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Abstract. We introduce the Geography and Election Outcome (GEO) metric, a new method for identifying potential partisan gerrymanders. In contrast with currently popular methods, the GEO metric uses both geographic information about a districting plan as well as election outcome data, rather than just one or the other. We motivate and define the GEO metric, which gives a count (a non-negative integer) to each political party. The count indicates the number of additional districts in which that party potentially could have been competitive, without losing any currently won districts, by making reasonable changes to the input map. With the GEO metric, we can also indicate which districts were likely packed, and indicate which districts in the GEO metric count are the most likely to have been cracked. We then analyze GEO metric scores for each party in several recent elections.

1. Introduction

Partisan gerrymandering is an issue which has been adjudicated many times in recent years, including at the Supreme Court [23]. In these cases, the metrics used to identify partisan gerrymandering fall broadly into two categories. The first category contains those that use data about a map to identify irregularly shaped districts and flag them as potential gerrymanders. Possibly the most widely used of these map metrics is the Polsby Popper Ratio, which calculates a multiple of the ratio of the district’s area to the square of its perimeter. Thus, it effectively measures the irregular wiggle-wagging of a district’s boundary. Other common map metrics are the Reock ratio (the ratio of a district’s area to the area of the smallest disk containing the district), the Convex Hull ratio (the ratio of the area of the district to the area of its convex hull), and the Perimeter test (which simply sums the perimeters in all the districts) [17]. But modern technology has allowed partisan demographers to create hundreds of thousands of maps, all having reasonably shaped districts, and then select the most partisan among those. Thus, looking for irregularly shaped districts is no longer an effective way of
finding partisan bias in a map. Technology also makes computation of boundaries ill-defined, depending on the level of map precision, as was discussed in [9]. These issues and others have led to the introduction of metrics relying on election data instead.

Thus, the second typical category of metrics is those that use election outcome data. Very generally, these metrics attempt to measure the “packing and cracking” that is widely understood to be how gerrymandering occurs. “Packing and cracking” is present when a mapmaker “packs” her opponents into a small number of districts which are won with an overwhelming majority, and then “cracks” the remaining opponents among many districts in which they cannot gain a majority. Perhaps the most common examples of metrics using election outcome data only are the Mean Median Difference and the Efficiency Gap. The Mean-Median Difference calculates the median vote share among all districts, and subtracts from that median the average (the mean) of the vote shares among all districts. The Efficiency Gap is based on the concept of a “wasted vote”; a vote is considered “wasted” if it was for a losing candidate or if it was a vote beyond the majority needed to win in a district. The Efficiency Gap calculates the difference between two parties’ wasted votes, and then divides by the total votes. Other metrics using only election data include the Partisan Bias and the Declination [17]. All of these metrics use nothing about the map, outside of how many votes each candidate received in each district. They are not influenced at all by the locations of the voters, or the locations of the districts.

In what follows we define a new method, the Geographic and Election Outcome (GEO) metric, which uses both map and election outcome data to identify partisan gerrymanders. But first, we provide an example which motivates the need to incorporate both the geographic information and the election outcome information in order to more accurately detect the presence of gerrymandering.

1.1. A motivating example. Consider two states, State X and State Y, each with seven districts and the election outcome data in Table 1.

Aside from the district numbers, these have the exact same election outcome data and therefore will have the same results from a metric using only election data, such as the Efficiency Gap. Indeed, if we assume equal turnout in all districts, then the Efficiency Gap of both of these elections is 0.

Now consider the maps in Figure 1 which correspond to State X and State Y.
Table 1. Two states with the same election outcomes. $EG = 0$ for both states.

We see that in State $X$, districts 1 and 2 appear to be potentially cracked for Party $A$, as they are losses for $A$, have a vote share close to 50%, and are adjacent to districts which are safe wins for Party $A$. That is, party $A$ has the possibility of improving its election outcome, based on the locations of the districts within the state. On the other hand, in State $Y$, while districts 5 and 7 have the same vote shares for Party $A$ as districts 1 and 2 in State $X$, their loss for Party $A$ seems more an artifact of the lack of Party $A$ voters in the eastern part of the state than an intentional cracking. Through this example, we can see that the location of the voters matters when it comes to the potential presence of packing and cracking.

In other words, gerrymandering occurs when district lines are drawn so as to include or exclude voters in particular districts, resulting in an outcome that is partisan beyond what the distribution of voters within the region would naturally dictate. This idea assumes that the lines could have been re-drawn so as to have a different outcome. That is,
certain districts have voters nearby that could have changed the outcome in that district. In defining the GEO metric, we capture this missing aspect of election outcome data only methods: whether the packing and cracking detected via election outcome data is geographically realizable or is simply an artifact of the voter distribution within the state. Indeed, in Section 3.1, we will see that for the Example in Figure 1, the GEO metric score for the orange party (party A) in state X is 2, but in state Y it is 0.

