

Constructing Random Steiner Triple Systems: An Experimental Study

Daniel Heinlein* and Patric R. J. Östergård

Department of Information and Communications Engineering

Aalto University School of Electrical Engineering

P.O. Box 15400, 00076 Aalto, Finland

{daniel.heinlein,patric.ostergard}@aalto.fi

Dedicated to Doug Stinson on the occasion of his 66th birthday.

Abstract

Several methods for generating random Steiner triple systems (STSs) have been proposed in the literature, such as Stinson's hill-climbing algorithm and Cameron's algorithm, but these are not yet completely understood. Those algorithms, as well as some variants, are here assessed for STSs of both small and large orders. For large orders, the number of occurrences of certain configurations in the constructed STSs are compared with the corresponding expected values of random hypergraphs. Modifications of the algorithms are proposed.

1 Introduction

Random generation of combinatorial structures is a problem that has been extensively studied both from a theoretical [12, 13] and a practical [1, 8, 21] point of view. When developing practical algorithms for random generation of structures with tight constraints, it can be far from clear how amenable central measures such as computation time and uniformity are to formal study. For the smallest parameters, structures are completely understood, but both the algorithms and the distribution of structures can behave differently for small parameters than for large ones. On the other hand, for large parameters

*Supported by the Academy of Finland, Grant 331044.

where the algorithms are truly needed, it is challenging to evaluate the performance.

Steiner triple systems (STSs) form one class of structures for which practical random generation algorithms have been developed but where an evaluation for large parameters is lacking, primarily due to the difficulty of judging performance. In this experimental study, we start by considering the case of Steiner triple systems with small orders and carry out evaluations of known algorithms, including some variants. For larger orders, we bring together random generation algorithms and a conjecture on substructures of Steiner triple systems obtained using a random model. In this paper, the desired distribution for the random generation of STSs is uniform among all *labeled STSs* of a fixed order.

In 1985, Stinson [21] published his seminal *hill-climbing* approach to generate random STSs. By exploring generated STSs with order 15, Stinson observed that STSs with large automorphism groups are underrepresented. As noted in [21], modifications of the algorithm are able to create Latin squares and strong starters and to complete partial STSs to STSs.

Heap, Danziger, and Mendelsohn [8] studied the number of occurrences of substructures in STSs generated with Stinson’s algorithm and reported that STSs with many Pasch configurations are underrepresented for orders up to 19 and STSs with many mitre configurations are overrepresented for order 15. Two variations of Stinson’s algorithm based on performing Pasch trades are also proposed in [8].

Random generation of Latin squares based on *Markov chains* by Jacobson and Matthews [11] inspired Cameron [1] to design a related algorithm for STSs. We here call the algorithm for STSs *Cameron’s algorithm*, but recognize that it could also be called the *Jacobson–Matthews–Cameron algorithm*.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, Steiner triple systems and related structures and concepts are defined, and the topic of generating random Steiner triple systems is introduced. In Section 3, Stinson’s algorithm and Cameron’s algorithm, as well as some variants, are described. Finally, computational experiments are carried out and analyzed in Section 4 and the paper is concluded in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Steiner Triple Systems and Configurations

A *Steiner triple system* (STS) is a pair (V, \mathcal{B}) , where V is a set of *points* and \mathcal{B} is a set of 3-subsets of points, called *blocks*, such that every 2-subset of points occurs in exactly one block. The size of the

point set is the *order* of the Steiner triple system, and a Steiner triple system of order v is denoted by $\text{STS}(v)$. An $\text{STS}(v)$ exists iff

$$v \equiv 1 \text{ or } 3 \pmod{6}.$$

Direct calculation gives that an $\text{STS}(v)$ has $v(v-1)/6$ blocks and each point is in $(v-1)/2$ blocks. More information about Steiner triple systems can be found in [4, 5].

A *transversal design* $\text{TD}(k, n)$ is a triple $(V, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B})$, where V is a set of kn elements; \mathcal{G} is a partition of V into k n -subsets (called *groups*); \mathcal{B} is a collection of k -subsets of V (called *blocks*); and every 2-subset of V is contained either in exactly one group or in exactly one block, but not both.

A *configuration* is a pair (V', \mathcal{B}') , where V' is a set of points and \mathcal{B}' is a collection of subsets of points—typically called *lines* but here called *blocks* to comply with other definitions—such that every 2-subset of points occurs in at most one block.

A configuration with the property that each point in V' occurs in at least two blocks is said to be *full*. A configuration with w points, w blocks, each block containing k points, and each point occurring in k blocks is called a w_k configuration. Throughout the paper, we assume block size 3. In the context of building up an STS block by block, the configuration consisting of the blocks that have been obtained so far is called a *partial STS*. It is possible that a partial STS cannot be completed to an STS.

The configurations considered in this paper are precisely the full n -block configurations with $n \leq 6$ and the w_3 configurations with $w \leq 8$, all of which are depicted in Figure 1.

