AUSTRALASIAN JOURNAL OF COMBINATORICS
Volume **46** (2010), Pages 191–202

The plurality strategy on graphs

Kannan Balakrishnan

Department of Computer Applications
Cochin University of Science and Technology
Cochin – 682 022
India
bkannan@cusat.ac.in

Manoj Changat*

Department of Futures Studies, University of Kerala
Trivandrum – 695 034
India
mchangat@gmail.com

Henry Martyn Mulder

Econometrisch Instituut, Erasmus Universiteit
P.O. Box 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam
The Netherlands
hmmulder@few.eur.nl

Abstract

Goldman [*Transportation Science* 5 (1971), 212–221] proved the classical result on how to find the medians for a set of clients in a tree using majority rule. Here the clients are located at vertices of the tree, and a median is a vertex in the tree that minimizes the sum of the distances to the locations of the clients. The majority rule can be rephrased as the Majority Strategy: if we are at vertex v, then we move to neighbor w of v if a majority of the clients is closer to w than to v. This strategy can be applied in any connected graph. In Mulder [*Discrete Applied Math.* 80 (1997), 97–105] the question was answered for which connected graphs the Majority Strategy always produces the set of medians for any given set of clients: these are precisely the median graphs. This class of graphs has been well-studied in the literature. In this paper we relax the Majority Strategy: instead of requiring a majority of the clients to be

* This work was done under the DST, Govt. of India grant M/04–1999 awarded to this author. The financial support of the DST, New Delhi is gratefully acknowledged.

closer to w than to v, we move to w if there are more vertices closer to w than to v (thus ignoring the clients at equal distance from v and w). The main result of the paper is that the Plurality Strategy always produces the median set for any given set of clients if and only if all median sets are connected. We prove a similar result for the Hill Climbing strategy and for the Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing strategy.

1 Introduction

The Median Problem is a typical problem in location theory: given a set of clients one wants to find an optimal location for a facility serving the clients. The criterion for optimality is minimizing the sum of the distances from the location of the facility to the locations of the clients. The solution of this location problem is generally known as a *median*. The *median set* is the set of all medians. One way to model this is using a network, where clients are positioned on points and the facility has to be placed on a point as well, see for instance [21, 22, 16]. In the discrete case, the network is just a connected graph and the clients and medians are located at vertices. One may also formulate the median problem in terms of achieving consensus amongst the clients. This approach has been fruitful in many other applications, e.g. in social choice theory, clustering, and biology, see for instance [6, 15, 3].

From the view point of consensus the classical result of Goldman [11] is very interesting: to find the median in a tree just move to the majority of the clients. This idea has been used in many algorithmic approaches to the median problem, see for instance [16], see [7] for a recent application, where the 'minority strategy' is used to find anti-medians (vertices maximizing the distance-sum). In [18] such a majority strategy was formulated for arbitrary connected graphs. The problem now is that in general this strategy does not necessarily find the median set for every set of clients. It was proved that the majority strategy finds all medians for any set of clients if and only if the graph is a median graph. A median graph is a connected graph in which any set of three clients has a unique median vertex. The class of median graphs comprises that of the trees as well as that of the hypercubes and grids. It allows a rich structure theory, see e.g. [17, 14, 13, 1]. Median graphs and related structures have found many and various applications, e.g. in location theory, consensus theory, informatics, mathematical biology, chemistry, and literary science. Although median graphs may seem to be rather exotic at first sight, it was proved in [12] that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the class of connected triangle-free graphs and a special subclass of median graphs. Hence, loosely speaking, in the universe of all graphs there are at least as many median graphs as there are connected triangle-free graphs.

