

# On testing substitutability

Cosmina Croitoru<sup>a</sup>, Kurt Mehlhorn<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Saarland University, Saarbrücken

<sup>b</sup>Max Planck Institut for Informatics, Saarbrücken

---

## Abstract

The papers [1] and [2] propose algorithms for testing whether the choice function induced by a (strict) preference list of length  $N$  over a universe  $U$  is substitutable. The running time of these algorithms is  $O(|U|^3 \cdot N^3)$ , respectively  $O(|U|^2 \cdot N^3)$ . In this note we present an algorithm with running time  $O(|U|^2 \cdot N^2)$ . Note that  $N$  may be exponential in the size  $|U|$  of the universe.

*Keywords:* Choice functions, Substitutability, Algorithm complexity

---

A *choice function* on a finite set  $U$  of alternatives is any function  $f$  from subsets of  $U$  to subsets of  $U$  that maps any set  $A$  to a subset of itself, i.e.,  $f(A) \subseteq A$  for all  $A \subseteq U$ . A choice function  $f$  is *substitutable* if

$$A \subseteq B \text{ implies } f(B) \cap A \subseteq f(A) \text{ for all } A, B \subseteq U,$$

i.e. the additional alternatives provided by  $B$  do not promote any  $x \in A - f(A)$  to the set of selected elements.

We are interested in choice functions induced by preference lists  $\mathbb{Y}$  on subsets of  $U$ . A preference list  $\mathbb{Y}$  is simply an ordered list of subsets of  $U$  and the associated choice function  $f_{\mathbb{Y}}$  maps any subset  $A$  of  $U$  to the first element on the list that is contained in  $A$ . If  $\mathbb{Y}$  is understood from the context, we write  $f$  instead of  $f_{\mathbb{Y}}$ . We use  $N$  to denote the number of elements on  $\mathbb{Y}$ , and, in order to make  $f$  defined for all  $A$ , we assume that the empty set is the last element of  $\mathbb{Y}$ . For elements  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\mathbb{Y}$ , we write  $X \succ Y$  if  $X$  properly precedes  $Y$  on  $\mathbb{Y}$  and we write  $X \succeq Y$  for  $X \succ Y$  or  $X = Y$ .

For example, let  $U = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and  $\mathbb{Y} = (\{a, b\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{a, c\}, \{a\}, \{c\}, \emptyset)$ . Then  $f_{\mathbb{Y}}(\{a, b, c\}) = \{a, b\}$ . The function  $f_{\mathbb{Y}}$  is not substitutable since  $d \in (f_{\mathbb{Y}}(\{a, c, d\}) \cap \{d\}) - f_{\mathbb{Y}}(\{d\})$ . We refer to [1] for a discussion of the role of substitutable choice functions in economics.

$\mathbb{Y}$  is *coherent* if  $X \succ Y$  implies  $X \not\subseteq Y$  for any two elements on  $\mathbb{Y}$ . Assume  $X \succ Y$  and  $X \subseteq Y$ . Then  $Y$  does not lie in the range of  $f_{\mathbb{Y}}$  and removing  $Y$  from  $\mathbb{Y}$  does not change the function  $f$ . Thus we may assume that  $\mathbb{Y}$  is coherent.

From now on,  $\mathbb{Y}$  denotes a coherent preference list and  $f$  stands for  $f_{\mathbb{Y}}$ .  $\mathbb{Y}$  is *substitutable* if  $f$  is a substitutable choice function.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathbb{Y}$  be a coherent preference list on  $U$ . Then for any  $A \subseteq U$ ,  $f(A) = A$  if and only if  $A \in \mathbb{Y}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $f$  maps the powerset of  $U$  to  $\mathbb{Y}$ ,  $f(A) = A$  implies  $A \in \mathbb{Y}$ . Conversely, assume  $A \in \mathbb{Y}$  and  $f(A) \succ A$ . Then  $f(A)$  and  $A$  are members of  $\mathbb{Y}$  with  $f(A) \succ A$  and  $f(A) \subseteq A$ , a contradiction to the coherence of  $\mathbb{Y}$ .  $\square$

An established condition of choice functions known as Aizerman's *outcast*, or Chernoff's *postulate 5\**, or  $\hat{\alpha}$  (see Brandt and Harrenstein [3]) is

$$(outcast) : \quad \text{if } f(A) \subseteq B \subseteq A \text{ then } f(B) = f(A).$$

**Lemma 2.** *If  $\mathbb{Y}$  is a coherent preference list on  $U$ , then  $f$  satisfies outcast.*

*Proof.*  $B \subseteq A$  implies  $f(A) \succeq f(B)$  and  $f(A) \subseteq B$  implies  $f(B) \succeq f(f(A)) = f(A)$ , where the last equality uses coherence. Thus  $f(A) = f(B)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathbb{Y}$  be a coherent and substitutable preference list on  $U$ . If  $X$  is a member of  $\mathbb{Y}$  then also every subset of  $X$  is a member of  $\mathbb{Y}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $X = f(X)$  and  $A \subseteq X$ . By substitutability,  $f(X) \cap A \subseteq f(A)$  and hence  $A = X \cap A = f(X) \cap A \subseteq f(A)$ . Thus  $f(A) = A$ .  $\square$

A preference list  $\mathbb{Y}$  is *complete* if it contains for each  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  also all of its subsets. Note that complete preference lists are exponentially long in the size of their largest member.

