

Opinion pooling on general agendas: Linearity or just neutrality?

Citation for published version (APA):

Dietrich, F. K., & List, C. (2008). *Opinion pooling on general agendas: Linearity or just neutrality? An appendix to "Opinion pooling on general agendas"*.

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2008

Document Version:

Accepted author manuscript (Peer reviewed / editorial board version)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Opinion pooling on general agendas: linearity or just neutrality?

An appendix to "Opinion pooling on general agendas" (F. Dietrich and C. List)¹

Franz Dietrich & Christian List

September 2007, revised April 2008

In "Opinion pooling on general agendas", we characterize linear and neutral opinion pooling functions $F : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, where unlike in the classical opinion pooling problem the agenda X of relevant events need not form a σ -algebra. These characterizations are based on two conditions on the pooling function: independence and implication-preservation. The latter condition is stronger than the standard (Pareto-like) condition of zero-preservation. In the present appendix, (i) we show that our characterizations would not in general hold if instead of implication-preservation we merely require zero-preservation; but (ii) for an interesting class of agendas, zero-preservation (still together with independence) suffices to force pooling to be neutral (Theorem 3) while leaving room for non-linear pooling (Theorem 4). These results suggest that without invoking the requirement of implication-preservation a normative defense of linear pooling becomes difficult. The framework and notation is the same as in the original paper.²

Say that a relevant event $A \in X$ *conditionally entails* another one $B \in X$ (written $A \vdash^* B$) if $\{A\} \cup Y$ entails B (i.e. $\bigcap_{C \in \{A\} \cup Y} C \subseteq B$) for some countable set $Y \subseteq X$ that is consistent with A (i.e. $\bigcap_{C \in \{A\} \cup Y} C \neq \emptyset$) and with B^c (i.e. $\bigcap_{C \in \{B^c\} \cup Y} C \neq \emptyset$). The agenda X is *pathconnected* if for any two events $A, B \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ there exist events $A_1, \dots, A_k \in X$ ($k \geq 1$) such that $A = A_1 \vdash^* A_2 \vdash^* \dots \vdash^* A_k = B$. In other words, any two contingent events in the agenda can be connected by a path of conditional entailments.³ For instance, $X := \{A, A^c : A \subseteq \mathbf{R} \text{ is a bounded interval}\}$ is a pathconnected agenda (a subset of the Borel- σ -algebra Σ over $\Omega = \mathbf{R}$).⁴ One easily shows that

¹The first version of the main paper still contained this appendix.

²Note however that, as zero-preservation does not anymore refer to the probability of events outside the agenda X , one might for the purpose of the present appendix re-define a pooling function as a mapping from \mathcal{P}_X^n to \mathcal{P}_X rather than for \mathcal{P}^n to \mathcal{P} , where \mathcal{P}_X is the set of functions $P : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that can be extended to a probability measure on Σ .

³Conditional entailment and pathconnectedness are closely related to the notions of conditional entailment and total blockedness introduced in a binary (not probabilistic) setup by Nehring and Puppe, "Strategy-proof social choice on single-peaked domains: possibility, impossibility and the space between", working paper (2002). The strategy to prove Theorem 3 reminds of arguments made in that paper (in particular, our lemma has an analogue in the binary setup).

⁴For example, a path of conditional entailments between the intervals $[0, 1]$ and $[2, 3]$ can

pathconnected agendas are non-simple; but many non-simple agendas are not pathconnected.

We now give a characterization of neutral pooling based on requiring just zero-preservation, not implication-prerservation.

Theorem 3 (a) *For a pathconnected agenda, every independent zero-preserving pooling function is neutral.*

(b) *For a non-pathconnected finite agenda, not every independent zero-preserving pooling function is neutral.*

So, for a pathconnected agenda, independence leads to neutrality. Does it even lead to linearity? The answer is negative, as the next theorem shows.

Theorem 4 *For some pathconnected agenda X (in some σ -algebra Σ over some set of worlds Ω), not every neutral zero-preserving pooling function is linear.*

The following lemma is central for proving part (a) of Theorem 3.

