

The Complexity of Determining the Necessary and Possible Top- k Winners in Partial Voting Profiles

Aviram Imber , Benny Kimelfeld

Technion – Israel Institute of Technology

{aviram.imber, bennyk}@cs.technion.ac.il

Abstract

When voter preferences are known in an incomplete (partial) manner, winner determination is commonly treated as the identification of the necessary and possible winners; these are the candidates who win in all completions or at least one completion, respectively, of the partial voting profile. In the case of a positional scoring rule, the winners are the candidates who receive the maximal total score from the voters. Yet, the outcome of an election might go beyond the absolute winners to the top- k winners, as in the case of committee selection, primaries of political parties, and ranking in recruiting. We investigate the computational complexity of determining the necessary and possible top- k winners over partial voting profiles. Our results apply to general classes of positional scoring rules and focus on the cases where k is given as part of the input and where k is fixed.

1 Introduction

A central task in social choice is that of *winner determination*—how to aggregate the candidate preferences of voters to select the winner. Relevant scenarios may be political elections, document rankings in search engines, hiring dynamics in the job market, decision making in multiagent systems, determination of outcomes in sports tournaments, and so on [Brandt *et al.*, 2016]. Different voting rules can be adopted for this task. The computational social-choice community has studied in depth the family of the *positional scoring rules*, where each voter assigns to each candidate a score based on the candidate’s position in the voter’s ranking, and then a winner is a candidate who receives the maximal sum of scores. Famous instantiations of the positional scoring rules include the plurality rule (where a winner is most frequently ranked first), the veto rule (where a winner is least frequently ranked last), their generalizations to t -approval and t -veto, respectively, and the Borda rule (where the score is the actual position in the reverse order).

The seminal work of Konczak and Lang [2005] has addressed the situation where voter preferences are expressed or known in just a partial manner. The framework is based on the notions of the *necessary winners* and *possible winners*, who

are the candidates that win in every completion, or at least one completion, respectively, of the given partial preferences into complete ones. More precisely, a voting profile consists of a partial order for each voter, and a completion consists of a linear extension for each of the partial orders. Determining the necessary and possible winners is computationally challenging since, conceptually, it involves reasoning about the entire (exponential-size) space of such completions. The complexity of these problems has been thoroughly studied in a series of publications that established a full classification of a general class of positional scoring rules (the “pure” scoring rules) into tractable and intractable ones [Betzler and Dorn, 2010; Xia and Conitzer, 2011; Baumeister and Rothe, 2012].

The outcome of an election often goes beyond the single winner to the set of top- k winners. For example, the top- k winners might be the elected parliament members, the entries of the first page of the search engine, the job candidates to recruit, and the finalists of a sports competition. In the case of a positional scoring rule, the top- k winners are the candidates who receive the top scores (under some tie-breaking mechanism) [Meir *et al.*, 2008]. Adopting the framework of Konczak and Lang [2005], in this paper we investigate the computational complexity of determining the necessary and possible top- k winners for incomplete voting profiles and positional scoring rules.

We show that the top- k variant makes the problems fundamentally harder than their top-1 counterparts (necessary and possible winners) when k is given as input. For example, it is known that detecting the possible winners is NP-hard for every pure rule, with the exception of plurality and veto where the problem is solvable in polynomial time [Betzler and Dorn, 2010; Xia and Conitzer, 2011; Baumeister and Rothe, 2012]; we show that in the case of top- k , the problem is NP-hard for *every* pure rule, *including plurality and veto*. Moreover, tractability of the necessary winners *does not* extend to the necessary top- k winners: we show that the detecting whether a candidate is necessarily a top- k winner is coNP-complete for a quite general class of positional scoring rules that include all of the aforementioned ones. We also study the impact of fixing k and establish a more positive picture: detecting the necessary top- k winners is tractable (assuming that the scores are polynomial in the number of candidates) and detecting the possible the top- k winners is tractable for plurality and veto.

The concept of the top- k winners can be viewed as a special case of *multiwinner election* that has been studied mostly in the context of *committee selection*. Various utilities have been studied for qualifying selected committee, such as maximizing the number of voters with approved candidates [Aziz *et al.*, 2015] and, in that spirit, the Condorcet committees [Elkind *et al.*, 2011; Darmann, 2013], aiming at proportional representation via frameworks such as Chamberlin and Courant’s [1983] and Monroe’s [1995], and the satisfaction of fairness and diversity constraints [Celis *et al.*, 2018; Brederick *et al.*, 2018].

In the case of incomplete voter preferences, the generalization of the problem we study is that of detecting the *necessary and possible committee members*. These are interesting and challenging problems in all the variants of committee selection, and we leave them for future investigation. Note, however, that the problem of determining the elected committee can be intractable even if the preferences are complete [Procaccia *et al.*, 2007; Procaccia *et al.*, 2008; Darmann, 2013; Skowron *et al.*, 2015], in contrast to the top- k winners. Yet, we show that our results imply the tractability of determining whether a candidate set is a necessary or possible Condorcet committee in the case of the plurality and veto rules. The problem of multiwinner determination for incomplete votes has been studied by Lu and Boutilier [2013] in a perspective different from the necessary and possible top- k winners: find a committee that minimizes the maximum objection (or “regret”) over all possible completions.

2 Preliminaries

We begin with some notation and terminology.

Voting Profiles and Positional Scoring Rules. Let $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ be the set of *candidates* (or *alternatives*) and let $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ be the set of *voters*. A *voting profile* $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ consists of n linear orders on C , where each T_i represents the ranking of C by v_i .

A *positional scoring rule* r is a series $\{\vec{s}_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ of m -dimensional vectors $\vec{s}_m = (\vec{s}_m(1), \dots, \vec{s}_m(m))$ where $\vec{s}_m(1) \geq \dots \geq \vec{s}_m(m)$ and $\vec{s}_m(1) > \vec{s}_m(m)$. We denote $\vec{s}_m(j)$ by $r(m, j)$. Some examples of positional scoring rules include the *plurality* rule $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$, the *t -approval* rule $(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ that begins with t ones, the *veto* rule $(1, \dots, 1, 0)$, the *t -veto* rule that ends with t zeros, and the *Borda* rule $(m-1, m-2, \dots, 0)$.

Given a voting profile $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$, the score $s(T_i, c, r)$ that the voter v_i contributes to the candidate c is $r(m, j)$ where j is the position of c in T_i . The score of c in \mathbf{T} is $s(\mathbf{T}, c, r) = \sum_{i=1}^n s(T_i, c, r)$ or simply $s(\mathbf{T}, c)$ if r is clear from context. The *winners* (or *co-winners*) are the candidates c with a maximal $s(\mathbf{T}, c)$.

We make standard assumptions about the positional scoring rule r . We assume that $r(m, i)$ is computable in polynomial time in m . We also assume that the numbers in each \vec{s}_m are co-prime (i.e., their greatest common divisor is one).

A positional scoring rule is *pure* if \vec{s}_{m+1} is obtained from \vec{s}_m by inserting a score at some position, for all $m > 1$.

