On the Lottery Problem: Tracing Stefan Mandel's Combinatorial Condensation

Ralph Stömmer *

(Working paper, version 1, June 15, 2024)

Abstract

Stefan Mandel is the man who won the lottery 14 times. He never disclosed the recipe he called combinatorial condensation, which enabled him to hit the Romanian lottery jackpot in the early phase of his betting career. Combinatorial condensation is frequently mixed up with another strategy known as buying the pot, which Stefan Mandel was pursuing later on. On occasion, he dropped a few hints on combinatorial condensation. The hints are applied in this work to narrow down and assess his initial recipe. The underlying theory resembles what a weekend mathematician, as he once referred to himself, may have encountered in the 1960s. Calculations indicate that he took residual risks that his method might fail. Residual risks explain why he changed his strategy from combinatorial condensation to buying the pot. The cardinality of the (15, 6, 6, 5)- and (49, 6, 6, 5)-lottery schemes shows that Stefan Mandel probably wasn't aware of lottery designs. First concepts on such topics had been available at that time, but coherent theories on combinatorial designs took off only in later decades, triggered by growing computing power, and eventually triggered by Stefan Mandel's publicity and successes in the field. But, as the comparison with actual covering designs reveals, Stefan Mandel most likely pioneered in constructing a (15, 6, 5)-covering design many years before others published about it, which he applied in the Romanian lottery.

Keywords: gambling, lottery problem, lottery design, lottery number, combinatorial design, covering design, covering number, combinatorial condensation, Stefan Mandel

MSC 05B05, 05B07, 05B30, 05B40, 62K05, 62K10, 62E17 JEL C02, G14, L83

^{*} Private researcher, Karl-Birzer-Str. 20, 85521 Ottobrunn, Germany.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background on combinatorial minimization

There are many lotteries around the world. A common lottery scheme is (49, 6, 6, t), known as 6/49 lottery, where 6 numbers are randomly drawn by the lottery agency from 49 numbers in an urn without replacement. Beforehand, people buy tickets and choose 6 numbers per ticket. People achieve a t-hit if the 6 numbers drawn intersect the 6 numbers on their ticket in t common elements. The amount of the prize depends on the country, the lottery agency, and the rules of the game. In general, the prize scales with t. For some lotteries the prize starts at t = 3, sometimes sufficient to cover the ticket costs, up to t = 6 for the jackpot. There are $\binom{49}{6}$ = 13.983.816 combinations to choose 6 from 49 numbers.

Let's consider a collection of four combinations such as {7, 24, 1, 16, 43, 42}, {42, 2, 17, 10, 16, 7}, {16, 5, 42, 33, 7, 28}, {8, 42, 19, 3, 7, 16}. The numbers 7, 16, and 42 do appear as common elements. Let p denote the quantity of elements drawn from a total of n elements, and let s, $1 < s \le p$, denote the quantity of any common elements, then the multitude of combinations with any s common elements MCE(s) in the p/n lottery is given by

$$MCE(s) = {\binom{n-s}{p-s}}.$$
 (1)

In the 6/49 lottery, with p = 6 and n = 49, any 3 common elements appear 15.180-fold, 4 common elements appear 990-fold, and 5 common elements appear 44-fold. Any 6 common elements are unique in a 6/49 lottery draw without replacement, they simply appear 1-fold. Early on, questions arised if it was possible to reduce the number of combinations required for a t-hit by condensing the overlap of combinations with common elements.

Documented efforts on related topics date back to the 1850s, when Thomas Kirkman challenged his contemporaries with the "fifteen schoolgirl problem". Fifteen individuals should be arranged in triples, 5 triples per day on 7 days, in such a way that any two individuals only meet once in a triple [1]. There are $\binom{15}{3} = 455$ combinations to choose 3 from 15 individuals. Equation 1 yields the multitude of combinations that any 2 of them meet more than once, which is $\binom{15-2}{3-2} = 13$. The multitude indicates that 455 combinations could further be melted down by an order of magnitude. First systematic solutions appeared over 100 years after Kirkman formulated the challenge [2, 3], and research on this topic is still ongoing [4].

1.2. Status of combinatorial designs during Stefan Mandel's early activities

When Stefan Mandel started first activities in Romania presumably in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the field of combinatorial designs to tackle lotteries was still a niche. Access to worldwide scientific literature on such topics was probably limited by the Iron Curtain, although a few contemporary experts in the field such as Turan, Sos, or Erdös were researching on the same side [5, 6, 7]. Even if access to their work was easier, there is doubt that Stefan Mandel was building on their achievements for combinatorial minimization, because he never mentioned anyone or any related content in interviews. He referred to the 13th century mathematician Leonardo Fibonacci instead [8]. On top of that, research on the lottery problem to reduce the number of combinations was just mastering 2-hits, reaching out to tackle 3-hits. A remark from Hanani et al. [6] sheds light on the situation in 1964:

"If in the lottery problem we want to construct in a similar way a minimal system S which assures a 3-, 4- or 5-hit, we would need a generalization of Turan's theorem and a generalization of Hanani's theorem and construction"

Around this time Stefan Mandel devised a number-picking algorithm based on a method he called combinatorial condensation, which would predict five out of six winning numbers [9]. Rephrased in the notation of lottery problems, he seems to have found a minimized design to the (n, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme, which he first applied at the Romanian lottery, and which he kept a secret ever since.

Given the fact that an upper limit for the minimum cardinality of combinations for achieving at least a 3-hit in the (49, 6, 6, 3)-lottery scheme was not determined until 1978 [10], one may ask: was Stefan Mandel ahead of his time?

1.3. Details on Stefan Mandel's combinatorial condensation

Money unfolds great attraction into all directions. It is not uncommon that amateurs draw level or occasionally are ahead of academics in novel or in niche disciplines. This often proves true for lotteries, where both camps complement and drive each other forward. Mathematicians publish proofs on novel lower and upper bounds of lottery designs [11], whereas others, building on computing power and search algorithms, just upload specific constructions of lottery designs and covering designs to online repositories, which are permanently improved [12, 13, 14, 15].

According to an investigation by reporter Zachary Crockett from The Hustle, Stefan Mandel disclosed a few hints on his combinatorial condensation [8]. In the Romanian 6/49 lottery, he selected 15 numbers, which would have required purchasing $\binom{15}{6} = 5.005$ combinations. With 5.005 tickets the odds of winning the jackpot increased to 1 in 2.794. Stefan Mandel claimed his algorithm would reduce these 5.005 combinations to just 569. If the 6 winning numbers fell among the 15 picks, he would be guaranteed to win at least a 2nd prize, that is a 5-hit, and hundreds of smaller prizes, which are 4-hits and 3-hits. Winning the jackpot, a 6-hit, was a 1 in 10 chance. On the same topic, journalist Juliana Lima from The Sun claimed Stefan Mandel's combinatorial condensation reduced the before mentioned 5.005 combinations to 669, instead of 569 [16]. His chance to hit the jackpot was 1 in 9, instead of 1 in 10. If Stefan Mandel was wrongly cited, or if he couldn't come up with the exact details after decades have passed, couldn't be clarified. For the basic conclusions of this work, the small difference doesn't carry much weight. In the further course, we will refer to the figures researched by Zachary Crockett.

In retrospect, one wonders why he limited the choice to just 15 numbers. The chapter on results shows that Stefan Mandel's approach probably made sense, when his circumstances, such as the lack of computing power, are taken into account.

2. Theory

In order to shed light onto the challenges Stefan Mandel had to face, one needs to understand the difference between lottery design and covering design. Although covering designs are more elementary, lottery designs are introduced first, because they relate to the familiar lottery problem. The terminology in this discipline has solidified in the past decades. We follow the notations provided by Bate, van Rees, Colbourn, and Stinson [17, 18, 19].

2.1. Lottery scheme, lottery design, lottery number, and lottery problem

An (n, k, p, t)-lottery scheme consists of an n-set of elements $V = \{1, 2, 3, ..., n\}$, a collection of k-element subsets of V (called k-subsets or blocks), and a p-element subset of V (called p-subset). The k-subsets, or blocks, are designated as a lottery design LD(n, k, p, t) when any p-subset of V intersects at least one of these blocks in at least t elements. L(n, k, p, t) denotes the lottery number, it is the smallest quantity of blocks of the lottery design LD(n, k, p, t).

