

Box-Hunter resolution in nonregular fractional factorial designs

Jay H. Beder
 Department of Mathematical Sciences
 University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
 P.O. Box 413
 Milwaukee, WI 53201-0413
 beder@uwm.edu

Wiebke S. Diestelkamp*
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Dayton
 Dayton, OH 45469-2316
 wiebke@udayton.edu

Abstract

In a 1961 paper, Box and Hunter defined the resolution of a regular fractional factorial design as a measure of the amount of aliasing in the fraction. They also indicated that the maximum resolution is equal to the minimum length of a defining word. The idea of a wordlength pattern has now been extended to nonregular designs by various authors, who show that the minimum generalized wordlength equals the maximum strength plus 1.

Minimum generalized wordlength is often taken as the definition of resolution. However, Box and Hunter's original definition, which does not depend on wordlength, can be extended to nonregular designs if they are simple. The purpose of this paper is to prove that the maximum Box-Hunter resolution does equal the maximum strength plus 1, and therefore equals the minimum generalized wordlength. Other approaches to resolution are briefly discussed.

Key words. Alias; fractional factorial design; orthogonal array; resolution; strength; wordlength pattern

AMS(MOS) subject classification. Primary: 62K15; Secondary: 05B15, 62K05

1 Introduction

Box and Hunter (1961) introduced the notion of resolution of a regular fraction, and observed that the maximum resolution, say R_{\max} , is equal to the length of the shortest defining word. Fries and Hunter (1980) pointed out that the *number* of defining words of length R_{\max} discriminates between fractions of equal resolution in a useful way: for example, for regular fractions of equal size and having the same factors, fewer defining words of length R_{\max} implies less

*Funded in part by an NSF-AWM Mentoring Travel Grant and a University of Dayton Women's Center Research Grant.

aliasing between main effects and interactions of order $R_{\max} - 1$. This led them to consider the *wordlength pattern* (A_1, \dots, A_k) of a regular fraction having k factors, where A_i is the number of defining words of length i , and to introduce their criterion of *relative aberration* for comparing two designs.

There have been various proposals for extending the idea of wordlength patterns to non-regular (and possibly mixed-level) designs. Deng and Tang (1999) and Tang and Deng (1999) gave a definition for 2-level designs that was generalized to arbitrary mixed-level designs by Xu and Wu (2001). An equivalent coding-theoretic version was developed simultaneously by Ma and Fang (2001). All these authors prove that the minimum generalized wordlength satisfies

$$\min\{i : A_i > 0\} = t_{\max} + 1, \quad (1.1)$$

t_{\max} being the maximum *strength* of the design (considered as an orthogonal array).

With some variation, these authors¹ simply *define* resolution to be the left-hand side of (1.1). However, Box and Hunter have given us an independent concept of resolution:

A design has resolution R if every interaction of p factors is unaliased with every interaction of fewer than $R - p$ factors.

This definition, and the definition of aliasing that underlies it, have been extended to arbitrary simple (or equireplicate) designs in a previous paper (Beder, 2004), where it was shown that a simple design of strength t has ‘‘Box-Hunter’’ resolution $R \geq t + 1$ (Corollary 3.6 below). In this paper we show that $R_{\max} = t_{\max} + 1$ (Theorem 3.7). This and (1.1) then *prove* that $R_{\max} = \min\{i : A_i > 0\}$.

To be sure, this result depends on the particular definitions of aliasing and resolution that we are using. Other approaches to these concepts will be discussed in Section 4. The present approach is illustrated with a regular fraction in Section 2 in preparation for the abstract set-up in Section 3.

Notation and basic definitions. We follow the notation and definitions given in Beder (2004). In particular, the cardinality of a set E is denoted by $|E|$, and the empty set by \emptyset . The integers are denoted by \mathbb{Z} , and the integers modulo n by \mathbb{Z}/n . The real numbers are denoted by \mathbb{R} , and the real-valued functions on the set T by \mathbb{R}^T . Given any finite set T (for us, the set of treatment combinations), \mathbb{R}^T is a Euclidean space with inner product

$$(u, v) = \sum_{s \in T} u(s)v(s) \quad (1.2)$$

for $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^T$ and norm $\|v\| = \sqrt{(v, v)}$. If we fix an ordering of the elements of T , we may view u and v as ordinary column vectors in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^g , where $g = |T|$. Then the formula in (1.2) is the ordinary dot product.

