

Enumeration of Row-Column Designs

Gerold Jäger
gerold.jager@umu.se

Klas Markström
klas.markstrom@umu.se

Denys Shcherbak
denys.shcherbak@umu.se

Lars-Daniel Öhman
lars-daniel.ohman@umu.se

Abstract

We computationally completely enumerate a number of types of row-column designs up to isotopism, including double, sesqui and triple arrays as known from the literature, and two newly introduced types that we call mono arrays and AO-arrays. We calculate autotopism group sizes for the designs we generate.

For larger parameter values, where complete enumeration is not feasible, we generate examples of some of the designs, and generate exhaustive lists of admissible parameters. For some admissible parameter sets, we prove non-existence results. We also give some explicit constructions of sesqui arrays, mono arrays and AO-arrays, and investigate connections to Youden rectangles and binary pseudo Youden designs.

1 Introduction

A classic object of study both in combinatorial design theory and practical experimental design is *balanced incomplete block designs* (BIBD:s). In such designs, blocks are unordered sets, but in the experimental design setting, *order* among elements in blocks is sometimes important, and designs with different types of ordering within blocks have likewise been studied, for example *Youden rectangles* introduced by Youden in [19]. The interplay between ordered and unordered designs is sometimes rather simple. For example, the elements in the blocks of any *symmetric* BIBD (SBIBD) can be ordered to become the columns of a Youden rectangle, and, vice versa, forgetting the ordering in the columns of a Youden rectangle yields an SBIBD.

A less well understood connection is between a type of designs introduced by Agrawal [2], now known as *triple arrays* on the one hand, and SBIBD:s

on the other hand, where Agrawal indirectly conjectured that any SBIBD can be used to construct a triple array. The converse, that existence of a triple array implies the existence of an SBIBD for corresponding parameters, was proven by McSorley et al. [16]. SBIBD:s have been studied extensively, but the literature on related ordered objects is more scarce.

In the present paper we therefore, for small parameters, completely enumerate several classes of *row-column designs*, that is, designs where blocks are interpreted as columns, and elements in blocks are ordered into rows. The term *two-way designs* has also been used in the literature for this class of designs, which includes triple arrays, but also other ordered designs, which we present below. In addition to the complete enumeration, we also provide examples of such designs produced heuristically for larger parameters, prove non-existence for a few parameter sets, and give some general constructions of families of row-column designs.

Our interest in these designs is mainly combinatorial, but they are also interesting from an applied experimental design point of view. The set of small examples of designs we produce are readily applicable as experimental designs, but may also prove useful as inspiration for further general constructions of families of designs.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give basic definitions and describe the notation used. In Section 3 we investigate what parameters are admissible for these designs and prove a non-existence result, followed by Section 4 where we prove some results on constructing sesqui- mono- and AO-arrays. In Section 5, we describe briefly the computational methods employed. Section 6 contains the main results from our computations, and Section 7 investigates connections to Youden rectangles and binary pseudo Youden designs. Section 8 concludes with two open questions.

2 Basic notation and definitions

2.1 Row-column designs

A *row-column design* is an $r \times c$ array on v symbols, where no symbol is used more than once in any row or any column, i.e., the design is *binary*. We shall also assume throughout that the array is *equireplicate* with replication number e , that is, each symbol appears exactly e times in the array.

Balanced incomplete block designs (BIBD:s) are a staple of combinatorial design theory, so we only briefly mention that we will infringe on the standard names of parameters, (v, b, r, k, λ) -BIBD (number of symbols,

number of blocks, number of blocks containing a given symbol, number of symbols in a block, number of blocks containing any 2 distinct symbols), or (v, k, λ) -BIBD for short, by using r not for the number of blocks, but for the number of rows in our row-column designs. The symbol v has the corresponding role in both BIBD:s and row-column designs.

Looking at the symbol sets in the single rows, or the single columns, a row-column design can satisfy additional intersection properties:

- (RR) Any pair of distinct rows contains λ_{rr} common symbols.
- (CC) Any pair of distinct columns contains λ_{cc} common symbols.
- (RC) Any pair of one row and one column contains λ_{rc} common symbols.

The property RC is usually referred to as *adjusted orthogonality*. The terminology for the row-column designs depends on which of these properties are satisfied. Treating these possibilities in a structured fashion, we shall begin with row-column designs satisfying all the properties, and then successively relax one or more of the properties.

Definition 2.1. A $(v, e, \lambda_{rr}, \lambda_{cc}, \lambda_{rc} : r \times c)$ triple array is an $r \times c$ row-column design on v symbols with replication number e , satisfying properties RR, CC and RC.

Triple arrays were introduced by Agrawal [2], though examples were known earlier. A good general introduction to the study of triple arrays is given by McSorley et al. in [16]. Clearly, the transpose of an $r \times c$ triple array is a $c \times r$ triple array, with parameters λ_{rr} and λ_{cc} interchanged.

Definition 2.2. A $(v, e, \lambda_{rr}, \lambda_{cc}, - : r \times c)$ double array is an $r \times c$ row-column design on v symbols with replication number e , satisfying properties RR and CC. If property RC is expressly forbidden to hold, the double array is called a proper double array.

Double arrays have generally been studied alongside of triple arrays, for example in [16], and any triple array is *a fortiori* also a double array (but of course not a *proper* double array). As for triple arrays, the transpose of a double array is again a double array.

Definition 2.3. A $(v, e, \lambda_{rr}, -, \lambda_{rc} : r \times c)$ sesqui array is an $r \times c$ row-column design on v symbols with replication number e , satisfying properties RR and RC. If property CC is expressly forbidden to hold, the sesqui array is called a proper sesqui array.

Sesqui arrays were introduced with this name in Bailey, Cameron and Nilson [6], though examples had appeared earlier, for instance in Bagchi [4]. With this definition, the transpose of a sesqui array is only then a sesqui array when it is a triple array. It seems unnecessary to introduce new terminology for a row-column design satisfying properties CC and RC, so we shall simply call such designs *transposed sesqui arrays*. A sesqui array with parameters $(v, e, \lambda_{rr}, -, \lambda_{rc} : r \times c)$ is then equivalent to a transposed sesqui array with parameters $(v, e, -, \lambda_{rr}, \lambda_{rc} : c \times r)$. Because of how we generate designs computationally, column by column, we mainly work with transposed sesqui arrays. Any triple array is clearly also a (transposed) sesqui array, but not a *proper* (transposed) sesqui array.

Definition 2.4. *A $(v, e, -, \lambda_{cc}, - : r \times c)$ mono array is an $r \times c$ row-column design on v symbols with replication number e , satisfying property CC. If properties RR and RC are expressly forbidden to hold, the mono array is called proper.*

Mono arrays have to our knowledge not been studied before. We include them here in order to be able to study the relation between the intersection conditions, and note that as for sesqui arrays, it makes sense to talk about *transposed mono arrays*. We are mainly concerned with the non-transposed variant. Also, any triple, double, or transposed sesqui array is also a mono array, but not a *proper* mono array.

Definition 2.5. *A $(v, e, -, -, \lambda_{rc} : r \times c)$ adjusted orthogonal array (AO-array for short) is an $r \times c$ row-column design on v symbols with replication number e , satisfying property RC. If properties RR and CC are expressly forbidden to hold, the AO-array is called proper.*

Transposes of AO-arrays are again AO-arrays. AO-arrays (our term) have been studied by e.g. Bagchi [3], under a range of slightly different names, sometimes without the assumption of equireplication.

2.2 Notions of equivalence

There are several possible notions of equivalence between the objects studied in the present paper. We shall consider two row-column designs A and B to be equivalent if a permutation of the rows, a permutation of the columns and a permutation of the symbols in the design A can yield the design B . This notion of equivalence is usually referred to as *isotopism*, so that A and B would be called isotopic. An isotopism that carries A to itself is called

an *autotopism*, and the set of autotopisms of a row-column design forms the *autotopism group*, in a standard way.

