Social ranking under uncertainty

Ariane Ravier

Supervision: Sebastien Konieczny, Stefano Moretti & Paolo Viappiani

November 30th 2021

Introduction

Social rankings

In situations where the only available information is over subgroups (coalitions) of a population :

- \rightarrow performance of teams
- → individuals defined by different criteria...

Social rankings

In situations where the only available information is over subgroups (coalitions) of a population :

- \rightarrow performance of teams
- \rightarrow individuals defined by different criteria...
- □ Given a decider's ordinal preference ranking over coalitions, how to determine a preference ranking over the individuals within these coalitions?

Lexicographic excellence

Let
$$X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\},\$$

$$34 \succ 123 \sim 24 \succ 134 \sim 124 \succ 13 \sim 23 \sim 1234 \succ 12 \succ 234 \sim 14$$

$$\theta_1 = (0, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1)$$

$$\theta_2 = (0, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1)$$

$$\theta_3 = (1, 1, 1, 3, 0, 1)$$

$$\theta_4 = (1, 1, 2, 1, 0, 2)$$

By simple lexicographic comparison of the θ_i vectors, we find that

$$4 \succ 3 \succ 2 \succ 1$$

CP-majority

Let $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\},\$

 $d_{24} = 2$, $d_{42} = 1$ $d_{34} = 2$, $d_{43} = 1$

⊳ Introduced by Haret, Khani, Moretti & Ôzturk in 2018 (2)

$$34 \succ 123 \sim 24 \succ 134 \sim 124 \succ 13 \sim 23 \sim 1234 \succ 12 \succ 234 \sim 14$$

 $d_{12} = 1 \ (134 \succ 234), \ d_{21} = 1 \ (24 \succ 14)$
 $d_{13} = 1 \ , \ d_{31} = 2$
 $d_{14} = 1 \ , \ d_{41} = 2$
 $d_{23} = 0, \ d_{32} = 2$

By pairwise comparison, we find that $1 \sim 2$, $3 \succ 1$, $4 \succ 1$, $3 \succ 2$, $2 \succ 4$ and $3 \succ 4$.

Ordinal Banzhaf

⊳ Introduced by Khani, Moretti & Öztürk in 2019 (3)

Let
$$X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\},\$$

$$34 \succ 24 \succ 134 \sim 124 \succ 13 \sim 23 \sim 234 \succ 12 \sim 123 \succ 1234 \sim 14$$

By comparison of ordinal Banzhaf scores s_i^{\succeq} , we find that

$$4 \succ 2 \succ 3 \succ 1$$

Types of preference uncertainties

All coalitions are present within subrankings.

- > Incomparable alternatives
- > Lack of information on pairwise comparisons

Let
$$X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\},\$$

$$12 \succ 13 \succ 234$$
 $124 \succ 24 \succ 34$
 $23 \succ 123$
 $14 \succ 1234 \succ 134$

Quasi-totality

 $\forall S \subseteq X, \exists T \subseteq X, S \neq T, S \succeq T \text{ or } T \succeq S$

Quasi-totality

 $\forall S \subseteq X, \exists T \subseteq X, S \neq T, S \succeq T \text{ or } T \succeq S$

Transitivity

 $\forall S, T, V \subseteq X, (S \succeq T \text{ and } T \succeq V) \Rightarrow S \succeq V$

Quasi-totality

 $\forall S \subseteq X, \exists T \subseteq X, S \neq T, S \succeq T \text{ or } T \succeq S$

Transitivity

 $\forall S, T, V \subseteq X, (S \succeq T \text{ and } T \succeq V) \Rightarrow S \succeq V$

Condition of presence

 $\forall x \in X, \exists S \subseteq X, x \in S \text{ and } \exists T \subseteq X, T \neq S, S \succeq T \text{ or } T \succeq S$

Not all coalitions are present in the preference profile.

- > Partial elicitation of preferences

Let
$$X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\},\$$

> Totality and quasi-totality are not verified.

> Totality and quasi-totality are not verified.

Transitivity

$$\forall S, T, V \subseteq X, (S \succeq T \text{ and } T \succeq V) \Rightarrow S \succeq V$$

> Totality and quasi-totality are not verified.

Transitivity

 $\forall S, T, V \subseteq X, (S \succeq T \text{ and } T \succeq V) \Rightarrow S \succeq V$

Condition of presence

 $\forall x \in X, \exists S \subseteq X, x \in S \text{ and } \exists T \subseteq X, T \neq S, S \succeq T \text{ or } T \succeq S$

Necessary and possible winners

Necessary winner

Voting procedures for situations where voters' preferences consist of partial orders.

 \rightarrow Study extensions of these partial orders.

Necessary winner

An alternative *a* is a *necessary winner* if it is a winner for every extension of the voters' profiles.

Possible winner

An alternative *a* is a *necessary winner* if it is a winner for at least one extension of the voters' profiles.

Adapting necessary winners to social ranking

> A necessary winner - if there is one - can be found in polynomial time if the social ranking rule is itself polynomial; determining a possible winner is an NP-complete problem

Adapting necessary winners to social ranking

- > A necessary winner if there is one can be found in polynomial time if the social ranking rule is itself polynomial; determining a possible winner is an NP-complete problem
- ⊳ Repeating the search for a necessary winner : if none exists, how to use the concept of possible winner ?

Adapting necessary winners to social ranking

- > A necessary winner if there is one can be found in polynomial time if the social ranking rule is itself polynomial; determining a possible winner is an NP-complete problem
- ▷ Repeating the search for a necessary winner : if none exists, how to use the concept of possible winner ?
- > Properties to reduce the number of considered extensions based on the given preference order

References I

- [1] BERNARDI, G., LUCCHETTI, R., AND MORETTI, S. Ranking objects from a preference relation over their subsets. *Social Choice and Welfare 52*, 4 (2019), 589–606.
- [2] HARET, A., KHANI, H., MORETTI, S., AND ÖZTÜRK, M. Ceteris paribus majority for social ranking. In *Proceedings* of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-18 (7 2018), International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, pp. 303–309.

References II

- [3] Khani, H., Moretti, S., and Öztürk, M. An ordinal banzhaf index for social ranking. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19* (7 2019), International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, pp. 378–384.
- [4] KONCZAK, K., AND LANG, J. Voting procedures with incomplete preferences. *Proceedings of the Multidisciplinary IJCAI-05 Workshop on Advances in Preference Handling* (01 2005).