

Universally Optimal Multivariate Crossover Designs

Shubham Niphadkar* and Siuli Mukhopadhyay*, †

Abstract

In this article, universally optimal multivariate crossover designs are studied. The multiple response crossover design is motivated by a 3×3 crossover setup, where the effect of 3 doses of an oral drug are studied on gene expressions related to mucosal inflammation. Subjects are assigned to three treatment sequences and response measurements on 5 different gene expressions are taken from each subject in each of the 3 time periods. To model multiple or g responses, where $g > 1$, in a crossover setup, a multivariate fixed effect model with both direct and carryover treatment effects is considered. It is assumed that there are non zero within response correlations, while between response correlations are taken to be zero. The information matrix corresponding to the direct effects is obtained and some results are studied. The information matrix in the multivariate case is shown to differ from the univariate case, particularly in the completely symmetric property. For the $g > 1$ case, with t treatments and p periods, for $p = t \geq 3$, the design represented by a Type I orthogonal array of strength 2 is proved to be universally optimal over the class of binary designs, for the direct treatment effects.

Keywords— Binary designs, Completely symmetric, Correlated response, Orthogonal arrays

*Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai 400 076, India

†Corresponding author; Email: siuli@math.iitb.ac.in

1 Introduction

Often in clinical studies, we come across crossover trials that measure multiple responses from each subject in each period. For example, consider the blood sugar levels recorded at multiple time points in each period (Putt and Chinchilli 1999) or multiple gene expression profiles of subjects measured in each period (Leaker et al. 2017; Pareek et al. 2023). Though these researchers discuss methods for estimating and analyzing the multiple responses measured in each period taking into account the various types of correlation structures which can exist between and within responses, they do not discuss any optimal design results for such multivariate crossover trials. In this article, our aim is to find universally optimal design for such multiple response crossover trials. The design represented by an orthogonal array of Type I and strength 2 is shown to be universally optimal for the $p = t \geq 3$ case, where p and t denote the number of periods and treatments, respectively.

Crossover designs were initially developed to be used in agricultural sciences (Cochran 1939). Later, these designs were also used in various other fields, such as pharmaceutical and clinical trials, and bioequivalence and biological studies (Singh and Mukhopadhyay 2016). Optimal crossover designs for univariate responses in a fixed effect model setting have been studied by numerous researchers, namely Hedayat and Afsarinejad (1975, 1978), Cheng and Wu (1980), Kunert (1983, 1984), Stufken (1991), Kushner (1997, 1998), Kunert and Martin (2000), Hedayat and Yang (2003, 2004) and Singh and Kunert (2021). Whereas, crossover designs with random subject effects were explored by Laska et al. (1983), Laska and Meisner (1985), Carriere and Reinsel (1993), Carriere and Huang (2000) and Hedayat et al. (2006), to name a few. Recently, there has been some interest in finding optimal crossover designs for generalized linear models, see Singh and Mukhopadhyay (2016), Jankar et al. (2020), Mukhopadhyay et al. (2021) and Singh et al. (2021). For a detailed review of crossover designs, we would like to refer to the paper by Bose and Dey (2013) and books by Senn (2002), Bose and Dey (2009) and Kenward and Jones (2014). However, all these works concentrate only on single responses measured in each period. Till date, there has been no work on the development of universally optimal crossover designs for the multiple response case.

In this article, to model data from a multiple response crossover trial, we propose a multivariate fixed effect model with both direct and carryover effects of treatments. The underlying assumption made is that no correlation exists between distinct responses. However, we allow for within response correlation, accounting for homoscedastic error variances. Information matrix for the direct effects is investigated and is shown to differ from the univariate case by its lack of complete symmetricity property thus violating the sufficient condition by Kiefer (1975). To find optimal designs we instead resort to the more general technique proposed by Yeh (1986) for determining

universally optimal multiple response crossover design.

2 Motivating Example

For motivating multiple response crossover trials, we use a gene expression dataset more recently considered by [Leaker et al. \(2017\)](#). In this study, a randomized, double-blind crossover experiment involving 3 periods and 3 treatments was considered. This crossover trial was placebo controlled and the goal was to study the effects of two single doses of oral drug, prednisone (10 mg and 25 mg), with placebo on biomarkers of mucosal inflammation and transcriptomics after a nasal allergen challenge. The subjects enrolled in the study were assigned to one of the 3 treatment sequences; ABC , CAB and BCA . Treatment A was the 10 mg dose of the drug, while B and C were the placebo and 25 mg dose of the drug, respectively. For our purpose, we considered 5 gene profiles recorded in the nasal allergen challenge as the multiple outcomes.

Various tests were performed to check for correlation between and within the 5 responses. Tables 1, 2 and 3 show the test results. Table 1 explores correlations between different responses in the same period, while Table 2 do this for different periods. Tables 1 and 2 show that there is no significant correlation (at a level of significance 0.01) between distinct responses measured in the same and different time periods. In Table 3, we investigate if there is a presence of within response correlation, i.e., if the observations measured on the same genes are correlated. From the results given in Table 3, we note that some sample correlation coefficients have significantly low p-values (lower than 0.01) thus implying within gene correlations.

We use the above motivating example of the genetic study and the corresponding correlation results to frame the multivariate crossover statistical model in the next section.

