

A Fisher type inequality for weighted regular t -wise balanced designs

Ziqing Xiang*

Abstract

Delsarte and Seidel found that the dimension of a certain linear space can serve as a Fisher type lower bound for the size of a weighted regular t -wise balanced design. They put it as a problem to explicitly determine this dimension. This note calculates the rank of a special set inclusion matrix and then solves the above problem.

1 Introduction

All arithmetic computations in this note are carried out over the field of reals.

For any nonnegative integer n , we use the notation $[n]$ for the set $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. We fix a positive integer v . For any positive integer t , a *weighted regular t -wise balanced design* with *point set* $[v]$ is a pair (\mathcal{B}, w) , where $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{[v]}$ is the set of *blocks* and $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{B}}$ is a strictly positive *weight function* over \mathcal{B} such that for any $S \in \binom{[v]}{\leq t}$ the number $\sum_{\substack{L \in \mathcal{B} \\ S \subseteq L}} w(L)$ is determined by $|S|$. Note that Delsarte and Seidel [1, §6] refer to a weighted regular t -wise balanced design as a Boolean design with indices from $[t]$.

For any set systems \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{G} , the *inclusion matrix* of \mathcal{H} vs \mathcal{G} is the $|\mathcal{H}|$ by $|\mathcal{G}|$ matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{G}}$ satisfying

$$M(H, G) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } H \subseteq G, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$. For any two nonnegative integers a and b we write $\mathbf{M}_{a,b}$ for the inclusion matrix of $\binom{[v]}{a}$ vs $\binom{[v]}{b}$. For any $A, B \subseteq [v]$, let $\mathbf{M}_{A,B}$ denote the $(\cup_{a \in A} \binom{[v]}{a}) \times (\cup_{b \in B} \binom{[v]}{b})$ matrix such that $\mathbf{M}_{A,B}(\binom{[v]}{a}, \binom{[v]}{b}) = \mathbf{M}_{a,b}$ for every $a \in A$ and $b \in B$.

Delsarte and Seidel obtain the following Fisher type lower bound for the size of a weighted regular t -wise balanced design.

*Department of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Theorem 1 (Delsarte-Seidel [1, Theorem6.3]). *Let $t = 2e$ be an even positive integer. Suppose (\mathcal{B}, w) is a weighted regular t -wise balanced design over $[v]$ and B is the set of block sizes of \mathcal{B} . If $e \leq b$ for every $b \in B$, then*

$$|\mathcal{B}| \geq \text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{[e], B}.$$

In view of the above theorem, it is of interest to determine $\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{[e], B}$. Delsarte and Seidel mention this as an open problem [1, p. 228] and report some partial results [1, p. 229]. In this note we will prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *Let $A = \{a_0, \dots, a_p\}$ and $B = \{b_0, \dots, b_q\}$ be subsets of $[v]$ where $a_p < \dots < a_0 \leq b_0 < \dots < b_q$. Then*

$$\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{A, B} = \sum_{i \in [\min\{p, q\}]} \min \left\{ \binom{v}{a_i}, \binom{v}{b_i} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

By taking $A = [e]$ in Theorem 2, we arrive at the next result, which settles the problem of Delsarte and Seidel.

Theorem 3. *Let e be a positive integer and let $B = \{b_0, \dots, b_q\}$ with $e \leq b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_q$. Then we have*

$$\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{[e], B} = \sum_{i \in [q]} \min \left\{ \binom{v}{e-i}, \binom{v}{b_i} \right\}.$$

The following is an immediate consequence of Theorems 1 and 3.

Corollary 4. *Let e be a positive integer and let (\mathcal{B}, w) be a weighted regular $2e$ -wise balanced design over $[v]$. If B is the set of block sizes of (\mathcal{B}, w) and $e \leq b \leq v - e$ for every $b \in B$, then*

$$|\mathcal{B}| \geq \text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{[e], B} = \sum_{i \in [|B|-1]} \binom{v}{e-i}.$$

2 Proof of Theorem 2

When we consider a matrix whose row index set and column index set are sets of integers, we adopt the convention that the rows/columns are arranged so that the ones with smaller indices come earlier. For example, if we say that a matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [p]}$ is lower triangular, this means that $U(i, j) = 0$ whenever $i < j$.

A matrix is *strictly totally positive* if all its minors are positive [6]. When we fix an ordering of the row index set and an ordering of the column index set, a *successive minor* of a matrix is the determinant of a submatrix whose row indices and column indices are both consecutive in the given orderings.

