

# THE CHARACTER OF NON-MANIPULABLE COLLECTIVE CHOICES BETWEEN TWO ALTERNATIVES

Achille Basile\*, K. P. S. Bhaskara Rao†, Surekha Rao‡,

August 3, 2022

## Abstract

We consider classes of non-manipulable two-valued social choice functions, i.e., social choice functions with range of cardinality two within a larger set of alternatives. Corresponding to the different classes, the functional forms are described. Further we show that they, and some others from previous literature, can all be unified using a common structure. Such a structure relies on the concept of character function we introduce. This is a function from the domain of the admissible profiles, that notably we do not assume to be universal, to a partially ordered set. The proper choice of the character function, marks the distinction among different classes and permits the description of all social choice functions of a class in simple terms.

JEL Code: D71

*Keywords: social choice functions, non-manipulability, anonymity, functional form, character function, weak preferences, restricted domain.*

---

\*Corresponding author, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Statistiche, Università Federico II, 80126 Napoli, Italy, E-mail: basile@unina.it.

†Department of Computer Information Systems, Indiana University Northwest, Gary, IN 46408, E-mail: bkop-part@iun.edu

‡School of Business and Economics, Indiana University Northwest, Gary, IN 46408, E-mail: skrao@iun.edu

# 1 Introduction

Analyzing the non-manipulable collective choice between two alternatives  $a$  and  $b$  (candidates, public projects, the introduction of a new law versus the status quo, ...) is different if individuals are asked to report their preference just between  $a$  and  $b$  or if they are asked for preferences over a larger set  $A$  (including  $\{a, b\}$ ) of alternatives. The reason that explains this is the following. If indifference is allowed, as we assume in this paper, the non-manipulability of the collective choice does not prevent alternatives in  $A \setminus \{a, b\}$  to be relevant.

The fact that the collectivity implements either  $a$  or  $b$ , may induce to think that the social choice is independent of the remaining alternatives (principle of independence from irrelevant alternatives). However this is not always the case. Even if strategic reporting is ruled out by the social choice function (*scf* or *rule*, for short) adopted. The following example demonstrates this phenomenon. There are only two agents  $\{v_1, v_2\}$  and three alternatives  $A = \{a, b, c\}$ . The scf we consider for the collective decision of implementing either  $a$  or  $b$  is as described next. Corresponding to a profile of preferences over  $A$  the collective choice is  $b$  if and only if either one of the following circumstances is true:

- agent  $v_1$  prefers  $b$  to  $a$ ;
- agent  $v_1$  is indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$  but prefers  $c$  to both  $a, b$ ;
- agent  $v_1$  is indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$ , but both are preferred to  $c$ , and agent  $v_2$  prefers  $b$  to  $a$ .

In all the other cases the rule selects  $a$ .

Neither agent may gain by lying, i.e. this scf is non-manipulable. Now, consider the following two situations  $P$  and  $Q$ . In situation  $P$ : agent  $v_1$  is indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$  that are both worse than  $c$ ; agent  $v_2$  strictly prefers  $a$  to  $b$  and  $c$ , and strictly prefers  $b$  to  $c$ . In situation  $Q$ : agent  $v_1$  is indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$ , but both alternatives are strictly preferred to  $c$ ; agent  $v_2$  reports the same preference as in situation  $P$ .

Even if both situations are indistinguishable between  $a$  and  $b$ , the collective choice described above selects  $b$  for  $P$  and  $a$  for  $Q$ .

Hence a non-manipulable scf does not guarantee the independence of the collective choice from the irrelevant alternatives.

On the other hand, considering a model for the social choice in which the realizable alternatives are two, indifference is permitted, and the collective decision is based on a preference profile of individuals who consider also other alternatives, is not merely an intellectual exercise. It is rather a way for balancing simplicity and full attention to individuals' necessities. An intuition supporting this idea can come from considering, for example, a municipality that needs to realize a project. Say building a new elementary school. Many possible locations have to be analyzed. Some locations may be in crowded areas, some locations may not have enough space for the parents to drop-off the kids, some locations may be not in the safest areas, and some locations may be far away from populated areas. Even the teaching methodologies may give the municipality options to consider. And other options can be conceived as well. So, all potentially feasible alternatives form the set  $A$ . Naturally, every citizen has his/her opinion about the solution to adopt. With respect to some, they may be indifferent. Even if the technical alternatives are many, for several reasons, the municipality may limit the outcome of the collective decision only to either build

solution  $a$  or build solution  $b$ . Nonetheless, the implementation of a scf that asks for preferences on  $A$  rather than only on  $\{a, b\}$ , allows to take into account individual preferences about the other alternatives. Doing so, there is a kind of balance between simplicity (either  $a$  or  $b$ ) and respect for the needs of citizens (the input for the social choice is a profile of preferences over all of  $A$ ). This is possible since the example above has shown that a non-manipulable two-valued scf with indifference is not independent of irrelevant alternatives. We believe that in this example emerges clearly “*the choice to restrict the range (of the scf) as a possible tool for the mechanism designer*”, as emphasized in the concluding Section of Barberà et al. [2].

To fix the terminology we adopt, the model of social choice between  $a$  and  $b$  is referred to as:

- *the binary model*, when no other alternative is considered, i.e.  $A = \{a, b\}$  is the set of all alternatives;
- *the two-valued model*, when we assume the weaker hypothesis that  $A \supseteq \{a, b\}$ .

Also, we shall use the terms *state*, *situation* and the more common *preference profile*, synonymously.

This paper completes the investigation we have conducted in [4] by extending to the two-valued model, considering also restricted domains, the study of the *functional form*, or *representation*, of the elements of some relevant classes of non-manipulable scfs. Notably:

- all non-manipulable scfs;
- all non-manipulable, anonymous scfs.

Our paper [4] provides the functional form in the binary model. The key for the results found in [4] is the notion of *veto pair*. This term stands for an ordered pair  $(S, W)$  of sets of voters, with  $S \subseteq W$ . A veto pair  $(S, W)$  determines a non-manipulable rule for the collective choice, and expresses a veto against one of the two alternatives  $\{a, b\}$ . For example, given  $S \subseteq W$ , the veto against  $b$  corresponds to the fact that to block  $b$  (i.e. determining the collective choice  $a$ ) it is enough that all members of  $S$  strictly prefer  $a$  and the other agents (if any) in  $W \setminus S$  either prefer  $a$  or are indifferent. Combining several of such rules, one can produce more non-manipulable rules. Let  $\Sigma = \{(S_i, W_i) : i \in I\}$  be a collection of veto pairs such that either  $S_i \not\subseteq S_j$  or  $W_i \not\subseteq W_j$  whenever  $i \neq j$ . The scf that selects  $a$  as the social choice if and only if the voters for  $a$  include  $S_i$  and those that either choose  $a$  or are indifferent include  $W_i$  for some index  $i$ , is a new non-manipulable scf  $\phi_\Sigma$ .

[4, Theorem 3.3] states that *in the binary case there are no other non-manipulable scfs*.

This theorem relies on a preceding result, [4, Theorem 2.5], where non-manipulability is characterized by means of a *monotonicity* à la Maskin: suppose that the society selects  $a$  in state  $Q$ , then it is natural to ask that  $a$  is again selected in a new state  $P$  that shows no less support for the alternative  $a$ .

With the sentence “*the state  $P$  shows no less support for the alternative  $a$  than the state  $Q$* ” we exactly mean that, changing the state of the society from  $Q$  to  $P$ , agents favoring  $a$  against  $b$  remain so, and agents that were indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$ , and have not moved to prefer  $a$ , remain indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$ . An alternative phrase we use with identical meaning is as follows: “*the profile  $P$  supports the alternative  $a$  at least as the profile  $Q$  does*”.

In the example we have described above, we see that even if the support for the alternative  $a$  shown by  $P$  is not less than the one shown by  $Q$ , the change of state from  $Q$  to  $P$  changes the collective choice from  $a$  to  $b$ . So the scf of that example is not monotone, and hence cannot take the functional form  $\phi_{\Sigma}$ . In other words, in the two-valued case, the theorems [4, Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 3.3] do not hold true. We need more (than the  $\phi_{\Sigma}$ 's) functions to recover all non-manipulable scfs. At the same time we also need to enlarge the class of monotone scfs in order to keep the equivalence between monotonicity and non-manipulability.

For these purposes we propose a more stringent interpretation to the sentence “*the profile  $P$  supports the alternative  $a$  at least as the profile  $Q$  does*”.

