

On new infinite families of completely regular and completely transitive codes

J. Borges* J. Rifà* V. A. Zinoviev†

March 21, 2023

Abstract

In two previous papers we constructed new families of completely regular codes by concatenation methods. Here we determine cases in which the new codes are completely transitive. For these cases we also find the automorphism groups of such codes. For the remaining cases, we show that the codes are not completely transitive assuming an upper bound on the order of the monomial automorphism groups, according to computational results.

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{F}_q be the finite field of order q , where q is a prime power. For a q -ary code $C \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ of length n , denote by d its *minimum (Hamming) distance* between any pair of distinct codewords. The *packing radius* of C

*Department of Information and Communications Engineering. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

†A.A. Kharkevich Institute for Problems of Information Transmission. Russian Academy of Sciences.

is $e = \lfloor (d - 1)/2 \rfloor$. Given any vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, its *distance to the code* C is $d(\mathbf{v}, C) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in C} \{d(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{x})\}$ and the *covering radius* of the code C is $\rho = \max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} \{d(\mathbf{v}, C)\}$. Note that $e \leq \rho$. A *linear* $[n, k, d; \rho]_q$ -code is a k -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n , with minimum distance d and covering radius ρ . We denote by $D = C + \mathbf{x}$ ($\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$) a *coset* of C , where $+$ means the component-wise addition in \mathbb{F}_q .

For a given code C of length n and covering radius ρ , define

$$C(i) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n : d(\mathbf{x}, C) = i\}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, \rho.$$

The sets $C(0) = C, C(1), \dots, C(\rho)$ are called the *subconstituents* of C .

Say that two vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are *neighbors* if $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 1$. Denote by $\mathbf{0}$ the all-zero vector or the all-zero matrix, depending on the context.

Definition 1.1 ([12]) *A code C of length n and covering radius ρ is completely regular, if for all $l \geq 0$ every vector $x \in C(l)$ has the same number c_l of neighbors in $C(l - 1)$ and the same number b_l of neighbors in $C(l + 1)$. Define $a_l = (q - 1) \cdot n - b_l - c_l$ and set $c_0 = b_\rho = 0$. The parameters a_l , b_l and c_l ($0 \leq l \leq \rho$) are called intersection numbers and the sequence $\{b_0, \dots, b_{\rho-1}; c_1, \dots, c_\rho\}$ is called the intersection array (shortly IA) of C .*

Let M be a monomial matrix, i.e. a matrix with exactly one nonzero entry in each row and column. If q is prime, then the automorphism group of C , $\text{Aut}(C)$, consists of all monomial $(n \times n)$ -matrices M over \mathbb{F}_q such that $\mathbf{c}M \in C$ for all $\mathbf{c} \in C$. If q is a power of a prime number, then $\text{Aut}(C)$ also contains any field automorphism of \mathbb{F}_q which preserves C . The group $\text{Aut}(C)$ acts on the set of cosets of C in the following way: for all $\pi \in \text{Aut}(C)$ and for every vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ we have $\pi(\mathbf{v} + C) = \pi(\mathbf{v}) + C$. Fix the following notation for groups, which we need: let C_t denote the cyclic group of order t ,

let S_t denote the symmetric group of order $t!$, and let $GL(m, q)$ be the q -ary general linear group (formed by all nonsingular q -ary $(n \times n)$ -matrices).

In this paper, we consider only monomial automorphisms. Thus, when q is not a prime, but a prime power, we omit the field automorphisms that fix the code. We denote by $\text{MAut}(C)$ the monomial automorphism group of a code C .

Definition 1.2 *Let C be a q -ary linear code with covering radius ρ . Then C is completely transitive if $\text{MAut}(C)$ has $\rho + 1$ orbits when acts on the cosets of C .*

Note that this definition generalizes to the q -ary case the definition given in [14]. However, it is a particular case of the definition of coset-completely transitive code given in [9], where not only monomial automorphisms are considered, but also the field automorphisms are taken into account.

Since two cosets in the same orbit have the same weight distribution, it is clear that any completely transitive code is completely regular.

