set of [balanced] networks or the set of [balanced] networks whose capacity has nonnegative values or the set of [balanced] networks whose capacity has values in the set of nonnegative integers.

⁶A tournament R on A is an asymmetric relation on A such that, for every $(x, y) \in A_{\ast}^2$, $(x, y) \in R$ or $(y, x) \in R$. A relation R on a set A can be identified with a 0-1-network $N = (A, A_{\ast}^2, c)$ where, for every $(x, y) \in A_{\ast}^2$, $c(x, y) = 1$ if $(x, y) \in R$ and $c(x, y) = 0$ if $(x, y) \notin R$.

⁷A network $N = (A, A_{\ast}^2, c)$ is balanced if there exists a constant $k \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that, for every $(x, y) \in A_{\ast}^2$, $c(x, y) + c(y, x) = k$.

⁸Brans et al. (1986) and Bouyssou (1992) refer to such network method as net-flow network method, but we think that the name net-outdegree better adheres to the rational behind the definition.

The net-outdegree network solution naturally induces a social choice correspondence, namely the correspondence that associates with any preference profile the value of \mathcal{O} at the network associated with that preference profile. Such a social choice correspondence is exactly the net-outdegree social choice correspondence O and that fact allows to deduce the main characterization theorem about O from the one about \mathcal{O} .

The proof of Theorem 22 is greatly inspired to the proof of the characterization theorem of the Borda rule by Young (1974). During the years, some scholars tried to simplify Young's arguments by avoiding linear algebra and graph theory and deduced weaker results following a different approach (see, for instance, Hansson and Sahlquist, 1976; see also the comments about the proof of Young's result on the Borda rule in Alós-Ferrer, 2006). In some sense, we try the opposite strategy carrying to its extreme the use of linear algebra and graph theory, especially network theory, and exploiting the potential of group theory, the natural tool to deeply explore the properties of anonymity and neutrality.⁹ Our wide-ranging approach seemed the only way to extract the treasure buried in Young's paper. Indeed, such an approach allowed to get new characterization theorems for network solutions that led in turn to new insight into crucial problems of social choice theory.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Sections 3 to 7 are devoted to the characterization theorems for network solutions; Sections 8 to 12 are devoted to the characterization theorems for social choice correspondences.

2 Basic notation

We denote by \mathbb{N} the set of positive integers and we set $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $[k] := \{x \in \mathbb{N} : x \leq k\}$ and $[k]_0 := \{x \in \mathbb{N}_0 : x \leq k\}$.

Given X a finite set, we denote by $|X|$ the size of X , by X_d^2 the set $\{(x, y) \in X^2 : x = y\}$, by X_*^2 the set $X^2 \setminus X_d^2$, by $P(X)$ the set of subsets of X , by $P_0(X)$ the set of nonempty subsets of X . We also denote by $\text{Sym}(X)$ the set of the permutations of X . Recall that $\text{Sym}(X)$ is a group under the usual composition of functions. If $|X| = n \geq 2$, given distinct $x_1, \dots, x_k \in X$ with $2 \leq k \leq n$, we denote by $(x_1 \cdots x_k)$ the permutation in $\text{Sym}(X)$ defined by $(x_1 \cdots x_k)(x_i) = x_{i+1}$ for all $i \in [k-1]$, $(x_1 \cdots x_k)(x_k) = x_1$ and $(x_1 \cdots x_k)(x) = x$ for all $x \in X \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. The identity function on X is denoted by id . Thus, $id \in \text{Sym}(X)$ and id is defined, for every $x \in X$, by $id(x) = x$.

3 Networks

Let A be a finite set with $|A| = m \geq 2$. A network on A is a triple $N = (A, A_*^2, c)$, where c is a function from A_*^2 to \mathbb{Q} . We say that A is the set of vertices of N , A_*^2 is the set of arcs of N and c is the capacity associated with N . The set of networks on A is denoted by $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

Let $N = (A, A_*^2, c) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$. The reversal of N is the network $N^r = (A, A_*^2, c^r) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ where, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, $c^r(x, y) = c(y, x)$. If $N = N^r$ we say that N is reversal symmetric. Given $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, we set $N^\psi = (A, A_*^2, c^\psi) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ where c^ψ is defined, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, by $c^\psi(x, y) = c(\psi^{-1}(x), \psi^{-1}(y))$. Given $k \in \mathbb{Q}$, N is k -constant if, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, $c(x, y) = k$; k -balanced if, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, $c(x, y) + c(y, x) = k$. The unique k -constant network is denoted by $N(k)$. N is balanced if N is k -balanced for some $k \in \mathbb{Q}$; constant if N is k -constant for some $k \in \mathbb{Q}$. The net-outdegree associated with N is the function δ^N from A to \mathbb{Q} defined, for every $x \in A$, by

$$\delta^N(x) := \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) - \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x). \quad (1)$$

The number $\delta^N(x)$ is called net-outdegree of x in N . N is pseudo-symmetric if, for every $x \in A$, $\delta^N(x) = 0$.

We denote by $\mathcal{R}(A)$ the set of reversal symmetric networks; by $\mathcal{C}(A)$ the set of constant networks; by $\mathcal{B}(A)$ the set of balanced networks; by $\mathcal{PS}(A)$ the set of pseudo-symmetric networks. Note that $\mathcal{C}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A) \cap \mathcal{B}(A)$ and that $\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{PS}(A)$.

Given $N = (A, A_*^2, c^N) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, $M = (A, A_*^2, c^M) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ and $k \in \mathbb{Q}$, we set $kN = (A, A_*^2, kc^N) \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ and $N + M = (A, A_*^2, c^N + c^M)$. That defines a \mathbb{Q} -vector space structure on $\mathcal{N}(A)$. Moreover, for every $N, M \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, $h, k \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\psi, \sigma \in \text{Sym}(A)$, the following properties hold true¹⁰

$$(hN + kM)^\psi = hN^\psi + kM^\psi, \quad (N^\psi)^\sigma = N^{\sigma\psi},$$

⁹The use of permutation groups consideration is not a novelty in this area. See, for instance, Bubboloni and Gori (2014) and (2015).

¹⁰In particular, $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}\text{Sym}(A)$ -module.

$$(hN)^r = hN^r, \quad (N + M)^r = N^r + M^r, \quad (N^\psi)^r = (N^r)^\psi.$$

Throughout the paper we are going to freely use the above properties with no reference. A sum of networks over an empty set of indices is always interpreted as the null network $N(0)$.

For every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, we denote by N_{xy} the network whose capacity is 1 on the arc (x, y) and 0 elsewhere. For every $x \in A$, we call the network

$$N_x := \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} N_{xy}$$

the outstar network on the vertex x . It is easily checked that the networks N_x for $x \in A$ are linearly independent in $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

For every $B \subseteq A$, we set

$$K_B := \sum_{(x,y) \in B_*^2} (N_{xy} + N_{yx}) \quad (2)$$

and call it the complete network on B . Note that $K_B \in \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{D} be a subset of $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

- \mathcal{D} is closed under permutation of vertices (CPV) if, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, $N^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$;
- \mathcal{D} is closed under addition (CA) if, for every $N, M \in \mathcal{D}$, $N + M \in \mathcal{D}$;
- \mathcal{D} is closed under reversal (CR) if, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}$, $N^r \in \mathcal{D}$;
- \mathcal{D} is coherent with outstar networks (CON) if, for every $x \in A$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$.

Observe that if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ is CON and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}'$, then \mathcal{D}' is CON. A similar property does not hold true in general for CPV, CA and CR.

Given $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, we denote by $\mathbb{X}\mathcal{D}$ the set of all the linear combinations with coefficients in \mathbb{X} of elements in \mathcal{D} . As usual, we include among the linear combinations the empty linear combination and assume that it gives the null network $N(0)$. We will be concerned especially with $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$. Note that $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

A simple check shows that $\mathcal{R}(A)$, $\mathcal{C}(A)$, $\mathcal{B}(A)$, $\mathcal{PS}(A)$ and $\mathcal{N}(A)$ satisfy CVP, CA and CR. Note also that $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is CON while $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is not CON. Moreover, $\mathcal{R}(A)$, $\mathcal{C}(A)$, $\mathcal{B}(A)$, $\mathcal{PS}(A)$ are vector subspaces of $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

Given $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$, we denote by $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{X}}(A)$ be the set of networks whose capacity has values in \mathbb{X} . In particular, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. Recall that $\mathbb{Q}_+ = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : q \geq 0\}$.

The set $\{N_{xy} : (x, y) \in A_*^2\}$ is a basis for the vector space $\mathcal{N}(A)$ so that $\dim \mathcal{N}(A) = m(m-1)$. Note also that the set $\{N_{xy} + N_{yx} : (x, y) \in A_*^2\}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{R}(A)$ so that

$$\dim \mathcal{R}(A) = \frac{m(m-1)}{2}.$$

Observe also that

$$\dim \mathcal{C}(A) = 1.$$

The next proposition states a useful property characterizing the constant networks.

Proposition 2. A network $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}(A)$ if and only if $N^\psi = N$ for all $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$.

Proof. Let $N \in \mathcal{C}(A)$ be k -constant and let $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Then for $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, we have $c^\psi(x, y) = c(\psi^{-1}(x), \psi^{-1}(y)) = k = c(x, y)$, which means $N^\psi = N$. Conversely let $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ and assume that $N^\psi = N$ holds for all $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Then we have $c = c^\psi$ for all $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Let $(x, y) \in A_*^2$ and $(u, v) \in A_*^2$. Since $x \neq y$ and $u \neq v$, there exists $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ such that $\psi(u) = x$ and $\psi(v) = y$ so that $c(x, y) = c^\psi(x, y) = c(\psi^{-1}(x), \psi^{-1}(y)) = c(u, v)$, and thus the function c is constant. \square

We introduce now the concept of cycle network. Let $\gamma = x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1$ be a k -cycle of the complete directed graph (A, A_*^2) , for some $2 \leq k \leq m$.¹¹ The k -cycle network associated with γ is defined by

$$C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1} := \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} N_{x_i x_{i+1}} \right) + N_{x_k x_1}.$$

A network $C \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ is called a cycle network if it is a k -cycle network for some $2 \leq k \leq m$. Note that cycle networks belong to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$.

Proposition 3. *Let $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$. Then $N = N(0)$ or there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(C_i)_{i=1}^s$ of cycle networks such that $N = \sum_{i=1}^s C_i$.*¹²

Proof. Given $N = (A, A_*^2, c) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$, let us define

$$G^N := \sum_{(x,y) \in A_*^2} c(x,y) \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

For every $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $\mathcal{PS}^r(A) := \{N \in \mathcal{PS}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) : G^N = r\}$. We complete the proof showing that, for every $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the following statement holds true:

Stat(r): if $N \in \mathcal{PS}^r(A)$, then $N = N(0)$ or there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(C_i)_{i=1}^s$ of cycle networks such that $N = \sum_{i=1}^s C_i$.

We work by induction on r . If $r = 0$, $\mathcal{PS}^0(A) = \{N(0)\}$ and Stat(r) is true. Let $r \geq 0$ and assume that Stat(t) is true for every $t \leq r$. We have to prove that Stat($r+1$) is true. Let $N = (A, A_*^2, c) \in \mathcal{PS}^{r+1}(A)$. For every $x \in A$, define

$$I(x) := \{y \in A \setminus \{x\} : c(x, y) \geq 1\}, \quad O(x) := \{y \in A \setminus \{x\} : c(y, x) \geq 1\},$$

and consider the set $A' = \{x \in A : O(x) \neq \emptyset\}$. First of all, note that, since $G^N = r+1 \geq 1$, there exists $x^* \in A'$. Moreover, for every $x \in A'$, $O(x) \neq \emptyset$ and, since in particular $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$, we have that $I(x) \neq \emptyset$. Finally, for every $x \in A'$, $I(x) \subseteq A'$ since if $y \in I(x)$, then $x \in O(y) \neq \emptyset$.

For every $x \in A'$, pick an element of $I(x)$ and denote it by $d(x)$. Thus, d defines a function from A' to A' such that, for every $x \in A'$, $d(x) \neq x$. Consider now the sequence $(x_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ in A' recursively defined as follows: $x_1 = x^*$ and, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{j+1} = d(x_j)$. Thus, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{j+1} \in I(x_j)$ so that $c(x_j, x_{j+1}) \geq 1$. Let

$$J := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, k < j, \text{ such that } x_j = x_k\}.$$

We show that $J \neq \emptyset$. Assume, by contradiction, that $J = \emptyset$. Then, for every $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k < j$, we have that $x_j \neq x_k$. As a consequence, the vertices in the sequence $(x_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ are distinct, against the fact that A is finite. We can then consider $j^* := \min J$. Then there exists $k^* \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k^* < j^*$ such that $x_{j^*} = x_{k^*}$, and, for every $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k < j < j^*$, $x_j \neq x_k$, that is, the vertices x_1, \dots, x_{j^*-1} are distinct. Since, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_j \neq x_{j+1}$, we also have that $k^* \neq j^* - 1$. Then $x_{k^*} \dots x_{j^*-1} x_{j^*}$ is a cycle of the complete directed graph (A, A_*^2) because the vertices $x_{k^*}, \dots, x_{j^*-1}$ are at least two and distinct and $x_{j^*} = x_{k^*}$.

Consider then the cycle network $C := \sum_{j=k^*}^{j^*-1} N_{(x_j, x_{j+1})}$ and note that $N - C \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$, because, for every $j \in \{k^*, \dots, j^* - 1\}$, we have that $c(x_j, x_{j+1}) \geq 1$. Moreover, we have that $N - C \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$ and $G^{N-C} = t$ for some $t \leq r$. It follows that $N = (N - C) + C$, with $N - C \in \mathcal{PS}^t(A)$ for some $t \leq r$. By the inductive assumption, we have then that $N - C = N(0)$ or there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $(C_i)_{i=1}^s$ of cycle networks such that $N - C = \sum_{i=1}^s C_i$. Thus, $N = C$ or $N = C + \sum_{i=1}^s C_i$ and that proves that Stat($r+1$) is true, as desired. \square

Proposition 4. $\mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathbb{Q}\{C \in \mathcal{N}(A) : C \text{ is a } k\text{-cycle, for some } 2 \leq k \leq m\}$.

¹¹That means that γ is the subgraph of (A, A_*^2) having as vertex set the set of k distinct vertices $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq A$ and arcs (x_i, x_{i+1}) , for $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, and (x_k, x_1) .

¹²Proposition 3 can be deduced by classic results on graph homology. However, since we could not find a statement perfectly in line with ours, we preferred to produce an original proof.

Proof. If C is a k -cycle then trivially $C \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$. Thus, $\mathbb{Q}\{C \in \mathcal{N}(A) : C \text{ is a } k\text{-cycle, for some } 2 \leq k \leq m\} \subseteq \mathcal{PS}(A)$. Let us prove the opposite inclusion. Let $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$. Surely there exist $k, h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\tilde{N} := kN + N(h) \in \mathcal{PS}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$. By Proposition 3, we then have $\tilde{N} = N(0)$ or $\tilde{N} = \sum_{i=1}^s C_i$ for some cycle networks C_i . It follows that $N = -\frac{1}{k}N(h)$ or $N = \frac{1}{k}\tilde{N} - \frac{1}{k}N(h) = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^s C_i - \frac{1}{k}N(h)$. Since $N(h) \in \mathcal{PS}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$, using again Proposition 3, we have that $N(h)$ is a sum of cycle networks and thus N is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of cycle networks. \square

The next proposition is inspired to a reasoning proposed in Young (1974).

