

Robust Sparse Voting

Youssef Allouah¹, Rachid Guerraoui¹, Lê-Nguyên Hoang¹, and Oscar VILLEMAUD¹

¹IC, EPFL, Switzerland

February 18, 2022

Abstract

Many modern Internet applications, like content moderation and recommendation on social media, require reviewing and score a large number of alternatives. In such a context, the voting can only be *sparse*, as the number of alternatives is too large for any individual to review a significant fraction of all of them. Moreover, in critical applications, malicious players might seek to hack the voting process by entering *dishonest* reviews or creating *fake accounts*. Classical voting methods are unfit for this task, as they usually (a) require each reviewer to assess all available alternatives and (b) can be easily manipulated by malicious players.

This paper defines precisely the problem of *robust sparse voting*, highlights its underlying technical challenges, and presents MEHESTAN, a novel voting mechanism that solves the problem. Namely, we prove that by using MEHESTAN, no (malicious) voter can have more than a small parametrizable effect on each alternative’s score, and we identify conditions of voters comparability under which any unanimous preferences can be recovered, even when these preferences are expressed by voters on very different scales.

1 Introduction

Context. Voting has proven over history to be an effective way to reach collective decisions despite irreconcilable preferences. However, voting schemes have traditionally been designed to handle a tractable set of alternatives. In particular, mechanisms like the *majority judgment* [BL11] or *randomized Condorcet* [Hoa17] typically require voters to provide ballots whose size is at least linear in the number of alternatives, and a computation time that is polynomial in this number of alternatives. Such solutions may be prohibitive in modern applications when the number of alternatives is in the thousands or in the billions, electing when electing the best movie of the year, the best paper of a conference or the best text of law to implement. In such contexts, voting becomes inevitably *sparse*, as voters typically only judge a small fraction of all alternatives.

Sparcity is very challenging because it raises two major issues: *preference scaling* and *Byzantine vulnerability*. To illustrate these issues, consider the case of scientific peer reviewing. Different reviewers might adopt very distinct reviewing styles. Some junior reviewers might use only modest judgments, e.g. *weak accept/reject*, while other reviewers may much more frequently use definitive judgments, e.g. *strong accept/reject*. Meanwhile, some may be systematically enthusiastic, e.g. only rarely suggest *reject*, while others may be consistently harsh, and almost always recommend rejection. The resulting acceptance decision of a paper may thus depend more on the reviewing styles of the reviewers assigned to the paper, rather than on the actual quality of the paper.

This phenomenon is exacerbated by the fact that the assignment of papers to reviewers is rarely random. In practice, a paper is more likely to be reviewed by someone whose expertise is close to the paper’s focus. Some reviewers may also strongly prefer reviewing top quality papers only, while other reviewers may assign a lot of importance to reviewing and rejecting bad papers. Overall, this means that some papers are much more likely to attract reviewers with a given reviewing style, inducing a systematic unfairness in the peer reviewing system. Basically, *robust sparse voting* requires protections against such biases.

On the other hand, especially when the number of alternatives far exceeds what all honest voters combined can score, we must expect the existence of alternatives that barely any honest voter scores. Most scores received by such alternatives may then come from malicious voters. In the parlance of distributed computing, we shall call such voters *Byzantine*. Naive solutions, like computing the median of reported scores, would be extremely vulnerable to Byzantine voters on hardly scored alternatives. *Robust sparse voting* also requires protections against such attacks.

Besides these aspects, different reviewers may have different levels of expertise to judge papers adequately, or may spend different amounts of attention to evaluate carefully. A *robust sparse voting* mechanism should also be *uncertainty-aware* and account for such variations between reviewers. Ideally, such a mechanism should also be able to output a measure of reviewers’ disagreement on the value of a paper, to better reflect reviewers’ ranges of assessment. Finally, some use cases may require *privacy* guarantees to enable reviewers to speak freely.

Contributions. We first characterize the problem of *robust sparse (cardinal) voting*. Essentially, we precisely pose the problem of robustly assigning scores to alternatives, based on a partial reporting of voters’ preferred scores, highlighting the very fact that this is a very important, challenging and yet neglected question. While formalizing it, we identify two key desirable properties for any robust sparse voting. Namely, we precisely capture the notions of *sparse unanimity*, which demands that any unanimous preference be recovered even when the voters express their preferences with very different “reviewing styles”, and *W-Byzantine resilience*, which demands each voter to have only a bounded effect on any alternative’s global score.

We then show that satisfying any of the properties is nontrivial. Our first key contribution is to prove that voting systems based on *individual-based normalized* preferences inherently fail to verify *sparse unanimity*. This impossibility theorem highlights the need for *collaborative preference normalization*; however, such a normalization can be potentially highly vulnerable to Byzantine voters. Designing a *Byzantine resilient* collaborative preference normalization is a highly nontrivial challenge that we also highlight. In fact, we stress that naive solutions, based on identifying anchor alternatives to find a common preference scaling, or based on identifying groups of mutually comparable voters, fail to be Byzantine-resilient. Our second contribution is to address Byzantine resilience through new parameterized robust statistics primitives, which we call the *Quadratically Regularized Median* (abbreviated QRMED) and the *Byzantine-Robustified Mean* (abbreviated BRMEAN). Remarkably, both primitives guarantee that any single voter will only have a bounded effect on their output. Moreover, QRMED fits the intuitively appealing “one person, one unit force” principle, while BRMEAN guarantees the exact computation of the mean under favorable conditions.

Our third contribution is to leverage BRMEAN to construct a Byzantine-resilient collaborative preference normalization scheme, which allows us to design a new sparse cardinal voting algorithm

we call MEHESTAN¹. Remarkably, we prove that MEHESTAN guarantees both *Byzantine resilience* and *sparse unanimity*. More precisely, we show how MEHESTAN guarantees that any voter can at most have a bounded parametrizable effect on MEHESTAN’s output, and that MEHESTAN will recover any *unanimous* and *comparable* scores, when sufficiently many voters participate.

Our fourth contribution is to empirically evaluate MEHESTAN on synthetic data, compared to alternative sparse voting algorithms. Essentially, we empirically evaluate the ability of MEHESTAN to recover a unanimous preference, under more or less adversarial settings. This allows to explore MEHESTAN’s performances when the assumptions of sparse unanimity are violated. In particular, we study MEHESTAN under incomplete voter comparability, small density (voters score only a few alternatives), adversarial sparsity (some voters mostly score a biased subset of alternatives). We also test the robustness of MEHESTAN by studying the correlation between its output on a given set of inputs, as opposed to a sparsification of the same inputs.

Our paper also makes several insightful remarks on privacy guarantees, uncertainty-awareness and (Byzantine-resilient) polarization measure. Interestingly, because MEHESTAN is *Byzantine-resilient*, it is simple to adapt MEHESTAN to guarantee ε -differential privacy, by adding to each reported score a Laplacian noise, whose scale is proportional to $1/\varepsilon W$. Furthermore, MEHESTAN’s underlying primitives can be naturally adapted to include users’ reported uncertainties on their votes, and then derive *W-Byzantine resilient* measures of uncertainties on MEHESTAN’s computed scores. In fact, our robust statistics toolbox also allows to robustly measure how *polarizing* a given alternative is, by robustly estimating a standard deviation of users’ reported (and robustly scaled) scores.

Applications. To understand how widespread and important the *robust sparse voting* problem is, it suffices to ponder the billions of ethical dilemmas that today’s large-scale Internet algorithms are asked to address on a daily basis. Namely, whenever a user searches “election frauds”, “climate change” or “vaccines” on YouTube, Facebook or Amazon, an algorithm is faced with a potentially life-or-death dilemma over which content ought to be recommended first to the user. This recommendation basically leverages users’ upvotes, dislikes or 5-star ratings, to then determine what to suggest to billions of other users. Crucially, such voting schemes are inevitably sparse. Indeed, most alternatives have been scored by only a small fraction of all users; and some alternatives might have been scored by barely any authentic user.

In this context, *Byzantine resilience* for such online *sparse voting* is critical. Social medias have become *information battlegrounds* [Ata19, BBH21], and their recommendation algorithms have been weaponized by all sorts of private and public actors [Sat21, Yue19], many of which leverage troll farms to fabricate misleading online activities [BH19, NHK19, Woo20], or even simply exploit the vulnerabilities of the social medias’ advertisement systems [ELM20]. The extent of such disinformation campaigns is arguably well illustrated by the whopping *15 billion* fake accounts that Facebook reportedly removed in only two years [Dol21]. Unfortunately, as revealed by the infamous *Facebook Files* [inv21], today’s opaque moderation, recommendation and ad-targeting algorithms seem successfully manipulated by disinformation or hate speech campaigns. Instead, if designed properly, a *robust sparse voting* mechanism might allow genuine users to collaboratively identify top quality content of public utility, and to amplify them at scale [HFJ⁺21]. However, for such

¹Mehestan, which literally means “the great place” in old Persian, is regarded as one of the earliest proto-Parliaments. Mehestan dates back to 247 BC, at the time of the Parthian Empire, and was located in Ancient Iran.

a mechanism to work properly, in addition to being Byzantine resilient, it seems critical that it also be at least *sparsely unanimous*. This is unfortunately far from trivial to guarantee, given that most users mostly consume only a non-random biased subset of all alternatives, and that they will inevitably use very different “reviewing styles”.

The *robust sparse voting* problem is arguably more general still. In particular, *safe and ethical* natural language processing can be framed as a robust sparse voting problem, where the set of alternatives is now the set of all possible texts that may be generated in a given context. This is particularly well illustrated by the Delphi project [JHB⁺21], which aimed to assign a moral judgment to any user-generated sentence. Typically, when prompted on “killing a bear”, Delphi replies² “it’s wrong”. However, it is important to stress that Delphi’s reply did not emerge out of nothing; it essentially results from generalizing the moral judgments of the humans that were queried to construct Delphi’s training dataset. Crucially, any such judgment, or any text completion, must depend on the prompt, also known as the *context*. Voting on what a language model should output in a given context would then amount to scoring any possible text completion in this context. Yet the number of possible text completions is exponential in the number of words needed for text completion. If we are to consider paragraph-long replies, which is needed for more complex prompts like “how robust is scientific peer reviewing?”, scoring all possible text completions is vastly intractable. Any user’s scoring³ will then be inevitably (extremely) *sparse*; any user will fail to even consider most imaginable text completions⁴. Thus, any *safe and ethical* language model must address the *robust sparse voting* problem. While MEHESTAN is unfit to tackle the extreme sparsity of language model design, our work arguably exposes how challenging addressing it is.

Structure of the paper. Section 2 formalizes the *robust sparse voting* problem. Section 3 stresses the difficulty of the problem by proving the impossibility of *sparse unanimity* for *individually scaled preferences*. Section 4 introduces new *Byzantine-resilient* primitives, and prove their desirable properties like *asymptotic correctness*. Section 5 introduces MEHESTAN, and proves that it guarantees *Byzantine resilience* and *sparse unanimity*. Section 6 presents the results of our empirical evaluation of MEHESTAN on a synthetic dataset, under adversarial sparsification. Section 7 extends MEHESTAN to guarantee additional desirable properties, like privacy, uncertainty awareness and polarization measurement. Section 8 reviews related work in social choice theory, collaborative filtering, recommender systems and Byzantine resilience. The appendices contain complete proofs.

2 The robust sparse voting problem

We consider a set $[N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$ of voters, and a set $[A] = \{1, \dots, A\}$ of alternatives to score. Each voter $n \in [N]$ is assigned a nonnegative voting right $w_n \geq 0$, and is asked to provide scores $\theta_{na} \in \mathbb{R}$ to different alternatives. However, we assume that their vote may be *sparse*. In other

²<https://delphi.allenai.org/?a1=Killing+a+bear>

³In today’s models, a user “votes” for a text completion, when “completing” the context. Word embedding then allows to generalize this vote, by considering that the user would score positively *similar* text completions, where the similarity is defined through word embedding. Whilst this generalization might be reliable for few-word completion, it is untrustworthy for paragraph completion. It is also questionable whether considering user’s natural completions as a vote on what language models ought to output, without the user’s knowledge and informed consent, is safe and ethical.

⁴The design of an actual language model is more challenging still, as it must be designed to address *all* contexts, which is exponential in the number of words defining the contexts.

words, they may only report *partial* vectors $\theta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{A_n}$, for a subset $A_n \subset [A]$ of all alternatives, which might verify $|A_n| \ll A$. We denote by $\mathbb{R}^{\leq A}$ the union of the sets \mathbb{R}^{A_n} , for $A_n \subset [A]$, and by $\vec{\theta} \triangleq (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)$ the tuple of voters' reported scores. Similarly, $\vec{w} \triangleq (w_1, \dots, w_N)$ denotes the family of voters' voting rights, with $\|\vec{w}\|_1 \triangleq \sum_n |w_n|$ computing the total of allocated voting rights.

