AUTOMORPHISM GROUPS OF DESIGNS WITH $\lambda = 1$

WILLIAM M. KANTOR

Abstract. If $G$ is a finite group and $k = q > 2$ or $k = q + 1$ for a prime power $q$ then, for infinitely many integers $v$, there is a $2-(v, k, 1)$-design $D$ for which $\text{Aut} D \cong G$.

1. Introduction

Starting with Frucht's theorem on graphs [Fr], there have been many papers proving that any finite group is isomorphic to the full automorphism group of some specific type of combinatorial object. Babai surveyed this topic [Ba1], and in [Ba1, p. 8] stated that in [Ba2] he had proved that $2$-designs with $\lambda = 1$ are such objects when $k = q > 2$ or $k = q + 1$ for a prime power $q$. (The case of Steiner triple systems was handled in [Me].) The purpose of this note is to provide a proof of Babai's result.

Theorem 1.1. Let $G$ be a finite group and $q$ a prime power.

(i) There are infinitely many integers $v$ such that there is a $2-(v, q+1, 1)$-design $D$ for which $\text{Aut} D \cong G$.

(ii) If $q > 2$ then there are infinitely many integers $v$ such that there is a $2-(v, q, 1)$-design $D$ for which $\text{Aut} D \cong G$.

Parts of our proof mimic [DK, Sec. 5] and [Ka, Sec. 4], but the present situation is much simpler. We modify a small number of subspaces of a projective or affine space in such a way that the projective or affine space can be recovered from the resulting design by elementary geometric arguments. Further geometric arguments determine the automorphism group.

Section 7 contains further properties of the design $D$ in the theorem, some of which are needed in future research [DoK].

Notation: We use standard permutation group notation, such as $x^\pi$ for the image of a point $x$ under a permutation $\pi$ and $g^h = h^{-1}gh$ for conjugation. The group of automorphisms of a projective space $Y = \text{PG}(V)$ defined by a vector space $V$ is denoted by $\text{PGL}(V) = \text{PGL}(Y)$; this is induced by the group $\Gamma L(V)$ of invertible semilinear transformations on $V$. Also $\Delta \Gamma L(V)$ denotes the group of automorphisms of the affine space $\text{AG}(V)$ defined by $V$.

2. A simple projective construction

Let $G$ be a finite group. For suitable $n$ let $\Gamma$ be a simple, undirected, connected graph on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $\text{Aut} \Gamma \cong G$ and $G$ acts semiregularly on the vertices (as in [Fr]). All sufficiently large $n$ satisfy these conditions; we always assume that $n \geq 6$.

1'This theorem was proved before I knew of Babai's result.
Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q \subset F = \mathbb{F}_{q^s}$, and let $\theta$ generate $F^*$. Let $V_F$ be an $n$-dimensional vector space over $F$, with basis $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. View $G$ as acting on $V_F$, permuting $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ as it does $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. View $V_F$ as a vector space $V$ over $K$. If $Y$ is a set of points of $P = PG(V)$ then $\langle Y \rangle$ denotes the smallest subspace of $P$ containing $Y$.

We will modify the point-line design $PG_1(V)$ of $P$, using nonisomorphic designs $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ whose parameters are those of $PG_1(K^4) = PG_1(3, q)$ but are not isomorphic to that design, chosen so that Aut $\Delta_1$ fixes a point (Proposition 3.4).

Our design $D$ has the set $\mathfrak{Q}$ of points of $P$ as its set of points. Most blocks of $D$ are lines of $P$, with the following exceptions involving some of the subspaces $Fv$, $0 \neq v \in V$, viewed as subsets of $\mathfrak{Q}$. For orbit representatives $i$ and $ij$ of $G$ on the vertices and edges of $\Gamma$,

(I) replace the set of lines of $PG_1(Fv_i)$ by a copy of the set of blocks of $\Delta_1$, subject only to the condition

(#) there are distinct blocks, neither of which is a line of $P$, whose span in $P$ is $PG_1(Fv_i)$, and then apply all $g \in G$ to these sets of blocks in order to obtain the blocks in $PG_1(Fv_i)^g$, $g \in G$; and

(II) replace the set of lines of $PG_1(Fv_i + \theta v_j)$ by a copy of the set of blocks of $\Delta_2$, subject only to (#), and then apply all $g \in G$ to these sets of blocks in order to obtain the blocks in $PG_1(Fv_i + \theta v_j)^g$, $g \in G$.

We need to check that these requirements can be met.

(i) **Satisfying (#):** Let $\Delta_s$ be an isomorphic copy of $\Delta_s$, $s = 1$ or 2, whose set of points is that of $PG_1(Fv) = PG_1(Fv_i)$ or $PG_1(F(v_i + \theta v_j))$. Let $B_1$ and $B_2$ be any distinct blocks of $\Delta_s$. Choose any permutation $\pi$ of the points of $PG_1(Fv)$ such that the sets $B_1^\pi$ and $B_2^\pi$ are not lines of $PG_1(Fv)$ and together span $PG_1(Fv)$. Using $\Delta_s^\pi$ in place of $\Delta_s$ satisfies (#). (If $q + 1 \geq 4$ then $B_2$ is not needed.)

