

s -Elusive Codes in Hamming Graphs

Daniel R. Hawtin ^{*†}

Department of Mathematics, University of Rijeka
Rijeka, Croatia, 51000
dan.hawtin@gmail.com

February 28, 2022

Abstract

A code is a subset of the vertex set of a Hamming graph. The set of s -neighbours of a code is the set of all vertices at Hamming distance s from their nearest codeword. A code C is s -elusive if there exists a distinct code C' that is equivalent to C under the full automorphism group of the Hamming graph such that C and C' have the same set of s -neighbours.

We show that the minimum distance of an s -elusive code is at most $2s + 2$, and that an s -elusive code with minimum distance at least $2s + 1$ gives rise to a q -ary t -design with certain parameters. This leads to the construction of: an infinite family of 1-elusive and completely transitive codes, an infinite family of 2-elusive codes, and a single example of a 3-elusive code. Answers to several open questions on elusive codes are also provided.

1 Introduction

A code in a Hamming graph $\Gamma = H(m, q)$ is a subset C of its vertex set $V\Gamma$. The elements of C are called *codewords* and the automorphism group of C is the setwise stabiliser of C in the full automorphism group of $H(m, q)$. An s -neighbour of C is a vertex α whose nearest codeword in C is Hamming distance s from α . A code C is called s -elusive if there exists an equivalent code C' to C such that the sets of s -neighbours of C and C' are the same. Note that the notion of equivalence used here is more general than the standard one; see Section 2.

The concept studied here is a generalisation of one originally studied in [15]. We consider the question of whether, given a code C in a Hamming graph $H(m, q)$, the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(C_s)$ of the set C_s of s -neighbours could be larger than the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(C)$ of the code itself (see Section 2). This question was encountered, for $s = 1$, when Gillespie and Praeger were deciding upon the definition for a neighbour-transitive code (see [10]). In [15] they give an affirmative answer via the construction of an infinite family of examples. Similarly, the significance of the existence of s -elusive codes relates to the precise definition of s -neighbour-transitive codes (see [11, 12, 18, 14]).

Theorem 1.1 exhibits examples of s -elusive codes, for $s = 1, 2$ and 3. The definition of the relevant Reed-Muller codes is given at the beginning of Section 4, and can be found for instance in [1, Section

^{*}This research was partially supported by an Australian Postgraduate Award and a University of Western Australia Safety-Net Top-Up Scholarship. This work has been supported in part by the Croatian Science Foundation under project 6732.

[†]The author thanks Neil Gillespie, Cheryl Praeger and Andrea Švob for kindly reading drafts of this manuscript, and two anonymous referees for their helpful comments on a previous version.

5.4]; the definition of the Preparata codes can be found in [6, (16.12)]. Part 1 of Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 4 and the remaining parts in Section 5. Note that a code C is G -completely transitive, for a group $G \leq \text{Aut}(C)$, if each C_i is a G -orbit, for $i \in \{0, \dots, \rho\}$, where ρ is the covering radius of C (see, for instance, [16]), and we say that a linear code C of length m , dimension ℓ and minimum distance δ has *parameters* $[m, \ell, \delta]$. Note also that each code appearing in Theorem 1.1 is known to be completely regular with covering radius $2s$ (see [3]), and that the result that $\mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)$ is completely transitive is new, to the best of the authors knowledge.

Theorem 1.1. 1. *The Reed-Muller codes $\mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)$, where q is a prime power and $k = (q - 1)d - 2$, are completely transitive and 1-elusive with parameters $[q^d, q^d - d - 1, \delta]$ where $\delta = 4$ when $q = 2$ and $\delta = 3$ otherwise.*

2. *The Preparata codes $\mathcal{P}(2d)$ in $H(2^{2d}, 2)$ (which are non-linear) are 2-elusive with minimum distance $\delta = 6$ and size $2^{2^{2d}-4d}$.*

3. *The punctured code of the even weight subcode of the perfect binary Golay code is 3-elusive with parameters $[22, 11, 7]$.*

For a code C to be s -elusive, there must be an automorphism $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$. It follows that C^x and C are not equal, but are equivalent codes, each with the same s -neighbour set C_s . As such, given knowledge only of the s -neighbour set and minimum distance of an s -elusive code, knowledge of the code itself remains elusive. Whether such codes exist seems to be related to the *minimum distance* δ of the code, namely the smallest distance between two distinct codewords. In [15] it is shown that (i) if C is a 1-elusive code then it has minimum distance $\delta \leq 4$, (ii) that if $\delta = 4$ then $q = 2$, and (iii) an infinite family of binary 1-elusive codes with $\delta = 4$ exists.

