601366

2 of 3

MEMORANDUM
RM-4112-PR
JUNE 1964

UPSETS IN ROUND ROBIN TOURNAMENTS

D. R. Fulkerson

DDC
RECEIVED
JUN 22 1964
DDC-IRA D

PREPARED FOR:
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE PROJECT RAND

The RAND Corporation
SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA

MEMORANDUM

RM-4112-PR

JUNE 1964

UPSETS IN ROUND ROBIN TOURNAMENTS

D. R. Fulkerson

This research is sponsored by the United States Air Force under Project RAND—contract No. AF 49(638)-700 monitored by the Directorate of Development Planning, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, Hq USAF. Views or conclusions contained in this Memorandum should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the United States Air Force.

DDC AVAILABILITY NOTICE

Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from the Defense Documentation Center (DDC).

The RAND Corporation

1700 MAIN ST. • SANTA MONICA • CALIFORNIA • 90406

PREFACE

As part of its Project RAND research program, RAND engages in basic supporting studies in mathematics. The present Memorandum treats two problems concerning (0,1)-matrices, i.e., rectangular arrays of numbers, each 0 or 1. Many problems in pure and applied mathematics depend on the properties of such matrices.

SUMMARY

Consider a round robin tournament in which each player plays one game with every other player, and assume that each game ends in a win for one of the players. The results of such a tournament can be recorded in a square (0, 1)-matrix $T = (t_{ij})$ by setting $t_{ij} = 1$ or 0 according as player i defeats or loses to player j, and $t_{ii} = 0$. This Memorandum studies the class of all tournament matrices having prescribed row sums $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \cdots \leq r_n$. In particular, simple constructions are given for two specific matrices $\tilde{T}$ and $\bar{T}$ in this class. The matrix $\tilde{T}$ minimizes the number of 1's above the main diagonal, and $\bar{T}$ maximizes the number of 1's above the main diagonal. Using the theory of minimal cost flows in networks, results about the block structure of $\tilde{T}$ and $\bar{T}$ are deduced.

UPSETS IN ROUND ROBIN TOURNAMENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Consider a round robin tournament in which each of n players is required to play precisely one game with each other player, and assume that each game ends in a win or a loss. The results of such a tournament can be conveniently recorded in a square (0, 1)-matrix $T = (t_{ij})$ of order n by setting $t_{ij} = 1$ if player i defeats player j, $t_{ij} = 0$ if player i loses to player j, and $t_{ii} = 0$. Thus T has 0's along the main diagonal, and in the off-diagonal positions T satisfies the "skew-symmetry" condition that $t_{ij} = 1$ if and only if $t_{ji} = 0$. We call such a (0, 1)-matrix T a <u>tournament matrix</u>.

Tournament matrices have received attention in [1 - 4]. In particular, Ryser [4] has studied the class of all n by n tournament matrices having specified row sums r_i, where

$$(1.1) \qquad 0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \cdots \leq r_n \leq n - 1 .$$

The i-th row sum of T represents the total number of wins for player i, and the i-th column sum represents his losses. Thus, denoting the i-th column sum by s_i, we have

$$(1.2) \qquad r_i + s_i = n - 1 ,$$

and the monotonicity assumption (1.1) implies

$$(1.3) \qquad n - 1 \geq s_1 \geq s_2 \geq \cdots \geq s_n \geq 0.$$

With the notation chosen as in (1.1), a 1 above the main diagonal of T means that a player has defeated another who has a better (or at least no worse) win record, that is, an upset occurred. One of the results of [4] is an explicit formula for the minimum number $\tilde{\tau}$ of upsets that could have occurred, given the integers r_i:

$$(1.4) \qquad \tilde{\tau} = \Sigma[r_i - (i - 1)] ,$$

the summation being over all i such that $r_i > i - 1$. It is clear that the sum in (1.4) is a lower bound for the number of upsets. That this bound can always be achieved is established in [4] by deducing the existence, in the class of all tournament matrices having row sums r_i, of a tournament matrix having the property that if row i contains a 0 in one or more of the positions 1, 2, ..., i-1, then row i contains only 0's in the remaining positions, for i = 1, 2, ..., n. In Sec. 2 we give a simple and direct construction for such a tournament matrix $\tilde{T}$, thereby providing an easier proof of (1.4). We then go on in Sec. 3 to show that the problem of finding a tournament matrix $\bar{T}$ which maximizes the number of upsets can also be solved by an equally simple construction.

