On the arrow-simplicity of tournaments
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Abstract

An n-tournament T with vertex set V is simple if there is no subset M of V such that 2 ≤ |M| ≤ n − 2 and for every x ∈ V \ M, either M → x or x → M. The arrow simplicity of a tournament T is the minimal number s(T) of arcs whose reversal yields a simple tournament. Müller and Pelant proved that s(T) ≤ \( \frac{n-1}{2} \), and that equality holds if and only if n ≡ 3 (mod 4) and T is doubly regular. In this paper, we give a refinement of this bound for n ̸≡ 3 (mod 4).

Keywords: Tournament, inversion, module, arrow-simplicity.

1. Introduction

A tournament T consists of a finite set V of vertices together with a set A of ordered pairs of distinct vertices, called arcs, such that for all x ≠ y ∈ V, (x, y) ∈ A if and only if (y, x) ∉ A. Such a tournament is denoted by T = (V, A). If (x, y) is an arc of a tournament T, we say that x dominates y and we write x → y. Extending the notation to subsets of vertices of T, we write X → Y if x → y holds for all pairs (x, y), with x ∈ X and y ∈ Y. A tournament is transitive, if for every three vertices x, y and z, x → y and y → z implies that x → z. The Slater index [13] of T is the minimum number of arcs that must be reversed to make T transitive. Several variants of this index have been investigated (see for example [8,3,2]). In this paper,
we consider another variant of Slater index, introduced by Müller and Pelant [10]. It is based on the notion of module. Let $T = (V, A)$ be a tournament. A module of $T$ is a subset $I$ of $V$ such that either $I \to \{x\}$ or $\{x\} \to I$ for every $x \in V \setminus I$. For example, $\emptyset$, $\{x\}$, where $x \in V$, and $V$ are modules of $T$, called trivial modules. A tournament is simple [6, 10] (or prime [1] or primitive [5] or indecomposable [7, 12]) if all its modules are trivial.

Throughout this paper, we mean by $n$-tournament, a tournament with $n$ vertices. Let $n \geq 3$ and let $T$ be an $n$-tournament, the arrow-simplicity $s(T)$ is the minimum number of arcs that must be reversed to make $T$ non simple. By definition, if $T$ is not simple then $s(T) = 0$. Furthermore, it is not difficult to see that $s(T) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. Müller and Pelant [10] proved that $s(T) = \frac{n-1}{2}$ if and only if $T$ is doubly regular. Recall that an $n$-tournament is doubly regular if there is an integer $k$ such that every pair of vertices dominates exactly $k$ vertices. If such a tournament exists then $n = 4k + 3$. It is shown in [11] that the existence of doubly regular $(4k+3)$-tournaments for all $k$ is equivalent to the unsolved problem of the existence of skew-Hadamard matrices of all orders $4k + 4$.

In this paper, we give an upper bound for $s(T)$ where $T$ is an $n$-tournament and $n \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. More precisely, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 1.** Let $T$ be an $n$-tournament, then the following assertions hold

i) If $n = 4k + 2$ then $s(T) \leq 2k$.

ii) If $n = 4k + 1$ then $s(T) \leq 2k - 1$.

iii) If $n = 4k$ then $s(T) \leq 2k - 2$.

Furthermore, assuming the existence of a skew Hadamard matrix of order $4k + 4$, we show that these bounds are the best possible.

2. Preliminaries

Let $T = (V, A)$ be an $n$-tournament. The out-neighborhood of a vertex $x$ is $v(x) := \{y \in V : x \to y\}$ and the in-neighborhood is $f(x) := \{y \in V : y \to x\}$. The out-degree (resp. the in-degree) of a vertex $x$ is $d_T^+(x) = |v(x)|$ (resp. $d_T^-(x) = |f(x)|$).

Recall that
\[
\sum_{x \in V} d_+^T(x) = \sum_{x \in V} d_-^T(x) = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}
\] (1)

A tournament is \textit{regular} if all its vertices have the same out-degree, it is \textit{near-regular} if there exists an integer \(k > 0\) such that the out-degree of every vertex is \(k\) or \(k - 1\).