Proposition 5. $\mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathbb{Q}\{C \in \mathcal{N}(A) : C \text{ is a } m\text{-cycle}\} + \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Proof. By Proposition 4 and recalling that $\mathcal{PS}(A) \supseteq \mathcal{R}(A)$ and that $\mathcal{PS}(A)$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we have that

$$\mathcal{PS}(A) \supseteq \mathbb{Q}\{C \in \mathcal{N}(A) : C \text{ is a } m\text{-cycle}\} + \mathcal{R}(A).$$

For the other inclusion, by Proposition 4, it is enough to show that, for every k with $2 \leq k \leq m-1$, every k -cycle network is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of $(k+1)$ -cycle networks and of a reversal symmetric network. Consider then $2 \leq k \leq m-1$. Let $C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1}$ be the k -cycle network associated with the k -cycle $x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1$, so that

$$C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1} = N_{x_k x_1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} N_{x_i x_{i+1}}. \quad (3)$$

Recall that x_1, \dots, x_k are distinct. Let $x_{k+1} \in A \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and let $\tilde{N} := \sum_{i=1}^k (N_{x_{k+1} x_i} + N_{x_i x_{k+1}}) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. We show that the following equality holds

$$\tilde{N} + (k-1)C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1} = C_{x_{k+1} x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_{k+1}} + C_{x_{k+1} x_2 \dots x_k x_1 x_{k+1}} + \dots + C_{x_{k+1} x_k x_1 x_2 \dots x_{k-1} x_{k+1}}.$$

Indeed, taking into account (3) and the definition of \tilde{N} , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & C_{x_{k+1} x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_{k+1}} + C_{x_{k+1} x_2 \dots x_k x_1 x_{k+1}} + \dots + C_{x_{k+1} x_k x_1 x_2 \dots x_{k-1} x_{k+1}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k (N_{x_{k+1} x_i} + N_{x_i x_{k+1}}) + (C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1} - N_{x_k x_1}) + (C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1} - N_{x_1 x_2}) + \dots + (C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1} - N_{x_{k-1} x_k}) \\ &= \tilde{N} + (k-1)C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $C_{x_1 x_2 \dots x_k x_1}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -linear combination of $(k+1)$ -cycle networks and of a reversal symmetric network, as desired. \square

4 Network solutions

Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$. A network solution on \mathcal{D} is a function from \mathcal{D} to $P_0(A)$. Thus, a network solution on \mathcal{D} is a procedure that allows to associate a nonempty set of vertices with any network belonging to \mathcal{D} . A network solution (NS) on $\mathcal{N}(A)$ is simply called a network solution.

A main example is given by the net-outdegree NS, denoted by \mathcal{O} , that associates with any $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ the set

$$\mathcal{O}(N) := \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} \delta^N(x).$$

Let us introduce now some of the properties a NS may meet.

Definition 6. Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a network solution on \mathcal{D} .

- \mathcal{F} satisfies neutrality if \mathcal{D} is CPV and, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in \operatorname{Sym}(A)$, $\mathcal{F}(N^\psi) = \psi(\mathcal{F}(N))$;
- \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency if \mathcal{D} is CA and, for every $N, M \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M) \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{F}(N + M) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M)$;

- \mathcal{F} satisfies outstar network faithfulness (ON-faithfulness) if, for every $x \in A$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$;
- \mathcal{F} satisfies cancellation if, for every $N \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$, $\mathcal{F}(N) = A$.

Note that if $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} is a network solution on \mathcal{D} satisfying ON-faithfulness, then \mathcal{D} is CON. Let us propose now some useful lemmas involving the properties in Definition 6 that we will use throughout the paper.

Lemma 7. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying consistency and cancellation. Let $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. Then $\mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.*

Proof. By cancellation, $\mathcal{F}(R) = A$ so that $\mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(R) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, by consistency, we have that $\mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(R) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap A = \mathcal{F}(N)$. \square

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying consistency and cancellation. Let $N, M \in \mathcal{D}$ and assume that there exist $R, S \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + R = M + S$. Then $\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}(M)$.*

Proof. By cancellation, $\mathcal{F}(R) = \mathcal{F}(S) = A$ so that $\mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(R) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F}(M) \cap \mathcal{F}(S) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, using consistency, we have that $\mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(R) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap A = \mathcal{F}(N)$ and $\mathcal{F}(M + S) = \mathcal{F}(M) \cap \mathcal{F}(S) = \mathcal{F}(M) \cap A = \mathcal{F}(M)$. Since $N + R = M + S$, we have $\mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(M + S)$, so that $\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}(M)$. \square

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying consistency. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq 2$ and $N_1, \dots, N_k \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_k) \neq \emptyset$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}(N_1 + \dots + N_k) = \mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_k). \quad (4)$$

Proof. Let us work by induction on k . If $k = 2$, then (4) is true by consistency of \mathcal{F} . Consider now $k \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that (4) is true for k and prove it for $k + 1$. Let $N_1, \dots, N_{k+1} \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{k+1}) \neq \emptyset$. In particular, $\mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_k) \neq \emptyset$, so that, by the inductive assumption, we get $\mathcal{F}(N_1 + \dots + N_k) = \mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_k)$. Once defined $N = N_1 + \dots + N_k$, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{k+1}) = (\mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_k)) \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{k+1}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus, by consistency,

$$\mathcal{F}(N + N_{k+1}) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{k+1}) = \mathcal{F}(N_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{k+1}).$$

Since $N + N_{k+1} = N_1 + \dots + N_{k+1}$, we get (4) for $k + 1$. \square

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying consistency. Let $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $kN \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}(kN) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.*

Proof. We work by induction on k . If $k = 1$ there is nothing to prove. Consider now $k \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that $kN \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{F}(kN) = \mathcal{F}(N)$ and prove that $(k + 1)N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}((k + 1)N) = \mathcal{F}(N)$. Since $(k + 1)N = kN + N$ and \mathcal{D} is CA we have that $(k + 1)N \in \mathcal{D}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(kN) \cap \mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}(N) \neq \emptyset$, using consistency we have that $\mathcal{F}((k + 1)N) = \mathcal{F}(kN + N) = \mathcal{F}(kN) \cap \mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}(N)$, as desired. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying consistency. Let $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ be such that $q > 0$ and $qN \in \mathcal{D}$. Then $\mathcal{F}(qN) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.*

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $kq \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $k, kq \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 10, we have that $\mathcal{F}((kq)N) = \mathcal{F}(N)$ and $\mathcal{F}((kq)N) = \mathcal{F}(k(qN)) = \mathcal{F}(qN)$. We conclude then that $\mathcal{F}(qN) = \mathcal{F}(N)$. \square

5 Preliminary characterization theorem for the net-outdegree NS

Let \mathbb{Q}^A be the set of functions from A to \mathbb{Q} . Of course, \mathbb{Q}^A is a \mathbb{Q} -vector space of dimension m . We denote by 0 its zero, that is, the function from A to \mathbb{Q} that associates with every $x \in A$ the value 0 . Consider now the function

$$\delta : \mathcal{N}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^A, \quad \delta(N) := \delta^N. \quad (5)$$

Thus, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ and $x \in A$, we have $\delta(N)(x) = \delta^N(x)$. Recalling the definition (1) and the definition of sum of networks, it is immediately shown that, for every $N, M \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, $h, k \in \mathbb{Q}$, we have

$$\delta^{hN+kM} = h\delta^N + k\delta^M.$$

In other words δ is a linear function between \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces. Note that $\text{Ker}(\delta) = \mathcal{PS}(A)$. Moreover, recalling the definition of N^ψ , for every $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, we have

$$\delta^{N^\psi} = \delta^N \psi^{-1}. \quad (6)$$

Some basic computations with δ are easy. For instance, for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, we have that

$$\delta(N_{xy}) = \chi_{\{x\}} - \chi_{\{y\}}$$

and hence

$$\delta(N_x) = (m-1)\chi_{\{x\}} - \chi_{A \setminus \{x\}} \quad (7)$$

where, for every $S \subseteq A$, $\chi_S \in \mathbb{Q}^A$ denotes the characteristic function of S .

Using the properties of δ above established, we are ready to show that \mathcal{O} satisfies the properties considered in Definition 6.

Proposition 12. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ be CPV, CA and CON. Then $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies neutrality, consistency, ON-faithfulness and cancellation.*

Proof. We show that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies neutrality. Let $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. For every $x \in A$, by (6), we have that $\delta^{N^\psi}(x) = \delta^N(\psi^{-1}(x))$ so that $x^* \in \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^{N^\psi}(x) = \mathcal{O}(N^\psi)$ if and only if $\psi^{-1}(x^*) \in \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) = \mathcal{O}(N)$. Thus $\mathcal{O}(N^\psi) = \psi \mathcal{O}(N)$.

We show that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies consistency. Let $N, M \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\mathcal{O}(N) \cap \mathcal{O}(M) \neq \emptyset$. We first claim that

$$\arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) \cap \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^M(x) = \arg\max_{x \in A} (\delta^N(x) + \delta^M(x)). \quad (8)$$

Let $x^* \in \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) \cap \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^M(x) = \mathcal{O}(N) \cap \mathcal{O}(M) \neq \emptyset$. Then we have $\delta^N(x^*) \geq \delta^N(x)$ and $\delta^M(x^*) \geq \delta^M(x)$, for all $x \in A$. It follows that $\delta^N(x^*) + \delta^M(x^*) \geq \delta^N(x) + \delta^M(x)$, for all $x \in A$. Hence the maximum of the function $\delta^N + \delta^M$ is assumed in x^* and $x^* \in \arg\max_{x \in A} (\delta^N(x) + \delta^M(x))$. In particular, $\arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) \cap \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^M(x) \subseteq \arg\max_{x \in A} (\delta^N(x) + \delta^M(x))$. Let next $y^* \in \arg\max_{x \in A} (\delta^N(x) + \delta^M(x))$. Then we have

$$\delta^N(y^*) + \delta^M(y^*) = \delta^N(x^*) + \delta^M(x^*). \quad (9)$$

By the definition of x^* , we have $\delta^N(y^*) \leq \delta^N(x^*)$ and $\delta^M(y^*) \leq \delta^M(x^*)$ so that (9) implies $\delta^N(y^*) = \delta^N(x^*)$ and $\delta^M(y^*) = \delta^M(x^*)$. Thus $y^* \in \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) \cap \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^M(x)$ and (8) is proved.

Now by (8) and the linearity of δ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(N+M) &= \arg\max_{x \in A} (\delta^{N+M}(x)) = \arg\max_{x \in A} (\delta^N(x) + \delta^M(x)) \\ &= \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) \cap \arg\max_{x \in A} \delta^M(x) = \mathcal{O}(N) \cap \mathcal{O}(M). \end{aligned}$$

We show that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies ON-faithfulness. Let $x \in A$. Since \mathcal{D} is CON, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Since δ is linear and $R \in \text{Ker}(\delta)$, we have $\delta^{kN_x + R} = k\delta^{N_x}$, so that

$$\mathcal{O}(kN_x + R) = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} \delta^{kN_x + R}(a) = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} \delta^{N_x}(a) = \{x\}.$$

We finally show that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ satisfies cancellation. Let $N \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. Then $N \in \text{Ker}(\delta)$ so that δ^N is the function 0. Thus $\mathcal{O}(N) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} 0 = A$. \square

We next deal with a characterization of the networks on which \mathcal{O} is not able to make a proper selection, in the sense that the whole set A of alternatives is selected.

Proposition 13. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$. Then $\mathcal{O}(N) = A$ if and only if $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$. In particular, if $N \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, then $\mathcal{O}(N) = A$.*

Proof. If $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$, we have that the function δ^N is constant equal to zero and thus all the elements in A are maxima for δ^N so that $\mathcal{O}(N) = A$. Conversely assume that $\mathcal{O}(N) = A$. Then δ^N is constant, so that there exists $k \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that, for every $x \in A$, $\delta^N(x) = k$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k|A| &= \sum_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) = \sum_{x \in A} \left(\sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) - \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x) \right) \\ &= \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) - \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x) = \sum_{(x, y) \in A_{\neq}^2} c(x, y) - \sum_{(x, y) \in A_{\neq}^2} c(y, x) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $k = 0$. It follows that $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$. \square

We now pass to study the image of δ and the dimension of the kernel of δ .

Proposition 14. $\delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) = \mathbb{Q}\{\delta(N_x) : x \in A\}$ and $\dim \delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) = m - 1$.

Proof. First of all note that, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}(A)$, we have

$$\sum_{x \in A} \delta^N(x) = \sum_{x \in A} \left(\sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) - \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x) \right) = \sum_{(x, y) \in A_{\neq}^2} c(x, y) - \sum_{(x, y) \in A_{\neq}^2} c(y, x) = 0.$$

Thus

$$\delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) \subseteq \left\{ q \in \mathbb{Q}^A : \sum_{x \in A} q(x) = 0 \right\},$$

and, as a consequence,

$$\dim \delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) \leq m - 1. \quad (10)$$

Consider now, for $x \in A$, the vectors $\delta(N_x) \in \mathbb{Q}^A$. Since

$$\sum_{x \in A} \delta(N_x) = \delta \left(\sum_{x \in A} N_x \right) = \delta(N(1)) = 0,$$

those vectors are dependent. Choose now x_1, \dots, x_{m-1} distinct elements of $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_{m-1}, x_m\}$. We show that the vectors $\delta(N_{x_i})$, $i \in [m-1]$ are independent. Assume that $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} q_i \delta(N_{x_i}) = 0$, for some $q_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $i \in [m-1]$. Then, using (7), we get the equality

$$(m-1) \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} q_i \chi_{\{x_i\}} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} q_i \chi_{A \setminus \{x_i\}}$$

between functions in \mathbb{Q}^A . Now computing on x_m we get $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} q_i = 0$ and hence, computing on x_j , we get $(m-1)q_j = \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^{m-1} q_i = -q_j$ for all $j \in [m-1]$. As a consequence we find $q_j = 0$ for all $j \in [m-1]$.

Thus $\dim \delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) \geq m - 1$. By (10), we deduce that

$$\dim \delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) = m - 1 = \dim \mathbb{Q}\{\delta(N_x) : x \in A\}$$

and hence also $\delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) = \mathbb{Q}\{\delta(N_x) : x \in A\}$. \square

Proposition 15. $\dim \text{Ker}(\delta) = \dim \mathcal{PS}(A) = (m - 1)^2$.

Proof. Recall that $\dim \mathcal{N}(A) = m(m - 1)$. From the equality $\dim \mathcal{N}(A) = \dim \delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) + \dim \text{Ker}(\delta)$ and Proposition 14, we have that $m(m - 1) - \dim \text{Ker}(\delta) = m - 1$. Thus, we conclude $\dim \text{Ker}(\delta) = (m - 1)^2$. \square

The next lemma is the last preliminary result that we need in order to prove the main result of this section, that is, Theorem 17.

Lemma 16. *Let \mathcal{V} be a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{V} . Assume that $\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and that \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Then, for every $x \in A$, we have that $N_x \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{F}(N_x) = \{x\}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in A$. By ON-faithfulness of \mathcal{F} , we know there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. Since $R \in \mathcal{V}$ and \mathcal{V} is a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we also have that $kN_x \in \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, by cancellation, $\mathcal{F}(R) = A$ and then, by Lemma 7, we deduce that $\mathcal{F}(kN_x) = \mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. Since \mathcal{V} is a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we also have $N_x \in \mathcal{V}$ and, by Lemma 10, $\mathcal{F}(N_x) = \mathcal{F}(kN_x) = \{x\}$, as desired. \square

Theorem 17. *Let \mathcal{V} be a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ such that $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \in \{\mathcal{R}(A), \mathcal{PS}(A)\}$. Let \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{V} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{V}}$.*

Proof. First of all, note that the condition $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \in \{\mathcal{R}(A), \mathcal{PS}(A)\}$ implies $\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.

Let $\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}$ be the restriction to \mathcal{V} of the linear map $\delta : \mathcal{N}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^A$ defined in (5) and note that $\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}$ is a linear map from \mathcal{V} to \mathbb{Q}^A . Applying Lemma 16, we have that

$$\text{for every } x \in A, N_x \in \mathcal{V} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}(N_x) = \{x\}. \quad (11)$$

As a consequence, $\mathbb{Q}\{\delta(N_x) : x \in A\} \subseteq \delta_{|\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V})$. Using Proposition 14, we have then that $\delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) \subseteq \delta_{|\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V})$. Since obviously $\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \delta(\mathcal{N}(A))$, we then get

$$\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V}) = \delta(\mathcal{N}(A)) = \mathbb{Q}\{\delta(N_x) : x \in A\}. \quad (12)$$

Moreover, again by Proposition 14, we have $\dim(\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{V})) = m - 1$. For what concerns the kernel, we have that $\text{Ker}(\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}) = \mathcal{V} \cap \text{Ker}(\delta) = \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \in \{\mathcal{R}(A), \mathcal{PS}(A)\}$.

