EFFICIENT IDENTIFICATION OF
IMPORTANT FACTORS IN LARGE
SCALE SIMULATIONS

Carl A. Mauro
Desmatics, Inc.
P.O. Box 618
State College, PA 16804

ABSTRACT

Large, complex computer simulation
models can require prohibitively costly and
time-consuming experimental programs to study
their behavior. Therefore we may want to
concentrate the analysis on the set of "most
important" factors (i.e., input variables).
Factor screening experiments, which attempt
to identify the more important variables, can
be extremely useful in the study of such
models. The number of computer runs
available for screening, however, is usually
severely limited. In fact, the number of
factors often exceeds the number of available
runs. In this paper we present a survey of
supersaturated designs for use in factor
screening experiments. The designs
considered are: random balance, systematic
supersaturated, group screening, modified
group screening, T-optimal, R-optimal, and
search designs. We discuss in general terms
the basic technique, advantages, and
disadvantages of each procedure surveyed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Large-scale computer simulation models,
because of their size and running time, can
require prohibitively costly and
time-consuming experimental programs to study
their behavior. Often it is anticipated,
however, that only relatively few factors
(i.e., input variables) will have major
effects. Therefore, one may want to conduct
an efficient preliminary experiment to
determine the subset of "most important"
factors. Once the most important factors
have been identified, subsequent
experimentation can focus on these particular
factors, thereby eliminating experimentation
with relatively unimportant factors which can
needlessly consume resources.

In some situations, of course, prior
information concerning the experimental
factors is available and can be used to
identify those factors which are most likely
to be of importance. Although the use of
prior information can be beneficial to the
screening process, in this paper we assume
that there is no prior information available.
This would not exclude, for example,
situations in which prior information is
available on the importance of some of the
factors, and it is desired to examine the
remaining factors in a screening experiment.

The function of a factor screening
experiment is to sort the factors into two
groups. One group consists of the important
factors which are judged worthwhile to
investigate further, while the other consists
of the remaining factors classified as
unimportant. In general, in screening
experiments we want (a) to detect as many
important factors as possible, (b) to declare
important as few unimportant factors as
possible, and (c) to expend as few computer
runs as possible. Since these are
conflicting objectives, one must generally
trade off how many runs a screening method
requires against how accurately it classifies
factors.

The screening problem can occur in two
general situations. These are the
unsaturated/saturated and the supersaturated
situations. In the unsaturated/saturated
situation, one can afford to invest more runs
than there are factors. In the

supersaturated situation, the number of factors equals or exceeds the number of runs available for screening. Although screening can be done more effectively in the unsaturated/saturated situation, the supersaturated situation is a common and practical situation in the analysis of large-scale simulation models. Here, once again, design economy is the primary consideration.

Supersaturated design procedures are not customarily discussed in textbooks on experimental design, and there are few examples of such experiments in the statistical or simulation literature. This paper presents a survey of supersaturated designs for use in factor screening, with application to large-scale simulation models. The designs considered are: (i) random balance designs, (ii) systematic supersaturated designs, (iii) group screening designs, (iv) modified group screening designs, (v) T-optimal designs, (vi) R-optimal designs, and (vii) search designs. Our intent is to provide a broad overview of supersaturated screening methods and to discuss in general terms the basic technique, analysis procedures, advantages, and disadvantages of each method surveyed. Appropriate references are provided if further information is desired.

2. A SCREENING MODEL

For the purpose of detecting the factors which have major effects, it generally suffices to assume the first-order model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{K} \beta_j x_{ij} + \varepsilon_i$$

where y_i is the value of the response (i.e., output variable) in the ith simulation run, K is the total number of factors, each of which is at two normalized levels (coded ± 1), x_{ij} is the level of the jth factor during the ith simulation run, β_0 is a constant component common to all observations, β_j ($j \geq 1$) is the (linear) effect of the jth factor, and ε_i is a random error component with mean 0 and unknown variance σ^2.

A common interpretation of this model is that it represents a first-order Taylor series approximation to the true relationship between the output y_i and the normalized input variables x_1, x_2, ..., x_K. Moreover, the coefficients β_1, β_2, ..., β_K can be related to the sensitivity of the output variable y_i to changes made in the input variables, at least in the vicinity of their nominal values. Ordinarily this model would be used over a relatively small region of the factor space.

