

# Designing Progressive Dinner Parties

DOUGLAS R. STINSON\*

*David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada*

**Abstract:** I recently came across a combinatorial design problem involving progressive dinner parties (also known as safari suppers). In this note, I provide some elementary methods of designing schedules for these kinds of dinner parties.

## 1 The Problem

A simple form of *progressive dinner party* could involve three couples eating a three-course dinner, with each couple hosting one course. I received email from Julian Regan asking if there was a nice way to design a more complicated type of progressive dinner party, which he described as follows:

The event involves a number of couples having each course of a three-course meal at a different person's house, with three couples at each course, every couple hosting once and no two couples meeting more than once.

Let us represent each couple by a *point*  $x \in X$  and each course of each meal by a *block* consisting of three points. Suppose there are  $v$  points (i.e., couples). Evidently we want a collection of blocks of size three, say  $\mathcal{B}$ , such that the following conditions are satisfied:

---

\*The author's research is supported by NSERC discovery grant RGPIN-03882.

1. The blocks can be partitioned into three parallel classes, each consisting of  $v/3$  disjoint blocks. (Each parallel class corresponds to a specific course of the meal.) Hence, there are a total of  $v$  blocks and we require  $v \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .
2. No pair of points occurs in more than one block.
3. There is a bijection  $h : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$  such that  $h(B) \in B$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . (That is, we can identify a *host* for each block in such a way that each point occurs as a host exactly once.)

We will refer to such a collection of blocks as a  $\text{PDP}(v)$ .

It is not hard to see that a  $\text{PDP}(v)$  does not exist if  $v = 3$  or  $v = 6$ , because we cannot satisfy condition 2. However, for all larger values of  $v$  divisible by three, we show in Section 2 that it is possible to construct a  $\text{PDP}(v)$ . Section 3 considers a generalization of the problem in which there are  $k$  courses and  $k$  couples present at each course, and gives a complete solution when  $k = 4$  or  $k = 5$ .

## 2 Two Solutions

We begin with a simple construction based on latin squares. A *latin square* of order  $n$  is an  $n$  by  $n$  array of  $n$  symbols, such that each symbol occurs in exactly one cell in each row and each column of the array. A *transversal* of a latin square of order  $n$  is a set of  $n$  cells, one from each row and each column, that contain  $n$  different symbols. Two transversals are *disjoint* if they do not contain any common cells.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose there is a latin square of order  $w$  that contains three disjoint transversals. Then there is a  $\text{PDP}(3w)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $L$  be a latin square of order  $w$  that contains disjoint transversals  $T_1, T_2$  and  $T_3$ . Let the rows of  $L$  be indexed by  $R$ , let the columns be indexed by  $C$  and let the symbols be indexed by  $S$ . We assume that  $R$ ,  $C$  and  $S$  are three mutually disjoint sets. Each transversal  $T_i$  consists of  $w$  ordered pairs in  $R \times C$ .

We will construct a  $\text{PDP}(3w)$  on points  $X = R \cup C \cup S$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , we

construct a parallel class  $P_i$  as follows:

$$P_i = \{\{r, c, L(r, c)\} : (r, c) \in T_i\}.$$

Finally, for any block  $B = \{r, c, s\} \in P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ , we define  $h(B)$  as follows:

- if  $B \in P_1$ , then  $h(B) = r$
- if  $B \in P_2$ , then  $h(B) = c$
- if  $B \in P_3$ , then  $h(B) = s$ .

The verifications are straightforward.

- First, because each  $T_i$  is a transversal, it is clear that each  $P_i$  is a parallel class.
- No pair of points  $\{r, c\}$  occurs in more than one block because the three transversals are disjoint.
- Suppose a pair of points  $\{r, s\}$  occurs in more than one block. Then there is  $L(r, c) \in T_i$  and  $L(r, c') \in T_j$  such that  $L(r, c) = L(r, c')$ .  $T_i$  and  $T_j$  are disjoint, so  $c \neq c'$ . But then we have two occurrences of the same symbol in row  $r$  of  $L$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $L$  is a latin square.
- The argument that no pair of points  $\{c, s\}$  occurs in more than one block is similar.
- Finally, the mapping  $h$  satisfies property 3 because each  $T_i$  is a transversal.