Lemma *For any independent and zero-preserving pooling function, $A \vdash^* B$ implies $D_A \leq D_B$ for all relevant events $A, B \in X$ (where $D_A : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the local pooling criterion for A , and D_B is that for B).*

Proof. Let F, A, B, D_A, D_B be as specified, and assume $A \vdash^* B$, say in virtue of the set $Y \subseteq X$. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^n$. We show that $D_A(x) \leq D_B(x)$. As $\cap_{C \in \{A\} \cup Y} C$ has empty intersection with B^c (by the conditional entailment), it equals its intersection with B ; in particular, $\cap_{C \in \{A, B\} \cup Y} C \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, as $\cap_{C \in \{B^c\} \cup Y} C$ has empty intersection with A , it equals its intersection with A^c ; in particular, $\cap_{C \in \{A^c, B^c\} \cup Y} C \neq \emptyset$. Hence there are worlds $\omega \in \cap_{C \in \{A, B\} \cup Y} C$ and $\omega' \in \cap_{C \in \{A^c, B^c\} \cup Y} C$. For each individual i , consider the probability measure $P_i : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined by

$$P_i := x_i \delta_\omega + (1 - x_i) \delta_{\omega'},$$

where $\delta_\omega, \delta_{\omega'} : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote the Dirac-measures in ω and ω' , respectively. As each P_i satisfies $P_i(A) = P_i(B) = x_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) &= D_A(P_1(A), \dots, P_n(A)) = D_A(x), \\ P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B) &= D_B(P_1(B), \dots, P_n(B)) = D_B(x). \end{aligned}$$

Further, for each P_i and each $C \in Y$ we have $P_i(C) = 1$, so that $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) = 1$ (by zero-preservation), and hence $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\cap_{C \in Y} C) = 1$ since the intersection of

be constructed as follows: $[0, 1] \vdash^* [0, 3]$ (one may conditionalise on the empty set of events $Y = \emptyset$, i.e. the entailment is *unconditional*), and $[0, 3] \vdash^* [2, 3]$ (one may conditionalise on $Y = \{[2, 4]\}$).

countably many events of probability one has again probability one. So

$$\begin{aligned} P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\cap_{C \in \{A\} \cup Y} C) &= P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) = D_A(x), \\ P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\cap_{C \in \{B\} \cup Y} C) &= P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B) = D_B(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\cap_{C \in \{A\} \cup Y} C) \leq P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\cap_{C \in \{B\} \cup Y} C)$ since

$$\cap_{C \in \{A\} \cup Y} C = \cap_{C \in \{A, B\} \cup Y} C \subseteq \cap_{C \in \{B\} \cup Y} C$$

(for the equality, see an earlier argument). So $D_A(x) \leq D_B(x)$, as desired. ■

Proof of Theorem 3. (a) Let X be pathconnected and F independent and zero-preserving. If $X = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, F is obviously neutral, as desired. Now let $X \neq \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and write D_A for the local pooling criterion of any contingent event $A \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. As X is pathconnected, repeated application of the above lemma yields $D_A \leq D_B$ for all $A, B \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, and hence $D_A = D_B$ for all $A, B \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. Define D as the common pooling criterion D_A of all $A \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. We complete the neutrality proof by showing that D also works as a pooling criterion for \emptyset and Ω . Consider any $P_1, \dots, P_n \in \mathcal{P}$. By definition of probability measures,

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(\emptyset) &= \dots = P_n(\emptyset) = P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\emptyset) = 0, \\ P_1(\Omega) &= \dots = P_n(\Omega) = P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(\Omega) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that $D(0, \dots, 0) = 0$ and $D(1, \dots, 1) = 1$, which follows from zero-preservation.