Following [VNM53], we assume that each voter n 's cardinal preference θ_n is defined up to a positive affine transformation. Namely, we denote $\theta_n \sim \theta'_n$, if and only if, the two vectors score the same subset A_n of alternatives, and there exists $s > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all alternatives $a \in A_n$, we have $\theta_{na} = s\theta'_{na} + \tau$. Equivalently, this amounts to saying that the correlation $\text{CORREL}_{|A_n}(\theta_n, \theta'_n) = 1$ is total between the two score partial vectors.

Our goal is to aggregate the different voters' scores into global complete scores $\rho_a \in \mathbb{R}$, for all alternatives $a \in [A]$. In other words, we aim to construct a vote algorithm $\text{VOTE} : \mathbb{R}_+^N \times (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$, $(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) \mapsto \rho$. The algorithm must be executable for any number of voters and alternatives. We also assume that it should treat any voter n without zero voting right the same way as it treats nonvoters, i.e. $w_n = 0$ must imply $\text{VOTE}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) = \text{VOTE}(\vec{w}_{-n}, \vec{\theta}_{-n})$. In this paper, we focus on the two following desirable vote properties, which we define below.

2.1 Sparse unanimity

The first desirable property we study is what we call *sparse unanimity*. To state it, for any voter score $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq A}$, denote $\theta_{|A_n} \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq A_n}$ the scores (partial) vector obtained by selecting only the entries $a \in A_n$ from the partial vector θ . Moreover, let $N_0 \triangleq [N]$ and define $AB_{nm}^* \triangleq \{(a, b) \in (A_n \cap A_m)^2 \mid a < b, \theta_{na} \neq \theta_{nb} \text{ and } \theta_{ma} \neq \theta_{mb}\}$ the set of pairs of alternatives that both voters n and m scored, each providing different scores to the two alternatives. Finally, define $A_{W_0} \triangleq \{a \in [A] \mid \sum_{n \in N_a} w_n \geq W_0\}$ the set of alternatives which receive votes from voters whose cumulative voting rights are at least W_0 . We can now formalize *sparse unanimity*.

Definition 1. *VOTE is sparsely unanimous if, for any θ_* , there exists W_0 such that, whenever voters' scores are θ_* -unanimous and comparable, if at least W_0 voting rights have been allocated, then VOTE retrieves the unanimous preference for all W_0 -voted alternatives. More precisely, for any number N of voters, any voting rights \vec{w} and any reported scores $\vec{\theta}$, the following three conditions*

$$\theta_*\text{-unanimity: } \forall n \in [N], \theta_n \sim \theta_{*|A_n},$$

$$\text{comparability: } \forall n, m \in [N], AB_{nm}^* \neq \emptyset,$$

$$W_0\text{-voting rights: } \|\vec{w}\|_1 \geq W_0,$$

must imply $\text{VOTE}(w, \vec{\theta})_{|A_{W_0}} \sim \theta_{|A_{W_0}}$.*

Sparse unanimity essentially demands that, in very favorable conditions, VOTE behave correctly. This can be regarded as a minimally desirable properties that any sparse voting algorithm ought to satisfy. The surprise, however, is that *sparse unanimity* is actually nontrivial to guarantee. Indeed, our impossibility theorem essentially shows that coordinate-wise (reasonable) aggregations of voters' scores with individual-based (reasonable) normalizations fail to be *sparsely unanimous*.

More interestingly, when combined with *Byzantine resilience* (defined below), *sparse unanimity* actually becomes very demanding. Indeed, since Byzantine resilience demands that the influence of any small subset of voters be limited, any *Byzantine-resilient sparsely unanimous* voting algorithm must guarantee a form of approximate sparse unanimity. Intuitively, any quasi-unanimous preference must then be approximately recovered.

2.2 Byzantine resilience

Our second desirable property under study is what we call *Byzantine resilience*. To formalize it, for any subset $F \subset [N]$ of (Byzantine) voters, denote \vec{w}^F the tuple of voting rights defined by $w_n^F \triangleq 0$ for $n \notin F$, and $w_f^F \triangleq w_f$ for $f \in F$. In other words, \vec{w}^F cancels the voting rights of non-Byzantine voters. Conversely, denote $\vec{w}^{-F} \triangleq \vec{w}^{[N]-F}$. Clearly, we have $\vec{w} = \vec{w}^F + \vec{w}^{-F}$. Byzantine resilience then demands that canceling (or activating) the Byzantine voters' voting rights will only have a limited effect on the vote outcome, whose scale is bounded by the Byzantine's total voting rights. Evidently, since we assume that VOTE cannot distinguish Byzantine voters from genuine voters, our definition of Byzantine resilience must treat any subset $F \subset [N]$ identically.

Definition 2. VOTE guarantees *W-Byzantine resilience* if, for any inputs $(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta})$, a subgroup $F \subset [N]$ can affect each output of the vote by at most $\|\vec{w}^F\|_1/W$, i.e.

$$\forall \vec{w}, \vec{\theta}, \forall F \subset [N], \forall a \in [A], \left| \text{VOTE}_a(\vec{w}^{-F}, \vec{\theta}) - \text{VOTE}_a(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) \right| \leq \frac{\|\vec{w}^F\|_1}{W}. \quad (1)$$

We say that VOTE is *Byzantine resilient*, if there exists $W > 0$ such that VOTE is *W-Byzantine resilient*.

The variable W can be interpreted as a resilience measure. Intuitively, it protects the vote against Byzantine voters whose cumulative voting right is bounded by W . More precisely, the Byzantine voters must have at least W voting rights to move an alternative's score by one unit. Put differently, this amounts to $1/W$ -Lipschitz continuity in voters' voting rights (with respect to ℓ_1 norm).

Now, in practice, some cardinal voting systems ask voters to report scores within a given range of diameter Δ , or rescale voters' scores so that they lie in $[0, \Delta]$. Given this, Byzantine resilience might seem easy to guarantee, e.g. by classical aggregation methods (mean, median, trimmed mean...), for $W \triangleq \min_n w_n / \Delta$, or by defining $W \triangleq \min_n w_n$ and by rescaling scores in $[0, \Delta]$ with $\Delta \triangleq 1/W$. However, both of these approaches actually fail to satisfy our definition, as W here depends on \vec{w} . As it turns out, simply designing W -Byzantine resilient mean estimator for bounded inputs is nontrivial; and our paper introduces, to the best of our knowledge, the first estimators able to achieve this task. Having said this, we stress that our definition becomes a lot more interesting, when W is fully a parametrizable hyperparameter of the voting algorithm, and can be made to take arbitrarily large values (based on a potentially evolving threat model).

Our Byzantine resilience definition may then be particularly useful for two use cases. On one hand, it seems critical for very *sparse* voting, especially when a few alternatives are scored by only a handful of honest voters. Indeed, assuming a lack of Byzantine resilience, Byzantine voters could then coordinate an attack to arbitrarily bias the score of the alternative, and make it either maximally high or low. This is especially important in applications where the alternatives with particularly low scores are censored or rejected, and where the alternatives with particularly high scores are widely recommended and celebrated.

On the other hand, Byzantine resilience seems important as well when voters provide (or updated) their scores through time, and when the global scores of the alternatives are updated online. In this setting, indeed, the stability of global scores over time may be salient. In fact, more generally, our definition may have applications in any system where high volatility is harmful, and where adversaries want to amplify volatility, e.g. to discredit the system. This may be particularly the

case of polls: malicious entities may want to give the impression that a certain group’s opinions are erratic, or that the group members disagree a lot more than they actually do.

3 Sparse unanimity requires collaborative preference scaling

In this section, we present our main impossibility theorem, which roughly says that any *coordinate-wise* vote with *individually normalized* scores must violate sparse unanimity. Our result highlights a central and nontrivial challenge for *sparse voting*, even in the absence of disagreeing voters. In spirit, we essentially prove that any scale-resilient sparse voting algorithm must leverage *collaborative* preference scaling. To formalize our impossibility theorem, we first need to introduce some assumptions on what seem to be reasonable *individual-based normalizations* and *score aggregations*.

3.1 Individual-based normalization

Intuitively, any *robust sparse voting* algorithm must make sure that its output will not be affected to the scaling used by voters when they report their alternative scorings. The simplest way to guarantee this is to perform a score *normalization* on voters’ reported scores. In this section, we define what a score normalization is, and what desirable properties it ought to have. First we define a **normalizer** as a function $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}} : (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N$ that preserves voters’ preferences, i.e. such that, for any voter $n \in [N]$, we have $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}_n(\theta) \sim \theta_n$. Below, we list other desirable properties.

Definition 3. A normalizer $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ is **individual-based** if a voter’s normalized scores only depend on the voters’ reported scores, i.e.

$$\exists \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}} : \mathbb{R}^{\leq A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\leq A}, \forall \vec{\theta} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N, \forall n \in [N], \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}_n(\vec{\theta}) = \text{NORM}(\theta_n), \quad (2)$$

Definition 4. A normalizer $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ is **scale-invariant** if the normalized scores are independent of the preference scaling of the reported scores, i.e.

$$\forall \vec{\theta}, \vec{\theta}' \in (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N, \forall n \in [N], \theta_n \sim \theta'_n \implies \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}(\vec{\theta}) = \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}(\vec{\theta}'). \quad (3)$$

Definition 5. A normalizer $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ is **neutral** if it treats all alternatives symmetrically. More precisely, denote $S(A)$ the set of permutations of $[A]$. For any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq A}$ and $\sigma \in S(A)$, we define $(\sigma \cdot \theta)_a \triangleq \theta_{\sigma(a)}$ if the entry $\sigma(a)$ of partial vector θ exists (otherwise $(\sigma \cdot \theta)_a$ is not defined). Similarly, we define $(\sigma \cdot \vec{\theta})_n \triangleq \sigma \cdot \theta_n$. **Neutrality** then demands that

$$\forall \vec{\theta} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N, \forall \sigma \in S(A), \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}(\sigma \cdot \vec{\theta}) = \sigma \cdot \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}(\vec{\theta}). \quad (4)$$

Definition 6. An individual-based normalizer $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ is **stable** if the function $x \mapsto \text{NORM}(0, x, 1)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[0, 1]$.

As an example of a (single-voter) normalizer, standardization is given by $\text{STDNORM}_a(x) \triangleq \frac{x_a - \text{MEAN}(x)}{\text{SD}(x)}$, where A_x is the subset of alternatives scored by the score vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq A}$, $\text{MEAN}(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{|A_x|} \sum_{a \in A_x} x_a$ is the mean of the scores and $\text{SD}^2(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{|A_x| - 1} \sum_{a \in A_x} (x_a - \text{MEAN}(x))^2$ is their standard deviation, assuming $\text{SD}(x) > 0$. If $\text{SD}(x) = 0$, then we may simply set $\text{STDNORM}_a(x) \triangleq 0$

for all scored alternatives $a \in A_x$. Another popular normalizer is min-max normalization, given by $\text{MINMAXNORM}_a(x) \triangleq \frac{x_a - \min_{b \in A_x} x_b}{\max_{b \in A_x} x_b - \min_{b \in A_x} x_b}$, assuming $\max_{b \in A_x} x_b > \min_{b \in A_x} x_b$ (otherwise, we return $\text{MINMAXNORM}_a(x) \triangleq 0$ for all scored alternatives $a \in A_x$). Applying such single-voter normalizers to all voters clearly yield normalizers $\overrightarrow{\text{STDNORM}}$ and $\overrightarrow{\text{MINMAXNORM}}$.

Proposition 1. *Standardization and min-max normalizers are individual-based, scale-invariant, neutral and stable.*

Proof. It is straightforward that they are an individual-based, scale-invariant and neutral normalizers. Plus, min-max normalizer is clearly stable. To show that standardization is stable, consider $g: x \mapsto \text{STDNORM}(0, x, 1) = \sqrt{2}(-x - 1, 2x - 1, 2 - x) / \sqrt{(x + 1)^2 + (2x - 1)^2 + (x - 2)^2}$. It follows that g is continuously differentiable, and therefore Lipschitz continuous on $[0, 1]$. \square

3.2 Score aggregation

A score aggregation is a function $\text{AGG} : (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^A$. Below, we identify properties that score aggregations may have.

Definition 7. *A score aggregation AGG is **coordinate-wise** if the score computed by an alternative only depends on the reported scores for this alternative, i.e., for any alternative $a \in [A]$,*

$$\exists \text{AGG}_a : (\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R})^{\leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \forall \vec{w}, \vec{\theta}, \left(\text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) \right)_a = \text{AGG}_a((w_n)_{n \in N_a}, (\theta_{na})_{n \in N_a}). \quad (5)$$

Definition 8. *A score aggregation AGG is **anonymous** if it treats alternatives symmetrically, i.e.*

$$\forall \vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall \vec{\theta} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N, \forall \sigma \in S(A), \text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \sigma \cdot \vec{\theta}) = \sigma \cdot \text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}). \quad (6)$$

Definition 9. *A score aggregation AGG is **neutral** if it treats voters symmetrically, i.e.*

$$\forall \vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall \vec{\theta} \in (\mathbb{R}^{\leq A})^N, \forall \sigma \in S(N), \text{AGG}(\sigma \cdot \vec{w}, \sigma \cdot \vec{\theta}) = \text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}), \quad (7)$$

where the action of σ on $\vec{\theta}$ is defined by $(\sigma \cdot \vec{\theta})_n \triangleq \theta_{\sigma(n)}$.

