LE MATEMATICHE Vol. LII (1997) - Fasc. I, pp. 141-146

# **COMMON BLOCKS FOR** *AS QS***(12)**

# LORENZO MILAZZO

*In Ricordo di Claudio Barone*

An  $ASQS(v)$  is a particular Steiner system featuring a set of v vertices and two separate families of blocks,  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$ , whose elements have a respective cardinality of 4 and 6. It has the property that any three vertices of *X* belong either to a B-block or to a G-block. The parameter *cb* is the number of common blocks in two separate ASQSs, both de�ned on the same set of vertices *X*. In this paper it is shown that  $cb \leq 29$  for any pair of ASQSs(12).

### **1. Introduction.**

An *Atypical Steiner Quadruple System* (ASQS) [2] is a Steiner system defined by the triple  $(X, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B})$  where X is a finite set of v points called *vertices*,  $\mathcal G$  is a family of subsets of  $X$  called  $G$ -blocks with a cardinality of 6, which partitions  $X$ , and  $\mathcal B$  is a family of subsets of  $X$  whose elements all have a cardinality of 4 and are called *B-blocks*. In this system each triple of vertices of *X* is contained either in a G-block or in a B-block. In general, if there is no need to specify whether an element belongs to  $\mathcal G$  or  $\mathcal B$  it will be called a *block*.

The number of G-blocks in the system is  $|\mathcal{G}| = \frac{v}{6}$ , while the number of B-blocks is  $|\mathcal{B}| = \frac{1}{4} \left[ \binom{v}{3} - 20 \cdot \frac{v}{6} \right]$ .

Entrato in Redazione il 19 dicembre 1996.

Research supported by GNSAGA (C.N.R.) with contribution MURST.

For classical  $SQS(v)$ s the authors of [3] posed the problem of determining the number of possible blocks in common between two separate SQSs defined on the same set of vertices. In this paper a similar problem is dealt with for ASQS(12) and for each pair of such systems it is determined that the number of blocks in common is  $cb \leq 29$ .

## **2. Preliminary Results.**

### *2.1. 1-factorizations.*

It has been proved that all the 1-factorizations of  $K_6$  are isomorphous [5]. From a 1-factorization,  $\mathcal{E}$ , of  $K_6$  it is possible to obtain another 1-factorization,  $\mathcal{F}$ , by permutation of the 1-factors of  $\varepsilon$ , in which case we say that  $\varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon$  are *different by permutation*. If two 1-factorizations are different, but not by permutation, they are said to be *strict sense different*.

**Lemma 1.** *In a 1-factorization of*  $K_6$  *any two* 1-factors define a circuit with a *length of*  $6$  *in*  $K_6$ *.* 

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_5\}$  be a 1-factorization of  $K_6$  and  $F_i$  and  $F_j$  two 1-factors of  $\mathcal{F}$ ; if we remove from  $K_6$  all the edges not belonging to  $F_i$  and  $F_j$ we obtain a regular graph of order two and, by Petersen's theorem  $[1]$  it can be made up either of two  $K_3$ 's or of a circuit with a length of 6. A graph made up of two  $K_3$ 's cannot contain two 1-factors and the lemma is proved.

**Lemma 2.** If two different 1-factorizations  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mathcal F$  of  $K_6$  have two equal 1*factors, then if they are different they are so by permutation.*

*Proof.* Let  $F_i$  and  $F_j$  be the two 1-factors present in  $\mathcal E$  and  $\mathcal F$ ; by the previous lemma the graph obtained from  $K_6$  by removing the edges present in  $F_i$  and  $F_j$ is as follows:



In it there are three 1-factors and it can easily be seen that the edges  $(1,2)$ ,  $(2,3)$ ,  $(4,5)$  and  $(5,6)$  belong to a single 1-factor.  $\Box$ 

#### *2.2. Doubling Construction.*

An ASQS =  $(X, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B})$  where  $X = 2v$  can be obtained from the two systems  $ASQS_1 = (X_1, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{B}_1)$  and  $ASQS_2 = (X_2, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{B}_2)$ , where  $|X_1| =$  $|X_2| = v$  with  $v = 2h$ ,  $X_1 \cup X_2 = X$  and  $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$  by means of the following double construction.

Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_{v-1}\}\$  and  $\mathcal{E} = \{E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_{v-1}\}\$  be two 1factorizations of  $K_v$  on the sets of vertices  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  and  $\alpha$  a permutation of the set  $\{1, 2, ..., v - 1\}.$ 

Let  $\mathcal{B}_0$  be the family of B-blocks thus defined: two vertices  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{F}_i$ belong to the B-block of  $\mathcal{B}_0$  {*x*<sub>1</sub>, *x*<sub>2</sub>, *y<sub>l</sub>*, *y<sub>m</sub>*} if and only if the pair  $(y_l, y_m) \in E_j$ and  $i\alpha = j$ .