An *isomorphism* between two STSs is a bijection between the point sets that preserves incidences. An isomorphism of an STS onto itself is an *automorphism*, and the set of all automorphisms of an STS forms a group under composition. The concepts of isomorphism, automorphism, and automorphism group are similarly defined for configurations.

A switch or a trade can be used to modify a Steiner triple system into another Steiner triple system of the same order [19]. A *cycle switch* of a Steiner triple system is defined as follows. Suppose that an STS contains the blocks

$$T_1 = \{ax_1x_2, bx_2x_3, ax_3x_4, bx_4x_5, \dots, bx_nx_1\}. \quad (1)$$

Then these blocks can be replaced by the blocks

$$T_2 = \{bx_1x_2, ax_2x_3, bx_3x_4, ax_4x_5, \dots, ax_nx_1\}.$$

to get another STS.




Figure 1: Configurations

For fixed and distinct points a and b , and c chosen so that $\{a, b, c\} \in \mathcal{B}$, the points $V \setminus \{a, b, c\}$ can in a unique way be partitioned into sets of points that occur together with a and b in sets of type T_1 . The name cycle switch comes from the fact that removal of the points a and b from the blocks in T_1 gives edges that form a cycle in a graph with vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$.

The smallest possible size of T_1 and T_2 is 4, and such a switch is called a *Pasch switch* as T_1 and T_2 are then Pasch configurations.

A *perfect* STS(v) is a Steiner triple system, in which each possible cycle switch involves $|T_1| = |T_2| = v - 3$ blocks. Perfect Steiner triple systems indeed exist; see, for example, [7].

When carrying out cycle switching for partial STSs, one also encounters situations where the two points a and b do not induce a 2-regular graph with vertex set $V \setminus \{a, b, c\}$, but induces a graph with vertex degrees at most 2. Such a graph consists of cycles and paths, and switches for paths are analogous to those for cycles. For example, the switch for the shortest possible path (of length 1) is simply

$$\{ax_1x_2\} \rightarrow \{bx_1x_2\}. \quad (2)$$

2.2 Hypergraph Models

Random 3-uniform hypergraphs on v vertices play a central role in our experimental study of algorithms for constructing random Steiner triple systems of order v . Specifically, we will focus on numerical values related to properties of the STSs and compare them with the corresponding values determined for the hypergraph models. Lacking theoretical results, computational results indicating that such values have the same asymptotic behavior provide some evidence for quality of the algorithms as well as the model with respect to the studied properties.

We denote the number of blocks in an $\text{STS}(v)$ by $b = v(v-1)/6$ and the number of 3-subsets of the set of v vertices by $w = \binom{v}{3}$. The properties of STSs to be considered are specifically the numbers of occurrences of configurations. For a given configuration with v' points, b' blocks, and automorphism group order $|\Gamma|$, there are $v'!/|\Gamma|$ labeled specimens on v' points and consequently

$$\frac{v'! \binom{v}{v'}}{|\Gamma|} = \prod_{i=0}^{v'-1} \frac{v-i}{|\Gamma|} \sim \frac{v^{v'}}{|\Gamma|} \quad (3)$$

labeled specimens on v points.

We consider generalizations of the two most common models for random graphs. In the first model, each hyperedge appears with equal probability p . With $p = b/w = 1/(v-2)$, the expected number of hyperedges is b , and this model has been used for STSs in [16, 10]. In this model, the probability for a specific specimen of a configuration to occur is

$$p^{b'} = (v-2)^{-b'} \sim v^{-b'}. \quad (4)$$

In the second model, a random hypergraph is chosen uniformly from the set of all hypergraphs with b hyperedges. Now the probability for a specific specimen of a configuration to occur is

$$\frac{\binom{w-b'}{\binom{w}{b}}}{\binom{w}{b}} = \prod_{i=0}^{b'-1} \frac{b-i}{w-i} = \prod_{i=0}^{b'-1} \frac{v^2 - v - 6i}{v^3 - 3v^2 + 2v - 6i} \sim v^{-b'}. \quad (5)$$

By (3), (4), (5), and linearity of expectation, the asymptotic expected number of occurrences of the configuration is for both models

$$\frac{v'! \binom{v}{v'} v^{-b'}}{|\Gamma|} \sim \frac{v^{v'-b'}}{|\Gamma|}. \quad (6)$$

For the configurations in Figure 1, we list in Table 1 the number of blocks b' , the number of points v' , the order of the automorphism group $|\Gamma|$, and the right-hand side of (6).

Table 1: Configuration data

Name	b'	w'	$ \Gamma $	asymptotic behavior
Pasch	4	6	24	$v^2/24$
Mitre	5	7	12	$v^2/12$
Fano–line	6	7	24	$v/24$
Crown	6	8	2	$v^2/2$
Hexagon	6	8	12	$v^2/12$
Prism	6	9	12	$v^3/12$
Grid	6	9	72	$v^3/72$
Fano	7	7	168	$1/168$
Möbius–Kantor	8	8	48	$1/48$

A hypergraph in which every pair of vertices is contained in at most one hyperedge is called linear. The probability that a random linear uniform hypergraph with a given number of vertices and hyperedges contains a given hypergraph as a subhypergraph is determined in [18, Theorem 1.4], but for random 3-uniform hypergraphs the result only applies to the case of $o(v^{3/2})$ hyperedges.

