

The flow network method*

Daniela Bubboloni

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica U.Dini
 Università degli Studi di Firenze
 viale Morgagni 67/a, 50134 Firenze, Italy
 e-mail: daniela.bubboloni@unifi.it
 tel: +39 055 2759667

Michele Gori

Dipartimento di Scienze per l'Economia e l'Impresa
 Università degli Studi di Firenze
 via delle Pandette 9, 50127 Firenze, Italy
 e-mail: michele.gori@unifi.it
 tel: +39 055 2759707

Abstract

In this paper we propose an in-depth analysis of a method, called the flow network method, which associates with any network a complete and quasi-transitive binary relation on its vertices. Such a method, originally proposed by Gvozdk (1987), is based on the concept of maximum flow. Given a competition involving two or more teams, the flow network method can be used to build a relation on the set of teams which establishes, for every ordered pair of teams, if the first one did at least as good as the second one in the competition. Such a relation naturally induces procedures for ranking teams and selecting the best k teams of a competition. Those procedures are proved to satisfy many desirable properties.

Keywords: Network, network flow, quasi-transitive relation, pairs comparison, ranking problem, Schulze method.

JEL classification: D71.

MSC classification: 05C21, 05C22, 94C15.

1 Introduction

The Lega Basket Serie A, the first and highest-tier level of the Italian basketball league, currently consists of 16 teams. During the regular season of the basketball championship every team plays every other team twice for a total of 30 matches and ties are not allowed. At the end of the season, teams are ranked by the total number of wins. Basketball fans certainly like having a ranking of the teams available at any stage of the season. The usual method to build those temporary rankings is still based on counting the number of wins of each team. However, it is simple to understand that such a method may lead to questionable outcomes because, even though two teams won the same number of matches at a given moment, they might have played their matches against opponents of different quality. That suggests the need to look for more expressive ranking methods.

*We wish to thank an anonymous referee for letting us know the existence of the papers by Gvozdk (1987) and Belkin and Gvozdk (1989) (in Russian), where the flow network method was first formulated. We also thank Andrey Sarychev for translating the mentioned papers. Daniela Bubboloni was partially supported by GNSAGA of INdAM.

Consider a set of teams and a list of matches played by those teams, where ties were not allowed. Such matches are supposed to be all the matches scheduled in a (possibly fictitious) competition among the considered teams. In order to rank the teams and select the winners one may compare them on the basis of the number of wins and, in fact, this method is largely used when each team confronts any other team the same number of times, as in the case of round-robin competitions. However, there are interesting situations which do not meet such a condition as the case of temporary rankings previously discussed or when the number of teams involved in a competition is so large that, for practical reasons, it is difficult to arrange all the possible matches¹. In these cases, counting the number of wins does not seem to be such a good idea. Consider, for instance, the competition among the three teams A, B and C described by the table²

A	2	0	B
A	2	0	C
B	5	0	C

(1)

and note that not all the pairs of teams confronted each other the same number of times. Here, counting the number of wins makes team B be the winner, even though most people probably believe that team A deserves to win the competition.

In order to overcome those difficulties, Gvozdik (1987) and Belkin and Gvozdik (1989) propose a method, that we are going to call the *flow network method*, which can be used to establish, for every competition and every pair of teams involved in the competition, if the first team did at least as good as the second one. In other words, the method associates with every competition a special binary relation on the set of teams. Moreover, it naturally allows to select the winners of the competition as well as to determine the rankings of the teams that are consistent with the competition³. We independently rediscover the flow network method and we strongly believe that it is worthwhile to provide an in-depth analysis of it by revisiting old results and presenting new ones. Indeed, since the two above mentioned papers are published only in Russian, the flow network method has not certainly received the attention it deserves yet.

First of all, let us describe how the flow network method operates through the analysis of a concrete example. Consider the competition C among the four teams A, B, C and D described by the following table:

A	1	0	B
A	1	2	C
A	2	2	D
B	1	2	C
B	1	1	D
C	2	2	D

(2)

Given two distinct teams x and y , let us use the writing xy to denote a match between x and y where x beat y . Thus, looking at the table we can list all the matches played in C and the corresponding winners as follows

$$AB, AC, CA, CA, AD, AD, DA, DA, BC, CB, CB, BD, DB, CD, CD, DC, DC. \quad (3)$$

Fix now two distinct teams x and y . Let us call path from x to y (in C) any sequence $x_1 \cdots x_n$ of $n \geq 2$ distinct teams x_1, \dots, x_n such that $x_1 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $x_1x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}x_n$ are all in (3). For

¹The National Football League (NFL) and the NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision are examples of competitions where there are teams which never play each other on the field.

²We describe a competition by a table in which every row has the shape

x	m	n	y
-----	-----	-----	-----

meaning that the matches involving the teams x and y were $m + n$ and that x won m times and y won n times.

³We stress that Belkin and Gvozdik (1989) mainly focus on the problem of building rankings.

instance, AB is a path from A to B since AB is in (3); ACD is a path from A to D since AC and CD are in (3); BAC is not a path from B to C since BA is not in (3). Given a path $x_1 \cdots x_n$ from x to y , we identify it with the sub-competition of C involving only the teams x_1, \dots, x_n and where only the matches $x_1x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}x_n$ were played. Of course, the intuition suggests that x did better than y in that sub-competition. For instance, we obviously have that A did better than B in AB. Moreover, it is natural to state that A did better than D in ACD since in ACD only two matches were played, namely A against C and C against D, and we know that A beat C and C beat D so that, in some sense, A indirectly beat D.

Denote next by λ_{xy} the maximum length of a list of paths from x to y that can be built using each element in (3) at most once. Note that the same path can appear more than once in a list. In order to clarify the definition of such a number, let us consider A and B and compute λ_{AB} . First of all, note that

$$AB, ADCB, ADCB, ACDB,$$

are four paths from A to B in C which are built using the following matches in (3)

$$AB, AD, DC, CB, AD, DC, CB, AC, CD, DB.$$

The matches in (3) which have not been used yet are

$$CA, CA, DA, DA, BC, BD, CD,$$

and it is clear that no further path from A to B can be built using them. Of course, matches in (3) might be arranged to get a different list of paths from A to B. For instance, we have that

$$AB, ACB, ADCB, ADB,$$

is a different family of four paths from A to B which are built using the following matches in (3)

$$AB, AC, CB, AD, DC, CB, AD, DB.$$

Also in this case, no further path from A to B can be built using the matches left out. Observe now that it is not possible to find more than four paths from A to B. Indeed, in (3) the number of matches of the type xB where $x \in \{A, C, D\}$ is four and any path from A to B has to involve exactly one match of that type. As a consequence, we get $\lambda_{AB} = 4$.

As a further example, let us now compute λ_{BA} . First, observe that BCA and BDA are two paths from B to A which are built using the matches BC, CA, BD and DA in (3). Moreover, we cannot build more than two paths from B to A since the number of matches of the type Bx where $x \in \{A, C, D\}$ is two and any path from B to A must involve exactly one match of that type. Thus, we get $\lambda_{BA} = 2$.

Using similar strategies, one can easily compute, for every pair of distinct teams x and y , the number λ_{xy} . Such computations give

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{AB} &= 4, \lambda_{BA} = 2, \lambda_{AC} = 4, \lambda_{CA} = 4, \lambda_{AD} = 4, \lambda_{DA} = 4, \\ \lambda_{BC} &= 2, \lambda_{CB} = 4, \lambda_{BD} = 2, \lambda_{DB} = 4, \lambda_{CD} = 5, \lambda_{DC} = 4. \end{aligned}$$

Given two distinct teams x and y , we interpret λ_{xy} as the number of times the team x directly or indirectly beat the team y in the competition \mathcal{C}^4 . As a consequence, for any pair of distinct teams x and y , we interpret the inequality $\lambda_{xy} \geq \lambda_{yx}$ as the fact that x did at least as good as y in C. In that case, we write $x \succeq_C y$. Of course, since we can assume that each team did at least as good as itself in C, we also set $x \succeq_C x$ for all $x \in \{A, B, C, D\}$. Thus, we get a relation on the set of teams which is fully described as follows

$$\begin{aligned} A &\succeq_C A, B \succeq_C B, C \succeq_C C, D \succeq_C D, \\ A &\succeq_C B, A \succeq_C C, C \succeq_C A, A \succeq_C D, \\ D &\succeq_C A, C \succeq_C B, D \succeq_C B, C \succeq_C D. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

⁴A similar interpretation appears in Patil (2015).

We call \geq_C the flow relation associated with C . Because of its definition, we interpret its maxima, namely A and C , as the winners of the competition C and its linear refinements, namely $A \geq_C C \geq_C D \geq_C B$, $C \geq_C A \geq_C D \geq_C B$ and $C \geq_C D \geq_C A \geq_C B$ as the rankings of the teams which are consistent with the competition C . We stress that \geq_C is complete but it is not transitive because, for instance, we have that $D \geq_C A$ and $A \geq_C C$ but $D \not\geq_C C$.

Observe also that, as it is immediately checked, the flow relation associated with the competition described by (1) is a linear order having A ranked first, B ranked second and C ranked third. In particular, the unique winner is A and the unique admissible ranking is the flow relation itself, as one would desire.

It is also implicit in its definition that the flow network method takes into account the quality of the opponents. Indeed, if in a competition a team A won against teams of good quality, namely which won many matches, then there exist many paths from A to the other teams. That potentially makes A behave better than other teams in the flow relation.

The flow network method owes its name to the fact that networks and flows are the basic concepts underlying its definition. In order to explain this fact, first note that there is a natural bijection between the set of competitions and the set of networks. Indeed, any competition can be identified with the network whose vertices are the teams involved in the competition and where, for every pair of distinct teams, the capacity of the arc from a team to another one is the number of times the first team beat the second one. Similarly, any network can be thought as a competition among its vertices where, for every arc, its capacity represents how many times its start vertex beat its end vertex⁵. Moreover, given a network, it can be proved that, for every pair of distinct vertices x and y , the number λ_{xy} previously described equals the so-called maximum flow value from x to y . In the paper, after having introduced in Section 2 suitable notation for networks and some crucial results about them, we give in Section 4 the formal definition of the flow network method. Then, in order to assess the method, in Section 6 we deepen the analysis carried on by Belkin and Gvozdk (1989). We first show that the outcomes of the flow network method are always complete and quasi-transitive relations (Theorem 3), even though not necessarily transitive (Proposition 4). We show then that the method may lead to any possible complete and quasi-transitive relation (Proposition 6) and that it is neutral, homogeneous, efficient, monotonic, reversal symmetric and symmetric (Propositions 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14). Remarkably, we also obtain a characterization of complete and quasi-transitive relations (Theorem 7).

Networks are actually used to model a variety of situations, not necessarily related to sport competitions, where suitable information about pairwise comparisons among different alternatives is known⁶ and a ranking of the alternatives is needed. Thus, it is certainly possible to find in the literature lots of network methods, that is, procedures to associate with any network a binary relation (usually complete and transitive) on the set of teams describing when a team is at least as good as another one. Those methods have been designed in response to very different needs so that the rationale behind their definition, as well as the properties they fulfil, strongly depend on the specific framework they are supposed to manage. Langville and Meyer (2012) present an overview of different contexts and settings (like social choice, voting, web search engines, psychology and statistics) where ranking alternatives is important and describe lots of ranking procedures that can be formalized as network methods.

Among the simplest network methods there are surely the Borda method, which associates with each network the relation which compares teams on the basis of the whole number of wins; the dual Borda method, which compares teams on the basis of the whole number of losses; the Copeland method⁷, which compares teams on the basis of the difference between the whole number of wins

⁵Due to the identification between competitions and networks, we are going to freely use the terminology of competitions for networks too.

⁶Note that in many applications networks capacities are allowed to be nonnegative real numbers and networks are identified with their adjacency matrix.

⁷The Copeland method is sometimes called net flow method (Bouyssou, 1992).

and the whole number of losses; the minimax method which compares teams on the basis of the maximum number of losses against each other team; the maxmin method which compares teams on the basis of the minimum number of wins against each other team. González-Díaz et al. (2014) consider several network methods originating from statistical and social choice approaches and compare them by studying how those methods perform with respect to a specific set of properties⁸. Vaziri et al. (2017) focus on some popular sports network methods and discuss whether they satisfy suitable properties that a fair and comprehensive ranking method should meet⁹. Several authors deepen the analysis of the properties of networks methods providing an axiomatic characterization of some of them. Bouyssou (1992), Palacios-Huerta and Volij (2004), Slutzki and Volij (2005), van den Brink and Gilles (2009) and Kitti (2016) respectively show that the Copeland, the normalized invariant, the fair-bets, the Borda and the non-normalized invariant network methods can be characterized by suitable sets of axioms¹⁰. Csató (2017) proves instead an impossibility result showing the incompatibility of the self-consistency and the order preservation principles. Further, Laslier (1997, Chapters 3 and 10) presents an extensive survey of various scoring methods defined on the set of tournaments¹¹ and on the set of balanced networks¹².

All the above mentioned methods, as the large majority of methods available in the literature, are based on suitable definitions of scores for teams so that they determine a complete and transitive relation on the set of teams. An exception is the network method which can be deduced from the paper by Schulze (2011) and which is described and studied in Section 10. In fact, as the flow network method, such a network method has the peculiar property to associate with any network a complete and quasi-transitive relation on its vertices which is not in general transitive. As a consequence, the flow network method is different from all those methods leading to complete and transitive relations and, as proved in Section 10, it is also different from the Schulze network method. However, we show that the flow and the Borda network methods agree on the class of balanced networks (Proposition 17)¹³. This is a remarkable fact as it shows that the flow network method can be seen as an extension of the well-known method of “counting the wins” outside the ordinary framework where it is generally accepted. But we discovered other classes of networks on which those methods agree (Proposition 21 and Theorem 22) and that shed light on the significance of the Borda network method outside the traditional context of the balanced networks.