Whereas in the binary case the meaning is: “*stepping from the state  $Q$  to the state  $P$ , agents in favor of  $a$  remain such, and agents that were indifferent and have not moved to prefer  $a$ , remain indifferent*”, in the two-valued case we change the meaning as follows: “*stepping from the state  $Q$  to the state  $P$ , agents in favor of  $a$  against  $b$  remain such, and agents that were indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$ , and have not moved to prefer  $a$ , **do not change their opinion about the entire set of alternatives***”.

Based on this, a consequent, weaker (yet straightforward) notion of monotonicity can be introduced that characterizes the non-manipulability in the two-valued framework (Theorems 3.4 and 3.4bis). And the functional form of non-manipulable scfs is determined (Theorems 3.12 and 3.13) also in the two-valued setting.

However our study goes really deeper than just this. Indeed, we show that the functional forms corresponding to different classes of two-valued non-manipulable scfs such as:

- (a) the entire class of non-manipulable rules, for which in the binary case we have in [4] the veto pairs representations,
- (b) the class of rules with strict preferences universal domain, for which in the binary case we have the voting by committee representation by Larsson and Svensson [7],
- (c) the class of anonymous rules, for which in the binary case we have in [4] the veto cardinalities representation and in [5] the  $\{a, b\}$ -list representation,
- (d) the class of strong group strategy-proof rules, for which we have the study by Barberà et al. [2],

can all be unified using a common structure that we call *canonical* functional form, or representation. Such a canonical functional form, based on the idea of *character*, is described next.

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of admissible profiles  $P$  of preferences over the set  $A$  of alternatives, i.e. the domain of our scfs. We do not assume  $\mathcal{P}$  to be necessarily universal.

We call **character** a function  $\chi$  from  $\mathcal{P}$  to a poset  $(L, \geq)$ .

Given a character, and a subset  $C$  of the poset  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq)$ , for two distinct alternatives  $a, b \in A$ , the following is a two-valued scf:

$$(\star) \quad \phi_{(\chi, C)}(P) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } \chi(P) \in C \\ b, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

We refer to  $(\star)$  as the canonical functional form of the two-valued scfs.

Note that if the set  $C$  contains all majorants of its elements (in which case we say that it is *super order closed* in  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq)$ ), we clearly have:

$$P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, \phi_{(\chi, C)}(Q) = a, \chi(P) \geq \chi(Q) \Rightarrow \phi_{(\chi, C)}(P) = a,$$

a property that resembles the Maskin monotonicity if the character function  $\chi$  is such that the inequality  $\chi(P) \geq \chi(Q)$  can be interpreted as *the profile  $P$  supports an alternative at least as the profile  $Q$  does*.

The purpose of the present paper is to show that if  $\Phi$  is one of the (a), (b), (c), (d) classes of scfs (on the domain  $\mathcal{P}$ ) we have listed before, we can always define

– an appropriate poset  $(L, \leq)$

– an appropriate character function  $\chi$

and exhibit a one-to-one correspondence between  $\Phi$  and the family of all super order closed (SOC, for short) subsets of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq)$ . Hence, every elements  $\phi$  of  $\Phi$  can be represented in a unique way in the canonical functional form  $\phi_{(\chi, C)}$  for a suitable SOC subset  $C$  of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq)$ .

The canonical functional form precisely corresponds to the representation we mentioned above in each of the respective (a), (b), (c), (d) cases. Notice that when a poset (in particular  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$ ) is finite, every SOC set can be identified with the subset of its minimal elements. This implies that when  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  is finite there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $\Phi$  and the family of all subsets of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq)$  consisting of incomparable elements.

**EXAMPLE.** We illustrate with an example the role of the character function in case (c) of anonymous non-manipulable scfs. Let us suppose we have  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{W}^V$ , where  $\mathcal{W}$  is a nonempty subset of the set of all preferences over  $A$ . By  $V$  we denote the set of voters.

To fix the ideas let us suppose that in  $\mathcal{W}$  the preferences under which  $a$  and  $b$  are indifferent are three:  $\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3$ , and the voters are eleven:  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_{11}\}$ .

In this case it turns out (see Section 4) that the appropriate poset  $L$  to use consists of the 4-tuples of elements of  $\{0, 1, \dots, 11\}$ , where for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3)$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3) \in L$  we define

$$\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y} \Leftrightarrow x_0 + \sum_{i=1}^3 (x_i - y_i)^+ \leq y_0.$$

The character function is  $P \in \mathcal{P} \mapsto \chi(P) \in L$  by letting  $(\chi(P))_0$  be the number of voters  $v \in V$  that under  $P_v$  prefer  $a$  to  $b$ , and  $(\chi(P))_i$  be the number of voters for which  $P_v = \pi_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ). Hence,

$$\chi(\mathcal{P}) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in L : \sum_{i=0}^3 x_i \leq 11 \right\}.$$

The elements of  $\Phi$ , i.e. the anonymous, non-manipulable scfs whose range is contained in  $\{a, b\}$ , are all and only the  $\{a, b\}$ -valued scfs  $\phi$  defined on  $\mathcal{P}$  which are monotone in the following sense

$$P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, \phi(Q) = a, \chi(P) \geq \chi(Q) \Rightarrow \phi(P) = a,$$

or, equivalently, all and only the scfs  $\phi_{(\chi, C)}$  where  $C$  runs over the SOC subsets of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq)$ .

Since the latter is finite, we can equivalently parametrize  $\Phi$  with the minimal elements of  $C$  rather than with  $C$  itself. This identification tells us that the character function permits the description of all scfs in simple understandable terms. For example, if the minimal elements of  $C$  are the following three (incomparable, of course) quadruples  $\mathbf{x} = (2, 4, 0, 3)$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = (4, 1, 3, 1)$ ,  $\mathbf{z} = (4, 2, 4, 0)$  of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$ , the correspondent anonymous non-manipulable two-valued scf  $\phi$  is

$$\phi(P) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if at least one of the following } \chi(P) \geq \mathbf{x}, \chi(P) \geq \mathbf{y}, \chi(P) \geq \mathbf{z}, \text{ holds true,} \\ b, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In words: the correspondent scf is the one that selects  $a$  in situations  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\mathbf{z}$ , and in each other situation that shows at least the same support for the alternative  $a$  than either  $\mathbf{x}$ , or  $\mathbf{y}$ , or  $\mathbf{z}$ . Otherwise the collective choice is  $b$ .

The general case, i.e. not necessarily anonymous, is essentially similar. When  $V$  and  $A$  are finite (as typically assumed) we identify somehow generalized veto pairs acting like veto units. They work similarly to what we described before about veto pairs  $(S, W)$ . To be precise, such generalized veto pairs are triples  $(S, T, \pi)$  consisting of disjoint subsets  $S, T$  of voters and a partial  $\{a, b\}$ -indifference profile  $\pi$ . The latter is a partially defined profile  $\pi$  such that for every voter  $v$  in its domain, the set  $T$ , one has that  $a$  and  $b$  are indifferent according to  $\pi_v$ . We may think  $T = W \setminus S$ . So we have a veto pair together with a  $\pi$ , acting as a veto unit: for the alternative  $b$  being blocked (i.e.  $a$  is the collective choice) it suffices that the individuals of  $S$  vote for  $a$  and those in  $T$  not voting of  $a$  are adamant at their  $\{a, b\}$ -indifferent preference.

We show that rules for a non-manipulable collective choice between two alternatives  $a$  and  $b$  can be formed uniquely in the way described next: with reference to some, in a sense independent, vetoers  $(S_1, T_1, \pi^{(1)})$ ,  $(S_2, T_2, \pi^{(2)})$ ,  $(S_3, T_3, \pi^{(3)})$ ,  $\dots$  the rule selects  $a$  if and only if at least one of the  $(S_i, T_i, \pi^{(i)})$  supports  $a$ .

The paper proceeds as follows. After presenting in Section 2 the social choice model we adopt, Section 3 is devoted to obtain the representation of general non-manipulable scfs with range of cardinality (at most) two. In Section 4 we analyze anonymous scfs. The two shorter Sections 5 and 6 respectively: – illustrate how our results generalize those existing in the literature for the binary case; – exemplify how the character function approach applies to the result of Barberà et al. [2] concerning the functional form of strong group strategy-proof scfs.

The paper ends with Conclusions and and Appendix with some proofs and illustrations.