Partial Profiles. A *partial voting profile* $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ consists of n partial orders on set C of candidates, where each

P_i represents the incomplete preference of the voter v_i . A *completion* of $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ is a complete voting profile $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ where each T_i is a completion (i.e., linear extension) of the partial order P_i .

The problems of *necessary winners* and *possible winners* were introduced by Konczak and Lang [2005]. Given a partial voting profile \mathbf{P} , a candidate $c \in C$ is a *necessary winner* if c is a winner in every completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} , and c is a *possible winner* if there exists a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} where c is a winner. The decision problems associated to a positional scoring rule r are those of determining, given a partial profile \mathbf{P} and a candidate c , whether c is a necessary winner and whether c is a possible winner. We denote these problems by NW and PW, respectively. A classification of the complexity of these problems has been established in a sequence of publications.

Theorem 1 (Classification Theorem [Betzler and Dorn, 2010; Xia and Conitzer, 2011; Baumeister and Rothe, 2012]). *NW can be solved in polynomial time for every positional scoring rule. PW is solvable in polynomial time for plurality and veto; for all other pure scoring rules, it is NP-complete.*

In this paper, we aim towards generalizing the Classification Theorem to determine the necessary and possible *top- k winners*, as we formalize next.

Top- k Winners. In principle, a *top- k winner* is a candidate that is ranked at one of the top k places with respect to the sum of scores from the voters. However, for a precise definition, we need to reason about *ties*. One could adopt several options for being on the top- k winners: (a) w.r.t. *at least one* tie-breaking order; (b) w.r.t. *every* tie-breaking order; and (c) w.r.t. a tie-breaking order *given as input*. For simplicity of presentation, we adopt the third variation and assume that the tie-breaking order is given as input. Nevertheless, *all of our results hold for all three variations*.

Formally, let r be a positional scoring rule, C be a set of candidates, \mathbf{T} a voting profile, and \succ_{tie} a *tie breaker*, which is simply a linear order over C . Let $R_{\mathbf{T}}$ be the linear order on C that sorts the candidates lexicographically by their scores and then by \succ_{tie} ; that is,

$$R_{\mathbf{T}} := \{c_1 > c_2 : s(\mathbf{T}, c_1) > s(\mathbf{T}, c_2)\} \cup \{c_1 > c_2 : s(\mathbf{T}, c_1) = s(\mathbf{T}, c_2) \wedge c_1 \succ_{\text{tie}} c_2\}.$$

A candidate c is a *top- k winner* if the position of c in $R_{\mathbf{T}}$, denoted by $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c)$, is at most k . Note that a top-1 winner is necessarily a winner, but a winner might not be a top-1 winner due to tie breaking.

If \mathbf{T} is replaced with a partial voting profile \mathbf{P} , then a candidate c is a *necessary top- k winner* if c is a top- k winner in every completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} , and a *possible top- k winner* if c is a top- k winner in at least one completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} . Hence, for a positional scoring rule r , we have two computational problems where the input consists of a candidate set C , a partial profile \mathbf{P} , a tie breaker \succ_{tie} , a candidate c and a number k :

- In NTW, the goal is to determine whether c is a necessary top- k winner.
- In PTW, the goal is to determine whether c is a possible top- k winner.

We will also consider the versions where k is fixed, and then denote it by parameterizing the problem with k : $\text{NTW}\langle k \rangle$ and $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$

Additional Notation. We use the following notation. For a set A and a partition A_1, \dots, A_t of A :

- $P(A_1, \dots, A_t)$ denotes the partitioned partial order $P(A_1, \dots, A_t) := \{a_1 \succ \dots \succ a_t : \forall i \in [t], a_i \in A_i\}$.
- $O(A_1, \dots, A_t)$ denotes an arbitrary linear order on A that completes $P(A_1, \dots, A_t)$.

A linear order $a_1 \succ \dots \succ a_t$ is also denoted as a vector (a_1, \dots, a_t) . The *concatenation* $(a_1, \dots, a_t) \circ (b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$ is $(a_1, \dots, a_t, b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$.

3 Hardness of Top-k Winners

We first show that the problems we study are computationally hard for quite general classes of positional scoring rules.

3.1 Plurality and Veto

The following theorems state the hardness for the plurality and veto rules where both NW and PW are solvable in polynomial time (according to the Classification Theorem).

Theorem 2. *For the plurality rule, NTW is coNP-complete and PTW is NP-complete.*

Proof. Memberships in the corresponding classes (coNP and NP) are straightforward, so we prove only hardness. We show a reduction for each of the two problems.

NTW: We show a reduction from *exact cover by-3sets* (X3C), which is the following decision problem: Given a vertex set $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_{3q}\}$ and a collection E of 3-element subsets of U , can we cover all the elements of U using q pairwise-disjoint sets from E ? For $u \in U$, denote by $E(u)$ the set $\{e \in E : u \in e\}$ of edges incident to u .

Given U and E , we construct an instance $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ of NTW under the plurality rule where $C = E \cup \{c^*\}$, where $\succ_{\text{tie}} = O(E, \{c^*\})$, and where \mathbf{P} is the partial voting profile $(P_1, \dots, P_{3q}, T_{3q+1}, T_{3q+2}, T_{3q+3})$. For every $i \in [3q]$,

$$P_i = P(E(u), E \setminus E(u), \{c^*\}).$$

This means that the i th voter can vote only for edges that cover u_i . For $i > 3q$ the order is $T_i = O(\{c^*\}, E)$. To complete, we show that there is an exact cover if and only if c^* is not a necessary top- q winner.

Suppose that c^* is not a necessary top- q winner, that is, there are q candidates e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_q} and a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} such that $s(\mathbf{T}, e_{i_j}) \geq s(\mathbf{T}, c^*) = 3$ for all $j \in [q]$. Since every edge can get at most three votes, we get that $s(\mathbf{T}, e_{i_j}) = 3$ for every $j \in [q]$. Therefore e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_q} is an exact cover: every vertex u_i is covered by the edge that P_i voted for, and the edges are pairwise disjoint (since, if two edges are overlapping, then one gets at most two votes).

Conversely, given an X3C solution $Q = \{e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_q}\}$ define a profile $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_{3q+3})$ such that for every $i \in [3q]$ we have

$$T_i = O(Q \cap E(u_i), E(u_i) \setminus Q, E \setminus E(u_i), \{c^*\}).$$

Every T_i extends P_i , for all $e \in Q$ we have $s(\mathbf{T}, e) = 3$, and $s(\mathbf{T}, c^*) = 3$. Hence, all edges in Q defeat c^* , and c^* is not a top- q winner in \mathbf{T} .

