

DECOMPOSABILITY AND STRATEGY-PROOFNESS IN MULTIDIMENSIONAL MODELS*

Shurojit Chatterji[†] and Huaxia Zeng[‡]

March 22, 2023

Abstract

We introduce the notion of a multidimensional hybrid preference domain on a (finite) set of alternatives that is a Cartesian product of finitely many components. We study strategy-proof rules on this domain and show that every such rule can be decomposed into component-wise strategy proof rules. More importantly, we show that under a suitable “richness” condition, every domain of preferences that reconciles decomposability of rules with strategy-proofness must be a multidimensional hybrid domain. We finally identify an intuitive weakening of separability that explains how a multidimensional hybrid domain may arise in a public goods provision model.

Keywords: Decomposition; strategy-proofness; multidimensional hybrid preference

JEL Classification: D71.

*Huaxia Zeng acknowledges that his work was supported by the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning (No. 2019140015) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No. 2018110153).

[†]School of Economics, Singapore Management University, Singapore.

[‡]School of Economics, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, and the Key Laboratory of Mathematical Economics (SUFE), Ministry of Education, Shanghai 200433, China.

1 INTRODUCTION

Public decisions entail vast expenditures on a variety of components such as defence, education, health. A mechanism design approach would base the decisions on the set of alternatives, formulated as the Cartesian product of these multiple components (denoted $A := \times_{s \in M} A^s$), on the preferences of agents over A . Decision making in such multidimensional settings is considerably more tractable if it can be “decomposed”, that is, if the social planner is able to take these decisions on each of the components independently based on “marginal” preferences in each component that are derived from the “overall” preferences of the agents over A , and then piece these component-wise decisions into a final social decision over A . Of course, one would also like this decomposed decision making process to have nice incentive properties. Thus we seek to study “straightforward” mechanisms in multidimensional settings, that is, mechanisms that are decomposable and strategy-proof.

If overall preferences satisfy separability¹, then a straightforward mechanism for social decisions can be simply constructed by assembling independent component-wise mechanisms that are also strategy-proof.² However, separability is too restrictive; for instance, in a model of club member recruitment (see [Barberà et al., 1991](#)), one might imagine that while the appointment of exactly one candidate is preferred to nobody being appointed, it may be less desirable to recruit all candidates, while in an auction model with non-quasilinear preferences (see [Morimoto and Serizawa, 2015](#)), large-scale payments might influence an agent’s ability to utilize objects. With a view to broadening the scope of straightforward mechanism design in multidimensional settings, we seek to develop here a methodology that allows for non-separable preferences beyond multidimensional single-peaked preferences, and allows us to answer the following question: What sort of preference

¹Intuitively speaking, fixing a marginal preference on each component, an overall preference preserves the property of separability if between any two distinct alternatives, the one endowed with a better element at each disagreed component (according to the related marginal preference) is preferred. Therefore, given a separable preference, one may derive a unique marginal preference on each component by fixing an arbitrary vector on the remaining components. Separability is an important preference restriction widely investigated in both the literature on strategic voting (e.g., [Le Breton and Sen, 1999](#)) and on mechanism design with monetary compensations (e.g., [Roberts, 1979](#)).

²A similar conclusion holds for “voting schemes” defined on domains of multidimensional single-peaked preferences introduced by [Barberà et al. \(1993\)](#).

domain over alternatives formulated as a Cartesian product of multiple components has the features (predicated on some way of deriving marginal preferences on each component) that (i) every rule³ that is strategy-proof turns out to be decomposable into strategy-proof component-wise rules over marginal preferences, and (ii) conversely, arbitrary strategy-proof component-wise rules can be assembled into a strategy-proof rule? We call the first feature *the decomposition property* and the second *the assembling property*.

Once non-separable preferences are involved, the derivation of marginal preferences on a component A^s may vary with the specification of elements on the other components (see [Le Breton and Weymark, 1999](#)). This would affect the scope for designing strategy-proof component-wise rules, which would in turn affect the class of strategy-proof rules consistent with the decomposition and assembling properties.⁴ We propose a natural way of deriving marginal preferences from overall preferences as follows. Given an overall preference over A , simply refer to the top-ranked alternative ($a := (a^s, a^{-s})$) and derive the marginal preference over a pair of elements x^s and y^s in the component A^s by comparing (x^s, a^{-s}) with (y^s, a^{-s}) in the overall preference. We show that this way of deriving marginal preferences allows us to reconcile decomposability with strategy-proofness on a general class of multidimensional models where preference domains satisfy a condition called multidimensional hybridness. These domains variously contain separable preferences, top-separable preferences and multidimensional single-peaked preferences, so that earlier results on the decomposability of strategy-proof rules emerge as special cases of our analysis. Thus while our way of deriving marginal preferences may appear ad hoc⁵, it has the merit of precipi-

³We focus on strategy-proofness, wherein a direct mechanism reduces to a social choice function that picks an outcome from A for each preference profile. The social choice function will be assumed to satisfy the mild requirement of unanimity and we use the term “rule” to refer to a unanimous social choice function.

⁴More specifically, if “too many” marginal preferences are derived, only dictatorships on each component survive strategy-proofness. This implies that any strategy-proof rule other than a *generalized dictatorship* (intuitively speaking, a combination of dictatorships on all components) fails to be decomposable, and the scope for assembling strategy-proof component-wise rules is limited to the class of generalized dictatorships.

⁵That said, the top-ranked alternative does play the role of an important benchmark in the study of strategy-proof rules. Indeed in many models, in particular ours, all strategy-proof rules are completely and endogenously determined by the profiles of top-ranked alternatives, i.e., satisfy *the tops-only property*. Correspondingly, a tops-only rule degenerates to a *voting scheme* that associates to each profile of top-ranked alternatives, an alternative.

tating the decomposability property on all strategy proof rules defined on the domain we identify. Thus it allows social decisions to be made component wise and then assembled, thereby simplifying the task confronting the social planner.

In order to establish multidimensional hybrid preferences, we first briefly introduce hybrid marginal preferences on a component. Let A^s be endowed with a prior order \prec^s . We fix two elements $\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \in A^s$ such that $\underline{x}^s \prec^s \bar{x}^s$.⁶ A *hybrid* marginal preference over A^s requires that for any distinct elements $a^s, b^s \in A^s$ such that a^s is located between the preference peak and b^s , and a^s is *not* located strictly between \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s , a^s is ranked above b^s . Thereby, the preferences over elements between \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s are unrestricted relative to each other, while the preferences over elements at the two sides of \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s retain the conventional restriction of *single-peakedness*. As a natural extension to the multidimensional setting, a preference over A with the top-ranked alternative x , is *multidimensional hybrid* if for any distinct $a, b \in A$ such that at each disagreed component s , a^s is located between x^s and b^s , and a^s is not located strictly between \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s , a is preferred to b .

We make the following claims on multidimensional hybrid domains. First, we show that on a class of rich domains⁷, multidimensional hybrid domains are the unique ones that preserve both the decomposition and assembling properties (see Theorem 1). This in return enables us to fully characterize strategy-proof rules on a rich multidimensional hybrid domain (see Corollary 1). A key step in our analysis is establishing the tops-only property endogenously embedded in all strategy-proof rules on a rich domain, and on marginal rules on domains of marginal preferences⁸, which clearly further simplifies the task of the designer since the social decision on each component is determined by the peak on that component. Next, we consider a model of public goods provision and demonstrate how multidimensional hybrid preferences may arise in such a setting. We contend that

⁶We further require that if $\underline{x}^s \neq \bar{x}^s$, the interval between \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s contains at least three elements.

⁷The richness condition requires a domain to satisfy *minimal richness* (i.e., each alternative is top-ranked in some preference), *diversity*⁺ (i.e., inclusion of two separable preferences that are complete reversals), and more importantly *no-restoration*⁺ which mainly imposes a no-restoration condition of Sato (2013) on a graph over all preferences formulated by the localness notions of *adjacency* (introduced by Sato, 2013) and *adjacency*⁺ (introduced by Chatterji and Zeng, 2019), so that the difference between any two preferences on the graph can be reconciled via a sufficiently short path.

⁸In most cases, the tops-only property is necessary for the decomposability of strategy-proof rules (see for instance, Barberà et al., 1991, 1993; Le Breton and Weymark, 1999).

requiring “semi-separability” in the procedure wherein marginal preferences are combined to generate overall preferences provides an intuitive route to multidimensional hybridness.⁹

This paper is organized as follows. The remainder of the Introduction reviews the literature. Section 2 sets out the model and preliminaries. In Section 3, we formally introduce multidimensional hybrid domains, establish the characterization results, and adopt a model of public goods provision to illustrate the rising of multidimensional hybrid preferences, while Section 4 concludes. All omitted proofs are gathered in an Appendix.

1.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Several preference restrictions have been introduced to reconcile decomposability with strategy-proofness in the literature. [Border and Jordan \(1983\)](#) required preferences over the real space \mathbb{R}^m to be separable and star-shaped, characterized that a rule is strategy-proof if only if it can be decomposed into component-wise strategy-proof rules, and further justified the salience of separability by showing that their decomposability result degenerates back to an impossibility result of the Gibbard-Satterthwaite Theorem ([Gibbard, 1973](#); [Satterthwaite, 1975](#)) as soon as separability is slightly tampered with. In the special instance where the set of alternatives is a Cartesian product of multiple binary-element components, i.e., $A := \{0, 1\} \times \cdots \times \{0, 1\}$, [Barberà et al. \(1991\)](#) characterized that each strategy-proof rule on the domain of separable preferences is a *voting-by-committees* - a rule that determines the choice at each component separately according to independent voting committees. [Barberà et al. \(1993\)](#) introduced a multidimensional setting where finitely many elements in each component are linearly ordered so that all alternatives can be viewed as located on a grid; they generalized the seminal preference restriction of *single-peakedness* to multidimensional single-peakedness on the grid, and showed that a rule is strategy-proof if and only if it can be decomposed into *fixed ballot rules* of [Moulin \(1980\)](#) at all compo-

⁹Semi-separability weakens the restriction of separability. It extracts pervasive preference information embedded in the domains of marginal preferences, and requires that the overall preference respects such information. Specifically, fixing a domain of marginal preferences in the component A^s , it may turn out that in all marginal preferences with the peak a^s , b^s is ranked above c^s (such a preference restriction always exists, since it is possible that $a^s = b^s$). Then, semi-separability requires each overall preference that includes a^s in its top-ranked alternative, ranks (b^s, x^{-s}) above (c^s, x^{-s}) for all $x^{-s} \in A^{-s} := \times_{t \in M \setminus \{s\}} A^t$.

nents. [Le Breton and Sen \(1999\)](#) restricted attention to separable preferences, introduced a mild richness condition on the preference domain, and demonstrated the necessity and sufficiency of decomposability for strategy-proofness. They further extended their decomposability result to the multidimensional single-peaked domain of [Barberà et al. \(1993\)](#) where non-separable preferences are involved, via the top-only property endogenously embedded in all strategy-proof rules. In a more generalized multidimensional setting where each component is assumed to be a first-countable Tychonoff space, [Le Breton and Weymark \(1999\)](#) introduced top-separable preferences which significantly weakens the restriction of separability, and characterized that a rule is strategy-proof if and only if it is a generalized dictatorship. Recently, [Gershkov et al. \(2020\)](#) study a multidimensional model where the preference over alternatives of \mathbb{R}^m is measured by a norm towards the preference peak; their main result shows that *the marginal median mechanism* (i.e., a combination of median rules at all components) is strategy-proof if and only if the norm satisfies *orthant monotonicity*, which implies the star-shape preference restriction of [Border and Jordan \(1983\)](#) and generalizes the requirement of separability. More discussion on strategy-proof social choice functions in multidimensional settings can be found in the two comprehensive survey papers of [Sprumont \(1995\)](#) and [Barberà \(2011\)](#). We introduce a particular way of deriving marginal preferences which enables us to investigate decomposability of social choice functions in a multidimensional model involving both separable and non-separable preferences.¹⁰ Our theorem characterizes that multidimensional hybridness under a richness condition is necessary and sufficient for *decomposable domains* (i.e., domains satisfying both the decomposition and assembling properties). This further empowers us to characterize all strategy-proof social choice functions, which covers as special cases the aforementioned characterization results on the domains of separable, multidimensional single-peaked and top-separable preferences in a setting with finitely many alternatives.

¹⁰Earlier literature in multidimensional settings involving non-separable preferences, for instance, the multidimensional single-peaked domain of [Barberà et al. \(1993\)](#) and the top-separable domain of [Le Breton and Weymark \(1999\)](#), was able to derive decomposability only for voting schemes (recall these are rules satisfying the tops-only property) since they did not derive marginal preferences as we do here. The characterization of strategy-proof rules requires a combination of the tops-only property established separately on rules, with the decomposition of the corresponding voting schemes. Our way of deriving marginal preferences provides a unified approach for analyzing decomposability of strategy-proof rules.

2 PRELIMINARIES

Let A be a finite set of alternatives with $|A| \geq 3$. We throughout the paper assume that the alternative set is represented by a **Cartesian product** of a finite number of sets, each of which contains finitely many elements. Formally, we fix $A = \times_{s \in M} A^s$ where $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$, $m \geq 2$ is an integer, and $2 \leq |A^s| < \infty$ for each $s \in M$.¹¹ Here, each $s \in M$ is called a **component**; A^s is referred to as a **component set**, and an element in A^s is denoted as a^s . Accordingly, an alternative is represented by an m -tuple, i.e., $a := (a^1, \dots, a^m)$. To highlight a component $s \in M$, we also write $a = (a^s, a^{-s})$. Given two alternatives $a, b \in A$, let $M(a, b) := \{s \in M : a^s \neq b^s\}$ denote the set of components on which a and b disagree. In particular, two alternatives a and b are said **similar** if $|M(a, b)| = 1$. Given $s \in M$ and $x^{-s} \in A^{-s}$, let $(A^s, x^{-s}) := \{a \in A : a^{-s} = x^{-s}\}$.

Let $N := \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a finite set of voters with $n \geq 2$. Each voter i has a preference order P_i over A which is complete, antisymmetric and transitive, i.e., a *linear order*. For any $a, b \in A$, $a P_i b$ is interpreted as “ a is strictly preferred to b according to P_i ”. Given a preference P_i , let $r_k(P_i)$, where $1 \leq k \leq |A|$, denote the k th ranked alternative in P_i . Moreover, given a nonempty subset $B \subseteq A$, let $\max^{P_i}(B)$ and $\min^{P_i}(B)$ be the best and worst alternatives in B according to P_i respectively. Two preferences P_i and P'_i are called **complete reversals** if for all distinct $a, b \in A$, we have $[a P_i b] \Leftrightarrow [b P'_i a]$. Two preferences P_i and P'_i over A are **adjacent**, denoted $P_i \sim P'_i$, if there exist distinct $a, b \in A$ such that $r_k(P_i) = r_{k+1}(P'_i) = a$ and $r_k(P'_i) = r_{k+1}(P_i) = b$ for some $1 \leq k < |A|$, and $r_\ell(P_i) = r_\ell(P'_i)$ for all $\ell \notin \{k, k+1\}$. Let \mathbb{P} denote the set containing *all* linear orders over A . The set of all admissible preferences is a set $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, referred to as a **preference domain**.¹² We call \mathbb{P} **the universal domain**. Given $a \in A$, let $\mathbb{D}^a := \{P_i \in \mathbb{D} : r_1(P_i) = a\}$. Correspondingly, a domain \mathbb{D} is **minimally rich** if $\mathbb{D}^a \neq \emptyset$ for every $a \in A$. Throughout the paper, all domains under investigation are assumed to be minimally rich. A **preference profile** is an n -tuple $P := (P_1, \dots, P_n) = (P_i, P_{-i}) \in \mathbb{D}^n$. Analogously, for each $s \in M$, let P_i^s denote a linear order over A^s , called a **marginal preference**, \mathbb{P}^s denote **the marginal universal domain**, and $\mathbb{D}^s \subseteq \mathbb{P}^s$ denote an admissible **marginal domain**.

A **Social Choice Function** (or **SCF**) is a map $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$, which associates to each

¹¹Note that the condition $|A^s| \geq 2$ for all $s \in M$, ensures indispensability of all components.

¹²In this paper, \subseteq and \subset denote the weak and strict inclusion relations respectively.

preference profile $P \in \mathbb{D}^n$, a “socially desirable” outcome $f(P)$. First, an SCF $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ is required to be **unanimous**, i.e., for all $a \in A$ and $P \in \mathbb{D}^n$, we have $[r_1(P_i) = a \text{ for all } i \in N] \Rightarrow [f(P) = a]$. For ease of presentation, a unanimous SCF henceforth is called a **rule**. Next, an SCF $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ satisfies the **tops-only property** if for all $P, P' \in \mathbb{D}^n$, we have $[r_1(P_i) = r_1(P'_i) \text{ for all } i \in N] \Rightarrow [f(P) = f(P')]$. Last, an SCF $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ is **strategy-proof** if for all $i \in N$, $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ and $P_{-i} \in \mathbb{D}^{n-1}$, we have $[f(P_i, P_{-i}) \neq f(P'_i, P_{-i})] \Rightarrow [f(P_i, P_{-i}) \succ_i f(P'_i, P_{-i})]$. Analogously, given $s \in M$, a **marginal SCF** is a map $f^s : [\mathbb{D}^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$. The three axioms above also apply to marginal SCFs. A unanimous marginal SCF is henceforth called a **marginal rule**. In particular, given a domain \mathbb{D} , if all strategy-proof rules $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$, $n \geq 2$, satisfy the tops-only property, we call \mathbb{D} a **tops-only domain**. The same definition applies to a marginal domain, called a **tops-only marginal domain**.

2.1 Graphs

In this section, we introduce some standard concepts from graph theory that will be repeatedly used throughout the paper. An (undirected) **graph**, denoted $G := \langle V, \mathcal{E} \rangle$, is a combination of a “vertex set” V , and an “edge set” $\mathcal{E} \subseteq V \times V$ such that $[(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}] \Rightarrow [\alpha \neq \beta \text{ and } (\beta, \alpha) \in \mathcal{E}]$. A vertex $\alpha \in V$ is called a **leaf** if there exists a unique vertex $\beta \in V$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}$. Given two distinct vertices $\alpha, \beta \in V$, a **path** in $G = \langle V, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ connecting α and β is a sequence of “non-repeated” vertices $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_v)$, $v \geq 2$, such that $\alpha_1 = \alpha$, $\alpha_v = \beta$, $\alpha_k \in V$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$, and $(\alpha_k, \alpha_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v - 1$. A graph $G = \langle V, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ is called a **connected graph** if for each pair of distinct vertices, there exists a path in G connecting them.

Note that the vertex set V here can represent a subset of alternatives, elements in one component set, preferences, or marginal preferences. We provide one important illustration. Given a marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s , two distinct elements $a^s, b^s \in A$ are said **strongly connected**, denoted $a^s \approx b^s$, if there exist $P_i^s, P_i^{s'} \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(P_i^s) = r_2(P_i^{s'}) = a^s$, $r_1(P_i^{s'}) = r_2(P_i^s) = b^s$ and $r_k(P_i^s) = r_k(P_i^{s'})$ for all $k = 3, \dots, |A^s|$.¹³ Accordingly, given a nonempty subset $B^s \subseteq A^s$, we can induce a graph $G_{\approx}^{B^s} := \langle B^s, \mathcal{E}_{\approx}^{B^s} \rangle$ such that two elements of B^s form an edge if and only if they are strongly connected, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_{\approx}^{B^s} = \{(a^s, b^s) : a^s, b^s \in$

¹³The notion of strong connectedness between alternatives was introduced by Chatterji et al. (2013).

B^s and $a^s \approx b^s$).

