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A B S T R A C T

Every four years, the 10 national teams members of the South American Football Confederation (CONMEBOL) compete for one of the South American slots in the final phase of the FIFA World Cup. The qualifying competition consists of a double round robin tournament. The matches are scheduled in 9 closely spaced pairs known as double rounds. Every team plays twice in each double round. The tournament is spread over 2 years, so the double rounds are months apart. After using the same mirrored schedule for about twenty years, and persistent complaints from its members, CONMEBOL decided to change the schedule for the 2018 World Cup. Supported by one of CONMEBOL’s members, we used integer programming to construct schedules that overcome the main drawbacks of the previous approach. After exploring many design criteria, we proposed a candidate schedule based on a French scheme. The main feature of the proposed schedule is that every team plays once at home and once away on each double round, a departure from traditional symmetric (mirrored) schemes. This proposal was unanimously approved by CONMEBOL members and is currently being used in the qualifier tournament for the 2018 FIFA World Cup in Russia.
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1. Introduction

Organized every 4 years by the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), the FIFA World Cup (or simply, World Cup) is the most important football competition in the world. With dozens of sponsors and intense media coverage, the final phase of the World Cup receives more international attention than any other single-sport event. Some 3.4 million spectators filled the stadiums for the 2014 World Cup finals matches in Brazil and the television coverage reached 3.2 billion people around the world (FIFA, 2014a; 2014b).

The World Cup begins with a qualifying stage in which each of FIFA’s six continental federations selects its representatives for the World Cup’s final stage. Out of FIFA’s 209 members, only 32 teams qualify for this final stage. In the South American qualifying stage, the teams that will represent the South American Football Confederation (CONMEBOL) are determined by the results of a double round-robin tournament organized by the
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might eventually be adopted, team assignments would be made by random draw. To ensure the new process was fair, CONMEBOL members were invited to submit candidate fixture templates (that is, a tournament fixture with the team assignments to the template positions left blank), which all of the members would then vote on.

In partnership with Chile’s National Professional Football Association (ANFP), we used integer programming (IP) to develop a series of generic schedules among which Chile’s proposal was selected. There is a relatively long tradition of using IP to schedule sports tournaments. Its use has been particularly popular in football; some examples are tournaments in Holland (Schreuder, 1992), Austria and Germany (Bartsch, Drexl, & Kröger, 2006), Chile (Alarcón et al., 2017; Durán et al., 2007; Durán, Guajardo, & Wolf-Yadin, 2012), Denmark (Rasmussen, 2008), Belgium (Goossens & Spieksma, 2009), Norway (Flatberg, Nilsson, & Stolevik, 2009), Honduras (Fiallos, Pérez, Sabillón, & Licona, 2010), Brazil (Ribeiro & Urrutia, 2012) and Ecuador (Recalde, Torres, & Vaca, 2013). We refer the reader to Rasmussen and Trick (2008), Wright (2009), Kendall, Knust, Ribeiro, and Urrutia (2010), and Ribeiro (2012) for reviews of the literature on the use of IP in sport scheduling.

In our work, candidate proposals were designed so as to balance several scheduling fairness considerations. One of our primary concerns was to eliminate the occurrence of double round breaks in which a team plays the two games in a double round either both at home or both away. Unfortunately, such a feature cannot be achieved in a mirrored fixture, as will be shown in this paper. We therefore devised our schedule proposals to eliminate double round breaks while maintaining a certain symmetry that would resemble a mirrored scheme. Some of these designs were inspired by the symmetric schemes used in certain European Leagues (Goossens & Spieksma, 2012).

The proposal finally chosen for submission by the ANF, which followed a French symmetric scheme (explained below), was voted unanimously by CONMEBOL members and adopted for scheduling the 2018 World Cup qualifying tournament, which at the time of writing is currently being played.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background on the World Cup qualification tournament. Section 3 describes the basic principles and symmetric schemes for scheduling, and sets out the IP formulations. Section 4 summarizes our results and analyzes the schedule adopted by CONMEBOL. Section 5 presents our conclusions.