3. SUPERSATURATED SCREENING DESIGNS

Screening designs can be classified as either "fixed" or "sequential" designs. In a fixed, or nonsequential, design, the factors are screened based on a given set of observations (i.e., computer runs). In a sequential design, results from a first-stage design are used to provide information on how to set up the design used in the next stage, and so on. All of the designs considered in this paper are fixed, with the exception of group screening designs which are sequential.

3.1 Random Balance Designs

Random balance (RB) designs, introduced by Budne (1959a, 1959b) and Satterthwaite (1959), were discussed at length by Anscombe (1959) and Youden et al. (1959). See also Dempster (1960), Mauro and Smith (1984), and Mauro and Burns (1984).

In a two-level (± 1) RB design, each column of the design matrix consists of N/2 +1's and N/2 -1's where N, an even number, denotes the total number of runs to be made. The +1's and -1's in each column are assigned randomly, making all possible combinations of N/2 +1's and N/2 -1's equally likely, with each column receiving an independent

randomization.

The principal advantage of the RB method is its flexibility. The number of runs N can be selected independently of the number of factors K. No mathematical restriction or relationship, except that N be an even number, need exist between N and K. A second advantage is that RB designs are very easy to prepare for any combination of N and K. This latter advantage can be an important consideration when K is large.

The major disadvantage of RB designs is that confounding is random. Anscombe (1959) has written:

> The fact that the degree of nonorthogonality or unbalance is random can be made the basis for an objection to the whole notion of random balance designs. Such designs may work well on the average, but should I trust to one on this occasion?

Indeed, the lack of control over the confounding in RB designs has been a controversial aspect since such experimentation was first proposed.

Another disadvantage of RB designs is that there is no generally accepted or established method of analysis for these designs. In fact, the problem of analysis is characteristic of supersaturated designs with irregular confounding patterns and is not peculiar to the RB method. The simplest analysis approach is to consider each factor separately, ignoring all other factors, and apply some standard analysis technique such as an F-test. More sophisticated analysis methods which can be used include variable selection procedures such as least squares stepwise and stagewise regression (see, for example, Draper and Smith 1981).

The simple least squares estimator of β_j obtained by ignoring all other factors is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_j = (\bar{y}_{+j} - \bar{y}_{-j})/2$$

where $\bar{y}_{+j}(\bar{y}_{-j})$ is the average value of the response over the N/2 runs at the +1(-1) level of the jth factor. Let $\underline{y}$ denote the Nx1 vector $(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_N)'$ of responses and $\underline{x}_j$ denote the Nx1 vector $(x_{1j}, x_{2j}, \ldots, x_{Nj})'$. Further, let $\underline{X} = [\underline{1}, \underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2, \ldots, \underline{x}_K]$, where $\underline{1}$ designates an Nx1 vector of +1's. In an RB design, the matrix $\underline{X}$ is, by construction, stochastic (except, of course, for the initial column of +1's). Assuming that $\underline{X}$ and the ε_i are independent, it is easily shown that conditional on $\underline{X}$,

$$E(\hat{\beta}_j | \underline{X}) = \beta_j + (\sum_{i \neq j} \beta_i \underline{x}_i' \underline{x}_j)/N \qquad (1)$$

and

$$V(\hat{\beta}_j | \underline{X}) = \sigma^2/N. \qquad (2)$$

The conditional mean square error (MSE) of $\hat{\beta}_j$ is then

$$MSE(\hat{\beta}_j | \underline{X}) = \sigma^2/N + (\sum_{i \neq j} \beta_i \underline{x}_i' \underline{x}_j)^2/N^2.$$

Unconditionally, it can be shown that

$$E(\hat{\beta}_j) = \beta_j \qquad (3)$$

and

$$V(\hat{\beta}_j) = \tau_j^2/(N-1) + \sigma^2/N \qquad (4)$$

where $\tau_j^2 = \sum_{m \neq j} \beta_m^2$.