We claim now that,

$$\text{for every } N \in \text{Ker}(\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}), \text{ we have } \mathcal{F}(N) = A. \quad (13)$$

If $\text{Ker}(\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}) = \mathcal{R}(A)$, that immediately follows from the fact that \mathcal{F} satisfies cancellation. Assume then that $\text{Ker}(\delta_{|\mathcal{V}}) = \mathcal{PS}(A)$. By Proposition 5 we have that any m -cycle network belongs to \mathcal{V} . Let C be a m -cycle network with associated cycle $\gamma = x_1 \cdots x_m x_1$. Note that $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and consider $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ given by $\psi = (x_1 x_2 \dots x_m)$. Note that, for every $n \in [m]$, $(qC)^{\psi^n} = qC$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies neutrality, we have $\mathcal{F}(qC) = \mathcal{F}((qC)^{\psi^n}) = \psi^n(\mathcal{F}(qC))$. This means that $\mathcal{F}(qC)$ is a nonempty subset of A which is transformed into itself by the action of the group $\langle \psi \rangle$. Since $\langle \psi \rangle$ has only one orbit on A , the only possibility is that

$$\mathcal{F}(qC) = A. \quad (14)$$

Consider now $N \in \text{Ker}(\delta_{|\mathcal{V}})$, that is, $N \in \mathcal{PS}(A)$. By Proposition 5, we know that $\mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathbb{Q}\{C \in \mathcal{N}(A) : C \text{ is a } m\text{-cycle}\} + \mathcal{R}(A)$. Thus, we can find $s \in \mathbb{N}$, rational numbers q_1, \dots, q_s , m -cycle networks C_1, \dots, C_s and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N = R + \sum_{i=1}^s q_i C_i$. By (14), for every $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we have that $\mathcal{F}(q_i C_i) = A$. Moreover, by cancellation of \mathcal{F} we also have $\mathcal{F}(R) = A$. Thus, since \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency and cancellation, we can apply Lemmas 7 and 9 obtaining

$$\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}\left(R + \sum_{i=1}^s q_i C_i\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i=1}^s q_i C_i\right) = \bigcap_{i=1}^s \mathcal{F}(q_i C_i) = A.$$

That completes the proof of the claim (13).

Let now $N, M \in \mathcal{V}$ be such that $\delta|_{\mathcal{V}}(N) = \delta|_{\mathcal{V}}(M)$. Then we have $\delta|_{\mathcal{V}}(N - M) = 0 \in \mathbb{Q}^A$, that is, $N - M \in \text{Ker}(\delta|_{\mathcal{V}})$ so that, by (13), $\mathcal{F}(N - M) = A$. As a consequence, by consistency of \mathcal{F} , we get $\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}(M + (N - M)) = \mathcal{F}(M)$. That shows that two networks in \mathcal{V} with the same image by δ also have the same image by \mathcal{F} .

We now show that, for every $N \in \mathcal{V}$, we have $\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{O}|_{\mathcal{V}}(N)$. Fix $N \in \mathcal{V}$ and look to the rational numbers $\delta^N(x)$ for $x \in A$. Let us enumerate the elements of A in such a way that $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and

$$\delta^N(x_1) \geq \delta^N(x_2) \geq \dots \geq \delta^N(x_m). \quad (15)$$

Our task is then to show that

$$\mathcal{F}(N) = \{x_k \in A : \delta^N(x_k) = \delta^N(x_1)\}.$$

By (12), there exist rational numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$ such that

$$\delta(N) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta(N_{x_j}). \quad (16)$$

Moreover, we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \delta(N_{x_j}) = 0. \quad (17)$$

Indeed, since $\mathcal{C}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{PS}(A) = \text{Ker}(\delta)$, we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \delta(N_{x_j}) = \delta\left(\sum_{j=1}^m N_{x_j}\right) = \delta(N(1)) = 0.$$

From (16) and (17), an easy computation leads to

$$\delta(N) = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} \delta(N_{x_i}). \quad (18)$$

Using the linearity of δ and (18) we get

$$\delta(N) = \delta\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right),$$

where $\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i} \in \mathcal{V}$. Since we have proved that two networks in \mathcal{V} with the same image by δ have also the same image by \mathcal{F} , we have that

$$\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right). \quad (19)$$

From (16), for every $i \in [m]$, we have

$$\delta^N(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \delta^{N_{x_j}}(x_i) = \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^m \lambda_j (-1)\right) + \lambda_i (m-1) = m\lambda_i - \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j. \quad (20)$$

It follows that, for every $i \in [m]$, we have

$$\delta^N(x_i) - \delta^N(x_j) = m(\lambda_i - \lambda_j). \quad (21)$$

By (15), $i \leq j$ implies $\delta^N(x_i) \geq \delta^N(x_j)$ and therefore, using (21), we also get $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_j$. Hence, we deduce that

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m. \quad (22)$$

Moreover, (21) also implies $\{x_k \in A : \delta^N(x_k) = \delta^N(x_1)\} = \{x_k \in A : \lambda_k = \lambda_1\}$ so that our purpose becomes to prove

$$\mathcal{F}(N) = \{x_k \in A : \lambda_k = \lambda_1\}. \quad (23)$$

For every $j \in [m]$, define $A_j = \{x_i \in A : i \leq j\}$. We claim that,

$$\text{for every } j \in [m], \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) = A_j. \quad (24)$$

We show (24) by backward induction on $j \in [m]$. If $j = m$, then

$$\sum_{i \leq m} N_{x_i} = N(1) \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{R}(A),$$

so that, since \mathcal{F} satisfies cancellation, $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq m} N_{x_i}\right) = \mathcal{F}(N(1)) = A = A_m$. Let now $j \in [m-1]$ be such that $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j+1} N_{x_i}\right) = A_{j+1}$ and prove that $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) = A_j$. Consider the subgroup S_j of $\text{Sym}(A)$ given by $S_j = \{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A) : \psi(A_j) = A_j\}$ and observe that, for every $\psi \in S_j$, we have that

$$\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)^\psi = \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}^\psi = \sum_{i \leq j} N_{\psi(x_i)} = \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}.$$

Assume, by contradiction, that there exists $k \geq j+1$ such that $x_k \in \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)$. Consider now $\psi = (x_{j+1} \cdots x_m) \in S_j$. Then, using the neutrality of \mathcal{F} , we have that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\psi^n(x_k) \in \psi^n\left(\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)^{\psi^n}\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right).$$

As a consequence, we have $\{x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)$. By inductive assumption, we know $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j+1} N_{x_i}\right) = A_{j+1}$. Since, by (11), $\mathcal{F}(N_{x_{j+1}}) = \{x_{j+1}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{x_{j+1}}) = \{x_{j+1}\}$, by consistency of \mathcal{F} , we get

$$A_{j+1} = \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j+1} N_{x_i}\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) \cap \mathcal{F}(N_{x_{j+1}}) = \{x_{j+1}\},$$

that is a contradiction since $|A_{j+1}| = j+1 \geq 2$. Thus, we have shown that $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) \subseteq A_j$. Since $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) \neq \emptyset$, there exists $x_k \in \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)$ so that $k \leq j$. Let $\psi = (x_1 \cdots x_j) \in S_j$. Then, using the neutrality of \mathcal{F} we have that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\psi^n(x_k) \in \psi^n\left(\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right)^{\psi^n}\right) = \mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right).$$

As a consequence, $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) \supseteq A_j$. Thus, we can finally conclude that $\mathcal{F}\left(\sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) = A_j$. That completes the proof of (24).

Note that, by (13), $\mathcal{F}(N(0)) = A$. Then, by (24) and Lemma 11, we have that, for every $j \in [m-1]$,

$$\mathcal{F}\left((\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) = B_j := \begin{cases} A & \text{if } \lambda_j = \lambda_{j+1} \\ A_j & \text{if } \lambda_j > \lambda_{j+1}. \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{m-1} \mathcal{F}\left((\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i}\right) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{m-1} B_j \supseteq \bigcap_{j=1}^{m-1} A_j = \{x_1\} \neq \emptyset.$$

By (19), consistency of \mathcal{F} and Lemma 9, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}(N) = \mathcal{F} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}) \sum_{i \leq j} N_{x_i} \right) = B := \bigcap_{j=1}^{m-1} B_j.$$

In order to get (23), we are left with proving that

$$B = \{x_k \in A : \lambda_k = \lambda_1\}. \quad (25)$$

Let $x_k \in A$ be such that $\lambda_1 > \lambda_k$. Then, by (22), there exists $j^* \in [m-1]$ with $j^* + 1 \leq k$ such that $\lambda_{j^*} > \lambda_{j^*+1}$. Thus, $B_{j^*} = A_{j^*}$ and $B \subseteq A_{j^*}$. Note that $k \geq j^* + 1$ implies $x_k \notin A_{j^*}$. We then deduce that $x_k \notin B$. Hence we have $B \subseteq \{x_k \in A : \lambda_k = \lambda_1\}$. Let now $x_k \in A$ be such that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_k$. We prove that $x_k \in B$ showing that $x_k \in B_j$ for all $j \in [m-1]$. Consider $j \in [m-1]$. Assume first that $\lambda_j > \lambda_{j+1}$ so that $B_j = A_j$. Then, by (22), we also have $\lambda_1 > \lambda_s$ for all $s \in \{j+1, \dots, m\}$. As a consequence, we have $k \neq s$ for all $s \in \{j+1, \dots, m\}$ that implies $k \leq j$. It follows that $x_k \in A_k \subseteq A_j = B_j$. Assume now that $\lambda_j = \lambda_{j+1}$. Thus $B_j = A$ so that clearly $x_k \in B_j$. Hence we also have $\{x_k \in A : \lambda_k = \lambda_1\} \subseteq B$ and (25) is proved. \square

We stress that the proof of Theorem 17 is greatly inspired to Young (1974). In some sense, we are trying to expand the ideas in there to their maximum extent using networks and linear algebra considerations.

6 Extending network solutions

Given $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ with $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}'$, a NS \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{D} and a NS \mathcal{F}' on \mathcal{D}' , we say that \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} if, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.

In this section we present conditions that allow to extend a NS \mathcal{F} defined on a subset \mathcal{D} of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ and satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness to the \mathbb{Q} -vector space $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ still maintaining those properties. The main extension result of this section is Theorem 21. It is proved through some intermediate propositions.

Proposition 18. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Assume that, for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, there exists $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Then there exists $\mathcal{F}' : \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ extension of \mathcal{F} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. By assumption we know that, for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, there exists $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Consider then $\mathcal{F}' : \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ be defined, for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, by

$$\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(N + R),$$

where $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ is such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. We are going to prove that \mathcal{F}' is a well defined extension of \mathcal{F} and satisfies neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Let us prove first that \mathcal{F}' is well defined. Consider then $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and assume that $R, R' \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ are such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$ and $N + R' \in \mathcal{D}$. We want to show that $\mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(N + R')$.

Since \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency, we have that \mathcal{D} is CA. Thus, we have that $(N + R) + R' = (N + R') + R \in \mathcal{D}$ and, since \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency and cancellation, we can apply Lemma 8 and deduce that $\mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(N + R')$.

We show that \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} . Let $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and pick $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Then, by the definition of \mathcal{F}' and Lemma 7, we have $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(N + R) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.

Let us prove now that \mathcal{F}' satisfies neutrality. We have that $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ is CVP. Indeed, let $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ and prove that $N^\psi \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$. By definition of $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, we have that there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $N_1, \dots, N_k \in \mathcal{D}$ and $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $N = \sum_{i=1}^k z_i N_i$. Thus, we have that

$$N^\psi = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k z_i N_i \right)^\psi = \sum_{i=1}^k z_i N_i^\psi.$$

Since \mathcal{F} satisfies neutrality we know that \mathcal{D} is CVP. We conclude then that $N^\psi \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, since, for every $i \in [k]$, $N_i^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$. Consider now $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ and prove that $\mathcal{F}'(N^\psi) = \psi(\mathcal{F}'(N))$. Indeed, consider $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ be

such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Since \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{R}(A)$ are CVP, we have that $R^\psi \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $(N + R)^\psi = N^\psi + R^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, by the neutrality of \mathcal{F} we have

$$\mathcal{F}'(N^\psi) = \mathcal{F}(N^\psi + R^\psi) = \mathcal{F}((N + R)^\psi) = \psi(\mathcal{F}(N + R)) = \psi(\mathcal{F}'(N)).$$

That finally proves the neutrality of \mathcal{F}' .

Let us prove now that \mathcal{F}' is consistent. It is immediate to verify that $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ is CA. Consider now $N, M \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}'(N) \cap \mathcal{F}'(M) \neq \emptyset$. We want to show that $\mathcal{F}'(N + M) = \mathcal{F}'(N) \cap \mathcal{F}'(M)$. Consider $S, T \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + S, M + T \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(N + S)$, $\mathcal{F}'(M) = \mathcal{F}(M + T)$ so that $\mathcal{F}(N + S) \cap \mathcal{F}(M + T) \neq \emptyset$. By consistency of \mathcal{F} , we have that

$$\mathcal{F}((N + S) + (M + T)) = \mathcal{F}(N + S) \cap \mathcal{F}(M + T).$$

Observe now that $(N + S) + (M + T) = (N + M) + (S + T) \in \mathcal{D}$, $N + M \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and $S + T \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ since both \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{R}(A)$ are CA. Thus, by the definition of \mathcal{F}' , we get

$$\mathcal{F}'(N + M) = \mathcal{F}(N + M + S + T) = \mathcal{F}(N + S) \cap \mathcal{F}(M + T) = \mathcal{F}'(N) \cap \mathcal{F}'(M),$$

and consistency of \mathcal{F}' is proved.

Let us prove now that \mathcal{F}' satisfies cancellation. Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ and prove that $\mathcal{F}'(N) = A$. Indeed, consider $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ be such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, since $\mathcal{R}(A)$ is CA, we also have that $N + R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. Thus, by cancellation of \mathcal{F} , we get $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(N + R) = A$, as desired.

We must finally prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies ON-faithfulness. Consider $x \in A$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies ON-faithfulness, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. Thus, since $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, we also have that $kN_x + R \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and, since \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} , $\mathcal{F}'(kN_x + R) = \mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. \square

Proposition 19. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ such that $\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{F} a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Then there exists $\mathcal{F}' : \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ extension of \mathcal{F} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. Recall that $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -vector space. First of all, note that, for every $N \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $kN \in \mathcal{D}$. Indeed, there exist $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $q_1, \dots, q_s \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $N_1, \dots, N_s \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $N = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i N_i$. Consider then $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $i \in [s]$, $kq_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we have

$$kN = \sum_{i=1}^s (kq_i) N_i \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}.$$

Given $N \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$, we have then that

$$K(N) := \{k \in \mathbb{N} : kN \in \mathcal{D}\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Define then $k_N := \min K(N)$ and consider $\mathcal{F}' : \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ be defined, for every $N \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$, by $\mathcal{F}'(N) := \mathcal{F}(k_N N)$. We are going to prove that \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} and satisfies neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

We have that \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} since, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}$, $k_N = 1$ so that $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(k_N N) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.

Let us prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies cancellation. Consider $N \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since $\mathcal{R}(A)$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we have that $k_N N \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. By cancellation of \mathcal{F} we have then that $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(k_N N) = A$, and cancellation of \mathcal{F}' is proved.

We now prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies neutrality. Let $N \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. We first show that $N^\psi \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$. We know that there are $s \in \mathbb{N}$, $N_1, \dots, N_s \in \mathcal{D}$ and $q_1, \dots, q_s \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $N = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i N_i$. Thus, we have that

$$N^\psi = \left(\sum_{i=1}^s q_i N_i \right)^\psi = \sum_{i=1}^s q_i N_i^\psi.$$

Since \mathcal{F} satisfies neutrality, we know that \mathcal{D} is CVP. We conclude then that, for every $i \in [s]$, $N_i^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$ so that $N^\psi \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$. Let us prove now that $k_N = k_{N^\psi}$. We know that $k_N N \in \mathcal{D}$. Since \mathcal{D} is CVP, $(k_N N)^\psi = k_N N^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$.

Thus, $k_N \in K(N^\psi)$ so that $k_{N^\psi} \leq k_N$. Moreover, we also know that $k_{N^\psi} N^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$. Since \mathcal{D} is CVP, $(k_{N^\psi} N^\psi)^{\psi^{-1}} = k_{N^\psi} (N^\psi)^{\psi^{-1}} = k_{N^\psi} N \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, $k_{N^\psi} \in K(N)$ so that $k_N \leq k_{N^\psi}$. We conclude then that $k_N = k_{N^\psi}$, as desired. Now, by neutrality of \mathcal{F} , we get

$$\mathcal{F}'(N^\psi) = \mathcal{F}(k_{N^\psi} N^\psi) = \mathcal{F}(k_N N^\psi) = \mathcal{F}((k_N N)^\psi) = \psi(\mathcal{F}(k_N N)) = \psi(\mathcal{F}'(N))$$

and neutrality of \mathcal{F}' is proved.

Let us prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies consistency. Let $N, M \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$ and assume that $\mathcal{F}'(N) \cap \mathcal{F}'(M) \neq \emptyset$. It is clear that $N + M \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$. We know that $k_N N, k_M M, k_{N+M}(N + M) \in \mathcal{D}$. Let us define $t = k_N k_M k_{N+M}$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency, by Lemma 10 and by the definition of \mathcal{F}' , we have that

$$\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(k_N N) = \mathcal{F}(tN), \quad \mathcal{F}'(M) = \mathcal{F}(k_M M) = \mathcal{F}(tM)$$

so that $\mathcal{F}(tN) \cap \mathcal{F}(tM) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, again by consistency of \mathcal{F} and Lemma 10, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}'(N + M) &= \mathcal{F}(k_{N+M}(N + M)) = \mathcal{F}(t(N + M)) = \mathcal{F}(tN + tM) = \\ &= \mathcal{F}(tN) \cap \mathcal{F}(tM) = \mathcal{F}'(N) \cap \mathcal{F}'(M) \end{aligned}$$

and consistency of \mathcal{F}' is proved.