3 Algorithms for Generating Random STSs

Now we shall have a look at Stinson’s algorithm and Cameron’s algorithm. A key difference between these is that an STS is constructed from scratch in Stinson’s algorithm, whereas Cameron’s algorithm repeatedly perturbs a structure that is an STS or nearly an STS (in a way that will become clear later). Only for Stinson’s algorithm do we know that every STS can be reached with a non-zero probability.

3.1 Random Steiner Triple Systems

We would like to develop an algorithm that constructs random Steiner triple system of a given order, with uniform distribution over all labeled systems of that order. If the Steiner triple systems of the given order have been classified, then there is an obvious solution. Pick a random isomorphism class, where the probability of choosing a class is given by the proportion of STSs in that class, and then apply a random permutation to the point set of the chosen isomorphism class representative. Since Steiner triple systems have been classified for all orders up to

19, this approach does not work for orders greater than or equal to 21. Moreover, a rather huge data structure is needed for the more than 11 billion isomorphism classes of STS(19)s [14]. (The problem of picking an isomorphism class uniformly at random is obviously straightforward for these parameters.)

What about orders greater than 19? In theory, the problem can be solved for arbitrary orders: the classification problem can be solved in finite time, whereafter the above mentioned approach can be used. Another solution, with finite expected time but infinite worst-case time, is as follows. Take a random $(v(v-1)/6)$ -subset of blocks and check whether these form an STS. If not, repeat the procedure. (For the problem of picking isomorphism classes uniformly at random, accept an STS that has been found with the probability given by the size of the automorphism group of the STS divided by a fixed constant that is an upper bound on the size of the automorphism groups of the STSs of the same order). Because of implementation and/or time issues, these methods have no practical importance.

We will next consider some methods that have been proposed for the construction of random labeled Steiner triple systems. How to evaluate them? Of course, one could evaluate them for small cases—up to order 19—which are completely understood. Such work is done in [8]. But what if the behavior of an algorithm changes when going from small to large orders? One challenge when evaluating algorithms for large orders is that such an evaluation is necessarily based on properties of the STSs and the behavior of a property when going from small to large orders is not necessarily well understood.

3.2 Stinson's Algorithm

Stinson [21] developed a celebrated hill-climbing algorithm for constructing STS(v)s. This algorithm is presented as Algorithm 1.

```

1  $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2 while  $|\mathcal{B}| < v(v-1)/6$  do
3   choose a point  $x$  that appears in fewer than  $(v-1)/2$  blocks of  $\mathcal{B}$ 
4   choose a point  $y$  such that  $\{x, y\}$  is not a subset of any block of  $\mathcal{B}$ 
5   choose a point  $z \neq y$  such that  $\{x, z\}$  is not a subset of any block of  $\mathcal{B}$ 
6   if there is a block  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\{y, z\} \subseteq B$  then
7      $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}$ 
8    $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \mathcal{B} \cup \{\{x, y, z\}\}$ 
```

Algorithm 1: Stinson's hill-climbing algorithm

The distribution of STSs generated by Stinson's algorithm is not known. Experiments showing that the distribution is not uniform for small orders [21, 8] have perhaps discouraged people from further investigation. However, as argued in Section 3.1, the situation may change with growing order, and we shall later elaborate on this.

There exist situations where Stinson's algorithm does not terminate, as shown by the example in [5, p. 37] for STS(15)s. That example can easily be generalized to an infinite family.

Theorem 1. *Let $v = 6n + 3$ with $n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. Then there is a non-zero probability that an execution of Stinson's algorithm in the search for an STS(v) will not terminate.*

Proof. For any partial STS, there is a non-zero probability of encountering it during the execution of the algorithm. Consider the situation where the partial STS is a TD(3, $2n + 1$) transversal design. After choosing x , the points y and z necessarily come from the same group as x and hence no blocks of the transversal design are ever removed. As the number of 2-subsets of points in a group is $2n^2 + n$, which is not divisible by 3 when $n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, the partial STS cannot be completed. \square

Although rare, situations of this kind are encountered in practice. An obvious way of dealing with a situation such as that in Theorem 1 is to set a limit on the number of executions of the **while** loop [21, 5, 8]. Obviously, at least $b = v(v - 1)/6 = \Theta(v^2)$ iterations are needed with Stinson's algorithm. The data structure for maintaining partial STSs can be implemented so that execution of any line in Algorithm 1 takes constant time, cf. [21]. There is empirical evidence [21] that Stinson's algorithm with a limit on the number of steps needs $\Theta(v^2 \log v)$ time on the average to construct STSs.