As Box (1959) pointed out, equations (1) and (2) refer to the behavior of the estimates for repetitions of a particular RB design. Equations (3) and (4), on the other hand, refer to the behavior of the estimates if we average over the random choice of RB designs. Box noted that although $\hat{\beta}_j$ is unconditionally unbiased, the effect of the conditional bias term in (1) is transferred to the unconditional variance of $\hat{\beta}_j$ which now contains terms from every other factor present. Conditionally, therefore, one pays the price of having a biased estimator;

unconditionally, one pays the price of having a potentially inflated variance. From either point of view, RB sampling would seem inefficient for detecting all but the very large effects. In a study of the RB method, Mauro and Burns (1984) derived formulas for determining (unconditional) power probabilities of detecting factor effects when separate F-tests are used as the method of analysis.

Some further results regarding the use of separate F-tests are that for $i \neq j$

$$\text{cov}(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j) = \beta_i \beta_j / (N-1)$$

and $\text{corr}(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j) \approx \beta_i \beta_j / (\tau_i^2 + \sigma^2)(\tau_j^2 + \sigma^2)$. (5)

The correlation expressed in equation (5) is a measure of the confounding between $\hat{\beta}_i$ and $\hat{\beta}_j$. It is interesting to note that an increase in N does not reduce the confounding in an RB design where simple least squares is used as the estimation method. As indicated by (5), the confounding between $\hat{\beta}_i$ and $\hat{\beta}_j$ is primarily a function of σ^2 and the magnitudes of the effects in the model.

It should also be noted that more sophisticated analysis techniques such as variable selection procedures are not immune to the adverse effects of the irregular confounding patterns characteristic of supersaturated designs. It is well known that multicollinearity in the predictor variables can cause serious computational and statistical difficulties. See, for example, Belsley, Kuh, and Welsch (1980) and Silvey (1969). Furthermore, sequential selection procedures have the added problem that it is difficult to control the true overall significance level (i.e., the probability of declaring important a negligible factor) of such procedures.

3.2 Systematic Supersaturated Designs

Because of the random confounding that occurs in RB designs, Booth and Cox (1962) introduced balanced (i.e., an equal number of +1's and -1's in each design column) two-level designs which systematically attempt to minimize confounding. Since not all design columns can be orthogonal when $N \leq K$, Booth and Cox constructed designs, which they termed systematic supersaturated (SS) designs, that minimize $\max_{i \neq j} |c_{ij}|$ where $c_{ij} = \underline{x}_i' \underline{x}_j$. For two or more designs with the same minimax value, the preferred SS design is the one which minimizes the number of pairs of columns attaining the minimax value.

The cosine of the angle θ_{ij}, $0 \leq \theta_{ij} \leq \pi$, between any two column vectors, $\underline{x}_i$ and $\underline{x}_j$, is defined by

$$\cos \theta_{ij} = c_{ij} / (c_{ii} c_{jj})^{1/2} = c_{ij} / N.$$

The vectors $\underline{x}_i$ and $\underline{x}_j$ are orthogonal if $c_{ij} = 0$ or, in other words, if the cosine of the angle between them is zero. The absolute value of the inner product, therefore, is a measure of the orthogonality of any two design columns. In a certain sense, then, SS designs are constructed as nearly orthogonal as possible.

Booth and Cox tabulated their SS designs for the following seven combinations of (N,K): (12,16), (12,20), (12,24), (18,24), (18,30), (18,36), and (24,30). As they pointed out, designs for intermediate values of K can be formed by dropping the final columns from the next largest SS design. The designs indicated above were obtained with the aid of an iterative computer search procedure, since it was impracticable to enumerate all possible designs and select the best.

The principal advantage of SS designs is that they attempt to minimize the confounding which inevitably occurs when $N \leq K$. The principal disadvantage is that these designs are not readily available for combinations of N and K other than those already tabulated. Furthermore, the time and expense needed to write and to run a computer program for the generation of these designs may be prohibitive, especially if K is large. Also,

as in RB designs, there remains the
difficulty that the analysis of SS designs is
complicated by the confounding of factor
effects.

A quick comparison of SS with RB designs
can be made based on an analysis of the
variance of the inner product of two columns
chosen at random from the design. For RB
designs, for example, the variance of $x_i'x_j$
for any i and j is $N^2/(N-1)$. Booth and Cox
made such a comparison for the seven SS
designs they derived and observed that SS
designs are substantially better than RB
designs when $N > K/2$. As would be expected,
SS designs lose their advantage when N is
small relative to K.

