

Diversity of Structured Domains via k -Kemeny Scores

Piotr Faliszewski Krzysztof Sornat Stanisław Szufa Tomasz Wąs

Abstract: In the k -KEMENY problem, we are given an ordinal election, i.e., a collection of votes ranking the candidates from best to worst, and we seek the smallest number of swaps of adjacent candidates that ensure that the election has at most k different rankings. We study this problem for a number of structured domains, including the single-peaked, single-crossing, group-separable, and Euclidean ones. We obtain two kinds of results: (1) We show that k -KEMENY remains intractable under most of these domains, even for $k = 2$, and (2) we use k -KEMENY to rank these domains in terms of their diversity.

1 Introduction

An *ordinal election* consists of a set of candidates and a collection of votes, ranking these candidates from the most to the least desirable one, where each vote comes from a given *domain*. We study the diversity of structured domains, such as the single-peaked [Black, 1958], single-crossing [Mirrlees, 1971; Roberts, 1977], group-separable [Inada, 1964, 1969], and Euclidean ones [Enelow and Hinich, 1984, 1990], as well as the diversity of elections with votes from these domains (see Section 2 for detailed definitions). In essence, structured domains restrict possible votes to those that are somehow *reasonable*; for example, in the single-peaked domain over the standard political left-right axis, one could not rank the extreme left-wing and right-wing candidates on the two top positions. To capture diversity, we employ a technique based on solving the k -Kemeny problem of Faliszewski et al. [2023]. The idea is that an election—or, a structured domain—is diverse if it includes many very different votes that cannot be easily grouped into (a small number of) clusters. Our results come in two main flavors. First, we establish the computational complexity of the k -Kemeny problem across our domains. Second, we rank these domains—as well as several statistical cultures used to sample elections from them—with respect to their diversity.

Studying the diversity of structured domains and structured elections is important for several reasons:

1. Diversity is a fundamental property of elections and domains, yet formally capturing this intuitive notion is challenging (see discussion of the related work below). Hence, it is valuable to both develop tools for analyzing diversity and to use these tools to gain better insights into various domains and elections.
2. Faliszewski et al. [2023] argued that one can understand the nature of elections—specifically, their locations on the map of elections [Szufa et al., 2025; Faliszewski et al.,

Authors' Information: Piotr Faliszewski , faliszew@agh.edu.pl, AGH University, Poland; Krzysztof Sornat , sornat@agh.edu.pl, AGH University, Poland; Stanisław Szufa , s.szufa@gmail.com, CNRS, Université Paris Dauphine-PSL, France; Tomasz Wąs , tomasz.was@cs.ox.ac.uk, University of Oxford, United Kingdom.

2023; Boehmer et al., 2022b)—by analyzing their three natural properties, including diversity (the other two are polarization and agreement).

3. When designing numerical experiments on elections, one may wish to consider synthetic datasets with different levels of diversity. In particular, one may choose various statistical cultures—i.e., probabilistic distributions over votes—based on the diversity of the data they produce.

The classic Kemeny score of an election is the smallest number of swaps of adjacent candidates required to ensure that all votes are identical (in Section 2 we give a different but equivalent definition; this one follows the distance-rationalization framework [Baigent, 1987; Meskanen and Nurmi, 2008; Elkind et al., 2015]). Similarly, the k -Kemeny score is the smallest number of swaps, which ensure that the election consists of at most k different votes. Intuitively, to compute the k -Kemeny score we need to find k groups of similar votes (thereby solving a clustering problem) and compute their Kemeny scores separately. Faliszewski et al. [2023] argued that a weighted sum of k -Kemeny scores for different values of k gives a good measure of diversity; the same approach, albeit with different weights, was taken by Faliszewski et al. [2025a].

1.1 Our Contributions

We obtain the following sets of results. First, we find a polynomial-time algorithm for computing the k -Kemeny score of single-crossing elections, but show NP-hardness for single-peaked and group-separable ones, already for $k = 2$. For Euclidean elections, the results are more varied and depend on the exact assumptions.

Second, using k -Kemeny scores, we rank our structured domains from the most to the least diverse one. Surprisingly, the caterpillar group-separable domain turns out to be the most diverse one, suggesting that it might deserve to be used in experiments more often.

Third, we find that the typical way of sampling Euclidean elections, used in most computational social choice papers that employ these models—see the survey of Boehmer et al. [2024]—by necessity does not generate a sizable fraction of votes that belong to this domain. We show how this affects the diversity of generated elections, as compared to sampling votes from these domains uniformly at random.

We also make a number of remarks about our domains, showing their various quirks. All proofs are in the appendix.

1.2 Related Work

The two most related papers are those of Faliszewski et al. [2023, 2025a], where the authors introduce and use measures of diversity based on computing weighted sums of k -Kemeny scores. The former work also argues that many previously studied notions of diversity—such as those considered by Alcalde-Unzu and Vorsatz [2013, 2016], Can et al. [2015, 2017] and Hashemi and Endriss [2014]—capture (dis)agreement among the votes rather than their diversity; in particular, they conflate the notions of diversity and polarization.

Recently, Ammann and Puppe [2025] developed a number of diversity notions for preference domains, based on the multi-attribute approach of Nehring and Puppe [2002]. The main idea is that the diversity of a domain depends on how many (possibly weighted) “attributes” its votes have, where an attribute can be a property such as “candidate c is ranked on top.” However, Ammann and Puppe [2025] mostly focus on the properties of their measures and not on applying them to particular domains. Karpov et al. [2024] analyze how many different

rankings of at least s candidates appear in a given Condorcet domain. While we focus on several mainstream domains, they consider numerous special ones. Overall, the main difference between our approach and those of [Ammann and Puppe \[2025\]](#) and [Karpov et al. \[2024\]](#) is that they count occurrences of particular structures in the votes, whereas our k -Kemeny-based approach analyzes interrelations between these votes.

The problem of computing the Kemeny score was shown to be NP-hard by [Bartholdi et al. \[1989\]](#), and its exact complexity was established by [Hemaspaandra et al. \[2005\]](#). There are various ways of circumventing these intractability results, ranging from approximation algorithms (see, e.g., the work of [Ailon et al. \[2008\]](#)), through parameterized approaches (see, e.g., the works of [Betzler et al. \[2009, 2014\]](#)), and heuristics (see, e.g., the work of [Conitzer et al. \[2006\]](#)). While it is well-known that Kemeny score can be computed in polynomial-time for Condorcet domains [[Barbut, 1980](#); [Truchon, 1998](#)], doing so is also possible if the input election is, in a certain formal sense, close to being in some such domains [[Cornaz et al., 2012, 2013](#)]. Researchers also considered the complexity of computing Kemeny scores in Euclidean elections [[Escoffier et al., 2022](#); [Hamm et al., 2021](#)]. Computational aspects of k -Kemeny scores were, so far, considered only by [Faliszewski et al. \[2023\]](#).

2 Preliminaries

Given a set of candidates $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$, we write $\mathcal{L}(C)$ to denote the set of all strict rankings (linear orders) over C , and we refer to $\mathcal{L}(C)$ as the *full domain* over C . We often focus on various other domains \mathcal{D} that are subsets of $\mathcal{L}(C)$, typically referred to as *structured domains*. For a ranking v and candidates a and b , we write $v: a > b$ to indicate that v ranks a higher than b . If A and B are two disjoint subsets of candidates, then by $v: A > B$ we mean that v prefers each member of A to each member of B . The *swap distance* of two rankings $u, v \in \mathcal{L}(C)$ is the number of swaps of adjacent candidates needed to transform u into v (equal to the number of inversions, i.e., the number of pairs of candidates that are ranked differently in u and v).

We assume knowledge of standard notions from computational complexity theory [[Papadimitriou, 1994](#)] and its parameterized variant [[Cygan et al., 2015](#)].

2.1 Elections

An *election* $E = (C, V)$ consists of a set C of candidates and a collection V of voters, where every voter has a vote from $\mathcal{L}(C)$, ranking the candidates from the most to the least desirable one. To streamline our discussion, we use the same symbols to refer to both the voters and their votes, with the exact meaning clear from the context. We often focus on elections where the votes are restricted to belong to some structured domain, rather than the full one.

(k -)Kemeny Rankings. Let us fix an election $E = (C, V)$ and let r be some ranking from $\mathcal{L}(C)$. Its *Kemeny score* is:

$$\text{Kemeny}_E(r) = \sum_{v \in V} \text{swap}(v, r).$$

A ranking with the lowest Kemeny score is known as a *Kemeny ranking* [Kemeny \[1959\]](#). Similarly, the k -Kemeny score of a set $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$ of k rankings is:

$$k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) = \sum_{v \in V} \min_{i \in [k]} \text{swap}(v, r_i).$$

We refer to the set that minimizes the k -Kemeny score as the *k -Kemeny set* and to its members as *k -Kemeny rankings* [[Faliszewski et al., 2023](#)]. We study the problem below.

Definition 2.1. In the k -KEMENY problem we are given an election E as well as integers k and q , and we ask if there is a set R of k rankings such that k -Kemeny $_E(R) \leq q$.

2.2 Structured Domains

In addition to the full domain, we also consider its various structured variants defined below:

Single-Peaked Domain (SP). Let \triangleleft be some ranking from $\mathcal{L}(C)$, referred to as an axis. The *single-peaked domain (SP)* for \triangleleft consists of all rankings $v \in \mathcal{L}(C)$ that satisfy the following condition: For every $t \in [|C|]$ the top t candidates in v form an interval within \triangleleft . This domain was introduced by Black [1958].

Single-Crossing Domains (SC). A subset of $\mathcal{L}(C)$ is *single-crossing (SC)* if it is possible to order its members as (v_1, \dots, v_n) , so that for each pair of candidates $a, b \in C$ there is a number $t_{ab} \in [n]$ such that voters $v_1, \dots, v_{t_{ab}}$ rank a and b in one way, and the remaining ones rank them in the opposite way. These domains were introduced by Mirrlees [1971] and Roberts [1977].

Group-Separable Domains (GS). Let \mathcal{T} be a rooted, ordered tree, where each leaf is labeled with a unique candidate from C and each internal node has at least two children. A vote $v \in \mathcal{L}(C)$ is *consistent* with \mathcal{T} if we can obtain it by reading the labels of the leaves from left to right, after possibly reversing the order of some nodes' children. A *group-separable domain (GS)* for tree \mathcal{T} contains all votes consistent with \mathcal{T} . The notion of group-separability is due to Inada [1964, 1969], but we follow the equivalent definition of Karпов [2019]. Whenever we speak of GS, we mean its variant for a given binary tree.

It is well-known that all single-peaked domains for candidate sets of the same cardinality are isomorphic, so we typically speak of *the* single-peaked domain. On the other hand, if there are at least three candidates then there are many different single-crossing domains; these observations are made explicitly, e.g., by Faliszewski et al. [2025b]. Group-separable domains are isomorphic, provided that the underlying trees are isomorphic. We are particularly interested in:

Balanced Group-Separable Domain (GS/bal). A GS domain is *balanced* if its underlying tree is a binary tree where each level—except possibly the last one—is completely filled (we refer to such trees as *balanced*).