It is well known, e.g. see [11], that the monomial automorphism group of a Hamming code \mathcal{H}_m of length $(q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ is isomorphic to the general linear group $GL(m, q)$, which acts transitively on the set of vectors of weight one. As a consequence, all cosets of minimum weight one are in the same orbit and thus Hamming codes are completely transitive. In the binary case, the action of $GL(m, 2)$ on the set of coordinate positions is even doubly transitive (but only in the binary case). Later, we will use this fact.

Completely regular and completely transitive codes are classical subjects in algebraic coding theory, which are closely connected with graph theory, combinatorial designs and algebraic combinatorics. Existence, construction and enumeration of all such codes are open hard problems (see [7, 15, 10, 12, 4] and references there).

It is well known that new completely regular codes can be obtained by the direct sum of perfect codes or, more general, by the direct sum of completely regular codes with covering radius 1 [1, 14]. In the previous papers [3, 5], we extend these constructions, giving several explicit constructions of new completely regular codes, based on concatenation methods. Here, we find the monomial automorphism groups for that families in some cases. This gives mutually nonequivalent binary linear completely regular codes with the same intersection arrays and isomorphic monomial automorphism groups. We show cases in which the constructed families of codes are also completely transitive.

In Section 2 we give some preliminary results, mostly coming from the previous papers [2, 3, 5] (where we introduced two infinite families of CR codes $A^{(r)}$ and $B^{(r)}$), that help to us place ourselves in the problem we want to address. In Section 3 we study the completely transitive character of codes $B^{(r)}$ and calculate $\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})$ for some cases. Finally, we give a result that gives us the character of completely transitive for these $B^{(r)}$ codes with an extra assumption about the order of $\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})$. This assumption is given by computational considerations on the order of such monomial automorphism groups.

2 Preliminary results

In this section we recall the results of [2, 3, 5]. Combining such results, in the next section, we specify cases in which the constructed infinite families of completely regular codes are also completely transitive.

For any vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, denote by $\sigma(x)$ the right cyclic shift of x , i.e. $\sigma(x) = (x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$. Define recursively $\sigma^i(x) = \sigma(\sigma^{i-1}(x))$,

for $i = 2, 3, \dots$ and $\sigma^1(x) = \sigma(x)$. For $j < 0$, we define $\sigma^j(x) = \sigma^\ell(x)$, where $\ell = j \pmod n$.

The next constructions are described in [3], although the dual codes of the resulting family of q -ary completely regular codes are well known as the family SU2 in [8].

Let H be the parity check matrix of a q -ary cyclic Hamming code \mathcal{H}_m of length $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ (recall that a cyclic version of \mathcal{H}_m exists exactly when n and $q - 1$ are coprime numbers). Clearly the simplex code generated by H is also a cyclic code. For any $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, consider the code $B^{(r)}$ of length nr with the following parity check matrix $H_b(r)$ (we call it Construction I in [3]):

$$H_b(r) = \begin{bmatrix} H & H & \cdots & H \\ H_1 & H_2 & \cdots & H_r \end{bmatrix}, \quad r = 1, \dots, n; \quad (1)$$

where H_i , for $1 \leq i \leq n$, is the matrix $H\xi^i$ (here $\xi \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ is a primitive n th root of unity), hence H_i is obtained from H by cyclically shifting i times its columns to the right (in these terms $H = H_n$). In [3] we also presented Construction II. In this case, the corresponding code of length $n(r+3)$, which we denote $A^{(r)}$, has parity check matrix $H_a(r)$ of the form:

$$H_a(r) = \begin{bmatrix} H & O & H & H & H & \cdots & H \\ O & H & H & H_1 & H_2 & \cdots & H_r \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

For the codes $A^{(r)}$ we fix the following interval for r : $r \in \{-2, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ (for $r = n$ we would have pairs of linear dependent columns), where $A^{(0)}$, $A^{(-1)}$ and $A^{(-2)}$ are defined by the parity check matrices, respectively

$$H_a(0) = \begin{bmatrix} H & O & H \\ O & H & H \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_a(-1) = \begin{bmatrix} H & O \\ O & H \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_a(-2) = \begin{bmatrix} H \\ O \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Note that the codes $B^{(1)}$ and $A^{(-2)}$ are the Hamming code of length $(q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let i and j be positive integers such that $i + j \leq n$. The code D with parity check matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} H & H & \cdots & H \\ H_i & H_{i+1} & \cdots & H_{i+j-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

is equivalent to the code $B^{(j)}$.