Both the minimum and maximum problems described above can be formulated as minimal cost flow problems in suitable networks. The concluding Sec. 4 discusses this and indicates how the duality theorem of linear inequality theory can be applied to deduce results about the structure of $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{T}}$.

2. THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF UPSETS

Let

$$(2.1) \qquad R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n)$$

denote the given row-sum vector whose components r_i are arranged monotonely as in (1.1), and let

$$(2.2) \qquad \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(R)$$

denote the class of all tournament matrices having row-sum vector R and column-sum vector

$$(2.3) \qquad S = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) .$$

The components of R and S of course satisfy (1.2). It is known that the class (2.2) is nonempty if and only if the inequalities

$$(2.4) \qquad r_1 + r_2 + \ldots + r_e \geq \frac{e(e-1)}{2}$$

hold for e = 1, 2, ..., n, the last with equality. The

necessity of the conditions (2.4) is obvious, and sufficiency has been established in various ways [1 - 4].

Let $T = (t_{ij})$ be in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. Since, for $i \neq j$, $t_{ij} = 1$ if and only if $t_{ji} = 0$, and $t_{ii} = 0$, it follows that for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$,

$$(2.5) \qquad \sum_{j>i} t_{ij} - \sum_{j<i} t_{ji} = r_i - (i-1) .$$

Conversely, if T is a tournament matrix whose elements above the main diagonal satisfy (2.5), then T is in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. Our construction for a tournament matrix $\hat{T}$ which minimizes upsets over all matrices in $\mathcal{T}(R)$ will be based on (2.5), and hence we shall deal primarily with the vector

$$(2.6) \qquad A = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$$

whose components a_i are given by

$$(2.7) \qquad a_i = r_i - (i-1) .$$

The validity of Theorem 2.1 below, which rephrases the existence conditions (2.4) in terms of the vector A, is readily checked.

<u>Theorem 2.1.</u> <u>Let</u> $A = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ <u>have components defined by (2.7). Then</u>

(2.8) $\quad a_1 \geq 0, \quad a_{i-1} - a_i \leq 1, \quad i = 2, 3, \ldots, n.$

<u>The class $\mathcal{T}(R)$ is nonempty if and only if the inequalities</u>

(2.9) $\quad a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_e \geq 0, \quad e = 1, 2, \ldots, n,$

<u>hold, the last with equality.</u>

Conditions (2.8), which assert that the components of A can decrease by at most 1, reflect the monotonicity assumption on the components of R.

We now describe a construction for a specific matrix $\tilde{T}$ in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. From (2.5), with $i = n$, we see that the last column of $\tilde{T}$ contains $s_n = -a_n$ 1's. We insert these 1's in certain positions corresponding to positive components of the vector A, as follows. Find the first member of the last consecutive string of positive components of A. Starting with this position in column n of the matrix $\tilde{T}$ to be constructed, insert 1's consecutively downward until either $-a_n$ 1's have been inserted or this string of positive components of A has been exhausted. In the latter case, find the first member of the next-to-last consecutive string of positive components of A, and continue inserting 1's as above. When $-a_n$ 1's have been inserted in column n in this fashion, define a new vector A' having n-1 components by

(2.10) $$a_i' = \begin{cases} a_i - 1 & \text{if column n has a 1 in position i,} \\ a_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. We may then fill in the last row of $\mathfrak{T}$ as the complement transpose of the last column. The entire procedure is then repeated using A' and the undetermined portion of column $n-1$, and so on.