**Remark 2.** Let \(T\) be an \(n\)-tournament. It follows from Equality (1) that

1. \(T\) is regular iff \(n\) is odd and every vertex has out-degree \(\frac{(n-1)}{2}\);
2. \(T\) is near-regular iff \(n\) is even and \(T\) has \(\frac{n}{2}\) vertices of out-degree \(\frac{n}{2}\), and \(\frac{n}{2}\) vertices of out-degree \(\frac{(n-2)}{2}\).

Let \(x, y\) be two distinct vertices of an \(n\)-tournament \(T = (V, A)\). The set \(V \setminus \{x, y\}\) is partitioned into four subsets: \(v(x) \cap v(y), f(x) \cap f(y), v(x) \cap f(y)\) and \(f(x) \cap v(y)\). The \textit{out-degree} (resp. the \textit{in-degree}) of \((x, y)\) is \(d_+^T(x, y) = |v(x) \cap v(y)|\) (resp. \(d_-^T(x, y) = |f(x) \cap f(y)|\)). The elements of \((v(x) \cap f(y)) \cup (f(x) \cap v(y))\) are called the \textit{separators} of \(x, y\) and their number is denoted by \(\Delta_T(x, y)\). Observe that

\[\Delta_T(x, y) + d_-^T(x, y) + d_+^T(x, y) = n - 2\] (2)

**Lemma 3.** Let \(T\) be an \(n\)-tournament with vertex set \(V\). Then, for every \(x \neq y \in V\), we have

\[d_-^T(x, y) - d_+^T(x, y) = d_-^T(x) - d_+^T(y)\]

In particular, if \(T\) is regular then for every \(x \neq y \in V\), \(d_-^T(x, y) = d_+^T(x, y)\).

**Proof.** We have

\[
|f(x)| = |f(x) \cap f(y)| + |f(x) \cap v(y)| + |f(x) \cap \{y\}| \\
|v(y)| = |v(y) \cap v(x)| + |v(y) \cap f(x)| + |v(y) \cap \{x\}|
\]

Moreover, \(y \in f(x)\) if and only if \(x \in v(y)\). It follows that \(|f(x) \cap \{y\}| = |v(y) \cap \{x\}|\). Hence \(|f(x) \cap f(y)| - |v(x) \cap v(y)| = |f(x)| - |v(y)|\), which completes the proof. \(\square\)
Let $T = (V, A)$ be a tournament, and let $(V^2) := \{\{x, y\} : x \neq y \in V\}$. By double-counting, we obtain the following equalities.

\[
\sum_{x, y \in (V^2)} \Delta_T(x, y) = \sum_{z \in V} d^+_T(z) d^-_T(z) \tag{3}
\]

\[
\sum_{x, y \in (V^2)} |f(x) \cap f(y)| = \sum_{z \in V} \left( \frac{d^+_T(z)}{2} \right) \tag{4}
\]

\[
\sum_{x, y \in (V^2)} |v(x) \cap v(y)| = \sum_{z \in V} \left( \frac{d^-_T(z)}{2} \right) \tag{5}
\]

In the following proposition, we give some basic properties of doubly regular tournaments (for the proof, see [10]).

**Proposition 4.** Let $T = (V, A)$ be a doubly regular tournament with $4k + 3$ vertices. Then

1. $T$ is regular;
2. For $x, y \in V$ such that $x \rightarrow y$, we have
   
   (a) $|v(x) \cap v(y)| = k$;
   (b) $|f(x) \cap f(y)| = k$;
   (c) $|v(x) \cap f(y)| = k$;
   (d) $|f(x) \cap v(y)| = k + 1$.

Let $T$ be a tournament of order $4k + 2$ obtained from a doubly regular tournament by deleting one vertex. Clearly $T$ is near-regular. Moreover the vertex set $V$ of $T$ is partitioned into two $(2k + 1)$ subsets, namely $V_e = \{z \in V, d^+_T(z) = 2k\}$ and $V_o = \{z \in V, d^+_T(z) = 2k + 1\}$. It is not difficult to check that

(C1) If $x, y \in V_e$ or $x, y \in V_o$ then $\Delta_T(x, y) = 2k + 1$.

(C2) If $x \in V_e$ and $y \in V_o$ then $\Delta_T(x, y) = 2k$.

Conversely, Lakhlifi [9] obtained the following proposition.
Proposition 5. Let $T = (V, A)$ be a near-regular tournament of order $4k+2$. Let $V_e = \{ z \in V, d^-_T(z) = 2k \}$ and $V_o = \{ z \in V, d^+_T(z) = 2k+1 \}$.