3.3 Modifications of Stinson's Algorithm

One weakness of Stinson's algorithm is that the distribution of constructed STSs is not uniform for small orders. In particular, STS(v)s with a large number of Pasch configurations are underrepresented. Heap, Danziger, and Mendelsohn [8] therefore suggest an extension of Stinson's algorithm, where Pasch switches are occasionally carried out: If the constructed STS contains at least one Pasch configuration, then with a fixed probability a Pasch switch is carried out on a (random) Pasch configuration and the STS thereby obtained is also output. (A related algorithm that produces single STSs is also presented in [8], but that algorithm actually produces STSs with a different distribution; for example, STSs without Pasch configurations are more frequent.)

In the current work, experiments were made to try to find variants of Stinson’s algorithm that would lead to a more uniform distribution of constructed STSs. Whereas the approach in [8] is to modify complete STSs, the main focus here is on modifying the search algorithm itself.

Choices are made in three places in Algorithm 1, in lines 3 to 5. When implementing the algorithm, one needs to specify how these choices are made. Such details are often omitted in studies where the algorithm has been used. One reason behind this is that statements like “choose” and “choose randomly” can be understood as choosing uniformly among candidates. In any case, precision is essential when analyzing and comparing variants of the algorithm.

Possible parameters for deriving probability distributions for the choice of the point x in line 3 of Algorithm 1 are n_q , defined as the number of blocks in which the point $q \in V$ already appears, and $m_q = (v - 1)/2 - n_q$. For any function $f_x(i)$ with nonnegative values, a probability distribution can now be obtained as

$$p_x(q) = \frac{f_x(m_q)}{\sum_{j \in V} f_x(m_j)}, \quad (7)$$

where $f_x(m_q)$ must be positive for at least one point q . For example, uniform distribution over candidate points is obtained with the signum function, $f_x(i) = \text{sgn } i$.

Obviously, nonuniform distributions may also be used for choosing y and z in Algorithm 1. The algorithms obtained with various distributions for x , y , and z are here called *weighted Stinson’s algorithms*.

An alternative possibility of changing Stinson’s algorithm is to change lines 6 to 8 of Algorithm 1. In that part of the algorithm, a block $B' = \{x, y, z\}$ is added and a block $B = \{y, z, w\}$ is possibly removed. The situation where B is removed is precisely the switch (2), as noticed in [19, p. 629].

A switch in Stinson’s algorithm—removing one block and adding another—can be done in constant time. By changing this part of the algorithm, one may end up trading speed for a better distribution of constructed STSs. We call algorithms where switching is done in different ways *extended Stinson’s algorithms*.

3.4 Cameron’s Algorithm

Jacobson and Matthews [11] published an algorithm for random generation of Latin squares, and Cameron [1, 2, 3] showed that a similar approach is possible also for Steiner triple systems. The main difference between the two settings is that stronger theoretical results have been proved for the Latin square algorithm.

The idea in Cameron’s algorithm is to apply perturbations repeatedly to get a sequence of structures, some of which are STSs and some of which are not (and are called proper and improper STSs, respectively). These structures can be defined as pairs (V, f) , where V is a set of points and f is a function that maps 3-subsets of points into the set $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ such that at most one 3-subset is mapped to -1 and

$$\sum_{z \in V \setminus \{x, y\}} f(\{x, y, z\}) = 1$$

for all 2-subsets $\{x, y\}$. We say that we have

- a *proper* STS if $f(B) \neq -1$ for all 3-subsets B ,
- an *improper* STS if there is a unique 3-subset B' such that $f(B') = -1$.

An STS as defined in Section 2 is a proper STS, where f is the characteristic function of the set of blocks. For an improper STS—which has $f(B') = -1$ —the 3-subsets B for which $f(B) = 1$ correspond to a triple system where each 2-subset of points occur in exactly one block, except for the 2-subsets of B' , which occur in exactly two blocks.

The possible perturbations are described in Table 2 for proper and improper STSs. In each case, the candidates are given by the values of x, y, z, x', y' , and z' that fulfill the conditions in line f , and the new function values are given in line f' . The total number of candidates is $v(v-1)(v-3)/6$ for proper STSs and 8 for improper STSs [1]. One of these is chosen uniformly at random in the algorithm. The value of $f'(\{x', y', z'\})$ determines whether the new structure is a proper or improper STS. Note that these transformations are essentially about doing Pasch switches. The random walk can be implemented so that each step takes constant time.

A directed graph in which the vertices are combinatorial structures and the arcs show possible transformations from one structure into another is called a *transition graph*. Reversible transformations can be modeled with undirected graphs. Here we may consider an undirected transition graph G whose vertices are the proper and improper STSs. Repeated perturbations that are carried out uniformly at random correspond to a random walk (Markov chain) in G . It can be shown [1] that the unique limiting distribution of this Markov chain has the property that all proper Steiner triple systems in the connected component where the walk starts have equal probability in the stationary distribution. The central, still open, question is whether G is connected; this is the case for small orders of Steiner triple systems [1, 6].