3.3 Group Screening Designs

In a group screening (GS) design we
partition the individual factors into groups
of suitable sizes and then test these groups
by considering each as a single factor. The
level of a "group-factor" is defined by
assigning the same level, either +1 or -1, to
each component factor. Because the number of
group-factors is generally much smaller than
the original number of factors, we can
usually study the group-factors in a standard
orthogonal design such as a Plackett-Burman
(PB) design. PB designs are two-level (± 1)
orthogonal designs for studying up to $K=4m-1$
factors in $N=4m$ runs. PB designs were
tabulated by Plackett and Burman (1946) for
$N \leq 100$ and are minimal in the number of runs
required to achieve orthogonality. When N is
a power of two, PB designs are the same as
resolution III 2^{k-p} fractional factorial
designs (see Box and Hunter 1961).

The grouping and testing process can be
repeated for any number of stages. In each
stage, however, we repartition into smaller
groups only those groups determined to be
significant in the previous stage. Further,
we hold at a constant level any factor not
included in a subsequent stage so not to bias
any of the later-stage group-factor
estimates. In the final stage of screening,

we test factors individually (i.e., the group
size is unity).

GS designs were introduced initially by
Watson (1961), who considered screening in
two stages. The GS method was then
generalized to more than two stages by both
Li (1962) and Patel (1962). For an excellent
overview of GS designs, the reader may
consult Kleijnen (1975).

There are two major advantages to GS
designs. The first of these is that we can
to a certain extent control the confounding
pattern, since factors within a group are
completely confounded and factors in
different groups are not confounded.
Secondly, the grouping process reduces the
dimensionality of the model and enables the
use of orthogonal main effect designs, such
as PB designs, to test the significance of
group-factors. Moreover, such designs can be
analyzed by the usual analysis of variance
procedures for factorial experiments.

There are two major disadvantages of the
GS method. The first of these is that the
total number of runs required by a GS
procedure is not fixed, since the number of
group-factors carried over from stage to
stage (when one progresses beyond the first
stage) is random. Thus, in a GS strategy,
one generally does not know prior to
experimentation the exact total number of
runs that will be expended. A second major
disadvantage is that the optimal choice of
group sizes and significance levels used in
the various stages of group screening
requires prior information on certain
properties of the underlying model, such as
the proportion of important effects. The
problem of selecting optimal two-stage group
screening designs has been discussed by Mauro
(1984) and Patel and Ottieno (1984).

Another consideration in the use of the
GS approach is that important effects may
cancel within a group. As a simple example,
consider two factors which have effects that
are negatives or near negatives of each

other. If these two factors are the only
important factors in a group, their effects
will essentially cancel and their combined
effect may be masked by experimental error.
Cancellation of effects cannot occur, of
course, if factor levels are assigned a
priori so that all effects are in the same
direction. See Mauro (1984), Mauro and Burns
(1984), and Mauro and Smith (1982) for a more
detailed analysis of the effects of
cancellation on the performance of two-stage
GS designs.

3.4 Modified Group Screening Designs

Because an analyst might be reluctant to
use a screening strategy in which the total
number of runs cannot be predetermined, Mauro
and Burns (1984) suggested a modified GS
procedure in two stages where the total
number of runs can be fixed prior to
experimentation. Consider a two-stage GS
strategy where the analyst decides beforehand
not only on the number of group-factors which
will be tested in the first stage but also on
the number of group-factors, say m, which
will be carried over to the second stage.
After the first-stage experiment, the m
group-factors with the largest estimated
effects are determined and their component
factors tested individually in a second-stage
experiment. In this strategy, the number of
first- and second-stage runs are both
predetermined.

The advantages of modified GS designs
are the same as for regular GS designs. The
same disadvantages also apply except of
course that the total number of runs is fixed
in modified GS and is random in regular GS.
An additional disadvantage of modified GS is
that the prespecification of m, the number of
group-factors to be carried over to the
second stage, may be inadequate in order to
reasonably insure that all of the apparently
significant groups reach the second stage.

