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Abstract

Let $T$ be a tournament with nondecreasing score sequence $R$ and $A$ be its tournament matrix. An upset of $T$ corresponds to an entry above the main diagonal of $A$. Given a feasible score sequence $R$, Fulkerson (1965) gave a simple recursive construction for a tournament with score sequence $R$ and the minimum number of upsets, and Hacioglu et al. (2019) provided a construction for all of such tournament matrices. Let $U_{\text{min}}(R)$ denote the set of tournament matrices with score sequence $R$ that have minimum number of upsets. Brauldi and Li (1983) characterized the strong score sequences $R$ ($R$ is strong if a tournament $T$ with score sequence $R$ is strongly connected) with $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1$.

In this article, we characterize all feasible score sequences $R$ with $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1$ and give an explicit formula for the number of the feasible score sequences $R$ with $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1$.
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1 Introduction

A tournament is an orientation graph of a complete graph. The score-list of a tournament is the sequence of the outdegrees of its vertices. A tournament matrix is the
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adjacency matrix, \( A = (a_{ij}) \), of a tournament. Then \( A \) is a \((0,1)\)-matrix satisfying that \( A + A^T = J - I \), where \( J \) is the all 1’s matrix and \( I \) is the identity matrix. So the row sum vector of \( A \) is the score-list of the tournament, also called the score sequence of \( A \). Throughout the paper, we identify \((0,1)\)-matrices and digraphs if no confusion from the context.

Let \( T(R) \) be the set of all \( n \)-by-\( n \) tournament matrices with row sum vector \( R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \). For a fixed nondecreasing integral vector \( R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \) with
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i = \binom{n}{2}, \tag{1}
\]
the Landau inequalities \([5]\)
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i \geq \binom{k}{2}, \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1
\]
provide sufficient and necessary conditions for the existence of a tournament matrix in \( T(R) \). We call a nondecreasing integral vector \( R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \) a feasible score sequence if \( R \) satisfying \((1)\) and the Landau inequalities. One of the fundamental problems in the study of the tournaments was generating all the tournament matrices in \( T(R) \), which has been solved independently by Kannan et al. \([4]\) and McShine \([6]\).

Let \( T \) be a tournament with feasible score-list \( R \) and \( A = (a_{ij}) \) be its tournament matrix. An upset of \( T \) corresponds to an entry \( a_{ij} = 1 \) with \( i < j \) in \( A \). In fact, regard \( n \) vertices of the tournament \( T \) as \( n \) teams, note that the score sequence is nondecreasing, an upset is a game that the team \( j \) lost to the team \( i \), but \( j > i \). So for the team with the higher score it is an upset game.

For a feasible score sequence \( R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \), let \( H_R = (h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_n) \), where \( h_i = r_i - (i - 1) \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \). \( H_R \) is called the normalized score vector of \( R \). Define multisets \( X = \{h_i \cdot i : h_i > 0\} \) and \( Y = \{(-h_j) \cdot j : h_j < 0\} \), where \( h_i \cdot i \) stands for \( h_i \) \( i \)'s. Let \( X' = \{i : h_i > 0\} \) and \( Y' = \{j : h_j < 0\} \). Then, by \((1)\), we have \( \sum_{i \in X'} h_i = -\sum_{j \in Y'} h_j \). Obviously the minimum number of upsets is at least \( \sum_{i \in X'} h_i \).

In fact, Ryser \([7]\) proved that the lower bound is actually the minimum number of upsets. Fulkerson \([2]\) provided an algorithm for the construction of a tournament with the minimum number of upsets. Denote \( \ell = \sum_{i \in X'} h_i \). A feasible \( \ell \)-tuple of \( X \times Y \) is \( \ell \) distinct ordered pairs \((i,j) \in X \times Y \) with \( i < j \), where \( i \in X \) occurs \( h_i \) times and \( j \in Y \) occurs \(-h_j \) times in the ordered pairs. Let \( P_R \) be the set of all feasible \( \ell \)-tuples.
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of $X \times Y$ and let $U_{\text{min}}(R)$ denote the set of tournament matrices with score sequence $R$ that have minimum number of upsets. In [3], Hacioglu et al. showed that

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 2.1 in [3]). Let $R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n)$ be a feasible score sequence. Then $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = |P_R|$ and the ordered pairs in each feasible $\ell$-tuple give us the location of the upsets.