It can easily be shown that the triple  $(X, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B})$ , where  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$  is an ASQS(2v).

### **3. Common Blocks.**

Let us consider two generic systems,  $ASQS_1 = (X, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{B}_1)$  and  $ASQS_2 =$  $(X, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{B}_2).$ 

**Definition 1.** *The two systems*  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  *and*  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$  *are said to be different if there exist in them blocks that are not in common.*

**Definition 2.** *Two different systems*  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  *and*  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$  *are said to be of the first species if*  $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_2$ *, of the second species if the opposite is true.* 

**Definition 3.** Let  $ASQS_1$  and  $ASQS_2$  be two different systems of the second *species, both defined on a set*  $X$  *of*  $12$  *vertices, and let*  $g_i$  *and*  $g_j$  *be any two G-blocks belonging respectively* to  $\mathcal{G}_1$  *and*  $\mathcal{G}_2$ *. We will then say that the two systems* are *of* the first type if  $g_i$  and  $g_j$  have one or five vertices in common, *of the second type if they have two or four vertices in common, and of the third type if they have three vertices in common.*

For two separate ASQSs -  $ASQS_1$  and  $ASQS_2$  - let us indicate the number of blocks they have in common as *cb* and try to establish the maximum value *cb* can take when pairs of ASQS(12)s are considered.

For two systems  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  and  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$  with 12 vertices we can make the following observations:

- 1. If  $\mathcal{G}_1 \neq \mathcal{G}_2$  the two systems cannot have G-blocks in common;
- 2. if  $g_{11}$  and  $g_{12}$  belong to the  $\mathcal{G}_1$  of  $ASQS_1$ , in each B-block of  $B_1$  there will be two vertices of  $g_{11}$  and two of  $g_{12}$ ;
- 3. if  $g_{11} = \{x, y, k, z, t, w\}$  then each pair of  $g_{11}$  is in three B-blocks and in these blocks the vertices of  $g_{12}$  define a 1-factor of  $K_6$  on the vertices of  $g_{12}$ ; in addition, the pairs  $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, k)$ ,  $(x, z)$ ,  $(x, t)$  and  $(x, w)$  define a 1-factorization of  $K_6$  on the vertices of  $g_{12}$  (due to the symmetry of the system it is possible to repeat what was said above for the vertices of the G-block *g*12);
- 4. the three types of different systems of the second species identified by Definition 3 are the only three possible.

# **Proposition 1.** For two different systems  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  and  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$ , of the first type *of the second species, cb*  $\leq$  25 *and this inequality is the best possible.*

*Proof.*  $ASQS_1$  and  $ASQS_2$  are two systems of the first type of the second species with  $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{g_{11}, g_{12}\}\$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{g_{21}, g_{22}\}\$ ; it is therefore possible to determine an *x* ∈ *g*<sub>11</sub> and a *y* ∈ *g*<sub>12</sub> such that  $g_{21} = (g_{11} - \{x\}) \cup \{y\}$  and *g*<sub>22</sub> = (*g*<sub>12</sub> − {*y*})∪ {*x*}. Then if *g*<sub>21</sub> = {*y*, *p*, *t*, *k*, *z*, *w*}, each pair of vertices of *g*<sup>21</sup> which does not contain *y* can be in two B-blocks common to *ASQS*<sup>1</sup> and *ASQS*2, while each pair of vertices of *g*<sup>21</sup> containing *y* can at most be in one common B-block. Therefore, as there are 15 different pairs of vertices in  $g_{21}$  and only 5 contain *y*,  $cb \le 25$ . This limit is the best possible; if, in fact, we consider a system ASQS =  $(X, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B})$  with  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, g_2\}$  and we choose an  $x \in g_1$  and a  $y \in g_2$ , then the system *ASQS'* obtained from *ASQS* by exchanging *x* with *y* and  $y$  with  $x$  in the blocks where these vertices are present, has 25 blocks in common with ASQS.  $\Box$ 

With analogous demonstration it is possible to prove that:

**Proposition 2.** If two different systems  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  and  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$  of the second *species are of the second or third type*,  $cb \leq 27$ *.* 

Unlike Proposition 1 this upper limit for cb is not the best possible.

Let us now consider two different systems  $ASQS_1$  and  $ASQS_2$  of the first species. They have two G-blocks in common. If C*B* is the set of B-blocks in common, the two systems  $(X, \mathcal{B}_1 - CB)$  and  $(X, \mathcal{B}_2 - CB)$  are two *disjoint mutually balanced* (DMB) PQSs, i.e. two partial systems of quadruples in which if a triple of vertices is in one block of one of the two systems it will also be in one block of the other system and, in addition, the two systems do not have blocks in common. From the results given in [3], *cb* can take the following values:  $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 32, 33, 35, 39\}.$ 

**Proposition 3.** For two different systems  $ASQS_1$  and  $ASQS_2$  of the first *species,*  $cb \leq 29$  *and this inequality is the best possible.* 

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{g_{11}, g_{12}\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{g_{21}, g_{22}\}$  be the two G-blocks of the systems  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  and  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$ . First we make the following consideration: if a pair  $(x, y)$  with  $x, y \in g_{11}$  (or  $x, y \in g_{12}$ ) is in one block not common to the two systems, then it will be in at least two non-common blocks. If, in fact, we assume this to be untrue, it will be in three common blocks, which would be absurd.