## 2 The Social Choice model

Let  $V$  be a set representing a collectivity of individuals whom we may also refer to as agents, voters and so on. Let  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  be the set of all weak preferences (i.e. complete, transitive binary relations) over a set  $A$  of alternatives. “Weak preference”, “preference”, and “weak ordering” will be used synonymously. With reference to a preference  $W \in \mathcal{W}(A)$ , we adopt standard notations:  $x \succ_W y$  stands for  $(x, y) \in W$ , the notation  $x \succ_W y$  stands for  $[(x, y) \in W \text{ and } (y, x) \notin W]$ , and the notation  $x \sim_W y$  stands for  $[(x, y) \in W \text{ and } (y, x) \in W]$ .

Functions  $\pi$  from subsets of  $V$  to  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  are named partial profiles of preferences. A partial profile is therefore  $\pi = (\pi_v)_{v \in T}$  where  $T$  is a subset of  $V$  and  $\pi_v \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  for every  $v \in T$ . In case  $T = V$ , we speak of a profile of preferences. The expression “profile of preferences” will be synonymously replaced, sometime, by terms such as “state” or “situation”. A special partial profile is that which involves the empty set as domain; then we speak of the empty profile. The class of all profiles is  $\mathcal{W}(A)^V$ .

For a profile  $P = (P_v)_{v \in V}$  we shall also use the notation  $P = [P_T, P_{T^c}]$  if  $T$  is a subset of  $V$ , the set  $T^c$  its complement, and  $P_T, P_{T^c}$  are the obvious restrictions  $P_T = (P_v)_{v \in T}, P_{T^c} = (P_v)_{v \notin T}$  of  $P$ . Extending this notation to arbitrary partitions of  $V$  or to partial profiles is straightforward.

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{W}(A)^V$ . We refer to  $\mathcal{P}$  as the class of feasible profiles. This is the most general case, of course. Possible assumptions on  $\mathcal{P}$  are:

*universal domain:*  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{W}(A)^V$ ,

*cartesian restricted domain:*  $\mathcal{P} = \times_{v \in V} \mathcal{W}_v$  with  $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{W}_v \subseteq \mathcal{W}(A)$ ,

*quasi-cartesian restricted domain:* for the set  $\mathcal{P}$  one has the property

$$P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, T \subseteq V \Rightarrow [P_T, Q_{T^c}] \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Trivially, cartesian implies quasi-cartesian. We observe that for a finite set of voters, there is no distinction between cartesian and quasi-cartesian restricted domains. The fact that the assumption of quasi-cartesian is weaker than cartesian emerges when we consider infinite sets  $V$ .<sup>1</sup> Note that the possibility of dealing with strict preferences (i.e. with the elements of the subset  $\mathcal{S}(A)$  of  $\mathcal{W}(A)$  made of relations that are also antisymmetric) is not excluded in the case of cartesian restricted domain (or quasi-cartesian). The case  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{S}(A)^V$ , is referred to as *strict universal domain*.

**Two-valued versus binary social choice functions.** Throughout the sequel,  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow A$  stands for a social choice function (scf, for short). If the range of  $\phi$  has cardinality (at most) two, we say that  $\phi$  is a two-valued scf. If  $|A| = 2$ , more specifically we say that  $\phi$  is a binary scf.

**Non-manipulability.** Dealing with arbitrary set  $V$  as model for collectivities, the notion of non-manipulability we adopt is based on coalitions of individuals rather than on a single individual.

**Definition 2.1** *Let  $\phi$  be scf. We say that a coalition  $D$  can manipulate a profile  $P \in \mathcal{P}$  under  $\phi$  if there is another profile  $Q \in \mathcal{P}$  such that*

- every voter  $v$  in  $D^c$  has the same preference in both  $P$  and  $Q$ , i.e.  $P_v = Q_v$ ;
- every voter  $v$  in  $D$  prefers  $\phi(Q)$  to  $\phi(P)$  according to  $P_v$ , i.e.  $\phi(Q) \succ_{P_v} \phi(P)$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, let  $V$  be the set of natural numbers and  $W_0, W_1$  two distinct preferences. The domain  $\mathcal{P}$  consisting of all profiles  $P$  that can be written as  $P_v = \begin{cases} W_1, & \text{if } v \in F \\ W_0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$  for some finite subset  $F$  of  $V$ , is quasi-cartesian but not cartesian.

A desirable property of a scf is that no group of agents has incentives to form a coalition that, with false reporting, can manipulate the social outcome for their own advantage. This is at the basis of the following definition.

**Definition 2.2** We say that a scf  $\phi$  is **coalitional strategy-proof** if no coalition of voters can manipulate any feasible profile under  $\phi$ . We also say in this case that  $\phi$  is **non-manipulable**. Moreover, we shorten the expression “coalition strategy-proof” by writing **CSP**.

Evidently, the non-manipulability of a scf  $\phi$  is the same as the validity of the following implication for  $\phi$ :

$$[D \text{ is a coalition, } P, Q \in \mathcal{P} \text{ are identical on } D^c] \Rightarrow [\exists v \in D : \phi(P) \succ_{\sim_{P_v}} \phi(Q)].$$

A further equivalent property is the following

$$P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, \phi(P) \neq \phi(Q) \implies \exists v \in V \text{ such that } \begin{cases} \phi(P) \succ_{\sim_{P_v}} \phi(Q) \\ P_v \neq Q_v \end{cases}$$

introduced in [6] under the name *almost preference reversal* (APR, for short).

If in the previous Definition 2.2 we replace coalitions with singletons, the corresponding notion we obtain is known as *individual strategy-proofness*.

**Definition 2.3** A scf  $\phi$  is **individually strategy-proof** (ISP, for short), if, according to  $P_v$ , the alternative  $\phi(P_v, P_{-v})$  is at least as good as  $\phi(Q_v, P_{-v})$ , for every voter  $v$ , for every profile  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , and for every weak ordering  $Q_v$  such that  $(Q_v, P_{-v}) \in \mathcal{P}$ .

It is well known that CSP and ISP are not equivalent notions in general. Even if we assume that  $V$  is finite, some assumptions are necessary in order to ensure that ISP implies CSP. Barberà et al. [1] investigates this deeply. However, some cases of equivalence of the two notions can be plainly recalled.

Suppose  $V$  is finite:

- ISP implies CSP when  $\mathcal{P}$  is universal (as it can be verified with a direct proof);
- also, ISP implies CSP when  $\mathcal{P}$  is a cartesian restricted domain but the scf has range of cardinality at most three ([1, Corollary 1], but also [6, Theorem 3.3 (ii)]).

**Remark 2.4** Since in this paper we deal only with two-valued scfs, we limit our attention to only coalitional strategy-proofness. Because of what we have just recalled above, CSP will be the appropriate non-manipulability notion for the case  $V$  is infinite, and can be certainly relaxed to individual strategy-proofness when  $V$  is finite.



### 3 The functional form of all two-valued CSP scfs

In this section we obtain the canonical representation of a two-valued CSP scf. Without loss of generality, we adopt the following approach. *For every set  $\{a, b\} \subseteq A$  consisting of two distinct alternatives we determine the functional form of the CSP social choice functions with range contained in  $\{a, b\}$ , showing that it is*

$$(\star) \quad \phi_{(\chi, C)}(P) = a \Leftrightarrow \chi(P) \in C,$$

where  $\chi$  is a character function, and  $C$  is a super order closed subset of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  (Definitions 3.6, and 3.5, *infra*).

With this in mind, we adopt the following notation: by  $D(x, P)$  we denote the subsets of  $V$  consisting of voters that, under the profile  $P$ , prefer the alternative  $x \in \{a, b\}$  to the other remaining alternative in  $\{a, b\}$ ; by  $I(P)$  we denote the subsets of  $V$  consisting of voters that, under  $P$  are indifferent between  $a$  and  $b$ . We also set  $\tilde{D}(x, P) = D(x, P) \cup I(P)$ .

#### 3.1 Monotonicity

The following definition formalizes the meaning of the sentence “*the profile  $P$  supports the alternative  $a$  at least as the profile  $Q$  does*” in the framework of two-valued scfs.

**Definition 3.1** *Given two profiles  $P$  and  $Q$ , we say that  $P$  supports the alternative  $a$  at least as  $Q$  does, and write  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$ , if*

$$D(a, Q) \subseteq D(a, P), \text{ and } v \in \tilde{D}(a, Q) \setminus D(a, P) \text{ implies that } P_v = Q_v.$$

Replacing  $b$  to  $a$  in Definition 3.1, we define the relation  $P \stackrel{b}{\geq} Q$  that can be interpreted accordingly. It is obvious that:  $P \stackrel{b}{\geq} Q \Leftrightarrow Q \stackrel{a}{\geq} P$ .