We must finally prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies ON-faithfulness. Consider $x \in A$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies ON-faithfulness, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. Thus, since $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$, we also have that $kN_k + R \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$ and, since \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} , $\mathcal{F}'(kN_x + R) = \mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. \square

Proposition 20. *Let \mathcal{D} be a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Then there exists $\mathcal{F}' : \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A) \rightarrow P_0(A)$ extension of \mathcal{F} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}' : \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A) \rightarrow P_0(A)$ be defined, for every $N' \in \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$, by $\mathcal{F}'(N') = \mathcal{F}(N)$, where $N' = N + R$ with $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. We are going to prove that \mathcal{F}' is a well defined extension of \mathcal{F} and satisfies neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

First we prove that \mathcal{F}' is well defined. Let $N' \in \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and assume that $N' = N_1 + R_1 = N_2 + R_2$ where $N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Observe then that $N_1 - N_2 = R_2 - R_1$. Since \mathcal{D} and $\mathcal{R}(A)$ are subspaces of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ we have that $N_1 - N_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R_2 - R_1 \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ so that $N_1 - N_2 \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency and cancellation and $N_1 = N_2 + (N_1 - N_2)$, by Lemma 7, we obtain that $\mathcal{F}(N_1) = \mathcal{F}(N_2)$, as desired.

In order to prove that \mathcal{F}' extends \mathcal{F} simply note that $N(0) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ because \mathcal{D} is a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$ so that, given $N \in \mathcal{D}$, $N = N + N(0) \in \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $\mathcal{F}'(N) = \mathcal{F}(N)$.

Let us prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies neutrality. Let $N' \in \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Then $N' = N + R$ where $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. We have that $R^\psi \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and, since \mathcal{F} is neutral, we also have that $N^\psi \in \mathcal{D}$. Finally, again using the neutrality of \mathcal{F} , we have that

$$\mathcal{F}'((N')^\psi) = \mathcal{F}'((N + R)^\psi) = \mathcal{F}'(N^\psi + R^\psi) = \mathcal{F}(N^\psi) = \psi(\mathcal{F}(N)) = \psi(\mathcal{F}'(N')),$$

that proves the neutrality of \mathcal{F}' .

Let us prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies consistency. Let $N', M' \in \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ be such that $\mathcal{F}'(N') \cap \mathcal{F}'(M') \neq \emptyset$. We have that $N' = N + S$ and $M' = M + T$ where $N, M \in \mathcal{D}$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since $\mathcal{F}'(N') = \mathcal{F}(N)$ and $\mathcal{F}'(M') = \mathcal{F}(M)$, we deduce that $\mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M) \neq \emptyset$. Note also that $N' + M' = (N + M) + (S + T)$ where $N + M \in \mathcal{D}$ and $S + T \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Then, by the consistency of \mathcal{F} and Lemma 7, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{F}'(N' + M') = \mathcal{F}((N + M) + (S + T)) = \mathcal{F}(N + M) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M) = \mathcal{F}'(N') \cap \mathcal{F}'(M')$$

that proves the consistency of \mathcal{F}' .

Let us prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies cancellation. Consider $N' \in (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{R}(A)$. We have that $N' = N + R$ for some $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. We deduce then that $N = N' - R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies cancellation, we conclude then that $\mathcal{F}'(N') = \mathcal{F}(N) = A$. That proves that \mathcal{F}' satisfies cancellation.

We must finally prove that \mathcal{F}' satisfies ON-faithfulness. Consider $x \in A$. Since \mathcal{F} satisfies ON-faithfulness, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. Thus, since $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$, we also have that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and, since \mathcal{F}' is an extension of \mathcal{F} , $\mathcal{F}'(kN_x + R) = \mathcal{F}(kN_x + R) = \{x\}$. \square

We are finally ready for the main result of this section.

Theorem 21. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Assume that, for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, there exists $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Then there exists $\mathcal{F}' : \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A) \rightarrow P_0(A)$ extension of \mathcal{F} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. By Proposition 18, there exists $\mathcal{F}_1 : \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$, extension of \mathcal{F} and satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Since $\mathbb{Z}(\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}) = \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, we can apply Proposition 19 to \mathcal{F}_1 obtaining the existence of $\mathcal{F}_2 : \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$, extension of \mathcal{F}_1 satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Thus, in particular, \mathcal{F}_2 is an extension of \mathcal{F} .

Since $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D}$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we can apply Proposition 20 to \mathcal{F}_2 obtaining the existence of $\mathcal{F}' : \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A) \rightarrow P_0(A)$, extension of \mathcal{F}_2 satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Thus, \mathcal{F}' is also an extension of \mathcal{F} having the required properties. \square

7 General characterization theorem for the net-outdegree NS

Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$. If \mathcal{D} is not CVP or not CA or not CON, there is no NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. On the other hand, by Proposition 12, if \mathcal{D} is CVP, CA and CON, we know that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ is a NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. The next result provides conditions on \mathcal{D} that guarantee that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ is the unique NS fulfilling those properties.

Theorem 22. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and assume that*

- (a) \mathcal{D} is CVP, CA and CON;
- (b) for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$, there exists $R \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N + R \in \mathcal{D}$;
- (c) $(\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \in \{\mathcal{R}(A), \mathcal{PS}(A)\}$.

Then $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ is the unique NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness and show that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$. Set $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$. By Theorem 21, there exists $\mathcal{F}' : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ extension of \mathcal{F} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Applying now Theorem 17 to \mathcal{F}' we deduce that $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{V}}$. We conclude then that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}'_{|\mathcal{D}} = (\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{V}})_{|\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$. \square

In what follows, we present some main consequences of Theorem 22.

Proposition 23. *Let $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A), \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A), \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}_+}(A), \mathcal{N}(A)\}$. Then $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the unique NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that \mathcal{D} satisfies conditions (a), (b) and (c) of Theorem 22. Clearly, we have that \mathcal{D} is CVP and CA. Given $x \in A$, we have that $N_x \in \mathcal{D}$ so that, setting $k = 1$ and $R = N(0) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, we have that $N_x = kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, \mathcal{D} is CON. We conclude then that \mathcal{D} satisfies condition (a). Pick now $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and let $k = \min_{(x,y) \in A_*^2} c^N(x, y)$. Consider $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t + k > 0$. Thus, we have that $N(t) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $N + N(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ so that condition (b) is satisfied. Finally, note that, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, we have that $N_{xy} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$. Thus, $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A)$ so that $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. Since $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, we also have that $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. Thus, $(\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{PS}(A)$ and (c) is satisfied. \square

In what follows we set

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) := \mathcal{B}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A), \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) := \mathcal{B}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A), \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{Q}_+}(A) := \mathcal{B}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}_+}(A).$$

Proposition 24. *Let $\mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A), \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A), \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{Q}_+}(A), \mathcal{B}(A)\}$. Then $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the unique NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that \mathcal{D} satisfies conditions (a), (b) and (c) of Theorem 22. Clearly, we have that \mathcal{D} is CVP and CA. Given $x \in A$, we have that $kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$, where $k = 2$ and $R = K_{A \setminus \{x\}} \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Thus, \mathcal{D} is CON. We conclude then that \mathcal{D} satisfies condition (a). Pick now $N \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and let $k = \min_{(x,y) \in A_*^2} c^N(x,y)$. Consider $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t + k > 0$. Thus, we have that $N(t) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $N + N(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ so that condition (b) is satisfied. Finally, given $(x,y) \in A_*^2$, let

$$R = \sum_{z \in A \setminus \{x,y\}} (N_{xz} + N_{zx}) + \sum_{z \in A \setminus \{x,y\}} (N_{yz} + N_{zy}) + K_{A \setminus \{x,y\}}.$$

We have that $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and that $2N_{xy} + R \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$. Since $N_{xy} = \frac{1}{2}(2N_{xy} + R) - \frac{1}{2}R$, we deduce that $N_{xy} \in \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and since $\{N_{xy} : (x,y) \in A_*^2\}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we get $\mathcal{N}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)$. By $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, we have then that $\mathcal{N}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and since the opposite inclusion is trivial we conclude that $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A)$. Thus, $(\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{PS}(A)$ and (c) is satisfied. \square

In order to prove the next characterization results, we need to prove some properties of the vector space $\mathcal{O}(A) := \mathbb{Q}\{N_x : x \in A\}$. Note that $\dim \mathcal{O}(A) = m$.

Lemma 25. $\mathcal{O}(A) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{C}(A)$.

Proof. Since $\delta(\mathcal{O}(A)) = \mathbb{Q}\{\delta(N_x) : x \in A\}$, by Proposition 14, we have $\delta(\mathcal{O}(A)) = \delta(\mathcal{N}(A))$. It follows that $\dim \delta(\mathcal{O}(A)) = m - 1$ and thus $m - 1 = m - \dim(\text{Ker}(\delta) \cap \mathcal{O}(A))$. Then we deduce $\dim(\mathcal{PS}(A) \cap \mathcal{O}(A)) = 1$. Since $N(1) = \sum_{x \in A} N_x \in \mathcal{O}(A) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A)$, we then have $\mathcal{PS}(A) \cap \mathcal{O}(A) = \mathbb{Q}N(1) = \mathcal{C}(A)$. \square

Lemma 26. $(\mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Proof. Since one inclusion is trivial, we only need to prove that $(\mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A)$. Let $N \in (\mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A)$. Then, there exist $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and, for every $x \in A$, $q_x \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$N = \sum_{x \in A} q_x N_x + R. \quad (26)$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{PS}(A) = \text{Ker}(\delta)$, we have that

$$0 = \delta(N) = \delta \left(\sum_{x \in A} q_x N_x \right).$$

Thus, $\sum_{x \in A} q_x N_x \in \mathcal{O}(A) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A)$. By Lemma 25 we have that $\sum_{x \in A} q_x N_x \in \mathcal{C}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A)$. From (26), we conclude that $N \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. \square

Proposition 27. Let $\mathbb{X} \in \{\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}_+, \mathbb{Q}\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{X}\{N_x : x \in A\}$. Then $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ is the unique NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Proof. It is enough to prove that \mathcal{D} satisfies conditions (a), (b) and (c) of Theorem 22. Note first that $\{N(k) : k \in \mathbb{N}_0\} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ because, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $N(k) = \sum_{x \in A} kN_x \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Clearly, we have that \mathcal{D} is CVP and CA. Given $x \in A$, we have that $N_x \in \mathcal{D}$ so that, setting $k = 1$ and $R = N(0) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, we have that $N_x = kN_x + R \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, \mathcal{D} is CON. We conclude then that \mathcal{D} satisfies condition (a). Pick now $N = (A, A_*^2, c) \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{D}$ and let $k = \min_{(x,y) \in A_*^2} c(x,y)$. Consider $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t + k > 0$. Thus, we have that $N(t) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{R}(A)$ and $N + N(t) \in \mathcal{D}$ so that condition (b) is satisfied. Observe finally that $\mathbb{Q}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O}(A)$. Thus, by Lemma 26, we have that (c) holds. \square

8 Preference profiles

A relation R on A is a subset of A^2 , that is, an element of $P(A^2)$. The set of relations on A is denoted by $\mathbf{R}(A)$. Let $R \in \mathbf{R}(A)$. Given $x, y \in A$, we sometimes write $x \geq_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \in R$; $x >_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, x) \notin R$; $x \sim_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, x) \in R$; $x \perp_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \notin R$ and $(y, x) \notin R$. For every $x \in A$, we define the sets

$$L(R, x) := \{y \in A : x >_R y\}, \quad U(R, x) := \{y \in A : y >_R x\},$$

$$I(R, x) := \{y \in A : x \sim_R y\}, \quad IN(R, x) := \{y \in A : x \perp_R y\}.$$

Note that $L(R, x)$, $U(R, x)$, $I(R, x)$ and $IN(R, x)$ are pairwise disjoint and $L(R, x) \cup U(R, x) \cup I(R, x) \cup IN(R, x) = A$. Given $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, we define $R^\psi = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : (\psi^{-1}(x), \psi^{-1}(y)) \in R\}$. We also set $R^r = \{(x, y) \in A^2 : (y, x) \in R\}$.

From now on, we interpret A as the set of alternatives. Consider a countably infinite set V whose elements are to be interpreted as potential voters. For simplicity, we assume $V = \mathbb{N}$. Elements of $\mathbf{R}(A)$ are interpreted as preference relations on A . Let us consider the set

$$\mathbf{R}(A)^* = \bigcup_{\substack{I \subseteq V \\ I \neq \emptyset \text{ finite}}} \mathbf{R}(A)^I.$$

An element of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ is called preference profile. Thus, a preference profile is a function from a finite nonempty subset of V to $\mathbf{R}(A)$. Given $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, we denote by $\text{Dom}(p)$ the domain of p and, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, $p(i) \in \mathbf{R}(A)$ is interpreted as the preference relation of voter i on the set of alternatives A .

If $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, we denote by p^r the element of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p^r) = \text{Dom}(p)$ and for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, $p^r(i) = p(i)^r$. If $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, we denote by p^ψ the element of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p^\psi) = \text{Dom}(p)$ and, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, $p^\psi(i) = p(i)^\psi$.

If $p, p' \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, we say that p, p' are disjoint if $\text{Dom}(p) \cap \text{Dom}(p') = \emptyset$; we say that p' is a clone of p if $|\text{Dom}(p)| = |\text{Dom}(p')|$ and there exists a bijection $\varphi : \text{Dom}(p) \rightarrow \text{Dom}(p')$ such that, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, we have $p'(\varphi(i)) = p(i)$; we say that p' is a disjoint clone of p if p' is a clone of p and p and p' are disjoint. If $p, p' \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ are disjoint, we denote by $p + p'$ the element of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p + p') = \text{Dom}(p) \cup \text{Dom}(p')$ and such that, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, we have $(p + p')(i) = p(i)$ and, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p')$, we have $(p + p')(i) = p'(i)$.

Note that if $p, p' \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ are disjoint, then $p + p' = p' + p$. Moreover, if $p, p', p'' \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ are pairwise disjoint, then $p + p'$ and p'' are disjoint, p and $p' + p''$ are disjoint and $(p + p') + p'' = p + (p' + p'')$. Thus we can write $p + p' + p''$ without ambiguity. A similar observation holds for any number of pairwise disjoint preference profiles.

Given $R \in \mathbf{R}(A)$, let $N(R) = (A, A_\#^2, c_R)$ be the network in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$ whose capacity c_R is defined, for every $(x, y) \in A_\#^2$, by $c_R(x, y) = 1$ if $(x, y) \in R$ and $c_R(x, y) = 0$ if $(x, y) \notin R$. Note that $R \subseteq A_d^2$ if and only if $N(R) = N(0)$.

Consider then the function $N : \mathbf{R}(A)^* \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(A)$ defined, for every $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, by

$$N(p) := \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} N(p(i)).$$

$N(p)$ is called the network associated with p . Note that the capacity of $N(p)$ is given by

$$c_p := \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} c_{p(i)}.$$

For every $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, we set $N(\mathbf{D}) = \{N(p) : p \in \mathbf{D}\}$.

Let $p, p' \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. If p, p' are disjoint, then the following properties hold true

$$N(p^r) = N(p)^r, \quad N(p^\psi) = N(p)^\psi, \quad N(p + p') = N(p) + N(p'). \quad (27)$$

Note also that if p and p' are clones, then $N(p) = N(p')$. As a consequence, if q is a clone of p^r disjoint from p then, using (27), we obtain

$$N(p + q) = N(p) + N(q) = N(p) + N(p^r) = N(p) + N(p)^r \in \mathcal{R}(A). \quad (28)$$

Definition 28. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$.

- \mathbf{D} is closed under permutation of alternatives (CPA) if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, $p^\psi \in \mathbf{D}$;
- \mathbf{D} is closed under addition (CA) if, for every $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint, $p + p' \in \mathbf{D}$;
- \mathbf{D} is coherent with outstar networks (CON) if, for every $x \in A$, there exist $p \in \mathbf{D}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N(p) = kN_x + R$;
- \mathbf{D} is coherent with clones (CWC) if, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathbf{D}$, there exist $q_1, \dots, q_k \in \mathbf{D}$ pairwise disjoint such that, for every $i, j \in [k]$, q_i is a clone of p_i disjoint from p_j ;

- \mathbf{D} is coherent with reversal symmetry (CRS) if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$, there exists $q \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint from p such that $N(p + q) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Note that if $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{D}' \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and \mathbf{D} is CON, then \mathbf{D}' is CON.