3 Proposed Statistical Model

We consider crossover designs with t treatments, n subjects and p periods, where $t, p \geq 2$. Let $\Omega_{t,n,p}$ be the class of all such designs. We consider that for any design in $\Omega_{t,n,p}$ and $g \geq 1$, there are g response variables on which observations are recorded corresponding to every subject in each period. For $1 \leq k \leq g$, corresponding to the k^{th} response, let Y_{dik} represent the random variable corresponding to the observation from the i^{th} period and the j^{th} subject, where $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. We consider that Y_{dik} satisfies the following model:

$$Y_{dik} = \mu_k + \alpha_{i,k} + \beta_{j,k} + \tau_{d(i,j),k} + \rho_{d(i-1,j),k} + \epsilon_{ijk}, \quad (3.1)$$

Table 1: Results for testing significance of within-period correlation coefficient between genes

Pair of Variables	Period 1		Period 2		Period 3	
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value
$(Gene_1, Gene_2)$	0.5249	0.0368	0.2405	0.3697	0.5819	0.0181
$(Gene_1, Gene_3)$	-0.5014	0.0479	-0.1112	0.6819	-0.1764	0.5135
$(Gene_1, Gene_4)$	-0.5898	0.0162	-0.5665	0.0221	0.0747	0.7834
$(Gene_1, Gene_5)$	0.0283	0.9172	0.0184	0.9461	-0.2763	0.3003
$(Gene_2, Gene_3)$	-0.5798	0.0186	-0.5100	0.0436	-0.3393	0.1985
$(Gene_2, Gene_4)$	-0.1938	0.472	-0.0055	0.9838	0.2499	0.3506
$(Gene_2, Gene_5)$	-0.2325	0.3862	0.0784	0.773	-0.2094	0.4364
$(Gene_3, Gene_4)$	0.1361	0.6152	0.5072	0.0449	0.3269	0.2166
$(Gene_3, Gene_5)$	-0.0201	0.9391	-0.1387	0.6085	-0.2275	0.3969
$(Gene_4, Gene_5)$	-0.2338	0.3834	-0.1856	0.4913	0.1346	0.6191

where corresponding to the k^{th} response variable, ϵ_{ijk} is the error term with mean 0 and variance σ^2 , μ_k is the intercept, $\alpha_{i,k}$ is the i^{th} period effect, $\beta_{j,k}$ is the j^{th} subject effect and for $1 \leq s \leq t$, $\tau_{s,k}$ is the direct effect and $\rho_{s,k}$ is the first order carryover effect due to the s^{th} treatment. Here $d(i, j)$ represents the treatment allocated to the i^{th} period and the j^{th} subject. We assume that the model (3.1) is a fixed effect model. In the above model, all the effects are taken to vary along with the response variable and no carryover effect is assumed in the first period.

Expressing the above model equation in matrix notations, we obtain

$$\mathbf{Y}_{dk} = \mathbf{X}_{dk}\boldsymbol{\theta}_k + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_{dk} = (Y_{d11k}, \dots, Y_{dp1k}, Y_{d12k}, \dots, Y_{dp2k}, \dots, Y_{d1nk}, \dots, Y_{dpnk})'$, $\mathbf{X}_{dk} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{U} & \mathbf{T}_d & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix}$, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k = (\epsilon_{11k}, \dots, \epsilon_{p1k}, \epsilon_{12k}, \dots, \epsilon_{p2k}, \dots, \epsilon_{1nk}, \dots, \epsilon_{pnk})'$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k = (\mu_k, \boldsymbol{\alpha}'_k, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}'_k, \boldsymbol{\rho}'_k)'$ is the parameter vector of length $(1 + p + n + 2t)$, with components: μ_k , $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_k = (\alpha_{1,k}, \dots, \alpha_{p,k})'$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k = (\beta_{1,k}, \dots, \beta_{n,k})'$, $\boldsymbol{\tau}_k = (\tau_{1,k}, \dots, \tau_{t,k})'$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}_k = (\rho_{1,k}, \dots, \rho_{t,k})'$. Here, the period and subject effects are accounted by, $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{1}_n \otimes \mathbf{I}_p$, $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}_n \otimes \mathbf{1}_p$, respectively, while \mathbf{T}_d is the design matrix corresponding to treatment effects, and \mathbf{F}_d is the design matrix for carryover effects. Note that $\mathbf{F}_d = (\mathbf{I}_n \otimes \boldsymbol{\psi}) \mathbf{T}_d$, where $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}'_{p-1 \times 1} & 0 \\ \mathbf{I}_{p-1} & \mathbf{0}_{p-1 \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$. We partition \mathbf{X}_{dk} as

$$\mathbf{X}_{dk} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{X}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.3)$$

Table 2: Results for testing significance of between-period correlation coefficient between genes

