

A simulation comparison of tournament designs for world men's handball championships

László Csató*

Institute for Computer Science and Control, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA SZTAKI)
Laboratory on Engineering and Management Intelligence, Research Group of Operations
Research and Decision Systems

Corvinus University of Budapest (BCE)
Department of Operations Research and Actuarial Sciences

Budapest, Hungary

11th June 2022

Wo es auch kein System, keinen Wahrheitsapparat gibt, da gibt es doch eine Wahrheit, und diese wird dann meistens nur durch ein geübtes Urteil und den Takt einer langen Erfahrung gefunden. Gibt also die Geschichte hier keine Formeln, so gibt sie doch hier wie überall Übung des Urteils.¹

(Carl von Clausewitz: *Vom Kriege*)

Abstract

The study aims to compare different designs for world men's handball championships. This event, organized in every two years, has adopted four hybrid formats consisting of knockout and round-robin stages in recent decades, including a change of design between the last and the next championships held in 2017 and 2019, respectively. They are evaluated under two seeding policies with respect to various outcome measures, applying Monte-Carlo simulations. We find that efficacy in terms of selecting the strongest competitors as the winner is not necessarily a monotonic function of the number of matches played, the most frugal design is the second most efficient, making it a good compromise in this unavoidable trade-off. We also identify a possible error in a particular design. The outcome uncertainty of the formats seems to be robust with respect to seeding rules. It is shown that the recent reform of tournament design has increased efficacy. Our results have useful implications for organizers of hybrid tournaments.

* e-mail: laszlo.csato@uni-corvinus.hu

¹ "Where neither system nor any dogmatic apparatus can be found, there may still be truth, and this truth will then, in most cases, only be discovered by a practised judgment and the tact of long experience. Therefore, even if history does not here furnish any formula, we may be certain that here as well as everywhere else, it will give us *exercise for the judgment*." (Source: Carl von Clausewitz: *On War*, translated by Colonel James John Graham, London, N. Trübner, 1873. <http://clausewitz.com/readings/OnWar1873/TOC.htm>)

JEL classification number: C44, C63, Z20

MSC class: 68U20

Keywords: OR in sports; tournament design; simulation; handball

1 Introduction

Finding the optimal design of major sports tournaments is an important question of scientific research (Szymanski, 2003). Ignoring the role of referees – who may be biased, for example, towards the home team (Garicano et al., 2005) –, organizers and sport governing bodies have supposedly no influence on match outcomes. However, they can certainly choose other characteristics of a tournament, including its format (Scarf et al., 2009; Scarf and Yusof, 2011; Guyon, 2017), the schedule of individual matches (Durán et al., 2017), the seeding policy (Guyon, 2015; Laliena and López, 2018), and the progression rules (Dagaev and Sonin, 2017; Vong, 2017; Csató, 2018a,c).

The current paper considers tournament designs as probabilistic mechanisms that select high-quality alternatives (players or teams) in a noisy environment (Ryvkin, 2010). Operational Research (OR) can play a prominent role here by analysing the effects of tournament structures on particular aspects of a sporting event: given a particular metric as an objective, and respecting design constraints, it becomes possible to choose the most favourable version.

In sports involving pairwise matches, there are two fundamental tournament formats (Scarf et al., 2009). The first is the *knockout* tournament where matches are played in rounds such that the winners play against each other in the next round, while the losers are immediately eliminated from the tournament. The sole remaining player, the winner of the final gets the first prize. The second basic design is the *round-robin* tournament where every competitor plays every other such that they earn points based on their number of wins, draws, and losses. The winner is the team with the greatest point score. All other designs can be considered as variations, such as the *double elimination* (McGarry and Schutz, 1997; Stanton and Williams, 2013), the *Swiss system* (Appleton, 1995; Csató, 2013, 2017), and hybrids like the FIFA World Cup or the UEFA Champions League in association football.

Tournament success measures are relatively straightforward to define. On the other hand, the identification of design constraints is usually more difficult because they are rarely communicated by the organizers. The only plausible assumption seems to be that a format already used for a given tournament remains feasible in the future. However, it does not help much when the tournament receives a modification to its structure only if the number of competitors changes. For example, FIFA World Cup was expanded to 24 teams in 1982, then to 32 in 1998, while the 2026 World Cup will have 48 finalist teams, but its format remained the same between these years. Similarly, the biannual European Men’s and Women’s Handball Championships started with 12 teams in 1994, were expanded to 16 teams in 2002, but were organised according to the same format. It means that suggesting a new design has not much practical value unless it dominates the one applied in the real-world in (almost) every respect.