As a final remark, we recall that the computation of flows in a network can be performed by well-known algorithms, based on the Ford and Fulkerson augmenting paths algorithm, which run in polynomial time with respect to the number of vertices. As a consequence, the outcome of the flow network method applied to a competition can be computed in a polynomial time with respect to the number of teams. That fact is certainly encouraging with a view to concretely applying the method.

After having carefully studied the properties of the flow network method, we focus on the procedure which associates with any network the family of the linear refinements of the flow relation¹⁴. Such a procedure, formally defined in Section 4, is called *flow network rule* and was first defined in

⁸We emphasize that some of the properties considered by González-Díaz et al. (2014) are satisfied by the flow network method as described in course of the paper.

⁹The flow network method fulfils the three main properties stated in that paper. Property I (opponent strength) has been already discussed; Property II (incentive to win) is the content of Proposition 11; Property III (sequence of matches) follows from the very definition of the method.

¹⁰Note that the (normalized) invariant and the fair-bets methods are also known as the (normalized) long path and the Markov methods, respectively.

¹¹A tournaments is a complete and asymmetric digraph. Tournaments can be identified with networks whose capacities are 0 or 1 and such that the sum of the capacities of any pair of opposite arcs is 1. They are used to represent round robin-competitions.

¹²A balanced network is a network whose sum of the capacities of any pair of opposite arcs is constant. Balanced networks represent competitions where any pair of teams confront each other the same number of time.

¹³The equality between the flow and the Borda network methods on balanced networks is stated, without proof, in Belkin and Gvozdik (1989, Lemma 1).

¹⁴Complete and quasi-acyclic relations always admit linear refinements (Proposition 27).

Belkin and Gvozdik (1989). On the basis of the discussion made about the flow network method, we have that it is in general different from the network rules built by the known network methods by taking, for every network, the linear refinements of the corresponding relation. It also generally differs from the Kemeny and the ranked pairs rules¹⁵. In Section 8 we prove several properties of the flow network rule.

We focus then on the problem of selecting a subset of a given size from the set of vertices of a network. Mainly in the framework of voting theory the problem of selecting committees has been receiving more and more attention in the last years (for a survey, see Elkind et al., 2017). Many k -multiwinner network solutions, that is procedures which associate with any network a family of subsets of size k , can be built by each complete and quasi-transitive (in particular transitive) network method by taking, for every network, the k -maximum sets of the corresponding relation¹⁶. A careful analysis of such solutions as well as a comparison among them represent, in our opinion, an interesting research line. However, at the best of our knowledge, no specific contribution on this theme is available in the literature when $k \geq 2$. The situation is different for the case $k = 1$. Aziz et al. (2015) propose a canonical way to extend to the whole set of networks any method which associates with each balanced network a subset of its vertices. There are also lots of contributions about procedures to select the vertices of special types of networks like tournaments, weak tournaments and partial tournaments¹⁷. We refer to Laslier (1997) for a survey on tournament solutions and to Peris and Subiza (1999), Aziz et al. (2015) and Brandt et al. (2016) for further interesting contributions on the extension of classical tournament solutions to the settings of weak and partial tournaments. We finally note that De Donder et al. (2000) also propose some results about balanced networks, while Dutta and Laslier (1999) consider a different framework somehow connected with networks, as discussed in Section 11. In Section 4 we consider, for every positive integer k , the procedure which associates with any network the k -maximum sets of its flow relation. Such a procedure, called *flow k -multiwinner network solution*, is a new object and is in general different from k -multiwinner network solutions originating from known network methods and network rules. In Sections 9, thanks to the previous analysis of the flow network method as well as some preliminary propositions about quasi-acyclic and quasi-transitive relations proved in Section 7, we show that the flow k -multiwinner network solution fulfils a lot of desirable properties.

2 Networks

We assume $0 \notin \mathbb{N}$ and we set $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Moreover, given $k \geq 1$, we denote by $\llbracket k \rrbracket$ the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. From now on, V is a fixed finite set of size $|V| = n \geq 2$, $\Delta = \{(x, x) \in V^2 : x \in V\}$ and $A = V^2 \setminus \Delta$.

A *network* on V is a triple $N = (V, A, c)$, where c is a function from A to \mathbb{N}_0 . We say that V is the set of vertices of N , A is the set of arcs of N and c is the capacity associated with N . Note that the pair (V, A) is a complete digraph (without loops) on the set of vertices V . The set of networks on V is denoted by \mathcal{N} .

Networks can be used to mathematically represent competitions. Assume to have a set of teams which played a certain number of matches among each other and to know, for every team, the number of matches it won against any other team. Then we can represent that competition by a network by defining V as the set of teams and, for every $(x, y) \in A$, defining $c(x, y)$ as the number

¹⁵That fact can be easily checked considering the network in Example 56.

¹⁶Given a relation R on a nonempty finite set V , a k -maximum set of R is a subset W of size k of V having the property that, for every $x \in W$ and $y \notin W$, $(x, y) \in R$. Complete and quasi-acyclic relations always admit k -maximum sets (Proposition 30).

¹⁷Weak tournaments and partial tournaments can be naturally identified with networks whose arcs always have capacities that are 0 or 1 and such that the sum of the capacities of each pair of opposite arcs is at least 1 and at most 1 respectively.

of matches in which x beat y . For instance, the competition C described in (2) can be represented by the network $N_C = (V, A, c)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \{A, B, C, D\}; \\ A &= \{(x, y) \in V^2 : x, y \in \{A, B, C, D\} \text{ and } x \neq y\}; \\ c : V &\rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ is defined by} \\ c(A, B) &= 1, c(B, A) = 0, c(A, C) = 1, c(C, A) = 2, \\ c(A, D) &= 2, c(D, A) = 2, c(B, C) = 1, c(C, B) = 2, \\ c(B, D) &= 1, c(D, B) = 1, c(C, D) = 2, c(D, C) = 2. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$. For every $x \in V$, the outdegree and the indegree of x in N are respectively defined by

$$o(x) = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y), \quad i(x) = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x).$$

Note that $o(x)$ and $i(x)$ depend on N but the notation $o(x)$ and $i(x)$ does not refer to the symbol N . When the reference to the network is important we adopt the writings $o^N(x)$ and $i^N(x)$. We use a similar style for any other symbol defined for networks.

We call reversal of N the network $N^r = (V, A, c^r) \in \mathcal{N}$ where, for every $(x, y) \in A$, $c^r(x, y) = c(y, x)$. Given a bijection $\psi : V \rightarrow V$, we set $N^\psi = (V, A, c^\psi) \in \mathcal{N}$ where c^ψ is defined, for every $(x, y) \in A$, by $c^\psi(x, y) = c(\psi^{-1}(x), \psi^{-1}(y))$. Moreover, given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\alpha N = (V, A, \alpha c) \in \mathcal{N}$.

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we say that N is a k -balanced network if, for every $(x, y) \in A$, $c(x, y) + c(y, x) = k$. In that case k is called the balance of N . We denote the set of k -balanced networks on V by \mathcal{B}_k and we call $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{B}_k$ the set of balanced networks on V . Note that modelling competitions where each team confronts with any other team the same number of times leads to balanced networks. In particular, networks in \mathcal{B}_1 are the right tool to model round-robin competitions, namely those competitions where each team confronts with any other team exactly once. Those special competitions are largely studied in the literature and are generally modelled via asymmetric and complete digraphs, the so-called tournaments. Of course, there is a natural bijection among the set of tournaments on V and the set \mathcal{B}_1 .

Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $s, t \in V$ with $s \neq t$. A flow from s to t in N is a function $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ such that, for every $(x, y) \in A$, $f(x, y) \leq c(x, y)$ and, for every $x \in V \setminus \{s, t\}$,

$$\sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} f(x, y) = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} f(y, x). \tag{6}$$

Note that the function $f_0 : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ defined by $f_0(x, y) = 0$ for all $(x, y) \in A$ is a flow. It is called the null flow. The set of flows from s to t in N is finite and it is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(N, s, t)$. Given $f \in \mathcal{F}(N, s, t)$, the value of f is the integer

$$\varphi(f) = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{s\}} f(s, y) - \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{s\}} f(y, s).$$

The number

$$\varphi_{st} = \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}(N, s, t)} \varphi(f),$$

which is well defined and belongs to \mathbb{N}_0 , is called the *maximum flow value* from s to t in N . If $f \in \mathcal{F}(N, s, t)$ is such that $\varphi(f) = \varphi_{st}$, then f is called a maximum flow from s to t in N . Let $S \subseteq V$ and denote by S^c its complement in V . If $\emptyset \neq S \neq V$, the number

$$c(S) = \sum_{x \in S, y \in S^c} c(x, y)$$

is called the capacity of S in N . S is called a *cut* from s to t (or for φ_{st}) in N if $s \in S$ and $t \in S^c$.

The set of cuts from s to t in N is nonempty and finite and it is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(N, s, t)$. It is well-known that, for every $f \in \mathcal{F}(N, s, t)$ and $S \in \mathcal{C}(N, s, t)$, we have

$$\varphi(f) \leq c(S). \quad (7)$$

In particular, if $S_1 = \{s\}$ and $S_2 = V \setminus \{t\}$, then $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{C}(N, s, t)$, $c(S_1) = o(s)$ and $c(S_2) = i(t)$. Thus, by (7), we get $\varphi_{st} \leq \min\{o(s), i(t)\}$.

The fundamental result about flows in networks, namely the famous Maxflow-Mincut Theorem, states that

$$\varphi_{st} = \min_{S \in \mathcal{C}(N, s, t)} c(S).$$

In particular, there always exists $S \in \mathcal{C}(N, s, t)$ such that $\varphi_{st} = c(S)$. Such a cut is called a *minimum cut* from s to t in N (or for φ_{st}). The next result will turn out to be fundamental for our work. It is due to Gomory and Hu (1961).

Proposition 1. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x, y, z \in V$ be distinct. Then $\varphi_{xz} \geq \min\{\varphi_{xy}, \varphi_{yz}\}$.*

Proof. Let S be a minimum cut from x to z in N . Then we have $x \in S$, $z \in S^c$ and $\varphi_{xz} = c(S)$. If $y \in S$, then S is a cut from y to z and thus, by (7), $\varphi_{yz} \leq c(S)$. If instead $y \in S^c$ then S is a cut from x to y and thus, by (7), $\varphi_{xy} \leq c(S)$. In both cases we get $\min\{\varphi_{xy}, \varphi_{yz}\} \leq \varphi_{xz}$. \square

We call a sequence of $m \geq 2$ distinct vertices x_1, \dots, x_m such that $x_1 = s$, $x_m = t$ and, for every $i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket$, $c(x_i, x_{i+1}) \geq 1$, a path from s to t in N and we denote it by $x_1 \cdots x_m$. The set of paths from s to t in N is denoted by $\Gamma(N, s, t)$. Given $\gamma = x_1 \cdots x_m \in \Gamma(N, s, t)$, we set $V(\gamma) = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $A(\gamma) = \{(x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_{m-1}, x_m)\}$. Fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define an arc-disjoint k -sequence in $\Gamma(N, s, t)$ as a sequence $(\gamma_j)_{j=1}^k$ of k (not necessarily distinct) paths in $\Gamma(N, s, t)$ such that, for every $a \in A$, $|\{j \in \llbracket k \rrbracket : a \in A(\gamma_j)\}| \leq c(a)$. We denote the set of arc-disjoint k -sequences in $\Gamma(N, s, t)$ by $\Gamma_k(N, s, t)$. Of course, if $\Gamma(N, s, t) = \emptyset$, then $\Gamma_k(N, s, t) = \emptyset$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We define

$$\lambda_{st} = \begin{cases} \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} : \Gamma_k(N, s, t) \neq \emptyset\} & \text{if } \Gamma(N, s, t) \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{if } \Gamma(N, s, t) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

From Bang-Jensen and Gutin (2008, Lemma 7.1.5), we have the equality

$$\varphi_{st} = \lambda_{st}, \quad (8)$$

which provides a useful interpretation of the maximum flow value in terms of arc-disjoint paths. Note that, due to (8), the maximum flow value from x to y in the network $N_{\mathcal{C}}$ described in (5) has been computed in the introduction for all distinct $x, y \in V$.

3 Relations

A relation R on V is a subset of V^2 . It is customary to use relations on V to represent individual or social preferences on V by identifying, for every $x, y \in V$, the membership relation $(x, y) \in R$ with the statement “ x is at least as good as y ”. We denote the set of relations on V by \mathbf{R} .

Let $R \in \mathbf{R}$. The strict relation associated with R is $S(R) = \{(x, y) \in V^2 : (x, y) \in R, (y, x) \notin R\}$; the reversal relation of R is $R^r = \{(x, y) \in V^2 : (y, x) \in R\}$. Given $x, y \in V$, we usually write $x \geq_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \in R$; $x >_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \in S(R)$; $x \sim_R y$ instead of $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, x) \in R$. Recall that, by definition, R is quasi-transitive if $S(R)$ is transitive; acyclic if, for every sequence x_1, \dots, x_m of $m \geq 2$ distinct elements of V such that $x_i \geq_R x_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket$, we have that $x_m \not\geq_R x_1$; quasi-acyclic if $S(R)$ is acyclic. Given a function $u : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the relation induced by u is $R(u) = \{(x, y) \in V^2 : u(x) \geq u(y)\}$.

We denote the set of complete and quasi-acyclic relations on V by \mathbf{A} ; the set of complete and quasi-transitive relations on V by \mathbf{T} ; the set of complete and transitive relations on V by \mathbf{O} ; the set of complete, quasi-transitive and antisymmetric relations on V by \mathbf{L} . The elements of \mathbf{O} are called orders; the ones of \mathbf{L} are called linear orders. Of course, we have $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{O} \subseteq \mathbf{T} \subseteq \mathbf{A}$.