Pair of Variables	(Period 1, Period 2)		(Period 1, Period 3)		(Period 2, Period 1)		(Period 3, Period 1)		(Period 3, Period 2)			
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value		
(<i>Gene</i> ₁ , <i>Gene</i> ₂)	0.6019	0.0136	0.4356	0.0917	0.3616	0.1687	0.3186	0.2292	0.2368	0.3772	0.2291	0.3935
(<i>Gene</i> ₁ , <i>Gene</i> ₃)	-0.3796	0.147	-0.3110	0.241	-0.3812	0.1451	0.0039	0.9887	-0.4121	0.1127	-0.0867	0.7497
(<i>Gene</i> ₁ , <i>Gene</i> ₄)	-0.3925	0.1327	0.1514	0.5758	-0.3572	0.1744	0.5284	0.0354	-0.2977	0.2628	-0.3366	0.2024
(<i>Gene</i> ₁ , <i>Gene</i> ₅)	0.1760	0.5145	0.1070	0.6932	-0.2620	0.327	0.2173	0.4189	-0.1770	0.512	0.2731	0.3061
(<i>Gene</i> ₂ , <i>Gene</i> ₃)	-0.2346	0.3819	-0.1038	0.702	-0.4676	0.0678	-0.2482	0.3539	-0.4988	0.0492	-0.2914	0.2736
(<i>Gene</i> ₂ , <i>Gene</i> ₄)	-0.2799	0.2938	0.2380	0.3748	-0.6061	0.0128	0.2259	0.4002	-0.1550	0.5664	-0.3463	0.1889
(<i>Gene</i> ₂ , <i>Gene</i> ₅)	0.0004	0.999	0.1501	0.5789	0.2867	0.2817	0.1587	0.5573	-0.2851	0.2844	0.0508	0.8517
(<i>Gene</i> ₃ , <i>Gene</i> ₄)	-0.0881	0.7456	0.0819	0.763	0.3954	0.1296	-0.5053	0.0459	-0.0110	0.9678	0.0025	0.9928
(<i>Gene</i> ₃ , <i>Gene</i> ₅)	0.1892	0.4829	-0.0959	0.7239	-0.2970	0.264	-0.0011	0.9967	-0.0234	0.9315	-0.1645	0.5426
(<i>Gene</i> ₄ , <i>Gene</i> ₅)	-0.2483	0.3539	-0.1959	0.4672	0.1379	0.6105	0.2486	0.3532	0.0785	0.7726	-0.1141	0.674

Table 3: Results for testing significance of between-period correlation coefficient within genes

Variable	(Period 1, Period 2)		(Period 1, Period 3)		(Period 2, Period 3)	
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value
$Gene_1$	0.6145	0.0113	0.6069	0.0127	0.4889	0.0547
$Gene_2$	0.3994	0.1253	0.5722	0.0206	0.5323	0.0338
$Gene_3$	-0.1713	0.5258	0.2573	0.336	0.0626	0.8178
$Gene_4$	0.0489	0.8574	-0.2812	0.2914	-0.6729	0.0043
$Gene_5$	-0.1912	0.478	0.0054	0.9841	-0.3650	0.1645

where $\mathbf{X}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{U} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{X}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_d & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix}$. Combining the model equations for all g responses, we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}'_{d1} & \cdots & \mathbf{Y}'_{dg} \end{bmatrix}' = (\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \mathbf{X}_{d1}) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\theta}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\theta}'_g \end{bmatrix}' + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_g \end{bmatrix}', \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k) = \mathbf{0}_{np \times 1}$. It is assumed that (i) the observations from different subjects are uncorrelated, and (ii) no correlations exists between distinct response variables implying, $\text{Cov}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k'}) = \mathbf{0}_{np \times np}$, for $1 \leq k \neq k' \leq g$. Under these assumptions, the dispersion matrix of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k$ is taken to be

$$\mathbb{D}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k) = \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \sigma^2 (\mathbf{I}_n \otimes \mathbf{V}), \quad (3.5)$$

where $\sigma^2 > 0$ is an unknown constant, while \mathbf{V} is assumed to be a known positive definite and symmetric $p \times p$ matrix.

4 Information Matrix of the Direct Treatment Effects

In this section, we determine the information matrix under model (3.4) for the direct effects, for $g \geq 1$. We use some results for the $g = 1$ case from Bose and Dey (2009).

For any design $d \in \Omega_{t,n,p}$, let \mathbf{C}_d represent the information matrix for the direct effects. Theorem 4.1 is the main result for the information matrix in the $g \geq 1$ case.

Theorem 4.1. *The information matrix for the direct effects can be expressed as*

$$\mathbf{C}_d = \mathbf{I}_g \otimes [\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12} \mathbf{C}_{d22}^- \mathbf{C}_{d21}], \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{d11} = \mathbf{T}'_d \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{T}_d$, $\mathbf{C}_{d12} = \mathbf{C}'_{d21} = \mathbf{T}'_d \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{F}_d$, $\mathbf{C}_{d22} = \mathbf{F}'_d \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{F}_d$, $\mathbf{A}^* = \mathbf{H}_n \otimes \mathbf{V}^*$ and $\mathbf{V}^* = \mathbf{V}^{-1} - (\mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{V}^{-1}$. Here $\mathbf{H}_n = \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}'_n$ and \mathbf{C}_{d22}^- is a generalized inverse of \mathbf{C}_{d22} .