Moreover, Hacioglu et al. also showed that

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 5.1 in [3]). Let $R_0 = (\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor, \ldots, \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil, \ldots, \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil)$, where $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ and $\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$ each occurs $\frac{n}{2}$ times when $n$ is even (called regular when $n$ is odd and near-regular when $n$ is even) score sequences in [3], respectively. Then $|U_{\text{min}}(R_0)| = 1$.

In fact, the above theorem can be viewed as a corollary of a result given by Brauldi and Li [1]. A feasible score sequence $R$ is strong if a tournament $T$ with score sequence $R$ is strongly connected.

**Theorem 1.3** (Theorem 2.7 in [1]). Let $R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n)$ be a strong score vector. Then $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1$ if and only if

$$R = (k, \ldots, k, k + 1, \ldots, n - k - 1, n - k - 1, \ldots, n - k - 1)$$

for some integer $k > 1$ satisfying $2k + 1 < n$.

This motivates us to consider the following problems.

**Problem 1.4.** (I) Characterize all the feasible score sequences $R$ with $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1$.

(II) How many feasible score sequences $R$ with the property that $|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1$.

Note that the normalized score vector of the strong score sequences is

$$H_R = (k, k - 1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0, -1, -2, \ldots, -k).$$

In general, we call a vector $H$ symmetric if $H$ has the form $(0, \ldots, 0)$ or $(p, p - 1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0, -1, -2, \ldots, -p)$ for some positive integer $p$. The following result generalizes Theorem [12] and solves problem (I).
Theorem 1.5. Let $R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n)$ be a feasible score sequence. Then $|U_{\min}(R)| = 1$ if and only if the normalized score vector of $R$ has the form

$$H_R = (H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_m)$$

where every segment $H_i$ is a symmetric vector for some positive integer $p_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

The following theorem compute the number of the feasible score sequences $R$ with the property that $|U_{\min}(R)| = 1$ and so answers problem (II).

Theorem 1.6. The number of the feasible score sequences $R$ of length $n$ with the property that $|U_{\min}(R)| = 1$ is

$$c_1 \left( \frac{1 - \sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}}{2} \right)^{n-1} + c_2 \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}}{2} \right)^{n-1} + c_3 \left( \frac{1 - i\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}}{2} \right)^{n-1} + c_4 \left( \frac{1 + i\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}}{2} \right)^{n-1},$$

where

$$c_1 = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}} \right), c_2 = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}} \right),$$

$$c_3 = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}} \right), c_4 = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}} \right).$$

The rest of the article is arranged as follows. We give the proof of Theorem 1.5 in Section 2, and in Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.6.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.5

From (1) and the Landau inequalities, we have the following fact.

Fact 1. Let $R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n)$ be a feasible score sequence and $H_R = (h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_n)$ be its normalized score sequence. Then $h_i - h_{i+1} \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1$, $h_1 \geq 0$, $h_n \leq 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} h_i \geq 0$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i = 0$. 
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Proof of Theorem 1.5. Sufficiency: Let \(X \) and \(Y\) be the multisets determined by the normalized score vector \(H_R\). From Theorem 1.4, it is sufficient to show that \(|P_R| = 1\), i.e., to show all the ordered pairs \((x, y)\) in \(X \times Y\) in a feasible \(\ell\)-tuple are determined uniquely. Let \(M\) be a feasible \(\ell\)-tuple of \(P_R\). Without loss of generality, assume \(H_1 = (h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_p}, h_{k_1}, \ldots, h_{k_r}, h_{j_1}, \ldots, h_{j_p})\), where \(h_{i_s} = p - s + 1, h_{j_s} = -s\) for \(s = 1, 2, \ldots, p\) and \(h_{k_1} = \ldots = h_{k_r} = 0\). Since \(h_{j_p} = -p, j_p\) occurs in \(p\) distinct ordered pairs of the form \((i, j)\) with \(i \in X\) and \(i < j\). Since there are exactly \(p\) distinct elements \(i_1, \ldots, i_p\) less than \(j_p\) in \(X\), the \(p\) ordered pairs in \(M\) containing \(j_p\) have to be \((i_1, j_p), \ldots, (i_p, j_p)\). Because \(h_{i_p} = 1\) and \(i_p\) occurs in \((i_p, j_p)\), \((i_p, j_{p-1})\) can not belong in \(M\). And since \(h_{j_{p-1}} = -(p-1)\), \(j_{p-1}\) has to occur in \((i_1, j_{p-1}), \ldots, (i_{p-1}, j_{p-1})\) with a same reason. Because \(h_{i_{p-1}} = 2\) and \((i_{p-1}, j_p), (i_{p-1}, j_{p-1})\) \(\in M\), \((i_{p-1}, j_{p-2})\) can not occur in \(M\). And since \(h_{j_{p-2}} = -(p-2)\), \(j_{p-2}\) has to occur in \((i_1, j_{p-2}), \ldots, (i_{p-2}, j_{p-2})\). Continue this procedure, we have \(j_1\) has to occur in \((i_1, j_1)\). Therefore, all the ordered pairs in \(M\) with entries being indices in \(H_1\) are determined uniquely, i.e. these ordered pairs are independent with the pairs with entries being indices out of \(H_1\). So with similar discussion on the ordered pairs in \(M\) with entries being indices in \(H_2\), we have that all such ordered pairs in \(M\) are determined uniquely too. Continue the same discussion on \(H_3, \ldots, H_m\) one by one, we have all ordered pairs in \(M\) are determined uniquely. This completes the proof of the sufficiency.

