

Ternary codes, biplanes, and the nonexistence of some quasi-symmetric and quasi-3 designs

Akihiro Munemasa* and Vladimir D. Tonchev†

February 27, 2022

Abstract

The dual codes of the ternary linear codes of the residual designs of biplanes on 56 points are used to prove the nonexistence of quasi-symmetric 2 -(56, 12, 9) and 2 -(57, 12, 11) designs with intersection numbers 0 and 3, and the nonexistence of a 2 -(267, 57, 12) quasi-3 design. The nonexistence of a 2 -(149, 37, 9) quasi-3 design is also proved.

Keywords: linear code, quasi-symmetric design, symmetric design, residual design, biplane, quasi-3 design.

1 Introduction

We assume familiarity with basic facts and notions from combinatorial design theory and coding theory ([1], [2], [5], [11], [22]).

A combinatorial *design* (or an *incidence structure*) is a pair $\mathcal{D} = (X, \mathcal{B})$ of a finite set $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^v$ of *points*, and a collection $\mathcal{B} = \{B_j\}_{j=1}^b$ of subsets $B_j \subseteq X$, called *blocks*. The (points by blocks) *incidence matrix* $A = (a_{i,j})$ of a design \mathcal{D} with v points and b blocks is a $(0, 1)$ -matrix with v rows indexed by the points and b columns indexed by the blocks, where $a_{i,j} = 1$ if the i th point belongs to the j th block, and $a_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. The transposed matrix A^T is called the blocks by points incidence matrix of \mathcal{D} . If p is a prime number, the p -rank of A (or $\text{rank}_p A$), is defined as the rank of A over a finite field of characteristic p .

Given a design \mathcal{D} with v points and b blocks, and a finite field $F = GF(q)$, one can define two linear codes over F associated with \mathcal{D} : the code of length b spanned by the rows of the v by b incidence matrix A is called the code of \mathcal{D} spanned by the points, while

*Graduate School of Information Sciences, Tohoku University, Sendai, 980-8579 Japan.
email:munemasa@math.is.tohoku.ac.jp

†Mathematical Sciences, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan, 49931 USA.
email:tonchev@mtu.edu

the code of length v spanned by the columns of A is called the code of \mathcal{D} spanned by the blocks.

Let $\mathcal{D} = (X, \mathcal{B})$ be a design, and let $B \in \mathcal{B}$ be a block of \mathcal{D} . The incidence structure $\mathcal{D}^B = (X', \mathcal{B}')$, where

$$X' = B, \mathcal{B}' = \{B \cap B_j \mid B_j \in \mathcal{B}, B_j \neq B\},$$

is called the *derived* design of \mathcal{D} with respect to block B .

The incidence structure $\mathcal{D}_B = (X'', \mathcal{B}'')$, where

$$X'' = X \setminus B, \mathcal{B}'' = \{B_j \setminus (B_j \cap B) \mid B_j \in \mathcal{B}, B_j \neq B\},$$

is called the *residual* design of \mathcal{D} with respect to block B .

Definition 1. Let A be the v by b incidence matrix of a design \mathcal{D} with v points and b blocks, and let A'' be the incidence matrix of a residual design \mathcal{D}_B with respect to a block B . The residual design \mathcal{D}_B is said to be **linearly embeddable** [20] over $F = GF(p)$, (p prime), if

$$\text{rank}_p A = \text{rank}_p A'' + 1. \quad (1)$$

Note 2. A sufficient condition for a residual design \mathcal{D}_B to be linearly embeddable is that the minimum distance of the linear code over F spanned by the blocks of \mathcal{D} is equal to $|B|$ [20, Theorem 2.2].

Given a design $\mathcal{D} = (X, \mathcal{B})$, its *dual* design \mathcal{D}^* is the incidence structure having as points the blocks of \mathcal{D} , and having as blocks the points of \mathcal{D} , where a point and a block of \mathcal{D}^* are incident if and only if the corresponding block and point of \mathcal{D} are incident. If A is the incidence matrix of \mathcal{D} , then A^T is the incidence matrix of the dual design \mathcal{D}^* .

Given integers $v \geq k \geq t \geq 0$, $\lambda \geq 0$, a t -(v, k, λ) design (or briefly, a t -design) \mathcal{D} is an incidence structure with v points and blocks of size k such that every t -subset of points is contained in exactly λ blocks. A t -(v, k, λ) design is also an s -(v, k, λ_s) design for every integer s in the range $0 \leq s \leq t$, with $\lambda_s = \lambda \binom{v-s}{t-s} / \binom{k-s}{t-s}$.