Proof. For details of the proof, refer to Appendix B. □

Remark 4.1. *The information matrix \mathbf{C}_d is symmetric, non-negative definite (n.n.d.) matrix having zero row sums and column sums, and is invariant with respect to the choice of generalized inverses involved.*

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix B. □

5 Universal Optimality

For the single response case, universal optimality criterion have been discussed by various authors including Kiefer (1975) and Bose and Dey (2009) (see Chapter 1, pp. 18–22). Here, we extend the definition of universally optimal designs by Kiefer (1975) to the $g > 1$ setup as follows:

Let for $g > 1$, \mathcal{B}_{gt} be a class of $gt \times gt$ symmetric, non-negative definite (n.n.d.) matrices having zero row sums. Suppose Φ is the class of functions $\phi : \mathcal{B}_{gt} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$, such that

1. ϕ is matrix convex;
2. For any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$, $\phi(x\mathbf{A})$ is non-increasing in the scalar $x \geq 0$;
3. ϕ is invariant under each simultaneous permutation of rows and columns of $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$.

Then a design $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{D} is a subclass of designs, is a universally optimal design for the parameters of interest over \mathcal{D} , if d^* minimizes $\phi(\mathbf{A}_d)$ over \mathcal{D} , where \mathbf{A}_d is the information matrix for the parameters of interest.

Note in the multivariate setup, we have gt direct treatment effect parameters and the information matrix \mathbf{A}_d is of order $gt \times gt$. In the single response case, the sufficient conditions of Kiefer (1975) (a) complete symmetricity of the information matrix corresponding to d^* , and (b) d^* maximizing the trace of the information matrix over \mathcal{D} , where \mathcal{D} is a subclass of designs, leads to the universal optimality of d^* over \mathcal{D} . However in the $g > 1$ setup, due to the lack of complete symmetricity of the information matrix for the direct effects (see Lemma A.1 in the Appendix A), we are unable to use a similar sufficient condition. For our multivariate setup, instead we resort to the use of a sufficient condition on the lines of Yeh (1986) as stated in the next Lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let a design $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ be such that for $d \in \mathcal{D}$, the corresponding information matrix $\mathbf{A}_d \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$; for any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{A}_d \neq \mathbf{0}_{gt \times gt}$, there exists scalars $b_{d1}, \dots, b_{d(gt)} \geq 0$ satisfying $\mathbf{A}_{d^*} = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{(gt)!} b_{d\kappa} \mathbf{P}_\kappa \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{P}'_\kappa$, where $g > 1$ and $\mathbf{P}_1, \dots, \mathbf{P}_{(gt)!}$ are all possible distinct $gt \times gt$ permutation*

matrices. Then the design d^* is universally optimal for the parameters of interest over \mathcal{D} , if d^* maximizes $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_d)$ over $d \in \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. The proof is on similar lines as in [Yeh \(1986\)](#). Please see Appendix A for an outline of the proof. \square

5.1 Universal Optimality of Orthogonal Array Designs

In this subsection, we consider designs with $p = t$. Our interest is to check if the universal optimality of a design represented by an orthogonal array of Type I and strength 2, $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p = t, t, 2)$, where $t \geq 3$ and λ is a positive integer, holds for the $g > 1$ case. Note that in the univariate case with correlated error terms, a design given as $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p, t, 2)$, where $3 \leq p \leq t$ and λ is a positive integer, is shown to be universally optimal for the direct effects over the class of binary designs by [Kunert and Martin \(2000\)](#).

Theorem 5.1. *Let $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ be a design given by $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p = t, t, 2)$, where \mathcal{D} is a class of binary designs with $p = t$, λ is a positive integer and $t \geq 3$. Then d^* is a universally optimal design for the direct effects over \mathcal{D} in the $g > 1$ case.*

Proof. Here $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ is a $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p = t, t, 2)$, where \mathcal{D} is a class of binary designs with $p = t$, λ is a positive integer and $t \geq 3$. From Remark 4.1, it can be clearly seen that for $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathbf{C}_d \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$. Also, d^* is a universally optimal design over \mathcal{D} under the $g = 1$ case ([Kunert and Martin 2000](#)). Thus we know that for $g = 1$, d^* maximizes $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_d) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12}\mathbf{C}_{d22}^-\mathbf{C}_{d21})$ over \mathcal{D} . From Theorem 4.1, for $g > 1$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$, the information matrix for the direct effects can be written as

$$\mathbf{C}_d = \mathbf{I}_g \otimes [\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12}\mathbf{C}_{d22}^-\mathbf{C}_{d21}]. \quad (5.1)$$

Hence for $g > 1$ also, d^* maximizes $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_d)$ over \mathcal{D} .

From [Martin and Eccleston \(1998\)](#) and [Kunert and Martin \(2000\)](#), we get that for $g = 1$, the information matrix \mathbf{C}_{d^*} is a completely symmetric matrix. So using Remark 1 from [Yeh \(1986\)](#), we get for $g = 1$, any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12}\mathbf{C}_{d22}^-\mathbf{C}_{d21} \neq \mathbf{0}_{t \times t}$,

$$\mathbf{C}_{d^*} = \mathbf{C}_{d^*11} - \mathbf{C}_{d^*12}\mathbf{C}_{d^*22}^-\mathbf{C}_{d^*21} = \sum_{v=1}^{t!} c_{dv} \mathbf{Q}_v (\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12}\mathbf{C}_{d22}^-\mathbf{C}_{d21}) \mathbf{Q}'_v, \quad (5.2)$$

where $c_{dv} = [\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{d^*})] / [t! \times \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12}\mathbf{C}_{d22}^-\mathbf{C}_{d21})] \geq 0$ and \mathbf{Q}_v 's are distinct $t \times t$ permutation matrices.

