

Liquid Democracy for Rating Systems

Hemanath Peddireddi

Department of Computer Science

University of Warwick

Supervised by Markus Brill

2 April 2025

Abstract

A project to enhance rating systems with liquid democracy features, focusing on implementing and analyzing various delegation mechanisms within the Votle decision making system.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Vodle	3
1.2	Liquid Democracy	3
1.3	Motivation	5
1.4	Project Goal	5
1.5	Project Outline	6
2	Research	7
3	Design	8
4	Implementation	9
5	Evaluation	10
6	Conclusions	11
6.1	Future work	11

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Vodle

Vodle is an online platform where users participate in polls to vote on any subject that they want to by creating a poll. Each poll contains a set of options, and users provide ratings for each option from 0 to 100 using a slider controls (below). When the poll ends, the ratings submitted by voters are then aggregated and a result that represents the overall sentiment of the voters is produced.

INSERT IMAGE OF SLIDERS

1.2 Liquid Democracy

Liquid democracy is a decision-making system that combines elements of both direct and representative democracy that offers a voter more flexibility than traditional voting models.

In direct democracy, every participant votes individually on each issue. This model offers the most individual input but can become impractical for large-scale decision-making due to the high level of participation required from each individual. As Ford (2002) states, direct democracy assumes that all individuals are both willing and able to engage meaningfully with every decision, which is often not the case in large groups due to the variance in both the interest and knowledge of voters. The cognitive demand of staying informed on all matters, combined with the time commitment necessary for constant participation, makes direct democracy unmanageable at scale.

In representative democracy, participants elect representatives to vote on their behalf. While more scalable, this approach can reduce the influence of individual voters and may not always reflect their evolving preferences.

Alternatively, representational democracy

Liquid democracy addresses these limitations by allowing voters to either cast their votes directly or delegate them to someone that they trust or to abstain from voting entirely (Blum and Zuber (2016)). These delegations are optional and can be updated at any time, giving users control over how their vote is used. Delegation is also transitive, meaning a vote can be passed through multiple levels of trusted participants. For example, if Alice delegates to Bob who in turn delegates to Charlie, Charlie's vote would then represent three individuals (Alice, Bob and Charlie).

The end result is

1.3 Motivation

Liquid democracy holds considerable potential, but practical applications face notable challenges. Common issues include delegation cycles, where voting authority becomes circular and unresolved; voter abstention, where users choose not to vote; and disproportionate influence by super-voters.

Current systems rarely implement solutions like ranked delegation (allowing users to specify multiple, ranked delegates) or the ability to allocate voting power across multiple delegates.

This project aims to address these gaps, specifically within platforms like Vodle, to improve rating accuracy and reliability.

1.4 Project Goal

The project's main goal is to integrate liquid democracy into the vodle platform.

Key features include ranked delegation, weighted voting, and backup votes. Addressing technical challenges such as delegation cycles and disproportionate influence is critical to enhancing rating accuracy, increasing user trust, and boosting engagement.

While the project explores theoretical aspects, its primary focus remains practical implementation and technical effectiveness.

1.5 Project Outline

This report is structured to clearly illustrate the project's progression and outcomes:

Chapter 2 presents background research, including existing variations of liquid democracy, real-world implementations, and relevant aspects of vodle's design and system architecture.

Chapter 3 defines the system specifications and outlines the project's objectives in detail.

Chapter 4 discusses the methodology used, including the iterative approach, planning, and risk assessment strategies.

Chapter 5 describes the design and implementation process of integrating liquid democracy into vodle.

Chapter 6 evaluates the implemented system through unit testing, user feedback, and commentary from the project customer.

Chapter 7 covers project management aspects such as legal and ethical considerations, a reflection on risk management, and personal reflections on the development process.

Chapter 8 concludes the report and discusses potential directions for future work.

Chapter 2

Research

Chapter 3

Design

In this chapter, we describe the overall design of our solution to the problem identified in Chapter 1, building on work described in Chapter 2.

Chapter 4

Implementation

In this chapter, we describe the implementation of the design we described in Chapter 3. You should **not** describe every line of code in your implementation. Instead, you should focus on the interesting aspects of the implementation: that is, the most challenging parts that would not be obvious to an average Computer Scientist. Include diagrams, short code snippets, etc. for illustration.

Chapter 5

Evaluation

Describe the approaches you have used to evaluate that the solution you have designed in Chapter 3 and executed in Chapter 4 actually solves the problem identified in Chapter 1.

While you can discuss unit testing etc. you have carried here a little bit, that is the minimum. You should present data here and discuss that. This might include *e.g.* performance data you have obtained from benchmarks, survey results, or application telemetry / analytics. Tables and graphs displaying this data are good.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

The project is a success. Summarise what you have done and accomplished.

6.1 Future work

Suggest what projects might follow up on this. The suggestions here should **not** be small improvements to what you have done, but more substantial work that can now be done thanks to the work you have done or research questions that have resulted from your work.

Bibliography

- Blum, Christian & Zuber, Christina Isabel. Liquid Democracy: Potentials, Problems, and Perspectives. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 24(2):162–182, June 2016. ISSN 0963-8016, 1467-9760. doi: 10.1111/jopp.12065. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jopp.12065>.
- Ford, Bryan Alexander. Delegative Democracy. May 2002. URL <https://infoscience.epfl.ch/handle/20.500.14299/156450>.