Isotopism is the most natural notion of equivalence in this setting, since the number of rows, the number of columns, and the number of symbols are generally all distinct, and therefore taking transposes or interchanging the roles of, e.g., symbols and rows is only possible in certain special cases. In our data, the only interesting case where some of these parameters coincide is when $r = c$. In these few instances, we have also investigated the number of equivalence classes, called *trisetopism classes*, we get when also allowing transposes. For a more in-depth discussion of different relevant notions of equivalence, see Egan and Wanless [12].

3 Parameter sets

To avoid trivial examples, we require that $r, c > 1$. Regarding v , if $v < \max\{r, c\}$, then the arrays can't be binary, but we also exclude $v = \max\{r, c\}$ to avoid including Latin rectangles and Youden rectangles, that have been enumerated by McKay and Wanless [14] and the current authors [13], respectively.

Similarly, if $v > rc$, then the arrays can't be equireplicate, but we also exclude the case $v = rc$, where the replication number would be $e = 1$, since such designs trivially exist, are unique up to isotopism, and are less interesting from a design point of view. The next possible integer value is $e = 2$, where we get $v = \frac{rc}{2}$. The range of values we are interested in for v is therefore $\max\{r, c\} < v \leq \frac{rc}{2}$.

3.1 Admissible parameters

Even apart from the initial observations and assumptions above, the parameters involved in row-column designs are not independent of each other. For example, equireplication immediately implies that $ev = rc$, by a standard double count. Depending on what further intersection properties we want to hold, there will be additional necessary divisibility conditions on the other parameters. Note that binarity does not impose any additional divisibility constraints.

Bagchi [4] observed that in any binary, equireplicate row-column design with adjusted orthogonality (property RC), the constant size λ_{rc} of the row-column intersections equals the replication number e . Therefore $\lambda_{rc} = e = \frac{rc}{v}$ holds for triple arrays, (proper, transposed) sesqui arrays and (proper) AO-arrays. Similarly, if row-row intersections have constant size, then $\lambda_{rr} =$

$\frac{c(e-1)}{(r-1)}$, and for constant size column-column intersections $\lambda_{cc} = \frac{r(e-1)}{(c-1)}$ (see McSorley et al. [16]).

Since all these parameters must be integers, this forces some rather restrictive divisibility conditions. As in the Handbook of Combinatorial Designs [9] for parameter sets for BIBD's, we use the term *admissible* for a set of parameters in this context (for a certain type of design), if the parameter set can't be ruled out on these basic divisibility conditions alone.

3.2 Average intersection sizes and non-existent proper arrays

The condition on λ_{rc} observed by Bagchi can be generalized slightly to designs without adjusted orthogonality. Let $\overline{\lambda_{rc}}$ be the average size of the row-column intersections in a row-column design.

Proposition 3.1. *In any equireplicate binary row-column design, $\overline{\lambda_{rc}} = e = \frac{rc}{v}$.*

Proof. Let I_{ij} denote the intersection between row i and column j , and let x be any symbol in the array. Since there are no repeats in any row or column, x appears in e columns, and in e rows, and so it appears in e^2 of the sets I_{ij} . The total number of symbols is v , so the sum of all the cardinalities of the I_{ij} is ve^2 . Since there are r rows and c columns, there are rc sets I_{ij} , and thus $ve^2 = rc\overline{\lambda_{rc}}$. Since $ev = rc$, we get $\overline{\lambda_{rc}} = e$. \square

Clearly, if $\overline{\lambda_{rc}} = \frac{rc}{v}$ is an integer, one way of attaining this as the average size of the row-column intersections is by all row-column intersections having constant size $\overline{\lambda_{rc}}$. A set of parameters is therefore admissible for exactly one of the following sets of design types:

- Only AO-arrays
- AO-arrays, mono arrays, and transposed sesqui arrays
- AO-arrays, transposed mono arrays, and sesqui arrays
- All designs considered here

Similarly as for $\overline{\lambda_{rc}}$, when v (number of symbols), r and c (number of rows and columns) have been set in a binary equireplicate array, using double counting arguments, the averages $\overline{\lambda_{rr}}$ and $\overline{\lambda_{cc}}$ can be calculated by $\overline{\lambda_{rr}} = \frac{c(e-1)}{(r-1)}$, and $\overline{\lambda_{cc}} = \frac{r(e-1)}{(c-1)}$. Using these averages, the possible sizes of intersections can exclude the possibility of some *proper* arrays.

Note that if $2r - v > \overline{\lambda_{rr}}$ or $2c - v > \overline{\lambda_{cc}}$, then the parameter sets are not admissible.

Proposition 3.2. *Let A be a binary, equireplicate $r \times c$ array on v symbols. If $2c - v = \overline{\lambda_{rr}} = \frac{c(e-1)}{(r-1)}$, then the property RR holds. If $2r - v = \overline{\lambda_{cc}} = \frac{r(e-1)}{(c-1)}$, then the property CC holds.*

Proof. With v symbols, any two rows of length c share at least $2c - v$ symbols. If this equals $\overline{\lambda_{rr}}$, all pairs of rows share exactly $\overline{\lambda_{rr}}$ symbols, so the row intersection property RR holds. A similar argument holds for the column intersection property CC. \square

In the range of parameters we investigate, Proposition 3.2 may be used to rule out the existence of proper AO-arrays for parameter sets (v, r, c) in

$$\{(6, 4, 3), (8, 6, 4), (9, 6, 3), (10, 8, 5), (12, 8, 3), (12, 9, 4), (12, 10, 6), (14, 12, 7)\}$$

and the corresponding transposes. We may also rule out proper mono arrays and proper transposed sesqui arrays for parameter sets (v, r, c) in

$$\{(6, 3, 4), (12, 4, 9)\}.$$

Remark 3.3. *Assuming that $1 < r \leq e$, the condition $2c - v = \overline{\lambda_{rr}} = \frac{c(e-1)}{(r-1)}$ in Proposition 3.2 can be rewritten as $r = e + 1$, by substituting $v = \frac{rc}{e}$ and simplifying. Correspondingly, the condition $2r - v = \overline{\lambda_{cc}} = \frac{r(e-1)}{(c-1)}$ can be rewritten as $c = e + 1$ if $c \neq 1$ and $c \leq e$.*

3.3 Component designs and non-existence

If a row-column design D has constant row-row intersection sizes, we may define a balanced incomplete block design, the *row design*, which we denote by $BIBD_R(D)$ or simply $BIBD_R$ if it is clear from the context what D is, in the following way.

Label the rows of D by R_1, R_2, \dots, R_r , and let them be the r symbols of $BIBD_R$. For each symbol x in D , define a block B_x in $BIBD_R$ by including R_i in B_x iff x appears in row R_i in D . All blocks in $BIBD_R$ have the same size e since D is binary and equireplicate, and each symbol R_i appears in c blocks, because each row contains c unique symbols. Each pair of symbols R_i and R_j in $BIBD_R$ appear together in λ_{rr} blocks, since any such pair of rows intersect in λ_{rr} symbols in D .

In standard parameter order for BIBD:s, the $BIBD_R$ has parameters $(r, v, c, e, \lambda_{rr})$, or shorter (r, e, λ_{rr}) (number of symbols, number of symbols

in a block, number of blocks containing any 2 distinct symbols). Similarly, if column-column intersection sizes are constant, we may define the *column design BIBD_C* which has parameters $(c, v, r, e, \lambda_{cc})$, or (c, e, λ_{cc}) for short.