Using (5.1), it is clear that for $g > 1$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathbf{C}_d = \mathbf{0}_{gt \times gt}$ if and only if $\mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12}\mathbf{C}_{d22}^{-1}\mathbf{C}_{d21} = \mathbf{0}_{t \times t}$. For $g > 1$, any $d \in \mathcal{D}$, $\mathbf{C}_d \neq \mathbf{0}_{gt \times gt}$ and $\kappa = 1, \dots, (gt)!$, if we suppose

$$b_{d\kappa} = \begin{cases} c_{dv}, & \text{if } \mathbf{P}_\kappa = \mathbf{I}_g \otimes \mathbf{Q}_v, \text{ for some } v, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

then using (5.1) and (5.2), we get that for $g > 1$, any $d \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{C}_d \neq \mathbf{0}_{gt \times gt}$,

$$\mathbf{C}_{d^*} = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{(gt)!} b_{d\kappa} \mathbf{P}_\kappa \mathbf{C}_d \mathbf{P}'_\kappa. \quad (5.4)$$

Thus from (5.4) and Lemma 5.1, we have proved d^* is universally optimal for the direct effects over \mathcal{D} in the $g > 1$ case. \square

6 Illustration

In this section, we evaluate the efficiency of the 3×3 binary crossover design used in the genetic study by Leaker et al. (2017). As our response variates, we take the 5 gene profiles. Each of the 3 treatment sequences, ABC , CAB and BCA , are applied on 6 subjects, where treatment A denotes the 10 mg dose of the drug, B denotes the placebo and C denotes the 25 mg dose of the drug. Let us denote the above considered design by d_0 . To study the efficiency of d_0 , we consider two different structures of matrix \mathbf{V} as follows:

$$1. \mathbf{V} = \left(1 - r_{(1)}^2\right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & r_{(1)} & r_{(1)}^2 \\ r_{(1)} & 1 & r_{(1)} \\ r_{(1)}^2 & r_{(1)} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } -1 < r_{(1)} < 1;$$

$$2. \mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & r_{(1)} & 0 \\ r_{(1)} & 1 & r_{(1)} \\ 0 & r_{(1)} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } -1/\sqrt{2} < r_{(1)} < 1/\sqrt{2}.$$

1 is a $AR(1)$ structure, and 2 is a tridiagonal structure with all diagonal and off-diagonal elements equal. From our choices of \mathbf{V} , we note it is a function of $r_{(1)}$ only, where $r_{(1)}$ is such that the matrix \mathbf{V} is positive definite. Note that if $r_{(1)} = 0$, then both $AR(1)$ and tridiagonal structure reduces to a diagonal structure.

From Theorem 5.1, we know that a design $d^* \in \mathcal{D}$ represented by $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p = t, t, 2)$, where \mathcal{D} is a class of binary designs with $p = t$, λ is a positive integer and $t \geq 3$, is universally

optimal for the direct effects over \mathcal{D} for the $g > 1$ setup. Suppose to get a measure of the efficiency of any binary design $d \in \mathcal{D}$ with t and n same as that of d^* we use the ratio of the traces as follows:

$$e = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_d)}{\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}_{d^*})}. \quad (6.1)$$

Values of e close to 1 shows that design, d , is a nearly efficient design. Figures 1 and 2 plot e under both the structures of \mathbf{V} . From Figures 1 and 2, we see that the maximum efficiency of design d_0 is 0.0278 as compared to the universal optimal design d^* for both structures of \mathbf{V} . Thus, d_0 is not an efficient/nearly efficient design.




Figure 1: Efficiency of d_0 when \mathbf{V} has a $AR(1)$ structure




Figure 2: Efficiency of d_0 when \mathbf{V} has a tridiagonal structure

7 Conclusion and Future Direction

In this article, we investigated universal optimality for an orthogonal array of Type I and strength 2 when g responses are recorded in each period from each subject, where $g \geq 1$. Under the multivariate fixed effect model, the information matrix for the direct effects differed from the $g = 1$ case, particularly in terms of the completely symmetric property. For the $g > 1$ case and non-zero within response correlation, for $p = t \geq 3$, we showed a design given as an orthogonal array of type I and strength 2 is universally optimal for the direct effects over a class of binary designs. By following similar techniques as employed in this article, we can also show that for uncorrelated and homoscedastic errors, if a balanced uniform design is universally optimal for the direct effects (carryover effects) over a subclass of designs for $g = 1$, then the universal optimality also holds over the same subclass of designs for the $g > 1$ case.

Though we did not consider that the between response correlation is measured in the same/different periods in this article, such correlation may exist in a multiple response crossover experiment. However, in those cases, the error covariances will be of complex nature and it may

be tedious to determine theoretical optimal designs. As a future direction, we plan to investigate optimality results in such correlated crossover scenarios. In the future, we also plan to study the effect of heteroscedastic error terms on the results for universal optimality in the $g > 1$ case.