1.2. An overview of the GEO metric. The inputs for the GEO metric are both a districting plan $D$ and district-level election data $\Delta$. A score is given to each of the parties in the election, which we denote by

$$\text{GEO}_A(D, \Delta)$$

for party A. This score is in fact a count, as it corresponds to the number of additional districts that might have become competitive for a party (and thus that party potentially might have won), given small perturbations in the map, and without losing any currently held districts. The GEO metric detects these new potential wins by considering vote swaps with other districts with whom it shares a border. Along with this GEO score giving the count of newly competitive districts, we can list which districts became newly competitive through these vote swaps, which districts won by party A contributed to making another district newly competitive (and thus are potentially packed), and which districts lost by party A contributed to making another district newly competitive (and thus are potentially cracked).

We note that the GEO metric is not symmetric in the two parties. That is, party A’s GEO score is not the negative of party B’s GEO score. We view this as a benefit, in that it recognizes that party A’s voters may distribute themselves throughout a state very differently from party B’s voters. We agree with DeFord et al in their argument that “there are serious obstructions to the practical implementation of symmetry standards” and that methods centered on varying districting lines (rather than votes) are better at assessing the presence of partisan map manipulation [7].

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 contains relevant definitions and background. In Section 3 we describe the algorithm by which we compute the GEO metric for a given districting plan and election outcome data. In Section 4 we analyze real world elections and and in Section 5 we give a critical mathematical analysis of the GEO metric. Finally in Section 6 we explore the use of the GEO metric on ensembles of maps.
2. Definitions

It is widely acknowledged that a districting plan is potentially gerrymandered if the voters of a given party have been either “packed” or “cracked”. While there is no agreed upon mathematically well-defined definition of packing or cracking we can broadly define packing as the concentration of the opposing party’s voters into one district to reduce the number of voters in other districts, and cracking as the division of the opposing party’s voters into several districts in order to dilute their power in any one district.

Suppose we are given a districting plan $D$ with districts $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n$ and election data $\Delta$. We start by making the districting graph. More specifically, the vertices of our graph are $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n$ and we say that $(D_i, D_j)$ is an edge if districts $i$ and $j$ share a boundary. A districting graph from the states in Figure 1 can be seen in Figure 2.

Each district is put into one of three categories, depending on the percentage of voters Party A wins in that district.

**Definition 1.** We say a district is a safe loss for party A if party A wins some percentage of the vote less than a fixed $\ell < 0.5$. To start with, we choose $\ell = 0.48$.

A district is a safe win for party A if party A wins some percentage of the vote larger than a fixed $w > 0.5$. To start with, we choose $w = 0.52$.

Otherwise, the vote share for party A in the district is in the interval $[\ell, w]$, in which case we say that district is competitive.

The minimum feasible vote share is a number $m$ which is a lower bound on what is considered a reasonable vote share for party A in a single district. The algorithm swapping vote shares to calculate the
GEO metric does not adjust a district’s party A vote share to be at or below $m$. To start with, we choose $m = 0.25$.

If a district is a safe win, the shareable vote share is the vote share for party A that can be swapped out without turning that district into a competitive district. That is, the shareable vote share for the safely won district $D_i$ is any number smaller than:

$$V(D_i) - w$$

If a district is a safe loss, the shareable vote share is the vote share for party A that can be swapped out without reaching the minimum feasible vote share. That is, the shareable vote share for the safely lost district $D_i$ is any number smaller than:

$$V(D_i) - m$$

3. The GEO Metric

The algorithm which calculates the GEO metric swaps vote shares between neighboring districts in a manner that is beneficial for the party in consideration, which we shall call party A. We consider districts to be neighboring if they share a boundary, which in turn means that their corresponding vertices in the districting graph share an edge. Vote shares are swapped between neighboring districts in order to turn a “safe loss” district into a “competitive” district. We only move vote shares out of a district which is either a safe loss or a safe win, as competitive districts are unlikely to have been gerrymandered because they do not represent an entrenched bias. We do not allow so many vote shares to be moved out of a safely won district so as to make it anything but a safely won district after the movement. That is, after swapping vote shares out of a safely won district, we require that the district keep a vote share larger than $w$ (which we generically started with at 0.52). We also do not allow so many vote shares to be moved out of a safely lost district so as to make the vote share for party A reach the minimum feasible vote share $m$. Finally, we only allow vote shares for party A to enter a district from one other district. The reason for this restriction is twofold. Firstly, the intention of the GEO metric is to capture how a single boundary adjustment could have benefitted a single district. And secondly, we want to avoid an inflated count of potentially cracked districts that can occur when we allow several districts to transfer party A vote shares into a single district.

