

# SAILING LEAGUE PROBLEMS

ROBERT SCHÜLER AND ACHILL SCHÜRMAN

**ABSTRACT.** We describe a class of combinatorial optimization problems which typically occur in professional sailing league competitions. We discuss connections to mathematical design theory. Moreover, we give suitable boolean quadratic and integer linear optimization problem formulations, as well as further heuristics and restrictions, that can be used to solve sailing league problems in practice. We apply those techniques to three case studies obtained from real sailing leagues and compare the results with used tournament plans.

(Dedicated to Karen Aardal on occasion of her 60th birthday.)

## 1. INTRODUCING SAILING LEAGUE PROBLEMS

There is a long history of human competitions finding the *best* in a certain category. While in some disciplines (as long jump or marathons) the winner can be determined by direct measurement, other disciplines only provide the possibility to directly compare participants (as football or chess). The latter are often organized in form of tournaments or leagues where the winner is found after a number of direct comparisons. Several different forms of sport leagues and tournaments have been developed, each with its own pros and cons.

A sailing league typically consists of a fixed number of teams that meet on certain events, often lasting a weekend or several days. During each event, there are a number of rounds, called *flights*, with a fixed number of equally sized races, such that every team competes exactly once during a flight. For instance, in the finals of the 2021 European Sailing Champions League 32 teams were scheduled to compete in 18 flights, each consisting of 4 races with 8 teams (see [ChampionsLeague]). In the first and second national German sailing league there are 6 events, where 18 teams compete in 16 flights, each with 3 races of 6 teams (see [Bundesliga]). Note that there should be a certain number of teams in each race to make it more exciting, but races with too many or even all teams are typically not desirable in a sailing league. So the teams are typically partitioned into 2,3 or 4 equally sized races for a flight.

The resulting ranking (for which the rankings of each race are added) of any league should be chosen as fair as possible. So for a better comparability of results, it is desirable that the number of races that a team is paired against a fixed other team does not vary too much. In a *perfect pairing list* each team would compete the same number of times with any other team. Whether or not such a perfect schedule exists is a special type of *block design problem*. We will discuss corresponding theoretical results in Section 3. It turns out that such perfect pairing lists do rarely exist. In particular, for the parameters of the sailing leagues mentioned above there is no such perfect schedule (see Corollary 3.2).

If for given parameters it is not possible to find a perfect schedule, it is natural to consider the following, more general *sailing league problem*: In it we ask to minimize the difference between upper and lower bound for the number of competitions any team competes with any other team. By this, the pairing list is as fair as possible in the sense that it is as close as possible to an ideal pairing list in which each team competes with every other team the same number of times. As we show in Sections 4 there are natural formulations of sailing league problems as boolean quadratic and as integer linear programming problems.

---

*Date:* December 7, 2022.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B05, 90C90.

*Key words and phrases.* sailing league problems, resolvable block design, quadratic programming, integer programming.

In Section 5 we apply the described techniques and take a closer look at three case studies. We analyze in particular the Asian Pacific and European Champions Leagues and the German National Leagues in their 2021 season. It turns out that schedules could have been improved with respect to the utility function of the sailing league problem. However, despite heavy computational efforts, some of the related combinatorial problems with larger parameters appear to be quite difficult and remain still open.

The sailing league problem studied here is related to round-robin tournaments, where after a predefined number of races, in which each participant competes against every other participant, a winner is chosen. For a nice survey on round-robin tournaments we refer the interested reader to [RT08]. While in the classical round-robin tournament only two participants are paired with one another, a sailing race pairs multiple teams against each other. While this is true for other disciplines too (as in games such as Skat for three players or Catan for four players), the number of teams in a sailing race is not predefined by the form of the competition and can be chosen freely by the organizers with respect to the available sailing track.

## 2. PARAMETERS AND EXAMPLES OF SAILING LEAGUE PROBLEMS

We start our survey with a precise introduction of *sailing league problems*. Given three positive integer parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}}, N_{\text{inrace}}$ , where  $N_{\text{inrace}}$  is a divisor of  $N_{\text{teams}}$ , we call the following setup a *pairing list*:

- (1) There is a set  $T$  of competing teams of cardinality  $N_{\text{teams}}$ .
- (2) There is a list  $R$  of races. Each race is a subset of teams of cardinality  $N_{\text{inrace}}$ .
- (3) The races are organized in a list of flights  $F$  of cardinality  $N_{\text{flights}}$  and each team participates in each flight exactly once. I. e,  $F$  is a partition of  $R$  and each flight  $f \in F$  is a partition of  $T$ .

Note that we use the term *list* to emphasize that it is allowed to repeat races and even flights. Mathematically, one could also use an *incidence structure* or a *multiset* here.

We derive some further dependent parameters that turn out to be useful:

- (1) The *number of races in a flight*:

$$N_{\text{inflight}} = \frac{N_{\text{teams}}}{N_{\text{inrace}}}$$

- (2) The *total number of races*:

$$(1) \quad N_{\text{races}} = |R| = \frac{N_{\text{teams}} \cdot N_{\text{flights}}}{N_{\text{inrace}}}$$

- (3) For each pair of teams  $t, t' \in T$  we have their *number of pairings*

$$\lambda(t, t') = |\{r \in R : t \in r \text{ and } t' \in r\}|.$$

- (4) Derived from the number of pairings, we have the *minimal*, the *maximal* and the *average* number of pairings:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min} &= \min_{\substack{t, t' \in T \\ t \neq t'}} \lambda(t, t') \\ \lambda_{\max} &= \max_{\substack{t, t' \in T \\ t \neq t'}} \lambda(t, t') \\ \lambda &= \frac{1}{N_{\text{teams}} \cdot (N_{\text{teams}} - 1)} \cdot \sum_{\substack{t, t' \in T \\ t \neq t'}} \lambda(t, t') \end{aligned}$$

We easily obtain the following:

**Lemma 2.1.** *We have*

$$\lambda = \frac{N_{\text{flights}} \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)}{N_{\text{teams}} - 1}$$

*Proof.* Let  $t \in T$  be a fixed team. In each flight,  $t$  participates in exactly one race against  $(N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)$  opposing teams. Therefore, there is a total of  $N_{\text{flights}} \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)$  pairings for each team. Since there are  $(N_{\text{teams}} - 1)$  opposing teams we get the claimed identity for the average number of pairings.  $\square$

For parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}}, N_{\text{inrace}}$  the corresponding *sailing league problem* asks to find a pairing list with  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}}$  as small as possible.

Note that  $\lambda_{\text{min}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  are integers by definition, while  $\lambda$  may not be an integer. If we manage to find a pairing list with  $\lambda = \lambda_{\text{min}} = \lambda_{\text{max}}$  and therefore  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 0$ , we call this pairing list *perfect*. Obviously, a perfect pairing list is also optimal for the respective sailing league problem.