Statements and Declarations

- **Funding** The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work.
- **Competing interests** The authors declare no competing interests.
- **Ethics approval and consent to participate** This research does not involve human or animal participants.
- **Consent for publication** Not applicable.
- **Data availability** The data is available in the Gene Expression Omnibus database under accession number GSE67200 and is available at the following URL: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE67200>.
- **Materials availability** Not applicable.
- **Code availability** <https://github.com/rsphd/Correlation-Code> contains the code (.R file) and the dataset on 5 genes (.zip file consisting of 5 Excel files), for checking the significance of correlation between and within genes.
- **Author contribution** All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, analysis and investigation were performed by Shubham Niphadkar. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Shubham Niphadkar and all authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Appendix A: Some Useful Proofs and Results

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Here $d \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{D} is a subclass of designs such that $\mathbf{A}_d \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$. For $g > 1$, if $\mathbf{A}_d = \mathbf{0}_{gt \times gt}$, then from condition 2, it is clear that $\phi(\mathbf{A}_{d*}) \leq \phi(\mathbf{A}_d)$. Now we consider the case when for $g > 1$, $\mathbf{A}_d \neq \mathbf{0}_{gt \times gt}$. Note that for $d \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $\mathbf{A}_d \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$. So $\mathbf{A}_d = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}'$, where $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{A}_d^{1/2}$. Hence we get that $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_d) > 0$. Here we have $\mathbf{A}_{d*} = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{(gt)!} b_{d\kappa} \mathbf{P}_\kappa \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{P}'_\kappa$. Since $\mathbf{A}_d \in \mathcal{B}_{gt}$, from condition 3 we get that $\phi(\mathbf{A}_d) = \phi(\mathbf{P}_\kappa \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{P}'_\kappa)$, for $\kappa = 1, \dots, (gt)!$. So, we get

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{d*}) = b_d \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_d), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $b_d = b_{d_1} + \dots + b_{d(gt)!}$. Also, here we know that d^* maximizes $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_d)$ over \mathcal{D} . Thus we get that $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{d^*}) \geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_d)$. Since $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_d) > 0$, from (A.1), we get that $b_d \geq 1$. Thus using conditions 1 and 2 along with $\mathbf{A}_{d^*} = \sum_{\kappa=1}^{(gt)!} b_{d\kappa} \mathbf{P}_\kappa \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{P}'_\kappa$, we get

$$\phi(\mathbf{A}_{d^*}) = \phi\left(b_d \sum_{\kappa=1}^{(gt)!} (b_{d\kappa}/b_d) \mathbf{P}_\kappa \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{P}'_\kappa\right) \leq \phi(\mathbf{A}_d).$$

Hence using the definition of universal optimality, we get that d^* is a universally optimal design. \square

Lemma A.1. *Let $d^* \in \Omega_{t,n=\lambda t(t-1),p=t}$ be a design given by $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p = t, t, 2)$, where λ is a positive integer and $t \geq 3$. Then for $g > 1$, the information matrix \mathbf{C}_{d^*} is not completely symmetric.*

Proof. Here $d^* \in \Omega_{t,n=\lambda t(t-1),p=t}$ is a design given by $OA_I(n = \lambda t(t-1), p = t, t, 2)$, where λ is a positive integer and $t \geq 3$. From Theorem 4.1, for $g > 1$, the information matrix \mathbf{C}_{d^*} is given as

$$\mathbf{C}_{d^*} = \mathbf{I}_g \otimes [\mathbf{C}_{d^*11} - \mathbf{C}_{d^*12} \mathbf{C}_{d^*22}^- \mathbf{C}_{d^*21}], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{d^*22}^-$ is a generalized inverse of \mathbf{C}_{d^*22} . From Martin and Eccleston (1998) and Bose and Dey (2009) (see Chapter 1, pp. 12–18), we get that for $g = 1$,

$$\mathbf{C}_{d^*} = \mathbf{C}_{d^*11} - \mathbf{C}_{d^*12} \mathbf{C}_{d^*22}^- \mathbf{C}_{d^*21} = (\det(\mathbf{E})/e_{22}) \mathbf{H}_t, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\mathbf{E} = \frac{n}{t-1} \begin{bmatrix} e_{11} & e_{12} \\ e_{12} & e_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, $\det(\mathbf{E}) \neq 0$, $e_{11} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}'_{d^*1} \mathbf{V}^* \mathbf{T}_{d^*1})$, $e_{12} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}'_{d^*1} \mathbf{V}^* \boldsymbol{\psi} \mathbf{T}_{d^*1})$ and $e_{22} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{T}'_{d^*1} \boldsymbol{\psi}' \mathbf{V}^* \boldsymbol{\psi} \mathbf{T}_{d^*1}) - \frac{(\mathbf{V}^*)_{1,1}}{t}$. Here $\mathbf{H}_t = \mathbf{I}_t - \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{1}_t \mathbf{1}'_t$, $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}'_{p-1 \times 1} & 0 \\ \mathbf{I}_{p-1} & \mathbf{0}_{p-1 \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathbf{V}^* = \mathbf{V}^{-1} - (\mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{V}^{-1}$, and $(\mathbf{V}^*)_{1,1}$ is the element corresponding to first row and first column of the matrix \mathbf{V}^* .