Some further sets of parameters can be ruled out for mono, double, sesqui, and triple arrays, if the required row design or column design is known not to exist. For example, as pointed out by McSorley et al. in [16], there is no $(21, 7, 15)$ double array, since the corresponding column design *BIBD_C*, with parameters $(15, 21, 7, 5, 2)$, or $(15, 5, 2)$ for short, does not exist. It follows by the same argument that there is no transposed sesqui array on parameters $(21, 7, 15)$, and similarly no transposed sesqui arrays on parameter sets $(21, 14, 15)$, $(28, 8, 21)$, and $(28, 20, 21)$.

Even if the basic divisibility conditions are met, and the required component BIBD:s exist, this is not sufficient in general for existence of row-column designs. The smallest example of this is the parameter set $(6, 3, 4)$ which satisfies all the conditions mentioned above. On these parameters, however, there is no triple array, but there are double arrays, as observed in [16], and additionally, there are sesqui arrays and mono arrays.

4 Constructions of sesqui arrays and AO-arrays

In the literature, there are by now several constructions of triple arrays, but we will restrict our discussion here to sesqui arrays and AO-arrays. Bailey, Cameron and Nilson [6] gave two general constructions of families of sesqui arrays. One of these constructions is for $(n+1) \times n^2$ sesqui arrays on $n(n+1)$ symbols, based on two Latin squares of orders $n \times n$ and $(n+1) \times (n+1)$, and works for any $n \geq 2$. The other construction starts with a *biplane* (that is, a BIBD with the same number of blocks as symbols, $v = b$, and $\lambda = 2$) and a selected block B in the biplane. It gives, except for $k = 3$, a $k \times (v - k)$ sesqui array on $k(k - 1)/2$ symbols, given that a condition on the intersections of B with the other blocks is satisfied.

We now give a general construction for $r \times mc$ sesqui arrays, whenever there exists an $r \times c$ sesqui array, which does not have to be proper.

Construction 4.1. *Let S be a $(v, e, \lambda_{rr}, -, \lambda_{rc} : r \times c)$ sesqui array. Introduce v sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_v of distinct symbols, such that $|S_i| = m$ for all i .*

Replace each of the v symbols s_1, s_2, \dots, s_v in S with a row of length m , and fill all of the rows corresponding to symbol s_i with the symbols from S_i in arbitrary order to get an $r \times mc$ array A .

An example of Construction 4.1 where $m = 3$ is given in Figure 1. The “canonical” way of entering the symbols from S_i is to use the same order for each occurrence of S_i , but using different orders for the different occurrences of s_i also works. Note that the column-column intersections will differ in size, and that the differences will in some sense be maximized when using the canonical ordering for each S_i . When using the canonical order, the column design will be *disconnected* (that is, the column/symbol incidence structure is disconnected), but it is easy to produce arrays with connected column designs, as in Figure 1c. The connectedness of the row design follows from the the array being a sesqui array.

3	0	1
2	3	0
1	2	3
0	1	2

(a) A 4×3 sesqui array S

J	K	L	A	B	C	D	E	F
G	H	I	J	K	L	A	B	C
D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I

(b) The canonical 4×9 sesqui array received from S by Construction 4.1 for $m = 3$.

J	K	L	B	C	A	D	E	F
G	H	I	J	K	L	C	A	B
D	E	F	I	G	H	J	K	L
A	B	C	D	E	F	H	I	G

(c) An alternative 4×9 sesqui array received from S by Construction 4.1, with connected column design.

Figure 1: Applying Construction 4.1.

As can be seen in Figure 1, a trivial sesqui array (that is, with $v = r$) can yield a non-trivial sesqui array. For example, the construction can be used to produce an $n \times (m(n - 1))$ non-trivial sesqui array for any m and n , by starting with an $n \times (n - 1)$ Latin rectangle on n symbols, since all such Latin rectangles are also $(n, n - 1, \lambda_{rr} = n - 2, -, \lambda_{rc} = n - 1 : n \times (n - 1))$ sesqui arrays.

Theorem 4.2. *The array A in Construction 4.1 is an $r \times mc$ sesqui array with row-row intersection size $\lambda_{rr}^A = m\lambda_{rr}$, row-column intersection size*

$\lambda_{rc}^A = \lambda_{rc}$ and replication number e . If $m \geq 2$, the resulting sesqui array is proper.

Proof. It is clear that the construction can be carried out in the way described, given the sesqui array S .

No symbol in A is repeated in any row, since the newly introduced symbols from any S_i occur only at most once in any row, since s_i is only used at most once in any row in S . No symbol in A is repeated in any column, since S_i and S_j are disjoint if $i \neq j$, and no s_i is repeated in any column in S .

To see that A is equireplicate with replication number e , note that S is equireplicate with replication number e , by definition, and that each new symbol $\sigma_{ij} \in S_i$ occurs exactly once for each occurrence of s_i in S .

To see that the row-row intersection size in A is constant $\lambda_{rr}^A = m\lambda_{rr}$, note that the symbols common to two rows in A are the ones corresponding to the λ_{rr} symbols common to two rows in S , and each such symbol in S is replaced by the same set of m symbols when constructing A .

To see that the row-column intersection size in A is constant $\lambda_{rc}^A = \lambda_{rc}$, regardless of the order in which the symbols from the different S_i are entered into A , note that in S , each column intersects each row in λ_{rc} symbols, say the set S_{rc} , by definition. Any column in A contains exactly one symbol from each set S_k corresponding to a symbol $s_k \in S_{rc}$, and each row in A contains all the symbols from a set S_k corresponding to a symbol $s_k \in S_{rc}$. Therefore, the row-column intersection size in A is still λ_{rc} .

To see that the sesqui array received is *proper* if $m \geq 2$, note that within the m first columns, the column intersection size is zero. However, there is a column among the columns $m+1, m+2, \dots, 2m$ such that its intersection size with column 1 is non-zero. \square

Trying to introduce some other configuration of symbols in Construction 4.1 rather than just a row with the symbols from S_i will not yield a sesqui array, at least not in any straightforward way. Similarly, trying to mimic the construction for double or triple arrays, also does not seem to work in any straightforward manner. For mono arrays and AO-arrays, though, since the conditions on the resulting arrays are weaker, some more general constructions are possible.

Construction 4.3. Let S be a $(v_S, e_S, -, \lambda_{cc}^S, - : r \times c)$ mono array and T be a $(v_T, e_T, -, \lambda_{cc}^T, - : a \times b)$ mono array.

Introduce v_S sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{v_S} of distinct symbols, such that $|S_i| = v_T$ for all i . Replace each of the v_S symbols s_i in S with a $(v_T, e_T, -, -, \lambda_{rc}^T :$

$a \times b$) mono array isotopic to T , on the symbol set S_i , producing an $ra \times bc$ array A on $v_S v_T$ symbols.

Construction 4.4. Let S be a $(v_S, e_S, -, -, \lambda_{rc}^S : r \times c)$ AO-array and T be a $(v_T, e_T, -, -, \lambda_{rc}^T : a \times b)$ AO-array T .

Introduce v_S sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{v_S} of distinct symbols, such that $|S_i| = v_T$ for all i . Replace each of the v_S symbols s_i in S with a $(v_T, e_T, -, -, \lambda_{rc}^T : a \times b)$ AO-array isotopic to T on the symbol set S_i , producing an $ra \times bc$ array A on $v_S v_T$ symbols.

The proofs that Constructions 4.3 and 4.4 yield new mono arrays and AO-arrays, respectively, are similar to that of Theorem 4.2, and are omitted. The resulting designs can rather easily be made to have connected row design (and column design) if the number of rows (columns) in at least one of the arrays used is strictly greater than 1, but we will not go into the details here.