The schema below (Fig. 2.1) illustrates the construction for

$$R = (1, 2, 3, 3, 3, 6, 6, 6, 6)$$
$$A = (1, 1, 1, 0, -1, 1, 0, -1, -2) .$$

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	1	1		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0		
4	1	1	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
5	1	1	0	1		0	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1				
6	1	1	1	1	1		0	0	1	1	0	0	0					
7	1	1	1	1	1	1		0	0	0	0	0						
8	1	0	1	1	1	1	1		0	-1	-1							
9	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		-2								

Fig. 2.1

We now verify that the construction produces a matrix $\mathfrak{T}$ in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. In view of (2.5) and (2.10), this will surely be the case provided the construction can be carried out

as described. To show that it can be, we may proceed inductively. We note first of all that (2.8) and (2.9) imply that A has at least $-a_n$ positive components, so the 1's can be inserted in column n as described. It now suffices to establish that the vector A' defined by (2.10) again satisfies (2.8) and (2.9). That A' satisfies (2.8) is obvious from the fact that we start with the first member of a string of positive components of A and work downward in reducing components of A. It remains to verify that A' satisfies (2.9).* Clearly

$$(2.11) \qquad a_1' + a_2' + \ldots + a_{n-1}' = 0 \ .$$

Thus if (2.9) were violated, there would be an integer e in the interval

$$(2.12) \qquad 1 \leq e \leq n-2$$

such that

$$(2.13) \qquad a_1' + a_2' + \ldots + a_e' < 0 \ .$$

---

*I am indebted to T. A. Brown for the following simple proof that the components of the reduced vector A' satisfy (2.9).

Hence $a_n < 0$. We may assume in (2.13) that

$$(2.14) \qquad a'_e < 0, \; a'_{e+1} \geq 0 \; .$$

For if this were not so, we could easily locate another integer e in the interval (2.12) for which (2.13) and (2.14) hold.

Let

$$(2.15) \qquad a'_1 + a'_2 + \dots + a'_e = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_e - p \; ,$$

$$(2.16) \qquad a'_{e+1} + a'_{e+2} + \dots + a'_{n-1} = a_{e+1} + a_{e+2} + \dots + a_{n-1} - q$$

for nonnegative integers p and q satisfying

$$(2.17) \qquad p + q = -a_n \; .$$

By (2.11) and (2.13) we have

$$(2.18) \qquad a'_{e+1} + a'_{e+2} + \dots + a'_{n-1} > 0 \; ,$$

and hence

$$(2.19) \qquad a_{e+1} + a_{e+2} + \dots + a_{n-1} > 0 \; .$$

It now follows from (2.8), (2.14), and (2.19) that the sequence $a_{e+1}, a_{e+2}, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ has more than $-a_{n-1}$ positive members, and hence has at least $-a_n$ positive members. Consequently, using (2.14), we see that our procedure for defining A' implies $q = -a_n$, $p = 0$. Thus $a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_e < 0$, contradicting the fact that A satisfies (2.9). Hence A' satisfies (2.9).

<u>Theorem 2.2. The matrix $\tilde{T}$ is in $\mathscr{T}(R)$ and minimizes the number of 1's above the main diagonal over all matrices in $\mathscr{T}(R)$.</u>

It remains only to check the last assertion of Theorem 2.2. But this is immediate, since $\tilde{T}$ clearly has

$$\tilde{\tau} = \Sigma\, a_i = \Sigma[r_i - (i-1)]$$

1's above the main diagonal, the summation being over all i such that $a_i > 0$.

We also point out that the construction for $\tilde{T}$ provides an independent proof of Theorem 2.1.

3. THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF UPSETS

In constructing the tournament matrix $\tilde{T}$, we worked with elements above the main diagonal so as to minimize the number of 1's which could be inserted to satisfy the constraints (2.5). We now shift attention to elements below the main diagonal, our aim being to minimize the number of 1's required to satisfy the constraints

$$(3.1) \qquad \sum_{j<i} t_{ij} - \sum_{j>i} t_{ji} = r_i - (n-i), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n,$$

which also characterize, via skew-symmetry, a matrix $T = (t_{ij})$ in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. Since minimizing the number of 1's below the main diagonal is equivalent to maximizing the number of 1's above the diagonal, we are here concerned with the maximum possible number of upsets.