(ii) **These replacements are well-defined:** For (II), if $F(v_i + \theta v_j)^g \cap F(v_i + \theta v_j)^{g'} \neq 0$ for some $g, g' \in G$, then $v_i + \theta v_j, v_i^g + \theta v_j^g \in F(v_i + \theta v_j)^g$. Then either $v_i^{g''} = v_i^g$ and $v_j^{g''} = v_j^g$, or $v_i^{g''} = \alpha v_i v_j$ and $v_j^{g''} = \alpha v_i v_j$ for some $\alpha \in F^*$; but in the latter case we obtain $1 = \alpha \theta$ and $\theta = \alpha$, whereas $\theta$ generates $F^*$. Thus, $v_i^{g''} = v_i^g$, so the semiregularity of $G$ on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ implies that $g' = g$, as required.

It is trivial to see that $D$ is a design having the same parameters as $PG_1(V)$.

Clearly $G$ acts on the collection of subsets of $\mathfrak{Q}$ occurring in (I) or (II): we can view $G$ as a subgroup of both Aut $D$ and PGL($V$).

We emphasize that the sets in (I) and (II) occupy a tiny portion of the underlying projective space: most sets $Fv$ are unchanged. More precisely, in view of the definition of $D$:

\begin{align}
\text{(2.1) } & \text{Every block of } D \text{ not contained in a set (I) or (II) is a line of } P, \\
\text{Every line of } P \text{ not contained in set (I) or (II) is a block of } D.
\end{align}

Nevertheless, we will distinguish between the lines of $P$ and the blocks of $D$, even when the blocks happen to be lines. A subspace of $D$ is a set of points that contains the block joining any pair of its points. (Examples: (I) and (II) involve subspaces of $D$.) A hyperplane of $D$ is a subspace of $D$ that meets every block but does not contain every point. We need further notation:

\begin{align}
\text{(2.2) } & \text{Distinct } y, z \in \mathfrak{Q} \text{ determine a block } yz \text{ of } D \text{ and a line } \langle y, z \rangle \text{ of } P.
\end{align}
(2.3) For distinct $y, z \in \mathcal{P}$ and $x \in \mathcal{P} - yz$, 
$$\langle x | y, z \rangle = \bigcup \{ xp \mid p \in y', y' \in x - \{ x \}, y' \in xz - \{ x \}, \{ y, z \} \neq \{ y', z' \} \}.$$ 

Here (2.3) depends only on $D$ not on $P$, which will allow us to recover $P$ from $D$.

**Lemma 2.4.** If $y, z \in \mathcal{P}$ are distinct, then there are more than $1/2|\mathcal{P}|$ points $x \in \mathcal{P} - yz$ such that

1. $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ is a plane of $P$ every line of which, except possibly $\langle y, z \rangle$, is a block of $D$.
2. $\langle y, z \rangle$ is a plane of $P$.
3. $\langle y, z \rangle$ is contained in a set $\langle y, z \rangle$.
4. $\langle y, z \rangle$ is contained in a set $\langle y, z \rangle$.

**Proof.** Let

(2.5) $x \notin yz \cup \{ (y, z, Fv) \mid Fv \in \text{(I) or (II)} \}.$

There are more than $|q^{4n} - 1)/(q - 1) - n^2(q^6 - 1)/(q - 1) - (q + 1) > 1/2|\mathcal{P}|$ such points $x$. Clearly $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ is a plane of $P$.

(1) Let $L \neq \langle y, z \rangle$ be a line of $\langle x, y, z \rangle$, so $\langle x, y, z \rangle = \langle y, z, L \rangle$. If $L$ is not a block of $D$ then, by (2.1), $L$ is contained in some set $Fv$ in (I) or (II), so $x \in \langle y, z, L \rangle \subseteq \langle y, z, Fv \rangle$ contradicts (2.5).

(2) By (1), $\langle x, y \rangle$ and $\langle x, z \rangle$ are blocks of $D$. Let $\langle y', z' \rangle$ be as in (2.3). Then $\langle y', z' \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle$ and $\langle y', z' \rangle \neq \langle y, z \rangle$. By (1), $\langle y', z' \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle$ and $xp = \langle x, p \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle$ for each point $p$ of $\langle y', z' \rangle$. Then $\langle x | y, z \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle$. Each point of $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ lies in such a line $(x, p)$; since that line is a block by (1), $\langle x, y, z \rangle \subseteq \langle x | y, z \rangle$.

(3) If $yz \neq \langle y, z \rangle$, then, by (2.1), $yz$ lies in some set $Fv$ in (I) or (II). By hypothesis and (2), $yz \subseteq \langle x | y, z \rangle \cap Fv = \langle x, y, z \rangle \cap Fv = \langle y, z \rangle$. Thus, $yz = \langle y, z \rangle$.

