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## SUMMARY

Orthogonal Latin hypercube designs are becoming popular in designing computer experiments. Available literature on construction of orthogonal or nearly orthogonal LHDs has one or more restriction in terms of either runs or factors. In this article, we have proposed a method of construction for obtaining nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube designs capable of accommodating flexible number of runs or factors.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

Computer experiments are being widely conducted in those situations where the physical experiments and the process underlying it are too expensive, time-consuming or sometimes not even possible to observe. While designing computer experiments, Latin Hypercube designs are popularly used. These designs were introduced by McKay et al. (1979) and said to have the one-dimensional space-filling property.

A Latin hypercube design denoted as $\operatorname{LHD}(n, m)$ is an $n \times m$ matrix whose columns are permutations of the column vector $(1,2, \ldots, n)^{\prime}$. For example, an LHD with 5 runs and 3 columns (or factors) is given below where columns are permutations of levels $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$.

| 1 | 2 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 4 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 5 | 4 |

Whenever polynomial models are considered, orthogonality will be an important criterion to evaluate LHDs. For any $L H D=\left(l_{1}, \ldots, l_{m}\right)$, where $l_{i}$ is the $i^{\text {th }}$
factor or column of the LHD, $\rho_{l_{l_{j}}}$ is defined as the correlation coefficient between $l_{i}$ and $l_{j}$ and is given as $\rho_{i l_{j}}=l_{i}^{\prime} l_{j} /\left(l_{i}^{\prime} l_{i} l_{j}^{\prime} l_{j}\right)^{1 / 2}$. If the correlation coefficient between any two factors is zero then LHD is orthogonal LHD (OLHD) i.e. $\rho_{i j}(L H D)=0$ for all $i \neq j$ and if $\rho_{i j}(L H D)$ is near zero then the LHD is nearly orthogonal LHD. An example of an OLHD with 7 runs and 3 factors is given below.

| 1 | 7 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 4 | 1 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 5 | 3 | 7 |
| 6 | 5 | 2 |
| 7 | 6 | 4 |

It may be checked that correlation between any two factors in the above design is zero.

Ye (1998) provided a real example of using OLHD to simulate the cooling system of an injection molding process in which there were six input variables (factors).

He used a $17 \times 6$ OLHD in the computer experiment through which he built two regression models for two reponse variables, one of them measuring quality and another measuring productivity of the system.

An OLHD with $n$ runs and $m$ factors is denoted as $\operatorname{OLHD}(n, m)$ and each factor includes $n$ uniformly spaced levels presented in its centered form i.e., levels of factors are given as $\left\{-\frac{n-1}{2},-\frac{n-3}{2}, \ldots,-\frac{n-2 i+1}{2}, \ldots, \frac{n-3}{2}, \frac{n-1}{2}\right\} . \mathrm{A}$ $1^{\text {st }}$ order OLHD is an LHD with mutually orthogonal columns that ensures independent estimation of linear effects when $1^{\text {st }}$ order model is considered. Similarly, an LHD is said to be a $2^{\text {nd }}$ order OLHD if any two columns are orthogonal and any column is orthogonal to element wise product of any other two columns, and these designs ensure independence of estimates of main effects and any quadratic or two factor interaction effects. An example of OLHD (8,4) is given below where levels are represented in centered form.

$$
D=1 / 2\left(\begin{array}{cccccccc}
1 & 3 & 5 & 7 & -1 & -3 & -5 & -7 \\
3 & -1 & -7 & 5 & -3 & 1 & 7 & -5 \\
5 & 7 & -1 & -3 & -5 & -7 & 1 & 3 \\
7 & -5 & 3 & -1 & -7 & 5 & -3 & 1
\end{array}\right)^{\prime}
$$

