Non-Transitive Dice and Directed Graphs

Alex Schaefer

Department of Mathematics
Binghamton University

February 28, 2014

Outline

1. Introduction
2. Existence
3. Directed Graphs
4. Tournaments

Outline

1. Introduction
2. Existence
3. Directed Graphs
4. Tournaments

Introduction

- The original phenomenon that was explored is that of *non-transitive dice*, an idea first introduced by Martin Gardner.

Introduction

- The original phenomenon that was explored is that of *non-transitive dice*, an idea first introduced by Martin Gardner.
- The concept is (perhaps) best explained in terms of a game.

Introduction

- The original phenomenon that was explored is that of *non-transitive dice*, an idea first introduced by Martin Gardner.
- The concept is (perhaps) best explained in terms of a game.
- I will take this concept and extrapolate it to a different setting (directed graphs).

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice D* is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice D* is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.
- $$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}.$$

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice* D is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.
- $D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}.$
- Let $P(A \succ B)$ be: the probability that die A rolls a higher number than die B.

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice* D is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.
- $D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}.$
- Let $P(A \succ B)$ be: the probability that die A rolls a higher number than die B.
- Note that:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(B \succ A) = 1$.

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice* D is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.
- $D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}.$
- Let $P(A \succ B)$ be: the probability that die A rolls a higher number than die B.
- Note that:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(B \succ A) = 1$.
  - The outcomes of our game can then be given by $P(A \succ B)$, $P(B \succ C)$, and $P(C \succ A)$.

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6+3+3+3+3+3)/36$$

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3)/36$$

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3)/36$$

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3)/36$$

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3)/36$$

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3)/36$$

Counting Victories

$$D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$$

$$P(A \succ B) = (6 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 3)/36$$

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice* D is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.
- $D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}.$
- Let $P(A \succ B)$ be: the probability that die A rolls a higher number than die B.
- Note that:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(B \succ A) = 1$.
  - The outcomes of our game can then be given by $P(A \succ B)$, $P(B \succ C)$, and $P(C \succ A)$.

Non-Transitive Dice and Probabilities

- A *set of dice* D is a triple of n-sided dice, using the numbers of $[3n]$ each exactly once.
- $D = \begin{array}{cccccc} A: & 18 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 \\ B: & 17 & 16 & 15 & 4 & 3 & 2 \\ C: & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 & 1 \end{array}$.
- Let $P(A \succ B)$ be: the probability that die A rolls a higher number than die B.
- Note that:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(B \succ A) = 1$.
  - The outcomes of our game can then be given by $P(A \succ B)$, $P(B \succ C)$, and $P(C \succ A)$.
- In the above example, $P(A \succ B) = \frac{21}{36}$, $P(B \succ C) = \frac{21}{36}$, and $P(C \succ A) = \frac{25}{36}$.

Balance

- Issues with this example:

Balance

- Issues with this example:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(A \succ C)$, $P(B \succ C) + P(B \succ A)$, and $P(C \succ A) + P(C \succ B)$.

Balance

- Issues with this example:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(A \succ C)$, $P(B \succ C) + P(B \succ A)$, and $P(C \succ A) + P(C \succ B)$.
  - It'd be nice if those were equal, which is equivalent to:

Balance

- Issues with this example:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(A \succ C)$, $P(B \succ C) + P(B \succ A)$, and $P(C \succ A) + P(C \succ B)$.
  - It'd be nice if those were equal, which is equivalent to:
  - $P(A \succ B) = P(B \succ C) = P(C \succ A)$, which we will call the "victorious probability".

Balance

- Issues with this example:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(A \succ C)$, $P(B \succ C) + P(B \succ A)$, and $P(C \succ A) + P(C \succ B)$.
  - It'd be nice if those were equal, which is equivalent to:
  - $P(A \succ B) = P(B \succ C) = P(C \succ A)$, which we will call the "victorious probability".
- This condition will be called *balance*.

Balance

- Issues with this example:
  - $P(A \succ B) + P(A \succ C)$, $P(B \succ C) + P(B \succ A)$, and $P(C \succ A) + P(C \succ B)$.
  - It'd be nice if those were equal, which is equivalent to:
  - $P(A \succ B) = P(B \succ C) = P(C \succ A)$, which we will call the "victorious probability".
- This condition will be called *balance*.
- $$\begin{array}{lcccccc} A: & 18 & 14 & 11 & 7 & 4 & 3 \\ B: & 17 & 13 & 10 & 9 & 6 & 2 \\ C: & 16 & 15 & 12 & 8 & 5 & 1 \end{array}$$ has victorious probability $\frac{19}{36}$.