PTW: We use a reduction from the *dominating set* problem, which is the following: Given an undirected graph $G = (U, E)$ and an integer k , is there a set $D \subseteq U$ of size k such that every vertex is either in D or adjacent to some vertex in D ? Given a graph (U, E) with $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$, we construct an instance $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ for PTW under plurality where $C = U \cup \{c^*\}$, where $\succ_{\text{tie}} = O(\{c^*\}, U)$, and where $P = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$. Let $N(u_i)$ be the set of neighbours of u_i , and let $N(u_i)^* = N(u_i) \cup \{u_i\}$. For all $i \in [n]$ we have

$$P_i := P(N(u_i)^*, U \setminus N(u_i)^*, \{c^*\}).$$

Hence, the i th voter can vote only for vertices that dominate u_i . To complete, we show that the graph has a dominating set of size k if and only if c^* is a possible top- k winner.

Suppose there is a dominating set D of size k , consider the profile $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ where for every $i \in [n]$,

$$T_i := O(N(u_i)^* \cap D, N(u_i)^* \setminus D, U \setminus N(u_i)^*, \{c^*\}).$$

In this completion, for each $u \notin D$ we get $s(\mathbf{T}, u) = 0$. These are $n - k$ candidates that c^* defeats, therefore c^* is a possible top- k winner. Conversely, if c^* is a possible top- k winner then in some completion \mathbf{T} it defeats at least $n - k$ candidates, and these candidates have a score 0 in \mathbf{T} . Let D be the set of candidates that c^* does not defeat in \mathbf{T} , all voters voted for candidates in D and $|D| \leq k$. A voter P_i can only vote for vertices which dominate u_i , hence D is a dominating set of size at most k . \square

Next, we show the hardness of NTW and PTW beyond the plurality rule. Given a binary positional scoring rule r , we define the *complementary-reversed* scoring rule, denoted r^R , to be the one given by $r^R(m, i) = 1 - r(m, m + 1 - i)$. For example, the complementary-reversed rule of plurality is veto, and more generally, the complementary-reversed rule of t -approval is t -veto.

Lemma 1. *For every binary positional scoring rule r , there is a reduction*

1. from NTW for r to the complement of PTW for r^R ;
2. from PTW for r to the complement of NTW for r^R .

Proof. For a partial order P_i , the *reversed order* is defined by $P_i^R := \{x \succ y : (y \succ x) \in P_i\}$. Note that T_i extends P_i if and only if T_i^R extends P_i^R .

Given $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ as input under r with $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$, consider $(C, \mathbf{P}', \succ_{\text{tie}}^R)$ under r^R where $\mathbf{P}' = (P_1^R, \dots, P_n^R)$. Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be a completion of \mathbf{P} , observe the completion $\mathbf{T}' = (T_1^R, \dots, T_n^R)$ of \mathbf{P}' . For every candidate c and a voter v_i we get $s(T_i^R, c, r^R) = 1 - s(T_i, c, r)$ so overall $s(\mathbf{T}', c, r^R) = n - s(\mathbf{T}, c, r)$. Since the tie-breaking order is also reversed, it holds that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}', c) = m + 1 - \text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c)$ for every $c \in C$. In same way, if \mathbf{T}' is a completion of \mathbf{P}' then by reversing the orders we get a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c) = m + 1 - \text{rank}(\mathbf{T}', c)$ for every $c \in C$. We can deduce that for any candidate c and integer k ,

1. c is not a necessary top- k winner w.r.t $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ and r (there exists a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c) > k$) if and only if c is a possible top- $(m-k)$ winner w.r.t $(C, \mathbf{P}', \succ_{\text{tie}}^R)$ and r^R (there exists a completion \mathbf{T}' of \mathbf{P}' such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}', c) \leq m + 1 - k$).
2. c is a possible top- k winner w.r.t $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ and r (there exists a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c) \leq k$) if and only if c is not a necessary top- $(m-k)$ winner w.r.t $(C, \mathbf{P}', \succ_{\text{tie}}^R)$ and r^R (there exists a completion \mathbf{T}' of \mathbf{P}' such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}', c) > m - k$).

From the above two points we conclude the two parts of the lemma, respectively. \square

Combining Lemma 1 and Theorem 2, we conclude that:

Theorem 3. *For the veto rule, NTW is coNP-complete and PTW is NP-complete.*

3.2 Beyond Plurality and Veto

What about positional scoring rules other than plurality and veto? For any other pure positional scoring rule, PW is NP-complete by the Classification Theorem, so PTW is also NP-complete (by choosing $k = 1$). Combining this observation with Theorems 2 and 3, we conclude that:

Corollary 1. PTW is NP-complete for every pure positional scoring rule.

While we do not have a full classification for NTW, we show the hardness of NTW under general conditions that include the commonly studied rules. First, we can deduce hardness for every pure positional scoring rule with binary scores. We already established hardness for plurality and veto in Theorems 2 and 3. For any other rule r in this class, PW is NP-complete for r^R (by the Classification Theorem), so a small change in the proof of Lemma 1 shows that NTW is coNP-complete for r . We conclude that:

Corollary 2. NTW is coNP-complete for every pure positional scoring rules with binary scores.

To discuss rules with scores beyond binary, we define the class of *polynomially frequent scoring rules* where some score occurs frequently in the scoring vector. All commonly studied rules fall under this definition, except for Borda.

Definition 1. A positional scoring rule r is *polynomially frequent* if there exists a score x and a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $|\{i : r(m, i) = x\}| = \Omega(m^\varepsilon)$.

Examples of polynomially frequent rules include t -approval (where $x = 0$) and t -veto (where $x = 1$). Another rule is $(2, 1, \dots, 1, 0)$ that has been studied in depth [Baumeister *et al.*, 2011]. This class strictly generalizes that of the *almost constant* scoring rules that has also been studied in the context of the complexity of winner determination [Kimelfeld *et al.*, 2018; Kenig and Kimelfeld, 2019].

We will prove that NTW is hard for all pure polynomially frequent scoring rules. For that, we need a definition and a lemma. Let r and r' be two positional scoring rules. We say that r' *polynomially contains* r if there exist a polynomial $p(m)$, an index $i_m \leq p(m) - m$ and two numbers $a_m > 0$

and b_m such that $r(m, j) = a_m \cdot r'(p(m), i_m + j) + b_m$ for all $m, j \in [m]$. For instance, t -approval polynomially contains plurality for every fixed t , by choosing $p(m) = m + t - 1$, $i_m = t - 1$, $a_m = 1$ and $b_m = 0$. Similarly, t -veto polynomially contains veto.

Lemma 2. *Let r and r' be two positional scoring rules. If r' polynomially contains r , then there is a reduction*

1. from NTW for r to NTW for r' ;
2. from PTW for r to PTW for r' .

Proof. Let $p(m)$, i_m , a_m , and b_m be the functions that realize the polynomial containment. Given $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ as input under r with $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$, consider the input $(C', \mathbf{P}', \succ'_{\text{tie}})$ under r' where:

- $C' = C \cup D_1 \cup D_2$ where D_1 and D_2 are disjoint sets of new candidates with $|D_1| = i_m$ and $|D_2| = p(m) - i_m - m$. Note that $|C'| = p(m)$.
- $\mathbf{P}' = (P'_1, \dots, P'_n)$ where, in each P'_j , the i_m highest-ranked candidates are the ones of D_1 , the $p(m) - i_m - m$ lowest-ranked candidates are the ones of D_2 , and between D_1 and D_2 the candidates of C are the same as in P_j . In our notation, $P'_j := P_j \cup P(D_1, C, D_2)$.
- In \succ'_{tie} , the i_m highest-ranked candidates are the ones of D_1 , the $p(m) - i_m - m$ lowest-ranked candidates are the ones of D_2 , and between D_1 and D_2 the candidates of C are the same as in \succ_{tie} . In our notation, $\succ'_{\text{tie}} = O(D_1) \circ \succ_{\text{tie}} \circ O(D_2)$.

Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be a completion of \mathbf{P} . Observe the completion $\mathbf{T}' = (T'_1, \dots, T'_n)$ of \mathbf{P}' where $T'_j = O(D_1) \circ T_j \circ O(D_2)$. Since r' polynomially contains r , for every $c \in C$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} s(\mathbf{T}', c, r') &= \sum_{j=1}^n s(T'_j, c, r') = \sum_{j=1}^n a_m \cdot s(T_j, c, r) + b_m \\ &= a_m \cdot s(\mathbf{T}, c, r) + nb_m. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the definition of \succ'_{tie} , the positions of the candidates satisfy $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}', c) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c) + i_m$. Conversely, let \mathbf{T}' be a completion of \mathbf{P}' . Every T'_j has to be of the form $O(D_1) \circ O(C) \circ O(D_2)$, so removing D_1 and D_2 from all the linear orders gives a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} such that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{T}, c) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{T}', c) - i_m$ for all $c \in C$. We conclude that for all $c \in C$ and k it holds that c is a necessary (resp., possible) top- k winner w.r.t. $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ and r if and only if c is a necessary (resp., possible) top- $(k + i_m)$ winner w.r.t. $(C', \mathbf{P}', \succ'_{\text{tie}})$ and r' . \square

Note that Lemma 2 can be applied for non-pure rules, so the second item can be used for rules not covered by Corollary 1. Consequently, we get the following general hardness.

Theorem 4. *NTW is coNP-complete for every pure polynomially frequent scoring rule.*

Proof. Let r be a pure polynomially frequent scoring rule, and denote r by $\{\vec{s}_m\}_{m>1}$. Let m' be the minimal m where x occurs in \vec{s}_m , and let j be the index of x in $\vec{s}_{m'}$. First, consider the case where $j > 1$, which means that $\vec{s}_{m'}$ contains

both x and a score greater than x . Since the rule is pure we can deduce that for every $m \geq m'$, \vec{s}_m also contains both x and a score greater than x . Then, there exists some score $y_m > x$ such that $\vec{s}_{O(m^{1/\varepsilon})}$ contains the vector (y_m, x, \dots, x) of length $m + 1$. Choosing $p(m) = O(m^{1/\varepsilon})$, i_m as the biggest index of y_m , $a_m = y_m - x$ and $b_m = x$ shows that, in this case, r polynomially contains plurality. The hardness results then follow from Theorem 2 and Lemma 2. Now consider the case where $j = 1$, hence for every $m \geq m'$, \vec{s}_m contains both x and a score smaller than x (since the rule is pure). Then, there exist some score $y_m < x$ such that $\vec{s}_{O(m^{1/\varepsilon})}$ contains the vector (x, \dots, x, y_m) of length $m + 1$. Choosing $p(m) = O(m^{1/\varepsilon})$, i_m as the smallest index of x , $a_m = x - y_m$, $b_m = y_m$ shows that in this case r polynomially contains veto. Hardness for r then follows from Theorem 3 and Lemma 2. \square

To complete the picture, we are still missing the complexity of the top- k winners for the (pure) positional scoring rules that are not polynomially frequent. An example that stands out is the Borda rule. This is left as an open direction for future investigation that we have found quite challenging. For the special case of Borda, we can prove the hardness of NTW.

Theorem 5. *NTW is coNP-complete for the Borda rule.*

The proof, discussed next, is nontrivial and heavily relies on the specific structure of this rule.

Proof of Theorem 5

We use the technique of *circular voting blocks* of Baumeister, Roos and Jörg [2011]. For a set $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_t\}$ and $i \in [t]$, the i th circular vote is

$$M_i(A) := (a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_t, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{i-1}).$$

We reduce from X3C as defined in the proof of Theorem 2. Given an X3C instance (U, E) with $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_{3q}\}$ and $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$, we construct an input $(C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}})$ for NTW under Borda. The candidates are $C = E \cup D \cup \{c^*\}$ where $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_{m-1}\}$ and $\succ_{\text{tie}} = O(E, \{c^*\}, D)$. The voting profile is the concatenation (union) $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^1 \circ \mathbf{T}^2 \circ \mathbf{T}^3$ of the three parts described next.

First, $\mathbf{P}^1 = (P_1^1, \dots, P_{3q}^1)$. For every $i \in [3q]$, only edges that cover u_i can receive a score of $2m - 1$. Edges that do not cover u_i can receive at most $m - 1$, and c^* receives 0. Formally, denote by $\deg(u_i) = |E(u_i)|$ the degree of u_i in the graph and let $D_{\leq j} = \{d_1, \dots, d_j\}$ and $D_{> j} = \{d_{j+1}, \dots, d_{m-1}\}$. We assume that $1 \leq \deg(u_i) \leq m - 1$, otherwise the problem is trivial. The partial order is $P_i^1 = P(E(u_i), D_{\leq m - \deg(u_i)}, D_{> m - \deg(u_i)} \cup (E \setminus E(u_i)), \{c^*\})$. Note that for every $e \in E \setminus E(u_i)$, the number of candidates ranked above e in P_i^1 is $|E(u_i)| + m - \deg(u_i) = m$, so indeed it receives a score of at most $m - 1$.

Second, \mathbf{T}^2 is composed of $S_{\text{cvr}} := 3(2m - 1) + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (m - i)$ copies of the profile (T_1^2, \dots, T_m^2) . For every $i \in [m]$ the order T_i^2 is constructed in the following way. Start with $M_i(E)$, then insert D and c^* such that the score of c^* is m and scores of $e_i, \dots, e_m, e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}$ are $2m - 1, 2m - 3, \dots, 5, 3, 0$ accordingly if m is even. If m is odd then the scores of the edges are the same as before but

with $m - 1$ instead of m and 1 instead of 0. Note that in both cases, the sum of the scores of the edges is the same.

Finally, \mathbf{T}^3 consists of $4(3q + S_{\text{cvr}})$ copies of the profile $(T_1^3, \dots, T_{m+1}^3)$. For this part only, denote $e_{m+1} = c^*$. For every $i \in [m + 1]$, $T_i^3 = M_i(\{e_1, \dots, e_{m+1}\}) \circ O(D)$.

