

## EXTREMAL ORTHOGONAL ARRAYS

ALEXANDER L. GAVRILYUK AND SHO SUDA

ABSTRACT. It is known that a Delsarte  $t$ -design in a  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme has degree at least  $\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil$ . Following Ionin and Shrikhande who studied combinatorial  $(2s - 1)$ -designs (i.e., Delsarte designs in Johnson association schemes) having exactly  $s$  block intersection numbers, we call a Delsarte  $(2s - 1)$ -design with degree  $s$  *extremal* and study extremal orthogonal arrays, which are Delsarte designs in Hamming association schemes.

It was shown by Delsarte that a  $t$ -design with degree  $s$  and  $t \geq 2s - 2$  in a Hamming association scheme induces an  $s$ -class association scheme. We prove that an extremal orthogonal array gives rise to a fission scheme of the latter one, which has  $2s - 1$  or  $2s$  classes. As a corollary, a new necessary condition for the existence of tight orthogonal arrays of strength 3 is obtained.

Furthermore, as a counterpart to a result of Ionin and Shrikhande, we prove an inequality for Hamming distances in extremal orthogonal arrays. The inequality is tight as shown by examples related to the Golay codes.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of an algebraic (or **Delsarte**)  $t$ -design in  $Q$ -polynomial association schemes was introduced in [17]. It unifies the notions of combinatorial (block) designs, orthogonal arrays, spherical designs. For an arbitrary  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme having a  $t$ -design with degree  $s$  and  $t \geq 2s - 2$ , Delsarte showed that such a design induces another  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme with  $s$  classes, which will be referred to as a **Delsarte scheme** of the design.

One of the challenging problems in Algebraic Combinatorics is to classify tight designs in various settings, such as the Hamming association schemes  $H(n, q)$ , the Johnson association schemes  $J(v, k)$ , or spherical designs on the real unit sphere  $S^{d-1}$ . A design is **tight** if its size achieves a Rao type or Fisher type lower bound (see [31, 32, 19] for  $H(n, q)$ ,  $J(v, k)$ ,  $S^{d-1}$  respectively).

Note that a tight  $2s$ -design necessarily has degree  $s$ . A classical necessary existence condition for the corresponding Delsarte scheme is given by the so-called Wilson type theorems ([17, Theorem 5.21]), which, loosely speaking, state that the degree set (the  $s$  intersection numbers) of such a design must be (nonnegative integer) roots of a certain polynomial. This condition restricts possible Hamming distances in tight orthogonal arrays, sizes of block intersections in tight combinatorial designs, and inner products of vectors in tight spherical designs, and it was a primary tool to show many classification results [3, 4, 24].

It is also known [17] that a Delsarte  $(2s - 1)$ -design has at least  $s$  intersection numbers. Combinatorial  $(2s - 1)$ -designs having exactly  $s$  block intersection numbers were studied by Ionin and Shrikhande [25], who called them *extremal*. Here we adopt this terminology and study **extremal** orthogonal arrays, i.e., Delsarte  $(2s - 1)$ -designs in Hamming association schemes with exactly  $s$  Hamming distances.

Recall that an **orthogonal array**  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, t)$  is an  $N \times n$  matrix with entries from the alphabet  $[q] := \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$  arranged in such a way that in every  $t$  columns all possible rows of  $[q]^t$  occur equally often. Since orthogonal arrays were introduced by Rao [31], they became one of the central topics in combinatorics [23]. Given strength  $t$ , the alphabet size  $q$ , and the number of columns  $n$ , a fundamental problem is constructing orthogonal arrays with minimum possible number of rows  $N$ . The lower bound on  $N$  was given by Rao [31] as follows:

$$(1.1) \quad N \geq \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^e \binom{n}{k} (q-1)^k, & \text{if } t = 2e, \\ \sum_{k=0}^{e-1} \binom{n}{k} (q-1)^k + \binom{n-1}{e-1} (q-1)^e, & \text{if } t = 2e-1. \end{cases}$$

An orthogonal array is said to be **tight** if it satisfies Eq. (1.1) or (1.2) with equality. By taking the rows of the matrix as points, an  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, t)$  can be viewed as a Delsarte  $t$ -design in the Hamming association scheme  $H(n, q)$ . Furthermore, if it is tight then the corresponding design has degree  $e$ .

Tight orthogonal arrays with  $t = 2$  and  $q = 2$  correspond to Hadamard matrices; thus, their classification seems hopeless. For  $t = 2$  and  $q \geq 3$ , tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, 2)$  are only known with  $n = q + 1$  and  $q$  a prime power [11]. However, for  $t > 2$ , the existence and classification problem of tight OAs with even strength has received considerable attention; its current state is summarized as follows, see [21].

**Result 1.1.** *The following holds.*

- (1) *If  $t = 4$ , then a tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, 4)$  is one of the following:*
  - (i) *the dual code of the binary repetition code of length 5, i.e.,  $(N, n, q) = (16, 5, 2)$ ;*
  - (ii) *the dual code of the ternary Golay code, i.e.,  $(N, n, q) = (243, 11, 3)$ .*
- (2) *If  $t = 6$ , then  $q = 2$  and a tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, 2, 6)$  is one of the following:*
  - (i) *the dual code of the binary repetition code of length 7, i.e.,  $(N, n) = (64, 7)$ ;*
  - (ii) *the dual code of the binary Golay code, i.e.,  $(N, n) = (2048, 23)$ .*
- (3) *There is no tight OA for all  $t = 2e \geq 6$  and  $q \geq 3$ .*

Note that *contracting* an  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, t)$ , i.e., taking the set of its rows having the same symbol in a fixed column, produces an  $\text{OA}(\frac{1}{q}N, n-1, q, t-1)$ . In particular, a contraction of a tight OA with strength  $t = 2e + 1$  is a tight OA with strength  $t = 2e$ . Thus, in view of Result 1.1, the classification problem of tight OAs makes sense in the following cases:  $q \geq 2$  and  $t = 3$ , or  $q \in \{2, 3\}$  and  $t = 5$ , or  $q = 2$  and  $t \geq 7$ . These cases were studied in [29, 30], as summarized below. It is conjectured in [29] that for all  $t \geq 8$  a tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, 2, t)$  exists if and only if  $n = t + 1$ .