Requiring $\delta \geq 2s + 1$ in what follows avoids certain trivial cases and technicalities, making some interesting results possible. In particular, Theorems 5.6 and 5.7 together generalise [15, Theorem 1], showing that the minimum distance of an s -elusive code is at most $2s + 2$, and that any s -elusive code with minimum distance at least $2s + 1$ has a set of q -ary s -($m, 2s, 1$) designs associated to it. Note that the latter fact allowed for the identification of those codes in Parts 2 and 3 of Theorem 1.1. Designs often arise as subsets of codes. For instance, [3, Theorem 2.12] states that the set of all weight k vertices of a completely regular code having minimum distance δ in $H(m, q)$ form a q -ary $\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor$ -(m, k, λ_k) design, for some integer λ_k .

In [17], for each $q \geq 3$, an infinite family of 1-elusive codes with $\delta = 3$ in $H(m, q)$ was constructed. It was observed in that paper that for all known examples the length m of the code is divisible by the alphabet size q . In [17, Question 1.3] it was asked whether this was true in general. This holds in the binary case, by [15, Theorem 1], since this implies that $m(q - 1) = m$ must be even, regardless of δ . The author thanks Andries Brouwer for sending in private correspondence [4] the basis of the beautiful argument contained in Section 3. This argument shows that the answer to the question is ‘yes’, that is, for an s -elusive code to exist in $H(m, q)$ it must be that q divides m . This generalises and simplifies [13, Theorem 1.2] in the unpublished manuscript of the author.

The family $\mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)$ of 1-elusive codes, as in Part 1 of Theorem 1.1, provides answers to further questions raised in [17].

1. In that paper there are only two images of each example code C under $\text{Aut}(C_1)$; [17, Question 1.4] asks if this is always the case.
2. A code C is G -neighbour-transitive if each of the sets C and C_1 are G -orbits for some group G . In [17, Question 1.5] it is asked whether the images under $\text{Aut}(C_1)$ of a 1-elusive code C which is $\text{Aut}(C)$ -neighbour-transitive must be pairwise disjoint.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $C = \mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)$, as in Part 1 of Theorem 1.1. If q is a power of the prime p then:*

1. there are at least p distinct images of C under $\text{Aut}(C_1)$; and,
2. there exists some $x \in \text{Aut}(C_1) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$ such that $\underline{0} \in C \cap C^x$.

It is of note that studying the s -neighbour set of a code, usually when s is equal the covering radius ρ , arises in cryptography. *Bent functions* are functions with “maximal non-linearity”, which turns out to be the same as being a vertex in $H(q^d, q)$ at distance ρ from the first order Reed-Muller code $\mathcal{RM}_q(1, d)$; see [19, Chapter 14, Section 5], or [7, 20] for extensions of this concept.

The next section introduces some notation, Section 3 answers [17, Question 1.3], before Sections 4 and 5 provide the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2 Preliminaries

Let the two sets M and Q have sizes m and q respectively. For any set S with $0 \in S$ write $S^\times = S \setminus \{0\}$. The vertex set of the Hamming graph $\Gamma = H(m, q)$ consists of all m -tuples with entries labelled by the set M and taken from the set Q . An edge exists between two vertices if they differ as m -tuples in exactly one position. For vertices $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ the *Hamming distance* $d(\alpha, \beta)$ (that is the distance in Γ) is the number of entries in which α and β differ.

For any vertex $\alpha \in \Gamma$, the set of r -neighbours of α is $\Gamma_r(\alpha) = \{\beta \in \Gamma \mid d(\alpha, \beta) = r\}$. The set of entries in which $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ differ is $\text{diff}(\alpha, \beta) = \{i \in M \mid \alpha_i \neq \beta_i\}$.

Let C be a code in $H(m, q)$. Then the *minimum distance* of C is $\delta = \min\{d(\alpha, \beta) \mid \alpha, \beta \in C, \alpha \neq \beta\}$. For a vertex α of Γ , define $d(\alpha, C) = \min\{d(\alpha, \beta) \mid \beta \in C\}$. Then the *covering radius* $\rho = \max\{d(\alpha, C) \mid \alpha \in \Gamma\}$. As in Section 1, for any $r \leq \rho$ let $C_r = \{\alpha \in \Gamma \mid d(\alpha, C) = r\}$. Note that if $\delta \geq 2r$, then the set of r -neighbours C_r of the code C satisfies $C_r = \cup_{\alpha \in C} \Gamma_r(\alpha)$ and if $\delta \geq 2r + 1$ this is a disjoint union.

