UCLA Department of Statistics Papers

Title

Two-Level Nonregular Designs From Quaternary Linear Codes

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2vg3j5xt>

Authors

Xu, Hongquan Wong, Alan

Publication Date 2005-10-19

Two-Level Nonregular Designs From Quaternary Linear Codes

Hongquan Xu and Alan Wong University of California, Los Angeles June 30, 2005

Abstract: A quaternary linear code is a linear space over the ring of integers modulo 4. Recent research in coding theory shows that many famous nonlinear codes such as the Nordstrom and Robinson (1967) code and its generalizations can be simply constructed from quaternary linear codes. This paper explores the use of quaternary codes to construct two-level nonregular designs. A general construction of nonregular designs is described and some theoretic results are obtained. Many nonregular designs constructed by this method have better statistical properties than regular designs of the same size in terms of resolution, aberration and projectivity. A systematic construction procedure is proposed and a collection of nonregular designs with 16, 32, 64, 128 and 256 runs is presented.

Key words and phrases: Fractional factorial design, generalized minimum aberration, generalized resolution, MacWilliams identity, quaternary code.

Running title: Nonregular Designs From Quaternary Codes

1 Introduction

Fractional factorial designs with factors at two levels are among the most widely used experimental designs. Designs that can be constructed through defining relations among factors are called *regular* designs. Any two factorial effects of regular designs can either be estimated independently or fully aliased with each other. All other designs that do not possess this kind of defining relationship are called nonregular designs.

Regular designs are typically chosen by the maximum resolution criterion (Box and Hunter (1961) and its refinement — the *minimum aberration* (MA) criterion (Fries and Hunter (1980)). Research on MA designs has been very active in the last 10-15 years. The reader is referred to Wu and Hamada (2000) for rich results and extensive references.

The concepts of resolution and aberration for regular designs have recently been extended to nonregular designs; see Deng and Tang (1999), Tang and Deng (1999), Ma and Fang (2001), Xu and Wu (2001), Xu (2003) and Ye (2003). Tang and Deng (1999) and Xu and Wu (2001) showed that generalized minimum aberration designs are model robust in the sense that they tend to minimize the contamination of non-negligible two-factor and higher-order interactions on the estimation of the main effects. Tang (2001) provided projection justification of the generalized minimum aberration criterion and Cheng, Deng and Tang (2002) showed that the generalized minimum aberration criterion is connected with some traditional model-dependent efficiency criteria.

With the generalized resolution and aberration criteria, it is now possible to systematically look at and compare the statistical properties of nonregular designs. The construction of good nonregular designs, however, remains challenging. Deng and Tang (2002) constructed generalized minimum aberration designs from Hadamard matrices of order 16, 20, and 24. Tang and Deng (2003) constructed generalized minimum aberration designs for 3, 4 and 5 factors and any run size. Li, Deng and Tang (2004) constructed designs with 20, 24, 28, 32 and 36 runs and up to 6 factors. Xu and Deng (2005) studied nonregular designs with 16, 20 and 27 runs. Sun, Li and Ye (2002) proposed a sequential algorithm and completely enumerated all 16 and 20-run orthogonal arrays. All these algorithmic constructions are limited to small run sizes (< 32) or small number of factors due to the existence of a large number of designs.

Butler (2003b, 2004) developed some theoretic results and constructed some special generalized minimum aberration designs over all possible designs without computer search. Xu (2005) constructed several nonregular designs with 64, 128 and 256 runs and 7-16 factors from the Nordstrom and Robinson (1967) code, a well-known nonlinear code in coding theory. These nonregular designs are better than regular designs of the same size in terms of both generalized resolution and aberration.

This paper considers the construction of two-level nonregular designs and proposes the use of quaternary codes to derive nonregular designs. The study of quaternary codes started in the early 1990s when it was discovered that many famous nonlinear binary codes (such as the Nordstrom and Robinson code and its generalizations) can be viewed as linear codes over $Z_4 = \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \pmod{4}$, the ring of integers modulo 4; see Hammons, Kumar, Calderbank, Sloane and Sole (1994).

The obvious advantage of using quaternary codes to construct nonregular designs is its relatively straightforward construction method. Furthermore, since it is a linear code over Z_4 , designs constructed by this quaternary code method can be presented and described in a simple manner. Like most papers that talk about regular designs, we use column indexes to describe these designs. More importantly, many nonregular designs constructed by this Z_4 construction method have better statistical properties than regular designs of the same size in terms of resolution, aberration and projectivity.

Background information, notation and definitions are presented in Section 2. Examples of quaternary codes and nonregular designs are given in Section 3. Section 4 presents some theoretic results and Section 5 describes a systematic construction procedure. A collection of nonregular designs with 16, 32, 64, 128 and 256 runs is presented in Section 6. Concluding remarks are given in Section 7.

2 Background Information, Notation and Definitions

A design D of N runs and n factors is represented by an $N \times n$ matrix, where each row corresponds to a run and each column to a factor. A two-level design takes on only two symbols, say −1 or +1. For $s = \{c_1, \ldots, c_k\}$, a subset of k columns of D, define

$$
J_k(s) = \left| \sum_{i=1}^N c_{i1} \cdots c_{ik} \right|,\tag{1}
$$

where c_{ij} is the *i*th component of column c_j . The J_k values are called the *J*-*characteristics* of design D. When D is a regular design, $J_k(s)$ takes on only two values: 0 or N. In general, $0 \leq J_k(s) \leq N$. If $J_k(s) = N$, these k columns in s form a word of length k.

Suppose that r is the smallest integer such that $\max_{|s|=r} J_r(s) > 0$, where the maximization is over all subsets of r columns of D. The *generalized resolution* (Deng and Tang (1999)) of D is defined as $R(D) = r + [1 - \max_{|s|=r} J_r(s)/N]$. Let

$$
A_k(D) = N^{-2} \sum_{|s|=k} [J_k(s)]^2.
$$
 (2)

The vector $(A_1(D),...,A_n(D))$ is called the *generalized wordlength pattern*. The *generalized mini*mum aberration criterion, called minimum G_2 -aberration by Tang and Deng (1999), is to sequentially minimize $A_1(D), A_2(D), \ldots, A_n(D)$. When restricted to regular designs, generalized resolution, generalized wordlength pattern and generalized minimum aberration reduce to the traditional resolution, wordlength pattern and minimum aberration, respectively. In the rest of the paper, we simply use resolution, wordlength pattern and minimum aberration for both regular and nonregular designs.

There is another version of generalized aberration criterion, which is based on the frequencies of J-characteristics. The *confounding frequency vector* of design D with run size N and n factors is defined as follows:

$$
cfv(D) = [(f_{11},...,f_{1N});(f_{21},...,f_{2N});...;(f_{n1},...,f_{nN})],
$$

where f_{kj} denotes the frequency of k-column combinations s with $J_k(s) = N + 1 - j$. The minimum G-aberration criterion (Deng and Tang (1999)) is to sequentially minimize the component in the confounding frequency vector.