BntD's

- BntD(1)/BntD(2)...no.

BntD's

- BntD(1)/BntD(2)...no.
- BntD(3)'s:

BntD's

- BntD(1)/BntD(2)...no.
- BntD(3)'s:
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array}$,
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array}$.

BntD's

- BntD(1)/BntD(2)...no.
- BntD(3)'s:
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array}$,
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array}$.
  - Both with victorious probability $\frac{5}{9}$.

BntD's

- BntD(1)/BntD(2)...no.
- BntD(3)'s:
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array}$,
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array}$.
  - Both with victorious probability $\frac{5}{9}$.
- A BntD(4): $\begin{array}{lcccc} A: & 12 & 10 & 3 & 1 \\ B: & 9 & 8 & 7 & 2 \\ C: & 11 & 6 & 5 & 4 \end{array}$, v.p. $\frac{9}{16}$.

BntD's

- BntD(1)/BntD(2)...no.
- BntD(3)'s:
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array}$,
  - $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array}$.
  - Both with victorious probability $\frac{5}{9}$.
- A BntD(4): $\begin{array}{lcccc} A: & 12 & 10 & 3 & 1 \\ B: & 9 & 8 & 7 & 2 \\ C: & 11 & 6 & 5 & 4 \end{array}$, v.p. $\frac{9}{16}$.
- A BntD(5): $\begin{array}{lccccc} A: & 15 & 11 & 7 & 4 & 3 \\ B: & 14 & 10 & 9 & 5 & 2 \\ C: & 13 & 12 & 8 & 6 & 1 \end{array}$, v.p. $\frac{13}{25}$.

Outline

1 Introduction

2 Existence

3 Directed Graphs

4 Tournaments

Concatenation Lemmas

- Concatenation of two sets of dice:

$$D_\sigma = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \right. , \quad D_\rho = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array} \right. .$$

Concatenation Lemmas

- Concatenation of two sets of dice:

$$D_\sigma = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \right. , \quad D_\rho = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array} \right. .$$

- $$D_{\rho\sigma} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc|ccc} A: & 18 & 14 & 10 & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 17 & 13 & 12 & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 16 & 15 & 11 & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array} \right. .$$

Concatenation Lemmas

- Concatenation of two sets of dice:

$$D_\sigma = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \right. , \quad D_\rho = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array} \right. .$$

- $$D_{\rho\sigma} = \left\{ \begin{array}{lccc|ccc} A: & 18 & 14 & 10 & 9 & 4 & 2 \\ B: & 17 & 13 & 12 & 8 & 6 & 1 \\ C: & 16 & 15 & 11 & 7 & 5 & 3 \end{array} \right. .$$

Lemmas (S. 2011)

Concatenation preserves both balance and non-transitivity.

Existence Theorem

Theorem (S. 2011)

There exists a BntD(n) for every $n \geq 3$.

Existence Theorem

Theorem (S. 2011)

There exists a BntD(n) for every $n \geq 3$.

- We have given BntD(n)'s for $n = 3, 4, 5$.

Existence Theorem

Theorem (S. 2011)

There exists a BntD(n) for every $n \geq 3$.

- We have given BntD(n)'s for $n = 3, 4, 5$.
- By lemmas, concatenation of two BntD's is a BntD.

Existence Theorem

Theorem (S. 2011)

There exists a BntD(n) for every $n \geq 3$.

A General Result

Theorem (S.2011)

Let A, B, C be disjoint subsets of $[3n]$, each of size n, and let P_{ab} represent the probability that a randomly chosen element of A is larger than a randomly chosen element of B (also analogously define P_{bc} and P_{ca}). Then

$$P_{ab} = P_{bc} = P_{ca}$$

if and only if

$$\sum_{a \in A} a = \sum_{b \in B} b = \sum_{c \in C} c.$$

Outline

1 Introduction

2 Existence

3 Directed Graphs

4 Tournaments

Cycles

- Our BntD(n)'s could be viewed as directed 3-cycles.

Cycles

- Our BntD(n)'s could be viewed as directed 3-cycles.
- The statement then says we can build a set of dice that *realizes* the edges of this directed graph.

