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## 1. Introduction.

Athletics competitions have the concern that a runner could "anticipate" the starter gun to gain a slight advantage. To prevent this, they judge any runner starting within 0.1 seconds of the starter gun to have committed a false start and thus be disqualified. This runs the risk of unfairly penalising a competitor for simply having a very fast reaction time.

It has been proposed ${ }^{2}$ to replace this rule by a computer-generated randomised start time, to avoid anticipation ${ }^{3}$. In this paper, we investigate how random start times can reduce the anticipation advantage.

## 2. Set-Up.

Suppose that, under a fair and equal start, a given runner has probability $p$ of winning (or otherwise "succeeding") in a race. However, they might choose to start at some particular time $t$ even before hearing the starter gun. If the gun then fires within their reaction time $\delta$, i.e. between times $t$ and $t+\delta$, then their win probability is multiplied by some factor $r>1$, i.e. becomes $r p$. On the other hand, if the gun does not fire by time $t+\delta$, then they commit a false start and are disqualified (so their win probability becomes 0 ).

[^0]Let $f(x)$ be the probability density function for the start time $X$ (in seconds, perhaps after a fixed get-set period of e.g. one second). Suppose for some $t \geq 0$, the given runner has decided to use the strategy of starting when they hear the gun or at time $t$, whichever comes first. And suppose all other runners simply start upon hearing the gun. Then the given runner's success probability is given by
$W=p \mathbf{P}[X \leq t]+r p \mathbf{P}[t<X \leq t+\delta]+0 \mathbf{P}[X>t+\delta]=p \int_{0}^{t} f(x) d x+r p \int_{t}^{t+\delta} f(x) d x$.
This can also be written as

$$
W=p F(t)+r p[F(t+\delta)-F(t)]=p[1+A]
$$

where $F(x)=\mathbf{P}(X \leq x)$, and

$$
A=A(t)=F(t)-1+r[F(t+\delta)-F(t)]=(r-1)[(1-F(t)]-r[1-F(t+\delta)]
$$

is the "anticipation advantage".
Or as

$$
W=p[1-G(t)]+r p[G(t)-G(t+\delta)]=p[1+(r-1) G(t)-r G(t+\delta)]=p[1+A]
$$

where $G(x)=\mathbf{P}(X>x)$, and $A=A(t)=(r-1) G(t)-r G(t+\delta)$ is the "anticipation advantage".

Our goal is to minimise $\sup _{t} A(t)$, the maximum possible anticipation advantage.

## 3. Exponential Case.

Suppose now that $X \sim \operatorname{Exp}(\lambda)$, i.e. $f(x)=\lambda e^{-\lambda x} \mathbf{1}_{x>0}$ and $F(x)=1-e^{-\lambda x}$. Then

$$
W=p\left(1-e^{-\lambda t}\right)+r p\left[\left(1-e^{-\lambda(t+\delta)}\right)-\left(1-e^{-\lambda t}\right)\right]=p\left[1+e^{-\lambda t}\left(-1+r\left(1-e^{-\lambda \delta}\right)\right] .\right.
$$

This anticipation advantage can be easily controlled:
Theorem. If $X \sim \operatorname{Exp}(\lambda)$, then provided that $r<1 /(\delta \lambda)$, we will always have $W<p$, i.e. there is no possible anticipation advantage.

Proof. Recall that $e^{z} \geq 1+z$ for any $z \in \mathbf{R}$. So, $1-e^{z} \leq-z$. It follows that

$$
W \leq p\left[1+e^{-\lambda t}(-1+r \lambda \delta)\right] .
$$

If $r<1 /(\delta \lambda)$, then $-1+r \lambda \delta<0$, so $W<p$, as claimed.

For example, if the reaction time is $\delta=0.1$ seconds, and the start time distribution has $\lambda=1$, then provided that the win probability multiplier satisfies $r<10$, then no anticipation advantage can be had, which is good.

## 4. Bounded Distributions.

The above exponential distribution is an excellent solution, except that the distribution of $X$ is not bounded. This means that there is no limit on how long the runners might have to wait in "set" position before the race begins, which could be problematic ${ }^{4}$.

To avoid this problem, we suppose from now on that the start times are bounded, i.e. there is $M<\infty$ with $\mathbf{P}(X \leq M)=1$. In this case, the situation is not as good as before:

Theorem. If the start time distribution is bounded, then there is always some positive anticipation advantage.

Proof. Since the start time distribution is bounded, we must have $L:=\sup \{x \geq 0: G(x)>$ $0\}<\infty$. But then with $t=L-\delta$, we have $A(L-\delta)=(r-1) G(M-\delta)>0$, so there is a positive anticipation advantage.

On the other hand, if $X \leq M$, then it follows that for $t \geq M-\delta, A(t)=(r-1) G(t)$ is a non-increasing function of $t$. Hence, we can assume that $t \leq M-\delta$.

