

## OPTIMAL BALANCED FRACTIONAL $2^m$ FACTORIAL DESIGNS OF RESOLUTION VII, $6 \leq m \leq 8$

BY TERUHIRO SHIRAKURA

Hiroshima University

Consider the class of balanced fractional  $2^m$  factorial designs of resolution VII. Within this class, optimal designs with respect to the trace criterion are given for any fixed  $N$  assemblies, which satisfy (i)  $m = 6$ ,  $42 \leq N \leq 64$ , (ii)  $m = 7$ ,  $64 \leq N \leq 90$  and (iii)  $m = 8$ ,  $93 \leq N \leq 128$ . The covariance matrices of the estimates of the effects are also given for such designs.

**1. Introduction.** Balanced designs were first introduced by Chakravarti (1956), who gave them the name "partially balanced arrays," as generalizations of orthogonal designs. An orthogonal design in general requires much more than the desirable number of assemblies or treatment combinations and the possibility of its existence is very small. On the other hand, balanced designs are flexible in the number of assemblies. Unlike an orthogonal design, the estimates of the effects can be correlated in these designs. The balanced designs are often used.

Balanced fractional  $2^m$  factorial (briefly,  $2^m$ -BFF) designs of resolution V have been investigated by Srivastava (1970), Srivastava and Chopra (1971a, b), Chopra and Srivastava (1973a, b), and others. Particularly in Srivastava and Chopra (1971a), and Chopra and Srivastava (1973a, b), optimal  $2^m$ -BFF designs of resolution V with respect to the trace criterion have been given for each  $m$  with  $4 \leq m \leq 7$ , and for some numbers of assemblies.

Those investigations, however, have been restricted to designs of resolution V. They have the property that the general mean, the main effects and two-factor interactions are estimable provided the remaining effects are assumed negligible. In general, designs are said to be of resolution  $2l + 1$  when in these designs all the effects involving up to  $l$ -factor interactions are estimable provided  $(l + 1)$ -factor and higher order interactions are assumed negligible. As computational techniques have improved, it has been possible to handle an experimental situation with many factors. Among these factors, as a matter of course, there may be ones similar to each other. This indicates that we cannot ignore three-factor interactions, that is, we need to consider designs of resolution VII.

Recently, Yamamoto, Shirakura and Kuwada (1975) have established some general properties of  $2^m$ -BFF designs of resolution  $2l + 1$ . Furthermore Yamamoto, Shirakura and Kuwada (1974) have succeeded in obtaining an explicit expression for the characteristic polynomial of the information matrix  $M_T$  of a

---

Received August 1974; revised August 1975.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 62K15; Secondary 05B15, 05B30.

Key words and phrases. Fractional designs, optimal balanced designs, trace criterion, balanced arrays, information matrix, covariance matrix.



$2^m$ -BFF design  $T$  of resolution  $2l + 1$ . This polynomial is useful for comparing  $2^m$ -BFF designs of higher resolution by the popular criterion such as the trace of  $M_T^{-1}$ .

In this paper, by using the above results for the case  $l = 3$ , optimal  $2^m$ -BFF designs of resolution VII are given for any fixed  $N$  assemblies, which satisfy (i)  $m = 6$ ,  $42 \leq N \leq 64$ , (ii)  $m = 7$ ,  $64 \leq N \leq 90$  and (iii)  $m = 8$ ,  $93 \leq N \leq 128$ . The covariance matrices of the estimates of the effects are given for such designs. The smallest number of  $N$  given for each case corresponds to a saturated design. On the other hand, for the largest number of  $N$  with  $m = 6$  or  $8$ , there exists an orthogonal fractional  $2^m$  factorial design of resolution VII, for which the information matrix is diagonal. It is well known that this design is optimal with respect to the trace criterion in the class of all designs of resolution VII with  $N$  assemblies.

**2.  $2^m$ -BFF designs of resolution VII.** Consider a factorial experimentation with  $m$  factors each at two levels. An assembly or treatment combination will be represented by  $(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m)$ , where  $j_k$ , the level of  $k$ th factor, equals 0 or 1. Consider the situation where four-factor and higher order interactions are assumed negligible throughout this paper. Then the total number of unknown parameters to be estimated is  $p_m = 1 + m + \binom{m}{2} + \binom{m}{3}$ . The vector of unknown parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}(p_m \times 1)$  will be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}' = (\theta_\phi; \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_m; \theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \dots, \theta_{m-1, m}; \theta_{123}, \theta_{124}, \dots, \theta_{m-2, m-1, m}),$$

where  $\theta_\phi$ ,  $\theta_i$ ,  $\theta_{ij}$  and  $\theta_{ijk}$  denote the general mean, the main effect of  $i$ th factor, the two-factor interaction of  $i$ th and  $j$ th factors and the three-factor interaction of  $i$ th,  $j$ th and  $k$ th factors, respectively.

Let  $T$  be a suitable set of  $N$  assemblies (called a fraction), then  $T$  can be expressed as a  $(0, 1)$  matrix of size  $m \times N$  whose columns denote assemblies. Let  $\mathbf{y}_T$  be the  $N \times 1$  observation vector whose  $\alpha$ th element is the observation in  $\alpha$ th assembly of  $T$  and consider the  $N$  observations in  $\mathbf{y}_T$  as independent random variables with common variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then the normal equations for estimating  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  based on  $T$  are (see, e.g., Bose and Srivastava (1964) or Yamamoto, Shirakura and Kuwada (1975))

$$M_T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = E_T' \mathbf{y}_T,$$

where  $E_T$  is the  $N \times p_m$  design matrix whose elements are 1 or -1 and  $M_T (= E_T'E_T)$  is the information matrix of  $T$ . A design  $T$  is of resolution VII if and only if the information matrix  $M_T$  is nonsingular. For any design  $T$  of resolution VII, the best linear unbiased estimate of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and the covariance matrix of its estimate are given by  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = V_T E_T' \mathbf{y}_T$  and  $\text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \sigma^2 V_T$ , respectively, where  $V_T = M_T^{-1}$ .