**Result 1.2.** *The following holds.*

- (1) *If  $t = 3$ , then a tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, 3)$  satisfies one of the following cases:*
  - (i)  *$(N, n, q) = (2n, n, 2)$  with  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ ; such an orthogonal array exists if and only if there exists a Hadamard matrix of order  $n$ ;*
  - (ii)  *$(N, n, q) = (q^3, q+2, q)$  with  $q$  even.*
- (2) *If  $t = 5$ , then a tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, 5)$  is one of the following:*
  - (i) *the dual code of the binary repetition code of length 6, i.e.,  $(N, n, q) = (32, 6, 2)$ ;*

- (ii) the dual code of the extended ternary Golay code, i.e.,  $(N, n, q) = (729, 12, 3)$ .
- (3) If  $t = 7$ , then  $q = 2$  and a tight  $\text{OA}(N, n, 2, 7)$  is one of the following:
  - (i) the dual code of the binary repetition code of length 8, i.e.,  $(N, n) = (128, 8)$ ;
  - (ii) the dual code of the extended binary Golay code, i.e.,  $(N, n) = (4096, 24)$ .
- (4) There is no  $\text{OA}(N, n, 2, t)$  with  $8 \leq t \leq 13$ ,  $n \neq t + 1$  and  $n \leq 10^9$ .

The orthogonal arrays in Result 1.2 (1-ii) are known to exist if  $q$  is a power of 2 [6, Section 9]. Our first result in this paper refines this part of Noda's result [30] by showing (see Corollary 3.5) that  $q > 2$  must be a multiple of four. To prove this, we take a closer look at the Delsarte scheme of an extremal orthogonal array of strength  $t = 2s - 1$ . We show in Theorem 3.3 that this Delsarte scheme admits a *fission scheme* with  $2s - 1$  or  $2s$  classes (depending on whether the given OA is tight or no) and then examine its feasibility, using so-called triple intersection numbers. This extends the approach of how the classification of tight OAs with strength 4 was completed in our joint work with Vidali [21].

Considering extremal combinatorial designs, Ionin and Shrikhande [25] characterized, under certain assumptions, the Witt 5-(24, 8, 1) and 4-(23, 7, 1) designs as the only extremal  $(2s - 1)$ - and  $2s$ -designs, respectively. Furthermore, they proved the following inequality for block intersection numbers.

**Result 1.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{B} \subset \binom{v}{k}$  be a  $(2s - 1)$ -design with intersection numbers  $x_1 < \dots < x_s$ , that is,  $\{|b \cap b'| \mid b, b' \in \mathcal{B}, b \neq b'\} = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$ . Then:*

$$\frac{(s - 1)(k - s)(k - s + 1)}{v - 2s + 2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^s x_i - \frac{s(s - 1)}{2} \leq \frac{s(k - s)(k - s + 1)}{v - 2s + 1},$$

*with equality in the left if and only if  $x_1 = 0$ , and with equality in the right if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a tight  $2s$ -design.*

Our second result (Theorem 4.1) is a similar two-sided inequality for Hamming distances between rows of an extremal OA. Furthermore, the ternary Golay codes in  $H(12, 3)$  and  $H(11, 3)$  show that this inequality is tight (see Example 4.2).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review some basic theory of association schemes and related concepts. In Section 3, we consider the Delsarte scheme of an extremal OA of strength  $2s - 1$  and construct a fission  $\mathcal{S}$  of this scheme, which has  $2s - 1$  or  $2s$  classes, and determine its second eigenmatrix. In Section 3.2, we investigate the triple intersection numbers of the scheme  $\mathcal{S}$  obtained from tight 3-designs in  $H(q + 2, q)$  to show that  $q$  must be a multiple of four if  $q > 2$ . In Section 4, we prove a Ionin-Shrikhande type inequality, determine some feasible parameters and known examples of extremal orthogonal arrays, and classify those with degree  $s = 2, 3, 4$  in  $H(n, 2)$ , whose Hamming distances are symmetric with respect to  $n/2$ . In the appendix, we calculate the determinant of the second eigenmatrix of the fission schemes  $\mathcal{S}$ . This allows us to strengthen a theorem by Calderbank and Goethals [12, Theorem 1], who considered the existence of  $(2s - 2)$ -designs with degree  $s$  in the Hamming association schemes in the context of coding theory. (Note that  $(2s - 2)$ -designs with degree  $s$  in the Johnson association schemes, referred to as *schematic designs*, were recently studied in [7, 27].)

It is known that tight Delsarte designs do not exist in most of the classical  $P$ - and  $Q$ -polynomial association schemes [15]. Thus, it is natural to quest for extremal

designs in these schemes. It is shown in [34, 35] that the collection of derived designs of a  $(2s-1)$ -design with degree  $s$  in an arbitrary  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme induces a coherent configuration. To study this configuration, it may be helpful to consider triple intersection numbers, which have proven useful in the studies on distance-regular graphs [16],  $Q$ -polynomial association schemes [22], and non-symmetric association schemes [20]. Furthermore, the proofs of Result 1.3 and Theorem 4.1 are based on regular semilattices, which also arise naturally in most of the classical schemes [18].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Here we recall some notions and facts needed in the subsequent sections.

**2.1. Association schemes.** We follow the standard notation and terminology from the theory of association schemes, see, e.g., [5]. Let  $X$  be a finite set of vertices and a pair  $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^D)$  be a symmetric **association scheme** of  $D$  classes defined on  $X$  with a set of binary (symmetric) relations  $\{R_0, R_1, \dots, R_D\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the Bose-Mesner algebra of the scheme<sup>1</sup>, generated by the adjacency matrices  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{X \times X}$  of the relations  $R_i$  ( $0 \leq i \leq D$ ). Recall that

$$A_i A_j = \sum_{k=0}^D p_{ij}^k A_k,$$

where  $p_{ij}^k$  ( $0 \leq i, j, k \leq D$ ) are nonnegative integers, called the **intersection numbers** of the scheme. Let  $E_0 = \frac{1}{|X|} J_{|X|}$ ,  $E_1, \dots, E_D$  denote the primitive idempotents of  $\mathcal{A}$ , which constitute another basis of the algebra, and recall that

$$E_i \circ E_j = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{k=0}^D q_{ij}^k E_k,$$

where  $q_{ij}^k$  ( $0 \leq i, j, k \leq D$ ) are nonnegative real numbers (see [17, Lemma 2.4]), called the **Krein parameters** of the scheme.

Let  $P$  and  $Q$  denote the **first** and **second eigenmatrices** of the scheme, given by

$$(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_d) = (E_0, E_1, \dots, E_d) \cdot P \quad \text{and} \quad Q = |X| \cdot P^{-1},$$

and recall that the entries of  $P$  are algebraic integers, as the  $(j, i)$ -entry of  $P$  is an eigenvalue of  $A_i$  for the eigenspace spanned by the columns of  $E_j$ .