Let

$$(3.2) \qquad B = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n)$$

have components defined by

$$(3.3) \qquad b_i = r_i - (n-i), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n .$$

The monotonicity assumption (1.1) on components of R implies

$$(3.4) \qquad -(n-1) \leq b_1 < b_2 < \ldots < b_n ,$$

and the existence conditions (2.4) imply

$$(3.5) \qquad b_1 + b_2 + \ldots + b_e \geq e(e-n), \quad e = 1, 2, \ldots, n,$$

with equality for $e = n$. However, we shall make no explicit use of (3.5) in verifying that the construction of this

section produces a matrix in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. The construction will not, in any event, maintain the strict monotonicity of (3.4) for the reduced vector B' defined below, although it will preserve monotonicity of components of B'.

Our argument will use interchanges [4], which we shall think of as being generated by elements below the main diagonal. Suppose we have a (0, 1)-solution t_{ij}, $i > j$, of equations (3.1). Let

$$(3.6) \qquad t_{i_1,j_1},\ t_{i_1,j_2},\ t_{i_2,j_2},\ t_{i_2,j_1}$$

be alternately 0 and 1 (or 1 and 0) in this solution. Then interchanging 0's and 1's in (3.6) gives another (0, 1)-solution to (3.1). Call this operation an interchange involving the positions

$$(3.7) \qquad (i_1,j_1),\ (i_1,j_2),\ (i_2,j_2),\ (i_2,j_1)\ .$$

Another type of four-way interchange involves the positions

$$(3.8) \qquad (i_1,j_1),\ (i_2,j_1),\ (j_2,i_1),\ (j_2,i_2)\ ,$$

where again the four corresponding values of t_{ij} are alternately 0 and 1 (or 1 and 0). Finally, a third type of interchange involves the three positions

$$(3.9) \qquad (i_1,j_1),\ (i_2,j_1),\ (i_2,i_1)\ ,$$

again the three corresponding values of t_{ij} being alternately 0 and 1 (or 1 and 0). Each of these interchanges produces another (0, 1)-solution to equations (3.1). Hence performing an interchange and its skew-symmetric mate changes a matrix T in $\mathcal{T}(R)$ to another matrix T' in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. It is shown in [4] that one can pass through the class $\mathcal{T}(R)$ by interchanges of these types. (Actually, a four-way interchange can be accomplished by a sequence of two three-way interchanges, but we find it convenient to ignore this fact.)

We now describe the construction of a particular matrix $\bar{T}$ in $\mathcal{T}(R)$. The first column of $\bar{T}$ contains $s_1 = -b_1$ 1's. We insert these 1's in positions corresponding to the $-b_1$ largest components of B, with preference given to topmost positions in case of equal components. Then define a new vector B' having n-1 components by

$$(3.10) \qquad b_i' = \begin{cases} b_i - 1 & \text{if a 1 has been inserted in position } i\ , \\ b_i & \text{otherwise}\ , \end{cases}$$

for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, n$. We may then fill in the first row of $\bar{T}$ by skew-symmetry. The procedure is then repeated using B' and the undetermined part of the second column, and so on.

The schema of Fig. 3.1 below illustrates the construction for

$$R = (1, 2, 3, 3, 3, 6, 6, 6, 6)$$

$$B = (-7, -5, -3, -2, -1, 3, 4, 5, 6) .$$

								-7		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
							-5	-5	0		1	1	0	0	0	0	0
						-4	-4	-3	1	0		1	1	0	0	0	0
					-3	-3	-3	-2	1	0	0		1	1	0	0	0
				-3	-3	-3	-2	-1	1	1	0	0		0	1	0	0
			-1	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	1	0	1		1	1	0
		0	0	0	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	1	0	0		1	1
	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	5	1	1	1	1	1	0	0		1
0	0	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	
9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Fig. 3.1