The *repetition code* $\text{Rep}(m, q)$ in $H(m, q)$ is the code consisting of all m -tuples (a, \dots, a) where $a \in Q$. A code C is *linear* if $Q \cong \mathbb{F}_q$ and C is a subspace of the vertex set $V\Gamma \cong \mathbb{F}_q^m$. If C is a linear code then $\text{Aut}(C)$ contains the subgroup T_C consisting of all translations t_α , where $\alpha \in C$, defined by $\beta \mapsto \alpha + \beta$ for all $\beta \in V\Gamma$. We denote the dual of a linear code C under the standard inner product by C^\perp . The code $\text{Rep}(m, 2)$ in $H(m, 2)$ is linear and its dual $\text{Rep}(m, 2)^\perp$ is the code consisting of all vertices of even weight. The *even-weight subcode* of any code C in $H(m, 2)$ is given by $C \cap \text{Rep}(m, 2)^\perp$.

Let S_n denote the symmetric group on $\{1, \dots, n\}$. The automorphism group $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ of the Hamming graph is the semi-direct product $B \rtimes L$, where $B \cong S_q^m$ and $L \cong S_m$ (see [5, Theorem 9.2.1]). Let $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m) \in B$, $\sigma \in L$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \Gamma$. Then g and σ act on $\alpha \in \Gamma$ as follows:

$$\alpha^g = (\alpha_1^{g_1}, \dots, \alpha_m^{g_m}) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^\sigma = (\alpha_{1\sigma^{-1}}, \dots, \alpha_{m\sigma^{-1}}).$$

The automorphism group of a code C in $\Gamma = H(m, q)$ is $\text{Aut}(C) = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_C$, the setwise stabiliser of C in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. The group of *pure permutations* on entries is $\text{PermAut}(C) = \text{Aut}(C) \cap L$. This notation will be used for any subset of vertices, in particular the automorphism group of the set of r -neighbours of C is $\text{Aut}(C_r) = \text{Aut}(\Gamma)_{C_r}$.

Two codes, C and C' , in $H(m, q)$, are *equivalent* if there exists $x \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $C^x = C'$. Equivalence preserves minimum distance. (See [15, Lemma 4]).

3 Alphabet Size Divides Length

The *adjacency matrix* of a graph has rows and columns indexed by the vertices of the graph, with an entry $1 \in \mathbb{R}$ if the corresponding vertices are adjacent and $0 \in \mathbb{R}$ otherwise. Let A be the adjacency matrix of the Hamming graph. A subset of the vertex set of a graph, and hence a code C , can be represented by a *characteristic vector* $\chi(C)$, where the entries are labelled by the vertices of the graph and take the value $1 \in \mathbb{R}$ if the vertex is in C and $0 \in \mathbb{R}$ otherwise. It follows that $A \cdot \chi(C)$ is related to the characteristic vector of C_1 , the entry of $A \cdot \chi(C)$ corresponding to the vertex β takes the value $|I_1(\beta) \cap C|$. In particular, if $\delta \geq 3$ then each element of C_1 is distance 1 from a unique codeword, and hence $A \cdot \chi(C) = \chi(C_1)$. To generalise this, note that the value of A^s in the i -th column and j -th row gives the number of paths of length s between the vertices i and j . Since two vertices at distance s differ in precisely s positions, there are $s!$ paths of length s between them. Also, if $\delta \geq 2s + 1$ then each element of C_s is distance s from a unique codeword. Hence, $A^s \cdot \chi(C) = s! \chi(C_s)$. Note that, in general, $K_s(A) \cdot \chi(C) = \chi(C_s)$, where K_s is a *Krawtchouk polynomial*, but here the condition $\delta \geq 2s + 1$ allows this expression to be simplified.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $s \in \{1, \dots, \rho\}$ and suppose that there exist distinct codes C and C' in $H(m, q)$ such that $C_s = C'_s$, with both C and C' having minimum distance at least $2s + 1$. Then q divides m .*

Proof. (Basis of this argument comes from [4]) Let A be the adjacency matrix of the Hamming graph $H(m, q)$ and let $u = \chi(C)$, $v = \chi(C')$. Since both C and C' have minimum distance at least $2s + 1$, it follows (from the discussion immediately preceding this result) that $A^s u = s! \chi(C_s) = s! \chi(C'_s) = A^s v$. Since $u \neq v$, it follows that A^s , and hence also A , is singular and has at least one zero eigenvalue. The Hamming graph is the Cartesian product of m copies of the complete graph K_q on q vertices. Thus, by [8, Theorem 2.3.4] and the fact that the eigenvalues of K_q are -1 and $q - 1$, the Hamming graph has eigenvalues $(m - i)(q - 1) - i = (q - 1)m - iq$, where $0 \leq i \leq m$. Since A has an eigenvalue zero this implies $(q - 1)m - iq = 0$, for some integer i , and hence $q \mid m$. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let C be an s -elusive code in $H(m, q)$ with $\delta \geq 2s + 1$. Then q divides m .*