We denote by 1 the constant function taking the value 1, and by 1_C the indicator or characteristic function of the set $C \subset T$:

$$1_C(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \in C, \\ 0 & \text{if } s \notin C. \end{cases}$$

¹See Ma and Fang (2001, page 88) and Xu and Wu (2001, page 1068), as well as Cheng and Ye (2004, Definition 4.1). A variation by Deng and Tang is noted in Remark 3.9 below.

Thus 1 is 1_T . Note that $(1_C, 1_D) = |C \cap D|$.

If there are k factors whose levels are indexed by sets A_1, \dots, A_k of size s_1, \dots, s_k , respectively, then the set of treatment combinations (or *cells*) is $T = A_1 \times \dots \times A_k$. We will refer to T as the *full factorial design*. A *fractional factorial design*, or *fraction*, is one in which each treatment combination appears with some multiplicity (possibly 0). The design is *simple* if it is a subset S of T , that is, if each treatment combination used in the design appears only once.

The design T is *symmetric* if $s_1 = \dots = s_k = s$, in which case we may take $A_1 = \dots = A_k = A$; otherwise it is *asymmetric* or *mixed-level*. Similar terminology applies to a fraction. If in a symmetric design s is a prime or prime power, we may take A to be the finite field $GF(s)$. In this case the fraction is *regular* if it is the solution set of a system of linear equations over the finite field $GF(s)$.

If the cells of the fraction are written as rows or columns of a matrix, then the fraction is an orthogonal array and thus has strength t , for some t , and (in the symmetric case) index λ (see Section 3).

Other notation is introduced as needed.

2 An illustrative example

In this section we illustrate the abstract definition of aliasing that will follow in Section 3. This is often illustrated in introductory experimental design texts by a regular 2_{III}^{3-1} fraction. A regular 3_{III}^{3-1} fraction will better display the features of the general situation.

Consider a regular fraction with defining relations

$$I = AB^2C^2 \quad (= A^2BC)$$

and aliases

$$\begin{aligned} A &= ABC = BC \\ B &= AC^2 = ABC^2 \\ C &= AB^2 = AB^2C \\ AB &= AC = BC^2. \end{aligned}$$

There are three such fractions, each having (maximum) resolution 3. We will choose the one given as the solution set to $x + 2y + 2z \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, namely the cells

$$002, 011, 020, 100, 112, 121, 201, 210, \text{ and } 222.$$

To construct it, we create a pair of contrasts for each of the 13 main effects and components of interaction in the full 3^3 factorial. Each effect is described by a partition of the 27 treatment combinations into 3 blocks, and we create a pair of contrasts by assigning 1, $-1, 0$ and $1, 0, -1$, respectively, to the blocks. A portion of the resulting contrast vectors (of length 27) would look like this:

cell	A	B	C	AB	AB ²	AC	AC ²	BC	BC ²	ABC	ABC ²	AB ² C	AB ² C ²
000	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
001	1	1	-1	1	1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1
002	1	1	0	-1	1	1	1	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1
010	1	-1	1	1	-1	0	0	-1	1	1	1	-1	0
011	1	-1	0	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	1	1
012	1	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	0	-1
020	1	0	-1	1	1	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	-1
021	1	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	1	1
022	1	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	1	0
100	-1	1	1	1	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	0	-1	0
101	-1	1	-1	0	-1	0	0	-1	1	1	-1	0	-1
102	-1	1	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	-1	-1	0	1
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

We now select from these only the 9 treatment combinations in our fraction, restricting the original columns to those 9 cells. This yields the columns below. Of course, those for AB^2C^2 no longer are contrast vectors as they represent a defining word.