Caterpillar Group-Separable Domain (GS/cat). A GS domain is *caterpillar* if its underlying tree is binary, where each internal node has at least one leaf as a child (we refer to such trees as *caterpillar*).

A domain \mathcal{D} is a *Condorcet domain* if for each election in \mathcal{D} there is a ranking r , called *Condorcet ranking*, such that for each two candidates a and b , $r: a > b$ implies that at least half of the voters prefer a to b . All the above domains are Condorcet. Other domains we consider are:

Single-Peaked on a Graph Domains (SP/G). For a graph G where each vertex is labeled with a unique candidate, a vote $v \in \mathcal{L}(C)$ is *single-peaked with respect to G* if for each $t \in [|C|]$ the graph induced by the top t candidates is connected (so, for a path we get the classic single-peaked domain). Similarly to GS, in each SP/G domain we assume a specific connected graph G for each candidate set, which we can compute in polynomial-time. This domain was mentioned, e.g., by Elkind et al. [2017]; its variant for trees is due to Demange [1982].

Single-Peaked on a Circle Domain (SPOC). This is the SP/G domain for the case where graph G is a cycle; it is due to [Peters and Lackner \[2020\]](#).

d -Euclidean Domains. Let d be a positive integer and let $x: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a function that associates each candidate with a point in the Euclidean space (called *embedding function*). A vote $v \in \mathcal{L}(C)$ belongs to the domain induced by x if there is a point $x_v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for each two candidates $a, b \in C$, if $v: a \succ b$ then the Euclidean distance between x_v and $x(a)$ is smaller than between x_v and $x(b)$. These domains are discussed, e.g., by [Enelow and Hinich \[1984, 1990\]](#).

Statistical Cultures. Fix a candidate set C and some domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(C)$. A statistical culture is a distribution over the votes from \mathcal{D} . In particular, by *impartial culture over \mathcal{D}* we mean the uniform distribution over \mathcal{D} . If we omit \mathcal{D} , then we mean impartial culture of $\mathcal{L}(C)$. We introduce further statistical cultures in [Section 4.1](#).

3 Computational Complexity of k -KEMENY

The k -KEMENY problem is NP-hard even if $k = 1$ and $n = 4$ voters [[Dwork et al., 2001](#); [Biedl et al., 2009](#)]. However, for Condorcet domains and $k = 1$ it can be solved trivially (it suffices to compute the Kemeny score of the Condorcet ranking, which is guaranteed to be optimal). We show that for some prominent Condorcet domains, including SP, GS/bal, and GS/cat, as well as for SP/G domains, k -KEMENY becomes NP-hard already for $k = 2$. We also discuss the complexity of k -KEMENY on Euclidean domains. We supplement these results with a general FPT algorithm for Condorcet domains, parameterized by the number of voters, and an outright polynomial-time algorithm for SC elections.

3.1 Intractability Results for Structured Domains

The key idea of our hardness proofs is to give reductions from the HYPERCUBE 2-SEGMENTATION (H2S) problem. To define this problem, we need some additional notation. For a binary string x , we write $x[j]$ to refer to its j -th symbol. *Hamming* distance between two equal-length strings x and y , denoted $\text{ham}(x, y)$, is the number of positions on which these two strings differ. For a sequence $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of binary strings, each of length m , the Hamming distance between S and another binary string r of length m is $\text{ham}(S, r) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{ham}(s_i, r)$. A string that minimizes the Hamming distance to S is called *central* for S and for every position $i \in [m]$, has the same symbol on this position as at least half of the strings in S (in case of a tie, a central string can take either symbol). The Hamming distance of such a string to S is the *Hamming score* of S , denoted $\text{ham}(S)$.

Definition 3.1. *An instance of H2S consists of a sequence $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of binary strings and of an integer t . We ask if it is possible to partition S into two groups, such that the sum of their Hamming scores is at most t .*

The first NP-completeness claim for H2S appears in the conference paper of [Kleinberg et al. \[1998\]](#), but without a proof. Its journal version does not include a proof either [[Kleinberg et al., 2004](#)], but claims MAXSNP-hardness (also without proof). The NP-hardness proof was eventually presented 16 years later by [Feige \[2014\]](#), who also argued why the MAXSNP-hardness claim was incorrect.

Theorem 3.1. *k -KEMENY is NP-complete even for $k = 2$ and elections that are both SP and GS/bal.*

Proof sketch. To show NP-hardness, we reduce from H2S. Let the input instance consist of an integer t and a sequence $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of binary strings, each of length m . We form a set of candidates $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ and we say that a preference order v is *aligned* if it is of the following form:

$$v: \{a_1, b_1\} > \{a_2, b_2\} > \dots > \{a_m, b_m\}.$$

An aligned vote is consistent with length- m binary string x if for each $j \in [m]$, we have $v: a_j > b_j$ when $x[j] = 1$ and $v: b_j > a_j$ if $x[j] = 0$. We form an election $E = (C, V)$, where for each string s_i we have exactly one vote v_i , aligned and consistent with it. We form a k -KEMENY instance with election E , $k = 2$, and $q = t$. We observe that election E is single-peaked with respect to societal axis:

$$a_m \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a_2 \triangleleft a_1 \triangleleft b_1 \triangleleft b_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft b_m.$$

It is also balanced group-separable, as witnesses by balanced binary tree \mathcal{T} with $2m$ leaves, where reading the labels of the leaves from left to right gives order $a_1 > b_1 > a_2 > b_2 > \dots > a_m > b_m$. We ask if there are two rankings r' and r'' such that $k\text{-KEMENY}_E(\{r', r''\}) \leq t$. \square

Before we discuss an analogous result for caterpillar group-separable elections, we make an observation about how one can generate GS/cat votes, or verify that votes are GS/cat. Take an axis $c_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft c_m$, corresponding to a caterpillar tree (the leaves, read from left to right, are labeled with c_1, \dots, c_m). To form a GS/cat vote for this axis, we consider the candidates in the order c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m and for each c_i we choose whether to place it on the highest or the lowest still available position. We refer to this as *caterpillar vote construction (CVC)*. The appeal is that if we sample decisions in CVC uniformly at random, it is very similar to uniform sampling of SP votes: There, we always place the considered candidate in the lowest available position, randomizing between selecting the top- or bottom not-yet-ranked candidate from the axis [Walsh, 2015]; a similar relation between GS/cat and SP was already noted by Boehmer et al. [2022a].

Theorem 3.2. *k -KEMENY is NP-complete even for $k = 2$ and elections that are caterpillar group-separable.*

Proof sketch. We sketch a reduction from H2S, similar in spirit to the one for Theorem 3.1, but with a different representation of the votes. Consider an H2S instance with sequence $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of binary strings of length- m each, and an integer t . Let $M = m^{10} n^{10}$.

We form a candidate set $C = A \cup B \cup X$, where $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$, $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ and $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$, where X is a large set of dummy candidates. For each binary string z of length m and each position $j \in [m]$, we let $c_z(j)$ be a_j if $z[j] = 1$, and we let $c_z(j)$ be b_j if $z[j] = 0$. By $\bar{c}_z(j)$ we mean the unique candidate in $\{a_j, b_j\} \setminus \{c_z(j)\}$. For each binary string z of length m , we define ranking $r(z)$:

$$r(z): c_z(1) > \dots > c_z(m) > X > \bar{c}_z(m) > \dots > \bar{c}_z(1),$$

where by X we mean listing members of X from x_1 to x_M . For example, if z has prefix 101, then $r(z)$ is of the form:

$$r(101\dots): a_1 > b_2 > a_3 > \dots > X > \dots > b_3 > a_2 > b_1.$$

We form an election E with candidate set C and a single vote $r(s_i)$ for each string $s_i \in S$. Note that E is GS/cat for axis $a_1 \triangleleft b_1 \triangleleft a_2 \triangleleft b_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a_m \triangleleft b_m \triangleleft x_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft x_M$.

Our k -KEMENY instance consists of election E , $k = 2$, and $q = 2Mt + 2nm^2$. Intuitively, whenever some symbol differs between a string from the input and the central one for its group, this corresponds to, at most, $2M + 2m^2$ swaps within a corresponding vote ($2M$ to swap the respective members of A and B between the sides of X , and the remaining ones to arrange their final positions). \square

We can also extend [Theorem 3.1](#) to show NP-hardness for all SP/G domains, which, e.g., include the SPOC domain.

Theorem 3.3. *For every SP/G domain, k -KEMENY is NP-complete even for $k = 2$ and elections from this domain.*

For the case of 2-Euclidean elections (and, naturally, higher-dimensional ones), [Escoffier et al. \[2022\]](#) have shown that already deciding if there is a Kemeny ranking with a given score is NP-complete, even if the embedding function is given. One of the reasons why this NP-hardness is possible is that there is no guarantee that the Kemeny ranking belongs to the given 2-Euclidean domain (which stands in contrast to Condorcet domains). Indeed, if we seek a ranking that minimizes the Kemeny score and belongs to the domain, then [Hamm et al. \[2021\]](#) gave a polynomial-time algorithm for this problem. Briefly put, the size of each d -Euclidean domain is at most $O(m^{2d})$, where m is the number of candidates, so one can use brute-force search (the approach of [Hamm et al. \[2021\]](#) is faster, though). We can also perform such a brute-force search for k -Kemeny scores.

Definition 3.2. *In the d -EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY problem we are given an election E over some d -Euclidean domain, an embedding function x for this domain, and an integer q . We ask if there is a set $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$ of k rankings from the domain, such that $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) \leq q$.*

Corollary 3.4. *For each fixed d and k , d -EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY is polynomial-time solvable.*

So, as opposed to k -KEMENY for SP, GS/bal and GS/cat domains, d -EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY is tractable for $k = 2$. Yet, if k is part of the input then d -EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY is NP-complete, even for 2-Euclidean elections.

Theorem 3.5. *d -EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY is NP-complete for $d \geq 2$.*

3.2 Algorithms for Condorcet Domains

[Faliszewski et al. \[2023\]](#) have shown that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an FPT approximation algorithm for k -KEMENY with $1 + \varepsilon$ approximation ratio, parameterized by the number n of the voters and running in time $O^*(n^n)$. Using dynamic programming, for Condorcet domains we improve this to an exact FPT algorithm, running in time $O^*(3^n)$. For the general domain such a result seems impossible, as 1-Kemeny is NP-hard even for $n = 4$ voters [[Dwork et al., 2001](#); [Biedl et al., 2009](#)].

