

A PROPERTY OF T-WISE BALANCED DESIGNS

Sanpei Kageyama

Department of Mathematics
Hiroshima University
Shinonome, Hiroshima 734
Japan

1. Introduction

Let \mathcal{X} be a finite v -set of objects called treatments and \mathcal{B} a family of non-null subsets (called blocks) of \mathcal{X} . For each subset S of \mathcal{X} , let $\lambda(S)$ denote the number of blocks containing S . Then the system $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ is called a t -wise balanced design d , if for any t -subset S of \mathcal{X} , $\lambda(S)$ is a constant, λ_t , say. Moreover, if for any x -subset S of \mathcal{X} , for given $x \leq t$, $\lambda(S) = \lambda_x$, then the design d is said to be regular t -wise balanced. Note that a 2-wise balanced design with the equal block size is a balanced incomplete block design.

Several combinatorial properties for t -wise balanced designs can be found in Mullin (1974) and Kramer (1983) with definitions of other terms used here. Here a new property on the inner structure of t -wise balanced designs is provided.

2. Statement

It is known (see Kramer (1983)) that a t -wise balanced design is not necessarily $(t-1)$ -wise balanced. Kramer also gave an example of a $13 - (24, \{14, 15\}, 11)$ design which is t -wise balanced for $t = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13$, but not-balanced for $6 \leq t \leq 12$.

Below is a property on inner structure of t -wise balanced designs.

Proposition 1. *If $d = d_1 \cup d_2$ is a t -wise and $(t-1)$ -wise balanced design with subdesigns d_i having block size k_i , ($i = 1, 2$; $k_1 \neq k_2$), then each d_i is a $(t-1)$ -design.*

Proof: Without loss of generality, let $k_1 > k_2$. For the usual treatment-block incidence matrices $((n_{ij}^{(2)}))$ and $((n_{ij}))$ of designs d_2 and d , respectively, it follows that for any distinct i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in d_2} n_{i_1 j}^{(2)} \cdots n_{i_{t-1} j}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{k_1 - k_2} \sum_{j \in d} (k_1 - n_{1j} - \cdots - n_{v_j}) n_{i_1 j} \cdots n_{i_{t-1} j} \\ &= \frac{1}{k_1 - k_2} \{ (k_1 - t + 1) \lambda_{t-1} - (v - t + 1) \lambda_t \} \\ & (= \lambda_{t-1}^{(2)}, \text{ say}) \end{aligned}$$

where $j \in d$ denotes the running over blocks belonging to the design d , and v is the number of treatments in d , which implies that d_2 is a $(t - 1) - (v, k_2, \lambda_{t-1}^{(2)})$ design, and hence d_1 is a $(t - 1) - (v, k_1, \lambda_{t-1} - \lambda_{t-1}^{(2)})$ design.

When $t = 3$ in Proposition 1, we have the following.

Corollary 1. *In a regular 3-wise balanced design with two distinct block sizes, each of subdesigns with all blocks of the equal block size is a 2-design.*

The technique used in the proof of Proposition 1 can not be applied to designs with more than two distinct block sizes for the similar purpose. But we can say a little. Based on Proposition 1, in a t -wise and $(t - 1)$ -wise balanced design $d = d_1 \cup d_2 \cup d_3$ with three distinct block sizes, if one of d_i for some i is a t -design, it follows that other two subdesigns are $(t - 1)$ -designs. Even so this is not powerful.

Though a complement of a t -wise balanced design is not necessarily t -wise balanced, as also pointed out in Mullin (1974), a combination of a regular 2-wise balanced design and its complement yields a regular 3-wise balanced design. This observation may reveal a kind of a converse to Corollary 1 when the original design has more than two distinct block sizes.

Recently, the fact described in Corollary 1 is used to characterize statistical block designs with supplemented balance (see Kageyama and Majumdar (1989)).

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank the referee for his comments on presentation of the context, and Dr. Tatsuaki Okamoto for his help on preparation of the paper using \TeX . This note was written while the author was visiting the Department of Combinatorics and Optimization at the University of Waterloo.

References

1. S. Kageyama and D. Majumdar, *Resistant balanced treatment incomplete block designs*, Submitted.
2. E.S. Kramer, *Some results on t -wise balanced designs*, *Ars Combinatoria* 15 (1983), 179–192.
3. R.C. Mullin, *A note on self-complementary designs*, *Congressus Numerantium* 10 (1974), 591–598.