cell	A	B	C	AB	AB ²	AC	AC ²	BC	BC ²	ABC	ABC ²	AB ² C	AB ² C ²
002	1	1	0	-1	1	1	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1
011	1	-1	-1	0	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	1
020	1	0	-1	1	1	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	-1
100	-1	1	1	1	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1
112	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	1	0	-1	1	1
121	-1	0	-1	0	1	1	0	-1	0	-1	1	1	-1
201	0	-1	1	1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	-1	1
210	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	0	0	-1	1	1	-1
222	0	-1	0	-1	-1	0	1	1	-1	0	1	1	0

The aliasing of AB and AC , for example, means that the restricted contrast vectors for AC are linear combinations of those for AB , and vice versa. On the other hand, the fact that, say, C and AB are *not* aliased in the fraction means that the restricted contrast vectors for C are *orthogonal* to those of AB . Another way to say this is that the *span* (in \mathbb{R}^9) of the restricted columns for AB equals the span of those for AC , and is orthogonal to the span of those representing C .

Of course, the particular choice of contrast vectors representing each effect in the full factorial is not the essential thing. Rather, each effect is described by a subspace of \mathbb{R}^{27} of dimension 2 consisting of contrast vectors, and the process of restriction yields a corresponding subspace of \mathbb{R}^9 . We might denote the subspaces of \mathbb{R}^{27} by $U_A, U_B, \dots, U_{AB^2C^2}$, and the corresponding subspaces of \mathbb{R}^9 by $\hat{U}_A, \hat{U}_B, \dots, \hat{U}_{AB^2C^2}$. The subspaces of \mathbb{R}^{27} are mutually orthogonal. The “complete” aliasing $A = BC = ABC$ in the fraction means that $\hat{U}_A = \hat{U}_{BC} = \hat{U}_{ABC}$, while the fact that A and B are unaliased in the fraction means that $\hat{U}_A \perp \hat{U}_B$. Since this fraction is regular, being equal (completely aliased) or orthogonal (unaliased) are the only possibilities.

This is the way we will view aliasing in Section 3. Two things occur when we move to

nonregular fractions. One is the appearance of partial aliasing. The other is the lack of “components of interaction” that we have in regular s -level fractions when $s > 2$.

3 Strength and resolution of fractional factorial designs

Let T be a finite set – for us, a set of treatments. An observation on a treatment $s \in T$ is assumed to have a mean $\mu(s)$, which we refer to as a *cell mean* (when T is a Cartesian product, its elements are “cells”). Contrasts in cell means are expressions of the form

$$\sum_{s \in T} c(s)\mu(s)$$

where $\sum_{s \in T} c(s) = 0$. We may refer to these functions $c \in \mathbb{R}^T$ as *contrast functions* or *contrast vectors*, or (by abuse of language) as *contrasts*.

Any blocking (or partition) \mathcal{C} of T determines a subspace $U_{\mathcal{C}} \subset \mathbb{R}^T$ of dimension $|\mathcal{C}| - 1$ consisting of the contrast functions that are constant on the blocks of \mathcal{C} . If $c \in U_{\mathcal{C}}$, then $\sum c(t)\mu(t)$ is a contrast between the blocks. The association of a vector space $U_{\mathcal{C}}$ to each partition \mathcal{C} was first formalized and studied by Tjur (1984).

If \mathcal{D} is another blocking of T , we define the *join* of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} to be the partition

$$\mathcal{C} \vee \mathcal{D} = \{C \cap D : C \in \mathcal{C}, D \in \mathcal{D}, C \cap D \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Let π be the uniform probability measure on T :

$$\pi(A) = |A|/|T|.$$

We denote the independence of A and B by $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$. This is simply the combinatorial condition

$$|A \cap B||T| = |A||B|.$$

We say that the set A is independent of the partition \mathcal{C} (written $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{C}$) if $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Similarly, the partitions \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} are independent ($\mathcal{C} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{D}$) if $C \perp\!\!\!\perp D$ for every $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$. This condition is important because of the fact (Beder, 1989, Lemma 3) that

$$U_{\mathcal{C}} \perp U_{\mathcal{D}} \text{ iff } \mathcal{C} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{D}.$$

Independence also gives us a convenient way to define the strength of an orthogonal array (see Lemma 3.3 below).