Nevertheless, a number of high profile events have received regular modification to their structure. We will analyse here a probably unique example, the [IHF World Men’s Handball Championship](#). This event is organized in every two years now (since 1993) and is one of the most important and prestigious championships for men’s handball national teams along Olympic games and [EHF European Men’s Handball Championship](#) as handball is most popular in the countries of continental Europe, which have won all medals but one

in the men's world championships. Attendance of the last championship in 2017, hosted in France, was over 500,000, or more than 6,500 per match. The next 26th IHF Men's World Championship in Germany/Denmark will see all matches played in venues with a capacity of 10,000 or more.

The number of qualified teams is fixed at 24 since 1995, but the tournament format has changed several times over the last two decades. Between 1995 and 2001 (four events), there were group games in the preliminary round, followed by a knockout stage. This format was used again between 2013 and 2017 (three events). However, there were two subsequent group stages between 2003 and 2011 (five events), in three different variants, one of them returning in 2019 (IHF, 2018). Consequently, there are four tournament structures that have been implemented in recent years, including a change between the last and the next tournament, which indicates that organizers experiment with finding the best design, and gives an extraordinary opportunity to compare them with the tools of OR.

It is clear that such complex designs, which mix knock-out and round-robin stages, can be analysed only by Monte-Carlo simulations. Academic literature has made several attempts to address similar problems. Scarf et al. (2009) propose a number of tournament metrics and describe how they may be evaluated for a particular design. The authors use UEFA Champions League to illustrate their methodology. Scarf and Yusof (2011) extend this investigation by considering the effect of the seeding policy on tournament outcome uncertainty while taking competitive balance into account. Goossens et al. (2012) examine four league formats that have been considered by the Royal Belgian Football Association. Lasek and Gagolewski (2015) compare the recently introduced competition format for the top association football division in Poland to the standard double round-robin structure. Yusof et al. (2016) develop a system called as 'E-compare of Soccer Tournament Structures' to assist decision makers in determining the fairest design for association football tournaments. Dagaev and Rudyak (2016) evaluate a recent reform of the seeding system in the UEFA Champions League.

These papers use specific models for simulating match results, but we do not apply such sophisticated but somewhat restrictive assumptions to compare the different tournament formats because of a number of reasons. First, we follow general works on the efficacy of sports tournaments with this choice (Appleton, 1995; McGarry and Schutz, 1997). Second, at least according to our knowledge, there exists no particular prediction model fitted to handball results, contrary to several methods making a good prediction about the outcome of a single match between two football teams (Maher, 1982; Dixon and Coles, 1997; Koning et al., 2003). The main difficulty is probably that handball is a fast, dynamic and high-scoring game, professional teams now typically score between 20 and 35 goals each, and the technical analysis of a handball match means a serious challenge (Bilge, 2012; Gruić et al., 2007). According to Dumangane et al. (2009), the dynamics of handball matches violate both independence and identical distribution, in some cases having a non-stationary behaviour. Furthermore, some tournament designs analysed here have been applied only once, so the lack of historical data prevents fitting a specific prediction model. Third, all of our designs contain at least one group stage, and Krumer et al. (2017) prove that in round-robin tournaments among three or four symmetric contestants, there is a first-mover advantage driven by strategic effects arising from the subgame perfect equilibrium. Krumer and Lechner (2017) give an empirical proof of this finding. To summarize, exact modelling of handball matches organised in such complicated hybrid designs seems to be beyond the current knowledge of the academic community.

The main contribution and novelty of our research is the analysis of a specific – but by no means marginal – handball tournament by simulations, which has received several

modifications to its format recently, so organizers are probably uncertain on its appropriate design. We have some interesting findings, for example, efficacy in terms of selecting the strongest competitors as the winner is not necessarily a monotonic function of the number of matches played: the most frugal design is the second most efficient, so it seems to be a good compromise in this unavoidable trade-off. Since it is mainly caused by the smaller groups of four teams instead of six in the first round-robin stage, this change is worth considering. According to our calculations, the recent change of the handball world championship format has increased the efficacy of the tournament.

In short, our results will have useful implications for hybrid tournaments that are applied in several sports such as basketball, handball, and volleyball, some of them are presented at the end of the paper.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the tournament designs, the metrics used to evaluate the efficacy of different formats, and the simulation experiment. The results obtained and their robustness check are detailed in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 discusses our main findings and concludes.

2 Methodology

For the comparison of different tournament designs, it is necessary to use simulation as historical data are limited: it will turn out that some structures were applied only once.

2.1 Tournament designs

World men’s handball championships have been organized with 24 participating teams in four fundamentally different designs in recent decades. These will serve as the basis for our investigation.

Each design contains one or two group stages. Groups are round-robin tournaments with all teams playing against any other teams in their group. In the case of two group stages, results of the matches played in the preliminary round between teams of the same main round groups are carried over to the main round.