When  $V_T$  is invariant under any permutation of  $m$  factors,  $T$  is called a  $2^m$ -BFF design of resolution VII. In other words,  $\text{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  is such that  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_i)$ ,  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{ij})$ ,  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}_{ijk})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_i)$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_j)$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$ ,

$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{jk})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{jkl})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ij}, \hat{\theta}_{ik})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ij}, \hat{\theta}_{kl})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ij}, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ij}, \hat{\theta}_{ikl})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ij}, \hat{\theta}_{klp})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ijk}, \hat{\theta}_{ijl})$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ijk}, \hat{\theta}_{ilp})$  and  $\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_{ijk}, \hat{\theta}_{lqp})$  are independent of distinct integers  $i, j, k, l, p$  and  $q$  chosen out of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . Let  $\varepsilon(x; y)$  denote the element of  $M_T$  in the cell corresponding to  $(x; y)$  for  $\theta_x$  and  $\theta_y$  in  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Then, for a design  $T$  of resolution VII, it is easily shown that a necessary and sufficient condition for  $T$  to be a  $2^m$ -BFF design is that  $M_T$  has at most seven distinct elements  $\gamma_i$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0 &= \varepsilon(\theta_\phi, \theta_\phi) = \varepsilon(\theta_i, \theta_i) = \varepsilon(\theta_{ij}, \theta_{ij}) = \varepsilon(\theta_{ijk}, \theta_{ijk}), \\ \gamma_1 &= \varepsilon(\theta_\phi, \theta_i) = \varepsilon(\theta_j, \theta_{ij}) = \varepsilon(\theta_{ij}, \theta_{ijk}), \\ \gamma_2 &= \varepsilon(\theta_\phi, \theta_{ij}) = \varepsilon(\theta_i, \theta_j) = \varepsilon(\theta_k, \theta_{ijk}) = \varepsilon(\theta_{ik}, \theta_{jk}) = \varepsilon(\theta_{ikl}, \theta_{jkl}), \\ \gamma_3 &= \varepsilon(\theta_\phi, \theta_{ijk}) = \varepsilon(\theta_i, \theta_{jk}) = \varepsilon(\theta_{il}, \theta_{jkl}), \quad \gamma_4 = \varepsilon(\theta_{ij}, \theta_{kl}) = \varepsilon(\theta_{ijp}, \theta_{klp}), \\ \gamma_5 &= \varepsilon(\theta_{ij}, \theta_{klp}), \quad \gamma_6 = \varepsilon(\theta_{ijk}, \theta_{lqp}),\end{aligned}$$

where  $i, j, k, l, p$  and  $q$  ( $= 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) are all distinct. Furthermore it is shown that a necessary and sufficient condition for  $M_T$  to be expressible by such elements  $\gamma_i$  is that  $T$  is a balanced array (B-array) of strength 6, defined below. A  $(0, 1)$  matrix  $T$  of size  $m \times N$  is called a B-array of strength 6, size  $N$ ,  $m$  constraints and index set  $\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_6\}$  if for every submatrix  $T_0(6 \times N)$  of  $T$ , every  $(0, 1)$  vector with weight (or number of nonzero elements)  $j$  occurs exactly  $\mu_j$  times ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, 6$ ) as a column of  $T_0$ . To avoid repetition, assume that we are considering such a B-array  $T$  throughout this paper. If all  $\mu_i$ 's are equal, then we obtain what is called an orthogonal array of strength 6. It is well known that an orthogonal fractional  $2^m$  factorial design of resolution VII is identical with an orthogonal array of strength 6.

A connection between the elements  $\gamma_i$  of  $M_T$  and the indices  $\mu_i$  of a B-array  $T$  is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0 &= N = \mu_6 + \mu_0 + 6(\mu_5 + \mu_1) + 15(\mu_4 + \mu_2) + 20\mu_3, \\ \gamma_1 &= \mu_6 - \mu_0 + 4(\mu_5 - \mu_1) + 5(\mu_4 - \mu_2), \\ \gamma_2 &= \mu_6 + \mu_0 + 2(\mu_5 + \mu_1) - (\mu_4 + \mu_2) - 4\mu_3, \\ \gamma_3 &= \mu_6 - \mu_0 - 3(\mu_4 - \mu_2), \\ \gamma_4 &= \mu_6 + \mu_0 - 2(\mu_5 + \mu_1) - (\mu_4 + \mu_2) + 4\mu_3, \\ \gamma_5 &= \mu_6 - \mu_0 - 4(\mu_5 - \mu_1) + 5(\mu_4 - \mu_2), \\ \gamma_6 &= \mu_6 + \mu_0 - 6(\mu_5 + \mu_1) + 15(\mu_4 + \mu_2) - 20\mu_3.\end{aligned}$$

The following two theorems are obtained from the characteristic polynomial of the information matrix  $M_T$  of a  $2^m$ -BFF design of resolution VII which has been given by Yamamoto, Shirakura and Kuwada (1974):