2.2 Hybrid marginal preferences

In this section, we introduce hybrid marginal preferences. Fix a component $s \in M$ and a linear order \prec^s over A^s .¹⁴ Given $a^s, b^s \in A^s$, let $\langle a^s, b^s \rangle := \{x^s \in A^s : a^s \preceq^s x^s \preceq^s b^s, \text{ or } b^s \preceq^s x^s \preceq^s a^s\}$ denote the **interval** that contains elements located between a^s and b^s on \prec^s , and let $\text{Int}\langle a^s, b^s \rangle := \{z^s \in A^s : a^s \prec^s z^s \prec^s b^s, \text{ or } b^s \prec^s z^s \prec^s a^s\}$ denote the **interior** of the interval $\langle a^s, b^s \rangle$. Two elements $\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \in A^s$ are called **marginal thresholds** on \prec^s if $\underline{x}^s \preceq^s \bar{x}^s$ and $[\underline{x}^s \neq \bar{x}^s] \Rightarrow [|\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle| \geq 3]$.

Given marginal thresholds $\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \in A^s$, and elements $x^s, a^s, b^s \in A^s$ such that $a^s \neq b^s$, note that one of the following three cases must occur: (1) $x^s = a^s$, (2) $x^s \neq a^s$ and $\underline{x}^s = \bar{x}^s$, or (3) $x^s \neq a^s$ and $\underline{x}^s \neq \bar{x}^s$. We adopt the following terminology: according to \prec^s , in Case (1), a^s is **trivially between** x^s and b^s ; in Case (2), a^s is said **naturally between** x^s and b^s if $a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle$, while in Case (3), a^s is **conditionally between** x^s and b^s if $a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle$ and $a^s \notin \text{Int}\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$.¹⁵ In summary, let $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)}$ denote a relation of trivial betweenness, or natural betweenness, or conditional betweenness, and $\mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ denote the set collecting all such betweenness relations.

DEFINITION 1 Fixing two marginal thresholds $\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \in A^s$, a marginal preference P_i^s , say $r_1(P_i^s) = x^s$, is **hybrid** on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s if for all distinct $a^s, b^s \in A^s$, we have

$$\left[\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) \right] \Rightarrow [a^s P_i^s b^s].$$

Let $\mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ denote **the hybrid marginal domain** that contains all hybrid marginal preferences on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s . A marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s is called **a hybrid marginal domain** on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s if $\mathbb{D}^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a connected graph, and $[\underline{x}^s \neq \bar{x}^s] \Rightarrow [G_{\approx}^{\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle} \text{ has no leaf}]$.

Note that if the marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s are identical, the conditional betweenness relation vanishes, and the trivial and natural betweenness relations can be merged, i.e., $\mathcal{B}(\prec^s$

¹⁴Let $a^s \preceq^s b^s$ denote either $a^s \neq b^s$ and $a^s \prec^s b^s$, or $a^s = b^s$.

¹⁵Note that if $|\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle| = 2$, then $\text{Int}\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle = \emptyset$. Consequently, natural betweenness and conditional betweenness become identical. This is why we intentionally rule out the case $\underline{x}^s \neq \bar{x}^s$ and $|\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle| = 2$ in the definition of marginal thresholds.

, $\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) = \left\{ \overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} : a^s \neq b^s \text{ and } a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle \right\}$. Consequently, hybridness degenerates to the seminal preference restriction of single-peakedness and the hybrid marginal domain $\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ equals **the single-peaked marginal domain**. In the other extreme, if $\underline{x}^s = \min^{\prec^s}(A^s)$ and $\bar{x}^s = \max^{\prec^s}(A^s)$, then only the trivial betweenness relations survive, i.e., $\mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) = \left\{ \overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} : a^s \neq b^s \text{ and } x^s = a^s \right\}$. Consequently, no preference restriction is imposed, and $\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ expands to the universal marginal domain \mathbb{P}^s . By Theorem 2 of [Chatterji et al. \(2022\)](#), all strategy-proof marginal rules on the hybrid marginal domain $\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ are characterized to be a subset of *fixed ballot rules* introduced by [Moulin \(1980\)](#).

2.3 Separable preferences and non-separable preferences

Formally, a preference P_i is **separable** if there exists a marginal preference P_i^s for each $s \in M$ such that for each pair of similar alternatives $a, b \in A$, say $M(a, b) = \{s\}$, we have $[a^s P_i^s b^s] \Rightarrow [a P_i b]$. As a natural extension of the notion of adjacency, two preferences P_i and P'_i are said **adjacent**⁺, denoted $P_i \sim^+ P'_i$, if they are separable preferences, and there exist $s \in M$ and distinct $a^s, b^s \in A^s$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) given arbitrary $z^{-s} \in A^{-s}$, $(a^s, z^{-s}) = r_k(P_i) = r_{k+1}(P'_i)$ and $(b^s, z^{-s}) = r_k(P'_i) = r_{k+1}(P_i)$ for some $1 \leq k < |A|$, and
- (ii) given arbitrary $c \in A$, $[c^s \notin \{a^s, b^s\}] \Rightarrow [c = r_\ell(P_i) = r_\ell(P'_i)]$ for some $1 \leq \ell \leq |A|$.

Let \mathbb{D}_S denote **the separable domain** that contains all separable preferences. Clearly, $\mathbb{D}_S \subset \mathbb{P}$. A domain \mathbb{D} is called **a separable domain** if $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_S$. Henceforth, any preference that is not separable is called a non-separable preference, and a domain \mathbb{D} is said to satisfy **diversity**⁺ if it contains two separable preferences that are complete reversals.

More importantly, we introduce a particular way of deriving marginal preferences from both separable and non-separable preferences. Given a preference P_i (separable or non-separable), say $r_1(P_i) = a$, for each $s \in M$, according to a^{-s} which are contained in the peak of P_i , we induce a marginal preference over A^s , denoted $[P_i]^s$, such that for all $x^s, y^s \in A^s$, $[x^s [P_i]^s y^s] \Leftrightarrow [(x^s, a^{-s}) P_i (y^s, a^{-s})]$. Accordingly, let $[\mathbb{D}]^s := \{[P_i]^s : P_i \in \mathbb{D}\}$ denote the set of marginal preferences over A^s induced from all preferences of a domain \mathbb{D} . To

avoid confusion with a marginal preference P_i^s and a marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s , we henceforth call $[P_i]^s$ an **induced marginal preference** and $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ an **induced marginal domain**.¹⁶

2.4 Decomposing and assembling SCFs

An SCF $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ is said **decomposable** if for each $s \in M$, there exists a marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ such that for all $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \mathbb{D}^n$, we have

$$[f(P_1, \dots, P_n) = a] \Leftrightarrow [f^s([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) = a^s \text{ for all } s \in M].$$

Conversely, given a domain \mathbb{D} and a marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ for each $s \in M$, let $f := (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ denote an SCF on \mathbb{D} assembled by all marginal SCFs. We call f the **assembled SCF**.

In order to investigate the relation between strategy-proof SCFs and marginal SCFs, we focus on preference domains that reconcile decomposability of strategy-proof rules and retain strategy-proofness on assembled SCFs.

DEFINITION 2 *A domain \mathbb{D} is a **decomposable domain** if the following two properties are satisfied: for all $n \geq 2$,*

(The decomposition property) *each strategy-proof rule $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ is decomposable, and all marginal SCFs are strategy-proof rules, and*

(The assembling property) *given an arbitrary strategy-proof marginal rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ for each $s \in M$, the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is a strategy-proof rule.*

Clearly, the Gibbard-Satterthwaite Theorem implies that a domain satisfying the assembling property must be embedded with some preference restriction. In particular, if all preferences are separable, the assembling property is immediately satisfied. Thus, by Theorem 4.1 of [Le Breton and Sen \(1999\)](#), all separable domains satisfying their richness condition are decomposable domains.

¹⁶Indeed, both P_i^s and $[P_i]^s$ refer to linear orders over A^s . For the sake of notation, $[P_i]^s$ emphasizes that it is induced from a given preference P_i . Similarly, \mathbb{D}^s represents an arbitrary marginal domain, while $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ emphasizes that it is induced from a given domain \mathbb{D} .

3 RESULTS

In this section, we introduce multidimensional hybrid domains, and adopt it to establish a complete characterization of decomposable domains under some mild richness condition. Next we consider a public goods provision model and provide a specific instance of how multidimensional hybridness may arise using the notion of semi-separability - a weakening of separability.

3.1 Multidimensional hybrid domains

Fixing a linear order \prec^s over A^s for each component $s \in M$, let $\prec := \times_{s \in M} \prec^s$ denote the Cartesian product of \prec^1, \dots, \prec^m . Two alternatives \underline{x} and \bar{x} (either identical or distinct) are called **thresholds** on \prec if \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s are marginal thresholds on \prec^s for each $s \in M$.

DEFINITION 3 *A preference P_i , say $r_1(P_i) = x$, is **multidimensional hybrid** on \prec w.r.t. thresholds \underline{x} and \bar{x} if for all similar $a, b \in A$, say $M(a, b) = \{s\}$, we have*

$$\left[\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) \right] \Rightarrow [a P_i b].^{17}$$

Let $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ denote **the multidimensional hybrid domain** that contains all multidimensional hybrid preferences on \prec w.r.t. \underline{x} and \bar{x} . A domain \mathbb{D} is called **a multidimensional hybrid domain** if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ for some thresholds $\underline{x}, \bar{x} \in A$, and
- (ii) for each $s \in M$, $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a hybrid marginal domain on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s .

We provide one example to explain multidimensional hybrid preferences.

EXAMPLE 1 Let $A = A^1 \times A^2$ where $A^1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $A^2 = \{0, 1\}$. Let \prec^1 and \prec^2 be the natural linear orders over A^1 and A^2 respectively and $\prec = \prec^1 \times \prec^2$ (see Figure 1).

¹⁷By transitivity, given distinct $a, b \in A$ (not necessarily similar alternatives), if $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ for all $s \in M(a, b)$, we have $a P_i b$. Note that for each $s \in M$, the induced marginal preference $[P_i]^s$ is hybrid on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s .

Figure 1: The Cartesian product of linear orders $\prec = \prec^1 \times \prec^2$

We fix two thresholds $\underline{x} = (2, 0)$ and $\bar{x} = (4, 0)$, and then specify all related betweenness relations:

$$\mathcal{B}(\prec^1, \underline{x}^1, \bar{x}^1) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 2)}, \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 3)}, \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 4)}, \\ \overrightarrow{(2, 2, 1)}, \overrightarrow{(2, 2, 3)}, \overrightarrow{(2, 2, 4)}, \\ \overrightarrow{(3, 3, 1)}, \overrightarrow{(3, 3, 2)}, \overrightarrow{(3, 3, 4)}, \\ \overrightarrow{(4, 4, 1)}, \overrightarrow{(4, 4, 2)}, \overrightarrow{(4, 4, 3)}. \end{array} \right\} \cup \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overrightarrow{(1, 2, 3)}, \\ \overrightarrow{(1, 2, 4)}, \\ \overrightarrow{(3, 2, 1)}, \\ \overrightarrow{(4, 2, 1)}. \end{array} \right\} \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(\prec^2, \underline{x}^2, \bar{x}^2) = \left\{ \overrightarrow{(0, 0, 1)}, \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 0)} \right\}.$$

For instance, to specify the restriction of multidimensional hybridness on a preference with the peak $(1, 0)$, the related betweenness relations are sorted into the following three groups: (i) $\left\{ \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 2)}, \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 3)}, \overrightarrow{(1, 1, 4)} \right\}$, (ii) $\left\{ \overrightarrow{(1, 2, 3)}, \overrightarrow{(1, 2, 4)} \right\}$ and (iii) $\left\{ \overrightarrow{(0, 0, 1)} \right\}$, which by Definition 3 respectively require that

- (i) for each $k \in \{0, 1\}$, the alternative $(1, k)$ is ranked above $(2, k)$, $(3, k)$ and $(4, k)$,
- (ii) for each $k \in \{0, 1\}$, the alternative $(2, k)$ is ranked above $(3, k)$ and $(4, k)$, and
- (iii) for each $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, the alternative $(k, 0)$ is ranked above $(k, 1)$.

Correspondingly, the two preferences specified below are multidimensional hybrid on \prec w.r.t. \underline{x} and \bar{x} :

$$P_i = (1, 0) \prec (2, 0) \prec (3, 0) \prec (4, 0) \prec (1, 1) \prec (2, 1) \prec (3, 1) \prec (4, 1), \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{P}_i = (1, 0) \prec (1, 1) \prec (2, 0) \prec (2, 1) \prec (3, 0) \prec (4, 0) \prec (4, 1) \prec (3, 1).^{18}$$

Note that P_i is a separable preference, while \hat{P}_i is a non-separable preference. \square

¹⁸To save space, we specify the two preferences here horizontally. For instance, the notation “ $(1, 0) \prec (2, 0)$ ” in the specification of the preference P_i represents “ $(1, 0) P_i (2, 0)$ ”.

REMARK 1 We consider the multidimensional hybrid domain $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ in two extreme cases: (1) $\underline{x}^s = \min^{\prec^s}(A^s)$ and $\bar{x}^s = \max^{\prec^s}(A^s)$ for each $s \in M$, and (2) $\underline{x} = \bar{x}$. In the first case, $\mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) = \left\{ \overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} : a^s \neq b^s \text{ and } x^s = a^s \right\}$ for each $s \in M$, and then multidimensional hybridness weakens to the preference restriction of top-separability introduced by [Le Breton and Weymark \(1999\)](#), i.e., a preference P_i , say $r_1(P_i) = x$, is **top-separable** if for all similar alternatives $a, b \in A$, say $M(a, b) = \{s\}$, we have $[a^s = x^s] \Rightarrow [a P_i b]$. Correspondingly, the multidimensional hybrid domain expands to **the top-separable domain** \mathbb{D}_{TS} .¹⁹ In the second case, $\mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) = \left\{ \overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} : a^s \neq b^s \text{ and } a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle \right\}$ for each $s \in M$, and then multidimensional hybridness is strengthened to multidimensional single-peakedness introduced by [Barberà et al. \(1993\)](#), i.e., a preference P_i , say $r_1(P_i) = x$, is **multidimensional single-peaked** on \prec if for all similar alternatives $a, b \in A$, say $M(a, b) = \{s\}$, we have $[a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle] \Rightarrow [a P_i b]$. Correspondingly, the multidimensional hybrid domain shrinks to **the multidimensional single-peaked domain** $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MSP}}(\prec)$.²⁰ For any thresholds $\underline{x}, \bar{x} \in A$ other than the two extreme cases, we have $\mathbb{D}_{\text{TS}} \supset \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x}) \supset \mathbb{D}_{\text{MSP}}(\prec)$. Furthermore, note that the separable domain \mathbb{D}_{S} is also a multidimensional hybrid domain, i.e., fixing thresholds \underline{x} and \bar{x} such that $\underline{x}^s = \min^{\prec^s}(A^s)$ and $\bar{x}^s = \max^{\prec^s}(A^s)$ for each $s \in M$, we have (i) $\mathbb{D}_{\text{S}} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, and (ii) $[\mathbb{D}_{\text{S}}]^s = \mathbb{P}^s = \mathbb{D}_{\text{H}}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ for each $s \in M$.

3.2 The Theorem

We first introduce the richness condition on domains that we are going to investigate. Recall the notions of adjacency and adjacency⁺ introduced in Section 2. Given a domain \mathbb{D} , we construct a graph $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}} := \langle \mathbb{D}, \mathcal{E}_{\sim/\sim+} \rangle$ such that two preferences form an edge if and only if they are adjacent or adjacent⁺, i.e., $[(P_i, P'_i) \in \mathcal{E}_{\sim/\sim+}] \Leftrightarrow [P_i \sim P'_i \text{ or } P_i \sim^+ P'_i]$. Fixing a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}}$, given distinct $a, b \in A$, the path π has **{a, b}-restoration** if the relative ranking of a and b has been flipped for more than once, i.e., there exist $1 \leq o < p < q \leq v$ such that either $a P_{i|o} b$, $b P_{i|p} a$ and $a P_{i|q} b$, or $b P_{i|o} a$, $a P_{i|p} b$ and $b P_{i|q} a$ hold.

¹⁹The top-separable domain \mathbb{D}_{TS} contains all top-separable preferences.

²⁰The multidimensional single-peaked domain $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MSP}}(\prec)$ contains all multidimensional single-peaked preferences on \prec .

DEFINITION 4 A domain \mathbb{D} satisfies **no-restoration**⁺ if given arbitrary distinct $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ and arbitrary distinct $a, b \in A$, there exists a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that the following three conditions are satisfied:

- (i) π has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration,
- (ii) if $r_1(P_i) = r_1(P'_i) := x \in \{a, b\}$, then $r_1(P_{i|k}) = x$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$, and
- (iii) if $r_1(P_i)$ and $r_1(P'_i)$ are similar, say $r_1(P_i), r_1(P'_i) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for some $s \in M$ and $x^{-s} \in A^{-s}$, and $a, b \in (A^s, x^{-s})$, then $r_1(P_{i|k}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$.

Henceforth, a domain \mathbb{D} is called a **rich domain** if it satisfies minimal richness, diversity⁺ and no-restoration⁺.

REMARK 2 It is evident that the universal domain \mathbb{P} is a rich domain. In Clarifications 1 and 3 of Appendix A, we respectively show that the separable domain \mathbb{D}_S and the multidimensional hybrid domain $\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ are rich domains. In particular, it is worth mentioning that $\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies Property *L* of Kumar et al. (2021) (see Definition 6 and Clarification 2 in Appendix A) which implies the first two conditions of no-restoration⁺.

THEOREM 1 Let \mathbb{D} be a rich domain. Then, \mathbb{D} is a decomposable domain if and only if it is a multidimensional hybrid domain.

Proof: We first prove the sufficiency part of the Theorem.

(Sufficiency Part) Let \mathbb{D} be a rich multidimensional domain on \prec w.r.t. the thresholds \underline{x} and \bar{x} . We show that \mathbb{D} is a decomposable domain.

LEMMA 1 Domain \mathbb{D} is a tops-only domain.

Proof: To show the Lemma, we adopt Proposition 2 of Chatterji and Zeng (2019), which says that a domain of top-separable preferences satisfying their Interior⁺ and Exterior⁺ properties is a tops-only domain. First, condition (ii) of no-restoration⁺ implies the Interior⁺ property, i.e., given distinct $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $r_1(P_i) = r_1(P'_i) := x$, there exists a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim}^{\mathbb{D}}$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that $r_1(P_{i|k}) = x$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Second, condition (i) of no-restoration⁺ implies the Exterior⁺ property,

i.e., given $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $r_1(P_i) \neq r_1(P'_i)$ and $a, b \in A$ such that $a P_i b$ and $a P'_i b$, there exists a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim^+}^{\mathbb{D}}$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that $a P_{i|k} b$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Last, since $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x}) \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\text{TS}}$, we know that all preferences of \mathbb{D} are top-separable. This hence proves the Lemma. \square

For establishing the next lemma, we introduce the notion of strong connectedness⁺ between alternatives. Intuitively speaking, given two adjacent⁺ preferences that disagree on peaks, we say the two peaks are strongly connected⁺. Formally, two distinct alternatives $a, b \in A$ are said **strongly connected**⁺, denoted $a \approx^+ b$, if there exist $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^a$ and $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}^b$ such that $P_i \sim^+ P'_i$. Accordingly, given a nonempty subset $B \subseteq A$, we can induce a graph $G_{\approx^+}^B := \langle B, \mathcal{E}_{\approx^+}^B \rangle$ such that two alternatives of B form an edge if and only if they are strongly connected⁺, i.e., $[(a, b) \in \mathcal{E}_{\approx^+}^B] \Leftrightarrow [a, b \in B \text{ and } a \approx^+ b]$.

