

BENFORD'S LAW ANOMALIES IN THE 2009 IRANIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

BY BOUDEWIJN F. ROUKEMA

Toruń Centre for Astronomy, Nicolaus Copernicus University

The vote count first digit frequencies of the 2009 Iranian presidential election are analysed assuming proportionality of candidates' votes to the total vote per voting area. This method is closely related to Benford's Law. A highly significant ($p_7 \sim 0.0007$) excess of vote counts for candidate K that start with the digit 7 is found (41 observed, 21.2–22 expected). Using this property as a selection criterion leads to the following coincidences. (i) Among the six most populous voting areas, this criterion selects those three that have greater proportions of votes for A than the other three. The probability that the two sub-groups are drawn from the same distribution is $p_{7abc,KS} \approx 0.1$. (ii) K's vote counts for these same three voting areas all have the same second digit. The probability of this is $p_{7abc,7ade,7afg} \sim 0.01$. (iii) Most (75%) of the vote counts for K in voting areas with 70 to 79 votes for K are odd, and every even number occurs exactly once. The probability of the latter is $p_{7a} \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}$. Interpreting the big city effect (i)+(ii) as an overestimate of the true vote, assumed to be roughly 50% to match other data, while retaining constant total vote numbers and increasing votes for the other three candidates in proportion to their average voting percentages, would imply that the difference between A's and M's vote totals would drop by about one million votes. These results do not exclude other anomalies.

1. Introduction. The results of the 12 June 2009 presidential election held in the Islamic Republic of Iran are of high political importance in Iran. International interest in these results is also considerable. On 14 June 2009, the Ministry of the Interior (MOI) published a table of the numbers of votes received by the four candidates for 366 voting areas ([MOI Iran 2009a](#)). In order to avoid focussing on personalities, the four candidates will be referred to here as A, R, K, and M, following the order given in the table. These letters correspond to the conventional Roman alphabet transliteration of the four candidates' names by which they are frequently referred to. The total votes for these four candidates from the MOI table give A as the winner with 24,515,209 votes, against R with 659,281 votes, K with 328,979 votes, and M with 13,225,330 votes.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62P25

The total numbers of votes in the 366 voting areas in the MOI's data vary from about 10^4 to 10^6 , i.e. two orders of magnitude. This suggests that Benford's Law (Newcomb 1881; Benford 1938) may be applicable to test the null hypothesis that the first digit in the candidates' absolute numbers of votes are consistent with random selection from a uniform, base 10 logarithmic distribution modulo 1. Analysis of digit distributions has been independently applied to this same data set for the distribution of the *second* digit (Mebane 2009) and for the *last* digits (Beber & Scacco 2009). Since use of the first digit distribution requires a uniform logarithmic distribution (modulo 1), which is not the case in all real world data sets [this may be frequently provided by the complexity of a data set, e.g. (Mebane 2009)], the standard form of Benford's Law is supplemented by an empirical form of Benford's Law generated directly from the data. Hence, *the null hypothesis that the first digit in the candidates' absolute numbers of votes are consistent with proportional random selection from the base 10 logarithmic distribution modulo 1 of the total vote counts* is considered here. The details of the method are described in Section 2. A plain text form of the MOI data (Roukema 2009a) and a plain text OCTAVE script (Roukema 2009b) for reproducing these results are provided along with this article. Results for constant voting proportions are presented in Section 3.2, and the effects of including scatter for K's vote counts are presented in Section 3.3. Discussion, including several anomalies that follow from the basic result and some statistical characteristics of the vote distributions, are given in Section 4. Conclusions are presented in Section 5.

2. Method. Benford's Law (Newcomb 1881; Benford 1938) for the relative frequency of the occurrence of the first digit i in decimal representations of real numbers

$$(1) \quad f(i) = \log_{10} \left(1 + \frac{1}{i} \right)$$

should be valid for real world samples that can be expected to be logarithmically uniform over several orders of magnitude.¹ The degree to which this assumption is accurate depends on the degree to which

$$(2) \quad \{\log_{10} v_j - \lfloor \log_{10} v_j \rfloor\},$$

i.e. the folding of a sample $\{v_j\}$ to a single decade, is uniform, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the greatest integer $\leq x$. This illustrates why data sets do not necessarily need to span many orders of magnitude in order to approximately satisfy

¹Powers of 10.




FIG 1. Histogram showing distribution N of the total vote counts in equal bins of $\log_{10} v_j$.

Benford's Law. The most striking characteristic follows from Eq. (1): the first digit is 1 with a frequency of $\log_{10} 2 \approx 30\%$, i.e. much more frequently than any other digit.

