

Vote trading and subset sums

Citation for published version (APA):

Bervoets, S., Merlin, V., & Woeginger, G. (2015). Vote trading and subset sums. *Operations Research Letters*, 43(1), 99-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2014.12.007>

DOI:

[10.1016/j.orl.2014.12.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2014.12.007)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2015

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.



Vote trading and subset sums



Sebastian Bervoets^a, Vincent Merlin^{b,a}, Gerhard J. Woeginger^{c,*}

^a CNRS, Marseille, France

^b Université de Caen, France

^c Department of Mathematics, TU Eindhoven, Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 September 2014

Received in revised form

6 November 2014

Accepted 8 December 2014

Available online 17 December 2014

Keywords:

Vote swapping

Vote trading

Manipulation

Subset sum problem

ABSTRACT

We analyze the complexity of vote trading problems with equal-sized voting districts. For two allied vote-swapping parties, the problem is polynomially solvable. For three parties, the problem is NP-complete.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In the 2000 presidential elections in the USA, the essential decision was to be made between the Republican candidate George W. Bush (the incumbent governor of Texas and son of former president George Bush) and the Democratic candidate Al Gore (the incumbent Vice President). There also was a third candidate, the Green Party nominee Ralph Nader, but he was a clear outsider and in the end received less than 3% of the total votes. (We remind the reader that in US presidential elections the country is divided up into states each with a certain number of electoral votes. The number of electoral votes in a state is roughly proportional to a state's population. The candidate who wins most of a state's popular votes wins all of this state's electoral votes. The candidate who wins a majority of the electoral votes wins the election.)

Now the 2000 presidential elections were expected to be very close between Gore and Bush, as they both attracted similar numbers of voters in the polls leading up to the election. Since Gore and Nader had similar political positions, the supporters of Gore were concerned that Nader was potentially taking votes away from Gore in swing states and that Gore could thus lose the election because of the presence of Nader. Therefore *vote trading* was introduced, an Internet mechanism with the idea that Gore should

become stronger in states where this would help him, while Nader should become stronger in states where this would not hurt Gore. The mechanism paired up Gore supporters in states that strongly favored Bush with Nader supporters in states where Gore and Bush were close. Each pair would agree to swap votes: the Gore supporter would vote for Nader and the Nader supporter would vote for Gore. In this way Gore would have a better chance to win in closely contested states, while Nader would still get the same number of votes nationally, which was important to him for future funding. As this mechanism preserves the total number of votes received by both candidates across states, it was attractive to electors and has also been implemented since in subsequent elections.

This vote trading mechanism raises a number of ethical issues that are discussed for instance by Randazza [8], Hartvigsen [6] and Bervoets and Merlin [2]. Bervoets and Merlin [1] perform an axiomatic analysis of the problem of vote trading, as well as of the closely related problem of gerrymandering. On the algorithmic side, vote trading triggers the investigation of optimal strategies for the involved candidates. Hartvigsen [5] presents a mathematical model for vote trading problems and analyzes a variety of algorithmic and combinatorial concepts in this area. In particular, Hartvigsen establishes the NP-hardness of optimal vote trading in the case where two allied parties *B* and *C* are swapping votes with the goal of weakening a third party *A* and where different voting districts may have different sizes. (This last assumption on the district sizes is open to criticism, as voting districts are usually designed to be of equal size.)

Our contribution. In this short technical note, we discuss vote trading in the cases where all the voting districts are of identical

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: Sebastian.Bervoets@univmed.fr (S. Bervoets), Vincent.Merlin@unicaen.fr (V. Merlin), gwoegi@win.tue.nl (G.J. Woeginger).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2014.12.007>

0167-6377/© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

size. We show that then the best vote trading can be found in polynomial time, if there are only two allied parties that are swapping votes; note that this result is in contrast to the result with arbitrarily sized districts of Hartvigsen [5]. For three allied parties, however, also the problem with identical sized districts becomes NP-complete. Our results draw a sharp separation line between easy and hard cases. Furthermore, they yield yet another example for Lawler's mystical power of twoness; see Lenstra [7].

The note is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses a variant of the classical subset sum problem, and identifies a polynomially solvable special case of this variant. Section 3 establishes a connection between vote swapping with two allied parties (and equal-sized voting districts) and the subset sum variant from Section 2; this connection yields the polynomial time result. Section 4 establishes NP-hardness of vote swapping with three allied parties (and equal-sized voting districts).