Further research and practical
experience on modified GS designs is needed.
However, preliminary indications are that the
performance of this strategy is comparable to
that of regular two-stage GS if the
proportion of important effects is not too
large.

3.5 T-Optimal Designs

In a two-level ($\pm$1) design, the inner
product between any two design columns is a
measure of their orthogonality. SS designs,
which were discussed in Section 3.2, are
constructed with the objective of minimizing
the maximum absolute inner product between
any two distinct design columns. One can
define other criteria, however, for measuring
the optimality of a supersaturated design.

We define a design to be T-optimal in a
given class of designs if it minimizes, over
all designs in that class, the trace of
$(\underline{X}'\underline{X})^2$, where $\underline{X}$ is as defined previously.
Equivalently, a design is T-optimal if it
minimizes the sum of squared inner products
of all pairs of columns in $\underline{X}$. Thus, the
columns of $\underline{X}$ are, in a certain sense, as
nearly orthogonal as possible.

The principal disadvantage of
supersaturated T-optimal designs is that
rules for their general construction have not
been developed, nor have any such designs
been tabulated within the class of two-level
($\pm$1) designs. However, in studies where the
constant term β_0 is known or an advance
estimate is available, rules for the
construction of supersaturated T-optimal
designs can essentially be found in Morris
and Mitchell (1983), who derived such designs
in the process of obtaining their trace-L
optimal designs for detecting two-factor
interactions. A second disadvantage is that,
as in RB and SS designs, the analysis of
T-optimal designs is made difficult by the
confounding of factor effects.

3.6 R-Optimal Designs

In matrix terms, the screening model
introduced in Section 2 can be expressed as

$$\underline{y} = \underline{X}\underline{\beta}+\underline{\epsilon}$$

where $\underline{y}$ is an $N\times 1$ vector of responses, $\underline{\beta}=(\beta_0,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_K)'$ is a $(K+1)\times 1$ vector of parameters, $\underline{\epsilon}$ is an $N\times 1$ vector of random error terms with mean 0 and variance σ^2, and $\underline{X}$ is an $N\times(K+1)$ matrix of coefficients of the parameters $\beta_0,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_K$. We shall assume that $N \leq K$ and that $\underline{X}$ is of rank N. For simplicity in the following discussion, we shall also assume that $\sigma^2=0$, so that $\underline{y}=\underline{X}\underline{\beta}$.

Consider, then, the supersaturated system of linear equations $y=\underline{X}\underline{\beta}$. Since $N \leq K$, this system is underdetermined and therefore possesses infinitely many solutions. It can be shown, however, that the solution which has minimum length is given by

$$\hat{\underline{\beta}}_m = \underline{X}'(\underline{X}\underline{X}')^{-1}\underline{y} . \qquad (6)$$

Because $\hat{\underline{\beta}}_m$ is the minimum length solution, it insures, in some sense, that factors are treated equally in the estimation process. For example, if two or more factors are completely confounded, the effect of each factor will be estimated by the average of their combined effects.

Substituting $\underline{y}=\underline{X}\underline{\beta}$ into (6), we obtain, in terms of the true $\underline{\beta}$,

$$\hat{\underline{\beta}}_m = \underline{R}\underline{\beta}$$

where $\underline{R} = \underline{X}'(\underline{X}\underline{X}')^{-1}\underline{X}$. We observe that $\underline{R}$ is a $(K+1)\times(K+1)$ symmetric idempotent matrix of rank N and is the projection matrix operator onto the space spanned by the rows of $\underline{X}$. In addition, since $\underline{R}$ is a projection matrix, we note that $0 \leq r_{ii} \leq 1$, where r_{ii} designates the ith diagonal element of $\underline{R}$. Furthermore, the sum of all diagonal elements of $\underline{R}$ equals N, since the trace of $\underline{R}$ equals its rank.

The notion of R-optimal designs was introduced by Mitchell, Hunter, and Showers (1980), who considered a Bayesian analysis of the supersaturated screening problem. Assuming that $\sigma^2=0$ and no constant term β_0 is

present and making certain prior assumptions regarding $\beta_1,\beta_2,\ldots,\beta_K$, $\hat{\underline{\beta}}_m$ was obtained as the Bayes estimate of $\underline{\beta}$. It may be noted that the coefficient matrix $\underline{X}$, in this case, does not include a column of $+1$'s corresponding to the constant term β_0.