LEMMA 2 *Given $s \in M$ and $x^{-s} \in A^{-s}$, $G_{\approx^+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ is a connected graph.*

Proof: Given distinct $a, b \in (A^s, x^{-s})$, we construct a path in $G_{\approx^+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting a and b . First, by minimal richness, we have $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^a$ and $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}^b$. Next, by condition (iii) of no-restoration⁺, there exists a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim^+}^{\mathbb{D}}$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that $r_1(P_{i|k}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Furthermore, we partition the path π according to preference peaks (without changing the orders of preferences in π):

$$\left(\frac{P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|k_1}}{\text{peak } x_1}, \dots, \frac{P_{i|k_{p-1}+1}, \dots, P_{i|k_p}}{\text{peak } x_p}, \frac{P_{i|k_p+1}, \dots, P_{i|k_{p+1}}}{\text{peak } x_{p+1}}, \dots, \frac{P_{i|k_{q-1}+1}, \dots, P_{i|k_q}}{\text{peak } x_q} \right),$$

where $q \geq 2$, $k_0 = 0$, $k_q = v$, $r_1(P_{i|k_{p-1}+1}) = \dots = r_1(P_{i|k_p}) = x_p$ for all $p = 1, \dots, q$, and $x_p \neq x_{p+1}$ for all $p = 1, \dots, q-1$. Thus, we have a sequence of alternatives (x_1, \dots, x_q) .

CLAIM 1: We have $x_p \approx^+ x_{p+1}$ for all $1 \leq p < q$.

Given $1 \leq p < q$, we have the preferences $P_{i|k_p}$ and $P_{i|k_{p+1}}$ and the peaks $r_1(P_{i|k_p}) = x_p$ and $r_1(P_{i|k_{p+1}}) = x_{p+1}$. Since $x_p, x_{p+1} \in (A^s, x^{-s})$, we write $x_p = (x^s, x^{-s})$ and $x_{p+1} = (y^s, x^{-s})$ where $x^s \neq y^s$. Clearly, either $P_{i|k_p} \sim P_{i|k_{p+1}}$ or $P_{i|k_p} \sim^+ P_{i|k_{p+1}}$ holds. If $P_{i|k_p} \sim^+ P_{i|k_{p+1}}$, it is evident that $x_p \approx^+ x_{p+1}$. We complete the verification by ruling out the possibility that $P_{i|k_p} \sim P_{i|k_{p+1}}$. Suppose by contradiction that $P_{i|k_p} \sim P_{i|k_{p+1}}$. Thus, (x^s, x^{-s}) and (y^s, x^{-s}) are the unique two alternatives that are oppositely ranked across $P_{i|k_p}$ and $P_{i|k_{p+1}}$. However, since $P_{i|k_p}$ and $P_{i|k_{p+1}}$ are shown to be top-separable in the

proof of Lemma 1, we have $(x^s, z^{-s}) P_{i|k_p} (y^s, z^{-s})$ and $(y^s, z^{-s}) P_{i|k_{p+1}} (x^s, z^{-s})$ for all $z^{-s} \in A^{-s}$ - a contradiction. This completes the verification of the claim.

Note that some alternatives may appear multiple times in the sequence (x_1, \dots, x_q) . For instance, let $x_p = x_{p'}$ where $1 \leq p < p' \leq q$. Since $x_p \neq x_{p+1}$, it is clear that $p+1 < p'$. We then refine the sequence $(x_1, \dots, x_p, x_{p+1}, \dots, x_{p'}, x_{p'+1}, \dots, x_q)$ to $(x_1, \dots, x_p, x_{p'+1}, \dots, x_q)$, where any two consecutive alternatives in the refined sequence remain to be strongly connected⁺. By repeatedly refining the sequence, we eventually eliminate repetitions of alternatives, and construct a path in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting a and b . \square

Now, we are ready to show the decomposition property via the following-up 4 lemmas. Fixing an arbitrary strategy-proof rule $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$, we show that f is decomposable, and all corresponding marginal SCFs are strategy-proof marginal rules. Clearly, by Lemma 1, f satisfies the tops-only property. For notational convenience, we henceforth write (a, P_{-i}) to denote a preference profile where voter i reports an arbitrary preference with the peak a , and all other voters report the preferences $P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_n$ respectively. Moreover, for ease of presentation, given $a \in A$, $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^a$ and $s \in M$, let $r_1(P_i)^s := a^s$; given $P \in \mathbb{D}$, $f(P) = a$ and $s \in M$, let $f(P)^s := a^s$.

LEMMA 3 *Given $i \in N$, $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ and $P_{-i} \in \mathbb{D}^{n-1}$, let $M(r_1(P_i), r_1(P'_i)) = \{s\}$. We have $f(P_i, P_{-i})^t = f(P'_i, P_{-i})^t$ for all $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$.*

Proof: For notational convenience, let $r_1(P_i) = (a^s, z^{-s})$ and $r_1(P'_i) = (b^s, z^{-s})$, where $a^s \neq b^s$. By Lemma 2, we have a path (a_1, \dots, a_v) in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, z^{-s})}$ connecting (a^s, z^{-s}) and (b^s, z^{-s}) . For ease of presentation, let $f(a_k, P_{-i}) = x_k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Clearly, $f(P_i, P_{-i}) = f(a_1, P_{-i}) = x_1$ and $f(P'_i, P_{-i}) = f(a_v, P_{-i}) = x_v$. To complete the verification, it suffices to show $x_k^{-s} = x_{k+1}^{-s}$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v-1$.

Given $1 \leq k < v$, we have $f(a_k, P_{-i}) = x_k$ and $f(a_{k+1}, P_{-i}) = x_{k+1}$. The result holds evidently if $x_k = x_{k+1}$. Next, assume $x_k \neq x_{k+1}$. Since $a_k \approx^+ a_{k+1}$, there exist $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}^{a_k}$ and $\hat{P}'_i \in \mathbb{D}^{a_{k+1}}$ such that $\hat{P}_i \sim^+ \hat{P}'_i$. Since $f(\hat{P}_i, P_{-i}) = f(a_k, P_{-i}) = x_k$ and $f(\hat{P}'_i, P_{-i}) = f(a_{k+1}, P_{-i}) = x_{k+1}$, strategy-proofness implies $x_k \hat{P}_i x_{k+1}$ and $x_{k+1} \hat{P}'_i x_k$. Since $\hat{P}_i \sim^+ \hat{P}'_i$, note that any two alternatives that are oppositely ranked across \hat{P}_i and \hat{P}'_i , agree on all components other than s . Hence, it must be the case that $x_k^{-s} = x_{k+1}^{-s}$, as required. \square

LEMMA 4 Given $i \in N$, $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$, $P_{-i} \in \mathbb{D}^{n-1}$ and $t \in M$, let $r_1(P_i)^t = r_1(P'_i)^t$. We have $f(P_i, P_{-i})^t = f(P'_i, P_{-i})^t$.

Proof: The Lemma immediately follows from the tops-only property if $r_1(P_i) = r_1(P'_i)$. Henceforth, let $r_1(P_i) \neq r_1(P'_i)$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $M(r_1(P_i), r_1(P'_i)) = \{1, \dots, s\}$, where $1 \leq s < m$. We write $r_1(P_i) = (a^1, \dots, a^s, z^{\{s+1, \dots, m\}})$ and $r_1(P'_i) = (b^1, \dots, b^s, z^{\{s+1, \dots, m\}})$ where $a^k \neq b^k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, s$. Clearly, $r_1(P_i)^t = r_1(P'_i)^t$ implies $s < t \leq m$. We construct the alternative $x_k = (b^1, \dots, b^k, a^{k+1}, \dots, a^s, z^{\{s+1, \dots, m\}})$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, s$. Thus, $x_0 = r_1(P_i)$ and $x_s = r_1(P'_i)$. Furthermore, by minimal richness, we fix a preference $P_{i|k} \in \mathbb{D}^{x_k}$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, s$. For each $k = 0, 1, \dots, s-1$, since $t \notin M(r_1(P_i^k), r_1(P_i^{k+1}))$, Lemma 3 implies $f(P_{i|k}, P_{-i})^t = f(P_{i|k+1}, P_{-i})^t$. Therefore, we have $f(P_i, P_{-i})^t = f(P_{i|0}, P_{-i})^t = \dots = f(P_{i|s}, P_{-i})^t = f(P'_i, P_{-i})^t$. \square

LEMMA 5 Given $P, P' \in \mathbb{D}^n$ and $t \in M$, let $r_1(P_i)^t = r_1(P'_i)^t$ for all $i \in N$. We have $f(P)^t = f(P')^t$.

Proof: We first construct the profile $P(k) = (P'_1, \dots, P'_k, P_{k+1}, \dots, P_n)$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Clearly, $P(0) = P$ and $P(n) = P'$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, note that $P(i-1) = (P'_1, \dots, P'_{i-1}, P_i, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_n)$ and $P(i) = (P'_1, \dots, P'_{i-1}, P'_i, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_n)$ agree on preferences of all voters other than voter i , and $r_1(P_i)^t = r_1(P'_i)^t$. Then, Lemma 4 implies $f(P(i-1))^t = f(P(i))^t$. Hence, we have $f(P)^t = f(P(0))^t = \dots = f(P(n))^t = f(P')^t$. \square

LEMMA 6 SCF f is decomposable, and each marginal SCF is a strategy-proof rule.

Proof: First, given a component $s \in M$, by Lemma 5 and minimal richness of \mathbb{D} , we can construct a function $g^s : [A^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ such that given arbitrary profile $(x_1^s, \dots, x_n^s) \in [A^s]^n$, $g^s(x_1^s, \dots, x_n^s) = f(P_1, \dots, P_n)^s$ for all $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \mathbb{D}^n$ with $(r_1(P_1)^s, \dots, r_1(P_n)^s) = (x_1^s, \dots, x_n^s)$. Next, according to g^s , we construct a marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ such that for all $([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n$, $f^s([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) = g^s(r_1([P_1]^s), \dots, r_1([P_n]^s))$. Now, by construction, it is clear that for all $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \mathbb{D}^n$, $[f(P_1, \dots, P_n) = a] \Leftrightarrow [f^s([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) = a^s \text{ for all } s \in M]$. Therefore, f is decomposable.

Given $s \in M$, we claim that f^s is unanimous. Given a profile $([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n$, let $r_1([P_1]^s) = \dots = r_1([P_n]^s) = a^s$. We show $f^s([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) = a^s$. Given $z^{-s} \in A^{-s}$,

by minimal richness, we fix a preference profile $(P'_1, \dots, P'_n) \in \mathbb{D}^n$ such that $r_1(P'_1) = \dots = r_1(P'_n) = (a^s, z^{-s})$. By unanimity of f , it is clear that $f(P'_1, \dots, P'_n) = (a^s, z^{-s})$. Then, by the decomposition of f , we have $f^s([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) = f(P'_1, \dots, P'_n)^s = a^s$, as required.

Last, given $s \in M$, we show strategy-proofness of f^s . Given $i \in N$, $[P_i]^s, [P'_i]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ and $[P_{-i}]^s := ([P_1]^s, \dots, [P_{i-1}]^s, [P_{i+1}]^s, \dots, [P_n]^s) \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^{n-1}$, let $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = a^s$, $f^s([P'_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = b^s$ and $a^s \neq b^s$. We show $a^s [P_i]^s b^s$. Since f^s by construction satisfies the tops-only property, $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) \neq f^s([P'_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$ implies $r_1([P_i]^s) \neq r_1([P'_i]^s)$. For notational convenience, let $r_1(P_i) = (z^s, z^{-s})$ and $r_1([P'_i]^s) = \hat{z}^s$. By minimal richness, we fix $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_i) = (\hat{z}^s, z^{-s})$, and $\hat{P}_j \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_j) = (r_1([P_j]^s), z^{-s})$ for each $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$. Thus, by the decomposition of f , the tops-only property of f^s and unanimity of all other marginal rules, we have $f(P_i, \hat{P}_{-i}) = (a^s, z^{-s})$ and $f(\hat{P}_i, \hat{P}_{-i}) = (b^s, z^{-s})$, which by strategy-proofness imply $(a^s, z^{-s}) P_i (b^s, z^{-s})$, and hence $a^s [P_i]^s b^s$, as required. This completes the verification of the Lemma and hence proves the decomposition property of domain \mathbb{D} . \square

Next, we turn to verifying the assembling property. As a preparation of the proof, we introduce the class of strategy-proof marginal rules on an induced marginal domain. Given a component $s \in M$, a marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s and the linear order \prec^s , a marginal SCF $f^s : [\mathbb{D}^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ is a **Fixed Ballot Rule** (or **FBR**) if there exists $b_J^s \in A^s$, called a “fixed ballot”, for each coalition $J \subseteq N$, satisfying “ballot unanimity”, i.e., $b_\emptyset^s = \min^{\prec^s}(A^s)$ and $b_N^s = \max^{\prec^s}(A^s)$, and “monotonicity”, i.e., $[J \subset J' \subseteq N] \Rightarrow [b_J^s \preceq^s b_{J'}^s]$, such that for all $(P_1^s, \dots, P_n^s) \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^n$, we have

$$f^s(P_1^s, \dots, P_n^s) = \max_{J \subseteq N}^{\prec^s} \left(\min_{i \in J}^{\prec^s} (r_1(P_i^s), b_J^s) \right).$$

Furthermore, given $\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \in A^s$ with $\underline{x}^s \prec^s \bar{x}^s$, the FBR f^s is called an **$(\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ -FBR** if the fixed ballots $(b_J^s)_{J \subseteq N}$ in addition satisfy “the constrained-dictatorship condition”, i.e., there exists $i \in N$ such that $[i \in J] \Rightarrow [\bar{x}^s \preceq^s b_J^s]$ and $[i \notin J] \Rightarrow [b_J^s \preceq^s \underline{x}^s]$.²¹

Recall that \mathbb{D} is a rich multidimensional hybrid domain on \prec w.r.t. thresholds \underline{x} and \bar{x} . Thus, for each $s \in M$, $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a hybrid marginal domain on \prec^s w.r.t. marginal thresholds

²¹Given a nonempty subset $B^s \subseteq A^s$, a marginal SCF $f^s : [\mathbb{D}^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ is said to **behave like a dictatorship** on B^s if there exists $i \in N$ such that for all $(P_1^s, \dots, P_n^s) \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^n$, $[r_1(P_1^s), \dots, r_1(P_n^s) \in B^s] \Rightarrow [f^s(P_1^s, \dots, P_n^s) = r_1(P_i^s)]$. The constrained-dictatorship condition here imposed on the fixed ballots ensures that the FBR behaves like a dictatorship on the interval $\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$.

\underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s . For ease of presentation, for each $s \in M$, we assume w.l.o.g. that $A^s := \{a_1^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s\}$ and $a_k^s \prec^s a_{k+1}^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, |A^s| - 1$.

The next lemma focuses on a component $s \in M \setminus M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ and fully characterizes strategy-proof marginal rules on $[\mathbb{D}]^s$.

LEMMA 7 *Given $s \in M \setminus M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, a marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ is a strategy-proof marginal rule if and only if it is an FBR.*

Proof: Note that $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ degenerates to a single-peaked marginal domain. Furthermore, since $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a connected graph, it is true that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ equals the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_k^s, a_{k+1}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Thus, $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a top-connected single-peaked marginal domain,²² and then the Lemma immediately follows from Theorem 1 of [Roy and Sadhukhan \(2019\)](#). \square

For the next lemma, we introduce some notation to simplify the presentation. Given $s \in M$ and two voters 1 and 2, let $((a^s \dots), (b^s \dots))$ denote a two-voter preference profile such that voter 1 reports an arbitrary induced marginal preference with the peak a^s , and voter 2 reports an arbitrary induced marginal preference with the peak b^s . More importantly, given a two-voter SCF $h^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$, let $h^s((a^s \dots), (b^s \dots)) = c^s$ denote $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = c^s$ for all $[P_1]^s, [P_2]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ such that $r_1([P_1]^s) = a^s$ and $r_1([P_2]^s) = b^s$.

LEMMA 8 *Given $s \in M$, fix a two-voter strategy-proof marginal rule $h^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$. Given a path (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s) in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$, the following two statements hold:*

- (i) *If $h^s((x_1^s \dots), (x_2^s \dots)) = x_1^s$, then $h^s((x_k^s \dots), (x_{k'}^s \dots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k' \leq v$.*
- (ii) *If $h^s((x_2^s \dots), (x_1^s \dots)) = x_1^s$, then $h^s((x_{k'}^s \dots), (x_k^s \dots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k' \leq v$.*

Proof: The two statements are symmetric. We focus on verifying statement (i). We first claim $h^s((x_k^s \dots), (x_{k+1}^s \dots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k < v$. Since $x_2^s \approx x_3^s$, by Claims A and B of [Sen \(2001\)](#) and their proofs, we have either $h^s((x_2^s \dots), (x_3^s \dots)) = x_2^s$ or $h^s((x_2^s \dots), (x_3^s \dots)) = x_3^s$. Suppose by contradiction that $h^s((x_2^s \dots), (x_3^s \dots)) = x_3^s$. Since $x_1^s \approx x_2^s$, we have $[P_1]^s, [P_1']^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ such that $r_1([P_1]^s) = r_2([P_1']^s) = x_1^s$, $r_1([P_1']^s) =$

²²A minimally rich single-peaked marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s on \prec^s is **top-connected** if for each $1 \leq k < |A^s|$, there exist $P_i^s, P_i^{s'} \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(P_i^s) = a_k^s$, $r_1(P_i^{s'}) = a_{k+1}^s$, $a_{k+1}^s \prec^s P_i^s \prec^s a_{k-1}^s$ (given $k > 1$) and $a_k^s \prec^s P_i^{s'} \prec^s a_{k+2}^s$ (given $k < |A^s| - 1$).

$r_2([P_1]^s) = x_2^s$ and $r_\ell([P_1]^s) = r_\ell([P_1']^s)$ for all $3 \leq \ell \leq |A^s|$. Similarly, by $x_2^s \approx x_3^s$, we have $[P_2]^s, [P_2']^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ such that $r_1([P_2]^s) = r_2([P_2']^s) = x_2^s$, $r_1([P_2']^s) = r_2([P_2]^s) = x_3^s$ and $r_\ell([P_2]^s) = r_\ell([P_2']^s)$ for all $3 \leq \ell \leq |A^s|$. Thus, $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = x_1^s$ and $h^s([P_1']^s, [P_2']^s) = x_3^s$. On the one hand, according to $[P_2]^s$ and $[P_2']^s$, by strategy-proofness, $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = x_1^s$ first implies $h^s([P_1']^s, [P_2']^s) = x_1^s$. On the other hand, according to $[P_1']^s$ and $[P_1]^s$, by strategy-proofness, $h^s([P_1']^s, [P_2']^s) = x_3^s$ implies $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = x_3^s$ - a contradiction. Therefore, $h^s((x_2^s \cdots), (x_3^s \cdots)) = x_2^s$. Following the path (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s) , by repeatedly applying the argument above, we eventually have $h^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k+1}^s \cdots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k < v$.

