

A comparative study of defining sets  
in designs

Nicholas Cavenagh  
University of Waikato

A defining set for a design is a subset of the design which determines it uniquely.

A Latin square of order  $n$  is an  $n \times n$  array with each symbol from a set of size  $n$  once per row and once per column.

Example 1. The following partially filled-in Latin square has precisely one completion to a Latin square of order 6.

0	1	2	3		
1	2				
2					
					3
				3	4

→

0	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	0
2	3	4	5	0	1
3	4	5	0	1	2
4	5	0	1	2	3
5	0	1	2	3	4

A defining set for a design is a subset of the design which determines it uniquely.

A Latin square of order  $n$  is an  $n \times n$  array with each symbol from a set of size  $n$  once per row and once per column.

Example 1. The following partially filled-in Latin square has precisely one completion to a Latin square of order 6.

0	1	2	3		
1	2				
2					
					3
				3	4

→

0	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	0
2	3	4	5	0	1
3	4	5	0	1	2
4	5	0	1	2	3
5	0	1	2	3	4

Example 2. The following is a defining set for a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with constant row and column 3.

0	0	0	1		
0	0				
0					
					1
				1	1



0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	1	0
0	1	1	1	1	0
1	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	1

Example 2. The following is a defining set for a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with constant row and column 3.

0	0	0	1		
0	0				
0					
					1
				1	1



0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	1	0
0	1	1	1	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	1

A frequency square  $F(n; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\alpha)$  is an  $n \times n$  array with symbol  $i$  occurring  $\lambda_i$  times in each row and column.

Example 3. The following is a defining set for  $F(6; 2, 2, 2)$ .  
(Fitina, Seberry, Sarvate, 1999)

0	1	1	2		
1	1				
1					
					2
				2	2

→

0	1	1	2	2	0
1	1	2	2	0	0
1	2	2	0	0	1
2	2	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	1	1	2
0	0	1	1	2	2

A frequency square  $F(n; \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\alpha)$  is an  $n \times n$  array with symbol  $i$  occurring  $\lambda_i$  times in each row and column.

Example 3. The following is a defining set for  $F(6; 2, 2, 2)$ .  
(Fitina, Seberry, Sarvate, 1999)

0	1	1	2		
1	1				
1					
					2
				2	2

→

0	1	1	2	2	0
1	1	2	2	0	0
1	2	2	0	0	1
2	2	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	1	1	2
0	0	1	1	2	2

A critical set for a design is a minimal defining set. That is, a defining set is a critical set if the removal of any element results in more than one completion. Each of the above defining sets are also critical sets.

0	1	2	3		
1	2				
2					
					3
				3	4



0	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	0
2	3	4	5	0	1
3	4	5	0	1	2
4	5	0	1	2	3
5	0	1	2	3	4



0	1	5	3	4	2
1	2	3	4	5	0
2	3	4	5	0	1
3	4	2	0	1	5
4	5	0	1	2	3
5	0	1	2	3	4

0	0	<i>0</i>	1		
0	0				
0					
					1
				1	1



0	0	<i>0</i>	1	1	<i>1</i>
0	0	1	1	1	0
0	1	1	1	0	0
1	1	<i>1</i>	0	0	<i>0</i>
1	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	1



0	0	<i>1</i>	1	1	<i>0</i>
0	0	1	1	1	0
0	1	1	1	0	0
1	1	<i>0</i>	0	0	<i>1</i>
1	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	1

0	1	1	2		
1	1				
1					
					2
				2	2



0	1	1	2	2	0
1	1	2	2	0	0
1	2	2	0	0	1
2	2	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	1	1	2
0	0	1	1	2	2



0	1	0	2	2	1
1	1	2	2	0	0
1	2	2	0	0	1
2	2	1	0	1	0
2	0	0	1	1	2
0	0	1	1	2	2

Trades.

A trade in a design  $D$  is a subset  $T \subseteq D$  for which there exists a disjoint mate  $T'$  such that  $T' \cap T = \emptyset$  and  $(D \setminus T) \cup T'$  is a design with the same parameters (or type) as  $D$ . Together  $(T, T')$  is called a bitrade.

If the design is some kind of array,  $T$  and  $T'$  occupy the same set of cells and each row and column contains the same set of entries, but in a different order.

