

ON BALANCED INCOMPLETE BLOCK DESIGNS WITH LARGE NUMBER OF ELEMENTS

HAIM HANANI

1. Introduction. A balanced incomplete block design (BIBD) $B[k, \lambda; v]$ is an arrangement of v distinct elements into blocks each containing exactly k distinct elements such that each pair of elements occurs together in exactly λ blocks.

The following is a well-known theorem [5, p. 248].

THEOREM 1. *A necessary condition for the existence of a BIBD $B[k, \lambda; v]$ is that*

$$(1) \quad \lambda(v - 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{(k - 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda v(v - 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{k(k - 1)}.$$

It is also well known [5] that condition (1) is not sufficient for the existence of $B[k, \lambda; v]$.

There is an old conjecture that for any given k and λ condition (1) may be sufficient for the existence of a BIBD $B[k, \lambda; v]$ if v is sufficiently large. It is attempted here to prove this conjecture in some specific cases.

2. Auxiliary lemmas. Let $q = p^r$, where p is an odd prime and r a positive integer. By [3, p. 248] there exists a field $\text{GF}(q)$ of q elements and an element $x \in \text{GF}(q)$ called a generator of $\text{GF}(q)$ such that

$$\{x^s: s = 0, 1, \dots, q - 2\} \cup \{0\} = \text{GF}(q).$$

Consider the differences $\{x^\gamma - 1: \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, q - 2\}$. Each of them is some power $\delta(\gamma)$ of x . The number of values of γ such that $\gamma \equiv j \pmod{2}$ and $\delta(\gamma) \equiv i \pmod{2}$ will be denoted by $M(i, j)$, $i, j = 0, 1$.

LEMMA 1. *Let q be a power of an odd prime. If $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $M(0, 0) = M(1, 0) = (q - 3)/4$; if $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, then $M(0, 0) = (q - 5)/4$ and $M(1, 0) = (q - 1)/4$.*

Proof [11]. Let x be a generator of $\text{GF}(q)$. The differences

$$\{x^\gamma - 1: \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, q - 2\}$$

produce all the powers of x with the exception of $-1 = x^{(q-1)/2}$. Therefore

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} M(0, 0) + M(0, 1) &= (q - 1)/2, & M(1, 0) + M(1, 1) \\ &= (q - 3)/2 & \text{for } q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}; \\ M(0, 0) + M(0, 1) &= (q - 3)/2, & M(1, 0) + M(1, 1) \\ &= (q - 1)/2 & \text{for } q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Received September 10, 1968. Work on this paper was done while the author was at City University of New York.

Let α be an integer ($1 \leq \alpha \leq (q - 3)/2$) such that

$$(3) \quad x^{2\alpha} - 1 = x^{2\beta+1}$$

for some β ($0 \leq \beta \leq (q - 3)/2$). Multiplying (3) by $x^{-2\beta-1}$ we obtain $x^{2(\alpha-\beta)-1} - 1 = x^{-2\beta-1}$ which shows that $M(1, 1) = M(1, 0)$. From (2) follows $M(1, 0) = (q - 3)/4$ for $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ and $M(1, 0) = (q - 1)/4$ for $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. On the other hand, it is clear that $M(0, 0) + M(1, 0) = (q - 3)/2$, which proves the lemma.

LEMMA 2. Let q be a power of an odd prime and let x be a generator of $GF(q)$. The differences of the elements $0, 1, 1, x^2, x^2, x^4, x^4, x^6, x^6, \dots, x^{q-3}, x^{q-3}$ are: $(q - 1)/2$ times the element 0 and $q - 1$ times each of the elements

$$(4) \quad 1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{(q-3)/2}.$$

Proof. Clearly, the difference 0 occurs $(q - 1)/2$ times. Further, for $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, each of the differences

$$(5) \quad |(x^{2\alpha} - 1)x^{2\beta}|, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, (q - 3)/4, \quad \beta = 0, 1, \dots, (q - 3)/2,$$

occurs four times and each of the differences

$$(6) \quad |x^{2\beta}|, \quad \beta = 0, 1, \dots, (q - 3)/2,$$

occurs twice. The differences (5) produce $(q - 3)/4$ times each of the elements (4) and the differences (6) produce these elements once each. Accordingly, every element of (4) occurs as difference $4(q - 3)/4 + 2 \cdot 1 = q - 1$ times.

Let $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Considering that $|x^{(q-1)/2}| = 1$, each of the differences

$$(7) \quad |(x^{2\gamma} - 1)x^{2\delta}|, \quad \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, (q - 3)/2, \quad \delta = 0, 1, \dots, (q - 5)/4,$$

occurs four times as well as each of the differences

$$(8) \quad |x^{2\delta}|, \quad \delta = 0, 1, \dots, (q - 5)/4.$$

By Lemma 1, the differences (7) produce $(q - 5)/4$ times the even powers of x and $(q - 1)/4$ times the odd powers of x . The differences (8) produce once the even powers of x . Accordingly, each element of (4) occurs as difference $q - 1$ times.

