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#### Abstract

In this paper, a study on evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial using a pair of balanced incomplete block designs ( $5 \leq \mathrm{v} \leq 15$ : v - number of factors) is suggested which enables us to assess the degree of modified rotatability for a given response surface design.
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## 1. Introduction

Response surface process is a collection of mathematical and statistical techniques appropriate for analysing problems in which several independent variables influence a dependent variable. The regressor variables are often called input or explanatory variables and the regressand variable is often the response variable. An important development of response surface designs was the introduction of rotatable designs suggested by [1]. Rotatable designs using balanced incomplete block designs (BIBD) was proposed by [2]. A design is said to be rotatable, if the variance of the response estimate is a function only of the distance of the point from the design centre. [3] developed modified second order response surface designs. [9] studied second order rotatable designs (SORD) through a pair of BIBDs. [4] introduced measure of rotatability for second degree polynomial designs. [10] studied modified second order rotatable designs and second order slope rotatable designs using a pair of BIBD. [15] studied measure of rotatability for second degree polynomial design using a pair of balanced incomplete block designs.
Lot of work was carried out by Victorbabu and some other authors on modified rotatability, measure of rotatability on second degree polynomial designs respectively [20], [21, 22], [23], [21], [16-19], [11], [12, 14] and [13]. Recently, evaluating measure of modified rotatability is studied by [5-8] using central composite designs (CCD), BIBD, pairwise balanced design and symmetrical unequal block arrangements with
two unequal block sizes respectively.
In this paper, we develop a new method of evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial using a pair of balanced incomplete block designs is suggested which enables us to assess the degree of rotatability for a given response surface design.

## 2. Conditions for SORD:

Suppose we want to use the second degree polynomial model $\mathrm{D}=\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}\right)$ to fit the surface,

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{u}=b_{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{v} b_{i} x_{i u}+\sum_{i=1}^{v} b_{i i} x_{i u}^{2}+\sum \sum_{i<j} b_{i j} x_{i u} x_{j u}+e_{u} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}$ denotes the level of the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ factor $(i=1,2, \ldots, v)$ in the $\mathrm{u}^{\text {th }}$ run $(u=$ $1,2, \ldots, N)$ of the experiment, $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ are uncorrelated random errors with mean zero and variance $\sigma^{2}$ is said to be rotatable design of second order, if the variance of the estimated response of $\hat{Y}_{\mathrm{u}}$ from the fitted surface is only a function of the distance $\left(\mathrm{d}^{2}=\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}^{2}\right)$ of the point $\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}, \mathrm{x}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{x}_{v}\right)$ from the origin (centre) of the design. Such a spherical variance function for estimation of second degree polynomial is achieved if the design points satisfy the following conditions [cf. [1], [2]].
(1)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}=0, \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}=0, \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j} u}^{2}=0, \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ku}}=0, \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{3}=0, \\
& \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}^{3}=0, \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ku}}^{2}=0, \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ku}} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{lu}}=0 ; \text { for } \mathrm{i} \neq \mathrm{j} \neq \mathrm{k} \neq 1 \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

(2)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { (i) } \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2}=\text { constant }=\mathrm{N} \lambda_{2}  \tag{3}\\
& \text { (ii) } \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{4}=\text { constant }=\mathrm{cN} \lambda_{4} ; \text { for all } i
\end{align*}
$$

(3)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}^{2}=\text { constant }=\mathrm{N} \lambda_{4} ; \text { for } i \neq j \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{4}=\mathrm{c} \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}^{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

(5)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\lambda_{4}}{\lambda_{2}^{2}}>\frac{\mathrm{v}}{(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-1)} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c, \lambda_{2}$ and $\lambda_{4}$ are constants and the summation is over the design points.

If the above mentioned conditions are satisfied, the variances and covariances of the estimated parameters become,