Theorem 5 (Fekete's Lemma [6, Lemma 2.1]). *A matrix is strictly totally positive if and only if all its successive minors are positive.*

Lemma 6 ([5, Lemma 3]). *Let $X_0, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n$, and Z_1, \dots, Z_n be indeterminates. Then*

$$\det_{i,j \in [n]} \left(\prod_{j < k \leq n} (X_i + Y_k) \prod_{1 \leq k \leq j} (X_i + Z_k) \right) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_i - X_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} (Z_i - Y_j).$$

For any two positive integers $m \leq n$, let $\mathbf{A}_{m|n}$ be the $(m+1) \times (m+1)$ matrix satisfying $\mathbf{A}_{m|n}(i, j) = \frac{1}{(n+i-j)!}$ for $i, j \in [m]$.

Corollary 7. $\det \mathbf{A}_{a|b} = \prod_{i \in [a]} \frac{i!}{(b+i)!} > 0$.

Proof. Taking all the Y_i to infinity, it is a direct consequence of Lemma 6 that

$$\det_{i,j \in [a]} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq j} (X_i + Z_k) \right) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j \leq a} (X_j - X_i).$$

Letting $X_i = b + i$ for $i \in [a]$ and $Z_k = -k$ for $k = 1, \dots, a$ we get

$$\det_{i,j \in [a]} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq j} (b + i - k) \right) = \prod_{i \in [a]} i!. \quad (2)$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathbf{A}_{a|b} &= \det_{i,j \in [a]} \left(\frac{1}{(b+i-j)!} \right) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \in [a]} \frac{1}{(b+i)!} \right) \det_{i,j \in [a]} \left(\prod_{1 \leq k \leq j} (b+i-k) \right) \\ &= \prod_{i \in [a]} \frac{i!}{(b+i)!}, \quad (\text{by Eq.(2)}) \end{aligned}$$

as was to be shown. \square

Corollary 8. *For any positive integer n , the matrix $\mathbf{A}_{n|n}$ is strictly totally positive.*

Proof. Take an arbitrary successive minor of $\mathbf{A}_{n|n}$, which must have the form $\det \mathbf{A}_{a|b}$ for some integers a and b satisfying $0 \leq a \leq b \leq 2n - a$. It is now clear that the result follows from Theorem 5 and Corollary 7, as desired. \square

The following results are well-known.

Lemma 9 (Kantor [4, p. 315]). *For any $a, b \in [v]$, $\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{a,b} = \min\left\{\binom{v}{a}, \binom{v}{b}\right\}$.*

Lemma 10 (Kantor [4, p. 317]). *If $0 \leq a \leq b \leq c \leq v$, then*

$$\frac{(c-a)!}{(c-b)!(b-a)!} \mathbf{M}_{a,c} = \mathbf{M}_{a,b} \mathbf{M}_{b,c}.$$

For any two nonnegative integers a and b we set $\mathbf{N}_{a,b} = (b-a)!\mathbf{M}_{a,b}$. For any $a \leq b \leq c$, it follows from Lemma 10 that

$$\mathbf{N}_{a,b}\mathbf{N}_{b,c} = \mathbf{N}_{a,c}. \quad (3)$$

Let us fix two subsets $A = \{a_0, \dots, a_p\}$ and $B = \{b_0, \dots, b_q\}$ of $[v]$ satisfying

$$a_p < \dots < a_0 \leq b_0 < \dots < b_q. \quad (4)$$

For any matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [p]}$, let $\psi(U) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\cup_{a \in A} \binom{[v]}{a}) \times (\cup_{a \in A} \binom{[v]}{a})}$ be specified by

$$\psi(U) \left(\binom{[v]}{a_i}, \binom{[v]}{a_\ell} \right) = U(i, \ell) \mathbf{N}_{a_i, a_\ell}, \forall i \in [p], \ell \in [p];$$

for any matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [q]}$, let $\phi(K) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\cup_{a \in A} \binom{[v]}{a}) \times (\cup_{b \in B} \binom{[v]}{b})}$ be specified by

$$\phi(K) \left(\binom{[v]}{a_\ell}, \binom{[v]}{b_m} \right) = K(\ell, m) \mathbf{N}_{a_\ell, b_m}, \forall \ell \in [p], m \in [q];$$

for any matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{[q] \times [q]}$, let $\tau(V) \in \mathbb{R}^{(\cup_{b \in B} \binom{[v]}{b}) \times (\cup_{b \in B} \binom{[v]}{b})}$ be specified by

$$\tau(V) \left(\binom{[v]}{b_m}, \binom{[v]}{b_j} \right) = V(m, j) \mathbf{N}_{b_m, b_j}, \forall m \in [q], j \in [q].$$

