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## Supplementary Material

## S1 Proof of Proposition 1

For given $\lambda_{2} \geq \lambda_{3}>0$, we have that $\lambda_{1} \leq L-\lambda_{2}-\lambda_{3}$. Hence,

$$
\varphi_{A}(d)=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\lambda_{1}}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{2}}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{3}}} \leq \frac{1}{\frac{1}{L-\lambda_{2}-\lambda_{3}}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{2}}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{3}}}
$$

Holding $\lambda_{3}$ fixed, this bound is maximal if $\lambda_{2}=L-\lambda_{2}-\lambda_{3}$, i.e. if $\lambda_{2}=$ $\left(L-\lambda_{3}\right) / 2$. This implies that

$$
\varphi_{A}(d) \leq \frac{1}{\frac{2}{L-\lambda_{3}}+\frac{2}{L-\lambda_{3}}+\frac{1}{\lambda_{3}}}
$$

This bound, however, gets maximal if $\lambda_{3}$ gets as near to $\left(L-\lambda_{3}\right) / 2$ as possible, which means that $\lambda_{3}=q$. This gives

$$
\varphi_{A}(d) \leq \frac{1}{\frac{2}{L-q}+\frac{2}{L-q}+\frac{1}{q}}
$$

If $\lambda_{3}=0$ we get $\varphi_{A}(d)=0$, which completes the proof.

## S2 Proof of Proposition 2

In our notation, the equation at the bottom of page 75 of Pukelsheim (1993) becomes

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{C}_{d 11} & \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \\
\mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} & \mathbf{C}_{d 22}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I}_{2} & \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \\
0 & \mathbf{I}_{4}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d} & 0 \\
0 & \mathbf{C}_{d 22}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{I}_{2} & 0 \\
\mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} & \mathbf{I}_{4}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Multiplying this by $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\mathbf{I}_{2} & -\mathbf{X}^{T}\end{array}\right]$ from the left and by $\left[\begin{array}{c}\mathbf{I}_{2} \\ -\mathbf{X}\end{array}\right]$ from the right, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{C}_{d 11}-\mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{X}-\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}+\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{X} \\
= & {\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{I}_{2} & \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+}-\mathbf{X}^{T}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_{d 22}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{I}_{2} & \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}-\mathbf{X}
\end{array}\right] } \\
= & \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}+\left(\mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+}-\mathbf{X}^{T}\right) \mathbf{C}_{d 22}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}-\mathbf{X}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This is almost the same as (5.2) in Kushner (1997), except that $\mathbf{X}$ is not square. Since $\left(\mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+}-\mathbf{X}^{T}\right) \mathbf{C}_{d 22}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}-\mathbf{X}\right) \geq 0$, it follows that

$$
\mathbf{C}_{d 11}-\mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{X}-\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}+\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{X} \geq \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}
$$

with equality for $\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}$.

## S3 Proof of Proposition 3

Define $Q(x)=\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}-2 \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} x+\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{b}_{2} x^{2}$.
Case 1: $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} \neq 0$.
Consider the matrix

$$
\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} \frac{x}{\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} \mathbf{b}_{2}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}
$$

Then $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{b}_{2}=x$.
It follows from Proposition 2 that

$$
\mathbf{k}^{T} \tilde{C}_{d} \mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{k}
$$

Since $\mathbf{C}_{d 12}$ has row-sums 0 , we have $\mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}=\mathbf{C}_{d 12}$. Since $\mathbf{C}_{d 22}$ has both row- and column-sums 0 , we even have $\mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}=\mathbf{C}_{d 22}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{k}^{T} \tilde{C}_{d} \mathbf{k} \leq & \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{k} \\
& -\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{k} \\
= & \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} x-x \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} \mathbf{k}+x \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{b}_{2} x \\
= & Q(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Because of Proposition 2, we get equality for $\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{X}_{d}=\mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}$, i.e., for

$$
x=\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T} \mathbf{k}=x_{d}
$$

Case 2: $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2}=0$.

Then $Q(x)=\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{b}_{2} x^{2} \geq \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}$ with equality for $x=0$.
On the other hand, it follows from $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2}=0$ that $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}=0$, and, therefore, that $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}=\mathbf{0}$. Hence, $\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 11} \mathbf{k}=\mathbf{k}^{T} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{k}$. Furthermore, $x_{d}=\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{b}_{2}=\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{b}_{2}=0$. This completes the proof.