Now, in conjunction with unanimity, we have $h^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k'}^s \cdots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k' \leq v$ with $k' - k \leq 1$. Next, we fix $2 \leq l \leq v - 1$ and introduce an induction hypothesis: $h^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k'}^s \cdots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k' \leq v$ with $k' - k < l$. We show $h^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k'}^s \cdots)) = x_k^s$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k' \leq v$ with $k' - k = l$. Fixing arbitrary $1 \leq k \leq k' \leq v$ with $k' - k = l$ and arbitrary $[P_2]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ with $r_1([P_2]^s) = x_{k'}^s$, we show $h^s((x_k^s \cdots), [P_2]^s) = x_k^s$. Since $k' - k = l \geq 2$, we have $1 \leq k' - (k + 1) < l$. Then, the induction hypothesis implies $h^s((x_{k+1}^s \cdots), [P_2]^s) = x_{k+1}^s$. Since $x_k^s \approx x_{k+1}^s$, we have $[P_1]^s, [P_1']^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ such that $r_1([P_1]^s) = r_2([P_1']^s) = x_{k+1}^s$, $r_1([P_1']^s) = r_2([P_1]^s) = x_k^s$ and $r_\ell([P_1]^s) = r_\ell([P_1']^s)$ for all $3 \leq \ell \leq |A^s|$. Thus, $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = x_{k+1}^s$. Furthermore, by strategy-proofness, $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = x_{k+1}^s$ implies $h^s([P_1']^s, [P_2]^s) \in \{x_k^s, x_{k+1}^s\}$. Note that $h^s([P_1']^s, [P_2]^s) = x_{k+1}^s$ contradicts the induction hypothesis. Therefore, $h^s([P_1']^s, [P_2]^s) = x_k^s$, and hence $h^s((x_k^s \cdots), [P_2]^s) = x_k^s$ by strategy-proofness, as required. This completes the verification of the induction hypothesis, and hence proves statement (i). \square

LEMMA 9 *Given $s \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a tops-only marginal domain.*

Proof: To simplify the proof, we bring the case of a single voter into consideration. It is clear that by unanimity, every one-voter marginal SCF defined on $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ satisfies the tops-only property. Next, we fix $n \geq 2$ and introduce the following induction hypothesis.

INDUCTION HYPOTHESIS: For all $1 \leq n' < n$, every strategy-proof marginal rule $f^{s'} : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^{n'} \rightarrow A^s$ satisfies the tops-only property.

Henceforth, we fix an n -voter strategy-proof marginal rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$, and show that f^s satisfies the tops-only property.

First, note that $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a hybrid marginal domain on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s , i.e., $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a connected graph, and $G_{\approx}^{\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle}$ has no leaf. We assume w.l.o.g. that $\underline{x}^s = a_p^s$ and $\bar{x}^s = a_q^s$ for some $1 \leq p < q \leq |A^s|$ with $q - p > 1$. Next, note that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, a connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ that has no leaf, and the line $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. By statement (i) of Lemma 4 of [Chatterji and Zeng \(2023\)](#), we first know that every two-voter strategy-proof marginal rules behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$. Furthermore, via a Ramification Theorem put in Appendix B, we can generalize the result to all n -voter strategy-proof marginal rules. Therefore, we claim that f^s behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$. Moreover, we can identify $1 \leq p \leq \underline{k}$ and $\bar{k} \leq q \leq |A^s|$ such that f^s behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, and f^s does not behave like a dictatorship on any interval $\langle a_{p'}^s, a_{q'}^s \rangle$ such that $p' \leq p$, $q' \geq q$ and $q' - p' > q - p$. Henceforth, we assume w.l.o.g. that voter 1 dictates on $\langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$ at f^s . According to f^s , we induce a two-voter marginal rule: for all $[P_1]^s, [P_2]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$, $h^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = f^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s, [P_2]^s, \dots, [P_2]^s)$. Note that if $n = 2$, then $h^s = f^s$. It is clear that h^s inherits unanimity and strategy-proofness from f^s , and hence is a strategy-proof marginal rule. Moreover, by construction, it is also true that voter 1 dictates on $\langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$ at h^s .

CLAIM 1: For all $[P]^s \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n$, $[r_1([P_1]^s) \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle] \Rightarrow [f^s([P]^s) = r_1([P_1]^s)]$.

Suppose not, i.e., there exists $[P]^s \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n$ such that $r_1([P_1]^s) = a_r^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$ and $f^s([P]^s) = a_k^s \neq a_r^s$. Clearly, by strategy-proofness, we have $h^s([P_1]^s, (a_k^s \dots)) = f^s([P_1]^s, (a_k^s \dots), \dots, (a_k^s \dots)) = a_k^s$. There are three cases: (i) $a_k^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, (ii) $a_k^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$ and (iii) $a_k^s \in \langle a_{q+1}^s, a_{|A^s|}^s \rangle$. In each case, we induce a contradiction.

In case (i), by voter 1's dictatorship on $\langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, we have $h^s([P_1]^s, (a_k^s \dots)) = a_r^s \neq a_k^s$ - a contradiction. Cases (ii) and (iii) are symmetric; we focus on case (ii). Recall that $|\langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle| \geq 3$, and $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ and the line $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Then, we have a path (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s) in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ such that $x_1^s, x_2^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, $a_r^s \in \{x_1^s, x_2^s\}$ and $x_v^s = a_k^s$. By voter 1's dictatorship on $\langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, we first have $h^s((x_1^s \dots), (x_2^s \dots)) = x_1^s$. Then, according to the path (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s) , by statement (i) of Lemma 8, we have $h^s((x_1^s \dots), (x_v^s \dots)) = x_1^s$ and $h^s((x_2^s \dots), (x_v^s \dots)) = x_2^s$, which imply $h^s((a_r^s \dots), (a_k^s \dots)) = a_r^s$ and hence $h^s([P_1]^s, (a_k^s \dots)) = a_r^s \neq a_k^s$ - a contradiction. This completes the verification of the claim.

CLAIM 2: Given $[P]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$, let $r_1([P_1]^s) = a_k^s$. The following two statements hold:

- (i) if $a_k^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$, then $f^s([P]^s) \in \langle a_k^s, a_p^s \rangle$, and
- (ii) if $a_k^s \in \langle a_{q+1}^s, a_{|A^s|}^s \rangle$, then $f^s([P]^s) \in \langle a_q^s, a_k^s \rangle$.

The two statements are symmetric, and we focus on verifying statement (i). Suppose not, i.e., either $f^s([P]^s) := a_r^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{k-1}^s \rangle$, or $f^s([P]^s) := a_r^s \in \langle a_{p+1}^s, a_{|A^s|}^s \rangle$ holds. If $a_r^s \in \langle a_{p+1}^s, a_{|A^s|}^s \rangle$, by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. a_k^s and a_k^s , it is true that $a_p^s [P_1]^s a_r^s$. Consequently, since $f^s((a_p^s \cdots), [P_{-1}]^s) = a_p^s$ by Claim 1, voter 1 will manipulate at $[P]^s$ via some induced marginal preference with the peak a_p^s .

Thus, we have $f^s([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_r^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{k-1}^s \rangle$. Immediately, strategy-proofness implies $f^s((a_r^s \cdots), [P_{-1}]^s) = a_r^s$. Since $a_r^s \approx a_{r+1}^s$, we have $[\hat{P}_1]^s, [\hat{P}'_1]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ such that $r_1([\hat{P}_1]^s) = r_2([\hat{P}_1]^s) = a_r^s$, $r_1([\hat{P}'_1]^s) = r_2([\hat{P}'_1]^s) = a_{r+1}^s$ and $r_\ell([\hat{P}_1]^s) = r_1([\hat{P}'_1]^s)$ for all $\ell = 3, \dots, |A^s|$. Clearly, $f^s([\hat{P}_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_r^s$. Then, strategy-proofness implies $f^s([\hat{P}'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) \in \{a_r^s, a_{r+1}^s\}$. Suppose $f^s([\hat{P}'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_r^s$. Immediately, strategy-proofness implies $h^s([\hat{P}'_1]^s, (a_r^s \cdots)) = f^s([\hat{P}'_1]^s, (a_r^s \cdots), \dots, (a_r^s \cdots)) = a_r^s$, which by $a_r^s \approx a_{r+1}^s$ further implies $h^s((a_{r+1}^s \cdots), (a_r^s \cdots)) = a_r^s$. Then, by statement (ii) of Lemma 8, according to the path $(a_r^s, \dots, a_k^s, \dots, a_p^s)$ in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$, we have $f^s((a_p^s \cdots), (a_r^s \cdots), \dots, (a_r^s \cdots)) = h^s((a_p^s \cdots), (a_r^s \cdots)) = a_r^s$, which contradicts Claim 1. Therefore, $f^s([\hat{P}'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_{r+1}^s$, and hence $f^s((a_{r+1}^s \cdots), [P_{-1}]^s) = a_{r+1}^s$ by strategy-proofness. Following the path $(a_{r+1}^s, \dots, a_k^s)$ in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ step by step, by repeatedly applying the argument above, we eventually have $f^s((a_k^s \cdots), [P_{-1}]^s) = a_k^s$, which contradicts the hypothesis $f^s([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_r^s$. Therefore, we have $f^s([P]^s) \in \langle a_k^s, a_p^s \rangle$. This completes the verification of the claim.

CLAIM 3: Given profiles $([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s), ([P'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$, if $r_1([P_1]^s) = r_1([P'_1]^s)$, then $f^s([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = f^s([P'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s)$.

Let $r_1([P_1]^s) = r_1([P'_1]^s) = a_k^s$. Clearly, either $a_k^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$, or $a_k^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, or $a_k^s \in \langle a_{q+1}^s, a_{|A^s|}^s \rangle$ holds. This claim follows from Claim 1 if $a_k^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$. The rest of two cases are symmetric, and we hence focus on the case $a_k^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$. Suppose by contradiction $f^s([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) \neq f^s([P'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s)$. For notational convenience, let $f^s([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_o^s$ and $f^s([P'_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s) = a_r^s$. Clearly, by strategy-proofness, $a_k^s \notin \{a_o^s, a_r^s\}$. Since $a_k^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$, statement (i) of Claim 2 implies $a_o^s, a_r^s \in \langle a_k^s, a_p^s \rangle$. Thus, we have $a_k^s \prec^s a_o^s \prec^s$

$a_r^s \preceq^s a_p^s$ or $a_k^s \prec^s a_r^s \prec^s a_o^s \preceq^s a_p^s$. If $a_k^s \prec^s a_o^s \prec^s a_r^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$, we know $a_o^s [P_1']^s a_r^s$. Consequently, voter 1 will manipulate at $([P_1']^s, [P_{-1}]^s)$ via $[P_1]^s$. Symmetrically, if $a_k^s \prec^s a_r^s \prec^s a_o^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, we know $a_r^s [P_1]^s a_o^s$. Consequently, voter 1 will manipulate at $([P_1]^s, [P_{-1}]^s)$ via $[P_1']^s$. This completes the verification of the claim.

CLAIM 4: Given $i \in N \setminus \{1\}$ and profiles $([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s), ([P_i']^s, [P_{-i}]^s) \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n$, if $r_1([P_i]^s) = r_1([P_i']^s)$, then $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = f^s([P_i']^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$.

Let $r_1([P_i]^s) = r_1([P_i']^s) = a_k^s$ and $r_1([P_1]^s) = a_r^s$. Clearly, either $a_r^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$, or $a_r^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$, or $a_r^s \in \langle a_{q+1}^s, a_{|A^s|}^s \rangle$ holds. This claim follows from Claim 1 if $a_r^s \in \langle a_p^s, a_q^s \rangle$. The rest of two cases are symmetric, and we hence focus on the case $a_r^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$. Suppose by contradiction that $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) \neq f^s([P_i']^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$. For notational convenience, let $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = a_u^s$ and $f^s([P_i']^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = a_v^s$. Since $a_r^s \in \langle a_1^s, a_{p-1}^s \rangle$, statement (i) of Claim 2 implies $a_u^s, a_v^s \in \langle a_r^s, a_p^s \rangle$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $a_r^s \preceq^s a_u^s \prec^s a_v^s \preceq^s a_p^s$. Accordingly, there are three subcases: (i) $a_k^s \preceq^s a_u^s$, (ii) $a_v^s \preceq^s a_k^s$ and (iii) $a_u^s \prec^s a_k^s \prec^s a_v^s$. In each case, we induce a manipulation. In subcase (i), by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$, we know $a_u^s [P_i']^s a_v^s$. Consequently, voter i will manipulate at $([P_i']^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$ via $[P_i]^s$. In subcase (ii), by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$, we know $a_v^s [P_i]^s a_u^s$. Consequently, voter i will manipulate at $([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$ via $[P_i']^s$. For subcase (iii), we consider two situations: $n = 2$ and $n > 2$.

First, let $n = 2$. Thus, $i = 2$ and $f^s([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s) = a_v^s$. Since $a_r^s \preceq^s a_u^s \prec^s a_k^s \prec^s a_v^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$, we have $a_k^s [P_1]^s a_v^s$. Consequently, since $f^s((a_k^s \cdots), [P_2]^s) = a_k^s$ by unanimity, voter 1 will manipulate at $([P_1]^s, [P_2]^s)$ via some induced marginal preference with the peak a_k^s . Last, let $n > 2$. We first combine voters 1 and i as one and induce an $(n - 1)$ -voter marginal SCF: $g^s([\hat{P}_1]^s, [\hat{P}_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = f^s([\hat{P}_1]^s, [\hat{P}_1]^s, [\hat{P}_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$ for all $[\hat{P}_1]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ and $[\hat{P}_{-\{1,i\}}]^s \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^{n-2}$. It is evident that g^s inherits unanimity and strategy-proofness from f^s , and hence by the induction hypothesis satisfies the tops-only property. Hence, $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_i]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = g^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = g^s([P_i']^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = f^s([P_i']^s, [P_i']^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$. Henceforth, for notational convenience, let $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_i]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = f^s([P_i']^s, [P_i']^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = a_w^s$. At $([P_i]^s, [P_i]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$, referring to voter 1,²³ since $r_1([P_i]^s) = a_k^s \prec^s a_v^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, statement (i) of Claim 2 implies $a_w^s \in$

²³At the profile $([P_i]^s, [P_i]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$, the first induced marginal preference $[P_i]^s$ is reported by voter

$\langle a_k^s, a_p^s \rangle$. Thus, we have $a_k^s \preceq^s a_w^s \prec^s a_v^s$, or $a_w^s = a_v^s$, or $a_v^s \prec^s a_w^s \preceq^s a_p^s$. If $a_k^s \preceq^s a_w^s \prec^s a_v^s$, we have $a_r^s \prec^s a_k^s \preceq^s a_w^s \prec^s a_v^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, and then by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. a_k^s and $a_k^s, a_w^s [P_1]^s a_v^s$. Consequently, voter 1 will manipulate at $([P_i']^s, [P_1]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$ via $[P_i']^s$. If $a_w^s = a_v^s$, by strategy-proofness, $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_1]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = a_u^s$ and $f^s([P_i']^s, [P_1]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s) = a_v^s = a_w^s$ imply $a_u^s [P_i]^s a_w^s$. Consequently, voter 1 will manipulate at $([P_i]^s, [P_i]^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$ via $[P_i]^s$. If $a_v^s \prec^s a_w^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, we have $a_k^s \prec^s a_v^s \prec^s a_w^s \preceq^s a_p^s$, and then by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. a_k^s and $a_k^s, a_v^s [P_i']^s a_w^s$. Consequently, voter 1 will manipulate at $([P_i']^s, [P_i']^s, [P_{-\{1,i\}}]^s)$ via $[P_i']^s$. This completes the verification of the claim.

Overall, by Claims 1, 3 and 4, we know $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = f^s([P_i']^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$ for all $i \in N$, $[P_i]^s, [P_i']^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ with $r_1([P_i]^s) = r_1([P_i']^s)$ and $[P_{-i}]^s \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^{n-1}$. This implies that f^s satisfies the tops-only property. This completes the verification of the induction hypothesis, and hence proves the Lemma. \square

LEMMA 10 *Given $s \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, a marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ is a strategy-proof marginal rule if and only if it is an $(\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ -FBR.*

Proof: The sufficiency part of the Lemma follows from the sufficiency part of Theorem 2 of Chatterji et al. (2022). The proof of the necessity part of Theorem 2 of Chatterji et al. (2022) (specifically, their Lemmas 8, 9, 12 and 13) implies that on a hybrid marginal domain on \prec^s w.r.t. distinct marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s , every tops-only and strategy-proof marginal rule that behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$, is an $(\underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ -FBR. Recall that in Lemma 9 and its proof, we have shown that every strategy-proof marginal rule defined on $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ satisfies the tops-only property and behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$. Then, we can directly apply their result to complete the proof. \square

LEMMA 11 *Fixing a strategy-proof marginal rule f^s for each $s \in M$, the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is a strategy-proof rule on \mathbb{D} .*

Proof: First, since all marginal SCFs satisfy unanimity, it is evident that the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is unanimous, and hence is a rule. Next, by the necessity part of Lemmas 7 and 10, we know that f^s is an FBR for each $s \in M \setminus M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, and f^t is an $(\underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$ -FBR for each $t \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$. For each $s \in M$, according to the fixed ballots $(b_j^s)_{j \subseteq N}$ of f^s , we

 i , while the second $[P_i]^s$ is reported by voter 1.

construct an FBR $\hat{f}^s : [\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)]^n \rightarrow A^s$. Clearly, by the sufficiency part of Lemmas 7 and 10, \hat{f}^s is a strategy-proof rule. Then, we have an assembled SCF $\hat{f} = (\hat{f}^1, \dots, \hat{f}^m)$ on the multidimensional hybrid domain $\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. Since f^s satisfies the tops-only property for all $s \in M$, \hat{f} by construction satisfies the tops-only property as well.

We next show that \hat{f} is strategy-proof. By Remark 2 and Clarification 3 in Appendix 3, we know that $\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies Property *L* of Kumar et al. (2021) according to the graph $G_{\sim/\sim^+}^{\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$. Then, by Theorem 1 of Kumar et al. (2021), to verify strategy-proofness of \hat{f} , it suffices to show the following: given arbitrary $i \in N$, $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ with $P_i \sim P'_i$ or $P_i \sim^+ P'_i$, and $P_{-i} \in [\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})]^{n-1}$, $[\hat{f}(P_i, P_{-i}) \neq \hat{f}(P'_i, P_{-i})] \Rightarrow [\hat{f}(P_i, P_{-i}) \succ P_i \hat{f}(P'_i, P_{-i})]$. Since $\hat{f}(P_i, P_{-i}) \neq \hat{f}(P'_i, P_{-i})$, the tops-only property of \hat{f} implies $r_1(P_i) \neq r_1(P'_i)$. Immediately, by the verification of Claim 1 in the proof of Lemma 2, it must be the case that $P_i \sim^+ P'_i$. Thus, P_i and P'_i are separable preferences and $M(r_1(P_i), r_1(P'_i)) = \{s\}$ for some $s \in M$. Immediately, the tops-only property of marginal rules implies $\hat{f}^t([P_i]^t, [P_{-i}]^t) = \hat{f}^t([P'_i]^t, [P_{-i}]^t)$ for all $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$. Furthermore, since $\hat{f}(P_i, P_{-i}) \neq \hat{f}(P'_i, P_{-i})$, by the construction of \hat{f} and strategy-proofness of \hat{f}^s , we know $\hat{f}^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) \succ [P_i]^s \hat{f}^s([P'_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$. Then, by the construction of \hat{f} and separability of P_i , we have $\hat{f}(P_i, P_{-i}) \succ P_i \hat{f}(P'_i, P_{-i})$, as required.

We last show that the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof on \mathbb{D} . Since $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, we know $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq [\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})]^s = \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ for each $s \in M$, and consequently for all $P \in \mathbb{D}$, $f(P) = (f^1([P]^1), \dots, f^m([P]^m)) = (\hat{f}^1([P]^1), \dots, \hat{f}^m([P]^m)) = \hat{f}(P)$. Hence, f inherits strategy-proofness from \hat{f} . This completes the verification of the lemma, and hence proves the assembling property of domain \mathbb{D} . \square

(Necessity Part) Let a rich domain \mathbb{D} be a decomposable domain. We show that \mathbb{D} is a multidimensional hybrid domain. By diversity⁺, we have two completely reversed separable preferences $\underline{P}_i, \bar{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}$. For each $s \in M$, according to the fixed linear order \prec^s , by relabeling elements as necessary, we can assume w.l.o.g. that for all $a^s, b^s \in A^s$, $[a^s \prec^s b^s] \Rightarrow [a^s [\underline{P}_i]^s b^s \text{ and } b^s [\bar{P}_i]^s a^s]$.