**THEOREM 2.1.** *For a  $2^m$ -BFF design  $T$  of resolution VII,*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned}\text{tr } V_T &= \text{tr } K_0^{-1} + (m-1) \cdot \text{tr } K_1^{-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{m(m-3)}{2} \cdot \text{tr } K_2^{-1} + \frac{m(m-1)(m-5)}{6} \cdot K_3^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{K}_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_0 & m^{\frac{1}{2}}\gamma_1 & \binom{m}{2}^{\frac{1}{2}}\gamma_2 \\ (4 \times 4) & \gamma_0 + (m-1)\gamma_2 & \{(m-1)/2\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\{2\gamma_1 + (m-2)\gamma_3\} \\ & & \gamma_0 + 2(m-2)\gamma_2 + \binom{m-2}{2}\gamma_4 \\ (\text{Sym.}) & & \end{bmatrix}, \\
 \mathbf{K}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_0 - \gamma_2 & (m-2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(\gamma_1 - \gamma_3) \\ (3 \times 3) & \gamma_0 + (m-4)\gamma_2 - (m-3)\gamma_4 \\ (\text{Sym.}) & \end{bmatrix}, \\
 \mathbf{K}_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_0 - 2\gamma_2 + \gamma_4 & (m-4)^{\frac{1}{2}}(\gamma_1 - 2\gamma_3 + \gamma_5) \\ (2 \times 2) & \gamma_0 + (m-7)\gamma_2 - (2m-11)\gamma_4 + (m-5)\gamma_6 \\ (\text{Sym.}) & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \\
 \mathbf{K}_3 &= \gamma_0 - 3\gamma_2 + 3\gamma_4 - \gamma_6 = 2^6\mu_3.
 \end{aligned}$$

**THEOREM 2.2.** *A necessary condition for the existence of a  $2^m$ -BFF design  $T$  of resolution VII is that the matrices  $\mathbf{K}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{K}_1$  and  $\mathbf{K}_2$  are positive definite and  $\mu_3 \geq 1$ .*

Using the elements of the inverse matrices  $\mathbf{K}_i^{-1}$  ( $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ ), Shirakura and Kuwada (1976) have obtained an explicit expression for all the distinct elements of  $V_T$ . It will be very useful for calculating the covariance matrices  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta})$  for optimal designs. Note that Theorem 2.2 includes a necessary condition for nonsingularity of  $M_T$  that the number of distinct columns in  $T$  must be at least  $p_m$ . Also note that for a  $2^m$ -BFF design  $T$  of resolution VII, we have  $\text{tr } V_T = \text{tr } V_{\bar{T}}$ , where  $\bar{T}$  is the complementary design obtained from  $T$  by an interchange of 0 and 1. This implies that since if  $T$  is a B-array with index set  $\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_6\}$ , then  $\bar{T}$  is a B-array with index set  $\{\mu_6, \mu_5, \dots, \mu_0\}$ , we may restrict to B-arrays such that (a)  $\mu_2 > \mu_4$ , if  $\mu_2 \neq \mu_4$ , (b)  $\mu_1 > \mu_5$ , if  $\mu_2 = \mu_4$  and  $\mu_1 \neq \mu_5$ , or (c)  $\mu_0 \geq \mu_6$ , if  $\mu_2 = \mu_4$  and  $\mu_1 = \mu_5$ .

**3. Constructions of B-arrays.** In this section, we state some known results for later use. Let  $\tau^m(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$  denote the number of times the vector  $\mathbf{x}$  occurs as a column of a B-array  $T$ , where  $\mathbf{x}$  contains 1 exactly at  $i_1$ th,  $i_2$ th, ...,  $i_k$ th positions and 0 elsewhere. Particularly, let  $\tau^m(\phi)$  denote the number of times the vector of weight 0 occurs as a column of  $T$ . The following three theorems are due to Srivastava (1972):

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $m = 7$ . A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence*

of a B-array  $T$  is that there exists an integer  $d$  such that

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} d &\geqq \phi_{11} = \max(0, \mu_0 - \mu_1, \mu_0 - \mu_1 + \mu_2 - \mu_3, \\ &\quad \mu_0 - \mu_1 + \mu_2 - \mu_3 + \mu_4 - \mu_5), \\ d &\leqq \phi_{12} = \min(\mu_0, \mu_0 - \mu_1 + \mu_2, \mu_0 - \mu_1 + \mu_2 - \mu_3 + \mu_4, \\ &\quad \mu_0 - \mu_1 + \mu_2 - \mu_3 + \mu_4 - \mu_5 + \mu_6). \end{aligned}$$

Also if there exists an integer  $d$  which satisfies (3.1), then, as a construction of  $T$ ,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau^7(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) &= \sum_{q=1}^k (-1)^{k+q} \mu_{q-1} + (-1)^k d \quad \text{for } 1 \leqq k \leqq 7, \\ \tau^7(\phi) &= d. \end{aligned}$$

**THEOREM 3.2.** Let  $m = 8$ . A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a B-array  $T$  is that there exist integers  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_8$  and  $d_0$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_{12} &\geqq d_1 \geqq d_2 \geqq d_3 \geqq d_4 \geqq d_5 \geqq d_6 \geqq d_7 \geqq d_8 \geqq \phi_{11}, \\ d_0 &\geqq \phi_{21} = \max(0, d_1 + d_2 - \mu_0, d_1 + d_2 + d_3 + d_4 - 3\mu_0 + 2\mu_1 - \mu_2, \\ &\quad d_1 + d_2 + d_3 + d_4 + d_5 + d_6 \\ &\quad - 5\mu_0 + 4\mu_1 - 3\mu_2 + 2\mu_3 - \mu_4, \\ &\quad d_1 + d_2 + d_3 + d_4 + d_5 + d_6 + d_7 + d_8 \\ &\quad - 7\mu_0 + 6\mu_1 - 5\mu_2 + 4\mu_3 - 3\mu_4 + 2\mu_5 - \mu_6), \\ d_0 &\leqq \phi_{22} = \min(d_8, d_8 + d_7 + d_6 - 2\mu_0 + \mu_1, \\ &\quad d_8 + d_7 + d_6 + d_5 + d_4 - 4\mu_0 + 3\mu_1 - 2\mu_2 + \mu_3, \\ &\quad d_8 + d_7 + d_6 + d_5 + d_4 + d_3 + d_2 \\ &\quad - 6\mu_0 + 5\mu_1 - 4\mu_2 + 3\mu_3 - 2\mu_4 + \mu_5). \end{aligned}$$