In order to demonstrate non-substitutability of a preference list, we need to exhibit sets  $A$  and  $B$  with  $A \subseteq B$  and  $f(B) \cap (A - f(A)) \neq \emptyset$ . We next show that we can restrict the search to special subsets of  $U$ . A *witness (to non-substitutability)* is a pair  $(X, Y)$  of members of  $\mathbb{Y}$  such that  $X \succ Y$ ,  $f(X \cup Y) = X$  and there is an  $x \in X - Y$  such that  $f(Y \cup \{x\}) = Y$ . Note that  $x$  is selected when the set of alternatives is  $X \cup Y$  (this is the set  $B$ ) but is not selected when the set of alternatives is  $Y \cup \{x\}$  (this is the set  $A$ ).

**Theorem 4.**  *$\mathbb{Y}$  is not substitutable if and only if there is a witness to non-substitutability.*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $(X, Y)$  is a witness. Then  $X \succ Y$ ,  $f(X \cup Y) = X$  and there is an  $x \in X - Y$  such that  $f(Y \cup \{x\}) = Y$ . Let  $A = Y \cup \{x\}$  and  $B = X \cup Y$ . Then  $A \subseteq B$  and  $x \in f(B) \cap (A - f(A))$ . Thus  $f$  is not substitutable.

Conversely, assume that  $f$  is not substitutable. Then there are subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $U$  with  $A \subseteq B$  and  $f(B) \cap A \not\subseteq f(A)$ . Since  $A \subseteq B$ , we have  $f(B) \succeq f(A)$ . In fact,  $f(B) \succ f(A)$  since  $f(B) = f(A)$  and  $f(A) \subseteq A$  implies  $f(B) \cap A = f(A)$ . Since  $f(A) \subseteq A \subseteq B$ , we have  $f(A) \cup f(B) \subseteq B$  and hence  $f(B) \subseteq f(A) \cup f(B) \subseteq B$ . Thus  $f(f(A) \cup f(B)) = f(B)$  by property (outcast). Let  $x \in (f(B) \cap A) - f(A)$ . Then  $f(B) \cup \{x\} \subseteq A$  and  $f(A) \subseteq f(A) \cup \{x\} \subseteq A$  and hence  $f(f(A) \cup \{x\}) = f(A)$  by (outcast). Thus  $(f(B), f(A))$  is a witness.  $\square$

Theorem 4 directly translates into an algorithm of running time  $O(N^3|U| + N^2|U|^2)$ . Note first that one can determine  $f(A)$  in time  $O(N|U|)$  by simply scanning the list  $\mathbb{Y}$  and checking each set for containment. The algorithm has two phases. In the first phase, one determines for each  $Y \in \mathbb{Y}$  the set of  $x$  for which  $f(Y \cup \{x\}) = Y$ . This requires  $N|U|$  function evaluations and  $O(N^2|U|^2)$  time. Then one checks for every pair  $(X, Y)$  of elements of  $\mathbb{Y}$ , whether it is a witness. This requires  $N^2$  function evaluations and  $N^2|U|$  look-ups of precomputed values and hence takes time  $O(N^3|U|)$ .

---

**1. Preprocessing**

```
for all  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  do {  $d_X := 1$ ; for all  $x \in U$  do  $\text{sens}(x, X) := \text{false}$  }
for all  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  do
  for all  $Y \in \mathbb{Y}$  with  $X \succ Y$  do {
    if  $X \subseteq Y$  then return  $\mathbb{Y}$  is NOT COHERENT;
    if  $Y \subseteq X$  then increment  $d_X$ ;
    for all  $x \in U - Y$  do if  $X \subseteq Y \cup \{x\}$  then  $\text{sens}(x, Y) := \text{true}$  }
for all  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  do if  $d_X \neq 2^{|X|}$  then return  $\mathbb{Y}$  is NOT COMPLETE;
```

**2. Looking for the first witness to non-substitutability**

```
for all  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  do
  for all  $Y \in \mathbb{Y}$  with  $X \succ Y$  do
    if  $(\exists x \in X - Y \text{ s.t. } \text{sens}(x, Y) = \text{true}) \wedge (\forall y \in Y - X \text{ sens}(y, X) = \text{false})$  then
      return  $\mathbb{Y}$  is NOT SUBSTITUTABLE: witness  $(X, Y)$ ;
```

**3. Success**

```
return  $\mathbb{Y}$  is SUBSTITUTABLE
```

---

Figure 1: Testing if the list  $\mathbb{Y}$  is substitutable

We improve the running time to  $O(N^2|U|^2)$ . The crucial insight is as follows. We search for a witness pair  $(X, Y)$  in increasing order of  $X$ . Of course, we stop the search as soon as we have found a witness. So when we consider a pair  $(X, Y)$  we know that there is no witness  $(Z, \cdot)$  with  $Z \succ X$ . We then have  $f(X \cup Y) = X$  if and only if  $f(X \cup \{x\}) = X$  for all elements  $x \in Y - X$ . We stress that this equivalence does not hold in general, it only holds under the assumption that there is no earlier witness. So we can replace the function evaluation  $f(X \cup Y)$  of cost  $O(N|U|)$  by  $|U|$  look-ups of precomputed values. We next give the details.