## S4 Proof of Proposition 4

It follows from Proposition 3 and Equation (3.6) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{k}^{T} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{k} & \leq \sum_{z \in Z_{p}} \pi_{d}(z)\left\{\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{11}(z) \mathbf{k}-2 \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \mathbf{b}_{2} x+\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{22}(z) \mathbf{b}_{2} x^{2}\right\} \\
& \leq \max _{z \in Z_{p}}\left\{\mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{11}(z) \mathbf{k}-2 \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \mathbf{b}_{2} x+\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{22}(z) \mathbf{b}_{2} x^{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

From the Courant-Fischer Theorem it follows that

$$
\lambda_{3}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}\right)=\min _{\mathbf{h}: \mathbf{h}^{T} \mathbf{1}_{4}=0} \frac{1}{\mathbf{h}^{T} \mathbf{h}} \mathbf{h}^{T} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d} \mathbf{h}
$$

and since

$$
\lambda_{3}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d}\right) \leq \lambda_{3}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}\right)
$$

the desired inequality follows.

## S5 Proof of Proposition 5

Since $\operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}\right) \geq \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d}\right)$, it follows directly from Proposition 2 and Equation (3.6) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d}\right) / n \\
\leq & \operatorname{tr}\left(\sum_{z \in Z_{p}} \pi_{d}(z)\left(\mathbf{C}_{11}(z)-\mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \mathbf{X}-\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{12}^{T}(z)+\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{22}(z) \mathbf{X}\right)\right) \\
\leq & \max _{z \in Z_{p}}\left(\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{11}(z)\right)-2 \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \mathbf{X}\right)+\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{X}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{22}(z) \mathbf{X}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof.

## S6 Proof of Proposition 6

Choosing $\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{X}_{f}$, it follows from (3.7) for any design $d \in \Delta_{2, n, p}$ that $\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d}\right) \leq \max _{z \in Z_{p}} L_{z}\left(\mathbf{X}_{f}\right)$. The conditions of Proposition 6 imply that $\max _{z \in Z_{p}} L_{z}\left(\mathbf{X}_{f}\right) \leq \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{f}\right)$ and, hence, that $\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{d}\right) \leq \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{f}\right)$.

## S7 Proof of Proposition 7

The design $d$ has weights $\pi_{d}(z), z \in Z_{p}$. Consider the dual design $\bar{d} \in \Delta_{2, n, p}$ with weights $\pi_{\bar{d}}(z), z \in Z_{p}$, where for each $z \in Z_{p}$ the dual design $\bar{d}$ allots the weight that $d$ has allotted to the dual sequence $\bar{z}$, i.e. $\pi_{\bar{d}}(z)=\pi_{d}(\bar{z})$. If
we define

$$
\mathbf{H}_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1 \\
1 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

then $\mathbf{S}_{\bar{d}}=\mathbf{S}_{d} \mathbf{H}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{\bar{d}}=\mathbf{M}_{d} \mathbf{H}_{2}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\bar{d}}=\mathbf{T}_{d} \mathbf{H}_{2}$. Therefore,

$$
\mathbf{C}_{\bar{d} 11}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{C}_{d 11}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right], \mathbf{C}_{\bar{d} 12}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{H}_{2}
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{C}_{\bar{d} 22}=\mathbf{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{d 22} \mathbf{H}_{2} .
$$

This implies that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\bar{d}}= & {\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{C}_{d 11}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] } \\
& -\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{C}_{d 12} \mathbf{H}_{2}\left(\mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{C}_{d 22}^{+} \mathbf{H}_{2}\right) \mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{C}_{d 12}^{T}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \\
= & {\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{2} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2}
\end{array}\right] . }
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that $\tilde{C}_{\bar{d}}$ has the same eigenvalues as $\tilde{C}_{d}$ and, consequently, that $\tilde{\varphi}_{A}(\bar{d})=\tilde{\varphi}_{A}(d)$.

Now consider the dual balanced design $f$ which allots to each sequence $z$ the weight $\pi_{f}(z)=\frac{1}{2} \pi_{d}(z)+\frac{1}{2} \pi_{\bar{d}}(z)$. It then follows from Proposition 1
of Kunert and Martin (2000) that

$$
\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{f} \geq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{d}+\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\bar{d}}
$$

which implies that

$$
\tilde{\varphi}_{A}(f) \geq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\varphi}_{A}(d)+\frac{1}{2} \tilde{\varphi}_{A}(\bar{d})=\tilde{\varphi}_{A}(d),
$$

since the A-criterion is concave and increasing.