Theorem 3.6. *There exists an FPT algorithm parameterized by the number n of the votes that given an instance of k -KEMENY—where the votes come from a Condorcet domain—solves it in time $O^*(3^n)$.*

For single-crossing elections we even get a polynomial-time algorithm. The idea is to model k -KEMENY as a Chamberlin–Courant (CC) multiwinner election [[Chamberlin and Courant, 1983](#)], where each vote from the original election is both a candidate and a voter in the CC one, ranking itself and the others with respect to the swap distance from itself. This yields single-peaked election, for which CC is tractable [[Betzler et al., 2013](#); [Sornat et al., 2022](#)].

Theorem 3.7. *Single-crossing instances of k -KEMENY can be solved in time $\tilde{O}(nm + n^2)$.*

4 Diversity of Structured Domains

Next we move on to the diversity analysis of our domains and the elections that one can sample from them. Given an election E and an integer k , we write $\kappa_E(k)$ to denote its k -Kemeny score, i.e., the k -Kemeny score of its k -Kemeny set. In this section we often view domains as elections that include a single copy of each possible vote.

Faliszewski et al. [2023, 2025a] proposed to measure the diversity of an election $E = (C, V)$ using function D defined as follows ($w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots$ are weights and $N(E)$ is a normalizing factor, depending on $|C|$ and $|V|$):

$$D(E) = N(E) \cdot (w_1 \kappa_E(1) + w_2 \kappa_E(2) + w_3 \kappa_E(3) + \dots);$$

the larger is the value $D(E)$, the more diverse is E . However, the choice of w_1, w_2, \dots and $N(E)$ is not obvious and the two above-cited papers make different ones. We follow their general approach, but focusing on qualitative comparisons between diversities of various elections/domains, by analyzing vectors

$$\kappa(E) = \left(\frac{1}{|V|} \kappa_E(1), \dots, \frac{1}{|V|} \kappa_E(|C|) \right).$$

We refer to values $\frac{1}{|V|} \kappa_E(k)$ as normalized k -Kemeny scores. We view an election $E' = (C, V')$ as more diverse than election $E'' = (C, V'')$ if $\kappa(E')$ dominates $\kappa(E'')$ —i.e., has greater-or-equal values on each coordinate—occasionally arguing how to resolve the situation when dominance does not hold either way. Faliszewski et al. [2023] also suggested that $\kappa_E(1) - \kappa_E(2)$, normalized appropriately, is a good measure of E 's polarization.

4.1 Setup, Domains, and Statistical Cultures

Throughout this section, we almost exclusively focus on the case of $m = 8$ candidates. This suffices for many realistic settings and is small enough for efficient computations and clear visualizations. Unless specified otherwise, all elections sampled from statistical cultures consist of 512 voters. All experiments calculating the k -Kemeny scores or domain sizes are averaged across 100 samples.

Let us fix $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_8\}$. We focus on the following nine domains, explained below (some of the acronyms were already introduced in Section 2):

1D-Int., 2D-Sq., 3D-Cb., SC, SP, SP/DF, SPOC, GS/bal, GS/cat.

Euclidean Domains. For positive integer t , t D-HyperCube domain is a Euclidean domain where candidate points are selected uniformly at random from $[-1, 1]^t$ (so, in fact, this is a family of domains, one for each embedding function). Note that these domains include all preference orders that can be obtained by putting a voter point somewhere in \mathbb{R}^t , even if this location is outside of $[-1, 1]^t$. For $t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we refer to these domains as 1D-Interval, 2D-Square, and 3D-Cube, respectively (abbreviated as 1D-Int., 2D-Sq., and 3D-Cb.).

Single Crossing Domains. To obtain a single-crossing domain (SC), we follow the approach of Szufa et al. [2025]: We form a sequence $v_1, \dots, v_{\binom{m}{2}}$ of votes, where $v_1: c_1 > \dots > c_8$ and for each $i > 1$ we obtain v_i from v_{i-1} by swapping a pair of candidates c_p, c_q , $p < q$, that are ranked consecutively (we select such a pair uniformly at random).




Figure 1: Domain size as a function of the number of candidates.





Figure 2: Average $\kappa(E)$ as a function of k .

SP/DF and the Remaining Domains. The remaining five domains are unique up to renaming the candidates and, with the exception of SP/DF, were described in Section 2. The SP/DF domain (or, the SP/double-forked domain) is a domain of votes that are single-peaked on the following tree:



Sizes of the Domains. In Figure 1 we plot the sizes of our domains—i.e., the numbers of distinct votes included in each—depending on the number of candidates (note that the y axis has a logarithmic scale). More details can be found in Section B. Interestingly, even though the sizes of SP (which is equal to the size of GS), SP/DF, and SPOC grow exponentially and the sizes of Euclidean domains grow polynomially, for $m = 8$, 2D-Square is larger than SP (GS) and almost as large as SPOC and SP/DF. 3D-Cube is outright larger and remains so until $m = 16$.

Statistical Cultures. Whenever we generate an election with votes from a given domain, we do so by sampling the required number of votes using a respective statistical culture. In particular, for each of our domains we consider its variant of impartial culture, i.e., sampling votes uniformly at random. For SP, this is known as the Walsh model [Walsh, 2015]. We also consider the Conitzer model of sampling SP votes [Conitzer, 2009]: First, we choose candidate c_i uniformly at random and place it on top of the vote. Next, we perform $|C| - 1$ iterations, so that in each we extend by one candidate, selected uniformly at random among at most two, so that the top-ranked candidates in the generated vote form an interval with respect to the axis (we assume $c_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft c_8$ for both models). For t D-HyperCube domains, we use the r -Box model, $r \in \mathbb{R}$, which works as follows: Given a domain and its embedding function, to sample a vote we choose its point uniformly from $[-r, r]^t$ (recall that candidates are chosen




Figure 3: Microscopes of our domains with IC.

from $[-1, 1]^t$). Large fraction of literature in computational social choice that uses the t D-HyperCube models uses the 1-Box model (or an isomorphic one) and not impartial culture over the given domain [Boehmer et al., 2024].

Computing k -Kemeny. Given an election E , an integer k , and a search space (i.e., a list of votes) we compute $\kappa_E(k)$ using a local search approximation algorithm of Faliszewski et al. [2023]. We start with a set of k centers, i.e., rankings selected uniformly at random from the search space, and iteratively improve this set by replacing one of the centers with a better one, from the search space, until no improvement is found. For Condorcet domains, it suffices to search over the domain itself [Barbut, 1980; Truchon, 1998]. For non-Condorcet domains, the search space consists of all the votes from the domain and of 512 votes sampled from IC (using more IC votes did not lead to notable improvements). We perform 10 random starts and select the best outcome.

4.2 Microscope View of Our Domains

Let us fix some election $E = (C, V)$, with $V = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$. Following Faliszewski et al. [2023], we visualize E as follows: We depict each vote $v \in V$ as a point on a plane, so that the Euclidean distance between points corresponding to votes $v_i, v_j \in V$ is as similar to $\text{swap}(v_i, v_j)$ as possible; to ensure such an embedding, we use the multidimensional scaling algorithm [Kruskal, 1964; de Leeuw, 2005]. While not perfectly accurate, such visualizations—which we call *microscopes*—offer some intuition of the nature of the votes in the election. They follow the general ideas of the map framework of Szufa et al. [2025].

In Figure 3, we present one microscope for each of our domains, except 3D-Cb. (for 1D-Int., 2D-Sq., and SC we show one representative example of a domain). The microscope shows the domain with 512 additional votes generated from IC (light gray dots); microscopes without added IC votes are in the appendix. For each domain, we have computed an approximate 4-Kemeny set, we indicate the rankings from these sets with stars, and we colored the votes according to the closest one. As expected, votes of the same color cluster together, providing a sanity check. We refer to these plots in the following discussions.




Figure 4: Histograms of the distances between the votes and their closest k -Kemeny ranking, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. (For the remaining models, see the appendix.)

4.3 Diversity of the Domains

For each of our domains—treated as an election \mathcal{D} —we have computed vector $\kappa(\mathcal{D})$ and present it on Figure 2. We repeated the computation 100 times and show averaged results, together with standard deviation in the shaded areas (nearly invisible in most cases; the randomness is over both the exact choice of the domain—for SC and the Euclidean ones—and on the randomness within our k -Kemeny heuristic). The plot also includes IC for reference (in this case, for each of the 100 repetitions we sampled new 512 votes from IC). As argued, for two domains \mathcal{D}' and \mathcal{D}'' where $\kappa(\mathcal{D}')$ dominates $\kappa(\mathcal{D}'')$, we say that \mathcal{D}' is (certainly) more diverse ($\mathcal{D}' > \mathcal{D}''$), leading to the following ranking (we also resolved some unclear cases and left others as ties):

$$\text{GS/cat} > \text{3D-Cube} > \{2\text{D-Square, SPOC}\} > \{\text{SP/DE, GS/bal}\} > \text{SP} > \{\text{SC, 1D-Interval}\}.$$

The three ties that we have left seem to be genuine—looking at the k -Kemeny scores of these pairs of domains we do not see strong arguments to view either of them as more diverse than the other. This is most clearly seen in case of SC and 1D-Interval, as their k -Kemeny scores are identical.

Remark 4.1. *It is well-known that every 1D-Interval election is both SP and SC, but there are elections that are SP and SC, which are not 1D-Interval [Chen et al., 2017; Elkind et al., 2020]. Yet, the set of the maximal-sized 1D-Interval domains is a subset of the set of maximal-sized SC domains.*

Our diversity ranking is in agreement with many intuitions that one might get by looking at the microscopes in Figure 3, but the fact that GS/cat is the most diverse among our domains, or that SPOC and GS/bal are ranked fairly highly, is surprising. Yet, this seems justified. Foremost, the microscopes only give approximate views of the domains and one of their features is that the points (i.e., the votes) that are presented on the outer part are typically much farther apart from each other than their Euclidean distance would suggest. Hence, e.g., the votes in the 2D-Square domain—which appear as a nice cluster in the inner part of the plot—are closer to each other than the SPOC votes, which are placed on the outer part. This is clearly seen in Figure 4, where we show histograms of the distances of the votes from their closest k -Kemeny ranking, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. In particular, for each 1-Kemeny ranking there are some GS/cat, SPOC, and GS/bal votes that are at the maximum possible distance from them (which is 28 for $m = 8$), meaning that these domains include reverses of their 1-Kemeny rankings (see also Section 4.5 below). Generally, GS/cat votes are typically farther from their k -Kemeny rankings than the 2D-Square ones.




Figure 5: Average $\kappa(E)$ for SP elections sampled from Wal./Con. models.




Figure 6: Average $\kappa(E)$ for Euclidean elections sampled using 1-Box.




Figure 7: Sizes of the rev.-sym. ext. of the domains over their original sizes.

4.3.1 Diversity of Conitzer and Walsh Elections.

In Figure 5 we show analogous plots as in Figure 2, but for elections sampled using the Walsh and Conitzer models. Intuitively, the Walsh model should produce more diverse elections as their votes cover SP more evenly, but this conclusion is not as strong as one might expect: Indeed 1-Kemeny score is higher for elections generated under the Conitzer model. However, if we disregard this one entry, then Walsh SP elections are indeed more diverse. Conitzer elections, on the other hand, are more polarized as their $\kappa_E(1) - \kappa_E(2)$ value, which measures polarization, is larger [Faliszewski et al., 2023].