As in Construction 4.2, trivial designs S and T can give rise to non-trivial designs, for example by using Latin rectangles. A sufficient condition for the resulting array to be proper is that at least one of the arrays used in the construction is proper, but usually the resulting arrays do not satisfy additional intersection properties even if both arrays are non-proper. In some cases, such as 4×9 arrays on 12 symbols, proper AO-arrays are excluded by Proposition 3.2, but Construction 4.4 is still applicable, using a 4×3 Latin rectangle and a 1×3 rectangle, and in this case yields a proper sesqui array. In fact, Construction 4.4 can in a sense always be used, as we prove in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.5. *Construction 4.4 can be used to produce AO-arrays for all parameter sets admissible for AO-arrays.*

Proof. Suppose v, e, r, c are admissible parameters for a non-trivial AO-array, so that $v > r$, $v > c$ and $ve = rc$. Write $v = mn$ where $m|r$ and $n|c$, where $m, n \geq 1$ and let a and b be given by $r = am$ and $c = bn$. It follows that $mn = v > r = am$, so $n > a$, and similarly that $m > b$.

We see then that Construction 4.4 is applicable, using an $m \times b$ Latin rectangle on m symbols, and an $a \times n$ Latin rectangle on n symbols, yielding an $am \times bn = r \times c$ AO-array on $mn = v$ symbols. \square

Another way of using cyclic Latin squares, that is, Latin squares that are group tables of the cyclic group, to produce non-trivial AO-arrays is the following. Note that cyclic Latin squares exist for any order.

Construction 4.6. Let k be a positive integer and L be a $2k \times 2k$ cyclic Latin square L on symbols $1, 2, \dots, 2k$ with rows and columns indexed by $1, 2, \dots, 2k$. Construct an array A as follows:

In row i of L , for positions $(i-1)k - (i-2), \dots, ik - (i-1)$ taken modulo $2k$, if the symbol in a position is s , replace it with a new symbol s' .

As an example, a $(24, 12, 12)$ AO-array constructed using Construction 4.6 is given in Figure 2. Unfortunately, both the row design and the column design are disconnected.

1'	2'	3'	4'	5'	6'	7	8	9	10	11	12
2	3	4	5	6	7'	8'	9'	10'	11'	12'	1
3'	4'	5'	6'	7	8	9	10	11	12	1'	2'
4	5	6	7'	8'	9'	10'	11'	12'	1	2	3
5'	6'	7	8	9	10	11	12	1'	2'	3'	4'
6	7'	8'	9'	10'	11'	12'	1	2	3	4	5
7	8	9	10	11	12	1'	2'	3'	4'	5'	6'
8'	9'	10'	11'	12'	1	2	3	4	5	6	7'
9	10	11	12	1'	2'	3'	4'	5'	6'	7	8
10'	11'	12'	1	2	3	4	5	6	7'	8'	9'
11	12	1'	2'	3'	4'	5'	6'	7	8	9	10
12'	1	2	3	4	5	6	7'	8'	9'	10'	11'

Figure 2: A 12×12 AO-array on 24 symbols constructed using Construction 4.6.

Theorem 4.7. For any positive integer k , Construction 4.6 produces a $(4k, k, -, -, k : 2k \times 2k)$ AO-array A .

Proof. It is clear that A is equireplicate, and each symbol occurs k times. It is binary since L was already binary.

With the specified pattern for replacing symbols with primed symbols, odd rows will have symbols $1, 2, \dots, k$ replaced, and even rows will have symbols $k+1, k+2, \dots, 2k$ replaced. Odd columns will have symbols $1, 3, \dots, 2\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 1, 2\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 2, \dots, 2k - 2, 2k$ replaced (i.e., the odd symbols below k and the even symbols above $k + 1$), and even columns will have the complement of these symbols replaced.

It is easy to check then that the intersection between any combination of a row and a column in A is k . \square

5 Computational methods

In this section, we briefly describe the different computational methods employed. We generated lists of admissible parameters for all types of arrays by a brute force search checking all divisibility conditions, and ran our complete enumeration code both for all admissible parameters sets in the range up to $v = 14$ and a few larger sets of parameters. We also ran the complete enumeration code for some sets of inadmissible parameters to check correctness, and indeed found no designs on inadmissible parameter sets.

5.1 Complete enumeration

The basic method for our complete generation routine for an $r \times c$ row-column design on v symbols and replication number e is quite straightforward: We extend a partial array column by column, and then perform an isotopism reduction where only one lexicographically minimal representative for each isotopism class is kept. As a byproduct of this procedure, we also get the autotopism group sizes.

Since our code is adapted to work primarily with constant column intersection sizes, we did not separately enumerate sesqui arrays and transposed mono arrays. Partial objects were immediately rejected if the requirement on constant column intersections was not met. The AO-arrays, where neither row nor column intersections are required to be constant, were enumerated using the same code, but here we did not use constant column intersection sizes to reject partial objects.

In the extension step, aside from constant column intersection sizes, we also took into account equireplication, so that no symbol was used too often, and we checked that the other target intersection sizes (row-row, row-column) were not exceeded by the partial objects.

When the full number of columns was reached, we checked if λ_{rr} and λ_{rc} are constant, to classify all received arrays as triple, (proper) double, (proper) transposed sesqui, (proper) mono, or AO-arrays. This procedure gives all non-isotopic row-column designs on a particular set of parameters.

In addition to checking isotopism, since the 4×4 AO-arrays on 8 symbols and the 6×6 AO-arrays on 9 symbols can be transposed, for these arrays we separately computed the number of distinct equivalence classes when also taking transposition into account.

We separately implemented an algorithm for generating our row-column designs from the corresponding unordered block designs, by selecting consecutive systems of distinct representatives. See Bailey [5] for further details

on this algorithm. It turns out that this method is not significantly more effective than our main method. The main limitation lies in the number of partial objects seen in the search and the number of these become unmanageable for both methods. However, the results from both methods coincide for all parameter sets for which we ran both algorithms and so the second method provides another correctness check.

The algorithms and methods used were implemented in C++ and the most taxing computations were run in a parallelized version on the Kebnekaise and Abisko supercomputers at High Performance Computing Centre North (HPC2N). The total run time for all the data in the paper was several core-years.

5.2 Heuristic search — Existence questions

For a range of larger parameters where complete generation of row-column designs is not feasible because of the large number of designs, we employ a heuristic method to find examples of row-column designs of the different types. Because there are already a reasonably good number of known triple and double arrays with larger parameters, we restrict this part of our investigation to transposed sesqui and AO-arrays.

The heuristic search starts with a random equireplicate array A with the selected parameters. In this array, as long as there exists a pair of cells such that switching the symbols in these two cells decreases the number of violations of the conditions placed on the type of row-column design currently under consideration (transposed sesqui array or AO-array), we perform such a switch and iterate. Whenever the number of violations reaches zero, the heuristic search algorithm outputs the resulting array and terminates. When there are no more good switches to perform, the heuristic search algorithm restarts with a new array A' . If the heuristic search algorithm produces an array with no violations, we check if the design produced is proper.

5.3 Proof of non-existence using a Boolean satisfiability model

Our methods for complete enumeration are not well suited for ruling out existence of designs on larger parameter sets. We therefore also modeled row-column designs using Boolean satisfiability.

A rather straightforward selection of variables and SAT clauses and pseudo-Boolean constraints, i.e., linear constraints over Boolean variables, then ensure that the desired properties are forced to hold, adapted to the type of design currently investigated (triple, double, sesqui, mono or AO-

array). We used the MINISAT+ solver, which is adapted for SAT problems that make use of pseudo-Boolean constraints. See Eén and Sörensson [11] for the theory and [10] for the source code of the solver.

5.4 Checking correctness

Our regimen for checking the correctness of our calculations included many standard protocols. Some correctness checks are mentioned elsewhere in the present paper, and here we mention some further checks.

We wrote implementations in Mathematica with which we performed an independent generation of the complete enumeration data for small sizes, in order to help verify the correctness of the C++ implementation.

Where previous enumeration results were available, we checked that our computational results matched those previously found. This included in particular the number of 5×6 triple arrays (see Phillips, Preece and Wallis [18]).