As we are only interested in proper STSs, it is useful to notice that the subsequence of proper STSs encountered in the walk is also

Table 2: Perturbations for proper and improper STSs

Proper								
	$\{x, y, z\}$	$\{x', y, z\}$	$\{x, y', z\}$	$\{x, y, z'\}$	$\{x, y', z'\}$	$\{x', y, z'\}$	$\{x', y', z\}$	$\{x', y', z'\}$
f	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	$a \geq 0$
f'	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	$a - 1$

Improper								
	$\{x, y, z\}$	$\{x', y, z\}$	$\{x, y', z\}$	$\{x, y, z'\}$	$\{x, y', z'\}$	$\{x', y, z'\}$	$\{x', y', z\}$	$\{x', y', z'\}$
f	-1	1	1	1	0	0	0	$a \geq 0$
f'	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	$a - 1$

a Markov chain with a unique stationary distribution that is uniform over the set of proper STSs in the same connected component; this follows from the proof of [11, Theorem 4].

Cameron's algorithm has two central parameters. First, one needs to choose the starting point of the random walk. One can then use an STS coming from some construction or even use Stinson's algorithm to construct one STS. Clearly, this STS fixes the connected component of the transition graph. In the experiments of the current work, the initial STS was constructed with Stinson's algorithm. If there would be more than one connected component for some parameters, this would be a dilemma for Cameron's algorithm, as the choice of starting points would play a central role. Generating starting points with the right distribution between components seems no easier than generating uniformly distributed random STSs.

Second, one needs to specify which proper STSs in the Markov chain to output. We shall get back to the question of convergence to the limiting distribution in Section 4.

3.5 Modifications of Cameron's Algorithm

For Cameron's algorithm, it is natural to address the possibility of considering only proper STSs and perturbations of those. Indeed, it is shown in [11] that the corresponding algorithm for Latin squares can be modified so that there are no improper intermediate structures. But a similar result for Steiner triple systems is missing: the problem of turning Cameron's unmodified algorithm into a Markov chain whose states are precisely the proper STSs of a fixed order is open.

For (proper) Steiner triple systems one may develop a different algorithm, where in each step a cycle switch is carried out. Connectivity of the transition graph is also now the main issue, and here we do know that the graph is not connected as perfect Steiner triple systems necessarily stay perfect. But we do arrive at a uniform stationary distribution within a connected component by defining the switches in the following way.

Choose, uniformly at random, a 2-subset of points $\{a, b\}$ and a point x , $x \notin \{a, b\}$. If there is a block $\{a, b, x\}$, then we do nothing; this loop in the transition graph ensures that the Markov chain is aperiodic. Otherwise we carry out the cycle switch with a and b as in (1) and $x \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. Some switches lead to the same transition, which can be handled in the framework of multigraphs (or graphs with weighted edges; this is relevant for the modeling of probabilities of transitions). It is an interesting question whether components of the transition graph have odd cycles, which is about aperiodicity after removing the loops.

4 Experimental Results

4.1 Constructing Small Steiner Triple Systems

As there is a unique STS(7), a unique STS(9), and two isomorphism classes of STS(13)s, the smallest order that can be used for evaluation of algorithms is 13. (In [8], the experimental work was done for orders 15 and 19.) The two STS(13)s—here called S_1 and S_2 —have automorphism groups of orders 6 and 39, that is, there are $13!/6 = 1\,037\,836\,800$ and $13!/39 = 159\,667\,200$ labeled such systems, so $13/15 = 0.8666\dots$ of the labeled STS(13)s belong to the former set and $2/15 = 0.1333\dots$ to the latter. The numbers of Pasch configurations in S_1 and S_2 are 8 and 13, respectively.

To simplify the study of this case, we will here group the labeled STSs into (the two) isomorphism classes and focus on those.

4.1.1 Stinson's Algorithm

There are two main open questions regarding Stinson's algorithm. Why does Stinson's algorithm seemingly not generate Steiner triple systems uniformly at random for small parameters? And how could Stinson's algorithm be modified to get better distributions for small parameters? A partial answer to the second question is provided in [8].

Already Stinson in his seminal paper [21] noticed an underrepresentation of Steiner triple systems with large isomorphism groups in

experiments. Later studies such as [8] mention an underrepresentation of Steiner triple systems with many Pasch configurations. Notice, however, that by [17, Table 1.29] there is a correlation between the group order and the number of Pasch configurations for order 15, a commonly considered case in experimental studies.

Let us now consider results for variants of Stinson's algorithm. We study STS(13)s and denote the number of STSs in an isomorphism class S found in a set of experiments by $n(S)$. Hence, an algorithm that generates uniformly distributed STS(13)s should have $n(S_1)/(n(S_1) + n(S_2)) \approx 13/15$. When tabulating such results, we present the percent error

$$100 \cdot \left| \frac{\frac{n(S_1)}{n(S_1)+n(S_2)} - 13/15}{13/15} \right|.$$

We modify Stinson's algorithm with five parameters and each modified algorithm is used to generate 10^8 STS(13)s in this comparison. Three parameters are for weighted Stinson's algorithms. For $i \in \{x, y, z\}$, $W_i = 0, 1$, and 2 mean that the probability distribution $f_i(j)$ is given by (7) and $f_i(j) = \text{sgn } j$, $f_i(j) = j$, and $f_i(j) = \binom{j}{2}$, respectively. Stinson's original algorithm corresponds to the case $W_x = W_y = W_z = 0$.