□

**Theorem 2.2.** *There is a PDP(3w) for all  $w \geq 3$ .*

*Proof.* If  $w \geq 3$ ,  $w \neq 6$ , there is a pair of orthogonal latin squares of order  $w$ . It is well-known that a pair of orthogonal latin squares of order  $w$  is equivalent to a latin square of order  $w$  that contains  $w$  disjoint transversals (see, e.g., [3, p. 162]). Since  $w \geq 3$ , we have three disjoint transversals and we can apply Lemma 2.1 to obtain a PDP( $w$ ). There do not exist a pair of orthogonal latin squares of order 6, but there is a latin square of order 6 that contains four disjoint transversals (see, e.g., [3, p. 193]). So we can also use Lemma 2.1 to construct a PDP(18). □

**Example 2.1.** We construct a PDP(12). Start with a pair of orthogonal latin squares of order 4:

$$L_1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 4 & 3 & 1 \\ \hline 3 & 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad L_2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 3 & 2 & 4 & 1 \\ \hline 4 & 1 & 3 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & 3 & 1 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Each symbol in  $L_2$  gives us a transversal in  $L_1$ . Suppose we index the rows by  $r_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq 4$ ) and the columns by  $c_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq 4$ ). From symbols 1, 2 and 3, we obtain the following three disjoint transversals in  $L_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \{(r_1, c_1), (r_2, c_4), (r_3, c_2), (r_4, c_3)\} \\ T_2 &= \{(r_1, c_3), (r_2, c_2), (r_3, c_4), (r_4, c_1)\} \\ T_3 &= \{(r_1, c_4), (r_2, c_1), (r_3, c_3), (r_4, c_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we relabel the points as  $1, \dots, 12$ , replacing  $r_1, \dots, r_4$  by  $1, \dots, 4$ ; replacing  $c_1, \dots, c_4$  by  $5, \dots, 8$ ; and replacing the symbols  $1, \dots, 4$  by  $9, \dots, 12$ . Then we obtain the following PDP(12), where the hosts are indicated in red:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \{\{1, 5, 9\}, \{2, 8, 11\}, \{3, 6, 12\}, \{4, 7, 10\}\} \\ P_2 &= \{\{1, 7, 12\}, \{2, 6, 10\}, \{3, 8, 9\}, \{4, 5, 11\}\} \\ P_3 &= \{\{1, 8, 10\}, \{2, 5, 12\}, \{3, 7, 11\}, \{4, 6, 9\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, using a pair of latin squares is overkill. It would perhaps be easier just to give explicit formulas to construct a PDP. Here is one simple solution that works for all  $v \geq 9$  such that  $v \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $v \neq 12$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $w \geq 3$ ,  $w \neq 4$ , and let  $X = \mathbb{Z}_w \times \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Define the following three parallel classes:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2)\} \pmod{w} \\ P_1 &= \{(0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2)\} \pmod{w} \\ P_2 &= \{(0, 0), (2, 1), (4, 2)\} \pmod{w}. \end{aligned}$$

For any block  $B = \{(i, 0), (j, 1), (k, 2)\} \in P_0 \cup P_1 \cup P_2$ , define  $h(B)$  as follows.

- if  $B \in P_0$ , then  $h(B) = (i, 0)$
- if  $B \in P_1$ , then  $h(B) = (j, 1)$

- if  $B \in P_2$ , then  $h(B) = (k, 2)$ .

Then  $P_0, P_1, P_2$ , and  $h$  yield a PDP( $3w$ ).

*Proof.* It is clear that each  $P_i$  is a parallel class because we are developing a base block modulo  $w$  and each base block contains one point with each possible second coordinate. For the same reason, the mapping  $h$  satisfies property 3.

Consider the differences  $(y - x) \bmod w$  that occur between pairs of points  $\{(x, 0), (y, 1)\}$ . We obtain all pairs with differences 0, 1 and 2 when we develop the three base blocks. The same thing happens when we look at the differences  $(y - x) \bmod w$  between pairs of points  $\{(x, 1), (y, 2)\}$ .

Finally, consider the differences  $(y - x) \bmod w$  that occur between pairs of points  $\{(x, 0), (y, 2)\}$ . We obtain all pairs with differences 0, 2 and 4 modulo  $w$  when we develop the three base blocks. Since  $w \neq 4$ , these differences are distinct and the pairs obtained by developing the base blocks are also distinct.  $\square$

If  $w = 4$ , then the construction given in Theorem 2.3 does not yield a PDP(12), because various pairs occur in more than one block. For example, the pair  $\{(0, 0), (0, 2)\}$  occurs in a block of  $P_0$  as well as in a block of  $P_2$ .