It is tempting to think that sampling votes from a domain uniformly at random maximizes the diversity of the resulting elections, but this is not always true. For an example of a domain where this does not hold, see Section C.1.

4.4 Diversity of Euclidean Elections

Euclidean domains (particularly 1D and 2D ones) are among the most frequently used structured domains in experiments [Boehmer et al., 2024]. While both voters' and candidates' ideal points can be drawn from various distributions, a common approach is to sample all points uniformly at random from the 1-Box models (or isomorphic ones).

In Figure 6 we show an analogous plot as in Figure 2, but for elections sampled from 1D-Interval, 2D-Square, and 3D-Cube using the 1-Box model, with IC included as a reference point. As expected, the lower the dimension, the less diverse are the sampled elections. Notably, 1-Kemeny scores are nearly identical across all three Euclidean models.

Yet, we observe that Euclidean elections sampled from the 1-Box model are visibly less diverse than their respective domains. Let us explain this on the example of the 2D-Square domain. Here, each possible vote corresponds to a polygon, but given the candidates' points, some polygons may lie outside of the $[-1, 1]^2$ square, or they may be so small that we never "hit" them during sampling. To measure how these two factors reduce the number of distinct votes in our samples, we conducted the following experiment. For each value of $r \in \{0.5, 0.75, \dots, 4\}$, we sampled 100 elections from the r -Box model. Then, using the candidates' positions in each election, we calculated both the maximum number of distinct votes possible within the given




Figure 8: Changes in the sizes of Euclidean domains (the plots on the left and in the center plot regard the 2D-Square domains; for the plot on the right, the dimension of the considered domain is on the x axis).

r -Box and the total number of possible votes overall.¹ Results are presented in Figure 8 (left). As expected, the maximum number of votes increases as we enlarge the box size. However, interestingly, the number of distinct sampled votes does not. Indeed, we find that the r -Box model produces most distinct sampled votes for $r = 1$ (we verified that this also gives the highest diversity). Jointly with the fact that this model captures the scenario where candidates and voters come from the same population, we see it as an argument for using the 1-Box model in experiments, as already done. However, we also encourage the use of impartial culture over Euclidean domains, which so far does not seem to be done at all, as these cultures produce much more diverse elections.

In Figure 8, we also show the results of two similar experiments. In the first one, we fix $r = 1$ and vary the number of candidates in 2 dimensions (center plot). In the second, we fix 8 candidates, but vary the number of dimensions (right plot). In both cases, the number of distinct sampled votes is significantly smaller than the domain size.

4.5 Reverse-Symmetric Domains

We call a domain \mathcal{D} *reverse-symmetric* if for each vote $v \in \mathcal{D}$, its reversal is also in \mathcal{D} . Similarly, it is *reverse-free* if for each of its votes, its reversal is not in \mathcal{D} . Among the considered domains, only GS and SPOC are reverse-symmetric, while the SP/DF is reverse-free (in fact, all SP on a tree domains are reverse-free, except for the SP on path).

We can extend each domain by adding a reversal of each vote (unless it is already present). By definition, for a reverse-symmetric domain, the size of its extension equals the size of the original domain itself. For a reverse-free domain, the size of its extension is twice that of the original one. For domains that are neither reverse-symmetric nor reverse-free, we computed the ratio between the sizes of their extensions and the original ones. The results in Figure 7 show that all curves appear to converge towards 2, with SP converging the fastest and 3D the slowest. Hence, we can classify our domains as either being reverse-symmetric or being (nearly) reverse-free. We encourage using domains of both types in experiments.

¹For experiments in this section, for a given dimension we sample 10 times more votes than in the domain (starting from 290 for 1D, up to 222120 for 5D).

5 Conclusions

The most important take-home messages from our work are that caterpillar group-separable elections are much more diverse than one might think, and that sampling votes from Euclidean domains uniformly at random may lead to very different elections than using the natural approach based on sampling voter points. Consequently, we encourage the use of these means of sampling preference data in experiments.

Acknowledgements

Tomasz Wąs was supported by UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) under grant EP/X038548/1. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 101002854).



References

- Ailon, N., Charikar, M., and Newman, A. (2008). Aggregating inconsistent information: Ranking and clustering. *Journal of the ACM*, 55(5):23:1–23:27.
- Alcalde-Unzu, J. and Vorsatz, M. (2013). Measuring the cohesiveness of preferences: An axiomatic analysis. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 41(4):965–988.
- Alcalde-Unzu, J. and Vorsatz, M. (2016). Do we agree? Measuring the cohesiveness of preferences. *Theory and Decision*, 80(2):313–339.
- Ammann, M. and Puppe, C. (2025). Preference diversity. *Review of Economic Design*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10058-025-00386-0>.
- Baigent, N. (1987). Metric rationalisation of social choice functions according to principles of social choice. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 13(1):59–65.
- Barbut, M. (1980). Médiannes, Condorcet et Kendall. *Mathématiques et Sciences Humaines*, 69:5–13.
- Bartholdi, III, J., Tovey, C., and Trick, M. (1989). Voting schemes for which it can be difficult to tell who won the election. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 6(2):157–165.
- Betzler, N., Bredereck, R., and Niedermeier, R. (2014). Theoretical and empirical evaluation of data for exact Kemeny rank aggregation. *Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, 28(5):721–748.
- Betzler, N., Fellows, M., Guo, J., Niedermeier, R., and Rosamond, F. (2009). Fixed-parameter algorithms for Kemeny scores. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(45):4554–4570.
- Betzler, N., Slinko, A., and Uhlmann, J. (2013). On the computation of fully proportional representation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:475–519.

- Biedl, T., Brandenburg, F. J., and Deng, X. (2009). On the complexity of crossings in permutations. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(7):1813–1823.
- Black, D. (1958). *The Theory of Committees and Elections*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boehmer, N., Bredereck, R., Elkind, E., Faliszewski, P., and Szufa, S. (2022a). Expected frequency matrices of elections: Computation, geometry, and preference learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS-2022*.
- Boehmer, N., Faliszewski, P., Janeczko, L., Kaczmarczyk, A., Lisowski, G., Pierczyński, G., Rey, S., Stolicki, D., Szufa, S., and Wąs, T. (2024). Guide to numerical experiments on elections in computational social choice. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2024*, pages 7962–7970.
- Boehmer, N., Faliszewski, P., Niedermeier, R., Szufa, S., and Wąs, T. (2022b). Understanding distance measures among elections. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2022*, pages 102–108.
- Bredereck, R., George, A., Israel, J., and Kellerhals, L. (2022). Single-peaked opinion updates. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2022*, pages 137–143.
- Can, B., Ozkes, A., and Storcken, T. (2017). Generalized measures of polarization in preferences. Technical report, HAL.
- Can, B., Ozkes, A. I., and Storcken, T. (2015). Measuring polarization in preferences. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 78:76–79.
- Chamberlin, B. and Courant, P. (1983). Representative deliberations and representative decisions: Proportional representation and the Borda rule. *American Political Science Review*, 77(3):718–733.
- Chan, T. M. and Pătraşcu, M. (2010). Counting inversions, offline orthogonal range counting, and related problems. In *Proceedings of SODA-2010*, pages 161–173.
- Chen, J., Pruhs, K., and Woeginger, G. (2017). The one-dimensional euclidean domain: Finitely many obstructions are not enough. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(2):409–432.
- Clark, B. N., Colbourn, C. J., and Johnson, D. S. (1990). Unit disk graphs. *Discrete mathematics*, 86(1-3):165–177.
- Conitzer, V. (2009). Eliciting single-peaked preferences using comparison queries. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 35:161–191.
- Conitzer, V., Davenport, A., and Kalagnanam, J. (2006). Improved bounds for computing Kemeny rankings. In *Proceedings of the 21st National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2006)*, pages 620–626.
- Cornaz, D., Galand, L., and Spanjaard, O. (2012). Bounded single-peaked width and proportional representation. In *Proceedings of ECAI-2012*, pages 270–275.
- Cornaz, D., Galand, L., and Spanjaard, O. (2013). Kemeny elections with bounded single-peaked or single-crossing width. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2013*, pages 76–82.
- Cygan, M., Fomin, F. V., Kowalik, L., Lokshantov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., and Saurabh, S. (2015). *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer.

- de Leeuw, J. (2005). Modern multidimensional scaling: Theory and applications. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 14:1–2.
- Demange, G. (1982). Single-peaked orders on a tree. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 3(4):389–396.
- Dwork, C., Kumar, R., Naor, M., and Sivakumar, D. (2001). Rank aggregation methods for the Web. In *Proceedings of WWW-2001*, pages 613–622.
- Elkind, E., Faliszewski, P., and Skowron, P. (2020). A characterization of the single-peaked single-crossing domain. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 54(1):167–181.
- Elkind, E., Faliszewski, P., and Slinko, A. (2015). Distance rationalization of voting rules. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 45(2):345–377.
- Elkind, E., Lackner, M., and Peters, D. (2016). Preference restrictions in computational social choice: Recent progress. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2016*, pages 4062–4065.
- Elkind, E., Lackner, M., and Peters, D. (2017). Structured preferences. In Endriss, U., editor, *Trends in Computational Social Choice*, pages 187–207. AI Access Foundation.
- Elkind, E., Lackner, M., and Peters, D. (2022). Preference restrictions in computational social choice: A survey. Technical Report arXiv:2205.09092 [cs.GT], arXiv.org.
- Enelow, J. and Hinich, M. (1984). *The Spatial Theory of Voting: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Enelow, J. and Hinich, M. (1990). *Advances in the Spatial Theory of Voting*. Cambridge University Press.
- Escoffier, B., Lang, J., and Öztürk, M. (2008). Single-peaked consistency and its complexity. In *Proceedings of ECAI-2008*, pages 366–370.
- Escoffier, B., Spanjaard, O., and Tydrichová, M. (2022). Weighted majority tournaments and Kemeny ranking with 2-dimensional euclidean preferences. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 318:6–12.
- Faliszewski, P., Kaczmarczyk, A., Sornat, K., Szufa, S., and Wąs, T. (2023). Diversity, agreement, and polarization in elections. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2023*, pages 2684–2692.
- Faliszewski, P., Mertlová, J., Nunn, P., Szufa, S., and Wąs, T. (2025a). Distances between top-truncated elections of different sizes. In *Proceedings of AAI-2025*, pages 13823–13830.
- Faliszewski, P., Skowron, P., Slinko, A., Sornat, K., Szufa, S., and Talmon, N. (2025b). How similar are two elections? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 150:103632.
- Feige, U. (2014). NP-hardness of hypercube 2-segmentation. Technical Report arXiv:1411.0821 [cs.CC], arXiv.org.
- Good, I. J. and Tideman, T. N. (1977). Stirling numbers and a geometric structure from voting theory. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 23(1):34–45.
- Hamm, T., Lackner, M., and Rapberger, A. (2021). Computing Kemeny rankings from d -Euclidean preferences. In *Proceedings of ADT-2021*, pages 147–161.