Notice in the example of Fig. 3.1 that the "tie-breaking" part of the construction which gives preference to topmost positions in case of equal components was used in assigning the 1's in column 5. This part of the rule maintains monotonicity of components of the new vector B', although not the strict monotonicity satisfied by components of the starting vector, of course. The fact that strict monotonicity may not be preserved means that the minor of

$\bar{T}$ which corresponds to the new vector may not have monotone row sums. For example, deleting the first and second rows and columns in Fig. 3.1 leaves a minor whose row sums are not monotone. This is to be contrasted with the construction of Sec. 2, where monotonicity of row sums was preserved.

We now prove that the construction produces a matrix $\bar{T}$ in $\mathscr{T}(R)$ which maximizes upsets. To this end, let T be a tournament matrix in $\mathscr{T}(R)$ which minimizes the number of 1's below the main diagonal. We shall show that the first column of T can be made to coincide with that of $\bar{T}$ by performing four-way interchanges on T. Let the bottommost 1 of the first column of T be in position e. Suppose $e < n$, so that

$$(3.11) \qquad t_{e1} = 1, \quad t_{e+1,1} = 0 .$$

We have

$$(3.12) \qquad \sum_{j<e} t_{ej} - \sum_{j>e} t_{je} = b_e \leq b_{e+1} = \sum_{j<e+1} t_{e+1,j} - \sum_{j>e+1} t_{j,e+1} .$$

It follows from (3.11) and (3.12) that either there is an integer j such that

$$(3.13) \qquad e < j \leq n, \quad t_{je} = 1, \quad t_{j,e+1} = 0 ,$$

or there is an integer i such that

(3.14) $\quad 1 \leq i < e, \quad t_{ei} = 0, \quad t_{e+1,i} = 1 .$

Suppose (3.13) holds. Then $j \neq e + 1$, for otherwise an interchange involving the three positions

$$(e, 1), \quad (e + 1, 1), \quad (e + 1, e)$$

produces a matrix in $\mathcal{T}(R)$ having fewer 1's below the diagonal than does T, contradicting our assumption on T. Hence $j > e + 1$ in (3.13). We may now perform a four-way interchange involving the positions

$$(e, 1), \quad (e + 1, 1), \quad (j, e), \quad (j, e + 1) .$$

This lowers the position of the bottommost 1 in the first column of T and yields a new matrix having the minimum number of 1's below the main diagonal. Similarly, if (3.14) holds, a four-way interchange involving the positions

$$(e, 1), \quad (e + 1, 1), \quad (e, i), \quad (e + 1, i)$$

accomplishes this also. Repetition of this argument shows that the 1's in the first column of T can be brought to appear consecutively at the bottom by four-way interchanges, thereby producing a new matrix T' in $\mathcal{T}(R)$ having the minimum number of 1's below the diagonal.

It is important to note that we did not require the strict inequality $b_e < b_{e+1}$ in (3.12) for the above argument, but used only the fact that $b_e \leq b_{e+1}$. This means that we can repeat the argument on the second column, using the vector B', and so on. For later stages of the argument, we need also to observe that in case the 1's in a column of $\bar{T}$ do not all appear consecutively at the bottom (because of the tie-breaking rule for equal components), we can first bring all 1's to the bottom by interchanges which affect adjacent rows, and then raise an appropriate number of 1's by similar interchanges, since we will be working with equal components of the reduced vector in the raising process.

Thus T can be transformed into $\bar{T}$ by four-way interchanges, and consequently $\bar{T}$ minimizes the number of 1's below the diagonal. This proves

<u>Theorem 3.1.</u> <u>The matrix</u> $\bar{T}$ <u>is in</u> $\mathcal{T}(R)$ <u>and maximizes the number of 1's above the main diagonal over all matrices in</u> $\mathcal{T}(R)$.