**Remark 3.2** In [3, Remark 2.12] a relation between profiles has been considered under the notation  $B_1(P, Q)$  to say that the three conditions below

$$D(a, P) \subseteq D(a, Q), \quad D(b, Q) \subseteq D(b, P), \quad \text{and } v \in I(P) \cap I(Q) \Rightarrow P_v = Q_v$$

hold true.

We note that: *Given two profiles  $P, Q$ , then the following equivalence holds true:  $P \stackrel{b}{\geq} Q \Leftrightarrow B_1(P, Q)$ .*

The fact that in our exposition we privilege the reference to  $a$  in the definition of monotonicity, does not affect the generality of what we obtain.

The next definition introduces an extension of the monotonicity property used in [4] with reference to binary scfs. To emphasize that the new definition is weaker than the monotonicity property in [4], we refer to it as *almost monotonicity*.

**Definition 3.3** Let  $V, \mathcal{P}, A$  be arbitrary and  $a, b$  two distinct elements of  $A$ . We say that a scf  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\}$  is almost monotone if

$$[P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q, \quad \phi(Q) = a] \Rightarrow \phi(P) = a.$$

The relation of almost monotonicity with non-manipulability is the focus of the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.4** Let  $a, b$  be two distinct elements of  $A$ . Consider a scf  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ . Then,  $\phi$  is CSP if it is almost monotone. Conversely,  $\phi$  is almost monotone if it is CSP on a quasi-cartesian restricted domain.

PROOF: We show that almost monotonicity implies almost preference reversal. Suppose  $\phi$  is not APR. By definition this means we find  $\phi(P) \neq \phi(Q)$  with, for every  $v \in V$ , either  $\phi(P) \underset{P_v}{\succ} \phi(Q)$

is true or  $P_v = Q_v$  is true. If  $\phi(P) = a$  we get  $P \stackrel{b}{\geq} Q$ . If  $\phi(P) = b$  we get  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$ . This is immediate. In both cases almost monotonicity is violated.

Now we prove the converse: CSP implies almost monotonicity when the scf is defined on a quasi-cartesian restricted domain.

Suppose almost monotonicity is violated. Then we have two profiles  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$ ,  $\phi(Q) = a$ , and  $\phi(P) = b$ . Let us consider the following partition  $\{V_0, V_1, V_2\}$  of  $V$ :

$$V_0 = \{v \in V : P_v = Q_v\},$$

$$V_1 = \{v \in V : P_v \neq Q_v\} \cap D(b, Q),$$

$$V_2 = \{v \in V : P_v \neq Q_v\} \cap \tilde{D}(a, Q).$$

Our assumption is that  $\phi$  is APR, so there is at least one voter  $v$  for which one has both  $P_v \neq Q_v$  and  $b \underset{P_v}{\succ} a$ . In other words we have:

$$\emptyset \neq \tilde{D}(b, P) \cap \{v \in V : P_v \neq Q_v\} \subseteq V_1$$

since the inclusion comes from  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$ .

Let us consider the profile  $P' = [P_{V_0}, Q_{V_1}, P_{V_2}] \in \mathcal{P}$ . Since  $\phi$  is CSP,  $\phi(P') = b$  otherwise the coalition  $V_1$  manipulates  $P'$  by means of  $P$ .

If the set  $V_2$  is empty, then  $P' = Q$  and we contradict  $\phi(Q) = a$ . So, it must be the case that the latter set is nonempty. However we again contradict  $\phi(Q) = a$ . Otherwise, having  $\phi(Q) = a$ , the coalition  $V_2$  manipulates  $P'$  by means of  $Q$  (the coalition  $V_2$  is contained in  $D(a, P)$ ).  $\square$

In order to prove the implication CSP  $\Rightarrow$  almost monotonicity, we cannot dispense with the assumption on  $\mathcal{P}$  of being quasi-cartesian at least. Indeed, let us consider  $V = \{v_1, v_2\}$ ,  $A = \{a, b, c, d\}$ , and the domain  $\mathcal{P}$  consisting of only two feasible profiles  $P, Q$ . Assume  $P$  is given by:  $P_{v_1} = a \succ b \succ c \succ d$ , and  $P_{v_2} = b \succ a \succ d \succ c$ . Assume  $Q$  is:  $Q_{v_1} = c \succ d \succ a \succ b$ , and  $Q_{v_2} = d \succ c \succ b \succ a$ . Define  $\phi(P) = a, \phi(Q) = b$ . The scf  $\phi$  is APR hence CSP but it is not almost monotone.

Before introducing all the ‘‘ingredients’’ needed for establishing the canonical representation of a two-valued non-manipulable scf, we recall some notions about general posets.

Let  $(L, \leq)$  be a partially ordered set<sup>2</sup>.

**Definition 3.5** A subset  $C$  of  $L$  is **super order closed** if

$$x \in L, f \in C, f \leq x \Rightarrow x \in C.$$

A subset  $M$  of  $L$  is an **antichain** when

$$x \neq x' \in M \Rightarrow x \leq x' \text{ is false.}$$

When  $C$  is a super order closed subset of  $L$  we write  $C$  is a SOC set or  $C$  is SOC, in short.

Of course the empty set is an antichain and it is SOC.

If  $X$  is a subset of  $L$ , the set  $m(X) = \{x \in X : y \leq x, y \in X \Rightarrow y = x\}$  denotes the set of the minimal elements of  $X$ . Of course  $m(X)$  is an antichain.

Note that for a finite poset  $L$  it is possible to prove that the antichains of  $L$  are in a one-to-one correspondence with the SOC subsets of  $L$ .

**Definition 3.6** A character on the set  $\mathcal{P}$  of the feasible profiles is a function  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow (L, \geq)$ .

**Definition 3.7** Let  $a$  and  $b$  be two distinct elements of  $A$ , and  $\chi$  be a character. For every  $C \subseteq \chi(\mathcal{P})$  we define a function  $\phi_{(\chi, C)} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ :

$$(\star) \quad \phi_{(\chi, C)}(P) = a \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} \chi(P) \in C.$$

Since typically no ambiguity occurs about the character, we shorten  $\phi_{(\chi, C)}$  as  $\phi_C$ .

Now we introduce a notion of monotonicity of  $\{a, b\}$ -valued scfs with respect to a character. As for the previous notions of monotonicity we can indifferently choose to refer to  $a$  or to  $b$ .

**Definition 3.8** A function  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\} \subseteq A$  is said to be  $(\chi, a)$ -monotone when

$$P, Q \in \mathcal{P}, \chi(P) \geq \chi(Q), \phi(Q) = a \Rightarrow \phi(P) = a.$$

It is immediate that if  $C$  is a SOC subset of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$  then  $\phi_C$  is  $(\chi, a)$ -monotone. In the next proposition we show the converse. Hence we can state the following.

**Proposition 3.9** Let  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\} \subseteq A$  be a scf.

$\phi$  is  $(\chi, a)$ -monotone  $\Leftrightarrow \exists! C$  SOC subset of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$  such that  $\phi = \phi_C$ .

PROOF: Assume  $\phi$  is  $(\chi, a)$ -monotone, and consider the set

$$C = C_\phi := \{x \in L : \exists P \in \phi^{-1}(\{a\}) \text{ such that } x = \chi(P)\}.$$

This is the desired SOC subset of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$ .

Indeed:

---

<sup>2</sup>i.e.  $\leq$  is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric.

- by  $(\chi, a)$ -monotonicity  $C$  is SOC in  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$ ;
- by  $(\chi, a)$ -monotonicity we have  $\phi(P) = a \Leftrightarrow \phi_C(P) = a$ ;
- $C$  and  $C'$  subsets of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$  with  $\phi_C = \phi_{C'} \Rightarrow C = C'$ . □

### 3.2 The character of two-valued non-manipulable scfs

We now introduce the poset necessary to define the character function for two-valued non-manipulable scfs.

**Definition 3.10** *By means of  $(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}, \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}})$  we denote the poset  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$  consisting of triples  $(S, T, \pi)$  with  $S, T$  disjoint subsets of  $V$ , and  $\pi$  a partial profile whose domain is  $T$ . The set  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$  is endowed with the following partial order:*<sup>3</sup>

$(S, T, \pi) \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}}(S', T', \pi')$  is defined as  $S \subseteq S'$ ,  $T \setminus S' \subseteq T'$ , and  $v \in T \setminus S' \Rightarrow \pi_v = \pi'_v$ .

The character of the two-valued CSP scfs is defined next.