- Hashemi, V. and Endriss, U. (2014). Measuring diversity of preferences in a group. In *Proceedings of ECAI-2014*, pages 423–428.
- Hemaspaandra, E., Spakowski, H., and Vogel, J. (2005). The complexity of Kemeny elections. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 349(3):382–391.
- Inada, K. (1964). A note on the simple majority decision rule. *Econometrica*, 32(32):525–531.
- Inada, K. (1969). The simple majority decision rule. *Econometrica*, 37(3):490–506.
- Karpov, A. (2019). On the number of group-separable preference profiles. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 28(3):501–517.
- Karpov, A., Markström, K., Riis, S., and Zhou, B. (2024). Local diversity of Condorcet domains. Technical Report arXiv:2401.11912 [econ.TH], arXiv.org.
- Kemeny, J. (1959). Mathematics without numbers. *Daedalus*, 88:577–591.
- Kleinberg, J., Papadimitriou, C., and Raghavan, P. (1998). Segmentation problems. In *Proceedings of STOC-1998*, pages 473–482.
- Kleinberg, J., Papadimitriou, C., and Raghavan, P. (2004). Segmentation problems. *Journal of the ACM*, 51(2):263–280.
- Kruskal, J. (1964). Multidimensional scaling by optimizing goodness of fit to a nonmetric hypothesis. *Psychometrika*, 29(1):1–27.
- Meskanen, T. and Nurmi, H. (2008). Closeness counts in social choice. In Braham, M. and Steffen, F., editors, *Power, Freedom, and Voting*. Springer-Verlag.
- Mirrlees, J. (1971). An exploration in the theory of optimal income taxation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 38:175–208.
- Nehring, K. and Puppe, C. (2002). A theory of diversity. *Econometrica*, 70(3):1155–1198.
- Papadimitriou, C. (1994). *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley.
- Peters, D. and Lackner, M. (2020). Preferences single-peaked on a circle. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 68:463–502.
- Roberts, K. (1977). Voting over income tax schedules. *Journal of Public Economics*, 8(3):329–340.
- Sornat, K., Vassilevska Williams, V., and Xu, Y. (2022). Near-tight algorithms for the Chamberlin-Courant and Thiele voting rules. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2022*, pages 482–488.
- Szufa, S., Boehmer, N., Bredereck, R., Faliszewski, P., Niedermeier, R., Skowron, P., Slinko, A., and Talmon, N. (2025). Drawing a map of elections. *Artificial Intelligence*, 343:104332.
- Truchon, M. (1998). An extension of the Condorcet criterion and Kemeny orders. Technical Report cahier 98-15 du Centre de Recherche en Économie et Finance Appliquées, Université Laval, Québec, Canada.
- Walsh, T. (2015). Generating single peaked votes. Technical Report arXiv:1503.02766 [cs.GT], arXiv.org.

A Missing Proofs

In this appendix, we provide the missing proofs that were omitted in the main part of the paper.

The next proposition is a well-known property of Kemeny rankings that will be crucial for many of our theoretical results. It has been expressed in various forms and shapes by a number of different authors (see, e.g., the works of [Barbut \[1980\]](#), [Truchon \[1998\]](#), and [Bredereck et al. \[2022\]](#)).

Proposition A.1. *Let $E = (C, V)$ be an election and let A, B be two disjoint subsets of candidates such that $C = A \cup B$. If for each two candidates $a \in A, b \in B$ we have that at least half of the voters prefer a to b , then there is a Kemeny ranking r for E such that $r: A \succ B$. If for each $a \in A$ and each $b \in B$ a strict majority of voters prefers a to b then for every Kemeny ranking r we have $r: A \succ B$.*

This implies that if an election has a Condorcet ranking then it also is a Kemeny ranking.

Corollary A.2. *Consider an election $E = (C, V)$ where the votes belong to some Condorcet domain. Each Condorcet ranking for E is also a Kemeny ranking for E .*

A.1 Proof of [Theorem 3.1](#)

It is immediate to see that k -KEMENY is in NP. To show NP-hardness, we give a reduction from H2S. Let the input instance consist of an integer t and a sequence $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ of binary strings, each of length m , where m is a power of two (this assumption is w.l.o.g. as we can always ensure that it holds by extending each of the strings with no more than $m - 1$ identical symbols). We form a set of candidates $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ and we say that a preference order v is *aligned* if it is of the following form:

$$v: \{a_1, b_1\} \succ \{a_2, b_2\} \succ \dots \succ \{a_m, b_m\}.$$

Further, we say that an aligned vote is consistent with length- m binary string x if for each $j \in [m]$, we have $v: a_j \succ b_j$ when $x[j] = 1$ and $v: b_j \succ a_j$ if $x[j] = 0$. We form an election $E = (C, V)$, where V contains exactly one vote v_i for each string s_i , such that v_i is aligned and consistent with s_i . We form a k -KEMENY instance with elections E , $k = 2$, and $q = t$. We observe that election E is single-peaked with respect to societal axis:

$$a_m \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a_2 \triangleleft a_1 \triangleleft b_1 \triangleleft b_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft b_m.$$

It is also balanced group-separable, as witnesses by balanced binary tree \mathcal{T} with $2m$ leaves, where reading the labels of the leaves from left to right gives order $a_1 \succ b_1 \succ a_2 \succ b_2 \succ \dots \succ a_m \succ b_m$. It is immediate that the reduction can be computed in polynomial time. We ask if there are two rankings r' and r'' such that k -Kemeny $_E(\{r', r''\}) \leq t$.

Let us now argue that the reduction is correct. Suppose there is a solution to the input H2S problem that partitions S into S' and S'' , such that $\text{ham}(S') + \text{ham}(S'') \leq t$. Let s' and s'' be two arbitrary central strings for S' and S'' . We partition the voter collection V into V' and V'' such that each vote v_i belongs to V' exactly if string s_i belongs to S' and we form two rankings, r' and r'' that both are aligned, r' is consistent with s' , and r'' is consistent with s'' . It is immediate that k -Kemeny $_E(\{r', r''\}) \leq t$ as, indeed, we have:

$$k\text{-Kemeny}_E(\{r', r''\}) \leq \sum_{v_i \in V'} \text{swap}(v_i, r') + \sum_{v_i \in V''} \text{swap}(v_i, r'') = t.$$

The other direction proceeds analogously. Assume that there are two rankings r' and r'' in $\mathcal{L}(C)$ such that $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(\{r', r''\}) \leq q = t$. By [Theorem A.1](#), we know that both r' and r'' are aligned, and so we can derive length- m binary strings s' and s'' such that r' and r'' are consistent with s' and s'' , respectively. We partition S into S' and S'' so that each string s_i belongs to S' exactly if $\text{swap}(v_i, r') \leq \text{swap}(v_i, r'')$, and it belongs to S'' otherwise. One can verify that $\text{ham}(S', s') + \text{ham}(S'', s'') \leq t$ and, hence, $\text{ham}(S') + \text{ham}(S'') \leq t$.

A.2 Proof of [Theorem 3.2](#)

It is clear that our problem is in NP and we give a reduction from H2S. Consider its instance with sequence $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ of binary strings of length- m each, and an integer t . Our proof is similar in spirit to that of [Theorem 3.1](#), but uses a different representation of the strings from the H2S instance.

Let $M = m^{10}n^{10}$. We form a candidate set $C = A \cup B \cup X$, where $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$, $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ and $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$. X is a large set of dummy candidates; while we could take much smaller M , the current choice makes our reasoning clear and easy to follow. For each binary string z of length m and each position $j \in [m]$, we let $c_z(j)$ be a_j if $z[j] = 1$, and we let $c_z(j)$ be b_j if $z[j] = 0$. By $\bar{c}_z(j)$ we mean the unique candidate in $\{a_j, b_j\} \setminus \{c_z(j)\}$ (so $\bar{c}_z(j)$ can be seen as a complement of $c_z(j)$). For each binary string z of length m , we define $r(z)$ to be the following preference ranking:

$$r(z): c_z(1) > c_z(2) > \dots > c_z(m) > X > \bar{c}_z(m) > \dots > \bar{c}_z(2) > \bar{c}_z(1),$$

where by X we mean listing members of X from x_1 to x_M . For example, if z has prefix 101, then $r(z)$ is of the form:

$$r(101\dots): a_1 > b_2 > a_3 > \dots > X > \dots > b_3 > a_2 > b_1.$$

We form an election $E = (C, V)$ with candidate set C and voter collection $V = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, where for each $i \in [n]$, v_i has preference order $r(s_i)$. Note that this election is caterpillar group-separable for the following axis (this follows by applying the CVC procedure in a straightforward way):

$$a_1 \triangleleft b_1 \triangleleft a_2 \triangleleft b_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a_m \triangleleft b_m \triangleleft x_1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft x_M.$$

Our $k\text{-KEMENY}$ instance consists of election E , $k = 2$, and $q = 2Mt + 2nm^2$. It is immediate that the reduction can be computed in polynomial time.

Let us now argue that the reduction is correct. First, assume that there is a partition of S into S' and S'' such that $\text{ham}(S') + \text{ham}(S'') \leq t$, and let s' and s'' be two central strings for S' and S'' , respectively. We partition V into V' and V'' so that V' contains voters corresponding to the members of S' , and V'' contains voters corresponding to members of S'' . We claim that for each vote $v_i \in V'$ it holds that:

$$\text{swap}(v_i, r(s')) \leq 2M \cdot \text{ham}(s_i, s') + 2m^2.$$

Indeed, for each position $j \in [m]$ such that $s_i[j] \neq s'[j]$, transforming v_i into $r(s')$ requires shifting a_j and b_j across the members of X , which requires $2M$ swaps, and then arranging the candidates on the top and bottom m positions requires, altogether, at most $2m^2$ swaps. Altogether, we need at most $2M \cdot \text{ham}(s_i, s') + 2m^2$ swaps per voter. As the same analysis applies to votes in V'' and $r(s'')$, altogether we have:

$$k\text{-Kemeny}_E(\{r(s'), r(s'')\}) \leq 2M(\text{ham}(S') + \text{ham}(S'')) + 2nm^2 = 2Mt + 2nm^2.$$

So, if the H2S instance has a solution then so does our k -KEMENY instance.

Let us now assume that there are rankings r' and $r'' \in \mathcal{L}(C)$ such that $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(\{r', r''\}) \leq q$. We partition S into S' and S'' so that a string s_i belongs to S' exactly if $\text{swap}(v_i, r') \leq \text{swap}(v_i, r'')$ (we could also use a strict inequality here, or distribute strings s_i for which $\text{swap}(v_i, r') = \text{swap}(v_i, r'')$ between S' and S'' in any arbitrary way). In the analysis below we focus on r' , V' , and S' , but the reasoning for r'' , V'' , and S'' is analogous.