In order to have a compact human readable way to present different pairing lists of sailing leagues, we introduce the concept of a *tournament plan* for a sailing league:

- (1) A tournament plan is a matrix with  $N_{\text{flights}}$  rows and  $N_{\text{teams}}$  columns, where each row corresponds to a flight and each column corresponds to a competing team.
- (2) Each flight consists of  $N_{\text{inflight}}$  races. We identify each race in a flight by a number between 1 and  $N_{\text{inflight}}$ .
- (3) The entry in the tournament plan corresponding to team  $t$  and flight  $f$  is the number of the race (in  $f$ ) that team  $t$  competes in. Since  $f$  is a partition of the teams, this number is uniquely determined.

To make the theoretical discussions of this paper more vivid, we take a look at three different examples of real world sailing leagues. Exemplarily, their parameters are chosen in such a way, that different techniques for their solution can be applied, respectively different phenomena can be explained.

In case of the national German (first and second) Sailing Leagues there are six events with the scheduling parameters

$$(2) \quad N_{\text{teams}} = 18, \quad N_{\text{flights}} = 16, \quad N_{\text{inrace}} = 6 \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\text{inflight}} = 3, \quad N_{\text{races}} = 48,$$

for each event. In contrast, events of the European Sailing Champions Leagues are realised with various different parameters. Under several possibilities, we study the final of the European Sailing Champions League 2021 in Porto Cervo with parameters

$$(3) \quad N_{\text{teams}} = 32, \quad N_{\text{flights}} = 18, \quad N_{\text{inrace}} = 8 \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\text{inflight}} = 4, \quad N_{\text{races}} = 72.$$

Despite the 32 possible slots for teams, in the actual event, only 29 teams competed. This gives a motivation to look at types of relaxed sailing league problems, which we discuss briefly in Section 6.

For the sake of small parameters we will also look at a pairing list for the final event in Newcastle, Australia, of the Asian Pacific Sailing Champions League in 2021. The parameters were

$$(4) \quad N_{\text{teams}} = 10, \quad N_{\text{flights}} = 8, \quad N_{\text{inrace}} = 5 \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\text{inflight}} = 2, \quad N_{\text{races}} = 16.$$

They used a base pairing list in which each team is in only 8 races/flights; see Table 2.1.

In the actual event this base schedule was to be repeated up to 6 times. So all parameters of the sailing league problem stay the same, except for  $N_{\text{races}}$  and  $N_{\text{flights}}$ , which are multiplied by 6.

In Section 5 we will give an optimal solution for the sailing league problem of the German national leagues as well as for the Asia-Pacific Champions-League with 8 and 16 flights. The parameters of the European Champions-League seem to make a solution very hard and the sailing league problem remains open in this case.

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
3	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2
4	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
5	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2
6	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
7	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2
8	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2

TABLE 2.1. The Asia-Pacific Champions-League tournament plan 2021 in Newcastle, Australia.

### 3. PERFECT PAIRING LISTS AND CONNECTIONS TO DESIGN THEORY

A simple necessary condition for the existence of a perfect pairing list is easily found:

**Lemma 3.1.** *If we have a perfect pairing list with parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}}$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}}$ , then  $\lambda$  is an integer. In particular,  $(N_{\text{teams}} - 1)$  is necessarily a divisor of  $N_{\text{flights}} \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* In a perfect pairing list, we have  $\lambda_{\min} = \lambda = \lambda_{\max}$  and thus  $\lambda$  clearly is an integer. The rest follows by Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

By this result, we immediately have negative news for the parameters of our three study cases:

**Corollary 3.2.** *There is no perfect pairing list with the parameters of the national German Sailing Leagues, the European Sailing Champions League and the Asian Pacific Sailing Champions League respectively.*

*Proof.* The corresponding values of  $\lambda$  are  $\frac{80}{17}$ ,  $\frac{126}{31}$  and  $\frac{32}{9}$  respectively, which are not integers.  $\square$

We note that it is not difficult to find *any* perfect pairing list – even when some parameters are given. We can for example do one of the following:

- (1) Let all teams participate in every race, i.e.  $N_{\text{inrace}} = N_{\text{teams}}$  and  $N_{\text{races}} = N_{\text{flights}}$ .
- (2) For given  $N_{\text{teams}}$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}}$  perform *all possible* flights.

However, these trivial perfect pairing lists are often not useful in practice. A race between too many participants as in (1) is apparently hard to realize under fair conditions. That is the main reason why sailing leagues are organized as they are. The other possibility in (2), leads to an extremely high number of flights, due to a combinatorial explosion. We have a total of

$$\frac{N_{\text{teams}}!}{(N_{\text{inrace}}!)^{N_{\text{inflight}}} \cdot N_{\text{inflight}}!}$$

flights, where we use  $N_{\text{inflight}} = N_{\text{teams}}/N_{\text{inrace}}$ . For example, if we have  $N_{\text{teams}} = 18$  teams and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 6$  teams per race, as in the national German Sailing Leagues, the pairing list with all possible flights would have a total of 2,858,856 flights.

Problems similar to finding a perfect pairing list have been studied in mathematical *design theory*. This theory is also used in other contexts to create team schedules or organizing experiments. For a nice introduction to design theory, we refer to [BJL99a] and [BJL99b].

One important concept of design theory are *block designs* (sometimes also called *balanced incomplete block designs*). For a block design, assume that we have a finite set whose elements are called *points*, together with a collection of *blocks* which are subsets of the points. Each block contains the same number of points as every other block, and each pair of points is also contained in the same number of blocks.

If we interpret points to be the teams participating in the sailing league and the blocks to be the different races, it is apparent that finding a block design and a perfect pairing list are two strongly related problems.

For our further discussion, we first give a precise definition of block designs, using the naming conventions of this paper:

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda$  be positive integers. A  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda)$ -block design is a tuple  $(T, R)$  where  $T$  is a set of teams and  $R$  is a list (an incidence structure) of subsets of  $T$ , such that:

- (1)  $|T| = N_{\text{teams}}$ ,
- (2)  $|r| = N_{\text{inrace}}$  for all  $r \in R$ ,
- (3)  $\lambda = \lambda(t, t')$  for all  $t, t' \in T, t \neq t'$ .

The elements of  $T$  are also called *points* of the design, while the elements of  $R$  are called *blocks* of the design. Note that in design theory literature, typically the cardinality of the pointset is denoted by  $v$ , the block size is  $k$  and therefore the notation of a  $(v, k, \lambda)$ -design is typically used. With our notation here we emphasize the connection to pairing lists.

Note that a pairing list is neither a stronger nor a weaker concept than a block design, since on the one hand it allows for different values of  $\lambda(t, t')$  while on the other hand the races have to be organized in flights. From a perfect pairing list we also get a block design. However, from an arbitrary block design we do not necessarily obtain a perfect pairing list, as it is not always possible to group the races into equally sized flights – even if the block (race) size  $k = N_{\text{inrace}}$  divides the number of teams  $v = N_{\text{teams}}$ .