The lottery problem is the fundamental question: what is the smallest quantity of blocks of the lottery design, and what is the lottery design in explicitly written out blocks?

2.2. Covering design and covering number

An (n, k, t)-covering design is a collection of k-element subsets (called k-subsets or blocks) of an n-set of elements $V = \{1, 2, 3, ..., n\}$ such that any t-element subset (called t-subset) is contained in at least one block. C(n, k, t) denotes the covering number, which is the smallest quantity of blocks of the (n, k, t)-covering design.

Covering problems have rarely made headlines, as can be witnessed with lottery problems. However, the challenge to find the smallest quantity of blocks of covering designs, supplemented with explicitly written out blocks, is similar.

2.3. The (7, 3, 3, 2)-lottery scheme to illustrate logical conclusion, lottery designs, covering designs, and probabilistic approaches

The definitions in the previous chapters 2.1 and 2.2 share some commonalities, but differ in a detail: a covering design is not related to a p-subset of V, which has to intersect with the blocks of the covering design. Covering designs are more fundamental and comprehensive in that one has to make sure that any t-subset is contained in at least one block.

In order to clarify the difference, let's assume a (7, 3, 3, 2)-lottery scheme, which corresponds to a simple 3/7 lottery. p = 3 numbers drawn from n = 7 numbers at random without replacement. Beforehand, people buy tickets and choose k = 3 numbers per ticket. A 2-hit is achieved if the p = 3 numbers drawn intersect the k = 3 numbers on at least one of the tickets in t = 2 common elements. All $N = {7 \choose 3} = 35$ combinations are

$$\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 5\}, \{1, 2, 6\}, \{1, 2, 7\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 3, 5\}, \{1, 3, 6\}, \{1, 3, 7\}, \{1, 4, 5\}, \{1, 4, 6\}, \{1, 4, 7\}, \{1, 5, 6\}, \{1, 5, 7\}, \{1, 6, 7\}, \{2, 3, 4\}, \{2, 3, 5\}, \{2, 3, 6\}, \{2, 3, 7\}, \{2, 4, 5\}, \{2, 4, 6\}, \{2, 4, 7\}, \{2, 5, 6\}, \{2, 5, 7\}, \{2, 6, 7\}, \{3, 4, 5\}, \{3, 4, 6\}, \{3, 4, 7\}, \{3, 5, 6\}, \{3, 5, 7\}, \{3, 6, 7\}, \{4, 5, 6\}, \{4, 5, 7\}, \{4, 6, 7\}, \{5, 6, 7\}.$$

2.3.1. Logical conclusion: an effective, but uneconomic way

The probability P(t) to achieve a t-hit is given by the fraction M_t/N , the basic Laplace definition of probability. N denotes the total number of combinations, $N = \binom{n}{p}$, and M_t the number of all possible combinations with a t-hit. It is given by

$$M_{t} = {p \choose t} {n-p \choose p-t}.$$
(2)

For the 3/7 lottery, the values for M_t , t = 0, 1, 2, 3, are $M_0 = 4$, $M_1 = 18$, $M_2 = 12$, $M_3 = 1$. With respect to the condition

$$\sum_{t=0}^{3} M_t = N \tag{3}$$

one can play it safe for achieving at least a 2-hit by filling out one more ticket than there are possible combinations M_0 with 0-hits and M_1 with 1-hits. Figuratively speaking, this method "saturates" possible hits with lower order t = 0, 1. The number of tickets v has to fulfill the condition $v = M_0 + M_1 + 1 = 23$. More formally rewritten as $v = N - \sum_{t=2}^{3} M_t + 1$, the expression corresponds to a graph theoretic upper bound for the lottery number provided by Gründlingh [11].

The tickets can be filled out at random, but each ticket has to be unique (tickets have to be pairwise different). The approach guarantees a 2-hit, but filling out 23 tickets, which covers almost 2/3 of all 35 combinations, is not efficient. The method definitely reaches its limits with a (49, 6, 6, 3)-lottery scheme, where $v = M_0 + M_1 + M_2 + 1 = 13.723.193$. Finally, it wouldn't make sense at all to apply this method to (n, 6, 6, 5)-lottery schemes, since $v = \sum_{t=0}^{4} M_t + 1 = N - M_5$.

2.3.2. Lottery design

The lottery design LD(7, 3, 3, 2) minimizes the number of tickets for achieving a 2-hit. Any 2 common elements appear $\binom{7-2}{3-2} = 5$ -fold, which may be verified by visual inspection of all 35 combinations in chapter 2.3, so one can expect the lottery number L(7, 3, 3, 2) < 23. For small n, lottery designs can be constructed by trial and error. More sophisticated methods, for higher n, apply computer programs and make use of back-track algorithms, greedy algorithms, simulated annealing, constraint programming and graph theory to reduce the cardinality of blocks [11, 20, 21, 22].

A lottery design with L(7, 3, 3, 2) = 7 may consist, for example, of the following combinations LD(7, 3, 3, 2) = {{1, 2, 3}, {2, 3, 4}, {3, 4, 5}, {4, 5, 6}, {5, 6, 7}, {6, 7, 1}, {7, 1, 2}}. It is generated, starting from the initial triple {1, 2, 3}, by increasing the elements of each triple {x, y, z} by 1 digit to yield the next triple {x+1, y+1, z+1}. When any element in any triple has reached the maximum number 7, the element in the following triple restarts with the number 1, as done with the last two triples of the lottery design. When the elements of the 7th triple {7, 1, 2} would be used to construct an 8th triple, it would read {1, 2, 3}, which is identical to the first.

The 7 blocks fulfill the definition of a lottery design. Any 3-subset of V, provided with the 35 combinations given in chapter 2.3, intersects at least one of the 7 blocks above in at least 2 elements. Anyone submitting the lottery design would be guaranteed at least a 2-hit. The lottery design is just one of several possible designs with 7 blocks.

As will be shown in the next chapter, the lottery design is no (7, 3, 2)-covering design, because, for example, the 2-subset $\{1, 4\}$ is missing. This circumstance will further be relevant in the results section.

The 7 blocks above can further be reduced. It is known that LD(7, 3, 3, 2) = 4 [11]. One of several minimized collections of blocks is $LD(7, 3, 3, 2) = \{\{1, 2, 5\}, \{3, 4, 7\}, \{5, 6, 2\}, \{1, 2, 6\}\}$. It fulfills the definition of a lottery design, and anyone submitting it to a 3/7 lottery achieves at least a 2-hit. It is obvious that such a reduced set of blocks is no covering design, because several 2-subsets are missing.

2.3.3. Covering design

As briefly noted at the beginning of chapter 2, covering designs are more elementary. They don't require an additional p-subset to intersect with at least one of the k-subsets in at least t elements. Instead, covering designs are comprehensive in that any t-subset is contained in at least one block.

The (7, 3, 2)-covering design with C(7, 3, 2) = 7 consists, for example, of the combinations $\{1, 2, 6\}, \{2, 3, 7\}, \{3, 4, 1\}, \{4, 5, 2\}, \{5, 6, 3\}, \{6, 7, 4\}, \{7, 1, 5\}$. It is generated the same way as the first lottery design in chapter 2.3.2, but this time the initial triple starts with $\{1, 2, 6\}$. The 7 blocks fulfill the definition of a covering design. Any 2-subset is contained in at least one block, no 2-subset is missing. Anyone submitting the

covering design above to a 3/7 lottery would be guaranteed at least a 2-hit, too. In contrast to the lottery design, the 7 blocks of the covering design can't be further reduced without loosing 2-subsets.

It is known that the covering number $C(n, k, t) \ge lottery$ number L(n, k, p, t) [17].