In the Majority Strategy we compare the two ends of an edge v and w: if we are at v and at least half of the clients is strictly nearer to w than to v, then we move to w. We could also formulate this in terms of voting: the clients strictly nearer to w vote for w, all others for v. Now, if w gets at least half of the votes, we move from v to w. We can rephrase the voting rule as follows: all clients at equal distance from v and w vote for v, the other clients vote for the nearest vertex among v and w. From the view point of voting this seems rather odd. A more natural voting rule would be that the votes of clients at equal distance from v and w are ignored and the other clients vote for the nearest of the two. Then we would want to move from v to w if w gets at least as many votes as v. Otherwise stated: if we are at v, then we move to w if there are at least as many clients nearer to w than to v. Note that in this case less than half of the clients may actually be nearer to w because there are clients having equal distance to v and w. We call this strategy the Plurality Strategy[1]. It is the first obvious and natural generalization of the Majority Strategy. Now we have the obvious and natural question: for which connected graphs does the Plurality Strategy always produce the median set for any given set of clients. The aim of this paper is to answer this question. At first sight one might expect a simple generalization of median graphs to be the answer to our question: there are many such classes available in the literature. But it turns out to be a much wider class: it is exactly the case when the median set induces a connected subgraph, for any set of clients (see [2]). The same holds for two other strategies from the literature: Hill Climbing and Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing, cf. [19]. Especially the first one of these is widely used in computer science. Note that median graphs are a specific instance of such graphs: in median graphs median sets are even convex. The connected graphs with connected median sets still form a quite interesting class of graphs, see [2]. One striking property is that local medians are also global medians, see below for details.

In Section 2 we list the necessary definitions and notations, and we discuss the Majority Strategy. In Section 3 we introduce the Plurality Strategy and recite the two other strategies from the literature: Hill Climbing and Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing. After reciting some results from the literature on graphs with connected medians and proving some preliminary results, we prove our main result: each of the three strategies given in this section, applied on a connected graph, produces the median set for any set of clients if and only if the graph has connected median sets.

2 Consensus Strategies

All graphs considered in this paper are finite, connected, undirected, simple graphs without loops. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E. The distance function of G is denoted by d, where $d(u, v)$ is the length of a shortest u, v-path. We call a subset W of V a *connected set* if it induces a connected subgraph in G.

A *profile* $\pi = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k)$ on G is a finite sequence of vertices in V, and $|\pi| = k$ is the *length* of the profile. Note that the definition of a profile allows multiple occurrences of a vertex. The *distance* of a vertex v to π is defined as

$$D(v, \pi) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} d(x_i, v).$$

[1]The idea of the Plurality Strategy was already proposed by Mulder in 1996.

A vertex minimizing $D(v, \pi)$ is a *median* of the profile. The set of all medians of the profile π is the *median set* of π and is denoted by $M(\pi)$. A vertex x such that $D(x, \pi) \leq D(y, \pi)$, for all neighbors y of x is a *local median* of π. The set of all local medians is denoted by $M_{loc}(\pi)$. For an edge vw in G, we denote by π_{vw} the subprofile of π consisting of the elements of π strictly closer to v than to w.

Let $T = (V, E)$ be a tree, and let π be a profile on T. In the classical paper of Goldman [11] the majority algorithm was formulated for finding a median vertex of π. We rephrase it here so as to serve our purposes. We can find the median set $M(\pi)$ of π as follows. Assume we are in a vertex v of T, and let w be a neighbor of v. If at least half of the elements of π is nearer to w than to v, then we have $D(w, \pi) \leq D(v, \pi)$. So, in moving from v to w, we improve our position (strictly speaking, our position does not get worse). We proceed in this way (moving to majority) until we arrive at a median vertex x of π. If x is the unique median vertex of π, then, for each neighbor z of x, there is a strict minority of π at the side of z, that is, there are strictly fewer elements of π nearer to z than to x. So we will *not* move to z. If π is even, then it is possible that we have an edge xy such that at both sides of this edge there lies exactly half of π. In this case both x and y must be in $M(\pi)$, and we can move back and forth along the edge xy. It is straightforward to show (see Goldman [11]) that in this case $M(\pi)$ is a path containing xy, and for each edge on this path exactly half of π is on one side of this edge and exactly half is on the other side. Moreover, for any vertex z outside the path, but adjacent to some vertex y on the path, there is a strict minority of π nearer to z than to y. So, according to our rule, we can move freely along this path. On the other hand, we may never leave this path. Thus we can formulate the stopping rule: either we get stuck at a vertex (in which case this vertex is the unique median vertex), or we visit some vertices at least twice, and for each neighbor z of such a vertex, either z is also visited at least twice or there is a strict minority at the side of z.