Due to [Theorem A.1](#), we can assume that there is some partition of $A \cup B$ into sets T and F such that r' is of the form $r': T \succ X \succ B$ and for each $j \in [m]$ we either have that $a_j \in T$ and $b_j \in F$, or we have that $a_j \in F$ and $b_j \in T$. We form a length- m binary string s' so that for each $j \in [m]$, $s'[j] = 1$ if $a_j \in T$, and $s'[j] = 0$ if $a_j \in F$. We observe that for each vote $v_i \in V'$ we have:

$$\text{swap}(v_i, r') \leq 2M \cdot \text{ham}(s_i, s') + 2m^2.$$

Indeed, this follows by the same reasoning as in the first part of the correctness proof. Consequently, we have that (we let $E' = (C, V')$ and $E'' = (C, V'')$):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Kemeny}_{E'}(r') &= \sum_{v_i \in V'} \text{swap}(v_i, r') \\ &\leq 2M \cdot \text{ham}(S') + 2|V'| \cdot m^2. \end{aligned}$$

By repeating the same analysis for r'' , V'' , and S'' , we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} k\text{-Kemeny}_E(\{r', r''\}) &\leq \text{Kemeny}_{E'}(r') + \text{Kemeny}_{E''}(r'') \\ &\leq 2M \cdot \text{ham}(S) + 2n \cdot m^2 \\ &\leq q. \end{aligned}$$

However, since $q = 2Mt + 2nm^2$, this inequality means that $\text{ham}(S) \leq t$. Indeed, if $\text{ham}(S) > t$ then we would have that $2M \cdot \text{ham}(S) > 2Mt + 2nm^2$, which would be a contradiction. This shows that if there is a solution for our k -KEMENY instance, then there also is one for H2S, which completes the correctness proof.

A.3 Proof of [Theorem 3.3](#)

k -KEMENY is in NP, thus we focus on showing the hardness, for which we reduce from k -KEMENY for single-peaked elections. Given a single-peaked election $E = (C, V)$ with $m = |C|$ candidates, we will construct a corresponding instance of SP/G election with a set of m^2 candidates X . We consider the same constants k and q in both instances.

At a high level, a graph with m^2 vertices has to either contain a path of length m or m vertices that are leaves of the spanning tree. In both cases, we can represent each ordering on C as an ordering on these m vertices and fix the positions of the remaining vertices. If we do that for all votes in election E we obtain an SP/G election, in which the k -KEMENY problem is equivalent to the k -KEMENY problem on E .

Formally, let us denote the societal axis of E by $c_1 \triangleleft c_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft c_m$ and consider arbitrary graph $G \in \mathcal{G}$, with the set of vertices being X . Let T be an arbitrary spanning tree of G . We will consider two cases based on whether the diameter of T , defined as the number of vertices in the longest path, $\text{diam}(T)$, is smaller than m or not.

Case 1. $\text{diam}(T) \geq m$. In such a case, there exists a path of m vertices $p = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$ in T , and thus also in G . Since G is connected, for the remaining vertices in $X \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ we can find an ordering $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_{m^2}$ such that for every $i \in \{m+1, \dots, m^2\}$ vertex x_i is connected by an edge to some vertex in the set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}\}$. Now, let $f: \mathcal{L}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(X)$ be

a function that transforms any ranking r over the original candidates C given by $c_{r_1} > c_{r_2} > \dots > c_{r_m}$ into a ranking over X that is:

$$f(r): x_{r_1} > x_{r_2} > \dots > x_{r_m} > x_{m+1} > \dots > x_{m^2}.$$

Then, we define a new election $E' = (X, V')$ which we obtain by transforming all of the original votes in this way, i.e., $V' = \{f(v) : v \in V\}$.

Observe that each vote $v \in V'$ is single-peaked on G . Indeed, for each $t \in [m]$, the first t candidates in the ranking of v form an interval on path p since $f^{-1}(v)$ is single-peaked. For every larger t , the first t candidates form a connected subgraph of G by the way we have chosen vertices x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{m^2} . Thus, E' is single-peaked on G .

Finally, observe that in the set of rankings R' that minimize k -Kemeny $_{E'}(R')$, every ranking will be of the form

$$\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} > x_{m+1} > \dots > x_{m^2}$$

(otherwise, the distance can be decreased by moving candidates x_i for $i \geq m+1$ into their respective positions). Also, for every ranking set R over the original set of candidates C and ranking set $R' = \{f(r) : r \in R\}$, we have k -Kemeny $_E(R) = k$ -Kemeny $_{E'}(R')$. Both facts imply that there exists a set of k rankings $R' \subseteq \mathcal{L}(X)$, with k -Kemeny $_{E'}(R') \leq q$, if and only if, there exists a set of k rankings $R \subseteq \mathcal{L}(C)$ such that k -Kemeny $_E(R) \leq q$. This concludes the analysis of this case.

Case 2. $\text{diam}(T) < m$. In this case, let us first show that necessarily T has at least m leaves. Assume otherwise, i.e., there are at most $m-1$ leaves. Let $r \in X$ denote an arbitrary vertex, which we from now call a *root*, and consider paths in T from every leaf to r . Every such path is of length at most $m-1$ (since $\text{diam}(T) < m$) and there are at most $m-1$ of them, hence, in total, they pass through at most $(m-1)^2$ distinct vertices. On the other hand, every vertex in a tree is on the path from some leaf to the root, thus this number should be at least $|X| = m^2$. Hence, we arrive at a contradiction.

Therefore, we can denote some m leaves in T as x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m . Consider a subgraph of T induced by all of the remaining vertices and observe that it is connected (as removing leaves keeps T connected). Hence, there exists an ordering $x_{m^2}, x_{m^2-1}, \dots, x_{m+1}$ of vertices in $X \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$ such that for every $i \in [m^2-1]$ vertex x_{m^2-i} is connected to some vertex in $\{x_{m^2}, x_{m^2-1}, \dots, x_{m^2-i+1}\}$.

Next, similarly as in Case 1, we take function $f: \mathcal{L}(C) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(X)$ that transforms any ranking r over the original candidates C given by $c_{r_1} > c_{r_2} > \dots > c_{r_m}$ into a ranking over X that is:

$$f(r): x_{m^2} > \dots > x_{m+1} > x_{r_1} > x_{r_2} > \dots > x_{r_m}.$$

Again, we define the new set of voters as a set of all voters in V transformed using f , i.e., $V' = \{f(v) : v \in V\}$. Then, election $E' = (X, V')$ is single-peaked on G . Indeed, for every vote $v \in V'$ and $t \in [m^2]$ subgraph induced by the first t candidates is connected, by the way we defined x_{m^2}, \dots, x_{m+1} and the fact that each leaf x_1, \dots, x_m is connected to some vertex in $\{x_{m^2}, \dots, x_{m+1}\}$.

Finally, as in Case 1, we observe that in the set of rankings R' that minimize k -Kemeny $_{E'}(R')$ every ranking will be of the form

$$x_{m^2} > \dots > x_{m+1} > \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$$

and for every ranking set R over the original set of candidates C and ranking set $R' = \{f(r) : r \in R\}$, we have k -Kemeny $_E(R) = k$ -Kemeny $_{E'}(R')$. Therefore, there exists a set of k rankings $R' \subseteq \mathcal{L}(X)$, with k -Kemeny $_{E'}(R') \leq q$, if and only if, there exists a set of k rankings $R \subseteq \mathcal{L}(C)$ such that k -Kemeny $_E(R) \leq q$.




Figure 9: An example instance of GRIDGRAPHDOMINATINGSET problem used in the proof of Theorem 3.5.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3.5

Clearly, the problem is in NP. For the hardness, we will focus only on the case of $d = 2$ as 2-Euclidean domain is a subdomain of every d -Euclidean domain, hence the negative results carry over.

We provide a reduction from GRIDGRAPHDOMINATINGSET. In this problem, we are given a constant $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and a graph $G = (V, E)$, in which a set of vertices is a subset of cells in a $n \times n$ Cartesian grid, i.e., $V \subseteq [n]^2$, and there is an edge between two vertices, if and only if, their cells are neighboring, i.e., $\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)\} \in E$, if and only if, $|x_1 - x_2| = 1$ and $y_1 = y_2$, or $x_1 = x_2$ and $|y_1 - y_2| = 1$ (see Figure 9 for an example). The question is whether there exists a subset $S \subseteq V$ of size s , known as *dominating set*, such that every vertex in the graph is adjacent to a vertex in S or is in S itself. The problem is known to be NP-complete Clark et al. [1990].

For every such graph $G = (V, E)$ with $V \subseteq [n]^2$ and constant s we will construct a corresponding instance of 2-EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY. To this end, let us first introduce some additional notation specific to 2-Euclidean elections. We say that the *divider* between pair of candidates a and b embedded in 2-dimensional Euclidean space, denoted by $d_{a,b}$, is a perpendicular bisection of a line segment connecting a and b . This is also the exact set of points that are equidistant from a and b . Thus, every voter located on one side of $d_{a,b}$ prefers a over b , and every voter on the other side prefers b over a . Furthermore, for any two voters u and v that do not lay any divider (and we will consider only such voters), the number of dividers we cross when we go from u to v via a straight line is equal to $\text{swap}(u, v)$.

Let us now describe the construction of the corresponding 2-EMBEDDABLE k -KEMENY instance E (see Figure 10 for an illustration). For each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \cup \{2n\}$ we put candidate a_i in position $(4i, 4i)$ and candidate b_i in position $(12n + 4i, 0)$. This gives us the total of $2n + 4$ candidates.

Next, let us analyze the dividers between all pairs of the candidates. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, the divider d_{b_{2n}, b_i} is a vertical line passing through the point $(16n + 2i, 0)$. Analogously, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, the divider d_{a_{2n}, a_i} is a line with 45° negative slope, passing through the point $(4n + 2i, 4n + 2i)$. Thus, we obtain a grid structure in which n rows are divided by lines $d_{a_{2n}, a_0}, \dots, d_{a_{2n}, a_n}$ and n columns by lines $d_{b_{2n}, b_0}, \dots, d_{b_{2n}, b_n}$. The grid is bounded by d_{a_{2n}, a_0} from the bottom, d_{a_{2n}, a_n} from the top, d_{b_{2n}, b_0} from the left, and d_{b_{2n}, b_n} from the right. Let us show that no other divider passes through that area.