**Example 2.2.** We apply Theorem 2.3 with  $w = 5$ . The three parallel classes, with hosts in red, are:

$P_0$	$P_1$	$P_2$
$\{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2)\}$	$\{(0, 0), (\textcolor{red}{1}, 1), (2, 2)\}$	$\{(0, 0), (2, 1), (\textcolor{red}{4}, 2)\}$
$\{(\textcolor{red}{1}, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}$	$\{(1, 0), (\textcolor{red}{2}, 1), (3, 2)\}$	$\{(1, 0), (3, 1), (\textcolor{red}{0}, 2)\}$
$\{(\textcolor{red}{2}, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}$	$\{(2, 0), (\textcolor{red}{3}, 1), (4, 2)\}$	$\{(2, 0), (4, 1), (\textcolor{red}{1}, 2)\}$
$\{(\textcolor{red}{3}, 0), (3, 1), (3, 2)\}$	$\{(3, 0), (\textcolor{red}{4}, 1), (0, 2)\}$	$\{(3, 0), (0, 1), (\textcolor{red}{2}, 2)\}$
$\{(\textcolor{red}{4}, 0), (4, 1), (4, 2)\}$	$\{(4, 0), (\textcolor{red}{0}, 1), (1, 2)\}$	$\{(4, 0), (1, 1), (\textcolor{red}{3}, 2)\}$

## 2.1 Finding Hosts

The specific constructions that we provided in Section 2 led to a very simple method to identify hosts. However, no matter what collection of three parallel classes we use, it will be possible to define hosts in such a way that property 3 of a PDP will be satisfied.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Suppose that  $P_1, P_2$  and  $P_3$  are three parallel classes of blocks of size three, containing points from a set  $X$  of size  $v \equiv 0 \pmod 3$ . Then we can define a mapping  $h$  that satisfies property 3.*

*Proof.* Construct the bipartite point-block incidence graph of the design. The nodes in this graph are all the elements of  $X \cup \mathcal{B}$ . For  $x \in X$  and  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , we create an edge from  $x$  to  $B$  if and only if  $x \in B$ . The resulting graph is a 3-regular bipartite graph and hence it has a perfect matching  $M$  (this is a corollary of Hall's Theorem, e.g., see [2, Corollary 16.6]). For every  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , define  $h(B) = x$ , where  $x$  is the point matched with  $B$  in the matching  $M$ .  $\square$

The following corollary is immediate.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Suppose that  $P_1, P_2$  and  $P_3$  are three parallel classes of blocks of size three, containing points from a set  $X$  of size  $v \equiv 0 \pmod 3$ . Suppose also that no pair of points occurs in more one block in  $\mathcal{B} = P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ . Then there is a PDP( $v$ ).*

### 3 A Generalization

Suppose we now consider a generalization where meals have  $k$  courses and each course includes  $k$  couples. We define a PDP( $k, v$ ) to be a set of blocks of size  $k$ , defined on a set of  $v$  points, which satisfies the following properties:

1. The blocks can be partitioned into  $k$  parallel classes, each consisting of  $v/k$  disjoint blocks. Hence, there are a total of  $v$  blocks and we require  $v \equiv 0 \pmod k$ .
2. No pair of points occurs in more than one block.
3. There is a bijection  $h : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$  such that  $h(B) \in B$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .

The problem we considered in Section 1 was just the special case  $k = 3$  of this general definition.

Here is a simple necessary condition for existence of a PDP( $k, v$ ).

**Lemma 3.1.** *If a PDP( $k, v$ ) exists, then  $v \geq k^2$ .*

*Proof.* A given point  $x$  occurs in  $k$  blocks, each having size  $k$ . The points in these blocks (excluding  $x$ ) must be distinct. Therefore,

$$v \geq k(k-1) + 1 = k^2 - (k-1).$$

Since  $k$  divides  $v$ , we must have  $v \geq k^2$ . □

We have the following results that are straightforward generalizations of our results from Section 2. The first three of these results are stated without proof.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose there are  $k-2$  orthogonal latin squares of order  $w$  that contain  $k$  disjoint common transversals. Then there is a  $PDP(k, kw)$ .*

**Corollary 3.3.** *Suppose there are  $k-1$  orthogonal latin squares of order  $w$ . Then there is a  $PDP(k, kw)$ .*

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  are  $k$  parallel classes of blocks of size  $k$ , containing points from a set  $X$  of size  $v \equiv 0 \pmod k$ . Then we can define a mapping  $h$  that satisfies property 3.*

Our last construction generalizes Theorem 2.3.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $w \geq k \geq 3$ . Suppose that the following condition holds:*

$$\text{There is no factorization } w = st \text{ with } 2 \leq s \leq k-1 \text{ and } 2 \leq t \leq k-1. \quad (1)$$

*Then there is a  $PDP(k, kw)$ .*

*Proof.* Define  $X = \mathbb{Z}_w \times \{0, \dots, k-1\}$  and define the following  $k$  parallel classes,  $P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}$ :

$$P_i = \{(0, 0), (i, 1), (2i, 2), \dots, ((k-1)i, k-1)\} \pmod w,$$

for  $i = 0, \dots, k-1$ . Finally, define the mapping  $h$  as follows. For any block  $B \in P_\ell$ , define  $h(B) = (x, \ell)$ , where  $(x, \ell)$  is the unique point in  $B$  having second coordinate equal to  $\ell$ . Then  $P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}$  and  $h$  yield a  $PDP(k, kw)$ .