Proof. The statement is evident, since the parity check matrices for the codes D and $B^{(j)}$ differ from each other by the multiplier ξ^{i-1} , applied to the second bottom part of rows. \square

In [3] we proved the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 ([3])

(i) *For any $r, 2 \leq r \leq n$, the code $B^{(r)}$ with parity check matrix $H_b(r)$ given in (1) is a completely regular $[nr, nr - 2m, 3; 2]_q$ -code with intersection array*

$$\text{IA} = \{(q - 1)nr, ((q - 1)n - r + 2)(r - 1); 1, r(r - 1)\}.$$

(ii) *For any $r, 0 \leq r \leq n - 1$, the code $A^{(r)}$ with parity check matrix $H_a(r)$ given in (2) is a completely regular $[(r + 3)n, (r + 3)n - 2m, 3; 2]_q$ -code with intersection array*

$$\text{IA} = \{(q - 1)n(r + 3), ((q - 1)n - 1 - r)(r + 2); 1, (r + 2)(r + 3)\}.$$

In [5] we defined the concept of *supplementary codes*. Let H_m be the parity check matrix of a q -ary Hamming code of length $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$.

Consider a non-empty subset of $n_A < n$ columns of H_m as a parity check matrix of a code A . Call B the code that has as parity check matrix the remaining $n_B = n - n_A$ columns of H_m . The code A is the supplementary code of B , and vice versa. We summarize the results of [5] in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3 ([5]) *Let A and B be supplementary codes as defined above.*

- (i) *If A has covering radius 1, then it is a Hamming code. Both codes A and B are completely regular and completely transitive.*
- (ii) *If A has covering radius 2, dimension $n_A - m$, and A is completely regular, then B is completely regular with covering radius at most 2.*
- (iii) *If A has covering radius 2, dimension $n_A - m$, and A is completely transitive, then B is completely transitive.*

In all cases, the parameters and intersection arrays are computed in [5].

Now, consider the parity check matrix H_{2m} of a q -ary Hamming code \mathcal{H}_{2m} of length $(q^{2m} - 1)/(q - 1)$, such that the q -ary Hamming code \mathcal{H}_m is cyclic. Equivalently, $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ and $q - 1$ are coprime numbers. We assume that $m \geq 3$ to avoid trivial cases. In fact, for $m = 2$, \mathcal{H}_m is cyclic only if q is a power of 2. Present H_{2m} as follows:

$$H_{2m} = \left[H_b(r) \mid H_c(r) \right], \quad r \in \{1, \dots, q^m\}, \quad (5)$$

where $H_b(r)$ is the matrix (1) with $rn = r(q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ columns, hence it is a parity check matrix for $B^{(r)}$. Call $C^{(r)}$ the supplementary code of $B^{(r)}$, i.e. $C^{(r)}$ has parity check matrix $H_c(r)$. By combining the results of [3] and [5], we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4 *Let $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ and let $B^{(r)}$ and $C^{(r)}$ be the supplementary codes as defined above.*