Note that MA regular designs always have maximum resolution among all regular designs. The situation is more complicated for nonregular designs. Nonregular designs having minimum G_2 aberration may not have maximum resolution. However, nonregular designs having minimum Gaberration always have maximum resolution. Throughout the paper, we use the notion of aberration for G_2 -aberration unless specified,

A two-level design D of N runs and n factors is an *orthogonal array* of strength t , denoted by $OA(N, n, 2, t)$, if all possible 2^t level combinations for any t factors appear equally often. Deng and Tang (1999) showed that a design has resolution $r \leq R < r + 1$ if and only if it is an orthogonal array of strength $t = r - 1$.

A two-level design is said to have *projectivity* p (Box and Tyssedal (1996)) if any p -factor projection contains a complete 2^p factorial design, possibly with some points replicated. A regular design with resolution $R = r$ is an orthogonal array of strength $r - 1$ and hence has projectivity $r-1$. Deng and Tang (1999) showed that a design with resolution $R > r$ has projectivity $p \geq r$.

Two designs are said to be *isomorphic* if one can be obtained from the other by permuting the rows, the columns, and the symbols of each column.

2.1 Connection with coding theory

The connection between factorial designs and linear codes was first observed by Bose (1961). For an introduction to coding theory, see Hedayat, Sloane, and Stufken (1999, Chapter 4), MacWilliams and Sloane (1977) and van Lint (1999).

A two-level design is also called a binary code in coding theory. From now on, a two-level design takes on values from $Z_2 = \{0, 1\}$ (mod 2). For any row vectors x in D, the Hamming weight is the number of non-zero elements in x. Let $W_i(D)$ be the number of row vectors of D with Hamming weight i. The vector $(W_0(D), W_1(D), \ldots, W_n(D))$ is called the *weight distribution* of D.

For two row vectors a and b, the Hamming distance $d_H(a, b)$ is the number of places where they differ. Let

$$
B_i(D) = N^{-1} |\{(a, b) : a, b \text{ are row vectors of } D, \text{ and } d_H(a, b) = i\}|.
$$

The vector $(B_0(D), B_1(D), \ldots, B_n(D))$ is called the *distance distribution* of D.

A binary code D is said to be distance invariant if the weight distributions of its translators $u+D$ are the same for all $u \in D$, where $u+D = \{u+x \pmod{2} : x \in D\}$. Essentially, a distance invariant code has the special characteristics that its distance distribution and weight distribution are the same, assuming that it contains the null vector (i.e., the row with all zeros). Clearly, binary linear codes (i.e., regular designs) are distance invariant.

Xu and Wu (2001) showed that the wordlength pattern is the MacWilliams transform of the distance distribution, i.e.,

$$
A_j(D) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n} P_j(i; n) B_i(D) \text{ for } j = 0, ..., n,
$$
 (3)

where $P_j(x; n) = \sum_{i=0}^j (-1)^i {x \choose i} {n-x \choose j-i}$ are the Krawtchouk polynomials and $A_0(D) = 1$. By the orthogonality of the Krawtchouk polynomials, it is easy to show that

$$
B_j(D) = N 2^{-n} \sum_{i=0}^{n} P_j(i; n) A_i(D) \text{ for } j = 0, ..., n.
$$
 (4)

The equations (3) and (4) are known as the generalized MacWilliams identities.

3 Quaternary Codes and Nonregular Designs

Let G be a $k \times n$ matrix over Z_4 . All possible linear combinations of the rows in G over Z_4 form a quaternary linear code, denoted by C . In order to obtain a two-level design, we apply the $Gray$ map

$$
\phi: 0 \to (0,0), 1 \to (0,1), 2 \to (1,1), 3 \to (1,0).
$$

That is, each element in Z_4 is replaced with a pair of 0 and 1. The resulting two-level design, denoted by $D = \phi(C)$, is called the binary image of C. Although the code C is linear over Z_4 , its binary image D is not necessarily linear over Z_2 . Indeed, most of the designs generated are in fact nonregular designs. Throughout the paper, we use C for a quaternary linear code and D for its binary image. Note that C is a $4^k \times n$ matrix over Z_4 and D is a $4^k \times 2n$ matrix over Z_2 .

Example 1. Consider a 2×6 matrix

$$
G = \left[\begin{array}{rrrrr} 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3 \end{array} \right].
$$

All linear combinations of the two rows of G form a 16×6 linear code C over Z_4 . Applying the Gray map, we obtain a 16×12 design $D = \phi(C)$. See Table 1 for the C and D matrices. It is straightforward to verify that D has resolution 3.5; therefore, it is a nonregular design. For comparison, any regular design of the same size has resolution 3.

Example 2. Consider a 4×8 matrix

$$
G = \left[\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{array} \right]
$$

.

All linear combinations of the rows of G over Z_4 form a 256×8 quaternary linear code C. Applying the Gray map, we obtain a 256 \times 16 design $D = \phi(C)$, which is isomorphic to the (extended) Nordstrom-Robinson code. The resulting design D is an $OA(256, 16, 2, 5)$ with many remarkable properties. Xu (2005) showed that it has resolution 6.5 and projectivity 7. For comparison, for a regular design to achieve the same resolution and projectivity, it would require at least 512 runs. For more statistical properties and results from the Nordstrom-Robinson code, see Xu (2005).

Quaternary code C (a)							(b) Nonregular design D												
Run	1	$\overline{2}$	3	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{5}$	$\,6$	Run	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	3	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{5}$	$\,6$	7	$8\,$	9	10	11	12
1	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	θ	θ	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	θ	$\overline{0}$									
$\overline{2}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{1}$	3	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$
3	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{2}$	$\boldsymbol{2}$	3	$\overline{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$
$\overline{4}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{3}$	$\overline{2}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{4}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$
$\overline{5}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{5}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$
6	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	3	3	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{0}$	6	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	1	$\overline{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$
$\overline{7}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	3	3	7	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$1\,$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$
8	$\mathbf{1}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	3	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{2}$	8	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$
9	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	9	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$
10	$\overline{2}$	$1\,$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	10	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$
11	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	11	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$							
$12\,$	2	3	3	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	3	12	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	θ	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	θ	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$
13	3	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{2}$	3	3	3	$13\,$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$
14	3	$\mathbf{1}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{2}$	14	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$
15	3	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{0}$	3	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	15	$\mathbf{1}$	θ	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	θ	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$
16	3	3	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{2}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	16	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\overline{0}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$

Table 1: An Example of Quaternary Code and Nonregular Design

The corresponding C and D matrices are too large and therefore not presented. For other forms of generator matrices of the Nordstrom-Robinson code, see Hammons et. al (1994) and Hedayat, Sloane and Stufken (1999, Section 5.10).

4 Some Theoretic Results

We first study when a binary image is a useful two-level design. The following theorem gives necessary and sufficient conditions on the generator matrix.