The divider between each pair of candidates among b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n is a vertical line to the left of d_{b_{2n}, b_0} . Similarly, the divider between each pair of candidates among a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n is a parallel line to d_{a_{2n}, a_0} going below it. Thus, none of these dividers pass through the grid area. It remains to check the dividers between a_i and b_j for each $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n, 2n\}$. Fix arbitrary such i and j , and observe that d_{a_i, b_j} is either a vertical or a positively sloped line that passes through the middle point between a_i and b_j that is $(6n + 2i + 2j, 2i)$. Since $6n + 2i + 2j \leq 6n + 4n + 4n = 14n < 16n$, divider d_{a_i, b_j} crosses d_{b_{2n}, b_0} , (i.e., the left bound of the grid), above point $(16n, 2i)$ (or not crosses it at all and is always to the left of d_{b_{2n}, b_0}). On the other hand, d_{a_{2n}, a_n} , so the top bound of the grid, crosses d_{b_{2n}, b_0} in the point $(16n, -4n)$. Thus, divider d_{a_i, b_j} does not pass through the grid area for each $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n, 2n\}$.




Figure 10: Illustration of the corresponding 2-Euclidean election to the graph instance in Figure 9, as constructed in the proof of Theorem 3.5. Blue empty dots represent candidates, full green dots represent voters, and each line is a divider between a pair of candidates. Thicker fragments of the lines mark the edges of the grid structure. The dividers outside of the grid structure do not play a role in the construction (they are marked with lighter gray in the figure).

Finally, we place one voter for each vertex of the graph in the GRIDGRAPHDOMINATINGSET instance in a cell of our grid corresponding to its cell in the $n \times n$ Cartesian grid. Specifically, for a given vertex $(i, j) \in V \subseteq [n]^2$, we place a single voter $v_{i,j}$ in position $(16n + 2i - 1, -8n + 4j - 2i - 1)$. This is to the right of $d_{b_{2n}, b_{i-1}}$, and to the left of d_{b_{2n}, b_i} that cover all points with the first coordinate being $16n + 2i - 2$ and $16n + 2i$, respectively. Also, this is above $d_{a_{2n}, a_{j-1}}$ and below d_{a_{2n}, a_j} , which go through the points

$$(16n + 2i - 1, -8n + 4(j - 1) - 2i + 1) \quad \text{and} \\ (16n + 2i - 1, -8n + 4j - 2i + 1),$$

respectively. Finally, we set $k = s$ and $q = |V| - k$.

In the remainder of the proof, we show that there exists a dominating set of size s in graph G , if and only if, there is a set R of k rankings embeddable in our instance such that $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) \leq q$.

If there exists a dominating set S , then we can select rankings given by voters that correspond to vertices in S , i.e., $R = \{v_{i,j} : (i, j) \in S\}$. Clearly, for every voter in R , the distance to the closest ranking in R is 0. Moreover, for every other voter, $v_{i,j} \notin R$, there is voter u that corresponds to vertex in S that is neighboring node (i, j) . But this means that there is only a single divider between u and $v_{i,j}$, hence $\text{swap}(u, v_{i,j}) = 1$. Therefore, we obtain that $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) = |V| - |R| = |V| - k = q$.

For the other direction, assume that there is a set of k rankings R such that $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) \leq q$. Observe that it has to mean that the rankings of at least k voters are selected to R . Otherwise, we would have at least $|V| - k + 1$ voters with distance at least 1, which would yield $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) \geq |V| - k + 1 = q + 1$. On the other hand, every other voter, $v \notin R$, has to be at distance 1 to some ranking in R . Otherwise, if we have at least a single voter with a distance of at least 2 to every ranking in R , then again $k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) \geq (|V| - k - 1) + 2 = q + 1$. Thus, for every $v \in V \setminus R$ there must exist voter $u \in R$ such that v and u belong to neighboring cells.

But in such a case, $S = \{(i, j) : v_{i,j} \in R\}$ is a dominating set in the original instance, which concludes the proof.

A.5 Proof of Theorem 3.6

Consider an instance of k -KEMENY with election $E = (C, V)$ and integers k and q . Let $n = |V|$; w.l.o.g., we assume that $n > k$ (otherwise there is a trivial k -Kemeny set with score equal to 0). The election comes from a Condorcet domain so, as a consequence, for every subsequence V' of its voters election (C, V') has at least one Condorcet ranking $r(V')$ which can be computed in polynomial time and which also is a Kemeny ranking for (C, V') (recall the discussion in Section 2). Hence the job of our algorithm is to check if it is possible to partition V into V_1, \dots, V_k such that the sum of Kemeny scores of election $(C, V_1), \dots, (C, V_k)$ is at most q .

To this end, we use dynamic programming based on computing the following function. For a subsequence V' of voters and a positive integer t , we define $f(V', t)$ to be t -Kemeny score of election (C, V') . Our goal is to check if $f(V, k) \leq q$. As a base case, we can compute $f(V', 1)$ for every $V' \subseteq V$, by evaluating the Kemeny score of the Condorcet ranking for (C, V') . We compute f for $t = 2, 3, \dots, k$ in $k - 1$ iterations as follows (let us fix the iteration number t that we execute):

1. Initially, we set $f(V', t) = \infty$ for each $V' \subseteq V$. We will be updating these values throughout the iteration.
2. We consider all functions $g: V \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$.
3. For each function g , we partition V into collections $V^{(0)}, V^{(1)}$, and $V^{(2)}$, so that each voter $v \in V$ belongs to this $V^{(g(v))}$. If the current value we have stored for $f(V^{(1)} \cup V^{(2)}, t)$ is greater than $f(V^{(1)}, 1) + f(V^{(2)}, t - 1)$ then we update $f(V^{(1)} \cup V^{(2)}, t)$ to be this value (intuitively, this corresponds to a scenario where there is a t -Kemeny set such that voters from $V^{(1)}$ are closest to one ranking, namely the Condorcet ranking of $(C, V^{(1)})$, and each voter in $V^{(2)}$ is closest to one of $t - 1$ other rankings from this t -Kemeny set).

We accept if thus-computed value $f(V, k)$ is at most q and reject otherwise. The correctness of the algorithm is immediate. The running time follows from the fact that in each iteration we need to consider 3^n functions g and for each of them the algorithm runs in time $O(|C| + |V|)$. Thus, altogether, the running time is $O(3^n \cdot t \cdot (|C| + |V|))$; note that this time is also sufficient to compute Condorcet rankings for all subsets of voters.

A.6 Proof of Theorem 3.7

We provide an algorithm which finds a k -Kemeny set, i.e., the set that minimizes the k -Kemeny score. This is enough to solve the decision variant of k -KEMENY. Let $E = (C, V)$ be a single-crossing instance of k -KEMENY and let (v_1, \dots, v_n) be an ordering of voters realizing the single-crossing property. The ordering can be found in polynomial time [Elkind et al., 2022, Theorem 4.8].

First, we observe that we can look for the k -Kemeny set among the votes.

Lemma A.3. *There exists an optimal solution to k -KEMENY on a single-crossing election that is a subset of V .*

Proof. Let R be any fixed optimal solution. By the definition of k -Kemeny $_E(R)$, every voter from V is assigned to a ranking in R (specifically, to the one that minimizes the swap distance

to R). Therefore, we can define a k -partition of V into V_1, \dots, V_k , where voters from V_i are assigned to the same $r_i \in R$.

We observe that, for every $i \in [k]$, r_i is an optimal solution to an instance (C, V_i) of 1-KEMENY. Otherwise we could decrease the k -Kemeny score of R by replacing r_i with an optimal solution to 1-KEMENY on (C, V_i) —this would be in contradiction with optimality of R .

Moreover, we observe that (C, V_i) is a single-crossing instance (with respective suborder of voters) and since (C, V_i) has rankings from a Condorcet domain it contains at least one Condorcet ranking which we call $o_i \in V_i$. [Theorem A.2](#) implies that o_i is an optimal solution to 1-KEMENY on (C, V_i) . It means that $O = \{o_1, \dots, o_k\}$ is a solution to E and has the k -Kemeny score equal to

$$\sum_{i \in [k]} \sum_{v \in V_i} \min_{o \in O} \text{swap}(v, o) \leq \sum_{i \in [k]} \sum_{v \in V_i} \text{swap}(v, o_i) = \sum_{i \in [k]} \sum_{v \in V_i} \text{swap}(v, r_i),$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that on the LHS a voter $v \in V_i$ is assigned to nearest $o \in O$, but on the RHS it is assigned to concrete o_i . The last one term equals k -Kemeny $_E(R)$ (by optimality of R the inequality becomes an equality). Therefore, O is a requested solution by the lemma statement. \square

Using [Theorem A.3](#) we will solve the problem by considering a problem of choosing size- k subset W of V , where the objective function is minimizing the sum of swap distances between elements of V and W . This can be done by solving a well known Chamberlin-Courant (CC) multiwinner election problem [[Chamberlin and Courant, 1983](#); [Betzler et al., 2013](#); [Sornat et al., 2022](#)]. Formally, we create an instance $E' = (V', C', \rho, k)$ of CC, in which we want to find a size- k subset $W \subseteq C'$ such that the *total misrepresentation* of W defined as $\rho(W) = \sum_{v \in V'} \rho(v, W) = \sum_{v \in V'} \min_{c \in W} \rho(v, c)$ is minimized, and in our case we have:

- $V' = V$, i.e., E' has the same set of voters as E .
- $C' = V$, i.e., we select k winners from the set of candidates C' corresponding the set of voters in E .
- A misrepresentation function $\rho: V' \times C' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is defined for every $v_i \in V', c_j \in C'$ as:

$$\rho(v_i, c_j) = \text{swap}(v_i, c_j).$$

Therefore, we can define the new instance of CC as $E' = (V, V, \text{swap}, k)$ but we will be using the terms V', C', ρ for clearer relation to CC. Formally, we have a correspondence between solutions in both instances (hence, also between optimal solutions of size k).

Lemma A.4. *For every subset of rankings $R \subseteq V$ we have*

$$k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) = \rho(R).$$

Proof. Using definitions of the swap distance and ρ we have

$$\begin{aligned} k\text{-Kemeny}_E(R) &= \sum_{v \in V} \min_{r \in R} \text{swap}(v, r) \\ &= \sum_{v \in V} \min_{r \in R} \rho(v, r) = \rho(R). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Moreover, we observe that E' is actually a single-peaked instance of CC. For that we will use the following definition of single-peakedness [[Betzler et al., 2013](#), Proposition 3].

Definition A.1. (V^*, C^*, ρ^*) is called a *single-peaked preference profile with an axis* $c_1^* \triangleleft c_2^* \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft c_m^*$ (a linear order \triangleleft over C^*) if for every triple of distinct candidates $c_i^*, c_j^*, c_k^* \in C^*$ with $c_i^* \triangleleft c_j^* \triangleleft c_k^*$ or with $c_k^* \triangleleft c_j^* \triangleleft c_i^*$ we have the following implication for every voter $v^* \in V^*$:

$$\rho^*(v^*, c_i^*) < \rho^*(v^*, c_j^*) \implies \rho^*(v^*, c_j^*) \leq \rho^*(v^*, c_k^*).$$

Lemma A.5. (V', C', ρ) is a *single-peaked preference profile with an axis* $v_1 \triangleleft v_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft v_n$.