Let $\mathcal{D} = (X, \mathcal{B})$ be a t -(v, k, λ) design, and let $x \in X$ be a point. The *derived design* \mathcal{D}^x with respect x is the $(t-1)$ -($v-1, k-1, \lambda$) design with point set $X \setminus \{x\}$, and block set $\{B \setminus \{x\} \mid B \in \mathcal{B}, x \in B\}$.

The *residual design* \mathcal{D}_x with respect to x is the $(t-1)$ -($v-1, k, \lambda_{t-1} - \lambda$) design with point set $X \setminus \{x\}$, and block set $\{B \mid B \in \mathcal{B}, x \notin B\}$.

If \mathcal{D} is a 2-(v, k, λ) design with $v > k > 0$, the number of blocks $b = v(v-1)\lambda/(k(k-1))$ satisfies the Fisher inequality:

$$b \geq v, \quad (2)$$

and the equality $b = v$ holds if and only if every two blocks of \mathcal{D} share exactly λ points.

A 2-(v, k, λ) design \mathcal{D} with $b = v$ is called *symmetric*. The dual design \mathcal{D}^* of a symmetric 2-(v, k, λ) design \mathcal{D} is a symmetric design having the same parameters as \mathcal{D} . A symmetric design is *self-dual* if it is isomorphic to its dual design. A *biplane* is a symmetric design with $\lambda = 2$.

Note 3. Assume that \mathcal{D} is a $2-(v, k, \lambda)$ design. If x is a point of \mathcal{D} , the derived design \mathcal{D}^x is a $1-(v-1, k-1, \lambda)$ design, while the residual design \mathcal{D}_x is a $1-(v-1, k, r-\lambda)$ design, where $r = \lambda_1 = \lambda(v-1)/(k-1)$ is the number of blocks of \mathcal{D} that contain x .

If \mathcal{D} is a symmetric $2-(v, k, \lambda)$ design, then $r = k$ and \mathcal{D}_x is a $1-(v-1, k, k-\lambda)$ design. In addition, if B is a block, the derived design \mathcal{D}^B is a $2-(k, \lambda, \lambda-1)$ design, while the residual design \mathcal{D}_B is a $2-(v-k, k-\lambda, \lambda)$ design.

A $2-(v, k, \lambda)$ design is *quasi-symmetric* with intersection numbers x, y , ($x < y$), if every two blocks intersect in either x or y points. A brief survey on quasi-symmetric designs is given in [18]. Links between quasi-symmetric designs and error-correcting codes are discussed in [21].

Examples of quasi-symmetric designs are: (1) unions of identical copies of symmetric 2-designs; (2) non-symmetric $2-(v, k, 1)$ designs; (3) strongly resolvable designs; (4) residual designs of biplanes. A quasi-symmetric $2-(v, k, \lambda)$ design with $2k < v$ which does not belong to any of these four classes is referred to as *exceptional*.

The classification of exceptional quasi-symmetric designs is a difficult open problem. A table of admissible parameters for exceptional quasi-symmetric designs with number of points $v \leq 70$ is given in [18, Table 48.25]. This table is an updated version of Neumaier's table [19] published in 1982.

Two admissible parameters sets for exceptional quasi-symmetric designs whose existence has been unknown since 1982, are $2-(56, 12, 9)$, ($x = 0, y = 3$), and $2-(57, 12, 11)$, ($x = 0, y = 3$). It is the goal of this paper to show that quasi-symmetric designs with these parameters do not exist. Note that the nonexistence of the latter is a direct consequence of that of former. We thank the anonymous reviewer who pointed out that the nonexistence of the latter is essentially known, if one notices that the latter is a $3-(57, 12, 2)$ design. See Remark 8.

The nonexistence of a quasi-symmetric $2-(57, 12, 11)$ design implies also the nonexistence of a quasi-3 design with parameters $2-(267, 57, 12)$. Similarly, using the nonexistence of quasi-symmetric $2-(37, 9, 8)$ designs with intersection numbers 1 and 3 [10], we show that a quasi-3 design with parameters $2-(149, 37, 9)$ does not exist. The existence of quasi-3 designs with these parameters was a long standing open question [15].

2 Residual $2-(45, 9, 2)$ designs and their ternary codes

Our proof of the nonexistence of a quasi-symmetric $2-(56, 12, 9)$ design is based on the following lemmas.

Lemma 4. Suppose that $\mathcal{D} = (X, \mathcal{B})$ is a quasi-symmetric $2-(56, 12, 9)$ design with intersection numbers 0 and 3, and let $z \in X$ be a point of \mathcal{D} .