We state some observations regarding the profile. In \mathbf{T}^2 , the score of c^* is

$$s(\mathbf{T}^2, c^*) = S_{\text{cvr}} \cdot s((T_1^2, \dots, T_m^2), c^*) = S_{\text{cvr}} \cdot m^2$$

For every $e \in E$, the score in \mathbf{T}^2 is

$$\begin{aligned} s(\mathbf{T}^2, e) &= S_{\text{cvr}} \sum_{i=2}^m (2i - 1) = S_{\text{cvr}} (m^2 - 1) \\ &= s(\mathbf{T}^2, c^*) - S_{\text{cvr}}. \end{aligned}$$

In \mathbf{T}^3 , for every $d \in D$, the score is

$$s(\mathbf{T}^3, d) \leq 4(3q + S_{\text{cvr}})(m + 1)(m - 2) \leq 4m^2(3q + S_{\text{cvr}})$$

For every $c \in C \setminus D$, the score in \mathbf{T}^3 is

$$\begin{aligned} s(\mathbf{T}^3, c) &= 4(3q + S_{\text{cvr}}) \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} (2m - i) \\ &= 2(3q + S_{\text{cvr}})(3m^2 + m - 2) \geq 6m^2(3q + S_{\text{cvr}}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every pair $d \in D, c \in C \setminus D$ it holds that $s(\mathbf{T}^3, c) - s(\mathbf{T}^3, d) \geq 2m^2(3q + S_{\text{cvr}})$. Let $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}^1 \circ \mathbf{T}^2 \circ \mathbf{T}^3$ be a completion of \mathbf{P} . For every pair $d \in D, c \in C \setminus D$, the score in $\mathbf{T}^1, \mathbf{T}^2$ satisfy $s(\mathbf{T}^1, d) - s(\mathbf{T}^1, c) < 6qm$ and $s(\mathbf{T}^2, d) - s(\mathbf{T}^2, c) < S_{\text{cvr}} \cdot 2m^2$ (by the definition of the Borda rule). Combining these two inequalities with what we showed for \mathbf{T}^3 , we can deduce that $s(\mathbf{T}, c) - s(\mathbf{T}, d) > 0$, which means that the candidates in $C \setminus D$ always defeat all candidates in D .

Claim 1. *If there is an X3C, then c^* is not a necessary top- q winner.*

Proof. Assume, w.l.o.g., that the exact cover is $Q = \{e_1, \dots, e_q\}$ and every edge in the cover is $e_i = \{i, q + i, 2q + i\}$. Define a completion $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}^1 \circ \mathbf{T}^2 \circ \mathbf{T}^3$, $\mathbf{T}^1 = (T_1^1, \dots, T_n^1)$. In \mathbf{T}^1 , every edge in the cover $e_i \in Q$ receives the following scores:

- e_i gets $2m - 1$ from $T_i^1, T_{q+i}^1, T_{2q+i}^1$, that is, e_i is placed at the top in the vertices which it covers.
- e_i gets $m - 1$ from the vertices of e_{i+1} , gets $m - 2$ from the vertices of e_{i+2} and so on (when we reach e_q we go to e_1 and continue until e_{i-1}). Note that in this way there is no vertex that should give the same score to two different edges, and since $q \leq m$ the range of scores e_i gets is $\{m - 1, m - 2, \dots, m - q + 1\} \subseteq \{m - 1, \dots, 1\}$ as required by the definition of \mathbf{P}^1 .

For every edge $e \in Q$, the total score in \mathbf{T}^1 is $s(\mathbf{T}^1, e) = 3(2m - 1) + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (m - i) = S_{\text{cvr}}$ and recall that $s(\mathbf{T}^1, c^*) = 0$. Combining this with what we already know for \mathbf{T}^2 and \mathbf{T}^3 implies that

$$s(\mathbf{T}, e) - s(\mathbf{T}, c^*) = S_{\text{cvr}} - S_{\text{cvr}} + 0 = 0.$$

All candidates in Q defeat c^* , hence c^* is not a necessary top- q winner. \square

Claim 2. *If c^* is not a necessary top- q -winner, then there is an X3C.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}^1 \circ \mathbf{T}^2 \circ \mathbf{T}^3$ be a completion where at least q candidates defeat c^* , let Q be the q highest rated candidates in T . The candidate c^* always defeats all candidates in D , hence $Q \subseteq E$. We show a lower bound and an upper bound on the total score of Q in \mathbf{T}^1 .

Lower bound. As we already showed, every $e \in Q$ should get $s(\mathbf{T}^1, e) \geq S_{\text{cvt}}$ in order to defeat c^* , therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in Q} s(\mathbf{T}^1, e) &\geq q \cdot S_{\text{cvt}} = 3q \cdot \left(2m - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} (m - i) \right) \\ &= 3mq^2 + 3mq - \frac{3q^3}{2} + \frac{3q^2}{2} - 3q \end{aligned}$$

Upper bound. For every $u \in U$ denote by $\deg_Q(u)$ the degree of u in the sub-graph induced by Q , then $\sum_{u \in U} \deg_Q(u) = 3q$. We get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{e \in Q} s(\mathbf{T}^1, e) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{3q} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\deg_Q(u_i)} (2m - j) + \sum_{j=1}^{q - \deg_Q(u_i)} (m - j) \right) \\ &= 3mq^2 + 3mq - \frac{3q^3}{2} + \frac{3q^2}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{3q} \deg_Q(u_i)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Overall, the two bounds imply that $\sum_{i=1}^{3q} \deg_Q(u_i)^2 \leq 3q$ and this is possible only if all the degrees are one: When all degrees are one, the sum is exactly $3q$. If we decrease $\deg_Q(u_i)$ to zero and increase $\deg_Q(u_j)$ to two, then the total sum increases by three. Any further changes cannot decrease the total sum. Therefore, all degrees in the sub-graphs induced by Q are one, and Q is an X3C. \square

3.3 Top- k Sets

We have shown hardness results for the necessary and possible top- k winners. Interestingly, we can retain the tractable cases of the necessary-winner and possible-winner problems for the variant of the problem where we are given a set $C' \subseteq C$ of k candidates, and the goal is to determine whether C' constitutes the exact set of top- k winners. We say that C' is a *necessary top- k set* if C' is the set of top- k winners in every completion, and a *possible top- k set* if C' is the set of top- k winners in at least one completion.

Theorem 6. *Let r be a positional scoring rule. We can determine in time $k \cdot \text{poly}(n, m)$:*

1. *whether a given candidate set is a necessary top- k set;*
2. *whether a given candidate set is a possible top- k set, assuming that r is either plurality or veto.*

Proof. For the first part of Theorem 6 (necessity), we only need to determine whether a candidate outside of C' can defeat a candidate from C' . This can be done using the algorithm of Xia and Conitzer [2011], with a minor adjustment to account for tie breaking.