Experimental results for weighted Stinson's algorithms are shown in Table 3, omitting some cases due to symmetry.

Table 3: Weighted Stinson's algorithms

W_x	0			1			2		
W_y	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	2
0	3.66	3.68	3.71	3.44	3.42	3.47	2.98	3.00	3.05
W_z 1		3.72	3.74		3.48	3.47		3.04	3.06
2			3.76			3.46			3.10

The best result is obtained with the variant $W_x = 2$, $W_y = W_z = 0$, which cuts roughly 20% of the deviation of the original algorithm.

The remaining two parameters give different extended Stinson's algorithms. Different ways of additional switching was considered. The best result was obtained by carrying out an additional switch after each execution of the **while** loop of Algorithm 1, so only the results from that approach will be tabulated here. As discussed in Section 2.1, a switch is carried out with respect to the two points a and b . Further

consider a point d so that $\{a, b, d\}$ is *not* a block; the point d gives the cycle or path in which switching is carried out.

The two parameters for extended Stinson's algorithms are as follows. The values of a , b , and d are chosen uniformly with these restrictions.

$$O \mid |\{x, y, z\} \cap \{a, b, d\}| \geq O$$

$$I \mid \text{No impact for } I = 0, y = a \text{ for } I = 1, \text{ and } y = d \text{ for } I = 2$$

Note that if $I \neq 0$, then $|\{x, y, z\} \cap \{a, b, d\}| \geq 1$ and the cases $O = 0$ and $O = 1$ coincide; we therefore omit the latter case.

Table 4 shows computational results for the ten best performing parameter settings. The overall best variant of Table 4 cuts as much as 99.95% of the deviation of the original algorithm. Note that although the results for weighted Stinson's algorithms in Table 3 suggest that it is beneficial to set $W_x = 2$, the best variant with this property is just fourth in the list. All other tested variants were inferior to those presented here.

Table 4: Weighted and extended Stinson's algorithms

W_x	W_y	W_z	O	I	percent error
0	0	2	2	2	0.002
1	0	2	2	2	0.005
0	1	1	0	2	0.011
2	1	2	0	2	0.013
2	1	0	1	0	0.014
0	2	0	0	2	0.016
2	0	2	2	2	0.019
2	1	0	0	2	0.020
0	2	1	0	2	0.031
1	1	0	2	2	0.037

A major drawback with extended Stinson's algorithms is that the empirical run time increases by a factor of v to $\Theta(v^3 \log v)$. One remedy for this increase could be to carry out cycle switching only when the STS is almost complete.

Returning to the question about why Stinson's algorithm behaves as it does, we present data on partial STS(13)s in Tables 5 and 6, the latter also containing some experimental results. In Table 5, we give the number of blocks k and the number of labeled partial STS(13)s that can be completed only to S_1 , to both S_1 and S_2 , and only to S_2 in columns N_1 , N_{12} , and N_2 , respectively. Finally, we give the total

number of isomorphism classes in the aforementioned three groups P' as well as the total number of isomorphism classes of partial STS(13)s P . The algorithms used to get these numbers are standard [15]: removing blocks from STS(13)s and building up partial STS(13)s block by block, with isomorph rejection.

Table 5: Partial STS(13)s

k	N_1	N_{12}	N_2	P'	P
1	0	286	0	1	1
2	0	36465	0	2	2
3	0	2748460	0	5	5
4	0	136963255	0	16	16
5	2522520	4777742970	0	53	54
6	539458920	119432267955	0	232	250
7	50727877200	2112851941200	0	1259	1419
8	2867932267200	24450299874000	0	7843	9768
9	75719643199200	152456669164800	272691619200	46338	71311
10	657490838724720	483068044499040	10805956761600	201856	482568
11	2411136555347520	893688887931840	86263438060800	562120	2729981
12	5003137094155200	1109870976614400	295345520870400	1041051	12142983
13	7144211666592000	1012594014432000	589917494073600	1411388	41023224
14	7818601132742400	711933731308800	810269287027200	1504182	103043009
15	6910864959398400	394063519449600	834134344243200	1310150	189057254
16	5054265734918400	172910875737600	674036601638400	950220	248583304
17	3088955181312000	59952718425600	438749658547200	578055	228896680
18	1580512841107200	16199594611200	233224761369600	295188	143386618
19	674387390476800	3313812902400	101714233420800	126036	58893945
20	237726897408000	485707622400	36274471833600	44573	15142370
21	68154742656000	45664819200	10457243596800	12875	2306220
22	15510470976000	2075673600	2384948966400	2994	197746
23	2698375680000	0	415134720000	548	9348
24	337296960000	0	51891840000	76	267
25	26983756800	0	4151347200	10	10
26	1037836800	0	159667200	2	2

Table 6 contains some of the data from Table 5 in processed form as well as some computational results. Specifically, $p_X := N_X/(N_1 + N_{12} + N_2)$. In the columns q_X , we show the distribution of partial STSs obtained experimentally with Algorithm 1 in 10^6 runs. Exact values of q_X could also be obtained analytically in the context of absorbing Markov chains, but such an approach seems impracticable here due to the very high number of states (partial STSs).

