

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Aziz, S. Gaspers, N. Mattei, N. Narodytska, and T. Walsh. Ties matter: Complexity of manipulation when tie-breaking with a random vote. In *Proc. of 27th AAAI Conference*, pages 74–80. AAAI Press, 2013.
- [2] A. I. Barvinok. A polynomial time algorithm for counting integral points in polyhedra when the dimension is fixed. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 19(4):769–779, 1994.
- [3] J. Bennett and S. Lanning. The Netflix prize. In *Proceedings of KDD Cup and Workshop*, 2007.
- [4] F. Brandt and H. G. Seedig. A tournament of order 24 with two disjoint TEQ-retentive sets. Technical report, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5592>, 2013.
- [5] F. Brandt and H. G. Seedig. On the discriminative power of tournament solutions. In *Proc. of 1st AAMAS Workshop on Exploring Beyond the Worst Case in Computational Social Choice (EXPLORE)*, 2014.
- [6] F. Brandt, F. Fischer, P. Harrenstein, and M. Mair. A computational analysis of the tournament equilibrium set. In *Proc. of 23rd AAAI Conference*, pages 38–43. AAAI Press, 2008.
- [7] F. Brandt, M. Chudnovsky, I. Kim, G. Liu, S. Norin, A. Scott, P. Seymour, and S. Thomassé. A counterexample to a conjecture of Schwartz. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 40:739–743, 2013.
- [8] F. Brandt, V. Conitzer, and U. Endriss. Computational social choice. In G. Weiß, editor, *Multiagent Systems*, chapter 6, pages 213–283. MIT Press, 2nd edition, 2013.
- [9] F. Brandt, V. Conitzer, U. Endriss, J. Lang, and A. Procaccia, editors. *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [10] W. Bruns and C. Söger. The computation of generalized Ehrhart series in Normaliz. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 68(2):75–86, 2015. Effective Methods in Algebraic Geometry.
- [11] W. Bruns, B. Ichim, T. Römer, R. Sieg, and C. Söger. Normaliz. Algorithms for rational cones and affine monoids. Available at <https://www.normaliz.uni-osnabrueck.de>.
- [12] Y. Chevaleyre, U. Endriss, J. Lang, and N. Maudet. A short introduction to computational social choice. In *Proc. of 33rd Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science (SOFSEM)*, volume 4362 of *LNCS*, pages 51–69. Springer, 2007.
- [13] C. J. Clopper and E. S. Pearson. The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika*, 26(4):404–413, 1934.
- [14] D. E. Critchlow, M. A. Fligner, and J. S. Verducci. Probability models on rankings. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 35:294–318, 1991.
- [15] J. A. De Loera, R. Hemmecke, J. Tauzer, and R. Yoshida. Effective lattice point counting in rational convex polytopes. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 38(4):1273–1302, 2004.
- [16] E. Ehrhart. Sur les polyedres rationnels homothétiques à n dimensions. *Compte-Rendus de l'académie des Sciences*, 254(4):616, 1962.
- [17] P. C. Fishburn. Paradoxes of voting. *The American Political Science Review*, 68(2):537–546, 1974.
- [18] P. C. Fishburn. Condorcet social choice functions. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 33(3):469–489, 1977.
- [19] W. V. Gehrlein. *Condorcet's Paradox*. Springer, 2006.
- [20] W. V. Gehrlein and D. Lepelley. *Voting paradoxes and group coherence: the Condorcet efficiency of voting rules*. Springer-Verlag, 2010.
- [21] J. Goldsmith, J. Lang, N. Mattei, and P. Perny. Voting with rank dependent scoring rules. In *Proc. of 28th AAAI Conference*, pages 698–704. AAAI Press, 2014.
- [22] H. C. Huang and V. C. H. Chua. Analytical representation of probabilities under the IAC condition. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 17(1):143–155, 2000.
- [23] D. Lepelley, A. Louichi, and H. Smaoui. On Ehrhart polynomials and probability calculations in voting theory. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(3):363–383, 2008.
- [24] J. I. Marden. *Analyzing and Modeling Rank Data*. Number 64 in Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman & Hall, 1995.
- [25] N. Mattei and T. Walsh. PrefLib: A library for preference data. In *Proc. of 3rd ADT*, volume 8176 of *LNCS*, pages 259–270. Springer, 2013.
- [26] N. Mattei, J. Forshee, and J. Goldsmith. An empirical study of voting rules and manipulation with large datasets. In *Proc. of 4th COMSOC*, 2012.
- [27] J. Oren, Y. Filmus, and C. Boutilier. Efficient vote elicitation under candidate uncertainty. In *Proc. of 23rd IJCAI*, pages 309–316. AAAI Press, 2015.
- [28] F. Plassmann and N. Tideman. How frequently do different voting rules encounter voting paradoxes in three-candidate elections? *Social Choice and Welfare*, 42(1):31–75, 2014.
- [29] M. Regenwetter, B. Grofman, A. A. J. Marley, and I. M. Tsetlin. *Behavioral Social Choice: Probabilistic Models, Statistical Inference, and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [30] J. Rothe, editor. *Economics and Computation: An Introduction to Algorithmic Game Theory, Computational Social Choice, and Fair Division*. Springer, 2015.
- [31] A. Schürmann. Exploiting polyhedral symmetries in social choice. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 40(4):1097–1110, 2013.
- [32] N. Tideman and F. Plassmann. Modeling the outcomes of vote-casting in actual elections. In D. S. Felsenthal and M. Machover, editors, *Electoral Systems: Paradoxes, Assumptions, and Procedures*, Studies in Choice and Welfare. Springer, 2012.
- [33] T. N. Tideman. Independence of clones as a criterion for voting rules. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 4(3):185–206, 1987.
- [34] M. C. Wilson and G. Pritchard. Probability calculations under the IAC hypothesis. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 54(3):244–256, 2007.