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{V}\left(\hat{\mathrm{~b}}_{0}\right)=\frac{\lambda_{4}(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-1) \sigma^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}\left[\lambda_{4}(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-1)-\mathrm{v} \lambda_{2}^{2}\right]}, \\
\mathrm{V}\left(\hat{\mathrm{~b}}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=\frac{\sigma^{2}}{\mathrm{~N} \lambda_{2}}, \\
\mathrm{~V}\left(\hat{\mathrm{~b}}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right)=\frac{\sigma^{2}}{\mathrm{~N} \lambda_{4}}, \\
\mathrm{~V}\left(\hat{\mathrm{~b}}_{\mathrm{ii}}\right)=\frac{\sigma^{2}}{(\mathrm{c}-1) \mathrm{N} \lambda_{4}}\left[\frac{\lambda_{4}(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-2)-(\mathrm{v}-1) \lambda_{2}^{2}}{\lambda_{4}(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-1)-\mathrm{v} \lambda_{2}^{2}}\right], \\
\operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathrm{b}}_{0}, \hat{\mathrm{~b}}_{\mathrm{ii}}\right)=\frac{-\lambda_{2} \sigma^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}\left[\lambda_{4}(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-1)-\mathrm{v} \lambda_{2}^{2}\right]}, \\
\operatorname{Cov}\left(\hat{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{ii}}, \hat{\mathrm{~b}}_{\mathrm{jj}}\right)=\frac{\left(\lambda_{2}^{2}-\lambda_{4}\right) \sigma^{2}}{(\mathrm{c}-1) \mathrm{N} \lambda_{4}\left[\lambda_{4}(\mathrm{c}+\mathrm{v}-1)-\mathrm{v} \lambda_{2}^{2}\right]} \tag{7}
\end{gather*}
$$

and other covariances are zero.

## 3. Evaluating Measure of Modified Rotatability for Second Degree Polynomial Using a Pair of BIBD

Following [1], [2], [9], [4], [3], [10] and [15] the proposed method of evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial designs using a pair of BIBD is suggested as follows.

Let $\mathrm{D}_{1}=\left(\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{b}_{1}, \mathrm{r}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{1}, \lambda_{1}\right), \mathrm{D}_{2}=\left(\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{b}_{2}, \mathrm{r}_{2}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \lambda_{2}\right)$ are two BIBD's. Then design points $\mathrm{y}_{1}\left[1-\left(\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{b}_{1}, \mathrm{r}_{1}, \mathrm{k}_{1}, \lambda_{1}\right)\right] 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)} \bigcup \mathrm{y}_{2}\left[\mathrm{a}-\left(\mathrm{v}, \mathrm{b}_{2}, \mathrm{r}_{2}, \mathrm{k}_{2}, \lambda_{2}\right)\right] 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right)} \bigcup\left(\mathrm{n}_{0}\right)$ will give a measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial using a pair of BIBD. From (3) and (4) we have,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2}=\mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{r}_{1} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{r}_{2} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{2}=\mathrm{N} \lambda_{2}  \tag{8}\\
& \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{4}=\mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{r}_{1} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{r}_{2} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{4}=\mathrm{cN} \lambda_{4} \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}^{2}=\mathrm{y}_{1} \lambda_{1} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \lambda_{2} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{4}=\mathrm{N} \lambda_{4} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (9) and (10), we get

$$
\mathrm{a}^{4}=\frac{\mathrm{y}_{1}\left(3 \lambda_{1}-\mathrm{r}_{1}\right)}{\mathrm{y}_{2}\left(\mathrm{r}_{2}-3 \lambda_{2}\right)} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)-\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right)}
$$

The modified condition $\left(\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2}\right)^{2}=\mathrm{N} \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}^{2}$ leads to N which is given by $\mathrm{N}=\frac{\left(\mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{r}_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{r}_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{2}\right)^{2}}{\mathrm{y}_{1} \lambda_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \lambda_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{4}}$. Alternatively N may be obtained directly as $\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{~b}_{1} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{~b}_{2} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right)}+\mathrm{n}_{0}$ design points without any additional set of points, where $n_{0}$ is given by $n_{0}=\frac{\left(y_{1} r_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+y_{2} r_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} a^{2}\right)^{2}}{y_{1} \lambda_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+y_{2} \lambda_{2} 2^{\left(k_{2}\right)} a^{4}}-y_{1} b_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}-y_{2} b_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)}$ and $n_{0}$ turns out to be an integer with ' $a$ ' prefixed and $c=\frac{y_{1} r_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+y_{2} r_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} a^{4}}{y_{1} \lambda_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+y_{2} \lambda_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} a^{4}}$.
From equations (8) and (10) and on simplification we get $\lambda_{2}=\frac{\mathrm{y}_{1} \mathrm{r}_{1} 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \mathrm{r}_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}}$ and $\quad \lambda_{4}=\frac{\mathrm{y}_{1} \lambda_{1} 2^{\mathrm{t}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right)}+\mathrm{y}_{2} \lambda_{2} 2^{t\left(k_{2}\right)} \mathrm{a}^{4}}{\mathrm{~N}}$.
To obtain measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial using a pair of BIBD, we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
P_{v}(D)=\frac{1}{1+R_{v}(D)} \\
R_{v}(D)=\left[\frac{(c-3)}{(c-1)}\right]^{2} \frac{6 v(v-1)}{\lambda_{4}^{2}(v+2)^{2}(v+4)(v+6)(v+8) g^{8}}
\end{gathered}
$$