It is clear that Benford's Law for a random variable X relies on the uniformity of the probability density function for $\log(X)$ [see e.g. (Mebane 2009) for an argument involving complexity]. Hence, in order to apply an equivalent probability distribution to Benford's Law, an empirical version of the law can be constructed as follows. Let the total numbers of votes in voting area j be v_j and the global fraction of votes received by candidate $X = A, R, K,$ and M be $\alpha_X = (\sum v_{Xj}) / (\sum v_j)$, where v_{Xj} is the vote count for candidate X in the j -th voting area. If voters in different areas vote fractionally in exactly identical ways independently of geography, then the distributions of first digits should follow the total vote counts, apart from a constant logarithmic shift. That is, let us define $f_X(i)$ as the relative frequency of the digit i in the set of digits

$$(3) \quad \{ \lfloor 10^{\log_{10}(\alpha_X v_j) - \lfloor \log_{10}(\alpha_X v_j) \rfloor} \rfloor \}.$$

In reality, geographic variation in voting preferences, and small town versus large town demographic variations in preferences make it unlikely that exact proportionality is valid, i.e. the actual vote counts v_{Xj} for candidate X are only approximated by the $\{\alpha_X v_{Xj}\}$. Nevertheless, $f - f_X$ should give an approximation to the inaccuracy introduced by the logarithmic uniformity assumption required in Eq. (1).

Another caveat is that if the vote counts v_{Xj} for a candidate who dominates the total vote count ($\alpha_X \approx 1$) themselves are anomalous, then $v_{Xj} \approx$




FIG 2. Histogram showing distribution of the total vote counts folded into a single decade [Eq. (2)].

v_j , so that the null hypothesis will contain nearly the same (anomalous) information as the sample. In this case, the empirical Benford’s Law will be a weak test for detecting anomalies.

3. Results.

3.1. *Total vote counts distribution.* Figure 1 shows that as expected, the distribution of total vote counts mostly covers only about two orders of magnitude, while Fig. 2 shows that the folded distribution [Eq. (2)] is more uniform.

Figure 3 shows that the concatenation of all four candidates’ vote counts is much better fit by Benford’s Law for a uniform logarithmic distribution rather than the empirical Benford’s Law. This is reasonable since the mean voting rates for the different candidates’ vary widely, so that the concatenated data v_{X_j} cover more orders of magnitude than the total vote data set v_j . For the same reason, the fact that the concatenated list of all the candidates’ votes fits Benford’s Law well does not imply that the votes for a single candidate should provide an equally satisfactory fit.

3.2. *Candidates’ vote counts distributions.* Figure 4 shows that first digits of the vote counts for candidate A have an excess of 2’s and a lack of 1’s relative to Benford’s Law f (smooth dotted line) by roughly 2 to 1.5 standard deviations respectively. On the other hand, the frequencies of 1’s and 2’s match the empirical Benford’s Law f_A much better. However, since A has about 60% of the total vote, he dominates it. Hence, as mentioned




FIG 3. Sample frequency distribution f_{obs} of the first digit of all individual vote counts v_{Xj} , $X \in \{A, R, K, M\}$, shown as (red) circles, with Poisson errors indicated by plus signs. The smooth, dotted (green) line shows the expected frequencies from Benford's Law [f in Eq. (1)]; the jagged continuous (blue) line shows the expected frequencies using the empirical Benford's Law [Eq. (3)] with $\alpha_X \equiv 1$. The frequency of the digit 0 is zero since this plot concerns the first digit.




FIG 4. As for Fig. 3, for candidate A vote counts only.




FIG 5. As for Fig. 4, for candidate R.




FIG 6. As for Fig. 4, for candidate K. The excess number of 7's is about 3 standard deviations in excess of the expected values for both the idealised and empirical Benford's Laws.




FIG 7. As for Fig. 4, for candidate M.

above, the similarity between A's first digit frequencies and the empirical distribution is mainly due to a built-in constraint and does not provide much useful information.

For minority candidates, the empirical Benford's Law f_X appears to provide a good complement to the uniform Benford's Law f . Figures 5 and 7 show candidate vote counts for R and M that are approximately bounded by the two probability density functions.

However, it is clear from Fig. 6 that the number of 7's in K's first digit distribution is about 3 standard deviations too high for *both* versions of the null hypothesis, f and f_K . K has 41 vote counts that start with the digit 7. For a sample size of 366, the uniform and empirical versions of Benford's Law predict 21.2 and 22.0 values starting with 7 respectively.

An initial rough estimate of the significance of this excess can be made by using the cumulative Poisson distribution $P_{\text{Poiiss}}(x, \lambda)$ of mean λ . It is not obvious that the assumption of a Poisson process is sufficiently accurate here. In Section 3.3, numerical simulations that simulate a Poisson process for each individual vote count are presented. Nevertheless, assuming a Poisson process for the first digit counts provides an initial estimate $p = 1 - P_{\text{Poiiss}}(41, 21.2) = 4 \times 10^{-5}$ for the standard Benford's Law and

$$(4) \quad p = 1 - P_{\text{Poiiss}}(41, 22.0) = 9.6 \times 10^{-5}$$

for the empirical model. Converting these to two-sided probabilities, since we have not hypothesised any particular form of anomalies, gives $p_7 = 1 - P \leq 1.9 \times 10^{-4}$.

This is a strong rejection of the null hypothesis in either form. However,




FIG 8. A 's proportions of vote counts v_{A_j}/v_j against total votes v_j . Voting areas where K 's vote count has the first digit 7 are shown by (blue) "x" signs, other areas are shown as (green) circles.




FIG 9. R 's proportions of vote counts, as for Fig. 8.




FIG 10. K 's proportions of vote counts, as for Fig. 8. The selection by the first digit 7 is clear.




FIG 11. M 's proportions of vote counts, as for Fig. 8.