LEMMA 12 *Domain \mathbb{D} is a tops-only domain.*

Proof: By the proof of Lemma 1, to complete the verification, we show that all preferences of \mathbb{D} are top-separable. Given $P_i \in \mathbb{D}$, say $r_1(P_i) = x$, and similar $a, b \in A$, say $M(a, b) =$

$\{s\}$, let $a^s = x^s$. We show $a P_i b$. Let $N = \{1, 2\}$. At component s , we construct a marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$ called *the voter-1 marginal dictatorship*,²⁴ while at each component $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we refer to the voter-2 marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^2 \rightarrow A^t$. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is a strategy-proof rule. Given two profiles $(P_1, P_2), (P'_1, P_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$ such that $P_1 = P_i, P_2 \in \mathbb{D}^b$ and $P'_1 = P_2$, we by construction have $f(P_1, P_2) = (x^s, b^{-s}) = a$ and $f(P'_1, P_2) = b$. Then, strategy-proofness implies $a P_1 b$, as required. \square

Then, note that Lemmas 2, 3 and 4 hold here as well.²⁵

LEMMA 13 *Given $s \in M$, $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a tops-only marginal domain.*

Proof: Suppose not, i.e., $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ admits a non-tops-only and strategy-proof marginal rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ for some $n \geq 2$. Then, there must exist $i \in N, P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ with $r_1([P_i]^s) = r_1([P'_i]^s)$ and $P_{-i} \in \mathbb{D}^{n-1}$ such that $f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) \neq f^s([P'_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s)$. For each component $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we fix a voter $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ and construct the voter- j marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^n \rightarrow A^t$. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof rule. Then, by Lemma 12, the assembled SCF f satisfies the tops-only property, which triggers Lemma 4. On the one hand, by construction, we have $f(P_i, P_{-i})^s = f^s([P_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) \neq f^s([P'_i]^s, [P_{-i}]^s) = f(P'_i, P_{-i})^s$. On the other hand, by Lemma 4, since $r_1(P_i)^s = r_1([P_i]^s) = r_1([P'_i]^s) = r_1(P'_i)^s$, we have $f(P_i, P_{-i})^s = f(P'_i, P_{-i})^s$ - a contradiction. \square

LEMMA 14 *Given $s \in M$, according to $[\mathbb{D}]^s$, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a connected graph.*

Proof: Given distinct $a^s, b^s \in A^s$, we construct a path in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a^s and b^s . Fixing arbitrary $x^{-s} \in A^s$, we have the alternatives (a^s, x^{-s}) and (b^s, x^{-s}) . Since $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ is a connected graph by Lemma 2, we have a path $\pi = (x_1, \dots, x_v)$ in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting (a^s, x^{-s}) and (b^s, x^{-s}) . Clearly, $x_1^{-s} = \dots = x_v^{-s} = x^{-s}$ and $x_k^s \neq x_{k'}^s$ for all $1 \leq k < k' \leq v$. Given arbitrary $1 \leq k < v$, since $x_k \approx^+ x_{k+1}$, we have preferences $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^{x_k}$ and $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}^{x_{k+1}}$

²⁴A marginal SCF $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$ is called **the voter- i marginal dictatorship** if $f^s([P]^s) = r_1([P_i]^s)$ for all $[P]^s \in [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^n$. Clearly, the voter- i marginal dictatorship is a strategy-proof marginal rule.

²⁵These lemmas are established on a rich domain and on tops-only and strategy-proof rules defined on the rich domain, and have nothing to do with the preference restriction of multidimensional hybridness.

such that $P_i \sim^+ P'_i$. Immediately, we have $r_1([P_i]^s) = r_2([P'_i]^s) = x_k^s$, $r_1([P'_i]^s) = r_2([P_i]^s) = x_{k+1}^s$ and $r_\ell([P_i]^s) = r_\ell([P'_i]^s)$ for all $3 \leq \ell \leq |A^s|$, which imply $x_k^s \approx x_{k+1}^s$. Then, we have a path $\pi' = (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s)$ in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a^s and b^s , as required. \square

LEMMA 15 *Given $s \in M$, $x^{-s} \in A^s$ and $a, b, c \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ with $b \neq c$, let b be included in all paths in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting a and c . Then, we have $b P_i c$ for all $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^a$.*

Proof: Suppose not, i.e., there exists $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^a$ such that $c P_i b$. Fixing a preference $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}^c$ by minimal richness, by no-restoration⁺, we have a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that π has no $\{c, b\}$ -restoration, and $r_1(P_{i|k}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Since $c P_i b$ and $c P'_i b$, no $\{c, b\}$ -restoration implies $c P_{i|k} b$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$, and hence $r_1(P_{i|k}) \neq b$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Consequently, according to π , by the proof of Lemma 2, we can elicit a path in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting a and c that excludes b - a contradiction. \square

LEMMA 16 *Given $s \in M$ and $a^s, b^s, c^s \in A^s$ with $b^s \neq c^s$, let b^s be included in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a^s and c^s . Then, we have $b^s [P_i]^s c^s$ for all $[P_i]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ with $r_1([P_i]^s) = a^s$.*

Proof: Fixing arbitrary $P_i \in \mathbb{D}$ with $r_1([P_i]^s) = a^s$, we show $b^s [P_i]^s c^s$. Let $r_1(P_i) = (a^s, x^{-s})$. Note that if $(b^s, x^{-s}) P_i (c^s, x^{-s})$, we immediately have $b^s [P_i]^s c^s$. Then, by Lemma 15, it suffices to show that (b^s, x^{-s}) is included in all paths in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting (a^s, x^{-s}) and (c^s, x^{-s}) . Suppose not, i.e., there exists a path (x_1, \dots, x_v) in $G_{\approx+}^{(A^s, x^{-s})}$ connecting (a^s, x^{-s}) and (c^s, x^{-s}) such that $x_k \neq (b^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Clearly, $x_k^s \neq b^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. Consequently, by the proof of Lemma 14, we have the path (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s) in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a^s and c^s that excludes b^s - a contradiction. \square

Now, for each $s \in M$, we know that $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a top-only marginal domain, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a connected graph, and $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ contains two induced marginal preferences $[P_i]^s$ and $[\bar{P}_i]^s$ that are complete reversals. Then, by applying Corollary 2 of [Chatterji and Zeng \(2023\)](#), we can infer that for each $s \in M$, one of the following two situations must occur:

Situation (i) there exists a pair of identical marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s such that $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, or

Situation (ii) there exists a pair of distinct marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s such that $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, and there exist no linear order \prec^s over A^s and marginal thresholds

$\hat{\underline{x}}^s$ and $\hat{\bar{x}}^s$ such that $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \hat{\underline{x}}^s, \hat{\bar{x}}^s)$ and $\langle \hat{\underline{x}}^s, \hat{\bar{x}}^s \rangle^{\prec^s} \subset \langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$, where $\langle \hat{\underline{x}}^s, \hat{\bar{x}}^s \rangle^{\prec^s}$ denotes the set of elements between $\hat{\underline{x}}^s$ and $\hat{\bar{x}}^s$ according to \prec^s .²⁶

The next lemma refines Situation (ii).

LEMMA 17 *Given $s \in M$, let **Situation (ii)** hold. The subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle}$ has no leaf.*

Proof: For ease of presentation, we assume w.l.o.g. that $A^s = \{a_1^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s\}$ and $a_k^s \prec^s a_{k+1}^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, |A^s| - 1$. Thus, $\underline{x}^s = a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $\bar{x}^s = a_{\bar{k}}^s$ for some $1 \leq \underline{k} < \bar{k} \leq |A^s|$ with $\bar{k} - \underline{k} > 1$, $a_k^s [P_i]^s a_{k+1}^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, |A^s| - 1$, and $a_{k+1}^s [\bar{P}_i]^s a_k^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, |A^s| - 1$.

Since $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) = \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s)$ and $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a connected graph, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ must be a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$, and the line $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Suppose by contradiction that $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ has a leaf. Thus, we have $a_k^s, a_{k'}^s \in \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$ such that a_k^s is a leaf of $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ and $a_k^s \approx a_{k'}^s$. There are two cases to consider: $k \in \{\underline{k}, \bar{k}\}$ and $\underline{k} < k < \bar{k}$. In each case, we induce a contradiction.

CLAIM 1: Let $k \in \{\underline{k}, \bar{k}\}$. We have $\underline{k} < k' < \bar{k}$.

We assume w.l.o.g. that $k = \underline{k}$. It is clear that $\underline{k} < k' \leq \bar{k}$. Suppose by contradiction that $k' = \bar{k}$. Since $\bar{k} - \underline{k} > 1$, we fix an arbitrary element a_p^s such that $\underline{k} < p < \bar{k}$. Since $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ is a connected subgraph, $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ is a leaf and $a_{\underline{k}}^s \approx a_p^s$, we know that $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ is included in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ connecting $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and a_p^s . Furthermore, since $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle}$ and $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$, it is true that $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ is included in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a_1^s and a_p^s . Consequently, Lemma 16 implies $a_{\underline{k}}^s [P_i]^s a_p^s$ for all $[P_i]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$ with $r_1([P_i]^s) = a_1^s$. However, we have $r_1([\underline{P}_i]^s) = a_1^s$ and $a_p^s [\underline{P}_i]^s a_{\bar{k}}^s$ - a contradiction. This completes the verification of the claim.

²⁶Theorem 1 of [Chatterji and Zeng \(2023\)](#) provides a classification of non-dictatorial, *unidimensional domains* (analogous to a marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s that induces a connected graph $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$, contains two completely reversed marginal preferences, and satisfies an additional condition called *leaf symmetry*) according to the existence and non-existence of anonymous, tops-only and strategy-proof rules, and then their Corollary 2 refines the classification by further requiring the non-dictatorial, unidimensional domains to be tops-only domains. Leaf symmetry plays a trivial role in the classification - it is only adopted to ensure that all non-dictatorial domains under investigate are fully characterized by *the unique seconds property* (see their footnote 38). If we enlarge the classification to cover both non-dictatorial and dictatorial domains, the condition of leaf symmetry can be removed from the definition of unidimensional domains, and their proof still works to establish a classification result (analogous to **Situations (i)** and **(ii)**).

Now, since $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle}$ is a connected subgraph, $a_{\underline{k}}$ is a leaf and $a_{\underline{k}}^s \approx a_{k'}^s$, it is evident that $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle \setminus \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\}}$ is also connected subgraph. Consequently, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{k'}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle \setminus \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\}}$ and the line $(a_{\underline{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Now, we construct a new linear order \triangleleft^s over A^s :

- if $k' = \underline{k} + 1$, let $\triangleleft^s = \prec^s$, and
- if $k' > \underline{k} + 1$, let $a_1^s \triangleleft^s \dots \triangleleft^s a_{\underline{k}}^s \triangleleft^s a_{k'}^s \triangleleft^s a_{\underline{k}+1}^s \triangleleft^s \dots \triangleleft^s a_{k'-1}^s \triangleleft^s a_{k'+1}^s \dots \triangleleft^s a_{\underline{k}}^s \triangleleft^s \dots \triangleleft^s a_{|A^s|}^s$.

There are two subcases to consider: (1) $|\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle| = 3$, and (2) $|\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle| > 3$. In subcase (1), we fix the identical marginal thresholds $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ on \triangleleft^s , which clearly implies $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s} = \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\} \subset \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle$. In subcase (2), we know $a_{k'}^s \triangleleft^s a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $\langle a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s} = \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle \setminus \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\} \subset \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle$, which imply that $a_{k'}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ are two distinct marginal thresholds on \triangleleft^s .

CLAIM 2: In subcase (1), we have $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\triangleleft^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, which contradicts the hypothesis of **Situation (ii)**.

Now, we know $\bar{k} = \underline{k} + 2$ and $k' = \underline{k} + 1$ which implies $\triangleleft^s = \prec^s$ and $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle \setminus \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\} = \{a_{\underline{k}+1}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s\}$. Recall that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}+1}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle \setminus \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\}} = G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}+1}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle}$ and the line $(a_{\underline{k}+2}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Evidently, since $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}+1}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle}$ is a connected subgraph, $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}+1}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle}$ must be a graph of two vertices and one singleton edge. Consequently, $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ equals the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}+1}^s, a_{\underline{k}+2}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Then, Lemma 16 implies that given arbitrary $[P_i]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$, say $r_1([P_i]^s) = a_o^s$, and $a_p^s, a_q^s \in A^s$ such that $a_p^s \in \langle a_o^s, a_q^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s}$, which implies $\overrightarrow{(a_o^s, a_p^s, a_q^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\triangleleft^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, we always have $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$. Therefore, $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\triangleleft^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$. This completes the verification of the claim.

CLAIM 3: In subcase (2), we have $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\triangleleft^s, a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, which contradicts the hypothesis of **Situation (ii)**.

Given $[P_i]^s \in [\mathbb{D}]^s$, say $r_1([P_i]^s) = a_o^s$, and distinct $a_p^s, a_q^s \in A^s$ such that $\overrightarrow{(a_o^s, a_p^s, a_q^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\triangleleft^s, a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, we show $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$. Thus, we know $a_p^s \in \langle a_o^s, a_q^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s}$ and $a_p^s \notin \text{Int}\langle a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s}$. If $a_p^s = a_o^s$, then $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$ holds evidently. Henceforth, we assume $a_p^s \neq a_o^s$. Since $a_p^s \notin \text{Int}\langle a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s}$, we know either $p \in \{1, \dots, \underline{k}\}$, or $p \in \{\bar{k}, \dots, |A^s|\}$, or $p = k'$ holds. If $p \in \{1, \dots, \underline{k}\}$, then $a_p^s \notin \text{Int}\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle$. Moreover, since $p \in \{1, \dots, \underline{k}\}$ and $a_p^s \in \langle a_o^s, a_q^s \rangle^{\triangleleft^s}$, we know either $o < p < q$ or $q < p < o$, which both imply $a_p^s \in \langle a_o^s, a_q^s \rangle$. Therefore, we have $\overrightarrow{(a_o^s, a_p^s, a_q^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, which then by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ implies $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$.

a_q^s , as required. Symmetrically, if $p \in \{\bar{k}, \dots, |A^s|\}$, we also have $\overline{(a_o^s, a_p^s, a_q^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s)$, which then by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\bar{k}}^s$ implies $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$, as required. Last, let $p = k'$. Then, by $a_p^s \in \langle a_o^s, a_q^s \rangle^{\prec^s}$, we know that one of the following two situations must occur: (i) $o \in \{1, \dots, \underline{k}\}$ and $q \in \{\underline{k} + 1, \dots, |A^s|\} \setminus \{k'\}$, and (ii) $o \in \{\underline{k} + 1, \dots, |A^s|\} \setminus \{k'\}$ and $q \in \{1, \dots, \underline{k}\}$. Recall that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{k'}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{k'}^s \rangle \setminus \{a_{\underline{k}}^s\}} = G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle}^{\prec^s}$, and the line $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Note that situation (i) implies that a_o^s is located in the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, and a_q^s is located in the subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{k'}^s, a_{\underline{k}}^s \rangle}^{\prec^s}$ or in the line $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Consequently, a_p^s is located in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a_o^s and a_q^s . Immediately, Lemma 16 implies $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$, as required. Symmetrically, in situation (ii), a_p^s is also located in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a_o^s and a_q^s , and hence Lemma 16 implies $a_p^s [P_i]^s a_q^s$, as required. This completes the verification of the claim.

CLAIM 4: Let $\underline{k} < k < \bar{k}$. We have $a_{k'}^s [P_i]^s a_k^s$ and $a_{k'}^s [\bar{P}_i]^s a_k^s$, contradicting the fact that $[P_i]^s$ and $[\bar{P}_i]^s$ are complete reversals.

Recall that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{k'}^s \rangle}$, and the line $(a_{\bar{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Since a_k^s is a leaf of $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{k'}^s \rangle}$, $\underline{k} < k < \bar{k}$ and $a_k^s \approx a_{k'}^s$, it is true that $a_{k'}^s$ is included in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting a_1^s and a_k^s , and $a_{k'}^s$ is also included in all paths in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ connecting $a_{|A^s|}^s$ and a_k^s . Immediately, Lemma 16 implies $a_{k'}^s [P_i]^s a_k^s$ and $a_{k'}^s [\bar{P}_i]^s a_k^s$, which contradict the fact that $[P_i]^s$ and $[\bar{P}_i]^s$ are complete reversals. This completes the verification of the claim, and hence proves the Lemma. \square

Now, we know that for each $s \in M$, $[\mathbb{D}]^s$ is a hybrid marginal domain on \prec^s w.r.t. marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s . Then, we have two thresholds $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}^1, \dots, \underline{x}^m)$ and $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}^1, \dots, \bar{x}^m)$ on $\prec = \times_{s \in M} \prec^s$. Last, according to Definition 3, to complete the verification, we show $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. As a preparation, we first highlight the following two specific two-voter FBRs that will be repeatedly adopted in the proof.

Fix $N = \{1, 2\}$. Given fixed ballots $(b_j^s)_{j \subseteq N}$, the FBR $f^s : [\mathbb{D}^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$ is called a **projection rule** if there exists $\hat{x}^s \in A^s$ such that $b_j^s = \hat{x}^s$ for all nonempty proper coalitions $J \subset N$. Then, f^s can be explicitly simplified as follows: for all $(P_1^s, P_2^s) \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^2$,

$$f^s(P_1^s, P_2^s) = \text{med}^{\prec^s} (r_1(P_1^s), r_1(P_2^s), \hat{x}^s).$$

We henceforth call the projection rule f^s above **the \hat{x}^s -projection rule**.²⁷ By Proposition

²⁷We call f^s a projection rule because it can be reinterpreted using the term of ‘‘projection’’. Given a pro-

2 of [Moulin \(1980\)](#), it is clear that if $\mathbb{D}^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ and $\underline{x}^s = \bar{x}^s$, then all projection rules are strategy-proof marginal rules.

Given fixed ballots $(b_j^s)_{j \subseteq N}$, the FBR $f^s : [\mathbb{D}^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$ is called a **hybrid rule** if there exist $i \in N$ and $\underline{a}^s, \bar{a}^s \in A^s$ with $\underline{a}^s \prec^s \bar{a}^s$ such that for all nonempty coalition $J \subseteq N$, $[i \notin J] \Rightarrow [b_j^s = \underline{a}^s]$ and $[i \in J] \Rightarrow [b_j^s = \bar{a}^s]$. Then, f^s can be explicitly simplified as follows: for all $(P_1^s, P_2^s) \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^2$,

$$f^s(P_1^s, P_2^s) = \begin{cases} r_1(P_i^s) & \text{if } r_1(P_i^s) \in \langle \underline{a}^s, \bar{a}^s \rangle, \\ \text{med}^{\prec^s}(r_1(P_1^s), r_1(P_2^s), \underline{a}^s) & \text{if } r_1(P_i^s) \prec^s \underline{a}^s, \text{ and} \\ \text{med}^{\prec^s}(r_1(P_1^s), r_1(P_2^s), \bar{a}^s) & \text{if } \bar{a}^s \prec^s r_1(P_i^s). \end{cases}$$

We henceforth call the hybrid rule f^s here **the voter- i - $(\underline{a}^s, \bar{a}^s)$ -hybrid rule**.²⁸ By Theorem 2 of [Chatterji et al. \(2022\)](#), we know that if $\mathbb{D}^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, $\underline{a}^s \preceq^s \underline{x}^s$ and $\bar{x}^s \preceq^s \bar{a}^s$, then the voter- i - $(\underline{a}^s, \bar{a}^s)$ -hybrid rule is a strategy-proof marginal rule.