2. Background

2.1. South American Qualifier Tournament

CONMEBOL, the South American Football Confederation, is the organization overseeing the 2018 World Cup qualifying phase for its ten member nations: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela.

It is arguably one of the strongest confederations in FIFA, its members having won 9 out of the 20 World Cup championships held between 1939 and 2014 (note that FIFA has 209 nation members, more than the United Nations). Thus, despite being the confederation with the fewest members, four of its teams qualify directly for the World Cup final phase while a fifth competes in an intercontinental playoff for an additional place in the finals.

CONMEBOL selects the teams that advance to the final phase of the World Cup based on the results of a double round-robin tournament in which each team plays all the other teams twice, once at home and once away. The tournament is played over 18 rounds, each consisting of 5 games and in which each team plays exactly once. Thus, the entire tournament consists of 90 matches. A match victory is worth 3 points, a draw 1 point, and a loss no points at all. At the end of the tournament, the 4 teams with the most points advance to the final phase of the World Cup (various tie-breaking rules apply) and the fifth team plays a two-legged tie against a team from the Asian or Oceanian confederation for an additional place.

Many players on CONMEBOL members’ national teams play for the best football clubs in the world. Since these clubs are always reluctant to grant their players permission to participate in international games, FIFA publishes in advance a calendar of double rounds listing one-week periods in which club players must be allowed to represent their national teams. These dates have to be carefully chosen so as to not interfere with international club-level competitions and national club leagues, and are thus rather few in number. As a result, consecutive double rounds are usually months apart.

The South American qualifying tournament games take place in 9 of FIFA’s double rounds, which are spread over a period of 2–3 years. Within each double round, two rounds of the qualifying tournament are separated by only 4 or 5 days. We refer to the first (second) round in a double round as the even (odd) round, in reference to the parity of their index numbers in the series of 18 single game rounds making up the tournament. The practice of playing two games during a double round has been promoted by FIFA not only for CONMEBOL but for other confederations as well.

2.2. Qualifier Tournament Fixture 1998–2014

For all five World Cup tournaments held between 1998 and 2014, CONMEBOL used a mirrored scheme. That is, in the first 9 rounds each team played every other team once, while in the second 9 rounds the same matchups were repeated in the same order but with the home-away status reversed. Moreover, the same schedule was used for all four World Cups between 2002 and 2014 (the only variation being that since Brazil was exempted from the process in 2014 as the host team, the side that in each round would otherwise have played the Brazilians had a bye). Table 1 shows this fixture. The columns are the rounds while the rows are the teams, the cells thus giving the corresponding team’s
opponent in each round with away games indicated by an “@” sign. As an example, Argentina played a home game against Chile in the first round and an away game against Venezuela in the second round.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no official documentation detailing the criteria behind the construction of this fixture. This lack of transparency has given rise to much speculation. For example, Gilardi (2013) suggests that the fixture was designed so as to favor a particular team that did not qualify to the 1998 World Cup. (The author lists a series of factors that arguably favors a particular country, which would be behind the construction of the fixture and that, paradoxically, subsequently failed to qualify to World Cups to date.)

The 2002–2014 fixture has some positive features. For example, no team plays more than two consecutive home or away games; also, each team plays once at home and once away in the first and last double rounds. This latter feature is perceived as contributing to the fairness of the tournament. Also, no teams play consecutively against Argentina and Brazil, which are considered the two strongest South American teams.

Unfortunately, the 2002–2014 fixture also has many undesirable features. Traditionally, the literature in sports scheduling has paid special attention to the number of breaks in a fixture. A break occurs when a team plays two games in a row either at home or away (see Section 4 in Rasmussen & Trick (2008)). Given the long separation between successive double rounds, in the context of the qualifying tournament, it stands to reason that the focus ought to be on double-round breaks; that is, double rounds in which both games are played either at home or away. In the 2002–2014 fixture, there are 18 double-round breaks. This is largely a feature of the mirrored structure of the fixture: it can be shown that the minimum number of such breaks in a mirrored tournament is 16.