In [18] this majority strategy was formalized for arbitrary graphs.

Majority Strategy
Input: A connected graph G, a profile π on G, and an *initial vertex* in V.
Output: The unique vertex where we get stuck or the set of vertices visited at least twice.

1. Start at the initial vertex.

2. [**MoveMS**] If we are in v and w is a neighbor of v with $|\pi_{wv}| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\pi|$, then we *move* to w.

3. We move only to a vertex already visited if there is no alternative.

4. We stop when
(i) we are stuck at a vertex v *or*
(ii) [**TwiceMS**] we have visited vertices at least twice, and, for each vertex v visited at least twice and each neighbor w of v, either $|\pi_{wv}| < \frac{1}{2}|\pi|$ or w is also visited at least twice.

In general the output of the Majority Strategy will depend on the profile as well as the initial vertex from which we start. For instance, take the complete graph K_3 on the three vertices u, v, w and take the profile $\pi = (u, v, w)$. Then $M(\pi) = \{u, v, w\}$. Now take, say, u as initial vertex and consider its neighbor v. Then only v is closer to v than to u, hence we may *not* move to v. Similarly, we may not move to w, and we are stuck at u. So we do not find the whole median set $M(\pi)$. Moreover, the output depends on the choice of the initial vertex. This gives rise to the question for which graphs the Majority Strategy will actually always find the median set for each profile, and for which graphs the output does not depend on the choice of the initial vertex. This was answered in [18].

Theorem A *Let G be a graph. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *G is a median graph.*
2. *Majority Strategy produces the median set $M(\pi)$ from any initial vertex, for each profile π on G.*
3. *Majority Strategy produces the same set from any initial vertex, for each profile on G.*

It was also proved in [18] that the above theorem holds when we restrict ourselves to profiles (x, y, z) of length 3 such that $d(y, z) \leq 2$.

The Majority Strategy can also be formulated in terms of voting: If we are at v and w is a neighbor of v, then the elements of π_{wv} vote for w, all other elements of π vote for v, that is, all elements with equal distance to v and w vote for v and all other elements vote for the vertex nearest to it. We move to w only if at least half of π votes for w. Thus in the Majority Strategy vertices at equal distance from v and w are "assigned" to v when deciding on which side of the edge the majority of the profile is located. Such vertices do not exist in bipartite graphs, but in the non-bipartite case they make a difference. From the viewpoint of finding medians however, one would like to ignore such vertices at equal distance from v and w. This is the reason for the Plurality Strategy below. We collect also similar strategies from the literature: Hill Climbing and Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing from Artificial Intelligence cf. [19]. Then conditions under which a move is made differ, whence also the stopping rule in case vertices are visited twice. We only recite the moves in which the strategies differ from the Majority Strategy. Loosely speaking one could say that the rule for the Plurality Strategy is "moving towards more". For the Hill Climbing strategies we actually have to compare the distance sums (i.e. the "costs") at v and its neighbors. These strategies are widely used in computer science.

Plurality Strategy

2. [**MovePS**] If we are in v and w is a neighbor of v with $|\pi_{wv}| \geq |\pi_{vw}|$, then we *move* to w.

4. (ii) [**TwicePS**] we have visited vertices at least twice, and, for each vertex v visited at least twice and each neighbor w of v, either $|\pi_{wv}| < |\pi_{vw}|$ or w is also visited at least twice.

The next two strategies were introduced to find a (local) minimum based on a heuristic function in a search graph. So the versions as in [19] make a move only to previously unexplored vertices. Because our purpose in this paper is to find all medians (i.e. the median set) of a profile, we have adapted the strategies such that we are able to visit vertices more than once.

Hill Climbing

2. [**MoveHC**] If we are in v and w is a neighbor of v with $D(w, \pi) \leq D(v, \pi)$, then we *move* to w.

4. (ii) [**TwiceHC**] we have visited vertices at least twice, and, for each vertex v visited at least twice and each neighbor w of v, either $D(w, \pi) > D(v, \pi)$ or w is also visited at least twice.

Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing

2. [**MoveSA**] If we are in v and w is a neighbor of v with $D(w, \pi) \leq D(v, \pi)$ and $D(w, \pi)$ is minimum among all neighbors of v, then we move to w.

4. (ii) [**TwiceSA**] = [**TwiceHC**].

The next simple lemma shows that Plurality Strategy and Hill Climbing produce the same output on any connected graph. Note that on bipartite graphs Majority and Plurality Strategy (hence also Hill Climbing) coincide, since there are no vertices at equal distance from the two ends of an edge.

Lemma 1 *Let G be a connected graph and π a profile on G. Plurality Strategy makes a move from vertex v to vertex w if and only if $D(w, \pi) \leq D(v, \pi)$.*

Proof. The assertion follows immediately from the following computation:

$$D(v, \pi) - D(w, \pi) = \sum_{x \in \pi_{vw}} d(v, x) + \sum_{x \in \pi_{wv}} d(v, x) - \sum_{x \in \pi_{vw}} d(w, x) - \sum_{x \in \pi_{wv}} d(w, x) =$$

$$= \sum_{x \in \pi_{vw}} d(v, x) + \sum_{x \in \pi_{wv}} d(v, x) - \sum_{x \in \pi_{vw}} (d(v, x) + 1) - \sum_{x \in \pi_{wv}} (d(v, x) - 1) = |\pi_{wv}| - |\pi_{vw}|.$$

□

Next we present an example that shows that Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing is essentially different from the other strategies. Note that the other strategies might make a move from v as soon as they find a neighbor w of v that satisfies the condition for a move, while Steepest Ascent has to check *all* neighbors of v before it can make a move. For a comparison of efficiencies of these strategies, see [8]. Consider the graph $K_{2,3}$ with vertices a, b and $1, 2, 3$, where two vertices are adjacent if and only if one is a 'letter'and the other a 'numeral'. Now take the profile $\pi = (b, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3)$. Then we have $D(a, \pi) = 11$, $D(b, \pi) = 9$, and $D(i, \pi) = 13$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Take 1 as initial vertex and assume that we check its neighbors in alphabetical order. Then Majority, Plurality and Hill Climbing move to a and get stuck there, whereas Steepest Ascent moves to b and thus finds the median vertex of π.

This example also shows that the first three strategies might not find the median vertex at all, even if the graph is bipartite. As we will see below, the special property of $K_{2,3}$ is that the profile $\rho = (1, 2, 3)$ has median set $\{a, b\}$, which is *not* connected.

3 Graphs with connected median sets

In general any subgraph may appear as a median set, see [20]. Graphs with connected median sets were characterized by Bandelt and Chepoi [2]. We need some definitions and notations for their main result.

A *weight function* on G is a mapping f from V to the set of non-negative real numbers. We say that f has a *local minimum* at $x \in V$ if $f(x) \leq f(y)$ for every y adjacent to x. We say that a function f has a *strict local minimum* at $x \in V$ if $f(x) < f(y)$ for every y adjacent to x. We call a weight function f *rational* if $f(x)$ is rational for every $x \in V$. For a vertex v of G, we define

$$D_f(v) = D(v, f) = \sum_{x \in V} d(v, x) f(x).$$

Note that D_f is a weight function on G as well. A *local median* of f is a vertex u such that D_f has a local minimum at u. The set of all local medians of a weight function f is denoted by $M_{loc}(f)$. A *median* of f is a vertex u such that D_f has a global minimum at u. The *median set* $M(f)$ of f is the set of all medians of f.

Theorem 2 ([2]) *Let G be a connected graph. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *The median set $M(f)$ is connected, for all weight functions f on G.*

2. *$M(f) = M_{loc}(f)$, for all weight functions f on G.*

Next we show that, for the purpose of computing median sets, profiles and rational weight functions are equivalent. Using this we characterize the class of graphs on which the Plurality Strategy produces the median set of a profile, starting from an arbitrary vertex.

Let π be a profile on G. Then the *weight function associated with* π is the function f_π, where $f_\pi(x)$ denotes the number of occurrences of x in π. The following lemma follows immediately from the definitions.