## S8 Proof of Proposition 8

The first row of both $\mathbf{S}_{z}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{z}$ is $[0,0]$. The first row of $\mathbf{T}_{z}$ is either $[1,0]$ or $[0,1]$, depending on whether the sequence $z$ starts with $R$ or $T$. Therefore, the first element of $\mathbf{S}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{M}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}$ is eitherl 1 or -1 .

Now consider the $i$-th element, for $i \geq 2$.
Case 1: The preceding treatment was $R$, the current treatment is $R$. Then the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{S}_{z}$ is $[1,0]$, the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{M}_{z}$ is $[0,0]$, and the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{T}_{z}$ is $[1,0]$. Hence, the $i$-th element of $\mathbf{S}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{M}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}$ equals 0 .

Case 2: The preceding treatment was $R$, the current treatment is $T$. Then the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{S}_{z}$ is $[0,0]$, the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{M}_{z}$ is $[1,0]$, and the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{T}_{z}$ is $[0,1]$. Hence, the $i$-th element of $\mathbf{S}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{M}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}$ equals 0 .

Case 3: The preceding treatment was $T$, the current treatment is $R$. Then the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{S}_{z}$ is $[0,0]$, the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{M}_{z}$ is $[0,1]$, and the $i$-th row of
$\mathbf{T}_{z}$ is $[0,1]$. Again, the $i$-th element of $\mathbf{S}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{M}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}$ equals 0 .
Case 4: The preceding treatment was $T$, the current treatment is $T$. Then the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{S}_{z}$ is $[0,1]$, the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{M}_{z}$ is $[0,0]$, and the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{T}_{z}$ is $[0,1]$. So also in this case, the $i$-th element of $\mathbf{S}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{M}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{b}_{2}$ equals 0 .

This completes the proof.

## S9 Proof of Proposition 9

Observing that

$$
\mathbf{k}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_{z}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)= & \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T},-\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}\right] \mathbf{C}_{11}(z)\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]-\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T},-\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}\right] \mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \mathbf{b}_{2} \\
& -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{12}^{T}(z)\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]+\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T} \mathbf{C}_{22}(z) \mathbf{b}_{2} \\
= & \frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T},-\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T},-\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}\right]\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{C}_{11}(z) & \mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \\
\mathbf{C}_{12}^{T}(z) & \mathbf{C}_{22}(z)
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Using (3.3)-(3.5) and the fact that

$$
\mathbf{B}_{4}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

we get

$$
J_{z}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left[\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T},-\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T},-\mathbf{b}_{2}^{T}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{S}_{z}^{T} \\
\mathbf{M}_{z}^{T} \\
\mathbf{T}_{z}^{T}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{B}_{p}\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}, \mathbf{M}_{z}, \mathbf{T}_{z}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

In Proposition 8 we have seen that

$$
\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}, \mathbf{M}_{z}, \mathbf{T}_{z}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{b}_{2}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}
a \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $a$ is either 1 or -1 . It follows that

$$
J_{z}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)=[1,0, \ldots, 0] \mathbf{B}_{p}\left[\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0
\end{array}\right]=\frac{p-1}{2 p}
$$

which completes the proof.

## S10 Proof of Proposition 10

For $\mathbf{X}^{*}=c\left[\mathbf{B}_{2},-\mathbf{B}_{2}\right]$, as in the statement of Proposition 10, define

$$
G_{z}=L_{z}\left(\mathbf{X}^{*}\right) / n=\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{11}(z)\right)-2 \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{C}_{12}(z) \mathbf{X}^{*}\right)+\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{X}^{* T} \mathbf{C}_{22}(z) \mathbf{X}^{*}\right) .
$$

We get from (3.3)-(3.5)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{z}= \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{B}_{4}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{S}_{z}^{T} \\
\mathbf{M}_{z}^{T}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{B}_{p}\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}, \mathbf{M}_{z}\right] \mathbf{B}_{4}\right) \\
&-2 c \operatorname{tr}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left.\mathbf{B}_{4}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{S}_{z}^{T} \\
\mathbf{M}_{z}^{T}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{B}_{p} \mathbf{T}_{z}\left[\mathbf{B}_{2},-\mathbf{B}_{2}\right]\right) \\
\\
\end{array}\right. \\
&+c^{2} \operatorname{tr}\left(\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{B}_{2} \\
-\mathbf{B}_{2}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{T}_{z}^{T} \mathbf{B}_{p} \mathbf{T}_{z}\left[\mathbf{B}_{2},-\mathbf{B}_{2}\right]\right) \\
&= \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{B}_{4}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left.\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\right] \\
\left.\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\right]
\end{array} \mathbf{B}_{p}\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right] \mathbf{B}_{4}\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used that $\left[\mathbf{B}_{2},-\mathbf{B}_{2}\right] \mathbf{B}_{4}=\left[\mathbf{B}_{2},-\mathbf{B}_{2}\right]$ and, for any $\mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}$, that $\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{A}_{1} \mathbf{A}_{2}\right)=\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{A}_{2} \mathbf{A}_{1}\right)$.