2. A subset sum variant

Subset sum problems are centered around n items with positive integer sizes u_1, \dots, u_n , and ask certain questions about the values attained by $u(I) := \sum_{i \in I} u_i$ as I ranges over the item subsets $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$. As a rule of thumb, subset sum problems are computationally intractable. For example, the problem of deciding whether $u(I)$ attains all integer values between two given bounds V^- and V^+ is Π_2^P -complete; see Eggermont and Woeginger [3]. As another example, the problem of deciding whether $u(I)$ attains some concrete given integer goal value V is NP-complete; see Garey and Johnson [4]. This latter example with goal value V constitutes the classical SUBSET-SUM problem, which plays a fundamental and prominent role in the area of combinatorial optimization.

In general, we should not expect to find simple certificates for NO-instances of SUBSET-SUM that are easy to verify (as this would imply $\text{NP} = \text{coNP}$). But for certain well-behaved special cases the NO-instances are easy to recognize. For example, if all the item sizes u_1, \dots, u_n are even while the goal value V is odd, then the answer certainly must be NO. For another example, if the sum of the largest three values among u_1, \dots, u_n is strictly smaller than V while the sum of the smallest four values among u_1, \dots, u_n is strictly larger than V , then the answer also must be NO. In the rest of this section, we will consider the following subset sum variant and we will identify a polynomially solvable special case that is centered around this latter observation.

Problem: SUBSET-SUM INTERVAL

Instance: Items with positive integer sizes u_1, \dots, u_n ; two integers $V^- \leq V^+$.

Question: Does there exist $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $V^- \leq u(I) \leq V^+$?

Note that for $V^- = V^+$, problem SUBSET-SUM INTERVAL boils down to problem SUBSET-SUM; consequently SUBSET-SUM INTERVAL is NP-complete.

Lemma 2.1. *The special case of SUBSET-SUM INTERVAL with*

$$V^+ - V^- \geq \max_{i=1}^n u_i - \min_{i=1}^n u_i \quad (1)$$

is polynomially solvable.

Proof. First renumber the items so that $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_n$ holds. For $1 \leq p \leq n$ define $S_p^{\min} = \sum_{i=1}^p u_i$ and $S_p^{\max} = \sum_{i=n-p+1}^n u_i$ as the sum of the p smallest respectively the p largest items; furthermore let $S_0^{\max} = -\infty$ and $S_{n+1}^{\min} = +\infty$. Consider the following polynomial time algorithm:

- Determine the largest index r ($0 \leq r \leq n$) for which $S_r^{\max} < V^-$.
- If $V^+ < S_{r+1}^{\min}$ then output NO, and otherwise output YES.

First assume that the algorithm outputs NO, so that $S_r^{\max} < V^- \leq V^+ < S_{r+1}^{\min}$ holds. Note that any set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ with cardinality $|I| \leq r$ satisfies $u(I) \leq S_r^{\max} < V^-$, and that any set I with cardinality $|I| > r$ satisfies $u(I) \geq S_{r+1}^{\min} > V^+$. Hence there is no I with $V^- \leq u(I) \leq V^+$, and the output of the algorithm is correct.

Next assume that the algorithm outputs YES. This implies $r + 1 \leq n$, and also $V^- \leq S_{r+1}^{\max}$ and $S_{r+1}^{\min} \leq V^+$. If $S_{r+1}^{\min} \geq V^-$ then the set $I = \{1, \dots, r + 1\}$ constitutes a feasible solution, and if $S_{r+1}^{\max} \leq V^+$ then the set $I = \{n - r + 1, \dots, n\}$ constitutes a feasible solution. It remains to consider the cases with

$$S_{r+1}^{\min} < V^- \leq V^+ < S_{r+1}^{\max}.$$

We start with the set $I = \{1, \dots, r + 1\}$ that contains the $r + 1$ smallest items, and then step by step replace some item by a larger one. Every step raises $u(I)$ by at most $\max_i u_i - \min_i u_i$, so that by (1) the value $u(I)$ eventually must fall between the bounds V^- and V^+ . Hence also in this case, the output of the algorithm is correct. \square

3. The vote trading problem

In this section, we discuss the following special case of vote trading with three political parties A, B, C and with m equal-sized voting districts. The number of voters in the i th district that respectively vote for A, B, C is denoted by a_i, b_i, c_i . As all voting districts have equal size s , we have $a_i + b_i + c_i = s$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Every district is won by the party that receives the relative majority of votes. For the sake of simplicity we assume that ties are always broken to the disadvantage of party A ; therefore party A wins the i th district if and only if $a_i > \max\{b_i, c_i\}$ holds.