Proof. If C is an s -elusive code, then there exists $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$ such that $C^x \neq C$ but $C_s^x = C_s$. Hence, since $\delta \geq 2s + 1$, Lemma 3.1 applies with $C' = C^x$. \square

4 Elusive Reed-Muller Codes

This section concerns Part 1 of Theorem 1.1, that is, we give an infinite family of 1-elusive and completely transitive codes. Each code is the dual of a first order q -ary Reed-Muller code and is contained in the dual of the repetition code of the respective length.

Fix the following notation throughout this section. Let q be a prime power, $Q = \mathbb{F}_q$ and $M = \mathbb{F}_q^d$, so that VI is an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space. For $\alpha \in VI$, consider the following equations:

$$\sum_{v \in M} \alpha_v = 0, \quad \text{and}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\sum_{v \in M} \alpha_v v = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Moreover, fix $k = (q - 1)d - 2$, as well as:

$$C = \mathcal{RM}_q(k, d) \quad \text{and} \quad C' = \mathcal{RM}_q(k + 1, d) = \text{Rep}(q^d, q)^\perp,$$

in $H(q^d, q)$ (where $\text{Rep}(q^d, q)^\perp$ is the dual of the repetition code). The significance of (4.1) and (4.2) is that $\alpha \in C'$ if and only if α satisfies (4.1), and $\alpha \in C$ if and only if α satisfies both equations (4.1) and (4.2) (see [1, Section 5.4]).

The next lemma states some well-known facts about C' , the dual of the repetition code; see, for instance, [19].

Lemma 4.1. *The code C' is linear with dimension $q^d - 1$, minimum distance $\delta' = 2$, covering radius $\rho' = 1$ and $|C'_1| = (q - 1)q^{q^d - 1}$.*

The next result is also well known.

Lemma 4.2. *[1, Corollary 5.5.4 and Theorem 5.4.1] The code C has covering radius $\rho = 2$, dimension $q^d - (d + 1)$, and minimum distance*

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } q = 2, d \geq 2, \\ 3 & \text{if } q \geq 3, d \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.3. *The sets C_1 and C'_1 of neighbours of C and C' satisfy $C_1 = C'_1$.*

Proof. Now, by Lemma 4.2, $|C| = q^{q^d - (d+1)}$. Since $\delta' = 2$ and $C \subset C'$ it follows that $C_1 \subseteq C'_1$. Also, since $\delta \geq 3$, $|C_1| = m(q - 1)|C| = q^d(q - 1)q^{q^d - (d+1)} = q^{q^d} - q^{q^d - 1}$, and thus $C_1 = C'_1$ by Lemma 4.1. \square

Lemma 4.4. *The Reed-Muller code $C = \mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)$ is a 1-elusive code.*

Proof. Now $\text{Aut}(C_1) = \text{Aut}(C')$ because, by Lemma 4.3, $C_1 = C'_1$, and, by Lemma 4.1, $VT = C' \cup C'_1$. Since C' is linear, $\text{Aut}(C_1) (= \text{Aut}(C'))$ contains the translation t_α by the vertex α for each $\alpha \in C'$. If $\alpha \in C' \setminus C$ then t_α does not fix C setwise, so $t_\alpha \notin \text{Aut}(C)$, and hence the image $C^{t_\alpha} \neq C$, so C is 1-elusive. \square

Recall from Section 2 that $\text{PermAut}(C) = \text{Aut}(C) \cap L$ is the group of pure permutations on entries fixing the code C . By [2, Theorem 5], $\text{PermAut}(C) \cong \text{AGL}(d, q)$. Since C' is the dual of the repetition code in $H(m, q)$, it follows that $\text{PermAut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(k+1, d)) \cong S_m$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is below, which provides answers to two open questions regarding elusive codes.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If p is the characteristic of the field \mathbb{F}_q , then any non-trivial translation in $\text{Aut}(C_1)$ has order p . As in the proof of Lemma 4.4 there is a translation in $\text{Aut}(C_1) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$, so there are at least p distinct images of C under elements of $\text{Aut}(C_1)$. This proves part 1. Note also that $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(C')$ for any $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(M)$, where σ acts by permuting entries. However, by [2, Theorem 5], $\sigma \in \text{PermAut}(C)$ if and only if $\sigma \in \text{AGL}(d, q)$. Thus if $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(M) \setminus \text{AGL}(d, q)$, then $C^\sigma \neq C$. However $\underline{0} \in C^\sigma \cap C$, proving part 2. \square