LEMMA 18 *We have $\mathbb{D} \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$.*

Proof: Fixing a preference $P_i^* \in \mathbb{D}$ and two similar alternatives $a, b \in A$, let $r_1(P_i^*) = x$, $M(a, b) = \{s\}$ and $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$. We show $a P_i^* b$. We consider 4 cases: (1) $a^s = x^s$, (2) $a^s \neq x^s$ and $s \notin M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, (3) $a^s \neq x^s$, $s \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ and $x^s \in \langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$, and (4) $a^s \neq x^s$, $s \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$ and $x^s \notin \langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$. In Case (1), since we have shown in the proof of Lemma 12 that P_i^* is a top-separable preference, it is evident that $a P_i^* b$. In the rest of three cases, we fix $N = \{1, 2\}$, assemble projection rules and hybrid rules to construct various strategy-proof rules, and show $a P_i^* b$ via strategy-proofness of these rules.

CASE (2). Since $s \notin M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, we know $\underline{x}^s = \bar{x}^s$, and hence the aforementioned **Situation (i)** occurs. Then, $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ implies $a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle$, and all projections rules are strategy-proof marginal rules on $[\mathbb{D}]^s$. We then refer to the b^s -projection rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$. At each $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we refer to the voter-2 marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^2 \rightarrow A^t$, which of course is a strategy-proof marginal rule. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof. Now, given $P_1 = P_i^*$,

file $(P_1^s, P_2^s) \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^2$, the projection of \hat{x}^s on the interval $\langle r_1(P_1^s), r_1(P_2^s) \rangle$ equals $\text{med}^{\prec^s}(r_1(P_1^s), r_1(P_2^s), \hat{x}^s)$.

²⁸We call f^s the voter- i - $(\underline{a}^s, \bar{a}^s)$ -hybrid rule to highlight that it is a hybrid of voter i 's dictatorship on the interval $\langle \underline{a}^s, \bar{a}^s \rangle$ and two projection rules.

$P'_1 \in \mathbb{D}^b$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{D}^a$, we have $f(P_1, P_2) = (a^s, b^{-s}) = a$ and $f(P'_1, P_2) = (b^s, b^{-s}) = b$, which by strategy-proofness imply $a P_1 b$, as required.

CASE (3). We know that $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{H}}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s)$, and $\overline{(x^s, a^s, b^s)}$ implies $a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle$ and $a^s \notin \text{Int}\langle \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s \rangle$. There are two symmetric subcases: $a^s \preceq^s \underline{x}^s$ and $\overline{x}^s \preceq^s a^s$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $a^s \preceq^s \underline{x}^s$. Then, by $x^s \in \langle \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s \rangle$ and $a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle$, it must be the case that $b^s \prec^s a^s \preceq^s \underline{x}^s \preceq^s x^s \preceq^s \overline{x}^s$. Correspondingly, we refer to the voter-2- (a^s, \overline{x}^s) -hybrid rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$, which is a strategy-proof marginal rule. At each $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we refer to the voter-2 marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^2 \rightarrow A^t$. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof. Now, given $P_1 = P_i^*$, $P'_1 \in \mathbb{D}^b$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{D}^b$, we have $f(P_1, P_2) = (a^s, b^{-s}) = a$ and $f(P'_1, P_2) = b$, which by strategy-proofness imply $a P_1 b$, as required.

CASE (4). We know that $[\mathbb{D}]^s \subseteq \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{H}}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s)$, and $\overline{(x^s, a^s, b^s)}$ implies $a^s \in \langle x^s, b^s \rangle$ and $a^s \notin \text{Int}\langle \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s \rangle$. Moreover, since $x^s \notin \langle \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s \rangle$, either $x^s \prec^s \underline{x}^s$ or $\overline{x}^s \prec^s x^s$ holds. We assume w.l.o.g. that $x^s \prec^s \underline{x}^s$. Thus, there are three subcases: (i) $a^s \prec^s x^s$, (ii) $x^s \prec^s a^s \prec^s \underline{x}^s$, and (iii) $x^s \prec^s \overline{x}^s \prec^s a^s$.

In subcase (i), it must be the case that $b^s \prec^s a^s \prec^s x^s \prec^s \underline{x}^s \prec^s \overline{x}^s$. Correspondingly, we refer to the voter-2- (a^s, \overline{x}^s) -hybrid rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$, which is a strategy-proof marginal rule. At each $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we refer to the voter-2 marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^2 \rightarrow A^t$. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof. Now, given $P_1 = P_i^*$, $P'_1 \in \mathbb{D}^b$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{D}^b$, we have $f(P_1, P_2) = (a^s, b^{-s}) = a$ and $f(P'_1, P_2) = b$, which by strategy-proofness imply $a P_1 b$, as required.

In subcase (ii), we know $x^s \prec^s a^s \prec^s \underline{x}^s \prec^s \overline{x}^s$ and $x^s \prec^s a^s \prec^s b^s$. Correspondingly, we refer to the voter-1- (a^s, \overline{x}^s) -hybrid rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$, which is a strategy-proof marginal rule. At each $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we refer to the voter-2 marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^2 \rightarrow A^t$. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof. Now, given $P_1 = P_i^*$, $P'_1 \in \mathbb{D}^b$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{D}^b$, we have $f(P_1, P_2) = (a^s, b^{-s}) = a$ and $f(P'_1, P_2) = b$, which by strategy-proofness imply $a P_1 b$, as required.

In subcase (iii), we know $x^s \prec^s \underline{x}^s \prec^s \overline{x}^s \prec^s a^s \prec^s b^s$. Correspondingly, we refer to the voter-2- (\underline{x}^s, a^s) -hybrid rule $f^s : [[\mathbb{D}]^s]^2 \rightarrow A^s$, which is a strategy-proof marginal rule. At each $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we refer to the voter-2 marginal dictatorship $f^t : [[\mathbb{D}]^t]^2 \rightarrow A^t$. Then, by the assembling property of \mathbb{D} , the assembled SCF $f = (f^1, \dots, f^m)$ is strategy-proof.

Now, given $P_1 = P_i^*$, $P_1' \in \mathbb{D}^b$ and $P_2 \in \mathbb{D}^b$, we have $f(P_1, P_2) = (a^s, b^{-s}) = a$ and $f(P_1', P_2) = (b^s, z^{-s}) = b$, which by strategy-proofness imply $a P_1 b$, as required.

In conclusion, P_i is multidimensional hybrid on \prec w.r.t. \underline{x} and \bar{x} . This completes the verification of the Lemma, and hence proves the necessity part of the Theorem. \square \square

By Theorem 1 and its proof, the Corollary below provides a full characterization of strategy-proof rules on a rich multidimensional hybrid domain, which covers all characterization results of Barberà et al. (1991), Barberà et al. (1993), Le Breton and Sen (1999) and Le Breton and Weymark (1999) as special cases.

COROLLARY 1 *Let \mathbb{D} be a rich multidimensional hybrid domain on \prec w.r.t. thresholds \underline{x} and \bar{x} . An SCF $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ is a strategy-proof rule if and only if f is decomposable and all marginal SCFs f^1, \dots, f^m are strategy-proof marginal rules, more specifically, f^s is an FBR for each $s \in M \setminus M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, and f^t is an $(\underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$ -FBR for each $t \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$.*

Proof: Clearly, by Theorem 1, \mathbb{D} is a decomposable domain, which immediately by the decomposition and assembling properties implies that an SCF $f : \mathbb{D}^n \rightarrow A$ is a strategy-proof rule if and only if f is decomposable and all marginal SCFs f^1, \dots, f^m are strategy-proof marginal rules. Furthermore, by Lemmas 7 and 10 in the proof of Theorem 1, we know that for each $s \in M \setminus M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, the strategy-proof marginal rule f^s is an FBR, and for each $t \in M(\underline{x}, \bar{x})$, the strategy-proof marginal rule f^t is an $(\underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$ -FBR. \square

3.3 AN APPLICATION: PUBLIC GOODS PROVISION

Imagine a railway running within a region. All stations $\Omega = \{l_1, \dots, l_t\}$, $t \geq 2$, along the railway are considered as possible locations for allocating public facilities, like a sports complex, a hospital, etc. We adopt the linear order $l_1 < \dots < l_t$ to depict the geometric relations among all stations along the railway. A set of multiple good public facilities $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$, $m \geq 2$, needs to be allocated on stations. For each public facility s , let a non-empty and non-singleton subset $A^s \subseteq \Omega$ collect all locations available for construction. Thus, an m -tuple $(a^1, \dots, a^m) \in \times_{s \in M} A^s$ represents a feasible allocation of these public facilities. For each public facility s , each individual i living in this region has a strict preference P_i^s on the feasible locations A^s , which is drawn from a fixed domain \mathbb{D}^s .

Given $s \in M$ and $x^s, a^s, b^s \in A^s$ such that $a^s \neq b^s$, according to \mathbb{D}^s , let $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)}$ represent a ternary relation indicating that a^s is always ranked above b^s in a preference where x^s is top-ranked. Clearly, $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)}$ specifies a restriction imposed on all preferences with the peak x^s . Let $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s) := \left\{ \overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} : a^s P_i^s b^s \text{ for all } P_i^s \in \mathbb{D}^s \text{ with } r_1(P_i^s) = x^s \right\}$ collect all such preference restrictions embedded in \mathbb{D}^s .

We assume that each individual's preference over all feasible allocations $A := \times_{s \in M} A^s$ is formulated according to the condition of semi-separability, which intuitively requires the rankings of allocations to fully respect the preference restrictions embedded in $\mathbb{D}^1, \dots, \mathbb{D}^m$.

DEFINITION 5 According to $\mathbb{D}^1, \dots, \mathbb{D}^m$, a preference P_i over A , say $r_1(P_i) = x$, is **semi-separable** w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^m)$, if for all distinct allocations $a, b \in A$, we have

$$\left[\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s) \text{ for all } s \in M(a, b) \right] \Rightarrow [a P_i b].$$

A domain \mathbb{D} is called **the semi-separable domain** w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^m)$ if we have

$$[P_i \in \mathbb{D}] \Leftrightarrow [P_i \text{ is semi-separable w.r.t. } \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^m)].$$

REMARK 3 Indeed, semi-separability weakens the restriction of separability. According to $\mathbb{D}^1, \dots, \mathbb{D}^m$, we can assemble a domain of separable preferences $\mathbb{D}^* = \{P_i \in \mathbb{D}_S : P_i^s \in \mathbb{D}^s \text{ for all } s \in M\}$. It is easy to show that all preferences of \mathbb{D}^* are also semi-separable w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^m)$: given $P_i \in \mathbb{D}^*$, say $r_1(P_i) = x$, and distinct $a, b \in A$ such that $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s)$ for all $s \in M(a, b)$, we have $a^s P_i^s b^s$ for all $s \in M(a, b)$, and then by separability $a P_i b$, which meets the requirement of semi-separability. Conversely, the semi-separable domain \mathbb{D} w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^m)$ however contains non-separable preferences. For instance, given $s \in M$ and $x^s, a^s, b^s \in A^s$ such that $a^s \neq b^s$, $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s)$ and $\overrightarrow{(x^s, b^s, a^s)} \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s)$, a semi-separable preference P_i that includes x^s in its peak, can have the following two opposite relative rankings: $(a^s, x^{-s}) P_i (b^s, x^{-s})$ and $(b^s, y^{-s}) P_i (a^s, y^{-s})$.

Furthermore, we recall the model of public goods provision in Section E.7 of [Chatterji and Zeng \(2019\)](#), where an urban area stands in the center of the region, surrounded by a large rural area, the railway goes through the urban area such that all multiple urban stations/locations cluster in the middle of the railway, and the urban area is postulated to

²⁹The bold line in the bigger oval represents the railway, while the dash lines denote the metro transportation system in the urban area that complements the railway.




Figure 2: The transportation system in the region ²⁹

possess a modern metro transportation system that fully connects all urban stations (see for instance Figure 2 above). Then, we can identify two particular urban stations $l_{\underline{k}}, l_{\bar{k}} \in \Omega$, $\underline{k} < \bar{k}$, that separate the railway into three parts $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, \dots, l_{\underline{k}}\}$, $\mathcal{M} = \{l_{\underline{k}}, \dots, l_{\bar{k}}\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{l_{\bar{k}}, \dots, l_t\}$ such that all stations of \mathcal{M} are urban stations, and the rest are all rural stations. In order to avoid trivialness, let $|\mathcal{M}| \geq 3$. As $l_{\underline{k}}$ is directly connected to all urban stations and is the gate to the rural stations left to it, we call $l_{\underline{k}}$ the left transportation hub. Symmetrically, $l_{\bar{k}}$ is called the right transportation hub. Moreover, for simplicity, we assume that for each public facility s , the two transportation hubs are available for construction whenever at least two urban locations are included in A^s , i.e., $[|A^s \cap \mathcal{M}| \geq 2] \Rightarrow [l_{\underline{k}}, l_{\bar{k}} \in A^s]$. Thus, we can induce a linear order \prec^s over A^s from the railway such that for all distinct $a^s, b^s \in A^s$, $[a^s \prec^s b^s] \Leftrightarrow [a^s < b^s]$, and identify marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s on \prec^s such that $[|A^s \cap \mathcal{M}| = 2] \Rightarrow [\underline{x}^s = \bar{x}^s \in A^s \text{ is arbitrary}]$ and $[|A^s \cap \mathcal{M}| \geq 3] \Rightarrow [\underline{x}^s = l_{\underline{k}} \text{ and } \bar{x}^s = l_{\bar{k}}]$.

Given a public facility s , it is natural to assume that the formulation of an individual's preference over locations of A^s is determined by the distance between locations measured by both the railway and the metro transportation system. Accordingly, if $|A^s \cap \mathcal{M}| \leq 2$, individuals have single-peaked preferences on available locations along the railway; if $|A^s \cap \mathcal{M}| \geq 3$, an individual living around a rural station would have single-peaked preferences on available locations that lie at the two sides of transportation hubs along the railway, and prefer the proximate transportation hub to any other available locations in the urban area, while an individual living in the urban area would have arbitrary preferences on all urban available locations attributed to the complementary metro transportation, and prefer an rural available location that is closer to its proximate transportation hub. Therefore, all preferences of \mathbb{D}^s are hybrid on \prec^s w.r.t. the marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s .

Last, the proposition below explains the emergence of multidimensional hybridness **via**

the procedure of combining hybridness across all components using the requirement of semi-separability.

PROPOSITION 1 *Let $\mathbb{D}^s = \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ for each $s \in M$. Then, the semi-separable domain \mathbb{D} w.r.t. $\mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^1), \dots, \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^m)$ equals the multidimensional hybrid domain $\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, and therefore is a decomposable domain.*

Proof: Given $P_i \in \mathbb{D}$, let $r_1(P_i) = x$. In order to prove $P_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, we fix similar $a, b \in A$, say $M(a, b) = \{s\}$, such that $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, and show $a P_i b$. Then, by hybridness on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s , it is true that $a^s P_i^s b^s$ for all $P_i^s \in \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s) = \mathbb{D}^s$ with $r_1(P_i^s) = x^s$, and hence $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s)$. Then, Definition 5 implies $a P_i b$, as required. Conversely, given $P_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, we show $P_i \in \mathbb{D}$. Let $r_1(P_i) = x$ and $a, b \in A$ be such that $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s)$ for all $s \in M(a, b)$. We show $a P_i b$. For each $s \in M(a, b)$, since $\mathbb{D}^s = \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$, to ensure $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbb{D}^s)$, it must be the case that a^s is located either trivially, or naturally, or conditionally between x^s and b^s , that is, $\overrightarrow{(x^s, a^s, b^s)} \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$. Then, by Definition 3 and transitivity of P_i , we have $a P_i b$, as required. Thus, we have $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. \square

4 CONCLUSION

In a class of rich preference domains, multidimensional hybrid domains are shown to be the only decomposable domains. We provide a characterization of strategy-proof rules on this domain. Finally we demonstrate how such a domain may be generated via semi-separability, a weakening of the requirement of separability in a public goods provision model.

REFERENCES

- BARBERÀ, S. (2011): “Strategy-proof social choice,” in *Handbook of Social Choice and Welfare*, vol. 2, 731–831.
- BARBERÀ, S., F. GUL, AND E. STACCHETTI (1993): “Generalized median voter schemes and committees,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 61, 262–289.

- BARBERÀ, S., H. SONNENSCHNEIN, AND L. ZHOU (1991): “Voting by committees,” *Econometrica*, 59, 595–609.
- BORDER, K., AND J. JORDAN (1983): “Straightforward elections, unanimity and phantom voters,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 50(1), 153–170.
- CHATTERJI, S., S. ROY, S. SADHUKHAN, A. SEN, AND H. ZENG (2022): “Probabilistic fixed ballot rules and hybrid domains,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 100, 102656.
- CHATTERJI, S., R. SANVER, AND A. SEN (2013): “On domains that admit well-behaved strategy-proof social choice functions,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 148, 1050–1073.
- CHATTERJI, S. AND H. ZENG (2019): “Random mechanism design on multidimensional domains,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 182, 25–105.
- CHATTERJI, S. AND H. ZENG (2023): “A taxonomy of non-dictatorial unidimensional domains,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 137, 228–269.
- GERSHKOV, A., B. MOLDOVANU, AND X. SHI (2020): “Monotonic Norms and Othogonal Issues in Multidimensional Voting,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 129, 105103.
- GIBBARD, A. (1973): “Manipulation of voting schemes: A general result,” *Econometrica*, 587–601.
- LE BRETON, M. AND A. SEN (1999): “Separable preferences, strategyproofness and decomposability,” *Econometrica*, 67, 605–628.
- LE BRETON, M. AND J. WEYMARK (1999): “Strategy-proof social choice with continuous separable preferences,” *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 32, 47–85.
- KUMAR, U., S. ROY, A. SEN, S. YADAV, AND H. ZENG (2021): “Local-global equivalence in voting models: A characterization and applications,” *Theoretical Economics*, 16, 1195–1220.
- MORIMOTO, S. AND S. SERIZAWA (2015): “Strategy-proofness and efficiency with non-quasi-linear preferences: A characterization of minimum price Walrasian rule,” *Theoretical Economics*, 10, 445–487.
- MOULIN, H. (1980): “On strategy-proofness and single peakedness,” *Public Choice*, 35(4), 437–455.
- ROBERTS, K. (1979): “The characterization of implementable choice rules,” *Aggregation and Revelation of Preferences*, 321–349, J-J. Laffont (ed.), North Holland Publishing Company.

- ROY, S. AND S. SADHUKHAN (2019): “A characterization of random min-max domains and its applications,” *Economic Theory*, 68, 887–906.
- SATO, S. (2013): “A sufficient condition for the equivalence of strategy-proofness and nonmanipulability by preferences adjacent to the sincere one,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 148, 259–278.
- SATTERTHWAITE, M. A. (1975): “Strategy-proofness and Arrow’s conditions: Existence and correspondence theorems for voting procedures and social welfare functions,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 10, 187–217.
- SEN, A. (2001): “Another direct proof of the Gibbard-Satterthwaite Theorem,” *Economic Letters*, 70, 381–385.
- SPRUMONT, Y. (1995): “Strategyproof collective choice in economic and political environments,” *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 68–107.

