

# Composition of Simple Games

Rupert Freeman  
Supervisor: Arkadii Slinko

University of Auckland  
*rfre038@aucklanduni.ac.nz*

March 24, 2013

- A simple game is a pair  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ , where  $P_G$  is a set of players and  $W_G \subseteq 2^{P_G}$  is a non-empty set of subsets (coalitions) which satisfy the monotonicity condition:

if  $X \in W_G$  and  $X \subseteq Y$ , then  $Y \in W_G$

Coalitions from  $W_G$  are called winning coalitions of  $G$ , the others are called *losing* coalitions.

- A simple game is a pair  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ , where  $P_G$  is a set of players and  $W_G \subseteq 2^{P_G}$  is a non-empty set of subsets (coalitions) which satisfy the monotonicity condition:

if  $X \in W_G$  and  $X \subseteq Y$ , then  $Y \in W_G$

Coalitions from  $W_G$  are called winning coalitions of  $G$ , the others are called losing coalitions.

- eg. UN Security Council  
5 permanent members, 10 non-permanent members. A vote requires the support of all 5 permanent members in addition to at least 4 non-permanent members to pass.

- A simple game is a pair  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ , where  $P_G$  is a set of players and  $W_G \subseteq 2^{P_G}$  is a non-empty set of subsets (coalitions) which satisfy the monotonicity condition:

$$\text{if } X \in W_G \text{ and } X \subseteq Y, \text{ then } Y \in W_G$$

Coalitions from  $W_G$  are called winning coalitions of  $G$ , the others are called *losing* coalitions.

- eg. UN Security Council  
5 permanent members, 10 non-permanent members. A vote requires the support of all 5 permanent members in addition to at least 4 non-permanent members to pass.
- [39; 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1]

# Composition of Games - Motivation

- Consider the board of a large company, who vote to make strategy decisions under a certain voting rule. Suppose one of the board members retires, but it is decided that their knowledge and experience is too great to replace with just a single person. Instead, a group of people fills the one spot on the board. They collectively vote on each issue. A collective yes vote means that the ex-board members vote is a yes, a collective no means that the ex-board members vote is a no.

# Composition of Games - Motivation

- Consider the board of a large company, who vote to make strategy decisions under a certain voting rule. Suppose one of the board members retires, but it is decided that their knowledge and experience is too great to replace with just a single person. Instead, a group of people fills the one spot on the board. They collectively vote on each issue. A collective yes vote means that the ex-board members vote is a yes, a collective no means that the ex-board members vote is a no.
- What properties does the resulting voting structure (game) have?

# Composition of Games - Motivation

- Consider the board of a large company, who vote to make strategy decisions under a certain voting rule. Suppose one of the board members retires, but it is decided that their knowledge and experience is too great to replace with just a single person. Instead, a group of people fills the one spot on the board. They collectively vote on each issue. A collective yes vote means that the ex-board members vote is a yes, a collective no means that the ex-board members vote is a no.
- What properties does the resulting voting structure (game) have?
- Is it possible to incorporate all voters in a one-step process, or do we require two separate votes?

## Definition

Let  $G$  and  $H$  be two games such that  $P_G$  and  $P_H$  are disjoint. Define the composition  $C = G \circ_g H$  via player  $g \in P_G$  by  $P_C = (P_G \setminus \{g\}) \cup P_H$  and

$$W_C^{min} = \{X \subseteq P_C : X \in W_G^{min}\} \cup \{X \subset P_C : \\ (X \cap P_G) \cup \{g\} \in W_G^{min} \text{ and } X \cap P_H \in W_H^{min}\}$$



## Definition

Let  $G$  and  $H$  be two games such that  $P_G$  and  $P_H$  are disjoint. Define the composition  $C = G \circ_g H$  via player  $g \in P_G$  by  $P_C = (P_G \setminus \{g\}) \cup P_H$  and

$$W_C^{min} = \{X \subseteq P_C : X \in W_G^{min}\} \cup \{X \subset P_C : \\ (X \cap P_G) \cup \{g\} \in W_G^{min} \text{ and } X \cap P_H \in W_H^{min}\}$$

- eg. Consider the case where  $G = H$  are  $k$  out of  $n$  majority games. Then the minimal winning coalitions of  $G \circ_g H$  are those consisting of  $k$  players from  $G$ , or  $k - 1$  players from  $G$  and  $k$  players from  $H$ .