Lemma 4.5. *The Reed-Muller code $C = \mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)$ is $\text{Aut}(C)$ -completely transitive.*

Proof. Since C is linear, $\text{Aut}(C)$ is transitive on C . By Lemma 4.2, C has covering radius 2, so it remains to prove that $\text{Aut}(C)$ acts transitively on C_1 and C_2 . Since $\delta \geq 3$, $\underline{0} \in C$ and $\text{Aut}(C)$ is transitive on C , to prove that $\text{Aut}(C)$ is transitive on C_1 it is sufficient to prove $\text{Aut}(C)_\underline{0}$ is transitive on the set of weight one vertices. Let ν be the weight one vertex with $\nu_i = a \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ for a unique $i \in M$. By [2, Theorem 5], $\text{PermAut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(k, d)) \cong \text{AGL}(d, q)$ acting 2-transitively as pure permutations on entries. Since C is linear $\text{Aut}(C)$ also contains a subgroup isomorphic to the multiplicative group \mathbb{F}_q^\times acting as scalar multiplication. Hence, multiplying by a^{-1} and then applying a permutation of the entries $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(C)$ which maps i to $0 \in M$, will map ν to the weight one vertex μ with $\mu_0 = 1$.

We now prove $\text{Aut}(C)$ is transitive on $\Gamma_2(\underline{0}) \cap C_2$, which will complete the proof. Recall $C' = \mathcal{RM}_q(k+1, d)$. Now $\Gamma_2(\underline{0}) \cap C_2$ consists of the weight two vertices ν with $\nu_i = a \in Q^\times$, $\nu_j = -a$ for distinct $i, j \in M$. To see this, first note that each such vertex ν satisfies the condition in (4.1), but not the conditions in (4.2) and so $\nu \in C \setminus C'$. By Lemma 4.1, C' has minimum distance 2 and, by Lemma 4.3, $C_1 = C'_1$, and thus $\nu \in C_2$. Next, suppose ν' is an arbitrary vertex in $\Gamma_2(\underline{0})$, with $\nu'_i \neq 0, \nu'_j \neq 0$, for some $i \neq j$. If $\nu_i \neq -\nu_j$ then $\nu \in C_1$ since, by (4.2), C contains the weight three vertex $\alpha \in \Gamma_1(\nu)$ with $\alpha_i = \nu'_i$, $\alpha_j = \nu'_j$ and $\alpha_{i+j} = -\nu'_i - \nu'_j$. Hence ν has the form claimed. Finally, we can map $\nu \in \Gamma_2(\underline{0}) \cap C_2$ to the weight two vertex μ , where $\mu_0 = 1$, $\mu_{e_1} = -1$, by multiplying by a^{-1} and then applying a permutation of entries $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(C)$ which maps the pair (u, v) to $(0, e_1)$. \square

Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 complete the proof of Part 1 of Theorem 1.1.

5 s -Elusive Codes

Let C be a code in $H(m, q)$. Recall that C is s -elusive if $\text{Aut}(C_s)$ is strictly larger than $\text{Aut}(C)$. Note that for any $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s)$ the code C^x is equivalent to C , and thus has the same size and minimum distance, and has conjugate automorphism group.

Lemma 5.1. *Let C be an s -elusive code and $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s)$. Then $(C_s)^x = (C^x)_s = C_s$.*

Proof. Note that $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s)$ and thus fixes C_s setwise, so it follows that $(C_s)^x = C_s$. It remains to be shown that $(C^x)_s = C_s$. Let $\nu \in C_s$ be distance s from $\alpha \in C$. Then $d(\nu^x, \alpha^x) = s$. Suppose there exists some $\beta \in C^x$ such that $d(\nu, \beta) < s$. Then $d(\nu^{x^{-1}}, \beta^{x^{-1}}) < s$, however $\beta^{x^{-1}} \in C$, contradicting the fact that x fixes C_s setwise. Hence $\nu \in (C^x)_s$ and thus $(C^x)_s = C_s$, as these sets have the same size. \square

If C is an s -elusive code then there exists an automorphism $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$. This implies that $C^x \neq C$, so that there is some codeword $\alpha \in C$ such that $\alpha^x \notin C$.

Definition 5.2. Let C be an s -elusive code in $H(m, q)$, $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$ and $\alpha \in C$ such that $\alpha^x \notin C$. Then we call the triple (C, α, x) an s -elusive triple.