(b) Now let X be finite and not pathconnected. By an argument in the main paper, we may assume that the σ -algebra generated by X is the entire σ -algebra Σ . Notationally, for any sub- σ -algebra $\bar{\Sigma} \subseteq \Sigma$, let $\mathcal{A}(\bar{\Sigma})$ be its set of atoms (i.e. with respect to set-inclusion minimal non-empty elements). We now define a pooling function and show that it has the desired properties. As an ingredient to the definition, let $D' : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $D'' : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the local decision rules of two distinct linear pooling functions; and let $\bar{A} \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ be a (by assumption existing) event such that not for all $A \in X \setminus \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ there is $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$, where " \vdash^* " stands for the existence of a finite path of conditional entailments as in the definition of pathconnectedness. Consider any profile $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \in \mathcal{P}^n$. To define a probability measure $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n} : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we start by defining probability measures on two sub- σ -algebras of Σ , denoted Σ' and Σ'' and defined as the σ -algebras generated by the sets

$$\begin{aligned} X' &:= \{A \in X : \bar{A} \vdash^* B \text{ for both } B \in \{A, A^c\}\}, \\ X'' &:= \{A \in X : \bar{A} \vdash^* B \text{ for no } B \in \{A, A^c\}\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Let $P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n} : \Sigma' \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and $P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n} : \Sigma'' \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) &= D'(P_1(A), \dots, P_n(A)) \text{ for all } A \in \Sigma', \\ P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) &= D''(P_1(A), \dots, P_n(A)) \text{ for all } A \in \Sigma''. \end{aligned}$$

The functions are indeed probability measures (on Σ' resp. Σ''), as they are linear averages of of probability measures.

Claim 3. The σ -algebras Σ' and Σ'' are logically independent, that is: if $A' \in \Sigma'$ and $A'' \in \Sigma''$ are non-empty, so is $A' \cap A''$.

Suppose the contrary. Then, as each non-empty element of Σ' is a superset of an atom of Σ' and hence of a non-empty intersection of events in X' , and similarly for Σ'' , there are consistent sets $Y' \subseteq X'$ and $Y'' \subseteq X''$ such that $Y' \cup Y''$ is inconsistent. Let Y be a minimal inconsistent subset of $Y' \cup Y''$. Y is not a subset of any of Y' and Y'' , because the latter sets are consistent. So there are $A \in Y \cap X'$ and $B \in Y \cap X''$. Note that $A \vdash^* B^c$, a contradiction since $A \in X'$ and $B^c \in X''$, q.e.d.

We now extend the measures P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n} and P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n} to a probability measure on the σ -algebra $\tilde{\Sigma}$ generated by $\Sigma' \cup \Sigma''$, i.e. generated by $X' \cup X''$, in such a way that the events in Σ' are probabilistically independent of those in Σ'' . By Claim 3, the atoms of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ are precisely the intersections of an atom of Σ' and one of Σ'' : $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Sigma}) = \{A' \cap A'' : A' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'), A'' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'')\}$. Let $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ be the unique measure on $\tilde{\Sigma}$ that behaves as follows on the atoms:

$$\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A' \cap A'') = P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A') P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A'') \quad (1)$$

for all $A' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma')$ and all $A'' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'')$. This measure is indeed a probability measure, because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Sigma})} \tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) &= \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'), A'' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'')} P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A') P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A'') \\ &= \sum_{A' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma')} P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A') \underbrace{\sum_{A'' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'')} P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A'')}_{=1} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

As one easily checks, restricting $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ to Σ' resp. Σ'' gives P'_{P_1, \dots, P_n} resp. P''_{P_1, \dots, P_n} , and so

$$\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) = \begin{cases} D'(P_1(A), \dots, P_n(A)) & \text{for all } A \in \Sigma' \\ D''(P_1(A), \dots, P_n(A)) & \text{for all } A \in \Sigma''. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Before we can extend $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ to the full σ -algebra Σ , we first prove another claim. For all $A \in X$ such that $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$ but not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A^c$, define

$$A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} := \begin{cases} A & \text{if } P_i(A) > 0 \text{ for some } i \\ A^c & \text{if } P_i(A) = 0 \text{ for all } i. \end{cases}$$

Claim 4. For all atoms C of $\tilde{\Sigma}$ ($= \sigma(X' \cup X'')$) with $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) > 0$, the event $C \cap (\bigcap_{A \in X: \bar{A} \vdash^* A \text{ and not } \bar{A} \vdash^* A^c} A_{P_1, \dots, P_n})$ is an atom of Σ .