Lemma 1. Let G be a $k \times n$ matrix over Z_4 , C be the quaternary linear code generated by G and $D = \phi(C)$ be the binary image. Then D is an orthogonal array of strength two if and only if G satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) it does not have any column containing entries 0 and 2 only,
- (ii) none of its column is a multiple of another column over Z_4 .

Proof. Necessity. If x is a column of G containing entries 0 and 2 only, then any linear combination of its elements is 0 or 2 over Z_4 . A column with entries 0 and 2 only generates two identical columns after applying the Gray map. For any column x, its multiples are λx with $\lambda = 0, 1, 2, 3$ over Z_4 . When $\lambda = 0, 2, \lambda x$ contains entries 0 and 2 only. When $\lambda = 3, \lambda x$ and x generate two identical pairs of columns after applying the Gray map. This proves that the conditions are necessary.

Sufficiency. First, consider the special case when $k = n = 2$. Let G be

$$
G = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ b & d \end{pmatrix}.
$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $a = 1$. Clearly

$$
G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ b & d \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } G_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ 0 & d - bc \end{pmatrix} \pmod{4}
$$

generate the same linear code over Z_4 . Because (c, d) is not a multiple of $(a, b) = (1, b)$ over Z_4 , $d - bc \neq 0 \pmod{4}$. If $d - bc = 1$ or 3 (mod 4), then G_2 becomes

$$
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}
$$
 or
$$
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & c \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
$$
.

Both matrices generate the same linear code over Z_4 with 16 distinct runs, regardless of c. The corresponding binary image is a 2^4 full factorial design. If $d - bc = 2 \pmod{4}$, c must be 1 or 3 by (i) [otherwise, both c and d are 0 or 2, which violates condition (i)]. Then G_2 becomes

$$
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}
$$
 or
$$
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 \ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}
$$
.

Both matrices generate the same linear code over Z_4 with eight distinct runs, each duplicated once. The corresponding binary image is a duplicated 2^{4-1} design with resolution 4.

In general, for a $k \times n$ matrix G, consider any pair of columns. By the assumption of G, we can always choose two rows of G such that the resulting 2×2 submatrix satisfying conditions (i) and (ii). Then the binary image of the linear code corresponding to this pair of columns is either a 2⁴ full factorial design, each run being repeated 4^{k-2} times, or a 2^{4-1} design with resolution 4, each run being repeated $2 \times 4^{k-2}$ times. Therefore, any pair of columns in the binary image D is orthogonal to each other. \Box

Lemma 1 implies that the resulting design D has resolution at least 3. The next result shows that the resolution is indeed at least 3.5.

Lemma 2. If G satisfies the conditions in Lemma 1, then $D = \phi(C)$ has resolution at least 3.5.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 1, it is sufficient to look at all possible 3×3 generator matrices. It can be verified that under elementary row and column operations, the generator matrix G satisfying the conditions is equivalent to one of the following

$$
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 1 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 2 \ 0 & 1 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 1 & 0 \ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 1 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \ 0 & 1 & 0 \ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
$$

The first matrix generates a replicated 16×6 design with resolution 3.5, the second matrix generates a replicated 16×6 design with resolution 4, the third matrix generates a replicated 32×6 design with resolution 4, the fourth matrix generates a replicated 32×6 design with resolution 6, and the fifth matrix generates a full 2^6 design. Therefore, the binary image D has resolution at least \Box 3.5.

Lemma 3. If G satisfies the conditions in Lemma 1, then it has a maximum of $(4^k-2^k)/2$ columns.

Proof. There are 4^k vectors with k elements over Z_4 , among which 2^k vectors containing 0 and 2 only. If a vector x contains 1 or 3, so is its multiple $3x \pmod{4}$. Note that $3x \pmod{4}$ is also a multiple of x over Z_4 . Therefore, we can only include either x or 3x in the generator matrix G as a column. Because there are $4^k - 2^k$ vectors containing 1 or 3, the generator matrix G has a maximum of $(4^k - 2^k)/2$ columns. \Box

The proof of Lemma 3 gives the construction of a $k \times (4^k - 2^k)/2$ generator matrix. To be specific, such a matrix can be constructed as follows:

- 1. Write down all possible columns of k elements over Z_4 .
- 2. Delete columns that do not contain any 1's.
- 3. Delete columns whose first non-zero and non-two entries are 3's.

Combining Lemmas 2 and 3, we have the following result.

Theorem 1. For an integer $k > 1$, let G be the generator matrix obtained from the above procedure. Then the binary image D generated by G is a $4^k \times (4^k - 2^k)$ design with resolution 3.5.

The nonregular design constructed in Theorem 1 has $4^k = 2^{2k}$ runs. We can construct designs with 2^{2k+1} runs as follows. Let G be a $k \times n$ matrix over Z_4 , C be the quaternary linear code generated by G and $D = \phi(C)$ be the binary image. Assume that C and D have 4^k distinct rows. Consider another generator matrix

$$
G' = \begin{pmatrix} G & G \\ 0_n & 2_n \end{pmatrix},\tag{5}
$$

where 0_n and 2_n are rows vectors of n 0's and 2's, respectively. Although G' has $k + 1$ rows, the quaternary linear code C' generated by G' has only 2^{2k+1} distinct rows, because G' contains a row with only 0 and 2. Without loss of generality, assume

$$
C' = \begin{pmatrix} C & C \\ C & C+2 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{4}.
$$

Then its binary image is

$$
D' = \phi(C') = \begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ D & D+1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{2}.
$$

Note that D is a $2^{2k} \times 2n$ design and D' is a $2^{2k+1} \times 4n$ design. Clearly, if G satisfies the conditions in Lemma 1, so does G' . Combining Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, we have the following result.

Theorem 2. For an integer $k > 1$, let G be the generator matrix in Theorem 1 and define G' by (5). Then the binary image D' generated by G' is a $2^{2k+1} \times (2^{2k+1} - 2^{k+1})$ design with resolution 3.5.

Note that the nonregular designs constructed in Theorems 1 and 2 has resolution 3.5. It is well known that for $n > 2^{k-1}$, a regular design with 2^k runs and n factors has resolution at most 3. Therefore, nonregular designs constructed from quaternary codes have higher resolution than corresponding regular designs when resolution 4 designs do not exist.

Now consider some computation issues. Note that the calculation of the wordlength pattern can be cumbersome according to definition (2) , especially when n is large. An alternative is to compute the distance distribution and then apply the MacWilliams transform (3) to obtain the wordlength pattern. However, the calculation of the distance distribution can also be cumbersome, especially when the run sizes become large. The next theorem, Theorem 2 of Hammons et al. (1994), shows that binary images of quaternary codes are distance invariant. As a result, we can use the weight distribution instead of the distance distribution. The weight distribution is substantially easier to compute than the distance distribution; therefore, a large amount of computing time can be saved.

Theorem 3. For any quaternary linear code C, its binary image $D = \phi(C)$ is distance invariant.