For the second part (possibility), for every candidate $c' \in C'$ and every integer score $0 \leq s \leq n$ we use Lemma 5 (that we prove in the following section) to check if there exists a completion \mathbf{T} which satisfies the following conditions. First, $s(\mathbf{T}, c') = s$. Second, for every $c \in C' \setminus \{c'\}$, if $c \succ_{\text{tie}} c'$ then $s(\mathbf{T}, c) \geq s$, otherwise $s(\mathbf{T}, c) > s$. This means that all candidates in $C' \setminus \{c'\}$ defeat c' . Finally, For every $c \in C \setminus C'$, if $c' \succ_{\text{tie}} c$ then $s(\mathbf{T}, c) \leq s$, otherwise $s(\mathbf{T}, c) < s$. This means that c' defeats all candidates in $C \setminus C'$. C' is a possible top- k set if and only if such completion exists for some candidate $c' \in C'$ and score s . \square

Interestingly, for the plurality and veto rules, a set C' of candidates is a top- k set for at least one tie-breaking order if and only if C' is a *Condorcet committee* [Fishburn, 1981]. Then, by a simple adjustment of the proof of Theorem 6 we can conclude that, in the case of plurality and veto, one can determine in polynomial time whether a given candidate set is a necessary or possible Condorcet committee.

4 The Case of a Fixed k

In the previous section, we established that the problems of finding the necessary and possible top- k winners are very often intractable. In this section, we investigate the complexity of these problems under the assumption that k is fixed (and, in particular, can be the degree of the polynomial that bounds the running time). We will show that the complexity picture for $\text{NTW}\langle k \rangle$ and $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$ is way more positive, as we generalize the tractability of *almost* all of the tractable scoring rules for NW and PW. We will also generalize hardness results from PW to $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$; interestingly, this generalization turns out to be quite nontrivial.

4.1 Tractability of $\text{NTW}\langle k \rangle$

We first prove that $\text{NTW}\langle k \rangle$ is tractable for every positional scoring rule (pure or not), as long as the scores are bounded by a polynomial in the number m of candidates; in this case, we say that the rule has *polynomial scores*. Note that this assumption is in addition to our usual assumption that the scores can be computed in polynomial time.

Theorem 7. *For all fixed k and positional scoring rules r with polynomial scores, $\text{NTW}\langle k \rangle$ is in polynomial time.*

Note that all of the specific rules mentioned so far (i.e., t -approval, t -veto, Borda and so on) have polynomial scores, and hence, are covered by Theorem 7. An example of a rule that is *not* covered is the rule defined by $r(m, j) = 2^{m-j}$.

In the remainder of this section, we prove Theorem 7. To determine whether a candidate c is a necessary top- k winner, we search for a counterexample, that is, k candidates that defeat c in some completion. For that, we iterate over every subset $\{c_1, \dots, c_k\} \subseteq C \setminus \{c\}$ and determine whether these $k + 1$ candidates can get a combination of scores that constitutes the counterexample.

More formally, let C be a set of candidates and r a positional scoring rule. For a partial profile $\mathbf{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$ and a sequence $S = (c_1, \dots, c_q)$ of candidates from C , we

denote by $\pi(\mathbf{P}, S)$ the set of all possible scores that the candidates in S can obtain jointly in a completion:

$$\pi(\mathbf{P}, S) := \{(s(\mathbf{T}, c_1), \dots, s(\mathbf{T}, c_q)) : \mathbf{T} \text{ completes } \mathbf{P}\}$$

Note that $\pi(\mathbf{P}, S) \subseteq \{0, \dots, n \cdot \vec{s}_m(1)\}^q$. When \mathbf{P} consists of a single voter P , we write $\pi(P, S)$ instead of $\pi(\mathbf{P}, S)$.

A counterexample for c being a necessary top- k winner is a sequence $S = (c_1, \dots, c_q)$ where $q = k + 1$ and $c_q = c$, and a sequence $(s_1, \dots, s_q) \in \pi(\mathbf{P}, S)$ such that each c_i beats c when for $i = 1, \dots, k$ the score of c_i is $s(c_i) = s_i$ and $s(c) = s_q$. The following two lemmas show that, indeed, we can find such a counterexample in polynomial time.

Lemma 3. *Let q be a fixed number and r a positional scoring rule. Whether $(s_1, \dots, s_q) \in \pi(P, S)$ can be determined in polynomial time, given a partial order P over a set of candidates, a sequence S of q candidates, and scores s_1, \dots, s_q .*

Proof. We use a reduction to a scheduling problem where tasks have execution times, release times, deadlines, and precedence constraints (i.e., task x should be completed before starting task y). This scheduling problem can be solved in polynomial time [Garey et al., 1981]. In the reduction, each candidate c is a task with a unit execution time. For every c_i in S , the release time is $\min\{j \in [n] : r(m, j) = s_i\}$, and the deadline is $1 + \max\{j \in [n] : r(m, j) = s_i\}$. For the rest of the candidates, the release time is 1 and the deadline is $m + 1$. The precedence constraints are P . It holds that $(s_1, \dots, s_q) \in \pi(P, S)$ if and only if the tasks can be scheduled according to all the requirements. \square

From Lemma 3 we can conclude that when q is fixed and r has polynomial scores, we can construct $\pi(\mathbf{P}, S)$ in polynomial time, via straightforward dynamic programming.

Lemma 4. *Let q be a fixed natural number and r a positional scoring rule with polynomial scores. The set $\pi(\mathbf{P}, S)$ can be constructed in polynomial time, given a partial profile \mathbf{P} and a sequence S of q candidates.*

Proof. First, for every $i \in [n]$, construct $\pi(P_i, S)$ using Lemma 3. Then, given $\pi((P_1, \dots, P_i), S)$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi((P_1, \dots, P_{i+1}), S) \\ &= \{\vec{u} + \vec{w} : \vec{u} \in \pi((P_1, \dots, P_i), S), \vec{w} \in \pi(P_{i+1}, S)\} \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{u} + \vec{w}$ is a point-wise sum of the two vectors $(\vec{u} + \vec{w})(j) = \vec{u}(j) + \vec{w}(j)$. Hence, $\pi(\mathbf{P}, S)$ can be constructed via straightforward dynamic programming. \square

4.2 Complexity of $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$

Plurality and Veto

We first show that the positional scoring rules that are tractable for PW, namely plurality and veto, are also tractable for $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$. This is done by a reduction to the problem of *polygamous matching* [Kimelfeld et al., 2019]: Given a bipartite graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$ and natural numbers $\alpha_w \leq \beta_w$ for all $w \in W$, determine whether there is a subset of E where each $u \in U$ is incident to exactly one edge and every $w \in W$ is incident to at least α_w edges and at most β_w edges. This problem is known to be solvable in polynomial time [Shiloach, 1981; Edmonds and Johnson, 2001].