Although covering designs go beyond lottery designs, they can be more systematically developed. A simple algorithm to develop a (7, 3, 2)-covering design, without guessing around, works as follows:

- i) record all N = $\binom{7}{3}$ = 35 combinations in ascending manner (done in chapter 2.3),
- ii) start the covering design with a low digit triple, here {1, 2, 3},
- iii) delete all following triples which contain the 2-subsets {1, 2}, {1, 3}, and {2, 3},
- iv) the first non-deleted triple following {1, 2, 3} is the 2nd candidate for the covering design, here {1, 4, 5},
- v) delete all following triples which contain the 2-subsets {1, 4}, {1, 5}, and {4, 5},
- vi) the first non-deleted triple following {1, 4, 5} is the 3rd candidate

for the covering design, here {1, 6, 7}, and so forth.

The procedure above does lead to a C(7, 3, 2) = 7 covering design with the combinations $\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 4, 5\}, \{1, 6, 7\}, \{2, 4, 6\}, \{2, 5, 7\}, \{3, 4, 7\}, \{3, 5, 6\}.$ The advantage of the approach above is that it is conclusive to the amateur. It can be expanded to find designs of higher order in n, k, and t. The simplicity of the algorithm comes with the disadvantage that considerable computing power is required for higher orders. A remark from Li still holds [23]:

"The unfortunate feature of computer search algorithms is that the search space

tends to grow exponentially with respect to the values of n, k, p and t".

Research for more sophisticated and faster ways is ongoing, for example by using Fanoplanes [22]. Various covering designs, with method of construction, are readily available in the La Jolla Covering Repository [13].

2.3.4. Probabilistic approach

The blocks can be generated at random, as long as each block is unique (all blocks have to be pairwise different). Mt denotes the number of all possible combinations with a t-hit, as

provided in equation 2. $Q(m_t \text{ in } v)$ defines the probability to achieve exactly m_t t-hits, when v blocks are generated. It is given by the hypergeometric distribution

$$Q(m_t \text{ in } v) = \frac{\binom{M_t}{m_t}\binom{N-M_t}{v-m_t}}{\binom{N}{v}}.$$
(4)

 $Q(m_t = 1 \text{ in } v = 1)$ is the probability to achieve exactly one t-hit with a single block. It is

$$Q(m_t = 1 \text{ in } v = 1) = \frac{\binom{M_t}{1}\binom{N-M_t}{0}}{\binom{N}{1}} = \frac{M_t}{N}.$$
(5)

The fraction M_t/N on the right hand side in equation 5 is the Laplace probability P(t) mentioned in chapter 2.3.1. With v = N equation 4 provides the obvious: $Q(m_t \text{ in } v = N) = 0$ for $m_t < M_t$ and $Q(m_t \text{ in } v = N) = 1$ for $m_t = M_t$. Tailored to the (7, 3, 3 2)-lottery design, the multivariate hypergeometric distribution provides the probability to draw m_t t-hits, t = 2, 3, in v blocks:

$$Q(m_2, m_3 \text{in } v) = \frac{\binom{M_2}{m_2}\binom{M_3}{m_3}\binom{N-M_2-M_3}{v-m_2-m_3}}{\binom{N}{v}}.$$
 (6)

 $Q(m_t \text{ in } v)$ will serve to define a level of safety for achieving a minimum number of t-hits with v blocks. At first, we ask for the probability that we achieve no 2-hit and no 3-hit in v blocks. With equation 6 and N = 35, M₂ = 12, M₃ = 1, m₂ = 0, m₃ = 0, we get

$$Q(m_2 = 0, m_3 = 0 \text{ in } v) = \frac{\binom{12}{0}\binom{1}{0}\binom{35-12-1}{v-0-0}}{\binom{35}{v}} = \frac{22!}{35!} \frac{(35-v)!}{(22-v)!} .$$
(7)

The probability to achieve no 2-hit and no 3-hit at all with v blocks, $Q(m_t = 0 \text{ in v})$, t = 2, 3, is interpreted as residual risk. The complementary probability is interpreted as a level of safety to achieve at least one 2-hit or more. It is given by

$$Q(m_2 = 1 \text{ or more in } v) = 1 - \frac{22!}{35!} \frac{(35-v)!}{(22-v)!}$$
 (8)

To be more specific about the complementary probability $Q(m_2 = 1 \text{ or more in } v)$: achieving at least one 2-hit or more includes 1 or 2 or 3 ... or finally all $M_2 = 12$ combinations with 2-hits or the 3-hit (with $M_3 = 1$ there is only one 3-hit). Equation 8 contains a result previously found by logical conclusion in chapter 2.3.1. For $v \ge 23$, the level of safety $Q(m_2 = 1 \text{ or more in } v) = 100\%$, which is a certain event. For v < 23, the level of safety is below 100%. Table 1 lists a selection of levels of safety with the associated number of blocks calculated with equation 8.

https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.06857

(7, 3, 3, 2)-lottery scheme, N = 35, M2 = 12, M3 = 1							
Level of safety Q (m2 = 1 or more in v) 76,5% 86,0% 95,4% 97,5% 99,3% 99,9% 100%							100%
Number of required blocks v	3	4	6	7	9	12	23

Table 1: Number of blocks required to achieve at least one 2-hit or more for various levels of safety.

With the example of the (7, 3, 3, 2)-lottery scheme, the advantages and the disadvantages of the probabilistic approach are evident. A construction of lottery designs or covering designs is not required at all. The only prerequisite is that all bocks, which can be generated at random, are unique (all blocks have to be pairwise different). The disadvantage is that the quantity of blocks required for acceptable levels of safety Q > 99% (residual risk < 1%) is higher compared to lottery designs, where L(7, 3, 3, 2) = 4, or compared to covering designs, where C(7, 3, 2) = 7, which by construction both guarantee 100% certainty. This distinction will be relevant again in the results section.

2.4. The probabilistic approach tailored to (n, 6, 6, 5)-lottery schemes

The probabilistic approach is further elaborated for higher order lottery schemes. It is required to fully exploit the methodological options Stefan Mandel might have resorted to 60 years ago. Stefan Mandel was focusing to achieve at least one 5-hit, so M_t, as provided in equation 2, can be limited to M₅ und M₆, which gives

$$Q(m_5, m_6 \text{ in } v) = \frac{\binom{M_5}{m_5}\binom{N_6}{m_6}\binom{N-M_5-M_6}{v-m_5-m_6}}{\binom{N}{v}}.$$
(9)

Similar to chapter 2.3.4, we develop the complementary probability. The probability that we achieve no 5-hit and no 6-hit at all, with $m_5 = 0$ and $m_6 = 0$, is given by

$$Q(m_5 = 0, m_6 = 0 \text{ in } v) = \frac{\binom{M_5}{0}\binom{M_6}{0}\binom{N-M_5-M_6}{v}}{\binom{N}{v}} = \frac{\binom{N-M_5-M_6}{v}}{\binom{N}{v}}.$$
 (10)

The fraction on the right hand side in equation 10 is provided in the alternative form

$$\frac{\binom{N-M_5-M_6}{V}}{\binom{N}{V}} = \frac{\binom{N-V}{M_5+M_6}}{\binom{N}{M_5+M_6}} .$$
(11)

With the constraint $M_5 + M_6 \ll (N - v)$, the fraction on the right hand side in equation 11 can be approximated with

https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.06857

$$Q(m_5 = 0, m_6 = 0 \text{ in } v) = (1 - \frac{v}{N})^{M_5 + M_6}$$
 (12)

Details on the approximation in equation 12 are given in the appendix of another preprint of the author [24]. For both the (49, 6, 6, 5)- and the (15, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme the constraint above is fulfilled. The advantage of the approximation is that one does get rid of the fractions of factorials of very large numbers in equation 10, which probably created obstacles 60 years ago, lacking access to computers and availability of electronic calculators. To achieve at least one 5-hit or more, the complimentary probability gives

$$Q(m_5 = 1 \text{ or more in } v) = 1 - (1 - \frac{v}{N})^{M_5 + M_6}$$
. (13)

To be more specific about the complementary probability $Q(m_5 = 1 \text{ or more in } v)$: achieving at least one 5-hit or more includes 1 or 2 or 3 ... or finally all M₅ combinations with 5-hits or the 6-hit (with M₆ = 1 there is only one 6-hit). The complimentary probability for the 6-hit, with M₆ = 1, does result in the simple equation

$$Q(m_6 = 1 \text{ in } v) = 1 - (1 - \frac{v}{N})^{M_6} = 1 - (1 - \frac{v}{N})^1 = \frac{v}{N}.$$
 (14)

It would be a natural next step to solve equation 13 for the number of blocks v as a function of the level of safety Q [24]. With respect to the circumstances 60 years ago, we stay with the implicit form of equation 13, which provides a fraction with an integer exponent on the right hand side. Table 2 lists the number of blocks required to achieve at least one 5-hit or more for various safety levels, for the lottery schemes (15, 6, 6, 5) and (49, 6, 6, 5).