We then count the number of districts that party A safely lost which are now competitive. That count will be an indication of how many
more districts party A “could have won” in addition to all of the districts it already did win. We emphasize that the purpose of this algorithm is not to find the optimal way of moving voters so as to benefit party A. Rather, we would like to notice any places where it seems likely that a revision of district lines could have benefitted party A.

For clarity, we summarize the rules of how vote shares can be transferred.

(1) Vote shares must be swapped. That is, if vote shares for party A are moved into district $D_i$ from district $D_j$, then the same number of vote shares for other parties should be moved from district $D_j$ into district $D_i$.

(2) Vote shares can only move between districts $D_i$ and $D_j$ if they are adjacent. (That is, we can’t have vote shares flowing from $D_i$, through $D_j$, and to $D_k$).

(3) Vote shares for party A can only leave a district that is a safe loss or a safe win.

(4) When vote shares for party A exit a safe win district, that district must remain a safe win after the swap. That is, the vote share for party A may not drop to $w$ (initially set at 52%) or below.

(5) When vote shares for party A exit a safe loss district, party A’s vote share is not allowed to reach or drop below the minimum feasible vote share $m$ (initially set at 25%).

(6) When vote shares for party A enter a district, they must enter from only one other district.

(7) When vote shares for party A enter a district, that district must change into competitive. That is, if there are not enough vote shares in a nearby district to make safe loss district $D_i$ into a competitive district, we just don’t swap any vote shares at all.

It remains to describe the details of algorithm that swaps vote shares from one district into a neighboring district. The algorithm is based in the intuitive idea that, to find gerrymandering, we look for where we think it is most likely. That is, we look for districts that party A lost, but which are in a region in which party A has the highest vote share. We first look for neighboring districts that party A won in order to transfer in vote shares, and if such districts don’t exist, we look to see if vote shares can be transferred in from neighboring districts that party A lost.

3.1. The Algorithm. For each district $D_i$, let $A_i$ be the average vote share for party A among that district and all of its neighbors. Thus, if a district is in a region in which party A is very popular, then this
average should be high. In general, the higher this average, the more we would expect party $A$ to win districts in the area. Then re-order the districts $D_1, D_2, \ldots$ so that

$$A_1 \geq A_2 \geq A_3 \geq \cdots$$

With this ordering, we do the following:

1. In order $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, consider district $D_i$.
2. If that district was won by party $A$, or if that district has its vote share in the competitive range $[\ell, w]$, we don’t need to do anything further. So we increase $i$ and go back to step (1).
3. Otherwise, that district was lost by party $A$. If party $A$ won in a neighboring district $D_j$, and if that district has a large enough shareable vote share to make $D_i$ competitive, transfer in that vote share from district $D_j$ to district $D_i$ (and transfer out the same vote share for other parties from district $D_i$ to district $D_j$).
   a. If there is more than one such district, transfer in vote shares from the district $D_j$ where the value $A_j$ was the highest.
   b. Increase $i$ and go back to step (1).
4. If it is not possible to transfer in vote shares from a district that party $A$ won, but there is a neighboring district $D_k$ that party $A$ lost which has a large enough shareable vote share to make $D_i$ competitive, transfer in that vote share from district $D_k$ to district $D_i$ (and transfer out the same vote share for other parties from $D_i$ to $D_k$).
   a. If there is more than one such district, transfer in vote shares from the district $D_k$ where the value $A_j$ was the highest.
   b. Increase $i$ and go back to step (1).
5. Otherwise, there is no way to transfer in a shareable vote share from a neighboring district into $D_i$ and make $D_i$ competitive. Increase $i$ and go back to step (1).

The value $\text{GEO}_A$ for this map and election outcome is then the number of newly competitive districts after the algorithm has gone through each district. As an example of the algorithm in action, we consider the sample states $X$ from Section 1.1 whose districting graph appears in Section 2. The steps of the algorithm calculating the $\text{GEO}$ metric can be seen visually in Figure 3.

At this point, we can also categorize some of the districts into: newly competitive, potentially packed, and additional potentially cracked:
(A) Initial setup. $A_i$s defined in the algorithm.

(b) Direction of first vote share swap.

(c) Outcome of first vote share swap.

(d) Direction of second vote share swap.

(e) Outcome of second vote share swap.

Figure 3. Here, GEO$A = 2$. (Party A is the orange party).