FIG 12. *Folded total vote count histogram as per Fig. 2, divided into smaller bins. The pair of vertical lines at the left shows where votes for K would come from if the voting percentage for K is exactly identical in every voting area, such that the first digit in the vote count for K would be 1. This shift is $-\log_{10} 0.00838$ to right in dex. The horizontal axis covers 1.0 dex, i.e. a factor of 10. The pair of vertical lines at the right shows where the first digit 7 votes for K would come from under the same assumption. This assumption is used for the “empirical” equivalent of Benford’s Law [Eq. 3].*

let us suppose that this is the only anomalous frequency for all the first digits of all four candidates, and to be conservative, let us suppose that these constitute 36 independent samples of a statistical test, i.e. let us apply a Šidák-Bonferonni correction (Abdi 2007) of a factor of 36. In that case, we have an initial estimate

$$(5) \quad p_7(\text{initial}) = 1 - P \leq 0.0069$$

for the full set of tests, conservatively using just one clearly divergent point.

3.3. *Allowing for scatter in v_{K_j}/v_j .* The “empirical” equivalent of Benford’s Law defined in Eq. (2) assumes that a candidate has *exactly*² equal percentages of the total vote in every voting area. This is clearly an oversimplification. In Figs 8–11, it is clear that there is a wide scatter of about 0.1–0.4 dex in the voting percentages for the different candidates as a function of the total vote. The more smoothing there is, the closer the empirical Benford’s Law should be to the standard version.

Nevertheless, it should be stressed that *the empirical equivalent of Benford’s Law, used above, only assumes that each candidate has a fixed fraction of the total vote and does not assume the shape of the distribution of the total*

²Apart from rounding effects.

TABLE 1

Skewness of vote counts $\gamma_1(\log_{10} v_{X_j})$ and its normalisation by the standard error in the skewness $\sigma_{\langle\gamma_1\rangle} \equiv \sqrt{\text{Var}(\gamma_1)}$, skewness of proportional vote counts, and width $\sigma(\log_{10} v_{X_j})$ of the four candidates' vote counts; and Spearman rank correlation coefficients ρ_X for the full set and the K first digit 7 excluded subset, normalised by the standard error in ρ .

candidate	A	R	K	M
$\gamma_1(\log_{10} v_{X_j})$	0.59	0.74	0.32	-0.09
$\gamma_1(\log_{10} v_{X_j})/\sigma_{\langle\gamma_1\rangle}$	4.6	5.8	2.5	-0.7
$\gamma_1[\log_{10}(v_{X_j}/v_j)]$	-1.65	1.52	0.51	-1.53
$\gamma_1[\log_{10}(v_{X_j}/v_j)]/\sigma_{\langle\gamma_1\rangle}$	-12.9	11.9	4.0	-12.0
$\sigma(\log_{10} v_{X_j})$	0.40	0.56	0.59	0.51
$\rho_X(\text{all})/\sqrt{1/365}$	-2.85	5.70	1.67	3.16
$\rho_X(v_K \neq 7\dots)/\sqrt{1/324}$	-2.59	4.87	0.78	2.85

vote counts; instead, it uses the total vote distribution directly. This is the sense in which the word “empirical” is used here.

Comparison of Figs 6 and 12 can help to understand this. If only the empirical version of Benford’s Law is considered, then Fig. 6 shows not only an excess of first digit 7’s, but also an excess of first digit 1’s. A χ^2 estimate of the goodness-of-fit gives $\chi^2 = 56.6$ for 8 degrees of freedom, i.e. the null hypothesis that per voting area, vote counts for K are exactly proportional to the total vote counts, is rejected with $p \approx 2 \times 10^{-9}$. This was not discussed above, because the standard version of Benford’s Law gives an expectation of a much higher fraction of 1’s than the empirical version. Reality should lie somewhere in between these two extremes.

Figure 12 shows precisely where in the “folded” total vote histogram the empirically expected frequencies of 1’s and 7’s come from. The offset is only a small fraction of one dex (a factor of 10) because K’s vote fraction is 0.00838, i.e. it is logarithmically close to 0.01. It is clear that the two vertical lines at the left, showing where K’s 1’s should come from if every voting area votes precisely according to the average voting rate for K, generally have lower frequencies than the rest of the plot. This is why the expected number of 1’s in Fig. 6 is low.

The region bounded by the two vertical lines to the right is where any null hypothesis explanation of the excess 7’s in K’s votes would have to come from. This region is clearly not exceptional; the frequencies there are close to the mean.

Figure 10 shows that as a function of total vote count, K’s voting rates have a lot of scatter. The other candidates’ voting rates also have a lot of

scatter. This is sociologically reasonable. If we were to include the scatter in the voting rates v_{Kj}/v_j for K instead of assuming a constant rate of voting for all voting areas, then instead of the expected first digit 1 votes for K coming from between the lefthand pair of vertical bars in Fig. 12, they would come from this region smoothed out, e.g. by convolution with a normal distribution. This should increase the expected number of 1's, bringing the expected frequency closer to the observed frequency. For sufficiently wide smoothing, the expected frequency should approach the standard form of Benford's Law. However, any smoothing at all will simultaneously make it even harder to explain the excess 7's, since the 7's cover only 0.058 dex.