- (i) The derived design \mathcal{D}^z is a $1-(55, 11, 9)$ design with 45 blocks whose dual design $(\mathcal{D}^z)^*$ is a $2-(45, 9, 2)$ design.

- (ii) The residual design \mathcal{D}_z is a 1-(55, 12, 36) design with 165 blocks. The columns of the 55×165 incidence matrix of \mathcal{D}_z belong to the dual code C^\perp of the linear code C over $GF(3)$ spanned by the columns of the 55×45 incidence matrix of \mathcal{D}^z .

Proof. (i) Since every two non-disjoint blocks of \mathcal{D} share exactly three points, every two blocks of \mathcal{D}^z share exactly two points. This implies that $(\mathcal{D}^z)^*$ is a 2-(45, 9, 2) design.

(ii) The inner product of the incidence vector of every block B of \mathcal{D}_z with the incidence vector of every block of \mathcal{D}^z is either 0 or 3. \square

By a theorem of Hall and Connor [8], every 2-(45, 9, 2) design is a residual design with respect to a block of a biplane with parameters 2-(56, 11, 2). There are five nonisomorphic biplanes B_i , ($1 \leq i \leq 5$) with these parameters [7, 15.8], all five being self-dual. The first biplane, B_1 , was found by Hall, Lane and Wales [9], B_2 was found by Mezzaroba and Salwach [17], B_3 and B_4 were found by Denniston [6], and B_5 was found by Janko and Trung [12]. The residual 2-(45, 9, 2) designs of the five biplanes fall into 16 isomorphism classes (see [14, Table 2]).

It was shown by an exhaustive computer search (Kaski and Östergård [13]), that up to isomorphism, there are exactly five biplanes with 56 points, and consequently, exactly 16 nonisomorphic 2-(45, 9, 2) designs.

Using Lemma 4, the existence question for a 2-(56, 12, 9) design can be resolved by computing the sets of all $(0, 1)$ -vectors of weight 12 in the dual codes of the ternary linear codes spanned by the rows of the 45×55 incidence matrices of the 16 nonisomorphic 2-(45, 9, 2) designs, and checking if any of these sets contains a subset of 165 vectors that form the incidence matrix of a 1-(55, 12, 36) design with 165 blocks of size 12, such that every two blocks are either disjoint or share exactly three points.

Lemma 5. Let \mathcal{D}_B be a 2-(45, 9, 2) design with point set $\{1, 2, \dots, 45\}$, being the residual design of a 2-(56, 11, 2) biplane \mathcal{D} with respect to a block $B = \{46, \dots, 56\}$. Let A be an incidence matrix of \mathcal{D} given by (3), where A'' is the 45×55 incidence matrix of \mathcal{D}_B , and A' is the 11×55 incidence matrix of the derived 2-(11, 2, 1) design \mathcal{D}^B .

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A'' \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ A' \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

If $c = (c_1, \dots, c_{55})$ is a $(0, 1)$ -codeword of weight 12 in the dual code $(L'')^\perp$ of the ternary linear code L'' spanned by the rows of A'' , then $c^* = (c_1, \dots, c_{55}, 0)$ belongs to the dual code L^\perp of the ternary linear code L spanned by the rows of A .

Proof. The ternary codes of the five biplanes with parameters 2-(56, 11, 2) were computed in [14], and all five codes have minimum distance 11. Thus, by Definition 1 and Note 2,




Figure 1: Lemma 6

every residual 2-(45, 9, 2) design is linearly embeddable over $GF(3)$, and

$$\text{rank}_3 A = \text{rank}_3 A'' + 1.$$

This implies

$$\dim L = \text{rank}_3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ A'' \\ 0 \\ \bar{1}_{55} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Since the sum of all rows of A over $GF(3)$ is the constant vector with all entries equal to 2, the all-one vector $\bar{1}_{56} = (\bar{1}_{55}, 1)$ of length 56 belongs to L . Thus, L is spanned by the row vectors of the matrix in the right-hand side of (4), to which c^* is orthogonal. Therefore, $c^* \in L^\perp$. \square

Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 imply the following (see Fig. 1 for an illustration).