(15, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme, N = 5.005, M5 = 54, M6 = 1							
Level of safety Q (m5 = 1 or more in v) 0,9% 9,0% 90,0% 99,0% 99,9%							
Number of required blocks v 1 9 205 402 591							
(49, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme, N = 13.983.816, M5 = 258, M6 = 1							
Level of safety Q (m5 = 1 or more in v) 0,9% 9,0% 90,0% 99,0% 99,9%							
Number of required blocks v	488	5.091	123.769	246.443	368.031		

Table 2: Number of blocks required to achieve at least one 5-hit or more for various levels of safetyfor two lottery schemes.

3. Results

The statements of Stefan Mandel on combinatorial condensation are related to the probabilistic method, to lottery designs, and to covering designs. The circumstances 60 years ago will be taken into account.

3.1. The limitation to 15 numbers in the 6/49 lottery

Stefan Mandel never disclosed further details why he limited himself right from the start to 15 numbers out of 49 numbers. The limitation basically creates a smaller 6/15 lottery. Ticket costs might have been a reason. N* = $\binom{15}{6}$ = 5.005 combinations exceeded his budget and that of his companions [8]. A more important reason might have been to avoid combinatorial complexity. Lacking computers and even simple electronic calculators, he was restricted to paper and pencil. Whatever he was up to, the combinations had to be written down first. With time and patience, 5.005 combinations can be listed on 100 pages of checkered paper, with ~ 50 combinations per side. All blocks can be generated in a systematic manner: each element in the 6-subset has to be changed digit by digit between 1 – 15, a dull but straight forward procedure similar to picking a combination lock with 6 rings, 15 numbers on each ring. The resulting number of combinations N* gives the number of blocks v which are applied in the 6/49 lottery. Equation 14 yields for the level of safety Q(m₆ = 1 in v = 5.005):

$$Q(m_6 = 1 \text{ in } v = 5.005) = \frac{5.005}{13.983.816} = 0,036\%.$$
 (15)

The result equals Stefan Mandel's statement, that 5.005 tickets do increase the odds of winning the jackpot to 1 in 2.794 [8]. Equation 13 is used to calculate the probability for at least one 5-hit or more. $M_5 = 258$ and $M_6 = 1$ yield

$$Q(m_5 = 1 \text{ or more in } v = 5.005) = 1 - (1 - \frac{5.005}{13.983.816})^{258+1} = 8,855\%.$$
 (16)

Achieving at least one 5-hit or more with a level of safety close to 9% may be impressive, but it contradicts what the New Zealand Herald wrote about the algorithm [9]: "Under that method, Mr. Mandel boasted he could predict five out of six winning numbers". In other words, Stefan Mandel was certain to achieve at least one 5-hit, which is inline with what he told The Hustle [8]. How does this fit to the result in equation 16? A short remark from the same source provides a solution to the puzzle, it says: "If the 6 winning numbers fell among the 15 picks…". Stefan Mandel was referring to the 15 picks he selected beforehand,

constituting a smaller 6/15 lottery. And he referred to his combinatorial condensation, which he claimed would reduce the number of blocks from 5.005 down to 569 [8]. With the reduced number of blocks, restricted to the 15 picks, the probabilistic approach yields for the jackpot:

$$Q(m_6 = 1 \text{ in } v = 569) = \frac{569}{5.005} = 11,4\%$$
 (17)

The level of safety to achieve at least one 5-hit, with $M_5 = 54$ and $M_6 = 1$, calculates to

$$Q(m_5 = 1 \text{ or more in } v = 569) = 1 - (1 - \frac{569}{5.005})^{54+1} = 99,9\%$$
 (18)

With 99,9%, the level of safety is close to a certain event. Stefan Mandel could indeed be confident to achieve at least one 5-hit. The level of safety is equal to that one provided in table 2 for v = 591, because the probabilities are rounded up to one digit after the comma. The result in equation 17 corresponds to another note, that "if the 6 winning numbers fell among his 15 picks, ..., he'd have a 1 in 10 chance of winning the grand prize" [8].

The mathematics upon which the probabilistic approach is developed was readily available 60 years ago. Lacking computers and calculators for large number arithmetic, the conversion in equation 11 and the approximation in equation 12 do recommend themselves. Since the Romanian lottery was a 6/49 system, it is certain that the level of safety to hit the jackpot was just 0,036%, and the level of safety to achieve at least one 5-hit or more was just close to 9%, as provided in equations 15 and 16. The residual risk Stefan Mandel took upon himself was fairly large.

However, the probabilistic method does miss the full picture: why took Stefan Mandel the effort to pore over combinations? The results in this chapter do match with his statements, and the probabilities in equations 17 and 18 could as well be achieved with 569 randomly generated blocks. And why did he limit himself to 15 picks, instead of, let's say 14 or 16 picks?

3.2. The LD(15, 6, 6, 5) and LD(49, 6, 6, 5) lottery designs

The interpretation of Stefan Mandel's achievements with the probability theory helped to understand the considerable risk he took upon himself. The analysis below demonstrates that it is unlikely that he developed a lottery design for a (n, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme. As mentioned in chapter 1.2, scientists in the early 1960s started to tackle 3-hits [6]. Higher

order lottery designs for 5-hits require computing power, which was unavailable at that time.

Recent activities reveal the challenges to construct LD(15, 6, 6, 5) and LD(49, 6, 6, 5) lottery designs. Before explicit lottery designs came up, the lower and the upper bounds for the lottery numbers L(15, 6, 6, 5) and L(49, 6, 6, 5) were determined to at least narrow down the challenge. In this context, the work of Gründling is significant, because it provides a survey of achievements up to 2004 [11]. It seems that addressing 5-hits didn't come up long before that date, because in 1996 Colbourn and Dinitz edited a book on the state of the art of combinatorial designs, where the lottery schemes discussed were still limited to 3-hits [18]. Obviously, high performance computing hardware and software developments considerably enhanced activities. From that, one can conclude that information on higher order lottery schemes was not available when Stefan Mandel developed his combinatorial condensation. Explicit lists with blocks appeared much later, made accessible in online repositories, with regular updates, often lacking thorough scientific examination. Table 3 provides a brief overview for the 2 lottery schemes in question. Where possible, the earlier dates of first uploads are provided, too.

l attau a shawa	Lott	tery number L(n, 6,	Lottery design LD(n, 6, 6, 5)		
Lottery scheme	lower bound	upper bound	published	number of blocks	published
(15, 6, 6, 5)	100 [11]	152 [11]	2004	143 [15] 142 [14, 15]	2006 2018
(49, 6, 6, 5)	62.151 [11]	151.771 [11]	2004	151.012 [15] 144.819 [15] 142.633 [14]	2012 2023 2024

Table 3: Basic data on lottery numbers and lottery designs for 2 lottery schemes.

Stefan Mandel's combinatorial condensation reduced 5.005 combinations to 569 blocks, which is not sufficient for a lottery design based on 49 numbers. First of all, lacking computing hardware at that time, he was unable to come up with a LD(49, 6, 6, 5) lottery design with block numbers going into the thousands. This challenge is currently being addressed, as the dates of the lottery designs in table 3 demonstrate.

It can be excluded that designs of such scale have been around unpublished for long for secretly testing them out, because bulk purchasing of lottery tickets as well as setting up syndicates for submitting thousands of tickets do violate lottery rules. In this regard,

restrictions to lottery regulations were implemented by the lottery agencies shortly after Stefan Mandel and his syndicate scooped several jackpots. We may assume that designs are published as soon as a certain degree of confidence is reached, driven by scientific and by pioneering spirit, to drive things forward, and for receiving feedback and appreciation.