APPENDIX

A THREE CLARIFICATIONS

We first introduce some notation and Property L of Kumar et al. (2021). Given a preference P_i and two alternatives $a, b \in A$, let $a P_i! b$ denote that a is consecutively ranked above b in P_i , i.e., $a P_i b$ and there exists no $c \in A$ such that $a P_i c$ and $c P_i b$. Given a preference P_i and an alternative $a \in A$, let $L(a, P_i) := \{x \in A : a P_i x\}$ denote the **strict lower contour set** of a at P_i , and $\overline{U}(a, P_i) := \{x \in A : x P_i a\} \cup \{a\}$ denote the **weak upper contour set** of a at P_i . The same notation works for marginal preferences as well.

DEFINITION 6 *A domain \mathbb{D} satisfies **Property L** on the graph $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}}$ if given arbitrary distinct $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}$ and arbitrary $a \in A$, there exists a path in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}}$ connecting P_i and P'_i that has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration for all $b \in L(a, P_i)$.*

It is clear that Property L implies the first two conditions of no-restoration⁺.

CLARIFICATION 1 *The separable domain \mathbb{D}_S is a rich domain.*

Proof: First, it is evident that \mathbb{D}_S is minimally rich and satisfies diversity⁺. Next, Proposition 2 of Kumar et al. (2021) has shown that the separable domain \mathbb{D}_S satisfies Property

L on $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}}$, which implies the first two conditions of no-restoration⁺. To show condition (iii) of no-restoration⁺ on \mathbb{D}_S , we first introduce two important facts.

FACT 1 *Given distinct $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_S$ such that $P_i^s = P_i'^s$ for all $s \in M$, there exists a path in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}_S}$ connecting P_i and P'_i that has no restoration for any pair of alternatives.*

FACT 2 *Fix a marginal preference $P_i^t \in \mathbb{P}^t$ for each $t \in M$, an alternative $a \in A$ and a component $s \in M$. There exists $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}_S$ satisfying the following three conditions:*

1. $\hat{P}_i^t = P_i^t$ for all $t \in M$,
2. $[x \hat{P}_i a] \Leftrightarrow [x^t \in \overline{U}(a^t, P_i^t)]$ for all $t \in M$.
3. for all distinct $b^s, c^s \in \overline{U}(a^s, P_i^s)$ or $b^s, c^s \in L(a^s, P_i^s)$,
 $[b^s \hat{P}_i! c^s] \Rightarrow [(b^s, y^{-s}) \hat{P}_i! (c^s, y^{-s})]$ for all $y^{-s} \in A^{-s}$.

Fact 1 is implied by the proof of Fact 5 of [Chatterji and Zeng \(2019\)](#), while Fact 2 follows from the proof of Lemma 3 of [Kumar et al. \(2021\)](#). Now, we start to show condition (iii) of no-restoration⁺ on \mathbb{D}_S .

Given distinct $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_S$ and distinct $a, b \in A$, let $r_1(P_i) = (x^s, x^{-s})$, $r_1(P'_i) = (y^s, x^{-s})$, $a = (a^s, x^{-s})$ and $b = (b^s, x^{-s})$, where $x^s \neq y^s$ and $a^s \neq b^s$. We construct a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}}$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that π has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration, and $r_1(P_{i|k}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $a P_i b$. There are two cases: (i) $a P_i b$ and (ii) $b P'_i a$. The construction of π consists of the following 4 steps.

STEP 1. According to P_i and P'_i , we have two groups of marginal preferences (P_i^1, \dots, P_i^m) and $(P_i^{1'}, \dots, P_i^{m'})$. For each $t \in M$, since $P_i^t, P_i^{t'} \in \mathbb{P}^t$, where \mathbb{P}^t is the universal marginal domain, by the proof of Proposition 4.1 of [Sato \(2013\)](#), there exists a path $\pi^t = (P_{i|1}^t, \dots, P_{i|v_t}^t)$ in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{P}^t}$ connecting P_i^t and $P_i^{t'}$ that has no restoration for any pair of elements. We make the following two observations:

- (1) on the path π^τ , where $\tau \in M \setminus \{s\}$, we have $r_1(P_{i|k}^\tau) = x^\tau$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, v_\tau\}$, and
- (2) on the path π^s , in case (i), we have $a^s P_{i|k}^s b^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v_s$, while in case (ii), there exists $1 \leq k^* < v_s$ such that $a^s P_{i|k}^s b^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, k^*$ and $b^s P_{i|k}^s a^s$ for all $k = k^* + 1, \dots, v_s$.

STEP 2. First, let case (i) hold. Given a component $t \in M$ and an index $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$, we identify marginal preference $P_{i|k}^t$ in the path π^t , and construct a profile of marginal preferences $(P_i^{1'}, \dots, P_i^{t-1'}, P_{i|k}^t, P_i^{t+1}, \dots, P_i^m)$. Then, according to the alternative a and the component t , we have a separable preference satisfying conditions 1 - 3 of Fact 2, denoted $P_i(t, k)$.

Second, let case (ii) hold. Given a component $t \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and an index $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$ (if $t < s$) or $k \in \{1, \dots, k^* - 1\}$ (if $t = s$), by the same construction introduced for case (1), according to the alternative a and the component t , we have a separable preference satisfying conditions 1 - 3 of Fact 2, denoted $P_i(t, k)$. Next, given a component $t \in \{s, \dots, m\}$ and an index $k \in \{k^*, \dots, v_s\}$ (if $t = s$) or $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$ (if $t > s$), symmetric to the construction introduced for case (1), according to the alternative b and the component t , we have a separable preference satisfying conditions 1 - 3 of Fact 2, denoted $P_i(t, k)$.

Last, we make three observations in this step:

- (1) for all $t \in \{1, \dots, m - 1\}$, since $P_i(t, v_t)$ and $P_i(t + 1, 1)$ share the same marginal preferences, i.e., $(P_i^{1'}, \dots, P_i^{t-1'}, P_{i|v_t}^t, P_i^{t+1}, \dots, P_i^m) = (P_i^{1'}, \dots, P_i^{t-1'}, P_i^t, P_{i|1}^{t+1}, \dots, P_i^m)$, by Fact 1, we have a path $\pi(t, v_t)$ in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}^s}$ connecting $P_i(t, v_t)$ and $P_i(t + 1, 1)$ that has no restoration for any pair of alternatives, which then by observation (1) in Step 1 implies that all preferences on $\pi(t, v_t)$ have the same peak in (A^s, x^{-s}) ,
- (2) for each $t \in M$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$, in the group $(P_i^{1'}, \dots, P_i^{t-1'}, P_{i|k}^t, P_i^{t+1}, \dots, P_i^m)$, the marginal preference on each component $\tau \in M \setminus \{s\}$ has the peak x^τ by observation (1) in Step 1, and hence $P_i(t, k)$ generated by Fact 2 has the peak in (A^s, x^{-s}) , and
- (3) by observation (2) in Step 1, in case (i), we have $a P_i(t, k) b$ for all $t \in M$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$, while in case (ii), we have $a P_i(t, k) b$ for all $t \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$ (if $t < s$) or $k \in \{1, \dots, k^*\}$ (if $t = s$), and $b P_i(t, k) a$ for all $t \in \{s, \dots, m\}$ and $k \in \{k^* + 1, \dots, v_s\}$ (if $t = s$) or $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t\}$ (if $t > s$).

STEP 3. Given a component $t \in M$ and an index $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t - 1\}$, we identify the consecutive marginal preferences $P_{i|k}^t$ and $P_{i|k+1}^t$ in π^t and the elements $c^t, d^t \in A^t$ that are locally switched across $P_{i|k}^t$ and $P_{i|k+1}^t$, i.e., $c^t P_{i|k}^t! d^t$ and $d^t P_{i|k+1}^t! c^t$. Then, we know that for all $t \in M \setminus \{s\}$, $c^t, d^t \in L(x^t, P_{i|k}^t) = L(a^t, P_{i|k}^t) = L(b^t, P_{i|k}^t)$; for the component s , $c^s, d^s \in \overline{U}(a^s, P_{i|k}^s)$ or $c^s, d^s \in L(a^s, P_{i|k}^s)$ holds in case (i), while in case (ii), $c^s, d^s \in \overline{U}(a^s, P_{i|k}^s)$ or $c^s, d^s \in L(a^s, P_{i|k}^s)$ holds if $k \in \{1, \dots, k^* - 1\}$, and $c^s, d^s \in$

$\overline{U}(b^s, P_{i|k}^s)$, or $c^s, d^s \in L(b^s, P_{i|k}^s)$ holds if $k \in \{k^*, \dots, v_s - 1\}$. Then, by condition 3 of Fact 2, we know $(c^t, y^{-t}) P_i(t, k) \succ (d^t, y^{-t})$ for all $y^{-t} \in A^{-t}$. By locally switching the relative ranking of (c^t, y^{-t}) and (d^t, y^{-t}) in $P_i(t, k)$ for all $y^{-t} \in A^{-t}$, we generate a new preference $\hat{P}_i(t, k)$. It is easy to show that $\hat{P}_i(t, k)$ is a separable preference, $P_i(t, k) \sim^+ \hat{P}_i(t, k)$ and $\hat{P}_i^\tau(t, k) = P_i^\tau(t, k+1)$ for all $\tau \in M$. Immediately, by Fact 1, we have a path $\pi(t, k)$ in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}^s}$ connecting $\hat{P}_i(t, k)$ and $P_i(t, k+1)$ that has no restoration. Now, for each $t \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, we construct a concatenated path π_t in $G_{\sim/\sim^+}^{\mathbb{D}^s}$ connecting $\hat{P}_i(t, 1)$ and $P_i(t+1, 1)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t &= (\pi(t, 1), \dots, \pi(t, k-1), \pi(t, k), \dots, \pi(t, v_t-1), \pi(t, v_t)) \\ &= \left(\underbrace{\hat{P}_i(t, 1), \dots, P_i(t, 2)}_{\text{Path } \pi(t, 1)}, \dots, \underbrace{\hat{P}_i(t, k-1), \dots, P_i(t, k)}_{\text{Path } \pi(t, k-1)} \sim^+ \underbrace{\hat{P}_i(t, k), \dots, P_i(t, k+1)}_{\text{Path } \pi(t, k)}, \dots, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \underbrace{\hat{P}_i(t, v_t-1), \dots, P_i(t, v_t)}_{\text{Path } \pi(t, v_t-1)} = \underbrace{P_i(t, v_t), \dots, P_i(t+1, 1)}_{\text{Path } \pi(t, v_t)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi(t, v_t)$ comes from observation (1) in Step 2, while for the component m , we construct a concatenated path π_m in $G_{\sim/\sim^+}^{\mathbb{D}^s}$ connecting $\hat{P}_i(m, 1)$ and $P_i(m, v_m)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_m &= (\pi(m, 1), \dots, \pi(m, k-1), \pi(m, k), \dots, \pi(m, v_m-1)) \\ &= \left(\underbrace{\hat{P}_i(m, 1), \dots, P_i(m, 2)}_{\text{Path } \pi(m, 1)}, \dots, \underbrace{\hat{P}_i(m, k-1), \dots, P_i(m, k)}_{\text{Path } \pi(m, k-1)} \sim^+ \underbrace{\hat{P}_i(m, k), \dots, P_i(m, k+1)}_{\text{Path } \pi(m, k)}, \dots, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \underbrace{\hat{P}_i(m, v_m-1), \dots, P_i(m, v_m)}_{\text{Path } \pi(m, v_m-1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We make the following three observations:

(1) for all $t \in M$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t - 1\}$, by no-restoration and observation (2) in Step 2, all preferences in $\pi(t, k)$ have the same peak in (A^s, x^{-s}) . Furthermore, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, by observation (1) in Step 2, we also know that all preferences in $\pi(t, v_t)$ have the same peak in (A^s, x^{-s}) . This implies that for all $t \in M$, all preferences in the path π_t have the peaks in (A^s, x^{-s}) .

(2) in case (i), given $t \in M$, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t - 1\}$, by no restoration on $\pi(t, k)$ and observation (3) in Step 2, a is ranked above b in all preferences of $\pi(t, k)$. Furthermore, for each $t \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$, since $a P_i(t, v_t) b$ and $a P_i(t+1, 1) b$ by observation (3) in Step 2, by no-restoration on $\pi(t, v_t)$ in observation (1) in Step 3, we know that a is also ranked above b in every preference of $\pi(t, v_t)$. This implies that for all $t \in M$, a is ranked above b in all preferences of π_t .

(3) in case (ii), by observation (3) in Step 2, we first know that a is ranked above b in all preferences of $\pi(t, k)$ if $t \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t-1\}$, or $t = s$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, k^*\}$, and then b is ranked above a in all preferences of $\pi(t, k)$ if $t = s$ and $k \in \{k^*+1, \dots, v_s-1\}$, or $t \in \{s+1, \dots, m\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, v_t-1\}$. This then by no restoration on $\pi(t, v_t)$ in observation (1) in Step 2 implies that a is ranked above b in all preferences of $\pi(t, v_t)$ if $t \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$, and b is ranked above a in all preferences of $\pi(t, v_t)$ if $t \in \{s, \dots, m-1\}$. Therefore, we know that a is ranked above b in all preferences of π_t if $t \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$, b is ranked above a in all preferences of π_t if $t \in \{s+1, \dots, m\}$, and furthermore along the path $\pi_s = (\pi(s, 1), \dots, \pi(s, k^*-1), \pi(s, k^*), \dots, \pi(s, v_s-1), \pi(s, v_s))$, a is ranked above b in all preferences of the subpath $(\pi(s, 1), \dots, \pi(s, k^*-1))$, and b is ranked above a in all preferences of $(\pi(s, k^*), \dots, \pi(s, v_s-1), \pi(s, v_s))$.³⁰

STEP 4. Since P_i and $P_i(1, 1)$ share the same marginal preference at each component, by Fact 1, we have a path π_0 in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}^s}$ connecting P_i and $P_i(1, 1)$ that has no restoration. Symmetrically, we have a path π_{m+1} in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}^s}$ connecting $P_i(m, v_m)$ and P'_i that has no restoration. Obviously, in case (i), a is ranked above b in all preferences of both paths π_0 and π_{m+1} , while in case (ii), a is ranked above b in all preferences of π_0 , and b is ranked above a in all preferences of π_{m+1} . Now, we construct the following path

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= (\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{t-1}, \pi_t, \dots, \pi_m, \pi_{m+1}) \\ &= \underbrace{(P_i, \dots, P_i(1, 1))}_{\text{Path } \pi_0} \sim^+ \underbrace{(\hat{P}_i(1, 1), \dots, P_i(2, 1))}_{\text{Path } \pi_1}, \dots, \underbrace{(\hat{P}_i(t-1, 1), \dots, P_i(t, 1))}_{\text{Path } \pi_{t-1}} \sim^+ \underbrace{(\hat{P}_i(t, 1), \dots, P_i(t+1, 1))}_{\text{Path } \pi_t}, \dots, \\ &\quad \underbrace{(\hat{P}_i(m, 1), \dots, P_i(m, v_m))}_{\text{Path } \pi_m} = \underbrace{(P_i(m, v_m), \dots, P'_i)}_{\text{Path } \pi_{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, by observation (1) in Step 3, all preferences of π have peaks in (A^s, x^{-s}) . By observations (2) and (3) in Step 3, we know that in case (i), a is ranked above b in all preferences of π , while in case (ii), the evolution of the relative rankings of a and b along the path π is depicted as follows,

$$\pi = \left(\underbrace{\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_s = (\pi(s, 1), \dots, \pi(s, k^*-1), \pi(s, k^*), \dots, \pi(s, v_s-1), \pi(s, v_s))}_{a \text{ is ranked above } b \text{ in each preference}}, \dots, \underbrace{\pi_m, \pi_{m+1}}_{b \text{ is ranked above } a \text{ in each preference}} \right),$$

which both clearly indicate no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration on π . This completes the verification of the Fact, and hence proves the Clarification. \square

³⁰In particular, if $s = m$, then remove $\pi(s, v_s)$ from π_s .

CLARIFICATION 2 *The multidimensional hybrid domain $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies Property L.*

Proof: Let $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x}) = \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x}) \cap \mathbb{D}_{\text{S}}$ denote the domain of preferences that are not only multidimensional hybrid on \prec w.r.t. \underline{x} and \bar{x} , but separable. It is evident that $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})} \subseteq G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$, and both $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ and $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ are minimally rich.

FACT 3 *Given distinct $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ (respectively, $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$) such that $r_1(P_i) = r_1(P'_i)$, there exists a path in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ (respectively, $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$) connecting P_i and P'_i that has no restoration for any pair of alternatives.*

Proof: Let $r_1(P_i) = r_1(P'_i) = z$. Searching from z down to the bottom of P_i and P'_i , since $P_i \neq P'_i$, we can identify $k \in \{2, \dots, |A|\}$ such that $r_k(P_i) \neq r_k(P'_i)$ and $r_\ell(P_i) = r_\ell(P'_i)$ for all $1 \leq \ell < k$. For notational convenience, let $r_k(P'_i) = y$ and $r_q(P_i) = y$. Clearly, $q > k$. Moreover, let $r_{q-1}(P_i) = x$. Since P_i and P'_i agree on the top- $(k-1)$ ranked alternatives, it is true that $y P'_i x$. Now, by locally switching the relative ranking of x and y in P_i , we generate a preference P''_i . It is clear that $P_i \sim P''_i$, $x P_i y$ and $y P''_i x$.

We first claim that $P''_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. Suppose by contradiction that $P''_i \notin \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. Since $P_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, by the construction of P''_i , it must be the case that $y P''_i x$ violates the definition of multidimensional hybridness on \prec w.r.t. \underline{x} and \bar{x} . Then, by Definition 3, we know that $M(x, y) = \{s\}$ for some $s \in M$ and $(z^s, x^s, y^s) \in \mathcal{B}(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$. Consequently, since $r_1(P'_i) = z$ and $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, we have $x P'_i y$ - a contradiction. Therefore, $P''_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. Next, we claim that if $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$, then $P''_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. We first know $P''_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. Furthermore, since both P_i and P'_i are separable preference, by the same proof of Fact 5 of Chatterji and Zeng (2019), we know that $P''_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{S}}$. Therefore, $P''_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$.

Now, notice that (i) P''_i and P'_i agree on the relative ranking of x and y , (ii) for any pair of alternatives other than x and y that are oppositely ranked across P_i and P'_i , they are still oppositely ranked across P''_i and P'_i , and (iii) for any pair of alternatives that are identically ranked across P_i and P'_i , they are still identically ranked across P''_i and P'_i . Therefore, we can say that P''_i is closer to P'_i than P_i . By repeatedly applying the procedure above, we eventually can construct a path π in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ (respectively, $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$) connecting P_i and P'_i . More importantly, by the construction of π , it is evident that π has no restoration for any pair of alternative. \square

FACT 4 Fix a marginal preference $P_i^t \in \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^t, \underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$ for each $t \in M$, an alternative $a \in A$ and a component $s \in M$. There exists $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfying the following three conditions:

1. $\hat{P}_i^t = P_i^t$ for all $t \in M$,
2. $[x \hat{P}_i a] \Leftrightarrow [x^t \in \bar{U}(a^t, P_i^t)$ for all $t \in M]$.
3. for all distinct $b^s, c^s \in \bar{U}(a^s, P_i^s)$ or $b^s, c^s \in L(a^s, P_i^s)$,
 $[b^s \hat{P}_i^s! c^s] \Rightarrow [(b^s, y^{-s}) \hat{P}_i^s! (c^s, y^{-s})$ for all $y^{-s} \in A^{-s}]$.