Given $R \in \mathbf{R}$, we also consider the sets

$$\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) = \{L \in \mathbf{L} : L \subseteq R\}, \quad \mathbf{L}^\circ(R) = \{L \in \mathbf{L} : L \supseteq R\},$$

that is, the set of linear refinements and the set of linear extensions of R . Both those sets may be empty and if $L \in \mathbf{L}$, then $\mathbf{L}_\circ(L) = \mathbf{L}^\circ(L) = \{L\}$.

Let $\mathbb{P}(V)$ be the set of the subsets of V and, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{P}_k(V)$ be the set of the subsets of V of size k . Given $R \in \mathbf{R}$ and $W \in \mathbb{P}_k(V)$, we say that W is a k -maximum set for R if, for every $x \in W$ and $y \in V \setminus W$, we have $x \geq_R y$. We define then the set

$$C_k(R) = \{W \in \mathbb{P}_k(V) : W \text{ is a } k\text{-maximum set for } R\}$$

Clearly, $C_n(R) = \{V\}$ and $C_k(R) = \emptyset$ for all $k > |V| = n$. Thus, the study of the set $C_k(R)$ is meaningful only if $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Note also that if R is reflexive, then $\max(R) = \{x \in V : \{x\} \in C_1(R)\}$, where $\max(R)$ denotes the set of maxima for R . Finally, if $R \in \mathbf{L}$ and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$, then $|C_k(R)| = 1$.

4 Definition of the flow network method

We call *network method* any function from \mathcal{N} to \mathbf{R} . A network method can be seen as a procedure to determine, for every competition and every ordered pair of teams, whether the first team did at least as good as the second one. The *flow network method* \mathfrak{F} is defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by

$$\mathfrak{F}(N) = \{(x, y) \in A : \varphi_{xy}^N \geq \varphi_{yx}^N\} \cup \Delta.$$

The relation $\mathfrak{F}(N)$ on V is called the *flow relation* associated with N . This network method was first proposed by Gvozdk (1987), who focuses only on balanced networks, and later extended and studied in Belkin and Gvozdk (1989). Note that, for the network N_C defined in (5), $\mathfrak{F}(N_C)$ coincides with the relation \geq_C in (4).

We call next *network rule* any correspondence from \mathcal{N} to \mathbf{L} . A network rule can be seen as a procedure to determine, for every competition, the set of all the possible rankings of the teams which are consistent with the competition. The *flow network rule* \mathfrak{F}_\circ is defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by

$$\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(\mathfrak{F}(N)).$$

Such a network rule is the main object studied by Belkin and Gvozdk (1989).

Given now $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$, we finally call *k-multiwinner network solution* any correspondence from \mathcal{N} to $\mathbb{P}_k(V)$. A k -multiwinner network solution can be seen as a procedure to determine, for every competition, all the possible choices for the set of the best k teams of the competition. The *flow k-multiwinner network solution* \mathfrak{F}_k is defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by

$$\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = C_k(\mathfrak{F}(N)).$$

Our purpose is to study the properties of the three objects above defined. In order to discuss the properties of the flow network method we just need the crucial fact about complete and quasi-transitive relations which is proved in the next section. For studying the flow network rule and the flow k -multiwinner network solution further results from the theory of relations are necessary. They are collected in Section 7.

Later on, given $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x, y \in V$, we write $x \geq_N y$ instead of $x \geq_{\mathfrak{F}(N)} y$; $x >_N y$ instead of $x >_{\mathfrak{F}(N)} y$; $x \sim_N y$ instead of $x \sim_{\mathfrak{F}(N)} y$. Thus, $x \geq_N y$ means $x = y$ or $\varphi_{x,y}^N \geq \varphi_{yx}^N$; $x >_N y$ means $x \neq y$ and $\varphi_{xy}^N > \varphi_{yx}^N$; $x \sim_N y$ means $x = y$ or $\varphi_{xy}^N = \varphi_{yx}^N$.

5 Building complete and quasi-transitive relations

This section is devoted to the description of a general procedure to construct complete and quasi-transitive relations on V . For every $\vartheta : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define $R(\vartheta) \in \mathbf{R}$ by

$$R(\vartheta) = \{(x, y) \in A : \vartheta(x, y) \geq \vartheta(y, x)\} \cup \Delta.$$

Given $\vartheta : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say that ϑ satisfies the *Gomory-Hu condition* if, for every $x, y, z \in V$ distinct, we have

$$\vartheta(x, z) \geq \min\{\vartheta(x, y), \vartheta(y, z)\}. \quad (9)$$

The next proposition is based on Schulze (2011, pp. 277-278).

Proposition 2. *If $\vartheta : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the Gomory-Hu condition, then $R(\vartheta) \in \mathbf{T}$.*

Proof. For shortness set $R = R(\vartheta)$. The completeness of R is obvious. We show that R is quasi-transitive. Let us consider $x, y, z \in V$ and assume that $x >_R y$ and $y >_R z$. We must prove that $x >_R z$, that is, $x \neq z$ and

$$\vartheta(x, z) > \vartheta(z, x). \quad (10)$$

Note that $x >_R y$ and $y >_R z$ mean $x \neq y$, $y \neq z$,

$$\vartheta(x, y) > \vartheta(y, x) \quad (11)$$

and

$$\vartheta(y, z) > \vartheta(z, y). \quad (12)$$

We first show that $x \neq z$. Indeed, if it were $x = z$, then we would get $\vartheta(x, y) > \vartheta(y, x)$ and $\vartheta(y, x) > \vartheta(x, y)$, a contradiction. By (9), we have

$$\vartheta(x, z) \geq \min\{\vartheta(x, y), \vartheta(y, z)\}. \quad (13)$$

$$\vartheta(z, y) \geq \min\{\vartheta(z, x), \vartheta(x, y)\}. \quad (14)$$

$$\vartheta(y, x) \geq \min\{\vartheta(y, z), \vartheta(z, x)\}. \quad (15)$$

Assume first that

$$\vartheta(x, y) \geq \vartheta(y, z). \quad (16)$$

Then, (13) and (12) give

$$\vartheta(x, z) > \vartheta(z, y). \quad (17)$$

Moreover, (16) and (12) give $\vartheta(x, y) > \vartheta(z, y)$. Since by (14), $\vartheta(z, y)$ must be greater or equal to one between $\vartheta(z, x)$ and $\vartheta(x, y)$, it follows that $\vartheta(z, y) \geq \vartheta(z, x)$. Using (17) we then get (10).

Assume next that $\vartheta(x, y) < \vartheta(y, z)$. Then (13) and (11) give

$$\vartheta(x, z) > \vartheta(y, x). \quad (18)$$

Moreover, by (11), $\vartheta(y, x) < \vartheta(y, z)$. Using (15), we get $\vartheta(y, x) \geq \vartheta(z, x)$. Using now (18) we finally get (10). \square

6 Properties of the flow network method

The next result establishes the fundamental property of \mathfrak{F} . Such a property was proved by Belkin and Gvozdk (1989, Lemma 2). We derive it as a particular application of Proposition 2. Given $N \in \mathcal{N}$, let $\varphi^N : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined, for every $(x, y) \in A$, by $\varphi^N(x, y) = \varphi_{xy}^N$ and note that $\mathfrak{F}(N) = R(\varphi^N)$.

Theorem 3. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}(N) \in \mathbf{T}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 1, φ^N satisfies the Gomory-Hu condition. Thus, by Proposition 2, we get $\mathfrak{F}(N) = R(\varphi^N) \in \mathbf{T}$. \square

If $n = 2$, we have $\mathbf{O} = \mathbf{T}$ so that the outcomes of the flow network method are always transitive. That does not hold true when $n \geq 3$, as shown by the next proposition.

Proposition 4. *Let $n \geq 3$. Then there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{F}(N) \notin \mathbf{O}$.*

Proof. Let $V = \llbracket n \rrbracket$. Consider $N = (V, A, c)$ such that $c(1, 2) = 1$ and $c(i, j) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ with $i \neq j$ and $(i, j) \neq (1, 2)$. Then $\mathfrak{F}(N)$ is such that $1 >_N 2$ and $i \sim_N j$ for all $i, j \in \llbracket n \rrbracket$ with $i \neq j$ and $\{i, j\} \neq \{1, 2\}$. In particular, we have $2 \geq_N 3$ and $3 \geq_N 1$ but $2 \not\geq_N 1$. Hence $\mathfrak{F}(N)$ is not transitive and so $\mathfrak{F}(N) \notin \mathbf{O}$. \square

Proposition 6 below states that any relation belonging to \mathbf{T} can in fact be the outcome of the flow network method applied to a suitable network. Its proof relies on the possibility to naturally associate a network to any relation. In what follows, given $R \in \mathbf{R}$, we set $N_R = (V, A, c_R) \in \mathcal{N}$ where, for every $(x, y) \in A$, $c_R(x, y) = 1$ if $x >_R y$ and $c_R(x, y) = 0$ otherwise.

Lemma 5. *Let $R \in \mathbf{T}$ and $(x, y) \in A$. Then:*

- (i) $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} > 0$ if and only if $x >_R y$;
- (ii) $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} = \varphi_{yx}^{N_R} = 0$ if and only if $x \sim_R y$.

Proof. (i) If $x >_R y$, then $c_R(x, y) = 1$ and in N_R we have at least the path xy , so that $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} \geq 1$. Assume next that $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} > 0$. Then there exists a path in N_R from x to y . Thus, there exist $m \geq 2$ and $x_1, \dots, x_m \in V$ distinct such that $x_1 = x$, $x_m = y$ and, for every $i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket$, $c_R(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$. It follows that we have the chain $x = x_1 >_R x_2 >_R \dots >_R x_{m-1} >_R x_m = y$. Since $S(R)$ is transitive, we also have $x >_R y$.

(ii) Let $x \sim_R y$. Then we neither have $x >_R y$ nor $y >_R x$ and so, by (i), we get $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} = \varphi_{yx}^{N_R} = 0$. Conversely let $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} = \varphi_{yx}^{N_R} = 0$. Then, by (i), we neither have $x >_R y$ nor $y >_R x$. By completeness, the only possibility is $x \sim_R y$. \square

Proposition 6. *If $R \in \mathbf{T}$ then $\mathfrak{F}(N_R) = R$.*

Proof. We need to see that, for every $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$, $x \geq_R y$ if and only if $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} \geq \varphi_{yx}^{N_R}$. Assume first that $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} \geq \varphi_{yx}^{N_R}$. If $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} > \varphi_{yx}^{N_R}$, then $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} > 0$ and, by Lemma 5 (i), we get $x >_R y$. If instead $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} = \varphi_{yx}^{N_R}$ then, by Lemma 5 (i), we necessarily have $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} = \varphi_{yx}^{N_R} = 0$ and thus, by Lemma 5 (ii), $x \sim_R y$ and, in particular, $x \geq_R y$. Assume next that $x \geq_R y$. If $\varphi_{yx}^{N_R} = 0$, we trivially have $\varphi_{xy}^{N_R} \geq \varphi_{yx}^{N_R}$. But we cannot have $\varphi_{yx}^{N_R} > 0$ since otherwise, by Lemma 5 (i), we would get $y >_R x$, against $x \geq_R y$. \square

As a consequence of the above result and Proposition 2, we derive the following interesting characterization of the complete and quasi-transitive relations.

Theorem 7. *Let $R \in \mathbf{R}$. Then $R \in \mathbf{T}$ if and only if there exists $\vartheta : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the Gomory-Hu condition, such that $R = R(\vartheta)$.*

Proof. One implication is just Proposition 2. Assume now that $R \in \mathbf{T}$. Then, by definition of flow relation, we have $R(\varphi^{N_R}) = \mathfrak{F}(N_R)$ and we know, by Proposition 1, that φ^{N_R} satisfies the Gomory-Hu condition. Since, by Proposition 6, we have $\mathfrak{F}(N_R) = R$, we deduce that $R = R(\varphi^{N_R})$. \square

We now present some further remarkable properties of \mathfrak{F} . The first property is about the behaviour of the relation $\mathfrak{F}(N)$ with respect to a relabelling of its vertices. It simply says that if one decides to relabel the network vertices, the flow relation accordingly changes. In other words, the flow relation does not depend on the names of vertices. For that reason we call that property neutrality. The second one is a homogeneity property for the flow relation. We observe that these two properties are considered by González-Díaz et al. (2014).¹⁸

Proposition 8. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and let $\psi : V \rightarrow V$ be a bijection. Then, for every $x, y \in V$, $x \succeq_N y$ if and only if $\psi(x) \succeq_{N^\psi} \psi(y)$.*

Proof. It is clearly enough to show that, for every $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$, every $(x, y) \in A$ and every bijection $\psi : V \rightarrow V$, we have

$$\varphi_{\psi(x)\psi(y)}^{N^\psi} = \varphi_{xy}^N. \quad (19)$$

Let S be a minimum cut from $\psi(x)$ to $\psi(y)$ in N^ψ . Then $\psi^{-1}(S)$ is a cut from x to y in N . Thus, by definition of c^ψ and by (7), we have

$$\varphi_{\psi(x)\psi(y)}^{N^\psi} = c^{N^\psi}(S) = \sum_{\psi(u) \in S, \psi(v) \in S^c} c^\psi(\psi(u), \psi(v)) = \sum_{u \in \psi^{-1}(S), v \in [\psi^{-1}(S)]^c} c(u, v) \geq \varphi_{xy}^N.$$

Then, we also have

$$\varphi_{xy}^N = \varphi_{\psi^{-1}(\psi(x))\psi^{-1}(\psi(y))}^{(N^\psi)^{\psi^{-1}}} \geq \varphi_{\psi(x)\psi(y)}^{N^\psi}$$

and so we get the equality (19). \square

Proposition 9. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}(\alpha N) = \mathfrak{F}(N)$.*

Proof. Let $N = (V, A, c)$ and let $\alpha N = (V, A, c')$, where $c' = \alpha c$. In order to get $\mathfrak{F}(\alpha N) = \mathfrak{F}(N)$ it is enough to show that, for every $(x, y) \in A$, $\varphi_{xy}^{\alpha N} = \alpha \varphi_{xy}^N$. Let $(x, y) \in A$. Consider $f \in \mathcal{F}(N, x, y)$ such that $\varphi_{xy}^N = \varphi(f)$. Then $\alpha f \in \mathcal{F}(\alpha N, x, y)$ so that $\varphi_{xy}^{\alpha N} \geq \varphi(\alpha f) = \alpha \varphi(f) = \alpha \varphi_{xy}^N$. Let S be a cut from x to y in N such that $c(S) = \varphi_{xy}^N$. Then S is also a cut from x to y in αN . Hence, by (7), $\alpha \varphi_{xy}^N = \alpha c(S) = c'(S) \geq \varphi_{xy}^{\alpha N}$ and the proof is completed. \square

Given a network N and two distinct vertices x^* and y^* , it can be useful to have simple conditions which are sufficient to guarantee $x^* \succeq_N y^*$ or $x^* \succ_N y^*$. Conditions of that type are described in the next proposition.