There is a design theoretic concept to attack this problem. A subset of  $R$  is called a *parallel class* of the design, if it is a partition of  $T$ . If the races can be partitioned into parallel classes, the block design is called *resolvable*. As a consequence, a perfect pairing list with parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}}, N_{\text{inrace}}$  describes the same concept as a resolvable  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda)$ -block design, and the terms *flight* and *parallel class* are interchangeable.

What can we use from the theory of resolvable block designs to solve our sailing league problems in general? On the one hand, we can certainly obtain existence or nonexistence results of perfect pairing lists for certain parameters from corresponding results about resolvable block designs. On the other hand, we can use the existence of such designs for finding fairly good pairing lists with slightly different parameters.

We start with some necessary conditions on parameters for the existence of block designs. We note that the formula of Lemma 2.1 remains valid for general block designs, even if the races (blocks) can not be grouped into flights (parallel classes). The parameter

$$N_{\text{flights}} = \frac{\lambda \cdot (N_{\text{teams}} - 1)}{N_{\text{inrace}} - 1}$$

is in general equal to the number of races that contain a given team – and each team in a block design is contained in the same number of races ([BJL99a, Thm. 2.10.]). Using this equality in (1) we obtain another known formula for a  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda)$ -block design:

$$N_{\text{races}} = \frac{\lambda \cdot N_{\text{teams}} \cdot (N_{\text{teams}} - 1)}{N_{\text{inrace}} \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)}$$

holds for the number of races (blocks) of the design. Since the quantities  $N_{\text{races}}$  and  $N_{\text{flights}}$  have to be integers, we can easily deduce the following:

**Corollary 3.4.** [BJL99a, Cor. 2.11.]

*If there exists an  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda)$ -block design, then*

- (1)  $(N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)$  divides  $\lambda \cdot (N_{\text{teams}} - 1)$ .
- (2)  $N_{\text{inrace}} \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)$  divides  $\lambda \cdot N_{\text{teams}} \cdot (N_{\text{teams}} - 1)$ .

Note that in the case that  $N_{\text{inrace}}$  divides  $N_{\text{teams}}$ , only the first condition is relevant as the second follows directly.

$N_{\text{teams}}$	$N_{\text{flights}}$	$N_{\text{inrace}}$	$\lambda$	ppl?	Table	Reference
8	7	4	3	Yes	A.1	[BJL99b, Table 9.1]
9	8	3	2	Yes	A.2	[BJL99b, Table 9.1]
10	9	5	4	No		[Mia94, Lemma 2.10]
12	11	3	2	Yes	A.3	[Han74, Theorem 4]
12	11	4	3	Yes	A.4	[Bak83, Table 1]
12	11	6	5	Yes	A.5	[Bak83, Table 3]
15	14	5	4	No		[KOr01]
16	15	4	3	Yes	A.6	[CK03, Thm. 6.9.2.]
16	15	8	7	Yes	A.7	[CK03, Thm. 6.9.2.]
18	17	6	5	Yes	A.8	[Bak83, Table 3]
20	19	4	3	Yes	A.9	[Bak83, Theorem 6.5]
20	19	5	4	Yes	A.10	[Mia94, Lemma 2.10]
35	17	7	3	unknown		

TABLE 3.1. Parameters near the parameters of the three exemplary sailings leagues that satisfy all necessary conditions. The column labeled *ppl?* indicates whether there exists a perfect pairing list with these specific parameters.

In case we have a perfect pairing list, the number of races (blocks) each team competes in is equal to the number of flights (parallel classes). We can find another necessary conditions for perfect pairing lists from the theory of resolvable block designs:

**Corollary 3.5.** [Bos42, Equation 1.20]

*If there exists a perfect pairing list with parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}}$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}}$ , then*

$$N_{\text{races}} \geq N_{\text{teams}} + N_{\text{flights}} - 1.$$

Can we hope for a perfect pairing list if we slightly modify the parameters in our three examples? For this, we examined all possible nearby parameters, in ranges  $N_{\text{teams}} \pm 3$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} \pm 3$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} \pm 2$ , where  $N_{\text{teams}}$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}}$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}}$  are set to be the parameters of the German Sailing Leagues, the European Champions Leagues and the Asian Pacific Sailing Champions Leagues respectively. After applying the necessary conditions above, there are only 13 cases left to discuss. Most of these cases can then be handled by results from design theory literature. A summarized discussion of these parameters is displayed in Table 3.1. For the convenience of the reader who hopes to apply these findings directly, we present related tournament plans of known existing perfect pairing lists in Appendix A.

It turns out that for the parameters of the German national league and the Asian Pacific Champions League, there are interesting “nearby results” in Table 3.1.

For the German national leagues we have an existence result for a corresponding perfect pairing list, with just one flight more and otherwise the same parameters. By removing an arbitrary flight from this perfect pairing list of Table A.8, we easily obtain an optimal pairing list with  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 1$ . The proof of optimality follows from Corollary 3.2.

For the Asian Pacific Champions League we have a nearby nonexistence result, for a putative perfect pairing list, with also just one flight more and otherwise the same parameters. This proves that there can not exist a pairing list with the parameters of the Asian Pacific Champions League having  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 1$ . Otherwise we could add an arbitrary flight to an existing perfect pairing list and obtain this utility value. As we will explain in the next section, it is possible to show  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 3$  using suitable optimization software. Note that this in return gives an alternative, computational proof of the nonexistence result in [Mia94].



We end this section by subsuming the above observation on removing or adding arbitrary flights to an (putative) existing pairing list:

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $P$  be a pairing list for parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}}, N_{\text{inrace}}$  and let  $k$  be an integer. If  $k < N_{\text{flights}}$ , then there exists a pairing list  $P'$  for parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}} - k, N_{\text{inrace}}$  with*

$$\lambda_{\max}(P) - \lambda_{\min}(P) \leq \lambda_{\max}(P') - \lambda_{\min}(P') \leq \lambda_{\max}(P) - \lambda_{\min}(P) + k.$$

*Furthermore, for arbitrary  $k$ , there also exists a pairing list  $P''$  for parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}} + k, N_{\text{inrace}}$  with*

$$\lambda_{\max}(P) - \lambda_{\min}(P) \leq \lambda_{\max}(P'') - \lambda_{\min}(P'') \leq \lambda_{\max}(P) - \lambda_{\min}(P) + k.$$

*If in addition  $N_{\text{teams}} > N_{\text{inrace}}$ ,  $k = 1$  and  $P$  is a perfect pairing list, then  $P'$  as well as  $P''$  are optimal with*

$$\lambda_{\max}(P') - \lambda_{\min}(P') = 1 = \lambda_{\max}(P'') - \lambda_{\min}(P'').$$

*Proof.* Consider removing  $k$  arbitrary flights from  $P$  to obtain  $P'$  and adding  $k$  arbitrary flights to  $P$  to obtain  $P''$ . Thereby, we alter the numbers of times two teams have been paired against each other by at most  $k$ , yielding the inequalities.