Lemma 6. *Let \mathcal{D} be a 2-(56, 11, 2) biplane, and let S be the set of all $(0, 1)$ -vectors of weight 12 in the dual code of the ternary linear code spanned by the points of \mathcal{D} . Let \mathcal{D}_B be a residual 2-(45, 9, 2) design of \mathcal{D} with respect to a block B .*

A necessary condition for the existence of a quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) design $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ having \mathcal{D}_B^ as a derived design is that the subset $S_B \subset S$ consisting of all vectors having 0 in the position labeled by B , contains a set of 165 vectors that are the incidence vectors of the blocks of a 1-(55, 12, 36) design $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_z$, such that every two blocks of $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_z$ are either disjoint or share exactly three points.*

3 The nonexistence of quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) and 2-(57, 12, 11) designs

Theorem 7. (i) *A quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) design with block intersection numbers 0, 3 does not exist.*

(ii) *A quasi-symmetric 2-(57, 12, 11) design with block intersection numbers 0, 3 does not exist.*

Proof. (i) By a theorem of Hall and Connor [8], every 2-(45, 9, 2) design is a residual design with respect to a block of a biplane with parameters 2-(56, 11, 2). Thus, by Lemma 6, it is sufficient to inspect the sets of all (0, 1)-codewords of weight 12 in the dual codes of the ternary codes of the five biplanes with 56 points. The number of such codewords can be found by computing with Magma [4] the complete weight enumerator of the dual codes. This was done in [14] for three of the biplanes, B_1 , B_2 and B_4 , while upper bounds 91 and 22 were found for the codes of the biplanes B_3 and B_5 [14, Table 1], and these results were used to prove that none of the five biplanes can be extended to a 3-(57, 12, 2) design.

Using Magma, we were able to compute the exact numbers of such codewords for the dual codes of B_3 and B_5 (84 and 20, respectively). We reproduce some of the properties of these codes in Table 1, where the first column lists the corresponding biplane, column two gives the 3-rank of its incidence matrix, or the code dimension, the third column gives the order of the automorphism group of the biplane, the fourth column gives the minimum distance of the code, and the last column gives the total number of (0, 1)-codewords of weight 12 in the dual code.

Since the dual codes of the biplanes B_3 , B_4 and B_5 each contains less than 165 (0, 1)-codewords of weight 12, it follows from Lemma 6 that none of the dual designs of their residual 2-(45, 9, 2) designs can be a derived 1-(55, 11, 9) design of a quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) design with intersection numbers 0, 3.

Since the automorphism group of B_1 acts transitively on the set of blocks, all residual 2-(45, 9, 2) designs of B_1 are isomorphic. We define a graph Γ_1 having as vertices the 2100 (0, 1)-codewords of weight 12 in the dual code of the ternary code spanned by the points of B_1 , where two codewords are adjacent in Γ if their supports are either disjoint or share exactly three points. It follows from Lemma 6 that if a quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) design exists and has a derived design with respect to a point which is the dual design of a residual 2-(45, 9, 2) design of B_1 , then Γ_1 will contain a clique of size 165. A quick computation with Cliquer [16] shows that the maximum clique size of Γ_1 is 22, thus none of the residual designs of B_1 is embeddable in a quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) design.

The graph Γ_2 having as vertices the 516 (0, 1)-codewords of weight 12 in the dual code of the ternary code spanned by the points of B_2 , where two codewords are adjacent in Γ_2 if their supports are either disjoint or share exactly three points, has maximum clique size 18. It follows by Lemma 6 that a quasi-symmetric 2-(56, 12, 9) design having a derived design which is the dual design of some residual 2-(45, 9, 2) design of B_2 , does not exist. This completes the proof of part (i).

	$\dim C$	$ \text{Aut } B_i $	min	# wt 12 in C^\perp
B1	20	80640	11	2100
B2	22	288	11	516
B3	26	144	11	84*
B4	24	64	11	148
B5	26	24	11	20*

Table 1: The ternary codes of the five biplanes. Entries with * were not found exactly, but were only estimated in [14]

(ii) Suppose there exists a quasi-symmetric $2-(57, 12, 11)$ design \mathcal{D} with block intersection numbers 0, 3. Then the residual design of \mathcal{D} with respect to a point p is a quasi-symmetric $2-(56, 12, 9)$ design with block intersection numbers 0, 3. Such a design does not exist by (i). \square

Remark 8. We thank the anonymous reviewer who pointed out that Theorem 7 (ii) is essentially known. Indeed, a quasi-symmetric $2-(57, 12, 11)$ design with block intersection numbers 0 and 3 is necessarily a $3-(57, 12, 2)$ design by using [19, Propostion 12] (see also [3]). The nonexistence of a $3-(57, 12, 2)$ design has already been established in [13, Corollary 2].

4 The nonexistence of some quasi-3 designs

Definition 9. A symmetric $2-(v, k, \lambda)$ design D is a *quasi-3 design* [15] with triple intersection numbers x and y ($x < y$) if every three blocks of D intersect in either x or y points.

Clearly, D is a quasi-3 design if and only if every of its derived (with respect to a block) $2-(k, \lambda, \lambda - 1)$ designs is a quasi-symmetric design with block intersection numbers x and y .