Proposition 10. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x^*, y^* \in V$ with $x^* \neq y^*$. Assume that $c(x^*, y^*) \geq c(y^*, x^*)$ and that, for every $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}$, $c(x^*, z) \geq c(y^*, z)$ and $c(z, y^*) \geq c(z, x^*)$. Then $x^* \succeq_N y^*$. Assume further that one of the following conditions holds true:*

- (a) $c(x^*, y^*) > c(y^*, x^*)$;
- (b) for every $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}$, $c(x^*, z) > c(y^*, z)$;
- (c) for every $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}$, $c(z, y^*) > c(z, x^*)$;
- (d) there exists $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}$ such that $c(x^*, z) > c(y^*, z)$ and $c(z, y^*) > c(z, x^*)$.

Then $x^* \succ_N y^*$.

¹⁸Those authors use the term anonymity instead of neutrality.

Proof. Let S be a minimum cut for $\varphi_{x^*y^*}$ so that $S \subseteq V$, $x^* \in S$, $y^* \notin S$ and $c(S) = \varphi_{x^*y^*}$. Define $T = (S \setminus \{x^*\}) \cup \{y^*\}$ and note that, since $T \subseteq V$, $y^* \in T$, $x^* \notin T$, we have that T is a cut for $\varphi_{y^*x^*}$. By (7), we have $c(T) \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}$. In order to obtain $\varphi_{x^*y^*} \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}$, that is $x^* \geq_N y^*$, it is enough to show $c(S) - c(T) \geq 0$. Note that

$$c(S) = \sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c} c(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x^*\}, v \in S^c \setminus \{y^*\}} c(u, v) + \sum_{v \in S^c \setminus \{y^*\}} c(x^*, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x^*\}} c(u, y^*) + c(x^*, y^*)$$

and

$$c(T) = \sum_{u \in T, v \in T^c} c(u, v) = \sum_{u \in T \setminus \{y^*\}, v \in T^c \setminus \{x^*\}} c(u, v) + \sum_{v \in T^c \setminus \{x^*\}} c(y^*, v) + \sum_{u \in T \setminus \{y^*\}} c(u, x^*) + c(y^*, x^*)$$

Observe now that $T \setminus \{y^*\} = S \setminus \{x^*\}$ and $T^c \setminus \{x^*\} = S^c \setminus \{y^*\}$. Thus

$$c(S) - c(T) = (c(x^*, y^*) - c(y^*, x^*)) + \sum_{v \in S^c \setminus \{y^*\}} (c(x^*, v) - c(y^*, v)) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x^*\}} (c(u, y^*) - c(u, x^*)) \quad (20)$$

and every term between brackets is non-negative, which says $c(S) - c(T) \geq 0$.

Assume further that one among (a), (b), (c) and (d) holds true. Then, at least one of the terms between brackets in (20) is now positive and so $\varphi_{x^*y^*} = c(S) > c(T) \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}$. Thus, $\varphi_{x^*y^*} > \varphi_{y^*x^*}$, that is, $x^* >_N y^*$. \square

The flow network method also satisfies a monotonicity property, as described by the next proposition. This property implies that teams have an incentive to win when the flow network method is used to assess their performance. That is in line with the Property II in Vaziri et al. (2017).

Proposition 11. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$, $N' = (V, A, c') \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x^* \in V$. Assume that the following conditions hold true:*

- (a) *for every $y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$, $c'(x^*, y) \geq c(x^*, y)$ and $c'(y, x^*) \leq c(y, x^*)$;*
- (b) *for every $(x, y) \in A$ with $x \neq x^*$ and $y \neq x^*$, $c'(x, y) = c(x, y)$.*

Then, for every $y \in V \setminus \{x^\}$ such that $x^* \geq_N y$, we have $x^* \geq_{N'} y$. Moreover, for every $y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that $x^* \geq_N y$ and one among $x^* >_N y$, $c'(x^*, y) > c(x^*, y)$ and $c'(y, x^*) < c(y, x^*)$ holds true, we have that $x^* >_{N'} y$.*

Proof. Let $y^* \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that $x^* \geq_N y^*$, that is $\varphi_{x^*y^*}^N \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^N$. We want to show that $\varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^{N'}$. We prove first that $\varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} \geq \varphi_{x^*y^*}^N + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*)$. Let f be a maximum flow from x^* to y^* in N such that

$$\text{for every } x \in V \setminus \{x^*\}, f(x, x^*) = 0. \quad (21)$$

Such a maximum flow can be obtained as the output of the well-known augmenting path algorithm applied to the null flow. Then we have

$$\varphi^N(f) = \varphi_{x^*y^*}^N = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}} f(x^*, y). \quad (22)$$

Consider now $f' : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ defined by

$$f'(x, y) = \begin{cases} f(x^*, y^*) + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*) & \text{if } (x, y) = (x^*, y^*) \\ f(x, y) & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (x^*, y^*) \end{cases}$$

We show that $f' \in \mathcal{F}(N', x^*, y^*)$. By (a) we have $f'(x, y) \geq 0$ for all $(x, y) \in A$. To see that $f'(x, y) \leq c'(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in A$, we need to distinguish some cases. Surely $f'(x^*, y^*) = f(x^*, y^*) + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*) \leq c'(x^*, y^*)$ because $f(x^*, y^*) \leq c(x^*, y^*)$. Let $(x, y) \in A \setminus \{(x^*, y^*)\}$. If $x = x^*$ and $y \neq y^*$ then, by (a), we have $f'(x^*, y) = f(x^*, y) \leq c(x^*, y) \leq c'(x^*, y)$. Assume next $x \neq x^*$. If $y = x^*$ then, by (21), $f'(x, y) = f(x, x^*) = 0 \leq c'(x, x^*)$. If instead $y \neq x^*$ then, by (b), we have $f'(x, y) = f(x, y) \leq c(x, y) = c'(x, y)$. We are left to show (6). Fix $u \notin \{x^*, y^*\}$. We need to show

$$\sum_{z \in V \setminus \{u\}} f'(u, z) = \sum_{z \in V \setminus \{u\}} f'(z, u). \quad (23)$$

Since $u \notin \{x^*, y^*\}$, by f' definition, (23) is the same as $\sum_{(u,z) \in A} f(u, z) = \sum_{(z,u) \in A} f(z, u)$ which holds true because $f \in \mathcal{F}(N, x^*, y^*)$. Now, using (22), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{N'}(f') &= \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}} f'(x^*, y) - \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}} f'(y, x^*) \\ &= f'(x^*, y^*) + \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}} f'(x^*, y) - \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}} f(y, x^*) \\ &= f(x^*, y^*) + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*) + \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}} f(x^*, y) = \varphi_{x^*y^*}^N + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*). \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} \geq \varphi^{N'}(f') = \varphi_{x^*y^*}^N + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*). \quad (24)$$

Consider now a minimum cut S from y^* to x^* in N . Then we have $c(S) = \varphi_{y^*x^*}^N$. Of course, S is also a cut from y^* to x^* in N' and then

$$c'(S) \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^{N'}. \quad (25)$$

Moreover we have

$$c'(S) = \sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c} c'(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c \setminus \{x^*\}} c'(u, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{y^*\}} c'(u, x^*) + c'(y^*, x^*).$$

Note now that, by the assumptions (a) and (b), we have

$$\sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c \setminus \{x^*\}} c'(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c \setminus \{x^*\}} c(u, v), \quad \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{y^*\}} c'(u, x^*) \leq \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{y^*\}} c(u, x^*)$$

and $c'(y^*, x^*) \leq c(y^*, x^*)$. As a consequence,

$$c'(S) + c(y^*, x^*) - c'(y^*, x^*) \leq c(S). \quad (26)$$

Using now the inequalities (24), (25) and (26) and recalling that $\varphi_{x^*y^*}^N \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^N$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} &\geq \varphi_{x^*y^*}^N + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*) \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^N + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*) \\ &= c(S) + c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*) \geq c'(S) + (c(y^*, x^*) - c'(y^*, x^*)) + (c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*)) \\ &\geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^{N'} + (c(y^*, x^*) - c'(y^*, x^*)) + (c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*)), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^{N'} + (c(y^*, x^*) - c'(y^*, x^*)) + (c'(x^*, y^*) - c(x^*, y^*)).$$

In particular, $\varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} \geq \varphi_{y^*x^*}^{N'}$ so that the proof of the first part of the theorem is complete.

Consider now $y^* \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that $x^* \geq_N y^*$ and one among $x^* >_N y^*$, $c'(x^*, y^*) > c(x^*, y^*)$ and $c'(y^*, x^*) < c(y^*, x^*)$ holds true. The same argument as above gives $\varphi_{x^*y^*}^{N'} > \varphi_{y^*x^*}^{N'}$ which completes the proof. \square

We now observe that reversing a network, the flow relation gets its reversal. We call such a property reversal symmetry due to its similarity to the concept of reversal symmetry for social welfare functions proposed by Saari (1994) and recently deepened by Bubboloni and Gori (2015). Note also that this property is called inversion by González-Díaz et al. (2014). The proof of this fact, formalized in the proposition below, is very easy and thus omitted.

Proposition 12. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then, for every $(x, y) \in A$, we have $\varphi_{yx}^{N^r} = \varphi_{xy}^N$. In particular, $\mathfrak{F}(N^r) = \mathfrak{F}(N)^r$.*

The next proposition shows that if in a competition the number of wins (losses) of a team is greater than the number of its losses (wins), then the flow network method does not make that team be the worst (best) one. Its proof immediately follows from Theorem 1 in Lovász (1973) once adapted to the network context¹⁹, and from Proposition 12 after having observed that $o^{N^r}(x) = i^N(x)$ for all $x \in V$.

Proposition 13. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x^* \in V$. If $o(x^*) > i(x^*)$, then there exists $y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that $x^* >_N y$. If $o(x^*) < i(x^*)$, then there exists $y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that $y >_N x^*$.*

A network method is said *flat* on a network N if it associates with N the total relation V^2 . A network method is said *symmetric* if it is flat on every network N such that $N = N^r$. The symmetry property is a basic requirement for network methods invoked by González-Díaz et al. (2014). The next proposition fully characterizes the set of networks on which \mathfrak{F} is flat. Generalizing the classic definition given for directed graphs, we define $N \in \mathcal{N}$ *pseudo-symmetric* if, for every $x \in V$, $o(x) = i(x)$.

Proposition 14. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. \mathfrak{F} is flat on N if and only if N is pseudo-symmetric. In particular, \mathfrak{F} is a symmetric network method.²⁰*

Proof. Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ be pseudo-symmetric. We want to show that, for every $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$, we have $\varphi_{yx}^N = \varphi_{xy}^N$. To that purpose we first show that, for every proper nonempty subset S of V , we have $c(S) = c(S^c)$ ²¹. Let $S \subseteq V$ with $\emptyset \neq S \neq V$. Given $x \in S$, we have that

$$o(x) = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) = \sum_{y \in S^c} c(x, y) + \sum_{y \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y)$$

while

$$i(x) = \sum_{y \in V \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x) = \sum_{y \in S^c} c(y, x) + \sum_{y \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x).$$

Thus, we have

$$\sum_{x \in S} o(x) = \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{y \in S^c} c(x, y) + \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{y \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(x, y) = c(S) + \sum_{(x, y) \in A \cap (S \times S)} c(x, y)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in S} i(x) &= \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{y \in S^c} c(y, x) + \sum_{x \in S} \sum_{y \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(y, x) = c(S^c) + \sum_{(x, y) \in A \cap (S \times S)} c(y, x) \\ &= c(S^c) + \sum_{(x, y) \in A \cap (S \times S)} c(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

¹⁹For a more general approach, see also the main result in Hartmann and Schneider (1993).

²⁰We thank László Lovász for useful advices about this proposition.

²¹That fact seems to be known in the literature even though we could not find a precise reference. Thus, for completeness, we provide a proof.

Since, for every $x \in S$, we have $o(x) = i(x)$, it follows that

$$0 = \sum_{x \in S} (o(x) - i(x)) = c(S) - c(S^c).$$

Let now $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$. The map from $\mathcal{C}(N, x, y)$ to $\mathcal{C}(N, y, x)$ associating with $S \in \mathcal{C}(N, x, y)$ the set $S^c \in \mathcal{C}(N, y, x)$ is a bijection. It follows that

$$\varphi_{xy} = \min_{S \in \mathcal{C}(N, x, y)} c(S) = \min_{S \in \mathcal{C}(N, x, y)} c(S^c) = \min_{T \in \mathcal{C}(N, y, x)} c(T) = \varphi_{yx}.$$

Let next \mathfrak{F} be flat on N . Assume, by contradiction, that there exists $x^* \in V$ with $o(x^*) \neq i(x^*)$. Then, by Proposition 13, there exists $y \in V$ such that $y \not\prec_N x^*$ against $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$.

Finally, to show that \mathfrak{F} is symmetric, note that if $N \in \mathcal{N}$ is such that $N = N^r$ then, for every $x \in V$, $o^N(x) = i^{N^r}(x) = i^N(x)$ and thus N is pseudo-symmetric. \square

Given two networks $\hat{N} = (V, A, c)$ and $\hat{N}' = (V, A, c')$, we define $\hat{N} + \hat{N}' = (V, A, c + c') \in \mathcal{N}$. From Proposition 14, we immediately obtain for the flow network method the flatness preservation property introduced by González-Díaz et al. (2014).