## Definition

Let  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ . We define the desirability relation  $\preceq$  on  $G$  by:  
 $i \preceq_G j$  if for all  $U \subseteq P_G \setminus \{i, j\}$ ,  $U \cup i \in W_G \implies U \cup j \in W_G$ . We say that  $j$  is more desirable than  $i$ .

## Definition

Let  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ . We define the desirability relation  $\preceq$  on  $G$  by:  
 $i \preceq_G j$  if for all  $U \subseteq P_G \setminus \{i, j\}$ ,  $U \cup i \in W_G \implies U \cup j \in W_G$ . We say that  $j$  is more desirable than  $i$ .

- This is a partial ordering.

## Definition

Let  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ . We define the desirability relation  $\preceq$  on  $G$  by:  $i \preceq_G j$  if for all  $U \subseteq P_G \setminus \{i, j\}$ ,  $U \cup i \in W_G \implies U \cup j \in W_G$ . We say that  $j$  is more desirable than  $i$ .

- This is a partial ordering.
- Say that a game is complete if " $\preceq$ " is a total ordering.

## Definition

Let  $G = (P_G, W_G)$ . We define the desirability relation  $\preceq$  on  $G$  by:  
 $i \preceq_G j$  if for all  $U \subseteq P_G \setminus \{i, j\}$ ,  $U \cup i \in W_G \implies U \cup j \in W_G$ . We say that  $j$  is more desirable than  $i$ .

- This is a partial ordering.
- Say that a game is complete if " $\preceq$ " is a total ordering.
- $G$  weighted  $\implies G$  complete.

## Definition

A simple game  $G$  is swap robust if for any two winning coalitions in that game, say  $S$  and  $T$ , if we swap one player in  $S$  with one player in  $T$ , then the resulting two coalitions are not both losing.

## Definition

A simple game  $G$  is swap robust if for any two winning coalitions in that game, say  $S$  and  $T$ , if we swap one player in  $S$  with one player in  $T$ , then the resulting two coalitions are not both losing.

## Definition

A simple game  $G$  is trade robust if for any set  $\mathcal{S}$  of winning coalitions in that game, any redistribution of players among the coalitions in  $\mathcal{S}$  does not result in all coalitions in  $\mathcal{S}$  becoming losing.

## Definition

A simple game  $G$  is swap robust if for any two winning coalitions in that game, say  $S$  and  $T$ , if we swap one player in  $S$  with one player in  $T$ , then the resulting two coalitions are not both losing.

## Definition

A simple game  $G$  is trade robust if for any set  $\mathcal{S}$  of winning coalitions in that game, any redistribution of players among the coalitions in  $\mathcal{S}$  does not result in all coalitions in  $\mathcal{S}$  becoming losing.

- $G$  swap robust  $\Leftrightarrow G$  complete
- $G$  trade robust  $\Leftrightarrow G$  weighted



## Theorem

*Let  $G$  and  $H$  be complete games with more than one distinct minimal winning coalition and no dummy players. Then the composition  $C = G \circ_g H$  is complete if and only if  $g$  is a member of the weakest desirability class of  $G$ .*

## Theorem

*Let  $G$  and  $H$  be complete games with more than one distinct minimal winning coalition and no dummy players. Then the composition  $C = G \circ_g H$  is complete if and only if  $g$  is a member of the weakest desirability class of  $G$ .*

## Proof.

$\Leftarrow$ : Let  $W_1, W_2 \in W_C$ . Write  $W_1 = X_1 \cup Y_1$  and  $W_2 = X_2 \cup Y_2$ .  $X_i \cup \{g\}$  is winning in  $G$  and  $Y_i$  is winning in  $H$  if  $X_i$  is not winning in  $G$ . Three ways to swap a player from  $W_1$  with a player from  $W_2$ :

- 1  $x_1 \in X_1$  with  $x_2 \in X_2$  :  $W_1$  or  $W_2$  still winning by completeness of  $G$ .
- 2  $y_1 \in Y_1$  with  $y_2 \in Y_2$  :  $W_1$  or  $W_2$  still winning by completeness of  $H$ .
- 3  $x_1 \in X_1$  with  $y_2 \in Y_2$  or vice versa : then  $X_2 \cup \{x_1\}$  is winning.



