## In Short

- A new model that extends Strategic Candidacy Games.
- Candidates may choose either to quit or to join the election at a real position.
- Voter positions are fixed and their preferences are determined by the distances from the candidates.
- Best response strategies are poly-time computable for any polynomial voting rule.
- Results on existence of Pure Nash Equilibria for Condorcet-consistent voting rules and positional scoring rules.


## Model and Notation

## Basics

- The set of voters is $V=\{1, \ldots, n\}$.
- The set of candidates is $C=\left\{c_{1}, \ldots, c_{m}\right\}$.
- Voter positions are given as $p=\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$
- Each candidate $c_{i}$ chooses a strategy $s_{i}=s_{c_{i}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\perp}=\mathbb{R} \cup\{\perp\}$ where $\perp$ denotes withdrawal of candidacy.
- The candidate position vector, AKA state, is $s=\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{m}\right) \in \mathbb{R}_{\perp}^{m}$.
- The election winner is denoted by $\mathcal{V}(p, s)$ or simply $\mathcal{V}(s)$.


## Preferences

- The positions $p, s$ are mapped to a preference profile $\mathcal{P}$ such that each voter ranks the candidates in increasing distance order.
- All ties are broken either lexicographically, in compliance with a fixed order $\succ_{*}$ over the candidates or randomly, by uniformly sampling the set of valid profiles.
- The most preferred candidate according to $\succ_{*}$ is denoted as $c^{*}$.
- Voter preferences are denoted by $\succ_{i}$ for every voter $i \in V$.
- Every candidate $c \in C$ has a fixed and predetermined preference order $\succ_{c}$ over the candidate set such that $c \succ_{c} c^{\prime}$ for all $c^{\prime} \neq c$.
- When random tie-breaking is used, we assume each candidate $c \in C$ has a fixed utility function $u_{c}: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ over the possible winners of the election, subject to $u_{c}(a)>u_{c}(b) \Rightarrow a \succ_{c} b$.


## Examples notation

- Voters are marked with large dots.
- Candidates are marked with lower case letters.
- Each candidate can position herself freely within the interval drawn beneath.



## Voting Rules

- We discuss the following irresolute versions of voting rules, i.e. functions of the form $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{L}(C)^{n} \rightarrow 2^{C}$ that map preference profiles to subsets of


## candidates.

- Monotonic positional scoring rules defined by $\alpha=\left(\alpha_{m}, \ldots, \alpha_{1}\right)$ such that
$\alpha_{m} \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_{1}$, Plurality, in particular.
- Condorcet-consistent voting rules.
- Super Condorcet-consistent (SCC) voting rules - Condorcet-consistent voting rules that always produce the set of Weak Condorcet-winners, if it is nonempty.
- An RCG always has a Weak Condorcet-winner!


## Best Responses

## Lexicographic tie-breaking

- Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a voting rule that is computable in $O\left(T_{n, m}\right)$ time for any preference profile of $n$ voters over $m$ candidates. For any candidate $c \in C$, the best responses set $\mathcal{B}_{c}(p, s)$ is computable in $O\left(n \cdot m \cdot\left[T_{n, m}+\log (m)\right]\right)$ time, for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, s \in \mathbb{R}_{\perp}^{m}$.


## Random tie-breaking

- Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the Plurality voting rule with random tie-breaking. For any voter and candidate position vectors $p \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, s \in \mathbb{R}_{\perp}^{m}$ and any given candidate $c \in C$, it is possible to compute
in $O(p o l y(n, m))$ time.


## Unrestricted Strategies

## - Candidates may choose any position in $\mathbb{R}$.

## Lexicographic tie-breaking

- For Condorcet-consistent voting rules when there is a single median position, SCC voting rules and monotonic scoring rules, a NE is only possible if $c^{*}$ is the winner. - For the same rules, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\perp}^{m}$, there is $s_{c^{*}}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\left(s_{c^{*}}^{\prime}, s_{-c^{*}}\right)$ is a NE .


## Random tie-breaking

- For Condorcet-consistent voting rules when there is a single median position, SCC voting rules and monotonic scoring rules, for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\perp}^{m}$ and any candidate $c \in C$, there is $s_{c}^{\prime} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathcal{V}\left(s_{c}^{\prime}, s_{-c}\right)=c\right)>0$.


## Restricted Strategies with Lexicographic Tie-breaking

- Each candidate $c$ may choose any position within a closed interval $I_{c}$.
- Ties are broken lexicographically.


## Conditions of guaranteed equilibrium existence

| Voting Rule | Withdrawals | Single | Median Position |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Candidates |  |  |  |
| SCC | Yes | Any | Any |
| Condorcet-consistent | Any | Yes | Any |
| Monotonic ccoring rule | Yes | Yes | Any |
| Plurality | Any | Any | 2 |
| Plurality | Yes | Any | 3 |

## Example 1 without an equilforium

- Plurality; no quitting; 3 or more candidates.
- Ties broken by $a \succ_{*} b \succ_{*} c$.
- Assume $b \succ_{c} a$.



## Example 2 without an equilibrium

- Plurality; with or without quitting; 4 or more candidates.
- Ties broken by $\alpha \succ_{*} a \succ_{*} b \succ_{*} c$.
- Assume $b \succ_{c} a$ and $a, c \succ_{b} \alpha$.



## Restricted Strategies with Random Tie-breaking

- Each candidate $c$ may choose any position within a closed interval $I_{c}$.
- Ties are broken randomly.
- Candidates wish to maximize expected utility.


## Example 3 without an equilibrium

- Plurality; with or without quitting; 4 or more candidates.
- The utility functions are defined by



## Example 4 without an equilibrium

- The voting rule is SCC with fallback (in case there are no Weak Condorcet-winners) to Plurality with lexicographic tie-breaking, subject to $a \succ_{*} b \succ_{*} c \succ_{*} d \succ_{*} e \succ_{*} f$.
- The utility functions are defined by