So using (A.2) and (A.3), it is clear that for $g > 1$, the matrix \mathbf{C}_{d^*} is completely symmetric if and only if all off-diagonal elements of $(\det(\mathbf{E})/e_{22}) \mathbf{H}_t$ are 0. We know that all off-diagonal elements of the matrix $\mathbf{H}_t = \mathbf{I}_t - \frac{1}{t} \mathbf{1}_t \mathbf{1}'_t$ are nonzero. From (A.3), for $t \geq 3$, we get that $\det(\mathbf{E}) \neq 0$. Hence for $g > 1$ and $t \geq 3$, all off-diagonal elements of \mathbf{C}_{d^*} are nonzero. Thus for $g > 1$ and $t \geq 3$, the information matrix \mathbf{C}_{d^*} is not completely symmetric. \square

Appendix B: Proofs of Section 4

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_k & \boldsymbol{\alpha}'_k & \boldsymbol{\beta}'_k & \boldsymbol{\rho}'_k \end{bmatrix}'$. Then by rearranging the parameters, the model (3.4) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}'_{d1} & \cdots & \mathbf{Y}'_{dg} \end{bmatrix}' &= (\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \mathbf{T}_d) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\tau}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\tau}'_g \end{bmatrix}' + \left(\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\xi}'_g \end{bmatrix}' \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_g \end{bmatrix}'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Premultiplying the above equation by $\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}$, we get the model as

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Y}'_{d1(new)} & \cdots & \mathbf{Y}'_{dg(new)} \end{bmatrix}' &= \left(\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_d \right) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\tau}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\tau}'_g \end{bmatrix}' \\ &+ \left(\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_1 & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\xi}'_g \end{bmatrix}' + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{1(new)} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{g(new)} \end{bmatrix}', \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_{dk(new)} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Y}_{dk}$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k(new)} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_k$. Note that the dispersion matrix of the vector of transformed error terms $\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{1(new)} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{g(new)} \end{bmatrix}'$ is $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_{gnp}$. Thus using the expression of the information matrix from Kunert (1983), we get that the information matrix for the direct effects can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{C}_d = \left(\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \mathbf{T}'_d \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \right) \text{pr}^\perp \left(\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix} \right) \left(\mathbf{I}_g \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_d \right), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\text{pr}^\perp(\mathbf{M}) = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{M}'\mathbf{M})^{-1}\mathbf{M}'$ is the orthogonal projection matrix onto the space orthogonal to the column space of matrix \mathbf{M} and the order of \mathbf{I} is same as the order of $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{M}'\mathbf{M})^{-1}\mathbf{M}'$. By calculation, the above equation can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{C}_d = \mathbf{I}_g \otimes \left[\mathbf{T}'_d \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \text{pr}^\perp \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix} \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_d \right]. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

From Bose and Dey (2009) (see Chapter 1, pp. 12–18), we know

$$\mathbf{T}'_d \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \text{pr}^\perp \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{np} & \mathbf{X}_1 & \mathbf{F}_d \end{bmatrix} \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{T}_d = \mathbf{C}_{d11} - \mathbf{C}_{d12} \mathbf{C}_{d22}^- \mathbf{C}_{d21}, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{d11} = \mathbf{T}'_d \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{T}_d$, $\mathbf{C}_{d12} = \mathbf{C}'_{d21} = \mathbf{T}'_d \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{F}_d$, $\mathbf{C}_{d22} = \mathbf{F}'_d \mathbf{A}^* \mathbf{F}_d$, $\mathbf{A}^* = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \text{pr}^\perp \left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_1 \right) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} = \mathbf{H}_n \otimes \mathbf{V}^*$ and $\mathbf{V}^* = \mathbf{V}^{-1} - \left(\mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \right)^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}'_p \mathbf{V}^{-1}$. Here $\mathbf{H}_n = \mathbf{I}_n - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n \mathbf{1}'_n$ and \mathbf{C}_{d22}^- is a generalized inverse of \mathbf{C}_{d22} . Thus from (B.4) and (B.5), we can prove (4.1). \square

Proof of Remark 4.1. From Bose and Dey (2009) (see Chapter 1, pp. 12–18), we get that for $g = 1$, under model (3.4), the information matrix for the direct effects, which is given as $\mathbf{C}_{d11} -$

$C_{d12}C_{d22}^-C_{d21}$, is symmetric, n.n.d., have row sums and column sums as zero, and is invariant with respect to the choice of generalized inverses involved.

Thus using the expression of the information matrix given in Theorem 4.1, we get that for $g \geq 1$, C_d is symmetric, n.n.d., satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} C_d \mathbf{1}_{gt} &= (\mathbf{I}_g \otimes [C_{d11} - C_{d12}C_{d22}^-C_{d21}]) \mathbf{1}_{gt} = \mathbf{0}_{gt \times 1}, \\ \mathbf{1}'_{gt} C_d &= \mathbf{1}'_{gt} (\mathbf{I}_g \otimes [C_{d11} - C_{d12}C_{d22}^-C_{d21}]) = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times gt} \end{aligned}$$