If  $P$  is a perfect pairing list and  $k = 1$ , then the inequalities yield  $\lambda_{\max}(P') - \lambda_{\min}(P'), \lambda_{\max}(P'') - \lambda_{\min}(P'') \leq 1$  and for the assertion to be true we are left to exclude that  $P'$  and  $P''$  are perfect pairing lists. Suppose  $P'$  is perfect. By Lemma 2.1 it follows that,  $\lambda(P) = \frac{N_{\text{flights}} \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)}{N_{\text{teams}} - 1}$  and  $\lambda(P') = \frac{(N_{\text{flights}} - 1) \cdot (N_{\text{inrace}} - 1)}{N_{\text{teams}} - 1}$  are integers. By

$$\lambda(P) - \lambda(P') = \frac{N_{\text{inrace}} - 1}{N_{\text{teams}} - 1} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

this yields that  $N_{\text{teams}} - 1$  has to be a divisor of  $N_{\text{inrace}} - 1$ . This is impossible since  $N_{\text{teams}} > N_{\text{inrace}}$  yielding a contradiction. A similar argument can be found for  $P''$ .  $\square$

#### 4. QUADRATIC AND LINEAR PROGRAMS FOR THE SAILING LEAGUE PROBLEM

As in our three study cases, there does not exist a perfect pairing list for most combinations of possible parameters. In this section we therefore describe approaches to formulate any sailing league problem with given parameters as an optimization problem. They can – at least in principle – be solved with a suitable software tool for operations research. We used Gurobi [Gurobi] and Cplex [Cplex] to compare the different programs. We first give a boolean quadratic problem formulation and then describe two different linear programs that appear to be better solvable in practice.

We identify in the following each team, race and flight by its index: We use  $k, l \in \{1, \dots, N_{\text{teams}}\}$  for team indices and the index  $j \in \{1, \dots, N_{\text{races}}\}$  for the race. Index  $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{\text{flights}}\}$  is used for the flight. Furthermore, we assume that the races are organized in such a way, that  $N_{\text{inflight}}$  consecutive races form a flight, i.e., flight  $i$  consists of the races with indices  $\{(i - 1) \cdot N_{\text{inflight}} + 1, \dots, i \cdot N_{\text{inflight}}\}$ .

Two conditions of a pairing list are already satisfied by the above conventions:

- (1) There are  $N_{\text{teams}}$  teams.
- (2) The flights form a partition of the races.

Other conditions are to be modelled in the respective programs below.

**4.1. A boolean quadratic program.** Allowing quadratic constraints there is a simple and straightforward formulation of the sailing league problem. For it we can use boolean, respectively 0-1 decision variables  $b_{jk} \in \{0, 1\}$  indicating if team  $k$  participates in race  $j$ .

We model the condition, that the number of teams in each race has to be equal to the constant  $N_{\text{inrace}}$  by the following linear equations for each race  $j$ . Since there is a fixed number of teams in each race, we get the constraints

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text{teams}}} b_{jk} = N_{\text{inrace}}$$

for every race  $j$ .

Additionally, we model the condition that every flight forms a partition of the teams (each team is in exactly one race per flight) by the following linear equation for every team  $k$  and every flight  $i$ :

$$\sum_{j=(i-1) \cdot N_{\text{inflight}} + 1}^{i \cdot N_{\text{inflight}}} b_{jk} = 1$$

In order to set up a linear utility function, we use two variables  $a$  and  $b$  as lower and upper bound for the number of competitions between two different teams  $k$  and  $l$  during a sailing league event. We obtain the two nonlinear quadratic inequalities

$$(5) \quad a \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{races}}} b_{jk} \cdot b_{jl} \leq b$$

for every pair of teams  $k, l$ , where we can assume  $l < k$  due to symmetry. Note that the quadratic 0-1-expressions  $b_{jk} \cdot b_{jl}$  indicate if team  $k$  and team  $l$  compete in race  $j$ . Thus we may assume that  $a$  and  $b$  are integers.

Our goal is now to minimize the linear utility function  $b - a$ . Note that for a pairing list that optimizes this program, we have  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = b$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{min}} = a$  and  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = b - a$  and thus the program is equivalent to the sailing league problem.

The described quadratically constrained program can be implemented in a straightforward way. However, further simplification, respectively a reduction of used variables is possible, by using some additional symmetry breaking assumptions: We can require for instance that the teams in race 1 are the teams 1, 2,  $\dots$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}}$  and so on... Thus we may assume

$$b_{1k} = 1 \text{ for } k \leq N_{\text{inrace}} \text{ and } b_{1k} = 0 \text{ otherwise,}$$

etc.. Additionally we can also require that team 1 is in the first race of every flight. So  $b_{jk} = 1$  for the first race of each flight, i.e. for all  $j = (i - 1) \cdot N_{\text{inflight}} + 1$ .

**4.2. An integer linear program.** For practical computations it is usually desirable to get rid of the quadratic constraints. With the 0-1 decision variables in the quadratic problem formulation of Section 4.1 we can easily set up a purely linear problem formulation. This has the price of additional variables though: We may use variables  $b_{jkl}$  for the non-linear expressions  $b_{jk} \cdot b_{jl}$  in the above quadratic problem formulation. The 0-1 variables  $b_{jkl}$  are thus indicating if team  $k$  and team  $l$  compete in race  $j$ .

The relation  $b_{jkl} = b_{jk} \cdot b_{jl}$  among the variables can be put into linear constraints for every race  $j$  and every pair of teams  $k, l$  with  $l < k$ : We use the three linear inequalities

$$(6) \quad b_{jk} + b_{jl} - 1 \leq b_{jkl} \leq b_{jk}, b_{jl}.$$

This is the *standard linearization* by Glover and Woolsey [GW74]. In it we have a total of  $3 \cdot N_{\text{races}} \cdot \binom{N_{\text{teams}}}{2}$  additional linear inequalities and  $N_{\text{races}} \cdot \binom{N_{\text{teams}}}{2}$  additional variables  $b_{jkl}$ . We note that these additional



variables can be chosen either binary or as real, but then with additional bounds  $0 \leq b_{jkl} \leq 1$ . Then the variables are forced to be 0 or 1 by the inequalities (6). Using real variables appears to be beneficial when used with the standard parameters of [Gurobi] or [CPLEX].

As in the quadratic problem formulation we want to minimize  $b - a$  under the now linear side constraints (see (5))

$$a \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{races}}} b_{jkl} \leq b,$$

for every pair of distinct teams  $k, l$ , with  $l < k$ .