Let C be as specified, and write C_{P_1, \dots, P_n} for the event in question. As noted above, C takes the form $C = A' \cap A''$ with $A' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma')$ and $A'' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma'')$. By $P(C) > 0$ and (1), we have $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A') > 0$ and $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A'') > 0$. As $A' \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma')$, we may write $A' = \bigcap_{A \in Y'} A$ for some set $Y' \subseteq X'$ containing exactly one member of each pair $A, A^c \in X'$. Similarly, $A'' = \bigcap_{A \in Y''} A$ for some set $Y'' \subseteq X''$ containing exactly one member of each pair $A, A^c \in X''$. Note also that $\bigcap_{A \in X: \bar{A} \vdash^* A}$ and not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A^c A_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ can be written as $\bigcap_{A \in Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}} A$, where the set

$$Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = \{A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} : A \in X, \bar{A} \vdash^* A, \text{ not } \bar{A} \vdash^* A^c\}$$

consists of exactly one member of each pair $A, A^c \in X \setminus (X' \cup X'')$. Thus $C_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = \bigcap_{A \in Y' \cup Y'' \cup Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}} A$, where the set $Y' \cup Y'' \cup Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ consists of exactly one member of each pair $A, A^c \in X$. So, as Σ is generated by X , C_{P_1, \dots, P_n} is either an atom or is empty. Hence it suffices to show that $C_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \neq \emptyset$. Suppose the contrary. Then $Y' \cup Y'' \cup Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ is inconsistent, hence has a minimal inconsistent subset Y . We distinguish two cases and derive a contradiction in each.

Case 1: there is a $B \in Y \cap Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ with $\bar{A} \vdash^* B$. Consider any $B' \in Y \setminus \{B\}$. We have (i) not $\bar{A} \vdash^* B'$: otherwise, by $B' \vdash^* B^c$ we would have $\bar{A} \vdash^* B^c$, hence $B \in X'$, in contradiction to $B \in Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$. Further, as $\bar{A} \vdash^* B$ and $B \vdash^* (B')^c$, we have (ii) $\bar{A} \vdash^* (B')^c$. By (i) and (ii), and letting $A := (B')^c$, the event $A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} (\in \{A, A^c\})$ is well-defined. As Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n} contains $A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} (\in \{A, A^c\})$, and contains $B' = A^c$ but not $(B')^c = A$, we must have $A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = A^c$. So all i have $P_i(A) = 0$, i.e. all i have $P_i(B') = 1$. Since this holds for all $B' \in Y \setminus \{B\}$, all i have $P_i(\bigcap_{B' \in Y} B') = P_i(B)$. Hence, as Y is inconsistent, all i have $P_i(B) = 0$. Hence, $B_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = B^c$. So $B^c \in Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$, in contradiction to $B \in Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$.

Case 2: there is no $B \in Y \cap Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ with $\bar{A} \vdash^* B$. Then all $B \in Y \cap Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ take the form $A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = A^c$, so that all i have $P_i(A) = 0$, i.e. all i have $P_i(B) = 1$. So, (*) all i have $P_i(\bigcap_{B \in Y} B) = P_i(\bigcap_{B \in Y \setminus Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n}} B)$. Now, we have either (i) $Y \subseteq Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \cup Y'$, or (ii) $Y \subseteq Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \cup Y''$, because otherwise there exist an $A' \in Y'$ and an $A'' \in Y''$, and we have $A' \vdash^* (A'')^c$, hence $\bar{A} \vdash^* (A'')^c$, a contradiction by $(A'')^c \in X''$. First suppose (i). Then $Y \setminus Y_{P_1, \dots, P_n} \subseteq Y'$, and so (*) implies that (**) all i have $P_i(\bigcap_{B \in Y} B) \geq P_i(\bigcap_{B \in Y'} B) = P_i(A')$. As by assumption $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A') > 0$, there exists by (2) at least one i with $P_i(A') > 0$, hence by (**) with $P_i(\bigcap_{B \in Y} B) > 0$. So $\bigcap_{B \in Y} B \neq \emptyset$, i.e. Y is consistent, a contradiction. Similarly, under (ii) one can show that Y is consistent, a contradiction, q.e.d.