**Definition 3.11** *The character function for two-valued scfs is the function  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$  defined as*

$$\chi(P) = (D(a, P), I(P), (P_v)_{v \in I(P)}).$$

A direct verification shows that  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q \Leftrightarrow \chi(P) \geq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}} \chi(Q)$ . Hence, we can reformulate Theorem 3.4 as follows.

**Theorem 3.4bis** *Let  $a, b$  be two distinct elements of  $A$ . Consider a scf  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\}$  defined over a quasi-cartesian restricted domain. Then,  $\phi$  is non-manipulable (i.e. CSP) if and only if it is  $(\chi, a)$ -monotone.*

We present below the canonical functional form of the non-manipulable two-valued scfs.

**Theorem 3.12** *Let  $a, b$  be two distinct elements of  $A$ . Under the quasi-cartesian restricted domain assumption on  $\mathcal{P}$ , the map  $C \mapsto \phi_C$  is a bijection from the set of all SOC subsets of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}})$  to the set of all non-manipulable (i.e. CSP) scfs with values in  $\{a, b\}$ .*

PROOF: Apply Proposition 3.9 and Theorem 3.4bis. □

When  $V$  and  $A$  are finite,  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  is such, and since SOC subsets of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  are in a one-to-one correspondence with antichains of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$ , the canonical functional form can be expressed in terms of sets of incomparable elements of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}})$ . An element of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  is a triple  $(S, T, \pi)$  consisting of disjoint subsets  $S, T$  of voters and a partial  $\{a, b\}$ -indifference profile  $\pi$ . The latter is a partial profile  $\pi$  such that for every voter  $v$  in its domain, the set  $T$ , one has that  $a$  and  $b$  are indifferent according to  $\pi_v$ . So, we are dealing with a generalized version of the veto pairs considered in [4]<sup>4</sup> that act similarly as a veto unit: for the alternative  $b$  being blocked (i.e.  $a$  is the collective choice)

<sup>3</sup>That it is a partial order is easily verified.

<sup>4</sup>With  $W = S \cup T$ , elements of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  are pairs consisting of a veto pair and a  $\pi$ .

it suffices that the individuals of  $S$  vote for  $a$  and those in  $T$  not voting of  $a$  are adamant at their  $\{a, b\}$ -indifferent preference.

According to the following representation theorem, rules for a non-manipulable collective choice between two alternatives  $a$  and  $b$  can be formed uniquely in the way described next: with reference to some incomparable<sup>5</sup> generalized vetoers  $(S_1, T_1, \pi^{(1)})$ ,  $(S_2, T_2, \pi^{(2)})$ ,  $(S_3, T_3, \pi^{(3)})$ ,  $\dots$  the rule selects  $a$  if and only if at least one of the  $(S_i, T_i, \pi^{(i)})$  supports  $a$ .

**Theorem 3.13** *Suppose  $V$  and  $A$  are finite,  $\mathcal{P} = \times_{v \in V} \mathcal{W}_v$ . Then, there is a bijection  $\Sigma \mapsto \phi_\Sigma$  from the set of all antichains  $\Sigma$  of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}})$  to the set of all non-manipulable scfs with values in  $\{a, b\}$ . For an antichain  $\Sigma$  the scf  $\phi_\Sigma$  is defined as follows*

$$\phi_\Sigma(P) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } \exists (S, T, \pi) \in \Sigma : (D(a, P), I(P), (P_v)_{v \in I(P)}) \geq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}} (S, T, \pi) \\ b, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

### 3.3 Strict preferences.

Let us suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  is the strict universal domain. The second and the third components of the character function are, respectively, the empty set and the empty profile. Consequently we identify  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}})$  with the power set of  $V$  ordered by the set inclusion and the concept of super order closed subset of  $\chi(\mathcal{P})$  gives back the concept of *committee*. We recall that a committee (also *simple game* in the Game Theory literature) is either, stricto sensu (Peleg [9]), a nonempty family of coalitions of voters which is closed under supersets or the empty set or the entire power set. Hence Theorem 3.12 gives

**Corollary 3.14** *Let  $V, A$  be arbitrary and  $a, b$  two distinct elements of  $A$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{P}$  is the strict universal domain. Then, the non-manipulable (i.e. CSP) scfs defined on  $\mathcal{P}$  with range included in  $\{a, b\}$  are all and only the functions  $P \mapsto \phi_C(P)$ , where  $C$  is a committee of voters, and the definition of  $\phi_C$  is:  $\phi_C(P) = a \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} D(a, P) \in C$ .*

The above corollary, when  $V$  is finite, and  $A = \{a, b\}$  gives back [7, Theorem 2].

## 4 Anonymous social choice functions

In this section we suppose that the set  $V$  of voters is finite, and  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{W}^V$ , with  $\mathcal{W}(A) \supseteq \mathcal{W}$ . Let  $\Phi_{AN}$  consists of all scfs  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\} \subseteq A$  which are non-manipulable (in this case one can refer to ISP or CSP indifferently) and anonymous.

**Definition 4.1** *A scf  $\phi$  is **anonymous** if, for every profile  $P$  and for every permutation  $\sigma$  of  $V$ , it results  $\phi(P) = \phi(P \circ \sigma)$ , where  $P \circ \sigma$  is the profile in which the preference of each voter  $v$  is  $P_{\sigma(v)}$ .*

---

<sup>5</sup>Note that incomparability in the poset  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_{\widehat{\mathcal{D}}})$  may be thought of as a form of independence in vetoing.

We also assume that there are finitely many preferences in  $\mathcal{W}$  for which the alternatives  $a$  and  $b$  are indifferent. Hence, setting  $\mathcal{I} = \{\pi \in \mathcal{W} : a \underset{\pi}{\sim} b\}$  we assume this set is finite, say of cardinality  $\tau$  ( $A$  need not be finite;  $\tau$  may be zero). Let us enumerate the elements of  $\mathcal{I}$  as follows  $\mathcal{I} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_\tau\}$ , and introduce the further sets  $I_i(P) = \{v \in V : P_v = \pi_i\}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, \tau$ . Of course the sets  $I_i(P)$  partition  $I(P)$ .

Now we describe the character function we associate to the class  $\Phi_{AN}$ . Let us fix that the number of voters is  $n$ .

It is the function  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow L$  with values into the set  $L = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^{\tau+1}$ , defined as

$$\chi = (\chi_0, \chi_1, \dots, \chi_\tau) \text{ with } \chi_0(P) = |D(a, P)|, \chi_i(P) = |I_i(P)| \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, \tau.$$

We consider  $L$  as a poset under the partial order according to which, for  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\ell} \in L$ , one has:

$$\mathbf{k} \leq_L \mathbf{\ell} \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} (k_i - \ell_i)^+ \leq \ell_0 - k_0.$$

It is straightforward checking that  $\mathbf{k} \leq_L \mathbf{\ell}$  is the same as  $k_0 + \sum_{i \in J} k_i \leq \ell_0 + \sum_{i \in J} \ell_i$  for every subset  $J$  of  $\{1, \dots, \tau\}$ .

We now have the main result of this section.

**Theorem 4.2** *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \{a, b\} \subseteq A$  be a scf. Then,*

$$\phi \in \Phi_{AN} \Leftrightarrow \phi \text{ is } (\chi, a)\text{-monotone.}$$

PROOF: Let us suppose that  $\phi$  is  $(\chi, a)$ -monotone. We know (Proposition 3.9) that  $\phi = \phi_C$  for some SOC subset of the poset  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_L)$ . Since  $\phi_C$  is obviously anonymous, we have to prove that it is non-manipulable. We prove (Theorem 3.4) that it is almost monotone:

$$P \stackrel{a}{\succeq} Q, \phi_C(Q) = a \Rightarrow \phi_C(P) = a,$$

or, what is the same,

$$P \stackrel{a}{\succeq} Q, \chi(Q) \in C \Rightarrow \chi(P) \in C.$$

The assertion will follow from showing that  $P \stackrel{a}{\succeq} Q \Rightarrow \chi(P) \geq_L \chi(Q)$  and from the super order closedness of  $C$ . The implication  $P \stackrel{a}{\succeq} Q \Rightarrow \chi(P) \geq_L \chi(Q)$  is proved in Appendix 8.1

For the converse, let us assume that  $\phi \in \Phi_{AN}$ . In Appendix 8.2 the following claim is proved.

CLAIM: The set  $C = \{\chi(P) : \phi(P) = a\}$  is SOC in  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_L)$ .