Also if there exist integers  $d_0, d_1, \dots, d_8$  which satisfy (3.3), then, as a construction of  $T$ ,

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau^8(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) &= \sum_{q=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-1+q} (k-q) \mu_{q-1} + (-1)^{k+1} \sum_{\alpha=1}^k d_{i_\alpha} \\ &\quad + (-1)^k d_0 \quad \text{for } 2 \leqq k \leqq 8, \\ \tau^8(i_1) &= d_{i_1} - d_0, \\ \tau^8(\phi) &= d_0. \end{aligned}$$

**THEOREM 3.3.** Let  $x_q$  ( $q = 0, 1, \dots, m$ ) denote the number of columns of a B-array  $T$  each of which is of weight  $q$ . Then

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{q=0}^m \binom{q}{j} \binom{m-q}{6-j} x_q = \binom{m}{6} \binom{6}{j} \mu_j \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, 6,$$

where  $\binom{a}{b} = 0$  if  $b > a \geqq 0$  or  $b < 0$ .

In Theorem 3.3, particularly, a B-array  $T$  is said to be "trim" if  $x_0 = x_m = 0$ .

Let  $C(j; m)$  be the  $(0, 1)$  matrix of size  $m \times \binom{m}{j}$  whose columns are all the distinct vectors of weight  $j$  ( $0 \leqq j \leqq m$ ). Then it can be easily shown that  $C(j; m)$  is a B-array with indices  $\binom{m-6}{j-i}$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, 6$ ). Therefore an array obtained by juxtaposing each  $C(j; m)$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$ ),  $\lambda_j$  ( $\geqq 0$ ) times yields a B-array with indices  $\mu_i = \sum_{j=0}^m \lambda_j \binom{m-6}{j-i}$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, 6$ ). Such an array is called

a simple array (S-array). An S-array is obviously expressible by  $m + 1$  non-negative integers  $\lambda_j$  ( $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$ ). Fortunately, as will be seen later, all B-arrays required in this paper are S-arrays except only two arrays for  $m = 8$ .

**4. Optimal  $2^m$ -BFF designs with  $m = 8$ .** In Table 3, the optimal  $2^8$ -BFF designs of resolution VII for each number of  $N$  satisfying  $93 (= p_m) \leq N \leq 128$  are given with the distinct elements of  $V_T$ . For each optimal design, its constructions are indicated in Table 5. We make certain investigations on B-arrays with  $m = 8$  which are helpful in obtaining such designs.

First consider trim B-arrays with  $x_0 = x_8 = 0$ . Also define  $\nu_0 = \mu_0 + \mu_6$ ,  $\nu_1 = \mu_1 + \mu_5$  and  $\nu_2 = \mu_2 + \mu_4$ . Then it follows from (3.5) that for a trim B-array  $T^*$ , the following hold:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) \quad & x_1 + x_7 = 8(-\mu_3 + \nu_2 - \nu_1 + \nu_0) \geq 0 \\ (b) \quad & x_2 + x_6 = 28(2\mu_3 - 2\nu_2 + 2\nu_1 - \nu_0) \geq 0 \\ (c) \quad & x_3 + x_5 = 56(-3\mu_3 + 3\nu_2 - 2\nu_1 + \nu_0) \geq 0 \\ (d) \quad & x_4 = 35(4\mu_3 - 3\nu_2 + 2\nu_1 - \nu_0) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

**THEOREM 4.1.** *For a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 8$ , the following inequalities hold:*

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) \quad & \mu_3 \leq \nu_2 \\ (b) \quad & 21\nu_2 + 14\mu_3 \leq N \\ (c) \quad & 8\nu_1 + 35\mu_3 \leq N. \end{aligned}$$

**PROOF.** From (4.1b, c) it is clear that  $\nu_2 \geq \mu_3$  and  $\nu_0 + 15\nu_2 \geq 2\nu_1 + 15\mu_3$  hold. Since  $N = \nu_0 + 6\nu_1 + 15\nu_2 + 20\mu_3$ , we have  $8\nu_1 + 35\mu_3 \leq N$ . From (4.1a, b, c) it is clear that  $6\nu_1 + \nu_0 \geq 6(\nu_2 - \mu_3)$  holds. Similarly we have  $21\nu_2 + 14\mu_3 \leq N$ .

Since we are interested in designs with  $N \leq 128$ , it follows from (4.2c) that B-arrays with  $\mu_3 \geq 4$  need not be considered.

**THEOREM 4.2.** *If there exists a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 8$ ,  $N \leq 128$  and  $\mu_3 = 1$ , then  $2 \leq \nu_2 \leq 5$ ,  $\nu_1 \leq 11$  and  $3\nu_2 - 2\nu_1 + \nu_0 = 4$  (i.e.,  $x_4 = 0$ ) hold.*

**PROOF.** The inequalities (4.2a, b, c), immediately, give  $1 \leq \nu_2 \leq 5$  and  $\nu_1 \leq 11$ . From (4.1b, c, d) it follows that  $\nu_2 = 1$  implies  $x_4 = 35$ ,  $x_3 + x_5 = 0$  and  $x_2 + x_6 = 0$ . Furthermore  $x_3 + x_5 = 0$  or  $x_2 + x_6 = 0$  implies  $d_1 = d_2 = \dots = d_8$  in (3.4). Hence  $x_4 = 35$  contradicts that  $x_4$  is a multiple of  $\binom{m}{4} = 70$ . Hence we have  $2 \leq \nu_2$ . The inequalities (4.1c, d) give  $0 \leq 4 - 3\nu_2 + 2\nu_1 - \nu_0 \leq 1$ . It follows that  $4 - 3\nu_2 + 2\nu_1 - \nu_0 = 1$  implies  $x_4 = 35$  and  $x_3 + x_5 = 0$ . Similarly  $4 - 3\nu_2 + 2\nu_1 - \nu_0 = 1$  gives a contradiction. Hence we have  $3\nu_2 - 2\nu_1 + \nu_0 = 4$ .