Cycles

- Our BntD(n)'s could be viewed as directed 3-cycles.
- The statement then says we can build a set of dice that *realizes* the edges of this directed graph.
- Next natural question: more vertices (more dice)?

More Dice?

- Efron's Dice: $\begin{array}{lcccccc} A: & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ B: & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ C: & 6 & 6 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ D: & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}.$

More Dice?

- Efron's Dice:

$$\begin{array}{lcccccc} A: & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ B: & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ C: & 6 & 6 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ D: & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}.$$

- Expand to:

$$\begin{array}{lcccccc} A: & 19 & 18 & 17 & 16 & 2 & 1 \\ B: & 15 & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 \\ C: & 24 & 23 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 \\ D: & 22 & 21 & 20 & 5 & 4 & 3 \end{array}$$

More Dice?

- Efron's Dice:

$$\begin{array}{lcccccc} A: & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\ B: & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ C: & 6 & 6 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ D: & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}.$$

- Expand to:

$$\begin{array}{lcccccc} A: & 19 & 18 & 17 & 16 & 2 & 1 \\ B: & 15 & 14 & 13 & 12 & 11 & 10 \\ C: & 24 & 23 & 9 & 8 & 7 & 6 \\ D: & 22 & 21 & 20 & 5 & 4 & 3 \end{array}$$

- Suitably modify definitions to: $\mathrm{BntD}_m(n)$.

More more dice?

- $\mathrm{BntD}_4(3)$: $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 5 & 2 \\ B: & 11 & 8 & 1 \\ C: & 10 & 7 & 3 \\ D: & 9 & 6 & 4 \end{array}$,

More more dice?

- $\mathrm{BntD}_4(3)$: $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 5 & 2 \\ B: & 11 & 8 & 1 \\ C: & 10 & 7 & 3 \\ D: & 9 & 6 & 4 \end{array}$,
- $\mathrm{BntD}_4(4)$: $\begin{array}{lcccc} A: & 16 & 10 & 7 & 1 \\ B: & 15 & 9 & 6 & 4 \\ C: & 14 & 12 & 5 & 3 \\ D: & 13 & 11 & 8 & 2 \end{array}$,

More more dice?

- $\mathrm{BntD}_4(3)$: $\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 5 & 2 \\ B: & 11 & 8 & 1 \\ C: & 10 & 7 & 3 \\ D: & 9 & 6 & 4 \end{array}$,
- $\mathrm{BntD}_4(4)$: $\begin{array}{lcccc} A: & 16 & 10 & 7 & 1 \\ B: & 15 & 9 & 6 & 4 \\ C: & 14 & 12 & 5 & 3 \\ D: & 13 & 11 & 8 & 2 \end{array}$,
- $\mathrm{BntD}_4(5)$: $\begin{array}{lccccc} A: & 20 & 13 & 10 & 6 & 4 \\ B: & 19 & 15 & 9 & 8 & 3 \\ C: & 18 & 16 & 12 & 5 & 1 \\ D: & 17 & 14 & 11 & 7 & 2 \end{array}$.

More more dice?

- Concatenation arguments. . .

The Cycle Question

- As it turns out, any directed m-cycle is realizable with n-sided balanced dice (both ≥ 3), giving the following:

The Cycle Question

- As it turns out, any directed m-cycle is realizable with n-sided balanced dice (both ≥ 3), giving the following:

Theorem (S. 2011)

Let $m, n \geq 3$. Then there exists a $BntD_m(n)$.

The Cycle Question

- As it turns out, any directed m-cycle is realizable with n-sided balanced dice (both ≥ 3), giving the following:

Theorem (S. 2011)

Let $m, n \geq 3$. Then there exists a $BntD_m(n)$.

- Proof: By induction.

Induction Example

- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{lccc} A: & \hat{9} & \hat{5} & \hat{1} \\ B: & \hat{8} & \hat{4} & \hat{3} \\ C: & \hat{7} & \hat{6} & \hat{2} \\ D: & ? & ? & ? \end{array}$$

Induction Example

- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{lccc} A: & \hat{9} & \hat{5} & \hat{1} \\ B: & \hat{8} & \hat{4} & \hat{3} \\ C: & \hat{7} & \hat{6} & \hat{2} \\ D: & ? & ? & ? \end{array}$$
- The dice related to D are A and C, requiring that $C \succ D$, $D \succ A$. But as $C \succ A$ already, this is a total ordering: $C > D > A$.