Organizers provide a strict final ranking at the end of the tournament, meaning that usually there are some further matches to be played by the teams already eliminated. We will focus only on the first four places, our stylized model contains only a third-place game played between two losers of the semifinals, similarly to the actual tournaments. Note that there were no playoffs for the 5-8th place in the 2013 and 2017 world championships.

2.1.1 Pure round-robin (*RR*)

While the 24 competitors have never played a round-robin tournament, we use this format as a reference.

2.1.2 One group stage with 6 teams per group (*KO*)

This design, presented in Figure A.1, has been used in world men’s handball championships between 1995 and 2001 as well as between 2013 and 2017. It contains one group stage with four groups of six teams each such that the top four teams qualify for the round of 16 (see Figure A.1a) when a standard knockout stage starts (see Figure A.1b).

2.1.3 Two group stages with 6 and 4 teams per group (G_{64})

This design, presented in Figure A.2, has been used in the 2003 World Men’s Handball Championship, hosted by Portugal. It contains two group stages (see Figure A.2a). The preliminary round consists of four groups of six teams each such that the top four teams qualify for the main round. The main round consists of four groups of four teams each such that two teams in each main round group are from the same preliminary round group, the first and the third, or the second and the fourth. Therefore, all teams play two further matches in the main round. Only the top team of main round groups qualifies for the semifinals in the knockout stage (see Figure A.2b).

2.1.4 Two group stages with 6 and 6 teams per group (G_{66})

This design, presented in Figure A.3, has been used first in the 2005 World Men’s Handball Championship and has been applied in 2009 and 2011. The 2019 championship will also be organised according to design G_{66} (IHF, 2018). It contains two group stages (see Figure A.3a). The preliminary round consists of four groups of six teams each such that the top three teams qualify for the main round. The main round consists of two groups of six teams, each created from two preliminary round groups. Therefore, all teams play three further matches in the main round. The top two teams of every main round group advance to the semifinals in the knockout stage (see Figure A.3b).

2.1.5 Two group stages with 4 and 6 teams per group (G_{46})

This design, presented in Figure A.4, has been used in the 2005 World Men’s Handball Championship, hosted by Germany. It contains two group stages (see Figure A.4a). Teams are drawn into six groups of four teams each in the preliminary round such that the top two teams proceed to the main round. The main round consists of two groups, each created from three preliminary round groups. Therefore, all teams play four further matches in the main round. Four teams of every main round group advance to the quarterfinals in the knockout stage (see Figure A.4b).

2.1.6 Seeding

Seeding is an important feature of knockout tournaments (Hwang, 1982; Schwenk, 2000; Marchand, 2002; Groh et al., 2012; Karpov, 2016; Dagaev and Suzdaltsev, 2018). It is not an issue in our case since the knockout stage of all formats is immediately determined by the previous group stage (see Figures A.1-A.4). However, competing teams should be drawn into groups before the start of the tournament, and this policy may influence the outcome, too (Guyon, 2015; Dagaev and Rudyak, 2016; Guyon, 2017; Laliena and López, 2018).

In recent world men’s handball championships, the pots were determined on the basis of geography and other aspects such as qualification results. For example, in the 2009 tournament, Pot 1 contained the host (Croatia), the defending World Champions (Germany), the champions of Europe (Denmark), and the third-placed team of the recent European Championship (France) where Croatia and Germany were the second- and fourth-placed teams, respectively.

We consider two variants of each tournament design called *seeded* and *unseeded*. In the seeded version, the preliminary round groups are seeded such that in the case of groups with k teams ($k = 4$ for design G_{46} and $k = 6$ otherwise), the strongest k teams are placed in Pot 1, the next strongest k teams in Pot 2, and so on. Unseeded version applies fully random seeding. In this case, some strong teams, allocated in a harsh group will have

more difficulties in qualifying than other weaker teams, allocated in an easier group, which can be regarded as unfair. Naturally, there is no need to seed the teams in the reference format *RR*.

2.2 Tournament metrics

Following the literature (Horen and Riezman, 1985; Scarf et al., 2009; Dagaev and Rudyak, 2016), we have chosen the following tournament success measures:

- the probability that one of the best p teams wins the tournament;
- the probability that at least one of the best p teams plays in the final;
- the average pre-tournament ranking of the winner, the second-, the third- and the fourth-placed teams;
- the expected quality of the final (the sum of the finalists' pre-tournament ranking);
- the expected competitive balance of the final (the difference between the finalists' pre-tournament ranking).

We have focused only on the first four places as can be seen in the tournament designs (Figures A.1-A.4). The reason is that there was a third place game in all handball world championships, however, other placement matches were organized arbitrarily.