LEMMA 3. Let $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ be a power of a prime and let x be a generator of $GF(q)$. The differences of the elements $0, 0, 1, 1, x^2, x^2, x^4, x^4, x^6, x^6, \dots, x^{q-3}, x^{q-3}$ are: $(q + 1)/2$ times the element 0 and $q + 1$ times each of the elements

$$(9) \quad 1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{(q-3)/2}.$$

Proof. Clearly the difference 0 occurs $(q + 1)/2$ times. Further, each of the differences (5) and (6) occurs four times and the proof continues on the same lines as that of Lemma 2.

3. Orthogonal Latin squares. A Latin square of order n ($n \geq 2$) is an arrangement of n distinct elements in an $n \times n$ matrix in such way that in each row and in each column every element occurs exactly once and in the whole matrix every element occurs exactly n times.

Two Latin squares are said to be orthogonal if for every element a of one square and every element b of the other one there exists exactly one pair of integers i, j such that in the i th row and j th column of the first square is the element a and in the same place in the second square is the element b . r ($r \geq 2$) Latin squares are said to be mutually orthogonal if any two of them are orthogonal.

Let $N(n)$ denote the maximal number of mutually orthogonal Latin squares of order n . Chowla, Erdős, and Straus proved [4] that $N(n)$ tends to infinity with n ; in other words we state the following result.

THEOREM 2. *For every positive integer r there exists n_r such that $N(n) \geq r$ for every $n > n_r$.*

Let n_r be the smallest integer satisfying Theorem 2. The best known estimates for n_r are the following.

THEOREM 3. (i) [10]. *For every $r \geq 2$, $n_r < cr^{42}$, where c is some constant.*

(ii) [9; 1; 2]. $n_2 = 6$.

(iii) [8]. $n_3 \leq 51$, $n_5 \leq 62$, $n_{29} \leq 34,115,553$.

We may also assume that $n_0 = 0$, $n_1 = 1$.

Let a rectangular $n \times m$ array A of mn elements in n rows and m columns be given. We denote by a group divisible design $\text{GD}[k, \lambda; n \times m]$ an arrangement of the elements of A into blocks each containing exactly k elements such that each pair of elements of distinct columns occurs together in exactly λ blocks, while no pair of elements of the same column occurs together in any block.

By a doubly group divisible design $\text{DGD}[k, \lambda; n \times m]$ we denote an arrangement of the elements of A into blocks of exactly k elements each such that each pair of elements of distinct columns and rows occurs together in exactly λ blocks, while no pair of elements of the same column or the same row occurs together in any block.

The existence of a group divisible design $\text{GD}[k, 1; n \times k]$ is equivalent to the existence of $k - 2$ mutually orthogonal Latin squares of order n . To show this we note that the blocks of $\text{GD}[k, 1; n \times k]$ are of the form

$$\{(a_1; 1), (a_2; 2), \dots, (a_k; k)\},$$

where $(a_i; i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, is the element of intersection of the a_i th row and i th column in A , and each such block states that on the intersection of the a_{k-1} th row and a_k th column of the j th Latin square comes the element $(a_j; j)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k - 2$.

Let a group divisible design $\text{GD}[k, 1; n \times k]$ be given. Delete the k th column. The blocks which contained any fixed element of the k th column are now dis-

joint and on the other hand they contain all the remaining elements of A . Without loss of generality we may assume that one such family of blocks coincides with the (truncated) rows of A . Delete those blocks (but not their elements). The remaining blocks form a doubly group divisible design $\text{DGD}[k - 1; n \times (k - 1)]$. By Theorem 2 we have the following result.

THEOREM 4. *If k is a positive integer and $v > n_{k-1}$, then there exists a doubly group divisible design $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$.*

4. Balanced incomplete block designs. Let $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$ be given. Denote by $(j; i), j = 1, 2, \dots, v, i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, the element of intersection of the j th row and the i th column in the corresponding array A . The blocks of the $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$ have the shape $\{(a_i; i): i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$, where $a_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $a_i \neq a_h$ for $i \neq h$. We form a configuration C of elements and blocks, taking as elements of C the rows of A , and for every block b of $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$ forming a block of C consisting of the rows of A which intersect b . Clearly C is a BIBD $B[k, k(k - 1); v]$ and the following result follows from Theorem 4.