Lemma 5.3. *Let (C, α, x) be an s -elusive triple in $H(m, q)$ with C having minimum distance $\delta \geq 2s + 1$. Then, for all $\nu \in \Gamma_s(\alpha)$, there exists a unique $\pi \in C_{2s} \cap \Gamma_s(\nu)$ such that $\pi \in C^x$.*

Proof. Since $\delta \geq 2s + 1$, the union $C_s = \cup_{\gamma \in C} \Gamma_s(\gamma)$ is disjoint. Now C^x is equivalent to C and, by Lemma 5.1, $C_s^x = C_s$. Thus each $\nu \in C_s$ is distance s from some vertex π in C^x . That is, if $\nu \in \Gamma_s(\alpha)$ then there exists some vertex $\pi \in \Gamma_s(\nu) \cap C^x$. Now, $d(\alpha, \pi) \leq d(\alpha, \nu) + d(\nu, \pi) = 2s$ and hence $\pi \notin C$ since $\delta \geq 2s + 1$. Moreover, this means $\pi \in C_k$, for some k such that $1 \leq k \leq 2s$.

Suppose $\pi \in C_k$, where $1 \leq k < 2s$. Then there exists $\beta \in C$ such that $\pi \in \Gamma_k(\beta)$, in particular there is a path of length k from β to π . Choose a vertex μ on this path, such that $\mu \in \Gamma_s(\beta)$. Then $\mu \in C_s$, however $d(\pi, \mu) = k - s < s$ contradicting the fact that $C_s^x = C_s$.

Suppose there exists $\pi' \in \Gamma_s(\nu) \cap C^x$ such that $\pi' \neq \pi$. Then π, π' are in the code C^x which is equivalent to C . However $d(\pi, \pi') \leq d(\pi, \nu) + d(\nu, \pi') = 2s$ contradicting $\delta = 2s + 1$. Thus π is unique. \square

The next definition introduces the concept of a q -ary t -design, which helps to describe the structure of an s -elusive code. Designs arise in many other contexts, for instance when considering s -regular codes [9]. First the notion of *covering* a vertex is required.

Definition 5.4. Let $0 \in Q$ and $\nu, \alpha \in H(m, q)$. The vertex ν is said to be *covered* by α , if $\nu_i = \alpha_i$ for every $i \in M$ such that $\nu_i \neq 0$.

In other words α *covers* ν if each non-zero entry of ν agrees with the corresponding entry of α .

Definition 5.5. A q -ary t -(m, k, λ) *design* consists of a subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \Gamma_k(\underline{0})$ of weight k vertices of $H(m, q)$ such that each vertex $\nu \in \Gamma_t(\underline{0})$ is covered by exactly λ vertices of \mathcal{D} . When $q = 2$, \mathcal{D} is simply a t -(m, k, λ) design and if additionally $\lambda = 1$, \mathcal{D} is called an $S(t, k, m)$ Steiner system.

There are many examples where designs arise in coding theory. Theorem 5.6 should be compared, for example, with [3, Theorem 2.12], which states that the set of all weight k vertices of a completely regular code having minimum distance δ in $H(m, q)$ form a q -ary $\lfloor \frac{\delta}{2} \rfloor$ -(m, k, λ_k) design, for some integer λ_k .

Theorem 5.6. Let $(C, \underline{0}, x)$ be an s -elusive triple in $H(m, q)$ with $\delta \geq 2s+1$. Then the set $\Gamma_{2s}(\underline{0}) \cap C^x$ forms a q -ary s -($m, 2s, 1$) design. In particular, if $q = 2$, then $\Gamma_{2s}(\underline{0}) \cap C^x$ forms an $S(s, 2s, m)$ Steiner system.

Proof. By Lemma 5.3, every vertex of $\Gamma_s(\underline{0})$ is covered by a unique element of $\Gamma_{2s}(\underline{0}) \cap C^x$, with respect to $\underline{0}$ and thus the result follows. \square

This gives the following bound for the minimum distance of an s -elusive code.

Theorem 5.7. Let C be an s -elusive code in $H(m, q)$. Then

1. if $q = 2$ then $\delta \leq 2s + 2$, and,
2. if $q \geq 3$ then $\delta \leq 2s + 1$.

Proof. If $\delta \leq 2s$, or $2s + 1 \geq m$, then the result holds trivially. Suppose $\delta \geq 2s + 1$ and $2s + 1 < m$. Now, there exists some $x \in \text{Aut}(C_s)$ and $\alpha \in C$ such that $\alpha^x \notin C$, where we may assume that $\alpha = \underline{0}$. Then, by Theorem 5.6, $\Gamma_{2s}(\underline{0}) \cap C^x$ forms a q -ary s -($m, 2s, 1$) design \mathcal{D} . Hence, for all $\mu \in \Gamma_s(\underline{0})$, there exists some $\beta \in \Gamma_{2s}(\underline{0}) \cap C^x$ such that β covers μ .