(i) *$B^{(1)}$ is a Hamming $[n, n - m, 3; 1]_q$ -code and $C^{(1)}$ is a $[q^m n, q^m n - 2m, 3, 2]_q$ -code. Both codes are completely regular and completely transitive with intersection arrays*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IA}(B^{(1)}) &= \{q^m - 1; 1\}; \\ \text{IA}(C^{(1)}) &= \{q^m(q^m - 1), q^m - 1; 1, q^m(q^m - 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) *For $2 \leq r \leq n$, $B^{(r)}$ is a $[rn, rn - 2m, 3; 2]_q$ -code and $C^{(r)}$ is a $[(q^m + 1 - r)n, (q^m + 1 - r)n - 2m, 3; 2]_q$ -code. Both codes are completely regular with intersection arrays*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IA}(B^{(r)}) &= \{r(q^m - 1), (r - 1)(q^m + 1 - r); 1, r(r - 1)\}; \\ \text{IA}(C^{(r)}) &= \{(q^m + 1 - r)(q^m - 1), r(q^m - r); 1, (q^m + 1 - r)(q^m - r)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $B^{(r)}$ is completely transitive if and only if $C^{(r)}$ is completely transitive.

Remark 1 *In the binary case, $q = 2$, the matrix H_{2m} can be written as*

$$H_{2m} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} H & H & \cdots & H & H & \cdots & H & H & \mathbf{0} & H \\ H_1 & H_2 & \cdots & H_r & H_{r+1} & \cdots & H_{n-1} & \mathbf{0} & H & H \end{array} \right], \quad (6)$$

where H is a parity check matrix of a binary cyclic Hamming code \mathcal{H}_m .

Indeed, H_{2m} has $n(n + 2) = 2^{2m} - 1$ columns and there are no repeated columns. Therefore, in the binary case and by Lemma 2.1, the code $C^{(r)}$ is equivalent to the code $A^{(n-r-1)}$ (Construction II in [3]).

3 Completely transitive families

For the rest of the paper, let $B^{(r)}$ be the code with parity check matrix $H_b(r)$ given in (1). Let T_1, \dots, T_r be the n -sets, which we call *blocks*, of coordinate positions corresponding to the columns of H_1, \dots, H_r . That is,

$$T_j = \{(j-1)n+1, (j-1)n+2, \dots, jn\}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, r.$$

Consider also the vectors of weight one indexed as follows:

$$e_1^1, \dots, e_n^1, e_1^2, \dots, e_n^2, \dots, e_1^r, \dots, e_n^r;$$

where the superindices indicate the corresponding block.

In order to establish in which cases the codes of Theorem 2.4 are completely transitive, we need several previous results.

Lemma 3.1 *The general linear group $\text{GL}(m, q)$ ($m \geq 3$) is not 2-homogeneous, unless $q = 2$.*

Proof. It is well known that the order of $\text{GL}(m, q)$ is $\prod_{k=0}^{m-1} (q^m - q^k)$, which is even. Hence, if $\text{GL}(m, q)$ is 2-homogeneous, it is also 2-transitive by [13, Lemma 2.1], implying $q = 2$. \square

Lemma 3.2 *Let $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$. For $1 < r \leq n$, let $B^{(r)}$ be the $[nr, nr - 2m, 3; 2]_q$ -code obtained by Construction I. Then, the number of cosets of $B^{(r)}$ with minimum weight 2 is $q^{2m} - 1 - r(q^m - 1)$.*

Proof. Since $B^{(r)}$ has minimum distance 3, we have that the number of cosets of weight 1 is $rn(q - 1) = r(q^m - 1)$. The total number of cosets is $q^{rn}/(q^{rn-2m}) = q^{2m}$. Hence, the number of cosets with minimum weight greater than 1 is $q^{2m} - 1 - r(q^m - 1)$. All such cosets have minimum weight 2, because the covering radius of $B^{(r)}$ is $\rho = 2$. \square

Lemma 3.3 *Let $B^{(r)}$ be the $[nr, nr-2m, 3; 2]_q$ -code obtained by Construction I, where $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$. Then,*

$$(i) \text{ MAut}(B^{(1)}) = \text{GL}(m, q).$$

$$(ii) \text{ MAut}(B^{(2)}) = \text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q) \times C_2.$$

$$(iii) \text{ MAut}(B^{(3)}) = \text{GL}(m, q) \times S_3.$$

Proof. The statement (i) is trivial, since $B^{(1)}$ is a Hamming code of length $(q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$. It is well known that its automorphism group is $\text{GL}(m, q)$ [11].

