

1. Introduction and preliminaries

•

•

•

Definition 1.0. Let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m be events in an arbitrary probability space. A graph $G = (V, E)$ on the set of vertices $V = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is said to be a dependency graph for the events A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m if for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq m$, the event A_i is mutually independent of a set of all the other events except for those A_j with $\{i, j\} \in E$.

In the following, e denotes the base of natural logarithms, i.e., $e \approx 2.71828$.

Theorem 1.1. (The Lovász Local Lemma; Symmetric case)

Let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m be events in an arbitrary probability space.

Suppose that each event A_i is mutually independent of a set of all the other events A_j but at most μ , and that $\Pr(A_i) \leq p$

for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $e \cdot p \cdot (\mu + 1) \leq 1$, then $\Pr\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m \overline{A_i}\right) > 0$.

•

•

•

2. The main results

For positive integers n and d , let $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\binom{[n]}{d}$ denote the collection of all d -subsets of $[n]$. Let $t(d, n)$ denote the minimum number of rows for a d -disjunct matrix with n columns. In [17], Yeh proved the following theorem by using Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.1. [17] $t(d, n) \leq d^{-d} \cdot (d+1)^{d+1} \cdot \left(1 + \ln(d+1) + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d+1} - \binom{n-d-1}{d+1} \right]\right)$.

To generalize Theorem 2.1, we start by giving a more general definition.

Definition 2.2. A $t \times n$ binary matrix M is called $(d, r]$ -disjunct if the union of any d columns does not contain the intersection of any other r columns in M .

It is worth of noting that a $(d, r]$ -disjunct matrix can identify the up-to- d positives on the complex model with at most complexes of size r , see [2] for a reference.

Let $t(n, d, r]$ denote the minimum number of rows for

a $(d, r]$ -disjunct matrix with n columns. Then we have the following generalization of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.3. $t(n, d, r] \leq d^{-d} \cdot r^{-r} \cdot (d+r)^{d+r} \cdot (1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right])$.

Proof. Let $M = (m_{ij})$ be a $t \times n$ random binary matrix with

$\Pr(m_{ij}=1) = p$ and $\Pr(m_{ij}=0) = 1-p$. Note that all m_{ij} 's are

chosen independently. Let $A_{D, \bar{R}}$ be the event that $\cap \bar{R} \subseteq UD$

where $D \in \binom{[n]}{d}$ and $\bar{R} \in \binom{[n]}{r}$ with $D \cap \bar{R} = \emptyset$. Then,

$$\Pr(A_{D, \bar{R}}) = (1 - p^r \cdot (1-p)^d)^{t \times n}$$

By Lovász's Local Lemma, a $(d, r]$ -disjunct matrix exists whenever

$$e \cdot (\mu+1) \cdot \Pr(A_{D, \bar{R}}) \leq 1$$

where $\mu+1 = \binom{n}{d} \cdot \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \cdot \binom{n-2d-r}{r}$. Here, μ is the maximum

degree of dependency graph.

Hence $e \cdot (1 - p^r \cdot (1-p)^d)^{t \times n} \cdot \left[\binom{n}{d} \cdot \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right] \leq 1$ is

required. This implies that

$$t \geq \frac{1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right]}{-\ln(1 - p^r \cdot (1-p)^d)} \quad \dots (*)$$

Since $-\ln(1-x) \geq x$ for $0 \leq x < 1$, we conclude that if

$$t \geq \frac{1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-d-r}{r} \right]}{p^r (1-p)^d} \quad (2)$$

holds, then the inequality

(*) holds. By the fact that $p = \frac{r}{d+r}$ gives the minimum value of

R.H.S. ^{we} ~~we~~ conclude the proof by plugging in p . □

By a similar technique, we also have the following result.

First, we need a definition.

Definition 2.4. A $t \times n$ binary matrix M is called (d, r) -disjunct if the union of any d columns does not contain the union of any other r columns in M .

Note that an (h, d) -disjunct matrix can be applied to identify the positives on the (d, h) -inhibitor model. ^[6] Here, h is the number of inhibitors.