Suppose that $q = 2$. Since $2s < m - 1$, it follows that there exists some $i \in M$ such that $\beta_i = 0$. Thus, there exists $\nu \in \Gamma_s(\underline{0})$ with $\nu_i = 1$ and $d(\mu, \nu) = 2$. Note that β does not cover ν . Hence, there exists some block γ of \mathcal{D} covering ν . It then follows from the triangle inequality that

$$d(\beta, \gamma) \leq d(\beta, \mu) + d(\mu, \nu) + d(\nu, \gamma) = 2s + 2.$$

As $\beta, \gamma \in C^x$, and C^x is equivalent to C , this proves part 1.

Let $q \geq 3$. Choose $i \in M$ such that $\mu_i \neq 0$. Since $q \geq 3$, there exists an $a \in Q^\times$ such that $\mu_i \neq a$. Let $\nu \in \Gamma_s(\underline{0})$ with $\nu_i = a$ and $\nu_j = \mu_j$ for $j \neq i$. Then β does not cover ν , so there exists a block γ of \mathcal{D} covering ν . It then follows from the triangle inequality that

$$d(\beta, \gamma) \leq d(\beta, \mu) + d(\mu, \nu) + d(\nu, \gamma) = 2s + 1.$$

Since $\beta, \gamma \in C^x$, and C^x is equivalent to C , this proves part 2. \square

The Preparata codes are a family of binary codes of length 2^{2d} for each integer $d \geq 2$. In addition to satisfying equations (4.1) and (4.2), codewords of the Preparata codes satisfy one extra non-linear equation. For a full definition see [6, (16.12)], taking note that $\bar{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$ is denoted as $\mathcal{P}(2d)$ here, with σ arbitrary.

Proposition 5.8. The Preparata codes $\mathcal{P}(2d)$ are 2-elusive codes.

Proof. Let $C = \mathcal{RM}_2(2d, 2d)$ and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(2d)$. It suffices to prove that the 2-neighbour sets \mathcal{P}_2 and C_2 are equal and that \mathcal{P} is properly contained in C . It then follows that $\text{Aut}(C)$ fixes \mathcal{P}_2 but not \mathcal{P} , since $\text{Aut}(C)$ contains the translations by any codeword. Thus \mathcal{P} is 2-elusive.

First, [6, (16.12) (a) and (b)] gives $\mathcal{P} \subset C$. Since $\delta(C) = 4$ it follows that $\mathcal{P}_2 \subseteq C_2$. Now, by Lemma 4.3, C has covering radius 2 and dimension $2^{2d} - 2d - 1$. Hence $H(2^{2d}, 2) = C \cup C_1 \cup C_2$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} |C_2| &= |H(2^{2d}, 2)| - |C| - |C_1| \\ &= 2^{2^{2d}} - 2^{2^{2d}-2d-1} - 2^{2^{2d}-2d-1} \cdot 2^{2d} \\ &= 2^{2^{2d}-1} - 2^{2^{2d}-2d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by [6, (16.16)], \mathcal{P} has minimum distance 6 so is properly contained in C . This also gives,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{P}_2| &= |\mathcal{P}| \binom{m}{2} (q-1)^2 \\ &= 2^{2^{2d}-4d} 2^{2d-1} (2^{2d} - 1) \\ &= 2^{2^{2d}-1} - 2^{2^{2d}-2d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 5.9. *Let $\underline{0} \in \mathcal{P}(2d)$ and $x \in \text{Aut}(C_2) \setminus \text{Aut}(C)$. Then $\Gamma_4(\underline{0}) \cap \mathcal{P}(2d)^x$ is an $S(2, 4, 2^{2d})$ Steiner system.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 5.6 and Lemma 5.8. □

There exists a 3-(22, 6, 1)-design, namely the Witt design W_{22} . This suggests an elusive code with these parameters may exist. Indeed, taking the even weight subcode of the binary perfect Golay code \mathcal{G}_{23} and puncturing the resulting code produces a 3-elusive code.