An important consequence of Eq. (3) is

$$\psi(U)\phi(K)\tau(V) = \phi(UKV) \quad (5)$$

for every lower triangular matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [p]}$, every $K \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [q]}$ and every upper triangular matrix $V \in \mathbb{R}^{[q] \times [q]}$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [q]}$ be the matrix with $\mathbf{K}(i, j) = \frac{1}{(b_j - a_i)!}$ for every $i \in [p]$ and $j \in [q]$. It is not hard to check that

$$\phi(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{M}_{A,B}. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, it follows from Corollary 8 that \mathbf{K} is a strictly totally positive matrix. This allows us to apply Gaussian elimination and obtain a unique LDU factorization of \mathbf{K} ([2, §3.1], [3, pp. 10–11], [6, p. 51]), that is,

$$\mathbf{K} = UKV, \quad (7)$$

where U is a unit lower triangular matrix, K a diagonal matrix and V a unit upper triangular matrix. Indeed, the three matrices $U \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [p]}$, $K \in \mathbb{R}^{[p] \times [q]}$

and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{[q] \times [q]}$ are explicitly given by

$$\begin{aligned}
U(i, j) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\det \mathbf{K}([j-1] \cup \{i\}, [j])}{\det \mathbf{K}([j], [j])}, & j \in [\min\{p, q\}], i \geq j, \\ 0, & j \in [\min\{p, q\}], i < j, \\ \delta_{i,j}, & j > \min\{p, q\}, \end{cases} \\
K(i, j) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\det \mathbf{K}([i], [i])}{\det \mathbf{K}([i-1], [i-1])}, & i = j \in [\min\{p, q\}], \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\
V(i, j) &= \begin{cases} \frac{\det \mathbf{K}([i], [i-1] \cup \{j\})}{\det \mathbf{K}([i], [i])}, & i \in [\min\{p, q\}], j \geq i, \\ 0, & j \in [\min\{p, q\}], j < i, \\ \delta_{i,j}, & i > \min\{p, q\}, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used δ for the Kronecker delta function and have adopted the convention that $\det \mathbf{K}(\emptyset, \emptyset) = 1$.

Note that both $\psi(U)$ and $\tau(V)$ are nonsingular matrices. Accordingly, Eqs. (5), (6) and (7) tell us that $\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{A,B} = \text{rank } \phi(K)$. By virtue of Lemma 9, the RHS of Eq. (1) is just $\text{rank } \phi(K)$ and this ends the proof. \square

The main work in this note is to get a formula for $\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{A,B}$ on the condition that Eq. (4) is satisfied. A natural question is to compute $\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{A,B}$ when Eq. (4) does not necessarily hold. In this general case, we can still treat each block \mathbf{M}_{a_i, b_j} as an individual element and then carry out block Gaussian elimination to find that $\text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{A,B} = \sum \text{rank } \mathbf{M}_{a_i, b_j}$ where (i, j) runs through a subset S of $[p] \times [q]$ with no two elements sharing the same first or second coordinate. It would be interesting to determine this set S in the general case.

Acknowledgement

The topic of this work was suggested by Eiichi Bannai during his lectures in the Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, in the Spring of 2011. The author would like to thank Eiichi Bannai, John Goldwasser and Yaokun Wu for many useful comments when preparing the manuscript. It is also a pleasure to acknowledge the help from the referees and the editors.

References

- [1] P. Delsarte, J.J. Seidel, Fisher type inequalities for euclidean t -designs, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **114-115** (1989), 213–230.
- [2] H. Dym, *Linear Algebra in Action*, American Mathematical Society, 2006.
- [3] A.S. Householder, *The Theory of Matrices in Numerical Analysis*, Dover, 1975.
- [4] W.M. Kantor, On incidence matrices of finite projective and affine spaces, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **124** (1972), 315–318.

- [5] C. Krattenthaler, Advanced determinant calculus, Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire **42** (1999), Art. B42q, 67 pp.
- [6] A. Pinkus, Totally Positive Matrices, Cambridge University Press, 2010.