Necessity: Let \(H\) be the normalized score vector of \(R\) and \(H_1\) be the first maximal segment starting with a positive string and ending in a nonpositive string with a negative end of \(H\), i.e. \(H_1 = (p, *, \ldots, *, 1, 0, \ldots, 0, -1, *, \ldots, *, -r)\), where the predecessor of \(p\) is zero (if any) and there is no negative entries between \(-r\) and the second positive string (if any) by the maximality of \(H_1\). Let \(-q\) be the minimum entry of the nonpositive string \((-1, *, \ldots, *, -r)\) and assume that \(h_{k_1} = -1\) (resp. \(h_{k_1} = -r\)) be the first (resp. last) negative entry and \(h_j = -q\) be the first \(-q\). Then \(k_1 \leq j \leq k_t\). Since \(|U_{\min}(R)| = 1\), \(P_R\) consists of precisely one feasible \(\ell\)-tuple, say \(M\). Since \(h_j = -q\), there are at least \(q\) positive entries with subscripts less than \(k_1\) in \(H\).

Claim 1. There are exactly \(q\) positive entries \(h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_q}\) in \(H\) satisfying that \(i_1 < \ldots < i_q < k_1\).

Proof of Claim 7. If not, assume that \(j\) occurs in \((i_1, j), \ldots, (i_q, j)\) and there exists an \(i_{q+1} < k_1\) such that \(h_{i_{q+1}} > 0\) and \(i_{q+1}\) occurs in \((i_{q+1}, j')\) for some \(j' \neq j\). Then \(k_1 \leq j'\) and \(h_{j'} < 0\). If there exists \(i_k, k \in \{1, \ldots, q\}\), with \(h_{i_k} = 1\) then \(i_k\) can not occur in any other ordered pairs in \(M\). So \(M' = (M \setminus \{(i_k, j), (i_{q+1}, j')\}) \cup \{(i_{q+1}, j), (i_k, j')\}\)
is another feasible \( \ell \)-tuple of \( P_R \), a contradiction to \( |P_R| = 1 \).

Now assume \( h_i > 1 \) for all \( i \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_q\} \) and let \( h_{i_0} \) be the last positive entry of \( H_1 \). Then \( h_{i_0} = 1 \) and \( i_0 < k_1 \). Assume \( i_0 \) occurs in \( (i_0, j'') \in M \).

If \( k_1 \leq j'' \leq k_t \) then \( h_{j''} \geq -q \). Since \( (i_0, j'') \in M \) and \( j'' \) occurs precisely \( -h_{j''} \leq q \) times in \( M \), there is at least one \( i \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_q\} \) such that \( (i, j'') \notin M \). So \( (M \setminus \{(i, j), (i_0, j'')\}) \cup \{(i_0, j), (i, j'')\} \) is a new \( \ell \)-tuple of \( P_R \), a contradiction.

Now assume \( j'' > k_t \). Then \( h_{j''} < 0 \). By the maximality of \( H_1 \) and Fact \( \ref{maximal-segment} \) \( H \) contains a positive string between \( h_{k_t} \) and \( h_{j''} \), and so there is \( j_0 \) such that \( k_t < j_0 < j'' \) and \( h_{j_0} = 1 \). Assume \( (j_0, j'') \in M \). Hence \( j_0 < j'' \). So \( (M \setminus \{(i_0, j''), (j_0, j'')\}) \cup \{(j_0, j''), (i_0, j'')\} \) is a feasible \( \ell \)-tuple different from \( M \), a contradiction. 