Things do seem less complex for the LD(15, 6, 6, 5) lottery design. Given the lower and the upper bounds for the lottery number, a lottery design was probably on the horizon. A lottery design with 142 blocks is online with a time stamp 2018, a first upload dates back to 2006. However, we can exclude that Stefan Mandel created a lottery design, because his algorithm did arrive at 569 blocks, which is a factor of 4 above actual lottery design proposals, as well as above the bounds for the lottery number. In retrospect, it turns out beneficial that he, probably unknowingly, didn't tackle lottery designs. As illustrated in chapter 2.3.2 for the 3/7 lottery, subsets do get lost in lottery designs, which isn't the case for covering designs.

3.2. The (15, 6, 5)- covering design

It was mentioned in chapter 2.3.3 that $C(n, k, t) \ge L(n, k, p, t)$, so we dispense with the discussion if Stefan Mandel might have created a (49, 6, 5)-covering design decades before sufficient computing power was available. Table 4 provides basic data on the (15, 6, 5)-covering design, framed with nearby designs. A first upload dates back to 1996, with the number of blocks reduced from 620 down to 578 in 2007. Referring to LD(15, 6, 6, 5) in table 3, the covering design was available earlier. Without overestimating the time stamps of the uploads, the decade in between covering design and lottery design indicates that covering designs are constructed easier in a straight forward manner, as mentioned in chapter 2.3.3.

Caucita	Cove	ring number C(n, ((n, 6, 5)-covering design		
Covering	lower bound	upper bound	published	number of blocks	published
(14, 6, 5)	348 [13]	371 [13]	1997	385 [13] 371 [13]	1996 1997
(15, 6, 5)	548 [13]	578 [13]	2007	620 [13] 578 [13]	1996 2007
(16, 6, 5)	731 [13]	808 [13]	1996	840 [13] 808 [13]	1996 1996

Table 4: Basic data on covering numbers and covering designs for relevant coverings.

It is not sure if Stefan Mandel applied equation 1 to anticipate that he could reduce 5.005 combinations by roughly one order of magnitude, since any 5 common elements do appear 10-fold in a 6/15 lottery. However he got there, his method resulted in 569 blocks, which corresponds well with the lower and upper bounds provided in table 4.

With respect to the conditions 60 years ago, the working hypothesis is as follows: Equipped with paper and pencil, he first might have recorded all N* = $\binom{15}{6}$ = 5.005 combinations in ascending manner. Then he moved forward with an algorithm similar to that one outlined in chapter 2.3.3. He might have started with a low digit 6-subset, such as {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6}, the 1st candidate for the covering design. Then he deleted all following combinations which contained the 5-subsets {1, 2, 3, 4, 5}, {1, 2, 3, 4, 6}, {1, 2, 3, 5, 6}, {1, 2, 4, 5, 6}, {1, 3, 4, 5, 6}, {2, 3, 4, 5, 6}. The first non-deleted combination then was the 2nd candidate for the covering design, and so forth. Deleted combinations were out of the game, so for each loop, the quantity of combinations to be checked for specific 5-subsets decreased.

We can only roughly estimate the complexity of the task, when Stefan Mandel checked all combinations downstream if they contained any of the six 5-subsets from the 1st to the final 569th candidate of the covering design. At the beginning of the procedure one doesn't know the final result for the covering number. In retrospect, 569 blocks with six 5-subsets each yield $569 \times 6 = 3.414$ 5-subsets in total. The 3.414 5-subsets do comprise the loops the search space, which reduces after each loop, is subjected to. We don't know if and how often he was back checking deleted blocks upstream to be on the safe side. With great margin, we might conclude the number of checks goes into several millions. With undisturbed focus, on average 4 s are needed for checking and deleting combinations, verified in a self-test by the author on a few pages filled with combinations. Scaling up the self-test, 1 million checks would result in ~ 1.111 h. Given 4 h per day spare time, the work would result in 278 days work, without leisure. With leisure, 1 million checks would roughly amount to a year. Basically, the whole enterprise was a question of accuracy, patience, and time. Time is what Stefan Mandel probably had, because the New Zealand Herald cites [9]: "... after years of painstaking research, he devised a number-picking algorithm, which drew on a method he called "combinatorial condensation". The Sun refers to the same topic with [16]: "After years of planning and mathematical research".

We do not know how often he tested his combinatorial condensation on fewer or on more picks. Table 4 provides examples for the (14, 6, 5)- and the (16, 6, 5)-covering design Stefan

Mandel may have encountered on his quest. Such experiments add considerable time budgets, which justifies the assumption that he carefully considered quantities. Equations 13 and 14 reveal that the number of picks should be high. 16 picks yield $N^* = {16 \choose 6} = 8.008$ combinations. With v = 8.008 inserted into equation 15, the level of safety to achieve the 6-hit increases to 0,057%. With equation 16 the level of safety to achieve at least one 5-hit or more increases to 13,788%. It is evident that 16 picks out of 49 are better than just 15 picks. Actual (16, 6, 5)-covering designs consist of 808 blocks [13]. 808 blocks with six 5-subsets each yield 4.848 5-subsets, which do comprise the loops the search space of initially 8.008 combinations is subjected to. From that, the time required to construct a (16, 6, 5)-covering design with paper and pencil is roughly a factor of 2 higher than the time required to come up with a (15, 6, 5)-covering design. Time was most likely the limiting factor.

On the level of the (15, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme, the advantage of his combinatorial condensation is not entirely evident. The (15, 6, 5)-covering design guarantees 100% certainty to achieve at least one 5-hit or more, wheras the probabilistic approach, with the same number of blocks generated at random, yields a level of safety of 99,9% after all. The advantage becomes clear in the (49, 6, 6, 5)-lottery scheme. The 569 blocks do represent the 5.005 blocks regarding the level of safety: any 5-subset of the 5.005 blocks is contained in at least one of the 569 blocks. It justifies the efforts to construct a covering design.

The appendix contains an example for a (15, 6, 5)-covering design provided by Barnabas Toth [13]. Although the covering number doesn't match exactly, which may be attributed to the fact that Stefan Mandel couldn't come up with the exact number after decades have passed, his design should have looked similar.

4. Conclusion

This work traces Stefan Mandel's combinatorial condensation, which he applied in the 1960s to hit the jackpot in the Romanian 6/49 lottery. He most likely constructed the first (15, 6, 5)-covering design with C(15, 6, 5) = 569, years before covering numbers of higher order were calculated to narrow down the challenge, and many years before explicit blocks for higher order covering designs were published.

Chapter 3.1 shows that he took a considerable residual risk by limiting the numbers to 15 picks. This restriction results in a level of safety of 0,036% to hit the jackpot in the 6/49

lottery, and in a level of safety of close to 9% to achieve at least one 5-hit or more. Given the circumstances 60 years ago, lacking any computing power, the measure he took served to reduce the combinatorial complexity to manageable levels. The (15, 6, 5)-covering design doesn't improve the levels of safety in a 6/49 lottery, but it allows to move into a 6/49 lottery with a nearly 10-fold reduction of the number of blocks. It turns out that at the end he was lucky, a circumstance which doesn't diminish his achievements of constructing a first covering design of higher order.

For whatever reason Stefan Mandel never revealed the details of his algorithm, it is unlikely that he just made up the whole story on combinatorial condensation. None of his companions in Romania and elsewhere, with whom he shared the costs for lottery tickets and efforts for submission, did object his story, which one would expect given the worldwide headlines his campaigns made. The hints he gave on several occasions fit together, the calculations confirm the figures, the odd number of 569 blocks he brought up fits well to actual boundaries, and the efforts involved to create a (15, 6, 5)-covering design with paper and pencil go with his remarks that the project on combinatorial condensation took years.

Further developments indicate that Stefan Mandel was aware of the residual risks his method implied, and he switched strategy to buying the pot. Buying the pot requires bulkpurchasing of lottery tickets to cover all combinations, which reduces the residual risk to zero. The money required to buy all tickets would be raised by a syndicate [25]. In the 1980s affordable personal computers came to the market. Efforts became manageable to program software for printing out all 13.983.816 combinations for the 6/49 lottery, or similar orders of magnitude for other lottery schemes. The main criterion was that the jackpot climbed to levels higher than all costs related to the venture, which includes ticket costs for all combinations, transaction efforts, and costs associated with running an enterprise. This is how Stefan Mandel continued in Australia and later in the USA, at times when bulk-purchasing and submission of tickets by syndicates were still legal [26].