Most of the verifications are straightforward, but it would perhaps be useful to see how condition (1) arises. Consider the differences  $(y-x) \pmod w$  that occur between pairs of points  $\{(x, c), (y, c+d)\}$ , where  $c$  and  $d$  are fixed,  $0 \leq c \leq k-2$ ,  $1 \leq d \leq k-c-1$ . These difference are

$$0, d, 2d, \dots, (k-1)d \pmod w,$$

where  $0 < d \leq k - 1$ . We want all of these differences to be distinct. Suppose that

$$id \equiv jd \pmod{w}$$

where  $0 \leq j < i \leq k - 1$ . Then

$$(i - j)d \equiv 0 \pmod{w}.$$

Hence,

$$ed \equiv 0 \pmod{w}$$

where  $0 < e \leq k - 1$  and  $0 < d \leq k - 1$ . Then, it not hard to see that  $w$  can be factored as the product of two positive integers, both of which are at most  $k - 1$ .

Conversely, suppose such a factorization exists, say  $w = st$ . Then the pair  $\{(0, 0), (0, t)\}$  occurs in a block in  $P_0$  and again in a block in  $P_s$ .  $\square$

Observe that condition (1) of Theorem 3.5 holds if  $w$  is prime or if  $w > (k - 1)^2$ . Therefore we have the following corollary of Theorem 3.5.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $w \geq k \geq 3$ . Suppose that  $w$  is prime or  $w > (k - 1)^2$ . Then there is a  $PDP(k, kw)$ .*

In general, some values of  $w$  will be ruled out (in the sense that Theorem 3.5 cannot be applied) for a given value of  $k$ . For example, as we have already seen in the previous section, we cannot take  $w = 4$  in Theorem 3.5 if  $k = 3$ . However, a  $PDP(12)$  was constructed by a different method in Example 2.1.

We have the following complete results for  $k = 4$  and  $k = 5$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** *There is a  $PDP(4, 4w)$  if and only if  $w \geq 4$ . Further, there is a  $PDP(5, 5w)$  if and only if  $w \geq 5$ .*

*Proof.* For  $k = 4$ , we proceed as follows. Theorem 3.5 yields a  $PDP(4, 4w)$  for all  $w \geq 4$ ,  $w \neq 4, 6, 9$ . Theorem 3.3 provides a  $PDP(4, 16)$  and a  $PDP(4, 36)$  since three orthogonal latin squares of orders 4 and 9 are known to exist (see [3]). The last case to consider is  $w = 6$ . Here we can use a resolvable 4-GDD of type  $3^8$  ([4]). Actually, we only need four of the seven parallel classes in this design. Then, to define the hosts, we can use Theorem 3.4.



We handle  $k = 5$  in a similar manner. Theorem 3.5 yields a  $\text{PDP}(5, 5w)$  for all  $w \geq 5$ ,  $w \neq 6, 8, 9, 12$  or  $16$ . There are four orthogonal latin squares of orders  $8, 9, 12$  and  $16$  (see [3]) so these values of  $w$  are taken care of by Theorem 3.3.

Finally, the value  $w = 6$  is handled by a direct construction due to Marco Buratti [1]. Define  $X = \mathbb{Z}_{30}$  and

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\{0, 1, 8, 12, 14\} \bmod 30\}.$$

So we have thirty blocks that are obtained from the base block  $B_0 = \{0, 1, 8, 12, 14\}$ . It is easy to check that no pair of points is repeated, because the differences of pairs of points occurring in  $B_0$  are all those in the set

$$\pm\{1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14\}.$$

Define

$$P_0 = \{B_0 + 5j \bmod 30 : j = 0, 1, \dots, 5\}$$

and for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , let

$$P_i = \{B + i \bmod 30 : B \in P_0\}.$$

In this way,  $\mathcal{B}$  is partitioned into five parallel classes, each containing six blocks.

Theorem 3.4 guarantees that we can define hosts in a suitable fashion. However, it is easy to write down an explicit formula, namely,  $h(B_0 + i) = i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq 29$ .  $\square$

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Julian Regan for bringing this problem to my attention. Thanks also to Marco Buratti for providing the construction for the  $\text{PDP}(5, 30)$  that was used in the proof of Theorem 3.7.

## References

- [1] M. Buratti. Private communication, March 6, 2020.

- [2] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty. *Graph Theory*. Springer, 2008.
- [3] C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, eds. *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, Second Edition*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2007.
- [4] H. Shen. On the existence of nearly Kirkman systems. *Ann. Discrete Math.* **52** (1992) 511–518.