Proposition 29. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$. Then the following facts hold true.*

- (i) *If \mathbf{D} is CPA, then $N(\mathbf{D})$ is CPV.*
- (ii) *If \mathbf{D} is CA and CWC, then $N(\mathbf{D})$ is CA.*
- (iii) *If \mathbf{D} is CA, CWC and CPA, then, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$, there exists $q \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint from p such that $N(p + q) \in N(\mathbf{D}) \cap \mathcal{C}(A)$. In particular, \mathbf{D} is CRS.*
- (iv) *If \mathbf{D} is CA, CWC and CPA and such that there exists $p \in \mathbf{D}$ with $N(p) \neq N(0)$, then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $t \geq k$ such that $N(t) \in N(\mathbf{D}) \cap \mathcal{C}(A)$.*

Proof. (i) Assume that \mathbf{D} is CPA and show that $N(\mathbf{D})$ is CPV. Let $N \in N(\mathbf{D})$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Then there exists $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N = N(p)$. Since \mathbf{D} is CPA we have that $p^\psi \in \mathbf{D}$. Thus, $N^\psi = N(p)^\psi = N(p^\psi) \in N(\mathbf{D})$.

(ii) Assume that \mathbf{D} is CA and CWC and show that $N(\mathbf{D})$ is CA. Let $N, M \in N(\mathbf{D})$. Then there exist $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N = N(p)$ and $M = N(p')$. Since \mathbf{D} is CWC we can find $\hat{p}, \hat{p}' \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint such that \hat{p} is a clone of p , \hat{p}' is a clone of p' . Since \mathbf{D} is CA we have that $\hat{p} + \hat{p}' \in \mathbf{D}$. Thus, $N + M = N(\hat{p}) + N(\hat{p}') = N(\hat{p} + \hat{p}') \in N(\mathbf{D})$.

(iii) Assume that \mathbf{D} is CA, CWC and CPA. Consider $p \in \mathbf{D}$. Let ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k be an enumeration of the $k = m! - 1$ elements of $\text{Sym}(A) \setminus \{id\}$. Since \mathbf{D} is CPA, for every $i \in [k]$, $p^{\psi_i} \in \mathbf{D}$. Since \mathbf{D} is CWC, there exist $\hat{p}_1, \dots, \hat{p}_k \in \mathbf{D}$ pairwise disjoint such that, for every $i \in [k]$, \hat{p}_i is a clone of p^{ψ_i} and \hat{p}_i is disjoint from p . Consider then $q := \hat{p}_1 + \dots + \hat{p}_k$ and note that q is disjoint from p . Since \mathbf{D} is CA, we have that $q \in \mathbf{D}$ and $p + q \in \mathbf{D}$ so that $N(p + q) \in N(\mathbf{D})$. We complete the proof showing that $N(p + q) \in \mathcal{C}(A)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} N(p + q) &= N\left(p + \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{p}_i\right) = N(p) + \sum_{i=1}^k N(\hat{p}_i) = N(p) + \sum_{i=1}^k N(p^{\psi_i}) \\ &= \sum_{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)} N(p^\psi) = \sum_{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)} N(p)^\psi. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(A)$,

$$\begin{aligned} N(p + q)^\sigma &= \left(\sum_{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)} N(p)^\psi \right)^\sigma = \sum_{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)} (N(p)^\psi)^\sigma \\ &= \sum_{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)} N(p)^{\sigma\psi} = \sum_{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)} N(p)^\psi = N(p + q). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2, we conclude that $N(p + q) \in \mathcal{C}(A)$.

(iv) Assume that \mathbf{D} is CA, CWC and CPA and that there exists $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N(p) \neq N(0)$. By (iii) we know that there exists $q \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint from p such that $N(p + q) \in N(\mathbf{D}) \cap \mathcal{C}(A)$. Set $p' := p + q$ and note that, since \mathbf{D} is CA and $N(p) \neq N(0)$, we have that $p' \in \mathbf{D}$ and $N(p') = N(r)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Fixed now $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $hr \geq k$. Defined $t := hr$, due to the fact that \mathbf{D} is CWC, there are $p_1, \dots, p_h \in \mathbf{D}$ pairwise disjoint clones of p' . Since \mathbf{D} is CA, we have that $p'' = p_1 + \dots + p_h \in \mathbf{D}$. Now we have that $N(p'') = N(t) \in N(\mathbf{D})$ and that completes the proof. \square

9 Social choice correspondences

Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$. A social choice correspondence (SCC) on \mathbf{D} is a function from \mathbf{D} to $P_0(A)$. The concepts of SCC and of NS are deeply linked. However, while the construction of a SCC starting from a NS is extremely natural and needs no particular assumption (Definition 30), the construction of a NS from a SCC is insidious and can be performed only under some assumptions on the SCC and its domain (Definition 36).

Definition 30. Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$ and \mathcal{F} be a NS on \mathcal{D} . Given $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ such that $N(\mathbf{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, the SCC on \mathbf{D} associated with \mathcal{F} is the SCC $F : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ defined, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$, by $F(p) := \mathcal{F}(N(p))$.

The net-outdegree SCC, denoted by O , is the SCC on $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ associated with the net-outdegree NS \mathcal{O} . Thus, O is the SCC that associates with every $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ the set

$$O(p) := \mathcal{O}(N(p)).$$

In order to give a more expressive description of O , let us define, for every $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$, the numbers

$$L(p, x) := \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} |L(p(i), x)| \quad \text{and} \quad U(p, x) := \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} |U(p(i), x)|.$$

Note that $L(p, x)$ counts how many times, within the preference profile p , x is better than some alternative. Similarly $U(p, x)$ counts how many times, within the preference profile p , x is worse than some alternative. We next define the net-outdegree score of x in p by

$$o(p, x) := L(p, x) - U(p, x). \quad (29)$$

By the above interpretation of $L(p, x)$ and $U(p, x)$, we see that $o(p, x)$ counts the difference between the number of occasions in which x is better than some alternative and the number of occasions in which x is worse than some alternative, within p .

Proposition 31. Let $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$. Then $\delta^{N(p)}(x) = o(p, x)$. In particular,

$$O(p) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} o(p, x).$$

Proof. We have that

$$\delta^{N(p)}(x) = \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c_p(x, y) - \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} c_p(y, x) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} (c_{p(i)}(x, y) - c_{p(i)}(y, x)).$$

Clearly, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, the alternatives in $I(p(i), x) \cup IN(p(i), x)$ contribute 0 to the above sum. It follows that

$$\delta^{N(p)}(x) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} \left(\sum_{y \in L(p(i), x)} 1 - \sum_{y \in U(p(i), x)} 1 \right) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} (|L(p(i), x)| - |U(p(i), x)|) = o(p, x).$$

□

Let us introduce now some of the properties a SCC may meet.

Definition 32. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} .

- F satisfies *neutrality* if \mathbf{D} is CPA and, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, $F(p^\psi) = \psi(F(p))$;
- F satisfies *consistency* if \mathbf{D} is CA and, for every $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint with $F(p) \cap F(p') \neq \emptyset$, $F(p + p') = F(p) \cap F(p')$;
- F satisfies *cancellation* if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N(p) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, $F(p) = A$;
- F satisfies *outstar network faithfulness (ON-faithfulness)* if, for every $x \in A$, there exist $p \in \mathbf{D}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N(p) = kN_x + R$ and $F(p) = \{x\}$;
- F satisfies *anonymity* if, for every $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ with $\text{Dom}(p) = \text{Dom}(p')$ and p' clone of p , we have $F(p) = F(p')$.
- F satisfies *strong anonymity* if, for every $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ with p' clone of p , $F(p) = F(p')$.

Note that if $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and F is a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying ON-faithfulness, then \mathbf{D} is CON. Note also that strong anonymity implies anonymity.

Consider now $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$. It is immediately proved that $O_{|\mathbf{D}}$ satisfies cancellation and strong anonymity. Moreover, if \mathbf{D} is CPA, CA and CON, then $O_{|\mathbf{D}}$ also satisfies neutrality, consistency and ON-faithfulness. That immediately follows from Proposition 12, using formulas (27). Note also that the existence of a SCC F on \mathbf{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency and ON-faithfulness implies \mathbf{D} being CPA, CA and CON. The main result of this section (Theorem 38) establishes that if \mathbf{D} satisfies suitable further properties, then $O_{|\mathbf{D}}$ is in fact the unique SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying the aforementioned properties.

We present now some auxiliary results for SCCs satisfying consistency and cancellation. They allow to establish, for this kind of SCCs, remarkable properties of anonymity and the possibility to construct a corresponding NS.

Lemma 33. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ be CA, CWC and CRS and let F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying consistency and cancellation. If $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ are disjoint clones, then $F(p) = F(p')$.*

Proof. Let $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ be disjoint clones. Since \mathbf{D} is CRS, there exists $q \in \mathbf{D}$ such that q is disjoint from p and $N(p+q) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since \mathbf{D} is CWC, there exists $s \in \mathbf{D}$ such that s is a clone of q disjoint from p and p' . We have then that $p+q, p+s$ and $p'+s$ are clones and $N(p+q) = N(p+s) = N(p'+s) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. By cancellation of F , we have that $F(p+s) = A$ and $F(p'+s) = A$. Using now consistency of F , we finally get $F(p) = F(p) \cap A = F(p) \cap F(p'+s) = F(p+(p'+s)) = F(p'+(p+s)) = F(p') \cap F(p+s) = F(p') \cap A = F(p')$. \square

The next lemma is inspired to Lemma 1 in Young (1974).

Lemma 34. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ be CA, CWC and CRS and let F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying consistency and cancellation. If $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ are such that $N(p) = N(p')$, then $F(p) = F(p')$.*

Proof. Let $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ be such that $N(p) = N(p')$. Since \mathbf{D} satisfies CWC, there exist $\hat{p}, \hat{p}' \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint such that \hat{p} is a clone of p , \hat{p}' is a clone of p' and \hat{p} and \hat{p}' are both disjoint from p and p' . Since \mathbf{D} satisfies CRS, there exist $q \in \mathbf{D}$ such that q is disjoint from p and $N(p+q) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since \mathbf{D} satisfies CWC, there exist $\hat{q} \in \mathbf{D}$ such that \hat{q} is a clone of q and \hat{q} is disjoint from p, q, \hat{p} and \hat{p}' . By $N(p) = N(p')$ and the properties of clones, we get

$$N(\hat{p} + \hat{q}) = N(\hat{p}) + N(\hat{q}) = N(p) + N(q) = N(p+q) \in \mathcal{R}(A),$$

$$N(\hat{p}' + \hat{q}) = N(\hat{p}') + N(\hat{q}) = N(p') + N(q) = N(p) + N(q) = N(p+q) \in \mathcal{R}(A).$$

Thus, by cancellation of F , we obtain that $F(\hat{p} + \hat{q}) = A$ and $F(\hat{p}' + \hat{q}) = A$. Applying now consistency of F , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(\hat{p}) &= F(\hat{p}) \cap A = F(\hat{p}) \cap F(\hat{p}' + \hat{q}) = F(\hat{p} + (\hat{p}' + \hat{q})) \\ &= F(\hat{p}' + (\hat{p} + \hat{q})) = F(\hat{p}') \cap F(\hat{p} + \hat{q}) = F(\hat{p}') \cap A = F(\hat{p}'). \end{aligned}$$

Since \hat{p} is a disjoint clone of p and \hat{p}' is a disjoint clone of p' , by Lemma 33, we finally obtain $F(p) = F(\hat{p}) = F(\hat{p}') = F(p')$. \square

Corollary 35. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ be CA, CWC and CRS and let F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying consistency and cancellation. Then F is strongly anonymous. In particular, F is anonymous.*

Proof. Let $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ be clones. Then $N(p) = N(p')$, so that, by Lemma 34, $F(p) = F(p')$. \square

Lemma 34 plays a formidable role in the not obvious construction of a NS from a SCC.

Definition 36. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ be CA, CWC and CRS and F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying consistency and cancellation. Given $\mathcal{D} \subseteq N(\mathbf{D})$, the NS on \mathcal{D} associated with F is the NS $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$, defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}$, by $\mathcal{F}(N) = F(p)$, where p is any element in \mathbf{D} such that $N(p) = N$.*

We stress that NS \mathcal{F} in Definition 36 is well-defined. Indeed, since \mathbf{D} is CA, CWC and CRS and F satisfies consistency and cancellation, if $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ are such that $N(p) = N(p') = N$ then, by Lemma 34, we have $F(p) = F(p')$.

10 General characterization theorem for the net-outdegree SCC

Let us introduce now an important definition.

Definition 37. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$. We say that \mathbf{D} is regular if

- (α) \mathbf{D} is CPA, CA, CON and CWC;
- (β) for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}N(\mathbf{D})$, there exist $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N(p) = N + N(p')$ with $N(p') \in \mathcal{R}(A)$;
- (γ) $(\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \in \{\mathcal{R}(A), \mathcal{PS}(A)\}$.

The importance of the above definition is due to the following theorem, the main result of the paper. As we will see in the next section, such a result implies a variety of very interesting corollaries.

Theorem 38. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ be regular. Then $O_{|\mathbf{D}}$ is the unique SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying, neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Proof. We have previously observed that $O_{|\mathbf{D}}$ is a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying, neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Let then $F : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow P_0(A)$ be a SCC satisfying, neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness. We want to prove that $F = O_{|\mathbf{D}}$. Let $\mathcal{D} := N(\mathbf{D}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$. We start showing that the conditions (a), (b) and (c) in Theorem 22 hold true for \mathcal{D} . First note that, since \mathbf{D} is CPA, CA and CWC, by Proposition 29, \mathcal{D} is CVP and CA. Moreover, since \mathbf{D} is CON, we immediately have that \mathcal{D} is CON. Thus, \mathcal{D} satisfies condition (a). Since \mathbf{D} satisfies conditions (β) and (γ), we immediately also have that \mathcal{D} satisfies conditions (b) and (c). By Theorem 22, it follows that $\mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$ is the unique NS on \mathcal{D} satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Since \mathbf{D} is CA, CWC and CRS and F satisfies consistency and cancellation, we can consider the NS on \mathcal{D} associated with F as in Definition 36. We denote such a NS by \mathcal{F} .

We show that \mathcal{F} satisfies neutrality. Let $N \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Consider $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N(p) = N$. Following the definition of \mathcal{F} , using formulas (27) and recalling the meaning of neutrality for a SCC, we have

$$\mathcal{F}(N^\psi) = \mathcal{F}(N(p)^\psi) = \mathcal{F}(N(p^\psi)) = F(p^\psi) = \psi F(p) = \psi \mathcal{F}(N(p)) = \psi \mathcal{F}(N).$$

Straightforward arguments show that \mathcal{F} satisfies cancellation and ON-faithfulness. Let us check now that \mathcal{F} satisfies consistency too. Let $N, M \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that $\mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M) \neq \emptyset$. Consider $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $N = N(p)$ and $M = N(p')$. Since \mathbf{D} is CWC there are $\hat{p}, \hat{p}' \in \mathbf{D}$ disjoint such that \hat{p} is a clone of p and \hat{p}' is a clone of p' . Thus, $N = N(\hat{p})$ and $M = N(\hat{p}')$. Then

$$F(\hat{p}) \cap F(\hat{p}') = \mathcal{F}(N(\hat{p})) \cap \mathcal{F}(N(\hat{p}')) = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M) \neq \emptyset,$$

and hence, using consistency of F , we get

$$\mathcal{F}(N + M) = \mathcal{F}(N(\hat{p}) + N(\hat{p}')) = \mathcal{F}(N(\hat{p} + \hat{p}')) = F(\hat{p} + \hat{p}') = F(\hat{p}) \cap F(\hat{p}') = \mathcal{F}(N) \cap \mathcal{F}(M).$$

By Theorem 22, we deduce that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{O}_{|\mathcal{D}}$. As a consequence, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$, we have $F(p) = \mathcal{F}(N(p)) = \mathcal{O}(N(p)) = O(p)$. That proves that $F = O_{|\mathbf{D}}$. \square

11 Some regular subsets of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$

Given $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$, we set

$$\mathbf{D}(A)^* := \bigcup_{\substack{I \subseteq V \\ I \neq \emptyset \text{ finite}}} \mathbf{D}(A)^I,$$

and note that $\mathbf{D}(A)^* \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$. The purpose of this section is to show that the set $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is regular for many remarkable qualifications of $\mathbf{D}(A)$.

11.1 Yet on relations

Let $R \in \mathbf{R}(A)$. We say that R is reflexive if $A_d^2 \subseteq R$; complete if, for every $x, y \in A$, $(x, y) \in R$ or $(y, x) \in R$; transitive if, for every $x, y, z \in A$, $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, z) \in R$ implies $(x, z) \in R$; antisymmetric if, for every $x, y \in A$, $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, x) \in R$ implies $x = y$. Note that a complete relation is necessarily reflexive. Note also that $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) = \{N(0)\}$ if and only if $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq P(A_d^2)$.