# Decomposition of Complete Games

- Say that a game  $G$  is reducible if there exist  $G_1, G_2$  such that  $\min\{|P_{G_1}|, |P_{G_2}|\} > 1$  such that  $G = G_1 \circ_g G_2$  for some  $g \in G_1$ .

# Decomposition of Complete Games

- Say that a game  $G$  is reducible if there exist  $G_1, G_2$  such that  $\min\{|P_{G_1}|, |P_{G_2}|\} > 1$  such that  $G = G_1 \circ_g G_2$  for some  $g \in G_1$ .

## Theorem

*The set of all complete games with the operation of composition forms a semigroup. Every complete game can be uniquely decomposed (up to isomorphism) as a composition  $G = G_1 \circ_{g_1} G_2 \dots \circ_{g_{n-1}} G_n$  where each  $G_i$  is irreducible.*

# Composition of Weighted Voting Games

- Goal: Given weighted voting games  $G$  and  $H$ , and  $g \in G$ , under what conditions is the composition weighted?

# Composition of Weighted Voting Games

- Goal: Given weighted voting games  $G$  and  $H$ , and  $g \in G$ , under what conditions is the composition weighted?
- If  $G \circ_g H$  is weighted, then  $g$  must be (one of) the least desirable player in  $G$ , or else  $G \circ_g H$  is not even complete.

## Example

Let  $G = [7; 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2]$  and let  $H = [2; 1, 1, 1]$ . Label the two players of weight 3 in  $G$  as type  $A$  players, the players of weight 2 in  $G$  as type  $B$  players and the players in  $H$  as type  $C$  players. We have the following certificate of incompleteness for  $G \circ_B H$ :

$$(AB^2, ABC^2; A^2C, B^3C)$$

So substituting via the least desirable player is not enough to ensure weightedness of the composition.

# A Partial Condition

- If  $G$  is weighted then we can always find integer weights and quota for  $G$ .



# A Partial Condition

- If  $G$  is weighted then we can always find integer weights and quota for  $G$ .

## Theorem

*Let  $G$  and  $H$  be weighted and suppose that there exists an integer system of weights for  $G$  such that the least desirable player,  $g$ , has weight 1. Then  $G \circ_g H$  is weighted.*

# A Partial Condition

- If  $G$  is weighted then we can always find integer weights and quota for  $G$ .

## Theorem

*Let  $G$  and  $H$  be weighted and suppose that there exists an integer system of weights for  $G$  such that the least desirable player,  $g$ , has weight 1. Then  $G \circ_g H$  is weighted.*

- We can prove the theorem by constructing a system of weights for the composition.

## Definition (Homogeneous Simple Game)

A homogeneous simple game  $G$  is a weighted voting game where it is possible to find a system of weights such that every minimal winning coalition has the same weight.

## Definition (Homogeneous Simple Game)

A homogeneous simple game  $G$  is a weighted voting game where it is possible to find a system of weights such that every minimal winning coalition has the same weight.

- Ostmann (1984) proved that all homogeneous games can be represented by an integer system of weights with some player having weight 1. Thus, if  $G$  is homogeneous and  $H$  is weighted, then  $G \circ_g H$  is weighted.

- Fully characterise conditions for  $G \circ_g H$  to be weighted.

- Fully characterise conditions for  $G \circ_g H$  to be weighted.
- Investigate decompositions of arbitrary games.

# Open Questions

- Fully characterise conditions for  $G \circ_g H$  to be weighted.
- Investigate decompositions of arbitrary games.
- Closure of other classes of game under composition. Eg. Is the composition of two homogeneous games in turn homogeneous?