In contrast with the situation for the minimum number of upsets $\tilde{\tau}$, we do not have a simple formula for the maximum number of upsets $\bar{\tau}$. In terms of the discussion in Sec. 4, this is because the rule for constructing $\bar{T}$ involves "transshipment" in satisfying "demands" from "supplies," whereas the rule for constructing $\tilde{T}$ does not.

4. FLOWS, DUALITY, AND NORMAL FORMS

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a directed graph consisting of nodes 1, 2, ..., n and directed arcs ij (from i to j). Suppose that each arc ij of $\mathcal{G}$ has associated with it two non-negative numbers c_{ij}, a_{ij}, and that each node i of $\mathcal{G}$ has associated with it a number a_i. We call c_{ij} the capacity of arc ij, a_{ij} the unit cost of flow in ij, and a_i the supply or demand at node i according as $a_i > 0$ or $a_i \leq 0$. We shall assume that

$$(4.1) \qquad a_1 + a_2 + \ldots + a_n = 0.$$

A feasible flow $X = (x_{ij})$ in $\mathcal{G}$ is a real vector having one component for each arc ij, which satisfies the equations and inequalities

$$(4.2) \qquad \sum_j (x_{ij} - x_{ji}) = a_i, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n,$$

$$0 \leq x_{ij} \leq c_{ij}, \qquad \text{all arcs } ij .$$

If, in addition, X minimizes the flow cost

$$(4.3) \qquad \sum_{ij} a_{ij} x_{ij}$$

over all feasible flows, we call X a minimal cost flow. We refer the reader to [1, Chapter III] for a discussion

of various iterative methods for constructing minimal cost flows. In particular, it is well known that if the supplies and demands a_i and the arc capacities c_{ij} are integers, then there is a minimal cost flow $X = (x_{ij})$ whose components x_{ij} are integers.

Both the minimum and maximum problems of Secs. 2 and 3 can thus be viewed as minimal cost flow problems in appropriate (acyclic) directed graphs, as suggested by (2.5) and (3.1). For the minimum upset problem, we may take the graph to consist of nodes 1, 2, ..., n with all arcs of the form ij, where $i < j$. Each arc ij has $c_{ij} = a_{ij} = 1$, and node i has supply (demand) $a_i = r_i - (i-1)$. Theorem 2.1 gives necessary and sufficient conditions for feasibility of the supplies and demands, the condition being that the cumulative net supply must be nonnegative. Theorem 2.2 shows that the flow $\tilde{X}$ whose components are given by the elements of $\tilde{T}$ which lie above the main diagonal is a minimal cost flow. This flow involves no transshipment, that is, $\tilde{x}_{ij} > 0$ implies that node i is a supply node and node j is a demand node. Consequently the minimal flow cost is given by

$$\tilde{\tau} = \Sigma\, a_i ,$$

where the summation is over supplies a_i.

For the maximum upset problem, we take the graph $\mathcal{G}$

to consist of nodes 1, 2, ..., n, with supplies and demands given by $b_i = r_i - (n-i)$, and arcs ij, where $i > j$, with capacities and unit costs $c_{ij} = a_{ij} = 1$. The elements below the main diagonal of the matrix $\bar{T}$ then give a minimal cost flow $\bar{X}$. This flow does involve transshipment. For example, in Fig. 3.1, node 1 receives shipments from nodes 3, 4, 5, which are themselves demand nodes.

The linear programming duality theorem can be applied to these minimal cost flow problems to deduce information about the structure of $\tilde{T}$ and $\bar{T}$. Consider the minimum upset problem. The dual of this can be formulated as follows. Find numbers π_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and non-negative numbers α_{ij}, for $i < j$, which maximize the dual form

$$(4.4) \qquad \sum_i a_i \pi_i - \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij}$$

subject to the dual constraints

$$(4.5) \qquad \pi_i - \pi_j - \alpha_{ij} \leq 1, \qquad (i < j,\ i,j = 1,2,\ldots,n) .$$