Definition 10. *A coordinate-wise score aggregation AGG is **max-dominated** if each of its coordinates is dominated by the max aggregation, i.e.*

$$\exists \lambda > 0, \forall \vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq A}, \|\text{AGG}(w, \theta)\|_\infty \leq \lambda \max_{n \in [N], a \in [A]} |\theta_{na}|. \quad (8)$$

Definition 11. *A coordinate-wise score aggregation AGG is **locally Lipschitz continuous** if each of its coordinates is locally Lipschitz continuous with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm.*

Definition 12. *A coordinate-wise score aggregation AGG is **asymptotically correct** if each of its coordinates can recover any score θ_* , once the input is a sufficiently large sequence converging to θ_* , i.e.*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n = 0 \implies \left(\forall \theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^A, \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N_0 > 0, \left\| \text{AGG}(\vec{1}^{N_0}, (\theta_* + \xi_n)_{n \in [N_0]}) - \theta_* \right\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \right), \quad (9)$$

where $\vec{1}^{N_0} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_0}$ is the vector whose entries all equal 1.

Proposition 2. *The mean, the median and QRMED are all coordinate-wise, anonymous, neutral, max-dominated, locally Lipschitz continuous and asymptotically correct score aggregations.*

Proof. It is straightforward that the mean, the median and QRMED are coordinate-wise, anonymous, and neutral score aggregations. The mean and the median are asymptotically correct by Lemmas 17 and 18 respectively. QRMED is asymptotically correct by Theorem 2. The mean and the median are trivially max-dominated. QRMED is max-dominated since $|\text{QRMED}| \leq |\text{MED}|$ by Lemma 16. The mean is trivially Lipschitz continuous, and thus locally Lipschitz continuous. QRMED is Lipschitz continuous by Proposition 5, and thus locally Lipschitz continuous. Since $\text{MED} = \text{QRMED}_0$, the median is also locally Lipschitz continuous. \square

3.3 The impossibility theorem

We now state our impossibility theorem. We stress that the theorem does not assume any Byzantine voter; in fact, as demanded by *sparse unanimity*, it assumes that all voters are honest and express the same preference θ_* , albeit each voter only scores a (potentially small) subset of all alternatives.

Theorem 1. *Given any individual-based, scale-invariant, neutral and stable normalizer $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ and any coordinate-wise, anonymous, neutral, max-dominated, locally Lipschitz continuous and asymptotically correct score aggregation AGG , $\text{VOTE}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) \triangleq \text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}(\vec{\theta}))$ fails to be **sparsely unanimous**.*

Sketch of proof. Our proof assumes $\theta_{*a} \triangleq a$, for all alternatives $a \in [A]$. We consider $N \triangleq K \cdot (A - 2)$ voters, each with a unit voting right, with voters $\{n, \dots, n + K - 1\}$ reporting the scores of alternatives 1, 2 and $n + 2$. The assumptions on $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ and AGG then imply that most alternatives a will receive roughly the same score, especially for a large enough. This then implies that the vote outputs scores that are hardly correlated with θ_* . In fact, the correlation goes to 0 in the limit $A, K \rightarrow \infty$. Appendix A provides the full proof. \square

Theorem 1 suggests that *sparse unanimity* cannot be achieved with individual score normalization. Instead, robust sparse voting seems to require adapting a voter’s score normalization based on other voters’ scores, i.e. the score normalization must be *collaborative*. It is critical to note that this may create a vulnerability in practice, as Byzantine voters may leverage their impact on other voters’ scores to scale these scores as best fits their purposes. Typically, whenever a voter n prefers a to b , a disagreeing Byzantine voter may want to make voter n ’s preference scale vanish, so that the vote essentially considers that voter n is nearly indifferent between a and b .

In fact, naive solutions for collaborative preference scaling fail to be *Byzantine resilient*, especially if they aim to identify a small subset of alternatives to serve as anchors, or if they aim to identify subsets of mutually comparable voters. Indeed, Byzantines with negligible (but positive) voting rights may then fabricate scores in order to upset the set of anchor alternatives, or the subsets of mutually comparable voters. In particular, the intervention of a handful of Byzantines with very small voting rights could then spectacularly upset most voters’ preference scaling, which would upset the outcome of the sparse vote. This may then vastly discredit the vote outcome.

To guarantee the Byzantine resilience of *robust sparse voting*, it seems critical to first solve the *Byzantine resilient* collaborative preference scaling problem, which itself requires a much more thorough understanding of what our definition of Byzantine resilience entails. Next, we introduce key primitives which will allow us to construct a solution to this problem. Our solution to robust sparse voting will then heavily rely on these primitives.

4 Introducing new Byzantine resilient primitives

In this section, we discuss Byzantine resilience. More precisely, we study (single-coordinate) score aggregation functions $\text{AGG} : \mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which output a global score $\text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$, based on the reported scores x_n and on their voting rights w_n . Without loss of generality, here, we assume that each voter does report a score (those that do not report any score may simply be ignored). In particular, a straightforward generalization of W -Byzantine resilience leads us to define the Byzantine resilience of aggregation functions as

$$\forall \vec{w} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \forall F \subset [N], \quad |\text{AGG}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) - \text{AGG}(\vec{w}^{-F}, \vec{x})| \leq \frac{\|\vec{w}^F\|_1}{W}. \quad (10)$$

In the sequel, we first show that classical (robust) statistics operators fail to be Byzantine resilient, as we defined it. We then introduce a new primitive, called the *Quadratically Regularized Median*, or QRMED, and we prove that QRMED does guarantee Byzantine resilience. We then leverage QRMED to construct another primitive called the *Byzantine-Robustified Mean*, or BRMEAN, which we prove to be Byzantine resilient and to equal the MEAN under some favorable conditions.

4.1 Weighted averaging is arbitrarily vulnerable

We start with the most naive voting algorithm, which is weighted averaging, given by $\text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \triangleq (\sum w_n x_n) / \|\vec{w}\|_1$. This algorithm is widely used by *collaborative filtering* algorithms for group recommender systems [FBST18a], and was proved by [PHG⁺00] to be the only *universal, unanimous, independent of irrelevant alternatives*⁵, *translation invariant*⁶ and sparse voting algorithm. Proposition 3 shows that weighted averaging is extremely vulnerable to Byzantine voters.

Proposition 3. *MEAN is arbitrarily manipulable by any voter with a positive voting right. More precisely, for any $f \in [N]$ with $w_f > 0$, for any voting right \vec{w}_n and score \vec{x}_n for voters $n \neq f$, and for any target score $y \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a Byzantine score reporting $x_f \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) = y$. As an immediate corollary, MEAN is not Byzantine resilient.*

Proof. It suffices to define $x_f \triangleq \frac{y}{w_f} \left(\sum_{n \in [N]} w_n \right) - \frac{1}{w_f} \sum_{n \neq f} w_n x_n$. □

4.2 The median is not Byzantine resilient

A popular robust statistics mean estimator is the median, which we denote MED. The median $M \triangleq \text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$ must guarantee that the left and right voting rights are at most half of all voting rights, i.e. $\sum_{n: x_n < M} w_n \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\vec{w}\|_1 \geq \sum_{n: x_n > M} w_n$. Note that the median may be ill-defined, as there may be multiple real numbers satisfying these properties. In this case, we define $\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \theta)$ to be the one closest to zero, which can be easily proven to be unique.

Proposition 4. *MED is not Byzantine resilient.*

The proposition is trivial in the case $N = 1$, as the median of the single voter’s input is clearly arbitrarily manipulable by this single voter. In the following proof, we show that this issue remains, even when the number of voters is very large.

⁵MEHESTAN fails to guarantee this property, which allows it to escape the impossibility theorem of [PHG⁺00].

⁶Translation invariance means invariance when adding a constant, as opposed to positive affine transformation invariance.

Proof. Fix $W > 0$ and any (potentially large) $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider $N \triangleq 2N_0 + 1$, with $w_n = 1$ for all $n \in [N]$. Assume moreover that $x_n \triangleq 0$ for $n \in [N_0]$, and $x_n \triangleq 2/W$ for $n \in [N_0 + 1, 2N_0] = \{N_0 + 1, N_0 + 2, \dots, 2N_0\}$. Now define $f \triangleq 2N_0 + 1$, i.e. the Byzantine voter is the last voter. Then $\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}_{-f}) = 0$. But by reporting $x_f \triangleq 2/W$, then $\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) = 2/W$. Thus, the intervention of the Byzantine voter modifies the output score by $2/W$, which is strictly larger than w_f/W . Thus MED fails to be W -Byzantine resilient, for any value of W . This proves the proposition. \square

Note that the key ideas of the proof can be easily generalized to other robust statistics operators, e.g. to trimmed means, especially if we consider $x_n = 2N/W$ for $n \in [N_0 + 1, 2N_0]$.

4.3 QrMed: A Byzantine-resilient asymptotically correct aggregation function

To guarantee Byzantine resilience, we introduce a new robust statistics operator, which we call the *quadratically regularized weighted median*, denoted QRMED . QRMED_W is parameterized by an additional weight $W > 0$, and is defined as follows:

$$\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \triangleq \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}(z | \vec{w}, \vec{x}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} W z^2 + \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n |z - x_n| \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Theorem 2. QRMED_W is well-defined, W -Byzantine resilient and asymptotically correct.

Sketch of proof. $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}$ is clearly W -strongly convex, which guarantees that QRMED_W is well-defined. By analyzing the derivatives of the loss, this also intuitively implies that any unit pull on z towards the right must overcome an increasing opposite force, whose scale increases at least proportionally to how far z is pulled. But given that, because of the absolute value, each (Byzantine) voter only pulls with a force proportional to their voting rights, this implies that the impact of their pull will also be proportional to their voting rights, which is why Byzantine resilience holds. Asymptotic correctness then follows from the fact that, once $\|\vec{w}\|_1$ is large enough, the quadratic regularization becomes negligible, and QRMED then approximately computes a median, which satisfies asymptotic correctness. The full proof is given in Appendix B. \square

We also state the following property of QRMED , which will be used to prove the Byzantine resilience of MEHESTAN.

Proposition 5. QRMED is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm.

Sketch of proof. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For simplicity, denote $q \triangleq \text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \theta)$. Denote the following objective function $L_\xi: x \mapsto \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n |x - \theta_n - \xi_n| + \frac{1}{2} W x^2$. We show in the proof that the minimum of L_ξ (which is exactly $\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \theta + \xi)$) is necessarily in the interval $[q - \|\xi\|_\infty, q + \|\xi\|_\infty]$ by remarking that L_ξ is strictly convex, that its subdifferential at $q + \|\xi\|_\infty$ includes non-negative values, and its subdifferential at $q - \|\xi\|_\infty$ includes non-positive values. \square

4.4 BrMean: A Byzantine resilient mean estimator

We now introduce another key robust statistics primitive, which successfully returns the mean of any sufficiently large set of bounded scores. We call it BRMEAN , for *Byzantine-Robustified Mean*. To define it, we first introduce the *Clipped Mean* CLIPMEAN centered on μ and of radius Δ by

$$\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} | \mu, \Delta) \triangleq \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \text{CLIP}(\vec{x} | \mu, \Delta)) = \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n \text{CLIP}(x_n | \mu, \Delta) \quad (12)$$

where $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) \triangleq \max\{\mu - \Delta, \min\{\mu + \Delta, x\}\}$ clips x within the interval $[\mu - \Delta, \mu + \Delta]$. BRMEAN is then obtained by executing CLIPMEAN , centered on QRMED , with a radius that grows linearly with the total amounts of votes:

$$\text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \triangleq \text{CLIPMEAN}\left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \mid \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W}\right). \quad (13)$$

Crucially for our purposes, BRMEAN has the following properties.

Theorem 3. *BRMEAN_W is W -Byzantine resilient. Moreover, if there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that $\|\vec{w}\|_1 \geq 8W\Delta$ and $x_n \in [-\Delta, \Delta]$ for all n , then $\text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$.*

Sketch of proof. The proof relies on the fact that CLIPMEAN is 1-Lipschitz in the center and in the radius, and is also sufficiently Byzantine resilient for small radii, when the amount of received votes is already large enough. The guarantee $\text{BRMEAN} = \text{MEAN}$ then holds once sufficiently many votes have been received, so that the radius of CLIPMEAN could safely grow large enough to contain all voters' inputs. The detailed proof is provided in Appendix C. \square

We stress that, remarkably, BRMEAN eventually returns the mean of bounded inputs, provided it received sufficiently many inputs, even though BRMEAN itself is oblivious to the input bounds. This is a critical property that will be at the heart of MEHESTAN . In particular, since MEAN is clearly covariant by (positive) affine transformations, this will allow us to guarantee that, in the favorable conditions defined by *sparse unanimity*, voters can effectively learn a common preference scaling. Designing a Byzantine resilient estimator with this feature turned out to be the most challenging aspect of our algorithm design and of our proof that MEHESTAN guarantees *sparse unanimity*.