(4) We have $yz \neq \langle y, z \rangle$ since $\langle y, z \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle = \langle x | y, z \rangle$ by (2). By (2.1), since $\langle y, z \rangle$ is not a block it is contained in some set $Fv$ in (I) or (II).

For any $\langle y_1, z_1 \rangle$ in (4) we have $\langle y_1, z_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle x | y, z \rangle = \langle x, y, z \rangle$ by (2), and $y_1z_1 \not\subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle$, so $\langle y_1, z_1 \rangle$ is not a block of $D$ and hence $\langle y_1, z_1 \rangle = \langle y, z \rangle$ by (1).

On the other hand, consider an arbitrary pair $\langle y_1, z_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle y, z \rangle \subseteq Fv$. Then $y_1z_1 \subseteq Fv$ by the definition of $D$. Since $\langle y, z \rangle$ is not a block, $y_1z_1 \not\subseteq \langle y, z \rangle = \langle x | y, z \rangle \cap Fv$ by (2), so $y_1z_1 \not\subseteq \langle x | y, z \rangle$. Thus, $\langle y, z \rangle$ is the union of the pairs $\langle y_1, z_1 \rangle$ in (4).

**Proof of Theorem 1(i).** We first recover the lines of $P$ from $D$. For distinct $y, z \in \mathcal{P}$, use each $x \notin yz$ in Lemma 2.4(3) or (4) in order to obtain, more than $1/2|\mathcal{P}|$ times, the same set of points that must be $\langle y, z \rangle$.

We have now reconstructed all lines of $P$ as subsets of $\mathcal{P}$. Then we have also recovered $P$, $V$, $\Gamma L(V)$ and $\Pi L(V)$, so that $\text{Aut}D$ is induced by a subgroup of $\text{Aut}P = \Pi L(V)$.

Any block of $D$ that is not a line of $P$ spans a 2-space or 3-space of $P$ occurring in some 3-space $\Pi L(1)(Fv)$ in (I) or (II), and spans at least a 4-space of $P$ together with any block in any $\Pi L(1)(Fv') \neq \Pi L(1)(Fv)$. Any two blocks of $D$ that are not lines of $P$ and lie in the same set in (I) or (II) span at most a 3-space of $P$; by (#) each set in (I) or (II) is spanned by two such blocks.

This recovers all subsets (I) and (II) of $\mathcal{P}$ from $D$ and $P$. Moreover, the fact that $\Delta_1 \neq \Delta_2$ specifies which of these subspaces of $D$ have type (I) or (II)).
We next determine the $F$-structure of $V$ using $D$. We claim that the subgroup of $\text{PGL}(V)$ fixing each set in (I) or (II) arises from scalar multiplications by members of $F^*$. Clearly such scalar multiplications behave this way. Let $h \in \text{PGL}(V)$ behave as stated. Let $\hat{h} \in \text{GL}(V)$ induce $h$. Then $\hat{h} : x v_i \mapsto (x A_i) v_i$ for all $x \in F$ and a $4 \times 4$ invertible matrix $A_i$ over $K$. If $ij$ is an edge of $\Gamma$ and $x \in F$, then $(x(v_i + \theta v_j))^h = (x A_i) v_i + ((x \theta) A_j) v_j$ is in $F(v_i + \theta v_j)$, so $(x A_i) \theta = (x \theta) A_j$. Since $ij = ji$, also $(x A_j) \theta = (x \theta) A_i$, so $(x \theta) A_i = ((x \theta) A_j) \theta = (x A_i) \theta$, and $A_i$ commutes with multiplication by $\theta^2$. By Schur’s Lemma, $x A_i = x a_i$ for all $x \in F$ and some $a_i \in F^*$. Then $x a_i \theta = x a_j$, so $a_i = a_j$. Since $\Gamma$ is connected, all $a_i$ are equal, proving our claim.

In particular, the field $F$ and the $F$-space $V_F$ can be reconstructed from $D$. Since $\text{Aut}D$ normalizes $F^*$ by the preceding paragraph, $\text{Aut}D \leq \text{PGL}(V_F)$. We know that $G$ is inside both $\text{Aut}D$ and $\text{PGL}(V)$. Since the sets in (II) correspond to (ordered) edges of $\Gamma$, $\text{Aut}D$ induces $\text{Aut} \Gamma \cong G$ on the collection of sets in (I).