If that $T$ satisfies (C1) and (C2) then the tournament $\hat{T}$ obtained from $T$ by adding a new vertex $\omega$ which dominates $V_o$ and is dominated by $V_e$ is doubly regular.

Under the notations and conditions of the proposition above, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6. For every $x, y \in V$ such that $x \rightarrow y$, we have

1. If $x, y \in V_o$ then $|f(x) \cap v(y)| = k + 1$ and $|v(x) \cap f(y)| = k$.
2. If $x, y \in V_e$ then $|f(x) \cap v(y)| = k + 1$ and $|v(x) \cap f(y)| = k$.
3. If $x \in V_o$ and $y \in V_e$ then $|f(x) \cap v(y)| = k$ and $|v(x) \cap f(y)| = k$.
4. If $x \in V_e$ and $y \in V_o$ then $|f(x) \cap v(y)| = k + 1$ and $|v(x) \cap f(y)| = k - 1$.

Proof. We have

$$|f(x) \cap f(y)| + |f(x) \cap v(y)| = |f(x)|$$
$$|v(x) \cap v(y)| + |v(x) \cap f(y)| = |v(x)| - 1$$

Using Lemma 3 and Equality (2), we get,

$$|f(x) \cap v(y)| = \frac{1}{2}(|f(x)| + |v(y)| - 4k + \Delta_T(x, y))$$
$$|v(x) \cap f(y)| = \frac{1}{2}(|f(x)| - |v(y)|) - \frac{1}{2}(4k - \Delta_T(x, y)) + |v(x)| - 1$$

The assertions follow from these equalities, by substitution, in each case. \qed

Proof of Proposition 5. Clearly, $\hat{T}$ is regular. Then by Lemma 3 and Equality (2), $d^+_T(x, y) = \frac{4k - \Delta_T(x, y)}{2}$ for every $x, y \in V \cup \{ \omega \}$. Hence $\hat{T}$ is doubly regular iff $\Delta_T(x, y) = 2k + 1$ for every $x, y \in V \cup \{ \omega \}$. The last equality is easy to check for $x, y \in V$. It remains to prove that $\Delta_T(\omega, z) = 2k + 1$ for $z \in V$. It is not difficult to see that $\Delta_T(\omega, z) = |v(z) \cap V_e| + |f(z) \cap V_o|$. Let $A_o := (v(z) \cap V_o)$, $A_e := (v(z) \cap V_e)$, $B_o := (f(z) \cap V_o)$ and $B_e := (f(z) \cap V_e)$. We will evaluate $|A_o|$, $|A_e|$, $|B_o|$ and $|B_e|$. Firstly, we assume that $z \in V_o$. By counting the number of arcs from $v(z)$ to $f(z)$ in two ways, we get

$$\sum_{t \in A_o} |f(z) \cap v(t)| + \sum_{t \in A_e} |f(z) \cap v(t)| = \sum_{t \in B_o} |f(t) \cap v(z)| + \sum_{t \in B_e} |f(t) \cap v(z)|$$
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It follows from Lemma 6 that
\[(k + 1) |A_o| + k |A_e| = (k + 1)(|B_o| + |B_e|)\]

Since \(z \in V_o\) we have \(|A_o| + |A_e| = 2k + 1, |B_o| + |B_e| = 2k, |A_o| + |B_o| = 2k\) and \(|A_e| + |B_e| = 2k + 1\).

It follows that \(|A_o| = k, |B_o| = k, |B_e| = k\) and \(|A_e| = k + 1\).

Using the same argument, we prove that, if \(z \in V_e\) then \(|A_o| = k, |B_o| = k + 1, |B_e| = k\) and \(|A_e| = k\).

In both cases, we have \(\Delta_T(\omega, z) = |A_e| + |B_o| = 2k + 1\).

3. Upper bound of the arrow-simplicity

For a given tournament \(T = (V, A)\), let \(B\) be a subset of \(A\), we denote by \(Inv(B, T)\) the tournament obtained from \(T\) by reversing all the arcs of \(B\). We use also the following notations:

1. \(\delta^+_T = \min \{d^+_T(x) : x \in V\}\);
2. \(\delta^-_T = \min \{d^-_T(x) : x \in V\}\);
3. \(\delta_T = \min(\delta^+_T, \delta^-_T)\);
4. \(\Delta_T = \min \{\Delta_T(x, y) : x \neq y \in V\}\).