Lemma 3 *Let G be a connected graph, and let π be a profile with associated weight function f_π. Then $D(v, \pi) = D(v, f_\pi)$, for every v in V. Furthermore, $M(f_\pi) = M(\pi)$, and $M_{loc}(f_\pi) = M_{loc}(\pi)$.*

Let f be a weight function on a connected graph G. For a positive real number t, we define tf to be the weight function with $(tf)(x) = t \times f(x)$. Then we have $M(tf) = M(f)$. Also we have $M_{loc}(tf) = M_{loc}(f)$. Finally, D_{tf} has a strict local minimum at a vertex w if and only if D_f has a strict local minimum at w.

Lemma 4 *Let g be rational weight function on a connected graph G. Then there is a profile π on G such that $f_\pi = tg$ for some positive integer t.*

Proof. Let $\frac{p_1}{q_1}, \ldots, \frac{p_r}{q_r}$, be the rational non-zero values of g, say at the vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_r$ respectively. Let t be the product of the denominators $q_1, \ldots, q_r$. Then tg is an integer valued weight function, with values, say $n_1, \ldots, n_r$ at the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_r$, respectively, and zero elsewhere. Now consider the profile π constructed by taking n_1 times v_1, and n_2 times v_2, ..., and n_r times v_r. Then we have $f_\pi = tg$. □

In other words, medians of profiles are exactly medians of rational weight functions. Next we prove that real-valued weight functions may be replaced by rational-valued weight functions, and thus by profiles, when one wants to compute median sets. First we prove two lemmata.

Lemma 5 *Let G be a connected graph, and let f be a weight function on G such that D_f has a local minimum at vertex u, which is not a global minimum. Then there is a weight function g such that D_g has a strict local minimum at u, which is not a global minimum. Furthermore if f is rational, then g may also be taken rational.*

Proof. First note that, for any two vertices x and y, we have $d(x, y) < n = |V|$. Let $D(u, f) = \epsilon_1$. Let D_f have a global minimum at z, that is, $D(z, f) = \epsilon < \epsilon_1$. Let $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon$. Now define the function g as follows.

$$g(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) & \text{if} \quad v \neq u \\ f(u) + \frac{\epsilon_2}{n} & \text{if} \quad v = u. \end{cases}$$

Then $D(u, g) = D(u, f)$, because in these sums the values $f(u)$ and $g(u)$ of the functions at u are multiplied by $d(u, u) = 0$. For any vertex w adjacent to u, we have

$$D(w, g) = D(w, f) + \frac{\epsilon_2}{n} > D(w, f) \geq D(u, f) = D(u, g).$$

So D_g has a strict local minimum at u. Furthermore,

$$D(z, g) = D(z, f) + d(u, z)\frac{\epsilon_2}{n} < D(z, f) + \epsilon_2 = D(u, f) = D(u, g).$$

So g has a strict local minimum at w that is not a global minimum. Also if f is rational, then ϵ_2 is rational. So g is also rational. □

Lemma 6 *Let G be a connected graph with the property that, for each rational weight function g, every local minimum of D_g is also a global minimum. Then the same property holds for any real-valued weight function f on G.*

Proof. Assume that for some real-valued weight function f there is a local minimum for D_f, at some vertex u that is not a global minimum. In view of the preceding lemma, we may assume that D_f has a strict local minimum at u. Let D_f have a global minimum at z, and let

$$\epsilon_1 = \min\{D(u,f) - D(w,f) \mid w \text{ adjacent to } u\},\ \epsilon_2 = D(u,f) - D(z,f),$$

$$\epsilon = \frac{\min(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)}{n^2}.$$

Now choose a rational weight function g such that $g(v) > f(v)$ and $g(v) - f(v) < \epsilon$, for all v. Then, for any vertex w adjacent to u, we have $D(u,g) < D(u,f) + \epsilon \times n^2 \leq D(u,f) + \epsilon_1 < D(w,f) < D(w,g)$. So u is a local minimum for D_g. Moreover, we have $D(z,g) < D(z,f) + \epsilon \times n^2 \leq D(z,f) + \epsilon_2 < D(u,f) < D(u,g)$. So u is not a global minimum for D_g, which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 7 *For a connected graph G the following are equivalent.*