5 A Systematic Construction Procedure

To obtain a collection of useful nonregular designs, we take a sequential approach as done by Chen, Sun and Wu (1993) and Xu (2004). Specifically, assume that we have a set of quaternary codes with n columns. We construct a set of quaternary codes with $(n+1)$ columns by adding a column to the generator matrices from the unused columns. Two-level designs are then obtained as binary images of quaternary codes. To eliminate redundant designs, all designs are divided into different categories according to their weight distributions and moment projection patterns. The moment projection pattern counts the frequency of the values of moments of projection designs; see Xu (2004) for more details. Designs in different categories are nonisomorphic. Whether designs in the same category are isomorphic can be determined by performing isomorphism check, which is very time consuming. To save computation time, we do not perform isomorphism check. Our empirical study on regular designs suggests that isomorphism check is usually not necessary for designs with 16, 32 and 64 runs. Also note that it is impractical to perform isomorphism check for designs with 128 runs and beyond because there are a huge number of nonisomorphic designs. Indeed, we have to limit the number of designs generated for 128 and 256 runs. We keep a maximum of 120,000 designs for each n and rank them by the minimum G_2 -aberration criterion; however, only the top $40,000$ designs are used to construct new designs for next n. The numbers are chosen arbitrarily.

To build a catalog, we choose two best designs among all designs according to the minimum G_2 and G-aberration criteria. It should be noted, however, that the two designs could be the same. In this case, we have only one design. To save computation time, we use a weak version of the minimum G-aberration criterion, that is, for designs with resolution $r \leq R < r + 1$, we only compute and compare the frequency of $J_r(s)$ values.

The above procedure generates designs with even number of columns. To obtain designs with

odd number of columns, we simply delete one column. When doing so, we limit to the one or two best designs. We try all possible deletions and choose two best designs according to the minimum G_2 and G -aberration criteria.

We observe that sometimes better designs can be derived from other designs via the half fraction method. For example, from an $N \times n$ design, we can get an $(N/2) \times (n-1)$ designs by taking half of the rows whose components are 0 for any particular column and deleting that column. When doing so, we again limit to the one or two best designs. We try all possible fractions and choose two best designs according to the minimum G_2 and G -aberration criteria. This method is used to construct some designs with 32 and 128 runs.

It should be noted that when deleting columns or taking fractions, wordlength patterns have to be calculated using the distance distributions, instead of the weight distributions.

6 Tables of Designs

With the construction method described in the last section, we obtain a collection of designs for 16, 32, 64, 128 and 256 runs, which are given in Tables 2–6.

The first column of these tables is the name of the designs. Designs with n factors and 2^{n-m} runs are labeled as $n-m.a$, $n-m.c$ or $n-m.ac$. An "a" designation corresponds to designs identified by the minimum G_2 -aberration criterion. A "c" designation corresponds to designs identified by the minimum G-aberration criterion. Finally, an "ac" designation corresponds to designs identified by both criteria.

The second and the third columns are the wordlength pattern (WLP) and the resolution (R) of the designs, respectively. Because all designs have resolution between 3 and 8, we only present A_3 up to A_8 for wordlength patterns.

The fourth column is the simplified confounding frequency vector (CFV). For a design D with resolution $r \leq R < r + 1$, all possible nonzero J_r values and their frequencies are given as $J : f$, where J is the J_r value and f is the frequency.

The last column shows how the design is constructed. If the design is a binary image of a quaternary linear code, the generator matrix is given in terms of column indexes, where a column $u = (u_0, \ldots, u_{k-1})$ is represented by its index $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 4^i u_i$. For example, design 12-8.ac in Table 2 has column indexes: 1, 4, 6, 9, 5 and 13. The corresponding generator matrix is presented in Example 1 and the design is given in Table 1(b). As another example, design 16-8.ac in Table 6 has column indexes: 1, 4, 16, 64, 84, 109, 181 and 217. The corresponding generator matrix is presented in Example 2 and the design is isomorphic to the Nordstrom-Robinson code.

If a design is derived from another design, the original design is given with the column number that is being deleted or fractioned. Whether a design is obtained by deletion or fraction should be clear from the labeling of the designs. For example, for design 11-7.ac in Table 2, the column index is $12-8$.ac(1). This means that the 11-7.ac design is obtained by deleting the first column of the 12-8.ac design, i.e., the design in Table 1(b) without the first column. As another example, for design 15-8.ac in Table 5, the column index is 16-8.ac(1). Note that 15-8.ac has $2^{15-8} = 128$ runs while 16-8.ac has $2^{16-8} = 256$ runs. This means that the former is obtained by taking the half fraction of 16-8.ac whose first components are 0 and deleting the first column. Design 16-8.ac is given in Table 6.

It is of primary interest to compare the nonregular designs with corresponding regular designs of the same size. Chen, Sun and Wu (1993) gave MA regular designs of 16, 32 and 64 runs up to 32 factors. MA regular designs with 64 runs and more than 32 factors can be obtained by the complementary design technique; see Chen and Hedayat (1996), Tang and Wu (1996) and Butler (1993a). Based on some conjecture, Block and Mee (2005) gave MA regular designs of 128 runs up to 64 factors. With computer random search, Block (2003) gave some 256-run designs up to 80 factors, which are the best known regular designs in the literature.

We compare our "a" and "ac" designs with MA (or best) regular designs of the same size in terms of aberration using wordlength patterns. The results are denoted with different number of asterisks after the name of the design. One asterisk (*) means our design has more aberration than MA regular design, two asterisks (**) means that our design has the same aberration as MA regular design, and three asterisks (***) means that our design has less aberration than MA regular design.

We also compare our nonregular designs with regular designs in terms of resolution. With one exception (256 runs and 17 factors, i.e., 17-9.a and 17-9.c in Table 6), all other nonregular designs have the same resolution as or larger resolution than the corresponding regular designs.

6.1 Designs of 16 runs

By Theorem 1, we can construct 16-run nonregular designs up to 12 factors with resolution at least 3.5. Table 2 shows the best nonregular designs of 16 runs for 6 to 12 factors. All designs are labeled with two asterisks, which means that they have the same aberration as the competing MA regular designs.

Now look at the resolution of the designs. Table 2 shows that the 6 to 8-column designs have resolution 4. This is the same as MA regular designs. In fact, the 6 and 7-column designs are projection designs (subdesigns) of the 8-column design, according to the column indexes. It has been verified that the 8-column design 8-4.ac is indeed a regular design, and it is isomorphic to the MA regular design. Therefore, the 6 and 7-column designs are both regular designs as well because they are projection designs of the 8-column design.

The 9 to 12-column designs have resolution 3.5. In contrast, regular designs of the same size have only resolution 3. Even though these nonregular designs have the same wordlength patterns as the corresponding regular designs, they have better projection properties because of their higher resolution. These nonregular designs have projectivity 3, while regular designs of the same size have only projectivity 2.

6.2 Designs of 32 runs

By Theorem 2, we can construct 32-run nonregular designs up to 24 factors with resolution at least 3.5. Table 3 shows the best nonregular designs of 32 runs for 7 to 24 factors.