As a rule of thumb, this linear problem formulation works best in practice with current solvers for suitable small parameters of the sailing league problem – despite its large number of variables.

**4.3. A smaller integer linear program.** Since every team competes in every flight only once, we can reduce the number of variables in the linear program formulation above. Instead of using variables  $b_{jkl}$  to indicate whether team  $k$  competes in race  $j$  against team  $l$ , we can use 0-1 variables  $b_{ikl}$  indicating if team  $k$  competes in flight  $i$  against team  $l$ . We require for each flight  $i$  and each team  $k$  that

$$\sum_{l=1, l \neq k}^{N_{\text{teams}}} b_{ikl} = N_{\text{inrace}} - 1,$$

that is, the number of teams competing against team  $k$  in flight  $i$  is fixed. Additionally we require that  $b_{ikl} = 1$  if  $b_{ikm} = 1$  and  $b_{ilm} = 1$ , for every flight  $i$  and all triples of distinct team indices  $k, l, m$ . This can be achieved by linear inequalities

$$b_{ikm} + b_{ilm} - 1 \leq b_{ikl}$$

for every flight  $i$  and all possible triples  $k, l, m$ . Note that we may use variables  $b_{ikl}$  with  $l < k$  only in all of these inequalities, because of the symmetry  $b_{ikl} = b_{ilk}$ .

From variables satisfying all the described inequalities we can easily construct a tournament plan. In it, the order of races in each flight can be chosen arbitrarily. In this way, this second linear problem formulation gives us a solution of a race plan up to symmetry of race numbering in each flight. As in the other two problem formulations we want to minimize  $b - a$ , this time under the linear side constraints (see (5))

$$a \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{flights}}} b_{ikl} \leq b,$$

for every pair of distinct teams  $k, l$ , with  $l < k$ .

Overall, this second linear problem formulation has the advantage of less variables compared with the one before. On the other hand it usually has more side constraints, as their number grows cubic with the number of teams – compared to quadratic growth in the other linear problem formulation. Concretely, in the second linear program we have a number of side constraints in the order  $O(N_{\text{flights}} \cdot N_{\text{teams}}^3)$  while in the first linear program the number is in the order of  $O(N_{\text{races}} \cdot N_{\text{teams}}^2)$ . An additional practical disadvantage of this second linear problem formulation is the fact that we can not simply relax the variables  $b_{ikl}$  to reals between 0 and 1 – as it is possible for the variables  $b_{jkl}$  in the first linear program. Here, in contrast to the first linear program, we do not have inequalities as in (6) which force the variables to be 0 or 1.

However, together with the advantage of less variables, in our experiments we also discovered a second useful advantage: If we relax some of the variables  $b_{ikl}$  to reals between 0 and 1, we obtain a possibly smaller minimum  $b - a$  that can be a useful lower bound! Since we know that  $b - a$  is an integer, such a bound can even be used to prove a tight bound on  $b - a$ , even if the corresponding 0-1-problem can not be solved. We use this *relaxation trick* in the next section to give a solution of the Asian Pacific Champions League with 16 flights.

## 5. THREE CASE STUDIES

Using the tools of Sections 3 and 4, we take a closer look at the three sailing league events mentioned in Section 2.

**5.1. Asian Pacific Sailing Champions League.** We start with the smallest event, involving only 10 teams. In 2021 the final event in Newcastle, Australia, was realized with the pairing list given in Table 2.1. A quick analysis of this base pairing list, with 8 flights and 16 races, reveals that already this schedule is particularly bad for the sailing league problem. Other criteria were seemingly more important for the schedule. Teams 6, 8 and 10, for instance, compete against each other in all 8 flights, while Team 2 competes against these three teams only once. I.e.  $\lambda_{\min} = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{\max} = 8$ ,  $\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} = 7$ . Multiplying the base schedule by 6 — as it was planned in the actual event — does even amount in 48 versus 6 matches for the same teams.

With the given parameters we can actually solve all linear/quadratic problems presented in Section 4 on a standard laptop. Fastest solutions with [Gurobi] and [CPLEX] are obtained when we use the first linear program of Section 4.2, with as many variables as possible relaxed to real variables between 0 and 1. Note that not only all the variables  $b_{jkl}$  can be relaxed in such a way without changing the outcome, but also some of the variables  $b_{jk}$  that are shared with the quadratic program. I.e., for every equation we can relax one of the involved variables to be real. Overall we obtain a computational proof of the following result:

**Theorem 5.1.** *For the parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 10$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 8$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 5$  an optimal tournament plan has a utility value  $\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} = 3$  and satisfies  $\lambda_{\min} = 2$ ,  $\lambda_{\max} = 5$ . A corresponding plan is contained in the first eight flights (rows) of Table C.2.*

Note that for the proof it is not enough to compute  $\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} = 3$  with the given parameters: Since the average of pairwise competitions in the Asian Pacific Champions League is  $\lambda = 32/9 = 3.555\dots$ , it could in principle also be possible that there exist tournament plans with lower and upper bounds  $\lambda_{\min} = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{\max} = 4$  or  $\lambda_{\min} = 3$ ,  $\lambda_{\max} = 6$ . However, corresponding integer linear programs with these values of  $a$  and  $b$  set fixed turn out to be infeasible, that is, there do not exist corresponding pairing lists.

Note that Theorem 5.1 together with Lemma 3.6 also implies the non existence of an  $(10, 9, 4)$ -block design as has been proven previously using combinatorics.

The computed optimal schedules with  $\lambda_{\min} = 2$  and  $\lambda_{\max} = 5$  are still quite uneven, respectively the minimum of the utility function appears quite big. This is in particular the case, as the base pairing list was to be repeated six times. So, in the overall event, some teams would still compete only 12 times against each other, while other pairs compete 30 times. This difference can be reduced by using for instance three times an optimized pairing list with 16 flights (instead of six times an optimized pairing list with 8 flights). We are able to solve the corresponding sailing league problem:

**Theorem 5.2.** *For the parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 10$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 16$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 5$  an optimal tournament plan has a utility value  $\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} = 2$ . A corresponding plan is contained in Table C.2.*

For the computational proof of this result, we can first find a schedule with utility value 2 as the one in Table C.2. A solver finds such a plan comparatively fast or other heuristic strategies can be used. It is more difficult to prove that utility value 1 is impossible. All of the described linear and quadratic programs of Section 4 did not finish on our computers in a reasonable amount of time. However, a specific relaxation of the linear integer problem presented in Section 4.3 allowed us to obtain a proof of optimality for the tournament plan in Table C.2: We allowed the binary variables  $b_{ikl}$  of the 4 teams  $k = 7, 8, 9, 10$  (and all flights  $i$ ) to be real valued between 0 and 1. Thus of the 720 binary variables, we relaxed a total of 480 variables to reals (as we assume  $l < k$  there are 30 variables for each flight  $i$ ). As any relaxation gives a lower bound to the actual minimum of  $b - a$ , the computed exact minimum of 1.25 in this relaxation proves that  $b - a \geq 2$  for the actual sailing league problem (in which  $b - a$  is an integer).