For the remainder of this section, let $T = A_1 \times \cdots \times A_k$ be the set of treatment combinations in an $s_1 \times \cdots \times s_k$ factorial, where A_i indexes the levels of factor i and $s_i = |A_i|$. Which main effect or interaction a contrast belongs to is determined entirely by the coefficients $c(s)$.

As r ranges over A_i , the sets

$$A_1 \times \cdots \times A_{i-1} \times \{r\} \times A_{i+1} \times \cdots \times A_k$$

form a blocking \mathcal{A}_i of T consisting of s_i blocks of equal size. For $i < j$ the blocks of $\mathcal{A}_i \vee \mathcal{A}_j$ are sets of the form

$$A_1 \times \cdots \times A_{i-1} \times \{r\} \times A_{i+1} \times \cdots \times A_{j-1} \times \{s\} \times A_{j+1} \times \cdots \times A_k$$

where $r \in A_i$ and $s \in A_j$.

In general, for any nonempty subset $I \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ the factors $i \in I$ determine the blocking $\vee_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ of T . Its blocks are formed by taking intersections of blocks, one from each \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in I$, and are subsets of T of the form $B_1 \times \dots \times B_k$, where for fixed elements $r_i \in A_i$ we have

$$B_i = \begin{cases} \{r_i\} & \text{if } i \in I, \\ A_i & \text{if } i \notin I. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

We pause to record some simple observations that will be needed below. Let \mathcal{C}_I denote $\vee_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$.

Lemma 3.1. *a. $\pi(B) = \frac{1}{\prod_{i \in I} s_i}$ for every block $B \in \mathcal{C}_I$.*

b. $\mathcal{C}_I \vee \mathcal{C}_J = \mathcal{C}_{I \cup J}$.

c. $\mathcal{C}_I \perp \mathcal{C}_J \Leftrightarrow I \cap J = \emptyset$.

Proof. For $B \in \mathcal{C}_I$, $|B| = \prod_{i=1}^k |B_i| = \prod_{i \notin I} s_i$. Thus $\pi(B) = \prod_{i \notin I} s_i / |T| = \prod_{i \in I} s_i$. This proves (a).

To prove (b), let $B' \in \mathcal{C}_I$ and $B'' \in \mathcal{C}_J$. Then $B' = B'_1 \times \dots \times B'_k$ and $B'' = B''_1 \times \dots \times B''_k$ where B'_i is of form (3.1) and B''_i is of the same form with I replaced by J (and possibly different elements r_i). We must show that either $B' \cap B''$ is also of this form, $I \cup J$ replacing I , or $B' \cap B'' = \emptyset$. But the first case occurs if B'_i and B''_i agree for all $i \in I \cap J$ (trivially if $I \cap J = \emptyset$), while the second occurs if they disagree. Thus $\mathcal{C}_I \vee \mathcal{C}_J \subset \mathcal{C}_{I \cup J}$.

Conversely, if $B \in \mathcal{C}_{I \cup J}$ then B is of form (3.1) with $I \cup J$ replacing I . Using the given values of $r_i, i \in I \cup J$, define

$$B'_i = \begin{cases} \{r_i\} & \text{if } i \in I, \\ A_i & \text{if } i \notin I. \end{cases}$$

and

$$B''_i = \begin{cases} \{r_i\} & \text{if } i \in J, \\ A_i & \text{if } i \notin J. \end{cases}$$

and put $B' = B'_1 \times \dots \times B'_k$ and $B'' = B''_1 \times \dots \times B''_k$. Note that B' and B'' automatically agree on $I \cap J$, and that $B' \in \mathcal{C}_I$ and $B'' \in \mathcal{C}_J$. Then $B = B' \cap B'' \in \mathcal{C}_I \vee \mathcal{C}_J$, and so $\mathcal{C}_{I \cup J} \subset \mathcal{C}_I \vee \mathcal{C}_J$, proving (b).