Proposition 15. *Let $N, N' \in \mathcal{N}$. If \mathfrak{F} is flat on N and N' , then \mathfrak{F} is flat on $N + N'$.*

6.1 The flow, the Borda and the dual Borda network methods

Let us consider now the Borda network method $\mathfrak{B} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and the dual Borda network method $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ respectively defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by $\mathfrak{B}(N) = R(o^N)$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}(N) = R(-i^N)$. In other words, $\mathfrak{B}(N)$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$ are the relations respectively induced by the outdegree function and by the opposite of the indegree function associated with the network N . Note that $\mathfrak{B}(N), \hat{\mathfrak{B}}(N) \in \mathbf{O}$ and that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}(N) = (R(i^N))^r$. Our purpose is to describe some links among the flow, the Borda and the dual Borda network methods.

We begin with the next lemma about balanced networks. It was stated, without proof, by Gvozdik (1987, Proposition 1) and Belkin and Gvozdik (1989, Lemma 1).

Proposition 16. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{B}$. Then, for every $x, y \in V^2$ with $x \neq y$, $\varphi_{xy} - \varphi_{yx} = o(x) - o(y)$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that, for every $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$, $\varphi_{xy} - \varphi_{yx} \geq o(x) - o(y)$. Let $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$. Let S be a minimum cut for φ_{xy} , so that $S \subseteq V$, $x \in S$, $y \notin S$ and $c(S) = \varphi_{xy}$. Define $T = (S \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\}$ and note that, since $T \subseteq V$, $y \in T$, $x \notin T$, we have that T is a cut for φ_{yx} . By (7), we get $c(T) \geq \varphi_{yx}$. As a consequence $\varphi_{xy} - \varphi_{yx} \geq c(S) - c(T)$. Note that

$$c(S) = \sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c} c(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}, v \in S^c \setminus \{y\}} c(u, v) + \sum_{v \in S^c} c(x, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, y)$$

and

$$c(T) = \sum_{u \in T, v \in T^c} c(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}, v \in S^c \setminus \{y\}} c(u, v) + \sum_{v \in (S^c \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} c(y, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, x).$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be the balance of N . Then we have $c(u, x) = k - c(x, u)$ for all $u \in V \setminus \{x\}$ and $c(u, y) = k - c(y, u)$ for all $u \in V \setminus \{y\}$. It follows that

$$\varphi_{xy} - \varphi_{yx} \geq c(S) - c(T) = \sum_{v \in S^c} c(x, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, y) - \sum_{v \in (S^c \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} c(y, v) - \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, x) =$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in S^c} c(x, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} k - \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(y, u) - \sum_{v \in (S^c \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} c(y, v) - \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} k + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(x, u) = \\ \sum_{u \in V \setminus \{x\}} c(x, u) - \sum_{u \in V \setminus \{x\}} c(y, u) = o(x) - o(y). \end{aligned}$$

□

As already pointed out by Belkin and Gvozdik (1989), from Proposition 16 we can immediately deduce that the flow and the Borda network methods agree on balanced networks. Indeed, we can also prove that on those networks they both agree with the dual Borda network method too.

Proposition 17. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$.*

Proof. Let $N = (V, A, c)$. By Proposition 16, we immediately have that $\mathfrak{F}(N) = R(o) = \mathfrak{B}(N)$. On the other hand, if $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ is the balance of N , we have $o(x) + i(x) = k(n-1)$ for all $x \in V$. Thus, $\mathfrak{B}(N) = R(o) = R(-i) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$. □

Since for $n = 2$, we have $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{B}$, we immediately get the next corollary.

Corollary 18. *Let $n = 2$. Then, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$.*

The following Propositions 19, 20, 21 and Theorem 22 deepen the comparison among the flow, the Borda and the dual Borda network methods. In particular, they show that those methods agree on a set of networks larger than the one of the balanced networks. Of course there are instead cases in which the Borda and the dual Borda network methods do not coincide with the flow network method. This happens for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$ for which $\mathfrak{F}(N) \notin \mathbf{O}$.

Proposition 19. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$. Assume that, for every distinct $x, y, u \in V$, there exists a real number $\beta(x, y, u) > -\frac{1}{n-2}$ such that*

$$c(y, u) - c(x, u) + c(u, y) - c(u, x) \geq \beta(x, y, u)(o(x) - o(y)).$$

Then $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N)$.

Proof. In order to show that $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N)$, it is enough to show that, for every $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$, $o(x) \geq o(y)$ implies $\varphi_{xy} \geq \varphi_{yx}$ and $o(x) > o(y)$ implies $\varphi_{xy} > \varphi_{yx}$. For that purpose we will show that, for every $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$, there exists a positive constant $\alpha(x, y)$ such that $\varphi_{xy} - \varphi_{yx} \geq \alpha(x, y)(o(x) - o(y))$.

Fix $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$ and let S be a minimum cut from x to y so that $c(S) = \varphi_{xy}$. Consider now $T = (S \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{y\}$ and note that, since $T \subseteq V$, $y \in T$ and $x \notin T$, we have that T is a cut from y to x . Then we have that

$$c(S) = \sum_{u \in S, v \in S^c} c(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}, v \in S^c \setminus \{y\}} c(u, v) + \sum_{v \in S^c} c(x, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, y)$$

and

$$c(T) = \sum_{u \in T, v \in T^c} c(u, v) = \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}, v \in S^c \setminus \{y\}} c(u, v) + \sum_{v \in (S^c \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} c(y, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, x).$$

Since $c(T) \geq \varphi_{yx}$, we then have

$$\varphi_{xy} - \varphi_{yx} \geq c(S) - c(T) = \sum_{v \in S^c} c(x, v) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, y) - \sum_{v \in (S^c \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} c(y, v) - \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} c(u, x)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= o(x) - o(y) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} (c(y, u) - c(x, u) + c(u, y) - c(u, x)) \\
&\geq o(x) - o(y) + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} \beta(x, y, u)(o(x) - o(y)) = \left(1 + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} \beta(x, y, u)\right)(o(x) - o(y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we are left with proving that $1 + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} \beta(x, y, u) > 0$. Indeed, since $|S| \leq n - 1$, we have

$$1 + \sum_{u \in S \setminus \{x\}} \beta(x, y, u) > 1 - \frac{|S| - 1}{n - 2} \geq 0,$$

and the proof is completed. \square

Proposition 20. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$. Assume that, for every distinct $x, y, u \in V$, there exists a real number $\gamma(x, y, u) > -\frac{1}{n-2}$ such that*

$$c(x, u) - c(y, u) + c(u, x) - c(u, y) \geq \gamma(x, y, u)(i(y) - i(x)).$$

Then $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$.

The proof of the above result is similar to the one of Proposition 19 and thus omitted.

Proposition 21. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$. Assume that there exist $a, b, l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $a + b > 0$ and $\omega : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ such that, for every $(x, y) \in A$, we have $c(x, y) = a\omega(x) + b\omega(y) + l$. If $(n - 1)a < b$ or $(n - 1)b < a$, then $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$.*

Proof. Let us prove first that $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N)$. Let $x, y, u \in V$ be distinct and show that there exists $\beta = \beta(x, y, u)$ such that $\beta > -\frac{1}{n-2}$ and

$$c(y, u) - c(x, u) + c(u, y) - c(u, x) \geq \beta(o(x) - o(y)),$$

in order to apply Proposition 19. Note that $c(y, u) - c(x, u) + c(u, y) - c(u, x) = (a + b)(\omega(y) - \omega(x))$ and that $o(x) - o(y) = (b - (n - 1)a)(\omega(y) - \omega(x))$. Then we have to show that there exists $\beta > -\frac{1}{n-2}$ such that

$$(a + b)(\omega(y) - \omega(x)) \geq \beta(b - (n - 1)a)(\omega(y) - \omega(x)).$$

If $\omega(y) - \omega(x) \geq 0$, we can choose $\beta = 0$. If $\omega(y) - \omega(x) < 0$, then it has to be $a + b \leq \beta(b - (n - 1)a)$. We cannot have $b - (n - 1)a = 0$. Namely if $(n - 1)a < b$, then $b - (n - 1)a > 0$. Let instead $(n - 1)b < a$ and assume, by contradiction, that $b - (n - 1)a = 0$. Then we have $(n - 1)^2 a < a$. Thus $a \neq 0$ and so, since $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $a > 0$. It follows that $n(n - 2) < 0$ against $n \geq 3$. Then it is meaningful to define

$$\beta = \frac{a + b}{b - (n - 1)a}.$$

If $(n - 1)a < b$, then we have $\beta > 0 > -\frac{1}{n-2}$. If instead $(n - 1)b < a$, then this implies $\beta > -\frac{1}{n-2}$.

Next we show that $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$. Let $x, y, u \in V$ be distinct and let us show that there exists $\gamma = \gamma(x, y, u)$ such that $\gamma > -\frac{1}{n-2}$ and

$$c(x, u) - c(y, u) + c(u, x) - c(u, y) \geq \gamma(i(y) - i(x)),$$

in order to apply Proposition 20. Note that $c(x, u) - c(y, u) + c(u, x) - c(u, y) = (a + b)(\omega(x) - \omega(y))$ and that $i(y) - i(x) = (a - (n - 1)b)(\omega(x) - \omega(y))$. Then we have to show that there exists $\gamma > -\frac{1}{n-2}$ such that

$$(a + b)(\omega(x) - \omega(y)) \geq \gamma(a - (n - 1)b)(\omega(x) - \omega(y)).$$

If $\omega(x) - \omega(y) \geq 0$, we can choose $\gamma = 0$. If $\omega(x) - \omega(y) < 0$, then it has to be $(a+b) \leq \gamma(a - (n-1)b)$. As before, it cannot be $a - (n-1)b = 0$. Thus it is meaningful to define

$$\gamma = \frac{a+b}{a - (n-1)b}.$$

If $(n-1)b < a$, then we have $\gamma = \frac{a+b}{a - (n-1)b} > 0 > -\frac{1}{n-2}$. If $(n-1)a < b$, then this implies $\gamma > -\frac{1}{n-2}$. \square

Let us finally define two special sets of networks, namely

$$\mathcal{O} = \{(V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N} : \exists \omega_1 : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that, } \forall (x, y) \in A, c(x, y) = \omega_1(x)\},$$

$$\mathcal{I} = \{(V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N} : \exists \omega_2 : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ such that, } \forall (x, y) \in A, c(x, y) = \omega_2(y)\}.$$

Theorem 22. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{I}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}(N) = \mathfrak{B}(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N)$.*

Proof. If $n = 2$, then apply Corollary 18. Assume now that $n \geq 3$. If $N \in \mathcal{B}$, then apply Proposition 17. If $N \in \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{I}$, then apply Proposition 21 with $a = 1, b = 0, l = 0$ and with $a = 0, b = 1, l = 0$. \square

Consider now the set of networks $\mathcal{C} = \{(V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N} : c \text{ is constant}\}$. It is easily proved that if $n = 2$, then $\mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{N}$; if $n \geq 3$, then $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C}$. In particular, \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{I} have a very small intersection with the set of balanced networks, so that $\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{I}$ is, in general, considerably larger than \mathcal{B} .

7 Further properties of relations

In this section we collect several facts about relations which are fundamental for the analysis of the flow network rule and the flow k -multiwinner network solution. We stress that all the theorems and propositions of the section do not require that V has at least two elements, but only need that V is finite and nonempty.

Let us begin with recalling a classic result about acyclic relations which will turn out to be crucial in the sequel (Szpilrajn, 1939).

Theorem 23. *Let $R \in \mathbf{R}$. Then the following facts hold:*

- (a) *R is acyclic if and only if $\mathbf{L}^\diamond(R) \neq \emptyset$.*
- (b) *If R is acyclic and $x, y \in V$ are such that $(x, y) \notin R$ and $(y, x) \notin R$, then there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}^\diamond(R)$ such that $x >_L y$.*

The proofs of the next three useful facts are almost immediate. We give the proof of the third one only.

Proposition 24. *Let $R \in \mathbf{R}$, $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$ and $x^* \in V$. Assume that there exist distinct $y_1, \dots, y_{n-k} \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that, for every $j \in \llbracket n-k \rrbracket$, $x^* >_R y_j$. Then, for every $W \in C_k(R)$, $x^* \in W$.*

Proposition 25. *Let $R \in \mathbf{R}$ and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Then $W \in C_k(R^r)$ if and only if $V \setminus W \in C_{n-k}(R)$.*

Proposition 26. *Let $R \in \mathbf{R}$ be reflexive and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Then $C_k(R) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ if and only if $R = V^2$.*

Proof. Let $R = V^2$ and pick $W \in \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. Then, for every $x \in W$ and every $y \in V \setminus W$, we have $x \geq_R y$ and thus $W \in C_k(R)$. Conversely let $C_k(R) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. Assume, by contradiction, that there exist $x \in V$ and $y \in V$ such that $x \not\geq_R y$. Since R is reflexive, we necessarily have $x \neq y$. Since $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$, there exists $W \in \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ with $x \in W$ and $y \in V \setminus W$. The fact that $x \not\geq_R y$ says that $W \notin C_k(R)$ against $C_k(R) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. \square

We propose now several results about complete and quasi-acyclic relations. We emphasize that such results, establishing the general properties of the set \mathbf{A} , provide tools to control the properties of any possible network method with values in \mathbf{A} .

Proposition 27. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$. Then $\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) = \mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R)) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. We first show that $\mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R)) \subseteq \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$. Let $L \in \mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R))$. Thus L is linear and $L \supseteq S(R)$. We want to show that $L \subseteq R$. Pick $(x, y) \in L$. If $x = y$, then $(x, x) \in R$ because R is complete and then, in particular, reflexive. Let then $x \neq y$. Assume, by contradiction, that $(x, y) \notin R$. Since R is complete, we have $(y, x) \in R$ and then $(y, x) \in S(R)$. Thus $(y, x) \in L$ and, since L is antisymmetric, we get the contradiction $x = y$.