We say that R is an order if R is complete and transitive; a linear order if R is complete, transitive and antisymmetric; a partial order if R is reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive. The set of orders on A is denoted by $\mathbf{O}(A)$; the set of linear orders on A is denoted by $\mathbf{L}(A)$; the set of partial orders on A is denoted by $\mathbf{P}(A)$. Of course, we have $\emptyset \neq \mathbf{L}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{P}(A)$. Note that, if $R \in \mathbf{O}(A)$, then $IN(R, x) = \emptyset$; if $R \in \mathbf{P}(A)$, then $I(R, x) = \{x\}$.

Given $R \in \mathbf{O}(A)$, define the sets

$$T(R) := \{x \in A : \forall y \in A \ x \geq_R y\}, \quad B(R) := \{x \in A : \forall y \in A \ y \geq_R x\}.$$

It is well-known that $T(R)$ and $B(R)$ are nonempty; for every $x \in T(R)$, $T(R) = I(R, x)$; for every $x \in B(R)$, $B(R) = I(R, x)$; $T(R) \cap B(R) \neq \emptyset$ implies $T(R) = B(R) = A$ so that $R = A^2$; for every $x \in T(R)$ and $y \in A \setminus T(R)$, $x >_R y$; for every $x \in B(R)$ and $y \in A \setminus B(R)$, $y >_R x$; if $R \in \mathbf{L}(A)$, then $|T(R)| = |B(R)| = 1$.

We say that R is a dichotomous order if $T(R) \cup B(R) = A$; a top-truncated order if, for every $x \in A \setminus B(R)$, $|I(R, x)| = 1$. The set of dichotomous orders on A is denoted by $\mathbf{Di}(A)$; the set of top-truncated orders on A is denoted by $\mathbf{T}(A)$. Note that $\mathbf{L}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{T}(A)$. In particular, $\mathbf{T}(A) \neq \emptyset$.

For every $t \in [m]$, we set $\mathbf{Di}_t(A) := \{x \in \mathbf{Di}(A) : |T(R)| = t\}$ and, given $X \subseteq [m]$, we set

$$\mathbf{Di}_X(A) := \bigcup_{t \in X} \mathbf{Di}_t(A).$$

For every $s \in [m-1]_0$, we set $\mathbf{T}_s(A) := \{x \in \mathbf{T}(A) : |A \setminus B(R)| = s\}$ and given $Y \subseteq [m-1]_0$, we set

$$\mathbf{T}_Y(A) := \bigcup_{s \in Y} \mathbf{T}_s(A).$$

Note that, for every $t \in [m]$, $\mathbf{Di}_t(A) \neq \emptyset$ and, for every $s \in [m-1]_0$, $\mathbf{T}_s(A) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, $\mathbf{Di}_m(A) = \mathbf{T}_0(A) = \{A^2\}$, $\mathbf{Di}_1(A) = \mathbf{T}_1(A)$, $\mathbf{T}_{m-1}(A) = \mathbf{L}(A)$.

11.2 Some useful propositions

We introduce an important property a set of relations on A may meet.

Definition 39. Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$. We say that $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives if, for every $R \in \mathbf{D}(A)$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, $R^\psi \in \mathbf{D}(A)$.

It is easily checked that the sets $\mathbf{R}(A)$, $\mathbf{P}(A)$, $\mathbf{O}(A)$, $\mathbf{L}(A)$, $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)$ and $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)$ are closed under permutation of alternatives.

When $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, the set $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ satisfies many useful properties, as described in the following propositions. In particular, Proposition 41 turns out to be a crucial short-cut for testing condition (β) of Definition 37.

Proposition 40. Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$. The following facts hold true.

- (i) $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CA and CWC and $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$ is CA.
- (ii) If $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, then $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CPA and CRS and $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$ is CPV.
- (iii) If $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives and there exists $R \in \mathbf{D}(A)$ such that $R \not\subseteq A_d^2$, then, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}$, with $t \geq k$ such that $N(t) \in N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) \cap \mathcal{C}(A)$.

Proof. It is immediately observed that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CA and CWC. Thus, by Proposition 29(ii), we get (i). If $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, it is immediate to show that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CPA. Thus, by Proposition 29(i)-(iii), we get (ii). Finally, if $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives and there exists $R \in \mathbf{D}(A)$ such that $R \not\subseteq A_d^2$, we can consider $p \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{1\}$ and $p(1) = R$. Then $N(p) \neq N(0)$ so that, applying Proposition 29(iv), we finally get (iii). \square

Proposition 41. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ be nonempty. If $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, then $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ satisfies condition (β) of Definition 37.*

Proof. Note that, since $\mathbf{D}(A) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\mathbf{D}(A)^* \neq \emptyset$. We need to show that, for every $N \in \mathbb{Z}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$,

$$\text{there exist } p, p' \in \mathbf{D}(A)^* \text{ with } N(p') \in \mathcal{R}(A) \text{ such that } N(p) = N + N(p'). \quad (30)$$

Assume first that $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq P(A_d^2)$. Then we have $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) = \{N(0)\}$ so that also $\mathbb{Z}N(\mathbf{D}) = \{N(0)\}$. Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}N(\mathbf{D})$. Picking any $p, p' \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$, we have that (30) is trivially satisfied since $N = N(p) = N(p') = N(0) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Assume next that $\mathbf{D}(A) \not\subseteq P(A_d^2)$. Then, by Proposition 40, we have that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CA, CWC, CPA and CRS, $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$ is CA and there exists $\bar{p} \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ such that $N(\bar{p}) \in \mathcal{C}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{R}(A)$. Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}N(\mathbf{D})$ and prove (30).

If $N = N(0)$, we get (30) choosing $p = p' = \bar{p}$. If $N \neq N(0)$, there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ and $m_1, \dots, m_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, with $m_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in [k]$, such that

$$N = \sum_{i \in [k]} m_i N(p_i).$$

Assume first that $m_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in [k]$. By the fact that $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$ is CA, we get that $N = N(q)$ for some $q \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$. Since $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CWC, there exists $p' \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ clone of \bar{p} disjoint from q . Moreover, let $p = q + p'$. Thus, $N(p') \in \mathcal{C}(A)$ and $N(p) = N(q + p') = N(q) + N(p') = N + N(p')$ so that (30) follows.

Assume now that $m_i < 0$ for some $i \in [k]$. Then

$$N = \sum_{i \in [k], m_i > 0} m_i N(p_i) - \sum_{i \in [k], m_i < 0} (-m_i) N(p_i). \quad (31)$$

Since $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$ is CA, there exists $q \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ such that $\sum_{i \in [k], m_i < 0} (-m_i) N(p_i) = N(q)$. There are two cases to discuss.

Suppose first that the first sum in (31) is empty. Then we have $N = -N(q)$. Since $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CRS there exists $q' \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ disjoint from q such that $N(q) + N(q') = N(q + q') \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. It follows that $N = N(q') - N(q + q')$ and thus $N + N(q + q') = N(q')$, which gives (30) by choosing $p = q'$ and $p' = q + q'$.

Suppose next that the first sum in (31) is not empty. Since $N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*)$ is CA and $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CWC, there exists $s \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ with s disjoint from q such that $N = N(s) - N(q)$. Since $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CRS and CWC, there exists $q' \in \mathbf{D}(A)^*$ disjoint from q and s such that $N(q) + N(q') = N(q + q') \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Thus, we get $N = N(q') + N(s) - N(q + q')$ so that $N + N(q + q') = N(q') + N(s) = N(q' + s)$, which gives (30) by choosing $p = q' + s$ and $p' = q + q'$. \square

We emphasize that it is not guaranteed that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CON. Let $R \in \mathbf{R}(A)$. We say that R is a cycle relation if $N(R)$ is a cycle network. Denote by $\mathbf{C}(A)$ the set of cycle relations on A .

Proposition 42. $\mathbf{C}(A)^*$ is not CON.

Proof. Let $x \in A$. Assume, by contradiction, that there exist $p \in \mathbf{C}(A)^*$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N(p) = kN_x + R$. It follows that $\delta^{N(p)}(x) = k(m-1) \neq 0$. On the other hand, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, we have $N(p(i)) = C_i$ for some cycle network C_i . Thus $N(p) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} C_i$ and, since $C_i \in \text{Ker}(\delta)$ for all $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, we deduce that $N(p) \in \text{Ker}(\delta)$, so that $\delta^{N(p)}(x) = 0$, a contradiction. \square

11.3 Linear orders

Let us consider now subsets of the type $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$, where $\mathbf{L}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$.

Proposition 43. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ with $\mathbf{L}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)$. Then $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CON.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{D}(A)^* \supseteq \mathbf{L}(A)^*$, it is sufficient to show that $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ is CON. We claim first that, for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, there exists $R_{xy} \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that

$$2N_{xy} + R_{xy} \in N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*). \quad (32)$$

Let $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$. Let $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, where x_1, \dots, x_m are distinct, $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = y$. Let $p_{xy} \in \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ be such that $\text{Dom}(p_{xy}) = \{1, 2\}$, $p_{xy}(1) = \{(x_i, x_j) \in A^2 : i, j \in [m], i \leq j\}$ and $p_{xy}(2) = (p_{xy}(1)^r)^{(x,y)}$.¹³ Then, it is immediately checked that $N(p) = 2N_{xy} + R_{xy}$, where

$$R_{xy} := \sum_{i \in [m]} \sum_{j \in [m] \setminus \{1, 2\}} (N_{x_i x_j} + N_{x_j x_i}) \in \mathcal{R}(A). \quad (33)$$

Note that $R_{xy} = N(0)$ when $m = 2$. That proves the claim.

Let now $x \in A$ be fixed. By Proposition 40 we know that $N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*)$ is CA. Thus, we have that

$$\sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} (2N_{xy} + R_{xy}) = 2N_x + R \in N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*),$$

where

$$R = \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} R_{xy} \in \mathcal{R}(A).$$

Then there exists $p \in \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ such that $N(p) = 2N_x + R$. That shows that $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ is CON. \square

Proposition 44. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ with $\mathbf{L}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)$. Then $\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$, it is sufficient to show that $\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) \supseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$. By (32), we have that, for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, the networks $2N_{xy} + R_{xy} \in N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*)$ and, by (33), $R_{xy} \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. It follows that $N_{xy} \in \mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since the networks N_{xy} are a basis for $\mathcal{N}(A)$, we deduce that $\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{L}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) \supseteq \mathcal{N}(A)$. \square

Theorem 45. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ be closed under permutation of alternatives and such that $\mathbf{L}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)$. Then $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is regular.*

Proof. We prove that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ satisfies the conditions (α) , (β) and (γ) of Definition 37.

Since $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, by Proposition 40, we have that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CPA, CA, CWC and CRS. The fact that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CON follows from Proposition 43 since $\mathbf{D}(A) \supseteq \mathbf{L}(A)$. Thus, (α) in Definition 37 holds. The fact that (β) in Definition 37 holds follows from Proposition 41, because $\mathbf{D}(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives and $\mathbf{D}(A) \neq \emptyset$. In order to prove that $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ satisfies (γ) in Definition 37, observe first that Proposition 44 implies

$$\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A).$$

As a consequence, we have

$$(\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{N}(A) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{PS}(A),$$

so that (γ) holds. \square

Corollary 46. $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$, $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$, $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$, $\mathbf{T}(A)^*$ and $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ are regular.

11.4 Dichotomous orders

Definition 47. *Let $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq A$. Denote by p_X the element of $\mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p_X) = \{1\}$ and $T(p_X(1)) = X$.*

It is easily checked that

$$N(p_X) = K_{A \setminus X} + \sum_{x \in X} N_x, \quad (34)$$

where $K_{A \setminus X}$ is the complete network on $A \setminus X$ (see (2)). In particular, for every $x \in A$, since $K_{\{x\}} = N(0)$, we have

$$N(p_{\{x\}}) = K_{A \setminus \{x\}} + N_x, \quad N(p_{A \setminus \{x\}}) = \sum_{y \in A \setminus \{x\}} N_y. \quad (35)$$

¹³Using the standard informal way to represent linear orders, we have that if $m = 2$, then $p_{xy}(1) = p_{xy}(2) = x_1 x_2$; if $m \geq 3$, then $p_{xy}(1) = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_m$ and $p_{xy}(2) = x_m x_{m-1} \cdots x_3 x_1 x_2$.

Proposition 48. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ with $\mathbf{Di}_t(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)$ for some $t \in [m-1]$. Then $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CON.*

Proof. Let $t \in [m-1]$ be such that $\mathbf{Di}_t(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)$. Since $\mathbf{Di}_t(A)^* \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)^*$, it is sufficient to show that $\mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ is CON. If $m = 2$, then $t = 1$ and $\mathbf{Di}_t(A)^* = \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ that is CON by Proposition 43. Assume then that $m \geq 3$. Let $a \in A$ and let $r := \binom{m-1}{t-1}$ be the number of subsets of A having size t and containing a . Let X_1, \dots, X_r be those subsets. Let $p \in \mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ be such that $\text{Dom}(p) = [r]$ and, for every $i \in [r]$, $T(p(i)) := X_i$. If $t = 1$, then we have $r = 1$ and, by (34), we have $N(p) = N(p_{\{a\}}) = K_{A \setminus \{a\}} + N_x$, as desired. Assume next $t \geq 2$. By (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(p) &= \sum_{i \in [r]} N(p_{X_i}) = \sum_{i \in [r]} \left(K_{A \setminus X_i} + \sum_{x \in X_i} N_x \right) = \sum_{i \in [r]} K_{A \setminus X_i} + \sum_{i \in [r]} \sum_{x \in X_i} N_x \\ &= \sum_{i \in [r]} K_{A \setminus X_i} + rN_a + \sum_{i \in [r]} \sum_{x \in X_i \setminus \{a\}} N_x = \sum_{i \in [r]} K_{A \setminus X_i} + rN_a + \binom{m-2}{t-2} \sum_{x \in A \setminus \{a\}} N_x \\ &= \sum_{i \in [r]} K_{A \setminus X_i} + rN_a + \binom{m-2}{t-2} \left(-N_a + \sum_{x \in A} N_x \right) \\ &= \left(r - \binom{m-2}{t-2} \right) N_a + \sum_{i \in [r]} K_{A \setminus X_i} + \binom{m-2}{t-2} N(1) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $R := \sum_{i \in [r]} K_{A \setminus X_i} + \binom{m-2}{t-2} N(1) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ and that, since $m \geq 3$, we have

$$k := \binom{m-1}{t-1} - \binom{m-2}{t-2} = \binom{m-2}{t-1} \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, we have proved that $N(p) = kN_a + R$. Hence $\mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ is CON. \square

Proposition 49. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{Di}(A)$. Then $(\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{R}(A)$.*

Proof. We first show that

$$\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A). \quad (36)$$

Recall that $\mathcal{O}(A) = \mathbb{Q}\{N_x : x \in A\}$. By (35), for every $x \in A$, we have $N_x + K_{A \setminus \{x\}} = N(p_{\{x\}}) \in N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*)$. Since $K_{A \setminus \{x\}} \in \mathcal{R}(A)$, we deduce that $N_x \in \mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)$. As a consequence, we have that $\mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)$.

Let $p \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ and, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, let $X_i = T(p(i))$. Using (34), we have that

$$N(p) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} N(p_{X_i}) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} \left(K_{A \setminus X_i} + \sum_{x \in X_i} N_x \right) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} K_{A \setminus X_i} + \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} \sum_{x \in X_i} N_x.$$

It follows that $N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)$ and thus $\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)$. That shows (36).

Let now $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{Di}(A)$. Then, by (36), we have

$$\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{Di}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A) = \mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A),$$

so that, by Proposition 26, we get

$$(\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) \subseteq (\mathcal{O}(A) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{R}(A).$$

Since the other inclusion trivially holds we deduce that $(\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{R}(A)$. \square

Theorem 50. *Let $X \subseteq [m]$ with $X \cap [m-1] \neq \emptyset$. Then $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ is regular.*

Proof. We prove that $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ satisfies the conditions (α) , (β) and (γ) of Definition 37. Since $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, by Proposition 40, we have that $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ is CPA, CA and CRS. Since $X \cap [m-1] \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\mathbf{Di}_X(A) \supseteq \mathbf{Di}_t(A)$ for some $t \in [m-1]$. Thus, by Proposition 48 we deduce that $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ is CON. Thus, condition (α) is satisfied. By Proposition 41 we deduce that condition (β) is satisfied. Since clearly $\mathbf{Di}_X(A) \subseteq \mathbf{Di}(A)$, by Proposition 49 we deduce that condition (γ) is satisfied too. \square

In particular, we immediately deduce the following result.