Finally, let $B' \in \mathcal{C}_I$ and $B'' \in \mathcal{C}_J$. If $I \cap J = \emptyset$, then it is easy to see that $\pi(B' \cap B'') = \pi(B')\pi(B'')$. If, however, $I \cap J \neq \emptyset$, then either there exists $i \in I \cap J$ such that $r'_i \neq r''_i$, in which case $\pi(B' \cap B'') = 0$, or $\pi(B' \cap B'') = 1 / \prod_{i \in I \cup J} s_i$. In either case, $\pi(B' \cap B'') \neq \pi(B')\pi(B'')$ for $B' \in \mathcal{C}_I$ and $B'' \in \mathcal{C}_J$. This proves (c). \square

We now describe the contrasts belonging to main effects and to various interactions in the factorial experiment. First, the contrasts between the blocks of \mathcal{A}_i define the main effect of factor i . The set of such contrast functions is then

$$U_i = U_{A_i}.$$

The contrast functions belonging to the ij -interaction are defined to be those elements of $U_{\mathcal{A}_i \vee \mathcal{A}_j}$ that are orthogonal to both U_i and U_j . They form a subspace which we denote U_{ij} . In general, for $\emptyset \neq I \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ we define the subspaces U_I inductively as

$$U_I = \{c \in U_{\mathcal{C}} : c \perp U_J \text{ for all } J \subsetneq I\},$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \vee_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ and U_{\emptyset} is the subspace of constant functions. For nonempty I , the subspace U_I is the set of contrast functions belonging to the interaction between the factors listed in the set I . This is a slightly modernized version of the definition given by Bose (1947). We note that $U_{\mathcal{C}}$ has the orthogonal decomposition

$$U_{\mathcal{C}} = \bigoplus_{J \subseteq I} U_J. \quad (3.2)$$

Next, we consider what happens when we observe only those treatment combinations in a subset, or *simple fraction*, $S \subset T$. Rao (1947, page 129) referred to such subsets as *arrays*. His crucial discovery was the parameter known as *strength*.

Definition 3.2. *S has strength $t \geq 1$ if, for every $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_t\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$, the projection of S onto the factors i_1, \dots, i_t consists of λ_I copies of the full factorial $A_{i_1} \times \dots \times A_{i_t}$.*

Note that for a symmetric array S , the multiplicities λ_I are all equal to a common value λ , the *index* of the array.

As is well known, it follows from the definition that if S has strength t then it also has strength t' for all $t' < t$. A convenient equivalent definition of strength is the following (Beder, 1998, Corollary 5.2).

Lemma 3.3. *A simple fraction S has strength t iff for every $I \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ of size t we have*

$$S \perp\!\!\!\perp \vee_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i.$$

In order to define aliasing in a fraction $S \subset T$, we restrict the contrast functions of the full factorial experiment to the subset S . Thus we let \hat{u} be the restriction of u to S , and let

$$\hat{U}_I = \{\hat{u} : u \in U_I\}. \quad (3.3)$$

\hat{U}_I denotes the set of restrictions of all the functions in U_I to the fraction S . Since addition and scalar multiplication are defined pointwise, \hat{U}_I is also a subspace (of \mathbb{R}^S). The definition of aliasing that follows allows us to define resolution in exactly the same way as Box and Hunter (1961, page 319) do in regular fractions.

Definition 3.4. *Let S be a simple fraction. U_I and U_J are*

- completely aliased in S if $\hat{U}_I = \hat{U}_J$,
- unaliased in S if $\hat{U}_I \perp \hat{U}_J$, and
- partially aliased in S otherwise.

S has resolution R if, for each p , every p -factor effect is unaliased with every effect having fewer than $R - p$ factors.

It is straightforward to see that a fraction having resolution R also has resolution R' for all $R' < R$.

We quote the following theorem and corollary from Beder (2004, Theorem 3.4(a) and Corollary 3.5). We include the brief proof of the corollary for convenience.

Theorem 3.5. *Let S be a simple fraction of strength t . Let $I, J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $|I \cup J| \leq t$. If $I \neq J$, then $\hat{U}_I \perp \hat{U}_J$.*

Corollary 3.6. *If S has strength t then it has resolution $t + 1$.*

Proof. Suppose S has strength t , and let I and J be subsets of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$|I| = p \quad \text{and} \quad |J| \leq t - p.$$

By Theorem 3.5, $\hat{U}_I \perp \hat{U}_J$. Thus no interaction of p factors is aliased with any interaction of at most $t - p$ factors. But this means that S has resolution $t + 1$. \square

Corollary 3.6 implies that if S has *maximum* strength t then S has resolution $R \geq t + 1$. We now show that R cannot exceed $t + 1$.