According to [15, Table 47.14], there are 12 parameter sets of quasi-3 designs with number of points $v \leq 400$, for which the existence of a quasi-3 design is unknown. Two of these twelve open cases are the parameters $2-(149, 37, 9)$, ($x = 1, y = 3$), and $2-(267, 57, 12)$, ($x = 0, y = 3$).

Theorem 10. A quasi-3 design with parameters $2-(267, 57, 12)$, ($x = 0, y = 3$), does not exist.

Proof. Any derived design with respect to a block of a quasi-3 $2-(267, 57, 12)$ design with triple intersection numbers $x = 0, y = 3$ is a quasi-symmetric $2-(57, 12, 11)$ design with block intersection numbers $x = 0, y = 3$. By Theorem 7, part (ii), a quasi-symmetric design with the latter parameters does not exist. \square

Theorem 11. *A quasi-3 design with parameters $2-(149, 37, 9)$, $(x = 1, y = 3)$, does not exist.*

Proof. Any derived design with respect to a block of a quasi-3 $2-(149, 37, 9)$ design with triple intersection numbers $x = 1, y = 3$ is a quasi-symmetric $2-(37, 9, 8)$ design with block intersection numbers $x = 1, y = 3$. However, it was proved in [10] that quasi-symmetric designs with the latter parameters do not exist. \square

References

- [1] E. F. Assmus, Jr., J. D. Key, *Designs and their codes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [2] T. Beth, D. Jungnickel, H. Lenz, *Design theory (2nd edition)*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [3] A. R. Calderbank, Geometric invariants for quasi-symmetric designs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **47** (1988), 101–110.
- [4] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, *Handbook of Magma Functions*, School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sidney, Sidney, July 22 (1999).
- [5] C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, 2nd ed., Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2007.
- [6] R.H.F. Denniston, On biplanes with 56 points, *Ars Combin.* **9** (1980), 167–179.
- [7] M. Hall, Jr., *Combinatorial Theory*, Second Edition, Wiley, New York 1986.
- [8] M. Hall, Jr., and W.S. Connor, An embedding theorem for balanced incomplete block designs, *Canad. J. Math.* **6** (1953), 35–41.
- [9] M. Hall, Jr., R. Lane, and D. Wales, Designs derived from permutation groups, *J. Combin. Theory* **8** (1970), 12–22.
- [10] M. Harada, A. Munemasa, and V.D. Tonchev, Self-dual codes and the nonexistence of a quasi-symmetric $2-(37, 9, 8)$ design with intersection numbers 1 and 3, *J. Combin. Designs* **25** (2017), 469–476.
- [11] W. C. Huffman and V. Pless, *Fundamentals of Error-Correcting Codes*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [12] Z. Janko and T. Van Trung, A new biplane of order 9 with a small automorphism group, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **42** (1986), 305–309.
- [13] P. Kaski and P.R. J. Östergård. There are exactly five biplanes with $k = 11$. *J. Combin. Des.*, 16(2):117–127, 2008.

- [14] J. Key and V.D. Tonchev, Computational results for the known biplanes of order 9, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* **245**, edited by J. W. P. Hirschfeld, S. S. Magliveras and M. J. de Resmini, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 113–122.
- [15] G. McGuire, Quasi-3 designs, Chapter VI.47 in: *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, 2nd Edition, C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, eds., Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2007, pp. 576–578.
- [16] Niskanen, S., Östergård, P. R. J.: Cliquer User’s Guide, Version 1.0. Tech. Rep. T48, Communications Laboratory, Helsinki University of Technology, Espoo, Finland, 2003.
- [17] C.J. Salwach and J.A. Mezzaroba, The four known biplanes with $k = 11$, *Intern. J. Math. & Math. Sci.* **2** (1979), 251–260.
- [18] M.S. Shrikhande, *Quasi-Symmetric Designs*, Chapter VI.48 in: *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs*, 2nd Edition, C.J. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz, eds., Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2007, pp. 578–582.
- [19] A. Neumaier, Regular sets and quasi-symmetric 2-designs, in: *Combinatorial Theory*, D. Jungnickel and K. Vedder, eds., Springer, Berlin, 1982, 258–275.
- [20] V.D. Tonchev, Linearly embeddable designs, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **85** (2017), 233–247.
- [21] V.D. Tonchev, *Codes and Designs*, Chapter 15 in: *Handbook of Coding Theory*, edited by V.S. Pless and W.C. Huffman, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1998, pp. 1229–1267.
- [22] V. D. Tonchev, *Combinatorial Configurations*, Wiley, New York, 1988.