An upper bound of the arrow-simplicity of a tournament is given by the following proposition.

**Proposition 7.** Let \(T\) be an \(n\)-tournament with \(n \geq 3\). Then

i) \(s(T) \leq \delta_T\);

ii) \(s(T) \leq \Delta_T\).

**Proof.** i) Let \(x \in V\), the subset \(V \setminus \{x\}\) is a common non trivial module of \(Inv(T, \{x\} \times v(x))\) and \(Inv(T, f(x) \times \{x\})\). Then \(s(T) \leq \min \{d^+_T(x), d^-_T(x)\}\). Thus \(s(T) \leq \delta_T\).

ii) Consider a pair \(\{x, y\}\) of vertices of \(T\) and let \(B := (\{x\} \times ((v(x) \cap f(y)) \cup (v(y) \cap f(x)) \times \{x\})\). Clearly \(\{x, y\}\) is a module of \(Inv(T, B)\). It follows that \(s(T) \leq |B| = |v(x) \cap f(y)| + |v(y) \cap f(x)| = \Delta_T(x, y)\). Hence \(s(T) \leq \Delta_T\). □
In addition to the previous proposition, the proof of Theorem requires the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.** Let $T = (V, A)$ be a $n$-tournament with $n \geq 2$. Then

i) $\delta_T \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor$;

ii) $\Delta_T \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor$.

*Proof.* i) Let $x \in V$. We have $\min\{d_T^-(x), d_T^+(x)\} \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. It follows that $\delta_T \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor$.

ii) Observe that $\Delta_T \leq \frac{2n}{n(n-1)} \sum_{z \in V} d_T^+(z)d_T^-(z)$

\[ \leq \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{z \in V} \left( d_T^+(z)+d_T^-(z) \right)^2 \]

\[ = \frac{n-1}{2} \]

Then $\Delta_T \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor$. \qed

**Proof of Theorem.** i) Let $n = 4k + 2$. By Proposition and Lemma we have $s(T) \leq \delta_T \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor = 2k$.

ii) Let $n = 4k + 1$. As in i), we have $s(T) \leq \delta_T$. If $T$ is not regular, then $\delta_T < \frac{n-1}{2}$ and hence $s(T) \leq 2k - 1$. Assume that $T$ is regular and let $x \neq y \in V$. By Equality $\Delta_T(x, y) = n - 2 - d_T^-(x, y) - d_T^+(x, y)$. Moreover using Lemma we get $d_T^+(x, y) = d_T^-(x, y)$. Then for every $x, y \in V$, $\Delta_T(x, y)$ is odd. In particular $\Delta_T$ is odd. Since $\Delta_T \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor = 2k$, by Lemma we get $s(T) \leq \Delta_T \leq 2k - 1$.

iii) Let $n = 4k$. If $T$ is not near-regular then $\delta_T < 2k - 1$ and hence by Proposition $s(T) \leq 2k - 2$. Assume now that $T$ is near-regular. By Remark for every $z \in V$, $d_T^+(z) \in \{2k, 2k - 1\}$. It follows that

\[ \sum_{\{x, y\} \in \binom{V}{2}} \Delta_T(x, y) = \sum_{z \in V} d_T^+(z)d_T^-(z) = 8k^2(2k - 1) \]

(6)
Then
\[
\Delta_T \leq \frac{1}{\binom{V}{2}} \sum_{(x,y) \in \binom{V}{2}} \Delta_T(x, y)
\]
\[
= \frac{2}{4k-1} 2k(2k-1)
\]
\[
= 2k - 1 + \frac{2k-1}{4k-1}
\]

Hence we get \( s(T) \leq \Delta_T \leq 2k - 1 \). Suppose for contradiction that \( s(T) = 2k - 1 \). Then \( \Delta_T = 2k - 1 \). By remark 2, the set \( V \) can be partitioned into two \( 2k \)-subsets \( V_e = \{ x \in V : d_T^-(x) = 2k \} \) and \( V_o = \{ x \in V : d_T^+(x) = 2k - 1 \} \).