An additional property, which will be used later in the proof for MEHESTAN 's Byzantine resilience, is the Lipschitz continuity of BRMEAN , as stated by Proposition 6.

Proposition 6. *BRMEAN is 2-Lipschitz continuous in the scores, with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm. Formally, for any $\vec{w}, \vec{x}, \vec{\xi}$, we have $\left| \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi}) - \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \right| \leq 2 \|\vec{\xi}\|_\infty$.*

Sketch of proof. Recall that CLIPMEAN is 1-Lipschitz (by Lemma 14) and 1-Lipschitz with respect to its center (by Lemma 11), and also that QRMED is 1-Lipschitz (by Proposition 5). We conclude using the triangular inequality. \square

5 Mehestan

In this section, we introduce MEHESTAN , which leverages BRMEAN to first solve collaborative robust preference scaling, and then QRMED to perform robust score aggregation.

5.1 The algorithm

MEHESTAN is presented in Algorithm 1. Essentially, MEHESTAN proceeds in four steps:

- (i) First, MEHESTAN performs an *individual-based* preference scaling. In our analysis, we consider min-max normalization.

Parameters: Voting resilience W , single-voter normalizer NORM

Input: Voters' scores $\vec{\theta}$, voting rights \vec{w} .

Output: The aggregated scores $\text{MEHESTAN}_W(w, \theta)$.

```

 $\forall n, \tilde{\theta}_n \leftarrow \text{NORM}(\theta_n);$  // Individual-based pre-normalization
 $\forall n, s_n \leftarrow 1 + \text{BRMEAN}_{\tau_W \|\tilde{\theta}\|_\infty} \{w_m, s_{nm} - 1 \mid m \in N_n^{AB}\};$  // Collaborative
preference scaling
 $\forall n, \tau_n \leftarrow \text{BRMEAN}_{\tau_W} \{w_m, \tau_{nm} \mid m \in N_n^A\};$  // Collaborative preference
translation
 $\forall a, \rho_a \leftarrow \text{QRMED}_{\tau_W}(\vec{w}, (s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n)_{n \in [N]});$  // Coordinate-wise score aggregation
return  $\rho$ ;

```

Algorithm 1: Computation of MEHESTAN

- (ii) Second, for each voter n , MEHESTAN leverages all other comparable voters' score scaling to collaboratively rescale the voter n 's preferences, using BRMEAN.
- (iii) Third, for each voter n , MEHESTAN leverages all other comparable voters' score translations to collaboratively re-translate the voter n 's preferences, using BRMEAN.
- (iv) Last, MEHESTAN performs a vote on the rescaled scores using QRMED.

Below, we detail the four steps.

5.1.1 Individual-based pre-normalization

MEHESTAN is parametrizable by the normalizer used for individual-based pre-normalization. Concretely, in our theoretical analysis, we will consider MEHESTAN based on min-max normalization. Thus, in particular, we will have $\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_\infty = 1$.

5.1.2 Collaborative preference scaling

For any voter $n \in [N]$, define $N_n^{AB} \triangleq \{m \in [N] \mid AB_{nm}^* \neq \emptyset\}$ the set of comparison-based comparable voters. In other words, $m \in N_n^{AB}$ if and only if there exists a pair of videos that n and m both scored with different scores. In particular, if n has scored at least two videos differently, then we have $n \in N_n^{AB}$. For each voter $m \in N_n^{AB}$, we define the comparative scaling of voters n and m by $s_{nm} \triangleq \frac{1}{|AB_{nm}^*|} \sum_{(a,b) \in AB_{nm}^*} \frac{|\tilde{\theta}_{ma} - \tilde{\theta}_{mb}|}{|\tilde{\theta}_{na} - \tilde{\theta}_{nb}|}$. Each voter m will then essentially vote for voter n 's preferences to be scaled according to voter m 's own scale, through BRMEAN:

$$s_n \triangleq 1 + \text{BRMEAN}_{\tau_W \|\tilde{\theta}\|_\infty} \{w_m, s_{nm} - 1 \mid m \in N_n^{AB}\}. \quad (14)$$

Note that we do not directly take the BRMEAN of the comparative scaling ratios s_{nm} , because we want the default value to equal 1 (in the absence of any comparable voter). It is also noteworthy that, if voters' scores are pre-normalized by min-max normalization, then $\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_\infty = 1$. However, the definition we provided will guarantee the following Byzantine resilience property, even for different preference pre-normalizations.

5.1.3 Collaborative preference translating

Similarly, voters indirectly vote for each other's translation factors. More precisely, define $N_n^A \triangleq \{m \in [N] \mid A_{nm} \neq \emptyset\}$ the set of translation-comparable voters. For each voter $m \in N_n^A$, we define $\tau_{nm} \triangleq \frac{1}{|A_{nm}|} \sum_{a \in A_{nm}} (s_m \tilde{\theta}_{ma} - s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na})$. We then compute the translation factor for voter n using the primitive BRMEAN:

$$\tau_n \triangleq \text{BRMEAN}_{7W} \{w_m, \tau_{nm} \mid m \in N_n^A\}. \quad (15)$$

5.1.4 Global scores

The global scores that result from MEHESTAN are then obtained by applying once again the quadratically regularized median to the rescaled voters' scores:

$$\text{MEHESTAN}_W(w, \theta) = \text{QRMED}_{7W} \{w_n, s_n \theta_n + \tau_n \mid n \in [N]\}. \quad (16)$$

5.2 Theoretical guarantees

Finally, we can state the main result of our paper.

Theorem 4. *Given MINMAXNORM as an individual-based pre-normalizer, MEHESTAN_W is W-Byzantine resilient and sparsely unanimous.*

Below, we sketch the proof of this main theorem. We first discuss the Byzantine resilience guarantee, which requires controlling the worst-case impact of Byzantine voters at each step of MEHESTAN. We then prove the sparse unanimity guarantee. Our proofs are nicely decomposed in lemmas, each of which may be interesting in their own rights.

5.3 Mehestan is Byzantine resilient

Let us now sketch the proof of the Byzantine resilience of MEHESTAN. First, note that the use of BRMEAN makes it possible to ensure a form of Byzantine resilience on the preference scaling.

Lemma 1. *For any subset $F \subset [N]$, denote s_n^{-F} the scaling obtained by involving only the voters $n \notin F$. Then, for any alternative a , we have $|s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} - s_n^{-F} \tilde{\theta}_{na}| \leq \frac{\|\tilde{w}^F\|_1}{7W}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3, $|s_n - s_n^{-F}| \leq \|\tilde{w}^{-F}\|_1 / 7W \|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_\infty$. From this, it follows that, for any alternative $a \in [A]$, we have $|s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} - s_n^{-F} \tilde{\theta}_{na}| = |s_n - s_n^{-F}| |\tilde{\theta}_{na}| \leq |s_n - s_n^{-F}| \|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\tilde{w}^F\|_1}{7W}$. \square

Lemma 2. *For any subset $F \subset [N]$, denote τ_n^{-F} the scaling obtained by involving only the voters $n \notin F$. Then, for any alternative a , we have $|\tau_n - \tau_n^{-F}| \leq \frac{5\|\tilde{w}^F\|_1}{7W}$.*

Sketch of proof. One complication is that Byzantine voters $f \in F$ affect the comparative translation factors τ_{nm} by affecting the scaling factors s_n and s_m that appear in their computations, even when $m \notin F$. Fortunately, combining Lemma 1, Proposition 6 allows to bound this impact. Combining this to Theorem 3 for the direct impact of Byzantines through τ_{nf} allows to conclude. The full proof is given in Appendix D. \square

Combining our lemmas and Theorem 2 guarantees the Byzantine resilience of MEHESTAN.

Lemma 3. MEHESTAN is W -Byzantine resilient.

Sketch of proof. The proof is akin to Lemma 2, by leveraging previous bounds, the Lipschitz continuity of QRMED and its Byzantine resilience. The full proof is given in Appendix D. \square

5.4 Mehestan is sparsely unanimous

We now sketch our proof of sparse unanimity, whose full proofs are provided in Appendix E. For any $\theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^A$, define the scaling bound

$$\bar{s}(\theta_*) \triangleq \frac{\max_{a,b} |\theta_{*a} - \theta_{*b}|}{\min_{a,b:\theta_{*a} \neq \theta_{*b}} |\theta_{*a} - \theta_{*b}|}, \quad (17)$$

which is trivially scale-invariant. Moreover, consider a complete score vector $\theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^A$, and denote $\tilde{\theta}_* \triangleq \text{MINMAXNORM}(\theta_*)$. We then have the following guarantee.

Lemma 4. Suppose θ_* -unanimity, comparability and MINMAXNORM pre-normalization. Then, for any $n \in [N]$, there must exist s_n^* and τ_n^* such that $\tilde{\theta}_n = s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*|A_n} + \tau_n^*$, with $1 \leq s_n^* \leq \bar{s}(\theta_*)$ and $-\bar{s}(\theta_*) \leq \tau_n^* \leq 0$.

Sketch of proof. Denoting a_n and b_n the best and worst alternatives scored by voter n , as opposed to the best and worst alternatives a and b according to θ_* , we can see that $s_n^* = \frac{\theta_{*a} - \theta_{*b}}{\theta_{*a_n} - \theta_{*b_n}} \in [1, \bar{s}(\theta_*)]$. The bound on τ_n^* is then obtained by looking at the normalized score of b_n . \square

As a consequence, each re-scaled quorum voter's preference is actually scaled identically to any other re-scaled quorum voter's preference.

Lemma 5. Suppose θ_* -unanimity, comparability, $8W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$ -weight and MINMAXNORM pre-normalization. Then the voters' re-scaled scores are consistent, in the sense that $s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n = s_m \tilde{\theta}_{ma} + \tau_m$, for all voters $n, m \in [N]$ and alternatives $a \in A_{nm}$ that both voters scored.

Sketch of proof. By comparability, Lemma 4 and Theorem 3, $s_n = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, (s_m^*/s_n^*)_{m \in [N]}) = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{s}^*)/s_n^*$. Thus $s_n s_n^*$, which is the overall multiplicative re-scaling compared to $\tilde{\theta}_*$, is independent of n . Similarly, Theorem 3 guarantees that $\tau_n = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, (s_m \tau_m^*)_{m \in [N]}) - s_n \tau_n^*$, which guarantees that the overall translation, with respect to $\tilde{\theta}_*$, is independent of the voter n . \square

It is noteworthy that the global multiplicative rescaling is a weighted average of the values s_n^* , which are known to be at least 1. Thus, under $8W\bar{s}(\theta_*)$ -weight, the collaborative preference normalization expands the scores' multiplicative scales. Aggregating correctly scaled unanimous preferences then allows to recover these preferences.

Lemma 6. Under θ_* -unanimity, comparability, $8W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$ -weight and MINMAXNORM pre-normalization, θ_* is recovered for $W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$ -scored alternatives, i.e. $\text{MEHESTAN}_W(\vec{\theta})|_{A_{W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2}} \sim \theta_*|_{A_{W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2}}$. In particular, MEHESTAN guarantees sparse unanimity for $W_0 \triangleq 8W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$.

Proof. By Lemma 5, under θ_* -unanimity, comparability and $8W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$ -weight, we know that there exists $\bar{s}^* \triangleq \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{s}^*) \in [1, \bar{s}(\theta_*)]$ and $\tilde{\tau}^* \triangleq \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, (s_m \tau_m^*)_{m \in [N]}) \in [-\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2, 0]$ such that $s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n = \bar{s}^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tilde{\tau}^* \in [-\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2, \bar{s}(\theta_*)^2]$ for all voters n and alternatives $a \in A_n$. Now suppose that an alternative a has received at least $W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$ votes (measured in voting rights). We know that these votes are all identical and equal to $\bar{s}^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tilde{\tau}^*$. But then, the optimality condition of QRMED_W shows that we must have $\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, (s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n)_{n \in [N]}) = \bar{s}^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tilde{\tau}^*$. Thus, for all alternatives $a \in A_{W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2}$, we must have $\text{MEHESTAN}_{W,a}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) = \bar{s}^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tilde{\tau}^*$, which is an affine transformation of $\tilde{\theta}_*$. This concludes the proof. \square

6 Empirical Evaluation

We present in this section our practical experiments on MEHESTAN. and other voting algorithms.

Experimental setting Throughout the experiments, by default, we test with $N = 150$ voters and $A = 300$ alternatives, on synthetic data. We first randomly generate a score vector $\theta_* \in \mathbb{R}^A$, drawn from a Cauchy distribution. Then, we randomly assign each voter a set of alternatives A_n that they scored using a Bernoulli distribution of parameter $\text{density} = 0.1$. Moreover, each voter n is assigned the following score vector $\theta_n = s_n^* \theta_{*|A_n} + \tau_n^*$, where $s_n^* > 0, \tau_n^*$ are randomly drawn, according to a log-normal distribution and a normal distribution, respectively. By default, we use the min-max normalization and set the voting resilience parameter to $W = 5$.