Corollary 51. *$\mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ is regular and, for every $t \in [m-1]$, $\mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ and $\mathbf{Di}_{[t]}(A)^*$ are regular.*

11.5 Top-truncated orders

Proposition 52. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ with $\mathbf{T}_s(A) \subseteq \mathbf{D}(A)$ for some $s \in [m-1]$. Then $\mathbf{D}(A)^*$ is CON.*

Proof. Let $x \in A$. We have to prove that there exist $p \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N(p) = kN_x + R$. Let $Q \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)$ be such that $T(Q) = \{x\}$. Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{(m-1)!}$ be the distinct permutations in the set $\Omega = \{\psi \in \text{Sym}(A) : \psi(x) = x\}$. Consider $p \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p) = [(m-1)!]$ and, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, $p(i) = Q^{\psi_i}$. Note that, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, $T(p(i)) = \{x\}$. It is immediately checked that $N(p) = (m-1)!N_x + R$, where

$$R = \sum_{\psi \in \Omega} N(Q^\psi \cap (A \setminus \{x\})^2) = \sum_{\psi \in \Omega} N(Q \cap (A \setminus \{x\})^2)^\psi.$$

We complete the proof showing that $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Indeed, note that $c^R(x', y') = 0$ if $x' = x$ or $y' = x$. Moreover, for every $\sigma \in \Omega$, $R^\sigma = R$. Then, using an argument analogous to the one used in the proof of Proposition 2, we see that there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $R = \alpha K_{A \setminus \{x\}} \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. \square

Proposition 53. *Let $\mathbf{D}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)$ with $\mathbf{D}(A) \supseteq \mathbf{T}_s(A)$, for some $s \in [m-1]$ with $s \geq 2$. Then*

$$(\mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{D}(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)) \cap \mathcal{PS}(A) = \mathcal{PS}(A).$$

Proof. Let $s \in [m-1]$, with $s \geq 2$, be such that $\mathbf{D}(A) \supseteq \mathbf{T}_s(A)$ and let $W := \mathbb{Q}N(\mathbf{T}_s(A)^*) + \mathcal{R}(A)$. In order to prove the desired equality, it is enough to show that $W = \mathcal{N}(A)$. Since W is vector subspace of $\mathcal{N}(A)$, in order to get the equality $W = \mathcal{N}(A)$ we show that, for every $(x, y) \in A_*^2$, $N_{xy} \in W$.

In order to simplify the notation, assume without loss of generality that $A = [m]$. By standard considerations about permutations of alternatives, it is enough to show that $N_{12} \in W$.

Consider $Q \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)$ be such that $B(Q) = A \setminus [s]$ and $1 >_Q 2 >_Q \dots >_Q s$. Let $p \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$ be such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{1\}$ and $p(1) = Q$. Then, we have

$$N(p) = \sum_{i \in [s]} N_i - \sum_{\substack{3 \leq u \leq s \\ j \in [u-1]}} N_{uj} - N_{21} + K_{A \setminus [s]} \in W. \quad (37)$$

By Proposition 52, for every $x \in A$, there exist $p \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N(p) = kN_x + R$. Thus, for every $x \in A$, we have that $N_x \in W$. As a consequence, we have that $\sum_{i \in [s]} N_i \in W$. Define now $M := \sum_{\substack{3 \leq u \leq s \\ j \in [u-1]}} N_{uj}$.

Then, by (37) and recalling that $K_{A \setminus [s]} \in \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq W$, we deduce that $M + N_{21} \in W$.

Consider $(1\ 2) \in \text{Sym}(A)$. Let $q \in \mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$ be such that $\text{Dom}(q) = \{1\}$ and $q(1) = Q^{(1\ 2)}$. Then we have

$$N(q) = \sum_{i \in [s]} N_i - \sum_{\substack{3 \leq u \leq s \\ j \in [u-1]}} N_{uj} - N_{12} + K_{A \setminus [s]} \in W,$$

which implies $M + N_{12} \in W$. As a consequence, we have $M + N_{21} + M + N_{12} \in W$. Since $N_{21} + N_{12} \in \mathcal{R}(A) \subseteq W$, we get $M \in W$. Hence also $N_{12} \in W$, as desired. \square

Theorem 54. *Let $Y \subseteq [m-1]_0$ with $Y \cap [m-1] \neq \emptyset$. Then $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ is regular.*

Proof. If $Y \cap [m-1] = \{1\}$, then we have $Y = \{1\}$ so that $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^* = \mathbf{T}_1(A)^* = \mathbf{Di}_1(A)^*$, or $Y = \{0, 1\}$ so that $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^* = \mathbf{T}_{\{0,1\}}(A)^* = \mathbf{Di}_{\{1,m\}}(A)^*$. In both cases, by Theorem 50, we have that $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ is regular. Assume now that $Y \cap [m-1] \neq \{1\}$. Thus, there exists $s \in Y \cap [m-1]$ with $s \geq 2$ and $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^* \supseteq \mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$. We prove that $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ satisfies the conditions (α) , (β) and (γ) of Definition 37. Since $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)$ is closed under permutation of alternatives, by Proposition 40, we have that $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ is CPA, CA and CRS. By Proposition 52 we deduce that $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ is CON. Thus, condition (α) is satisfied. By Proposition 41 we deduce that condition (β) is satisfied. By Proposition 53 we deduce that condition (γ) is satisfied too. \square

In particular, we immediately deduce the following result.

Corollary 55. *$\mathbf{T}(A)^*$ is regular and, for every $s \in [m-1]$, $\mathbf{T}_s(A)^*$ and $\mathbf{T}_{[s]}(A)^*$ are regular.*

12 Classic and new characterization results for SCCs

In this section we exploit the power and the generality of our results to obtain classic and new characterization results for various known SCC on $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$, $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$, $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$, $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ and $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$.

12.1 ON-faithfulness, faithfulness and averseness

We start our enquiry recalling the classic property of faithfulness given by Young (1974) and Fishburn (1979). Moreover, we introduce in $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$, with the name of averseness, a property considered by Cullinan et al. (2014) in the context $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$. The term averseness appears in Kurihara (2018) referred to $\mathbf{Di}_{(m-1)}(A)^*$.

Definition 56. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} . We say that F satisfies faithfulness if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{i\}$ for some $i \in V$, we have $F(p) = T(p(i))$.

Note that if $\mathbf{D}' \subseteq \mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and F is a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying faithfulness, then $F|_{\mathbf{D}'}$ satisfies faithfulness on \mathbf{D}' .

Definition 57. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$ and F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} . We say that F satisfies averseness if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{i\}$ for some $i \in V$ and for every $x, y \in A$, we have that $y >_{p(i)} x$ implies $x \notin F(p)$.

Note that, if $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$, a SCC F on \mathbf{D} satisfies averseness if and only if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{i\}$ for some $i \in V$, we have $F(p) \subseteq T(p(i))$. Propositions 58 and 59 describe the link between faithfulness and averseness.

Proposition 58. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and let F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying faithfulness. Then F satisfies averseness.

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbf{D}$ be such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{i\}$ for some $i \in V$. Since F satisfies faithfulness, we have that $F(p) = T(p(i))$, so that, in particular, $F(p) \subseteq T(p(i))$. \square

Proposition 59. Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and let F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying averseness and neutrality. Then F satisfies faithfulness.

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbf{D}$ be such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{i\}$ for some $i \in V$. We have to show that $F(p) = T(p(i))$. By averseness we know that $F(p) \subseteq T(p(i))$. Thus, we are left with proving that $T(p(i)) \subseteq F(p)$. Let $y \in T(p(i))$ and prove that $y \in F(p)$. Since $F(p) \neq \emptyset$, there exists $x \in F(p)$. Since $x \in T(p(i))$, there exists $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ such that $\psi(x) = y$ and fixing the alternatives in $A \setminus T(p(i))$. Surely we have $p^\psi = p$. Thus, using the neutrality of F , we obtain $y = \psi(x) \in \psi F(p) = F(p^\psi) = F(p)$, as desired. \square

We explore now two remarkable contexts where faithfulness and consistency imply ON-faithfulness.

Proposition 60. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ satisfying faithfulness and consistency. If $\mathbf{D} \supseteq \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ or $\mathbf{D} \supseteq \mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ for some $t \in [m-1]$, then F satisfies ON-faithfulness.

Proof. Let $x \in A$. We have to prove that there exists $p \in \mathbf{D}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$ such that $N(p) = kN_x + R$ and $F(p) = \{x\}$. Let $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ with x_1, \dots, x_m distinct and $x_1 = x$.

Assume first that $\mathbf{D} \supseteq \mathbf{L}(A)^*$. In what follows, given $p \in \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ and $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, denote by p^i the element of $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p) = \{i\}$ and $p^i(i) = p(i)$. If $m = 2$, consider $p \in \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ with $\text{Dom}(p) = \{1, 2\}$, $p(1) = x_1x_2$ and $p(2) = x_1x_2$. Then $N(p) = 2N_x + N(0)$ and $N(0) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Since by faithfulness we have that $F(p^1) = F(p^2) = \{x\}$, we can apply consistency and deduce that

$$F(p) = F(p^1 + p^2) = F(p^1) \cap F(p^2) = \{x\}.$$

If $m \geq 3$, consider $p \in \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ with $\text{Dom}(p) = \{1, 2\}$,

$$p(1) = \{(x_i, x_j) \in A^2 : i, j \in [m], i \leq j\},$$

and

$$p(2) = \{(x_i, x_j) \in A^2 : i, j \in \{2, \dots, m\}, i \geq j\} \cup \{(x_1, x_i) \in A^2 : i \in [m]\}.$$
¹⁴

¹⁴Using the informal notation for linear orders, we have that $p(1) = x_1x_2 \dots x_m$ and $p(2) = x_1x_mx_{m-1} \dots x_2$.

Then $N(p) = 2N_x + R$, where

$$R = \sum_{i,j \in \{2, \dots, m\}, i < j} (N_{x_i x_j} + N_{x_j x_i}) \in \mathcal{R}(A).$$

Since by faithfulness we have that $F(p^1) = F(p^2) = \{x\}$, we can apply consistency and deduce that

$$F(p) = F(p^1 + p^2) = F(p^1) \cap F(p^2) = \{x\}.$$

Assume now that there exists $t \in [m-1]$ such that $\mathbf{D} \supseteq \mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$. If $t = 1$, consider $p_{\{x\}} \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ as in Definition 47. Then $N(p) = N_x + R$, where

$$R = \sum_{i,j \in \{2, \dots, m\}, i < j} (N_{x_i x_j} + N_{x_j x_i}) \in \mathcal{R}(A).$$

Moreover, by faithfulness of F , we have that $F(p) = \{x\}$. If $t \geq 2$, then $m \geq 3$. Set $r := \binom{m-1}{t-1}$ be the number of subsets of A having size t and containing x . Let X_1, \dots, X_r be those subsets. Let us consider $p \in \mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ be such that $\text{Dom}(p) = [r]$ and, for every $i \in [r]$, $T(p(i)) := X_i$. As proved in Proposition 48, we have that $N(p) = kN_x + R$ for suitable $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. For every $i \in [r]$, let $\hat{p}_{X_i} \in \mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ be such that $\text{Dom}(\hat{p}_{X_i}) = \{i\}$ and $T(\hat{p}_{X_i}(i)) = X_i$. Then the preference profiles $\hat{p}_{X_1}, \dots, \hat{p}_{X_r}$ are pairwise disjoint, and $p = \sum_{i \in [r]} \hat{p}_{X_i}$. By faithfulness, for every $i \in [r]$, we have $F(\hat{p}_{X_i}) = X_i$. Moreover, since $\bigcap_{i \in [r]} X_i = \{x\}$ and F satisfies consistency, by Lemma 9 we get $F(p) = \{x\}$. \square

Proposition 61. *Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency and averseness. If $\mathbf{D} \supseteq \mathbf{L}(A)^*$ or $\mathbf{D} \supseteq \mathbf{Di}_t(A)^*$ for some $t \in [m-1]$, then F satisfies ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. By Proposition 59, F satisfies faithfulness. Hence, by Proposition 60, F satisfies ON-faithfulness. \square

12.2 Characterization of the Borda rule

We recall the Borda rule on $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$ as defined in the literature (Mas-Colell et al., 1997, Example 21.C.1; Vorsatz, 2008). For every $R \in \mathbf{O}(A)$ and $x \in A$, the Borda score of x in R is defined by

$$b(R, x) := \frac{1}{|I(R, x)|} \sum_{i=0}^{|I(R, x)|-1} (|L(R, x)| + i) = |L(R, x)| + \frac{|I(R, x)|}{2} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

For every $p \in \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$, the Borda score of x in p is defined by

$$b(p, x) := \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} b(p(i), x).$$

The Borda rule is then the SCC defined, for every $p \in \mathbf{O}(A)^*$, by

$$\text{BOR}(p) := \underset{x \in A}{\text{argmax}} b(p, x).$$

The above definition extends to $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$ the classic definition of the Borda rule defined on $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$.

Proposition 62. *$\text{BOR} = O_{|\mathbf{O}(A)^*}$. In particular, $\text{BOR}_{|\mathbf{L}(A)^*} = O_{|\mathbf{L}(A)^*}$.*

Proof. Let $R \in \mathbf{O}(A)$ and $x \in A$. Since $IN(R, x) = \emptyset$, we have that A is the disjoint union of $L(R, x), U(R, x), I(R, x)$. It follows that $m = |L(R, x)| + |U(R, x)| + |I(R, x)|$. Thus, we have

$$b(R, x) = |L(R, x)| + \frac{1}{2}(m - |L(R, x)| - |U(R, x)|) - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(|L(R, x)| - |U(R, x)| + m - 1).$$

As a consequence, recalling (29), for every $p \in \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$ we get

$$b(p, x) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} \frac{1}{2}(|L(p(i), x)| - |U(p(i), x)| + m - 1) = \frac{1}{2}o(p, x) + \frac{m-1}{2}|\text{Dom}(p)|.$$

Thus, by Proposition 31, for every $p \in \mathbf{O}(A)^*$, we have

$$BOR(p) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} \left(\frac{1}{2}o(p, x) + \frac{m-1}{2}|\operatorname{Dom}(p)| \right) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} o(p, x) = O(p),$$

as desired. \square

Theorem 63. $BOR_{|\mathbf{L}(A)^*}$ is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Proof. It immediately follows from Corollary 46, Theorem 38 and Proposition 62. \square

Theorem 63 implies the well-known characterization of the Borda rule on $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ due to Young (1974).

Theorem 64. [Young, 1974, Theorem 1] $BOR_{|\mathbf{L}(A)^*}$ is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness.

Proof. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness. By Proposition 60, we have that F satisfies ON-faithfulness. By Theorem 63, we finally deduce that $F = BOR_{|\mathbf{L}(A)^*}$. \square

Theorem 65. BOR is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.

Proof. It immediately follows from Corollary 46, Theorem 38 and Proposition 62. \square

Theorem 66. BOR is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness.

Proof. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{O}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness. By Proposition 60, we have that F satisfies ON-faithfulness. By Theorem 65, we finally deduce that $F = BOR$. \square

Young (1974) states that the content of Theorem 66 can be easily proved adapting the proof of his Theorem 1. However, it does not seem obvious how one could adapt Young's reasoning to the new framework since it appears, in many parts, guided by the specific properties of linear orders. However, the use of Theorem 38 allows to get the proof of Young's statement.

12.3 Characterization of the Partial Borda rule

The Partial Borda rule is a SCC on $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$ introduced by Cullinan et al. (2014) and defined as follows. Given $R \in \mathbf{P}(A)$, the partial Borda score of x in R is defined by

$$pb(R, x) := 2|L(R, x)| + |IN(R, x)|.$$

For every $p \in \mathbf{P}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$, the partial Borda score of x in p is defined by

$$pb(p, x) := \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Dom}(p)} pb(p(i), x).$$

The Partial Borda rule is then the SCC defined, for every $p \in \mathbf{P}(A)^*$, by

$$PBOR(p) := \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} pb(p, x).$$

Proposition 67. $PBOR = O_{|\mathbf{P}(A)^*}$.

Proof. We first claim that, for every $R \in \mathbf{P}(A)$ and $x \in A$, we have

$$pb(R, x) = |L(R, x)| - |U(R, x)| + m - 1. \quad (38)$$

Indeed, recalling that $|I(R, x)| = 1$, we have

$$pb(R, x) = 2|L(R, x)| + |IN(R, x)| = |L(R, x)| + |L(R, x)| + |IN(R, x)|$$

$$= |L(R, x)| + (m - U(R, x) - I(R, x)) = |L(R, x)| - |U(R, x)| + m - 1.$$

Consider now $p \in \mathbf{O}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$. By (38), we get

$$pb(p, x) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} (|L(p(i), x)| - |U(p(i), x)| + m - 1) = o(p, x) + (m - 1)|\text{Dom}(p)|.$$

Thus, by Proposition 31, for every $p \in \mathbf{O}(A)^*$, we have

$$PBOR(p) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} o(p, x) + (m - 1)|\text{Dom}(p)| = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} o(p, x) = O(p),$$

as desired. \square

Theorem 68. *PBOR is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. It immediately follows from Corollary 46, Theorem 38 and Proposition 67. \square

Theorem 68 implies the following characterization for the Partial Borda rule due to Cullinan et al. (2014).