2.3 Simulation procedure

Given the design and a prediction model for match results, we are able to simulate a complete tournament repeatedly and obtain estimates of any metrics of interest.

2.3.1 Playing abilities

The probability with which a given team would beat another team is fixed *a priori*. We have chosen a generalized version of Jackson (1993)'s model for this purpose:


$$p_{ij} = \frac{1}{1 + [(i + \beta)/(j + \beta)]^\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

where p_{ij} is the probability that team i defeats team j , $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ are parameters and $1 \leq i, j \leq 24$ is the *identifier* of the teams. The model was used by Jackson (1993) and Marchand (2002) with $\beta = 0$. The role of this novel parameter β is a to lessen the sharp increase of winning probabilities for the strongest teams. The function of α is similar to the original model, its smaller or larger values reflect situations where there is a smaller or larger dispersion in the teams' strengths, respectively.

Stationarity and independence of the probability that team i beats team j is assumed, they do not change throughout the tournament and are independent of previous results. While in practice they are dynamic and changing probabilities are expected to alter the outcome of the tournament on a single occasion, it is probably not unreasonable that stationary probabilities are good approximations of long-run averages.

The value $\beta = 24$ is considered during the whole simulation. Baseline results are obtained with $\alpha = 4$, and this parameter will be used for robustness check. Figure 1 shows the probabilities of beating the opponents for certain teams as derived from formula (1). Our choice somewhat follows the idea behind Matrix I of McGarry and Schutz (1997): adjacent teams are closely matched (team $k - 1$ defeats team k with a probability of no more than 0.54), however, the difference between a top and an underdog team is significant (the strongest team has greater than 90% chance to win against the last five teams).

Figure 1: Probability that team i beats its opponents (baseline, $\alpha = 4$)



2.3.2 Technical details

Draws between the teams are not allowed. This is not to be confused with ties in the ranking of round-robin groups, resolved in our simulations with an equal-odds 'coin toss'.

Every simulation has been run one million times ($N = 1,000,000$) using different starting seeds from the random number stream. We have recorded the first four teams and the teams which play the final.

The validity of the simulation procedure has been tested in several ways. First, a matrix representing equality among all teams ($p_{ij} = 0.5$ for all combinations of i and j) has led to, as expected, an outcome where all teams are placed first to fourth equally often. Second, simulations with a fully deterministic matrix ($p_{ij} = 1$ if $i < j$) have been analysed. Note that it still shows the differences between our tournament designs. For example, in the seeded versions of $G66$ and $G46$, the top four best teams are guaranteed to occupy the first four places in their natural order. However, in the seeded KO and $G64$, the two strongest teams can meet in a semifinal with a probability of $1/3$. Regarding the unseeded variants, the worst team that may qualify for the semifinals is the sixth in $G46$, the seventh in KO , and the fourteenth in $G64$ and $G66$. Finally, some values have been changed in the fully deterministic matrix in order to see whether they function in an expected way.

We have concluded from these checks that the simulation procedure is valid.

3 Comparison of tournament designs

In the following, our findings on the four tournament designs, that have been used in the recent world men's handball championships, are reviewed.


3.1 Match distribution

By looking at the tournament formats, one can realize that two teams may play at most two times against each other, and this number could be two only if one of these matches is the final or the third-place game.

However, these designs require different number of matches:

- A round-robin tournament with 24 teams contains $24 \times 23/2 = 276$ games.
- Format *KO* contains $4 \times 6 \times 5/2 = 60$ games in the group stage, and $8 + 4 + 2 + 2 = 16$ games in the knockout stage, that is, 76 in total.
- Format *G64* contains $4 \times 6 \times 5/2 = 60$ games in the preliminary round, $4 \times 4 \times 2/2 = 16$ games in the main round, and $2 + 2 = 4$ games in the knockout stage, that is, 80 in total.
- Format *G66* contains $4 \times 6 \times 5/2 = 60$ games in the preliminary round, $2 \times 6 \times 3/2 = 18$ games in the main round, and $2 + 2 = 4$ games in the knockout stage, that is, 82 in total.
- Format *G46* contains $6 \times 4 \times 3/2 = 36$ games in the preliminary round, $2 \times 6 \times 4/2 = 24$ games in the main round, and $4 + 2 + 2 = 8$ games in the knockout stage, that is, 68 in total.


Figure 2: Distribution of matches played in different tournament designs



Besides the total number of matches, its distribution, presented in Figure 2, is also interesting. It presents the number of teams with a given number of matches, for example, under the design *KO*, eight teams play five matches. In *G46*, half of the teams play only three matches, however, the others play at least seven. For the three alternative designs, the minimum number of games to be played by a team is five. The maximum is nine in *KO* and *G64*, while ten in *G66* and *G46*.