Figure 12 *does* show a few sharp peaks that could conceivably explain the excess 7's, provided that there is very little scatter in the voting rates for K around the mean voting rate. Independently of whether or not these peaks in the total vote counts occur due to administrative/political reasons or due to Poisson fluctuations, it is true that they could, in principle, lead to the excess 7's feature. However, not only are the peaks in the wrong positions in Fig. 12 to do this, but requiring a zero or small scatter in v_{Kj}/v_j forces the expected distribution to contain significantly fewer first digit 1's than the observed distribution. Smoothing should help with the 1's problem, but would cause the effects of these peaks in the total vote counts to be smoothed out.

Can we refine the empirical model (constant proportions of total vote counts) in order to see if this is correct? A minimal model would be to make a linear fit in the log-log plane of Fig. 10 in order to see how the voting fraction varies with total vote count, and in addition to simulate the scatter given the actual dispersion around this best fit.

Table 1 shows that for K, modelling a linear fit is not required. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient ρ_X for the four candidates shows that while A has a strong anticorrelation with the total numbers of voters, and R and M have strong correlations, K's correlation ρ_K is not significantly different from zero.

Surprisingly, removal of the voting areas whose votes for K start with 7 induces little fractional change to the correlations of A, R, and M (just decreasing their absolute correlations slightly), but halves K's own correlation, bringing it down from 1.67 to 0.78, i.e. below one standard deviation. Interpretation of this would require external data and/or assumptions. Can it be expected that the demographic characteristics of voters for K are very uniformly spread between small and large voting areas, so that there is no significant correlation, i.e. $\rho_K(\text{all})/\sqrt{1/365}$ and $\rho_K(v_K \neq 7\dots)/\sqrt{1/324}$ are

TABLE 2

Probabilities p of obtaining frequencies of K 's first digit 1's, 7's, or both, as high as the frequencies in the MOI table, estimated from 10^6 numerical simulations based on the total vote counts [Eq. (6)], for \log_{10} Gaussian width σ .

σ	first digit(s) condition		
	1	7	1 and 7
0.0	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$
0.1	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$	$\sim 3 \times 10^{-6}$	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$
0.2	7×10^{-4}	$\sim 7 \times 10^{-6}$	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$
0.3	0.013	1.6×10^{-5}	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$
0.4	0.03	2.1×10^{-5}	$\sim 10^{-6}$
0.5	0.04	2.4×10^{-5}	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$
1.0	0.08	1.8×10^{-5}	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$
1.5	0.41	$\sim 4 \times 10^{-6}$	$\lesssim 10^{-6}$

within about one standard deviation³ of zero? And what is special about towns that have 7... K supporters who voted on 12 June 2009, such that they contribute half of the full correlation with voting area size,⁴ even though they constitute only about 11% of the data set? Clearly, voting areas that each gave 7... votes to K play a major role in the overall statistical characteristics of votes for K from all 366 voting areas.

Independently of whatever the explanation is for K's low ρ_K value, this makes numerical simulation of the expected vote counts relatively easy, since we do not need to include a dependence on v_j . For total vote counts with $v_j > 10^5, 3 \times 10^5$, and 10^6 , the scatter $\sigma[\log_{10}(v_{Kj}/v_j)] = 0.28, 0.15$, and 0.17 respectively, while the scatter for all 366 voting areas is 0.42.

A simulation with 10^6 realisations was carried out, each consisting of 366 simulated vote counts

$$(6) \quad w_i = 10^{\log_{10}[\langle v_{Kj}/v_j \rangle v_j + g(0, \sigma)]},$$

where $\sigma = 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 1.0$, and 1.5 and $g(0, \sigma)$ is a number selected from a normal distribution of mean zero and width σ .⁵ A Poisson error is added to each value w_i .⁶ The first digit frequencies are then calculated, providing estimates of the probability of the observation occurring, given the model.

³The standard deviation of Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is $\sqrt{1/(N-1)}$ for sample size N .

⁴By number of total votes.

⁵A Dirac delta function is used in the case of $\sigma = 0$.

⁶Using a Gaussian approximation.

The first row of Table 2, i.e. for zero scatter, shows that the initial estimate $p \approx 10^{-4}$ given in Eq. (4) overestimates the expected frequency of obtaining 41 first digit 7's by at least an order of magnitude. A likely explanation is that Poisson errors in the vote counts in individual voting areas only allow the total vote count to vary by a relatively small amount logarithmically, whereas Poisson errors in first digit frequency distributions ignore this constraint. For example, in town Y with 100,000 total votes and candidate X of average popularity 40%, the Poisson error in votes for X gives 40000 ± 200 votes for X. For the initial digit 4 to be converted to a 3 or a 5 would require an offset by 10,000 votes, i.e. 50 standard deviations. The same row also shows that when the scatter in the voting rates v_{Kj}/v_j is ignored, the excess of first digit 1's is also highly improbable, with $p \lesssim 10^{-6}$.