1. If a district was previously a safe loss for party $A$ but was made competitive by the algorithm calculating GEO$A$, that district is called “newly competitive.”

2. If a district was won by party $A$ and had vote shares transferred out of it in order to make another district competitive during the algorithm, we call that district “potentially packed.”

3. If a district was lost by party $A$ and had vote shares transferred out of it in order to make another district competitive during the algorithm, we call that district an “additional potentially cracked” district. “Additional” because the newly competitive districts can also be considered potentially cracked.

Recall that $A_i$ is the average vote share to party $A$ among district $D_i$ and all of its neighbors. Thus in general, the larger $A_i$, the more we would expect party $A$ to win district $D_i$. This is another way of delineating the districts in each of these three categories. In Section 4, we will list the districts in each of those categories in order of largest $A_i$ to smallest.
In the example from Figure 3, from the steps of the algorithm, we can see that district 4 would be labeled as potentially packed and districts 1 and 2 would be labeled as newly competitive.

We note here that, while the GEO metric counts the number of newly competitive districts, and thus indicates how many additional districts a party potentially could have won, the GEO metric score is not intended to count the number of additional districts a party should have won. It is unreasonable that a party would win all of its competitive districts. Rather, it would be more reasonable to say that party A could reasonably have won approximately GEO_{A}/2 districts, with small changes to the current map. More importantly, the GEO score indicates the flexibility that a party has in improving its outcome. If one party has a lot of flexibility to improve its outcome, while another has just a little or even none at all, this would indicate influence by the mapmaker to benefit the party which has little or no ability to improve its outcome.

4. Analysis of real world elections

In this section, we show the results of the GEO metric scores on the 2011 North Carolina Congressional congressional districting map, the 2011 Pennsylvania congressional districting map, the 2011 Maryland congressional districting map, and Colorado’s 2013-enacted congressional districting map. We’ve chosen these maps because North Carolina and Pennsylvania are states that are largely understood to have been intentionally gerrymandered for the Republican party. Indeed, the Pennsylvania State Supreme court declared that Pennsylvania’s map violated the state constitution [14]. And North Carolina’s congressional redistricting map was struck down by the Supreme Court of the United States as an unconstitutional racial gerrymander [6]. The Brennan Center for Justice [18] and others have argued that Maryland’s 6th district is a gerrymander for the Democratic party. We’ve chosen Colorado because it is a state whose 2013-enacted map was recently argued to not have effective partisan manipulation [5].

The design of the GEO metric allows for analysis of elections with candidates from more than two parties. But for this introductory paper, we focus on the two-party calculation and analysis with two parties. Thus, all data in this section (Section 4) and in Section 6 have omitted votes that are not for the Democratic or Republican candidates.

The 2011 North Carolina Congressional districting map [11] can be seen in Figure 4.
The GEO scores for both parties in North Carolina, using the 2011 election districting map and the 2016 Presidential election data, can be seen in Tables 2 and 3. We included $m = 0.35$ for these tables; for an explanation see Section 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>GEO$_{Dem}$</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Potentially Packed Districts</th>
<th>Additional Potentially Cracked Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6, 13, 2, 3, 8, 9, 5, 7, 10</td>
<td>4, 1, 12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6, 13, 2, 3, 8, 9, 5, 7</td>
<td>4, 1, 12</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6, 13, 2, 3, 8, 9, 5, 7</td>
<td>4, 1, 12</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6, 13, 2, 3, 8, 9, 5, 7</td>
<td>4, 1, 12</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. GEO scores for Democratic Party, using North Carolina 2011 districting map and the 2016 Presidential election data. Districts are ordered from largest to smallest average neighborhood Democratic vote share $A_i$. 

Figure 4. 2011 NC Congressional districting map
We note that the districts that are labeled as potentially packed, newly competitive, and additional potentially cracked align with the analysis done by the Quantifying Gerrymandering Group’s blog post, “Towards a Localized Analysis” [15].

The 2011 Pennsylvania Congressional districting map [22] can be seen in Figure 5.

![Figure 5. 2011 PA Congressional districting map](image)

The GEO scores for both parties in Pennsylvania, using the 2011 election districting map and the Senate 2016 election outcome data, can be seen in Tables 4 and 5. We included $m = 0.15$ for these tables; for an explanation see Section 6.