and is invariant with respect to the choice of generalized inverses involved. □

References

- Bose, M. and Dey, A. (2009). *Optimal crossover designs*. World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ. <https://doi.org/10.1142/9789812818430>.
- Bose, M. and Dey, A. (2013). Developments in crossover designs.
- Carriere, K. C. and Huang, R. (2000). Crossover designs for two-treatment clinical trials. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 87(1):125–134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3758\(99\)00185-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3758(99)00185-8).
- Carriere, K. C. and Reinsel, G. C. (1993). Optimal two-period repeated measurement designs with two or more treatments. *Biometrika*, 80(4):924–929. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/80.4.924>.
- Cheng, C. S. and Wu, C. F. (1980). Balanced repeated measurements designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 8(6):1272–1283. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176345200>.
- Cochran, W. G. (1939). Long-term agricultural experiments. *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 6(2):104–148. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2983686>.
- Hedayat, A. S. and Afsarinejad, K. (1975). Repeated measurements design, I. In *A Survey of Statistical Design and Linear Models* (J. N. Srivastava Ed.), pp. 229–242. North Holland, Amsterdam.
- Hedayat, A. S. and Afsarinejad, K. (1978). Repeated measurements designs, II. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(3):619–628. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176344206>.
- Hedayat, A. S., Stufken, J., and Yang, M. (2006). Optimal and efficient crossover designs when subject effects are random. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):1031–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214505000001384>.

- Hedayat, A. S. and Yang, M. (2003). Universal optimality of balanced uniform crossover designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 31(3):978–983. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1056562469>.
- Hedayat, A. S. and Yang, M. (2004). Universal optimality for selected crossover designs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(466):461–466. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000000331>.
- Jankar, J., Mandal, A., and Yang, J. (2020). Optimal crossover designs for generalized linear models. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, 14(2):1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42519-020-00089-5>.
- Kenward, M. G. and Jones, B. (2014). Crossover trials. In *Methods and applications of statistics in clinical trials*, (Vol. 1), pp. 310–319. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118596005.ch27>.
- Kiefer, J. (1975). Construction and optimality of generalized Youden designs. In *A survey of statistical design and linear models* (J. N. Srivastava Ed.), pp. 333–353. North-Holland, Amsterdam-Oxford.
- Kunert, J. (1983). Optimal design and refinement of the linear model with applications to repeated measurements designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 11(1):247–257. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176346075>.
- Kunert, J. (1984). Optimality of balanced uniform repeated measurements designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 12(3):1006–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176346717>.
- Kunert, J. and Martin, R. J. (2000). Optimality of type I orthogonal arrays for cross-over models with correlated errors. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 87(1):119–124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3758\(99\)00182-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3758(99)00182-2).
- Kushner, H. B. (1997). Optimality and efficiency of two-treatment repeated measurements designs. *Biometrika*, 84(2):455–468. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/84.2.455>.
- Kushner, H. B. (1998). Optimal and efficient repeated-measurements designs for uncorrelated observations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(443):1176–1187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1998.10473778>.
- Laska, E. M. and Meisner, M. (1985). A variational approach to optimal two-treatment crossover designs: application to carryover-effect models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80(391):704–710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1985.10478172>.

- Laska, E. M., Meisner, M., and Kushner, H. B. (1983). Optimal crossover designs in the presence of carryover effects. *Biometrics*, 39(4):1087–1091. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2531343>.
- Leaker, B. R., Malkov, V. A., Mogg, R., Ruddy, M. K., Nicholson, G. C., Tan, A. J., Tribouley, C., Chen, G., De Lepeleire, I., Calder, N. A., Chung, H., Lavender, P., Carayannopoulos, L. N., and Hansel, T. T. (2017). The nasal mucosal late allergic reaction to grass pollen involves type 2 inflammation (IL-5 and IL-13), the inflammasome (IL-1 β), and complement. *Mucosal immunology*, 10(2):408–420. <https://doi.org/10.1038/mi.2016.74>.
- Martin, R. J. and Eccleston, J. A. (1998). Variance-balanced change-over designs for dependent observations. *Biometrika*, 85(4):883–892. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/85.4.883>.
- Mukhopadhyay, S., Singh, S. P., and Singh, A. (2021). Locally optimal binary crossover designs. *Stat Appl*, 19(1):223–246.
- Pareek, S., Das, K., and Mukhopadhyay, S. (2023). Likelihood-based missing data analysis in crossover trials. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 37(2):329–350. <https://doi.org/10.1214/23-BJPS570>.
- Putt, M. and Chinchilli, V. M. (1999). A mixed effects model for the analysis of repeated measures cross-over studies. *Statistics in Medicine*, 18(22):3037–3058. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0258\(19991130\)18:22<3037::AID-SIM243>3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19991130)18:22<3037::AID-SIM243>3.0.CO;2-7).
- Senn, S. S. (2002). *Cross-over trials in clinical research*, (Vol. 5). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470854596>.
- Singh, R. and Kunert, J. (2021). Efficient crossover designs for non-regular settings. *Metrika*, 84(4):497–510. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00184-020-00780-4>.
- Singh, S. P. and Mukhopadhyay, S. (2016). Bayesian crossover designs for generalized linear models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 104:35–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2016.06.002>.
- Singh, S. P., Mukhopadhyay, S., and Raj, H. (2021). Min–max crossover designs for two treatments binary and poisson crossover trials. *Statistics and Computing*, 31(5):1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-021-10029-3>.
- Stufken, J. (1991). Some families of optimal and efficient repeated measurements designs. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 27(1):75–83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3758\(91\)90083-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-3758(91)90083-Q).

Yeh, C. M. (1986). Conditions for universal optimality of block designs. *Biometrika*, 73(3):701–706.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/73.3.701>.