Bagchi [3] claimed that there are exactly 3 binary, equireplicate row-column designs on 6 symbols, 3 rows and 4 columns, up to isomorphism (which is not explicitly defined there) and gave these three arrays. We have rediscovered these three arrays in our computational results, two of which are double arrays, and one of which is a sesqui array. We additionally found one more sesqui array and 3 transposed mono arrays. We double-checked all the additional arrays we found, and they were indeed correct and non-isotopic examples.

When there was a theoretical result available, including such simple observations as the fact that there is a one-to-one correspondence between $r \times c$ and $c \times r$ proper double arrays, in the full enumeration we sometimes still generated both sets separately, and checked that the results matched. This includes the calculation of the autotopism groups for double, triple and AO-arrays.

6 Computational results and analysis

We now turn to the results and analysis of our computational work. With some exceptions, due to size restrictions, all the data we generated is available for download at [1]. Further details about the organization of the data are given there.

6.1 The number of row-column designs for $v \leq 14$

We completely enumerated the number of non-isotopic proper triple, double, (transposed) sesqui, (transposed) mono and AO-arrays for all of the admissible parameter sets up to $v = 10$, with the exception of 8×5 mono arrays and the corresponding transposes which were too numerous, about half of the admissible parameter sets for $v = 12$, and for some further types of arrays with $v = 14$ and $v = 15$. The limiting factor was generally the number of partial objects.

The resulting numbers up to $v \leq 14$ are given in Table 1. An EX in the table indicates that full enumeration was too taxing, but we have found such arrays either by extending some of the partial objects found in an attempt to perform complete enumeration, or in our heuristic search. Note that we have excluded potential rows and columns in the table where there are no admissible parameters for any of the designs. In addition to $v \leq 14$, we note in Table 2 that there are 3 instances of 5×6 proper transposed sesqui arrays on 15 symbols.

For $(v, r, c) = (10, 5, 6)$, there is no proper transposed sesqui array, even though there are all other types of designs. We have no clean and simple proof for why this is so, which would generalize to other larger parameter sets.

When regarding transposes as “equivalent”, which is only relevant for the square arrays, there are 12 different *tristotopism classes* of 4×4 AO-arrays on 8 symbols, and 26 632 different *tristotopism classes* of 6×6 AO-arrays on 9 symbols (see Table 8 in Appendix A).

6.2 Parameter sets with $v \neq r + c - 1$

McSorley et al. [16] proved that no triple array can have $v < r + c - 1$, and asked if a *double* array can ever have $v < r + c - 1$. They also gave the so far only known example of a triple array with $v > r + c - 1$, a $TA(35, 3, 5, 1, 3 : 7 \times 15)$. Recall that, as observed in Section 3.2, parameters admissible for double arrays are automatically admissible for triple arrays. In our search for admissible parameter sets, we also looked in the range excluded by the inequality $v < r + c - 1$ for triple arrays, and there are no *admissible* parameter sets for double/triple arrays with $v < r + c - 1$ for $v \leq 100\,000$. This leads us to ask the following rather number theoretical question:

Question 6.1. *Let v, r, c, e be integers satisfying $ev = rc$, and suppose that both $\lambda_{rr} = \frac{c(e-1)}{r-1}$ and $\lambda_{cc} = \frac{r(e-1)}{c-1}$ are integers. Does it then always hold*

v	e	$r \times c$	MA	SA^T	MA^T	SA	DA	TA	AO	
6	2	3×4	–	–	3	2	2	0	–	
		4×3	3	2	–	–	2	0	–	
8	2	4×4							20	
	3	4×6			12 336	113			–	
		6×4	12 336	113					–	
9	2	3×6			104	5			–	
		6×3	104	5				–		
	4	6×6							53 215	
10	2	4×5	189	1					45	
		5×4			189	1			45	
	3	5×6	362 120	0	8 364 560	49	24 663	7	8707	
		6×5	8 364 560	49	362 120	0	24 663	7	8707	
	4	5×8			EX	1 549 129			–	
		8×5	EX	1 549 129					–	
12	2	3×8			4367	15			–	
		8×3	4367	15				–		
		4×6			29 695	20			312	
		6×4	29 698	20					312	
	3	4×9	–	–	EX	249 625	2893	1	–	
		9×4	EX	249 625	–	–	2893	1	–	
		6×6							EX	
	4	6×8							EX	
		8×6							EX	
	5	6×10			EX	EX			–	
		10×6	EX	EX					–	
	6	8×9	EX	EX					EX	
		9×8			EX	EX			EX	
	14	2	4×7							1632
			7×4							1632
3		6×7	EX	44 602					EX	
		7×6			EX	44 602			EX	
4		7×8	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	
		8×7	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	
5		7×10							EX	
		10×7							EX	
6		7×12			EX	EX			–	
		12×7	EX	EX					–	

Table 1: All admissible parameter sets up to $v = 14$, with existence and the number of non-isotopic proper row-column designs of different types. A dash “–” indicates that the existence is ruled out by Proposition 3.2, and an “EX” indicates that we have found examples of such arrays but have no complete enumeration. An empty cell indicates that the parameter set is not admissible.

that $v \geq r + c - 1$? In other words, are there admissible parameter sets for double/triple arrays that satisfy $v < r + c - 1$?

It can be seen in Table 1 that for mono, sesqui and AO-arrays, there are rather small admissible parameter sets both with $v < r + c - 1$ and $v > r + c - 1$, and indeed examples of such arrays, so relaxing either the condition on λ_{rr} or λ_{cc} in Question 6.1 gives a negative answer. For $v < r + c - 1$, the smallest such examples are $v = 8$, where there are both proper mono arrays and transposed sesqui arrays of order 6×4 , and $v = 9$, where there are AO-arrays of order 6×6 . For $v > r + c - 1$, the smallest examples are $v = 8$, where there are AO-arrays of order 4×4 , and $v = 9$, where there are both proper mono arrays and transposed sesqui arrays of order 6×3 . In our further search for admissible larger parameters, we found numerous examples of both $v < r + c - 1$ and $v > r + c - 1$ for sesqui, mono and AO-arrays.

6.3 Existence questions for $v \geq 15$

We present data on the existence of transposed sesqui arrays for $15 \leq v \leq 32$ in Table 2 and AO-arrays for $15 \leq v \leq 32$ in Table 3. Table 2 includes all admissible parameter sets, that is, parameters that were not ruled out by divisibility conditions, as detailed above.

Observation 6.2. *For $(15, 6, 10)$, there is no proper transposed sesqui array. This was established using the SAT-model. There are, however, proper AO-arrays including some found in the heuristic search. This is noted with the label AO in Table 2. There are also triple arrays on these parameters, as noted by the label T in Table 2.*

Observation 6.3. *For $(15, 9, 10)$, there is no transposed sesqui array. This was established using the SAT-model. There are, however, proper AO-arrays, including some found in the heuristic search. This is noted with the label AO in Table 2.*

Note that in Table 2 there are 8 possible parameter sets for transposed sesqui arrays up to $n = 16$. The parameters $(15, 9, 10)$ are inadmissible as observed above, but for most of the remaining 7 parameter sets, the heuristic search found at least 20 non-isotopic transposed sesqui arrays. In general, the heuristic search finds examples that do not come from the constructions.