Similarly we have

**THEOREM 4.3.** *If there exists a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 8$ ,  $N \leq 128$  and  $\mu_3 = 2$ , then  $2 \leq \nu_2 \leq 4$ ,  $\nu_1 \leq 7$  and  $2\nu_2 - 4 \leq 2\nu_1 - \nu_0 \leq 3\nu_2 - 6$  hold.*

**THEOREM 4.4.** *If there exists a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 8$ ,  $N \leq 128$  and  $\mu_3 = 3$ , then  $\nu_2 = 4$ ,  $\nu_1 \leq 2$  and  $2 \leq 2\nu_1 - \nu_0 \leq 3$  hold.*

Using Theorem 3.2, we can obtain trim B-arrays with  $m = 8$  and  $93 \leq N \leq 128$  which satisfy a necessary condition of Theorem 4.2, 4.3 or 4.4. In the same time, we find that all B-arrays obtained so are S-arrays with  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_8 = 0$  except the following only one array with index set  $\{2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1\}$  and  $N = 127$ :

$$(4.3) \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c} 0 & 0 \dots 0 & 1 & 1 \dots 1 & 0 & 0 \dots 0 & 1 & 1 \dots 1 \\ \hline C(1; 7) & C(1; 7) & C(3; 7) & C(3; 7) & C(5; 7) & C(5; 7) & \vdots & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \right].$$

General B-arrays can be easily obtained from trim B-arrays by adding column vectors, each being of weight 0 or 8. Consider the set of index sets which satisfy  $N = \mu_0 + \mu_6 + 6(\mu_1 + \mu_5) + 15(\mu_2 + \mu_4) + 20\mu_3$ , among all the B-arrays for each  $N$  with  $93 \leq N \leq 128$ . Then, using Theorem 2.1, we can find the required optimal designs which minimize  $\text{tr } V_T$  in this set. For a given index set, there are in general more than one distinct (nonisomorphic) B-arrays. That is, note that optimal designs cannot always be determined uniquely.

EXAMPLE 1. The following is an S-array with  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_4 = \lambda_6 = 1$  and  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_5 = \lambda_7 = \lambda_8 = 0$ :

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c|c|c|c} 0 & & & \\ 0 & & & \\ \vdots & C(2; 8) & C(4; 8) & C(6; 8) \\ \vdots & & & \\ 0 & & & \end{array} \right].$$

This array is a B-array with index set  $\{2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1\}$  and  $N = 127$ , which is distinct from the array in (4.3). From Table 3, it is seen that the B-arrays with this index set are the optimal designs for  $N = 127$ .

### 5. Optimal $2^m$ -BFF designs with $m = 6$ and 7.

(i) The case  $m = 6$ . Here, we are interested in B-arrays with  $p_m (= 42) \leq N \leq 64$ . It follows from the definition of a B-array that there exists a B-array for any index set  $\{\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_6\}$  and that it is also an S-array (i.e.,  $\lambda_i = \mu_i$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots, 6$ )). Therefore, among all solutions  $\{\mu_0, \dots, \mu_6\}$  satisfying  $N = \mu_0 + \mu_6 + 6(\mu_1 + \mu_5) + 15(\mu_2 + \mu_4) + 20\mu_3$  for each  $N$  ( $42 \leq N \leq 64$ ), we find the optimal designs which minimize  $\text{tr } V_T$  in (2.1). In Table 1, these are listed with the distinct elements of  $V_T$ . As will be seen in this table, for each number of  $N = 48, 50$  and  $52$ , there are two optimal designs in which their index sets are distinct from each other.

(ii) The case  $m = 7$ . Here, we are interested in B-arrays with  $p_m (= 64) \leq N \leq 90$ . Using the same method as the case  $m = 8$ , we make certain investigations on B-arrays with  $m = 7$ . For a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $x_0 = x_7 = 0$ ,