We split $G_{z}$ up into several parts. Define

$$
G_{z}^{(1)}=\operatorname{tr}\left(\left[\begin{array}{c}
\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T} \\
\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right]\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right]\right)
$$

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\operatorname{tr}\left(\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T} \\
\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right] \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_{p} \mathbf{1}_{p}^{T}\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right]\right)
$$

and

$$
G_{z}^{(3)}=\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{1}_{4}^{T}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T} \\
\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{B}_{p}\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right] \mathbf{1}_{4}
$$

Then $G_{z}=G_{z}^{(1)}-G_{z}^{(2)}-G_{z}^{(3)}$, because $\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{B}_{4} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}_{4}\right)=\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A})-\frac{1}{4} \mathbf{1}_{4}^{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{1}_{4}$.
If $z$ starts with $R$, the first row of $\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}$ equals $[-c / 2, c / 2]$.
Otherwise it is $[c / 2,-c / 2]$.
For $i \geq 2$, the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}$ equals

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[1-c / 2, c / 2], \text { if } z(i-1)=R, z(i)=R,} \\
& {[c / 2,-c / 2], \quad \text { if } z(i-1)=R, z(i)=T,} \\
& {[-c / 2, c / 2], \quad \text { if } z(i-1)=T, z(i)=R,} \\
& {[c / 2,1-c / 2], \text { if } z(i-1)=T, z(i)=T .}
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, the first row of $\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}$ is $[c / 2,-c / 2]$ if $z$ starts with $R$, and $[-c / 2, c / 2]$ if it starts with $T$. For $i \geq 2$, the $i$-th row of $\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}$ equals

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[c / 2,-c / 2], \quad \text { if } z(i-1)=R, z(i)=R,} \\
& {[1-c / 2, c / 2], \text { if } z(i-1)=R, z(i)=T,}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[c / 2,1-c / 2], \text { if } z(i-1)=T, z(i)=R} \\
& {[-c / 2, c / 2], \quad \text { if } z(i-1)=T, z(i)=T}
\end{aligned}
$$

We therefore have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)= \\
& {\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{c^{2}}{4} & -\frac{c^{2}}{4} \\
-\frac{c^{2}}{4} & \frac{c^{2}}{4}
\end{array}\right]+s_{R R}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right)^{2} & \frac{c}{2}\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right) \\
\frac{c}{2}\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right) & \frac{c^{2}}{4}
\end{array}\right]} \\
& +m_{R T}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{c^{2}}{4} & -\frac{c^{2}}{4} \\
-\frac{c^{2}}{4} & \frac{c^{2}}{4}
\end{array}\right]+m_{T R}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{c^{2}}{4} & -\frac{c^{2}}{4} \\
-\frac{c^{2}}{4} & \frac{c^{2}}{4}
\end{array}\right]+s_{T T}\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{c^{2}}{4} & \frac{c}{2}\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right) \\
\frac{c}{2}\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right) & \left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right)^{2}
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)\right)= \\
& \left(1+m_{R T}+m_{T R}\right) \frac{c^{2}}{2}+\left(s_{R R}+s_{T T}\right)\left(\frac{c^{2}}{4}+\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right)^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)\right) \\
= & \left(1+s_{R R}+s_{T T}\right) \frac{c^{2}}{2}+\left(m_{R T}+m_{T R}\right)\left(\frac{c^{2}}{4}+\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right)^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Noting that $s_{R R}+s_{T T}+m_{R T}+m_{T R}=p-1$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{z}^{(1)}= & \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)\right) \\
& +\operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =(p+1) \frac{c^{2}}{2}+(p-1)\left(\frac{c^{2}}{4}+\left(1-\frac{c}{2}\right)^{2}\right) \\
& =\frac{3 p^{3}+4 p^{2}-2 p-4}{4(p+1)^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We also get from our analysis of the rows of $\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}$ and of $\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}$ that

$$
\mathbf{1}_{4}^{T}\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T} \\
\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right]=[0,1, \ldots, 1]
$$

for any sequence $z$. Therefore,

$$
G_{z}^{(3)}=\frac{1}{4}[0,1, \ldots, 1] \mathbf{B}_{p}[0,1, \ldots, 1]^{T}=\frac{p-1}{4 p} .
$$