(v, r, c)		(v, r, c)		(v, r, c)		(v, r, c)	
(15, 10, 3)	C_P, H	(21, 14, 3)	C_P, H	(26, 6, 13)	C_P	(30, 20, 3)	C_P, H
(15, 12, 5)	C_P, H	(21, 6, 7)	C_P, H	(26, 8, 13)	C_P	(30, 15, 4)	C_P, H
(15, 5, 6)	3	(21, 9, 7)	C_P, H	(26, 12, 13)	C_P	(30, 12, 5)	C_P, H
(15, 10, 6)	H, T	(21, 12, 7)	C_P, H	(26, 14, 13)	C_P, T	(30, 18, 5)	C_P, H
(15, 6, 10)	AO, T	(21, 15, 7)	C_P, H	(26, 18, 13)	C_P	(30, 24, 5)	C_P, H
(15, 9, 10)	AO	(21, 18, 7)	C_P, H	(26, 20, 13)	C_P	(30, 10, 6)	C_P, H
(16, 12, 4)	C_P, H	(21, 7, 15)	--	(26, 24, 13)	C_P	(30, 15, 6)	C_P, H
(16, 14, 8)	C_P, H	(21, 14, 15)	--	(26, 13, 14)	?, T	(30, 20, 6)	C_P, H
(18, 12, 3)	C_P, H	(22, 10, 11)	C_P	(27, 18, 3)	C_P, H	(30, 25, 6)	C_P, H, T
(18, 9, 4)	C_P, H	(22, 12, 11)	C_P, T	(27, 24, 9)	C_P, H	(30, 9, 10)	C_P
(18, 15, 6)	C_P, H	(22, 20, 11)	C_P, H	(28, 21, 4)	C_P, H	(30, 12, 10)	C_P
(18, 8, 9)	C_P, H	(22, 11, 12)	?, T	(28, 12, 7)	C_P, H	(30, 18, 10)	C_P
(18, 10, 9)	C_P, T	(24, 16, 3)	C_P, H	(28, 16, 7)	C_P	(30, 21, 10)	C_P, T
(18, 16, 9)	C_P, H	(24, 12, 4)	C_P, H	(28, 24, 7)	C_P, H	(30, 27, 10)	C_P, H
(18, 9, 10)	?, T	(24, 18, 4)	C_P, H	(28, 7, 8)	H	(30, 14, 15)	C_P
(20, 15, 4)	C_P, H	(24, 20, 6)	C_P, H	(28, 14, 8)	C_P	(30, 16, 15)	C_P, T
(20, 8, 5)	C_P, H	(24, 21, 8)	C_P, H	(28, 21, 8)	?	(30, 28, 15)	C_P, H
(20, 12, 5)	C_P, H	(24, 8, 9)	C_P	(28, 26, 14)	C_P	(30, 15, 16)	?, T
(20, 16, 5)	C_P, H, T	(24, 16, 9)	C_P, T	(28, 8, 21)	--	(30, 10, 21)	?, T
(20, 10, 6)	C_P, H	(24, 22, 12)	C_P, H	(28, 20, 21)	--	(30, 20, 21)	?
(20, 18, 10)	C_P, H	(24, 9, 16)	?, T			(30, 6, 25)	-, T
(20, 5, 16)	-, T	(24, 15, 16)	?			(30, 24, 25)	?
(20, 15, 16)	?	(25, 20, 5)	C_P, H			(32, 24, 4)	C_P, H
						(32, 28, 8)	C_P, H
						(32, 12, 16)	C_P
						(32, 20, 16)	C_P
						(32, 30, 16)	C_P

Table 2: Existence of proper transposed sesqui arrays for admissible parameter sets with $15 \leq v \leq 32$ symbols. An “H” means that we found such designs in the heuristic search. The label “ C_P ” means that such an array can be constructed using the transposed version of Construction 4.1. A “-” indicates that the existence of a proper array is excluded by Proposition 3.2. A “--” indicates that the required column BIBD is non-existent, so no such proper SA^T exists. An “AO” indicates that we proved that no such SA^T exists using the SAT-model, but that we found a proper AO-array on these parameters. A “?” means that the heuristic search did not find an example, the parameter set is not covered by any construction, but we cannot rule out existence. An additional “T” indicates that there are known triple arrays.

(v, r, c)		(v, r, c)		(v, r, c)	
(15, 5, 9)	H	(20, 4, 10)	H	(24, 6, 8)	H
(15, 10, 12)	H	(20, 8, 10)	H	(24, 6, 12)	H
(16, 4, 8)	H	(20, 8, 15)	H	(24, 6, 16)	H
(16, 6, 8)	H	(20, 10, 10)	H, C_S	(24, 8, 12)	H
(16, 8, 8)	H, C_S	(20, 10, 12)		(24, 8, 15)	
(16, 8, 10)	H	(20, 10, 14)		(24, 8, 18)	H
(16, 8, 12)	H	(20, 10, 16)		(24, 10, 12)	
(16, 12, 12)		(20, 12, 15)		(24, 12, 12)	C_S
(18, 6, 6)	H, C_S	(21, 6, 14)	H	(24, 12, 14)	
(18, 6, 9)	H	(21, 9, 14)	H	(24, 12, 16)	
(18, 6, 12)	H	(21, 12, 14)		(24, 12, 18)	
(18, 9, 12)	H	(21, 14, 18)		(24, 12, 20)	
(18, 9, 14)	H	(22, 4, 11)	H	(24, 16, 18)	
(18, 12, 12)	C_S	(22, 6, 11)	H	(24, 16, 21)	
(18, 12, 15)		(22, 8, 11)	H	(24, 18, 20)	
		(22, 11, 14)			
		(22, 11, 16)			
		(22, 11, 18)			

Table 3: Existence of proper AO-arrays with $r \leq c$ on $15 \leq v \leq 24$ symbols, for parameter sets only admissible for AO-arrays. The label “H” means that we found such designs in the heuristic search. The label “ C_S ” means that such a design can be constructed using Construction 4.6. Note that Construction 4.4 is also applicable for any admissible parameter set.

6.4 Autotopism group orders

Data on the distribution of autotopism group orders are collected in Appendix A, in Tables 5 (for double and triple arrays), 6 (for mono arrays), 7 (for transposed sesqui arrays), and 8 (for AO-arrays). We see that generally the most common autotopism group order is 1, but that there are also some very symmetric objects.

The designs constructed using Constructions 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4 retain the autotopisms inherited from the component arrays. For example, if the AO-array A is constructed from AO-arrays B and C using the canonical ordering, and denoting by $Aut(X)$ the autotopism group of the array X , the direct product of $Aut(B)$ and $Aut(C)$ is a subgroup of $Aut(A)$.

7 Relation to other design types

There is a rather rich flora of other closely related design types with ordered blocks. Here we briefly investigate the relation between, on the one hand, the row-column designs in the present paper, and on the other hand, Youden rectangles and binary Pseudo Youden designs.

7.1 Relation to Youden rectangles

An (n, k, λ) Youden rectangle is a binary $k \times n$ array on n symbols, where each pair of columns have exactly $\lambda = k(k-1)/(n-1)$ symbols in common, or, equivalently, where each pair of symbols appears together in exactly λ columns. Some of the arrays treated in the present paper can be constructed from a Youden rectangle Y with suitable parameters, by picking a column C in Y with symbol set S , removing all the symbols in S from Y , removing column C , and then exchanging the roles of columns and symbols. Regarding parameters, an (n, k, λ) Youden rectangle gives rise to an array on $v = n - 1$ symbols, $r = k$ rows, $c = n - k$ columns in this way. It was proved by Nilson and Öhman in [17] that the resulting array using this transformation is always binary, equireplicate with replication number $e = k - \lambda$, and has constant column/column intersections of size $\lambda_{cc} = \lambda$, that is, it is a mono array. It was also proven there that any triple array with $\lambda_{cc} = 2$ can be produced from a suitable Youden rectangle in this way.

In [13] the present authors completely enumerated Youden rectangles for small parameters, and investigated which rectangles give rise to triple arrays, double arrays and transposed sesqui arrays using the transformation described above. These previous results (numerators) are summarized in

Table 4, together with the total number (denominators) of designs of the appropriate type that we found in the present enumeration. We see that for some but not all parameters, we receive all triple and proper double arrays in this way, but not all proper transposed sesqui arrays for any of the parameters in this range. It was asked by Nilson and Öhman in [17] if any Youden rectangle yields a double array by this transformation at least for *some* column. The present authors answered this in the negative by providing counterexamples in [13], and we can now supplement this by observing that not all double arrays can be constructed in this way.