A scheme is said to be  **$Q$ -polynomial** if, for some ordering of  $E_1, \dots, E_D$ , the matrix  $L_1^* := (q_{1j}^k)_{k,j=0}^D$  of Krein parameters is tridiagonal with nonzero superdiagonal and subdiagonal [5, p. 193]: then  $q_{ij}^k = 0$  holds whenever the triple  $(i, j, k)$  does not satisfy the triangle inequality (i.e., when  $|i-j| < k$  or  $i+j > k$ ). For a  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme, set  $a_i^* = q_{1,i}^1$ ,  $b_i^* = q_{1,i+1}^1$ , and  $c_i^* = q_{1,i-1}^1$ . These numbers are usually gathered in the **Krein array**  $\{b_0^*, b_1^*, \dots, b_{D-1}^*; c_1^*, c_2^*, \dots, c_D^*\}$ , as the remaining Krein parameters can be computed from them. A  $Q$ -polynomial scheme is called  **$Q$ -antipodal** if  $b_i^* = c_{D-i}^*$  for  $0 \leq i \leq D$ ,  $i \neq \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ . By Van Dam [37], 3-class  $Q$ -antipodal schemes are equivalent to linked systems of symmetric designs, see [26].

<sup>1</sup>We will often refer to an association scheme simply as a “scheme”.

Given an association scheme on  $X$  of  $D$  classes, a triple of vertices  $u, v, w \in X$  and integers  $i, j, k$  ( $0 \leq i, j, k \leq D$ ), denote by  $\begin{bmatrix} u & v & w \\ i & j & k \end{bmatrix}$  (or simply  $[i \ j \ k]$  when it is clear which triple  $(u, v, w)$  we have in mind) the number of vertices  $x \in X$  such that  $(u, x) \in R_i$ ,  $(v, x) \in R_j$  and  $(w, x) \in R_k$ . These numbers are usually referred to as **triple intersection numbers**. The triple intersection numbers depend, in general, on the particular choice of  $(u, v, w)$ , and are not determined by the parameters (intersection numbers) of the scheme. Nevertheless, the following theorem often (especially, when the scheme is  $Q$ -polynomial) gives nontrivial equations with respect to triple intersection numbers.

**Theorem 2.1.** ([16, Theorem 3], cf. [9, Theorem 2.3.2]) *Let  $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^D)$  be an association scheme of  $D$  classes with second eigenmatrix  $Q$  and Krein parameters  $q_{ij}^k$  ( $0 \leq i, j, k \leq D$ ). Then*

$$q_{ij}^k = 0 \iff \sum_{r,s,t=0}^D Q_{ri} Q_{sj} Q_{tk} \begin{bmatrix} u & v & w \\ r & s & t \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad \text{holds for all } u, v, w \in X.$$

These equations together with the standard double counting that relates triple intersection numbers to the ordinary intersection numbers (see, e.g., [16]) may reveal the nonexistence of a putative association scheme or shed light on its structure. This was first observed in [14] for schemes of 2 classes (i.e., strongly regular graphs) and later used to show the nonexistence of some putative distance-regular graphs (see, e.g., [16, 38, 36]) and  $Q$ -polynomial association schemes [22]; see also [20] for triple intersection numbers in non-symmetric association schemes.

Given a  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme on  $X$  of  $D$  classes, a subset  $C$  of  $X$  is a  **$t$ -design** if its characteristic vector  $\chi := \chi_C$  satisfies  $E_i \chi = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq t$  [17]. A subset  $C$  of  $X$  is said to have **degree  $s$**  if its characteristic vector  $\chi$  satisfies  $s = |\{i \in \{1, \dots, D\} \mid \chi^\top A_i \chi \neq 0\}|$ , i.e.,  $C$  is an  $s$ -distance set.

Let  $G \in \mathbb{R}^{X \times X}$  be a matrix that diagonalizes all the adjacency matrices of the scheme (see [17, p. 11]). We write  $G$  in a column-partitioned form  $G = (G_0 \ G_1 \ \dots \ G_D)$  such that  $GG^\top = |X|I_{|X|}$  and  $E_i = \frac{1}{|X|} G_i G_i^\top$  ( $0 \leq i \leq D$ ). Define the  $i$ -th **characteristic matrix**  $H_i = H_i(C)$  of a nonempty subset  $C$  of  $X$  as the submatrix of  $G_i$  formed by the rows indexed by  $C$ . (Throughout this paper, a subset  $C$  of  $X$  is always nonempty.)

Let  $(X, \{R_i\}_{i=0}^d)$  and  $(X, \{S_i\}_{i=0}^e)$  be association schemes. Then the latter is called a **fission scheme** of the former if there exists a partition  $\{\Lambda_0, \Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_d\}$  of  $\{0, 1, \dots, e\}$  such that  $\Lambda_0 = \{0\}$  and  $\cup_{k \in \Lambda_i} S_k = R_i$  for each  $i$ .

**2.2. Hamming association schemes and orthogonal arrays.** Let  $H(n, q)$  denote the **Hamming association scheme** defined on  $X = [q]^n$ ,  $[q] = \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $q \geq 2$ , with  $R_i := \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in X, \partial(x, y) = i\}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , where  $\partial(x, y)$  denotes the **Hamming distance** between  $x, y \in X$ .

The Hamming scheme  $H(n, q)$  is  $Q$ -polynomial with the second eigenmatrix  $Q = (K_{n,q,j}(i))_{i,j=0}^n$ , where  $K_{n,q,j}(x)$  are Krawtchouk polynomials of degree  $j$  given by

$$K_{n,q,j}(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^j (-1)^\ell (q-1)^{j-\ell} \binom{x}{\ell} \binom{n-x}{j-\ell}.$$

Given an orthogonal array  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, t)$ , the set  $C$  of its  $N$  rows can be naturally identified with a subset of the point set  $X$  of  $H(n, q)$ . It follows from [17,

Theorem 4.4] that  $C$  is a  $t$ -design in the Hamming scheme  $H(n, q)$  and vice versa. In what follows, we will identify an OA and the corresponding  $t$ -design  $C$ . An orthogonal array is said to be **tight** if it satisfies Eq. (1.1) or (1.2) with equality.

Given a set  $C \subseteq X$ , define  $C_i$  to be

$$(2.1) \quad C_i = \{(x_2, \dots, x_n) \mid (i, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in C\} \quad (1 \leq i \leq q).$$

It is known that a  $(2e + 1)$ -design  $C$  is tight in  $H(n, q)$  if and only if, for every  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ , the set  $C_i$  is a tight  $2e$ -design in  $H(n - 1, q)$ .