1. *The median set $M(f)$ is connected, for all weight functions f on G.*
2. *$M(f) = M_{loc}(f)$, for all weight functions f on G.*
3. *$M(f) = M_{loc}(f)$, for all rational weight functions f on G.*
4. *$M(\pi) = M_{loc}(\pi)$, for all profiles π on G.*

Proof. (1) and (2) are equivalent by Theorem 2. (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) follows trivially since every rational weight function is also real-valued. (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows from Lemma 6.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4): Let π be a profile on G. Now consider the weight function f_π. By Lemma 3, $D(v, f_\pi) = D(v, \pi)$. Since D_{f_π} cannot have any local minimum that is not a global minimum, D_π also cannot have any local minimum that is not a global minimum.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Let g be any rational weight function on G. By Lemma 4, there is a positive integer t and a profile π such that $f_\pi = tg$. By Lemma 3, $D_{f_\pi} = D_\pi$, and, as observed above, D_{f_π} has a local minimum that is not a global minimum if and only if D_g have a local minimum that is not a global minimum. So D_g cannot have a local minimum that is not a global minimum. □

The main result of this paper is now an easy consequence of the results above.

Theorem 8 *The following are equivalent for a connected graph G.*

1. *Plurality Strategy produces $M(\pi)$ from any initial vertex, for all profiles π on G.*
2. *$M(\pi)$ is connected, for all profiles π on G.*
3. *$M(\pi) = M_{loc}(\pi)$, for all profiles π on G.*

4. *Hill Climbing produces $M(\pi)$ from any initial vertex, for all profiles π on G.*

5. *Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing produces $M(\pi)$ from any initial vertex, for all profiles π on G.*

6. *Plurality Strategy (Hill Climbing, Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing) produces the same set from any initial vertex, for all profiles.*

Proof. (1) ⇒ (2): Suppose the median set is not connected for some profile π. Then let v and w be two vertices in different components of $M(\pi)$. Now, if Plurality Strategy starts at v, then it cannot reach vertex w, because a move from a median vertex to a non-median vertex is not possible by Lemma 1. So the set computed by Plurality Strategy will not include w, which is a contradiction.

(2) ⇒ (3): This follows from Theorem 7.

(3) ⇒ (4): Starting at any vertex, Hill Climbing always finds a local minimum. Since this local minimum is also global, we see that Hill Climbing always reaches the median. Moreover, since the median is connected, it produces all the median vertices.

(4) ⇒ (1): Assume that Hill Climbing finds the median set. This means that Hill Climbing will move to a median starting from any vertex and finds all the other medians. The same moves will be made by Plurality Strategy, by Lemma 1. Hence Plurality Strategy will compute the median set correctly.

(3) ⇒ (5) follows similarly to (3) ⇒ (4).

(5) ⇒ (2) follows from the fact that Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing finds a local minimum and does move from median to median but does not move from a median to a non-median.

To include (6), we consider the three strategies separately. First the Plurality Strategy: (1) ⇒ (6) is obvious. (6) ⇒ (1) follows from the fact that, starting from a median, Plurality Strategy can produce only a set of medians which includes the initial vertex. So starting from any median it produces the same set if and only if the produced set is actually $M(\pi)$.

Next (6) for Hill Climbing: (4) ⇒ (6) is obvious. (6) ⇒ (4) follows from the fact that, starting from a median, Hill Climbing can produce only a set of medians which includes the initial vertex. So starting from any median it produces the same set if and only if the produced set is actually $M(\pi)$.

Finally (6) for Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing: (5) ⇒ (6) is obvious. (6) ⇒ (5) follows from the fact that, starting from a median, Steepest Ascent Hill Climbing can produce only a set of medians which includes the initial vertex. So starting from any median it produces the same set if and only if the produced set is actually $M(\pi)$.