Let \( x \in V_e \) and \( y \in V_o \). It follows from Equality (2) and Lemma 3 that \( \Delta_T(x, y) \) is even and hence \( \Delta_T(x, y) \geq 2k \). So there is at least \( (2k)^2 \) of pairs \( \{x, y\} \) satisfying \( \Delta_T(x, y) \geq 2k \). For the other \( 2\binom{2k}{2} \) pairs we have \( \Delta_T(x, y) \geq \Delta_T = 2k - 1 \). It follows that:

\[
\sum_{\{x,y\}\in\binom{V}{2}} \Delta_T(x, y) \geq 2\binom{2k}{2}(2k-1) + (2k)^2(2k) > 8k^2(2k-1)
\]

which contradicts Equality (6). Hence \( s(T) \leq 2k - 2 \).

4. Tournaments with large arrow-simplicity

The following theorem shows that the bounds given in Theorem 1 are the best possible for \( n \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \) and for \( n \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \).

**Theorem 9.** Let \( T = (V, A) \) be a doubly regular tournament of order \( 4k + 3 \) with \( k \geq 2 \). Then

i) the arrow-simplicity of the tournament obtained from \( T \) by removing two vertices is \( 2k - 1 \);

ii) the arrow-simplicity of the tournament obtained from \( T \) by removing three vertices is \( 2k - 2 \).

Before proving this theorem, we will introduce the concept of decomposability graph. All the graphs we consider are simple. We use notations and terminology of [4].

Let \( T = (V, A) \) be a \( n \)-tournament and let \( C \) be a set of vertices of \( T \). We denote by \( s_C(T) \) the minimum number of arcs that must be reversed to make \( C \) a module of \( T \). Clearly, \( s(T) = \min \{ s_C(T) : 2 \leq |C| \leq n - 1 \} \).

Let \( E \) be a subset of \( \binom{V}{2} \). The graph \( G = (V, E) \) is called a decomposability graph for \( C \) if \( C \) is a module in the tournament obtained from \( T \) by reversing the orientation between \( x \) and \( y \) for every \( \{x, y\} \in E \). By definition, \( s_C(T) = \)
where the minimum is taken over all decomposability graphs \( G = (V, E) \) for the set \( C \).

In the following lemma, we present some properties of decomposability graphs.

**Lemma 10.** Let \( T = (V, A) \) be an \( n \)-tournament and let \( C \) be a subset of \( V \) such that \( 2 \leq |C| \leq n - 1 \). If \( G \) is a decomposability graph for \( C \) with a minimal number of edges then

i) \( G \) is bipartite and \( \{C, V \setminus C\} \) is a bipartition of \( G \);

ii) for every \( x \in V \setminus C \), \( N_G(x) = f(x) \cap C \) or \( N_G(x) = v(x) \cap C \). In particular the degree \( d_G(x) \) of \( x \) is \( \min\{|f(x) \cap C|, |v(x) \cap C|\} \).

**Proof.** i) Assume that \( G \) has two adjacent vertices \( x, y \) such that \( x, y \in V \setminus C \) or \( x, y \in C \). The graph obtained from \( G \), by deleting the edge between \( x \) and \( y \) is still a decomposability graph for \( C \). This contradicts the fact that \( G \) has a minimal number of edges.

ii) Let \( x \in V \setminus C \). The neighbour set \( N_G(x) \) of \( x \) in \( G \) cannot contain two vertices \( y, z \) such that \( y \in f(x) \) and \( z \in v(x) \) and moreover, by i) \( V \setminus C \) is an independent set of \( G \). Then \( N_G(x) = f(x) \cap C \) or \( N_G(x) = v(x) \cap C \). Assume for example that \( N_G(x) = f(x) \cap C \). Then \( |f(x) \cap C| \leq |v(x) \cap C| \).

Otherwise, the graph obtained from \( G \) by deleting edges between \( x \) and \( f(x) \cap C \), and adding those between \( x \) and \( v(x) \cap C \), is still a decomposability graph for \( C \). This contradicts the fact that \( G \) has a minimal number of edges.

It follows that \( d_G(x) = \min\{|f(x) \cap C|, |v(x) \cap C|\} \). \( \square \)

Under the assumptions of the previous lemma, we have

**Proposition 11.**

i) if \( n - \delta_T \leq |C| \) then \( s_C(T) \geq \delta_T \);

ii) if \( |C| \leq \Delta_T \) then \( s_C(T) \geq \Delta_T \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a decomposability graph for \( C \) with a minimal number of edges.