The question is whether parties B and C can repartition their votes such that they reach the relative majority in at least k of the districts. This reflects the specific situation of the US presidential elections (involving Bush, Gore, and Nader) as discussed at the beginning of this paper: one might be pretty sure that even after vote trading between B and C (Gore and Nader) only one of B and C (Gore) will win any district. Under this assumption, keeping A below 50% will do the job. Here is a formal description of this question.

Problem: VOTE TRADING

Instance: Non-negative integers $a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_m$, and c_1, \dots, c_m with $a_i + b_i + c_i = s$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$; an integer k .

Question: Do there exist non-negative integers b'_1, \dots, b'_m and c'_1, \dots, c'_m , with $\sum_{i=1}^m b'_i = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i$, and $\sum_{i=1}^m c'_i = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i$, and $b'_i + c'_i = b_i + c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that the following holds: there exists an index set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $|I| = k$, such that $a_i \leq \max\{b'_i, c'_i\}$ for all $i \in I$?

For later reference, we note that $a_i + b_i + c_i = s$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^m a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i + \sum_{i=1}^m c_i = ms. \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, we will assume without loss of generality that the numbering of the districts satisfies

$$a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_{m-1} \leq a_m. \quad (3)$$

Under (3) it is straightforward to see that parties B and C can win k districts if and only if they can win the first k districts. Finally, we

will assume that

$$a_k \leq s/2. \quad (4)$$

Note that whenever (4) is violated with $a_k > s/2$, there is no way for parties B and C to win the districts k, \dots, m ; hence in these cases the answer to VOTE TRADING is trivially negative.

Lemma 3.1. *An instance of VOTE TRADING has answer YES, if and only if there exists a set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that*

$$-ms + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \leq \sum_{i \in I} a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i. \quad (5)$$

Proof. For the only-if part, assume that the VOTE TRADING instance has answer YES. Consider the corresponding integers b'_1, \dots, b'_m and c'_1, \dots, c'_m for which parties B and C win the first k districts. Define I as the set of all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ with $b'_i \geq c'_i$, and define $J = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus I$. Then $a_i \leq b'_i$ for $i \in I$ yields $\sum_{i \in I} a_i \leq \sum_{i \in I} b'_i$, which implies the right hand inequality in (5). Similarly, $a_i \leq c'_i$ for $i \in J$ yields $\sum_{i \in J} a_i \leq \sum_{i \in J} c'_i$ and consequently

$$\sum_{i \in J} a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^m c_i. \quad (6)$$

By using (2) and $\sum_{i=1}^k a_i = \sum_{i \in I} a_i + \sum_{i \in J} a_i$, inequality (6) can be rewritten into the left hand inequality in (5).

For the if part, consider a set $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ that satisfies (5). For $i \in I$, we initialize $b'_i := a_i$ and for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus I$ we initialize $c'_i := a_i$. The right hand inequality in (5) yields that after this initialization the sum of all b'_i is at most $\sum_{i=1}^m b_i$, while the left hand inequality in (5) yields that the sum of all c'_i is at most $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i$. We then increase the values b'_i and c'_i appropriately so that they satisfy the constraints $\sum_{i=1}^m b'_i = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i$, $\sum_{i=1}^m c'_i = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i$, and $b'_i + c'_i = b_i + c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. \square

Theorem 3.2. *The VOTE TRADING problem with two allied political parties and equal-sized voting districts is polynomially solvable.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, VOTE TRADING is a special case of SUBSET-SUM INTERVAL with k items of size a_1, \dots, a_k . The bounds are $V^- = -ms + \sum_{i=1}^k a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i$ and $V^+ = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i$, the smallest item size is a_1 and the largest item size is a_k . From (3) and (4) we derive the upper bounds $a_i \leq s/2$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $a_i \leq s$ for $k+1 \leq i \leq m$. This yields

$$ms = 2k \frac{s}{2} + (m-k)s \geq \left(a_1 + 2 \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} a_i + 3a_k \right) + \sum_{i=k+1}^m a_i. \quad (7)$$

Since (7) is equivalent to the condition $V^+ - V^- \geq \max_i a_i - \min_i a_i$ in (1), the polynomial time result now follows from Lemma 2.1. \square

4. A hardness result

Finally, let us discuss the generalization of the above VOTE TRADING problem to four political parties A, B, C, D in an odd number $2m-1$ of equal-sized voting districts. In the i th district ($1 \leq i \leq 2m-1$) there are a_i votes for party A , and parties B, C, D have respectively T_B, T_C, T_D votes at their disposal that they may repartition. Since every district has exactly s voters, these numbers are assumed to satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} a_i + T_B + T_C + T_D = (2m-1)s. \quad (8)$$

Parties B, C, D are plotting up against party A , and their goal is to reach the relative majority in at least m of the $2m-1$ districts. Formally, the problem is to decide whether there exist non-negative integers b_i, c_i, d_i with $\sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} b_i = T_B$, $\sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} c_i = T_C$, $\sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} d_i = T_D$, and with $a_i + b_i + c_i + d_i = s$ in all districts, and $a_i \leq \max\{b_i, c_i, d_i\}$ in at least m of the districts?