We next show that $\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \subseteq \mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R))$. Let $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$. Thus L is linear and $L \subseteq R$. We need to show that $S(R) \subseteq L$. Let $(x, y) \in S(R)$, so that we have $(x, y) \in R$, $(y, x) \notin R$. Assume, by contradiction, that $(x, y) \notin L$. Then, since L is complete, we have $(y, x) \in L$ and so also $(y, x) \in R$, a contradiction. Finally, since $R \in \mathbf{A}$, we have that $S(R)$ is acyclic so that, by Theorem 23, $\mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R)) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Proposition 28. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$, $x^* \in V$ and $W \subseteq V \setminus \{x^*\}$. Assume that, for every $y \in W$, $x^* >_R y$. Then, for every $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$ and $y \in W$, $x^* >_L y$.*

Proof. Let $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$. Then, by Proposition 27, we have that $L \in \mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R))$, that is, $L \supseteq S(R)$. Thus, $x^* >_R y$ for all $y \in W$ implies $x^* \geq_L y$ for all $y \in W$. On the other hand, since $W \subseteq V \setminus \{x^*\}$, we necessarily have $x^* >_L y$ for all $y \in W$. \square

Proposition 29. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$, $x^* \in V$ and $W \subseteq V \setminus \{x^*\}$. Assume that, for every $y \in W$, $x^* \geq_R y$. Then there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$ such that, for every $y \in W$, $x^* >_L y$.*

Proof. Let $Z = \{z \in W : z \sim_R x^*\}$ and note that $x^* \notin Z$. Then $W \setminus Z = \{y \in W : x^* >_R y\} \subseteq V \setminus \{x^*\}$ and, by Proposition 28, for every $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$ and $y \in W \setminus Z$, we have $x^* >_L y$. Thus, if $Z = \emptyset$, it is sufficient to pick any $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$. Assume next that $Z \neq \emptyset$. By the above observation, we only need to find $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$ such that for every $z \in Z$, $x^* >_L z$. Let $|Z| = m$ for some $1 \leq m \leq |W|$ and let $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$. Define, for every $i \in \{2, \dots, m+1\}$, $U_i(R) = \{(x^*, z_j) : j \in \llbracket i-1 \rrbracket\}$, and consider the $m+1$ relations on V given by $R_1 = S(R)$ and $R_i = S(R) \cup U_i(R)$. Note that, for every $i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket$, $(x^*, z_i) \notin R_i$ and $(z_i, x^*) \notin R_i$. Indeed, since $z_i \in Z$, we have that $(x^*, z_i) \notin S(R)$ and $(z_i, x^*) \notin S(R)$ and, by $U_i(R)$ definition, we also have $(x^*, z_i) \notin U_i(R)$, $(z_i, x^*) \notin U_i(R)$.

Let $I = \llbracket m+1 \rrbracket$. We claim that, for every $i \in I$, $\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_i) \neq \emptyset$. Assume, by contradiction, that there exists $i \in I$ such that $\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_i) = \emptyset$. Let $s = \min\{i \in I : \mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_i) = \emptyset\}$ and note that, since by Proposition 27, $\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_1) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R)) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \neq \emptyset$, we surely have $s \geq 2$. By definition of s , we then have $\mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_{s-1}) \neq \emptyset$. From $\mathbf{L}^\circ(R_{s-1}) \neq \emptyset$, by Theorem 23 (a), we deduce that R_{s-1} is acyclic. Moreover x^* and z_{s-1} are distinct $(x^*, z_{s-1}) \notin R_{s-1}$ and $(z_{s-1}, x^*) \notin R_{s-1}$. Thus, by Theorem 23 (b), there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_{s-1})$ such that $x^* >_L z_{s-1}$. Since $R_s = R_{s-1} \cup \{(x^*, z_{s-1})\}$, this says that $L \in \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_s)$. From $R_s \supseteq S(R)$ and from Proposition 27, we then deduce that $L \in \mathbf{L}^\circ(S(R)) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$. Hence $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_s)$, against the definition of s .

Now pick $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R) \cap \mathbf{L}^\circ(R_{m+1})$. Then we have $L \in \mathbf{L}_\circ(R)$ and $x^* >_L z_i$ for all $i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket$, as required. \square

Let W be a nonempty finite subset of V . Recall that the restriction of R to W is the relation on W defined by $R|_W = R \cap W^2$.

Proposition 30. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$ and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Then*

$$C_k(R) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)} C_k(L).$$

In particular, $1 \leq |C_k(R)| \leq |\mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)|$ and $C_k(R) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $C = \bigcup_{L \in \mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)} C_k(L)$. By Proposition 27, we have that $\mathbf{L}_\diamond(R) \neq \emptyset$ and, for every $L \in \mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)$, we have $|C_k(L)| = 1$. Thus surely $1 \leq |C| \leq |\mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)|$. We next show that $C_k(R) = C$. Let $W \in C$. Then there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)$ such that $W \in C_k(L)$. Thus, for every $x \in W$ and $y \in V \setminus W$, we have $x \geq_L y$ and so, since L is a refinement of R , we also have $x \geq_R y$. Hence $W \in C_k(R)$. Consider now $W \in C_k(R)$. Since $R|_W$ is a complete and acyclic relation on W and $R|_{V \setminus W}$ is a complete and acyclic relation on $V \setminus W$, by Proposition 27, we have that both admit linear refinements. Let L_1 be a linear refinement of $R|_W$ and L_2 be a linear refinement of $R|_{V \setminus W}$. Then

$$L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \{(x, y) \in V^2 : x \in W, y \in V \setminus W\}$$

is a refinement of R which is a linear order of V , that is, $L \in \mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)$. Moreover, $C_k(L) = \{W\}$. Hence $W \in C$. \square

The following result is now immediate taking into account that, given a relation R in \mathbf{A} , we have that its reversal is still in \mathbf{A} , and that $|\max(R)| = |C_1(R)|$ and $|\min(R)| = |\max(R^r)|$.

Corollary 31. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$. Then $1 \leq |\max(R)| \leq |\mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)|$ and $1 \leq |\min(R)| \leq |\mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)|$.*

Proposition 32. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$ and $k, l, m \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$ with $l \leq k \leq m$. Then for every $W \in C_k(R)$, there exist $W' \in C_m(R)$ and $W'' \in C_l(R)$ such that $W'' \subseteq W \subseteq W'$.*

Proof. Let $W \in C_k(R)$. Thus $W \subseteq V$, $|W| = k$ and, for every $x \in W$ and $y \in V \setminus W$, we have $x \geq_R y$. We first show that there exists $W' \in C_m(R)$ such that $W \subseteq W'$. The case $m = k$ is obvious. Assume then that $m > k$. Then $n \geq 3$ and $1 \leq m - k \leq (n - k) - 1$. Consider now the set $V \setminus W$, whose size is $n - k \geq 2$. The relation $R|_{V \setminus W}$ is quasi-acyclic and complete and so, by Proposition 30, we have that $C_{m-k}(R|_{V \setminus W}) \neq \emptyset$. Pick $\hat{W} \in C_{m-k}(R|_{V \setminus W})$ and define $W' = W \cup \hat{W}$. We show that $W' \in C_m(R)$. Surely $|W'| = m$ because the sets W and \hat{W} are disjoint. Let $x \in W'$ and $y \in V \setminus W'$. Since $V \setminus W' \subseteq V \setminus W$, if $x \in W$ we have $x \geq_R y$. Since $V \setminus W' \subseteq V \setminus \hat{W}$, if $x \in \hat{W}$ we also have $x \geq_R y$. We next show that there exists $W'' \in C_l(R)$ such that $W'' \subseteq W$. The case $l = k$ is obvious. Assume then that $l < k$. Then $n \geq 3$ and $1 \leq k - l \leq k - 1$. Since W has size $k \geq 2$ and the relation $R|_W$ is quasi-acyclic and complete, by Proposition 30 we have that $C_{k-l}(R|_W) \neq \emptyset$. Pick $\overline{W} \in C_{k-l}(R|_W)$ and define $W'' = W \setminus \overline{W}$. Then $W'' \subseteq W \subseteq V$ and $|W''| = l$. We show that $W'' \in C_l(R)$. Let $x \in W''$ and $y \in V \setminus W''$. If $y \in V \setminus W$, then $x \geq_R y$ because $x \in W$. If instead $y \in \overline{W}$, since $x \in W \setminus \overline{W}$, we have $y \geq_{R^r} x$, that is, $x \geq_R y$. \square

Proposition 33. *Let $R \in \mathbf{A}$, $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$ and $x^* \in V$. Assume that there exist distinct $y_1, \dots, y_{n-k} \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that, for every $j \in \llbracket n-k \rrbracket$, $x^* \geq_R y_j$. Then there exists $W \in C_k(R)$ such that $x^* \in W$.*

Proof. By Proposition 29, there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}_\diamond(R)$ such that, for every $j \in \llbracket n-k \rrbracket$, $x^* >_L y_j$. By Proposition 30, we have $C_k(R) \supseteq C_k(L)$ and we also know that $C_k(L) = \{W\}$ for a suitable $W \subseteq V$ with $|W| = k$. Assume now by contradiction that $x^* \notin W$. Then there exists $j^* \in \llbracket n-k \rrbracket$ such that $y_{j^*} \in W$. That leads to the contradiction $y_{j^*} >_L x^*$. \square

We end the section with a result which describes the effects on the set of the k -maximum sets of reversing a complete and quasi-transitive relation R . It says that there exists at least a k -maximum set for R which does not appear as a k -maximum set for the reversal of R .

Proposition 34. *Let $R \in \mathbf{T}$ with $R \neq V^2$. Then, for every $k \in \llbracket n - 1 \rrbracket$, $C_k(R) \not\subseteq C_k(R^r)$.*

Proof. Recalling that $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{T}$, by Corollary 31, we have that $\max(R) \neq \emptyset$ and that $\min(R) \neq \emptyset$. As a preliminary step, we show that there exist $x^* \in \max(R)$ and $y^* \in \min(R)$ such that $x^* >_R y^*$.

We first see that there exist $x^* \in \max(R)$ and $y \in V$ such that $x^* >_R y$. Assume, by contradiction, that that fact does not happen. Since $R \neq V^2$ and R is complete, there exist $x_0, x_1 \in V$ such that $x_1 >_R x_0$. In particular, $x_1 \neq x_0$. Since $x_1 \notin \max(R)$, there exists $x_2 \in V$ such that $x_1 \not\geq_R x_2$. By completeness, we then have $x_2 >_R x_1$ and, in particular, $x_2 \neq x_1$. We also have $x_2 \neq x_0$, otherwise we would have the cycle $x_0 >_R x_1 >_R x_0$. Since also $x_2 \notin \max(R)$ we can repeat the argument constructing a sequence x_0, \dots, x_m of arbitrary length $m \in \mathbb{N}$ of distinct elements of V , against V finite.

We now show that there exists $y^* \in \min(R)$ such that $x^* >_R y^*$. Assume, by contradiction, that that fact does not happen. By what shown above, there exists $y_0 \in V$ such that $x^* >_R y_0$. Since $y_0 \notin \min(R)$, there exists $y_1 \in V$ such that $y_1 \not\geq_R y_0$. By completeness $y_0 >_R y_1$ and, in particular, $y_1 \neq y_0$. Thus, by the transitivity of $S(R)$, we get $x^* >_R y_1$. Since $y_1 \notin \min(R)$, there exists $y_2 \in V$ with $y_1 >_R y_2$. In particular $y_2 \neq y_1$. We also have $y_2 \neq y_0$, otherwise we would have the cycle $y_0 >_R y_1 >_R y_0$. Thus, as before, we can repeat the argument constructing a sequence y_0, \dots, y_m of arbitrary length $m \in \mathbb{N}$ of distinct elements of V , against V finite.

Fix now $x^* \in \max(R)$ and $y^* \in \min(R)$ such that $x^* >_R y^*$. Note that, in particular, $x^* \neq y^*$. We prove that there exists $W' \in C_k(R)$ such that $x^* \in W'$ and $y^* \notin W'$. That implies the desired relation $C_k(R) \not\subseteq C_k(R^r)$ since certainly $W' \notin C_k(R^r)$, due to the fact that $y^* >_{R^r} x^*$.

By Proposition 33, there exists $W \in C_k(R)$ such that $x^* \in W$. If $y^* \notin W$, then set $W' = W$. Let then $y^* \in W$. Since $R_{|V \setminus W}$ is complete and acyclic, by Corollary 31, there exists $z^* \in \max(R_{|V \setminus W})$. Define then $W' = (W \setminus \{y^*\}) \cup \{z^*\}$ and show that it is indeed the k -subset we are looking for. Trivially we have that $|W'| = k$, $x^* \in W'$ and $y^* \notin W'$. Thus we are left with proving that $W' \in C_k(R)$. Consider then $x \in W'$ and $y \in V \setminus W'$. If $x \neq z^*$ and $y \neq y^*$, then $x \in W$ and $y \in V \setminus W$ so that $x \geq_R y$. Let next $y = y^*$. Then $x \geq_R y^*$ holds since $y^* \in \min(R)$. Finally let $x = z^*$ and $y \neq y^*$. Then $y \in V \setminus W$ and thus $z^* \geq_R y$ because $z^* \in \max(R_{|V \setminus W})$. \square

8 Properties of the flow network rule

In this section we propose some properties of the flow network rule. Namely, we prove that that rule is decisive, neutral, homogeneous and that it satisfies non-imposition, efficiency, monotonicity, reversal symmetry and symmetry properties (Propositions 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42, respectively). Moreover, we show that the flow network rule coincides with the Borda and the dual Borda network rule on a wide class of networks (Proposition 43). We emphasize that Propositions 37, 39, 40 and 41 are revisions of propositions stated, without proofs, in Belkin and Gvozdkik (1989).