THEOREM 5. *If k is a positive integer and $v > n_{k-1}$, then there exists a BIBD, $B[k, k(k - 1); v]$.*

Let $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$ be given, where k is a power of an odd prime. Consider a set E of $kv + \epsilon$ elements, where $\epsilon = 0$ or 1 . Denote the elements of E by $(j, g_\gamma), j = 1, 2, \dots, v, \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k$, where g_γ are distinct elements of $\text{GF}(k)$. In the case that $\epsilon = 1$, denote the additional element by (∞) . For every block $\{(a_i; i): i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ of $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$ form on the set E the blocks

$$\{(a_1, g_\gamma), (a_i, x^{2(\lfloor i/2 \rfloor - 1)} + g_\gamma): i = 2, 3, \dots, k\}, \quad \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

where x is a generator of $\text{GF}(q)$. By Lemma 2, every pair of elements of $E, \{(j, g_\gamma), (h, g_\delta)\}$ with $h \neq j$ occurs together in exactly $k - 1$ blocks. Form additional blocks on E as follows: if $\epsilon = 0$, form the blocks

$$\{(j, g_\gamma): \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, v,$$

$k - 1$ times each; if $\epsilon = 1$, form on each of the sets

$$\{(\infty), (j, g_\gamma): \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, v,$$

all the $k + 1$ possible k -tuples. The constructed blocks on E form clearly a BIBD $B[k, k - 1; kv + \epsilon]$ and by Theorem 4 we have the following result.

THEOREM 6. *If k is a power of an odd prime and if $v > kn_{k-1} + 1$ satisfies $v \equiv 0$ or $1 \pmod{k}$, then there exists a BIBD, $B[k, k - 1; v]$.*

Let $\text{DGD}[k, 1; v \times k]$ be given, where $k - 1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ is a power of a prime. Consider a set E of $(k - 1)v + 1$ elements, which we denote by (∞) and $(j, g_\gamma), j = 1, 2, \dots, v, \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$, where g_γ are distinct elements

of $GF(k - 1)$. For every block $\{(a_i; i): i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ of $DGD[k, 1; v \times k]$, form on the set E the blocks

$$\{(a_1, g_\gamma), (a_k, g_\gamma), (a_i, x^{2^{(i/2)-1}} + g_\gamma): i = 2, 3, \dots, k - 1\},$$

$\gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$, where x is a generator of $GF(k - 1)$. By Lemma 3, every pair of elements of E , $\{(j, g_\gamma), (h, g_\delta)\}$ with $h \neq j$, occurs together in exactly k blocks. Form additional blocks on E , namely

$$\{(\infty), (j, g_\gamma): \gamma = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1\},$$

$j = 1, 2, \dots, v, k$ times each. The constructed blocks on E form clearly a BIBD, $B[k, k; (k - 1)v + 1]$ and by Theorem 4 we have the following result.

THEOREM 7. *If $k \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and $k - 1$ is a power of a prime and if $v > (k - 1)n_{k-1} + 1$ satisfies $v \equiv 1 \pmod{k - 1}$, then there exists a BIBD, $B[k, k; v]$.*

It should be mentioned that for $k \leq 5$, Theorems 5, 6, and 7 are correct without the restriction that v must be sufficiently large [6; 7].

Putting together Theorems 5, 6, 7 with Theorem 1 we obtain the following result.

THEOREM 8. *Condition (1) is necessary and sufficient for the existence of a BIBD, $B[k, \lambda; v]$, if v is sufficiently large and*

- (i) if $\lambda = k(k - 1)$, or
- (ii) if k is a power of an odd prime and $\lambda = k - 1$, or
- (iii) if $k - 1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ is a power of a prime and $\lambda = k$.

REFERENCES

1. R. C. Bose and S. Shrikhande, *On the construction of sets of mutually orthogonal Latin squares and the falsity of a conjecture of Euler*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. *95* (1960), 191-209.
2. R. C. Bose, E. T. Parker, and S. Shrikhande, *Further results on the construction of mutually orthogonal Latin squares and the falsity of Euler's conjecture*, Can. J. Math. *12* (1960), 189-203.
3. R. D. Carmichael, *Introduction to the theory of groups of finite order* (Dover, New York, 1956).
4. S. Chowla, P. Erdős, and E. G. Straus, *On the maximal number of pairwise orthogonal Latin squares of a given order*, Can. J. Math. *12* (1960), 204-208.
5. M. Hall, Jr., *Combinatorial theory* (Blaisdell, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1967).
6. H. Hanani, *The existence and construction of balanced incomplete block designs*, Ann. Math. Statist. *32* (1961), 361-386.
7. ——— *A balanced incomplete block design*, Ann. Math. Statist. *36* (1965), 711.
8. ——— *On the number of orthogonal Latin squares*, J. Combinatorial Theory (to appear).
9. E. Parker, *Construction of some sets of mutually orthogonal Latin squares*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. *10* (1959), 946-949.
10. K. Rogers, *A note on orthogonal Latin squares*, Pacific J. Math. *14* (1964), 1395-1397.
11. Th. Storer, *Cyclotomy and difference sets* (Markham, Chicago, 1967).

*Technion—Israel Institute of Technology,
Technion City, Haifa*