To determine $G_{z}^{(2)}$, we calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\begin{array}{c}
\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T} \\
\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{1}_{p}=\left[\begin{array}{c}
-\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2} \\
-\frac{c}{2}
\end{array}\right]+s_{R R}\left[\begin{array}{c}
1-\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2} \\
-\frac{c}{2}
\end{array}\right]} \\
& +m_{R T}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{c}{2} \\
-\frac{c}{2} \\
1-\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2}
\end{array}\right]+m_{T R}\left[\begin{array}{c}
-\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2} \\
1-\frac{c}{2}
\end{array}\right]+s_{T T}\left[\begin{array}{c}
\frac{c}{2} \\
1-\frac{c}{2} \\
-\frac{c}{2} \\
\frac{c}{2}
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
=\left[\begin{array}{c}
s_{R R}-\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)+1\right) \\
s_{T T}+\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)+1\right) \\
m_{R T}+\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)+1\right) \\
m_{T R}-\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)+1\right)
\end{array}\right],
$$

if the sequence starts with $R$, and, similarly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[\begin{array}{c}
\left(\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T} \\
\left(\mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right)^{T}
\end{array}\right] \mathbf{1}_{p} } \\
= & {\left[\begin{array}{c}
s_{R R}-\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)-1\right) \\
s_{T T}+\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)-1\right) \\
m_{R T}+\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)-1\right) \\
m_{T R}-\frac{c}{2}\left(s_{R R}-s_{T T}-\left(m_{R T}-m_{T R}\right)-1\right)
\end{array}\right], }
\end{aligned}
$$

if the sequence starts with $T$.
Defining the parameters

$$
\begin{gathered}
s=s_{R R}+s_{T T}, \quad d_{s}=s_{R R}-s_{T T} \\
m=m_{R T}+m_{T R}, \quad d_{m}=m_{R T}-m_{T R}
\end{gathered}
$$

we then get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{z}^{(2)}= \\
& \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{1}_{p}^{T}\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right]\left[\mathbf{S}_{z}-c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}, \mathbf{M}_{z}+c \mathbf{T}_{z} \mathbf{B}_{2}\right]^{T} \mathbf{1}_{p} \\
= & \frac{1}{p}\left(\left(\frac{s}{2}+\frac{d_{s}}{2}-\frac{c}{2}\left(d_{s}-d_{m}+1\right)\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{s}{2}-\frac{d_{s}}{2}+\frac{c}{2}\left(d_{s}-d_{m}+1\right)\right)^{2}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.+\left(\frac{m}{2}+\frac{d_{m}}{2}+\frac{c}{2}\left(d_{s}-d_{m}+1\right)\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{m}{2}-\frac{d_{m}}{2}-\frac{c}{2}\left(d_{s}-d_{m}+1\right)\right)^{2}\right) \\
= & \frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}-d_{m}+1\right)\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(d_{m}+c\left(d_{s}-d_{m}+1\right)\right)^{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

if the sequence $z$ starts with $R$. In the same way we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{z}^{(2)}= \\
& \frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}-d_{m}-1\right)\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(d_{m}+c\left(d_{s}-d_{m}-1\right)\right)^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

if $z$ starts with $T$.
To determine a minimum of $G_{z}^{(2)}$, we consider four cases.
Case 1: The sequence $z$ starts with $R$ and ends with $R$.
In this case $m_{R T}=m_{T R}$ and, therefore, $d_{m}=0$. Hence,

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}\right)
$$

Observe that

$$
\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}+\left(c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}=d_{s}^{2}\left(1-2 c+2 c^{2}\right)-d_{s}\left(2 c-4 c^{2}\right)+2 c^{2}
$$

Since $d_{s}$ is an integer, we have $d_{s} \leq d_{s}^{2}$. Making use of $0<c<1 / 2$, this implies that $-d_{s}\left(2 c-4 c^{2}\right) \geq-d_{s}^{2}\left(2 c-4 c^{2}\right)$ and, therefore,

$$
\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}+\left(c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2} \geq d_{s}^{2}\left(1-4 c+6 c^{2}\right)+2 c^{2}
$$

Observing that $\left(1-4 c+6 c^{2}\right)=(1-2 c)^{2}+2 c^{2}>0$, we get that

$$
\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}+\left(c\left(d_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2} \geq 2 c^{2}
$$