Subsequent rows in Table 2 show that inclusion of scatter brings the expected number of 1's high enough so that the observed number is accepted with $p \sim 0.03$ for $\sigma = 0.4$. So, even when scatter is used to generate the expected distribution, K's excess 1's remain hard to explain, although not as difficult to explain as the excess 7's. The table shows that with a high enough scatter, the probability of obtaining the observed number of first digit 7's can be raised to $\sim 2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ for $\sigma \approx 0.4$, i.e. for the scatter of all the v_{Kj}/v_j values. Using $p \approx 2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ and again applying a Šidák-Bonferonni correction factor of 36, Eq. (5) can be replaced by the more accurate estimate

$$(7) \quad p_7 \sim 0.00072$$

for the full set of tests.

However, this estimate is only based on the excess of 7's. Table 2 also shows the joint probability to obtain *both* the excess 7's *and* the excess 1's is less than $\sim 10^{-6}$ for any scatter σ . That is, in 1,000,000 simulations, only one realisation (for $\sigma = 0.4$) satisfied both conditions. So the two probabilities appear to be approximately independent. A high scatter, e.g. $1.0 \lesssim \sigma \lesssim 1.5$, i.e. about 2.5 to 4 times the vertical scatter (standard deviation) in Fig. 10, brings the expected 1's frequency high enough that the observed frequency is accepted at $p \gtrsim 0.1$, but also brings the expected distribution closer to the standard Benford's Law, strengthening the difficulty of explaining the excess 7's. Hence, Eq. (7) is a conservative upper estimate to the probability that the four candidates' vote counts' first digit frequencies are consistent with the null hypothesis.

4. Discussion.

TABLE 3

Votes for K and proportion of votes for A for the six voting areas with the greatest numbers of total votes.

voting area	v_j	v_{K_j}	v_{A_j}/v_j
Tabriz	876919	3513	0.497
Shiraz	947168	7078	0.600
Karaj	950243	8057	0.537
Isfahan	1095399	7002	0.609
Mashhad	1536106	7098	0.669
Tehran	4179188	43073	0.433

4.1. *Excess 7's for K.* The rejection of the null hypothesis at $p_7 \sim 0.00072$ is estimated using just 41 vote counts starting with the digit 7 for candidate K, in excess to an expected 20–21.2 vote counts starting with 7. Could this just be a copying error by employees under pressure in a stressful situation? Various sources of unintentional errors are possible. The present analysis only concerns the data as published by the MOI.

This is unlikely to be a transliteration error: the different files appear to contain the same substantial content. The number of entries that start with 7 under candidate K in the Persian-Arabic numerals PDF file is 41 (MOI Iran 2009c).

The fact that “just a few dozen 7’s” may intuitively seem insignificant could itself be a reason for the anomaly. In the case of artificial modification of the data, “just a few dozen 7’s” may have seemed sufficiently “random” not to be detectable.

One possible method to test whether this is just an odd fluke would be to check the validity of the vote counts for candidate K in the voting areas where the official number of votes for K starts with the digit 7.

4.1.1. *Excess 7abcd vote counts for K.* However, if the excess 7’s for K indicate interference in the data, then other signs of interference could be expected. A reasonable hypothesis would be that vote counts for one of the major candidates were decreased or increased. Figures 8, 9, 10 and 11 show proportions of votes that each candidate received as a function of total votes, where those voting areas selected by having 7 as the first digit in K’s vote count.

It is clear in Fig. 8 that for candidate A, among the six voting areas with the greatest numbers of total votes, the three of these that voted for A in the highest proportions are all selected by the K first digit 7. Data for these six voting areas are listed in Table 3. Figure 11 shows correspondingly that the

three of the six most populous voting areas who voted least for M are also those selected by the K first digit 7. Since the vote fractions for K and R are only about 1% each, the high proportions of votes for A necessarily imply low proportions of votes for M.

Are these two populations, the K first digit 7 group voting over 60% for A, versus the K first digit other than 7 group voting less than 55% for A, significantly distinct? Given the very small number of points (six), the use of any test requiring a specific model would be risky. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test is a non-parametric test that enables the comparison of these two populations. Among the six voting areas with the highest vote numbers, the probability that the three vote proportions for A $\{v_{Aj}/v_j|K = 7 \dots\}$ and the three vote proportions for A $\{v_{Aj}/v_j|K \neq 7 \dots\}$ are sampled from the same probability density function, or equivalently, that the vote proportions $\{v_{Aj}/v_j|v_{Aj}/v_j > 0.60\}$ and the vote proportions $\{v_{Aj}/v_j|v_{Aj}/v_j < 0.55\}$ are sampled from the same probability density function, is

$$(8) \quad p_{7abc,KS} \approx 0.100.$$

This high probability may seem counterintuitive, since the two sets of three values are completely non-overlapping. However, the number of values is small. Making any statistical test to compare the distributions of such small numbers of values is necessarily difficult.

Could it be expected that there is any dependence between the initial first digit test leading to the excess of 7's for K and the separation of the largest six voting areas into two distinct distributions using this same characteristic? This seems unlikely.

Another coincidence is obvious among the three $7abc$ vote counts shown in Table 3: the second digit a is zero in all three cases. Since an approximately log-uniform distribution is seen from the above figures to be a sufficiently good approximation for the standard Benford's Law for first digits and the empirical version of the law to be mostly consistent with one another, the standard form of Benford's Law should be sufficient for the second digit distribution. This gives the probability of 0 as a second digit to be 11.97%, i.e. slightly greater than 10%.⁷ The probability that all three digits are identical is

$$(9) \quad p_{7abc,7ade,7afg} \approx 0.01037,$$

i.e. slightly greater than $10(0.1)^3$, which would be estimated assuming a uniform *linear* distribution of values.