Now we define P_{P_1, \dots, P_n} as the unique measure Σ that assigns the following measure to the atoms of Σ . If an atom takes the form in Claim 4, i.e. the form

$$B = C \cap (\bigcap_{A \in X: \bar{A} \vdash^* A \text{ and not } \bar{A} \vdash^* A^c} A_{P_1, \dots, P_n})$$

where $C \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Sigma})$ and $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) > 0$, then we define its measure as

$$P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B) = \tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C).$$

Any other atom has measure defined as zero.

Claim 5. P_{P_1, \dots, P_n} extends $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ (hence, is a probability measure).

It suffices to show that P_{P_1, \dots, P_n} coincides with $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ on $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Sigma})$. Consider any $C \in \mathcal{A}(\tilde{\Sigma})$. As Σ is a refinement of $\tilde{\Sigma}$, we have

$$P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma): B \subseteq C} P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B). \quad (3)$$

There are two cases.

Case 1: $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) = 0$. Then for all $B \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma)$ with $B \subseteq C$ we have $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B) = 0$ (by definition of P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}), and so by (3) we have $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) = 0 = \tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C)$, as desired.

Case 2: $\tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) > 0$. Then, among all atoms $B \in \mathcal{A}(\Sigma)$ with $B \subseteq C$, there exists (by definition of P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}) exactly one with $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B) > 0$ (namely $B = C \cap (\bigcap_{A \in X: \bar{A} \vdash^* A \text{ and not } \bar{A} \vdash^* A^c} A_{P_1, \dots, P_n})$), and this B receives probability $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(B) = \tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C)$. So by (3) we have $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C) = \tilde{P}_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(C)$, q.e.d.

Claim 6. For all $A \in X$ such that $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$ and not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A^c$, $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A)$ is 1 if some individual i has $P_i(A) > 0$, and 0 otherwise.

By definition of P_{P_1, \dots, P_n} , every atom of Σ that has positive probability is a subset of the event $\bigcap_{A \in X: \bar{A} \vdash^* A \text{ and not } \bar{A} \vdash^* A^c} A_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$, and so this event has probability 1. It follows that, for all $A \in X$ such that $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$ and not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A^c$, we have $P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A_{P_1, \dots, P_n}) = 1$, and hence

$$P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = A, \text{ i.e. if } P_i(A) > 0 \text{ for some } i \\ 0 & \text{if } A_{P_1, \dots, P_n} = A^c, \text{ i.e. if } P_i(A) = 0 \text{ for all } i, \end{cases}$$

q.e.d.

By Claim 5, we have constructed a well-defined pooling function $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \mapsto P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$. By (2) and Claims 5 and 6, we know its behaviour on the entire agenda X : the pooling function is independent with local decision criterion D_A given by

- (i) the linear criterion D' if $A \in X'$,
- (ii) the different linear criterion D'' if $A \in X''$,
- (iii) a non-linear criterion \hat{D} (taking everywhere except on $(0, \dots, 0)$ the value 1) if $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$ but not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A^c$,
- (iv) the non-linear criterion $1 - \hat{D}$ if not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$ but $\bar{A} \vdash^* A^c$.

These decision criteria also ensure unanimity-preservation. To see that pooling is not neutral, it suffices to show that, of the four different types of events (i)-(iv), at least two occur. The latter is so because \bar{A} is of type (i) or (iii) and because by assumption there exists an $A \in X$ such that not $\bar{A} \vdash^* A$, i.e. such that A has type (ii) or (iv). ■

Proof of Theorem 4. Our counterexample uses a set $\Omega := \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4\}$ of (pairwise distinct) states ω_k , the σ -algebra $\Sigma := \{A : A \subseteq \Omega\}$ (the power set of

Ω), and the agenda $X := \{A \subseteq \Omega : |A| = 2\}$ (the set of binary events). As X is negation-closed and non-empty, it is indeed an agenda.