Compounding such a problem, double-round breaks in the 2002–2014 fixture are unevenly distributed among the teams. Table 2 provides summary statistics on the number of home (\(B_h\)), away (\(B_a\)) and total (\(B\)) double-round breaks per team. We see, for example, that Bolivia has the most (4) double-round breaks while Argentina and Brazil have none.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>(B_h)</th>
<th>(B_a)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>H-A</th>
<th>A-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Away double-round breaks might also involve long travel sequences to foreign countries within just a few days, exacerbat- ing player fatigue. For example, in double round 2, Bolivia has an away break against Argentina and Venezuela. This means a trip totalling 7340 kilometers (slightly more than the distance from London to Mumbai), and the fifth longest of the side’s 72 possible travel sequences. By contrast, Peru’s only double-round away break is against Bolivia and Paraguay in double round 5, the second shortest of the Peruvian side’s 72 possible trips.

Table 2 also reveals an unbalanced distribution of home-away (H-A) and away-home (A-H) sequences in double rounds (for example, Argentina had nine H-A sequences while Brazil did not have any). For logistical reasons, national teams generally prefer the H-A sequence. Since players typically return to their home countries before the first game of a double round, playing first at home means more time to prepare and only one additional flight (to the away game) before heading back to their respective club teams.

2.3. Controversy and the CONMEBOL decision

Aside from the structural deficiencies of the 2002–2014 fixture, its repeated use gave rise over the years to other problems that might have been avoided had there been a random draw before each qualifying tournament. For example, the fixture had Uruguay playing at home against Argentina in the final round. As one of the strongest teams, Argentina usually came to the final round already qualified while Uruguay typically was still seeking qualification, either directly or in the intercontinental play-off. In the 2002 qualifiers, Argentina had already won a place in the finals while Uruguay needed a draw to play in the intercontinental play-off, and the two teams drew 1–1. In the 2006 edition, Argentina again had already qualified but Uruguay, this time needing a win to make the intercontinental play-off, defeated Argentina by a score of 1–0. Then, in the 2010 qualification, Argentina had not yet qualified and took the match 1–0 over the Uruguayans, who later secured a place in the finals by winning the intercontinental play-off. Finally, in the 2014 qualification, whereas Argentina’s berth in the finals was already assured by the time of the match, Uruguay needed 3 points to keep their hopes of qualifying directly alive. The Argentineans fielded a team replete with reserve players that lost 3–2, and only because of results in other teams’ matches did Uruguay have to win in the intercontinental play-off in order to qualify. This type of situation is not uncommon in decisive football tournament games (e.g., Kendall and Lenten, 2017 recount the cases of tacit collusion between Austria and West Germany in the 1982 World Cup, and Sweden and Denmark in the 2004 UEFA Euro championship).

The foregoing is just one of many examples of controversies arising from the repeated use of an unbalanced (in terms of sporting fairness) fixture. Whether or not the suspicions of football fans and the media are well-founded, CONMEBOL took notice of the many complaints received over the years. In January 2015, CONMEBOL members agreed that a new methodology would be used for scheduling the 2018 qualifier tournament. Under this new approach, the fixture would be drawn up initially as a template in which the teams are represented by numbers and the actual team assignments would be made by random draw. It was also agreed that the definitive template would be selected from template proposals made by the ten CONMEBOL members. By the time CONMEBOL made the decision to change its methodology, our research team had been working with the ANFP in the application of IP techniques to the scheduling of Chile’s professional football leagues for more than ten years (Durán et al., 2007; Durán et al., 2012). The impact of such application and general features on its portability to other sports competitions such as the World Cup qualifiers and the Argentinean leagues of volleyball and basketball have been...
recounted in Alarcón et al. (2017). Collaborating with the ANFP we developed a series of fixture templates for the 2018 qualifiers, and the one finally submitted by the Association was chosen by CONMEBOL as the winning proposal. The technical approach to the formulation of this proposal is discussed in the next section.