3.2 Main results

Figure 3: Dependence of some tournament metrics on the number of iterations (design unseeded KO ; $\alpha = 4$)




We have tested simulations with the unseeded variant of tournament design KO for various number of independent runs (Figure 3). Since two success measures, the proportion of tournament wins for the highest ranked team, and the proportion of tournament finals between the two highest ranked teams are stable after one million runs, we have decided to implement all of our following simulations with one million runs.

Figure 4: Probability that one of the best p teams wins the tournament (seeded designs; $\alpha = 4$)




The first tournament metric to be analysed, the probability that one of the best p teams wins the tournament is shown in Figure 4 for some tournament designs. As expected from the number of matches played in each design (Section 3.1), the round-robin is the format that maximises the probability that the best teams win.

Figure 5: Probability difference that one of the best p teams *wins* the tournament, compared to a round-robin tournament with 24 teams (RR)



Furthermore, the other designs are almost indistinguishable, therefore it is worth calculating the difference of other formats compared to the 'ideal' case of RR , as presented in Figure 5. It reveals that designs are ordered as $G66 \succ G46 \succ KO \succ G64$ from the perspective of their ability to select the strongest teams. Furthermore, seeding has not much effect, with the possible exception of design KO : while the seeded variants of KO and $G64$ have the same efficacy, KO becomes marginally better with a random seeding.

Figure 6: Probability that at least one of the best p teams *plays in the final*



The same pattern is attested for our second tournament metric, the probability that at least one of the best p teams plays in the final (Figure 6).

The remaining outcome characteristics for the nine tournament designs are summarized in Table 1. A format is said to be *more efficient* if the average pre-tournament rank of the team finishing in the p th place ($p = 1, 2, 3, 4$) is smaller, the proportion of wins for the highest ranked team is higher, as well as the expected quality and the expected competitive balance of the final is lower. The round-robin design emerges as the most efficient. However, it requires an especially high number of matches, only the other formats can be applied in practice. Among the seeded variants, $G66$ is the best, followed by $G46$, while the order of KO and $G64$ remains undecided, although the former has a marginal advantage.

Eliminating the seeding procedure changes the metrics according to our expectations, for example, the unseeded $G66$ is approximately at the same level as seeded $G46$, whereas the efficacy of the unseeded $G46$ is still higher than the efficacy of KO . An interesting

Table 1: Estimates of the tournament metrics for all designs
(1 million simulations for each version; $\alpha = 4$)
s = seeded version of the design; r = unseeded (random) version of the design

Comp. bal.: $\alpha = 4$	RR	KO/s	KO/r	G64/s	G64/r	G66/s	G66/r	G46/s	G46/r
Min. games	23	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	3
Max. games	23	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	10
Total games	276	76	76	80	80	82	82	68	68
Average rank of #1	2.56	3.90	3.88	3.90	3.96	3.48	3.58	3.60	3.70
Average rank of #2	3.31	5.71	5.69	5.75	5.88	4.88	5.10	5.08	5.31
Average rank of #3	4.03	5.82	5.87	5.74	6.11	4.94	5.37	5.18	5.44
Average rank of #4	4.79	8.63	8.76	8.62	9.20	7.15	7.87	7.49	8.01
Proportion of wins for the highest ranked	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.26	0.26	0.25
Expected quality of the final	—	9.61	9.57	9.66	9.83	8.36	8.68	8.69	9.01
Expected competitive balance of the final	—	4.40	4.37	4.45	4.52	3.78	3.95	3.89	4.09

observation – perhaps a kind of puzzle – is that the performance of the design *KO*, where the knockout stage plays the greatest role, is not influenced by seeding, actually, its unseeded version is somewhat more efficient.

The seeded version of *G64* is somewhat flawed because the average pre-tournament ranking of the bronze medallist is a bit smaller than the average ranking of the silver medallist, which is perhaps caused by its strange knockout stage, where only the group winners of the main round compete.

It is reasonable to assume that if a given design is more efficient than another in both its seeded and unseeded variants, then it is more efficient in practice when the actual allocation of the teams into pots is between these two extreme cases.

All results should be considered with respect to the number of games played. It is the smallest, 68 in the design *G46*, so its second-place according to efficacy has a favourable message for the organizers: there exists no clear trade-off between efficacy and the number of matches. On the other hand, half of the participating teams play only three games, which seems to be enough to determine the competitors with the greatest chance to win the tournament. The other three formats are closer to each other from this point of view, all teams play at least five matches, and the total number of games is between 76 and 82. This fact also shows that *G64* is a misaligned design because the relatively high number of matches does not reduce but increases outcome uncertainty.