Lemma 5. *The following decision problem can be solved in polynomial time for the plurality and veto rules: given a partial profile \mathbf{P} over a set C of candidates and numbers $\gamma_c \leq \delta_c$ for every candidate c , is there a completion \mathbf{T} such that $\gamma_c \leq s(\mathbf{T}, c) \leq \delta_c$ for every $c \in C$?*

Proof. For both rules, we apply a reduction to polygamous matching, where $U = V$ (the set of voters) and $W = C$. For plurality, E connects $v_i \in V$ and $c \in C$ whenever c can be in the top position in one or more completions of P_i , and the bounds are $\alpha_c = \gamma_c$ and $\beta_c = \delta_c$. For veto, receiving a score s is equivalent to being placed in the bottom position of $n - s$ voters, so E connects $v_i \in V$ and $c \in C$ whenever c can be in the bottom position in one or more completions of P_i . The bounds are $\alpha_c = n - \delta_c$ and $\beta_c = n - \gamma_c$. \square

Finally, to solve $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$ given $C, \mathbf{P}, \succ_{\text{tie}}$ and c , we consider every set $D \subseteq C \setminus \{c\}$ of size $m - k$ and search for a completion where c defeats all candidates of D . For that, we iterate over every integer score $0 \leq s \leq n$ and use Lemma 5 to test whether there exists a completion \mathbf{T} such that $s(\mathbf{T}, c) \geq s$, and for every $d \in D$ we have $s(\mathbf{T}, d) \leq s$ if $c \succ_{\text{tie}} d$ or $s(\mathbf{T}, d) < s$ otherwise. Hence, we conclude that:

Theorem 8. *For every fixed k , $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$ can be solved in polynomial time under the plurality and veto rules.*

The polynomial degree in Theorem 8 depends on k . This is unavoidable, at least for the plurality rule, under conventional assumptions in parameterized complexity. This is shown by the proof of Theorem 2 that gives an FPT reduction from the dominating-set problem, which is $W[2]$ -hard, to PTW .

Theorem 9. *Under the plurality rule, PTW is $W[2]$ -hard for the parameter k .*

Beyond Plurality and Veto

The Classification Theorem (Theorem 1) states that PW is intractable for every pure scoring rule other than plurality or veto. While this hardness easily generalizes to $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$ for $k = 1$, it is not at all clear how to generalize it to any $k > 1$. In particular, we cannot see how to reduce PW to $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$ while assuming only the purity of the rule. We can, however, show such a reduction under a stronger notion of purity.

A rule r is *strongly pure* if the score sequence for $m + 1$ candidates is obtained from the score sequence for m candidates by inserting a new score, either to beginning or the end of the sequence. More formally, $r = \{\vec{s}_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ is strongly pure if for all $m \geq 1$, either $\vec{s}_{m+1} = \vec{s}_{m+1}(1) \circ \vec{s}_m$ or $\vec{s}_{m+1} = \vec{s}_m \circ \vec{s}_{m+1}(m + 1)$. Note that t -approval, t -veto and Borda are all strongly pure.

Theorem 10. *Suppose that the positional scoring rule is strongly pure, has polynomial scores, and is neither plurality nor veto. Then $\text{PTW}\langle k \rangle$ is NP-complete for all fixed k .*

Proof. Let r be a positional scoring rule that satisfies the conditions of the theorem, and let us denote r by $\{\vec{s}_m\}_{m > 1}$. We use a reduction from PW under r . Consider the input \mathbf{P} and c for PW over a set C of m candidates. Let $m' = m + k - 1$. Since r is strongly pure, there is an index $t \leq k - 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{s}_{m'} &= (\vec{s}_{m'}(1), \dots, \vec{s}_{m'}(t)) \circ \vec{s}_m \\ &\quad \circ (\vec{s}_{m'}(t + m + 1), \dots, \vec{s}_{m'}(m')). \end{aligned}$$

scores	$M_{1,1}$	\dots	$M_{1,m'}$	\dots	$M_{k-1,1}$	\dots	$M_{k-1,m'}$
$r'(1)$	d_1		d_1		d_{k-1}		d_{k-1}
$r'(2)$	d_2		d_2		d_1		d_1
\vdots	\vdots		\vdots		\vdots		\vdots
$r'(k-1)$	d_{k-1}		d_{k-1}		d_{k-2}		d_{k-2}
$r'(k)$	c_1		$c_{m'}$		c_1		$c_{m'}$
$r'(k+1)$	c_2		c_1		c_2		c_1
\vdots	\vdots		\vdots		\vdots		\vdots
$r'(m')$	$c_{m'}$		$c_{m'-1}$		$c_{m'}$		$c_{m'-1}$

Figure 1: The voters $M_{i,j}$ used in the proof of Theorem 10 with $r'(j)$ as a shorthand notation for $r(m', j)$

That is, $\vec{s}_{m'}$ is obtained from \vec{s}_m by inserting t values at the top coordinates and $k-1-t$ values at the bottom coordinates. We define C' , \mathbf{P}' and \succ'_{tie} as follows.

- $C' = C \cup D_1 \cup D_2$ where $D_1 = \{d_1, \dots, d_t\}$ and $D_2 = \{d_{t+1}, \dots, d_{k-1}\}$. Denote $D = D_1 \cup D_2$.
- \mathbf{P}' is the concatenation $\mathbf{Q} \circ \mathbf{M}$ of two partial profiles. The first is $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_n)$, where Q_i is the same as P_i , except that the candidates of D_1 are placed at the top positions and the candidates of D_2 are placed at the bottom positions. Formally, $Q_i := P_i \cup P(D_1, C, D_2)$. The second, \mathbf{M} , consists of $n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1)$ copies of the profile

$$\{M_{i,j}\}_{i=1,\dots,k-1, j=1,\dots,m}$$

where $M_{i,j}$ is $M_i(D) \circ M_j(C)$ for the circular votes $M_i(D)$ and $M_j(C)$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 5.

- $\succ'_{\text{tie}} = O(D, \{c\}, C \setminus \{c\})$.

We show that the candidates of D always defeat all other candidates. For every $d \in D$, the score of d in \mathbf{M} is $s(\mathbf{M}, d) = n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) \cdot m \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \vec{s}_{m'}(i)$, and for every $c' \in C$ the score in \mathbf{M} is

$$s(\mathbf{M}, c') = n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) \cdot (k-1) \sum_{i=k}^{m'} \vec{s}_{m'}(i) \leq n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) \cdot \left(m \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \vec{s}_{m'}(i) - 1 \right) = s(\mathbf{M}, d) - n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1)$$

where the inequality is due to the assumption that $\vec{s}_{m'}(1) > \vec{s}_{m'}(m')$. Let \mathbf{T}' be a completion of \mathbf{P}' , we get that

$$s(\mathbf{T}', c') \leq n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) + s(\mathbf{M}, c') \leq \vec{s}_{m'}(1) + s(\mathbf{M}, d) - n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) \leq s(\mathbf{T}', d).$$

Since the candidates of D are the first candidates in \succ'_{tie} , they always defeat the candidates of C .