Observations:

1.  $D \subset L$  is a defining set for a design  $L$  if and only if for every trade  $T \subseteq L$ ,  $D \cap T \neq \emptyset$ ;
2.  $D$  is a critical set for a design  $L$  if and only if it is:
  - (a) a defining set for  $L$  and
  - (b) for each element  $e \in D$  there is a trade  $T \subset L$  such that  $T \cap D = \{e\}$ .

Given a design  $D$ , we define  $sds(D)$  to be the size of the smallest defining set in  $D$  and

$$\mu(= \mu(D)) = \frac{sds(D)}{|D|}.$$

For each of the above designs,  $\mu = 1/4$ .

The following Latin squares have  $\mu = 5/16$ ,  $\mu = 6/25$  and  $\mu = 7/25$  (Adams, Khodkar, 2001), respectively.

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>

	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>		<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	
<i>3</i>		<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>

	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>0</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	
<i>1</i>		<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>

The following Latin squares have  $\mu = 5/16$ ,  $\mu = 6/25$  and  $\mu = 7/25$  (Adams, Khodkar, 2001), respectively.

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>

	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>		<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	
<i>3</i>		<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>

	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		<i>0</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>2</i>	
<i>1</i>		<i>0</i>	<i>3</i>

For a design  $D$  of some order  $n$  and “type”  $T$   
(e.g.  $T \in \{ \text{“Latin square”}, \text{“frequency square”} \}$ ),

$$\mu(T, n) := \min\{\mu(D) \mid D \text{ is a design of type } T \text{ and order } n\}.$$

We also define the surety of type  $T$  to be the following limit  
(if it exists):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(T, n).$$

Surety is a potentially interesting measure because:

- Surety is an indication of both the storability and the security of a design.
- Algebraic objects typically have surety 0.
- Purely combinatorial objects typically have surety 1.
- Designs are “interesting” as they often have non-trivial surety (strictly between 0 and 1).

Surety (or an equivalent concept) has been considered for various designs:

- member defining sets for Steiner designs (Gray and Ramsay, 1999),
- projective planes (Gray, Hamilton, O'Keefe (1997)),
- Hadamard designs (Seberry (1992), Sarvate and Seberry (1994)).

Let  $T(F)$  be the type  $n \times n$  frequency square, with no symbol occurring more than  $n/2$  times in each row/column.

The Conjecture.

$$\mu(T(F), n) = \begin{cases} 1/4 & \text{if } n \text{ is even;} \\ \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor / n^2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

If The Conjecture is true, the surety of type  $T(F)$  is equal to  $1/4$ .

Let  $scs(n)$  be the size of the smallest critical set in any Latin square of order  $n$ .

Sub-conjecture. For each integer  $n \geq 1$ ,  $scs(n) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$ .

This conjecture is true for

- $n \leq 5$ : Curran and van Rees (1978)
- $n = 6, 7$ : Adams and Kohdkar (2001)
- $n = 8$ : Bean (2005)

Best known upper and lower bounds for general  $n$ :

For each  $n \geq 1$ ,  $scs(n) \leq \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$ . (Cooper, Donovan, Seberry (1991,1996)).

On the other hand, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $scs(n) \geq n \lfloor (\log n)^{1/3}/2 \rfloor$  (Cavenagh, 2007).

Next consider a  $2m \times 2m$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix with constant row and column sum  $m$ . (Equivalently, a frequency square  $F(2m; m, m)$ .)

Theorem. (Fitina, Seberry, Sarvate, 1999)

$$\mu(F(2m; m, m)) \leq 1/4.$$

Theorem. (Cavenagh, 2011)

$$\mu(F(2m; m, m)) = 1/4.$$

Hence the surety of frequency squares of the form  $F(2m; m, m)$  is  $1/4$ .

Why is The Conjecture tractible for  $(0, 1)$ -matrices, yet unverified for Latin squares?

Trades in  $(0, 1)$ -matrices.

Here we consider a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix with fixed row and column sums. Since only two symbols are allowed, a trade  $T$  in a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix has a *unique* disjoint mate  $T'$ .

0	1	1	0	
1	0		0	1
1		0		
	0		1	
0	1		1	0

$T$

1	0	0	1	
0	1		1	0
0		1		
	1		0	
1	0		0	1

$T'$

Moreover, each row and column must have the same number of 0's and 1's.