We note that the districts that are labeled as potentially packed, newly competitive, and additional potentially cracked align with the analysis done by Azavea in their article, “Exploring Pennsylvania’s
Table 4. GEO scores for Democratic Party, using Pennsylvania 2011 districting map and the Senate 2016 election outcome data. Districts are ordered from largest to smallest average neighborhood Democratic vote share $A_i$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>GEO&lt;sub&gt;Dem&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Potentially Packed Districts</th>
<th>Additional Potentially Cracked Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7, 8, 18, 6, 12, 16, 4, 11, 10, 9</td>
<td>2, 1, 14</td>
<td>15, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7, 8, 18, 6, 12, 16, 4, 11, 10, 9</td>
<td>2, 1, 14</td>
<td>15, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7, 8, 18, 6, 12, 16, 4, 11, 3</td>
<td>2, 1, 14</td>
<td>15, 10, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7, 8, 18, 6, 12, 16, 4</td>
<td>2, 1, 14</td>
<td>15, 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. GEO scores for Republican Party, using Pennsylvania 2011 districting map and the Senate 2016 election outcome data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>GEO&lt;sub&gt;Rep&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Potentially Packed Districts</th>
<th>Additional Potentially Cracked Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gerrymandered Congressional Districts” [16]. Specifically, that article described districts 1, 13, as Democratically - packed; and districts 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 as cracking Democratic constituencies.

The 2011 Maryland Congressional districting map [20] can be seen in Figure 6.

The GEO scores for both parties in Maryland, using the 2011 election districting map and the 2012 Presidential election outcome data, can be seen in Tables 6 and 7.
Figure 6. 2011 MD Congressional districting map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>GEO$_{Dem}$</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Potentially Packed Districts</th>
<th>Additional Potentially Cracked Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(none)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. GEO scores for Democratic Party, using Maryland 2011 districting map and the 2012 Presidential election outcome data.

Note that, in Table 7, we do see District 6 coming up as a flagged district for the Republican party, as we would expect from [18] and many other apolitical analyses.

The 2013-enacted Colorado Congressional districting map [19] can be seen in Figure 7.

The GEO scores for both parties in Colorado, using the 2013-enacted districting map and the Governor 2018 election outcome data, can be seen in Tables 8 and 9. We included $m = 0.35$ for these tables; for an explanation see Section 6.

Recall that Clelland et al, in their analysis of Colorado [5], stated that they “do not find evidence of effective partisan manipulation in
Table 7. GEO scores for Republican Party, using Maryland 2011 districting map and the 2012 Presidential election outcome data. Districts are ordered from largest to smallest average neighborhood Republican vote share $A_i$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m$</th>
<th>GEO_{Rep}</th>
<th>Newly Competitive Districts</th>
<th>Potentially Packed Districts</th>
<th>Additional Potentially Cracked Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>8,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>8,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. 2013-enacted CO Congressional districting map

the 2011/2012 adopted maps.” Nevertheless, they do point out several districts that seemed unusual. Specifically, in section 5.1 of [5], Districts 2, 4, 5, and 7 were singled out for various unusual characteristics. We find it notable that those districts are also singled out by the GEO metric.

Note that the GEO metric is sensitive to the value of $m$ in that, not surprisingly, the higher $m$ is, the lower the GEO score is. However, the newly competitive/potentially packed/additional potentially
cracked districts are, not surprisingly, fairly consistent. We will say more about the impact of varying the value of $m$ in Section 6. In general, we believe that $m$ should be based on what is truly a realistic minimum feasible vote share in a single district, based on state-specific data.

5. GEO Metric Zero

Many analyses of metrics intended to detect partisan gerrymandering have centered on instances in which the metric is equal to 0, as this is the “ideal” value of the metric \cite{24,8,7}. In an effort to both mathematically analyze the GEO metric and compare the GEO metric
to previously defined metrics, we will also explore possible \((V, S)\) pairs that could result in the GEO metric being equal to 0, where \(V\) is party A’s vote share and \(S\) is party A’s seat share. We emphasize that we do not consider a GEO metric score of 0 to be required, or even more desirable than nonzero GEO scores that are relatively balanced in each party.

First, it is worth noting that the districting graph matters a lot here. For example, suppose that \(V < \frac{1}{2}\) and the districting graph is the “star” on \(n\) vertices, as in Figure 8.

![Figure 8. The star on \(n\) vertices.](image)

It is possible for party A to get seat share \(S = \frac{1}{n}\) and for the GEO score to be 0 for both parties if \(n > \frac{0.52}{V}\). Specifically, suppose that turnout in all districts is equal. If district \(n\) has 52% of the vote for party A and then the remaining districts each have a vote share of \(V - \frac{0.52 - V}{n-1}\), then this results in an overall vote share of

\[
V - \frac{0.52 - V}{n-1}
\]

then this results in an overall vote share of

\[
\frac{(n-1) \left( V - \frac{0.52 - V}{n-1} \right) + 0.52}{n} = V
\]

for party A, a seat share of \(S = \frac{1}{n}\), and a GEO score of 0 for both parties. This is a result of the fact that the district won by party A has no vote shares to trade and none of party A’s losing districts are adjacent to each other. And for party B, the district that party B lost is on the cusp of “competitive” so that district would not count toward party B’s GEO score.
Figure 9. Districting map whose district graph is the star on $n$ vertices.