The **degree set** of an orthogonal array  $C$  is the set  $S(C)$  of Hamming distances between pairwise distinct  $x, y \in C$ , and the **degree**  $s$  of  $C$  is defined as  $s = |S(C)|$ . We also define the **degree set between  $C$  and  $C'$**  as the set  $S(C, C')$  of Hamming distances  $\partial(x, y)$  for all  $x \in C, y \in C'$ , and the **degree**  $s(C, C')$  between  $C$  and  $C'$  is defined as  $s(C, C') = |S(C, C')|$ . The following lemma gives an upper bound on the cardinality of an orthogonal array.

**Lemma 2.2.** ([17, Theorem 5.21]) *Let  $C$  be a subset of the point set of  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$ . Then*

$$(2.2) \quad |C| \leq \sum_{k=0}^s \binom{n}{k} (q-1)^k.$$

Recall that an OA is **extremal** if it is a  $(2s - 1)$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$  for some  $s$ . The following inequality is well known.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $C$  be a  $t$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$ . Then  $t \leq 2s$ .*

*Proof.* Immediately by Eqs. (1.1), (1.2) and (2.2).  $\square$

The following lemma characterizes designs in terms of their characteristic matrices  $H_i$  (see the definition of  $H_i$  in Section 2.1). The subsequent lemma and theorems can be formulated for any  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme, but we state them only for  $H(n, q)$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** ([17, Theorem 3.15]) *Let  $C$  be a subset of the point set of  $H(n, q)$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $C$  is a  $t$ -design,
- (2)  $H_k^\top H_\ell = \delta_{k\ell} |C| I$  for  $0 \leq k + \ell \leq t$ ,
- (3)  $\sum_{x, y \in C} K_{n, q, i}(\partial(x, y)) = 0$  for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ .

**Theorem 2.5.** ([17, Theorem 5.21]) *Let  $C$  be a tight  $t$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree set  $S = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$ , where  $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_s$ .*

- (1) *If  $t = 2e$  then  $s = e$  and  $|C| \prod_{i=1}^e (1 - x/\alpha_i) = \sum_{j=0}^e K_{n, q, j}(x)$  holds.*
- (2) *If  $t = 2e - 1$  then  $s = e$ ,  $\alpha_s = n$  and  $\frac{|C|}{q} \prod_{i=1}^{e-1} (1 - x/\alpha_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{e-1} K_{n-1, q, j}(x)$  holds.*

The following theorem of Delsarte shows that a  $t$ -design  $C$  in  $H(n, q)$  with  $t \geq 2s - 2$  induces an  $s$ -class  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme (a **Delsarte scheme**) whose binary relations are determined by the Hamming distances between its points. For a design  $C$  with degree set  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$ , we set  $\alpha_0 = 0$  and define  $S_i = \{(x, y) \in C \times C \mid \partial(x, y) = \alpha_i\}$  ( $0 \leq i \leq s$ ).

**Theorem 2.6.** ([17, Theorem 5.25]) *Let  $C$  be a  $t$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$  and degree set  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$ . If  $t \geq 2s - 2$ , then the pair  $(C, \{S_i\}_{i=0}^s)$  is a  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme of  $s$  classes with the following second eigenmatrix:*

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & K_{n,q,1}(\alpha_0) & \cdots & K_{n,q,s-1}(\alpha_0) & |C| - \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n,q,\ell}(\alpha_0) \\ 1 & K_{n,q,1}(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{n,q,s-1}(\alpha_1) & -\sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n,q,\ell}(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & K_{n,q,1}(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{n,q,s-1}(\alpha_s) & -\sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n,q,\ell}(\alpha_s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

### 3. FISSION SCHEMES FOR EXTREMAL ORTHOGONAL ARRAYS

**3.1. Eigenmatrices.** According to Theorem 2.6, an extremal OA, that is, a  $(2s - 1)$ -design with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$  gives rise to a  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme of  $s$  classes. In this section, we show that this scheme admits a fission scheme of at most  $2s$  classes.

Let  $C$  be a  $(2s - 1)$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree set  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$  and set  $\alpha_0 = 0$ . Recall the definition of  $C_i$ , see Eq. (2.1). Note that  $C_i$  is obtained from  $C$  by deleting the first coordinate of the vectors with  $x_1 = i$  in  $C$  and  $|C_i| = |C|/q$  for each  $i$ . Then  $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^q \{i\} \times C_i$  holds. We will construct an association scheme on the point set  $\tilde{C} = \bigcup_{i=1}^q C_i$ .

Denote by  $H_k^{(i)}$  the  $k$ -th characteristic matrix of  $C_i$  in  $H(n - 1, q)$ , and observe that  $C_i$  is a  $(2s - 2)$ -design with degree  $s_i$  in  $H(n - 1, q)$ , where  $s_i = s(C_i)$ . First we state the following lemma, which is crucial for constructing our scheme on  $\tilde{C}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(2s - 1)$ -design with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$ . Define  $F_\ell^{(i,j)}$  to be*

$$F_\ell^{(i,j)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|C_i||C_j|}} H_\ell^{(i)} (H_\ell^{(j)})^\top \quad (1 \leq i, j \leq q, \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\})$$

and

$$F_s^{(i,i)} = I - \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} F_k^{(i,i)} \quad (1 \leq i \leq q).$$

Then  $F_\ell^{(i,j)} F_{\ell'}^{(j,k)} = \delta_{\ell\ell'} F_\ell^{(i,k)}$  holds for  $1 \leq i, j, k \leq q$  and  $\ell, \ell' \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$ , and  $F_s^{(i,i)} F_\ell^{(i,j)} = F_\ell^{(i,j)} F_s^{(j,j)} = O$  holds for  $1 \leq i, j \leq q$  and  $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, s - 1\}$ .

