

## Class 8 Exercises

CS250/EE387, Winter 2025

1. In the lecture videos/notes, we saw the “Kautz-Singleton” construction for group testing matrices, and we instantiated it using RS codes. Say that  $N = 300$  and  $d = 2$  and you want to build a group testing matrix like this. How will you choose parameters for  $q, k$ ? What will your final group testing matrix look like? How many tests does it use? (Note: you may need to come up with a group testing matrix for  $N' > N$  items, and then drop some items, since 300 is not a power of a prime).
2. In this problem we will adapt the Kautz-Singleton construction from the lecture videos/notes to deal with false negatives and false positives. The set-up is the same: we have  $N$  items, at most  $d$  of which are positive, and we wish to make  $T$  tests. However, now there may be up to  $E$  false negatives and  $E$  false positives. (Here, a “false positive” is a test that does not contain any positive items but comes up positive anyway; a “false negative” is a test that does contain a positive item but comes up negative).
  - (a) Come up with a condition that is similar to  $d$ -disjunctness and prove a statement like “if a pooling matrix  $\Phi$  satisfies [your condition], then  $\Phi$  can identify up to  $d$  positive items, even with up to  $E$  false positives and  $E$  false negatives. Assume that the false negatives/positives are worst-case.
  - (b) Adapt the Kautz-Singleton argument to show that RS-code-based group testing schemes can handle false positives/negatives. How do the parameters depend on  $E$ ? (Note: you don’t need to change the construction, just the parameters). Your final answer should be of the form “the number of tests  $T$  needs to be at least [some function of  $N, d$ , and  $E$ ].”
3. **(Bonus – if you finish early, here’s something else to work on!)** Can you come up with a way to set parameters in the Kautz-Singleton construction to get good results when, say,  $d = N/100$ ? (Notice that the bound of  $d^2 \log N$  isn’t great in this parameter regime...) What’s the best group testing scheme you can come up with in this setting? (Don’t worry about false positives/negatives). What’s a natural lower bound on the number of tests you would need?
4. **(Bonus – if you finish early, here’s yet another thing to work on!)** Say that a group testing matrix  $\Phi \in \{0, 1\}^{t \times N}$  is “ $d$ -good” if it can identify up to  $d$  defective items. More precisely, for  $d < N$ ,  $\Phi \in \{0, 1\}^{t \times N}$  is  $d$ -good iff the map from sets  $T \subset [N]$  with  $|T| \leq d$  to outcomes in  $\{0, 1\}^t$  given by
 
$$T \mapsto \left( \bigvee_{i \in T} \Phi_{1,i}, \bigvee_{i \in T} \Phi_{2,i}, \dots, \bigvee_{i \in T} \Phi_{t,i} \right)$$
 is injective.
 

In class we proved that if  $\Phi \in \{0, 1\}^{t \times N}$  is  $d$ -disjunct, then it is  $d$ -good.

  - (a) Show that for  $d = 2$ , there are matrices that are  $d$ -good but not  $d$ -disjunct. (It’s okay if you show this by giving a somewhat silly example).
  - (b) Show that any  $d$ -good matrix is  $(d - 1)$ -disjunct.
  - (c) Can you come up with a family of  $d$ -good matrices that are not  $d$ -disjunct for general  $d$  (and which *isn’t* a somewhat silly example)?