Each experiment consists in measuring Pearson’s correlation between the algorithms’ outputs and the unanimous preferences θ_* , by varying one parameter while keeping the others fixed to their default value. Each experiment is repeated 5 times with the seeds 1 to 5 for reproducibility. The correlation values are averaged, and the 95% confidence interval is shown in the plots.

We vary the following parameters:

- *comparability* $\in [0, 1]$ is a measure of voter comparability, with 1 indicating that all voters are comparable and 0 indicating that no intervention was made to make voters more comparable than after score generation. By default, in other experiments, we set *comparability* = 0,
- *density*, as previously mentioned, is a parameter in $[0, 1]$ indicating how sparse the inputs are, with 0 indicating full sparsity and 1 indicating scoring completeness.
- *n_extreme* is the number of voters who have a biased choice of alternatives they were assigned to score. Such voters, which we will refer to as *reporting-biased* voters, are assigned randomly alternatives with top or bottom scores from θ_* . Its default value is 0.

Additionally, we test the tolerance to biased sparsity. That is, we initially compute the outcome of the vote on the synthetic data with the default parameters (*density* = 0.1 in particular). Next, we only leave a percentage (denoted as *density* in Subfigure 1d). Importantly, the top/bottom scores of 10 voters are hidden. Then, we report the correlation of the output of the vote with its initial output (not the unanimous preferences).

Results Our results are presented in Figure 1. Remarkably, Subfigure 1a shows that MEHESTAN performs well for sparse scores, and essentially recovers the unanimous preference with *density* = 0.2

only. Conversely, MED without score normalization has poor performances, even at relatively small sparsity, like $density=0.5$. This underlines the importance of tackling score normalization.

Subfigure 1b shows that MEHESTAN performs fairly well, even when voters are hardly completely comparable, though increased comparability helps. Note also that QRMED outperforms MED on identically normalized preferences. Meanwhile, Subfigure 1c shows that having numerous reporting-biased voters makes recovering the unanimous significantly harder. It also shows that MEHESTAN provides significant improvement over other algorithms in the presence of biased voters.

Finally, Subfigure 1d shows the result of the experiment testing the vote’s tolerance to biased sparsity, as explained in the previous section. It is desirable for a voting algorithm not to change its outcome by too much when a few scores are hidden. This experiment is actually very challenging since the scores to be hidden are voluntarily those of top/bottom alternatives. Nevertheless, MEHESTAN achieves 100% correlation with its initial output even after 40% of the data is hidden.

7 Extensions

We discuss here how additional desirable properties can be guaranteed, by tweaking MEHESTAN.

7.1 Differential Privacy

In several applications, guaranteeing the privacy of robust sparse voting may be critical to prevent voter coercion. In this section, we prove that MEHESTAN can be easily made differentially private. Let us first recall the definition of (voter-level) differential privacy.

Definition 13 (Voter-level differential privacy). *Let $\epsilon > 0$. A (randomized) vote $VOTE$ is ϵ -differentially private if, for any $f \in [N]$ and all subsets $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^A$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[VOTE(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathcal{S} \right] \leq e^\epsilon \mathbb{P} \left[VOTE(\vec{w}-f, \vec{\theta}_{-f}) \in \mathcal{S} \right]. \quad (18)$$

For any parameter $\epsilon > 0$, we define the ϵ -differentially private MEHESTAN voting algorithm by simply adding a Laplacian noise to each returned global score, whose scale is proportional to $1/\epsilon W$. More formally, for any alternative $a \in [A]$, we define

$$DP\text{-MEHESTAN}_{W\epsilon a}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) \triangleq \text{MEHESTAN}_{W a}(\vec{w}, \vec{\theta}) + \text{LAP} \left(0, \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_\infty}{\epsilon W} \right), \quad (19)$$



where $\text{LAP}(0, b)$ is a random variable drawn from the Laplace distribution with mean 0 and scale b .

Theorem 5. *For all $\epsilon > 0$, $DP\text{-MEHESTAN}_{W\epsilon}$ is ϵ -differentially private.*



Proof. This follows trivially from the ϵ -differential privacy of the Laplace mechanism, combined with the Byzantine resilience guarantee of MEHESTAN. \square

7.2 Uncertainty-aware voting

In practice, reported scores are noisy, with potentially different levels of noise. Here, we show how MEHESTAN can be enhanced to account for uncertainty in the input. Our key solution is to leverage a new operator called the *mean-risk distance* MRDIST. Essentially, MRDIST simulates the



(a) Sparsity tolerance: how much sparsity can be tolerated while still recovering unanimous preferences
 (b) Comparability-awareness: the capacity of the prefer-vote algorithm to leverage the comparability of voters' scores to recover unanimous preferences



(c) Biased voters tolerance: preference recovery in the presence of reporting-based voters
 (d) Biased sparsity tolerance: the vote's output with 10% density is compared to its output after hiding top/bottom rated scores of voters

Figure 1: Numerical results of the experiments testing: the vote's (a) sparsity tolerance, (b) comparability-awareness, (c) biased voters tolerance and (d) biased sparsity tolerance. The results show overall that MEHESTAN performs best, and that using QRMED significantly improves MED's performance.

fact that a voter’s uncertainty-aware vote is its expected vote, when the voter’s score is drawn from our Bayesian prior on their actual score. More formally, given a prior probability distribution \mathcal{D} of finite expectation and a point $z \in \mathbb{R}$, MRDIST is defined as:

$$\text{MRDIST}(z | \mathcal{D}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\theta \sim \mathcal{D}} [|z - \theta|]. \quad (20)$$

QRMED can then be easily made uncertainty-aware, by replacing the absolute values as follows:

$$\text{QRMED}_W(w, \mathcal{D}) \triangleq \arg \min_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} W z^2 + \sum_{n \in [N]} \text{MRDIST}(z | \mathcal{D}_n). \quad (21)$$

Crucially, since MRDIST is a mean of functions whose subderivatives are always of absolute value at most 1, the subderivatives of MRDIST are also always of absolute value at most 1. Intuitively, this means that if z falls into a voter n ’s uncertainty set, then the voter n will only slightly pull z towards their maximum-a-posterior score. However, if z falls very far from this uncertainty set, the voter n will be pulling with its entire voting rights w_n . In any case, the fact that any voter’s pull remains bounded by their voting rights guarantees the W -Byzantine resilience of this generalization of QRMED. Additionally, MEHESTAN can be similarly adapted, though handling collaborative scaling normalization is not straightforward. Interestingly, MRDIST yields a closed form expression for some parameterized priors, like the Laplacian prior.

Proposition 7. *For a Laplacian prior $\mathcal{D} = \text{LAP}(\mu, \delta)$, $\text{MRDIST}(z | \mathcal{D}) = |z - \mu| - \mu + \delta e^{-\frac{|z - \mu|}{\delta}}$.*

Proof. This is a straightforward integral computation. \square

7.3 Measuring preference polarization

We now propose a Byzantine-resilient polarization measure on a given alternative a . To do this, we divide the voters $n \in N_a$ who scored a in two equal subsets of high and low-scoring voters. More precisely, define $w_a \triangleq \sum_{n \in N_a} w_n$ and $m_a \triangleq \text{MED} \left\{ w_n, s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n \mid n \in N_a \right\}$. Now consider $N_a^+ \triangleq \left\{ n \in N_a \mid s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n > m_a \right\}$ and $N_a^- \triangleq \left\{ n \in N_a \mid s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n < m_a \right\}$. Define finally $w_a^+ \triangleq \sum_{n \in N_a^+} w_n$ and $w_a^- \triangleq \sum_{n \in N_a^-} w_n$. By definition of the median, we must have $w_a^- \geq \frac{1}{2} w_a$ and $w_a^+ \geq \frac{1}{2} w_a$.

Now denote $\rho_a \triangleq \text{MEHESTAN}_{W_a}(w, \vec{\theta})$. For any voter $n \in N_a$ who scored a , we define $\eta_{na}^+ \triangleq \max(0, s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n - \rho_a)$. Similarly, denote $\eta_{na}^- \triangleq \max(0, \rho_a - s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} - \tau_n)$. We define the positive polarization ψ_a^+ and the negative polarization ψ_a^- , on alternative a by

$$\psi_a^\star \triangleq 1 + \text{QRMED}_W \left\{ \left\{ w_n, \eta_{na}^\star - 1 \mid n \in N_a^\star \right\} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} w_a - w_a^\star, \max \{ m_a - \rho_a, -1 \} \right\} \right\}, \quad (22)$$

for $\star \in \{-, +\}$. In other words, the polarization is initially assumed to be 1. Voters who believe that ρ_a is underestimated will then pull ψ_a^+ towards larger values; but they can only do so with a unit force. This prevents Byzantines from hacking polarization measures.

8 Related Work

Our research lies at the intersection of numerous research domains. Below, we overview prior works in these domains that are related to our *robust sparse voting* problem.

Social choice theory. This area [Lis13, End17] is primarily concerned with combining individual preferences into a collective aggregate, in order to facilitate a collective decision. A popular and important result from social choice theory is Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem [Arr50], stating that dictatorship is the only ranking-based voting mechanism that satisfies a few fairness criteria. Fortunately, it is possible to escape this rather pessimistic result by including additional information from the voters [Sen99]. For example, range voting [Smi00] requires voters to give a score to each candidate and verifies the fairness criteria of Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem. Likewise, in our work, we assume that voters provide real-valued scores to alternatives.

The problem of *sparse voting* has rarely been addressed in social choice theory. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning recent work that tackles the sparse voting problem in the ordinal setting [MCE16], where voters only rank a small subset of the candidates. The authors formulated desirable properties to be verified by a distance between incomplete rankings, and generalized Kemeny and Snell’s approach [KS62] to verify these properties.

Group recommender systems. An important use case of our work is that of group recommender systems (GRS). In contrast to a single-user recommender system (SRS) [RV97], a GRS [FBST18b] provides recommendations aimed at a group of people, rather than an individual. In practice, any algorithm used for group recommendation faces the problem of preference aggregation at some point. A categorization of the aggregation functions used in GRS, all inspired from social choice theory, was proposed in [FBST18a]. When the input of a GRS are sparse real-valued lists of ratings, especially when there could be malicious users, then our voting system can be used effectively for GRS.

In fact, there are situations where the preference aggregation techniques used in GRS can be employed to solve problems encountered in SRS. Two such situations were discussed in [Mas03]: (i) the cold-start problem, that is when new users join the system and the SRS has no previous data on them, and (ii) when there are multiple criteria rated for each alternative. Interestingly, single-user recommendation is another potential application of our mechanism.

The scaling problem. When voters provide numerical ratings, preference aggregation functions need to consider the difference in users’ internal rating scale [PHG⁺00, YZCW13, Lem05]. Scale invariance is then a desirable property for preference aggregation functions. In fact, interestingly, it was shown in [Lem05] that some scale-invariant collaborative filtering algorithms outperform their non-invariant counterparts. The attempt to verify the scale invariance property may explain why collaborative filtering based recommender systems usually use weighted averaging to aggregate preferences [PHG⁺00]. This clearly makes such scaling-invariant solutions very vulnerable to Byzantine attacks.

A significant amount of previous work proposed solutions to address the scaling problem. Scale-invariant similarity metrics such as Pearson’s correlation were leveraged for that purpose in [Lem05, SK09]. We also quantify all rating vectors’ distance by using Pearson’s correlation. Various normalization techniques were used in [RIS⁺94, XL15, Lem05] to bring users’ ratings to a single global scale. Interestingly, we show in our paper that individual-based normalization techniques fail to solve the scaling problem.

Content recommendation with adversaries. Recommender systems are not immune to adversaries. For example, collaborative filtering based recommender systems are known to be vul-

nerable to shilling attacks [SL20], namely fake profiles and bogus ratings’ injection. In particular, graph-based recommender systems [FPRS07] were shown in [FYGL18] to recommend a target item a hundred times more, when only 1% of the total users were injected fake profiles.

Most prior work investigated ways to defend against such attacks by leveraging trust (between voters). For instance, trust network was used in [TMLS09] to limit the amount of votes collected from fake users via the max-flow concept. However, it is not clear how the quality of the vote can be evaluated. A trust-based SRS was developed in [ABC⁺08] (with binary recommendations) based on random walks that are incentive compatible [YSK⁺09].

Decentralized Byzantine voting. The problem of voting in the presence of a limited fraction of Byzantine voters has been addressed recently in the distributed setting. This line of research tackles a generalization of the Byzantine Agreement problem [LSP82] in Distributed Computing. For example, the algorithms proposed in [CG13, Tse17] yield the single winner of an election held in the presence of a fraction of Byzantine voters, using the plurality voting rule. Voters’ rankings were used in [MWW18] to output an aggregated ranking leveraging the Kemeny rule [KS62], while verifying a correctness condition. Sparse unanimity (Property 1) is closely related to the correctness properties (i.e. properties that ensure that the vote output is meaningful) sought in the aforementioned works. However, in contrast, our voting mechanism tolerates sparse inputs, can utilize scores (and not just rankings) and assumes a centralized mechanism. Finally, instead of considering a constant fraction of Byzantine players, we seek Byzantine resilience (Property 2) to control their influence.