$YR(n, k, \lambda)$	Array params.	TA	DA	SA^T
(7,3,1)	(6 : 3 × 4)	0/0	1/2	0/0
(7,4,2)	(6 : 4 × 3)	0/0	2/2	1/2
(11,5,2)	(10 : 5 × 6)	7/7	17 642/24 663	0/0
(11,6,3)	(10 : 6 × 5)	7/7	24 663/24 663	34/49
(13,4,1)	(12 : 4 × 9)	0/1	192/2893	0/0

Table 4: The proportion of proper row-column designs that can be constructed from Youden rectangles by removing a column, all the symbols therein, and then exchanging the roles of symbols and columns.

In the course of our computations for Table 4, we rediscovered (see our previous paper [13]) some highly symmetric Youden rectangles that give rise to a triple array for any choice of removed column. We also noted in [13] that there are examples of Youden rectangles that do not yield double arrays for any choice of removed column. Between these extremes, we also found Youden rectangles that give double arrays when removing some column.

7.2 Relation to binary pseudo Youden designs

A class of row-column designs called *Pseudo Youden designs* (PYD) was introduced by Cheng [8]. Adding the assumption of binarity, a *binary* PYD is an $r \times r$ binary and equireplicate row-column design on v symbols, denoted by $PYD(v : r \times r)$, such that when taking the rows and columns as $2r$ blocks, they form a BIBD, that is, any pair of symbols occurs in a constant number of blocks. Since block sizes in a BIBD are constant, the row-column design has to be square, that is, $r = c$, in order to be a PYD. The replication number of symbols in the row-column design, $e = \frac{r^2}{v}$, has to be an integer, and the symbol replication in the corresponding BIBD will be twice this

number, since each entry is counted once among the rows, and once among the columns. Additionally, the pair replication number in the BIBD $\lambda = 2e(r-1)/(v-1)$ must be integer, by standard BIBD theory, where we note that e and r are not the parameter names usually used for BIBD:s.

Cheng [7] constructed an infinite family of binary $PYD(s^2 : s(s+1)/2 \times s(s+1)/2)$ for $s \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ where s is a prime or prime power, but we have found no general characterization of admissible parameters for PYD:s in the literature. We therefore prove the following proposition, which covers all the parameter sets in Cheng's construction.

Proposition 7.1. *Let s_i be the i :th odd number, and t_i be the i :th even triangular number. Then for $i \geq 2$, $v = s_i^2$ symbols and $r = t_i$ is a set of admissible parameters for an $r \times r$ PYD.*

Proof. Let e be the replication number in the row-column designs (to be calculated), and consequently $2e$ be the replication number in the BIBD corresponding to these PYD parameters.

The standard divisibility conditions for the BIBD give that we must satisfy $2ve = br$, where $v = s_i^2$ is the number of symbols, $b = 2t_i$ is the number of blocks in the BIBD, and $r = t_i$ is the size of the blocks. Additionally, for the pair replication number λ in the BIBD we must have $\lambda(v-1) = 2e(r-1)$.

The i :th odd square can be written as $s_i^2 = (2i-1)^2$, and the i :th even triangular number can be written as $(2i-1)(2i-1 - (-1)^{(i-1)})/2$. The replication number in the row-column design will then be $e = t_i^2/s_i^2 = (2i-1 - (-1)^{(i-1)})^2/4$, which is clearly integer since the numerator is a square of an even number and non-zero if $i \geq 2$, and the corresponding replication number of the BIBD is $2e = (2i-1 - (-1)^{(i-1)})^2/2$, which is of course also integer and non-zero.

The pair replication number in the BIBD will then be

$$\lambda = \frac{2e(r-1)}{v-1} = \frac{(2i-1 - (-1)^{(i-1)})^2((2i-1)(2i-1 - (-1)^{(i-1)}))/2 - 1}{2((2i-1)^2 - 1)}.$$

For convenience, we treat odd and even i separately. In the even case, by some basic algebra, the expression for λ simplifies to $i(2i+1)/2$, which is clearly integer. In the odd case, we instead get $(i-1)(2i-3)/2$, which again is integer and non-zero for $i \geq 2$.

Since all divisibility criteria for BIBD are thus met, we conclude that the parameters are admissible. \square

We note that the replication numbers of the row-column design parameters are consecutive squares of even numbers, but they only go up for every

second increase of i . We also ran a brute-force search for other admissible PYD parameters, and up to $v = 367^2$ there are no such parameters for anything other than v being an odd square. However, for some values of i , the first being $i = 17$, we found other possible dimensions for the PYD. For $i = 17$, the main series of parameters given in Proposition 7.1 predicts $PYD(289 : 136 \times 136)$, but additionally, $PYD(289 : 204 \times 204)$ is also admissible. For $i = 99$ we found the first instance of three admissible parameter sets, namely $PYD(99 : 3465 \times 3465)$, $PYD(99 : 4950 \times 4950)$, and $PYD(99 : 6930 \times 6930)$, where $r = 4950$ is what Proposition 7.1 predicts.

Among the parameter sets admissible for PYD:s, some are admissible for AO-arrays, but as we now prove, none of the other types of row-column designs we treat here can be square in the non-trivial range for v . Note that for $r = v$, we get a Latin square, which trivially satisfies all the intersection conditions.

Proposition 7.2. *Suppose $r = c$, $r < v < r^2$ and the parameters (v, r, r) are admissible for a row-column design A . Then A is a proper AO-array.*

Proof. As observed in Section 3.2, if a parameter set is admissible for some row-column design, then it is admissible for an AO-array, so λ_{rc} is integer.

If we additionally want, say, $\overline{\lambda_{rr}} = \frac{r(e-1)}{r-1}$ to be integer, $r-1$ clearly has to divide $e-1$. If $e = 1$, we get an array where each symbol appears only once, which trivially is a triple array, but since $v < r^2$, it holds that $e > 1$, and it follows that for some integer $a \geq 1$, $e-1 = a(r-1)$. Substituting $e = \frac{r^2}{v}$ and solving for a , it follows that $1 \leq a = (r^2 - v)/(vr - v)$, so $r \geq v$, a contradiction to the assumption that $r < v$.

Since $\overline{\lambda_{cc}} = \overline{\lambda_{rr}} = \frac{r(e-1)}{r-1}$ in a square design, the same argument holds if we instead assume that $\overline{\lambda_{cc}}$ is integer. It follows that A is a proper AO-array. \square

For square AO-arrays, we have fully enumerated 4×4 AO-arrays on 8 symbols and 6×6 AO-arrays on 9 symbols. By Proposition 4.5, AO-arrays exist for any admissible parameter set, and we additionally constructed 12×12 AO-arrays on 16, 18 and 24 symbols, respectively, using Construction 4.6. In our heuristic search, we have also found additional examples of AO-arrays of sizes 6×6 on 12 or 18 symbols, 8×8 on 16 symbols, and 10×10 on 20 symbols (see Table 3).

Most of these parameters sets are ruled out for PYD:s, since the corresponding BIBD does not exist. In particular, an $r \times r$ AO-array on v symbols and replication number e would give rise to a $(v, 2r, 2e, r, \frac{2e(r-1)}{v-1})$ -BIBD, or

0	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	0	4	6	7
2	3	8	6	5	0
3	4	7	5	8	1
7	8	5	2	1	6
8	6	4	7	0	3

Figure 3: A 6×6 AO-array on 9 symbols that is also a PYD.

$(v, r, \frac{2e(r-1)}{v-1})$ -BIBD for short. Among our examples, this only leaves 6×6 AO-arrays on 9 symbols as candidates for being PYD:s.