Let $h \in \text{Aut}D \leq \text{PGL}(V_F)$. Multiply $h$ by an element of $G$ in order to have $h$ fix all $F v_i$. Let $h \in \Gamma \text{L}(V_F)$ induce $h$, with associated field automorphism $\sigma \in \text{Aut}F$. For each $i$ we have $v_i^h = a_i v_i$ for some $a_i \in F^*$. Let $ij$ be an edge of $\Gamma$ and write $b = a_j/a_i$. As above, $F(v_i + \theta v_j)^h = F(a_i v_i + \theta^\sigma a_j v_j) = F(v_i + \theta^\sigma b v_j)$ and $F(\theta v_i + v_j)^h = F(\theta a_i v_i + a_j v_j) = F(v_i + \theta^{-\sigma} b v_j)$ both have type (II), so $\theta^\sigma b = \theta^{\pm 1}$ and $\theta^{-\sigma} b = \theta^{\mp 1}$. Then $b^2 = 1$, $\theta^\sigma = \pm \theta^{\pm 1}$, and hence $\sigma = 1$ and $b = 1$ since $\theta$ generates $F^*$. The connectedness of $\Gamma$ implies that all $a_i$ are equal: $\hat{h}$ is scalar multiplication by $a_1$.

Since $h$ fixes $F v_1$, it induces an automorphism of the subspace of $D$ determined by $F v_1$. By (I) and our condition on $\Delta_1$, $h$ fixes a point $K c v_1$ of $F v_1$. Then $K c v_1 = (K c v_1)^h = K c a_1 v_1$, so $a_1 \in K$. Thus, $h = 1$ on $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\text{Aut}D \cong G$. 

3. A SIMPLER PROJECTIVE CONSTRUCTION

We need a fairly weak result (Proposition 3.4) concerning designs with the parameters of $\text{PG}_1(3, q)$. We know of two published constructions for designs having those parameters, due to Skolem [Wi, p. 268] and Lorimer [Lo]. However, isomorphism questions seem difficult using their descriptions. Instead, we will use a method that imitates [Sh, Ka] (but which was hinted at by Skolem’s idea).

Consider a hyperplane $X$ of $P = \text{PG}(d, q)$, $d \geq 3$; we identify $P$ with $\text{PG}_1(d, q)$. Let $\pi$ be any permutation of the points of $X$. Define a geometry $D_\pi$ as follows:

- the set $\mathfrak{P}$ of points is the set of points of $P$, and
- blocks are of two sorts:
  - the lines of $P$ not in $X$, and
  - the sets $L^\pi$ for lines $L \subset X$.

Once again it is trivial to see that $D_\pi$ is a design having the same parameters as $P$. Note that $\pi$ has nothing to do with the incidences between points and the blocks not in $X$.

We have a hyperplane $X$ of $D_\pi$ such that the blocks of $D_\pi$ not in $X$ are lines of a projective space $P$ for which $\mathfrak{P}$ is the set of points. We claim that the lines of this projective space can be recovered from $D_\pi$ and $X$. Namely, we have all points and lines of $P$ not in $X$. For distinct $y, z \in X$ and $x \notin X$, the set $\{x \mid y, z\}$ in $D_\pi$ consists of the points of the plane $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ of $P$, and $\langle x \mid y, z \rangle \cap X$ is the line $\langle y, z \rangle$.
We have now obtained all lines of the original projective space $P$, as claimed. It follows that $\text{Aut}D_2 \leq \text{Aut}P$.

The symbol $X$ is ambiguous: it will now mean either a set of points or a hyperplane of the underlying projective space (as in the next result). It will not refer to $X$ together with a different set of lines produced by a permutation $\pi$.

**Proposition 3.1.** The designs $D_2$ and $D_{\pi'}$, are isomorphic by an isomorphism sending $X$ to itself if and only if $\pi$ and $\pi'$ are in the same $\text{PGL}(X), \text{PGL}(X)$ double coset of $\text{Sym}(X)$.

Moreover, the pointwise stabilizer of $X$ in $\text{Aut}D_{\pi}$ is transitive on the points outside of $X$, and the stabilizer $(\text{Aut}D_{\pi})_X$ of $X$ induces $\text{PGL}(X) \cap \text{PGL}(X)^\pi$ on $X$.

**Proof.** Let $g : D_{\pi} \to D_{\pi'}$ be such an isomorphism. We just saw that $P$ is naturally reconstructible from either design. It follows that $g$ is a collineation of $P$; its restriction $\bar{g}$ to $X$ is in $\text{PGL}(X)$.

If $L \subset X$ is a line of $P$ then $g$ sends the block $L^\pi \subset X$ of $D_\pi$ to a block $L^\pi g \subset X$ of $D_{\pi'}$. Then $L^\pi g^\pi \pi^{-1}$ is a line of $P$, so that $\pi g^\pi \pi^{-1}$ is a permutation of the points of the hyperplane $X$ of $P$ sending lines to lines, and hence is an element $h \in \text{PGL}(X)$. Thus, $\pi$ and $\pi'$ are in the same $\text{PGL}(X), \text{PGL}(X)$ double coset.

Conversely, if $\pi$ and $\pi'$ are in the same $\text{PGL}(X), \text{PGL}(X)$ double coset let $\bar{g}, h \in \text{PGL}(X)$ with $\pi g^\pi \pi^{-1} = h$. Extend $\bar{g}$ to $g \in \text{Aut}P$ in any way. We claim that $g$ is an isomorphism $D_\pi \to D_{\pi'}$. It preserves incidences between blocks not in $X$ and points of $P$ since $g \in \text{Aut}P$ and those incidences have nothing to do with $\pi$ and $\pi'$. Consider an incidence $x \in B \subset X$ for a block $B$ of $D_\pi$. Then $B = L^\pi$ for a line $L \subset X$. Since $g \in \text{Aut}P$, $x^g \in B^g = B^g = L^\pi g = (L^h)^{\pi'}$, which is a block of $D_{\pi'}$, as required.