Notably, the skew distribution emerges in late stages. For example, the experimentally obtained distribution for 21-block partial STSs is close to the theoretically obtained one.

Table 6: Data for partial STS(13)s

k	p_1	p_{12}	p_2	q_1	q_{12}	q_2
1	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
2	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
3	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
4	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
5	0.0005	0.9995	0.0000	0.0005	0.9995	0.0000
6	0.0045	0.9955	0.0000	0.0043	0.9957	0.0000
7	0.0234	0.9766	0.0000	0.0221	0.9779	0.0000
8	0.1050	0.8950	0.0000	0.0913	0.9087	0.0000
9	0.3315	0.6674	0.0012	0.2775	0.7219	0.0006
10	0.5711	0.4196	0.0094	0.4898	0.5054	0.0048
11	0.7110	0.2635	0.0254	0.6267	0.3599	0.0134
12	0.7807	0.1732	0.0461	0.7088	0.2666	0.0246
13	0.8168	0.1158	0.0674	0.7627	0.1989	0.0384
14	0.8370	0.0762	0.0867	0.7977	0.1488	0.0535
15	0.8491	0.0484	0.1025	0.8194	0.1107	0.0699
16	0.8565	0.0293	0.1142	0.8365	0.0786	0.0849
17	0.8610	0.0167	0.1223	0.8437	0.0572	0.0991
18	0.8637	0.0089	0.1274	0.8540	0.0361	0.1099
19	0.8652	0.0043	0.1305	0.8587	0.0223	0.1190
20	0.8661	0.0018	0.1322	0.8644	0.0119	0.1237
21	0.8665	0.0006	0.1329	0.8656	0.0051	0.1293
22	0.8666	0.0001	0.1333	0.8717	0.0020	0.1263
23	0.8667	0.0000	0.1333	0.8762	0.0000	0.1238
24	0.8667	0.0000	0.1333	0.8828	0.0000	0.1172
25	0.8667	0.0000	0.1333	0.8985	0.0000	0.1015
26	0.8667	0.0000	0.1333	0.8985	0.0000	0.1015

4.1.2 Cameron's Algorithm

Considering the case of STS(13)s, the subsequence of isomorphism classes of proper STSs encountered by Cameron's algorithm can be modeled as a Markov chain with two states, which we also call S_1 and S_2 . We denote the transition probabilities $S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ and $S_2 \rightarrow S_1$ by p and q , respectively, and the limiting, stationary distribution by $(\pi(1), \pi(2))$. Determining p and q analytically seems challenging, but we can get estimates with computational experiments. In a Markov chain with 10^9 proper STSs, we get estimates $p \approx 0.108954$ and $q \approx 0.708279$. A two-state Markov chain with such transition probabilities converges to a probability distribution $(q/(p+q) \approx 0.86668, p/(p+q) \approx 0.13332)$, which is reasonably close to $(\pi(1) = 13/15, \pi(2) = 2/15)$.

The values of p and q can also be used to determine the convergence rate. Let $\mu_t(i)$ denote the probability that we are in state i at time t . Regardless of the initial state,

$$|\mu_t(i) - \pi(i)| < |1 - p - q|^t < 0.2^t \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\};$$

see, for example, [20]. That is, we have exponential convergence. In fact, all Markov chains that are indecomposable and aperiodic converge exponentially quickly [20]. Unfortunately, a more formal treatment gets difficult for our problem with STSs of order greater than 13.

4.2 Constructing Large Steiner Triple Systems

The fact that Stinson's algorithm apparently does not perform optimally for STS(13)s and other small parameters does not necessarily mean that the same holds for larger parameters. Although we do conjecture that Stinson's algorithm performs nonoptimally with respect to certain individual STSs for any order, we do not exclude the possibility that the obtained distribution converges in some manner to the desired distribution. (We refrain from formulating this statement explicitly, which would also require picking an appropriate measure for comparing distributions.) Nevertheless we do have some experimental results showing that the situation may be different for small and large orders.

We implemented Stinson's algorithm and Cameron's algorithm and carried out a set of experiments for a wide range of orders. In Cameron's algorithm, every v th proper STS(v) was output. For each order up to 200, 10^6 random STSs were generated and the numbers of the configurations listed in Figure 1 were counted using algorithms from [9]. The results after dividing by the right-hand side of (6) are shown in Figures 2 to 10. The continuous lines in Figures 2 to 8 show the minimum, mean, and maximum values of the underlying distribution.