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

Further, one can see that the degree set  $S(\tilde{C})$  is contained in  $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_i - 1 \mid 1 \leq i \leq s\}$  (as  $\tilde{C} = \bigcup_{i=1}^q C_i$  is a subset in  $H(n - 1, q)$ ). Define  $\tilde{S}_{0,0}, \tilde{S}_{i,j}$  ( $i \in \{0, 1\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ ) by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_{0,0} &= \{(x, y) \in \tilde{C} \times \tilde{C} \mid x, y \in C_k \text{ for some } k \text{ and } \partial(x, y) = 0\}, \\ \tilde{S}_{0,j} &= \{(x, y) \in \tilde{C} \times \tilde{C} \mid x \in C_k, y \in C_\ell \text{ for some } k \neq \ell, \text{ and } \partial(x, y) = \alpha_j - 1\}, \\ \tilde{S}_{1,j} &= \{(x, y) \in \tilde{C} \times \tilde{C} \mid x, y \in C_k \text{ for some } k, x \neq y \text{ and } \partial(x, y) = \alpha_j\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\tilde{S}_{i,j}$  are symmetric relations on  $\tilde{C}$  that partition  $\tilde{C} \times \tilde{C}$ , and let  $A_{i,j}$  denote the adjacency  $(0, 1)$ -matrix of the binary relation  $\tilde{S}_{i,j}$ . Further, define  $A_\ell^{(i,j)}$  to be the submatrix of  $A_{1,\ell}$  with the rows and columns restricted to  $\tilde{C}_i \times \tilde{C}_j$  for distinct  $i, j$ .

Since, for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ ,  $C_i$  is a  $(2s-2)$ -design with degree  $s_i$  in  $H(n-1, q)$ , it follows that  $s_i \leq s$ ; furthermore,  $s-1 \leq s_i$  holds by [17, Theorem 5.21]. Thus,  $s_i \in \{s-1, s\}$ . Set  $s_{i,j} = s(C_i, C_j)$  for distinct  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(2s-1)$ -design with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$ . Then, with the above notation,  $s_{i,j} = s$  for all distinct  $i, j$ , and one of the following holds:*

- (1)  $s_i = s-1$  for every  $i$  (and  $C$  is a tight  $(2s-1)$ -design),
- (2)  $s_i = s$  for every  $i$  (and  $C$  is a nontight  $(2s-1)$ -design).

*Proof.* The case  $s_i = s-1$  occurs if and only if  $C_i$  is a tight  $(2s-2)$ -design in  $H(n-1, q)$ , that is,  $C$  is a tight  $(2s-1)$ -design. Therefore,  $s_i = s-1$  occurs for some  $i$  if and only if  $s_j = s-1$  for every  $j$ . Thus, we have the two cases from the statement.

Further, we claim that  $s_{i,j} = s$  for all distinct  $i, j$ . For all distinct  $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ , define

$$\mathcal{A}^{(i,j)} = \text{span}\{A_\ell^{(i,j)} \mid 1 \leq \ell \leq s\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that  $\dim \mathcal{A}^{(i,j)} = s_{i,j}$ , and

$$\mathcal{A}^{(i,j)} = \text{span}\{F_\ell^{(i,j)} \mid 0 \leq \ell \leq s-1\}.$$

Note that the set  $\{F_\ell^{(i,j)} \mid \ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}\}$  is linearly independent. Indeed, suppose  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} c_\ell F_\ell^{(i,j)} = 0$  for some scalars  $c_\ell$ . By Lemma 3.1, multiplying the latter equality by  $F_m^{(j,j)}$  for  $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}$  yields  $c_m F_m^{(i,j)} = 0$ . Since each matrix  $F_m^{(i,j)}$  is nonzero,  $c_m = 0$  holds. Therefore,  $s_{i,j} = \dim \mathcal{A}^{(i,j)} = s$ .  $\square$

Define a matrix  $M_{n-1,q}[x_1, \dots, x_s]$  as follows:

$$M_{n-1,q}[x_1, \dots, x_s] := \begin{bmatrix} K_{n-1,q,0}(x_1) & \cdots & K_{n-1,q,s-1}(x_1) \\ K_{n-1,q,0}(x_2) & \cdots & K_{n-1,q,s-1}(x_2) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_{n-1,q,0}(x_s) & \cdots & K_{n-1,q,s-1}(x_s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The next theorem is main in this section. It shows that a  $(2s-1)$ -design  $C$  with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$  gives rise to an association scheme of  $2s-1$  or  $2s$  classes, which is the fission scheme of the Delsarte scheme of  $C$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(2s-1)$ -design with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$ .*

- (1) *If the design  $C$  is tight, then  $(\tilde{C}, \{\tilde{S}_{0,0}\} \cup \{\tilde{S}_{i,j} \mid i \in \{0, 1\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}\} \setminus \{\tilde{S}_{0,s}\})$  is an association scheme of  $(2s-1)$  classes with the second eigenmatrix*

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{s-1}] & (q-1)M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{s-1}] \\ M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_1-1, \dots, \alpha_s-1] & (-1)M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_1-1, \dots, \alpha_s-1] \end{bmatrix}.$$

- (2) *If the design  $C$  is not tight, then  $(\tilde{C}, \{\tilde{S}_{0,0}\} \cup \{\tilde{S}_{i,j} \mid i \in \{0, 1\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}\})$  is an association scheme of  $2s$  classes with the second eigenmatrix*

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_s] & \mathbf{c} & (q-1)M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_s] \\ M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_1-1, \dots, \alpha_s-1] & O_{s \times 1} & (-1)M_{n-1,q}[\alpha_1-1, \dots, \alpha_s-1] \end{bmatrix},$$



$$\text{where } \mathbf{c} = \begin{bmatrix} |C| - q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_0) \\ -q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots \\ -q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

*Proof.* It follows from Theorem 2.6 that each  $C_i$ , being a  $(2s-2)$ -design with degree  $s_i$  in  $H(n-1, q)$ , defines an association scheme of  $s_i$  classes, whose relations are determined by the Hamming distances from the degree set  $S(C_i)$ . Furthermore, it follows from the proof of Theorem 2.6 that the primitive idempotents of this scheme are defined in Lemma 3.1 as follows:

$$F_0^{(i,i)}, F_1^{(i,i)}, \dots, F_{s-1}^{(i,i)}, \quad \text{and, if } s_i = s, \quad F_s^{(i,i)} = I - \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} F_k^{(i,i)},$$

while in the case  $s_i = s-1$  the matrix  $F_s^{(i,i)}$  is zero (and hence not an idempotent).