## Trades in Latin squares.

A trade in a Latin square may have more than one disjoint mate:

0	1	2	3	
4	5		2	3
2		0		
	3		1	
3	2		5	4

$T$

3	2	0	1	
2	3		5	4
0		2		
	1		3	
4	5		2	3

$T'$

2	3	0	1	
3	2		5	4
0		2		
	1		3	
4	5		2	3

$T'$

Lemma.

Let  $M$  be a partially filled-in  $(0, 1)$ -matrix such that each row and column of  $M$  has at least one 0 and at least one 1. Then  $M$  contains a trade.

Theorem. Any trade in a  $(0,1)$ -matrix can be partitioned into disjoint minimal trades (which are alternating 0 – 1-cycles):

<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>		<b>0</b>		
	<b>0</b>		<b>1</b>	
<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

*T*

<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>		<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>0</b>		<b>1</b>		
	<b>1</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

*T'*

Lemma. Suppose  $D$  is a defining set for a  $(0,1)$ -matrix  $M$  and  $D \subset M$ . Then  $M \setminus D$  must have either a row or column containing only 0's or only 1's.

Consequence: Completing defining sets for  $(0,1)$ -matrices is easy (can be done in polynomial time), a rather boring Sudoku puzzle!!!

Theorem. (Colbourn, 1984) Deciding whether a partial Latin square is completable is NP-complete, even if there are no more than 3 unfilled cells in each row and column.

In the following critical set, no missing entry is directly “forced”:

				4
	0	3		
2				
3		1		
			1	

Theorem. Let  $D$  be a critical set for a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix  $M$ . Then  $D$  contains no trades. On the surface this theorem is non-intuitive!!!

Corollary. The complement of a critical set in a  $(0, 1)$ -matrix is always a defining set.

The following is a critical set for a Latin square of order 4. It contains a trade; thus its complement is not a defining set.

0	1	2	3
1	0		
2		0	
3			

Theorem. Any defining set for a  $2m \times 2m$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix with constant row and columns sum  $m$  has size at least  $m^2$ .

Proof by coin-flipping.

Corollary. Any critical set for a  $2m \times 2m$   $(0, 1)$ -matrix with constant row and columns sum  $m$  has size *at most*  $3m^2$ .

Open problem: Do there exist critical sets which meet this bound? Not for small orders...



We can exactly describe the structure of critical sets in  $F(2m; m, m)$  of minimal size.

Theorem. (Gale-Ryser, Walkup, Brualdi) A rectangular array on symbols 0 and 1 has no trades if and only if the rows and columns can be arranged so that a line with non-negative gradient can be drawn with only 1's below the line and only 0's above the line.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Theorem. Let  $D$  be a defining set for a matrix  $M \in F(2m; m, m)$  with size  $m^2$ . Then  $M$  may be split into four quadrants:

$$M = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} E & F \\ \hline G & H \end{array} \right]$$

such that each quadrant has no trades,  $E = H$ ,  $F = G$ . Moreover  $D$  contains every 0 from quadrant  $E$  and every 1 from quadrant  $H$  and no other symbols.

Example. A defining set in  $F(8; 4, 4)$ :

<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>

So we know all about the size of minimum defining sets for  $(0, 1)$ -matrices (in this special case)... but not yet for Latin squares.

Next steps:

- Look at frequency squares with at most 3 distinct symbols.
- Are there other designs with surety equal to  $1/4$ ???

## Summary

- The surety for Latin squares and certain  $(0, 1)$ -matrices with constant row and column sum appears to be the same (i.e.  $1/4$ ).
- This is perhaps because they can both belong to a broader class of frequency squares with constant surety.
- Current methods only handle special cases of “The Conjecture” .

- Surety is a tool for comparing the structure of designs, and may unearth new connections between different types of designs.

The idea of surety can be generalized. We can also consider:

- The size of the largest critical set in any design of a given type and order.
- The design of a given type and order which has the largest smallest critical set size (inf). For Latin squares,

$$n^2 - (e + o(1))n^{5/3} \leq \inf \leq n^2 - O(n^{3/2})$$

(Ghandehari, Hatami, Mahmoodian, 2005)

- The design of a given type and order which has the smallest largest critical set size (sup).