⁷The expected frequency of second digit i is $\sum_{j=1}^9 \log_{10}[1 + 1/(10j + i)]$.

TABLE 4
Frequencies N of the two-digit votes for K starting with the digit 7.

v_{Kj}	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79
N	1	2	1	4	1	4	1	2	1	3

Again, this should be independent of the previous probability estimates. There is no reason why dividing the six most populous voting areas into two groups based on their first digit for K's votes being 7, or for being in the upper or lower half of voting proportions for A, should have an effect on the second digits of K's votes.

If we suppose that (i) these three voting areas (Shiraz, Isfahan and Mashhad for 7078, 7002 and 7098 votes for K respectively) should have proportions of about 50% for A in agreement with Tabriz and Karaj, which follow an approximately linear upper boundary to A's proportions of votes in the log-log plot in Fig. 8, and if (ii) the total number of votes should remain constant, then from Table 3 this would imply that the correct number of votes for A would be about 473,000 less than in the MOI table. To keep the total number of votes constant, M's, K's and R's votes would also have to be corrected. If these are corrected in proportion to the three candidates' overall vote percentages, then the difference between A's and M's total vote counts would be reduced by about one million votes.

4.1.2. *Excess 7a vote counts for K.* The $v_{Kj} = 7abc$ voting areas comprise just a small fraction of the total number of excess first digit 7 votes for K. In Fig. 15, discussed below, a peak in the 70's, i.e. $7a$ votes appears strongly. Table 4 shows these vote counts.

This distribution is quite literally odd. Most (15 out of 20) of the votes are odd, but the few even votes that occur are themselves distributed with perfect uniformity. Every even number occurs exactly once. The latter necessarily implies the former — these two coincidences are dependent on one another. Given that there are 20 integers in the range from 70 to 79, what is the probability for each even number to occur exactly once (and by implication, for there to be a large majority of odd numbers)?

Numerical generation of 20-tuplets of numbers

$$(10) \quad \{ \lfloor 10^{\log_{10} 7 + x_j \log_{10}(1+1/7)} \rfloor \}_{j=1,20},$$

where x_j is selected uniformly on $[0, 1)$, gives a sample of a logarithmically uniform distribution of numbers in the interval $[70, 80)$. This gives the probability that even numbers occur exactly once each $p \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}$. That is,




FIG 13. *Distribution of the logarithmic vote counts for A, shown as numbers per logarithmic bin in $\log_{10} v_{Aj}$.*

the probability for the twenty $7a$ vote counts for K to have exactly one occurrence of each even number $7a$ (and by implication, fifteen occurrences of odd numbers), given that they are randomly selected from a logarithmically uniform distribution in the range $[70, 80)$, is

$$(11) \quad p_{7a} \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}.$$

Again, it is difficult to see how this characteristic could be statistically dependent on the initial selection based on the overall first digit statistics for the candidates' vote counts.

4.2. Other statistics. Are there other statistics that could help to distinguish the null hypothesis from the alternative hypothesis? To motivate further analyses, Figs 13, 14, 15, and 16 show the logarithmic distributions of the four candidates' votes. Fig. 13 does appear to have high, locally significant spikes at $\log_{10} v_{Aj} \approx 4.3, 5.3$, i.e. $v_{Aj} \approx 20,000$ and $v_{Aj} \approx 200,000$ respectively.

On the other hand, Fig. 14 appears to be very far from a lognormal distribution: there appears to be a significant dip at $3 < \log_{10} v_{Rj} < 3.3$, i.e. in the range 1000 to 2000. This was not detectable in the Benford's Law tests since the above-100 and above-1000 decades were combined.

Can we quantify the characteristics of these four plots in a way that is independent of the relative popularity (assuming that the data are correct) of the four candidates? For 366 values, the standard error of skewness $\sigma_{\langle \gamma_1 \rangle} \approx \sqrt{6/366} \approx 0.128$. Table 1 shows that candidate R's distribution is skewed




FIG 14. *Distribution of the logarithmic vote counts for R, shown as numbers per logarithmic bin in $\log_{10} v_{Rj}$.*




FIG 15. *Distribution of the logarithmic vote counts for K, shown as numbers per logarithmic bin in $\log_{10} v_{Kj}$.*




FIG 16. Distribution of the logarithmic vote counts for M , shown as numbers per logarithmic bin in $\log_{10} v_{Mj}$.




FIG 17. Logarithmic skewness of proportional counts, as in Table 1, comparing the 2005 first (“+”) and second (“x”) round and 2009 first (“o”) round candidates’ results, shown against the overall proportions of votes.

by about $5.8\sigma_{\langle\gamma_1\rangle}$. A's is skewed by $4.6\sigma_{\langle\gamma_1\rangle}$ and K's by $2.5\sigma_{\langle\gamma_1\rangle}$. For a log-normal null hypothesis, these would correspond to rejection probabilities of $p \sim 7 \times 10^{-9}$, 4×10^{-6} , and 1.2×10^{-2} respectively. In contrast, M's distribution has no significant skew at all.