To prove i), let \( x \in V \setminus C \). By assertion ii) of Lemma 10, we have

\[
d_G(x) = \min\{|f(x) \cap C|, |v(x) \cap C|\} = |C| - \max\{|f(x) \cap C|, |v(x) \cap C|\}
\]
It follows that
\[
\begin{align*}
d_G(x) & \geq |C| - \max\{|f(x)|, |v(x)|\} \\
& = |C| - \max\{d_T^+(x), d_T^-(x)\} \\
& = |C| - \max\{n - 1 - d_T^+(x), n - 1 - d_T^-(x)\} \\
& \geq (|C| - (n - 1) - \delta_T)
\end{align*}
\]

As \(G\) is bipartite, we have \(|E| = \sum_{x \in V \smallsetminus C} d_G(x)\) and then
\[
|E| \geq |V \smallsetminus C| (|C| - (n - 1 - \delta_T)) \\
= (n - |C|)(|C| - (n - 1 - \delta_T))
\]

Moreover, \((n - |C|)(|C| - (n - 1 - \delta_T)) - \delta_T = (n - 1 - |C|)(|C| - (n - \delta_T)) \geq 0\). Then \(s_C(T) = |E| \geq \delta_T\).

To prove ii) let \(x \neq y \in C\) and let \(z \in ((V \smallsetminus C) \cap f(x) \cap v(y)) \cup ((V \smallsetminus C) \cap v(x) \cap f(y))\). Exactly one of the two pairs \(\{x, z\}, \{y, z\}\) is an edge of \(G\), and so it contributes one to \(d_G(x) + d_G(y)\). Using this fact, we get
\[
\begin{align*}
d_G(x) + d_G(y) & \geq |(V \smallsetminus C) \cap f(x) \cap v(y)| + |(V \smallsetminus C) \cap v(x) \cap f(y)| \\
& = n - |C| - |(V \smallsetminus C) \cap f(x) \cap f(y)| - |(V \smallsetminus C) \cap v(x) \cap v(y)| \\
& \geq (n - |C|) - (|f(x) \cap v(y)| + |v(x) \cap v(y)|) \\
& = (n - |C|) - (n - 2) - (|f(x) \cap v(y)| + |f(y) \cap v(x)|)) \\
& = (n - |C|) - (n - 2) + \Delta_T(x, y)
\end{align*}
\]

Thus
\[
d_G(x) + d_G(y) \geq 2 - |C| + \Delta_T \tag{7}
\]

To continue the proof, we will use the following equality
\[
\sum_{\{x, y\} \in \binom{\mathcal{C}}{2}} (d_G(x) + d_G(y)) = (|C| - 1) \sum_{x \in C} d_G(x)
\]

By inequality \(\Box\) we get
\[
(|C| - 1) \sum_{x \in C} d_G(x) \geq (\frac{|C|}{2})(2 - |C| + \Delta_T)
\]

Since \(G\) is bipartite, \(|E| = \sum_{x \in C} d_G(x)\). It follows that \(s_C(T) = |E| \geq \Delta_T\). \(\square\)
Proof of Theorem 9.  
i) Let \( R \) be a tournament obtained from \( T \) by removing two vertices \( v \) and \( w \).

Using Remark 11 we obtain: \( \delta_R = 2k - 1 \) and \( \Delta_R = 2k - 1 \).

Let \( C \) be a subset of \( V \setminus \{v, w\} \), with \( 2 \leq |C| \leq 4k \). It follows from Proposition 11 that if \( |C| \in \{2, \ldots, 2k - 1\} \cup \{2k + 2, \ldots, 4k\} \) then \( s_C(R) \geq \inf(\delta_R, \Delta_R) = 2k - 1 \). Assume that \( |C| = 2k \) or \( |C| = 2k + 1 \) and let \( G \) be a decomposability graph for \( C \) with a minimal number of edges.

Suppose that there exist \( x \neq y \in V \setminus (C \cup \{v, w\}) \) such that \( d_G(x) = d_G(y) = 0 \)

It follows from ii) of Lemma 10 that \( C \) is contained in one of the following sets \( \{f(x) \cap v(y)\}, \{f(x) \cap f(y)\}, \{v(x) \cap v(y)\}, \{v(x) \cap f(y)\} \).