For the final assertion, the pointwise stabilizer of $X$ in $\text{Aut}P$ is in $\text{Aut}D_{\pi}$ by the definition of $D_\pi$. We have seen that the group induced on $X$ by $\text{Aut}D_{\pi}$ corresponds to the pairs $(\bar{g}, h) \in \text{PGL}(X) \times \text{PGL}(X)$ satisfying $\pi g^\pi \pi^{-1} = h$.\n
Note that there are many extensions $g$ of $\bar{g}$ since the designs $D_\pi$ have many automorphisms inducing the identity on $X$. Double cosets arise naturally in this type of result; compare [Kl, Theorem 4.4].

Let $v_i = (q^i - 1)/(q - 1)$.

**Corollary 3.2.** There are at least $v_d!/v_{d+1}|\text{PGL}(d,q)|^2$ pairwise nonisomorphic designs having the same parameters as $P$.

**Proof.** Fix $\pi$ in the proposition. There are at most $v_{d+1}$ hyperplanes $Y$ of $D_\pi$ (as in [IT, Theorem 2.2]). By the proposition there are then at most $|\text{PGL}(X)|^2$ choices for $\pi'$ such that $D_\pi \cong D_{\pi'}$ by an isomorphism sending $Y$ to $X$. Since there are $v_d!$ choices for $\pi$ we obtain the stated lower bound.\n
**Remark 3.3.** We describe a useful trick. A transposition $\sigma$ and a 3-cycle $\tau$ are in different $\text{PGL}(d,q), \text{PGL}(d,q)$ double cosets in $\text{Sym}(N)$, $N = (q^d - 1)/(q - 1)$, if $d \geq 3$ and we exclude the case $d = 3, q = 2$. For, if $\sigma g = h \tau$ with $g, h \in \text{PGL}(d, q)$ then $g^{-1} h = g^{-1} \sigma g \tau^{-1} = \sigma \tau^{-1} \in \text{PGL}(d, q)$ fixes at least $N - 5$ points, and hence is 1 by our restriction on $d$, whereas $\sigma \neq \tau$.

**Proposition 3.4.** For any $q$ there are two designs having the parameters of $P = \text{PG}_2(3, q)$ and not isomorphic to one another or to $P$, for one of which the automorphism group fixes a point.
Proof. If $q = 2$ then there are even such designs with trivial automorphism group \([CCW]\). (Undoubtedly such designs exist for all $q$.)

Assume that $q > 2$. The preceding corollary and remark provide us with two nonisomorphic designs. It remains to deal with the final assertion constructively.

Let $\pi$ be a transposition $(x_1, x_2)$ of $X$. We will show that $D_\pi$ behaves as stated.

First note that each $g \in AutD_\pi \leq AutP$ fixes $X$. For, suppose that $Y = X^g \neq X$ for some $g$. The blocks in $Y$ not in $X$ are lines of $P$. Then the same is true of the blocks in $Y^{g^{-1}} = X$ not in $X^{g^{-1}}$. This contradicts the fact that $\pi$ sends all lines $\neq \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ of $P$ inside $X$ and on to sets that are not lines of $P$.

By Proposition 3.1, $AutD_\pi = (AutD_\pi)_X$ induces $PGL(X) \cap PGL(X)^\pi$ on $X$. Let $\pi \bar{\gamma} \pi^{-1} = h$ for $\bar{\gamma}, h \in PGL(X)$. Then $\bar{\gamma}^{-1}h = \pi \bar{\gamma} \pi^{-1}$ is a collineation of $X$ that moves at most 2-2 points of $X$ and hence fixes at least $(q^2 + q + 1) - 2\cdot 2 > q + \sqrt{q} + 1$ points. By elementary (semi)linear algebra, the only such collineation is 1, so that $\bar{\gamma} = h$ commutes with $\pi$ and hence fixes the line $(x_1, x_2)$. Then $\bar{\gamma}$ also fixes a point of $X$ and hence of $D_\pi$.

Remark 3.5. By excluding the possibilities $q \leq 8$ and $q$ prime in the previous section we could have used nondesarguesian projective planes (and $|F: K| = 3$).

4. A SIMPLE AFFINE CONSTRUCTION

We now consider Theorem 1.1(ii). The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1.1(i). That result handles the cases $q = 3, 4$ or 5, but we ignore this and only assume that $q > 2$.

Let $G$ and $\Gamma$ be as in Section 2. This time we use $K = F_q \subset F = F_q^2$; once again $\theta$ generates $F^*$. Let $V_F$ be an $n$-dimensional vector space over $F$, with basis $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. View $V_F$ as a vector space $V$ over $K$. If $Y$ is a set of points of $A$ then $\langle Y \rangle$ denotes the smallest affine subspace containing $Y$.