It is apparent from (4.4) and (4.5) that we may set

$$(4.6) \qquad \alpha_{ij} = \max\ (0,\ \pi_i - \pi_j - 1) ,$$

and thus the dual problem becomes that of maximizing the

(unconstrained) function

$$(4.7) \qquad \sum_i a_i\pi_i - \sum_{ij} \max\,(0,\ \pi_i - \pi_j - 1)\ .$$

The results of [4] and Sec. 2 show that an optimal solution to the dual problem is given by

$$(4.8) \qquad \tilde{\pi}_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_i > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } a_i \leq 0\ . \end{cases}$$

(It is not an accident that optimal π_i turn out to be integers. This is always the case for minimal cost flow problems in which the a_{ij} are integers.) That (4.8) constitutes an optimal solution to the dual problem follows from the fact that (4.8) inserted in (4.7) and $\tilde{X}$ in (4.3) produce equality between primal and dual forms,

$$(4.9) \qquad \sum_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ij} = \sum_i a_i\tilde{\pi}_i - \sum_{ij} \max\,(0,\ \tilde{\pi}_i - \tilde{\pi}_j - 1)\ ,$$

both sides of (4.9) being equal to $\tilde{\tau}$.

The optimal dual solution $\tilde{\Pi}$ given by (4.8) can be used to obtain, via well-known optimality properties for the pair of dual linear programs being dealt with here, certain information about the structure of a minimal cost flow, hence of $\tilde{T}$. Since X and Π are optimal in their respective programs if and only if

$$(4.10)\qquad \begin{cases} \pi_i - \pi_j < 1 & \text{implies} \quad x_{ij} = 0 \quad (i < j)\ , \\ \pi_i - \pi_j > 1 & \text{implies} \quad x_{ij} = 1 \quad (i < j)\ , \end{cases}$$

it follows that a matrix T which minimizes upsets has the form illustrated in Fig. 4.1 below. Conversely, any tournament matrix in $\mathcal{T}(R)$ having this form minimizes upsets.

$\Pi \rightarrow$ ↓	1	0	1	0	1	0	
1	1 \ 0	*	0	*	0	*	$a_i > 0$
0	*	1 \ 0	0	0	0	0	$a_i \leq 0$
1	1	1	1 \ 0	*	0	*	$a_i > 0$
0	*	1	*	1 \ 0	0	0	$a_i \leq 0$
1	1	1	1	1	1 \ 0	*	$a_i > 0$
0	*	1	*	1	*	1 \ 0	$a_i \leq 0$

Fig. 4.1

In Fig. 4.1, 1 stands for all elements 1, 0 for all elements 0, and * for undetermined portions. The partitioning is determined solely by the positivity and nonpositivity of the a_i, as shown. (Rows corresponding to $a_i = 0$ could be included in either way.) Note that this form precludes transshipment; that is, it has the minimizing property deduced in [4], namely that if row i has a 0 in its initial segment (i, 1), (i, 2), ..., (i, i-1), then it has only 0's in its terminal segment.

We turn now to the maximum upset problem, expressed as a minimal cost flow problem. The dual of this problem is that of finding π_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and nonnegative α_{ij}, $i > j$, which maximize

$$(4.11) \qquad \sum_i b_i\pi_i - \sum_{ij} \alpha_{ij}$$

subject to the constraints

$$(4.12) \qquad \pi_i - \pi_j - \alpha_{ij} \leq 1, \qquad (i > j;\ i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n) .$$

Again we may assume (4.6), so that the dual problem asks for the (unconstrained) maximum of the function

$$(4.13) \qquad g(\Pi) = \sum_i b_i\pi_i - \sum_{ij} \max\ (0, \pi_i - \pi_j - 1) .$$

It suffices to consider vectors $\Pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_n)$

having integral components π_i in (4.13), as noted in the discussion of the minimum upset problem.