We note that the dual graph being the star is extremely unusual, and would mean that the districting map looks something like Figure 9.

So it is very important that this metric be used in conjunction with maps. Note that if $V < \frac{27}{n} + 25$, then the districts that party $A$ lost have a vote share less than 25%, which is our assumed lower bound for any district. Granted, not every district will have each party’s vote share above 25%, and it is precisely when party $A$’s vote share is large that this example is problematic, but we nevertheless note this threshold.

5.1. **One party’s GEO metric zero.** First we explore situations in which we assume only that party $A$ has a GEO metric score of 0. This indicates that party $A$ has little to no flexibility to improve its election outcome, so that perhaps the map is a gerrymander for party $A$ (particularly if party $B$ has a high GEO score). Given the fact that the GEO metric relies so heavily on the districting graph, there are few assumptions we can reasonably make in terms of vote swapping. As a graph corresponding to the dual graph of a map, the districting graph is a planar graph. From observations of real data, the faces of the districting graph are likely almost all triangles.

We assume here that there are exactly two parties in the election: party $A$ and party $B$. Suppose that $D_1$ and $D_2$ are adjacent losing districts for party $A$ and party $A$ has no GEO metric points. This
implies that

$$V(D_1) + (V(D_2) - m) \leq \ell$$

$$\frac{V(D_1) + V(D_2)}{2} \leq \frac{\ell + m}{2}$$

(1)

where $V(D_i)$ is the vote share in district $D_i$. In words: the average vote share for party $A$ in adjacent districts that party $A$ lost must be no more than $\frac{\ell + m}{2}$.

Now, suppose that $D_3$ is a district that party $A$ lost, which is adjacent to $D_4$, a district that party $A$ won. The GEO metric does not gain any count for party $A$ by shuttling winning vote shares into a losing district. This implies that

(2) $$V(D_3) + V(D_4) \leq 1$$

In words: party $A$'s vote shares in adjacent districts which are won by opposing parties must sum to no more than 1.

At this point, in order to be able to make more concrete conclusions about what happens with $\text{GEO}_A = 0$, we will need to make more substantial assumptions. Let $x$ be the average vote share in districts that party $A$ lost and let $y$ be the average vote share in districts that party $A$ won. We will assume that there are adjacent districts $D_1$ and $D_2$ that party $A$ lost, and adjacent districts $D_3$ and $D_4$ exactly one of which was won by party $A$, such that

(3) $$x \leq \frac{V(D_1) + V(D_2)}{2}$$

(4) $$x + y \leq V(D_3) + V(D_4)$$

In words: Equation (3) states that there are adjacent districts lost by party $A$ such that their pairwise average vote share is at least party $A$'s average vote share among all districts that party $A$ lost. Equation (4) states that there are adjacent districts, one lost by party $A$ and one won, such that the sum of their vote shares is at least the sum of the average vote share among districts lost by party $A$ and the average vote share among districts won by party $A$.

In effect, Equations (3) and (4) say that there are many different kinds of districts (districts won and districts lost by party $A$) and that they are sufficiently mixed. That is, among the pairs of adjacent districts that party $A$ lost, there is at least one whose average vote share is at least as large as one would “expect,” based on average vote share in districts party $A$ lost. And among pairs of adjacent districts, one losing and one winning for party $A$, we have one pair with at least as large a vote share sum as one might “expect.” While these equations
are based in the idea of districts sufficiently mixed, they are certainly not expected to be true of all maps, especially not maps with a small number of districts.

With the assumptions from Equations (3) and (4), we have

\[ x \leq \frac{m + \ell}{2} \]

\[ x + y \leq 1 \]

in general, and in the case of \( m = 0.25 \) and \( \ell = 0.48 \) we have

\[ x \leq 0.365 \]

\[ x + y \leq 1 \]

Assuming turnout is equal in every district, we have

\[ V = x(1 - S) + yS \]

\[ V \leq x(1 - S) + (1 - x)S \]

\[ S \geq \frac{V - x}{1 - 2x} \]