Proof: First, by Fact 2, we have a separable preference \hat{P}_i satisfying conditions 1 - 3. Next, since $\hat{P}_i^t = P_i^t$ is a hybrid marginal preference on \prec^s w.r.t. \underline{x}^t and \bar{x}^t for all $t \in M$, it is evident that the separable preference \hat{P}_i is multidimensional hybrid on \prec w.r.t. \underline{x} and \bar{x} . Therefore, $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$. \square

Based on Facts 3 and 4 which are analogous to Lemmas 2 and 3 of Kumar et al. (2021), by applying the same proof of Proposition 2 of Kumar et al. (2021), we can claim that $\mathbb{D}_{MH}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies Property L on $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{MH}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$, which implies the first two conditions of no-restoration⁺. Moreover, by applying the proof of Clarification 1, we can also claim that $\mathbb{D}_{MH}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies condition (iii) of no-restoration⁺.³¹

Now, we are ready to show that $\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies Property L . In order to simplify the verification of Property L on a minimally rich domain, Kumar et al. (2021) introduce an equivalent definition, called **Property L'** (see Proposition 2 of Kumar et al. (2021)), which contains two conditions. Indeed, the first condition of Property L' is implied Fact 3. To complete the verification of the second condition, we show that given $P_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ and $a \in A$ such that $r_1(P_i) \neq a$, there exist $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ such that $r_1(P'_i) = a$ and a path in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{MH}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ connecting P_i and P'_i that has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration for all $b \in L(a, P_i)$.

For notational convenience, let $r_1(P_i) = x$. For each $t \in M$, according to x^t and a^t , by the definition of $\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^t, \underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$, we can identify a marginal preference $\hat{P}_i^t \in \mathbb{D}_H(\prec^t, \underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$

³¹We need to change the reference of the universal marginal domain \mathbb{P}^t in Step 1 of the proof of Clarification 1 to the hybrid marginal domain $\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^t, \underline{x}^t, \bar{x}^t)$. By the proof of Clarification 1 of Chatterji et al. (2022), it is also true that every pair of two distinct marginal preferences of $\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)$ are connected by a path in $G_{\sim}^{\mathbb{D}_H(\prec^s, \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s)}$ that has no restoration for any pair of elements.

such that $r_1(\hat{P}_i^t) = x^t$, $\overline{U}(a^t, \hat{P}_i^t) = \{a^t\}$ (if $x^t = a^t$), and $\overline{U}(a^t, \hat{P}_i^t) = [\langle x^t, a^t \rangle \setminus \text{Int}\langle \underline{x}^t, \overline{x}^t \rangle] \cup \{x^t, a^t\}$ (if $x^t \neq a^t$). Then, according to the marginal preferences $\hat{P}_i^1, \dots, \hat{P}_i^m$, the alternative a and an arbitrary component $s \in M$, we have a preference $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfying conditions 1 - 3 of Fact 4. It is clear that $r_1(\hat{P}_i) = r_1(P_i)$. Immediately, by Fact 3, we have a path π' in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})}$ connecting P_i and \hat{P}_i that has no restoration for any pair of alternatives. By minimal richness of $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$, we fix an arbitrary $P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ such that $r_1(P'_i) = a$. Now, since $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfies Property L , we have a path π in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})}$ connecting \hat{P}_i and P'_i that has no $\{a, c\}$ -restoration for all $c \in L(a, \hat{P}_i)$. Then, we have a concatenated path $\pi'' = (\pi', \pi)$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})}$ connecting P_i and P'_i . To complete the verification, we last show that π'' has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration for all $b \in L(a, P_i)$.

Fixing arbitrary $b \in L(a, P_i)$, since $a P_i b$ and $a P'_i b$, to show no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration on $\pi'' = (\pi', \pi)$, it suffices to show that a is ranked above b in all preferences of π' and π . Since $a P_i b$, by Definition 3 and footnote 17, there must exist $t \in M(a, b)$ such that $\overrightarrow{(x^t, b^t, a^t)} \notin \mathcal{B}(\prec^t, \underline{x}^t, \overline{x}^t)$. Consequently, either $b^t \notin \langle x^t, a^t \rangle$, or $b^t \in \langle x^t, a^t \rangle$ and $b^t \in \text{Int}\langle \underline{x}^t, \overline{x}^t \rangle$ holds, which both imply $b^t \notin \overline{U}(a^t, \hat{P}_i^t)$. Then, by condition 2 of Fact 4, we know $a \hat{P}_i b$, or equivalently $b \in L(a, \hat{P}_i)$. Now, by no restoration on π' , $a P_i b$ and $a \hat{P}_i b$ imply that a is ranked above b in all preferences of π' . Symmetrically, since π has no $\{a, c\}$ -restoration for all $c \in L(a, \hat{P}_i)$, $a \hat{P}_i b$ and $r_1(P'_i) = a$ imply that a is ranked above b in all preferences of π , as required. This completes the verification of the Clarification. \square

CLARIFICATION 3 *The multidimensional hybrid domain $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ is a rich domain.*

Proof: It is evident that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfy minimal richness and diversity⁺. Since $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfies Property L by Clarification 2, it is clear that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfies the first two conditions of no-restoration⁺. We henceforth show that $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ satisfies condition (iii) of no-restoration⁺.

Given $P_i, P'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ and $a, b \in A$, let $r_1(P_i) = (x^s, x^{-s})$, $r_1(P'_i) = (y^s, x^{-s})$, $a = (a^s, x^{-s})$ and $b = (b^s, x^{-s})$, where $x^s \neq y^s$ and $a^s \neq b^s$. We construct a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})}$ connecting P_i and P'_i such that π has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration, and $r_1(P_{i|k}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v$. We assume w.l.o.g. that $a P_i b$. There are two cases (i) $a P'_i b$ and (ii) $b P'_i a$. By the proof of Clarification 2, we know that there exists $\hat{P}_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_i) = r_1(P_i)$ and $a \hat{P}_i b$, and there exists $\hat{P}'_i \in \mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \overline{x})$

such that $r_1(\hat{P}'_i) = r_1(P'_i)$, $a \hat{P}'_i b$ in case (i) and $b \hat{P}'_i a$ in case (ii). Since $\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})$ satisfies condition (iii) of no-restoration⁺, we have a path $\hat{\pi} = (\hat{P}'_{i|1}, \dots, \hat{P}'_{i|q})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}^*(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ connecting \hat{P}'_i and \hat{P}'_i such that $\hat{\pi}$ has no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration, and $r_1(\hat{P}'_{i|k}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. Thus, in case (i), we have $a \hat{P}'_{i|k} b$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, while in case (ii), there exists $1 \leq k^* < q$ such that $a \hat{P}'_{i|k} b$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, k^*\}$ and $b \hat{P}'_{i|k} a$ for all $k \in \{k^*+1, \dots, q\}$. Furthermore, since $r_1(P_i) = r_1(\hat{P}_i)$, $a P_i b$ and $a \hat{P}_i b$, by Fact 3, we have a path $\pi = (P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ connecting P_i and \hat{P}_i that has no restoration for any pair of alternatives, which clearly implies $r_1(P_{i|k}) = (x^s, x^{-s}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$ and $a P_{i|k} b$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, v\}$. Symmetrically, by Fact 3, we have a path $\pi' = (P'_{i|1}, \dots, P'_{i|w})$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ connecting \hat{P}'_i and P'_i such that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, w\}$, $r_1(P'_{i|k}) = (y^s, x^{-s}) \in (A^s, x^{-s})$, $a P'_{i|k} b$ in case (i), and $b P'_{i|k} a$ in case (ii). Now, we have a concatenated path $\pi'' = (\pi, \hat{\pi}, \pi')$ in $G_{\sim/\sim+}^{\mathbb{D}_{\text{MH}}(\prec, \underline{x}, \bar{x})}$ connecting P_i and P'_i . It is clear that every preference of π'' has a peak in (A^s, x^{-s}) . In case (i), it is evident that a is ranked above b in every preference of π'' , while in case (ii), the evolution of the relative rankings of a and b along π'' is depicted as follows:

$$\pi'' = \left(\underbrace{P_{i|1}, \dots, P_{i|v}}_{a \text{ is ranked above } b} = \underbrace{\hat{P}'_{i|1}, \dots, \hat{P}'_{i|k^*}}_{a \text{ is ranked above } b} \underbrace{\hat{P}'_{i|k^*+1}, \dots, \hat{P}'_{i|q}}_{b \text{ is ranked above } a} = \underbrace{P'_{i|1}, \dots, P'_{i|w}}_{b \text{ is ranked above } a} \right),$$

which both clearly indicate no $\{a, b\}$ -restoration on π'' . This completes the verification of the Clarification. \square

B A RAMIFICATION THEOREM

A RAMIFICATION THEOREM. *Given $s \in M$ and a hybrid marginal domain \mathbb{D}^s on \prec^s w.r.t. distinct marginal thresholds \underline{x}^s and \bar{x}^s , the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *Every two-voter strategy-proof marginal rule behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$.*
- (b) *Every n -voter strategy-proof marginal rule, $n \geq 2$, behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle \underline{x}^s, \bar{x}^s \rangle$.*

Proof: It is evident that statement (b) implies (a). We focus on showing (a) \Rightarrow (b).

For notational convenience, let $A^s = \{a_1^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s\}$ and $a_k^s \prec^s a_{k+1}^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, |A^s| - 1$. Thus, $\underline{x}^s = a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $\bar{x}^s = a_{\bar{k}}^s$ for some $1 \leq \underline{k} < \bar{k} \leq |A^s|$ with $\bar{k} - \underline{k} > 1$. Since \mathbb{D}^s is a hy-

brid marginal domain on \prec^s w.r.t. $a_{\underline{k}}^s$ and $a_{\overline{k}}^s$, we know that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{(a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s)}$ that has no leaf, and the line $(a_{\overline{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$.

Now, we fix an integer $n > 2$ and introduce an induction argument.

INDUCTION HYPOTHESIS: For all $2 \leq n' < n$, every strategy-proof marginal rule $f^{s'} : [\mathbb{D}^s]^{n'} \rightarrow A^s$ behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$.

We henceforth fix a strategy-proof marginal rule $f^s : [\mathbb{D}^s]^n \rightarrow A^s$, and show that f^s behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle \underline{x}^s, \overline{x}^s \rangle$. Given arbitrary $i \in N$, we combine all voters other than i as one, say voter j , and then induce a two-voter marginal SCF $h_i^s(P_i^s, P_j^s) = f^s(P_i^s, P_j^s, \dots, P_j^s)$ for all $P_i^s, P_j^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$. It is clear that h_i^s inherits unanimity and strategy-proofness from f^s , and hence by statement (a) behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$: either voter i or j dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_i^s . The claim below addresses a deeper relation between h_i^s and f^s .

CLAIM 1: If voter i dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_i^s , then voter i dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s .

Suppose not, i.e., there exists $P^s \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^n$ such that $r_1(P_1^s), \dots, r_1(P_n^s) \in \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ and $f^s(P^s) \neq r_1(P_i^s)$. For notational convenience, let $r_1(P_i^s) = a_{\overline{k}}^s$ and $f^s(P^s) = a_v^s$. By minimal richness, we fix a marginal preference $\hat{P}_j^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_j^s) = a_v^s$. Immediately, by strategy-proofness, we know $h_i^s(P_i^s, \hat{P}_j^s) = f^s(P_i^s, \hat{P}_j^s, \dots, \hat{P}_j^s) = a_v^s \neq a_{\overline{k}}^s$. Then, to be consistent with voter i 's dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_i^s , it must be the case that $a_v^s \notin \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$. Recall that $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ is a combination of the line $(a_1^s, \dots, a_{\underline{k}}^s)$, the connected subgraph $G_{\approx}^{(a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s)}$ that has no leaf, and the line $(a_{\overline{k}}^s, \dots, a_{|A^s|}^s)$. Hence, there must exist a path $\pi = (x_1^s, \dots, x_\ell^s)$ in $G_{\approx}^{A^s}$ such that $\ell \geq 3$, $x_1^s, x_2^s \in \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$, $a_{\overline{k}}^s \in \{x_1^s, x_2^s\}$ and $a_v^s = x_\ell^s$. By voter i 's dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_i^s , we first have $h_i^s((x_1^s \dots), (x_2^s \dots)) = x_1^s$. Then, along the path π , by statement (i) of Lemma 8, we have $h_i^s((x_1^s \dots), (x_\ell^s \dots)) = x_1^s$ and $h_i^s((x_2^s \dots), (x_\ell^s \dots)) = x_2^s$, which imply $h_i^s(P_i^s, \hat{P}_j^s) = a_{\overline{k}}^s$ - a contradiction. This completes the verification of the claim.

Next, we fix voters 1 and 2, and clone them to construct a marginal SCF $g^s(P_1^s, P_{-\{1,2\}}^s) = f^s(P_1^s, P_1^s, P_{-\{1,2\}}^s)$ for all $P_1^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ and $P_{-\{1,2\}}^s \in [\mathbb{D}^s]^{n-2}$. It is evident that g^s inherits unanimity and strategy-proofness from f^s , and hence by the induction hypothesis behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$. Thus, there are two cases: (1) some voter $o \in \{3, \dots, n\}$ dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at g^s , and (2) voter 1 dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at g^s .

CLAIM 2: In case (1), voter o dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s .

By voter o 's dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at g^s , we know $h_o^s(P_o^s, P_j^s) = f^s(P_o^s, P_j^s, \dots, P_j^s) = g^s\left(\frac{P_j^s}{\text{voter } 1}, \frac{P_j^s}{\text{voters } 3, \dots, o-1}, P_o^s, \frac{P_j^s}{\text{voters } o+1, \dots, n}\right)$ for all $P_o^s, P_j^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ with $r_1(P_o^s), r_1(P_j^s) \in \langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$. This indicates that voter o dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_o^s . Then, by Claim 1, voter o dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s . This completes the verification of the claim.

Henceforth, we assume that case (2) occurs. Thus, voter 1 dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at g^s . Recall that $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle}$ is connected subgraph and has no leaf. Then, there must exist a cycle $\mathcal{C} := (x_1^s, \dots, x_v^s)$ in $G_{\approx}^{\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle}$, i.e., $v \geq 3$, $x_k^s \approx x_{k+1}^s$ for all $k = 1, \dots, v-1$, and $x_v^s \approx x_1^s$. For the next two claims, we fix a marginal preference $P_3^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(P_3^s) = x_v^s$.

CLAIM 3: For all $k = 1, \dots, v-1$, we have either $f^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k+1}^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$, or $f^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k+1}^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{k+1}^s$.

Since $x_k^s \approx x_{k+1}^s$, we have $\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_1^s) = r_2(\hat{P}_2^s) = x_k^s$, $r_1(\hat{P}_2^s) = r_2(\hat{P}_1^s) = x_{k+1}^s$ and $r_\ell(\hat{P}_1^s) = r_\ell(\hat{P}_2^s)$ for all $\ell \in \{3, \dots, |A^s|\}$. Then, by voter 1's dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at g^s , we have $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_1^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = g^s(\hat{P}_1^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$ and $f^s(\hat{P}_2^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = g^s(\hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{k+1}^s$. Immediately, by strategy-proofness, $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_1^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$ implies $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) \in \{x_k^s, x_{k+1}^s\}$. We first assume $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$, and show $f^s((x_k^s \cdots), (x_{k+1}^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$. Given arbitrary $P_1^s, P_2^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ with $r_1(P_1^s) = x_k^s$ and $r_1(P_2^s) = x_{k+1}^s$, we claim $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) \in \{x_k^s, x_{k+1}^s\}$. Suppose not, i.e., $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = z^s \notin \{x_k^s, x_{k+1}^s\}$. By voter 1's dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at g^s , we first have $f^s(P_2^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = g^s(P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{k+1}^s$. Consequently, since $x_{k+1}^s \hat{P}_1^s z^s$, voter 1 will manipulate at $(\hat{P}_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s)$ via P_2^s . Hence, $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) \in \{x_k^s, x_{k+1}^s\}$. If $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{k+1}^s$, voter 2 will manipulate at $(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s)$ via P_2^s . Hence, we have $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$, which then by strategy-proofness implies $f^s(P_1^s, P_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_k^s$, as required. Symmetrically, if $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{k+1}^s$, we have $f^s((x_1^s \cdots), (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{k+1}^s$. This completes the verification of the claim.

CLAIM 4: Either voter 1 or 2 dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s .

Now, by Claim 3, we clearly know that either $f^s((x_1^s \cdots), (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_1^s$, or $f^s((x_1^s \cdots), (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_2^s$ holds. First, let $f^s((x_1^s \cdots), (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_2^s$. We claim that voter 2 dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\overline{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s . Since $x_1^s \approx x_v^s$, we have $\hat{P}_1^s, \tilde{P}_1^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$

such that $r_1(\hat{P}_1^s) = r_2(\tilde{P}_1^s) = x_1^s$, $r_1(\tilde{P}_1^s) = r_2(\hat{P}_1^s) = x_v^s$ and $r_\ell(\hat{P}_1^s) = r_\ell(\tilde{P}_1^s)$ for all $\ell \in \{3, \dots, |A^s|\}$. Clearly, $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_2^s$. Then, by strategy-proofness, we have $f^s(\tilde{P}_1^s, (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_2^s$. Now, we refer to the strategy-proof marginal rule h_2^s which behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$. We claim that voter 2 dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_2^s . Otherwise, we have $f^s(P_3^s, (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = h_2^s((x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s) = x_v^s$, and then $f^s(\tilde{P}_1^s, (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_v^s$ by strategy-proofness - a contradiction. Hence, voter 2 dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_2^s , and furthermore by Claim 1, also dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s .

In the rest of the proof, we assume $f^s((x_1^s \cdots), (x_2^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_1^s$. We first claim $f^s((x_2^s \cdots), (x_3^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_2^s$. Suppose that it is not true. Then, by Claim 3, we have $f^s((x_2^s \cdots), (x_3^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_3^s$. Since $x_1^s \approx x_2^s$ and $x_2^s \approx x_3^s$, we have $\hat{P}_1^s, \tilde{P}_1^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_1^s) = r_2(\tilde{P}_1^s) = x_1^s$, $r_1(\tilde{P}_1^s) = r_2(\hat{P}_1^s) = x_2^s$ and $r_\ell(\hat{P}_1^s) = r_\ell(\tilde{P}_1^s)$ for all $\ell \in \{3, \dots, |A^s|\}$, and $\hat{P}_2^s, \tilde{P}_2^s \in \mathbb{D}^s$ such that $r_1(\hat{P}_2^s) = r_2(\tilde{P}_2^s) = x_2^s$, $r_1(\tilde{P}_2^s) = r_2(\hat{P}_2^s) = x_3^s$ and $r_\ell(\hat{P}_2^s) = r_\ell(\tilde{P}_2^s)$ for all $\ell \in \{3, \dots, |A^s|\}$. Clearly, $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_1^s$ and $f^s(\tilde{P}_1^s, \tilde{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_3^s$. Then, by strategy-proofness, we have $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \tilde{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \hat{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_1^s$ and $f^s(\hat{P}_1^s, \tilde{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = f^s(\tilde{P}_1^s, \tilde{P}_2^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_3^s$ - a contradiction. Therefore, it is true that $f^s((x_2^s \cdots), (x_3^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_2^s$. Following the path (x_2^s, \dots, x_v^s) and applying a symmetric argument step by step, we eventually have $f^s((x_{v-1}^s \cdots), (x_v^s \cdots), P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{v-1}^s$. Consequently, by referring to the strategy-proof marginal rule h_1^s which behaves like a dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$, we have $h_1^s((x_{v-1}^s \cdots), P_3^s) = f^s((x_{v-1}^s \cdots), P_3^s, P_3^s, \dots, P_3^s) = x_{v-1}^s$, which indicates voter 1's dictatorship on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$ at h_1^s . Hence, by Claim 1, voter 1 also dictates on $\langle a_{\underline{k}}^s, a_{\bar{k}}^s \rangle$ at f^s . This completes the verification of the claim, and hence proves the Ramification Theorem. \square