3. Integer programming approach

Encouraged by our results in scheduling the Chilenian professional leagues, we approach the scheduling of the World Cup qualifiers using IP. As mentioned in Section 1, the use of IP in sports scheduling has been widely documented. The double-round feature of the setting, however, has received little attention. Wright (2006) introduces the concept to represent two matches played by a single team over two consecutive days in New Zealand’s National Basketball League. In this league, the teams prefer to play both matches in a double round away, in contrast to our case where it is desirable to avoid breaks in double rounds. Goossens and Spiegelsma (2011) generalize the concept of a break by defining it as any arbitrarily chosen pair of rounds with the same home-away status instead of just a consecutive pair with such status. In our problem, then, double rounds are arbitrary pairs formed by an odd round and its following even round. Their approach differs from ours, however, in that they focus on minimizing generalized breaks in a single round robin tournament with no additional constraints. Kendall (2008) and Kendall and Westphal (2013), attempting to minimize the travel distances in English football, analyze fixtures where there is exactly one home and one away game in two consecutive matches. These fixtures, however, are limited to only one or two pairs of rounds around the Christmas period rather than an entire tournament.

3.1. Base IP formulation

Let \( I = \{1, \ldots, n\} \) be the set of teams (\( n = 10 \)). Also, let \( K = \{1, \ldots, 18\} \) be the set of rounds and \( K_{odd} \) the set of first rounds in a double round. For \( i, j \in I \) and \( k \in K \), define the binary variable \( x_{i,j,k} \) as equal to 1 if team \( i \) plays at home against team \( j \) in round \( k \), and zero otherwise.

**Double round robin constraints.** In a double round robin tournament, all teams must play twice against any other team. Here, we maintain traditional features of the tournament: every team faces every other team once in the first half and once on the second half, and exactly one of the two games is played at home while the other one is played away. These constraints are formulated below:

\[
\sum_{k \in K \mid k < n-1} (x_{i,j,k} + x_{j,i,k}) = 1 \quad \forall i \in I, j \in I : i \neq j \tag{1}
\]

\[
\sum_{k \in K \mid k < n-1} (x_{i,j,k} + x_{j,i,k}) = 1 \quad \forall i \in I, j \in I : i \neq j \tag{2}
\]

\[
\sum_{k \in K} x_{i,j,k} = 1 \quad \forall i \in I, j \in I : i \neq j \tag{3}
\]

\[
\sum_{i \in I \mid i \neq j} (x_{i,j,k} + x_{j,i,k}) = 1 \quad \forall j \in I, k \in K \tag{4}
\]

**Compactness.** The schedule must also be compact, that is, all teams must play one match in each round.

**Top team constraints.** The set of top teams, denoted \( I_5 \), contains Argentina and Brazil, the acknowledged powerhouses of South American football. These two teams have by far the best historical records in the qualifying tournaments, one or other of them winning first place in every tournament since 1998. Thus, it is desirable that no other team be required to play against them in consecutive matches.

\[
\sum_{j \in I_5} (x_{i,j,k} + x_{j,i,k} + x_{i,j,k+1} + x_{j,i,k+1}) \leq 1 \quad \forall i \in I \setminus I_5, k \in K : k < |K| \tag{5}
\]

**Balance constraints.** These are included to maintain a balanced distribution among the teams of H-A sequences in double rounds. Given that there are \( n - 1 \) double rounds, we impose that each team has between \( n/2 - 1 \) and \( n/2 \) such sequences. These constraints are encoded with the help of auxiliary variables \( y_{i,k} \), which take a value of 1 if team \( i \) has an H-A sequence in the double round that start at round \( k \) and zero otherwise. The auxiliary variables must satisfy the following constraints:

\[
n/2 - 1 \leq \sum_{k \in K_{odd}} y_{i,k} \leq n/2, \quad \forall i \in I, \tag{6}
\]

\[
\sum_{j \in I \mid j \neq i} (x_{i,j,k} + x_{j,i,k+1}) \leq 1 + y_{i,k}, \quad \forall i \in I, k \in K_{odd}. \tag{7}
\]

\[
y_{i,k} \leq \sum_{j \in I \mid j \neq i} x_{i,j,k}, \quad \forall i \in I, k \in K_{odd}. \tag{8}
\]

\[
y_{i,k} \leq \sum_{j \in I \mid j \neq i} x_{j,i,k+1}, \quad \forall i \in I, k \in K_{odd}. \tag{9}
\]