Now we define  $E_{0,0}, E_{0,1}, \dots, E_{0,s}, E_{1,0}, \dots, E_{1,s-1}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{0,i} &= \frac{1}{q} \begin{bmatrix} F_i^{(1,1)} & F_i^{(1,2)} & \dots & F_i^{(1,q)} \\ F_i^{(2,1)} & F_i^{(2,2)} & \dots & F_i^{(2,q)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ F_i^{(q,1)} & F_i^{(q,2)} & \dots & F_i^{(q,q)} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq s-1, \\ E_{0,s} &= \begin{bmatrix} F_s^{(1,1)} & O & \dots & O \\ O & F_s^{(2,2)} & \dots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & O & \dots & F_s^{(q,q)} \end{bmatrix}, \\ E_{1,s-1-i} &= \frac{1}{q} \begin{bmatrix} (q-1)F_i^{(1,1)} & -F_i^{(1,2)} & \dots & -F_i^{(1,q)} \\ -F_i^{(2,1)} & (q-1)F_i^{(2,2)} & \dots & -F_i^{(2,q)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -F_i^{(q,1)} & -F_i^{(q,2)} & \dots & (q-1)F_i^{(q,q)} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq s-1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that each  $E_{i,j}$ , possibly except for  $E_{0,s}$ , is a nonzero matrix, and  $E_{0,s}$  is a zero matrix if and only if the degree of  $C_i$  is  $s-1$ .

Recall that  $A_{i,j}$  is the adjacency matrix of the binary relation  $\tilde{S}_{i,j}$  on  $\tilde{C}$ , for  $(i,j) \in \{(k,\ell) \mid 0 \leq k \leq 1, 1 \leq \ell \leq s\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote the vector space spanned by all  $A_{i,j}$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since the matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_i^{(1,1)} & O & \dots & O \\ O & F_i^{(2,2)} & \dots & O \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ O & O & \dots & F_i^{(q,q)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} O & F_i^{(1,2)} & \dots & F_i^{(1,q)} \\ F_i^{(2,1)} & O & \dots & F_i^{(2,q)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ F_i^{(q,1)} & F_i^{(q,2)} & \dots & O \end{bmatrix}$$

are written as linear combinations of  $A_{0,0}, A_{0,1}, \dots, A_{0,s}, A_{1,1}, \dots, A_{1,s}$ , so are the matrices  $E_{0,0}, E_{0,1}, \dots, E_{0,s}, E_{1,0}, \dots, E_{1,s-1}$ . From Lemma 3.1, it follows that the nonzero matrices from  $E_{0,0}, E_{0,1}, \dots, E_{0,s}, E_{1,0}, \dots, E_{1,s-1}$  are mutually orthogonal idempotents. Thus,  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under the matrix multiplication, and the set  $\tilde{C}$  with the binary relations as defined in the statement of the theorem form an association

scheme with primitive idempotents  $E_{0,0}, E_{0,1}, \dots, E_{0,s-1}, E_{1,0}, \dots, E_{1,s-1}$  and with  $E_{0,s}$  if  $s_i = s$ .

Next, we determine the second eigenmatrix  $Q$  of this scheme.

(1) If  $s_i = s - 1$ , then  $Q$  is defined by the following blocks:

$$\begin{array}{cc} & E_{0,j} & E_{1,j'} \\ \begin{array}{c} A_{0,i} \\ A_{1,i'} \end{array} & \begin{bmatrix} K_{n-1,q,j}(\alpha_i) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,j'}(\alpha_i) \\ K_{n-1,q,j}(\alpha_{i'} - 1) & -K_{n-1,q,j'}(\alpha_{i'} - 1) \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

where  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}, i' \in \{1, \dots, s\}, j, j' \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}$  and  $S(C_i) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{s-1}\}, S(C_i, C_j) = \{\alpha_1 - 1, \dots, \alpha_s - 1\}$ , where  $\alpha_s = n$ .

(2) If  $s_i = s$ , then  $Q$  is defined by the following blocks:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & E_{0,j} & E_{0,s} & E_{1,j'} \\ \begin{array}{c} A_{0,0} \\ A_{0,i} \\ A_{1,i'} \end{array} & \begin{bmatrix} K_{n-1,q,j}(\alpha_0) & |C| - q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_0) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,j'}(\alpha_0) \\ K_{n-1,q,j}(\alpha_i) & -q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_i) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,j'}(\alpha_i) \\ K_{n-1,q,j}(\alpha_{i'} - 1) & 0 & -K_{n-1,q,j'}(\alpha_{i'} - 1) \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

where  $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, s\}, j, j' \in \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}$  and  $S(C_i) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}, \alpha_0 = 0, S(C_i, C_j) = \{\alpha_1 - 1, \dots, \alpha_s - 1\}$ .

The lemma is proved.  $\square$

**3.2. Application: tight 3-designs.** In this section, we apply Theorem 3.3 in the case  $s = 2$ . Assume that there exists a 3-design  $C$  with degree 2 in  $H(n, q)$ . Each derived design  $C_i$  is a 2-design with degree at most 2 in  $H(n-1, q)$ . The fission scheme of the Delsarte scheme of  $C$ , constructed by Theorem 3.3, is of 3 classes or 4 classes depending on whether  $C$  is tight or not. We will discuss the nontight case in the Appendix A.

Suppose now that the design  $C$  is tight and set  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$  and  $\alpha_0 = 0$ . Then the 3-class fission scheme of  $C$  has the second eigenmatrix  $Q$  given by:

$$Q = \begin{array}{ccc} & E_{0,0} & E_{0,1} & E_{1,0} & E_{1,1} \\ \begin{array}{c} A_{0,0} \\ A_{0,1} \\ A_{1,1} \\ A_{1,2} \end{array} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_0) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_0) & q-1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1) & q-1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & -K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & -1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_2 - 1) & -K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_2 - 1) & -1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}.$$

It is shown in [30] that  $(|C|, n, q, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  is  $(2n, n, 2, n/2, n)$  with  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  or  $(q^3, q+2, q, q, q+2)$  with  $q$  even. In the former case, the existence of  $C$  is equivalent to that of a Hadamard matrix of order  $n$ ; the 3-class fission scheme corresponds to a distance-regular graph defined by the Hadamard matrix, see [9, Theorem 1.6.1].

In the latter case, a construction is known [6, Section 5] for every  $q$  being a power of 2, in which case each  $C_i$  is a complete set of mutually orthogonal Latin squares of order  $q$ .