Robust statistics. Our algorithm MEHESTAN relies on primitives such as QRMED and BRMEAN, which can be described as robust estimators in statistical terms. Such objects have been developed and studied in the field of robust statistics [Hub04, Mor07]. In our work, we use regularization to stabilize the robust estimation when the number of voters of an alternative is low, which can be expected in the sparse setting. A similar idea was suggested in the field of signal processing in [LP19] in the context of robust mean and covariance matrix estimation for incomplete data with the monotone missing-data pattern.

High-dimensional voting. A new line of research has studied voting in high dimension [EFGH21], based on the fairness principle “one voter, one unit force”. Essentially, each voter would select a preferred vector, and would then pull on a social choice vector with a unit force towards their preferred vector. The result of the vote is then defined as the equilibrium of this pulling process. When the norm of the forces is measured by the Euclidean distance, then the resulting social choice vector boils down to the *geometric median*. Interestingly, it was shown in [EFGH21] that, while not strategyproof, the geometric median is asymptotically α -strategyproof.

However, the geometric median must input as a voter’s preferences a high-dimensional vector. In the context of content recommendation with billions of alternatives, where each alternative is given a score, this would amount to a 1-billion vector entry. Evidently, it is unreasonable to ask every user to provide such an input. To overcome this issue, a mechanism (named LICCHAVI) was proposed in [FGH21], combining learning and voting, thereby enabling sparse voting. However, LICCHAVI was not designed to be invariant to affine positive transformations of voters’ cardinal preferences.

9 Conclusion

This paper defines the robust sparse voting problem, highlights its underlying technical challenges, and presents MEHESTAN, a novel robust sparse voting algorithm. Our work opens several questions. In particular, we conjecture that majoritarianism, instead of unanimity, may be impossible to couple with Byzantine resilience. It might also be interesting to investigate whether additional properties could be ensured, such as order consistency and independence of irrelevant alternatives. As we assumed a centralized setting, it would be appealing to investigate how to decentralize MEHESTAN.

References

- [ABC⁺08] Reid Andersen, Christian Borgs, Jennifer T. Chayes, Uriel Feige, Abraham D. Flaxman, Adam Kalai, Vahab S. Mirrokni, and Moshe Tennenholtz. Trust-based recommendation systems: an axiomatic approach. In Jinpeng Huai, Robin Chen, Hsiao-Wuen Hon, Yunhao Liu, Wei-Ying Ma, Andrew Tomkins, and Xiaodong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2008, Beijing, China, April 21-25, 2008*, pages 199–208. ACM, 2008.
- [Arr50] Kenneth J Arrow. A difficulty in the concept of social welfare. *Journal of political economy*, 58(4):328–346, 1950.
- [Ata19] Nada Maucourant Atallah. How internet has become a battleground in the lebanese revolution. *Le Commerce du Levant*, 26, 2019.
- [BBH21] Samantha Bradshaw, Hannah Bailey, and Philip N Howard. Industrialized disinformation: 2020 global inventory of organized social media manipulation, 2021.
- [BH19] Samantha Bradshaw and Philip N Howard. *The global disinformation order: 2019 global inventory of organised social media manipulation*. Project on Computational Propaganda, 2019.
- [BL11] Michel Balinski and Rida Laraki. *Majority judgment: measuring, ranking, and electing*. MIT press, 2011.
- [CG13] Himanshu Chauhan and Vijay K Garg. Democratic elections in faulty distributed systems. In *International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*, pages 176–191. Springer, 2013.
- [Dol21] Lara Dolden. Facebook removed over 15 billion fake accounts in 2 years. *Tech Round*, 2021.
- [EFGH21] El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi, Sadegh Farhadkhani, Rachid Guerraoui, and Lê Nguyễn Hoang. On the strategyproofness of the geometric median. *CoRR*, abs/2106.02394, 2021.
- [ELM20] Laura Edelson, Tobias Lauinger, and Damon McCoy. A security analysis of the facebook ad library. In *2020 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2020, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 18-21, 2020*, pages 661–678. IEEE, 2020.
- [End17] Ulle Endriss. *Trends in computational social choice*. Lulu. com, 2017.

- [FBST18a] Alexander Felfernig, Ludovico Boratto, Martin Stettinger, and Marko Tkalčič. Algorithms for group recommendation. In *Group recommender systems*, pages 27–58. Springer, 2018.
- [FBST18b] Alexander Felfernig, Ludovico Boratto, Martin Stettinger, and Marko Tkalčič. *Group recommender systems: An introduction*. Springer, 2018.
- [FGH21] Sadeqh Farhadkhani, Rachid Guerraoui, and Lê Nguyễn Hoàng. Strategyproof learning: Building trustworthy user-generated datasets. *CoRR*, abs/2106.02398, 2021.
- [FPRS07] Francois Fouss, Alain Pirotte, Jean-Michel Renders, and Marco Saerens. Random-walk computation of similarities between nodes of a graph with application to collaborative recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 19(3):355–369, 2007.
- [FYGL18] Minghong Fang, Guolei Yang, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, and Jia Liu. Poisoning attacks to graph-based recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference*, pages 381–392, 2018.
- [HFJ⁺21] Lê Nguyễn Hoàng, Louis Faucon, Aidan Jungo, Sergei Volodin, Dalia Papuc, Orfeas Liossatos, Ben Crulis, Mariame Tighanimine, Isabela Constantin, Anastasiia Kucherenko, Alexandre Maurer, Felix Grimberg, Vlad Nitu, Chris Vossen, Sébastien Rouault, and El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi. Tournesol: A quest for a large, secure and trustworthy database of reliable human judgments. *CoRR*, abs/2107.07334, 2021.
- [Hoa17] Lê Nguyễn Hoàng. Strategy-proofness of the randomized condorcet voting system. *Soc. Choice Welf.*, 48(3):679–701, 2017.
- [Hub04] Peter J Huber. *Robust statistics*, volume 523. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [inv21] A Wall Street Journal investigation. The facebook files. *The Wall Street Journal*, 2021.
- [JHB⁺21] Liwei Jiang, Jena D. Hwang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Maxwell Forbes, Jon Borchardt, Jenny Liang, Oren Etzioni, Maarten Sap, and Yejin Choi. Delphi: Towards machine ethics and norms. *CoRR*, abs/2110.07574, 2021.
- [KS62] John G Kemeny and LJ Snell. Preference ranking: an axiomatic approach. *Mathematical models in the social sciences*, pages 9–23, 1962.
- [Lem05] Daniel Lemire. Scale and translation invariant collaborative filtering systems. *Information Retrieval*, 8(1):129–150, 2005.
- [Lis13] Christian List. *Social choice theory*. 2013.
- [LP19] Junyan Liu and Daniel P Palomar. Regularized robust estimation of mean and covariance matrix for incomplete data. *Signal Processing*, 165:278–291, 2019.
- [LSP82] Leslie Lamport, Robert E. Shostak, and Marshall C. Pease. The byzantine generals problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.

- [Mas03] Judith Masthoff. Modeling the multiple people that are me. In *International Conference on User Modeling*, pages 258–262. Springer, 2003.
- [MCE16] Erick Moreno-Centeno and Adolfo R Escobedo. Axiomatic aggregation of incomplete rankings. *IIE Transactions*, 48(6):475–488, 2016.
- [Mor07] Stephan Morgenthaler. A survey of robust statistics. *Statistical Methods and Applications*, 15(3):271–293, 2007.
- [MWW18] Darya Melnyk, Yuyi Wang, and Roger Wattenhofer. Byzantine preferential voting. In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, pages 327–340. Springer, 2018.
- [NHK19] Lisa-Maria Neudert, Philip Howard, and Bence Kollanyi. Sourcing and automation of political news and information during three european elections. *Social Media+ Society*, 5(3):2056305119863147, 2019.
- [PHG⁺00] David M Pennock, Eric Horvitz, C Lee Giles, et al. Social choice theory and recommender systems: Analysis of the axiomatic foundations of collaborative filtering. In *AAAI/IAAI*, pages 729–734, 2000.
- [RIS⁺94] Paul Resnick, Neophytos Iacovou, Mitesh Suchak, Peter Bergstrom, and John Riedl. GroupLens: An open architecture for collaborative filtering of netnews. In *Proceedings of the 1994 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, pages 175–186, 1994.
- [RV97] Paul Resnick and Hal R Varian. Recommender systems. *Communications of the ACM*, 40(3):56–58, 1997.
- [Sat21] Adam Satariano. Inside a pro-huawei influence campaign. *The New York Times*, 2021.
- [Sen99] Amartya Sen. The possibility of social choice. *American economic review*, 89(3):349–378, 1999.
- [SK09] Xiaoyuan Su and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey of collaborative filtering techniques. *Advances in artificial intelligence*, 2009, 2009.
- [SL20] Mingdan Si and Qingshan Li. Shilling attacks against collaborative recommender systems: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 53(1):291–319, 2020.
- [Smi00] Warren D Smith. Range voting. *The paper can be downloaded from the author’s homepage at <http://www.math.temple.edu/~wds/homepage/works.html>*, 2000.
- [TML09] Dinh Nguyen Tran, Bonan Min, Jinyang Li, and Lakshminarayanan Subramanian. Sybil-resilient online content voting. In Jennifer Rexford and Emin Gün Sirer, editors, *Proceedings of the 6th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation, NSDI 2009, April 22-24, 2009, Boston, MA, USA*, pages 15–28. USENIX Association, 2009.

- [Tse17] Lewis Tseng. Voting in the presence of byzantine faults. In *2017 IEEE 22nd Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing (PRDC)*, pages 1–10. IEEE, 2017.
- [VNM53] John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern. *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton university press, 1953.
- [Woo20] Samuel Woolley. *The Reality Game: A gripping investigation into deepfake videos, the next wave of fake news and what it means for democracy*. Hachette UK, 2020.
- [XL15] Hong Xie and John CS Lui. Mathematical modeling and analysis of product rating with partial information. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 9(4):1–33, 2015.
- [YSK⁺09] Haifeng Yu, Chenwei Shi, Michael Kaminsky, Phillip B Gibbons, and Feng Xiao. Dsybil: Optimal sybil-resistance for recommendation systems. In *2009 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 283–298. IEEE, 2009.
- [Yue19] Neriah Yue. The” weaponization” of facebook in myanmar: A case for corporate criminal liability. *Hastings LJ*, 71:813, 2019.
- [YZCW13] Surong Yan, Xiaolin Zheng, Deren Chen, and Yan Wang. Exploiting two-faceted web of trust for enhanced-quality recommendations. *Expert systems with applications*, 40(17):7080–7095, 2013.

A Proof of our impossibility theorem

Theorem 1. *Given any individual-based, scale-invariant, neutral and stable normalizer $\overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}$ and any coordinate-wise, anonymous, neutral, max-dominated, locally Lipschitz continuous and asymptotically correct score aggregation AGG , the vote $\text{VOTE}(w, \vec{\theta}) \triangleq \text{AGG}(w, \overrightarrow{\text{NORM}}(\vec{\theta}))$ fails to be sparsely majoritarian, even when the set $[N]$ of all voters forms a unanimous comparable quorum.*

Proof. Consider θ_* defined by $\theta_{*a} = a$, for all alternatives $a \in [A]$. Assume that there are $N \triangleq K \cdot (A - 2)$ voters, with voters $\{n, \dots, n + K - 1\}$ reporting the scores of alternatives 1, 2 and $n + 2$. Note that any alternative $a \geq 3$ is then scored only by the group of voters $\{a - 2, \dots, a + K - 3\}$. We then give the same voting right $w_n \triangleq w_0$ to all voters n , which we choose to be large enough to guarantee the conditions of sparse unanimity. We will then consider the limit of this setting, as $A, K \rightarrow \infty$.

By scale invariance, we know that $\text{NORM}(\theta_n) = \text{NORM}\left(\frac{\theta_n - 1}{n + 1}\right) = \text{NORM}\left(0, \frac{1}{n + 1}, 1\right)$, where the entries of $\left(0, \frac{1}{n + 1}, 1\right)$ correspond to the alternatives 1, 2 and $n + 2$.

Since NORM is stable, we have $\text{NORM}(\theta_n) = \text{NORM}(0, 0, 1) + \mathcal{O}(1/n) = (x, x, z) + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$, where $x, z \in \mathbb{R}$ are fully determined by the normalization function NORM (note that we use the neutrality of NORM to guarantee that x and z do not depend on which alternatives' scores have been reported by voter n).

Moreover, we necessarily have $x \neq z$ because NORM is a normalizer, and thus preserves strict order.

Since F is coordinate-wise, for any alternative a , there exists a function f_a such that $F_a(\vec{\theta}) = f_a(\vec{\theta}_a)$.

Since F is neutral, we must have $f_a = f_b \triangleq f$ for any two alternatives $a, b \in [A]$.

Since F is anonymous and neutral, we must have $f(\vec{\theta}_a) = f(\vec{\theta}_b)$ if both $\vec{\theta}_a$ and $\vec{\theta}_b$ contain the same entries (but potentially from different voters).