McSorley and Philips [15] enumerated and analyzed in great detail all 6×6 PYD:s on 9 symbols. They found 696 non-isotopic PYD:s, which reduced to 348 species when allowing transposes, since no PYD was found to be isotopic to its own transpose.

Among our data, 157 of the 53 125 non-isotopic 6×6 AO-arrays on 9 symbols were found to also satisfy the PYD condition, one of which is given in Figure 3, and we found that this reduces to 153 AO-arrays when considering transposes to be equivalent. We note that this shows that not all PYD:s are AO-arrays, and that not all AO-arrays on suitable parameters are PYD:s. Construction 4.4 does not in general yield PYD:s. In [15], several further properties of 6×6 PYD:s are investigated, but such further investigations of the AO-arrays are beyond the scope of the present paper.

8 Open questions

It can be observed in Table 1 that there are only a few admissible parameter sets for which the corresponding design does not exist. One such set, which has already been discussed in the literature is $(6, 3, 4)$, for which there exists no triple array. The other parameter set in Table 1 is $(10, 5, 6)$, where there are no proper transposed sesqui arrays, and $(10, 6, 5)$ where there are no proper sesqui arrays. We have also observed above in Observations 6.2 and 6.3 that there are no proper transposed sesqui arrays on parameters $(15, 6, 10)$ and $(15, 9, 10)$. In all these cases, the relevant component designs exist. This leads us to ask the following question.

Question 8.1. *Is there some ‘simple’ necessary condition for existence that rules out proper transposed sesqui arrays on parameters $(10, 5, 6)$, $(15, 6, 10)$ or $(15, 9, 10)$?*

We would also like to restate Question 6.1.

Question 8.2. *Are there admissible parameter sets for double/triple arrays that satisfy $v < r + c - 1$?*

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Alexey Gordeev for independently verifying the computational results in Tables 5 through 8 in Appendix A.

The computational work was performed on resources provided by the Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at High Performance Computing Center North (HPC2N). This work was supported by the Swedish strategic research programme eSENCE. This work was supported by The Swedish Research Council grant 2014-4897.

References

- [1] Row-column designs. <http://abel.math.umu.se/~klasm/Data/RowCol/>.
- [2] H. Agrawal. Some methods of construction of designs for two-way elimination of heterogeneity. I. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 61:1153–1171, 1966.
- [3] S. Bagchi. An infinite series of adjusted orthogonal designs with replication two. *Statistica Sinica*, 6(4):975–987, 1996.
- [4] S. Bagchi. On two-way designs. *Graphs Combin.*, 14(4):313–319, 1998.
- [5] R.A. Bailey. *Design of comparative experiments*, volume 25 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [6] R.A. Bailey, P.J. Cameron, and T. Nilson. Sesqui-arrays, a generalisation of triple arrays. *Australas. J. Combin.*, 71:427–451, 2018.
- [7] C.-S. Cheng. A family of pseudo-Youden designs with row size less than the number of symbols. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 31(2):219–221, 1981.
- [8] C.-S. Cheng. Optimality and construction of pseudo-Youden designs. *Ann. Statist.*, 9(1):201–205, 1981.
- [9] C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, editors. *Handbook of combinatorial designs*. Discrete Mathematics and its Applications (Boca Raton). Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, second edition, 2007.

- [10] N. Eén and N. Sörensson. MINISAT+: Source code for SAT problems using pseudo-boolean constraints. <http://minisat.se/MiniSat+.html>.
- [11] N. Eén and N. Sörensson. Translating pseudo-boolean constraints into SAT. *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation*, 2:1–25, 2006.
- [12] J. Egan and I.M. Wanless. Enumeration of MOLS of small order. *Math. Comp.*, 85(298):799–824, 2016.
- [13] G. Jäger, K. Markström, D. Shcherbak, and L.-D. Öhman. Small Youden rectangles, near Youden rectangles, and their connections to other row-column designs. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 25(1):Paper No. 9, 28, 2023.
- [14] B.D. McKay and I.M. Wanless. On the number of Latin squares. *Ann. Comb.*, 9(3):335–344, 2005.
- [15] J.P. McSorley and N.C. Phillips. Complete enumeration and properties of binary pseudo-Youden designs PYD(9, 6, 6). *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 137(4):1464–1473, 2007.
- [16] J.P. McSorley, N.C.K. Phillips, W.D. Wallis, and J.L. Yucas. Double arrays, triple arrays and balanced grids. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 35(1):21–45, 2005.
- [17] T. Nilson and L.-D. Öhman. Triple arrays and Youden squares. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 75(3):429–451, 2015.
- [18] N.C.K. Phillips, D.A. Preece, and W.D. Wallis. The seven classes of 5×6 triple arrays. *Discrete Math.*, 293(1-3):213–218, 2005.
- [19] W.J. Youden. Use of incomplete block replications in estimating tobacco-mosaic virus. *Contributions from the Boyce Thompson Institute*, (9):41–48, 1937.

A Autotopism group orders

		Double arrays			Triple arrays	
v		6	10	12	10	12
$r \times c$		3×4	5×6	4×9	5×6	4×9
Total #		2	24 663	2893	7	1
Aut	1		24 146	2867		
	2	1	398			
	3	1	89	24	2	1
	4		13		1	
	5		5			
	6		8		1	
	9			2		
	10		1			
	12		3		2	
	60					1

Table 5: The number of proper double arrays and triple arrays sorted by autotopism group order.

v	6	8	9	10			12		
$r \times c$	4×3	6×4	6×3	4×5	5×6	6×5	6×4	8×3	
Total #	3	12 336	104	189	362 120	8 364 560	29 695	4367	
Aut	1		11 643	65	140	360 485	8 357 136	28 007	3970
	2	2	598	31	40	1610	6890	1492	338
	3		19	2		14	423	28	9
	4	1	58	1	7		86	125	29
	5					5	4		
	6		7	5		4	18	19	14
	8		10		2			18	6
	10					2	3		
	12		1					3	
16							3	1	

Table 6: The number of proper mono arrays sorted by autotopism group order.

v	6	8	9	10			12			14	15	
$r \times c$	4×3	6×4	6×3	4×5	6×5	8×5	6×4	8×3	9×4	6×7	5×6	
Total #	2	113	5	1	49	1 549 129	20	15	249 625	44 602	3	
Aut	1		40			31	1 537 034		1	243 241	40 617	
	2		35	1		9	11 617	3	4	5660	3887	1
	3		1			3	148			86	41	
	4	1	17	1		1	214	4		484		
	5						4					
	6		1	1		4	84	2	2	52	55	2
	8		11				23	6	4	63		
	9									1		
	12	1								15		
	16		4					2	1	9		
	18			1					1	2		
	20				1	1						
	24		2				4	2	1	9		
	36			1								
	40						1					
	42										2	
	48		2							2		
96							1					
144								1	1			

Table 7: The number of transposed proper sesqui arrays sorted by autotopism group order.

		Autotopism					Autotrisotopism		
v		8	9	10		12	14	8	9
$r \times c$		4×4	6×6	4×5	5×6	4×6	4×7	4×4	6×6
Total #		20	53 215	45	8707	312	1632	12	26 632
Aut	1		49 280	3	7534	38	641		24 634
	2	1	3488	15	1042	105	593	1	1746
	3		105		8				52
	4	4	238	16	113	76	232	4	133
	5				1				
	6		70		2	2	9		36
	8	7		4		40	60	3	12
	9		2						1
	10				2		1		
	12		18	3	4	12	36		8
	14						1		
	16	5				15	13	2	
	18		6						3
	20			1	1		5		
	24			3		5	18		2
	28						1		
	32	2				8	3	1	
	36		8			1			3
	40						4		
	48					2	12		
64	1				3		1		
72					4			2	
96						3			
384					1				

Table 8: The number of proper AO-arrays sorted by autotopism group order, or autotrisotopism group order, respectively.