□

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper we characterized the connected graphs with connected medians as the graphs in which the Plurality Strategy always produces the median set. The other characterizations of connected graphs with connected median sets in [2] all involve statements about weight functions or rather technical statements. Unfortunately, so far there is no characterization in terms of simple graph properties or in terms of a listing of classes of graphs. It is quite clear that such a characterization should be some kind of generalization of median graphs. For more information on median graphs see e.g. [17, 13]. There are a number of well studied generalizations of median graphs that have connected medians. First the quasi-median graphs, which were introduced in [17], see also [5]. These graphs also have interesting applications in diverse areas, e.g. in biology, see [3]. Another class is that of the pseudo-median graphs introduced in [4], see [10] for a study of median sets in these graphs. These are all examples of the so-called *weakly median graphs*, see [9]. Another example is that of the *Helly graphs* (cf. [2]) defined by the property that every pairwise intersecting family of balls has a non-empty intersection. But all these are still proper subclasses of the class of connected graphs on which the Plurality Strategy always finds the median set.

References

[1] K. Balakrishnan, M. Changat and S. Klavžar, The median function on graphs with bounded profiles, *Discr. Appl. Math.* **156** (2008), 2882–2889.

[2] H.J. Bandelt and V. Chepoi, Graphs with connected medians, *SIAM J. Discr. Math.* **15** (2002), 268–282.

[3] H.J. Bandelt, K. Huber and V. Moulton, Quasi-median graphs from sets of partitions, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **122** (2002), 23–35.

[4] H.J. Bandelt and H.M. Mulder, Pseudo-median graphs: decomposition via amalgamation and cartesian multiplication, *Discrete Math.* **94** (1991), 161–180.

[5] H.J. Bandelt, H.M. Mulder and E. Wilkeit, Quasi-median graphs and algebras, *J. Graph Theory* **18** (1994), 681–703.

[6] J.P. Barthelemy and B. Monjardet, The median procedure in cluster analysis and social choice theory, *Math. Social Sci.* bf 1 (1981), 235–268.

[7] K. Balakrishnan, B. Brešar, M. Changat, S. Klavžar, M. Kovše and A.R. Subhamathi, Computing median and antimedian sets in median graphs, *Algorithmica*, DOI 10.1007/s00453-008-9200-4.

[8] M. Changat, K. Balakrishnan and H.M. Mulder, *Median computation in graphs using consensus strategies*, Report EI 2007-34, Econometrisch Instituut, Erasmus Universiteit, 2006, Rotterdam.

[9] V. Chepoi, Seperation of two convex sets in convexity structures, *J. Geom.* **50** (1994), 30–51.

[10] F. Dragan and V. Chepoi, Medians in pseudo-median graphs, *Operation Research and Management Science* (Kiev) **35** (1991), 47–56.

[11] A.J. Goldman, Optimal center location in simple networks, *Transportation Science* **5** (1971), 212–221.

[12] W. Imrich, S. Klavžar and H.M. Mulder, Median graphs and triangle-free graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **12** (1999), 111–118.

[13] S. Klavžar and H.M. Mulder, Median graphs: characterizations, location theory and related structures, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **30** (1999), 103–127.

[14] F.R. McMorris, H.M. Mulder and F.S. Roberts, The median procdure on median graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **84** (1998), 165–181.

[15] F.R. McMorris and R.C. Powers, The median procedure in a formal theory of consensus, *Siam J. Discrete Math.* **8** (1995), 507–516.

[16] P.B. Mirchandani and R.L. Francis, *Discrete Location Theory*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1990.

[17] H.M. Mulder, *The Interval Function of a Graph*, Mathematical Centre Tracts 132, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1980.

[18] H.M. Mulder, The majority strategy on graphs, *Discrete Applied Math.* **80** (1997), 97–105.

[19] S. Russell and P. Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence. A modern Approach*, Prentice-Hall 2003.

[20] P.J. Slater, Medians of arbitrary graphs, *J. Graph Theory* **4** (1980), 389–392.

[21] R.C. Tansel, R.I. Francis and T.J. Lowe, Location on networks: A survey I, *Management Sci.* **29** (1983), 482–497.

[22] R.C. Tansel, R.I. Francis and T.J. Lowe, Location on networks: A survey II, *Management Sci.* **29** (1983), 498–511.

(Received 11 Feb 2009; revised 4 June 2009)