Designs with 7 to 9 columns have the same aberration as and higher resolution than MA regular designs. These nonregular designs have resolution 4.5 and projectivity 4, while the MA regular designs have only resolution 4 and projectivity 3.

Designs with 10 to 16 columns have the same resolution as MA regular designs. All but one "a" or "ac" designs have the same aberration as MA regular designs. Design 10-5.a has more aberration than MA regular design.

Designs with 17 to 24 columns have the same aberration as MA regular designs, with the exception of the 20 and 21-column designs, which have slightly more aberration (same A_3 but larger A_4). These designs, however, have resolution 3.5, while MA regular designs have resolution 3. Therefore, our nonregular designs have higher projectivity than MA regular designs.

It should be noted that designs 7-2.ac and 9-4.ac are half fractions of 64-run designs 8-2.ac and 10-4.ac given in Table 4. The 10 to 16-column designs are all generated from one single 64-run design 18-12.c given in Table 4. Design 16-11.ac is obtained by taking half of the runs of design 18- 12.c whose fifth column is 0 and omitting the fifth and sixth columns. Other designs are obtained by further deleting columns from design 16-11.ac.

6.3 Designs of 64 runs

By Theorem 1, we can construct 64-run nonregular designs up to 56 factors with resolution at least 3.5. Table 4 shows the best nonregular designs of 64 runs for 8 to 56 factors.

Designs with 8–14 columns have higher resolution than MA regular designs. The MA regular design with 8 columns has resolution 5, while our design has resolution 5.5. MA regular designs with 9–14 columns have resolution 4, while our designs have resolution 4.5. Designs with $8-12$ columns have the same aberration as MA regular designs. Designs with 13 and 14 columns have less aberration than MA regular designs.

Designs with 15–32 columns have the same resolution as MA regular designs. Most of these designs have the same aberration as MA regular designs, except for a few designs (with 15, 16, 21 and 22 columns) having slightly more aberration. For designs with 33–56 columns, our designs have resolution 3.5 while MA regular designs have resolution 3, which again shows that our designs are superior to MA regular designs in terms of projection properties.

6.4 Designs of 128 runs

By Theorem 2, we can construct 128-run nonregular designs up to 112 factors with resolution at least 3.5. Here we focus on designs with resolution at least 4. Table 5 shows the best nonregular designs of 128 runs for 9 to 64 factors.

Note that design 15-8.ac is a half fraction of the 16-8.ac design, which is equivalent to the Nordstrom-Robinson code. Designs with 10–14 columns are projection designs of 15-8.ac. Xu (2005) showed that these designs have resolution 5.5 and projectivity 6. In comparison, MA regular designs of 128 runs have resolution 5 for 10–11 columns and resolution 4 for 12–15 columns. Therefore, these nonregular designs have higher resolution and better projectivity than MA regular designs of the same size. Designs with 12–15 columns have less aberration than MA regular designs.

For 16–19 columns, Table 5 shows both "a" and "c" designs, one each for the minimum G_2 and G-aberration criteria. All of the "a" designs have resolution 4, and therefore, projectivity 3. Comparing to MA regular designs, the 16 and 18-column designs have the same aberration, the 17-column design has slightly more aberration, and the 19-column design has less aberration. All of the "c" designs have resolution 4.5, and therefore, projectivity at least 4. These designs, therefore, have better projection properties than MA regular designs, which have resolution 4 and projectivity 3.

Designs with 20–64 columns have resolution 4, which is the same as MA regular designs. For designs with 20–28 columns, all the "a" and "ac" designs have less aberration than MA regular designs, with the exception of 23-16.ac, which has slightly more aberration. For example, design 28-21.ac has wordlength pattern (0, 203, 896, 2688, . . .), while the MA regular design given by Block and Mee (2005) has wordlength pattern $(0, 210, 840, 2800, ...)$. Designs with 29–64 columns either have the same aberration as or more aberration than MA regular designs.

It should be noted that designs with 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17 columns are half fractions of 256-run designs given in Table 6. Designs 18-11.a and 19-12.c are also derived from 256-run designs.

6.5 Designs of 256 runs

By Theorem 1, we can construct 256-run nonregular designs up to 240 factors with resolution at least 3.5. Here we focus on designs with resolution at least 4. Table 6 shows the best nonregular designs for 10 to 64 factors.

Designs with 11–16 columns and 10-2.c have resolution 6.5. In comparison, MA regular designs have resolution 6 for $10-12$ columns and resolution 5 for $13-16$ columns. As mentioned earlier, the 16-8.ac design is equivalent to the Nordstrom-Robinson code, and the generator matrix is presented in Example 2. Designs with 11–15 columns and 10-2.c are projection designs of the 16-8.ac design. Xu (2005) showed that these designs have projectivity 7. Designs with 13–16 columns have less aberration than MA regular designs.

Design with 17–30 columns are either designated as "a" or "c". All the "a" designs have resolution 4 and all the "c" designs have resolution 4.5. The 17-column designs 17-9.a and 17-9.c have smaller resolution than MA regular design and therefore are not recommended. The "c" designs with 18–30 columns have higher resolution than MA regular designs, which have resolution 4. Compared to the best regular designs given by Block (2003), some "a" designs (with 19, 20, 25, 27, 28 and 30 columns) have the same aberration and others have more aberration, with the exception of 24-16.a, which has less aberration. The best known regular 24-column design has wordlength pattern $(0, 27, 214, 582, ...)$, while design 24-16.a has wordlength pattern $(0, 26, 216, 584, ...)$.

All designs with 31–64 columns have resolution 4, which is the same as MA regular designs. Compared to the best regular designs given by Block (2003), 17 designs (with 32–34, 41–46 and 49–56 columns) have less aberration and other designs either have same or more aberration.

7 Concluding Remarks

This paper uses quaternary codes to construct nonregular designs with 16, 32, 64, 128 and 256 runs. Many designs are better than regular designs of the same size in terms of resolution and projectivity. We observe that it is relatively easier to construct nonregular designs having higher resolution than regular designs, but it is more challenging to construct nonregular designs having less aberration than regular designs. With the quaternary method, we construct 37 nonregular designs with less aberration than MA (or best) regular designs.

It is a challenging task to construct nonregular designs with good statistical properties. The main reason is that these designs do not have the aliasing structure like regular designs, and therefore, there are too many designs to consider, especially when the run size gets larger. We are able to keep all quaternary codes for 16, 32 and 64 runs. For 128 and 256 runs, however, the computational time becomes so long that it is necessary to put an upper limit to the maximum number of designs generated. Depending on the choice of limits, our algorithm ends with 50–68 columns for 256-run designs with resolution 4. It is apparent that we are missing some good designs because 256-run designs with resolution 4 can have up to 128 columns. Further research is needed for 256-run and larger designs.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by NSF grants DMS-0204009 and DMS-0505728.