1. In this part of the proof, we show that X is pathconnected. Consider any events $A, B \in X$. We construct a path from A to B , by distinguishing three cases.

Case 1: $A = B$. Then the path is trivial, since $A \vdash^* A$ (take $Y = \emptyset$).

Case 2: A and B have exactly one world in common. We may then write $A = \{\omega_A, \omega\}$ and $B = \{\omega_B, \omega\}$ with $\omega_A, \omega_B, \omega$ pairwise distinct. We have $\{\omega_A, \omega\} \vdash^* \{\omega\}$ (take $Y = \{\{\omega, \omega'\}\}$, where ω' is the element of $\Omega \setminus \{\omega_A, \omega_B, \omega\}$) and $\{\omega\} \vdash^* \{\omega_B, \omega\}$ (take $Y = \emptyset$).

Case 3: A and B have no world in common. We may then write $A = \{\omega_A, \omega'_A\}$ and $B = \{\omega_B, \omega'_B\}$ with $\omega_A, \omega'_A, \omega_B, \omega'_B$ pairwise distinct. We have $\{\omega_A, \omega'_A\} \vdash^* \{\omega_A, \omega_B\}$ (take $Y = \{\{\omega_A, \omega'_B\}\}$) and $\{\omega_A, \omega_B\} \vdash^* \{\omega_B, \omega'_B\}$ (take $Y = \{\{\omega_B, \omega'_A\}\}$).

2. In this part, we construct a pooling function $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \mapsto P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ that is zero-preserving, neutral, but not linear. As an ingredient to the construction, consider first a linear pooling function $L : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. We show that L can be transformed into a non-linear pooling function that is still neutral and zero-preserving. We use an (arbitrary) fixed transformation $T : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that:

- (i) $T(1 - x) = 1 - T(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ (hence $T(1/2) = 1/2$);
 - (ii) $T(0) = 0$ (hence by (i) $T(1) = 1$);
 - (iii) T is strictly concave on $[0, 1/2]$ (hence by (i) strictly convex on $[1/2, 1]$).
- (Such a T indeed exists; e.g. $T(x) = 4(x - 1/2)^3 + 1/2$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.)

We prove that for every probability measure $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ (thought of as the outcome of applying the linear pooling function L) there exist real numbers $p_k = p_k^Q$, $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ (thought of as the new probabilities of the states ω_k , $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$, after transforming Q) such that:

- (a) $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \geq 0$ and $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 = 1$;
- (b) for all $A \in X$, $\sum_{k: \omega_k \in A} p_k = T(Q(A))$.

This completes the proof, because by (a) a pooling function $F : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \mapsto P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}$ can be defined by letting

$$P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) := \sum_{k: \omega_k \in A} p_k^{L(P_1, \dots, P_n)} \text{ for all } A \in \Sigma,$$

which by (b) satisfies

$$P_{P_1, \dots, P_n}(A) = T(L(P_1, \dots, P_n)(A)) \text{ for all } A \in X,$$

implying that F is neutral (as L is neutral), zero-preserving (as L is zero-preserving and $T(0) = 0$), and non-linear (as L is linear and T a non-linear transformation).

Let $Q \in \mathcal{P}^n$. For any $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, put $q^k := Q(\{\omega_k\})$; and for any $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, k < l$, put $q_{kl} = Q(\{\omega_k, \omega_l\})$.

In order for numbers p_1, \dots, p_4 to satisfy (b), they must satisfy the system

$$p_k + p_l = T(q_{kl}) \text{ for all } k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \text{ with } k < l.$$

Given $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 = 1$, three of these six equalities are redundant. Indeed, suppose that $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, k < l$, and define $k', l' \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, k' < l'$, by $\{k', l'\} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \setminus \{k, l\}$. By $p_k + p_l = 1 - p_{k'} - p_{l'}$ and $T(q_{kl}) = T(1 - q_{k'l'}) = 1 - T(q_{k'l'})$, the equality $p_k + p_l = T(q_{kl})$ is equivalent to $p_{k'} + p_{l'} = T(q_{k'l'})$. So (b) reduces (given $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 + p_4 = 1$) to the system

$$p_1 + p_2 = T(q_{12}), p_1 + p_3 = T(q_{13}), p_2 + p_3 = T(q_{23}).$$

We now solve this system of three linear equations in $(p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \mathbf{R}^3$. Write $t_{kl} := T(q_{kl})$ for all $k, l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, k < l$.