Proposition 35. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 3 and Proposition 27. \square

Given $L \in \mathbf{L}$ and a bijection $\psi : V \rightarrow V$, let $\psi L \in \mathbf{L}$ be defined, for every $x, y \in V$, by setting $x \geq_{\psi L} y$ if and only if $\psi^{-1}(x) \geq_L \psi^{-1}(y)$.

Proposition 36. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\psi : V \rightarrow V$ be a bijection. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N^\psi) = \{\psi L : L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)\}$.*

Proof. We first show that if $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$ and $\psi : V \rightarrow V$ is a bijection, then $\psi L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N^\psi)$. Let $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$. We need to see that, for every $x, y \in V$, $x \succeq_{\psi L} y$ implies $x \succeq_{N^\psi} y$. Fix then $x, y \in V$ and assume that $x \succeq_{\psi L} y$, that is, $\psi^{-1}(x) \succeq_L \psi^{-1}(y)$. Since $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$, we have $\psi^{-1}(x) \succeq_N \psi^{-1}(y)$ and, by Proposition 8, we get $x \succeq_{N^\psi} y$.

Next let $M \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N^\psi)$ and prove that there exists $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$ such that $M = \psi L$. Define then $L = \psi^{-1}M$. Of course, we have that $M = \psi L$. Moreover, by the first part of the proof, $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ((N^\psi)^{\psi^{-1}}) = \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$. \square

By Proposition 9, we immediately obtain the next result.

Proposition 37. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathfrak{F}_\circ(\alpha N)$.*

Proposition 38. *Let $L \in \mathbf{L}$. Then there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \{L\}$.*

Proof. Consider the network N_L . Then, by Proposition 6, we have $\mathfrak{F}(N_L) = L$ and thus $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \{L\}$. \square

Proposition 39. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x^*, y^* \in V$ with $x^* \neq y^*$. Assume that $c(x^*, y^*) \geq c(y^*, x^*)$ and, for every $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y^*\}$, $c(x^*, z) \geq c(y^*, z)$ and $c(z, y^*) \geq c(z, x^*)$. Then there exists $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$ such that $x^* \succ_L y^*$. Moreover, if one of the conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Proposition 10 holds true, then, for every $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$, $x^* \succ_L y^*$.*

Proof. By Proposition 10, we have that $x^* \succeq_N y^*$. Then, by Proposition 29, there exists $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$ such that $x^* \succ_L y^*$. Moreover, if one of the conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Proposition 10 holds true, Proposition 10 gives $x^* \succ_N y^*$ and, by Proposition 28, we get $x^* \succ_L y^*$ for all $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$. \square

Proposition 40. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x^* \in V$. Let $N' = (V, A, c') \in \mathcal{N}$ be such that conditions (a) and (b) of Proposition 11 hold true. Then, for every $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$, there exists $L' \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N')$ such that $\{y \in V : x^* \succ_L y\} \subseteq \{y \in V : x^* \succ_{L'} y\}$. Assume further that, for every $y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$, $c'(x^*, y) > c(x^*, y)$ or $c'(y, x^*) < c(y, x^*)$. Then, for every $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$ and $L' \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N')$, we have that $\{y \in V : x^* \succ_L y\} \subseteq \{y \in V : x^* \succ_{L'} y\}$.*

Proof. Let $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$. Then $\{y \in V : x^* \succ_L y\} \subseteq \{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succeq_N y\}$. By Proposition 11, we have that $\{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succeq_N y\} \subseteq \{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succeq_{N'} y\}$. By Proposition 29, there exists $L' \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N')$ such that $\{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succeq_{N'} y\} \subseteq \{y \in V : x^* \succ_{L'} y\}$, and the first part of the statement follows.

Assume now that, for every $y \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$, $c'(x^*, y) > c(x^*, y)$ or $c'(y, x^*) < c(y, x^*)$ and consider $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$ and $L' \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N')$. Then $\{y \in V : x^* \succ_L y\} \subseteq \{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succeq_N y\}$. By Proposition 11, we have that $\{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succeq_N y\} \subseteq \{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succ_{N'} y\}$. By Proposition 28, we have that $\{y \in V \setminus \{x^*\} : x^* \succ_{N'} y\} \subseteq \{y \in V : x^* \succ_{L'} y\}$, and the second part of the statement follows. \square

Proposition 41. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N^r) = \{L^r : L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)\}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 12, we know that $\mathfrak{F}(N^r) = \mathfrak{F}(N)^r$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N^r) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(\mathfrak{F}(N^r)) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(\mathfrak{F}(N)^r)$ and it is immediately observed that $\mathbf{L}_\circ(\mathfrak{F}(N)^r) = \{L^r : L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)\}$. \square

Proposition 42. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}$ if and only if N is pseudo-symmetric.*

Proof. If N is pseudo-symmetric then, by Proposition 14, $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$ so that $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}$. Assume now $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}$. We complete the proof showing that $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$ and applying Proposition 14. Consider $x, y \in V$. If $x = y$, then $x \succeq_N y$. If $x \neq y$ then suppose, by contradiction, that $x \not\succeq_N y$. Since $\mathfrak{F}(N)$ is complete, we have that $y \succ_N x$. As a consequence, by Proposition 28, we have that, for every $L \in \mathfrak{F}_\circ(N)$, $y \succ_L x$ against $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}$. \square

The Borda network rule \mathfrak{B}_\circ and the dual Borda network rule $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_\circ$ are respectively defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by $\mathfrak{B}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(\mathfrak{B}(N))$ and $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N))$. Immediately from Theorem 22, we get the next proposition.

Proposition 43. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{I}$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N) = \mathfrak{B}_\circ(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_\circ(N)$.*

9 Properties of the flow k -multiwinner network solution

This section is devoted to present some remarkable properties of the flow k -multiwinner network solution. In the five propositions below we prove that it is decisive, neutral, homogeneous and satisfies a non-imposition property as well as a consistency property with respect to the parameter k (Propositions 44, 45, 46, 47 and 48, respectively).

Proposition 44. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. It immediately follows from Theorem 3 and Proposition 30. \square

The next two results are easily obtained applying Proposition 8 and Proposition 9.

Proposition 45. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$, $\psi : V \rightarrow V$ bijective and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_k(N^\psi) = \{\psi(W) : W \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N)\}$.*

Proposition 46. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_k(\alpha N) = \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$.*

Proposition 47. *Let $W \in \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. Then there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \{W\}$.*

Proof. Let L be a linear order having ranked in its first k positions the element of W . Then, by Proposition 6, we have $\mathfrak{F}(N_L) = L$ and thus $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \{W\}$. \square

Proposition 48. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $l, k, m \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$ with $l \leq k \leq m$. For every $W \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$, there exists $W' \in \mathfrak{F}_m(N)$ and $W'' \in \mathfrak{F}_l(N)$ such that $W'' \subseteq W \subseteq W'$.*

Proof. Apply Proposition 32 to the relation $\mathfrak{F}(N)$. \square

The next two propositions show that \mathfrak{F}_k satisfies properties sharing strong similarities with the concept of efficiency and monotonicity for social choice correspondences.

Proposition 49. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$, $x^* \in V$ and $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$. Assume that there exist distinct $y_1^*, \dots, y_k^* \in V \setminus \{x^*\}$ such that, for every $j \in \llbracket k \rrbracket$ and $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y_j^*\}$, we have $c(y_j^*, x^*) \geq c(x^*, y_j^*)$, $c(y_j^*, z) \geq c(x^*, z)$ and $c(z, x^*) \geq c(z, y_j^*)$. Then there exists $W \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$ such that $x^* \notin W$. Assume further that, for every $j \in \llbracket k \rrbracket$, at least one of the following conditions holds true:*

- (a) $c(y_j^*, x^*) > c(x^*, y_j^*)$;
- (b) for every $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y_j^*\}$, $c(y_j^*, z) > c(x^*, z)$;
- (c) for every $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y_j^*\}$, $c(z, x^*) > c(z, y_j^*)$;
- (d) there exists $z \in V \setminus \{x^*, y_j^*\}$ such that $c(y_j^*, z) > c(x^*, z)$ and $c(z, x^*) > c(z, y_j^*)$.

Then, for every $W \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$, $x^* \notin W$.

Proof. By Proposition 10, we have that, for every $j \in \llbracket k \rrbracket$, $y_j^* \geq_N x^*$. Then, for every $j \in \llbracket k \rrbracket$, $x^* \geq_{N^r} y_j^*$. By Proposition 33, there exists $W' \in C_{n-k}(\mathfrak{F}(N^r))$ such that $x^* \in W'$. Define now $W = V \setminus W'$. By Proposition 12, we have $C_{n-k}(\mathfrak{F}(N^r)) = C_{n-k}(\mathfrak{F}(N)^r)$, so that by Proposition 25, we get $W \in C_k(\mathfrak{F}(N)) = \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$, with $x^* \notin W$.

Assume now that one among (a), (b), (c) and (d) holds true too. Then, by Proposition 10, for every $j \in \llbracket k \rrbracket$, we have that $y_j^* >_N x^*$ that is $x^* >_{N^r} y_j^*$. Thus, by Proposition 24, we have $x^* \in W'$ for all $W' \in C_{n-k}(\mathfrak{F}(N^r)) = C_{n-k}(\mathfrak{F}(N)^r)$. By Proposition 25, it follows then that, for every $W \in C_k(\mathfrak{F}(N)) = \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$, $x^* \notin W$. \square

Proposition 50. *Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$, $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$, $W \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N)$ and $x^* \in W$. Let $N' = (V, A, c') \in \mathcal{N}$ be such that the conditions (a) and (b) of Proposition 11 hold true. Then there exists $W' \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N')$ such that $x^* \in W'$. Assume further that, for every $y \in V \setminus W$, we have $x^* >_N y$ or $c'(x^*, y) > c(x^*, y)$ or $c'(y, x^*) < c(y, x^*)$. Then, for every $W' \in \mathfrak{F}_k(N')$, we have $x^* \in W'$.*

Proof. By Proposition 11 we know that, for every $y \in V \setminus W$, $x^* \succeq_{N'} y$. Then, applying Proposition 33, we conclude. Assume now that, for every $y \in V \setminus W$, we have $x^* \succ_N y$ or $c'(x^*, y) > c(x^*, y)$ or $c'(y, x^*) < c(y, x^*)$. By Proposition 11 we know that, for every $y \in V \setminus W$, $x^* \succ_{N'} y$. Then applying Proposition 24 we conclude. \square

The next proposition describes the effects of reversing a network on the outcomes of the flow k -multiwinner network solution. Remarkably we have that if on a network and on its reversal the flow k -multiwinner network solution selects a unique k -maximum set, those two sets cannot coincide. We refer to that property by saying that \mathfrak{F}_k is immune to the reversal bias. The concept of immunity to the reversal bias has been introduced by Saari and Barney (2003) for voting systems and recently studied by Bubboloni and Gori (2016a, 2016b) in the framework of social choice correspondences.

Proposition 51. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \in \llbracket n - 1 \rrbracket$. Then the following facts hold:*

- (i) $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \neq \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ implies $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{F}_k(N^r)$;
- (ii) $|\mathfrak{F}_k(N)| = 1$ implies $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{F}_k(N^r)$;
- (iii) if $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \{W\}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_k(N^r) = \{U\}$, then $W \neq U$;
- (iv) If $N = N^r$, then $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$;
- (v) $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}_k(N^r) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$.

Proof. (i) Fix $N \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \neq \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. By Proposition 26, we have $\mathfrak{F}(N) \neq V^2$. Since $\mathfrak{F}(N) \in \mathbf{T}$, by Propositions 34 and 12, we get $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = C_k(\mathfrak{F}(N)) \not\subseteq C_k(\mathfrak{F}(N)^r) = C_k(\mathfrak{F}(N^r)) = \mathfrak{F}_k(N^r)$.

(ii) Since $n \geq 2$ and $k \in \llbracket n - 1 \rrbracket$, we have that $|\mathbb{P}_k(V)| \geq 2$. Thus $|\mathfrak{F}_k(N)| = 1$ implies $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \neq \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ and applying (i), we get $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{F}_k(N^r)$.

(iii) It follows immediately from (ii).

(iv) Let $N = N^r$. Then, $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathfrak{F}_k(N^r)$ and (i) gives $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$.

(v) By Proposition 26, we have that $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$. But, obviously, $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$ is also equivalent to $\mathfrak{F}(N)^r = V^2$ which, by Proposition 12, is equivalent to $\mathfrak{F}(N^r) = V^2$. This last fact, by Proposition 26, is in turn equivalent to $\mathfrak{F}_k(N^r) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. \square

The next proposition refers to the symmetry properties of the flow k -multiwinner network solution.

Proposition 52. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \in \llbracket n - 1 \rrbracket$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$ if and only if N is pseudo-symmetric.*

Proof. If N is pseudo-symmetric then, by Proposition 14, $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$ so that $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. Assume now $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathbb{P}_k(V)$. By Proposition 26 we get $\mathfrak{F}(N) = V^2$ and applying again Proposition 14 we conclude that N is pseudo-symmetric. \square

Given $k \in \llbracket n - 1 \rrbracket$, the Borda k -multiwinner network solution \mathfrak{B}_k and the dual Borda k -multiwinner network solution $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_k$ are respectively defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by $\mathfrak{B}_k(N) = C_k(\mathfrak{B}(N))$ and $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_k(N) = C_k(\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}(N))$. Immediately, from Theorem 22, we obtain that those classical solutions coincide with the k -multiwinner network solution on a wide class of networks.

Proposition 53. *Let $N \in \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{O} \cup \mathcal{I}$ and $k \in \llbracket n - 1 \rrbracket$. Then $\mathfrak{F}_k(N) = \mathfrak{B}_k(N) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_k(N)$.*

10 The Schulze network method

On the basis of the so called Schulze method introduced by Schulze (2011), we can formulate what we are going to call the *Schulze network method*.