One wonders why he didn't expand his combinatorial condensation to higher order lottery schemes when computers were available. Maybe he tried. But given the computing power in the 1980s and early 1990s, it seemed less complex to print out all combinations of a lottery, instead of devising sophisticated algorithms. It is an irony of time that an amateur, "an accountant without too much education" as he called himself [8], discarded combinatorial condensation at a moment when research on that topic unfolded momentum.

18

5. Appendix

Example for a (15, 6, 5)-covering design provided by Barnabas Toth [13], C(15, 6, 5) = 578.

1 0 0 1 5 1	4 0 7 4 4 5 1 -	4 4 5 5 6 11	4 7 0 0 10	0.4.5.044.55	0 0 0 10 17 1-	0.5.0.00.00	4 7 0 0 10 1-
1 2 3 4 5 14	1 2 7 11 12 15	1 4 5 7 9 10	1 7 8 9 13 15	2 4 5 6 11 13	2 6 9 12 13 15	3 5 9 10 11 14	4 7 8 9 10 15
1 2 3 4 6 11	1 2 8 9 11 13	1 4 5 7 12 15	1 7 8 10 12 13	2 4 5 6 12 14	2 6 10 11 12 15	3 5 10 11 12 13	4 7 8 9 14 15
123479	1 2 8 9 12 13	1 4 5 8 9 13	1 7 9 10 12 15	2 4 5 7 8 15	2 6 11 13 14 15	3 5 10 12 14 15	4 7 8 10 11 15
1 2 3 4 8 12	1 2 8 10 12 15	1 4 5 8 10 12	1 7 9 10 14 15	2 4 5 7 10 13	2 7 8 9 10 12	3 6 7 8 10 11	4 7 8 10 13 14
1 2 2 4 40 45	1 2 9 10 12 13	4 4 5 9 44 45	1 7 0 11 10 14	2 4 5 7 10 13	2 7 9 10 14 40	2 6 7 9 49 44	4 7 9 44 49 49
1 2 3 4 10 15	1 2 8 10 13 14	14581115	1 7 9 11 12 13	2 4 5 / 13 14	2 / 8 10 11 13	3 0 / 8 13 14	4 / 8 11 12 13
1 2 3 4 11 13	1 2 8 12 14 15	1 4 5 9 10 15	1 7 10 11 12 13	2458912	2 7 8 11 13 14	3 6 7 9 14 15	4 7 8 12 13 15
1 2 3 5 6 10	1 2 9 10 12 14	1 4 5 11 12 13	1 7 12 13 14 15	2 4 5 8 11 14	2 7 9 10 13 14	3 6 7 10 12 13	4 7 9 10 12 13
123578	1 2 9 13 14 15	1 4 5 13 14 15	1 8 9 10 11 15	2 4 5 9 11 12	2 7 9 11 14 15	3 6 7 10 12 14	4 7 9 11 12 15
1 2 3 5 8 15	1 2 11 12 13 14	1 4 6 7 8 10	1 8 9 10 13 14	2 4 5 9 13 15	2 7 10 12 13 14	3 6 7 10 12 15	4 7 9 11 13 14
1 2 2 5 0 14	12150	1 4 6 7 0 45	1 9 0 11 10 14	2 4 5 10 10 15	2 7 10 12 14 15	2 6 7 11 12 15	4 9 0 10 11 14
1233911	1 3 4 3 0 8	1 4 0 7 9 15	103111214	2 4 5 10 12 15	2 1 10 13 14 15	0 0 0 0 10 10	+ 0 5 10 11 14
1 2 3 5 12 13	1 3 4 5 7 12	1 4 6 7 11 12	1 8 11 13 14 15	2 4 5 11 14 15	2 8 9 10 13 15	36891012	4 8 9 10 12 14
1 2 3 6 7 15	1 3 4 5 7 15	1 4 6 8 9 11	1 9 11 12 13 15	2467914	2 8 9 11 14 15	3 6 8 9 11 14	4 8 9 11 13 15
1 2 3 6 8 14	1 3 4 5 9 11	1 4 6 8 12 14	1 10 12 13 14 15	2 4 6 7 11 15	2 8 11 12 13 15	3 6 8 9 13 15	4 9 10 13 14 15
1 2 3 6 9 15	1 3 4 5 10 13	1 4 6 8 13 15	2345615	2 4 6 8 11 13	2 9 10 11 12 13	3 6 8 11 12 13	4 10 11 12 13 15
1 2 3 6 12 15	1 3 4 5 12 15	1 4 6 9 10 14	234579	2 4 6 8 12 15	2 9 10 11 14 15	3 6 8 12 14 15	4 11 12 13 14 15
1 2 3 6 42 45	1 2 4 6 7 4 4	1 4 6 0 40 40	2 3 4 5 9 4 9	2 4 6 9 40 44	2 0 10 11 14 10	3 6 0 10 14 13	- 11 12 13 14 13 E C 7 0 40 40
1 2 3 0 13 15	1 3 4 0 / 14	1 4 0 9 12 13	2 3 4 5 8 10	2 4 0 8 13 14	2 9 11 12 14 15	5 0 9 10 11 15	5 0 / 8 10 12
1 2 3 7 10 13	1 3 4 6 9 12	1 4 6 10 12 15	2 3 4 5 10 11	2 4 6 9 11 13	3 4 5 6 7 10	3 6 9 10 13 14	5 6 7 8 12 14
1 2 3 7 11 12	1 3 4 6 10 13	1 4 6 11 13 15	2 3 4 5 12 13	2 4 6 9 14 15	3 4 5 6 8 11	3 6 9 12 13 14	5 6 7 9 10 15
1 2 3 7 13 14	1 3 4 6 14 15	1 4 7 8 9 12	2 3 4 6 7 13	2 4 6 10 11 14	3 4 5 6 8 12	3 6 11 12 14 15	5 6 7 9 13 14
1 2 3 8 9 13	1 3 4 7 8 13	1 4 7 8 11 15	234689	2 4 6 10 13 15	3 4 5 6 8 13	3 7 8 9 10 13	5 6 7 10 11 13
1 2 3 8 10 11	1 3 4 7 10 11	1 / 7 0 11 1/	23461012	2 / 6 11 12 12	3 4 5 6 0 14	3 7 8 0 12 15	5 6 7 11 12 15
1 2 3 0 10 11		4 4 7 0 10 14	2 3 4 0 10 12	2 4 0 11 12 13	0 4 5 7 0 14	0 7 0 44 40 45	5 0 0 11 12 15
1 2 3 9 10 14	1 3 4 8 9 10	1 4 7 9 13 14	2 3 4 6 12 14	24/8913	345/814	3 / 8 11 13 15	ວ b ୪ 9 10 11
1 2 3 9 12 14	1 3 4 8 9 14	1 4 7 10 12 14	2347811	2 4 7 8 12 14	3 4 5 7 11 13	3 7 9 10 11 12	5 6 8 9 12 13
1 2 3 10 11 15	1 3 4 8 11 15	1 4 7 10 13 15	2 3 4 7 9 12	2 4 7 9 10 11	3 4 5 7 12 15	3 7 9 11 12 14	5 6 8 9 14 15
1 2 3 10 12 14	1 3 4 9 11 15	1 4 7 11 13 14	2347915	2 4 7 10 12 15	3 4 5 8 9 15	3 7 9 12 13 15	5 6 8 11 12 15
1 2 3 11 14 15	1 3 4 9 13 15	1 4 8 10 11 13	2 3 4 7 10 14	2 4 7 11 12 14	3 4 5 9 10 12	3 7 9 13 14 15	5 6 8 11 13 14
1 2 4 5 6 45	1 2 4 40 40 40	1 4 9 40 44 45	2 2 4 0 42 45	2 4 7 44 42 45	2 4 5 0 12 14	2 7 10 14 10 14	5 6 0 44 40 44
1 2 4 3 6 15	1 3 4 10 12 13	1 4 0 10 14 15	2 3 4 0 13 15	2 4 / 11 13 15	3 4 5 9 13 14	3 7 10 11 13 14	5 0 9 11 12 14
1245711	1 3 4 10 13 14	1 4 8 11 12 15	2 3 4 8 14 15	2 4 8 9 10 14	3 4 5 10 14 15	3 / 11 12 13 15	5 6 10 11 14 15
1 2 4 5 8 13	1 3 4 11 12 14	1 4 8 12 13 14	2 3 4 9 10 13	2 4 8 9 11 12	3 4 5 11 12 14	3 8 9 10 14 15	5 6 10 12 13 14
1 2 4 5 9 14	1 3 5 6 7 13	1 4 9 10 11 12	2 3 4 9 11 14	2 4 8 10 11 15	3 4 5 11 13 15	3 8 9 11 12 15	5 6 11 12 13 15
1 2 4 5 10 14	1 3 5 6 9 10	1 4 9 11 13 14	2 3 4 11 12 15	2 4 8 10 12 13	3 4 6 7 8 15	3 8 9 11 13 14	5 7 8 9 10 13
1 2 4 5 12 14	1 3 5 6 11 15	1 4 9 12 14 15	2 3 4 13 14 15	2 4 9 10 12 15	3 4 6 7 9 13	3 8 10 12 13 14	57891114
124679	1 3 5 6 12 14	1 / 10 11 14 15	2 3 5 6 7 14	2 / 0 12 12 14	3 / 6 7 11 10	3 0 10 12 12 15	5 7 8 12 14 15
1240/8	1 3 3 0 12 14	4 5 0 7 0 11	2330711	2 4 3 12 13 14	3 4 0 7 11 12	0 0 10 12 13 10	5 7 0 10 14 15