Note that

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{V - x}{1 - 2x} \right) = \frac{2V - 1}{(1 - 2x)^2} < 0 \]

if \( V < \frac{1}{2} \). Thus, if \( V < \frac{1}{2} \), then \( \frac{V - x}{1 - 2x} \) is maximized when \( x \) is as small as possible, and minimized when \( x \) is as large as possible. By the assumptions from Equations (3) and (4), \( \frac{m + \ell}{2} \) is the largest possible value for \( x \). Since \( x \) is the average vote share in districts party A lost and \( m \) is the minimum feasible vote share, we would expect \( x \geq m \) and assume so for our calculations. Using the bounds \( m \leq x \leq \frac{m + \ell}{2} \), when \( m = 0.25 \) and \( \ell = 0.48 \), the largest that \( \frac{V - x}{1 - 2x} \) can be is

\[ \frac{V - 0.25}{1 - 2(0.25)} = 2V - \frac{1}{2} \]

and the smallest that \( \frac{V - x}{1 - 2x} \) can be is

\[ \frac{V - 0.365}{1 - 2(0.365)} = \frac{100}{27}V - \frac{73}{54} \]

It’s worth noting that expressions (5) and (6) give a responsiveness range between 2 and \( \frac{100}{27} \approx 3.7 \) (see [13] for a discussion of electoral responsiveness). A picture of this region can be seen in Figure 10. Note that the argument above has assumed \( V < \frac{1}{2} \). Thus, \( S = 2V - \frac{1}{2} \).
Figure 10. Lavender is when $S \geq \frac{100}{27}V - \frac{73}{54}$, teal is when $S \geq 2V - \frac{1}{2}$, and blue is when both inequalities are true.

is the upper bounding line when $V < \frac{1}{2}$, and the lower bounding line when $V > \frac{1}{2}$.

5.2. Both party’s GEO metric zero. While it certainly can happen that a single party’s GEO metric is 0 (see Section 4), we expect it to be very unlikely that both party’s GEO metric values are 0. Indeed, this would imply that both parties do not have any freedom to improve their outcomes. If this does happen to be the case, then equations (1) and (2) would be true both for party A as well as for party B (when considering vote shares, and losses/wins from party B’s perspective).

If we again additionally assume equations (3) and (4) to be true, as well as the two same equations from party B’s perspective, and again assume turnout to be equal in every district, we get the equation:

$$S = \frac{V - x}{1 - 2x}$$

The minimum and maximum ranges for $S$ that were found in Section 5.1 again hold true. Figure 11 gives a picture of the corresponding $(V, S)$ pairs in the resulting ranges.
6. Using GEO metric with ensembles

In the past five years or so, mathematicians have promoted the usage of outlier analysis for the purpose of detecting gerrymandering. See, for example, [21] for an overview of the outlier analysis method. We briefly describe this method as follows: a large number of potential districting maps is created; the set of such maps is called an ensemble. All maps in the ensemble satisfy that state’s set of restrictions, whether they include VRA districts, compactness requirements, or any other map-specific requirements. A proposed map is then compared to all other maps in the ensemble. This comparison can be made using any kind of metric. For example, we could use a single set of election data and simply see how many districts the Republican party would have won with each map in the ensemble (in this example the metric is simply number of seats). Each map in the ensemble has a number of Republican seats associated with the map, and each number of Republican seats has some frequency in the ensemble. The proposed map can be compared with all maps in the ensemble by seeing how unusual the proposed map’s number of Republican seats is. That is, we can see
if the proposed map’s number of Republican seats is typical, unusually high, or unusually low as compared with the number of Republican seats in all maps in the ensemble.

There are a variety of ensemble creation methods that have been promoted; because of the mathematical theory and rigor behind them, we focus on ensemble creation methods that use a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) process. For examples of the kinds of MCMC algorithms that have been proposed for the purpose of creating an ensemble of districting maps, see [12, 11, 8, 4, 2].

While the GEO metric does take both geographic and election outcome data into account, it does not look at the actual locations of voters to see if the vote swaps incorporated in calculating the GEO metric are physically possible. The creation of an ensemble of maps does create a wide variety of allowable maps, and thus enhances the utility of the GEO metric by allowing us to compare a map’s GEO metric to the GEO metric of many other allowable maps. We used the Metric Geometry Gerrymandering Group’s publicly available GerryChain Recom MCMC [8] to create an ensemble of maps for each of North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Colorado’s 2011 maps. (Maryland’s data is not yet working in the GerryChain Recom MCMC, which is why we are unable to include that analysis). We followed the description parameters set up at [10]. We also took 10,000 steps in the chain for each map.

The outcome of this outlier analysis can be seen in Figures 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

As expected, we can see that the Democratic GEO metric scores in both North Carolina and Pennsylvania are unusually high, while the Republican GEO metric scores in those states are unusually low. And the GEO scores for both parties in Colorado are fairly low, as expected.