We establish NP-hardness of this four party variant, by means of a reduction from the NP-complete PARTITION problem; see Garey and Johnson [4].

Problem: PARTITION

Instance: Positive integers u_1, \dots, u_{2n} that satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{2n} u_i = 2U$, and $u_i \leq U$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$.

Question: Does there exist $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $|I| = n$ and $u(I) = U$?

Theorem 4.1. *The vote trading problem with three allied political parties and equal-sized voting districts is NP-complete.*

Proof. From an instance of PARTITION, we construct $4n-1$ equal-sized voting districts with $s = (8n+2)U$ voters. In the i th district, we define $a_i = 4nU + u_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ and $a_i = s$ for $2n+1 \leq i \leq 4n-1$. Furthermore, we set $T_B = T_C = (4n^2+1)U$ and $T_D = (4n-4)U$. It is easily verified that these numbers satisfy (8). We claim that the considered PARTITION instance has answer YES, if and only if the constructed instance of vote trading allows parties B, C, D to win the first $2n$ districts.

Assume that parties B, C, D can indeed win the first $2n$ districts. As $a_i \geq 4nU > T_D$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, party D is not able to win any of these districts. As for winning $n+1$ districts against party A one needs more than $(n+1)4nU$ votes, parties B and C each must win precisely n districts. Since $T_B + T_C = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} a_i$, the i th district can only be won by B, C, D if (i) $a_i = b_i$ and $c_i = 0$ or if (ii) $a_i = c_i$ and $b_i = 0$. This implies that $I = \{i : a_i = b_i\}$ satisfies $|I| = n$ and $u(I) = U$.

Next assume that the PARTITION instance has a solution I with $|I| = n$ and $u(I) = U$. For $i \in I$ we set $b_i := a_i$; for $i \in \{1, \dots, 2n\} \setminus I$ we set $c_i := a_i$; and for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ we set $d_i := s - 2a_i$. All remaining values a_i, b_i, c_i are set to 0. With these settings, parties B, C, D will win the first $2n$ districts. \square

5. Final remarks

Our results precisely pinpoint the computational complexity of the considered vote trading problem: it is easy for $p = 2$ allied parties, and hard for $p \geq 3$ allied parties. If the number p of allied parties is fixed (and not part of the input), the problem can be solved in pseudo-polynomial time by a routine dynamic programming approach. If the number p is part of the input, the problem is strongly NP-hard. This can be proved by a reduction from the strongly NP-hard THREE PARTITION problem [4]; as the arguments are very similar to those in Section 4, we leave all details to the reader.

Acknowledgments

Part of this work was started during the Schloss Dagstuhl seminar 12101 on ‘‘Computation and Incentives in Social Choice’’. We are grateful to the organizers of this meeting and to the Dagstuhl staff for providing a stimulating atmosphere.

Gerhard Woeginger acknowledges support by DIAMANT (a mathematics cluster of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research NWO), and by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, Bonn, Germany.

References

- [1] S. Bervoets, V. Merlin, Gerrymander-proof representative democracies, *Internat. J. Game Theory* 41 (2012) 473–488.
- [2] S. Bervoets, V. Merlin, Can we avoid vote swapping? Should we avoid vote swapping? Manuscript, 2014.
- [3] C. Eggermont, G.J. Woeginger, Motion planning with pulley, rope, and baskets, *Theory Comput. Syst.* 53 (2013) 569–582.
- [4] M.R. Garey, D.S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, Freeman, San Francisco, 1979.
- [5] D. Hartvigsen, Vote trading in public elections, *Math. Social Sci.* 52 (2006) 31–48.
- [6] D. Hartvigsen, The manipulation of voting systems, *J. Bus. Ethics* 80 (2008) 13–21.
- [7] J.K. Lenstra, The mystical power of twoness: in memoriam Eugene L. Lawler, *J. Sched.* 1 (1998) 3–14.
- [8] M.J. Randazza, The constitutionality of online vote swapping, *Loyola Los Angeles Law Rev.* 34 (2001) 1297–1337.