Different methods of construction are available in the literature. Tang (1993) proposed orthogonal arraysbased space filling Latin hypercube designs which have better space filling properties than randomly selected Latin hypercube designs and Tang (1994) proposed method of construction of maximin Latin Hypercube designs. Such designs were based on maximization of minimum distances between the pairs of design points. Ye (1998) provided the method of construction of OLHD for given $n=2^{k}$ or $n=2^{k+1}$ and $m=2^{k-2}$ for any integer $k>1$. Steinberg and Lin (2006) provided construction methods for obtaining OLHD for particular $2^{2^{k}}$ run sizes for any integer $k$. Cioppa and Lucas (2007) proposed an algorithmic approach to obtain OLHD, given a fixed sample size in more dimensions. Lin et al. (2009) coupled an orthogonal array of index 1 with a small orthogonal or nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube to obtain orthogonal or nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube. Sun et al. (2009) proposed a method for constructing OLHDs in which all the linear terms are orthogonal not only to each other, but also to the
quadratic terms. Sun et al. (2010) presented an approach for obtaining OLHDs with $n=r 2^{c+1}$ or $r 2^{c+1}+1$ runs and for $k=2^{c}$ columns/factors where, $r$ is a positive integer. Lin et al. (2010) proved that no OLHD exists for $4 r+2$ runs, where $r$ is any positive integer and also developed a more flexible method for constructing orthogonal or nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube designs. Dey and Sarkar (2014) extended result of Lin et al. (2009) and used orthogonal array of strength 2 to obtain several $1^{s t}$ order OLHD $(n, m)$. Efthimiou et al. (2015) proposed methods for constructing nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube designs with 2,4,8,12, 16,20 factors having flexible run sizes. Parui et al. (2015) proposed construction methods for obtaining OLHDs for all permissible number of runs for 2 and 3 factors. Mandal et al. (2016) proposed method for obtaining OLHDs with special reference to four factors.

One can see that the available methods OLHD construction usually have restrictions either in terms of runs or factors. Among others, Bingham et al. (2009), Lin et al. (2009, 2010), Sun et al. (2010), Gu and Yang (2013), Wang et al. (2015) also obtained methods to construct nearly OLHDs. In this paper we propose a method to construct nearly OLHDs. The method of construction developed provides nearly OLHDs with flexible number of runs and factors.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the methodology to obtain nearly OLHDs. In Section 3, a comparison is made on the designs available in the literature and the designs obtained from proposed method. In Section 4 discussion is made on obtaining nearly OLHDs.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

Pang et al. (2022) developed construction method to obtain nearly OLHD ( $\left.2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}\right)$ based on the construction method available in Sun et al. (2009) and Algorithm 1 in Wang et al. (2015) and focused on maximin $L_{2}$ distance criterion to show asymptotic optimality of the design. In this section, we present construction method to obtain nearly OLHD $\left(r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}\right)$ based on the method given in Sun et al. (2010) and Algorithm 1 of Wang et al. (2015). Consider the following steps to first obtain OLHD ( $r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}$ ), followed by steps to obtain nearly OLHD $\left(r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}\right)$ from resulted OLHD.

Step 1. Let $c$ be any positive integer. Then for $c=1$

$$
S_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{rr}
1 & 1 \\
1 & -1
\end{array}\right) \text { and } T_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{rr}
1 & 2 \\
2 & -1
\end{array}\right)
$$

Step 2. For $c \geq 2$, define $S_{c}$ and $T_{c}$ as follow
$S_{c}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}S_{c-1} & -S^{*}{ }_{c-1} \\ S_{c-1} & S_{c-1}^{*}\end{array}\right)$,
$T_{c}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}T_{c-1} & -\left(T^{*}{ }_{c-1}+2^{c-1} S^{*}{ }_{c-1}\right) \\ T_{c-1}+2^{c-1} S_{c-1} & T^{*}{ }_{c-1}\end{array}\right)$
where, ${ }^{*}$ operator on an even rowed matrix results into top half of the rows multiplied by -1 and others rows left without any change.

Step 3. Let $H_{c}=\left(T_{c}-\frac{S_{c}}{2}\right)$. For any positive integer $c$ and $r$ and $B_{r .2^{* *} 2^{c}}=\left(\left(H_{c}^{1}\right)^{\prime},\left(H_{c}^{2}\right)^{\prime}, \ldots,\left(H_{c}^{r}\right)^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$, where $H_{c}^{i}$ is calculated as $H_{c}^{i}=H_{c}+(i-1)\left(2^{c} . S_{c}\right)$, where $i=1,2 \ldots r$.