$$(a) \quad x_1 + x_6 = 7\nu_0$$

TABLE 1

N	index set	tr $V_T$	$V(\hat{\theta}_\phi)$ Cov ( $\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_i$ )	$Cov (\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$ Cov ( $\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ijk}$ )	$V(\hat{\theta}_i)$ Cov ( $\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_j$ )	$Cov (\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$ Cov ( $\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{jk}$ )	$Cov (\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$
42	1011010	1.46417	0.02583 0.00153	0.00028 -0.00146	0.02583 0.00153	0.00028 -0.00146	0.00028
43	1011011	1.41525	0.02580 0.00150	0.00008 -0.00166	0.02580 0.000150	0.00008 -0.00166	0.00008
44	2011011	1.40310	0.02447 0.00234	-0.00057 -0.00121	0.02527 0.00097	0.00048 -0.00125	-0.00020
45	2011012	1.39491	0.02445 0.00234	-0.00064 -0.00128	0.02527 0.00097	0.00047 -0.00126	-0.00021
46	3011012	1.39068	0.02398 0.00263	-0.00087 -0.00113	0.02509 0.00079	0.00062 -0.00112	-0.00030
47	0111010	1.33854	0.03125 0.00000	0.00000 -0.00781	0.02474 0.00130	0.00260 -0.00130	0.00260
48	0111011	1.21875	0.02832 0.00195	0.00098 -0.00391	0.02344 0.00000	0.00195 -0.00195	0.00000
48	1111010	1.21875	0.02466 0.00293	-0.00073 -0.00195	0.02344 0.00000	0.00293 -0.00098	0.00000
49	1111011	1.17909	0.02464 0.00300	-0.00060 -0.00180	0.02314 -0.00030	0.00240 -0.00150	-0.00060
50	1111012	1.17188	0.02464 0.00302	-0.00058 -0.00178	0.02308 -0.00036	0.00231 -0.00160	-0.00071
50	2111011	1.17188	0.02397 0.00320	-0.00089 -0.00142	0.02308 -0.00036	0.00249 -0.00142	-0.00071
51	2111012	1.16507	0.02397 0.00319	-0.00090 -0.00143	0.02304 -0.00040	0.00239 -0.00151	-0.00080
52	2111013	1.16217	0.02397 0.00319	-0.00091 -0.00144	0.02302 -0.00042	0.00235 -0.00155	-0.00083
52	3111012	1.16217	0.02368 0.00326	-0.00104 -0.00129	0.02302 -0.00042	0.00243 -0.00148	-0.00083
53	3111013	1.15929	0.02368 0.00326	-0.00106 -0.00130	0.02300 -0.00043	0.00239 -0.00152	-0.00087
54	1111020	1.14148	0.02144 0.00095	-0.00177 -0.00234	0.01963 -0.00071	0.00084 -0.00089	-0.00086
55	1111021	1.10695	0.02068 0.00107	-0.00107 -0.00138	0.01961 -0.00073	0.00073 -0.00101	-0.00101
56	1111022	1.09942	0.02051 0.00110	-0.00092 -0.00117	0.01961 -0.00073	0.00070 -0.00103	-0.00105
57	0111101	0.87629	0.01994 0.00119	0.00211 -0.00101	0.01994 0.00119	0.00211 -0.00101	0.00211
58	1111101	0.84375	0.01855 0.00195	0.00098 0.00000	0.01953 0.00078	0.00273 -0.00039	0.00156
59	1111102	0.83144	0.01752 0.00114	0.00039 -0.00036	0.01890 0.00015	0.00228 0.00015	0.00128
60	2111102	0.82489	0.01718 0.00129	0.00012 -0.00015	0.01884 0.00009	0.00239 -0.00074	0.00119
61	2111103	0.82061	0.01680 0.00100	-0.00010 -0.00027	0.01863 -0.00012	0.00223 -0.00090	0.00110
62	0111110	0.73958	0.01660 0.00000	0.00098 0.00000	0.01823 0.00260	0.00000 0.00000	0.00260
63	1111110	0.68608	0.01634 0.00071	0.00071 0.00071	0.01634 0.00071	0.00071 0.00071	0.00071
64	1111111	0.65625	0.01563 0.00000	0.00000 0.00000	0.01563 0.00000	0.00000 0.00000	0.00000



TABLE 2

N	index set	$\text{tr } V_T$	$V(\hat{\theta}_\phi)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$	$V(\hat{\theta}_i)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ik})$
			$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_i)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_j)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{jk})$	
64	1111111	1.00000	0.01563 0.00000	0.00000 0.00000	0.01563 0.00000	0.00000 0.00000	0.00000 0.00000
65	2111111	0.99219	0.01550 0.00012	-0.00012 0.00012	0.01550 0.00012	0.00012 -0.00012	-0.00012 0.00012
66	2111112	0.98477	0.01534 0.00000	-0.00029 0.00000	0.01541 -0.00021	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00021 0.00000
67	3111112	0.98221	0.01528 0.00004	-0.00035 0.00004	0.01538 -0.00024	0.00004 0.00004	-0.00024 0.00004
68	3111113	0.97964	0.01521 0.00000	-0.00041 0.00000	0.01536 -0.00027	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00027 0.00000
69	4111113	0.97833	0.01518 0.00002	-0.00044 0.00002	0.01534 0.00028	0.00002 0.00002	-0.00028 0.00002
70	1211111	0.96759	0.01478 0.00063	-0.00040 0.00018	0.01480 -0.00033	0.00053 0.00004	-0.00023 0.00004
71	2211111	0.94531	0.01477 0.00061	-0.00037 0.00012	0.01477 -0.00037	0.00061 0.00012	-0.00037 0.00012
72	2211112	0.93750	0.01465 0.00049	-0.00049 0.00000	0.01465 -0.00049	0.00049 0.00000	-0.00049 0.00000
73	3211112	0.93348	0.01465 0.00049	-0.00049 0.00001	0.01465 -0.00049	0.00049 0.00001	-0.00049 0.00001
74	3211113	0.93097	0.01461 0.00045	-0.00054 -0.00003	0.01461 -0.00053	0.00045 -0.00004	-0.00053 -0.00004
75	4211113	0.92917	0.01460 0.00045	-0.00055 -0.00002	0.01461 -0.00053	0.00045 -0.00004	-0.00053 -0.00004
76	4211114	0.92789	0.01458 0.00043	-0.00057 -0.00004	0.01459 -0.00055	0.00042 -0.00006	-0.00055 -0.00006
77	2211121	0.91627	0.01397 -0.00001	-0.00073 -0.00004	0.01405 -0.00076	0.00008 0.00008	-0.00053 0.00008
78	2211122	0.89406	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00071 0.00000	0.01402 -0.00078	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00065 0.00000
79	3211122	0.88947	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00071 -0.00001	0.01401 -0.00079	0.00002 0.00002	-0.00067 0.00002
80	3211123	0.88561	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00070 0.00000	0.01401 -0.00079	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00069 0.00000
81	4211123	0.88385	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00070 0.00000	0.01401 -0.00079	0.00001 0.00001	-0.00070 0.00001
82	4211124	0.88217	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00069 0.00000	0.01401 -0.00080	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00070 0.00000
83	5211124	0.88119	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00069 0.00000	0.01401 -0.00080	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00071 0.00000
84	5211125	0.88023	0.01397 0.00000	-0.00069 0.00000	0.01401 -0.00080	0.00000 0.00000	-0.00071 0.00000
85	1221111	0.83594	0.01306 0.00110	-0.00012 -0.00037	0.01306 -0.00012	0.00110 -0.00012	-0.00012 -0.00037
86	2221111	0.82813	0.01294 0.00122	-0.00024 -0.00024	0.01294 -0.00024	0.00122 -0.00024	-0.00024 -0.00024
87	2221112	0.82105	0.01291 0.00115	-0.00032 -0.00029	0.01278 -0.00041	0.00106 -0.00041	-0.00035 -0.00041
88	3221112	0.81849	0.01286 0.00119	-0.00037 -0.00025	0.01275 -0.00043	0.00110 -0.00037	-0.00038 -0.00037
89	3221113	0.81597	0.01285 0.00116	-0.00040 -0.00027	0.01270 -0.00049	0.00104 -0.00042	-0.00042 -0.00042
90	4221113	0.81467	0.01282 0.00118	-0.00043 -0.00025	0.01269 -0.00050	0.00106 -0.00043	-0.00043 -0.00041