For (ii), note that, after linear operations on the rows, the parity check matrix $H_b(2)$ of the code $B^{(2)}$ can be presented in the form

$$H_b(2) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} H & O \\ \hline O & H \end{array} \right].$$

Since the Hamming code of length $(q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ (defined by the parity check matrix H) is stabilized by the group $\text{GL}(m, q)$, we have that the code $B^{(2)}$ is invariant under the action of any matrix G of type

$$G = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} G_1 & O \\ \hline O & G_2 \end{array} \right], \quad (7)$$

where both matrices G_1 and G_2 are arbitrary matrices from the group $\text{GL}(m, q)$. We conclude that the monomial automorphism group $\text{MAut}(B^{(2)})$ contains as a subgroup the group $\text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q)$. From the other side, we can clearly interchange the blocks corresponding to the columns of G_1 and G_2 , respectively, without changing the code $B^{(2)}$. Hence the group $\text{MAut}(B^{(2)})$ contains as a subgroup the group of order 2. It is easy to see that any monomial automorphism of $B^{(2)}$ contains only automorphisms from these groups

above. Indeed, assume that the matrix G belongs to $\text{GL}(2m, q)$, but not to $\text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q)$. Then we can see (by solving the corresponding system of linear equations) that any column of $H_b(2)$ can be moved to any other column. But this leads to a contradiction to the shape of $H_b(2)$. Hence, we conclude that $\text{MAut}(B^{(2)})$ contains as subgroups only $\text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q)$ and C_2 . Since the two cosets of $\text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q)$ induced by C_2 coincide, we deduce that $\text{MAut}(B^{(2)})$ is a direct product of all three subgroups, i.e.

$$\text{MAut}(B^{(2)}) = \text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q) \times C_2.$$

For (iii), the parity check matrix $H_b(3)$ (see (1)) of $B^{(3)}$ can be transformed, by linear operations on the rows and column permutations, to the following form:

$$H_b(3) \simeq \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} H & O & H \\ \hline O & H & H \end{array} \right].$$

The exclusive property of this matrix is that any of all three blocks is stabilized by all matrices G of the type

$$G = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} G_1 & O \\ \hline O & G_1 \end{array} \right],$$

where G_1 is an arbitrary matrix from the group $\text{GL}(m, q)$. We conclude that the group $\text{MAut}(B^{(3)})$ contains as a subgroup the group $\text{GL}(m, q)$. Now we can see that any codeword $z = (x, y, u)$ of $B^{(3)}$ can be presented in the form $z = (u + x_1, u + x_2, u + x_3)$, where x_i is a codeword of the Hamming code (of length $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$, i.e. it has the support only in the block T_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, and u is an arbitrary binary vector of length n). We deduce that all three blocks can be arbitrary permuted without changing of the code $B^{(3)}$ and, therefore, $\text{MAut}(B^{(3)})$ contains as a subgroup the group S_3 . Similarly to the previous case, we can see that these are the only monomial

automorphisms of the code $B^{(3)}$. Indeed, if for example $G_1 \neq G_2$, where G is of the form (7) (see case (ii)), we change the third block of $H_b(3)$ and obtain the column which does not belong to the third block of $H_b(3)$. Since any element of $\text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q)$ cannot interchange the blocks and since they intersect only in the identity element, we conclude that the group $\text{MAut}(B^{(3)})$ is the direct product of groups $\text{GL}(m, q)$ and S_3 , i.e.

$$\text{MAut}(B^{(3)}) = \text{GL}(m, q) \times S_3.$$

Evidently, the actions of both $\text{GL}(m, q)$ and S_3 do not depend on each other. \square

The next statement shows cases in which the code $B^{(r)}$ is completely transitive (hence, so is $C^{(r)}$).

Proposition 1 *The codes $B^{(1)}$ and $B^{(2)}$ are completely transitive. Furthermore, for $q = 2$, the codes $B^{(3)}$, $B^{(n-1)}$ and $B^{(n)}$ are also completely transitive (here $n = (q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$).*

Proof. The code $B^{(1)}$ is a Hamming code. Its automorphism group is $\text{GL}(m, q)$ [11], that acts transitively over the set of vectors of weight one. Hence all cosets with minimum weight one are in the same orbit and thus $B^{(1)}$ is completely transitive.