3.3 Sensitivity analysis

Following Scarf et al. (2009), the robustness of the results is addressed by calculating our metrics for more and less competitive tournaments than the baseline version. It is achieved by changing the parameter α in (1) from its original value of 4 to 3 (more competitive) and 5 (less competitive).

Figure A.5 reproduces Figure 5. It can be seen that the ranking of designs by efficacy remains unchanged as $G66 \succ G46 \succ KO \succ G64$. The advantage of an ideal round-robin tournament is more significant if the competitive balance is smaller, that is, results are more difficult to predict. Figure A.6 reinforces that seeding has not much effect on tournament outcomes, and, while the actual differences among the four designs are modest (at least compared to a round-robin format), they are robust with respect to the distribution of teams' strength.

Table 2: Sensitivity analysis – Estimates of the tournament metrics for all designs
(1 million simulations for each version)
s = seeded version of the design; r = unseeded (random) version of the design

(a) $\alpha = 3$ (more competitive)

Comp. bal.: $\alpha = 3$	RR	KO/s	KO/r	G64/s	G64/r	G66/s	G66/r	G46/s	G46/r
Average rank of #1	3.00	4.78	4.79	4.81	4.89	4.28	4.41	4.41	4.56
Average rank of #2	3.82	6.73	6.76	6.82	6.96	5.85	6.11	6.06	6.36
Average rank of #3	4.58	6.84	6.90	6.78	7.15	5.90	6.33	6.15	6.48
Average rank of #4	5.36	9.59	9.72	9.61	10.08	8.24	8.85	8.52	9.08
Proportion of wins for the highest ranked	0.31	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.21
Expected quality of the final	—	11.51	11.55	11.63	11.86	10.14	10.52	10.47	10.92
Expected competitive balance of the final	—	5.30	5.31	5.38	5.46	4.65	4.84	4.76	5.01

(b) $\alpha = 5$ (less competitive)

Comp. bal.: $\alpha = 5$	RR	KO/s	KO/r	G64/s	G64/r	G66/s	G66/r	G46/s	G46/r
Average rank of #1	2.31	3.34	3.32	3.34	3.38	3.00	3.09	3.13	3.18
Average rank of #2	3.02	5.02	4.99	5.04	5.12	4.27	4.47	4.47	4.64
Average rank of #3	3.73	5.12	5.17	5.03	5.40	4.34	4.77	4.59	4.78
Average rank of #4	4.50	7.85	7.97	7.82	8.44	6.39	7.16	6.74	7.21
Proportion of wins for the highest ranked	0.40	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.31	0.30	0.29	0.29
Expected quality of the final	—	8.36	8.31	8.38	8.50	7.27	7.55	7.60	7.82
Expected competitive balance of the final	—	3.80	3.76	3.82	3.86	3.23	3.38	3.35	3.49

Further tournament characteristics are summarized in Table 2. Our conclusions do not change significantly, although the unseeded *KO* is clearly worse than its seeded variant if $\alpha = 3$, that is when teams’ abilities are more different. The effect of seeding increases with a lower competitiveness, which reinforces that our simulation process is valid. The flaw of design *G64* under seeding (the average pre-tournament rank of the third-placed team is lower than the average rank of the second-placed) can be observed as before, too.

4 Discussion

We have compared four tournament formats of recent world men’s handball championships. They have been analysed by Monte-Carlo simulations under two seeding policies: allocating teams into pots on the basis of their strength, and a fully random draw of groups. Our main findings on these designs are the following:

- *KO* (applied from 1995 to 2001 and between 2013 and 2017, see Section 2.1.2): it is almost insensitive to the seeding rule. While it seems to be a somewhat surprising fact as the knockout phase plays the greatest role in this format, Marchand (2002) provides evidence that the outcomes of the standard and the random knockout tournaments may not vary as much as one might expect.
- *G64* (applied in 2003, see Section 2.1.4): it seems to be a flawed design because of its weak ability to select the best teams despite the relatively high number of

matches as well as the average pre-tournament rank third-placed team is lower than the average pre-tournament rank of the second-placed team in the seeded variant.

- *G66* (actual design for 2019 (IHF, 2018), applied in 2005, 2009 and 2011, see Section 2.1.4): it maximises the association between teams’ strength and finish position, partially due to the highest number of matches among our designs.
- *G46* (applied in 2007, see Section 2.1.5): it means a good compromise between efficacy and compactness, the only format with a better performance (*G66*) requires to increase the number of matches by 20%.

The analysis clearly shows that no single best tournament design exists. For example, format *G46* allows only three matches for certain teams before they are eliminated, which may be regarded as the price for an appropriate selection of top teams. On the other hand, format *KO* is insensitive to the drawing of groups, so, in a sense, this competition structure minimizes randomness by being independent of the seeding policy. In short, we can agree with Scarf et al. (2009): one cannot come up with a single definition of fairness that all would accept.