1 2 4 6 7 10	1 3 5 7 9 13	1 5 6 7 8 11	235689	2 4 10 11 13 14	34681014	3 10 11 13 14 15	ວ / 9 10 12 14
1 2 4 6 9 12	1 3 5 7 9 14	1 5 6 7 10 14	2 3 5 6 11 14	2 4 10 12 14 15	3 4 6 9 10 11	456789	5 7 9 11 12 13
1 2 4 6 13 14	1 3 5 7 10 11	1 5 6 7 12 13	2 3 5 6 12 13	2 5 6 7 8 13	3 4 6 9 10 15	4 5 6 7 9 11	5 7 9 12 14 15
1 2 4 7 8 10	1 3 5 8 9 11	1 5 6 7 13 15	2 3 5 7 10 12	2 5 6 7 8 14	3 4 6 10 11 15	4 5 6 7 14 15	5 7 10 12 13 15
1 2 4 7 12 13	1 3 5 8 10 12	1 5 6 8 9 15	2 3 5 7 11 14	2 5 6 7 10 15	3 4 6 11 13 14	4 5 6 8 10 15	5 7 11 13 14 15
1 2 4 7 14 15	1 3 5 8 12 14	1 5 6 8 10 12	2 3 5 7 12 15	2 5 6 8 10 11	3 / 6 12 12 15	1 5 6 9 12 15	5 8 9 10 12 15
1 2 4 7 14 13	1 3 5 6 13 14	1 5 6 0 44 40	2 3 5 7 13 13	2 5 6 0 10 11	3 4 0 12 13 13	4 5 6 40 40 40	5 0 5 10 12 15
1248915	1 3 5 9 11 12	15691113	23581113	∠ 5 6 8 13 15	3478911	4 5 6 10 12 13	5 8 9 11 13 15
1 2 4 8 11 14	1 3 5 9 13 15	1 5 6 9 14 15	2 3 5 8 12 14	2 5 6 9 10 12	3 4 7 8 10 12	4 5 6 10 13 14	5 8 10 11 13 14
1 2 4 9 10 13	1 3 5 10 14 15	1 5 6 10 12 15	2 3 5 9 10 15	2 5 6 9 10 13	3 4 7 9 10 14	4 5 6 11 12 15	5 8 11 12 13 14
1 2 4 9 11 15	1 3 5 11 13 14	1 5 7 8 9 12	2 3 5 9 12 13	2 5 6 9 10 14	3 4 7 10 13 15	4 5 7 8 10 11	5 9 10 11 12 15
1 2 4 10 11 12	136789	1 5 7 8 10 15	2 3 5 9 14 15	2 5 6 9 11 15	3 4 7 11 14 15	4 5 7 8 12 13	5 9 10 13 14 15
1 2 / 12 12 15	1 3 6 7 0 11	1 5 7 8 11 12	2 3 5 10 12 14	2 5 6 12 14 15	3 / 7 12 12 14	4 5 7 9 12 14	67801014
1 2 4 12 13 13	1 3 0 7 3 11	1 5 7 0 11 13	2 3 3 10 13 14	2 0 0 12 14 10	3 4 / 12 13 14	4 5 7 9 12 14	07091014
125679	1 3 6 7 10 12	15/91115	2 3 5 11 12 15	25/8915	34891213	45/91315	0 / 8 9 11 12
1 2 5 6 8 12	1 3 6 8 10 15	1 5 7 10 13 14	2 3 6 7 8 12	2 5 7 8 10 14	3 4 8 10 11 13	4 5 7 10 11 12	67891113
1 2 5 6 11 12	1 3 6 8 11 12	1 5 7 11 12 14	2 3 6 7 9 10	2 5 7 8 11 15	3 4 8 10 12 15	4 5 7 10 11 14	6 7 8 9 11 15
1 2 5 6 13 14	1 3 6 8 11 13	1 5 8 9 14 15	2 3 6 7 11 14	2 5 7 8 12 15	3 4 8 11 12 14	4 5 7 10 11 15	6 7 8 10 13 15
1 2 5 7 9 13	1 3 6 9 13 14	1 5 8 10 11 12	2 3 6 8 10 13	2 5 7 9 10 11	3 4 8 13 14 15	4 5 8 9 10 14	6 7 9 10 11 14
1 2 5 7 10 12	1 3 6 10 11 14	1 5 8 10 12 14	2 3 6 8 11 15	2 5 7 9 12 14	3 4 9 11 12 13	4 5 8 9 11 12	6 7 11 12 13 14
1 2 5 7 10 12	1 2 6 11 10 10	1 5 0 10 12 14	2 3 6 0 44 49	2 5 7 5 12 14	2 4 0 12 14 45	4 5 9 40 40 45	6 9 40 44 40 45
1 2 5 / 14 15	1 3 0 11 12 13	1 5 8 12 13 15	23091112	2 5 7 11 12 13	3 4 9 12 14 15	4 5 8 10 13 15	0 8 10 11 13 15
1 2 5 8 9 10	1 3 7 8 10 14	1 5 9 10 11 14	2 3 6 9 13 14	2 5 8 9 11 12	3 4 10 11 12 14	4 5 8 11 13 14	6 8 10 12 13 15
1 2 5 8 11 14	1 3 7 8 11 14	1 5 9 10 12 13	2 3 6 10 11 13	2 5 8 9 13 14	3 5 6 7 8 15	4 5 8 12 14 15	6 8 10 13 14 15
1 2 5 9 12 15	1 3 7 8 12 14	1 5 9 12 13 14	2 3 6 10 14 15	2 5 8 10 12 13	3 5 6 7 9 12	4 5 9 10 11 13	6 9 10 11 12 13
1 2 5 10 11 13	1 3 7 8 14 15	1 5 10 11 13 15	2 3 7 8 9 14	2 5 8 10 14 15	3 5 6 7 11 14	4 5 9 11 14 15	6 9 10 12 14 15
1 2 5 10 12 15	1 3 7 9 10 12	1 5 11 12 14 15	2 3 7 8 10 15	2 5 9 11 12 14	3 5 6 8 10 14	4 5 9 12 12 15	6 9 11 13 14 15
1 2 5 10 13 13	1 2 7 0 40 45	1 6 7 9 40 45	2 3 7 9 40 40	2 5 5 11 13 14	3 5 6 0 10 14	4 5 40 40 40 44	7 9 0 10 10 14 10
1 2 5 11 13 15	1 3 / 91015	10/81215	23181213	2 5 10 11 12 14	3 5 6 9 11 13	4 5 10 12 13 14	7 8 9 12 13 14
1 2 6 7 8 10	1 3 7 11 13 15	1 6 7 8 13 14	2 3 7 9 11 13	2 5 10 11 13 15	3 5 6 9 12 15	4 6 7 8 11 14	7 8 10 11 12 14
1 2 6 7 11 13	1 3 7 12 13 15	1 6 7 9 10 13	2 3 7 10 11 15	2 5 12 13 14 15	3 5 6 10 11 12	4 6 7 8 12 13	7 8 10 12 14 15
1 2 6 7 12 14	1 3 8 9 12 13	1 6 7 9 12 14	2 3 7 12 14 15	2 6 7 8 9 11	3 5 6 10 13 15	4 6 7 9 10 12	7 8 11 12 14 15
1 2 6 8 9 13	1 3 8 9 12 15	1 6 7 10 11 15	2 3 8 9 10 11	2 6 7 8 14 15	3 5 6 13 14 15	4 6 7 10 11 13	7 9 10 11 13 15
1 2 6 8 11 15	1 3 8 10 13 15	1 6 7 11 14 15	2 3 8 9 12 15	2 6 7 9 12 13	3 5 7 8 9 10	4 6 7 10 14 15	7 10 11 12 14 15
1 2 6 0 10 11	1 2 0 10 13 13	1 6 9 0 10 12	2 2 9 10 11 10	26701213	2 5 7 9 40 42	A 6 7 10 14 10	9 0 10 11 12 14 10
1 2 0 9 10 11	1 3 9 10 11 13	1 0 0 9 10 12	2 3 0 10 11 12	20/91215	5 5 7 6 10 13	4 0 7 12 14 15	0 9 10 11 12 13
1 2 6 9 11 14	1 3 9 11 14 15	1 6 8 9 14 15	2 3 8 10 11 14	2 6 7 9 13 15	3 5 7 8 11 12	4 6 7 13 14 15	8 9 12 13 14 15
1 2 6 10 12 13	1 3 10 11 12 15	1 6 8 10 11 14	2 3 8 13 14 15	2 6 7 10 11 12	3 5 7 9 11 15	4 6 8 9 10 13	8 10 11 12 14 15
1 2 6 10 14 15	1 3 12 13 14 15	1 6 8 11 12 13	2 3 9 10 12 14	2 6 7 10 13 14	3 5 7 10 14 15	4 6 8 9 12 15	9 10 11 12 13 14
1 2 7 8 9 14	1 4 5 6 7 13	1 6 9 10 13 15	2 3 9 11 13 15	2 6 7 12 13 15	3 5 7 12 13 14	4 6 8 9 13 14	
1 2 7 8 11 12	1 4 5 6 8 14	1 6 9 11 12 15	2 3 10 12 13 15	2 6 8 9 10 15	3 5 8 9 10 13	4 6 8 10 11 12	
1 2 7 0 12 45	1 4 5 6 0 49	1 6 10 11 12 13	2 3 11 12 12 14	2 6 8 0 12 14	3 5 8 0 12 14	1 6 8 11 14 15	
1 2 / 8 13 15	1450912	1 0 10 11 12 14	2 3 11 12 13 14	20091214	3 5 8 9 12 14	4 0 0 11 14 15	
1 2 / 9 10 15	1 4 5 6 10 11	1 6 10 11 13 14	2456712	2 6 8 10 12 14	3 5 8 10 11 15	4 6 9 10 11 15	
1 2 7 9 11 12	1 4 5 6 11 14	1 6 12 13 14 15	2 4 5 6 8 10	2 6 8 11 12 14	3 5 8 11 14 15	4 6 9 11 12 14	
1 2 7 10 11 14	1 4 5 7 8 14	1 7 8 9 10 11	2 4 5 6 9 10	2 6 8 12 13 14	3 5 8 12 13 15	4 6 10 12 13 14	