Consider further the case  $(|C|, n, q) = (q^3, q+2, q)$  with  $q$  even. We have  $\alpha_1 = q, \alpha_2 = q+2$ , and the 3-class fission scheme of  $C$  has the following second

eigenmatrix  $Q$  and matrix  $L_1^*$  (see the definition of  $L_1^*$  in Section 2.1):

$$(3.1) \quad Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & q^2 - 1 & (q-1)^2(q+1) & q-1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1-q & q-1 \\ 1 & q-1 & 1-q & -1 \\ 1 & -q-1 & q+1 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$L_1^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & q^2 - 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & q-2 & (q-1)q & 0 \\ 0 & q & (q-2)(q+1) & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & q^2 - 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which means that the fission scheme is  $Q$ -polynomial and has the Krein array  $\{q^2 - 1, (q-1)q, 1; 1, q, q^2 - 1\}$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose there exists a  $Q$ -polynomial association scheme with the Krein array  $\{q^2 - 1, (q-1)q, 1; 1, q, q^2 - 1\}$ . If  $q > 2$ , then  $q \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $q > 2$ . Computing the intersection numbers shows that  $p_{2,2}^2 = \frac{1}{4}q(q+3)(q-2) > 0$ ; hence there exist three points of the scheme in pairwise relation  $R_2$ . Computing (using, e.g., the sage-drg package [38]) the triple intersection numbers with respect to these three points, we get  $[1, 2, 3] = \frac{1}{4}(q^2 - q)$ , which thus must be an integer. Therefore,  $q \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$  as desired.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *Suppose there exists a tight 3-design in  $H(q+2, q)$ . If  $q > 2$ , then  $q$  is a multiple of four.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.3, a tight 3-design  $C$  in  $H(q+2, q)$  gives rise to the fission scheme with the second eigenmatrix in Eq. (3.1). Since  $q$  is even by the result of [30],  $q$  must be a multiple of four by Theorem 3.4.  $\square$

*Remark 3.6.* The scheme from Theorem 3.4 corresponds to a linked system of symmetric designs with parameters  $v = q^2$ ,  $k = q(q-1)/2$ ,  $\lambda = q(q-2)/4$  by [37]. The examples are known for  $q = 2t$ , see Manon's family in [26]. The linked systems of symmetric designs is of "optimistic" type in the sense of [26], and [26, Theorem 7.5] shows that  $q$  is a multiple of 4, which is stronger than Theorem 3.4.

#### 4. HAMMING DISTANCES IN EXTREMAL ORTHOGONAL ARRAYS

**4.1. Inequalities.** In this section, we prove the following theorem, which can be seen as a counterpart of Result 1.3 for extremal combinatorial designs.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(2s-1)$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$ . Define  $S'(C) = \{n - \partial(x, y) \mid x, y \in C, x \neq y\}$  and set  $S'(C) = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_s$ . Then*

$$\frac{(s-1)(n-s)}{q} + \frac{s(s-1)}{2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^s x_i \leq \frac{s(n-s)}{q} + \frac{s(s-1)}{2},$$

*with equality in the left if and only if  $x_1 = 0$ , and with equality in the right if and only if  $C$  is a tight  $2s$ -design.*

*Example 4.2.* Consider the following two well-known designs.

- (1) Let  $C$  be the dual of the extended ternary Golay code in  $H(12, 3)$ . Then  $S'(C) = \{x_1 = 0, x_2 = 3, x_3 = 6\}$ , and the left-hand side in Theorem 4.1 equals

$$\frac{(s-1)(n-s)}{q} + \frac{s(s-1)}{2} = \frac{(3-1)(12-3)}{3} + \frac{3(3-1)}{2} = 9 = x_1 + x_2 + x_3.$$

- (2) Let  $C$  be the dual code of the ternary Golay code in  $H(11, 3)$ , which is a tight 4-design. Then  $S'(C) = \{x_1 = 2, x_2 = 5\}$ , and the right-hand side in Theorem 4.1 equals

$$\frac{s(n-s)}{q} + \frac{s(s-1)}{2} = \frac{2(11-2)}{3} + \frac{2(2-1)}{2} = 7 = x_1 + x_2.$$

This shows that both sides of the inequality are tight.

We will need a series of lemmas for the proof of Theorem 4.1. For a set  $C$  of the point set of the Hamming scheme  $H(n, q)$ , recall  $S(C) = \{\partial(x, y) \mid x, y \in C, x \neq y\}$  and  $S'(C) = \{n - \partial(x, y) \mid x, y \in C, x \neq y\}$ . Let  $S'(C) = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_s$ .

Following Ionin and Shrikhande [25], for pairwise distinct nonnegative integers  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s$ , we define the following polynomial:

$$P_s(z) = \prod_{i=1}^s (z - x_i),$$

and the following recurrence sequence  $F_j^{(k)}$  ( $k \geq 1, 0 \leq j \leq k$ ) by  $F_0^{(k)} = 1, F_k^{(k)} = x_1 \cdots x_k$  and

$$F_j^{(k)} = F_j^{(k-1)} + (x_k - k + j)F_{j-1}^{(k-1)} \quad (k \geq 2, 1 \leq j \leq k).$$

**Lemma 4.3.** ([25, Lemma 1.4])  $P_s(z) = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} \cdot (z)_{s-j}$ , where  $(z)_i$  is the Pochhammer symbol  $z(z+1) \cdots (z+i-1)$ .

Define the  $(s+1) \times (s+1)$  matrix  $M_s = M_s(x_1, \dots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s)$  by

$$M_s = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ a_1 & x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_s \\ a_2 & (x_1)_2 & (x_2)_2 & \cdots & (x_s)_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_s & (x_1)_s & (x_2)_s & \cdots & (x_s)_s \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Lemma 4.4.** *The following holds.*

- (1)  $\det M_s(x_1 - 1, \dots, x_s - 1; a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s) = \det M_s(x_1, \dots, x_s; b_0, b_1, \dots, b_s)$ , where  $b_0 = a_0$  and  $b_i = ia_{i-1} + a_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ .
- (2) ([25, Proposition 2.2]) *The determinant of  $M_s$  is equal to*

$$(-1)^s \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (x_j - x_i) \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j a_{s-j} F_j^{(s)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $A = M_s(x_1 - 1, \dots, x_s - 1; a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s)$ . Note that  $j(x_i - 1)_{j-1} + (x_i - 1)_j = (x_i)_j$ . For  $i = s, s-1, \dots, 1$ , adding  $i$  times the  $(i-1)$ -th row of  $A$  to the  $i$ -th row of  $A$  yields the other matrix.  $\square$

Define a semilattice attached to the Hamming scheme  $H(n, q)$  as follows. Let  $n, q$  be integers such that  $n \geq 1, q \geq 2$ . Let  $V$  and  $F$  be finite sets with sizes  $n$  and  $q$  respectively. Define  $X = \{(E, f) : E \subseteq V, f \in \text{Map}(E, F)\}$ . For  $(E, f), (E', f') \in X$ , set  $(E, f) \preceq (E', f')$  if and only if  $E \subseteq E'$  and  $f'|_E = f$ . Then  $(X, \preceq)$  forms a semilattice with rank function, denoted  $|x|$  for  $x \in X$ , taking the size of  $E$ . For every  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , define the fiber  $X_i := \{x \in X : |x| = i\}$ . We regard  $X_n$  as the vertex set of the Hamming scheme  $H(n, q)$ . As usual, the element  $x \wedge y$  denotes the greatest lower bound of  $x$  and  $y$  for  $x, y \in X$ .