These tournament designs have also been used in other team championships with 24 competitors. [IHF World Women’s Handball Championship](#) is organized in every two years since 1993, with 24 participating teams since 1997. Its design has followed the world men’s handball championship taken place in the same year, except for 2003, when women national teams competed under the design *G66*, while men played in format *G64*.² Similarly to the men championship, the next women championship to be held in 2019 will also use the format *G66* instead of *KO* (IHF, 2018).

In basketball, the 2006 and the 2010 [FIBA World Championships](#) as well as 2014 [FIBA Basketball World Cup](#) (the tournament previously known as the FIBA World Championship), the [EuroBasket 2015](#), and the [EuroBasket 2017](#) applied our design *KO*. However, format *G66* has been used in the 1986 [FIBA World Championship](#) and the [EuroBasket 2013](#). Finally, the 1978 and 1982 [FIVB Volleyball Men’s World Championships](#) applied a structure similar to *G46*, but only the two top teams from the two main round groups qualified for the semifinals – while in handball, the second group stage was followed by quarterfinals (see Figure A.4). In the view of our findings, perhaps it is not a coincidence that no further use of the strange design *G64* has been found in practice.

There is a great scope for future research. First, one can implement a more extensive sensitivity analysis. Second, as discussed in the Introduction, the method of allocating wins in the simulation is not based on data from real tournaments since it is far from trivial to model them. Third, other tournament designs with 24 teams or simple modifications of the formats analysed by us (recall that a slightly modified variant of structure *G46* was used in volleyball) can be investigated with the methodology presented here. Finally, further properties of the tournament designs can be examined. For example, it is not difficult to check that format *KO* satisfies strategy-proofness, but structures *G64*, *G66*, and *G46* are incentive incompatible (Csató, 2018b).

To conclude, we feel that the content has the scope to impact on practice, and organizers of team championships may consider our results when deciding on the design of future tournaments. The recent change of the handball world championship format (from *KO* to *G66*) seems to be a step in this direction as revealed by our results.

² It is interesting the no women tournament was organised according to the flawed design *G64*.

Acknowledgements

This paper could not be written without my father, who have coded the simulations in Python during a Christmas break.

We are grateful to *Tamás Halm* for reading the manuscript.

Two anonymous reviewers provided valuable comments and suggestions on an earlier draft.

We are indebted to the [Wikipedia community](#) for contributing to our research by collecting and structuring some information used in the paper.

The research was supported by OTKA grant K 111797 and by the MTA Premium Post Doctorate Research Program.

References

- Appleton, D. R. (1995). May the best man win? *The Statistician*, 44(4):529–538.
- Bilge, M. (2012). Game analysis of Olympic, World and European Championships in men’s handball. *Journal of Human Kinetics*, 35(1):109–118.
- Csató, L. (2013). Ranking by pairwise comparisons for Swiss-system tournaments. *Central European Journal of Operations Research*, 21(4):783–803.
- Csató, L. (2017). On the ranking of a Swiss system chess team tournament. *Annals of Operations Research*, 254(1-2):17–36.
- Csató, L. (2018a). Incentive compatible designs for FIFA and UEFA tournament qualifiers. Manuscript. [arXiv: 1804.04422](#).
- Csató, L. (2018b). Multi-stage tournaments are incentive incompatible when some results are carried over. Manuscript. [arXiv: 1712.04183](#).
- Csató, L. (2018c). Was Zidane honest or well-informed? How UEFA barely avoided a serious scandal. *Economics Bulletin*, 38(1):152–158.
- Dagaev, D. and Rudyak, V. (2016). Seeding the UEFA Champions League participants: Evaluation of the reform. Manuscript. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.2754127](#).
- Dagaev, D. and Sonin, K. (2017). Winning by losing: Incentive incompatibility in multiple qualifiers. *Journal of Sports Economics*, forthcoming. DOI: [10.1177/1527002517704022](#).
- Dagaev, D. and Suzdaltsev, A. (2018). Competitive intensity and quality maximizing seedings in knock-out tournaments. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 35(1):170–188.
- Dixon, M. J. and Coles, S. G. (1997). Modelling association football scores and inefficiencies in the football betting market. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 46(2):265–280.
- Dumangane, M., Rosati, N., and Volossovitch, A. (2009). Departure from independence and stationarity in a handball match. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 36(7):723–741.
- Durán, G., Guajardo, M., and Sauré, D. (2017). Scheduling the South American Qualifiers to the 2018 FIFA World Cup by integer programming. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 262(3):1109–1115.