We will modify the point-line design $AG_1(V)$ of $A = AG(V)$, using nonisomorphic designs $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$ whose parameters are those of $AG_1(3, q)$ but are not isomorphic to that design, chosen so that $Aut\Delta_1$ fixes at least two points (Proposition 5.2).

Our design $D$ has $V$ as its set of points. Most blocks of $D$ are lines of $A$, with exceptions involving the sets $Fv, 0 \neq v \in V$, in Section 2(I, II), where now $Fv$ is viewed as a 3-dimensional affine space.

As before, the set of lines of $AG_1(Fv_i)$ or $AG_1(F(v_i + \theta v_j))$ is replaced by a copy of the set of blocks of $\Delta_1$ or $\Delta_2$. This time, for each of these we require

(\#') there are distinct blocks, each of which spans a plane of $A$, such that the intersection of those planes is a line.

Clearly, these two blocks span a 3-space. (When $q > 3$ it would be marginally easier to require that there is a single block that spans a 3-space.) Condition (\#') can be satisfied exactly as in Satisfying (\#) in Section 2. Since different sets $Fv$ meet only in a single point, the modifications made inside them are unrelated. Once again it is easy to check that this produces a design $D$ with the desired parameters for which $G \leq AutD$.

As in Section 2 most sets $Fv$ are unchanged. In view of the definition of $D$, the analogue of (2.1) holds. We use the natural analogues of definitions (2.2) and (2.3), using $A$ in place of $P$ and $V$ in place of $\mathfrak{V}$.

Lemma 4.1. If $y, z \in V$ are distinct, then there are more than $\frac{1}{2}|V|$ points $x \in V - yz$ such that
(1) every line of the plane \(\langle x, y, z \rangle\) of \(A\), except possibly \(\langle y, z \rangle\), is a block of \(D\),
(2) \(\langle x, y, z \rangle = \langle x, y, z \rangle\),
(3) if \(yz \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\) then \(\langle y, z \rangle = yz\), and
(4) if \(yz \not\subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\) then \(\langle y, z \rangle\) is the union of the pairs \(\{y_1, z_1\} \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\) such that \(y_1z_1 \not\subseteq \langle x, y \rangle\).

Proof. Using \(x\) in (2.3), this is proved exactly as in Lemma 2.4 except for (2), where we need to consider parallel lines using blocks that are lines by (1). Clearly \(\langle x, y, z \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\); we must show that \(\langle x, y, z \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\). In (2.3), for \(p\) in the line \(y'z' = \langle y', z' \rangle\) of \(\langle x, y, z \rangle\) parallel to \(\langle y, z \rangle\), the blocks \(xp \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\) cover all points of the plane \(\langle x, y, z \rangle\) except for those in the line \(L\) on \(x\) parallel to \(\langle y, z \rangle\). If \(y' \in xy - \{x, y\}\) and \(p' = y'z \cap L\), then \(L = xp' \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\), so \(\langle x, y, z \rangle \subseteq \langle x, y, z \rangle\). 

Proof of Theorem 1.1(ii). First recover all lines of \(A\) from \(D\) exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.1(i). This also produces both the \(K\)-space \(V\) and \(\Gamma L(V)\) from \(D\).

We recover all subsets (I) and (II) essentially as before. Consider a pair \(B, B'\) of blocks of \(D\) behaving as in (\#'): \(\langle B \rangle\) and \(\langle B' \rangle\) are planes and \(\langle B \rangle \cap \langle B' \rangle\) is a line. Since distinct subsets in (I) or (II) do not have a common line, each such pair \(B, B'\) spans a subset in (I) or (II). Thus, by (\#') we have obtained each subset in (I) or (II) from \(D\) and \(A\) using some pair \(B, B'\). Once again, the fact that \(\Delta_1 \not\cong \Delta_2\) specifies which of these subspaces of \(D\) have type (I) or (II)).

The subsets (I) all contain 0, and \(\text{Aut} D\) fixes their intersection, so \(\text{Aut} D\) is induced by a subgroup of \(\Gamma L(V)_0 = \Gamma L(V)\).

Recover the field \(F\) exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.1(i). Once again, \(\text{Aut} D\) is a subgroup of \(\Gamma L(V_F)\) that induces \(\text{Aut} \hat{V} \cong G\) on the collection of sets in (I).

By repeating the argument at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.1(i) we reduce to the case of \(h \in \text{Aut} D\) fixing all sets in (I) and acting on \(V\) as \(v \mapsto av\) for some \(a \in F^\times\). We chose \(\Delta_1\) so that \(\text{Aut} \Delta_1\) fixes at least two of its points. It follows that \(a = 1\), so that \(h = 1\) and \(\text{Aut} D \cong G\).