Step 4. Then OLHD $\left(r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}\right)$ is given as
D $\left(r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}\right)=\binom{B_{r 2^{c} * 2^{c}}}{-B_{r 2^{c} 2^{c}}}$ and denote it by $L$.
Step 5. Let OLHD ( $r 2^{c}, 2^{c-1}$ ) be denoted as $L_{0}$, then $E_{1}$ and $F_{1}$ is given as, $E_{1}=2 L_{0}-J / 2$, $F_{1}=2 L_{0}+J / 2$, where $J$ is a unit matrix of imension ( $\left(r 2^{c} * 2^{c-1}\right)$.

Step 6. Let, $K=\left(E_{1}^{\prime}, F_{1}{ }^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$. Then nearly OLHD say $P$ of dimensions $\left(r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}\right)$ is given as $P$ $\left(r 2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}\right)=(L, K)$.

Example 1. For $r=3$ and $c=2$, consider obtaining a nearly OLHD $(24,6)$.

Firstly, we obtain $T_{2}$ from $S_{1}$ and $T_{1}$. $T_{2}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & -1 & -4 & 3 \\ 3 & 4 & -1 & -2 \\ 4 & -3 & 2 & -1\end{array}\right)$

Then, $H_{2}=\left(T_{2}-\frac{S_{2}}{2}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}0.5 & 1.5 & 2.5 & 3.5 \\ 1.5 & -0.5 & -3.5 & 2.5 \\ 2.5 & 3.5 & -0.5 & -1.5 \\ 3.5 & -2.5 & 1.5 & -0.5\end{array}\right)$.

$$
\text { Now for } r=2 \text { and } c=2, B_{22^{2 *} 2^{2}}=\left(\left(H_{2}^{1}\right)^{\prime},\left(H_{2}^{2}\right)^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}
$$ is obtained.

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{2}^{1}=H_{2}+(1-1)\left(2^{2} . S_{2}\right) \quad(\text { for } i=1) . \quad \text { Therefore, } \\
H_{2}^{1}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0.5 & 1.5 & 2.5 & 3.5 \\
1.5 & -0.5 & -3.5 & 2.5 \\
2.5 & 3.5 & -0.5 & -1.5 \\
3.5 & -2.5 & 1.5 & -0.5
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { Similarly, } \quad H_{2}^{2}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
4.5 & 5.5 & 6.5 & 7.5 \\
5.5 & -4.5 & -7.5 & 6.5 \\
6.5 & 7.5 & -4.5 & -5.5 \\
7.5 & -6.5 & 5.5 & -4.5
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { and }
$$

$$
H_{2}^{3}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
8.5 & 9.5 & 10.5 & 11.5 \\
9.5 & -8.5 & -11.5 & 10.5 \\
10.5 & 11.5 & -8.5 & -9.5 \\
11.5 & -10.5 & 9.5 & -8.5
\end{array}\right) \text { is obtained. Now }
$$

OLHD $\left(2.2^{2+1}, 2^{2}\right)$ is given as OLHD $(16,4)=\binom{B_{3.2^{2}, 2^{2}}}{-B_{3.2^{2}, 2^{2}}}=$
$B_{12,4}=\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}0.5 & 1.5 & 2.5 & 3.5 & 4.5 & 5.5 & 6.5 & 7.5 & 8.5 & 9.5 & 10.5 & 11.5 \\ 1.5 & -0.5 & -3.5 & 2.5 & 5.5 & -4.5 & -7.5 & 6.5 & 9.5 & -8.5 & -11.5 & -10.5 \\ 2.5 & 3.5 & -0.5 & -1.5 & 6.5 & 7.5 & -4.5 & -5.5 & 10.5 & 11.5 & -8.5 & -9.5 \\ 3.5 & -2.5 & 1.5 & -0.5 & 7.5 & -6.5 & 5.5 & -4.5 & 11.5 & -10.5 & 9.5 & -8.5\end{array}\right)$.
Therefore, $\operatorname{OLHD}(24,4)=\binom{B_{12,4}}{-B_{12,4}}=$