We call  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  *insensitive* to  $x \in U$  if  $f(X \cup \{x\}) = X$  and *sensitive* otherwise.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $X, Y \in \mathbb{Y}$  with  $X \succ Y$ . If  $f(X \cup Y) = X$ , then  $X$  is insensitive to all  $x \in Y - X$ . If  $X$  is insensitive to all  $x \in Y - X$  and there is no witness  $(Z, \cdot)$  with  $Z \succ X$ , then  $f(X \cup Y) = X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in Y - X$  be arbitrary. Then  $X \subseteq X \cup \{x\} \subseteq X \cup Y$  and hence  $X = f(X \cup Y) \succeq f(X \cup \{x\}) \succeq f(X) = X$ . Thus  $f(X \cup \{x\}) = X$  and  $X$  is insensitive to  $x$ .

For the second part, assume  $f(X \cup Y) = Z$  with  $Z \succ X$ . Then  $Z \subseteq X \cup Y$  and hence  $Z \cup X \subseteq X \cup Y$ . Thus  $Z \succeq f(X \cup Y) \succeq f(X \cup Z) \succeq Z$ , where the last inequality follows from  $Z \subseteq X \cup Z$ . Thus  $f(X \cup Z) = Z$ . Since  $(Z, X)$  is not a witness, we must have  $f(X \cup \{x\}) \neq X$  for every  $x \in Z - X$ . On the other hand,  $Z - X \subseteq Y - X$  (since  $Z \subseteq X \cup Y$ ) and  $f(X \cup \{x\}) = X$  since  $X$  is insensitive to all  $x \in Y - X$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Lemma 5 suggests a way to find the non-substitutability witness  $(X, \cdot)$  with minimal first component.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $X, Y \in \mathbb{Y}$  with  $X \succ Y$  and assume that there is no witness  $(Z, \cdot)$  with  $Z \succ X$ . Then  $(X, Y)$  is a witness if and only if  $X$  is insensitive to all  $x \in Y - X$  and  $Y$  is sensitive to some  $x \in X - Y$ .*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $(X, Y)$  is a witness pair. Then  $Y$  is sensitive to some  $x \in X - Y$  and  $f(X \cup Y) = X$ . The latter implies that  $X$  is insensitive to all elements of  $Y - X$ .

Conversely, assume that  $X$  is insensitive to all  $x \in Y - X$  and  $Y$  is sensitive to some  $x \in X - Y$ . Then,  $f(X \cup Y) = X$  by Lemma 5 and hence  $(X, Y)$  is a witness pair.  $\square$

We are now ready for the algorithm. The algorithm has two phases. In a preprocessing phase, we determine whether  $\mathbb{Y}$  is coherent, complete, and, most importantly, compute the Boolean flags  $sens(x, X)$  which is true if  $X \in \mathbb{Y}$  is sensitive to  $x$ .

In the main computation, we search for the first witness to non-substitutability. We iterate over the elements of  $X$  of  $\mathbb{Y}$  in increasing order. Assume that there is no witness  $(Z, \cdot)$  with  $Z \succ X$ . We then iterate over the  $Y \in \mathbb{Y}$  with  $X \succ Y$  and use Theorem 6 to determine whether  $(X, Y)$  is a witness pair.

The most expensive task of the first phase is the construction of the Boolean matrix  $sens$  of size  $|U| \times N$ . Since an inclusion test needs  $O(|U|)$  time, the overall time is therefore  $O(|U|^2 \cdot N^2)$ . The time complexity of the second phase is  $O(|U| \cdot N^2)$  (the  $|U|$  factor is given by the inspection of the Boolean matrix  $sens$  in order to apply Theorem 6).

By Theorems 4 and 6 and the above discussion, the following corollary holds.

**Corollary 1.** *The algorithm in Figure 1 tests in  $O(|U|^2 \cdot N^2)$  time if a given preference list of size  $N$  over an universe  $U$  is substitutable.*

**Remarks.** The  $O(N)$  speed-up over the existing algorithms is significant since (as we noted after the definition of complete lists)  $N$  is exponential in the size of the largest member of  $\mathbb{Y}$ . The algorithm in [2] also applies to weak preferences. We leave it as an open problem whether this also holds for our algorithm.

## References

- [1] J. W. Hatfield, N. Immorlica, S. D. Kominers, Testing substitutability, *Games and Economic Behavior* (2011) 639–645.
- [2] H. Aziz, M. Brill, P. Harrenstein, Testing substitutability of weak preferences, *Mathematical Social Sciences* (2013) 91–94.
- [3] F. Brandt, P. Harrenstein, Set-retionalizable choice functions and self- stability, *Journal of Economic Theory* 146 (2011) 233–273.