**Objective function.** We aim at minimizing the total number of away breaks within double rounds across all teams. To accomplish this, we first define auxiliary variables \( w_{i,k} \), which take a value of 1 if team \( i \) has an away break in the double round starting in round \( k \) and zero otherwise. These variables must then satisfy the following constraints:

\[
\sum_{j \in I \mid j \neq i} (x_{i,j,k} + x_{j,i,k+1}) \leq 1 + w_{i,k}, \quad \forall i \in I, k \in K_{odd}. \tag{10}
\]

\[
w_{i,k} \leq \sum_{j \in I \mid j \neq i} x_{i,j,k}, \quad \forall i \in I, k \in K_{odd}. \tag{11}
\]

\[
w_{i,k} \leq \sum_{j \in I \mid j \neq i} x_{j,i,k+1}, \quad \forall i \in I, k \in K_{odd}. \tag{12}
\]

Note also that since the existence of an away break for a given team in a double round necessarily implies a home break for some other team in the same double round (de Werra, 1988), the minimization of the total number of breaks in double rounds is captured by the following objective function:

\[
\min \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{k \in K_{odd}} w_{i,k}. \tag{13}
\]

3.2. Symmetric schemes

Unlike the mirrored structure of previous World Cup qualifier tournaments, the base formulation above does not impose any type of symmetry between the first 9 rounds and the last 9. Some form of symmetry is present in most tournament formats, however. In a survey of the schedules of 25 European football leagues for the 2008–2009 season, Goossens and Spiegelsma (2012) found that this was the case for 20 of them, the mirrored scheme being the one most frequently used (in 15 leagues).

Anticipating reluctance on the part of CONMEBOL to adopt a scheme that did not incorporate some element of symmetry, we studied several possibilities and designed our proposals accordingly.
Table 3: Representation of the symmetric schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mirrored scheme</td>
<td>1 2 3 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French scheme</td>
<td>1 2 3 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English scheme</td>
<td>1 2 3 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted scheme</td>
<td>1 2 3 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-to-back scheme</td>
<td>1 2 ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mirrored scheme.** The mirroring condition can be incorporated into the base IP formulation by adding the following constraints:

\[ x_{i,k} = x_{j,k+n-1} \quad \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, k \in K : 1 \leq k \leq n - 1. \]  

(14)

Unfortunately, imposing only constraints (1) to (5) in addition to the above condition results in at least 16 double-round breaks, the very feature we want to minimize. Also, adding the H-A balance constraints leads to infeasibility. We therefore explored several other forms of symmetry, which are set out below.

**French scheme.** In this scheme, the first and last rounds are identical but their home-away status is reversed; the same holds for rounds \( k \) and \( k + n - 2 \), \( k = 2, \ldots, n - 1 \). That is,

\[ x_{i,j+1} = x_{i,j+2n-2}, \quad x_{i,j+1} = x_{j+1,k+n-2} \quad \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, 2 \leq k \leq n - 1. \]  

(15)

**English scheme.** In this scheme, rounds \( n/2 - 1 \) and \( n/2 \) are identical but their home-away status is reversed; the same holds for rounds \( k \) and \( k + n, k = 2, \ldots, n - 2 \). That is,

\[ x_{i,j+n-1} = x_{i,j}, \quad x_{i,j+n-1} = x_{j,k+n} \quad \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, 2 \leq k \leq n - 2. \]  

(16)

**Inverted scheme.** In this scheme, round \( k \) and \( 2n - k - 1 \) are identical but their home-away status is reversed, for \( k = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \). That is,

\[ x_{i,j+k} = x_{j+2n-k-1,i} \quad \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, 1 \leq k \leq n - 1. \]  

(17)

**Back-to-back scheme.** In this scheme, round \( k \) and \( k + 1 \) are identical but their home-away status is reversed, for \( k \in K_{add} \). That is,

\[ x_{i,j+k} = x_{j,k+1,i} \quad \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, k \in K_{add}. \]  

(18)

**Min–Max separation scheme.** In this scheme, the two games between any two teams are separated by at least \( c \) rounds and at most \( d \) consecutive rounds. That is,

\[ \sum_{k \in K_{k=1}} (x_{i,j+k} + x_{j,i+k}) \leq 1. \quad \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, k \leq |K| - c, \]  