TABLE 3

N	index set	tr $V_T$	$V(\hat{\theta}_\phi)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$	$V(\hat{\theta}_i)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ij})$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$
			$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_i)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_\phi, \hat{\theta}_{ijk})$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_j)$	$\text{Cov}(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\theta}_{jk})$	
93	2221122	1.17184	0.01306 0.00069	-0.00082 -0.00043	0.01306 0.00069	0.00082 -0.00043	-0.00082
94	2221123	1.16531	0.01265 0.00074	-0.00061 -0.00028	0.01305 0.00079	0.00079 -0.00046	-0.00084
95	3221123	1.16255	0.01264 0.00077	-0.00064 -0.00026	0.01301 0.00074	0.00084 -0.00041	-0.00086
96	3221124	1.16035	0.01251 0.00078	-0.00057 -0.00022	0.01301 0.00083	0.00083 -0.00042	-0.00087
97	4221124	1.15911	0.01250 0.00079	-0.00058 -0.00021	0.01299 0.00085	0.00085 -0.00040	-0.00088
98	4221125	1.15798	0.01244 0.00079	-0.00054 -0.00019	0.01299 0.00076	0.00085 -0.00040	-0.00088
99	5221125	1.15727	0.01244 0.00080	-0.00055 -0.00019	0.01298 0.00077	0.00086 -0.00039	-0.00089
100	5221126	1.15658	0.01240 0.00080	-0.00052 -0.00017	0.01298 0.00077	0.00086 -0.00039	-0.00089
101	4321122	1.11959	0.01301 0.00078	-0.00088 -0.00041	0.01261 -0.00083	0.00070 -0.00024	-0.00066
102	4321123	1.11306	0.01260 0.00084	-0.00068 -0.00026	0.01260 0.00084	0.00068 -0.00026	-0.00068
103	4321124	1.11088	0.01247 0.00085	-0.00061 -0.00021	0.01260 -0.00084	0.00067 -0.00027	-0.00068
104	4321125	1.10980	0.01240 0.00086	-0.00057 -0.00018	0.01260 -0.00084	0.00066 -0.00027	-0.00069
105	5321125	1.10874	0.01240 0.00086	-0.00057 -0.00019	0.01260 -0.00084	0.00067 -0.00027	-0.00069
106	5321126	1.10808	0.01236 0.00087	-0.00055 -0.00017	0.01260 -0.00084	0.00067 -0.00027	-0.00069
107	2222112	1.04927	0.01130 0.00150	0.00015 -0.00058	0.01077 0.00030	0.00117 -0.00034	-0.00003
108	3222112	1.04241	0.01066 0.00142	-0.00001 -0.00034	0.01076 0.00029	0.00115 -0.00036	0.00000
109	3222113	1.03944	0.01066 0.00142	-0.00003 -0.00035	0.01075 0.00028	0.00115 -0.00037	-0.00001
110	4222113	1.03736	0.01043 0.00139	-0.00009 -0.00028	0.01075 0.00028	0.00114 -0.00037	0.00000
111	4222114	1.03614	0.01043 0.00139	-0.00011 -0.00029	0.01075 0.00029	0.00113 -0.00038	-0.00001
112	5222114	1.03509	0.01031 0.00137	-0.00014 -0.00025	0.01075 0.00028	0.00113 -0.00038	0.00000
113	5222115	1.03440	0.01030 0.00137	-0.00015 -0.00026	0.01075 0.00028	0.00112 -0.00039	0.00000
114	6222115	1.03376	0.01022 0.00136	-0.00018 -0.00024	0.01074 0.00027	0.00112 -0.00039	0.00000
115	2222124	0.99811	0.01048 0.00104	-0.00006 -0.00063	0.00941 0.00019	0.00043 -0.00024	-0.00032
116	3222124	0.99126	0.00985 0.00096	-0.00022 -0.00039	0.00940 0.00018	0.00041 -0.00026	-0.00029
117	3222125	0.98886	0.00977 0.00092	-0.00018 -0.00034	0.00938 0.00016	0.00043 -0.00025	-0.00027
118	4222125	0.98693	0.00959 0.00091	-0.00024 -0.00028	0.00938 0.00016	0.00043 -0.00025	-0.00026
119	4222126	0.98581	0.00957 0.00089	-0.00023 -0.00026	0.00937 0.00015	0.00044 -0.00024	-0.00025
120	5222126	0.98487	0.00948 0.00089	-0.00026 -0.00023	0.00937 0.00015	0.00043 -0.00024	-0.00025
121	5222127	0.98421	0.00947 0.00088	-0.00025 -0.00022	0.00936 0.00014	0.00044 -0.00024	-0.00024
122	6222127	0.98364	0.00942 0.00088	-0.00027 -0.00021	0.00936 0.00014	0.00044 -0.00024	-0.00024







- (b)  $x_2 + x_5 = 21(\nu_1 - \nu_0) \geqq 0$   
(c)  $x_3 + x_4 = 35(\nu_2 + \nu_0 - \nu_1) = 35\mu_3$ .