The boxplots show the first quartile, median, and third quartile, and the whiskers show the furthest datapoints of the distribution which fall into 1.5 times the interquartile range. As most STSs contain neither Fano nor Möbius–Kantor configurations, only the mean value divided by the right-hand side of (6) is presented in Figures 9 and 10.

It can be seen that the degree of the monomials in Table 1 has an impact on convergence. The cases where it is not 2 are Fano–line (degree 1; Figure 4) and prism and grid (degree 3; Figures 7 and 8). For the Pasch, mitre, crown, and hexagon, the curves seem to converge very nicely to 1. These are precisely the configurations with a quadratic polynomial in Table 1. Also in the cases of Fano–line, prism, grid, Fano, and Möbius–Kantor, 1 is approached, but a consideration of larger parameters would be needed to study the behavior more closely.

The only noticeable difference between Stinson’s algorithm and Cameron’s algorithm is for Fano planes in STSs of small order (Figure 9). The curves cannot be used to draw conclusions, but this hints that STSs with Fano planes might be underrepresented for small parameters when Stinson’s algorithm is used.

5 Conclusions

The current study does not show clear evidence in favor of any of the two studied algorithms for large orders, and both have their advantages and disadvantages. One disadvantage of Cameron’s algorithm is that one might end up having to implement both algorithms. The authors hope that the current results inspire work on alternative approaches for evaluating algorithms for constructing random Steiner triple systems of large orders. Moreover, the experimental results linking the hypergraph models and the behavior of the algorithms motivate theoretical work in this area.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the anonymous referees for valuable comments.

References

- [1] Cameron, P.J.: A Markov chain for Steiner triple systems. (2002) Available at <https://webspaces.maths.qmul.ac.uk/p.j.cameron/csgnotes/random.pdf>




Figure 2: Pasch




Figure 3: Mitre




Figure 4: Fano-line




Figure 5: Crown




Figure 6: Hexagon




Figure 7: Prism




Figure 8: Grid




Figure 9: Fano




Figure 10: Möbius–Kantor

- [2] Cameron, P.J.: Research problems from the 18th British Combinatorial Conference. *Discrete Math.* **266**, 441–451 (2003)
- [3] Cameron, P.J.: A generalisation of t -designs. *Discrete Math.* **309**, 4835–4842 (2009)
- [4] Colbourn, C.J.: Triple systems. In: Colbourn, C.J., Dinitz, J.H. (eds.) *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, 2nd ed., pp. 58–71. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (2007)
- [5] Colbourn, C.J., Rosa, A.: *Triple Systems*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1999)
- [6] Drizen, A.L., Grannell, M.J., Griggs, T.S.: Pasch trades with a negative block. *Discrete Math.* **311**, 2411–2416 (2011)
- [7] Grannell, M.J., Griggs, T.S., Murphy, J.P.: Some new perfect Steiner triple systems. *J. Combin. Des.* **7**, 327–330 (1999)
- [8] Heap, D., Danziger, P., Mendelsohn, E.: Hill-climbing to Pasch valleys. *J. Combin. Des.* **15**, 405–419 (2007)
- [9] Heinlein, D., Östergård, P.R.J.: Algorithms and complexity for counting configurations in Steiner triple systems. *J. Combin. Des.* **30**, 527–546 (2022)
- [10] Heinlein, D., Östergård, P.R.J.: Steiner triple systems of order 21 with subsystems. *Glas. Mat. Ser. III*, to appear

- [11] Jacobson, M.T., Matthews, P.: Generating uniformly distributed random Latin squares. *J. Combin. Des.* **4**, 405–437 (1996)
- [12] Jerrum, M.: *Counting, Sampling and Integrating: Algorithms and Complexity*. Birkhäuser, Basel (2003)
- [13] Jerrum, M.R., Valiant, L.G., Vazirani, V.V.: Random generation of combinatorial structures from a uniform distribution. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **43**, 169–188 (1986)
- [14] Kaski, P., Östergård, P.R.J.: The Steiner triple systems of order 19. *Math. Comp.* **73**, 2075–2092 (2004)
- [15] Kaski, P., Östergård, P.R.J.: *Classification Algorithms for Codes and Designs*. Springer, Berlin (2006)
- [16] Kwan, M.: Almost all Steiner triple systems have perfect matchings. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **121**, 1468–1495 (2020)
- [17] Mathon, R., Rosa, A.: 2 -(v, k, λ) designs of small order. In: Colbourn, C.J., Dinitz, J.H. (eds.) *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, 2nd ed., pp. 25–58. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (2007)
- [18] McKay, B.D., Tian, F.: Asymptotic enumeration of linear hypergraphs with given number of vertices and edges. *Adv. Appl. Math.* **115**, 102000 (2020)
- [19] Östergård, P.R.J.: Switching codes and designs. *Discrete Math.* **312**, 621–632 (2012)
- [20] Rosenthal, J.S.: Convergence rates for Markov chains. *SIAM Rev.* **37**, 387–405 (1995)
- [21] Stinson, D.R.: Hill-climbing algorithms for the construction of combinatorial designs. *Ann. Discrete Math.* **26**, 321–334 (1985)