| Runs | $\boldsymbol{X}_{1}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{3}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{4}$ | Runs | $\boldsymbol{X}_{1}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{3}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.5 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | -0.5 | -1.5 | -2.5 | -3.5 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 1.5 | -0.5 | 3.5 | -2.5 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | -1.5 | 0.5 | -3.5 | 2.5 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 2.5 | -3.5 | -0.5 | 1.5 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | -2.5 | 3.5 | 0.5 | -1.5 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 3.5 | 2.5 | -1.5 | -0.5 | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | -3.5 | -2.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 4.5 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 7.5 | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | -4.5 | -5.5 | -6.5 | -7.5 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 5.5 | -4.5 | 7.5 | -6.5 | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | -5.5 | 4.5 | -7.5 | 6.5 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 6.5 | -7.5 | -4.5 | 5.5 | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | -6.5 | 7.5 | 4.5 | -5.5 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 7.5 | 6.5 | -5.5 | -4.5 | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | -7.5 | -6.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 8.5 | 9.5 | 10.5 | 11.5 | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | -8.5 | -9.5 | -10.5 | -11.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 9.5 | -8.5 | 11.5 | -10.5 | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | -9.5 | 8.5 | -11.5 | 10.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 10.5 | -11.5 | -8.5 | 9.5 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | -10.5 | 11.5 | 8.5 | -9.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 11.5 | 10.5 | -9.5 | -8.5 | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | -11.5 | -10.5 | 9.5 | 8.5 |

Now, let OLHD $\left(r 2^{c} * 2^{c-1}\right)$ i.e., OLHD $(12,2)$ $=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc}0.5 & 1.5 & 2.5 & 3.5 & 4.5 & 5.5 & -0.5 & -1.5 & -2.5 & -3.5 & -4.5 & -5.5 \\ 1.5 & -0.5 & 3.5 & -2.5 & 5.5 & -4.5 & -1.5 & 0.5 & -3.5 & 2.5 & -5.5 & 4.5\end{array}\right)$,
be considered as $L_{0}$. Then, $E_{1}$ and $F_{1}$ are obtained,
$E_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}1.5 & 3.5 & 5.5 & 7.5 & 9.5 & 11.5 & -0.5 & -2.5 & -4.5 & -6.5 & -8.5 & -10.5 \\ 3.5 & -0.5 & 7.5 & -4.5 & 11.5 & -8.5 & -2.5 & 1.5 & -6.5 & 5.5 & -10.5 & 9.5\end{array}\right)$, and
$F_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}0.5 & 2.5 & 4.5 & 6.5 & 8.5 & 10.5 & -1.5 & -3.5 & -5.5 & -7.5 & -9.5 & -11.5 \\ 2.5 & -1.5 & 6.5 & -5.5 & 10.5 & -9.5 & -3.5 & 0.5 & -7.5 & 4.5 & -11.5 & 8.5\end{array}\right)$, and K is given as,
$K=\left(E_{1}^{\prime}, F_{1}^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$. Therefore, nearly OLHD $\left(r .2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}\right)$ is given as $P=\left(L^{\prime}, K^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}$.

The above obtained design $P$ is a nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube design of dimension (r. $2^{c+1}, 2^{c}+2^{c-1}$ )i.e. $(24,6)$. The correlation coefficient found between the column pairs $(1,5),(1,6)$, $(3,5),(3,6),(4,5),(4,6)$ and $(5,6)$ is $0.06206,0.06206$, $0.010435, \quad 0.010435,-0.005217,0.005217$ and 0.005217 , respectively. For other column pairs, the correlation coefficient is zero. The maximum absolute correlation is 0.06206 found between column/factor pairs $(1,5)$ and $(1,6)$.

## 3. COMPARISON WITH DESIGNS AVAILABLE IN LITERATURE

Table 1 presents some nearly orthogonal LHDs constructed using proposed methodology and its comparison with some of the existing methods of constructing nearly OLHDs. In the first column, run sizes of the designs has been given and corresponding maximum number of factors under existing methods and proposed method has been given in other columns.