Theorem 69. [Cullinan et al., 2014, Theorem 2] *PBOR is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and averseness.*

Proof. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{P}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and averseness. By Proposition 61, we have that F satisfies ON-faithfulness. By Theorem 68, we finally deduce that $F = PBOR$. \square

12.4 Characterization of the Averaged Borda rule

The Averaged Borda rule is a SCC on $\mathbf{T}(A)^*$ introduced by Dummett (1997). Such a SCC, here denoted by $ABOR$, coincides with $BOR|_{\mathbf{T}(A)^*}$.

Proposition 70. $ABOR = O|_{\mathbf{T}(A)^*}$.

Proof. It immediately follows from the fact that $ABOR = BOR|_{\mathbf{T}(A)^*}$ and Proposition 62. \square

Theorems 71 and 72 are two new characterizations of the Averaged Borda rule.

Theorem 71. *Let $Y \subseteq [m - 1]_0$ with $Y \cap [m - 1] \neq \emptyset$. Then $ABOR|_{\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*}$ is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. It immediately follows from Theorems 54 and 38 and Proposition 67. \square

Theorem 72. *Let $Y \subseteq [m - 1]_0$ with $Y \cap [m - 1] \neq \emptyset$. Then $ABOR|_{\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*}$ is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness.*

Proof. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{T}_Y(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and faithfulness. By Proposition 60, we have that F satisfies ON-faithfulness. By Theorem 71, we finally deduce that $F = ABOR$. \square

From Theorem 71, it is possible to easily get a result by Terzopoulou and Endriss (2021). In order to show that fact we need some preliminary definitions. Given $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, let $(xy) \in \text{Sym}(A)$ be the permutation that switches x and y and leaves all the other alternatives fixed. A SCC F on $\mathbf{T}(A)^*$ is monotonic if the following condition holds true: given $p, p' \in \mathbf{T}(A)^*$ with $\text{Dom}(p) = \text{Dom}(p')$, $i^* \in \text{Dom}(p)$ and $x, y \in A$, if $p(i) = p'(i)$ for all $i \in \text{Dom}(p) \setminus \{i^*\}$, $x \succ_{p(i^*)} y$, $y \in F(p)$ and $p'(i^*) = p(i^*)^{(xy)}$, then $F(p') = \{y\}$.

Theorem 73. [Terzopoulou and Endriss, 2021, Theorem 6] *ABOR is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{T}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and monotonicity.*

Proof. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{T}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and monotonicity. We complete the proof showing that F satisfies ON-faithfulness and applying Theorem 71. Let $x \in A$. Consider $p_{\{x\}} \in \mathbf{Di}_1(A)^* \subseteq \mathbf{T}(A)^*$ as in Definition 47. By (35), we know that $N(p_{\{x\}}) = N_x + K_{A \setminus \{x\}}$, where $K_{A \setminus \{x\}} \in \mathcal{R}(A)$. Moreover, $F(p_{\{x\}}) = \{x\}$. Indeed, assume by contradiction that there exists $y \in F(p_{\{x\}})$ such that $y \neq x$. Of course $x \succ_{p_{\{x\}}(1)} y$. Thus, by monotonicity of F , we have that $F(p_{\{x\}}^{(xy)}) = \{y\}$. On the other hand, by neutrality, we have that $F(p_{\{x\}}^{(xy)}) = (xy)F(p_{\{x\}})$ contains x , a contradiction. That proves that F satisfies ON-faithfulness. \square

12.5 Characterizations of the Approval Voting

The Approval Voting is defined on $\mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ as follows. For every $p \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$, the approval score of x in p is defined as

$$av(p, x) := |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : x \in T(p(i))\}|.$$

The Approval Voting is then the SCC defined, for every $p \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$, by

$$AV(p) := \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} av(p, x).$$

Proposition 74. $AV = BOR_{|\mathbf{Di}(A)^*} = O_{|\mathbf{Di}(A)^*}$.

Proof. By Proposition 62, we immediately have that $BOR_{|\mathbf{Di}(A)^*} = O_{|\mathbf{Di}(A)^*}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $AV = O_{|\mathbf{Di}(A)^*}$. Let $p \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ and $x \in A$. Then, by (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} o(p, x) &= \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} |L(p(i), x)| - |U(p(i), x)| = \sum_{\substack{i \in \text{Dom}(p), \\ x \in T(p(i))}} (m - |T(p(i))|) + \sum_{\substack{i \in \text{Dom}(p), \\ x \notin T(p(i))}} -|T(p(i))| \\ &= m \cdot av(p, x) - \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(p)} |T(p(i))|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every $p \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$, we have

$$O(p) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} o(p, x) = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in A} av(p, x) = AV(p),$$

as desired. \square

We emphasize that the equality $AV = BOR_{|\mathbf{Di}(A)^*}$ is known (Vorsatz, 2008, Proposition 1).

Theorem 75. *Let $X \subseteq [m]$ with $X \cap [m-1] \neq \emptyset$. Then AV is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Proof. It immediately follows from Theorems 50 and 38 and Proposition 74. \square

Observe now that the Plurality rule is the SCC defined by

$$PLU : \mathbf{Di}_1(A)^* \rightarrow P_0(A), \quad PLU(p) = AV(p)$$

and the anti-Plurality rule is the SCC defined by

$$APLU : \mathbf{Di}_{m-1}(A)^* \rightarrow P_0(A), \quad APLU(p) = AV(p)$$

Thus, from Theorem 75, we immediately get the following characterization results for such SCCs.

Theorem 76. *PLU is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_1(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Theorem 77. *$APLU$ is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_{m-1}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, cancellation and ON-faithfulness.*

Let us introduce now the following definition due to Fishburn (1979).

Definition 78. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ and F be a SCC on \mathbf{D} . We say that F satisfies Fishburn-cancellation if, for every $p \in \mathbf{D}$ such that $av(p, x) = av(p, y)$ for all $x, y \in A$, we have that $F(p) = A$.*

The next proposition explains that in Theorems 75, 76 and 77 the property of cancellation can be replaced by the property of Fishburn-cancellation, which is certainly more intuitive when dichotomous orders are involved.

Proposition 79. *Let $p \in \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$. Then, the following facts are equivalent:*

- (a) $N(p) \in \mathcal{R}(A)$;

(b) for every $x, y \in A$, $av(p, x) = av(p, y)$.

In particular, given $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{Di}(A)^*$ and a SCC F on \mathbf{D} , we have that F satisfies cancellation if and only if F satisfies Fishburn-cancellation.

Proof. First of all, observe that (a) is equivalent to

(a') for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, $c_p(x, y) = c_p(y, x)$,

and (b) is equivalent to

(b') for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, $av(p, x) = av(p, y)$

It is then enough to prove that (a') is equivalent to (b'). Observe that, for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, we have that

$$av(p, x) = |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : x \in T(p(i)), y \in T(p(i))\}| + |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : x \in T(p(i)), y \notin T(p(i))\}|$$

and

$$c_p(x, y) = |\text{Dom}(p)| - |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : x \notin T(p(i)), y \in T(p(i))\}|.$$

Thus, for every $x, y \in A$ with $x \neq y$, we have that

$$av(p, x) - av(p, y) = (|\text{Dom}(p)| - c_p(y, x)) - (|\text{Dom}(p)| - c_p(x, y)) = c_p(x, y) - c_p(y, x).$$

As a consequence, we deduce that (a') is equivalent to (b') and the proof is completed. \square

We can now deduce the following theorem due to Fishburn (1979).

Theorem 80. [Fishburn, 1979, Theorem 4] *Let $X \subseteq [m]$ with $X \cap [m-1] \neq \emptyset$. Then AV is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, Fishburn-cancellation and faithfulness.*

Proof. Let F be a SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_X(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, Fishburn-cancellation and faithfulness. By Proposition 79, we have that F satisfies cancellation. By Proposition 60, we have that F satisfies ON-faithfulness. By Theorem 75, we finally deduce that $F = AV$. \square

With a similar argument and making use of Theorems 76 and 77, we can also get the following characterizations of the Plurality and the anti-Plurality rules.

Theorem 81. *PLU is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_1(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, Fishburn-cancellation and faithfulness.*

Theorem 82. *APLU is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_{m-1}(A)^*$ satisfying neutrality, consistency, Fishburn-cancellation and faithfulness.*

There are in the literature some other characterization results for PLU and APLU. We discuss now how easily they can be derived by the two above characterizations and by the following easy lemma. In the sequel, for $p \in \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, $\varphi \in \text{Sym}(\text{Dom}(p))$ and $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, we denote by $p^{(\varphi, \psi)}$ the element of $\mathbf{R}(A)^*$ such that $\text{Dom}(p^{(\varphi, \psi)}) = \text{Dom}(p)$ and, for every $i \in \text{Dom}(p)$, $p^{(\varphi, \psi)}(i) = p(\varphi^{-1}(i))^\psi$.¹⁵

Lemma 83. *Let $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A)^*$, F be SCC on \mathbf{D} satisfying anonymity and neutrality and $p \in \mathbf{D}$. Assume that, for every $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, there exists $\varphi \in \text{Sym}(\text{Dom}(p))$ such that $p^{(\varphi, \psi)} = p$. Then $F(p) = A$.*

Proof. Let $y \in A$ and prove that $y \in F(p)$. Since $F(p) \neq \emptyset$, there exists $x^* \in F(p)$. Consider then $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ such that $y = \psi(x^*)$ and let $\varphi \in \text{Sym}(\text{Dom}(p))$ be such that $p^{(\varphi, \psi)} = p$. Since F is anonymous and neutral and since $x^* \in F(p)$, we have that $y = \psi(x^*) \in \psi F(p) = F(p^{(\varphi, \psi)}) = F(p)$. \square

We start showing that Theorem 81 implies a result by Sekiguchi (2012).¹⁶

¹⁵Details on the symbol $p^{(\varphi, \psi)}$ and its properties can be found in Bubboloni and Gori (2014) and (2015).

¹⁶Theorem 1 in Sekiguchi (2012) actually refers to the Plurality rule defined in $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ and involves a further property called tops-only. However, because of the tops-only property, that result is equivalent to our Theorem 84.

Theorem 84. [Sekiguchi, 2012, Theorem 1] *PLU is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_1(A)^*$ satisfying anonymity, neutrality, consistency and faithfulness.*

Proof. By Theorem 81, it is enough to show that F satisfies Fishburn-cancellation. Let $p \in \mathbf{Di}_1(A)^*$ be such that $av(p, x) = av(p, y)$ for all $x, y \in A$. Then we have $|\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : T(p(i)) = \{x\}\}| = |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : T(p(i)) = \{y\}\}|$ for all $x, y \in A$. As a consequence, for every $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, there exists $\varphi \in \text{Sym}(\text{Dom}(p))$ such that $p^{(\varphi, \psi)} = p$. Since F is anonymous and neutral, by Lemma 83 we deduce $F(p) = A$. \square

We next show that Theorem 82 implies a result by Kurihara (2018).¹⁷

Theorem 85. [Kurihara, 2018, Theorem 1] *APLU is the unique SCC on $\mathbf{Di}_{m-1}(A)^*$ satisfying anonymity, neutrality, consistency and averseness.*

Proof. By Theorem 59, F satisfies faithfulness. Thus, by Proposition 82, it is enough to show that F satisfies Fishburn-cancellation. Let $p \in \mathbf{Di}_{m-1}(A)^*$ be such that $av(p, x) = av(p, y)$ for all $x, y \in A$. Then we have $|\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : x \notin B(p(i))\}| = |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : y \notin B(p(i))\}|$ for all $x, y \in A$. As a consequence we also have $|\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : x \in B(p(i))\}| = |\{i \in \text{Dom}(p) : y \in B(p(i))\}|$ for all $x, y \in A$. Hence, for every $\psi \in \text{Sym}(A)$, there exists $\varphi \in \text{Sym}(\text{Dom}(p))$ such that $p^{(\varphi, \psi)} = p$. Since F is anonymous and neutral, by Lemma 83 we deduce $F(p) = A$. \square

References

- Alós-Ferrer, C., 2006. A simple characterization of approval voting. *Social Choice and Welfare* 27, 621–625.
- Belkin, A.R., Gvozdkik, A.A., 1989. The flow model for ranking objects. *Problems of Cybernetics, Decision Making and Analysis of Expert Information*, Eds. Dorofeyuk, A., Litvak, B., Tjurin, Yu., Moscow, 109–117 (in Russian).
- Bouyssou, D., 1992. Ranking methods based on valued preference relations: a characterization of the net flow method. *European Journal of Operational Research* 60, 61–67.
- Brams, S.J., Fishburn, P.C., 1978. Approval Voting. *The American Political Science Review* 72, 831–847.
- Brans, J.P., Vincke, Ph., Mareschal, B., 1986. How to select and how to rank projects: The Promethee method. *European Journal of Operational Research* 24, 228–238.
- Bubboloni, D., Gori, M., 2014. Anonymous and neutral majority rules. *Social Choice and Welfare* 43, 377–401.
- Bubboloni, D., Gori, M., 2015. Symmetric majority rules. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 76, 73–86.
- Bubboloni, D., Gori, M., 2018. The flow network method. *Social Choice and Welfare* 51, 621–656.
- Cullinan, J., Hsiao, S.K., Polett, D., 2014. A borda count for partially ordered ballots. *Social Choice and Welfare* 42, 913–926.
- Dummett, M., 1997. *Principles of Electoral Reform*. Oxford University Press.
- Fishburn, P.C., 1979. Symmetric and consistent aggregation with dichotomous voting. In: J-J. Laffont (ed.), *Aggregation and revelation of preferences*, North Holland.
- Gvozdkik, A.A., 1987. Flow interpretation of the tournament model for ranking. Abstracts of the VI-th Moscow Conference of young scientists on cybernetics and computing, Moscow: Scientific Council on Cybernetics of RAS, 1987, p.56 (in Russian).
- Kurihara, T., 2018. A simple characterization of the anti-plurality rule. *Economics Letters* 168, 110–111.
- Henriet, D., 1985. The Copeland choice function - An axiomatic characterization. *Social Choice and Welfare* 2, 49–64.
- Hansson, B., Sahlquist, H., 1976. A proof technique for social choice with variable electorate. *Journal of Economic Theory* 13, 193–200.

¹⁷Theorem 1 in Kurihara (2018) actually refers to the anti-Plurality rule defined in $\mathbf{L}(A)^*$ and involves a further property called bottoms-only. However, because of the bottoms-only property, that result is equivalent to our Theorem 85.

- Langville, A.N., Meyer, C.D., 2012. *Who Is #1? The Science of Rating and Ranking*. Princeton University Press.
- Laslier, J.-F., 1997. *Tournament solutions and majority voting*. Studies in Economic Theory, Volume 7. Springer.
- Mas-Colell, A., Whinston, M.D., Green, J., 1995. *Microeconomic Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moulin, H., 1988. Condorcet's principle implies the no show paradox. *Journal of Economic Theory* 45, 53–64.
- Myerson, R.B., 1995. Axiomatic derivation of scoring rules without the ordering assumption. *Social Choice and Welfare* 12, 59–74.
- Rubinstein, A., 1980. Ranking the participants in a tournament. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 38, 108–111.
- Sekiguchi, Y., 2012. A characterization of the Plurality rule. *Economic Letters* 116, 330–332.
- Schulze, M., 2011. A new monotonic, clone-independent, reversal symmetric, and Condorcet-consistent single-winner election method. *Social Choice and Welfare* 36, 267–303.
- Terzopoulou, Z., Endriss, U., 2021. The Borda class - An axiomatic study of the Borda rule on top-truncated preferences. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 92, 31–40.
- van den Brink, R., Gilles, R.P., 2009. The outflow ranking method for weighted directed graphs. *European Journal of Operational Research* 193, 484–491.
- Vorsatz, M., 2008. Scoring rules on dichotomous preferences. *Social Choice and Welfare* 31, 151–162.
- Young, H.P., 1974. An axiomatization of Borda's rule. *Journal of Economic Theory* 9, 43–52.
- Young, H.P., 1975. Social choice scoring functions. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 28, 824–838.
- Young, H.P., 1988. Condorcet's theory of voting. *American Political Science Review* 82, 1231–1244.