(19)

\[ \sum_{k \in K_{(k-d) \leq c}} (x_{i,j+k} + x_{j,i+k}) \]  

\[ \forall i, j \in I : i \neq j, k \in K. \]  

(20)

A summary of the conditions imposed by each symmetric scheme is presented in Table 3. Here, a schedule for a generic team is illustrated by an ordered array of its opponents (represented by the digits \( 1, \ldots, 9 \)), where the position in the array refers to the round an opponent is faced and the second appearance of a digit indicates a match with the same opponent but with the home-away status reversed. (We have excluded the Min–Max scheme as it does not necessarily repeat rounds generically throughout the fixture.)

Although not as popular as the mirrored scheme, some of the schemes above have been used in the professional football leagues of various countries. For example, the French scheme has been used in Czech Republic, France, Luxembourg and Russia, while the English and the inverted schemes have been used in Austria and Switzerland, respectively (Goossens & Spieksma, 2012). In South America, the inverted scheme has been used for the prestigious Copa Libertadores (international clubs) tournament.

We solved the base formulation in combination with the various symmetry-related constraints and obtained a number of template schedules with an objective function value of zero. As some constraints are incompatible with some symmetric schemes, we relaxed the former when necessary. For example, for the back-to-back scheme, we relaxed the constraint that every team faces every other team once in the first half of the tournament and once in the second half, which is clearly incompatible with the scheme. Note also that for every symmetry scheme above, there might exist multiple schedules. In each setting, we obtained schedules that eliminated double-round breaks. For the Min–Max separation scheme we use \( c = 6 \) and \( d = 12 \), as these were the closest possible values to the inflexible mirrored case \( (c = 9 \) and \( d = 9 \)) that eliminated double-round breaks. Among all schemes, the French one allowed us to satisfy all constraints and, more important, was well accepted by ANFP officials, as we detail next.

4. Results and implementation in practice

Among the templates presented in the previous section, ANFP officials selected the one following the French scheme. The ANFP proposed this schedule at a meeting of CONMEBOL’s members in April 2015. Although other countries also presented proposals, ours was unanimously selected by all members for the 2018 World Cup qualifiers.

In July 2015, the random draw for the assignment of teams to the template fixture took place in Saint Petersburg at an event involving the 200 FIFA-affiliated national associations, which was broadcast worldwide. Former Best World Cup Award players Ronaldo and Forlán drew balls from two pots to define the South American Qualifiers schedule. One pot contained the names of the participating teams while the other contained the numbers indicating the position each team would take in the schedule we constructed. The outcome of the draw was the schedule presented in Table 4.

By construction, the definitive schedule departs from a mirrored scheme only in that the last round of matches in the second half is the reverse of the first round in the first half. All teams play once at home and once away in each double round. The schedule also has a series of features that significantly improve upon the 2002–2014 setup, as can be seen in the comparisons in Table 5. First, it achieves a much better balance of H-A and A-H sequences by assigning every team at least 4 and at most 5 of each of these sequences. Second, the number of breaks in double rounds was reduced from 18 to 0. This feature in particular significantly enhances sporting fairness. Our schedule also performs well on g-ranking-balancedness, a fairness concept introduced by Goossens and Spieksma (2012) that compares the number of home games played by each team upon completion of each round. A schedule is considered to be g-ranking-balanced if, immediately after each round, the difference between the number of home games played by any two teams up till then is at most \( g \). Of the 25 leagues the authors studied, only the English league had the minimum possible g value of 1. Our schedule also achieves a \( g \) value of 1. Moreover, at the end of every even round, all of the teams have played exactly the same number of home and away games. This is perhaps positive when people look at the standing and compare the number of points of every team. In addition, our schedule balances the H-A sequences within double rounds, especially for Brazil, Chile and Venezuela, which instead of having either 0 or 1 such sequence, as in the 2002–2014 fixture, now have 4 or 5 of them. As with the 2002–2014 schedule, in the new schedule no team plays consecutively against Argentina and Brazil. In the draw, a special colour
was used to identify the balls associated with these two teams (which constituted set $I_b$ in our formulation) and their two predefined numbers in the template.