Table 1. Comparison of maximum number of factors of nearly orthogonal Latin hypercube designs for some given run sizes ( $<200$ )

| Run <br> size | LMT | GY | GE | WYLL | PWY | Proposed <br> method |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | - | 6 | - | - | 6 | 6 |
| 16 | - | 12 | - | 15 | 12 | 12 |
| 24 | - | - | - | 23 | - | 6 |
| 32 | - | 24 | - | 31 | 24 | 24 |
| 40 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 48 | - | - | - | 47 | - | 12 |
| 56 | - | - | - | 24 | - | 6 |
| 64 | 48 | 48 | - | 63 | 48 | 48 |
| 72 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 80 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| 88 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 96 | - | - | 24 | 71 | - | 24 |
| 104 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 112 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| 120 | - | - | - | - |  | 6 |
| 128 | - | 96 | - | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| 136 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 144 | - | - | - | - | - | 12 |
| 152 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 160 | - | - | - | 36 | - | 24 |
| 168 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 176 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 184 | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| 192 | - | - | - | 72 | - | 48 |
| 200 | - | - | - | 48 | - | 6 |

Note: LMT = Lin, Mukerjee and Tang (2009); GY = Gu and Yang (2012): GE = Georgiou and Efthimiou (2015); WYLL = Wang, Yang, Lin and Liu (2015); PWY = Pang, Wang and Yang (2022).

| $\boldsymbol{n}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{1}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{3}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{4}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{5}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{6}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{1}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{3}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{4}$ | $\boldsymbol{X}_{5}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 0.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 1.5 | 3.5 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | -0.5 | -1.5 | -2.5 | -3.5 | 0.5 | 2.5 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 1.5 | -0.5 | 3.5 | -2.5 | 3.5 | -0.5 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | -1.5 | 0.5 | -3.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | -1.5 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 2.5 | -3.5 | -0.5 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 7.5 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | -2.5 | 3.5 | 0.5 | -1.5 | 4.5 | 6.5 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 3.5 | 2.5 | -1.5 | -0.5 | 7.5 | -4.5 | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | -3.5 | -2.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 6.5 | -5.5 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 4.5 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 11.5 | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | -4.5 | -5.5 | -6.5 | -7.5 | 8.5 | 10.5 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 5.5 | -4.5 | 7.5 | -6.5 | 11.5 | -8.5 | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | -5.5 | 4.5 | -7.5 | 6.5 | 10.5 | -9.5 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 6.5 | -7.5 | -4.5 | 5.5 | -0.5 | -2.5 | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | -6.5 | 7.5 | 4.5 | -5.5 | -1.5 | -3.5 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 7.5 | 6.5 | -5.5 | -4.5 | -2.5 | 1.5 | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | -7.5 | -6.5 | 5.5 | 4.5 | -3.5 | 0.5 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 8.5 | 9.5 | 10.5 | 11.5 | -4.5 | -6.5 | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | -8.5 | -9.5 | -10.5 | -11.5 | -5.5 | -7.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 9.5 | -8.5 | 11.5 | -10.5 | -6.5 | 5.5 | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | -9.5 | 8.5 | -11.5 | 10.5 | -7.5 | 4.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 10.5 | -11.5 | -8.5 | 9.5 | -8.5 | -10.5 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | -10.5 | 11.5 | 8.5 | -9.5 | -9.5 | -11.5 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 11.5 | 10.5 | -9.5 | -8.5 | -10.5 | 9.5 | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | -11.5 | -10.5 | 9.5 | 8.5 | -11.5 | 8.5 |

It can be seen that proposed method can construct nearly OLHDs for many more number of runs than the existing methods for given number of columns.

## 4. DISCUSSION

LHDs are widely used in designing computer experiments. LHD with its orthogonal factors help in independent estimation of effect of individual factors on the output of the model. In this regard, construction of methods to obtain an orthogonal LHDs is gaining importance and because of difficulties in developing methods to obtain OLHDs, methods are developed for obtaining nearly OLHDs. In this paper a method to obtain nearly OLHD is developed based on the construction methods in Sun et al. (2010) and Wang et al. (2015). One restriction of the proposed method is that the run sizes can only be multiples of two. Therefore, future scope of the research would be to develop methods for other run size and/or factor combination. One can also study $L_{2}$ distance efficiency of the designs and see whether design is asymptotically optimal or not under maximin $L_{2}$ distance criterion and can extend results of Wang et al. (2018) to show any connection between maximin distance designs and orthogonal designs.
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