- Garicano, L., Palacios-Huerta, I., and Prendergast, C. (2005). Favoritism under social pressure. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87(2):208–216.
- Goossens, D. R., Beliën, J., and Spieksma, F. C. R. (2012). Comparing league formats with respect to match importance in Belgian football. *Annals of Operations Research*, 194(1):223–240.
- Groh, C., Moldovanu, B., Sela, A., and Sunde, U. (2012). Optimal seedings in elimination tournaments. *Economic Theory*, 49(1):59–80.
- Gruć, I., Vuleta, D., and Milanović, D. (2007). Performance indicators of teams at the 2003 Men’s World Handball Championship in Portugal. *Kinesiology: International journal of fundamental and applied kinesiology*, 38(2):164–175.
- Guyon, J. (2015). Rethinking the FIFA World CupTM final draw. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 11(3):169–182.
- Guyon, J. (2017). What a fairer 24 team UEFA Euro could look like. Manuscript. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.2714199](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2714199).
- Horen, J. and Riezman, R. (1985). Comparing draws for single elimination tournaments. *Operations Research*, 33(2):249–262.
- Hwang, F. K. (1982). New concepts in seeding knockout tournaments. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 89(4):235–239.
- IHF (2018). *Regulations for IHF Competitions*. International Handball Federation. Edition: 14 January 2018. http://ihf.info/files/Uploads/NewsAttachments/0_Regulations%20for%20IHF%20Competitions_GB.pdf.
- Jackson, D. A. (1993). Independent trials are a model for disaster. *Applied Statistics*, 42(1):211–220.
- Karpov, A. (2016). A new knockout tournament seeding method and its axiomatic justification. *Operations Research Letters*, 44(6):706–711.
- Koning, R. H., Koolhaas, M., Renes, G., and Ridder, G. (2003). A simulation model for football championships. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 148(2):268–276.
- Krumer, A. and Lechner, M. (2017). First in first win: Evidence on schedule effects in round-robin tournaments in mega-events. *European Economic Review*, 100:412–427.
- Krumer, A., Megidish, R., and Sela, A. (2017). First-mover advantage in round-robin tournaments. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 48(3):633–658.
- Laliena, P. and López, F. J. (2018). Fair draws for group rounds in sport tournaments. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, forthcoming. DOI: [10.1111/itor.12565](https://doi.org/10.1111/itor.12565).
- Lasek, J. and Gagolewski, M. (2015). Predictive efficacy of a new association football league format in Polish Ekstraklasa. In *Machine Learning and Data Mining for Sports Analytics Workshop at ECML/PPKD*.
- Maher, M. J. (1982). Modelling association football scores. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 36(3):109–118.

- Marchand, É. (2002). On the comparison between standard and random knockout tournaments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 51(2):169–178.
- McGarry, T. and Schutz, R. W. (1997). Efficacy of traditional sport tournament structures. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 48(1):65–74.
- Ryvkin, D. (2010). The selection efficiency of tournaments. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 206(3):667–675.
- Scarf, P., Yusof, M. M., and Bilbao, M. (2009). A numerical study of designs for sporting contests. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 198(1):190–198.
- Scarf, P. A. and Yusof, M. M. (2011). A numerical study of tournament structure and seeding policy for the soccer World Cup Finals. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 65(1):43–57.
- Schwenk, A. J. (2000). What is the correct way to seed a knockout tournament? *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 107(2):140–150.
- Stanton, I. and Williams, V. V. (2013). The structure, efficacy, and manipulation of double-elimination tournaments. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 9(4):319–335.
- Szymanski, S. (2003). The economic design of sporting contests. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 41(4):1137–1187.
- Vong, A. I. K. (2017). Strategic manipulation in tournament games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 102:562–567.
- Yusof, M. M., Khalid, R., Sulaiman, T., Hamid, M. S. A., Mansor, R., and Rosli, N. C. (2016). E-compare of soccer tournament structures. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(8S):294–298.

Appendix

Figure A.1: Format *KO*, used in the [2017 World Men's Handball Championship](#)

(a) Group stage: preliminary round

Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D
A1	B1	C1	D1
A2	B2	C2	D2
A3	B3	C3	D3
A4	B4	C4	D4
A5	B5	C5	D5
A6	B6	C6	D6

(b) Knockout stage




Figure A.2: Format *G64*, used in the 2003 World Men's Handball Championship





Figure A.3: Format *G66*, to be used in the 2019 World Men’s Handball Championship






Figure A.4: Format *G46*, used in the 2007 World Men's Handball Championship

(a) Group stages: preliminary and main rounds



(b) Knockout stage




Figure A.5: Sensitivity analysis – Probability difference that one of the best p teams *wins* the tournament, compared to a round-robin tournament with 24 teams (RR)




Figure A.6: Sensitivity analysis – Probability that at least one of the best p teams plays in the final