As a consequence, we have that  $\phi = \phi_C$ , i.e.  $\phi(P) = a \Leftrightarrow \phi_C(P) = a$ . Indeed the implication  $\phi(P) = a \Rightarrow \phi_C(P) = a$  is true by definition of  $C$ , whereas the converse  $\phi(P) = a \Leftarrow \phi_C(P) = a$  derives from the anonymity of  $\phi$  together with the definition of the character function. Finally, Proposition 3.9 applies.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3** *Suppose  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{W}^V$ ,  $V$ , as well as the preferences in  $\mathcal{W}$  for which the alternatives  $a$  and  $b$  are indifferent, are finite. Then, there is a bijection  $\Sigma \mapsto \phi_\Sigma$  from the set of all antichains  $\Sigma$  of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \leq_L)$  to the set of all non-manipulable scfs with values in  $\{a, b\}$ . For an antichain  $\Sigma$  the scf  $\phi_\Sigma$  is defined as follows*

$$\phi_\Sigma(P) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } \exists (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\tau) \in \Sigma : (|D(a, P)|, |I_1(P)|, \dots, |I_\tau(P)|) \geq_L (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\tau) \\ b, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

## 5 Binary scfs

In this Section we assume  $A = \{a, b\}$ , namely, according to the terminology we adopt, we deal with binary scfs. This is the framework of [4] in which we assumed finiteness of  $V$  and universality of the domain  $\mathcal{P}$ . Both these hypothesis are not necessarily assumed here.

**Remark 5.1** In the binary case Definition 3.1 gives back [4, Definition 2.2]. Note that in the two valued model we needed a more stringent interpretation for the sentence “the profile  $P$  supports the alternative  $a$  at least as the profile  $Q$  does”, namely we needed a stronger notion of the relation  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$  originally introduced in [4, Definition 2.2].

To be explicit,

whereas in the **binary case** we set  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$  when: *stepping from the situation  $Q$  to the situation  $P$ , agents in favor of  $a$  remain such, and agents that were indifferent and have not moved to prefer  $a$ , remain indifferent*

in the **two-valued case** we needed to set  $P \stackrel{a}{\geq} Q$  when: *stepping from the situation  $Q$  to the situation  $P$ , agents in favor of  $a$  remain such, and agents that were indifferent **between  $a$  and  $b$**  and have not moved to prefer  $a$ , **do not change opinion about the entire set of alternatives.***

Since, given a profile  $P$ , the partial profile  $(P_v)_{v \in I(P)}$  is uniquely determined, we can identify the triple  $(D(a, P), I(P), (P_v)_{v \in I(P)})$  with the pair  $(D(a, P), I(P))$ . This allows a simplification. The role of the poset  $L$ , instead of  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ , can be played by the simpler poset  $(\mathcal{D}, \geq_{\mathcal{D}})$ , where  $\mathcal{D}$  consists of the disjoint pairs  $(S, T)$  of subsets of  $V$  with the partial order  $(S, T) \leq_{\mathcal{D}} (S', T')$  defined as  $S \subseteq S'$  and  $T \setminus S' \subseteq T'$ .<sup>6</sup> The character is just  $\chi(P) = (D(a, P), I(P))$ . Hence, Theorems 3.12 and 3.13 specialize as follows.

**Corollary 5.2** (Theorem 3.12 in the binary case). *On the quasi-cartesian restricted domain  $\mathcal{P}$ , the binary non-manipulable scfs are all and only the functions  $\phi_C$  defined by  $(\star)$ , with SOC set  $C$  of veto pairs.*

**Corollary 5.3** (Theorem 3.13 in the binary case). *Suppose  $V$  is finite, and  $\mathcal{P} = \times_{v \in V} \mathcal{W}_v$ . Then, there is a bijection  $\Sigma \mapsto \phi_\Sigma$  from the set of all antichains  $\Sigma$  of  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_{\mathcal{D}})$  to the set of*

---

<sup>6</sup>The poset  $\mathcal{D}$  is clearly embeddable into  $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}$ .

all non-manipulable binary scfs. For an antichain  $\Sigma$  the scf  $\phi_\Sigma$  is defined as follows

$$\phi_\Sigma(P) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } \exists (S, T) \in \Sigma : (D(a, P), I(P)) \geq_{\mathcal{D}} (S, T) \\ b, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Observing that the poset  $\mathcal{D}$  is isomorphic to the poset  $\mathcal{V}$  consisting of the set  $\{(S, W) \in 2^V \times 2^V : S \subseteq W\}$  endowed with the componentwise set inclusion as partial order  $\leq_{\mathcal{V}}$ , the above Corollary gives the **veto pairs representation** of non-manipulable binary scfs provided in [4, Theorem 3.3].

Similarly, considering the anonymous case, the poset  $L$  of Section 4 becomes:  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  in the case of strict preferences, and  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  when indifference is allowed.

- Case of strict preferences:

$L = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  is endowed with the usual order. The character is  $\chi(P) = |D(a, P)|$ . The fact that all and only the non-manipulable scfs are the functions  $\phi_C$  with  $C$  SOC subset of  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ , gives the quota majority method (see [8, Corollary p. 63]) as the functional form of these scfs.

- Case of weak preferences:

$L = \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \times \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  is endowed with the order relation:  $\mathbf{x} \leq_L \mathbf{y} \Leftrightarrow x_0 \leq y_0$ , and  $x_0 + x_1 \leq y_0 + y_1$ . Assume  $\mathcal{P}$  is the universal domain, so that we are in the framework of [4] and [5].

Let  $\mathbb{Z}$  stand for the set of integers, whereas  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ .

It is straightforward to verify that the set  $\chi(P) = \{(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0 : x_0 + x_1 \leq n\}$  with the order  $\geq_L$  is order isomorphic to the poset (introduced in [4, Subsection 4.1])  $(G, \geq_G)$  where

$$G = \{(x_0, x_1) \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^2 : x_0 \leq x_1\}, \text{ and the order is } \mathbf{x} \leq_G \mathbf{y} \Leftrightarrow x_i \leq y_i, i = 0, 1.$$

Hence, Corollary 4.3 becomes, in the present special case, the veto cardinality representation of [4, Teorem 4.3].

To compare with the geometric results in [5], observe that  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$  is also isomorphic to the poset  $\mathbf{G}_n = \{(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0 : x_0 + x_1 \leq n\}$ , ordered by the cone  $C_a = \{(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} : x_0 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_1 \leq 0\}$ , introduced in [5, Section 3].

For the readers convenience we illustrate in the Appendix these three posets and give explicitly the isomorphisms and their interpretations.

## 6 Strong group strategy-proofness

In this section we exemplify how the character function approach applies to the result of Barberà et al. [2] concerning the functional form of strong group strategy-proof scfs. Notice that their results require the assumption about  $\mathcal{P}$  they refer to as “*minimal assumption*”:

$\mathcal{P} = \times_{v \in V} \mathcal{W}_v$  with  $\mathcal{W}_v \subseteq \mathcal{W}(A)$ , and every  $\mathcal{W}_v$  contains at least three preferences  $W^i \in \mathcal{W}(A)$  for  $i = \sim, a, b$  (depending on  $v$ ) such that in  $W^\sim$   $a, b$  are indifferent, in  $W^a$   $a$  is preferred to  $b$ , in  $W^b$   $b$  is preferred to  $a$ .

It is a kind of cartesian restricted domain, *normal*, one could say, with respect to the pair  $\{a, b\}$  of distinct alternatives in  $A$ .



Let us recall that a scf is strongly group strategy-proof when it is immune to weak manipulation: all members of the manipulating coalition  $D$  are not worse off and at least one is better off.

Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}$  be the set  $\{P \in \mathcal{P} : I(P) = V\}$ , i.e. the set of all feasible profiles under which all voters, unanimously, are indifferent between alternative  $a$  and alternative  $b$ .

To fix ideas we consider the case that there are at least three individuals in  $V$ <sup>7</sup>.

It is known from [2, Theorem 3] that a scf  $\phi$ , with range of cardinality two, is strongly group strategy-proof if and only if it is, with a suitable choice of a subset  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ , either a


**veto for b:**

$$\phi(P) = a \stackrel{def}{\iff} \text{either } D(a, P) \neq \emptyset \text{ or } P \in \mathcal{U},$$

or a **veto for a:**

$$\phi(P) = a \stackrel{def}{\iff} \text{either } [D(a, P) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } D(b, P) = \emptyset] \text{ or } P \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Let  $(L, \geq)$  be the poset (see the figure below) with  $L = \{-1, 0, 1\} \cup \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$  and where 1 and  $-1$  are respectively the maximum and the minimum, and the remaining elements being pairwise incomparable.