The variance-covariance matrix of the posterior distribution of $\underline{\beta}$, as derived by Mitchell, Hunter, and Showers, was found to be proportional to the matrix $\underline{I}-\underline{R}$. Consideration of this result lead to the following design criteria. A design is said to be R-optimal in a given class of designs if it minimizes, over all designs in that class, the maximum diagonal element of $\underline{R}$. This amounts to making the diagonal elements of $\underline{R}$, hence also $\underline{I}-\underline{R}$, as nearly equal as possible (since the trace of $\underline{R}$ is fixed). Thus, an R-optimal design would, in some sense, provide equal information on all the β_i's. It follows that if a design exists such that all r_{ii} are equal, that design is R-optimal.

In a related Bayesian treatment of this problem, Anscombe (1963) imposed certain restrictions on the coefficient matrix $\underline{X}$ in order to expedite calculation of the posterior distribution. One of these was that the rows of $\underline{X}$ are orthogonal. It is easy to show that if $\underline{X}$ is a row-orthogonal matrix, the diagonal elements of $\underline{R}$ are all equal, and consequently the associated design is R-optimal. This indicates that, for certain values of N and K, a supersaturated R-optimal design can be readily obtained by transposing a $(K+1)\times N$ $(N \leq K)$ column-orthogonal matrix (where a row of $+1$'s is reserved as coefficients of the constant term β_0).

The principal advantage to R-optimal designs is that, under certain restrictions, estimation of $\underline{\beta}$ is isotropic, i.e., the posterior variances of the β_i are all equal. The principal disadvantage of such designs is that their general performance characteristics in factor screening experiments have not been fully evaluated.

302

3.7 Search Designs

The factor screening problem can also be formulated as a "search" problem, following Srivastava (1975). Suppose it is known that at most k of the K factor effects are non-zero and the remaining (K-k) effects are zero. The goal of the search problem is to determine the k non-zero effects and estimate them.

Srivastava developed design criteria for obtaining search designs in the case where no experimental error is present (i.e., $\sigma^2=0$). We can write the coefficient matrix $\underline{X}$ as $\underline{X}=(\underline{1} \ \underline{D})$, where $\underline{1}$ is an Nx1 vector of +1's and $\underline{D}$ is an NxK design matrix. In order to ensure that the k non-zero effects can be uniquely determined from the K!/k!(K-k)! possible subsets, every subset of 2k columns of $\underline{D}$ together with the column vector $\underline{1}$ must have a combined rank of 2k+1. This implies, of course, that $N \geq 2k+1$.

Smaller sized search designs are possible, however, under the further restriction that the response vector $\underline{y}$ does not lie in the intersection of two competing subspaces. An equivalent restriction is that no linear relationships exist among the β_i's. In this case, $\underline{X}$ may be chosen so that no two (k+1)-dimensional column subspaces are identical, where each subspace includes the column vector $\underline{1}$. This implies, of course, that $N \geq k+1$.

The principal advantage of search designs is that theoretically the non-negligible effects should be identified and estimated with reasonable power, since this is an inherent condition of the construction of such designs.

There are three major disadvantages of search designs. The first of these is that construction of two-level (± 1) search designs is extremely difficult, particularly for large-scale simulation studies. A second disadvantage is that it is assumed that the maximum number of non-negligible effects, k,

is known. It is unclear, however, what impact misspecification of k will have on the search procedure. Finally, the analysis of search designs, which is based on subset regressions, may require a prohibitive number of computations even for moderate values of N, K, and k.

4. SUMMARY DISCUSSION

In this paper we have presented a description and comparative discussion of eight different types of supersaturated designs which have been suggested for use in factor screening experiments, with application to the study of large-scale computer simulation models. Because of the lack of comparative performance data, there are currently no definitive guidelines for the selection and use of supersaturated screening methods. Nevertheless, of those methods surveyed, the group screening method has been generally recommended, and we would concur with this recommendation except when the number of runs relative to the number of factors is severely limited. In such a case, Mauro and Burns (1984) found that the performance of group screening can be extremely poor, even for detecting the large effects. In such situations, then, alternative design strategies, such as systematic supersaturated designs, should be considered. From a practical point of view, although the screening plans considered in this paper are appealing, further theoretical development of these and other methods is needed, particularly in relation to the study of computer simulations per se.