References

- [1] Kirkman, T. P. Query VI. *Lady's and Gentleman's Diary*, 48 (1850).
- [2] Jiaxi, L. Collected works on combinatorial designs. *Inner Mongolia People's Press*, Hunhot, Mongolia (1990).
- [3] Ray-Chaudhuri, D. K. & Wilson, R. M. Solution of Kirkman's schoolgirl problem, *Proc.* Symp. Pure Math., Amer. Math. Soc. 19, 187 – 204 (1971).
- [4] Pavone, M. On the seven non-isomorphic solutions of the fifteen schoolgirl problem.*Discrete Mathematics* 346, 113316 (2023).
- [5] Turan, P. Research problems. *Publ. of the Math. Inst. of the Hung. Acad. of Sci.* 6, 417 423 (1961).
- [6] Hanani, H., Ornstein, D. & Sos, V. T. On the lottery problem, *Magyar. Tud. Acad. Mat. Kutato* 9, 155-158 (1964).
- [7] Erdös, P. & Renyi, A. On some combinatorial problems. *Publ. Math. Deprecen* 4, 398 406 (1956).
- [8] Crockett, Z. The man who won the lottery 14 times. *The Hustle* (2023). https://thehustle.co/the-man-who-won-the-lottery-14-times
- [9] Sneaky way maths whiz managed to play the system and change lotto rules forever. *The New Zealand Herald* (2018). https://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/sneaky-way-maths-whiz-managed-to-play-the-system-and-change-lotto-rules-forever/QZ367L33KTW537WFUQX4D4VWXE/
- [10] Sterboul, F. Le probleme du loto. *Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes de Recherche Operationelle* 20, 443 449 (1978).
- [11] Gründlingh, W. R. Two New Combinatorial Problems involving Dominating Sets for Lottery Schemes. *Dissertation for the degree Doctor of Philosophy at the Department of Applied Mathematics of the University of Stellenbosch*, South Africa (2004).
- [12] Belic, R. Lotto Systems and Toto Systems. http://www.xs4all.nl/~rbelic/
- [13] La Jolla Covering Repository Tables. https://www.dmgordon.org/cover/
- [14] The Covering Repository. http://www.coveringrepository.com/

- [15] Repository for lotto designs. https://lottodesigns.altervista.org/
- [16] Lima, J. C. How maths genius 'hacked' lottery with perfect number formula to win 14 times – before he ended up bankrupt. *The Sun* (2024). https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/28127334/maths-genius-stefan-mandel-hackedlottery-romania/
- [17] Bate, J. A. & van Rees, G. H. J. Lotto Designs. *Papers in Honour of Anne Penfold Street* 28, 15 39 (1998).
- [18] Colbourn, C. J. Winning the Lottery. CRC Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, edited by Colbourn, C. J. & Dinitz, J. H, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 578 – 584 (1996).
- [19] Stinson, D. R. Coverings. CRC Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, edited by Colbourn, C. J. & Dinitz, J. H, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 260 – 265 (1996).
- [20] Li, B. P. C. & van Rees, G. H. J. (2002). Lotto Design Tables. *Journal of Combinatorial Designs* **10**, 335 359 (2002).
- [21] Li, B. P. C. Some Results on Lotto Designs. *Doctoral thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies at the Department of Computer Science of the University of Manitoba Winnipeg*, Canada (1999).
- [22] Cushing, D. & Stewart, D. I. Applying constraint programming to minimal lottery designs. *Constraints* (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10601-024-09368-5
- [23] Li, P. C. & van Rees, G. H. J. New constructions of lotto designs. *Utilitas Mathematica* 58, 45-64 (2000).
- [24] Stömmer, R. Beating the average: how to generate profit by exploiting the inefficiencies of soccer betting. *Paper 2303.16648, arxiv.org* (2023). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.16648
- [25] Moffitt, S. & Ziemba, W. T. Does It Pay to Buy the Pot in the Canadian 6/49 Lottery? Implications for Lottery Design. *Abstract 2909324, SSRN* (2018). http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2909324
- [26] Group invests \$5 million to hedge bets in lottery. *The New York Times*, 1 (1992). https://www.nytimes.com/1992/02/25/us/group-invests-5-million-to-hedge-betsin-lottery.html