Here $g$ is a scaling factor and can be obtained as follows,

$$
g=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{1}{a}, \text { if } a \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{r_{2}}\left[\frac{y_{1}\left(b_{1}-r_{1}\right) 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)-t\left(k_{2}\right)}}{y_{2}}+b_{2}\right]} \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{r_{2}}\left[\frac{y_{1}\left(b_{1}-r_{1}\right) 2^{t\left(k_{1}\right)-t\left(k_{2}\right)}}{y_{2}}+b_{2}\right]}}, \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

The following table gives the values of an evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial using a pair of BIBD. It can be verified that $P_{v}(D)$ is 1 if and only if the design is modified rotatable, and it is smaller than one for nearly modified rotatable designs.
Example: We illustrate the evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial for $\mathrm{v}=5$ factors with the help of a pair of BIBDs with parameters $D_{1}=\left(\mathrm{v}=5, b_{1}=5, r_{1}=4, k_{1}=4, \lambda_{1}=3\right)$ and $D_{2}=\left(\mathrm{v}=5, \quad b_{2}=10, r_{2}=\right.$ $\left.4, k_{2}=2, \lambda_{2}=1\right)$. The design points, $\mathrm{y}_{1}\left[1-\left(\mathrm{v}=5, \mathrm{~b}_{1}=5, \mathrm{r}_{1}=4, \mathrm{k}_{1}=4, \lambda_{1}=\right.\right.$ $3)] 2^{4} \bigcup \mathrm{y}_{2}\left[\mathrm{a}-\left(\mathrm{v}=5, \mathrm{~b}_{2}=10, \mathrm{r}_{2}=4, \mathrm{k}_{2}=2, \lambda_{2}=1\right)\right] 2^{2} \bigcup\left(\mathrm{n}_{0}\right)$
will give a measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial in $\mathrm{N}=162$ design points. From (8), (9) and (10), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2}=\mathrm{y}_{1} 64+\mathrm{y}_{2} 16 \mathrm{a}^{2}=\mathrm{N} \lambda_{2} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{4}=\mathrm{y}_{1} 64+\mathrm{y}_{2} 16 \mathrm{a}^{4}=\mathrm{cN} \lambda_{4}  \tag{12}\\
& \sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{iu}}^{2} \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{ju}}^{2}=\mathrm{y}_{1} 48+\mathrm{y}_{2} 4 \mathrm{a}^{4}=\mathrm{N} \lambda_{4} \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

From equations (12) and (13) with rotatability value $\mathrm{c}=3, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1$ and $\mathrm{y}_{2}=5$, we get $\mathrm{a}^{4}=4 \Rightarrow \mathrm{a}^{2}=2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{a}=1.414213$. From equations (11) and (13) using the modified condition with $\left(\lambda_{2}^{2}=\lambda_{4}\right)$ along with $\mathrm{a}^{2}=2, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1$ and $\mathrm{y}_{2}=5$, we get $\mathrm{N}=162$, $\mathrm{n}_{0}=112$. For modified SORD we get $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})=1$ by taking $\mathrm{a}=1.414213$ and scaling factor $g=0.7071$. Then the design is modified SORD using a pair of BIBD.
Instead of taking $a=1.414213$ if we take $a=2.2$ for the above pair of BIBD $D_{1}=\left(\mathrm{v}=5, b_{1}=5, r_{1}=4, k_{1}=4, \lambda_{1}=3\right)$ and $\mathrm{D}_{2}=\left(\mathrm{v}=5, \mathrm{~b}_{2}=10, \mathrm{r}_{2}=4, \mathrm{k}_{2}=2, \lambda_{2}=\right.$ 1) from equations (12) and (13), we get $c=3.7522$. The scaling factorg $=0.6086$, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})=0.0121$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})=0.9881$. Here $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ becomes smaller it deviates from modified rotatability.
Table 1 gives the values of evaluating measure of modified rotatability $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ for second degree polynomial using a pair of BIBD, at different values of 'a' for $5 \leq \mathrm{v} \leq 15$. It can be verified that $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ is one, if and only if a design ' $\mathrm{D}^{\prime}$ is modified rotatable. $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ becomes smaller as ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{D}^{\prime}$ deviates from a modified rotatable design.
Conclusion: Evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial designs using a pair of BIBD, at different values of 'a' for $5 \leq \mathrm{v} \leq 15$. It can be verified that $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ is one if and only if the design is modified rotatable design and it is less than one for a nearly modified rotatable design.
Table 1: Evaluating measure of modified rotatability for second degree polynomial using a pair of BIBD.