We show that c is a possible winner for \mathbf{P} if and only if c is a possible top- k winner for $(C', \mathbf{P}', \succ'_{\text{tie}})$. Let $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ be a completion of \mathbf{P} where c is a winner. Consider the completion $\mathbf{T}' = (T'_1, \dots, T'_n) \circ \mathbf{M}$ of \mathbf{P}' where $T'_i = O(D_1) \circ T_i \circ O(D_2)$. For every $c' \in C$, we know that $s(\mathbf{T}', d) \geq s(\mathbf{T}', c')$ for every $d \in D$, and from the property of $\vec{s}_{m'}$ we get that

$$s(\mathbf{T}', c') = s(\mathbf{T}, c') + n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) \cdot \sum_{i=k}^{m'} \vec{s}_{m'}(i).$$

From the choice of \succ'_{tie} , c defeats all candidates of $C \setminus \{c\}$ in \mathbf{T}' , hence c' is a top- k winner in \mathbf{T}' . Conversely, let $\mathbf{T}' = (T'_1, \dots, T'_n) \circ \mathbf{M}$ be a completion of \mathbf{P}' where c is a top- k winner, define a completion \mathbf{T} of \mathbf{P} by removing D from all orders in (T'_1, \dots, T'_n) . For every $c' \in C$ we have

$$s(\mathbf{T}, c') = s(\mathbf{T}', c') - n \cdot \vec{s}_{m'}(1) \cdot \sum_{i=k}^{m'} \vec{s}_{m'}(i)$$

hence c is a winner in \mathbf{T} . \square

The proof of Theorem 10 can be easily adjusted to show the hardness of determining whether a given candidate set of the fixed size k is a top- k set.

Theorem 11. *Suppose that the positional scoring rule is strongly pure, has polynomial scores, and is neither plurality nor veto. Then for every fixed k it is NP-complete to decide whether a given candidate set is a possible top- k set.*

5 Concluding Remarks

We studied the problems of detecting the necessary and possible top- k winners over incomplete voting profiles. We showed that these problems are fundamentally harder than their classic top-1 counterparts (necessary and possible winners) when k is given as part of the input. For a fixed k , we have generally recovered the tractable positional scoring rules of the top-1 variant. Many problems are left for investigation in future research: completing our results towards full classifications (of the class of pure rules), establishing useful tractability conditions for an input k , further investigating the parameterized complexity of the problem when k is the parameter, detecting the necessary and possible committee members under different committee-selection policies, and incorporating fairness and diversity constraints.

References

- [Aziz *et al.*, 2015] Haris Aziz, Serge Gaspers, Joachim Gudmundsson, Simon Mackenzie, Nicholas Mattei, and Toby Walsh. Computational aspects of multi-winner approval voting. In *AAMAS*, pages 107–115, 2015.
- [Baumeister and Rothe, 2012] Dorothea Baumeister and Jörg Rothe. Taking the final step to a full dichotomy of the possible winner problem in pure scoring rules. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 112(5):186–190, 2012.
- [Baumeister *et al.*, 2011] Dorothea Baumeister, Magnus Roos, and Jörg Rothe. Computational complexity of two variants of the possible winner problem. In *AAMAS*, pages 853–860, 2011.
- [Betzler and Dorn, 2010] Nadja Betzler and Britta Dorn. Towards a dichotomy for the possible winner problem in elections based on scoring rules. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 76(8):812–836, 2010.
- [Brandt *et al.*, 2016] Felix Brandt, Vincent Conitzer, Ulle Endriss, Jérôme Lang, and Ariel D. Procaccia, editors. *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.

- [Bredereck *et al.*, 2018] Robert Bredereck, Piotr Faliszewski, Ayumi Igarashi, Martin Lackner, and Piotr Skowron. Multiwinner elections with diversity constraints. In *AAAI*, pages 933–940, 2018.
- [Celis *et al.*, 2018] L. Elisa Celis, Lingxiao Huang, and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Multiwinner voting with fairness constraints. In *IJCAI*, pages 144–151, 2018.
- [Chamberlin and Courant, 1983] John R. Chamberlin and Paul N. Courant. Representative deliberations and representative decisions: Proportional representation and the borda rule. *The American Political Science Review*, 77(3):718–733, 1983.
- [Darmann, 2013] Andreas Darmann. How hard is it to tell which is a condorcet committee? *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 66(3):282–292, 2013.
- [Edmonds and Johnson, 2001] Jack Edmonds and Ellis L. Johnson. Matching: A well-solved class of integer linear programs. In *Combinatorial Optimization - Eureka, You Shrink!, Papers Dedicated to Jack Edmonds*, volume 2570 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 27–30. Springer, 2001.
- [Elkind *et al.*, 2011] Edith Elkind, Jérôme Lang, and Abdallah Saffidine. Choosing collectively optimal sets of alternatives based on the condorcet criterion. In *IJCAI*, pages 186–191, 2011.
- [Fishburn, 1981] Peter C. Fishburn. An analysis of simple voting systems for electing committees. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 41(3):499–502, 1981.
- [Garey *et al.*, 1981] M. R. Garey, David S. Johnson, Barbara B. Simons, and Robert Endre Tarjan. Scheduling unit-time tasks with arbitrary release times and deadlines. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 10(2):256–269, 1981.
- [Kenig and Kimelfeld, 2019] Batya Kenig and Benny Kimelfeld. Approximate inference of outcomes in probabilistic elections. In *AAAI*, pages 2061–2068. AAAI Press, 2019.
- [Kimelfeld *et al.*, 2018] Benny Kimelfeld, Phokion G. Kolaitis, and Julia Stoyanovich. Computational social choice meets databases. In *IJCAI*, pages 317–323. ijcai.org, 2018.
- [Kimelfeld *et al.*, 2019] Benny Kimelfeld, Phokion G. Kolaitis, and Muhammad Tibi. Query evaluation in election databases. In *PODS*, pages 32–46, 2019.
- [Konczak and Lang, 2005] Kathrin Konczak and Jerome Lang. Voting procedures with incomplete preferences. *Proceedings of the Multidisciplinary IJCAI-05 Workshop on Advances in Preference Handling*, 01 2005.
- [Lu and Boutilier, 2013] Tyler Lu and Craig Boutilier. Multi-winner social choice with incomplete preferences. In *IJCAI*, pages 263–270, 2013.
- [Meir *et al.*, 2008] Reshef Meir, Ariel D. Procaccia, Jeffrey S. Rosenschein, and Aviv Zohar. Complexity of strategic behavior in multi-winner elections. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 33:149–178, 2008.
- [Monroe, 1995] Burt L. Monroe. Fully proportional representation. *American Political Science Review*, 89(4):925–940, 1995.
- [Procaccia *et al.*, 2007] Ariel D. Procaccia, Jeffrey S. Rosenschein, and Aviv Zohar. Multi-winner elections: Complexity of manipulation, control and winner-determination. In *IJCAI*, pages 1476–1481, 2007.
- [Procaccia *et al.*, 2008] Ariel D. Procaccia, Jeffrey S. Rosenschein, and Aviv Zohar. On the complexity of achieving proportional representation. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(3):353–362, 2008.
- [Shiloach, 1981] Yossi Shiloach. Another look at the degree constrained subgraph problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 12(2):89–92, 1981.
- [Skowron *et al.*, 2015] Piotr Skowron, Lan Yu, Piotr Faliszewski, and Edith Elkind. The complexity of fully proportional representation for single-crossing electorates. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 569:43–57, 2015.
- [Xia and Conitzer, 2011] Lirong Xia and Vincent Conitzer. Determining possible and necessary winners given partial orders. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, 41:25–67, 2011.