Hence \( |C| \leq k + 1 \), which contradicts the fact that \( |C| \geq 2k \).

Then \( s_C(R) = \sum_{x \in V \setminus (C \cup \{v, w\})} d_G(x) \geq |V \setminus (C \cup \{v, w\})| - 1 \geq 2k - 1 \) and hence \( s(R) \geq 2k - 1 \). We conclude by Theorem 11 that \( s(R) = 2k - 1 \).

ii) Let \( Q \) be a tournament obtained from \( T \) by removing three vertices \( u, v \) and \( w \).

Clearly we have \( \inf\{\Delta_Q, \delta_Q\} \geq 2k - 2 \). Consider as in i) a subset \( C \) of \( V \setminus \{u, v, w\} \), with \( 2 \leq |C| \leq 4k - 1 \). It follows from Proposition 11 that if \( |C| \in \{2, \ldots, 2k - 2\} \cup \{2k + 2, \ldots, 4k - 1\} \) then \( s_C(R) \geq \inf(\delta_Q, \Delta_Q) \geq 2k - 2 \).

It remains to establish that \( s_C(R) \geq 2k - 2 \) when \( 2k - 1 \leq |C| \leq 2k + 1 \). For this let \( G \) be a decomposability graph for \( C \) with a minimal number of edges.

Suppose that there exist \( x \neq y \in V \setminus (C \cup \{u, v, w\}) \) such that \( d_G(x) = d_G(y) = 0 \). It follows from ii) of Lemma 10 that \( C \) is contained in one of the following sets \( \{f(x) \cap v(y)\}, \{f(x) \cap f(y)\}, \{v(x) \cap v(y)\}, \{v(x) \cap f(y)\} \). Hence \( |C| \leq k + 1 < 2k - 1 \) which contradicts our assumption about \( |C| \).

Then \( s_C(R) = \sum_{x \in V \setminus (C \cup \{u, v, w\})} d_G(x) \geq |V \setminus (C \cup \{u, v, w\})| - 1 \geq 2k - 2 \)

Hence \( s(T) \geq 2k - 2 \), and so, by Theorem 11, \( s(T) = 2k - 2 \).

The following theorem gives a characterization of \( n \)-tournament with maximal arrow-simplicity for \( n \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \).

**Theorem 12.** Let \( T = (V, A) \) be a tournament with \( 4k + 2 \) vertices, then the following statements are equivalent

i) \( s(T) = 2k \).
ii) $T$ is obtained from a doubly regular tournament by removing one vertex.

Proof. The proof of ii) $\implies$ i) is similar to assertion i) of Theorem 9. Conversely, assume that $s(T) = 2k$. Firstly, remark that $T$ is necessarily near-regular, because otherwise $\delta_T < 2k$ which contradicts Proposition 7. Then by Remark 2, the set $V$ is partitioned into two $(2k+1)$-subsets $V_e = \{z \in V, d^+_T(z) = 2k\}$ and $V_o = \{z \in V, d^+_T(z) = 2k+1\}$.

By Proposition 7 again, $\Delta_T(x, y) \geq 2k$ for every $x, y \in V$. Moreover, by using Lemma 3 and Equality 2 it is easy to check that if $x, y \in V_e$ or $x, y \in V_o$ then $\Delta_T(x, y)$ is odd and hence $\Delta_T(x, y) \geq 2k + 1$. We will prove that the tournament $T$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 5. For this assume the contrary. Then one of the following situations occurs

a) There is $x, y \in V_e$ such that $\Delta_T(x, y) > 2k + 1$

b) There is $x, y \in V_o$ such that $\Delta_T(x, y) > 2k + 1$

c) There is $x \in V_e$ and $y \in V_o$ such that $\Delta_T(x, y) > 2k$

It follows that

$$\sum_{x, y \in \binom{V}{2}} \Delta_T(x, y) > (2k + 1)(\binom{|V_e|}{2}) + (2k + 1)(\binom{|V_o|}{2}) + 2k|V_e||V_o|$$

$$= 4k(2k + 1)^2$$

However, by Equality 3

$$\sum_{x, y \in \binom{V}{2}} \Delta_T(x, y) = 4k(2k + 1)^2$$

contradiction.

We conclude by applying Proposition 5.
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