Let us consider the two PQS systems  $\mathcal{M}_1 = (X, \mathcal{B}_1 - \mathcal{C}B)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2 =$  $(X, \mathcal{B}_2 - CB)$ . They are DMB and by Theorem 2.7 in [3] the number of blocks present in these systems, if  $|CB| \ge 29$  is 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, or 17.

Let us assume that  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  have 8 or 14 or 16 or 17 blocks. As these integers are not multiples of three, in  $g_{11} = g_{21}$  (or  $g_{12} = g_{22}$ ) there exists a pair  $(x, y)$  which is only present in two blocks of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . If  $g_{11} = g_{21} = \{x, y, k, z, t, w\}$  (or  $g_{12} = g_{22} = \{x, y, k, z, t, w\}$ ), then  $(x, y)$ identifies in  $g_{12}$  ( $g_{11}$ ) a 1-factor in  $ASQS_1$  and a 1-factor in  $ASQS_2$  which only have one edge in common. This implies that the pairs  $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, k)$ ,  $(x, z)$ ,  $(x, t)$ ,  $(x, w)$ , by Lemma 2, identify in  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  and  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$  two strict sense different 1-factorizations which can have at most one 1-factor in common and therefore in  $g_{12}$  (or  $g_{11}$ ) we can count at least 8 different pairs present in at least two blocks of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , and so these systems cannot have 8 or 14 blocks.

If  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  have 12 or 15 blocks, then each pair of  $g_{11}$  and  $g_{12}$  present in one block of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  is present in three blocks. The only DMB PQSs with 12 and 15 blocks were determined in [4] and it can easily be seen that these systems do not have the same features.

If  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  have 16 blocks, as 16 cannot be divided by 3 a pair  $(x, y)$ of *g*<sup>11</sup> (or *g*12) is only present in two blocks. So, according to what was said previously, there exist exactly 8 different pairs in *g*<sup>11</sup> and *g*<sup>12</sup> each only present in two blocks. If  $g_{11} = \{x, y, k, t, w, z\}$  and the pair  $(x, y)$  is in two noncommon blocks there are in  $g_{11}$  (or  $g_{12}$ ) at least 4 different pairs in which *x* is present, three different pairs in which *y* is present and two in which *k* or *t* or w or *z* is present. These nine pairs are all different from each other and have the property of being present in two blocks. This is absurd as there are 16 blocks in  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

If  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  have 17 blocks, there must be at least one pair of  $g_{11}$  (or  $g_{12}$ ) present in two blocks and one and only one pair  $(x, y)$  present in three noncommon blocks. This implies that the 1-factorizations of  $g_{12}$  (or  $g_{11}$ ) identified by the pairs  $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, t)$ ,  $(x, k)$ ,  $(x, z)$ ,  $(x, w)$  in  $ASQS<sub>1</sub>$  and  $ASQS<sub>2</sub>$  are strict sense different and in  $g_{12}$  (or  $g_{11}$ ) there are at least nine different pairs present in non-common blocks, which would be absurd.

Therefore  $cb \leq 29$  and this inequality is the best possible. It is sufficient, in fact, to consider a system,  $ASQS'$ , obtained from a double construction which

uses the 1-factorization  $\mathcal E$ . If two 1-factors of  $\mathcal E$  are exchanged, a new ASQS - *ASQS"* - is obtained which has exactly 29 blocks in common with *ASQS'*.

 $\Box$ 

From the last three propositions we get:

**Theorem 1.** *For two different systems*  $ASQS_1$  *and*  $ASQS_2$ *, cb*  $\leq$  29*.* 

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] C. Berge, *Hypergraph: combinatories of �nite sets,* North Holland, 1989.
- [2] M. C. Di Domenico, *Su atipici sistemi di Steiner: ASTS, ASQS,* Thesis, (1995).
- [3] M. Gionfriddo C. C. Lindner, *Construction of Steiner quadruple systems having a prescribed number of blocks in common,* Discrete Mathematics, 34 (1981), pp. 31-42.
- [4] M. Gionfriddo, *Construction of all disjoint and mutually balanced partial quadruple systems with* 12, 14 *or* 15 *blocks*, Rend. Sem. Brescia, 7 (1984), pp. 343–353.
- [5] E. Mendelsohn A. Rosa, *One-factorization of the complete graph a survey*, Journal of Graph Theory,  $9(1985)$ , pp. 43–65.

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Universita` di Catania, Viale Andrea Doria 6, 95125 Catania (ITALY)*