Our goal is to minimise $\sup \{A(t): 0 \leq t \leq M-\delta\}$, by choosing appropriate bounded distributions for $X$ on $[0, M]$. Intuitively, we want $X$ to be more likely to be in the lower part of that interval, but still have some chance of being in the higher part too.

[^1]
### 4.1. Uniform Case (Unif).

Suppose first that $X \sim$ Uniform $[0, M]$. Then

$$
W=p(t / M)+r p(1 / M) \delta=(p / M)[t+r \delta]
$$

If $t=M-\delta$, then this becomes

$$
W=(p / M)[M-\delta+r \delta]=p\left[1+\delta \frac{r-1}{M}\right]
$$

Since $r>1$, this leads to $W>p$, i.e. to an anticipation advantage.
For example, if $\delta=0.1$ and $r=2$ and $M=0.2$ (which might be approximately the case for a typical starter gun), then we get $W=p[1+(0.1)(2-1) / 0.2]=1.5 p$, increasing the win probability by an extra $50 \%$.

However, this advantage decreases as $M$ increases. For example, if $\delta=0.1$ and $r=2$ and $M=3$, then we get $W=p[1+(0.1)(2-1) / 3]=1.0333 p$, increasing the win probability by only an extra $A=1 / 30$.

### 4.2. Truncated Exponential Case (TE $\lambda$ ).

Suppose now that $X \sim \min [\operatorname{Exp}(\lambda), M]$, i.e. an exponential distribution except truncated at $M$, so $F(x)=1-e^{-\lambda x}$ for $0 \leq x<M$ but $F(M)=1$.

Then for $t<M-\delta, W$ is the same as in the full Exponential Case above, with negative anticipation advantage over a wide range of $\delta$ and $r$.

However, when $t=M-\delta$, we compute that

$$
W=p\left(1-e^{-\lambda(M-\delta)}\right)+r p\left[1-\left(1-e^{-\lambda(M-\delta)}\right)\right]=p\left[1+(r-1) e^{-\lambda(M-\delta)}\right] .
$$

In this case, we always have $W>p$, so as expected there is a (small) anticipation advantage at $t=M-\delta$. For example, if the reaction time is $\delta=0.1$ seconds, and the start time distribution has $\lambda=1$, with maximum $M=3$, and anticipation factor $r=2$, then $W=1.05502 p$. This is slightly worse than the uniform case.

### 4.3. Conditional Exponential Case (CE $\lambda$ ).

Suppose now that $\left.X \sim \operatorname{Exp}(\lambda)\right|_{X \leq M}$, i.e. an exponential distribution conditional on being $\leq M$, so $F(x)=\left(1-e^{-\lambda x}\right) /\left(1-e^{-\lambda M}\right)$ for $0 \leq x \leq M$. Then

$$
W=p \frac{1-e^{-\lambda(M-\delta)}}{1-e^{-\lambda M}}+r p \frac{1-\left(1-e^{-\lambda(M-\delta)}\right)}{1-e^{-\lambda M}} .
$$

This distribution comes closest to mimicking the unbounded distribution $\operatorname{Exp}(\lambda)$ above, so it seems the most promising, as we shall see below.

## 5. Numerical Comparisons.

We now compare the performance of the above various bounded densities. We fix the maximum delay time at $M=3$ seconds, and consider various reaction times $\delta=0.1$ or 0.25 , and anticipation multipliers $r=2$ or 3 . In each case, we compute $\sup \{A(t): 0 \leq t \leq M-\delta\}$, where $A(t)$ is the anticipation advantage at time $t$ as above. Our results are as in Figure 1.

## 6. Conclusion.

As can be seen from Figure 1, the Truncated Exponential with $\lambda=2$ (TE2), and the Conditional Exponential with $\lambda=2$ (CE2), both perform well unless both the reaction time $\delta$ and the anticipation multiplier $r$ get large.

By contrast, the Conditional Exponential with $\lambda=1$ (CE1) performs quite well over a wide range of values of $\delta$ and $r$.

We thus recommend the CE1 distribution for the Random Race Start Timer. Indeed, this is the distribution that we have implemented in our online version ${ }^{5}$. (The online version also adds a one-second get-set period to the beginning of the delay time, so its total delay time is $1+X$ seconds where $X \sim \mathrm{CE} 1$ is conditional on $M \leq 3$, i.e. its total delay time is always between 1 and 4 seconds.)
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Figure 1: Numerical comparison of the maximum anticipation advantage for various different bounded delay time distributions, with maximum delay $M=3$, anticipation time $\delta=0.1$ (top) or 0.25 (bottom), and anticipation multiplier $r=2$ (left) or 3 (right), showing that CE1 is the most consistently small.
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