Induction Example

- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{lccc} A: & \hat{9} & \hat{5} & \hat{1} \\ B: & \hat{8} & \hat{4} & \hat{3} \\ C: & \hat{7} & \hat{6} & \hat{2} \\ D: & ? & ? & ? \end{array}$$
- The dice related to D are A and C, requiring that $C \succ D$, $D \succ A$. But as $C \succ A$ already, this is a total ordering: $C > D > A$.
- So, because $C \succ A$, we step outside $\mathbb{N}$ to make D numerically "similar" to C, but "inferior" to it:

$$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \\ D: & 6.9 & 5.9 & 2.1 \end{array}$$

Induction Example

- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{lccc} A: & \hat{9} & \hat{5} & \hat{1} \\ B: & \hat{8} & \hat{4} & \hat{3} \\ C: & \hat{7} & \hat{6} & \hat{2} \\ D: & ? & ? & ? \end{array}$$
- The dice related to D are A and C, requiring that $C \succ D$, $D \succ A$. But as $C \succ A$ already, this is a total ordering: $C > D > A$.
- So, because $C \succ A$, we step outside $\mathbb{N}$ to make D numerically "similar" to C, but "inferior" to it:

$$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \\ D: & 6.9 & 5.9 & 2.1 \end{array}$$

- Insert our new die into the mix:

A :	9	5	1
B :	8	4	3
C :	7	6	2
D :	6.9	5.9	2.1

- Insert our new die into the mix:

$$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \\ D: & 6.9 & 5.9 & 2.1 \end{array}$$

- Finally, re-label linearly:

$$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 9 & 5 & 1 \\ B: & 8 & 4 & 3 \\ C: & 7 & 6 & 2 \\ D: & 6.9 & 5.9 & 2.1 \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 6 & 1 \\ B: & 11 & 5 & 4 \\ C: & 10 & 8 & 2 \\ D: & 9 & 7 & 3 \end{array}$$

Proof by Induction

- Base case: $k = 3 \checkmark$

Proof by Induction

- Base case: $k = 3\checkmark$
- Assume the existence of a $BntD_k(n)$.

Proof by Induction

- Base case: $k = 3\checkmark$
- Assume the existence of a $BntD_k(n)$.
- Artificially insert a die called $K + 1$, with the same numbers as die K.

Proof by Induction

- Base case: $k = 3\checkmark$
- Assume the existence of a $BntD_k(n)$.
- Artificially insert a die called $K + 1$, with the same numbers as die K.
- We then shift the labels of die $K + 1$. First, a few notes.

A Few Notes

- Our new setup needs $K \succ (K+1)$ and $(K+1) \succ A$. But as $K \succ A$ by the inductive hypothesis, this provides a total ordering on these three dice.

A Few Notes

- Our new setup needs $K \succ (K+1)$ and $(K+1) \succ A$. But as $K \succ A$ by the inductive hypothesis, this provides a total ordering on these three dice.
- Then there do in fact exist labels of $K+1$ providing the necessary relationship (from a purely $\succ$ viewpoint).

A Few Notes

- Our new setup needs $K \succ (K+1)$ and $(K+1) \succ A$. But as $K \succ A$ by the inductive hypothesis, this provides a total ordering on these three dice.
- Then there do in fact exist labels of $K+1$ providing the necessary relationship (from a purely $\succ$ viewpoint).
- This proves the theorem is true if we omit the condition of balance.

A Few Notes

- Our new setup needs $K \succ (K+1)$ and $(K+1) \succ A$. But as $K \succ A$ by the inductive hypothesis, this provides a total ordering on these three dice.
- Then there do in fact exist labels of $K+1$ providing the necessary relationship (from a purely $\succ$ viewpoint).
- This proves the theorem is true if we omit the condition of balance.
- We will now, however, recover it.

Regaining Our Balance

- We need to shift some labels *down* and some labels *up*.

Regaining Our Balance

- We need to shift some labels *down* and some labels *up*.
- Shift them all down, and count the victories of K over $K + 1$.

Regaining Our Balance

- We need to shift some labels *down* and some labels *up*.
- Shift them all down, and count the victories of K over $K + 1$.
- If we shift the last label up instead, we reduce the number of victories by exactly one.

Regaining Our Balance

- We need to shift some labels *down* and some labels *up*.
- Shift them all down, and count the victories of K over $K + 1$.
- If we shift the last label up instead, we reduce the number of victories by exactly one.
- And so on...