The poset  $L$

Let us define the character function  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow L$  as follows:

$$\chi(P) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } D(a, P) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } D(b, P) = \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{if } D(a, P) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } D(b, P) \neq \emptyset, \\ -1, & \text{if } D(a, P) = \emptyset \text{ and } D(b, P) \neq \emptyset, \\ P, & \text{if } D(a, P) = \emptyset \text{ and } D(b, P) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

The SOC subsets  $C$  of  $(L, \geq)$  are: the empty set;  $L$ ; the sets  $\{0, 1\} \cup \mathcal{U}$  with  $\emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{U} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ ; the sets  $\{1\} \cup \mathcal{U}$  with  $\emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{U} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{U}}$ . When  $C$  is empty  $\phi_C$  is constantly  $b$ . When  $C = L$  then  $\phi_C$  is constantly  $a$ . For  $C = \{0, 1\} \cup \mathcal{U}$ , the scf  $\phi_C$  is the veto for  $b$  and in the latter case we get the veto for  $a$ , so exhausting all strongly group strategy-proof scfs with range of cardinality at most two.

<sup>7</sup>There is a difference in case  $|V| = 2$ , but for our illustrative purposes the case  $|V| > 2$  is sufficient.

## 7 Conclusions

Our study shows that non-manipulable social choice functions with range of cardinality (at most) two, within a larger set of alternatives, can always be represented in a functional form that we can say it is “canonical” for its unifying effect. Even if we consider some extra property joint with non-manipulability, this “canonical” functional form applies. It unifies functional forms previously obtained, mainly in the special case  $A = \{a, b\}$ , by Larsson and Svensson [7], Barberà, et al. [2], and the authors [4, 5].

Consider, say, a rule  $\phi$ , with values in a set  $\{a, b\}$  subset of a set  $A$  of alternatives, which is

- non-manipulable,
- non-manipulable and anonymous,
- strong-group strategy-proof.

We can anyway observe that for every profile  $P$ ,

$$\phi(P) = a \text{ if and only if } \chi(P) \in C,$$

where  $\chi$  is a function from the domain  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\phi$  to a poset  $(L, \geq_L)$ , and  $C$  is a subset of  $L$  with the following two properties:

- (1)  $C$  is contained into the  $\chi$ -image of  $\mathcal{P}$ ,
- (2)  $\chi(Q) \in C$ , and  $\chi(P) \geq_L \chi(Q) \Rightarrow \chi(P) \in C$ .

What marks the distinction of the different cases is a specific pair  $L, \chi$  for each case. So, the different character of the three types of social choice functions is captured by  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow L$ , and for this reason we named it character function.

Our study has also shown that only very mild assumptions on  $\mathcal{P}$  are necessary for the validity of our conclusions.

When voters and alternatives are finite, in the parametrization of  $\phi$  we can replace  $C$  with the set of its  $\geq_L$ -minimal elements, which in turn, gives a simple description of  $\phi$ .

## References

- [1] Barberà, S., Berga, D. and Moreno, B., Individual versus group strategy-proofness: When do they coincide?, *J. of Economic Theory*, 145(2010), 1648-1674.
- [2] Barberà, S., Berga, D. and Moreno, B., Group strategy-proof social choice functions with binary ranges and arbitrary domains: characterization results, *Int. J. Game Theory*, 41(2012), 791-808.
- [3] Basile, A., Rao, S., and Bhaskara Rao, K.P.S., The structure of two-valued coalitional strategy-proof social choice functions, *Journal of Math. Economics*, 95(2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmateco.2021.102474>.

- [4] Basile, A., Rao, S., and Bhaskara Rao, K.P.S., Anonymous, non-manipulable, binary social choice, *Games and Economic Behavior*, 133 (2022), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2022.02.007>
- [5] Basile, A., Rao, S., and Bhaskara Rao, K.P.S., Geometry of anonymous binary social choices that are strategy-proof, *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 116 (2022), 85–91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geb.2022.02.007>
- [6] Bhaskara Rao, K.P.S., Basile, A., and Rao, S., On the relation between preference reversal and strategy-proofness, *Economics Letters*, 206(2021).
- [7] Larsson, B. and Svensson, L.G., Strategy-proof voting on the full preference domain, *Math. Soc. Sci.*, 52(2006), 272–287.
- [8] Moulin, H., *The Strategy of Social Choice*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1983, Amsterdam.
- [9] Peleg, B, *Game Theoretic Analysis of Voting in Committees*, Cambridge University Press, 1984,

## 8 Appendix

### 8.1 The implication $P \stackrel{a}{\succeq} Q \Rightarrow \chi(P) \geq_L \chi(Q)$ of Theorem 4.2

PROOF:

So, let us assume that  $P \stackrel{a}{\succeq} Q$ . We know from Remark 3.2 this is equivalent to:

$$(1) \quad D(a, Q) \subseteq D(a, P), \quad D(b, P) \subseteq D(b, Q), \quad \text{and } v \in I(P) \cap I(Q) \Rightarrow P_v = Q_v.$$

From the two partitions  $\{D(a, Q), I(Q), D(b, Q)\}$ , and  $\{D(a, P), I(P), D(b, P)\}$ , of  $V$ , due to (1), we have the partitions

$$(2) \quad V = D(a, Q) \dot{\cup} [D(a, P) \setminus D(a, Q)] \dot{\cup} [I(P) \cap I(Q)] \dot{\cup} [D(b, Q) \cap I(P)] \dot{\cup} D(b, P),$$

and

$$(3) \quad V = D(a, Q) \dot{\cup} [I(Q) \cap D(a, P)] \dot{\cup} [I(Q) \cap I(P)] \dot{\cup} [D(b, Q) \setminus D(b, P)] \dot{\cup} D(b, P).$$

Let us set:  $D = I(Q) \cap I(P)$ ,  $E = [D(a, P) \setminus D(a, Q)]$ ,  $F = [D(b, Q) \setminus D(b, P)]$ . Then, for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}$ , using again (1), we have:

$$I_i(Q) = [I_i(Q) \cap E] \dot{\cup} [I_i(Q) \cap D], \quad \text{from (2),}$$

and

$$I_i(P) = [I_i(P) \cap F] \dot{\cup} [I_i(P) \cap D], \quad \text{from (3).}$$

Also notice that  $I_i(Q) \cap D = I_i(P) \cap D$ .<sup>8</sup>

Now, setting  $J = \{i : |I_i(Q)| > |I_i(P)|\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} [ |I_i(Q)| - |I_i(P)| ]^+ &= \sum_{i \in J} |I_i(Q)| - |I_i(P)| = \sum_{i \in J} |I_i(Q) \cap E| - |I_i(P) \cap F| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in J} |I_i(Q) \cap E| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} |I_i(Q) \cap E| = |I(Q) \cap E| \leq |E| = |D(a, P)| - |D(a, Q)| \end{aligned}$$

(again because of (1)) which is the same as the relation  $\chi(P) \geq_L \chi(Q)$  desired.  $\square$

## 8.2 Proof of the CLAIM of Theorem 4.2

PROOF: Let us consider two profiles  $P', Q'$  with  $\phi(P') = a$ , and  $\chi(P') \leq_L \chi(Q')$ . We show that  $\phi(Q') = a$ .

For brevity, we set  $\chi(P') = (k_0, k_1, \dots, k_{\tau})$ , and  $\chi(Q') = (\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_{\tau})$ . Moreover, we partition the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, \tau\}$  as  $J \cup J^c$  where  $j \in J \Leftrightarrow k_j > \ell_j$ . Without loss of generality we assume that  $J \neq \emptyset$  (the case  $J = \emptyset$  is similar and in a sense easier). Let us enumerate the elements of  $J$  and  $J^c$  as follows:

$$J = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{\beta}\} \quad J^c = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{\alpha}\}.$$

We shall introduce two new profiles  $P$ , and  $Q$ , respectively permutations of  $P'$ , and  $Q'$ , and show that from  $\phi(P) = a$  (due to anonymity) we get  $\phi(Q) = a$ . Again anonymity will produce the asserted  $\phi(Q') = a$ .

For convenience we denote the voters as  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ , and use the intuitive interval notations:  $V = [v_1, v_n]$ ,  $\{v_{\gamma+1}, v_{\gamma+2}, \dots, v_{\delta}\} = ]v_{\gamma}, v_{\delta}]$ , and so forth.