For $B^{(2)}$, we have that its automorphism group is $\text{GL}(m, q) \times \text{GL}(m, q) \times C_2$ (Lemma 3.3) which acts transitively over the set of vectors of weight one in each block and also both blocks can be interchanged. Therefore all cosets with minimum weight one are in the same orbit. By Theorem 2.2, the covering radius of $B^{(2)}$ is 2. Hence, we only need to prove that the cosets with minimum weight two are also in the same orbit. Note that any vector at distance 2 from the code has its nonzero coordinates in different blocks

of coordinate positions. Since we can act to these blocks independently, we have that the cosets with minimum weight two of $B^{(2)}$ are in the same orbit.

For $q = 2$, by Lemma 3.3, the automorphism group of $B^{(3)}$ is $\text{GL}(m, 2) \times S_3$, that clearly acts transitively over the coordinate positions. Hence, the cosets of $B^{(3)}$ with minimum weight one are in the same orbit. Consider two cosets of $B^{(3)}$ with minimum weight two, $B^{(3)} + \mathbf{x}$ and $B^{(3)} + \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} = e_i^a + e_j^b$ and $\mathbf{y} = e_k^c + e_\ell^d$. Note that

$$i \neq j, k \neq \ell, a \neq b, c \neq d;$$

otherwise both vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} would not be at distance 2 from the code. Since $\text{GL}(m, 2)$ is doubly transitive [11], there exists $\phi \in \text{MAut}(B^{(3)})$ such that $\phi(e_i^a + e_j^b) = e_k^a + e_\ell^b$. Now, consider $\theta \in S_3$ such that $\theta(T_a) = T_c$ and $\theta(T_b) = T_d$. We obtain that $\theta(\phi(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{y}$. Therefore all cosets with minimum weight 2 are in the same orbit. Thus, $B^{(3)}$ is completely transitive since its covering radius is 2.

For $q = 2$, the supplementary codes of $B^{(n-1)}$ and $B^{(n)}$ have, respectively, parity check matrices $H_a(0)$ and $H_a(-1)$ defined in (3). We have seen that these codes are equivalent to $B^{(3)}$ and $B^{(2)}$, respectively. From Theorem 2.4, we deduce that $B^{(n-1)}$ and $B^{(n)}$ are completely transitive codes. \square

Lemma 3.4 *The code $B^{(3)}$ is completely transitive if and only if $q = 2$.*

Proof. By Proposition 1 we know that $B^{(3)}$ is completely transitive for $q = 2$. We have to prove that it is not for $q > 2$.

The code $B^{(3)}$ is equivalent to the code C that has parity check matrix:

$$H_b(3) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c} H & O & H \\ \hline O & H & H \end{array} \right].$$

Consider the set of vectors

$$S = \{\alpha e_i^1 + e_j^2 \mid (i, \alpha) \neq (j, 1), \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}, i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

Clearly, any vector in S is at distance two from C . Indeed, if $\mathbf{x} = \alpha e_i^1 + e_j^2 \in S$, then $H_b(3)\mathbf{x}^T$ is a nonzero vector which is not a column of $H_b(3)$. Moreover, given two such vectors $\mathbf{x} = \alpha e_i^1 + e_j^2$ and $\mathbf{y} = \alpha' e_{i'}^1 + e_{j'}^2$, where $i \neq i'$ or $j \neq j'$ or $\alpha \neq \alpha'$, we have that $H_b(3)(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^T$ is a nonzero vector, thus $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \notin C$. Therefore, all vectors in S are in different cosets of C .

Compute the cardinality of S :

- (i) Vectors of the form $\alpha e_i^1 + e_i^2$, ($\alpha \neq 1$). There are $n(q-2)$ such vectors.
- (ii) Vectors of the form $\alpha e_i^1 + e_j^2$, where $i \neq j$. There are $n(q-1)(n-1)$ such vectors.