Regaining Our Balance

- We need to shift some labels *down* and some labels *up*.
- Shift them all down, and count the victories of K over $K + 1$.
- If we shift the last label up instead, we reduce the number of victories by exactly one.
- And so on...
- *Any number of victories we would desire is obtainable!*

A General Question

- *Tournament*: a copy of the complete graph on m vertices K_m, where each edge is given an orientation from one incident vertex to the other.

A General Question

- *Tournament*: a copy of the complete graph on m vertices K_m, where each edge is given an orientation from one incident vertex to the other.
- Given an arbitrary tournament, does it have a *realization* as dice? Balanced dice??

A General Question

- *Tournament*: a copy of the complete graph on m vertices K_m, where each edge is given an orientation from one incident vertex to the other.
- Given an arbitrary tournament, does it have a *realization* as dice? Balanced dice??
- Because acyclic graphs correspond to total (well) orderings, they are trivially realizable, even by one-sided dice. However, the condition of balance (all victorious probabilities equal) has no meaning here.

A Few Cases Answered

- Any tournament T_3 is either acyclic, which is realizable, or it is a directed 3-cycle (a $BntD(n)$).

A Few Cases Answered

- A T_4:

A Few Cases Answered

- A T_4:
  - Up to isomorphism, there are 4 of them.

A Few Cases Answered

- A T_4:
  - Up to isomorphism, there are 4 of them.
  - One is acyclic✓

A Few Cases Answered

- A T_4:
  - Up to isomorphism, there are 4 of them.
  - One is acyclic✓
  - One is a 3-cycle, plus a "powerhouse"✓

A Few Cases Answered

- A T_4:
  - Up to isomorphism, there are 4 of them.
  - One is acyclic✓
  - One is a 3-cycle, plus a “powerhouse”✓
  - One is a 3-cycle, plus a “loser”✓

A Few Cases Answered

- A T_4:
  - Up to isomorphism, there are 4 of them.
  - One is acyclic✓
  - One is a 3-cycle, plus a “powerhouse”✓
  - One is a 3-cycle, plus a “loser”✓
  - Only one has a 4-cycle, so that is a $BnD_4(n)$✓

A Few Cases Answered

- The real issue...

Outline

1 Introduction

2 Existence

3 Directed Graphs

4 Tournaments

The Ignored Structure

- With 4 dice,
- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 6 & 1 \\ B: & 11 & 5 & 4 \\ C: & 10 & 8 & 2 \\ D: & 9 & 7 & 3 \end{array}$$

The Ignored Structure

- With 4 dice,
- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 6 & 1 \\ B: & 11 & 5 & 4 \\ C: & 10 & 8 & 2 \\ D: & 9 & 7 & 3 \end{array}$$
- $A \succ B \succ C \succ D \succ A$.

The Ignored Structure

- With 4 dice,
- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 6 & 1 \\ B: & 11 & 5 & 4 \\ C: & 10 & 8 & 2 \\ D: & 9 & 7 & 3 \end{array}$$
- $A \succ B \succ C \succ D \succ A$.
- How do A, C relate? B, D?

The Ignored Structure

- With 4 dice,
- $$\begin{array}{lccc} A: & 12 & 6 & 1 \\ B: & 11 & 5 & 4 \\ C: & 10 & 8 & 2 \\ D: & 9 & 7 & 3 \end{array}$$
- $A \succ B \succ C \succ D \succ A$.
- How do A, C relate? B, D?
- Is it forced or can it be manipulated?

The New Question

- Can an arbitrary orientation of K_n be constructed with a set of dice?

The New Question

- Can an arbitrary orientation of K_n be constructed with a set of dice?
- If so, we will call the given tournament *realizable*.

Connectedness

- Given a directed graph on n vertices, a *connected component* is a subset of the vertices for which any two contain a directed path between them (in both directions).

Connectedness

- Given a directed graph on n vertices, a *connected component* is a subset of the vertices for which any two contain a directed path between them (in both directions).
- Alternately: a connected component is a set of vertices which form a maximal directed cycle.

Connectedness

- Given a directed graph on n vertices, a *connected component* is a subset of the vertices for which any two contain a directed path between them (in both directions).
- Alternately: a connected component is a set of vertices which form a maximal directed cycle.
- Belonging to a connected component is an equivalence relation.