REFERENCES

Anscombe, F. J. (1959). Quick analysis methods for random balance screening experiments. Technometrics 1, 195-209.

Anscombe, F. J. (1963). Bayesian inference concerning many parameters with reference to supersaturated designs. Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute 40, 721-733.

Belsley, D. A., Kuh, E., and Welsch (1980). Regression Diagnostics: Identifying Influential Data and Sources of Collinearity. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Booth, K. H. V. and Cox, D. R. (1962). Some systematic supersaturated designs. Technometrics 4, 489-495.

Box, G. E. P. (1959). Discussion of the papers of Messrs. Satterthwaite and Budne. Technometrics 1, 174-180.

Box, G. E. P. and Hunter J. S. (1961). The 2^{k-p} fractional factorial designs, part I and part II. Technometrics 3, 311-351 and 449-458.

Budne, T. A. (1959a). The application of random balance designs. Technometrics 1, 139-155.

Budne, T. A. (1959b). Random balance: Part I -- The missing statistical link in fact finding techniques. Industrial Quality Control 15, 5-10.

Dempster, A. P. (1960). Random allocation designs I: On general classes of estimation methods. Annals of Mathematical Statistics 31, 885-905.

Draper, N. R. and Smith, H. (1981). Applied Regression Analysis, Second Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Kleijnen, J. P. C. (1975). Statistical Techniques in Simulation - Part II. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.

Li, C. H. (1962). A sequential method for screening experimental variables. Journal of the American Statistical Association 57, 455-477.

Mauro, C. A. (1984). On the performance of two-stage group screening. Technometrics 26, 255-264.

Mauro, C. A. and Burns, K. C. (1984). A comparison of random balance and two-stage group screening designs: A case study. Communications in Statistics A13, 2625-2647.

Mauro, C. A. and Smith, D. E. (1982). The performance of two-stage group screening in factor screening experiments. Technometrics 24, 325-330.

Mauro, C. A. and Smith, D. E. (1984). Factor screening in simulation: Evaluation of two strategies based on random balance sampling. Management Science 30, 209-221.

Mitchell, T. S., Hunter, W. G., and Showers, D. K. (1980). Design of experiments for studying computer codes. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin.

Morris, M. D. and Mitchell, T. J. (1983). Two-level multifactor designs for detecting the presence of interactions. Technometrics 25, 345-355.

Patel, M. S. (1962). Group screening with more than two stages. Technometrics 4, 209-217.

Patel, M. S. and Ottieno, J. A. M. (1984). Optimum two stage group-screening designs. Communications in Statistics A13, 2649-2663.

Plackett, R. L. and Burman, J. P. (1946). The design of optimum multifactor experiments. Biometrika 33, 305-325.

Satterthwaite, F. W. (1959). Random balance experimentation. Technometrics 1, 111-137.

Silvey, S. D. (1969). Multicollinearity and imprecise estimation. Journal of Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 31, 539-552.

Srivastava, J. N. (1975). Designs for searching non-negligible effects. In: A Survey of Statistical Design and Linear Models (J. N. Srivastava, ed.). North-Holland Publishing Company, New York, 507-519.

Watson, G. S. (1961). A study of the group screening method. Technometrics 3, 371-388.

Youden, W. J., Kempthorne, O., Tukey, J. W., Box, G. E. P., and Hunter, J. S. (1959). Discussions of the papers of Messrs. Satterthwaite and Budne. Technometrics 1, 157-193.

Carl A. Mauro
Desmatics, Inc.
P.O. Box 618
State College, PA   16804
(814)238-9621

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

CARL A. MAURO is a senior statistician with Desmatics, Inc. He received a B.S. in mathematics and M.A. in statistics from the Pennsylvania State University in 1977 and 1979, respectively. His interests include mathematical statistics, data analysis techniques, experimental design, computer simulation, and general statistical methodology. He is a member of ASA and ORSA. He has published in a number of journals, including Simulation, Management Science, Technometrics, Communications in Statistics, and American Journal of Mathematical and Management Sciences.