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & t_{12} \\ 1 & & 1 & t_{13} \\ & 1 & 1 & t_{23} \end{pmatrix} &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & t_{12} \\ & -1 & 1 & t_{13} - t_{12} \\ & & 2 & t_{23} + t_{13} - t_{12} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & t_{12} \\ & 1 & -1 & t_{12} - t_{13} \\ & & 1 & \frac{t_{23} + t_{13} - t_{12}}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} p_3 &= \frac{t_{23} + t_{13} - t_{12}}{2}, \\ p_2 &= t_{12} - t_{13} + \frac{t_{23} + t_{13} - t_{12}}{2} = \frac{t_{12} + t_{23} - t_{13}}{2}, \\ p_1 &= t_{12} - \frac{t_{12} + t_{23} - t_{13}}{2} = \frac{t_{12} + t_{13} - t_{23}}{2}, \\ p_4 &= 1 - (p_1 + p_2 + p_3) = 1 - \frac{t_{12} + t_{13} + t_{23}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

We have to show that the numbers p_1, \dots, p_4 so-defined satisfy not only (b) and $p_1 + \dots + p_4 = 1$ but also the remaining condition in (a), i.e. non-negativity. We do this by proving two claims.

Claim 1. $p_4 \geq 0$, i.e. $\frac{t_{12} + t_{13} + t_{23}}{2} \leq 1$.

We have to prove that $T(q_{12}) + T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \leq 2$. Note that

$$q_{12} + q_{13} + q_{23} = q^1 + q^2 + q^1 + q^3 + q^2 + q^3 = 2(q^1 + q^2 + q^3) \leq 2.$$

We distinguish three cases.

Case 1: all of q_{12}, q_{13}, q_{23} are all $\geq 1/2$. Then by (i)-(iii) $T(q_{12}) + T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \leq q_{12} + q_{13} + q_{23} \leq 2$, as desired.

Case 2: at least two of q_{12}, q_{13}, q_{23} are $< 1/2$. Then, again using (i)-(iii), $T(q_{12}) + T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) < 1/2 + 1/2 + 1 = 2$, as desired.

Case 3: exactly one of q_{12}, q_{13}, q_{23} is $< 1/2$. Suppose $q_{12} < 1/2 \leq q_{13} \leq q_{23}$ (otherwise just switch the roles of q_{12}, q_{13}, q_{23}). For all $\delta \geq 0$ such that $q_{13} - \delta, q_{23} + \delta \in [1/2, 1]$, the convexity of T on $[1/2, 1]$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} T(q_{13}) &\leq \frac{1}{2} [T(q_{13} - \delta) + T(q_{23} + \delta)] \\ \text{and } T(q_{23}) &\leq \frac{1}{2} [T(q_{13} - \delta) + T(q_{23} + \delta)], \end{aligned}$$

so that (by adding these two inequalities)

$$T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \leq T(q_{13} - \delta) + T(q_{23} + \delta).$$

This inequality may be applied to $\delta = 1 - q_{23}$, since

$$q_{13} - (1 - q_{23}) = (q_{13} + q_{23} + q_{12}) - q_{12} - 1 \leq 2 - q_{12} - 1 = 1 - q_{12} \in [1/2, 1];$$

which gives us

$$T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \leq T(q_{13} - (1 - q_{23})) + T(1).$$

On the right hand side of this inequality, we have $T(1) = 1$ and, by $q_{13} - (1 - q_{23}) \leq 1 - q_{12}$ and T 's increasingness, $T(q_{13} - (1 - q_{23})) \leq T(1 - q_{12}) = 1 - T(q_{12})$. So we obtain $T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \leq 1 + 1 - T(q_{12})$, i.e. $T(q_{12}) + T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \leq 2$, as desired.