Hence,

$$|S| = n(q-2) + n(q-1)(n-1) = n(q^m - 2) = \frac{(q^m - 1)(q^m - 2)}{q - 1}.$$

As a consequence, we can find $(q^m - 1)(q^m - 2)/(q - 1)$ vectors which are all in different cosets of minimum weight 2. Thus, if all such cosets are in the same orbit, we have that the monomial automorphisms in $\text{GL}(q, m)$ of the form

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 & O \\ O & g_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

acts 2-homogeneously on the first two blocks (indeed, for any vector $\alpha e_i^1 + \beta e_j^2$, we can consider a multiple $\alpha' e_i^1 + e_j^2$ in the same coset). But this implies that the action of $\text{GL}(q, m)$ in only one block is 2-homogeneous, since any automorphism like g acts identically in both blocks. Thus, we have $q = 2$, by Lemma 3.1. \square

Remark 2 According to Lemma 3.2, the total number of cosets of minimum weight 2 is $(q^m - 1)(q^m - 2)$. Note that for $q = 2$, the number of cosets induced by the set S coincides and since the action of $\text{GL}(q, m)$ is doubly transitive, all the cosets of minimum weight 2 are in the same orbit. This is an alternative argument to see that $B^{(3)}$ is completely transitive in the binary case (Proposition 1).

To determine the monomial automorphism group of $B^{(r)}$ in the general case seems to be a challenging problem. However, many computational results using MAGMA [6], suggest that the order of the monomial automorphism group is not greater than $8n(q - 1)$, for $r > 3$ except when $q = 2$ and $r \in \{n - 1, n\}$. In these last two cases we have $\text{MAut}(B^{(n-1)}) = \text{MAut}(B^{(3)}) = \text{GL}(m, 2) \times S_3$ and $\text{MAut}(B^{(n)}) = \text{MAut}(B^{(2)}) = \text{GL}(m, 2) \times \text{GL}(m, 2) \times C_2$, respectively, and it is clear that in these two cases the order of $\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})$ is greater than $8n(q - 1)$. Assuming such upper bound we have that the codes not mentioned in Proposition 1 are not completely transitive.

Proposition 2 If $B^{(r)}$ is completely transitive, then $|\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})| = cn(q - 1)$, where

$$c \geq \max\{r, n(q - 1) + 2 - r\}.$$

Proof. If $B^{(r)}$ is completely transitive, then $\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})$ must be transitive over the set of vectors of weight one since all cosets of minimum weight one must be in the same orbit. Hence $|\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})|$ is a multiple of $rn(q - 1)$, say $cn(q - 1)$. Moreover, $cn(q - 1) \geq rn(q - 1)$ since $B^{(r)}$ has $rn(q - 1)$ cosets of minimum weight one. By Lemma 3.2, the number of cosets of minimum weight two is $n(q - 1)(n(q - 1) + 2 - r)$. All such cosets must be in the same orbit and thus $c \geq n(q - 1) + 2 - r$. \square

Corollary 1 *Assume that $|\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})| \leq 8n(q-1)$, for $r > 3$ except when $q = 2$ and $r \in \{n-1, n\}$.*

(i) *If $q = 2$ and $4 \leq r < n-1$, then $B^{(r)}$ is not completely transitive.*

(ii) *If $q > 2$ and $4 \leq r \leq n$, then $B^{(r)}$ is not completely transitive.*

Proof. From Proposition 2, we have $r \leq 8$ and $n(q-1) + 2 - r \leq 8$. Combining both inequalities, we obtain $n(q-1) \leq 14$. Thus,

(i) If $q = 2$, then $m \leq 3$ (and $n \leq 7$). Hence, the only possible cases are $m = 3$, $r \in \{4, 5\}$.

(ii) If $q > 2$, then the only possible cases are $q = 3$, $m = 2$ (hence $n = 4$), $r \in \{3, 4\}$.