Let $t(n, d, r)$ denote the minimum number of rows for a (d, r) -disjunct matrix with n columns. The following is also a generalization of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.5. $t(n, d, r) \leq \left(1 + \frac{d}{r}\right) \left(1 + \frac{r}{d}\right)^{\frac{d}{r}} \cdot \left(1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right] \right)$

Proof. By a similar set up as in Theorem 2.3. Let $A_{D,R}$ be the event that $UR \subseteq UD$ where $D \in \binom{[n]}{d}$, $R \in \binom{[n]}{r}$ and $D \cap R = \emptyset$. Then,

$$\Pr(A_{D,R}) = \left(1 - (1-p)^d \cdot [1 - (1-p)^r]\right)^{\frac{d}{r}}$$

By using the Lovász Local Lemma, we conclude that a $t \times n$ (d, r) -disjunct matrix

exists whenever

$$e \cdot \Pr(A_{D,R}) \cdot \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right] \leq 1.$$

Hence, we conclude the proof by letting $p = 1 - \left(\frac{d}{d+r}\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$. ▀

We can use the following notion to extend the above two types of disjunct matrices.

Definition 2.6. For $1 \leq s \leq r$, a $t \times n$ binary matrix M is called

$(d, s \text{ out of } r)$ -disjunct if for any d columns and any other r

columns of M , there exists a row index in which none of

the d columns appear and at least s of the r columns do.

Clearly, $(d, 1 \text{ out of } r)$ -disjunctness is precisely the

(d, r) -disjunctness and $(d, s \text{ out of } r)$ -disjunctness is equivalent to (d, r) -disjunctness.

Now, with the same technique, we can also find a good upper bound for the number of rows " t " in a $t \times n$ (d, s out of r)-disjunct matrix.

Theorem 2.7. Let $t(n, d, r, s)$ denote the minimum number of rows we need in a (d, s out of r)-disjunct matrix with n columns.

Then, $t(n, d, r, s) \leq (1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right]) / f_{d,r,s}(p)$ for all $0 < p < 1$, where $f_{d,r,s}(p) = (1-p)^d \cdot \left[1 - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \binom{r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{r-i} \right]$.

Proof. By using the same set up as above, let $\overline{A_{D,R}}$ be the event that there exists a row index in which none of the column $C_j, j \in D$, and appear at least s of the columns $C_k, k \in R$, do. Then,

$$\Pr(\overline{A_{D,R}}) = \left\{ (1-p)^d \cdot \left[1 - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \binom{r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{r-i} \right] \right\}^t$$

For convenience, let $f_{d,r,s}(p) = (1-p)^d \cdot \left[1 - \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \binom{r}{i} p^i (1-p)^{r-i} \right]$.

Again, by Theorem 1.1, a $t \times n$ (d, s out of r)-disjunct matrix exists

whenever $e \cdot [1 - f_{d,r,s}(p)]^t \cdot \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right] \leq 1$.

Hence, $t \geq 1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{d} \binom{n-d}{r} - \binom{n-d-r}{d} \binom{n-2d-r}{r} \right] / f_{d,r,s}(p)$ by \square

using the fact $-\ln(1-x) \geq x$ for $0 \leq x < 1$.

We can use similar approaches to obtain an upper bound for the minimum size (of rows) of a (k, m, n) -selector. Review that a (k, m, n) -selector with t rows is a $t \times n$ binary matrix M such that any submatrix of M obtained by choosing arbitrary k columns of M contains at least m rows of the identity matrix I_k . The integer t is commonly known as the size of the (k, m, n) -selector. Du and Hwang [9] proved that a (k, m, n) -selector is $(m-1, k-m+1)$ -disjunct, but in general the reverse statement is not true. The (k, m, n) -selector does have quite a few applications in group testing, see [5] for examples.

Let $t_s(k, m, n)$ denote the minimum size of a (k, m, n) -selector. De Bonis et al. [5] obtained upper bounds for $t_s(k, m, n)$ by translating the problem into the hypergraph language.

Theorem 2.8. [5]
$$t_s(k, m, n) < \frac{ek^2}{k-m+1} \binom{n}{k} + \frac{ek(2k-1)}{k-m+1}.$$

The following upper bound is obtained by applying Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 2.9.
$$t_s(k, m, n) \leq \frac{m}{\binom{k}{m} \cdot m!} \left[k \left(1 + \frac{1}{k-1} \right)^{k-1} \right]^m \cdot \left[1 + \ln \left(\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-k}{k} \right) \right].$$

Proof. Let $M^* = (m_{x,y}^*)$ be a $t \times n$ random binary matrix

with $\Pr(m_{x,y}^* = 1) = p$ and $\Pr(m_{x,y}^* = 0) = 1 - p$. For $K \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ and

$M \in \binom{[t]}{m}$, define A_K be the event that the $t \times k$ submatrix of M^* corresponding to K contains at most $m-1$ rows of I_k , and