Furthermore, we have

**Claim 2.** \( h_{i_1}, h_{i_2}, \ldots, h_{i_q} \) are \( q \) distinct positive integers.

**Proof of Claim 2.** By Claim \( \ref{claim-1} \) we have \( h_{i_q} = 1 \). By Fact \( \ref{maximal-segment} \) \( \max\{h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_q}\} \leq q \), and the equality holds if and only if \( h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_q} \) are pairwise distinct. So if \( h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_q} \) are not pairwise distinct then \( \max\{h_{i_1}, \ldots, h_{i_q}\} = p < q \). Hence

\[
\sum_{i=i_1}^{i_q} h_i < \sum_{i=1}^{p} i + (p + 1) + (p + 2) + \cdots + q = \sum_{i=1}^{q} i.
\]

So

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{k_t} h_i = \sum_{i=i_1}^{i_q} h_i + \sum_{i=k_1}^{k_t} h_i < \sum_{i=1}^{q} i + \sum_{i=1}^{q} (-i) < 0,
\]

contradicts to the Landau conditions. 

By Claims \( \ref{claim-1} \) \( \ref{claim-2} \) and Fact \( \ref{maximal-segment} \) \( h_{k_1}, \ldots, h_{k_t} \) are pairwise different and \( (h_{k_1}, \ldots, h_{k_t}) = (-1, -2, \ldots, -q) \). So we have \( H_1 = (q, q - 1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, 0, -1, -2, \ldots, -q) \). With the similar discussion on the second maximal segment \( H_2 \) starting with a positive string and ending in a nonpositive string with a negative end of \( H \), we have \( H_2 \) is symmetric too. Continuing the same analysis, we get the conclusion. 

**Corollary 2.1.** Let \( R = (0, 1, \ldots, n - 1) \). Then \( |U_{\min}(R)| = 1 \).

**Proof.** Clearly, \( H_R = (0, 0, \ldots, 0) \) is symmetric. So \( |U_{\min}(R)| = 1 \) by Theorem \( \ref{maximal-segment} \).
Example 1. Let \( R = (2, 2, 2, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 9, 9) \). Then \( R \) is feasible and \( H_R = (2, 1, 0, -1, -2, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, -1) \). From Theorem 1.5, \(|U_{\min}(R)| = 1\) and

\[
P_R = \{((1, 5), (2, 5), (1, 4), (9, 11))\}.
\]

So

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Example 2. Let \( R = (2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 8, 9) \). Then \( R \) is feasible but \( H_R = (2, 1, 0, -1, -1, 0, 0, 1, 0, -1, -1) \). Clearly, \( H_R \) does not satisfy the requirement of Theorem 1.5. So \(|U_{\min}(R)| > 0\). Note that \( \ell = 2 + 1 + 1 = 4 \). It can be checked that \( P_R \) has six feasible 4-tuples and

\[
P_R = \{((1, 4), (1, 5), (2, 10), (8, 11)), ((1, 4), (1, 5), (2, 11), (8, 10)), \\
((1, 5), (2, 4), (1, 10), (8, 11)), ((1, 5), (2, 4), (1, 11), (8, 10)), \\
((2, 5), (1, 4), (1, 10), (8, 11)), ((2, 5), (1, 4), (1, 11), (8, 10))\}.
\]
\[ A = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}, \]

\[ S_0 \]
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix},
\]

or

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix},
\]

or

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]
3 Proof of Theorem 1.6

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let \( a_n \) be the number of the feasible score sequence \( R = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \) with the property that \(|U_{\text{min}}(R)| = 1\). Let \( H_R = (h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_n) \) be the normalized score vector of \( R \). Then \( R \) and \( H_R \) have a one to one correspondence. Let \( b_n \) be the number of the score sequences with \( h_1 = 0 \) and \( c_n \) be the ones with \( h_1 \neq 0 \). Then \( a_n = b_n + c_n \). By Theorem 1.5, \( H_R = (H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_m) \) and every \( H_i \) is a symmetric vector for some positive integer \( p_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \). If \( h_1 = 0 \) then \( H' = (h_2, \ldots, h_n) \) corresponds to a score sequence \( R' = (r_2, \ldots, r_n) \) with \(|U_{\text{min}}(R')| = 1\). Thus we have \( b_n = a_{n-1} \) for \( n \geq 2 \) and we define \( a_0 = 1 \). To calculate \( c_n \), assume that \( h_1 = p > 0 \). Then \( H_1 = (p, p-1, \ldots, 1, 0, \ldots, -1, -2, \ldots, -p) \), where the number of zeros between 1 and \(-1\) is at least 1 and at most \( n - 2p \). So \( 2p + 1 \leq n \). Therefore, the recursion relation of \( c_n \) is