References

- Block, R. M. (2003). Theory and Construction Methods for Largely Regular Resolution IV Designs. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Available at http://etd.utk.edu/2003/BlockRobert.pdf.
- Block, R. M. and Mee, R. W. (2005). Resolution IV designs with 128 runs. J. Quality Technology 37, to appear.
- Bose, R. C. (1961). On some connections between the design of experiments and information theory. Bull. Inst. Internat. Statist. 38, 257–271.
- Box, G. E. P. and Hunter, J. S. (1961). The 2^{k-p} fractional factorial designs. Technometrics 3, 311–351, 449–458.
- Box, G. E. P. and Tyssedal, J. (1996). Projective properties of certain orthogonal arrays. *Biometrika* 83, 950–955.
- Butler, N. A. (2003a). Some theory for constructing minimum aberration fractional factorial designs. Biometrika 90, 233–238.
- Butler, N. A. (2003b). Minimum aberration construction results for nonregular two-level fractional factorial designs. Biometrika 90, 891–898.
- Butler, N. A. (2004). Minimum G_2 -aberration properties of two-level foldover designs. Statistics and Probability Letters 67, 121–132.
- Chen, H. and Hedayat, A. S. (1996). 2^{n-l} designs with weak minimum aberration. Ann. Statist. 24, 2536–2548.
- Chen, J., Sun, D. X. and Wu, C. F. J. (1993). A catalogue of two-level and three-level fractional factorial designs with small runs. *Internat. Statist. Rev.* **61**, 131–145.
- Cheng, C. S., Deng, L. Y. and Tang, B. (2002). Generalized minimum aberration and design efficiency for nonregular fractional factorial designs. Statist. Sinica 12, 991–1000.
- Deng, L. Y. and Tang, B. (1999). Generalized resolution and minimum aberration criteria for Plackett-Burman and other nonregular factorial designs. Statist. Sinica 9, 1071–1082.
- Deng, L. Y. and Tang, B. (2002). Design selection and classification for Hadamard matrices using generalized minimum aberration criteria. Technometrics 44, 173–184.
- Fries, A. and Hunter, W. G. (1980). Minimum aberration 2^{k-p} designs. Technometrics 22, 601– 608.
- Hammons, A. R., Jr., Kumar, P. V., Calderbank, A. R., Sloane, N. J. A. and Sole, P. (1994). The Z4-linearity of Kerdock, Preparata, Goethals, and related codes. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 40, 301–319.
- Hedayat, A. S., Sloane, N. J. A. and Stufken, J. (1999). Orthogonal Arrays: Theory and Applications. Springer, New York.
- Li, Y., Deng, L. Y. and Tang, B. (2004). Design catalog based on minimum G-aberration. J. Statist. Plann. Inference 124, 219–230.
- Ma, C. X. and Fang, K. T. (2001). A note on generalized aberration in factorial designs. *Metrika* 53, 85–93.
- MacWilliams, F. J. and Sloane, N. J. A. (1977). The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Nordstrom, A. W. and Robinson, J. P. (1967). An optimum nonlinear code. *Inform. Control* 11, 613–616.
- Sun, D. X., Li, W. and Ye, K. Q. (2002). An algorithm for sequentially constructing nonisomorphic orthogonal designs and its applications. Technical report SUNYSB-AMS-02-13, Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, SUNY at Stony Brook.
- Tang, B. (2001). Theory of J-characteristics for fractional factorial designs and projection justification of minimum G_2 -aberration. *Biometrika* 88, 401–407.
- Tang, B. and Deng, L. Y. (1999). Minimum G_2 -aberration for non-regular fractional factorial designs. Ann. Statist. 27, 1914–1926.
- Tang, B. and Deng, L. Y. (2003). Construction of generalized minimum aberration designs of 3, 4 and 5 factors. J. Statist. Plann. Inference 113, 335–340.
- Tang, B. and Wu, C. F. J. (1996). Characterization of minimum aberration 2^{n-m} designs in terms of their complementary designs. Ann. Statist. 24, 2549–2559.
- van Lint, J. H. (1999). Introduction to Coding Theory. 3rd ed. Springer, New York.
- Wu, C. F. J. and Hamada, M. (2000). Experiments: Planning, Analysis and Parameter Design Optimization. Wiley, New York.
- Xu, H. (2003). Minimum moment aberration for nonregular designs and supersaturated designs. Statist. Sinica 13, 691–708.
- Xu, H. (2004). A catalogue of three-level regular fractional factorial designs. Metrika, accepted. Available at http://www.stat.ucla.edu/∼hqxu/.
- Xu, H. (2005). Some nonregular designs from the Nordstrom and Robinson code and their statistical properties. Biometrika 92, 385–397.
- Xu, H. and Deng, L. Y. (2005). Moment aberration projection for nonregular fractional factorial designs. Technometrics 47, 121–131.
- Xu, H. and Wu, C. F. J. (2001). Generalized minimum aberration for asymmetrical fractional factorial designs. Ann. Statist. 29, 1066–1077.
- Ye, K. Q. (2003). Indicator functions and its application in two-level factorial designs. Ann. Statist. 31, 984–994.

Department of Statistics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1554, U.S.A. E-mail: hqxu@stat.ucla.edu E-mail: alanw@stat.ucla.edu

Table 2: 16-Run Designs

Design WLP			R CFV Column Indexes
$\overline{6\text{-}2\text{-}}ac^{**}$ 0 3 0 0		4.0 $16:3$ 1 4 6	
$7-3.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 0 7 0 0 0			4.0 16:7 $8-4 \cdot \text{ac}(1)$
	$8-4.ac$ ** 0140001		4.0 16:14 1 4 6 9
	$9-5.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 4 14 8 0 4 1		3.5 8:16 10-6. $ac(9)$
	$10-6.\text{ac}^{**}$ 8 18 16 8 8 5 3.5 8:32 1 4 6 9 5		
	$11-7.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 12 26 28 24 20 13 3.5 8:48 12-8. $\mathrm{ac}(1)$		
	$12-8.5x^{**}$ 16 39 48 48 48 39 3.5 8:64 1 4 6 9 5 13		