**THEOREM 5.1.** *For a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 7$ , the inequalities (a)  $\mu_3 \leqq \nu_2$ , (b)  $21\nu_2 + 14\mu_3 \leqq N$  and (c)  $7\nu_1 + 35\mu_3 \leqq N$  hold.*

**THEOREM 5.2.** *If there exists a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 8$ ,  $N \leqq 90$  and  $\mu_3 = 1$ , then  $1 \leqq \nu_2 \leqq 3$ ,  $\nu_1 \leqq 7$  and  $\nu_0 = 1 + \nu_1 - \nu_2$  hold.*

**THEOREM 5.3.** *If there exists a trim B-array  $T^*$  with  $m = 8$ ,  $N \leqq 90$  and  $\mu_3 = 2$ , then  $\nu_2 = 1$ ,  $\nu_1 \leqq 5$  and  $\nu_0 = 2 + \nu_1 - \nu_2$  hold.*

Using Theorem 3.1, we can obtain trim B-arrays with  $m = 7$  and  $64 \leqq N \leqq 90$  which satisfy a necessary condition of Theorem 5.2 or 5.3. However, since  $\tau^7(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$  in (3.2) do not depend on the positions in which 1 occurs, it follows that all B-arrays with  $m = 7$  are S-arrays. That is, every B-array is expressible by  $\lambda_0 = \tau^7(\phi)$  and  $\lambda_k = \tau^7(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 7$ .

As in Section 4, the required optimal designs which minimize  $\text{tr } V_T$  for each  $N$  ( $64 \leqq N \leqq 90$ ) can be obtained. In Table 2, these are listed with the distinct elements of  $V_T$ . For each design in this table, its constructions are indicated in Table 4.

**EXAMPLE 2.** Consider a B-array with index set  $\{1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1\}$  which is an optimal design for  $N = 85$ . From Theorem 3.1, there exist two distinct values of  $d$  (say  $d = 0$  and 1). Therefore we have the following two distinct S-arrays:

(a) For  $d = 0$ ,

$$\lambda_0 = \lambda_4 = \lambda_6 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_5 = \lambda_7 = 1 .$$

(b) For  $d = 1$ ,

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_5 = \lambda_7 = 0 , \quad \lambda_0 = \lambda_4 = \lambda_6 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = 2 .$$

Tables 1, 2 and 3 are prepared at the Hiroshima University Computing Center, TOSBAC 3400/41.

**Acknowledgment.** I wish to thank Professor Sumiyasu Yamamoto for his guidance and his helpful suggestions. I also wish to thank the editor for his helpful comments concerning English usage, and for his constructive suggestions which have greatly improved the presentation of this paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] BOSE, R. C. and SRIVASTAVA, J. N. (1964). Analysis of irregular factorial fractions. *Sankhyā Ser. A* **26** 117-144.
- [2] CHAKRAVARTI, I. M. (1956). Fractional replication in asymmetrical factorial designs and partially balanced arrays. *Sankhyā* **17** 143-164.
- [3] CHOPRA, D. V. and SRIVASTAVA, J. N. (1973a). Optimal balanced  $2^7$  fractional factorial designs of resolution V, with  $N \leqq 42$ . *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **25** 587-604.
- [4] CHOPRA, D. V. and SRIVASTAVA, J. N. (1973b). Optimal balanced  $2^7$  fractional factorial designs of resolution V,  $49 \leqq N \leqq 55$ . *Commun. Statist.* **2** 59-84.

- [5] SHIRAKURA, T. and KUWADA, M. (1976). Covariance matrices of the estimates for balanced fractional  $2^m$  factorial designs of resolution  $2l + 1$ . To appear in *J. Japan Statist. Soc.*
- [6] SRIVASTAVA, J. N. (1970). Optimal balanced  $2^m$  fractional factorial designs. S. N. Roy Memorial Volume. Univ. of North Carolina, and Indian Statistical Institute, 689–706.
- [7] SRIVASTAVA, J. N. (1972). Some general existence conditions for balanced arrays of strength  $t$  and 2 symbols. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A* **13** 198–206.
- [8] SRIVASTAVA, J. N. and CHOPRA, D. V. (1971a). Balanced optimal  $2^m$  fractional factorial designs of resolution V,  $m \leq 6$ . *Technometrics* **13** 257–269.
- [9] SRIVASTAVA, J. N. and CHOPRA, D. V. (1971b). On the characteristic roots of the information matrix of  $2^m$  balanced factorial designs of resolution V, with applications. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **42** 722–734.
- [10] YAMAMOTO, S., SHIRAKURA, T. and KUWADA, M. (1974). Characteristic polynomials of the information matrices of balanced fractional  $2^m$  factorial designs of higher  $(2l + 1)$  resolution. To appear in *Essays in Probability and Statistics Presented in Honor of Professor J. Ogawa on his 60th Birthday*.
- [11] YAMAMOTO, S., SHIRAKURA, T. and KUWADA, M. (1975). Balanced arrays of strength  $2l$  and balanced fractional  $2^m$  factorial designs. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **27** 143–157.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
FACULTY OF SCIENCE  
HIROSHIMA UNIVERSITY  
HIROSHIMA, JAPAN