We also see that $m$ influences how unusual the proposed districting map looks within the ensemble. In general, we believe that $m$ should be determined to be a value which truly is a reasonable minimum feasible vote share in a single district, given a state’s data. For example, consider Table 10 where we define $N_{NC}$, $N_{PA}$ and $N_{CO}$ as follows:

\[
N_{NC}(x) = \text{Number of maps in the NC ensemble with at least one district having < } x\% \text{ vote share for either party}
\]

\[
N_{PA}(x) = \text{Number of maps in the PA ensemble with at least one district having < } x\% \text{ vote share for either party}
\]

\[
N_{CO}(x) = \text{Number of maps in the CO ensemble with at least one district having < } x\% \text{ vote share for either party}
\]
We can quite clearly see that the true “minimum feasible vote share” in a district is quite different between, for example, North Carolina. For example, a number like $m = 0.2$ might be quite reasonable for Pennsylvania, and is clearly unreasonable for North Carolina.

7. Caveats, Clarifications, and Takeaways

The big idea behind the GEO metric is to detect when boundary lines between two districts could potentially be adjusted so that a political
Figure 13. Ensemble outcomes of Republican GEO metric for North Carolina, using the 2016 Presidential election outcome data. The black line is the median value of GEO\textsubscript{Rep}, and the yellow line is the value of GEO\textsubscript{Rep} for the 2011 Congressional redistricting map.

A party might gain an additional seat without losing any of its current seats. This is achieved by considering which districts are adjacent, and looking at the vote shares of those adjacent districts. The metric does not look at the actual locations of voters to see if the vote swaps incorporated in calculating the GEO metric are physically possible, and thus does not propose a specific alternative map. So while it can suggest that a better outcome for a particular party seems likely, it cannot guarantee that such a better outcome is available.

The significance of a particular GEO metric value is highly dependent on the number of districts in a state. Thus, when evaluating the GEO metric values for different parties within a state, one should also consider the number of districts. A GEO metric score of 5 for party A and 0 for party B is much more concerning in a state with 10 districts than in a state with 100 districts. We’ve chosen to keep the GEO metric score as a count (by not dividing by the number of districts, for example) because we’d like the value to have more meaning than simply “this map appears to be gerrymandered.” Specifically, the GEO
metric score is an indication of how many more districts might have potentially been competitive for a party. However, we emphasize that the goal of the GEO metric is not to declare the number of additional districts that a party should have won, but rather the number of additional districts a party could have won. In general, because the algorithm behind the GEO metric puts new districts into the “competitive” range, it is indeed most reasonable to say that party A more likely could have won

\[ \text{GEO}_A \]

\[ \frac{2}{\text{districts}} \]

districts; the idea being that once a district is in the competitive range, it’s approximately a 50/50 chance that party A wins that district. We chose not to have the algorithm behind the GEO metric swap vote shares in order to give party A a safe win because we didn’t want to advocate for a party A gerrymander. Rather, we’d like to see how much possibility party A has for improvement.
This idea of possibility for improvement of each party is the best way to think about the GEO metric. If, for example, a state has 15 districts, and we know that \( \text{GEO}(A) = 5 \), while \( \text{GEO}(B) = 0 \), this indicates that party \( A \) could potentially have a much better outcome, while party \( B \) has no flexibility to improve its outcome. This lack of flexibility for party \( B \) indicates that the map has likely been drawn to optimize party \( B \)’s outcome. Whereas, if a state has 15 districts and we have \( \text{GEO}(A) = 7 \), and \( \text{GEO}(B) = 4 \), both parties have flexibility to improve their outcome. Because it focuses on this presence of flexibility, the GEO metric does a better job than other metrics of determining when a party is potentially the beneficiary of gerrymandering. Specifically, if a party’s GEO score is 0, this indicates a lack of flexibility in the map to improve on that party’s outcome.

The GEO metric is an improvement on prior metrics. It uses both the Geography of the map and Election Outcome data to detect the presence of gerrymandering. There are no fixed threshold values that we promote in order to determine exactly when gerrymandering has
FIGURE 16. Ensemble outcomes of Democratic GEO metric for Colorado, using the Governor 2018 election outcome data. The yellow line is both the median value of GEO$_{Dem}$, and the value of GEO$_{Dem}$ for the 2013-enacted Congressional redistricting map. 

happened, but a reasonable comparison of the GEO metric score for each party, taking into account the total number of districts, will indicate the potential for improvement in that party’s outcome with the given election outcome data.
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Figure 17. Ensemble outcomes of Republican GEO metric for Colorado, using the Governor 2018 election outcome data. The yellow line is both the median value of GEO\textsubscript{Rep}, and the value of GEO\textsubscript{Rep} for the 2013-enacted Congressional redistricting map.
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