| $(5,5,4,4,3)(5,10,4,2,1), \mathrm{N}=162, \mathrm{a}=1.414213, \mathrm{n}_{0}=112, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1, \mathrm{y}_{2}=5$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 2.1176 | 1 | $1.8997 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9981 |
| 1.3 | 2.7824 | 0.7692 | $3.707 \times 10^{-4}$ | 0.9996 |
| ${ }^{2} 1.414213$ | 3 | 0.7071 | 0 | 1 |
| 1.6 | 3.2852 | 0.625 | $5.901 \times 10^{-4}$ | 0.9994 |
| 1.9 | 3.5853 | 0.6086 | $8.302 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9918 |
| 2.2 | 3.7522 | 0.6086 | 0.0121 | 0.9881 |
| 2.5 | 3.8456 | 0.6086 | 0.0143 | 0.9859 |
| 2.8 | 3.8998 | 0.6086 | 0.0156 | 0.9846 |
| 3.1 | 3.9325 | 0.6086 | 0.0164 | 0.9839 |


| $(6,15,10,4,6)(6,15,5,2,1), \mathrm{N}=360, \mathrm{a}=2, \mathrm{n}_{0}=60, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1, \mathrm{y}_{2}=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 1.8 | 1 | 0.0191 | 0.9813 |
| 1.3 | 2.0212 | 0.7692 | 0.0635 | 0.9403 |
| 1.6 | 2.3817 | 0.625 | 0.0729 | 0.9321 |
| 1.9 | 2.8397 | 0.5263 | 0.0109 | 0.9891 |
| $* 2.0$ | 3 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 |
| 2.2 | 3.3131 | 0.4545 | 0.0852 | 0.9215 |
| 2.5 | 3.7314 | 0.4 | 0.9273 | 0.5188 |
| 2.8 | 4.0639 | 0.3779 | 2.4537 | 0.2895 |
| 3.1 | 4.3124 | 0.3779 | 3.1945 | 0.2384 |


| $(7,7,6,6,5)(7,21,6,2,1), \mathrm{N}=882, \mathrm{a}=2, \mathrm{n}_{0}=182, \mathrm{y}_{1}=2, \mathrm{y}_{2}=3$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 1.3735 | 1 | 0.0816 | 0.9245 |
| 1.3 | 1.6644 | 0.7692 | 0.1419 | 0.8757 |
| 1.6 | 2.1469 | 0.625 | 0.1023 | 0.9072 |
| 1.9 | 2.7757 | 0.5263 | 0.0117 | 0.9885 |
| ${ }^{2} 2.0$ | 3.4447 | 0.5035 | 0.0345 | 0.9667 |
| 2.2 | 3 | 0.5035 | 0 | 1 |
| 2.5 | 4.0526 | 0.5035 | 0.1239 | 0.8898 |
| 2.8 | 4.5476 | 0.5035 | 0.1983 | 0.8345 |
| 3.1 | 4.9245 | 0.5035 | 0.2515 | 0.7996 |


| $(8,14,7,4,3)(8,28,7,2,1), \mathrm{N}=700, \mathrm{a}=1.414213, \mathrm{n}_{0}=140, \mathrm{y}_{1}=2, \mathrm{y}_{2}=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 2.52 | 1 | $4.8693 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9952 |
| 1.3 | 2.8296 | 0.7692 | $3.4536 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9966 |
| ${ }^{*} 1.414213$ | 3 | 0.7071 | 0 | 1 |
| 1.6 | 3.3343 | 0.625 | 0.043 | 0.9588 |
| 1.9 | 3.9756 | 0.5263 | 0.8914 | 0.5287 |
| 2.2 | 4.6384 | 0.4545 | 5.4334 | 0.1554 |
| 2.5 | 5.224 | 0.4 | 20.6542 | 0.0462 |
| 2.8 | 5.6895 | 0.3571 | 60.6777 | 0.0162 |
| 3.1 | 6.0374 | 0.3226 | 151.4104 | 0.0066 |