By local Lipschitz continuity of F , if these entries are equal to $z + \mathcal{O}(1/a)$, then $F_a(\vec{\theta}) = f(z, \dots, z) + \mathcal{O}(1/a)$.

Now, recall that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^A$, $\text{CORREL}(x, y) = \left\langle \frac{\pi(x)}{\|\pi(x)\|_2}, \frac{\pi(y)}{\|\pi(y)\|_2} \right\rangle$, where for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^A$, $\pi(x) = x - \text{MEAN}(x)$.

Denote $\rho \triangleq \text{VOTE}(w, \vec{\theta})$. We then have $\rho_1 = f(\vec{x}_1)$ and $\rho_2 = f(\vec{x}_2)$, where $x_{1n} = x + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$ and $x_{2n} = x + \mathcal{O}(1/n)$. Since F is max-dominated, it directly follows that $f(\vec{x}_1), f(\vec{x}_2) = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

For $a \geq 3$, we then have $\rho_a = f(z, \dots, z) + \mathcal{O}(1/a)$.

Moreover, since F is asymptotically correct, once K is large enough, we have $|f(z, \dots, z) - z| \leq |z - x|/2$.

In particular, since $z \neq x$, this means that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that $|f(z, \dots, z) - x| > c_1$.

Thus, on one hand

$$\text{MEAN}(\rho) = \frac{\mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1) + Af(z, \dots, z) + \sum_a \mathcal{O}(1/a)}{A} = f(z, \dots, z) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln A}{A}\right). \quad (23)$$

And on the other hand, we have that there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|\rho - \text{MEAN}(\rho)\|_2^2 > c_2, \quad (24)$$

Also, thanks to the choice of θ_* , by computing $\frac{\pi(\theta_*)}{\|\pi(\theta_*)\|_2}$ we have

$$\left\| \frac{\pi(\theta_*)}{\|\pi(\theta_*)\|_2} \right\|_\infty = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{A}}\right). \quad (25)$$

We can now conclude that

$$|\text{CORREL}(\rho, \theta_*)| = \left| \left\langle \frac{\pi(\theta_*)}{\|\pi(\theta_*)\|_2}, \frac{\pi(\rho)}{\|\pi(\rho)\|_2} \right\rangle \right| \quad (26)$$

$$\leq \left\| \frac{\pi(\theta_*)}{\|\pi(\theta_*)\|_2} \right\|_\infty \cdot \left(\mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1) + A\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln A}{A}\right) + \sum_a \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) \right) \quad (27)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\ln A}{\sqrt{A}}\right). \quad (28)$$

□

B Proof of the theorem on QrMed

Lemma 7. QRMED_W is W -Byzantine resilient.

Proof. Consider any inputs (\vec{w}, \vec{x}) and any subset $F \subset [N]$. Denote $q \triangleq \text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$ and $q^{-F} \triangleq \text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}^{-F}, \vec{x})$. Clearly, Byzantine resilience is verified if $q = q^{-F}$. Assume that $q^{-F} > q$ (the case $q^{-F} < q$ can be treated similarly). We want to guarantee that $\Delta \triangleq q^{-F} - q \leq w_f/W$.

To do so, denote $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}^{-F}$ the loss for input (\vec{w}^{-F}, \vec{x}) , and $g_0 \triangleq \sup \partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}^{-F}(q^{-F})$ the maximum subderivative of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}^{-F}$ at its optimum. By the optimality condition on subderivatives, we know that $g_0 \geq 0$. Now define $g_1 \triangleq \inf \partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}^{-F}(1)$ the minimal subderivative of the restricted loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}^{-F}$ at the QRMED of all voters. By W -strongly convexity of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}^{-F}$, we know that we must have $(g_1 - g_0)\Delta \geq W\Delta^2$, and thus $g_1 \geq g_0 + W\Delta \geq W\Delta$.

But now, note that, for any $\partial(w_f |z - x_f|) = w_f \text{sign}(z - x_f) \subset [-w_f, +w_f]$. As a result, defining $h \triangleq \inf \partial \sum_{f \in F} w_f |q - x_f|$ the minimal subderivative of the weighted sum of distances to Byzantine's scores, at the QRMED of all voters, we must have $h \geq -w_f$. We then have $\min \partial L(q) = g_1 + h \geq W\Delta - w_f$. But by the optimality of QRMED, this minimum must also be nonpositive. This implies that $0 \geq W\Delta - w_f$, which can be rewritten as $\Delta \leq w_f/W$. This proves W -Byzantine resilience. □

Lemma 8. QRMED_W is asymptotically correct.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of real numbers converging to 0. We will assume that $x \geq 0$, the case $x \leq 0$ being analogous. Now, let $\varepsilon > 0$. By convergence of $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we know that there is N_0 such that for all $n \geq N_0 + 1$, we have $|\xi_n| \leq \varepsilon/2$. We then introduce $N_1 \triangleq 2N_0 + \max(0, W(x - \varepsilon))$ and the function $L: t \mapsto \frac{W}{2}t^2 + \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N_1} |t - x - \xi_n|$. The function L is strictly convex, subdifferentiable, and its minimum is attained at $q \triangleq \text{QRMED}_W((x + \xi_n)_{1 \leq n \leq N_1})$. Thanks to the aforementioned result about the convergence of $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we can show that $\partial L(x + \varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{R}^+$. Similarly, we can show that $\partial L(x - \varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{R}^-$. We conclude by convexity of L that we necessarily have $q \in [x - \varepsilon, x + \varepsilon]$, i.e. $|x - q| \leq \varepsilon$. □

C BrMean is Byzantine resilient

In this section, we provide the complete proof of the Byzantine resilience of BRMEAN.

Note that CLIPMEAN has the following desirable properties.

Lemma 9. *CLIP is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the radius, i.e.*

$$\forall x, \mu, \Delta, \Delta' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta')| \leq |\Delta - \Delta'|. \quad (29)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\Delta' \geq \Delta$. If $x \in [\mu - \Delta, \mu + \Delta]$, then $x \in [\mu - \Delta', \mu + \Delta']$, and hence $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) = x = \text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta')$. Thus the difference, which is zero, is smaller than $|\Delta - \Delta'|$. If $x > \mu + \Delta$, then $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) = \mu + \Delta$ and $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta') = \min\{\mu + \Delta', x\} \in [\mu + \Delta, \mu + \Delta']$. We then have $|\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta')| \leq (\mu + \Delta') - (\mu + \Delta) = |\Delta - \Delta'|$. The case $x < \mu - \Delta$ is treated similarly. \square

Lemma 10. *CLIPMEAN is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the radius, i.e.*

$$\forall \vec{w}, \vec{x}, \forall \mu, \Delta, \Delta' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta')| \leq |\Delta - \Delta'|. \quad (30)$$

Proof. By triangle inequality and Lemma 9, we have $|\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta')| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum w_n |\text{CLIP}(x_n|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x_n|\mu, \Delta')| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum w_n |\Delta - \Delta'| = |\Delta - \Delta'|$. \square

Lemma 11. *CLIP is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the center, i.e.*

$$\forall x, \Delta, \mu, \mu' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x|\mu', \Delta)| \leq |\mu - \mu'|. \quad (31)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\mu \leq \mu'$. Suppose for now that $\mu + \Delta \leq \mu' - \Delta$. We then consider the five (possibly empty) intervals $(-\infty, \mu - \Delta]$, $[\mu - \Delta, \mu + \Delta]$, $[\mu + \Delta, \mu' - \Delta]$, $[\mu' - \Delta, \mu' + \Delta]$ and $[\mu' + \Delta, +\infty)$, which cover \mathbb{R} . If x is in the first interval, then $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) = \mu - \Delta$ and $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu', \Delta) = \mu' - \Delta$, and their absolute difference is equal to $|\mu - \mu'|$. If x is in the second or third interval, we have $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) \geq \mu - \Delta$ and $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu', \Delta) = \mu' - \Delta$, and their absolute difference is thus at most $|\mu - \mu'|$. If x is in the fourth interval, then we have $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) = \mu + \Delta$ and $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu', \Delta) \leq \mu' + \Delta$, and their absolute difference is thus at most $|\mu - \mu'|$. Finally, the fifth interval is akin to the first interval.

Now assume that $\mu + \Delta \geq \mu' - \Delta$. We now consider the five (possibly empty) intervals $(-\infty, \mu - \Delta]$, $[\mu - \Delta, \mu' - \Delta]$, $[\mu' - \Delta, \mu + \Delta]$, $[\mu + \Delta, \mu' + \Delta]$ and $[\mu' + \Delta, +\infty)$, which cover \mathbb{R} . The first and fifth intervals are still treated similarly as before. Now assume that x is in the second interval. Then $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) \geq \mu - \Delta$ and $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu', \Delta) = \mu' - \Delta$, which implies that their absolute difference is at most $|\mu - \mu'|$. The fourth interval is treated symmetrically. Finally, when x is in the third interval, then $\text{CLIP}(x|\mu, \Delta) = \text{CLIP}(x|\mu', \Delta)$, and their absolute difference is zero. In all cases, the inequality of the lemma holds. \square

Lemma 12. *CLIPMEAN is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the center, i.e.*

$$\forall \vec{w}, \vec{x}, \forall \Delta, \mu, \mu' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu', \Delta)| \leq |\mu - \mu'|. \quad (32)$$

Proof. By triangle inequality and Lemma 11, we have $|\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu', \Delta)| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum w_n |\text{CLIP}(x_n|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x_n|\mu', \Delta)| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum w_n |\mu - \mu'| = |\mu - \mu'|$. \square

Lemma 13. *If $\vec{v} \geq 0$, then $|\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w} + \vec{v}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta)| \leq 2 \frac{\|\vec{v}\|_1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \Delta$.*

Proof. Denote $\vec{y} \triangleq \text{CLIP}(\vec{x}|\mu, \Delta)$, and $\bar{y} \triangleq \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w} + \vec{v}, \vec{x}|\mu, \Delta)| \\ &= \left| (\bar{y} - \mu) - \frac{1}{\|\vec{w} + \vec{v}\|_1} \sum_{n \in [N]} (w_n + v_n)(y_n - \mu) \right| \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$= \left| (\bar{y} - \mu) - \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} (\bar{y} - \mu) - \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} \sum_{n \in [N]} v_n (y_n - \mu) \right| \quad (34)$$

$$\leq \left(1 - \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} \right) |\bar{y} - \mu| + \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} \sum_{n \in [N]} v_n |y_n - \mu| \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \left(1 - \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} \right) \Delta + \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} \sum_{n \in [N]} v_n \Delta \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \frac{2 \|\vec{v}\|_1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1 + \|\vec{v}\|_1} \Delta \leq \frac{2 \|\vec{v}\|_1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \Delta, \quad (37)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

We now define BRMEAN as follows

$$\text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \triangleq \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right). \quad (38)$$

Crucially for our purposes, BRMEAN has the following properties.

Theorem 3. *BRMEAN_W is W-Byzantine resilient. Moreover, if there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that $\|\vec{w}\|_1 \geq 8W\Delta$ and $x_n \in [-\Delta, \Delta]$ for all n , then $\text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$.*

Proof. Denote $q_{-F} \triangleq \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F})$ and $q \triangleq \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F}) - \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})| \\ & \leq \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F} \left| q_{-F}, \frac{\|\vec{w}_{-F}\|_1}{3W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F} \left| q_{-F}, \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\ & + \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F} \left| q_{-F}, \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F} \left| q, \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\ & + \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}_{-F}, \vec{x}_{-F} \left| q, \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \left| q, \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} - \frac{\|\vec{w}_{-F}\|_1}{4W} \right) + |q_{-F} - q| + 2 \frac{w_F}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \leq \frac{w_F}{W}, \quad (40)$$

where we used lemmas 10, 12 and 13 to move to the last line.

The accuracy part of the theorem follows by first observing that $\text{QRMED}_{3W} \in [-\Delta, \Delta]$, and by then noting that the interval $\left[\text{QRMED}_{4W} - \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W}, \text{QRMED}_{3W} + \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right]$ then contains all of $[-\Delta, \Delta]$. \square

D Mehestan is Byzantine resilient

Lemma 2. Denote τ_n^{+f} the scaling by including inputs from a new voter $f \notin [N]$. Then, for any alternative a , we have $\left| \tau_n^{+f} - \tau_n \right| \leq \frac{5w_f}{7W}$.

Proof. Let us introduce the following variable

$$t_n \triangleq \text{BRMEAN}_{7W} \{w_m, t_{nm} \mid m \in N_n^A\}. \quad (41)$$

where $t_{nm} \triangleq \frac{1}{|A_{nm}|} (\sum_{a \in A_{nm}} s_m^{+f} \tilde{\theta}_{ma} - s_n^{+f} \tilde{\theta}_{na})$.

First, we will prove that

$$|\tau_n - t_n| \leq \frac{4w_f}{7W}. \quad (42)$$

For this, consider $\xi = \left[(s_m - s_m^{+f}) \tilde{\theta}_{ma} - (s_n - s_n^{+f}) \tilde{\theta}_{na} \right]_{\substack{m \in [N] \\ a \in A_{nm}}}$.