We finally note that the problem of finding an optimal tournament plan for parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 10$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 5$  and  $N_{\text{flights}} = n \cdot 8$  with  $n \geq 3$  ( $n$  times the base schedule of the Asian Pacific Champions League) still appears to be open.

**5.2. German Sailing Leagues.** We analyzed a total of 20 events of the German National Leagues, all with the usual parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 18$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 16$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 6$ . The utility values for these events were either 2 or 3 indicating that the organizers put in some effort to obtain good tournament plans in the sense of the sailing league problem. We ourselves conducted some heuristical searches for optimal tournament plans and tried a bunch of different strategies adapting or relaxing the quadratic and integer programs of Section 4. In all of these approaches we were not able to obtain a tournament plan  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 1$ . As the average of pairwise competitions in the events of the German national Leagues is  $\lambda = 80/17 = 4.7058\dots$  a tournament plan with  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 1$  necessarily satisfies  $a = \lambda_{\text{max}} = 5$  and  $b = \lambda_{\text{min}} = 4$ . We used this additional setting in the corresponding programs without success.

However, in contrast to the problems with a computational solution using one of the standard approaches of Section 4, we found a solution using a suitable existence result from design theory:

**Theorem 5.3.** *For the parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 18$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 16$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 6$  an optimal tournament plan has a utility value  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 1$ . A corresponding plan is obtained by removing an arbitrary flight (row) of Table A.8.*

A simple proof of this result is a direction application of Lemma 3.6 with  $k = 1$ .

**5.3. European Sailing Champions League.** The biggest parameters we analyzed are those of the European Champions League in 2021 with 32 slots for teams. The actual number of teams competing in the event was 29, so that three team slots were marked “empty” in the corresponding tournament plan. Analyzing the 72 races of this event, we find that the 29 competing teams had between 2 and 7 matches against each other. Thus in this case we may consider a kind of relaxed problem in which only a subset of the  $N_{\text{teams}}$  teams in the tournament plan is taken into account when computing the bounds  $a = \lambda_{\text{max}}$  and  $b = \lambda_{\text{min}}$ .

Unfortunately, we could not find an optimal pairing list for this problem. Not even in the relaxed case using only 29 teams or by other approaches. To find at least a pairing list that yields a good upper bound, we used a perfect pairing list with parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 32$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 8$  and  $N_{\text{flights}} = 31$  (see also [Rok84, Lemma 5]) and then applied a heuristic search method to find the presumably best way to remove 13 of the flights. The resulting tournament plan is given in Table C.1. Together with Corollary 3.2 this yields the following result:

**Theorem 5.4.** *For the parameters  $N_{\text{teams}} = 32$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 18$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 8$  of the European Sailing Champions League Final 2021, an optimal pairing list satisfies*

$$1 \leq \lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} \leq 3.$$

While we improved the utility value by two, compared with the actual event in 2021, so far we can not prove optimality of the tournament plan in Table C.1. We finally note that other events of the European Sailing Champions League use various other parameters yielding even more unsolved sailing league problems with relatively big parameters.

We finally want to remark that a natural *greedy approach* to solve a given sailing league problem does often not work. It is tempting to think that one can get a quite good tournament plan by optimizing the utility function for a few initial flights and then sequentially take a solution for a fixed number of flights and optimize the tournament plan with  $n$  additional flights. This greedy strategy does in particular not work for the parameters of the European Sailing Champions League Final 2021. Here we optimized for 4 initial flights and obtained a tournament plan with utility value 2. Then we added sequentially two flights to obtain tournament plans with 6, 8,  $\dots$ , 18 flights. This first lead to tournament plans with utility value 3, but for 18

flights the optimal plan found in this way had utility value 4 – even if we counted only pairings of 29 of the 32 teams in our computations. Hence, this gives an example where this natural greedy strategy produces a result worse than the one in Table C.1. found with another heuristic.

## 6. ADDITIONAL CONNECTIONS AND REMARKS

In this section we discuss further information which, while interesting, have not been necessary for the discussion of the three use cases.

**6.1. More connections to design theory.** General pairing lists are strongly connected to the concept of *partially balanced block designs*. In particular, a pairing list with parameters  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{flights}}, N_{\text{inrace}}$  and derived parameter  $\lambda$  corresponds to a  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda)$ -resolvable partially balanced block design  $(T, R, \Lambda)$  with  $m$  associate classes where

$$m - 1 \leq \lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} = \max(\Lambda) - \min(\Lambda).$$

In particular, pairing lists with  $\lambda_{\max} - \lambda_{\min} = 1$  correspond to resolvable partially balanced block designs with 2 associate classes.

More information about resolvable partially balanced block designs can be found, for example, in [SSS21].

To the best of our knowledge, resolvable partially balanced block designs are only known for very specific parameters and do not yield useful results for our three example cases.

**6.2. Relaxations.** During the work on this paper, we also thought about different ways of relaxing the definition of a sailing league problem, in order to obtain tournament plans in which the number of pairwise matches does not vary too much.

The European Champions League in 2021 showed – with three teams missing in the final – that we could allow the races to be of different size for example, as effectively done in the event. There are several results in the literature concerning block designs with multiple possible block sizes which could be useful in this setting.

Another possible relaxation is, to allow flights that are not a partition of the teams. In particular, we could allow pairing lists such that each flight lets every team compete, except a fixed number of teams who skip this flight, i.e. the flight is just a partition of a subset of the teams. If every flight has exactly one team that does not participate, this is strongly connected to the concept of *nearly resolvable block designs* (see for example [BAA18]). Some examples of pairing lists obtained in such a way are given in Appendix B.

Note that it is possible, to adapt the quadratic/linear programs of Section 4 according to these relaxations.

**6.3. Related problem.** The sailing league problem discussed in this paper strictly requires the flights to be a partition of the teams, but principally allows different values for  $\lambda(t, t')$ . If we strictly require that the pairing list is perfect but allow that the flights might not partition the teams, we get the following related problem:

Let  $N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda'$  be positive integer parameters. A *relaxed pairing list* (with respect to the given parameters) is a  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda)$ -block design with  $\lambda \geq \lambda'$  where additionally the races are organized in a list of flights which are partitions of respective subsets of the teams.

Find an  $(N_{\text{teams}}, N_{\text{inrace}}, \lambda')$ -relaxed pairing list such that the number of flights is as small as possible.