Theorem 3.7. *If a simple fraction S has maximum strength t , then S has maximum resolution $t + 1$.*

Proof. To show that S does not have resolution $t + 2$, we must produce $I, J \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $|J| < t + 2 - |I|$ but $\hat{U}_I \not\perp \hat{U}_J$.

Since S does not have strength $t + 1$, there exists a set $K \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $|K| = t + 1$ and $S \not\perp \mathcal{C}_K$, where $\mathcal{C}_K = \bigvee_{i \in K} \mathcal{A}_i$. That means there exists a block $B \in \mathcal{C}_K$ such that $S \not\perp B$.

Now $|K| \geq 2$, so we may write $K = I \cup J$, where both I and J are nontrivial and $I \cap J = \emptyset$. Since $K = I \cup J$, we have $\mathcal{C}_K = \mathcal{C}_I \vee \mathcal{C}_J$ by Lemma 3.1, so there exist $B' \in \mathcal{C}_I$ and $B'' \in \mathcal{C}_J$ such that $B = B' \cap B''$.

Let $u = 1_{B'} - \pi(B')1$ and $v = 1_{B''} - \pi(B'')1$. Then $u \in U_{\mathcal{C}_I}$ and $v \in U_{\mathcal{C}_J}$. Using equation (3.2) we have the orthogonal sums

$$u = \sum_{I' \subset I} u_{I'}, \quad v = \sum_{J' \subset J} v_{J'},$$

where $u_{I'} \in U_{I'}$ and $v_{J'} \in U_{J'}$. Now if $I' \subset I$ and $J' \subset J$, then $I' \neq J'$ (in fact they are disjoint); moreover, if $I' \neq I$ or $J' \neq J$, then $|I' \cup J'| \leq t$, and thus $(\hat{u}_{I'}, \hat{v}_{J'}) = 0$ by Theorem 3.5. Hence $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) = (\hat{u}_I, \hat{v}_J)$. We will show that $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \neq 0$. Then $(\hat{u}_I, \hat{v}_J) \neq 0$, and thus $\hat{U}_I \not\perp \hat{U}_J$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) &= \sum_{s \in S} u(s)v(s) \\ &= \sum_{s \in S} (1_{B'}(s) - \pi(B')1)(1_{B''}(s) - \pi(B'')1) \\ &= |B' \cap B'' \cap S| - \pi(B')|B'' \cap S| - \pi(B'')|B' \cap S| + |S|\pi(B')\pi(B'') \\ &= |T| [\pi(B' \cap B'' \cap S) - \pi(B')\pi(B'' \cap S) - \pi(B'')\pi(B' \cap S) + \pi(S)\pi(B')\pi(B'')]. \end{aligned}$$

Since S has strength t , it is independent of both \mathcal{C}_I and \mathcal{C}_J (Lemma 3.3), and so we have $\pi(B' \cap S) = \pi(B')\pi(S)$ and $\pi(B'' \cap S) = \pi(B'')\pi(S)$. Moreover, since $I \cap J = \emptyset$, we have

$\mathcal{C}_I \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{C}_J$ by Lemma 3.1, and thus $\pi(B' \cap B'') = \pi(B')\pi(B'')$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) &= |T| [\pi(B' \cap B'' \cap S) - \pi(B')\pi(B'')\pi(S)] \\
&= |T| [\pi(B \cap S) - \pi(B')\pi(B'')\pi(S)] \\
&= |T| [\pi(B \cap S) - \pi(B' \cap B'')\pi(S)] \\
&= |T| [\pi(B \cap S) - \pi(B)\pi(S)] \\
&\neq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since $S \not\perp\!\!\!\perp B$. □

In the following, the notation $OA(N, k, s, t)$ denotes a symmetric orthogonal array of size N (the number of “runs”), k factors, s symbols and strength t .