\[
c_n = \sum_{p=1}^{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-2p} a_{n-2p-i}.
\]

So we have

\[
a_n = a_{n-1} + \sum_{p=1}^{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-2p} a_{n-2p-i}.
\] (2)

Let

\[
S_n = \sum_{p=1}^{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-2p} a_{n-2p-i}.
\]

Then \( a_n = a_{n-1} + S_n \). When \( n \) is odd, it can be directly checked that

\[
S_{n+1} - S_n = \sum_{p=1}^{n+1} a_{n-2p}
\]

and

\[
S_{n+3} - S_{n+2} = \sum_{p=1}^{n+1} a_{n+2-2p}.
\]

So we have

\[
S_{n+3} - S_{n+2} - (S_{n+1} - S_n) = a_n.
\]

When \( n \) is even, we similarly have

\[
S_{n+3} - S_{n+2} - (S_{n+1} - S_n) = a_n.
\]
Note that
\[ a_{n+1} - a_n = a_n - a_{n-1} + S_{n+1} - S_n \]
and
\[ a_{n+3} - a_{n+2} = a_{n+2} - a_{n+1} + S_{n+3} - S_{n+2}. \]
So
\[ a_{n+3} - a_{n+2} - (a_{n+1} - a_n) = a_{n+2} - a_{n+1} - (a_n - a_{n-1}) + a_n. \]
Therefore, the recursion relation of the sequence \( \{a_n\} \) is
\[ a_{n+3} - 2a_{n+2} + a_n - a_{n-1} = 0. \] (3)
Solve the characteristic equation
\[ x^4 - 2x^3 + x - 1 = 0, \]
we have \( \lambda_1 = \frac{1 - \sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}}{2} \), \( \lambda_2 = \frac{1 + \sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}}{2} \), \( \lambda_3 = \frac{1 - i\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}}{2} \), \( \lambda_4 = \frac{1 + i\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}}{2} \). So the general formula of \( a_n \) is
\[ a_n = c_1\lambda_1^n + c_2\lambda_2^n + c_3\lambda_3^n + c_4\lambda_4^n. \]
It can be easily checked that the original values
\( a_1 = 1, a_2 = 1, a_3 = 2, \) and \( a_4 = 4. \)
So we have
\[
\begin{cases}
  c_1\lambda_1 + c_2\lambda_2 + c_3\lambda_3 + c_4\lambda_4 = 1 \\
  c_1\lambda_1^2 + c_2\lambda_2^2 + c_3\lambda_3^2 + c_4\lambda_4^2 = 1 \\
  c_1\lambda_1^3 + c_2\lambda_2^3 + c_3\lambda_3^3 + c_4\lambda_4^3 = 2 \\
  c_1\lambda_1^4 + c_2\lambda_2^4 + c_3\lambda_3^4 + c_4\lambda_4^4 = 4
\end{cases}
\]
(4)
or equivalently,
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
  \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \lambda_3 & \lambda_4 \\
  \lambda_1^2 & \lambda_2^2 & \lambda_3^2 & \lambda_4^2 \\
  \lambda_1^3 & \lambda_2^3 & \lambda_3^3 & \lambda_4^3 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
  c_1\lambda_1 \\
  c_2\lambda_2 \\
  c_3\lambda_3 \\
  c_4\lambda_4
\end{pmatrix}
= 
\begin{pmatrix}
  1 \\
  1 \\
  2 \\
  4
\end{pmatrix}
\]
Solve the system of linear equations, we have
\[ c_1\lambda_1 = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}} \right), \]
\[ c_2\lambda_2 = \frac{\sqrt{5} + 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} + 3}} \right), \]
\[ c_3\lambda_3 = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}} \right), \]
and \( c_4\lambda_4 = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\sqrt{5} - 3}} \right). \)
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