

A NOTE ON BINARY DESIGNS

DĂNUȚ MARCU

Abstract. *In this note, we give an upper bound and a lower bound on the number of blocks for binary block designs.*

Consider v treatments arranged in b blocks in a block design with the incidence matrix $N = (n_{ij})$, where n_{ij} denotes the number of experimental units in the j -th block getting the i -th treatment, such that the i -th treatment is replicated r_i times ($i = 1, 2, \dots, v$) and the j -th block is of size k_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, b$). If $n_{ij} = 0$ or 1 , the design is called *binary*.

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^b (n_{ij}^2 / k_j) \geq [\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^b (n_{ij} / k_j)]^2 / [\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^b (1 / k_j)], \tag{1}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^b (n_{ij}^2 / r_i) \geq [\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^b (n_{ij} / r_i)]^2 / [\sum_{i=1}^v \sum_{j=1}^b (1 / r_i)], \tag{2}$$

both equalities holding if and only if the design is a complete block design, that is, $N = cJ_{v \times b}$ for some constant c , where $J_{v \times b}$ is a $v \times b$ matrix whose elements are all unity. Throughout this paper, we deal only with a non-complete binary design, that is, $N \neq J_{v \times b}$. This means that the equalities in (1) and (2) are not attained in the present design. Since $n_{ij} = 0$ or 1 , then, from (1), we have

$$b < v[\sum_{j=1}^b (1 / k_j)] (= A, \text{ say}), \tag{3}$$

which shows that when A is an integer, then $b \leq A - 1$; when A is not an integer, then $B \leq |A|$, where $|x|$ denotes the largest integer not exceeding x .

On the other hand, from (2), we have

$$b > v[\sum_{i=1}^v (1 / r_i)]^{-1}, \tag{4}$$

which yields that $b \geq |v[\sum_{i=1}^v (1 / r_i)]^{-1}| + 1$.

Thus, we have established the following

Theorem. *For a binary block design with parameters v, b, r_i, k_j ($i = 1, 2, \dots, v; j = 1, 2, \dots, b$), which is not a complete block design, we have*

(i) $b \geq |v[\sum_{i=1}^v (1 / r_i)]^{-1}| + 1;$

- (ii) when $v[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)]$ is an integer, then $b \leq v[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)] - 1$;
- (iii) when $v[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)]$ is not an integer, then $b \leq \lfloor v[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)] \rfloor$. □

In general, it is known [1] that for a block design, $b \geq v - \alpha$ holds, where α is the multiplicity of the maximum eigenvalue, 1, of the matrix $R^{-1/2} CR^{-1/2}$ in which $C = \text{diag} [r_1, r_2, \dots, r_v] - N \text{diag} [k_1^{-1}, k_2^{-1}, \dots, k_b^{-1}] N'$ and $R^{1/2} = \text{diag} [\sqrt{r_1}, \sqrt{r_2}, \dots, \sqrt{r_v}]$. However, the statements here are very simple and alternative expressions. This is the main point of this note, together with a representation of an "upper" bound on the number of blocks in a general binary block design. In [2], Saha gave essentially an inequality $b < v [\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)]$ for an efficiency-balanced block design. Note that the same inequality (3) as the Saha one is valid in general. But, our bounds are still valid for a general binary block design.

Remark 1. For inequalities (ii) and (iii), if we transform them as in the following form

$$b / [\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)] < v, \tag{5}$$

then, for given values v and b , (5) shows some restrictions on block sizes k_j , for $j = 1, 2, \dots, b$.

Remark 2. The inequality (i) shows that in a binary block design satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^v (1/r_i) < 1$, (i) is stronger than the Fisher inequality, $b \geq v$.

But, most block designs satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^v (1/r_i) > 1$, which means that, as is well-known, the Fisher inequality does not hold, in general, in any binary block design having some structure, for example, in certain partially balanced incomplete block designs.

When $r_1 = r_2 = \dots = r_v (= r, \text{ say})$ and $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_b$, from (i) and (ii) we have $b \geq r + 1$, which is obvious.

Numerical example. Consider the following block designs with incidence matrices

$$\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{matrix}$$

Obviously, both of which attain all the bounds in inequalities (i), (ii) and (iii).

Incidentally, as an upper bound for the number of blocks, in [2] it is also shown that for a general block design, we have

$$b < \lfloor nv[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)] \rfloor^{1/2},$$

where $n = \sum_{i=1}^v v_i = \sum_{j=1}^b k_j$. However, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as

$$[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)] (\sum_{j=1}^b k_j) \geq (\sum_{j=1}^b 1)^2,$$

we can obtain

$$b \leq |n[\sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j)]|^{1/2} \quad (6)$$

which, obviously, improves considerably the bound on b from [2]. Similarly, we can obtain

$$v \leq |n[\sum_{i=1}^v (1/r_i)]|^{1/2}.$$

Remark 3. In (6), the equality holds if and only if $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_b$. Additionally, it obviously follows that (3) and (4) are alternatively derived by using relations

$$\sum_{j=1}^b (n_{ij}/k_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^b (1/k_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^v (n_{ij}/r_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^v (1/r_i),$$

respectively.

Remark 4. The argument here is valid for general block designs. Therefore, the bounds derived here are applicable to a wide class of available block designs.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. KAGEYAMA, *Mathematical expression of an inequality for a block design*, Ann. Inst. Statist. Math., A31 (1979), 293-298.
- [2] G.M. SAHA, *On variance balance and efficiency balance in block designs*, Invited talk in 68-th Session of the Indian Science Congress, Banaras Hindu University, India, January 3-7, 1981.

Received May 29, 1996
Str. Pasului 3, Sect. 2
70241 - Bucharest
ROMANIA