Finally, although our work focused on the particular case of the South American Qualifiers, which involve 10 teams, we have also explored the possibilities of the French system for generating schedules using the same criteria for other tournament sizes. Through numerical experiments, and also through some simple logical reasoning, it can easily be shown that for $n = 4$ and $n = 6$, the problem becomes infeasible. However, numerical experiments allow us to find feasible schedules under the French system without double-round breaks for all even $n$ between 8 and 38. Any general result about this and the other formats remain worthy of investigation.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we have shown our use of IP to the design of a new schedule for the South American qualification phase of the FIFA World Cup football championship. Our work contributes to the theory and practice of sports scheduling by presenting what is, to the best of our knowledge, the first real-world application of OR to football scheduling at the international level. The proposed schedule replaced a fixture used by CONMEBOL for the last two decades. Resistance to change, a barrier to the adoption of technology, is specially strong in the culture of an international organization such as CONMEBOL, which must align the interests of its ten members, each with their own cultural identity and point of view.

Our proposal introduced a series of modifications that, from a rather objective perspective, improved upon the traditional schedule, and was selected unanimously by CONMEBOL members. The proposed schedule, with teams assigned as in Table 4, is currently being used in the qualification tournament for the 2018 World Cup. The tournament started in October 2015 and will conclude in October 2017. At the time of writing, with 4 rounds remaining, there are 8 teams with plausible possibilities to qualify, in what is being arguably one of the tightest qualification tournaments in the recent history.

While having fewer teams than regular football league tournaments, the scheduling problem for the South American Qualifiers has features that pose interesting technical challenges. One of these is the temporal spacing of the games and the structure derived from the double rounds. Our focus on minimizing double-round breaks resulted in a fixture that has all teams playing at least once at home in every double round. This is in sharp contrast to mirrored schedules, where teams can go without playing at home for several months. With the double round feature also adopted by other confederations, such as UEFA in Europe and AFC in Asia, solutions addressing this issue are all the more necessary.
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Table 4 Schedule of the South American Qualifiers to the 2018 FIFA World Cup Russia.

| Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ARG  | ECU | @PAR | BRA | @COL | @CHI | BOL | URU | @VEN | @PER | PAR | @ECU | BOL | ECU | @EPU | @ECU | BOL | ECU |
| BOL  | ECU | BOL | VEN | @PAR | COL | @CHI | BOL | URU | @VEN | @PER | PAR | @ECU | BOL | ECU | @EPU | @ECU | BOL | ECU |
| BRA  | @CHI | VEN | @ARG | PER | URI | @PAR | @ECU | COL | BOL | @VEN | CHI | BOL | ECU | @EPU | @ECU | BOL | ECU |
| CHI  | BOL | @PER | COL | @URU | ARG | @VEN | @PAR | BOL | ECU | VEN | @BRA | @PAR | URI | @PER | @ECU | BOL | ECU |
| COL  | PER | @URU | @CHI | ARG | @BOL | @VEN | @PAR | BOL | ECU | VEN | @BRA | @PAR | URI | @PER | @ECU | BOL | ECU |
| ECU  | @ARG | BOL | URU | @VEN | PAR | @COL | BOL | ECU | @BRA | @PER | CHI | @BOL | ARG | PAR | @ECU | BOL | ECU |
| PAR  | @VEN | ARG | @PER | BOL | @ECU | BOL | ECU | BOL | ARG | @BRA | CHI | @URU | COL | @ARG | VEN | @BRA | BOL |
| PER  | @COL | CHI | PAR | @BRA | VEN | @URU | @BOL | ECU | ARG | @CHI | COL | | | | | | |
| URU  | @BOL | COL | @ECU | CHI | @BRA | PER | @ARG | VEN | @COL | BOL | | | | | | | |
| VEN  | PAR | @BRA | @BOL | ECU | @PER | CHI | @COL | ARG | @URU | BOL | | | | | | | |

Table 5 Comparison of the 2018 and 2002–2014 South American qualifying tournament schedules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Schedule 2002–2014</th>
<th>Schedule 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B_b$</td>
<td>$B_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