| $(9,18,8,4,3)(9,12,4,3,1), \mathrm{N}=800, \mathrm{a}=1.414213, \mathrm{n}_{0}=128, \mathrm{y}_{1}=2, \mathrm{y}_{2}=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 2.7692 | 1 | $7.1575 \times 10^{-4}$ | 0.9993 |
| 1.3 | 2.923 | 0.7692 | $5.5022 \times 10^{-4}$ | 0.9995 |
| ${ }^{2} 1.414213$ | 3 | 0.7071 | 0 | 1 |
| 1.6 | 3.1376 | 0.625 | 7.4906 | 0.9926 |
| 1.9 | 3.3608 | 0.5263 | 0.1669 | 0.857 |
| 2.2 | 3.5483 | 0.4545 | 1.0096 | 0.4976 |
| 2.5 | 3.6867 | 0.4 | 3.9603 | 0.2016 |
| 2.8 | 3.7822 | 0.3571 | 12.5633 | 0.0737 |
| 3.1 | 3.8467 | 0.3226 | 31.741 | 0.0305 |

$(12,22,11,6,5)(12,33,11,4,3), \mathrm{N}=1408, \mathrm{a}=1.414213, \mathrm{n}_{0}=176, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1, \mathrm{y}_{2}=1$

| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.0 | 2.5385 | 1 | $1.0102 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9989 |
| 1.3 | 2.8768 | 0.7692 | $3.9461 \times 10^{-4}$ | 0.9996 |
| ${ }^{*} 1.414213$ | 3 | 0.7071 | 0 | 1 |
| 1.6 | 3.1722 | 0.625 | 0.012 | 0.9882 |
| 1.9 | 3.3679 | 0.5263 | 0.046 | 0.956 |
| 2.2 | 3.484 | 0.4545 | 0.2338 | 0.8105 |
| 2.5 | 3.5514 | 0.4472 | 0.3276 | 0.7532 |
| 2.8 | 3.5912 | 0.4472 | 0.3652 | 0.7325 |
| 3.1 | 3.6156 | 0.4472 | 0.3886 | 0.7202 |


| $(13,26,12,6,5)(13,26,6,3,1), \mathrm{N}=1200, \mathrm{a}=1.414213, \mathrm{n}_{0}=160, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1, \mathrm{y}_{2}=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 2.5714 | 1 | $1.7819 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9982 |
| 1.3 | 2.8499 | 0.7692 | $2.5252 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9975 |
| ${ }^{*} 1.414213$ | 3 | 0.7071 | 0 | 1 |
| 1.6 | 3.2885 | 0.625 | 0.0168 | 0.9834 |
| 1.9 | 3.8203 | 0.5263 | 0.3442 | 0.7439 |
| 2.2 | 4.342 | 0.4545 | 2.1199 | 0.3205 |
| 2.5 | 4.781 | 0.4 | 8.1106 | 0.1097 |
| 2.8 | 5.1162 | 0.3571 | 23.923 | 0.0401 |
| 3.1 | 5.3592 | 0.3226 | 59.8453 | 0.0164 |


| $(15,15,7,7,3)(15,35,7,3,1), \mathrm{N}=1400, \mathrm{a}=1.414213, \mathrm{n}_{0}=160, \mathrm{y}_{1}=1, \mathrm{y}_{2}=1$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a | c | g | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{D})$ |
| 1.0 | 2.52 | 1 | $1.8507 \times 10^{-3}$ | 0.9982 |
| 1.3 | 1.9197 | 0.7692 | 0.2089 | 0.8272 |
| ${ }^{*} 1.414213$ | 3 | 0.7071 | 0 | 1 |
| 1.6 | 3.3343 | 0.625 | 0.0163 | 0.9839 |
| 1.9 | 3.9756 | 0.5263 | 0.3388 | 0.7469 |
| 2.2 | 4.6384 | 0.4545 | 2.0651 | 0.3263 |
| 2.5 | 5.224 | 0.4 | 7.8500 | 0.113 |
| 2.8 | 5.6895 | 0.3571 | 23.0617 | 0.0416 |
| 3.1 | 6.0374 | 0.3226 | 0.1421 | 0.8756 |

*indicates exact modified rotatability value using a pair of BIBDs (cf. [10])
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