One possible explanation of why at least candidates with high vote counts should have skewed log-normal distributions is that their votes are constrained by the total numbers of votes. A tail to lower values is allowed, but not a tail to higher values. Hence, a strong negative skew is reasonable. However, $\gamma_1(\log_{10} v_{Aj})$ is positively skewed, not negatively skewed. The skewness of the proportional counts $\gamma_1[\log_{10}(v_{Xj}/v_j)]$ shown in Table 1 is easier to understand. In this case A's distribution is negatively skewed, consistently with a long tail to lower values.

Positive skewness for candidates with low vote numbers could be expected since candidates' votes cannot fall below 1; fractional votes are not possible in a standard voting system and vote counts of zero would have to be excluded for evaluating logarithmic skewness. R's and K's vote proportions do not go this low, but are nevertheless positively skewed. However, Fig. 17 shows a comparison with candidates' vote distributions from the first and second rounds of the 2005 Iranian presidential election.⁸ Strong negative skews occur for candidates with high proportions of the vote as expected. In addition, the low popularity candidates of the 2005 first round election suggest a general monotonic relation. In the absence of a detailed model for how the skewness should behave for realistic voting populations, it is not obvious whether or not K's and R's distributions are exceptional compared to the low popularity candidates of the 2005 first round election.

In any case, more demographic information would be needed if these distribution characteristics and shapes were to be used to test the null hypothesis that the data have not been artificially interfered with.

5. Conclusion. The vote counts per voting area published on 2009-06-14 by the Ministry of the Interior of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the 2009 presidential election show a highly significant excess of the first digit 7 for candidate K, compared to the expectations either from a uniform Benford's Law or from the assumption that the total vote distribution represents a probability density function of which the individual candidates' votes are selected after multiplying by their average popularity. The latter is referred to here as an empirical form of Benford's Law. Addition of scatter to the dependence of a candidate's votes on the total vote count fails to explain the excess of 7's for K.

⁸Kindly provided by Walter Mebane (Mebane 2009).

An excess of first digit 1's for K also remains difficult to explain. Smoothing weakens the significance of the excess 1's, but reinforces the difficulty in explaining the excess 7's. A smoothing estimated from the data itself only brings the probability of finding the actual number of 1's up to $p = 0.03$. More than twice this amount of smoothing is required in order to get $p > 0.1$. Given that the test was applied for all four candidates, the null hypothesis that the first digits in the candidates' absolute numbers of votes are consistent with random selection as proportions of the total vote distribution, as described above, is conservatively rejected at a significance of $p_7 \sim 0.00072$, i.e. $1 - p_7 \sim 99.99\%$. [Eq. (7)].

Selection among the 366 voting areas by requiring the first digit for K's vote count to be 7 leads to the following coincidences:

- (i) Of the six voting areas with the greatest total numbers of voters, three of these (Shiraz, Isfahan, Mashhad) satisfy this criterion, i.e. they have vote totals for K that start with 7 (7078, 7002, 7098 votes respectively). All three of these have greater proportions of votes for A than the other three voting areas. The probability for the two sub-groups of the six big cities to be drawn from the same distribution is mildly rejected by a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, with $p_{7abc,KS} \approx 0.100$ [Eq. (8)].
- (ii) The other surprising property of the three big cities that have total votes starting with the digit 7 for K is that they all have the same second digit. The probability for the second digit of all three to be equal (not necessarily zero) is $p_{7abc,7ade,7afg} \approx 0.01037$ [Eq. (9)].
- (iii) The voting areas that voted for K with a total of $70 + i$ votes, for any digit i , show an unusual characteristic: 15 of the 20 values are odd numbers, and the even numbers occur exactly once each (Table 4). The chance of the latter is $p_{7a} \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}$ [Eq. (11)].
- (iv) Removal of the K first digit 7 voting areas from the sample reduces the Spearman rank correlation coefficient of voting rates v_{Kj}/v_j with total vote count v_j from 1.67 to 0.78 standard deviations (Table 1), i.e. by a factor of about two. In other words, the K first digit 7 subsample contributes about half the correlation of voting proportion to total vote count for K, even though it constitutes only 11% of the full sample. The correlation coefficients of the other three candidates proportionally drop much less when the K 7 selected sub-sample is removed.

It is difficult to see, given no artificial intervention in the data, how any of (i), (ii) or (iii) should be dependent on each other or on the use of the K first digit 7 as a marker for the selection. In other words, an anomaly unexpected at $p_7 \sim 7 \times 10^{-4}$ led to anomalies with probabilities (i) $p_{7abc,KS} = 0.1$,

(ii) $p_{7abc,7ade,7afg} = 0.01$, and (iii) $p_{7a} = 5 \times 10^{-4}$. Can these probabilities be combined? The tests for (i), (ii) and (iii) are all *post-hoc* tests, i.e. they were chosen after seeing the data, so considering these as independent tests would require applying a Šidàk-Bonferonni correction (Abdi 2007). Estimating this as a factor $C = 3$ gives

$$(12) \quad p_{\text{all}} \sim 3p_7 p_{7abc,KS} p_{7abc,7ade,7afg} p_{7a} = 1 \times 10^{-9}.$$

If selection of the three big cities voting most for A is interpreted as a misestimate of the true vote and the true voting proportions for A are set to 50%, while retaining constant total vote numbers and increasing votes for the other three candidates in proportion to the average voting percentages, then the difference between A's and M's vote numbers would drop by about one million votes.