Connectedness

- Given a directed graph on n vertices, a *connected component* is a subset of the vertices for which any two contain a directed path between them (in both directions).
- Alternately: a connected component is a set of vertices which form a maximal directed cycle.
- Belonging to a connected component is an equivalence relation.
- Viewing a component as one new vertex, and keeping all edges not contained in a component gives an acyclic directed graph.

Example



Example



=



Example



Example



Example



$\mapsto$



Strong Tournaments

- A tournament is said to be *strong* if it has exactly 1 connected component.

Strong Tournaments

- A tournament is said to be *strong* if it has exactly 1 connected component.
- Alternately: a tournament is strong if and only if it contains a directed Hamilton cycle.

Strong Tournaments

- A tournament is said to be *strong* if it has exactly 1 connected component.
- Alternately: a tournament is strong if and only if it contains a directed Hamilton cycle.
- Note: a strong tournament then has a subgraph (obtained only by deleting edges) which is a directed cycle and thus can be realized with a set of balanced dice.

Strong Tournaments

- A tournament is said to be *strong* if it has exactly 1 connected component.
- Alternately: a tournament is strong if and only if it contains a directed Hamilton cycle.
- Note: a strong tournament then has a subgraph (obtained only by deleting edges) which is a directed cycle and thus can be realized with a set of balanced dice.
- We now recover the deleted edges.

How This Is Going To Work

- We will begin with a directed cycle, and construct a “traditional” set of dice.

How This Is Going To Work

- We will begin with a directed cycle, and construct a “traditional” set of dice.
- Then, we will check the number of victories for the pair of dice we wish to add as an edge in our tournament.

How This Is Going To Work

- We will begin with a directed cycle, and construct a “traditional” set of dice.
- Then, we will check the number of victories for the pair of dice we wish to add as an edge in our tournament.
- Then, we will add sides to those dice to alter the number of victories (or to ensure all dice end up with the same number of sides).

Algorithm Example

We start with a set of 5 dice. Note that every die has either 4 or 5 victories over any other.



$$\begin{array}{rlccc} & A: & 15 & 7 & 1 \\ & B: & 14 & 6 & 5 \\ \rightarrow & C: & 13 & 10 & 2 \\ & D: & 12 & 9 & 3 \\ & E: & 11 & 8 & 4 \end{array}$$

Algorithm Example

Using a little foresight, we shift our labels up by 10.



$$\begin{array}{rlccc} & A: & 25 & 17 & 11 \\ & B: & 24 & 16 & 15 \\ \rightarrow & C: & 23 & 20 & 12 \\ & D: & 22 & 19 & 13 \\ & E: & 21 & 18 & 14 \end{array}$$

Algorithm Example

The first edge we choose to add requires $A \succ C$.



$$
\begin{array}{rl|ccc|c}
 & A: & ? & 25 & 17 & 11 & ? \\
 & B: & & 24 & 16 & 15 & \\
\rightarrow & C: & ? & 23 & 20 & 12 & ? \\
 & D: & & 22 & 19 & 13 & \\
 & E: & & 21 & 18 & 14 &
\end{array}
$$

Algorithm Example

$A \succ C$ means we place the larger of $\{26, 27\}$ on A. A only had 4 victories over C, so we place the larger of $\{9, 10\}$ on A to add one more.



	A :	27	25	17	11	10
	B :		24	16	15	
$\rightarrow$	C :	26	23	20	12	9
	D :		22	19	13	
	E :		21	18	14	

You might worry how this affects the relationship between say, A and B. We'll discuss that in a moment.

Algorithm Example

The next edge requires that $B \succ D$.



	A :	27	25	17	11	10
	B :	?	24	16	15	?
$\rightarrow$	C :	26	23	20	12	9
	D :	?	22	19	13	?
	E :		21	18	14	

Algorithm Example

$B \succ D$ means we place the larger of $\{28, 29\}$ on B. This time, B already had 5 victories over D, so we place the *smaller* of $\{7, 8\}$ on B.



A :	27	25	17	11	10
B :	29	24	16	15	7
$\rightarrow$ C :	26	23	20	12	9
D :	28	22	19	13	8
E :		21	18	14	

Now, look back to A and B.

Algorithm Example

The next edge we choose is $B \succ E$.



	A :		27	25	17	11	10	
	B :	?	29	24	16	15	7	?
$\rightarrow$	C :		26	23	20	12	9	
	D :		28	22	19	13	8	
	E :		?	21	18	14	?	

Algorithm Example

$B \succ E$ means we place the larger of $\{30, 31\}$ on B. B originally had 5 victories over E, so we place the smaller of $\{5, 6\}$ on B.