Hence, we have shown that in Case 1

$$
G_{z}^{(2)} \geq \frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+m^{2}+2 c^{2}\right)
$$

Case 2: The sequence $z$ starts with $R$ and ends with $T$.
In this case $m_{R T}=m_{T R}+1$ and, therefore, $d_{m}=1$. Hence,

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(d_{s}-c d_{s}\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(1+c d_{s}\right)^{2}\right) .
$$

Define $g=d_{s}+1$. Then $d_{s}=g-1$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(d_{s}-c d_{s}\right)^{2}+\left(1+c d_{s}\right)^{2}=(g-1)^{2}(1-c)^{2}+(1-c+c g)^{2} \\
= & 2(1-c)^{2}+g^{2}\left(1-2 c+2 c^{2}\right)-g\left(2-6 c+4 c^{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Because $g$ is an integer and because $2-6 c+4 c^{2}=2(1-c)(1-2 c) \geq 0$ we conclude that $-g\left(2-6 c+4 c^{2}\right) \geq-g^{2}\left(2-6 c+4 c^{2}\right)$ and therefore that

$$
\left(d_{s}-c d_{s}\right)^{2}+\left(1-c d_{s}\right)^{2} \geq 2(1-c)^{2}+g^{2}\left(4 c-1-2 c^{2}\right)
$$

Since $c=\frac{p}{2(p+1)}$ and $p \geq 2$, we have

$$
4 c-1-2 c^{2}=\frac{p^{2}-2}{2 p^{2}+4 p+2}>0
$$

and, therefore,

$$
\left(d_{s}-c d_{s}\right)^{2}+\left(1-c d_{s}\right)^{2} \geq 2(1-c)^{2}
$$

Note that $0<c<1 / 2$. Therefore, $2(1-c)^{2}>2 c^{2}$ and we have shown that in Case 2

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}>\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+m^{2}+2 c^{2}\right)
$$

Case 3: The sequence starts with $T$ and ends with $R$.
In this case $m_{T R}=m_{R T}+1$ and therefore $d_{m}=-1$. This implies that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(d_{s}-c d_{s}\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(-1+c d_{s}\right)^{2}\right)
$$

If we define $\bar{d}_{s}=-d_{s}$, we see that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(\bar{d}_{s}-c \bar{d}_{s}\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(1+c \bar{d}_{s}\right)^{2}\right)
$$

Hence, we conclude in the same way as in Case 2, that in Case 3 we also have

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}>\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+m^{2}+2 c^{2}\right)
$$

Case 4: The sequence starts and ends with $T$.
In this case $m_{T R}=m_{R T}$ and therefore $d_{m}=0$. This implies that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(d_{s}-c\left(d_{s}-1\right)\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(c\left(d_{s}-1\right)\right)^{2}\right)
$$

Defining $\bar{d}_{s}=-d_{s}$, we see that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)}=\frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+\left(\bar{d}_{s}-c\left(\bar{d}_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}+m^{2}+\left(c\left(\bar{d}_{s}+1\right)\right)^{2}\right) .
$$

Hence, we conclude in the same way as in Case 1 that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)} \geq \frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+m^{2}+2 c^{2}\right)
$$

Combining the four cases, we have shown for any sequence $z$ that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)} \geq \frac{1}{2 p}\left(s^{2}+m^{2}+2 c^{2}\right)
$$

Since $s+m=s_{R R}+s_{T T}+m_{R T}+m_{T R}=p-1$, we get $s^{2}+m^{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}(p-1)^{2}$. Inserting $c=\frac{p}{2(p+1)}$, we hence have that

$$
G_{z}^{(2)} \geq \frac{1}{4 p}\left((p-1)^{2}+\frac{p^{2}}{(p+1)^{2}}\right)
$$

Combining the results for the three terms, we conclude for any $z \in Z_{p}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{z} & \leq \frac{3 p^{3}+4 p^{2}-2 p-4}{4(p+1)^{2}}-\frac{(p-1)^{2}+\frac{p^{2}}{(p+1)^{2}}}{4 p}-\frac{p-1}{4 p} \\
& =\frac{3 p^{4}+4 p^{3}-2 p^{2}-4 p}{4 p(p+1)^{2}}-\frac{p^{4}-p^{2}+1}{4 p(p+1)^{2}}-\frac{(p-1)(p+1)^{2}}{4 p(p+1)^{2}} \\
& =\frac{(2 p+3)(p-1)}{4(p+1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 10.