The highly significant excess of 7's for K could be checked by examining the credibility of the total vote numbers (and likely voting patterns) for Shiraz, Isfahan and Mashhad, as well as for the other voting areas selected this way, especially the 15 voting areas that gave odd numbers of 7a votes to K according to the MOI data. The voting areas' names are listed in the table published by the MOI (MOI Iran 2009a; MOI Iran 2009b; MOI Iran 2009c). A possible clue for further investigation could be the positive skewness of the low popularity candidates of the 2009 first round election. Any demographic models of Iranian voting patterns will need to either reproduce these statistical characteristics for both the 2005 and 2009 elections, or else make hypotheses regarding systematic anomalies in the data.

While it does seem that checking both the standard form of Benford's Law and an empirical variant based on the same idea has led to the detection of highly significant anomalies in an electoral poll, *the reverse would clearly not be true*. Benford's Law may detect anomalies in a data set but cannot guarantee the absence of anomalies, because many randomising effects can combine to hide artefacts. The anomalies detected in the analysis presented above, suggesting an error of about one million votes, may not constitute the full set of anomalies. An alternative interesting in-depth analysis is that of Mebane (Mebane 2009).

Acknowledgements. Thank you to the pseudo-anonymous Wikipedia editor "128.100.5.143" who alerted me to the MOI publication of the data set, to Walter R. Mebane Jr for providing a copy of the 2005 data set, and to an anonymous physicist from Iran for a useful idea. Thank you to numerous people who provided useful comments and will remain anonymous unless they request otherwise. This work has used the GNU OCTAVE command-

line, high-level numerical computation software
(<http://www.gnu.org/software/octave>).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplement A: Plain text files containing the MOI data

(<http://arXiv.org/e-print/0906.2789>). The data from (MOI Iran 2009a) used in this analysis are listed in the two plain text files TOTAL and CANDS, which are part of the source version of this article at ArXiv.org.

Supplement B: Plain text octave script

(<http://arXiv.org/e-print/0906.2789>). This plain text file BENFORD.M is an OCTAVE script for carrying out the analysis in this paper, using the input files TOTAL and CANDS. This file will be of the source version of this article at ArXiv.org.

References.

- [Abdi 2007] ABDI, H. (2007). *Bonferroni and Sidak corrections for multiple comparisons*, in N.J. Salkind (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Measurement and Statistics*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage, <http://www.utdallas.edu/~herve/Abdi-Bonferroni2007-pretty.pdf>
- [Beber & Scacco 2009] BEBER, B. & SCACCO, A. (2009). *The Devil is in the Digits*, Washington Post, 20 June 2009, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/20/AR2009062000004.html?hpid=opinionsbox1>
- [Benford 1938] BENFORD, F. (1938). *The law of anomalous numbers*, in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, **78**, 551–572.
- [Mebane 2009] MEBANE, W.R., JR. (2009). *Note on the presidential election in Iran, June 2009*, <http://www.umich.edu/~wmebane/note20jun2009.pdf>
- [MOI Iran 2009a] MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN (2009a). XLS file <http://www.moi.ir/Portal/File/ShowFile.aspx?ID=0793459f-18c3-4077-81ef-b6ead48a5065>, 2009-06-14; archived at the University of Toronto <http://www.webcitation.org/5hXHfYNbN>.⁹
- [MOI Iran 2009b] MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN (2009b). XLS file, <http://www.moi.ir/ostan.xls>, 2009-06-15, containing the same numerical data as MOI Iran 2009a, but in multiple tables; archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/5hYWBcT7w>.
- [MOI Iran 2009c] MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN (2009b). PDF file, <http://www.moi.ir/ostan.pdf>, 2009-06-15, containing the same numerical data as MOI Iran 2009b, using Persian-Arabic numerals; archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/5hZbt9YhD>.

⁹The main url linking to MOI Iran 2009a, 2009b, 2009c is <http://www.moi.ir/Portal/Home/ShowPage.aspx?Object=News&ID=e3dffc8f-9d5a-4a54-bbcd-74ce90361c62&LayoutID=b05ef124-0db1-4d33-b0b6-90f50139044b&CategoryID=832a711b-95fe-4505-8aa3-38f5e17309c9>; archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/5hYWAcdhW>.

- [Newcomb 1881] NEWCOMB, S. (1881). *Note on the frequency of use of the different digits in natural numbers*, *American Journal of Mathematics*, **4**, 39–40.
- [Roukema 2009a] ROUKEMA, B.F. (2009a). Supplement to “Benford’s Law anomalies in the 2009 Iranian presidential election”.
- [Roukema 2009b] ROUKEMA, B.F. (2009b). Supplement to “Benford’s Law anomalies in the 2009 Iranian presidential election”.

TORUŃ CENTRE FOR ASTRONOMY, UMK
UL. GAGARINA 11, 87-100 TORUŃ, POLAND
E-MAIL: boud@astro.umk.pl