In view of the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i = 0$, replacing π_i by $\pi_i + k$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, does not change (4.13), and hence we may deal with nonnegative integers π_i. We shall show, in fact, that optimal π_i may be assumed to satisfy

$$(4.14) \qquad 0 = \pi_1 \leq \pi_2 \leq \cdots \leq \pi_n$$

and

$$(4.15) \qquad \pi_{i+1} - \pi_i \leq 1, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1 .$$

To establish (4.14), suppose that

$$(4.16) \qquad \pi_{e+1} < \pi_e$$

for some e. Let

$$\Pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_e, \pi_{e+1}, \ldots, \pi_n) ,$$
$$\Pi' = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_{e+1}, \pi_e, \ldots, \pi_n) .$$

Then

$$g(\Pi') - g(\Pi) = \pi_{e+1}b_e + \pi_e b_{e+1} - \pi_e b_e - \pi_{e+1}b_{e+1}$$
$$- \max (0, \pi_e - \pi_{e+1} - 1) + \max (0, \pi_{e+1} - \pi_e - 1).$$

By (4.16), this becomes

$$g(\Pi') - g(\Pi) = (\pi_e - \pi_{e+1})(b_{e+1} - b_e - 1) + 1 .$$

Hence, since $b_e < b_{e+1}$,

$$g(\Pi') - g(\Pi) \geq 1 .$$

Consequently, interchanging adjacent components of Π which satisfy (4.16) increases (4.13). This proves (4.14).

For (4.15), assume

$$\pi_{e+1} \geq \pi_e + 2 \tag{4.17}$$

for some e, and let

$$\Pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_e, \pi_{e+1}, \ldots, \pi_n) ,$$

$$\Pi' = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_e, \pi_{e+1}-1, \ldots, \pi_n-1) ,$$

the components of Π being monotone. Then

$$g(\Pi') - g(\Pi) = \tag{4.18}$$

$$-\sum_{i=e+1}^{n} b_i + \sum_{i=e+1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{e} [\max(0,\pi_i-\pi_j-1) - \max(0,\pi_i-\pi_j-2)].$$

By (4.14) and (4.17), each term in the double sum of (4.18) is at least 1, and hence

$$(4.19) \qquad g(\Pi') - g(\Pi) \geq - \sum_{i=e+1}^{n} b_i + e(n-e) \ .$$

By (3.5), the right side of (4.19) is nonnegative. Hence we may assume (4.15).

It follows now from (4.14), (4.15), and the optimality properties (4.10) that a tournament matrix $\bar{T}$ which maximizes upsets has the form illustrated in Fig. 4.2 below, and conversely.

$\Pi \rightarrow$ ↓	0	1	2	3	4
0	0 \ 1	*	0	0	0
1	*	0 \ 1	*	0	0
2	1	*	0 \ 1	*	0
3	1	1	*	0 \ 1	*
4	1	1	1	*	0 \ 1

Fig. 4.2

For example, the matrix $\bar{T}$ of Fig. 3.1 has the partitioned form

$\Pi \rightarrow$	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3
$\downarrow$									
0		1							
0			1	1					
1	1			1	1				
1	1				1	1			
1	1	1					1		
2	1	1	1		1		1	1	
2	1	1	1	1				1	1
2	1	1	1	1	1				1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1			

The partitioning is not in general unique. For instance, another optimal dual solution in this example is given by

$$\pi_1 = 0,\ \pi_2 = 1,\ \pi_3 = \pi_4 = \pi_5 = 2,\ \pi_6 = \pi_7 = \pi_8 = 3,\ \pi_9 = 4\ .$$

REFERENCES

1. Ford, L. R., Jr., and D. R. Fulkerson, Flows in Networks, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1962.

2. Landau, H. G., "On Dominance Relations and the Structure of Animal Societies; III. The Conditions for a Score Structure," Bull. Math. Biophysics, Vol. 15, 1953, pp. 143-148.

3. Moon, J. W., "An Extension of Landau's Theorem on Tournaments," Pacific Jour. Math., Vol. 13, 1963, pp. 1343-1347.

4. Ryser, H. J., "Matrices of Zeros and Ones in Combinatorial Mathematics" (to appear).