Let $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x, y \in V$ with $x \neq y$. Define, for every $\gamma = x_1 \cdots x_m \in \Gamma(N, x, y)$,

$$\delta(\gamma) = \min\{c(x_i, x_{i+1}) : i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket\}$$

and put

$$s_{xy} = \begin{cases} \max\{\delta(\gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma(N, x, y)\} & \text{if } \Gamma(N, x, y) \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{if } \Gamma(N, x, y) = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

Let $s : A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ be the map associating to every $(x, y) \in A$ the number s_{xy} . We call s the Schulze function. Note that, due to the definition of path, $s_{xy} = 0$ if and only if there exists no path from x to y in N . Note also that $s_{xy} \geq c(x, y)$. Inspired by (2.2.5) in Schulze (2011), we get the following result.

Proposition 54. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then s satisfies the Gomory-Hu condition.*

Proof. We need to show that, for every $x, y, z \in V$ distinct, $s_{xz} \geq \min\{s_{xy}, s_{yz}\}$. By contradiction, assume that there exist $x, y, z \in V$ distinct such that $s_{xz} < \min\{s_{xy}, s_{yz}\}$. Thus, $s_{xy} > s_{xz}$ and $s_{yz} > s_{xz}$. In particular, $s_{xy} > 0$ and $s_{yz} > 0$.

Thus, by definition of s_{xy} , there exists a path $\gamma_{xy} = x_1 \cdots x_m \in \Gamma(N, x, y)$, with $m \geq 2$, such that $s_{xy} = \delta(\gamma_{xy}) \geq \delta(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma(N, x, y)$. In particular, for every $i \in \llbracket m-1 \rrbracket$, we have

$$c(x_i, x_{i+1}) \geq s_{xy} > s_{xz}. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, by definition of s_{yz} , there exists a path $\gamma_{yz} = y_1 \cdots y_l \in \Gamma(N, y, z)$, with $l \geq 2$, such that $s_{yz} = \delta(\gamma_{yz}) \geq \delta(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma(N, y, z)$. In particular, for every $i \in \llbracket l-1 \rrbracket$, we have

$$c(y_i, y_{i+1}) \geq s_{yz} > s_{xz}. \quad (28)$$

Being $x_m = y = y_1$, the set $\{i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket : x_i \in V(\gamma_{yz})\}$ is nonempty and hence there exists $\nu = \min\{i \in \llbracket m \rrbracket : x_i \in V(\gamma_{yz})\}$. Since in a path the vertices are distinct, there exists a unique $\mu \in \llbracket l \rrbracket$ such that $x_\nu = y_\mu$. Moreover, due to $x \neq z$, we have $(\nu, \mu) \neq (1, l)$.

If $\mu = l$, then $x_\nu = z$ and $\nu \geq 2$, so that, by (27), $\gamma = x_1 \cdots x_\nu \in \Gamma(N, x, z)$ and $\delta(\gamma) > s_{xz}$ which contradicts the definition of s_{xz} . If instead $\mu \leq l-1$ then, by definition of ν and μ , the vertices $x_1, \dots, x_\nu, y_{\mu+1}, \dots, y_l$ are all distinct and, by (27) and (28), all the arcs between two consecutive vertices in that list have capacity greater than s_{xz} . It follows that $\gamma = x_1 \cdots x_\nu y_{\mu+1} \cdots y_l \in \Gamma(N, x, z)$ and $\delta(\gamma) > s_{xz}$ which again contradicts the definition of s_{xz} . \square

The Schulze network method \mathfrak{S} is now defined associating with every $N \in \mathcal{N}$ the relation $\mathfrak{S}(N) = R(s)$. Then, by Proposition 54 and Proposition 2, we immediately get the next result which is completely analogous to Theorem 3.

Theorem 55. *Let $N \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\mathfrak{S}(N) \in \mathbf{T}$.*

Thus, we can replicate, word by word, all the definitions given in the flow environment. We obtain then the *Schulze network rule* defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by $\mathfrak{S}_\circ(N) = \mathbf{L}_\circ(\mathfrak{S}(N))$; the *Schulze k -multiwinner network solution* defined, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, by $\mathfrak{S}_k(N) = C_k(\mathfrak{S}(N))$. Of course, all the results obtained in the flow environment using only the fact that the flow relation is complete and quasi-transitive continue to hold true in the Schulze environment. In particular, since it is immediately observed that, for every $N \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $\mathfrak{S}(N^r) = \mathfrak{S}(N)^r$, Proposition 51 remains true substituting the symbol \mathfrak{F} with \mathfrak{S} . As a consequence, for every $k \in \llbracket n-1 \rrbracket$, $|\mathfrak{S}_k(N)| = 1$

implies $\mathfrak{S}_k(N) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{S}_k(N^r)$ so that, remarkably, the Schulze k -multiwinner network solution \mathfrak{S}_k is immune to the reversal bias.

On the other hand, there are some crucial differences between the flow and the Schulze network methods. Indeed, given $N \in \mathcal{N}$ and $x, y \in V$, considering s_{xy} instead of φ_{xy} to judge whether x is at least as good as y means to choose to focus only on the “best path” from x to y disregarding the contributes of the other paths. In our opinion, taking into account the whole network by considering the contribution not only of the main stream from x to y but also those of the secondary creeks, is more appropriate in many contexts. The next example concretely illustrates our point of view.

Example 56. Consider the competition D among the three teams in $V = \{A, B, C\}$ described by the table

A	1	1	B
A	1	1	C
B	0	1	C

and let N_D be the associated network. Then, for every $x \in \{B, C\}$, we have $c(A, x) = c(x, A) = 1$ and so also $s_{Ax} = s_{xA} = 1$. Moreover $s_{BC} = s_{CB} = 1$, so that s is a constant function. It follows that $\mathfrak{S}(N_D) = V^2$, so that, in particular, $\mathfrak{S}_1(N_D) = \{\{A\}, \{B\}, \{C\}\}$. On the other hand, being $\varphi_{AB} = 2$, $\varphi_{BA} = 1$, $\varphi_{AC} = 1$, $\varphi_{CA} = 2$, $\varphi_{BC} = 1$, $\varphi_{CB} = 2$, we instead have that $\mathfrak{F}(N_D)$ is the linear order L given by $C > A > B$ and so $\mathfrak{F}_1(N_D) = \{\{C\}\}$.²²

An accurate analysis of the Schulze network method as well as a comparison with the flow network method is surely an interesting issue. It goes beyond the aim of the present paper.

11 Comparison functions

Following Dutta and Laslier (1999), a comparison function on V is a function $g : V^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $(x, y) \in V^2$, $g(x, y) = -g(y, x)$. Denote by \mathcal{G} the set of all the comparison functions on V . Any correspondence from \mathcal{G} to V is called a choice correspondence²³. Some interesting choice correspondences are defined by Dutta and Laslier (1999) in their paper. They are called the uncovered set (UC), the sign-uncovered set (SUC), the minimal covering set (MC), the sign minimal covering set (SMC), the essential set (ES) and the sign essential set (SES) and, as their names suggest, can be seen as extensions of some classical tournament solutions.

Given $N = (V, A, c) \in \mathcal{N}$, it can be naturally associated with it the comparison function g_N , defined as follows

$$g_N(x, y) = \begin{cases} c(x, y) - c(y, x) & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

The function g_N is called the margin function of N . As a consequence, any choice correspondence F induces the 1-multiwinner network solution \mathfrak{G}_F associating with any $N \in \mathcal{N}$ the set $\{\{x\} \subseteq V : x \in F(g_N)\}$. Thus, it can be interesting a comparison between the flow 1-multiwinner network solution and the 1-multiwinner network solutions induced by the choice correspondences above mentioned. Even though a deep analysis of that problem it is outside the purposes of this paper, we can easily

²²Note that, on the network N_D , the Kemeny network rule and the ranked pair network rule are equal to $\{L, C > B > A, A > C > B\}$, while $\mathfrak{F}_\circ(N_D) = \{L\}$.

²³Actually, this definition is less general than the one in the paper of Dutta and Laslier. Nevertheless, it is sufficient for our purposes.

prove that, in general, $\mathfrak{F}_1 \neq \mathfrak{G}_{UC}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_1 \neq \mathfrak{G}_{MC}$. Indeed, consider $N = (V, A, c)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \{A, B, C, D\}; \\ A &= \{(x, y) \in V^2 : x, y \in \{A, B, C, D\} \text{ and } x \neq y\}; \\ c : A &\rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ is defined by} \\ c(A, B) &= 2, c(B, A) = 0, c(A, C) = 2, c(C, A) = 0, \\ c(A, D) &= 1, c(D, A) = 0, c(B, C) = 2, c(C, B) = 0, \\ c(B, D) &= 1, c(D, B) = 0, c(C, D) = 1, c(D, C) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

A simple computation shows that $\{D\} \notin \mathfrak{F}_1(N)$. Moreover, g_N is such that

$$\begin{aligned} g_N(A, B) &= 2, g_N(B, A) = -2, g_N(A, C) = 2, g_N(C, A) = -2, \\ g_N(A, D) &= 1, g_N(D, A) = -1, g_N(B, C) = 2, g_N(C, B) = -2, \\ g_N(B, D) &= 1, g_N(D, B) = -1, g_N(C, D) = 1, g_N(D, C) = -1. \end{aligned}$$

Since g_N is the same comparison function considered in Example 4.1 in Dutta and Laslier (1999), we get that $\{D\} \in UC(g_N) = MC(g_N)$ so that $\mathfrak{F}_1(N) \neq \mathfrak{G}_{UC}(N)$ and $\mathfrak{F}_1(N) \neq \mathfrak{G}_{MC}(N)$.

References

- Aziz, H., Brill, M., Fischer, F., Harrenstein, P., Lang, J., Seeding, H.G., 2015. Possible and necessary winners of partial tournaments. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 54, 493-534.
- Bang-Jensen, J., Gutin, G., 2008. *Digraphs Theory, Algorithms and Applications*. Springer.
- Belkin, A.R., Gvozdik, A.A., 1989. The flow model for ranking objects. *Problems of Cybernetics, Decision Making and Analysis of Expert Information*, Eds. Dorofeyuk, A., Litvak, B., Tjurin, Yu., Moscow, 109-117 (in Russian).
- Bouyssou, D., 1992. Ranking methods based on valued preference relations: A characterization of the net flow method. *European Journal of Operational Research* 60, 61-67.
- Brandt, F., Brill, M., Harrenstein, P., 2016. Extending tournament solutions. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Bubboloni, D., Gori, M., 2015. Symmetric majority rules. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 76, 73-86.
- Bubboloni, D., Gori, M., 2016a. On the reversal bias of the Minimax social choice correspondence. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 81, 53-61.
- Bubboloni, D., Gori, M., 2016b. Resolute refinements of social choices correspondences. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 84, 37-49.
- Csató, L., 2017. Some impossibilities of ranking in generalized tournaments. arXiv:1701.06539v4.
- De Donder, P., Le Breton, M., Truchon, M., 2000. Choosing from a weighted tournament. *Mathematical Social Sciences* 40, 85-109.
- Dutta and Laslier, 1999. Comparison functions and choice correspondences. *Social Choice and Welfare* 16, 513-532.
- Elkind, E., Faliszewski, P., Skowron, P., Slinko, A., 2017. Properties of Multiwinner Voting Rules. *Social Choice and Welfare*. doi:10.1007/s00355-017-1026-z.
- Gomory, R. E., Hu T. C., 1961. Multi-terminal network flows. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 9, No. 4, 551-570.

- González-Díaz, J., Hendrickx, R., Lohmann, E., 2014. Paired comparisons analysis: an axiomatic approach of ranking methods. *Social Choice and Welfare* 42, 139-169.
- Gvozdk, A.A., 1987. Flow interpretation of the tournament model for ranking. Abstracts of the VI-th Moscow Conference of young scientists on cybernetics and computing, Moscow: Scientific Council on Cybernetics of RAS, 1987, p.56 (in Russian).
- Hartmann, M., Schneider, M.H., 1993. Flow symmetry and algebraic flows. *ZOR - Methods and Models of Operations Research* 38, 261-267.
- Kitti, M., 2016. Axioms for centrality scoring with principal eigenvectors. *Social Choice and Welfare* 46, 639-653.
- Langville, A. N., Meyer, C. D., 2012. *Who Is #1? The Science of Rating and Ranking*. Princeton University Press.
- Laslier, J.-F., 1997. *Tournament solutions and majority voting*. *Studies in Economic Theory*, Volume 7. Springer.
- Lovász, L., 1973. Connectivity in digraphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory (B)* 15, 174-177.
- Palacios-Huerta, I., Volij, O., 2004. The measurement of intellectual influence. *Econometrica* 72, 963-977.
- Patel, Jaymin, 2015. College football rankings: maximum flow model. *Industrial Engineering Undergraduate Honors Theses*, paper 35.
- Peris, J.E., Subiza, B., 1999. Condorcet choice correspondences for weak tournaments. *Social Choice and Welfare* 16, 217-231.
- Saari, D.G., 1994. *Geometry of Voting*. In: *Studies in Economic Theory*, vol. 3. Springer.
- Saari, D.G., Barney, S., 2003. Consequences of reversing preferences. *The Mathematical Intelligencer* 25, 17-31.
- Schulze, M., 2011. A new monotonic, clone-independent, reversal symmetric, and Condorcet-consistent single-winner election method. *Social Choice and Welfare* 36, 267-303.
- Slutzki, G., Volij, O., 2005. Ranking participants in generalized tournaments. *International Journal of Game Theory* 33, 255-270.
- Szpilrajn, E., 1930. Sur l'extension de l'ordre partiel. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 16, 386-389.
- van den Brink, R., Gilles, R.P., 2009. The outflow ranking method for weighted directed graphs. *European Journal of Operational Research* 193, 484-491.
- Vaziri, B., Dabadghao, S., Yih, Y., Morin, T. L., 2017. Properties of sports ranking methods. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 1-12, doi:10.1057/s41274-017-0266-8.