Proposition 5.10. *Let \mathcal{PG} and \mathcal{EG} be the codes obtained by puncturing the binary perfect Golay code \mathcal{G}_{23} and the even weight subcode of the Golay code \mathcal{G}_{23} , respectively. Then $\mathcal{PG}_3 = \mathcal{EG}_3$ and \mathcal{EG} is 3-elusive with minimum distance $\delta = 7$.*

Proof. Now \mathcal{G}_{23} is a linear $[23, 12, 7]$ code with covering radius 3, and $\text{PermAut}(\mathcal{G}_{23})^M \cong M_{23}$ is transitive on M . Thus, puncturing \mathcal{G}_{23} results in the linear $[22, 12, 6]$ code \mathcal{PG} with covering radius $\rho = 3$. The even weight subcode of \mathcal{G}_{23} is a linear $[23, 11, 8]$ code, again with M_{23} acting as pure permutations on entries, so puncturing results in the $[22, 11, 7]$ code \mathcal{EG} .

Since \mathcal{PG} has covering radius 3 and minimum distance 6 it follows that $V\Gamma = \mathcal{PG} \cup \mathcal{PG}_1 \cup \mathcal{PG}_2 \cup \mathcal{PG}_3$, where this union is disjoint. So,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{PG}_3| &= |V\Gamma| - |\mathcal{PG}| - |\mathcal{PG}_1| - |\mathcal{PG}_2| \\ &= 2^{22} - 2^{12} - 2^{12} \cdot 22 - 2^{12} \cdot \frac{22 \cdot 21}{2} \\ &= 2^{12} (2^{10} - 1 - 22 - 11 \cdot 21) \\ &= 2^{13} \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11. \end{aligned}$$

Now, \mathcal{EG} has minimum distance 7, so $|\mathcal{EG}_3| = 2^{11} \cdot 22 \cdot 21 \cdot 20/6 = 2^{13} \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 = |\mathcal{PG}_3|$. Since \mathcal{PG} is linear, any translation by a vertex in $\mathcal{PG} \setminus \mathcal{EG}$ fixes $\mathcal{PG}_3 = \mathcal{EG}_3$. However this automorphism is not an element of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{EG})$. □

References

- [1] E. F. Assmus and J. D. Key. *Designs and their Codes*, volume 103 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [2] T. Berger and P. Charpin. The automorphism group of generalized Reed-Muller codes. *Discrete mathematics*, 117(1):1–17, 1993.
- [3] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev. On completely regular codes. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 55(1):1–45, 2019.
- [4] A. E. Brouwer. Private communication. Recieved: 10-04-2014.
- [5] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier. *Distance-Regular Graphs*, volume 18 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [6] P. J. Cameron and J. H. van Lint. *Designs, Graphs, Codes and Their Links*. London Mathematical Society Student Texts. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [7] C. Carlet and P. Gaborit. Hyper-bent functions and cyclic codes. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 113(3):466–482, 2006.
- [8] D. Cvetkovic, P. Rowlinson, and S. Simic. *Eigenspaces of Graphs*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [9] P. Delsarte. *An Algebraic Approach to the Association Schemes of Coding Theory*. Philips research reports: Supplements. N. V. Philips’ Gloeilampenfabrieken, 1973.
- [10] N. I. Gillespie. *Neighbour transitivity on codes in Hamming graphs*. PhD thesis, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia, 2011.
- [11] N. I. Gillespie, M. Giudici, D. R. Hawtin, and C. E. Praeger. Entry-faithful 2-neighbour transitive codes. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 79(3):549–564, 2016.
- [12] N. I. Gillespie and D. R. Hawtin. Alphabet-almost-simple 2-neighbour-transitive codes. *Ars Mathematica Contemporanea*, 14(2):345–357, 2017.
- [13] N. I. Gillespie, D. R. Hawtin, and C. E. Praeger. The structure of elusive codes in Hamming graphs. *Preprint*, (arXiv:1404.0950v1), 2014.
- [14] N. I. Gillespie, D. R. Hawtin, and C. E. Praeger. 2-Neighbour-transitive codes with small blocks of imprimitivity. *Preprint*, (arXiv:1806.10514), June 2018.
- [15] N. I. Gillespie and C. E. Praeger. Neighbour transitivity on codes in Hamming graphs. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 67(3):385–393, 2013.
- [16] M. Giudici and C. E. Praeger. Completely transitive codes in Hamming graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 20(7):647–662, 1999.
- [17] D. R. Hawtin, N. I. Gillespie, and C. E. Praeger. Elusive codes in Hamming graphs. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 88:286–296, 2013.
- [18] D. R. Hawtin and C. E. Praeger. Minimal binary 2-neighbour-transitive codes. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 171, 2020.

- [19] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane. *The Theory of Error Correcting Codes*. North-Holland Mathematical Library. North-Holland, 1978.
- [20] N. Tokareva. *Bent Functions: Results and Applications to Cryptography*. Elsevier Science, 2015.