Table 3: 32-Run Designs

Design	WLP	R CFV	Column Indexes
$7 - 2 \cdot 12x^{**}$	0 1 2 0 0	4.5 16:4	$8-2 \cdot \text{ac}(3)$
$8 - 3 \cdot 3 \cdot x^{**}$	034000	4.5 16:12	$9-4 \cdot \text{ac}(1)$
$9-4.5e^{**}$	0 6 8 0 0 1 4.5 16:24		$10-4 \cdot \text{ac}(5)$
	$10-5.a^*$ 0 15.75 0 12.75 0 2.25 4.0 32:5 16:43		$11-6.c(5)$
	$10-5.c$ 0 16 0 12 0 3	4.0 32:3 16:52	$11-6.c(11)$
	$11-6.8$ ^{**} 0 25 0 27 0 10 4.0 32:8 16:68		$12 - 7 \cdot \text{ac}(8)$
	11-6.c $0\ 25.5\ 0\ 25.5\ 0\ 11.5$ $4.0\ 32.6\ 16.78$ $12\text{-}7.\text{ac}(12)$		
	$12\text{-}7.\text{ac}^{**}$ 0 38 0 52 0 33 4.0 32:10 16:112 13-8. $\text{ac}(13)$		
	$13-8.ac^{**}$ 0 55 0 96 0 87 4.0 32:16 16:156 14-9. $ac(14)$		
	$14-9.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 0 77 0 168 0 203	4.0 32:23 16:216 15-10. $ac(14)$	
	$15-10 \cdot \text{ac}^{**}$ 0 105 0 280 0 435 4.0 32:33 16:288 16-11. $\text{ac}(16)$		
	$16-11 \text{a}c^{**}$ 0 140 0 448 0 870	4.0 32:44 16:384 Δ	
	$17-12.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 8 140 112 448 504	3.5 $16:32$ 18-13. $ac(17)$	
	$18-13.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 16 148 224 560 1008	3.5 16:64	1 4 33 9 36 6 38 41 5
	$19-14.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 24 164 344 784 1624	3.5 16:96	$20-15 \text{.} \text{ac}(17)$
	$20-15.\text{ac}^*$ 32 189 480 1120 2464 3.5 16:128		1 4 33 9 36 6 38 41 5 13
	$21-16.\mathrm{ac}^*$ 40 221 640 1600 3648 3.5 16:160		$22-17 \text{.} \text{ac} (17)$
	$22-17.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 48 263 832 2224 5312 3.5 16:192		$1\ 4\ 33\ 9\ 36\ 6\ 38\ 41\ 5\ 13\ 37$
	$23-18.\mathrm{ac}^{**}$ 56 315 1064 3024 7616 3.5 16:224		$24-19 \text{.} \text{ac}(1)$
	24-19.ac** 64 378 1344 4032 10752 3.5 16:256		1 4 33 9 36 6 38 41 5 13 37 45

∆: Obtained by taking half of the runs of 18-12.c whose fifth column is 0 and omitting the fifth and sixth columns

∆: Obtained by taking half of the runs of 20-12.a whose first column is 0 and omitting the first two columns

Design	WЦP	ČEV ≃	Column Indexes
$43-36.a$	02012095040	64:3168 128:1220 $\frac{1}{4}$	$44-37 \text{ a} (7)$
$44-37 \cdot a^*$ 43-36.c	0 2215 0 110016 0 2017 0 94951	64:3456 128:775 64:4968 128:1351 $\ddot{0}$ $\ddot{0}$	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 53 $44-37.c(5)$
44-37.c	22220109888 \circ	128:872 64:5400 $\ddot{0}$	1 4 16 133 38 148 9 165 145 18 185 180 21 61 6 29 153 150 24 33 141 26
$45-38.a*$	2433 0 126902 \circ	64:3744 128:1497 0.4	$46-39.a(21)$
45-38.c	24410126758 \circ	128:965 64:5904 $\frac{1}{4}$	$46-39.c(3)$
$46-39.a*$	26670145892 \circ	64:4032 128:1659 $\ddot{ }$	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 53 41
46-39.c	26770145716 \circ	64:6408 128:1075 0.1	1 4 16 133 38 148 9 165 145 18 185 180 21 61 6 29 153 150 24 33 141 26 36
$47 - 40 \cdot a***$	2915 0 167244 \circ	64:4752 128:1727 $\ddot{0}$	$48-41.a(1)$
47-40.c	2925 0 167052 \circ	64:6984 128:1179 0.1	$48 - 41.c(3)$
$48 - 41 \cdot a***$	3180 0 191136 \circ	64:5184 128:1884 $\ddot{0}$	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154
48-41.c	31920190896 \circ	64:7560 128:1302 0.5	1 4 16 133 38 148 9 165 145 18 185 180 21 61 6 29 153 150 24 33 141 26 36 182
$49 - 42 \cdot a^{**}$	3466 0 217734 \circ	64:5616 128:2062 0.1	$50-43.a(49)$
49-42.c	3478 0 217494 \circ	64:8244 128:1417 0.1	$50-43.c(1)$
$50 - 43 \cdot a^{**}$	37700247368 \circ	64:6048 128:2258 $\ddot{ }$	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24
50-43.с	37850247074 \circ	64:8928 128:1553 $\ddot{4.0}$	₹ 1 4 16 133 38 148 9 165 145 18 185 180 21 61 6 29 153 150 24 33 141 26 36 182
$51-44.a*$	040920280324	64:6336 128:2508 0.1	$52-45.a(1)$
51-44.c	41070280023 \circ	64:9712 128:1679	$52 - 45 \cdot c(1)$
$52 - 45 \cdot a^{**}$	316888 44330 \circ	64:6912 128:2705	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 146
52-45.c	316504 44520 \circ	64:10496 128:1828	E 1 4 16 133 38 148 9 165 145 18 185 180 21 61 6 29 153 150 24 33 141 26 36 182 41
$53-46 \text{a}$ **	357292 07970	64:7488 128:2925 0.1	$54-47.a(35)$
53-46.c	356952 048130	64:11392 128:1965 0.1	$54-47.c(1)$
$54-47.a*$	51830401900 \circ	64:8064 128:3167 0.1	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 146 38
54-47.c	51990401552 \circ	64:12288 128:2127 0.1	$1\ 4\ 16\ 133\ 38\ 148\ 9\ 165\ 145\ 18\ 185\ 180\ 21\ 61\ 6\ 29\ 153\ 150\ 24\ 33\ 141\ 26\ 36\ 182\ 41\ 53$
$55 - 48.a*$	5590 0 451100 \circ	64:8916 128:3361 $\frac{1}{4}$	$56-49.a(1)$
55-48.с	56030450800 \circ	64:13312 128:2275 $\ddot{=}$	$56-49.c(1)$
$56-49.a***$	505232 60200 \circ	64:9600 128:3620 $^{4.0}$	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 38 41 157
56-49.с	60340504896	128:2450 0.1	64:14336 1 4 16 133 38 148 9 165 145 18 185 180 21 61 6 29 153 150 24 33 141 26 36 182 41 53 173 177
$57 - 50.a***$	564655 64750 \circ	64:10192 128:3927 $\ddot{0}$	$58 - 51 \cdot 3c(1)$
$57-50.c$	564655 64750 \circ	128:3903 $\ddot{4.0}$	64:10288 58-51.1(17)
$58 - 51.ac***$	069550629798	128:4211 $\frac{1}{4}$	33 64:10976 1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 38 41 157
$59 - 52 \text{a} \text{c}$ **	74610701091 $\overline{}$	128:4521 0.1	64:11760 60-53.ac(1)
$60 - 53 \text{ a} \text{c}^{**}$	888821 0 7662	128:4858 0.1	64:12544 1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 38 41 157 53 137
$61 - 54 \text{ a} \text{c}$ **	85550863968	128:5195	$64:13440$ $62-55$. $ac(1)$
$62 - 55.ac***$	91450956536	128:5561	64:14336 1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 38 41 157 53 137 146
$63 - 56 \text{.ac}$ **	976501057224	128:5925	64:15360 64-57.ac(1)
$64 - 57 \cdot 3e^{**}$	10416 0 1166592 \circ	64:16384 128:6320	1 4 16 129 26 164 18 152 21 149 33 36 181 6 132 9 161 134 169 189 29 61 144 154 24 38 41 157 53 137 146 166