For these remaining cases, $(q, m, r) \in \{(2, 3, 4), (2, 3, 5), (3, 2, 3), (3, 2, 4)\}$, we have verified with MAGMA that the corresponding codes are not completely transitive. \square

From Proposition 1, Lemma 3.4, and Corollary 1 we can state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.5 *Let $B^{(r)}$ be the code over \mathbb{F}_q of length $rn = r(q^m - 1)/(q - 1)$ ($1 \leq r \leq n$), obtained by Construction I. Let $C^{(r)}$ be the supplementary code of $B^{(r)}$, such that the concatenation of the parity check matrices of $B^{(r)}$ and $C^{(r)}$ is H_{2m} , the parity check matrix of a Hamming code of length $(q^{2m} - 1)/(q - 1)$. Then,*

(i) *For $q = 2$, the codes $B^{(r)}$ and $C^{(r)}$ are completely transitive if $r \in \{1, 2, 3, n-1, n\}$.*

(ii) *For $q > 2$, the codes $B^{(r)}$ and $C^{(r)}$ are completely transitive if $r \in \{1, 2\}$.*

(iii) *For $q > 2$, the codes $B^{(3)}$ and $C^{(3)}$ are not completely transitive.*

(iv) For the remaining cases (not in (i), (ii) nor (iii)) the codes $B^{(r)}$ and $C^{(r)}$ are not completely transitive, assuming that in these cases the order of $\text{MAut}(B^{(r)})$ is not greater than $8n(q-1)$.

Acknowledgements

This work has been partially supported by the Spanish Grant PID2022-137924NB-I00 (AEI/10.13039/501100011033) and the Catalan AGAUR Grant 2021SGR-00643. The research of the third author of the paper was carried out at the IITP RAS within the program of fundamental research on the topic “Mathematical Foundations of the Theory of Error-Correcting Codes” and was also supported by the National Science Foundation of Bulgaria under the project no. 20-51-18002.

References

- [1] L.A. Bassalygo, G.V. Zaitsev, V.A. Zinoviev, Uniformly packed codes. *Problems Inform. Transmiss*, **10**, (1974), 9–14.
- [2] J. Borges, J. Rifà and V.A. Zinoviev, On completely regular codes by concatenation constructions, in *WCC2017-10th International Workshop on Coding and Cryptography 2017*, 2017.
- [3] J. Borges, J. Rifà and V.A. Zinoviev, On completely regular codes by concatenating Hamming codes, *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*, **12** (2018), 337–349.
- [4] J. Borges, J. Rifà and V.A. Zinoviev, On completely regular codes, *Problems of Information Transmission*, (2019), 1–45.

- [5] J. Borges, J. Rifà and V.A. Zinoviev, On completely regular and completely transitive supplementary codes, *Discrete Mathematics* 343.3 (2020): 111732.
- [6] W. Bosma, J. Cannon and C. Playoust, The MAGMA algebra system i: The user language, *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, **24** (1997), 235–265.
- [7] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen and A. Neumaier, *Distance-Regular Graphs*, Springer, 1989.
- [8] R. Calderbank and W. Kantor, The geometry of two-weight codes, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, **18** (1986), 97–122.
- [9] M. Giudici and C. E. Praeger, Completely transitive codes in hamming graphs, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, **20** (1999), 647–662.
- [10] J. Koolen, D. Krotov and B. Martin, Completely regular codes, <https://sites.google.com/site/completelyregularcodes>.
- [11] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The theory of error-correcting codes*, Elsevier, 1977.
- [12] A. Neumaier, Completely regular codes, *Discrete mathematics*, **106** (1992), 353–360.
- [13] G. R. Sharp, Algorithmic recognition of actions of 2-homogeneous groups on pairs, *LMS Journal of Computation and Mathematics*, **1** (1998), 109–147.
- [14] P. Solé, Completely regular codes and completely transitive codes, *Discrete Mathematics*, **81** (1990), 193–201.

- [15] E. R. van Dam, J. H. Koolen and H. Tanaka, Distance-regular graphs, *The Journal of Combinatorics*, (2016), DS22.