We deduce from Lemma 1 that $\|\xi\|_\infty \leq \frac{2w_f}{7W}$.

Now, by using the previous ξ in Proposition 6 of BRMEAN, we obtain Inequality (42).

Second, by Proposition 6, we know that

$$\left| \tau_n^{+f} - t_n \right| \leq \frac{w_f}{7W}. \quad (43)$$

We conclude by using the triangular inequality and Inequalities (42)+(43). \square

Lemma 3. MEHESTAN is W -Byzantine Resilient.

Proof. Let $f \in F$ and $a \in [A]$.

Let us introduce the following variable

$$r_a \triangleq \text{QRMED}_{7W}(w, (s_n^{+f} \tilde{\theta}_n + \tau_n^{+f})_{n \in [N]}). \quad (44)$$

First, we will prove that

$$|r_a - \text{MEHESTAN}_W(w, \theta)| \leq \frac{6w_f}{7w}. \quad (45)$$

For this, consider $\xi = \left[(s_n - s_n^{+f}) \tilde{\theta}_n + (\tau_n - \tau_n^{+f}) \right]_{n \in [N]}$.

We deduce from Propositions 1+2 that $\|\xi\|_\infty \leq \frac{6w_f}{7W}$.

Now, by using the previous ξ in Property 5 of QRMED, we obtain Inequality (45).

Second, by Property 5, we know that

$$\left| r_a - \text{MEHESTAN}_W(w, \theta^{+f}) \right| \leq \frac{w_f}{7W}. \quad (46)$$

We conclude by using the triangular inequality and Inequalities (45)+(46). \square

E Mehestan is sparsely unanimous

Lemma 4. *Suppose θ_* -unanimity, comparability and MINMAXNORM pre-normalization. Then, for any $n \in [N]$, there must exist s_n^* and τ_n^* such that $\tilde{\theta}_n = s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*|A_n} + \tau_n^*$, with $1 \leq s_n^* \leq \bar{s}(\theta_*)$ and $-\bar{s}(\theta_*) \leq \tau_n^* \leq 0$.*

Proof. Let $n \in [N]$. By θ_* -unanimity, we know that $\tilde{\theta}_n \sim \theta_n \sim \theta_{*|A_n} \sim \tilde{\theta}_{*|A_n}$. Thus there exists s_n^* and τ_n^* such that $\tilde{\theta}_n = s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*|A_n} + \tau_n^*$. Now consider a_n the best-scored alternative by voter n , and b_n their worst-scored alternative. By comparability, we have $AB_{nm}^* \neq \emptyset$, which implies that there exists two alternatives $a, b \in A_n$ that voter n scored differently. Therefore, $\theta_{na} > \theta_{nb}$. Then we must have $\tilde{\theta}_{na} > \tilde{\theta}_{nb}$. In particular, by min-max normalization, we then have $1 = \max_{c \in A_n} \tilde{\theta}_{nc} - \min_{c \in A_n} \tilde{\theta}_{nc} = \theta_{na} - \theta_{nb} = (s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tau_n^*) - (s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*b} + \tau_n^*) = s_n^* (\tilde{\theta}_{*a} - \tilde{\theta}_{*b})$. Therefore $s_n^* = \frac{1}{\tilde{\theta}_{*a} - \tilde{\theta}_{*b}} = \frac{\max_{c,c'} |\tilde{\theta}_{*c} - \tilde{\theta}_{*c'}|}{\tilde{\theta}_{*a} - \tilde{\theta}_{*b}} \leq \bar{s}(\tilde{\theta}_*) = \bar{s}(\theta_*)$. Moreover, since by min-max normalization, we must also have $\tilde{\theta}_{*a} - \tilde{\theta}_{*b} \leq 1$, we also conclude that $s_n^* \geq 1$. Finally, observe that $0 = \tilde{\theta}_{nb} = s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*b} + \tau_n^*$. Thus $\tau_n = -s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*b}$. Since $\tilde{\theta}_{*b} \in [0, 1]$, we must then have $\tau_n^* \in [-s_n^*, 0] \subset [-\bar{s}(\theta_*), 0]$. \square

Lemma 5. *Suppose θ_* -unanimity, comparability, $8W\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$ -weight and MINMAXNORM pre-normalization. Then the voters' re-scaled scores are consistent, in the sense that $s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n = s_m \tilde{\theta}_{ma} + \tau_m$, for all voters $n, m \in [N]$ and alternatives $a \in A_{nm}$ that both voters scored.*

Proof. Under θ_* -unanimity and comparability, by virtue of Lemma 4, we know that $s_{nm} = \frac{1}{|AB_{nm}^*|} \sum_{(a,b) \in AB_{nm}^*} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{ma} - \tilde{\theta}_{*a}}{|\tilde{\theta}_{*a} - \tilde{\theta}_{*b}|}$. $\frac{1}{|AB_{nm}^*|} \sum_{(a,b) \in AB_{nm}^*} \frac{s_m^*}{s_n^*} = \frac{s_m^*}{s_n^*}$. Using the bounds of Lemma 4, we know that $s_{nm} \in [0, \bar{s}(\theta_*)]$. In particular, $|s_{nm}| - 1 \leq \bar{s}(\theta_*)$ (using also $\bar{s}(\theta_*) \geq 1$). Theorem 3 (combined with comparability) then guarantees that for $\|\vec{w}\|_1 \geq 8Ws(\theta_*)$, we have $s_n \triangleq 1 + \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{s}_n - 1) = 1 + \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{s}_n - 1) = \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum_m w_m \frac{s_m^*}{s_n^*} = \frac{1}{s_n^*} \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{s}^*)$, where $\vec{s}_n \triangleq (s_{nm})_{m \in [N]}$ and $\vec{s}^* \triangleq (s_n^*)_{n \in [N]}$. Crucially, we then have $s_n s_n^* = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{s}^*)$, which is independent from n . In particular, we then have $s_n s_n^* = s_m s_m^*$ for all voters n, m . In fact, we make the additional remark that $s_n s_n^*$ is an average of values s_n^* , which all belong to $[1, \bar{s}(\theta_*)]$. Thus $s_n s_n^* \in [1, \bar{s}(\theta_*)]$.

Now we note that we have the equality $\tau_{nm} = \frac{1}{A_{nm}} \sum_{a \in A_{nm}} (s_m (s_m^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tau_m^*) - s_n (s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tau_n^*)) = \frac{1}{A_{nm}} \sum_{a \in A_{nm}} (s_m \tau_m^* - s_n \tau_n^*) = s_m \tau_m^* - s_n \tau_n^*$, using the equality $s_n s_n^* = s_m s_m^*$. But given Lemma 4, we know that $-\bar{s}(\theta_*)^2 \leq s_n \tau_n^* \leq 0$, thus $|\tau_{nm}| \leq \bar{s}(\theta_*)^2$. Theorem 3 (combined with comparability) then guarantees that for $\|\vec{w}\|_1 \geq 8Ws(\theta_*)^2$, we have $\tau_n \triangleq \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{\tau}_n) = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{\tau}_n) = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, (s_m \tau_m^*)_{m \in [N]}) - s_n \tau_n^*$. As a result, $\tau_n + s_n \tau_n^* = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, (s_m \tau_m^*)_{m \in [N]})$, which is independent from n .

We conclude by noting that, for any voter $n \in [N]$ and any alternative $a \in A_n$, we then have $s_n \tilde{\theta}_{na} + \tau_n = s_n (s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tau_n^*) + \tau_n = s_n s_n^* \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \tau_n + s_n \tau_n^* = \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{s}^*) \tilde{\theta}_{*a} + \text{MEAN}(\vec{w}, (s_m \tau_m^*)_{m \in [N]})$, which is independent from voter n . \square

F Proofs

Proposition 5. *QRMED is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm.*

Formally, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have

$$|\text{QRMED}_W(w, \theta + \xi) - \text{QRMED}_W(w, \theta)| \leq \|\xi\|_\infty. \quad (47)$$

Proof. Let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For simplicity, we will use the notation $q \triangleq \text{QRMED}_W(w, \theta)$.

Let us also denote for all $a \in [A]$ the loss function as follows:

$$L_\xi(x) = \text{QRMED}_W(x|w, \theta + \xi) \triangleq \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n |x - \theta_n - \xi_n| + \frac{1}{2} W x^2. \quad (48)$$

We will prove that

$$\partial L_\xi(q + \|\xi\|_\infty) \cap \mathbb{R}^+ \neq \emptyset, \text{ and} \quad (49)$$

$$\partial L_\xi(q - \|\xi\|_\infty) \cap \mathbb{R}^- \neq \emptyset. \quad (50)$$

Given that L_ξ is strictly convex, and since it is differentiable almost everywhere, its derivative L'_ξ is increasing. We will only show (49) holds, as (50) is an analogous case.

Now, since q minimizes L , we know that $0 \in \partial L(q)$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= Wq + \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n \text{sign}(q - \theta_n) \\ &\leq W \|\xi\|_\infty + Wq + \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n \text{sign}(q - \theta_n) \\ &\leq W \cdot (q + \|\xi\|_\infty) + \sum_{n \in [N]} w_n \text{sign}(q + \|\xi\|_\infty - \theta_n - \xi_n) \\ &\in \partial L_\xi(q + \|\xi\|_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 14. *CLIP is 1-Lipschitz continuous, i.e.*

$$\forall x, \xi, \Delta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \quad |\text{CLIP}(x + \xi | \mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x | \mu, \Delta)| \leq |\xi|. \quad (51)$$

Proof. We conclude by remarking that the function $x \mapsto \text{CLIP}(x | \mu, \Delta)$ is piecewise, continuous, and that its subdifferential is a subset of $[0, 1]$ at every point. □

Lemma 15. *CLIPMEAN is 1-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the input scores. Formally, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$\forall \vec{w}, \vec{x}, \forall \Delta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \left| \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} | \mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} | \mu, \Delta) \right| \leq \left\| \vec{\xi} \right\|_\infty. \quad (52)$$

Proof. By triangle inequality and Lemma 11, we have $\left| \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} | \mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIPMEAN}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} | \mu, \Delta) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum w_n |\text{CLIP}(x_n + \xi_n | \mu, \Delta) - \text{CLIP}(x_n | \mu, \Delta)| \leq \frac{1}{\|\vec{w}\|_1} \sum w_n |\xi_n| \leq \left\| \vec{\xi} \right\|_\infty$. □

Proposition 6. *BRMEAN is 2-Lipschitz continuous with respect to the ℓ_∞ -norm. Formally, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have*

$$|\text{BRMEAN}_W(w, \theta + \xi) - \text{BRMEAN}_W(w, \theta)| \leq \|\xi\|_\infty. \quad (53)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi}) - \text{BRMEAN}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \right| \\
&= \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi}) - \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\
&\quad (\text{by Lemma 12}) \\
&\leq \|\vec{\xi}\|_\infty + \left| \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} + \vec{\xi} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) - \text{CLIPMEAN} \left(\vec{w}, \vec{x} \left| \text{QRMED}_{4W}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}), \frac{\|\vec{w}\|_1}{4W} \right. \right) \right| \\
&\quad (\text{by Proposition 5}) \\
&\leq 2 \|\vec{\xi}\|_\infty \quad (\text{by Lemma 15}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 16. $\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$ has the same sign as $\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$ and $|\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})| \leq |\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})|$.

Proof. If $\text{sign}(\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})) \neq \text{sign}(\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x}))$, then $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}(0) < \mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}(\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}))$. This contradicts the fact that $\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$ minimizes $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}$.

If $|\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})| > |\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})|$, then $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}(\text{MED}(\vec{w}, \vec{x})) < \mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}(\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x}))$. This contradicts the fact that $\text{QRMED}_W(\vec{w}, \vec{x})$ minimizes $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QRMED}_W}$. □

G Technical lemmas

Lemma 17. Let $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of real numbers. Consider the sequence $(S_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n u_k)_{n \geq 1}$. If $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $l \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(S_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to l as well.

Proof. Assume $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $l \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$.

By the convergence of $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ to l , we know that there exists N_0 such that for all $n \geq N_0$, $|u_n - l| \leq \varepsilon/2$.

Also, we know that there exists $N_1 \geq N_0$ such that for all $n \geq N_1$, we have $\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} u_k \right| \leq \varepsilon/2$.

As a consequence, we have for all $n > N_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_n - l| &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{N_1} u_k \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=N_1+1}^n (u_k - l) \right| \\
&\leq \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 18. *Let $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of real numbers. Consider the sequence $(M_n = \text{MED}((u_k)_{1 \leq k \leq n}))$. If $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $l \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to l as well.*

Proof. Assume $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges to $l \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$.

By the convergence of $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ to l , we know that there exists N_0 such that for all $n \geq N_0$, $|u_n - l| \leq \varepsilon$.

This implies that for all $n \geq 2N_0 + 1$, we have $|M_n - l| \leq \varepsilon$. Indeed, when $n \geq 2N_0 + 1$ there is a majority (at least $N_0 + 1$ among $2N_0 + 1$) of terms of the sequence in the interval $[l - \varepsilon, l + \varepsilon]$. \square