Let us consider the sequence of integers

$$0 \leq k_0 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \dots \leq \gamma_{\alpha} \leq \delta_1 \leq \dots \leq \delta_{\beta} \leq n,$$

where:

$\gamma_r = k_0 + k_{i_1} + \dots + k_{i_r}$  for  $r = 1, \dots, \alpha$ , and

$\delta_r = \gamma_{\alpha} + \ell_{j_1} + \dots + \ell_{j_r}$  for  $r = 1, \dots, \beta$ .

Obviously,

$$\gamma_{\alpha} = k_0 + \sum_{i \in J^c} k_i, \quad \delta_{\beta} = k_0 + \sum_{i \in J^c} k_i + \sum_{j \in J} \ell_j,$$

and since we have assumed  $J \neq \emptyset$  we have

$$\delta_{\beta} < w(P') = \sum_{i=0}^{\tau} k_i.$$

---

<sup>8</sup>We show the inclusion  $\subseteq$ . From  $v \in I_i(Q) \cap D = I_i(Q) \cap I(P)$ , due to (1), we have  $P_v = Q_v = \pi_i$ . Hence  $v \in I_i(P)$ .

On the other hand, from  $(k_0, k_1, \dots, k_\tau) \leq_L (\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_\tau)$  we get  $w(P') \leq \delta_\beta + (\ell_0 - k_0)$ . Hence, summing up, we have the following sequence of integers:

$$0 \leq k_0 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \dots \leq \gamma_\alpha \leq \delta_1 \leq \dots \leq \delta_\beta < w(P') \leq \delta_\beta + (\ell_0 - k_0) \leq w(Q') \leq n$$

by means of which we define the mentioned profiles  $P$  and  $Q$ .

The next figure illustrates these definitions.

voters	$]v_1, v_{k_0}]$	$]v_{k_0}, v_{\gamma_1}]$	...	$]v_{\gamma_{\alpha-1}}, v_{\gamma_\alpha}]$	$]v_{\gamma_\alpha}, v_{\delta_1}]$	...	$]v_{\delta_{\beta-1}}, v_{\delta_\beta}]$	$]v_{\delta_\beta}, v_{w(P')}]$	$]v_{w(P')}, v_n]$		
permutation $P$ of $P'$	$aP'$	$\pi_{i_1}$	...	$\pi_{i_\alpha}$	$\pi_{j_1}$	...	$\pi_{j_\beta}$	$\pi_{j_1} \dots \pi_{j_\beta}$	$bP'$	$bP'$	$bP'$
permutation $Q$ of $Q'$	$aQ'$	$\pi_{i_1}$	...	$\pi_{i_\alpha}$	$\pi_{j_1}$	...	$\pi_{j_\beta}$	$aQ'$	$aQ'$	$\pi_{i_1} \dots \pi_{i_\alpha}$	$bQ'$
voters	$]v_1, v_{k_0}]$	$]v_{k_0}, v_{\gamma_1}]$	...	$]v_{\gamma_{\alpha-1}}, v_{\gamma_\alpha}]$	$]v_{\gamma_\alpha}, v_{\delta_1}]$	...	$]v_{\delta_{\beta-1}}, v_{\delta_\beta}]$	$]v_{\delta_\beta}, v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}]$	$]v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}, v_{w(Q')}]$		
profile $Q^1$	$aP'$	$\pi_{i_1}$	...	$\pi_{i_\alpha}$	$\pi_{j_1}$	...	$\pi_{j_\beta}$	$\pi_{j_1} \dots \pi_{j_\beta}$	$bP'$	$\pi_{i_1} \dots \pi_{i_\alpha}$	$bQ'$

Definition of  $P$ :

- on the set  $]v_1, v_{k_0}]$  of voters we assign (arbitrarily) the preferences of the voters in  $D(a, P')$ ;
- on the set  $]v_{k_0}, v_{\gamma_1}]$  we assign the preference  $\pi_{i_1}$  to all voters;
- ...
- on the set  $]v_{\gamma_{\alpha-1}}, v_{\gamma_\alpha}]$  we assign the preference  $\pi_{i_\alpha}$  to all voters;
- on the set  $]v_{\gamma_\alpha}, v_{\delta_1}]$  we assign the preference  $\pi_{j_1}$  to all voters;
- ...
- on the set  $]v_{\delta_{\beta-1}}, v_{\delta_\beta}]$  we assign the preference  $\pi_{j_\beta}$  to all voters;
- on the set of voters  $]v_{\delta_\beta}, v_{w(P')}]$  we distribute the remaining preferences  $\pi_{j_r}$  each being present  $(k_{j_r} - \ell_{j_r})$  more times in the original profile  $P'$ ;
- to the remaining voters in  $]v_{w(P')}, v_n]$  we assign (arbitrarily) the preferences of the voters in  $D(b, P')$ .

Definition of  $Q$ :

- on the set  $]v_1, v_{k_0}]$  of voters we assign (arbitrarily) preferences of  $k_0$  voters in  $D(a, Q')$ ; since preferences of remaining  $(\ell_0 - k_0)$  voters in  $D(a, Q')$  have not been selected, we distribute them (arbitrarily) to the voters of the set  $]v_{\delta_\beta}, v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}]$ ;
- to the voters of the sets  $]v_{k_0}, v_{\gamma_1}] \dots, ]v_{\gamma_{\alpha-1}}, v_{\gamma_\alpha}]$ ,  $]v_{\gamma_\alpha}, v_{\delta_1}] \dots, ]v_{\delta_{\beta-1}}, v_{\delta_\beta}]$  we assign respectively the preference  $\pi_{i_1}, \dots, \pi_{i_\alpha}, \pi_{j_1}, \dots, \pi_{j_\beta}$ ;


- on the set of voters  $]v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}, v_{w(Q')}]$  we distribute the remaining preferences  $\pi_{i_r}$  each being present  $(\ell_{i_r} - k_{i_r})$  more times in the original profile  $Q'$ ;
- to the remaining voters in  $]v_{w(Q')}, v_n]$  we assign (arbitrarily) the preferences of the voters in  $D(b, Q')$ .

Let us also introduce the profile  $Q^1$  identical to  $P$  from voter  $v_1$  till voter  $v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}$ , and identical to  $Q$  on the remaining voters, i.e.  $Q^1 = [P_{[v_1, v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}]}, Q_{]v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}, v_n}]$

Now suppose that on the contrary  $\phi(Q) = b$ . Considering the profile  $Q^1$ , we have that  $\phi(Q^1)$  must be  $b$ , otherwise the coalition  $[v_1, v_{k_0}] \cup ]v_{\delta_\beta}, v_{\delta_\beta + \ell_0 - k_0}]$  manipulates  $Q$  by presenting  $Q^1$ . If  $\delta_\beta + (\ell_0 - k_0) = n$ , then  $Q^1$  coincides with  $P$  and this is not possible since  $\phi(P) = a$ . Therefore it must be the case that  $\delta_\beta + (\ell_0 - k_0) < n$ , hence the coalition  $]v_{\delta_\beta + (\ell_0 - k_0)}, v_n]$  manipulates  $P$  by presenting  $Q^1$ .  $\square$


### 8.3 Appendix: three illustrations for the binary, anonymous, universal domain case, and $V=n$

The following figure illustrate  $(\chi(\mathcal{P}), \geq_L)$ .



The point  $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1) \in \chi(\mathcal{P})$  is interpreted as  $x_0 = |D(a, P)|$  and  $x_1 = |I(P)|$ . The ordering cone is also represented.


Next figure illustrate  $(G, \geq_G)$  of the Subsection 4.1 in [4].



The poset  $(G, \geq_G)$  of [4, Subsection 4.1]

The point  $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1) \in G$  is interpreted as  $x_0 = |D(a, P)|$  and  $x_1 = |D(a, P)| + |I(P)|$ . The ordering cone is also represented. The isomorphism is therefore  $(x_0, x_1) \in \chi(\mathcal{P}) \mapsto (x_0, x_0 + x_1) \in G$ .

Finally, we illustrate  $(\mathbf{G}_n, \geq_{\mathbf{G}_n})$  of the Section 3 in [5].



The poset  $(\mathbf{G}_n, \geq_{\mathbf{G}_n})$  of [5, Section 3]

The point  $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1) \in \mathbf{G}_n$  is interpreted as  $x_0 = |D(a, P)|$  and  $x_1 = |D(b, P)|$ . The ordering cone is also represented. The isomorphism is therefore  $(x_0, x_1) \in \chi(\mathcal{P}) \mapsto (x_0, n - x_0 - x_1) \in \mathbf{G}_n$ .