Table 5: 128-Run Designs (Continued) Table 5: 128-Run Designs (Continued)

Table 6: 256-Run Designs

Design	WLP	R CFV	Column Indexes
$10-2.a**$	000120	6.0 256:1	1 4 16 64 90
$10-2.c$	000201	6.5 128.8	1 4 16 64 86
$11-3.5^{\ast\ast}$	000601	6.5 128:24	$12-4 \cdot \text{ac}(1)$
$12 - 4.ac**$	0001203	6.5 128:48	1 4 16 64 86 109
	$13-5.\text{ac}***00002403$	6.5 128:96	$14-6 \cdot \text{ac}(1)$
	$14-6.\mathrm{ac}^{***}$ 0 0 0 42 0 7	6.5 128:168	1 4 16 64 86 109 181
	$15 - 7 \cdot 10^{-11}$ 0 0 0 70 0 15	6.5 128:280	$16-8 \cdot \text{ac}(1)$
	$16-8.\mathrm{ac}^{***}$ 0 0 0 112 0 30	6.5 128:448	1 4 16 64 86 109 181 217
$17-9.a*$	0 1 30 73 76	4.0 256:1	$18-10.a(15)$
$17-9.c$	0 2 31 67 73	4.5 128:8	$18-10.c(15)$
$18-10.a*$	0 3 40 104 113	4.0 256:3	1 4 16 64 86 109 181 25 153
$18 - 10.c$	0 4 44 92 116	4.5 128:16	1 4 16 64 86 109 181 25 37
$19-11.a**$	0 4 48 168 208	4.0 256:4	$20-12.a(1)$
19-11.c	0 7 59 126 184	4.5 128:28	$20-12.c(15)$
$20-12.a**$	0 5 64 240 320	4.0 256:5	1 4 16 64 85 26 98 125 137 164
$20-12.c$	0 10 80 172 276	4.5 128:40	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 53 180
$21-13.a*$	0 13 88 276	4.0 256:1 128:48	$22-14.a(21)$
$21-13.c$	0 14 94 254	4.5 128.56	$22-14.a(13)$
$22 - 14.a*$	0 17 120 356	4.0 256:1 128:64	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 185 53 209 141
$22 - 14.c$	0 22 122 315	4.5 128:88	1 4 16 64 90 97 118 133 253 22 198
$23 - 15.a*$	0 21 172 441	4.0 256:1 128:80	$24-16.a(17)$
$23 - 15.c$	0 30 156 399	4.5 128:120	$24-16.c(23)$
	24-16.a*** 0 26 216 584	4.0 256:2 128:96	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 198
24-16.c	0 38 192 533	4.5 128:152	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 249 157 210
$25-17.a**$	0 34 266 752	4.0 256:4 128:120	$26-18.a(17)$
$25-17.c$	0 48 237 689	4.5 128:192	$26-18.c(13)$
$26 - 18. a^*$	0 43 326 960	4.0 256:7 128:144	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 198 37
$26 - 18.c$	0 58 296 880	4.5 128:232	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 249 157 210 198
$27-19.a**$	0 53 395 1224	4.0 256:11 128:168	$28-20.a(13)$
27-19.c	0 72 356 1124	4.5 128:288	$28-20.c(27)$
$28 - 20 \cdot a^{**}$	0 64 476 1550		4.0 256:16 128:192 1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 198 37 185
$28-20.c$	0 86 428 1432	4.5 128:344	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 249 157 210 198 213
$29-21.a*$	0 81 573 1884	4.0 256:20 128:244	$30-22.a(17)$
$29-21.c$	0 110 516 1756	4.5 128:440	$30-22.c(1)$
$30 - 22.a**$	0 95 686 2340	4.0 256:25 128:280	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 198 37 146 205
$30-22.c$	0 130 616 2185	4.5 128:520	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 249 117 100 61 225 218
$31-23.a*$	0 114 798 2906	4.0 256:33 128:324 32-24.a(1)	
31-23.c	0 138 736 2785	4.0 256:2 128:544	$32 - 24$.c(7)
	32-24.a *** 0 131 944 3570	4.0 256:35 128:384	1 4 16 64 90 97 118 133 198 146 229 18 152 25 53 166
$32 - 24.c$	0 155 876 3458	4.0 256:5 128:600	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 100 66 189 117 88 81 225
	33-25.a *** 0 151 1108 4354	4.0 256:39 128:448 34-26.a(7)	
$33-25.c$	0 181 1016 4236	4.0 256:7 128:696	$34-26.c(33)$
	34-26.a*** 0 174 1288 5280		4.0 256:46 128:512 1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 33 106 161 169 88 113
34-26.c	0 210 1168 5172	4.0 256:12 128:792	1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 100 66 189 117 88 81 225 73
$35-27.a*$	0 200 1496 6340	4.0 256:52 128:592	$36-28.a(7)$
35-27.c	0 239 1356 6269	4.0 256:16 128:892 36-28.c(31)	
$36 - 28.a*$	0 229 1728 7576		4.0 256:61 128:672 1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 33 106 161 169 88 113 212
$36-28.c$	0 273 1552 7569		4.0 256:23 128:1000 1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 100 66 189 117 88 81 225 73 180
$37-29.a**$	0 264 2004 8928	4.0 256:92 128:688 38-30.a(1)	
37-29.c	0 318 1750 9055 4.0 256:32 128:1144 38-30.c(37)		
$38-30.a**$			0 297 2304 10592 4.0 256:105 128:768 1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 180 100 198 37 146 205 106 161 185 166
38-30.c			0 366 1972 10806 4.0 256:44 128:1288 1 4 16 64 86 109 25 133 54 100 66 189 117 88 81 225 73 180 212
$39-31.a**$	0 333 2632 12512 4.0 256:117 128:864 40-32.a(1)		
39-31.c	0 379 2328 13060 4.0 256:55 128:1296 40-32.c(9)		
$40 - 32 \cdot a^{**}$			$0\ 370\ 3008\ 14720\ 4.0\ 256:130\ 128:960\ 1\ 4\ 16\ 64\ 86\ 109\ 25\ 133\ 54\ 180\ 100\ 198\ 37\ 146\ 205\ 106\ 161\ 185\ 166\ 212$
$40-32.c$			0 426 2624 15488 4.0 256:66 128:1440 1 4 16 64 90 97 133 125 209 84 216 21 205 180 245 102 54 233 198 173

Table 6: 256-Run Designs (Continued) Table 6: 256-Run Designs (Continued)