Claim 2. $p_k \geq 0$ for all $k = 1, 2, 3$.

We only show that $p_1 \geq 0$, as the proofs for p_2 and p_3 are analogous. We have to prove that $t_{13} + t_{23} - t_{12} \geq 0$, i.e. that $T(q_{13}) + T(q_{23}) \geq T(q_{12})$, or equivalently that $T(q^1 + q^3) + T(q^2 + q^3) \geq T(q^1 + q^2)$. As T is an increasing function, it suffices to establish $T(q^1) + T(q^2) \geq T(q^1 + q^2)$. Again, we consider three cases.

Case 1: $q^1 + q^2 \leq 1/2$. Suppose $q^1 \leq q^2$ (otherwise the roles of q^1 and q^2 get swapped). For all $\delta \geq 0$ such that $q^1 - \delta, q^2 + \delta \in [0, 1/2]$, the concavity of T on $[0, 1/2]$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} T(q^1) &\geq \frac{1}{2} [T(q^1 - \delta) + T(q^2 + \delta)] \\ \text{and } T(q^2) &\geq \frac{1}{2} [T(q^1 - \delta) + T(q^2 + \delta)], \end{aligned}$$

so that (by adding these inequalities)

$$T(q^1) + T(q^2) \geq T(q^1 - \delta) + T(q^2 + \delta)$$

Applying this to $\delta = q^1$ yields $T(q^1) + T(q^2) \geq T(0) + T(q^2 + q^1) = T(q^1 + q^2)$, as desired.

Case 2: $q^1 + q^2 > 1/2$ but $q^1, q^2 \leq 1/2$. By (i)-(iii),

$$T(q^1) + T(q^2) \geq q^1 + q^2 \geq T(q^1 + q^2),$$

as desired.

Case 3: $q^1 > 1/2$ or $q^2 > 1/2$. Suppose $q^2 > 1/2$ (otherwise swap q^1 and q^2 in the proof). Then $q^1 < 1/2$, as otherwise $q^1 + q^2 > 1$. Define $y := 1 - q^1 - q^2$. As also $y < 1/2$, an argument analogous to that in case 1 yields $T(q^1) + T(y) \geq T(q^1 + y)$, i.e. $T(q^1) + T(1 - q^1 - q^2) \geq T(1 - q^2)$. So, by (i), $T(q^1) + 1 - T(q^1 + q^2) \geq 1 - T(q^2)$, i.e. $T(q^1) + T(q^2) \geq T(q^1 + q^2)$. ■

One might wonder why the pooling function constructed in the proof of Theorem 4 violates implication-preservation – which it must do since Theorem 2 tells us that implication-preserving independent pooling functions must be linear (for non-simple, hence in particular for pathconnected agendas). Let Ω, Σ, X be as in the proof, and consider a profile with complete unanimity: all individuals i give ω_1 probability 0, each of ω_2, ω_3 probability $1/4$, and hence ω_4 probability $1/2$. As $\{\omega_1\}$ is the difference of two events in X (e.g. $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\} \setminus \{\omega_2, \omega_3\}$), implication-preservation would require the collective probability of ω_1 to be 0 too. But the collective probability of ω_1 is (in the notation of the proof) given by

$$p_1 = \frac{t_{12} + t_{13} - t_{23}}{2} = \frac{T(q_{12}) + T(q_{13}) - T(q_{23})}{2},$$

where q_{kl} is the collective probability of $\{\omega_k, \omega_l\}$ under a linear pooling function, so that q_{kl} equals the unanimous individual probability of $\{\omega_k, \omega_l\}$. So

$$p_1 = \frac{T(1/4) + T(1/4) - T(1/2)}{2} = T(1/4) - \frac{T(1/2)}{2},$$

which is strictly positive as T is strictly concave on $[0, 1/2]$ with $T(0) = 0$.