Example 3.8. The solution set of the equation $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + 2x_4 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ forms a $1/4$ fraction of a 4^4 factorial, and is an $OA(64, 4, 4, 2)$. It does not have strength 3, as its projection on the first three factors is not a complete 4^3 factorial, but is rather the juxtaposition of 2 copies each of the fractions of a 4^3 factorial given by $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$. Thus it has (maximum) resolution 3: main effects are unaliased with each other, but some two-factor interactions are aliased with main effects.

We can even say a bit more about where the aliasing is occurring. Let us call the factors A, B, C , and D . If we project the fraction on any set of three factors that includes D , we indeed get a complete 4^3 factorial design. Thus those three main effects and all their interactions will be unaliased in the fraction. Aliasing between main effects and two-factor interactions is limited to the three factors other than D .

One might be tempted to view this as a regular fraction with defining contrast $ABCD^2$, based on the defining equation, and to conclude that its resolution should be 4 since the “wordlength” of $ABCD^2$ is 4. However, the fraction is a solution set of an equation over $\mathbb{Z}/4$, not $GF(4)$. According to our definition, this fraction is not regular and the usual wordlength algorithm need not apply – indeed it doesn’t. We note that the generalized wordlength pattern of this fraction, computed according to Xu and Wu (2001), is $(0, 0, 1, 2)$.

Remark 3.9. We have allowed fractions to have strength 1 (resolution 2). It is even possible to allow $t = 0$ in our definition of strength (take an empty join to be the trivial partition $\{T\}$). Then a fraction has maximum strength 0 if it does not even have strength 1. Similarly, all fractions vacuously have resolution 1, and with a bit of elaboration one may show that all ensuing results extend to this case. As there is no practical need for this, we have omitted it.

Roughly speaking, two contrasts are completely aliased if they are equal, and unaliased if they are orthogonal. Partial aliasing is something in between. Using this idea, Deng and Tang (1999, page 1074) introduce a generalized resolution for 2-level designs that equals Box-Hunter resolution plus a fraction. This is extended to other designs by Evangelaras et al. (2005, Section 5).

Remark 3.10. An alternate proof of Theorem 3.7 can be constructed using machinery introduced by Cheng and Ye (2004).

4 Other approaches to resolution and aliasing

Several authors, such as John (1971, page 152) and Raktøe et al. (1981, page 88), define a fraction to have resolution R if all contrasts belonging to effects of order at most $\lceil R/2 \rceil - 1$ are estimable. (An effect is of *order* k if it involves exactly k factors. The symbol $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the greatest integer not exceeding x .) This is accompanied by the assumption that certain high-order effects are absent, an assumption not present in Box and Hunter's original formulation (see Beder (2004) for a discussion of this issue). One consequence of their definition is that while a design of strength t has resolution $t + 1$, it may, for example, have resolution R but maximum strength $R - 2$ (Raktøe et al., 1981, page 174). Hedayat et al. (1999, page 281) add a further assumption to deal with this problem.

Dey and Mukerjee (1999, page 18) define a fractional design to have resolution (f, t) , $f \leq t$, if contrasts belonging to effects of order at most f are estimable when effects of order greater than t are absent. They show that fractions of strength g are universally optimal as long as $f + t = g$, and then *define* the resolution of such a fraction to be $g + 1$ (Dey and Mukerjee, 1999, Theorem 2.6.1 and Remark 2.6.2).

Box-Hunter resolution distinguishes itself from these approaches in a couple of ways:

- It is a combinatorial property of the underlying fraction, independent of any modeling assumptions (such as the absence of high-order interactions).
- It is a measure of the amount of aliasing in a fraction rather than of the estimability of terms in a model.

We are relying here on the concept of aliasing used in regular fractions (Definition 3.4). We note, however, that aliasing is sometimes defined in terms of bias, specifically as a measure of the biases caused by misspecification of a model (cf. Box and Wilson (1951, page 7) and Raktøe et al. (1981, page 95)). The relation between the two views of aliasing is discussed in Beder (2004).