5. A SIMPLER AFFINE CONSTRUCTION

Consider a plane \(X\) of \(A = \text{AG}(3, q) = \text{AG}(V)\), \(q > 2\); we identify \(A\) with \(\text{AG}(3, q)\). Let \(\pi\) be any permutation of the points of \(X\). Define a geometry \(D_\pi\) as follows:

- the set \(V\) of points is the set of points of \(A\), and
- blocks are of two sorts:
  - the lines of \(A\) not in \(X\), and
  - the sets \(L^\pi\) for lines \(L \subseteq X\).

Once again it is trivial to see that \(D_\pi\) is a design having the same parameters as \(A\).

As in Section 3, the blocks of \(D_\pi\) not in \(X\) are lines of an affine space \(A\) for which \(V\) is the set of points. As in Sections 3 and 4, the lines of this affine space can be recovered from \(D_\pi\) using the analogue of (2.3).

**Proposition 5.1.** The designs \(D_\pi\) and \(D_{\pi'}\) are isomorphic by an isomorphism sending \(X\) to itself if and only if \(\pi\) and \(\pi'\) are in the same \(\Gamma L(X)\) double coset in \(\text{Sym}(X)\). This produces at least \(q^2!/(q^2 + q + 1)|\text{AG}(2, q)|^2\) pairwise nonisomorphic designs having the same parameters as \(\text{AG}(3, q)\).

Moreover, the pointwise stabilizer of \(X\) in \(\text{Aut} D_\pi\) is transitive on the points outside of \(X\), and \((\text{Aut} D_\pi)_X\) induces \(\Gamma L(X) \cap \Gamma L(X)^\pi\) on \(X\).
Proof. This is the same as for Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.2. □

Proposition 5.2. For any $q \geq 3$ there are at least two designs having the parameters of $A = AG_1(3,q)$, not isomorphic to one another or to $A$, such that the automorphism group of one of them fixes at least two points.

Proof. The bound in the preceding proposition provides us with many nonisomorphic designs. We need to deal with the requirement concerning automorphism groups. By [LR] we may assume that $q \geq 4$.

Let $\pi \in \text{Sym}(X)$ be a 4-cycle $(x,x_1,x_2,x_3)$, where $x_1,x_2,x_3$ are on a line not containing $x$. We will show that $\text{Aut}_x$ behaves as required.

Let $g \in \text{Aut}_x$. As in the proof of Proposition 5.1, $g$ fixes $X$ and induces a collineation $\bar{g}$ of the subspace $X$ of $A$. By Proposition 5.1, $\pi \bar{g} = h\pi$ with $\bar{g}, h \in AGL(X)$. As before, $\bar{g}^{-1}h = \pi^2\pi^{-1}$ is a collineation of $X$ that fixes at least $q^2 - 2q > q$ points as $q \geq 4$. Then $\bar{g} = h$ and $\pi^2 = \pi$. Since the collineation $\bar{g}$ commutes with $\pi$ it fixes $\{x,x_1,x_2,x_3\}$ and hence also $x$, and so is the identity on the support of $\pi$. Thus, $\text{Aut}_x$ is the identity on that support. □

6. Steiner quadruple systems

We have avoided $AG(d,2)$ in the preceding two sections. Here we briefly comment about those spaces in the context of 3–$(v,4,1)$-designs (Steiner quadruple systems), outlining a proof of the following result in [Mc].

Theorem 6.1. If $G$ is a finite group then there are infinitely many integers $v$ such that there is a 3–$(v,4,1)$-design $D$ for which $\text{Aut}_D \cong G$.

Proof. Let $K = F_2 \subset F = F_16$ be as in Section 2 with $\theta$ a generator of $F^*$. Let $V_F$ be a vector space with basis $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, viewed as a $K$-space $V$. This time we modify the 3-design $AG_2(V)$ of points and (affine) planes of $V$. We use nonisomorphic designs $\Delta_1, \Delta_2$ having the parameters of $AG_2(4,2)$ but not isomorphic to that design, and such that $\text{Aut}(\Delta_1) = 1$ [KOP].

Once again our design $D$ has $V$ as its set of points. Most blocks of $D$ are planes of $A$, with exceptions involving the sets $Fv$, $0 \neq v \in V$, in Section 2(I, II), where now $Fv$ is viewed as a 4-dimensional affine space. As before, the set of planes of $AG_2(Fv_1)$ or $AG_2(F(v_1 + \theta v_1))$ is replaced by a copy of the set of blocks of $\Delta_1$ or $\Delta_2$. This time, for each of these we require

(##") there are distinct blocks, each of which spans a 3-space of $A$, such that the intersection of those 3-spaces is a plane.

Once again it is easy to check that this produces a design $D$ with the desired parameters for which $G \leq \text{Aut}_D$.

Distinct $x,y,z \in V$ determine a block $xyz$ of $D$ and a plane $\langle x,y,z \rangle$ of $A$. For distinct $x,y,z$ and $w \notin xyz$, instead of (2.3) we use $\langle w|x,y,z \rangle = \bigcup \{abc \mid a \in wxz - \{w\}, b \in wxy - \{w\}, c \in wyz - \{w\} \}$, with $a,b,c$ distinct and not all in $\{x,y,z\}$.