In an event planned with this premise, each pair of teams would meet *exactly* the same number of times in as less flights as possible.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we give an introduction to sailing league problems, depending on the number of competing teams, the number of flights (rounds) and the number of teams per race. We find in particular that recently organized sailing events could be enhanced in terms of the discussed utility function. In very few cases of the parameters there exist perfect pairing lists, namely if and only if there exists a corresponding resolvable block design (see for instance Table 3.1 and Appendix A). If, as in most cases, the parameters of a given sailing league do not allow the existence of a perfect pairing list, a combination of knowledge from design theory and implementations of linear and quadratic programs can be used to find good or even optimal pairing lists. In particular, the tournament plans presented in Appendix C and Table A.8 could be used for the parameters of the Asian Pacific Champions League, the German Sailing Leagues and the European Sailing Champions Leagues discussed in Section 5.

Despite the findings of this paper, the sailing league problem in general seems hard to solve and many parameters of real sailing events have not been considered yet. Furthermore, several relaxed and related problems discussed in Section 6 have not been studied sufficiently. So further research is necessary to get a more complete picture.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Gundram Leifert (ASV Warnemünde) for making us familiar with sailing league problems. We like to thank Frieder Ladisch, Valentin Dannenberg and Kerrin Bielser for helpful feedback on an earlier version. Furthermore, we like to thank a former class-mate of the first author for a very useful hint.

## REFERENCES

- [BAA18] S. Banerjee, R. Awad, and B. Agrawal. Some constructions of nearly  $\mu$ -resolvable designs. *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 6:36–43, 2018.
- [Bak83] Ronald D. Baker. Resolvable BIBD and SOLS. *Discrete Math.*, 44(1):13–29, 1983.
- [BJL99a] T. Beth, D. Jungnickel, and H. Lenz. *Design theory. Vol. I*, volume 69 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1999.
- [BJL99b] T. Beth, D. Jungnickel, and H. Lenz. *Design theory. Vol. II*, volume 78 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1999.
- [Bos42] Raj Chandra Bose. A note on the resolvability of balanced incomplete block designs. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics*, pages 105–110, 1942.
- [CK03] T. Caliński and S. Kageyama. *Block designs: a randomization approach. Vol. II*, volume 170 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003. Design.
- [GW74] Fred Glover and Eugene Woolsey. Converting the 0-1 polynomial programming problem to a 0-1 linear program. *Operations research*, 22(1):180–182, 1974.
- [Han74] Haim Hanani. On resolvable balanced incomplete block designs. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A*, 17:275–289, 1974.
- [KOr01] Petteri Kaski and Patric R. J. Östergård. There exists no  $(15, 5, 4)$  RBIBD. *J. Combin. Des.*, 9(5):357–362, 2001.
- [Mia94] Ying Miao. Existence of resolvable BIBDs with  $k = 5$  and  $\lambda = 4$ . *Discrete Math.*, 128(1-3):283–303, 1994.
- [Rok84] Barbara Rokowska. Resolvable systems of 8-tuples. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 9(1):131–141, 1984.
- [RT08] Rasmus V. Rasmussen and Michael A. Trick. Round robin scheduling – a survey. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 188(3):617–636, 2008.
- [SSS21] Shyam Saurabh, Kishore Sinha, and Mithilesh Kumar Singh. A survey of resolvable solutions of partially balanced designs. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, pages 1–17, 2021.

## SOFTWARE AND WEBPAGES

- [Gurobi] Gurobi - The Fastest Solver, <https://www.gurobi.com/>
- [CPLEX] IBM CPLEX Optimizer, <https://www.ibm.com/de-de/analytics/cplex-optimizer>
- [Bundesliga] National German sailing league, <https://deutsche-segelbundesliga.de>
- [ChampionsLeague] Sailing Champions League, <https://sailing-championsleague.com>

## APPENDIX A. PERFECT PAIRING LISTS

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2
3	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2
4	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2
5	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2
6	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2
7	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2

TABLE A.1. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 8$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 7$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 4$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	2	3
2	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	3	3
3	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	3
4	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
5	2	2	2	1	3	1	3	1	3
6	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	3	3
7	2	3	1	3	2	2	1	1	3
8	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	3

TABLE A.2. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 9$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 8$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 3$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	4	3	3	3	4
2	4	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	4	3	3	3
3	1	4	1	1	2	4	2	2	3	4	3	3
4	1	1	4	1	2	2	4	2	3	3	4	3
5	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1
6	1	4	3	2	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	4
7	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	4	1	4	3	2
8	3	2	1	4	1	4	3	2	4	1	2	3
9	1	4	3	2	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	4
10	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	4	1	4	3	2
11	3	2	1	4	1	4	3	2	4	1	2	3

TABLE A.3. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 12$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 11$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 3$ .



Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2
2	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	2	3
3	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	2	3	3	2
4	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	3	3
5	1	3	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	3
6	1	3	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	3	1	1
7	1	1	3	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	3	1
8	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	3
9	1	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	1	2	2
10	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
11	1	2	1	3	2	3	3	2	1	3	2	1

TABLE A.4. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 12$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 11$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 4$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
3	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2
4	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1
5	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1
6	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
7	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
8	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1
9	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
10	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2
11	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1

TABLE A.5. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 12$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 11$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 6$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	1	1	1	1	2	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	4	2	3	4
2	1	2	3	4	1	1	1	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	3
3	1	2	3	4	2	3	4	1	1	1	4	2	3	3	4	2
4	1	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	4
5	1	2	3	4	4	2	3	3	4	2	2	3	4	1	1	1

TABLE A.6. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 16$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 5$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 4$ . Repeating this pairing list three times yields The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 16$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 15$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 4$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2
3	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
4	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
5	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
6	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1
7	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1
10	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
11	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2
12	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
13	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2
14	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2
15	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1

TABLE A.7. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 16$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 15$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 8$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
2	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	2	1
3	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	1
4	1	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	3
5	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	1	3	1	3	2	1	2
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
7	1	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	2	1
8	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	1
9	1	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	3
10	1	2	1	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	1	3	1	3	2	1	2
11	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	3
12	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	2
13	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	3	3	2
14	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
15	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	1
16	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	2
17	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	2

TABLE A.8. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 18$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 17$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 6$ . Removing one flight gives us an optimal pairing list for the parameters of the German-Sailing-Leagues.