Proof. We need to check the condition (the implication) from [Definition A.1](#) for every voter $v_x \in V = V'$ and for every triple of distinct candidates $v_i, v_j, v_k \in V = C'$ with $v_i \triangleleft v_j \triangleleft v_k$ or with $v_k \triangleleft v_j \triangleleft v_i$. Below we consider only the case $v_i \triangleleft v_j \triangleleft v_k$ as the proof for the other case is analogous.

If $\rho(v_x, v_i) < \rho(v_x, v_j)$ then by the definition of ρ we have $\text{swap}(v_x, v_i) < \text{swap}(v_x, v_j)$. We consider two cases depending on how v_x is positioned in an order $v_1 \triangleleft v_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft v_n$ comparing to v_j .

The first case is $v_x \triangleleft v_j \triangleleft v_k$. By the definition of single-crossingness on (v_1, \dots, v_n) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{swap}(v_x, v_k) &= |\{(a, b) \in C \times C : x \leq t_{ab} < k\}| \\ &\geq |\{(a, b) \in C \times C : x \leq t_{ab} < j\}| \\ &= \text{swap}(v_x, v_j). \end{aligned}$$

By the equivalence of swap and ρ we obtain $\rho(v_x, v_j) \leq \rho(v_x, v_k)$ as requested.

The above might be derived from observations made by [Elkind et al. \[2016, Proposition 4.7\]](#) regarding the relation of single-craziness of $v_1 \triangleleft v_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft v_n$ and swap distance between v_1 and v_i and between v_i and v_{i+1} .

The second case is $v_i \triangleleft v_j \triangleleft v_x$. By the definition of single-crossingness on (v_1, \dots, v_n) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{swap}(v_i, v_x) &= |\{(a, b) \in C \times C : i \leq t_{ab} < x\}| \\ &\geq |\{(a, b) \in C \times C : j \leq t_{ab} < x\}| \\ &= \text{swap}(v_j, v_x). \end{aligned}$$

By the equivalence of swap and ρ we obtain $\rho(v_x, v_i) \geq \rho(v_x, v_j)$, but this is in contradiction with the initial assumption $\rho(v_x, v_i) < \rho(v_x, v_j)$.

This finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

Finally, [Theorem A.4](#) together with [Theorem A.5](#) imply that in order to provide a solution to k -KEMENY on single-crossing elections it is enough to select an optimal committee under the Chamberlin-Courant rule on single-peaked elections. This can be done in polynomial-time using known algorithms, e.g., a classic dynamic program of [Betzler et al. \[2013, Theorem 8\]](#) with the running time $O(|V'| \cdot |C'|^2) = O(n^3)$ or an almost linear (in the input size, i.e. $\tilde{O}(|V'| \cdot |C'|) = \tilde{O}(n^2)$) time algorithm of [Sornat et al. \[2022, Theorem 6\]](#).²

Unfortunately, both algorithms require an oracle access to values of ρ therefore we need to define its $O(n^2)$ many values. It can be done using a straightforward computation of the swap distance in time $O(m\sqrt{\log m})$ [[Chan and Pătraşcu, 2010](#)] for every pair of voters from V .

²The algorithm has running time $\tilde{O}(|V'| \cdot |C'|) = \tilde{O}(n^2)$ (\tilde{O} hides subpolynomial factors) assuming that the single-peaked order of voters is given in the input. In the instance we have constructed each preference from (V', C', ρ) —after removing duplicates from V' (i.e. having the same vote in E)—is a linear order over C' , hence we can recognize an axis in $O(|V'| \cdot |C'|) = O(n^2)$ time [[Escoffier et al., 2008](#)] so this does not increase the claimed running time.

In total, this would take $O(n^2 \cdot m \sqrt{\log m})$ time for computing ρ and such an approach would be a bottle-neck of the whole algorithm.

A more refined approach is as follows. First, we find an SC ordering of voters (v_1, \dots, v_n) in time $O(nm \log m)$ [Elkind et al., 2022, Theorem 4.8]. Then, we compute $n - 1$ swap distances between each consecutive voters v_i, v_{i+1} in time $O(nm \sqrt{\log m})$ [Chan and Pătraşcu, 2010]. These values allow us to compute all values of $\text{swap}(v_1, v_i)$ in additional time $O(n)$ using a formula $\text{swap}(v_1, v_{i+1}) = \text{swap}(v_1, v_i) + \text{swap}(v_i, v_{i+1})$ [Elkind et al., 2016, Proposition 4.7]. Next, we can compute all $O(n^2)$ values of $\rho = \text{swap}$ using a formula $\text{swap}(v_{i+1}, v_j) = \text{swap}(v_i, v_j) - \text{swap}(v_i, v_{i+1})$, each in constant time. Therefore, computing all values of ρ can be done in $O(nm \log m + n^2)$ time.

The total running time of our algorithm via finding an SC ordering, computing all values of ρ and applying an algorithm of Sornat et al. [2022] is $\tilde{O}(nm + n^2)$.

B Domain Sizes

In this appendix, we provide the maximum sizes of some of the considered domains. Assume that there are $m \geq 2$ candidates.

- The single-peaked domain and group-separable domains: 2^{m-1} (OEIS: A131577).
- The single-peaked double-forked domain: $16 \cdot (2^{m-3} - 1)$, for $m \geq 5$ (OEIS: A175164).
- The SPOC domain: $m \cdot 2^{m-2}$ (OEIS: A057711).
- Single-crossing domains and 1D Euclidean domains: $\binom{m}{2} + 1$ (OEIS: A000124).
- 2D Euclidean domains: $s(m, m) + s(m, m-1) + s(m, m-2)$, where $s(n, k)$ are the unsigned Stirling numbers of the first kind [Good and Tideman, 1977] (OEIS: A308305).

C Additional Experiments & Missing Plots

In this appendix, we provide additional experimental results that were omitted in the main part of the paper.

C.1 IC is Not Always the Most Diverse

Consider the following domain structure: We start with a maximal SC domain with ordered votes. To build our domain, we take the first vote, then omit t votes, then take two votes and omit t votes again. We continue by taking four votes and omitting t votes, and so on—always omitting t votes while doubling the number of selected votes each time.

We may either sample votes from this domain uniformly at random, or we can use an alternative method using weighted probabilities: The first vote included in the domain has a weight of 1, the next two votes have weights of $1/2$, the next four votes have weights of $1/4$, and so on. Sampling votes using these weights can achieve higher diversity than sampling uniformly at random from the same domain.

We consider a single-crossing domain with 16 candidates and $t = 12$ gap size. Results are presented in Figure 11. The fact that the lines cross at $k = 5$ is simply because, for 16 candidates and $t = 12$ gap size, there are 5 groups of voters.




Figure 11: Diversity of sampled data.




Figure 12: Diversity of sampled data.

C.2 Euclidean Box

In Figure 12 we present a corresponding plot to the one presented in Figure 8 (left), but on the y-axis, instead of showing the domain size, we present the normalized k -Kemeny score.

C.3 More Microscopes

In Figure 13 we present an analogous plot to the one presented in Figure 3, but without any additional IC votes. While the microscope with IC votes shows how a given domain looks compared to (an approximation of) the space of all possible votes, the one without IC votes presents the domain's internal structure better.

In Figure 14 we present a microscope of extended domains, described in Section 4.5.

C.4 More Histograms

In Figure 15 we present the histograms omitted in Figure 4.

C.5 Scalability

In Figure 16 we present similar results to those in Figure 2, but for 6,8,10, and 12 candidates.

In Figure 17 we present similar results to those in Figure 6, but for 6,8,10, and 12 candidates.

In Figure 18 we present similar results to those in Figure 5, but for 6,8,10, and 12 candidates.

D Heuristic Evaluation

We analyze the performance of our heuristic by comparing the average scores obtained through heuristic local search against those from brute force (optimal solution) across various parameter sets. Each reported value represents the average of ten instances.

The results are presented in Tables Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6. As we can see, in most cases our heuristic found the optimal solution.




Figure 13: Microscopes of our domains without IC.




Figure 14: Extended Microscope without IC.




Figure 15: Histograms of the distances between the votes and their closest k -Kemeny ranking, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.




Figure 16: Average $\kappa(E)$ of various domains.




Figure 17: Average $\kappa(E)$ for Euclidean elections sampled using 1-Box.




Figure 18: Average $\kappa(E)$ for SP elections sampled from Wal./Con. models.

Domain	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$	$m = 6$	$m = 7$	$m = 8$
1D-Int.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GS/cat	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GS/bal	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SPOC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
2D-Square	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
3D-Cube	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP/DF	N/A	N/A	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table 1: Average score obtained by heuristic local search divided by optimal solution, for $k = 1$.

Domain	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$	$m = 6$	$m = 7$	$m = 8$
1D-Int.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GS/cat	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GS/bal	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SPOC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
2D-Square	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0009 ± 0.0027	1.0004 ± 0.0008
3D-Cube	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0008 ± 0.0015	1.0019 ± 0.0027	1.0013 ± 0.0020
SP/DF	N/A	N/A	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table 2: Average score obtained by heuristic local search divided by optimal solution, for $k = 2$.

Domain	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$	$m = 6$	$m = 7$	$m = 8$
1D-Int.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GS/cat	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
GS/bal	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table 3: Average score obtained by heuristic local search divided by optimal solution, for $k = 3$.

Sampled	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$	$m = 6$	$m = 7$	$m = 8$
IC	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0004 ± 0.0010	1.0007 ± 0.0007	1.0027 ± 0.0018
3D-Cube	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0003 ± 0.0006	1.0065 ± 0.0082	1.0041 ± 0.0047
2D-Square	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0002 ± 0.0006	1.0006 ± 0.0017	1.0014 ± 0.0018
1D-Int.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP/Wal	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP/Con	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table 4: Average score obtained by heuristic local search divided by optimal solution, for $k = 1$.

Sampled	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$	$m = 6$	$m = 7$
IC	1.0	1.0011 ± 0.0034	1.0004 ± 0.0009	1.0066 ± 0.0049	1.0075 ± 0.0032
3D-Cube	1.0	1.0	1.0002 ± 0.0005	1.0	1.0006 ± 0.0009
2D-Square	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0006 ± 0.0018
1D-Int.	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP/Wal	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
SP/Con	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

Table 5: Average score obtained by heuristic local search divided by optimal solution, for $k = 2$.

Sampled	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$
IC	1.0	1.0016 ± 0.0035	1.0003 ± 0.0007
3D-Cube	1.0	1.0	1.0
2D-Square	1.0	1.0	1.0
1D-Int.	1.0	1.0	1.0010 ± 0.0030
SP/Wal	1.0	1.0	1.0028 ± 0.0085
SP/Con	1.0	1.0	1.0015 ± 0.0034

Table 6: Average score obtained by heuristic local search divided by optimal solution, for $k = 3$.