$\rightarrow$

A :		27	25	17	11	10	
B :	31	29	24	16	15	7	5
C :		26	23	20	12	9	
D :		28	22	19	13	8	
E :		30	21	18	14	6	

Algorithm Example

The next edge we add is $C \succ E$.



	A :		27	25	17	11	10	
	B :	31	29	24	16	15	7	5
$\rightarrow$	C :	?	26	23	20	12	9	?
	D :		28	22	19	13	8	
	E :	?	30	21	18	14	6	?

Algorithm Example

$C \succ E$ means we place the larger of $\{32, 33\}$ to C. C had 5 victories over E, so give it the smaller of $\{3, 4\}$.



$$\rightarrow \begin{array}{c|cc|ccc|cc} A: & & 27 & 25 & 17 & 11 & 10 & \\ B: & 31 & 29 & 24 & 16 & 15 & 7 & 5 \\ C: & 33 & 26 & 23 & 20 & 12 & 9 & 3 \\ D: & & 28 & 22 & 19 & 13 & 8 & \\ E: & 32 & 30 & 21 & 18 & 14 & 6 & 4 \end{array}$$

Algorithm Example

Lastly, we add $A \succ D$.



$$\rightarrow \begin{array}{c|cc|ccc|cc} A: & ? & 27 & 25 & 17 & 11 & 10 & ? \\ B: & 31 & 29 & 24 & 16 & 15 & 7 & 5 \\ C: & 33 & 26 & 23 & 20 & 12 & 9 & 3 \\ D: & ? & 28 & 22 & 19 & 13 & 8 & ? \\ E: & 32 & 30 & 21 & 18 & 14 & 6 & 4 \end{array}$$

Algorithm Example

$A \succ D$ means A gets the larger of $\{34, 35\}$. A had 4 victories over D, so it gets the larger of $\{1, 2\}$.



$\rightarrow$

A :	35	27	25	17	11	10	2
B :	31	29	24	16	15	7	5
C :	33	26	23	20	12	9	3
D :	34	28	22	19	13	8	1
E :	32	30	21	18	14	6	4

Algorithm Example

We have constructed a set of balanced dice such that the probabilities correspond exactly with the direction of the edges.



$$\rightarrow \begin{array}{lcccccccc} A: & 35 & 27 & 25 & 17 & 11 & 10 & 2 \\ B: & 31 & 29 & 24 & 16 & 15 & 7 & 5 \\ C: & 33 & 26 & 23 & 20 & 12 & 9 & 3 \\ D: & 34 & 28 & 22 & 19 & 13 & 8 & 1 \\ E: & 32 & 30 & 21 & 18 & 14 & 6 & 4 \end{array}$$

Non-Strong Tournaments

- If a tournament is not strong, *it is acyclic on its strong components*.

Non-Strong Tournaments

- If a tournament is not strong, *it is acyclic on its strong components*.
- Then, do the following:

Non-Strong Tournaments

- If a tournament is not strong, *it is acyclic on its strong components*.
- Then, do the following:
  1. Take the subgraphs consisting of each strong component.

Non-Strong Tournaments

- If a tournament is not strong, *it is acyclic on its strong components*.
- Then, do the following:
  1. Take the subgraphs consisting of each strong component.
  2. Perform the above algorithm on them.

Non-Strong Tournaments

- If a tournament is not strong, *it is acyclic on its strong components*.
- Then, do the following:
  1. Take the subgraphs consisting of each strong component.
  2. Perform the above algorithm on them.
  3. Concatenate in acyclic (total) order.

Balance In Tournaments

- The algorithm maintains balance!

Balance In Tournaments

- The algorithm maintains balance!
- So, if the tournament is strong, it can be realized with *balanced* dice.

Balance In Tournaments

- The algorithm maintains balance!
- So, if the tournament is strong, it can be realized with *balanced* dice.
- If the tournament is not strong, balance is impossible.

Incomplete Directed Graphs

- An arbitrary directed graph isn't a problem.

Incomplete Directed Graphs

- An arbitrary directed graph isn't a problem.
- Consider it as a subgraph of a tournament on the same vertex set.

The End Result

Theorem (S. 2012):

Let G be a directed graph. Then there is a set of dice which realizes G. Further, the dice can be made balanced if and only if G is a subgraph of a strong tournament on the same vertex set.

Thank You!