5 Conclusion

Consider the following simple orthogonal array, an $OA(18, 3, 3, 2)$ that is the juxtaposition of two regular $OA(9, 3, 3, 2)$:

$$O = \begin{bmatrix} 000111222 & 000111222 \\ 012012012 & 120012210 \\ 012120201 & 012012021 \end{bmatrix}$$

Here the runs are the 18 columns. The components are the solutions to $x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \equiv 0$ and $\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, and so the defining relation is $I = ABC^2 = A^2B^2C$ for each component. Thus the wordlength pattern for each component is $(0, 0, 2)$, while the generalized wordlength pattern of the combined array, computed according to Xu and Wu (2001), is $(0, 0, 1/2)$.

The question suggested by this example is just what information about aliasing is encoded in the generalized wordlength pattern. We have seen that this pattern does capture the resolution of a design in the sense of Box and Hunter. What makes the wordlength pattern useful in the case of regular designs is the underlying aliasing structure, which is directly controlled by the defining words. We do not yet seem to have a comparable theory for nonregular designs, one

that would explain an example such as the one above. It would seem that Theorem 3.7 should be a natural part of such a theory.

The development leading up to our Theorem 3.7 depends directly on the property that a design is simple (or equireplicate). To extend it to non-simple designs would require extending to such designs the concept of aliasing in Definition 3.4. It is not clear at this time how to do this. Such an extension would be a larger goal of the theory.

Acknowledgments. We thank Jeb Willenbring and Dan Lutter for assistance with computing. We also thank the referees for correcting or clarifying references to the literature, and especially for drawing our attention to Cheng and Ye (2004). Finally, we are grateful to Associate Editor Manohar L. Aggarwal for his invaluable assistance.

References

- Beder, J.H., 1989. The problem of confounding in two-factor experiments. *Communications in Statistics: Theory and Methods* A18, 2165–2188. Correction, A23(7), 1994.
- Beder, J.H., 1998. On Rao’s inequalities for arrays of strength d . *Utilitas Mathematica* 54, 85–109.
- Beder, J.H., 2004. On the definition of effects in fractional factorial designs. *Utilitas Mathematica* 66, 47–60.
- Bose, R.C., 1947. Mathematical theory of the symmetrical factorial design. *Sankhyā* 8, 107–166.
- Box, G.E.P., Hunter, J.S., 1961. The 2^{k-p} fractional factorial designs. *Technometrics* 3, 311–351; 449–458.
- Box, G.E.P., Wilson, K.B., 1951. On the experimental attainment of optimal conditions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 13, 1–45.
- Cheng, S.W., Ye, K.Q., 2004. Geometric isomorphism and minimum aberration for factorial designs with quantitative factors. *The Annals of Statistics* 32, 2168–2185.
- Deng, L.Y., Tang, B., 1999. Generalized resolution and minimum aberration criteria for Plackett-Burman and other nonregular factorial designs. *Statistica Sinica* 9, 1071–1082.
- Dey, A., Mukerjee, R., 1999. *Fractional Factorial Plans*, Wiley, New York.
- Evangelaras, H., Koukouvinos, C., Dean, A.M., Dingus, C.A., 2005. Projection properties of certain three level orthogonal arrays. *Metrika* 62, 241–257.
- Fries, A., Hunter, W.G., 1980. Minimum aberration 2^{k-p} designs. *Technometrics* 22, 601–608.
- Hedayat, A.S., Sloane, N.J.A., Stufken, J., 1999. *Orthogonal arrays: Theory and applications*, Springer Verlag, New York.
- John, P.W.M., 1971. *Statistical Design and Analysis of Experiments*, Macmillan, New York.

- Ma, C.X., Fang, K.T., 2001. A note on generalized aberration in factorial designs. *Metrika* 53, 85–93.
- Raktoe, B.L., Hedayat, A., Federer, W.T., 1981. *Factorial Designs*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Rao, C.R., 1947. Factorial experiments derivable from combinatorial arrangements of arrays. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* Supplement, IX, 128–139.
- Tang, B., Deng, L.Y., 1999. Minimum G_2 -aberration criteria for nonregular fractional factorial designs. *The Annals of Statistics* 9, 1914–1926.
- Tjur, T., 1984. Analysis of variance models in orthogonal designs. *International Statistical Review* 52, 33–81. With discussion.
- Xu, H., Wu, C.F.J., 2001. Generalized minimum aberration for asymmetrical fractional factorial designs. *The Annals of Statistics* 29, 1066–1077.