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	1	2	5	3	1	4	5	5	4	4	1	3	3	5	2	4	3	1	2	2
2	1	3	5	3	4	1	5	5	1	4	4	2	3	5	3	4	2	1	2	2
3	1	3	5	1	4	3	5	5	3	2	4	4	1	5	3	2	4	1	2	2
4	1	5	4	4	1	3	3	1	4	5	2	5	3	2	2	4	3	5	2	1
5	1	5	1	4	4	2	3	4	1	5	3	5	3	2	3	4	2	5	2	1
6	1	5	3	2	4	4	1	4	3	5	3	5	1	2	3	2	4	5	2	1
7	1	1	3	3	5	4	4	2	5	3	1	4	5	1	2	4	3	2	5	2
8	1	4	2	3	5	1	4	3	5	3	4	1	5	1	3	4	2	2	5	2
9	1	4	4	1	5	3	2	3	5	1	4	3	5	1	3	2	4	2	5	2
10	1	1	4	5	2	5	3	1	3	3	5	4	4	2	2	4	3	2	1	5
11	1	4	1	5	3	5	3	4	2	3	5	1	4	2	3	4	2	2	1	5
12	1	4	3	5	3	5	1	4	4	1	5	3	2	2	3	2	4	2	1	5
13	5	2	4	3	2	4	3	1	3	4	1	3	4	2	5	5	5	1	1	2
14	5	3	1	3	3	1	3	4	2	4	4	2	4	2	5	5	5	1	1	2
15	5	3	3	1	3	3	1	4	4	2	4	4	2	2	5	5	5	1	1	2
16	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	5	3	4	3	2	5	2	4	2	5	3	4	5
17	1	2	5	3	3	2	4	1	1	1	5	4	2	2	4	5	3	3	5	4
18	1	3	4	5	4	2	3	2	5	4	1	1	1	5	5	2	3	2	3	4
19	5	4	2	3	5	5	5	3	4	1	1	3	2	1	2	4	1	2	3	4

TABLE A.9. The tournament plan of a perfect pairing list for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 20$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 19$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 4$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4
2	1	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4
3	1	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3
4	1	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4
5	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1
6	1	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3
7	1	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2
8	1	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4
9	1	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2
10	1	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4
11	1	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3
12	1	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3
13	1	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2	2
14	1	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3	2
15	1	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1	3
16	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1	1
17	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2	1
18	1	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1	2
19	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	3	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	4	3	4	4	1

TABLE A.10. A perfect tournament plan for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 20$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 19$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 5$ .

APPENDIX B. PAIRING LISTS FROM NEARLY RESOLVABLE DESIGNS

Description	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1	1	2	3	4	2	4	3	2	1	3	4	0
2	0	1	4	2	3	3	2	4	2	1	3	4	1
3	1	0	3	4	2	4	3	2	2	1	3	4	1
4	2	3	0	4	4	1	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
5	2	3	4	0	4	3	2	1	2	4	1	3	1
6	2	3	4	4	0	2	1	3	3	4	2	1	1
7	2	3	1	3	2	0	4	4	1	4	2	3	1
8	2	3	3	2	1	4	0	4	2	4	3	1	1
9	2	3	2	1	3	4	4	0	3	4	1	2	1
10	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	0	4	4	4	1
11	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	0	4	4	1
12	2	3	3	1	2	2	3	1	4	4	0	4	1
13	2	3	2	3	1	3	1	2	4	4	4	0	1

TABLE B.1. A pairing list obtained from a nearly resolvable design for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 13$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 13$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 3$ . A zero indicates that the respective team skips the respective flight.

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	1	1	1	2	3	4	5	2	5	3	4	2	4	5	3	0
2	0	1	1	2	3	4	5	4	3	5	2	5	3	2	4	1
3	1	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	2	1
4	1	1	0	2	3	4	5	3	4	2	5	4	2	3	5	1
5	2	3	4	0	5	5	5	1	3	4	2	1	4	2	3	1
6	2	3	4	5	0	5	5	4	2	1	3	3	2	4	1	1
7	2	3	4	5	5	0	5	2	4	3	1	4	1	3	2	1
8	2	3	4	5	5	5	0	3	1	2	4	2	3	1	4	1
9	2	3	4	1	4	2	3	0	5	5	5	1	3	4	2	1
10	2	3	4	3	2	4	1	5	0	5	5	4	2	1	3	1
11	2	3	4	4	1	3	2	5	5	0	5	2	4	3	1	1
12	2	3	4	2	3	1	4	5	5	5	0	3	1	2	4	1
13	2	3	4	1	3	4	2	1	4	2	3	0	5	5	5	1
14	2	3	4	4	2	1	3	3	2	4	1	5	0	5	5	1
15	2	3	4	2	4	3	1	4	1	3	2	5	5	0	5	1
16	2	3	4	3	1	2	4	2	3	1	4	5	5	5	0	1

TABLE B.2. A pairing list obtained from a nearly resolvable design for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 16$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 16$  and  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 3$ . A zero indicates that the respective team skips the respective flight.

APPENDIX C. TOURNAMENT PLANS WITH BEST KNOWN UTILITY

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ROSTOCK, 18051 ROSTOCK, GERMANY  
 Email address: {robert.schueler, achill.schuermann}@uni-rostock.de

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	1	3	3	4	4	2	2	1	1	4	4	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	
4	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	3	1	1	2	2	4	4	4	4	1	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	4	4	3	3	
5	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	3	1	1	4	4	3	3	4	4	1	1	2	2	
6	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	2	4	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	2	4	4	1	1	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	
7	1	2	1	2	3	4	3	4	1	3	4	2	4	2	1	4	1	4	1	4	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	4	3	4
8	1	2	1	2	3	4	3	4	1	3	1	2	4	2	4	4	1	4	1	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	4	3	4	3	
9	1	2	1	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	1	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	1	4	1	4	3	4	3	4	1	2	1	2	
10	1	2	1	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	2	4	3	1	3	1	3	2	3	2	4	1	4	1	4	3	4	3	2	1	2	1
11	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3	1	3	3	1	4	2	2	4	1	4	4	1	2	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3
12	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3	1	3	2	4	4	2	4	1	1	4	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	2	4	3	3	4	3	4
13	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3	2	4	1	3	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	4	4	1	3	4	4	3	1	2	2	1	2	1
14	1	2	2	1	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	2	3	4	1	1	4	4	3	3	4	2	1	1	2
15	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	2	4	3	1	2	4	3	1	3	2	4	1	3	2	4	1	4	3	2	1	4	3	2	1
16	1	2	3	4	2	1	4	3	2	4	3	1	4	2	1	3	3	2	4	1	2	3	1	4	4	3	2	1	3	4	1	2
17	1	2	3	4	3	4	1	2	4	2	1	3	1	3	4	2	2	3	1	4	1	4	2	3	3	4	1	2	1	2	3	4
18	1	2	3	4	4	3	2	1	2	4	3	1	1	3	4	2	3	2	4	1	1	4	2	3	4	3	2	1	1	2	3	4

TABLE C.1. A tournament plan for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 32$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 18$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 8$  with  $\lambda_{\text{max}} - \lambda_{\text{min}} = 3$ .

Flight/Team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2
2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2
3	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
4	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	1
5	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1
6	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2
7	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2
8	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1
9	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
10	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
11	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1
12	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2
13	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1
14	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
15	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
16	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1

TABLE C.2. A tournament plan for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 10$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 16$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 5$  with utility value 2. The first eight rows are an optimal tournament plan for  $N_{\text{teams}} = 10$ ,  $N_{\text{flights}} = 8$ ,  $N_{\text{inrace}} = 5$ .