As before, all planes of $A$ can be recovered from $D$, this time using various sets $\langle w|x,y,z \rangle$. Also the sets in (I) and (II) can be recovered, as can $F$, and the argument at the end of Section 4 goes through as before. □
Concluding remarks

Remark 7.1. When considering possible consequences of this paper it became clear that additional properties of our designs should also be mentioned.

1. Additional properties of the design $D$ in Theorem 1.1(i).
   (a) $\text{PG}(3, q)$-connectedness. The following graph is connected: the vertices are the subspaces of $D$ isomorphic to $\text{PG}_1(3, q)$, with two joined when they meet.
   (b) $\text{PG}(n - 1, q)$ generation. $D$ is generated by its subspaces isomorphic to $\text{PG}_1(n - 1, q)$.
   (c) Every point of $D$ is in a subspace isomorphic to $\text{PG}_1(n - 1, q)$ (in fact, many of these).
   (d) More than $q^n$ points are moved by every nontrivial automorphism of $D$.

2. Additional properties of the design $D$ in Theorem 1.1(ii).
   (a) $\text{AG}(3, q)$-connectedness. The following graph is connected: the vertices are the subspaces of $D$ isomorphic to $\text{AG}_1(3, q)$, with two joined when they meet.
   (b) $\text{AG}(n, q)$ generation. $D$ is generated by its subspaces isomorphic to $\text{AG}_1(n, q)$.
   (c) Every point of $D$ is in a subspace isomorphic to $\text{AG}_1(n, q)$ (in fact, many of these).
   (d) More than $q^n$ points are moved by every nontrivial automorphism of $D$.

3. Additional properties of the design $D$ in Theorem 6.1. This time versions of (2a) (using $\text{AG}_2(4, 2)$-connectedness), (2b), (2c) and (2d) hold.

These reflect the fact that the sets of points in (I) or (II) cover a tiny portion of the underlying projective or affine space: a subset of the points determined by $F$-linear combinations of at most two of the $v_i$. For (1a), it is easy to see that any point in $V$ lies in a 4-space of $V$ that contains some point $K\beta\sum_i v_i$, $\beta \in F^*$, and meets each set in (I) or (II) in at most a point; by (2.1) this produces a subspace of $D$ isomorphic to $\text{PG}_1(3, q)$. Moreover, all $K\beta\sum_i v_i$ lie in $F(\sum_i v_i)$, which also produces a subspace of $D$ isomorphic to $\text{PG}_1(3, q)$.

For (1b) we give examples of subspaces of $V$:

$$\langle v_1 + \theta^i v_2, v_2 + \theta^i v_3, \ldots, v_{n-2} + \theta^i v_n, v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + v_5, \theta(v_1 + v_2 + v_4 + v_5) \rangle$$

for $2 < i < q^4 - 1$. Each of these misses all sets in (I) or (II), and hence determines a subspace of $D$ isomorphic to $\text{PG}_1(n - 1, q)$. These subspaces generate a subspace of $D$ containing the points $K(\theta^i - \theta^3)v_n$, $3 < i < q^4 - 1$, and hence also $\text{PG}_1(Fv_n)$. Now permute the subscripts to generate $D$.

Part (1c) holds by using $K$-subspaces similar to the above ones. There are clearly projective spaces of larger dimension that are subdesigns of $D$.

Part (1d) depends on the semiregularity of $G$ on $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$. Use the points $K\sum_i \alpha_i v_i$ with $\alpha_1 = 1$ and $\alpha_i \in F - \{1\}$ for $i > 1$, where each $\alpha_i \in F - \{1\}$ occurs either for 0 or at least two basis vectors $v_i$. The lower bound $q^n$ is easy to obtain but very poor.

Both (2) and (3) are handled as in (1).
Remark 7.2. In (II) we used the \( K \)-subspaces \( F(v_i + \theta v_j) \). We could have used subspaces \( F(v_i + \theta_r v_j) \), \( r = 1, \ldots, s \), for various \( \theta_r \), together with further nonisomorphic designs \( \Delta_{2,r} \) (which are needed to distinguish among the \( F(v_i + \theta_r v_j) \)). All proofs go through without difficulty, as do the additional properties in the preceding remark.

Remark 7.3. Each of our designs has the same parameters as some \( \text{PG}_1(V) \) or \( \text{AG}_1(V) \). What is needed is a much better type of result, such as: for each finite group \( G \) there is an integer \( f(|G|) \) such that, if \( q \) is a prime power and if \( v > f(|G|) \) satisfies the necessary conditions for the existence of a \( 2-(v, q+1, 1) \)-design, then there is such a design \( \mathbf{D} \) for which \( \text{Aut}\mathbf{D} \cong G \). When \( q = 2 \) this result is proved in a sequel to the present paper [DoK].
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