$A_{K,M}$ be the event that the $m \times k$ submatrix of M^* corresponding to K and M doesn't consist m distinct rows of I_k . Observe

$$\text{that } A_K = \bigcap_{M \in \binom{[t]}{m}} A_{K,M}.$$

For convenience, assume that $m|t$. Let $M_i = \{m(i-1)+1,$

$m(i-1)+2, \dots, mi\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \frac{t}{m}$. Then

$$\Pr(A_K) = \Pr\left(\bigcap_{M \in \binom{[t]}{m}} A_{K,M}\right) \leq \Pr\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\frac{t}{m}} A_{K,M_i}\right).$$

$$= \left[1 - \binom{k}{m} m! \cdot p^m \cdot (1-p)^{m(k-1)}\right]^{\frac{t}{m}}.$$

Note that A_K is mutually independent of all the other

events $A_{K'}$ except for those $K' \cap K \neq \emptyset$. There are exactly

$\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-k}{k} - 1$ such events. Now, by Theorem 1.1, a $t \times n$

(k, m, n) -selector exists whenever

$$e \cdot \left[1 - \binom{k}{m} m! p^m (1-p)^{m(k-1)} \right]^{\frac{t}{m}} \cdot \left[\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-k}{k} \right] \leq 1.$$

This implies that

$$t \geq m \cdot \frac{1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-k}{k} \right]}{-\ln \left[1 - \binom{k}{m} m! p^m (1-p)^{m(k-1)} \right]} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\text{thus } t \geq m \cdot \frac{1 + \ln \left[\binom{n}{k} - \binom{n-k}{k} \right]}{\binom{k}{m} m! p^m (1-p)^{m(k-1)}}.$$

Now, by plugging in $p = \frac{1}{k}$, we obtain the desired upper bound for $t_s(k, m, n)$. ▣

References

~~Bibliography~~

- [1] Noga Alon, Joel H. Spencer, The Probabilistic Method, 2nd ed., *John Wiley and Sons, Inc.*, (2000).
- [2] H. B. Chen, D. Z. Du and F. K. Hwang, An unexpected meeting of four seemingly unrelated problems: graph testing, DNA complex screening, superimposed codes and secure key distribution, *J. Combin. Opt.*, to appear.
- [3] H. B. Chen, H. L. Fu and F. K. Hwang, An upper bound of the number of tests in pooling designs for the error-tolerant complex model, *Opt. Letters*, to appear.
- [4] P. Damaschke, Threshold Group Testing, *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* 21, (2005), 265-271.
- [5] A. De Bonis, Leszek Gąsieniec, U. Vaccaro, Optimal Two-Stage Algorithms for Group Testing Problems, *SIAM J. Comput. Vol. 34, No. 5*, (2005), 1253-1270.
- [6] A. De Bonis and U. Vaccaro, Improved algorithms for group testing with inhibitors, *Inform. Process Lett.* 67, (1998), 57-64.
- [7] D. Deng, D. R. Stinson, R. Wei, The Lovász Local Lemma and Its Applications to some Combinatorial Arrays, *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 32, (2004), 121-134.

- [8] Ding-Zhu Du, Frank K. Hwang, Combinatorial Group Testing and Its Applications, 2nd ed., *World Scientific*, (2000).
- [9] Ding-Zhu Du, Frank K. Hwang, Pooling Designs and Nonadaptive Group Testing - Important Tools for DNA Sequencing, *World Scientific*, (2006).
- [10] P. Erdős, L. Lovász, Problems and Results on 3-chromatic Hypergraphs and Some Related Questions, *in: Infinite and Finite Sets*(A. Hajnal et al., eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1975), 609-628.
- [11] M. Farach, S. Kannan, E. Knill, S. Muthukrishnan, Group Testing Problem with Sequences in Experimental Molecular Biology, *Proc. Compression and Complexity of Sequences*, (1997), 357-367.
- [12] C. H. Li, A sequential method for screening experimental variables, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 57, (1962), 455-477.
- [13] L. Lovász, On the Ratio of Optimal Integral and Fractional Covers, *Discrete Math.*, 13, (1975), 383-390.
- [14] F. P. Ramsey, On A Problem of Formal Logic, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 30(2), (1929), 264-286.
- [15] Joel Spencer, Probabilistic Methods, *Graphs and Combinatorics* 1, (1985), 357-382.
- [16] D. R. Stinson and R. Wei, Generalized cover-free families, *Discrete Math.* 279, (2004), 463-477.
- [17] Hong-Gwa Yeh, d-Disjunct matrices: bounds and Lovász Local Lemma, *Discrete Mathematics* 253, (2002), 97-107.