Recall that the **index**  $\lambda := \frac{N}{q^t}$  of an  $\text{OA}(N, n, q, t)$  is the multiplicity of any row of  $[q]^t$  among any chosen  $t$  columns of the array. Let  $C$  be a  $(2s-1)$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with index  $\lambda_{2s-1}$ , where  $\lambda_{2s-1} = \frac{|C|}{q^{2s-1}}$ . Regarding  $C$  as an  $i$ -design, for  $i \leq 2s-1$ , its index  $\lambda_i$  is  $\lambda_i = \frac{|C|}{q^i}$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $C$  be a  $t$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$ .*

(1) *If  $t \geq s$ , then*

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j (n)_{s-j} \lambda_{s-j} F_j^{(s)} = P_s(n).$$

(2) *If  $t \geq 2s-1$ , then*

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j (n-\ell)_{s-j} \lambda_{s-j} F_j^{(s)} = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \ell \leq s-1.$$

*Proof.* (1) Let  $y$  be a fixed point in  $C$ . For  $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ , let  $m_j$  denote the number of points  $x$  such that  $n - \partial(x, y) = x_j$ . Additionally, set  $m_0 = -1$  and  $x_0 = n$ . Then, for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ , double counting the set

$$\{(x, I) \in C \times X_i \mid I \preceq x \wedge y\}$$

yields

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{j=0}^s m_j \binom{x_j}{i} = \binom{n}{i} \lambda_i.$$

Multiplying the  $i$ -th equation by  $i!$ , one can consider Eq. (4.3) with  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$  as a homogeneous system of linear equations in the unknowns  $m_0, m_1, \dots, m_s$  with the coefficient matrix  $M_s = M_s(x_1, \dots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s)$ , where  $a_i = (n)_i (\lambda_i - 1)$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ . As we set  $m_0 \neq 0$ , it follows that  $\det M_s = 0$ . By Lemma 4.4,

$$\sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j a_{s-j} F_j^{(s)} = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j (n)_{s-j} (\lambda_{s-j} - 1) F_j^{(s)} = 0,$$

which, together with Lemma 4.3, gives Eq. (4.1). This shows (1).

(2) Next, consider the contraction (say, by the first coordinate)  $C_1$  of  $C$ , which is a  $(2s-2)$ -design with index  $\lambda'_{2s-2}$  in  $H(n-1, q)$ . Note that  $S'(C_1)$  is contained in  $\{x_1 - 1, \dots, x_s - 1\}$  and  $\lambda'_i = \lambda_{i+1}$ . Lemma 4.4 and the above argument<sup>2</sup> applied to  $C_1$  yield

$$\det M_s(x_1, \dots, x_s; b_0, b_1, \dots, b_s) = \det M_s(x_1 - 1, \dots, x_s - 1; a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s) = 0,$$

<sup>2</sup>When  $x_i - 1 \notin S'(X)$ , we set  $m_i = 0$ . Since we set  $m_0 = -1$ , the homogeneous system of linear equations whose unknowns are  $m_0, m_1, \dots, m_s$  has a nontrivial solution.

where  $a_i = (n-1)_i(\lambda'_i - 1)$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ ,  $b_0 = a_0$  and  $b_i = ia_{i-1} + a_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j b_{s-j} F_j^{(s)} \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} a_{s-j} + \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} (s-j) a_{s-j-1} \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} (n-1)_{s-j} (\lambda'_{s-j} - 1) + \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} ((n)_{s-j} - (n-1)_{s-j}) (\lambda'_{s-j-1} - 1) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} (n-1)_{s-j} (\lambda_{s-j+1} - \lambda_{s-j}) + P_s(n) - P_s(n) \\
&\quad (\text{by Lemma 4.5(1) and Lemma 4.3}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} (n-1)_{s-j} \left( \frac{1}{q} \lambda_{s-j} - \lambda_{s-j} \right) \\
&= \left( \frac{1}{q} - 1 \right) \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} (n-1)_{s-j} \lambda_{s-j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\frac{1}{q} - 1 \neq 0$ , it follows that  $\sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} (n-1)_{s-j} \lambda_{s-j} = 0$ . This shows Eq. (4.2) for  $\ell = 1$ . The cases for  $\ell \in \{2, \dots, s-1\}$  are similarly proven.  $\square$

Lemma 4.5(2) with  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$  yields a homogeneous system of linear equations whose unknowns are  $F_j^{(s)}$  with  $0 \leq j \leq s$ . By rewriting  $s-j$  with  $j$ , we have the following:

$$A\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{0},$$

where  $A = ((-1)^{s-j} (n-\ell)_j \lambda_j)_{\substack{\ell=1, \dots, s-1, \\ j=0, \dots, s}}$ ,  $\mathbf{f} = (F_{s-\ell}^{(s)})_{\ell=0, \dots, s}$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *The reduced row echelon form of the matrix  $A$  is  $[I_{s-1} \quad \mathbf{c}_s \quad \mathbf{c}_{s+1}]$ , where the  $i$ -th entry of the column  $\mathbf{c}_s$  is  $-\frac{\binom{s-1}{i-1}(n-i)_{s-i}}{q^{s-i}}$  and the  $i$ -th entry of  $\mathbf{c}_{s+1}$  is  $\frac{((s-1)\binom{s-1}{i-1} - \binom{s-1}{i-2})(n-i)_{s-i+1}}{q^{s-i+1}}$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, s-1\}$ .*

*Proof.* By direct calculations.  $\square$

By Lemma 4.6,  $F_j^{(s)}$  for  $j \in \{2, \dots, s\}$  and  $F_1^{(s)}$  are related as follows:

$$(4.4) \quad F_j^{(s)} = \frac{(n-s+j-1)_{j-1}}{q^{j-1}} \left( \binom{s-1}{j-1} F_1^{(s)} - \frac{((s-1)\binom{s-1}{j-1} - \binom{s-1}{j}) (n-s)}{q} \right).$$

Note that Eq. (4.4) is valid for  $j = 1$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.1 for the lower bound.* By Eq. (4.4),  $F_s^{(s)}$  and  $F_1^{(s)}$  are related as follows:

$$F_s^{(s)} = \frac{(n-1)_{s-1}}{q^{s-1}} \left( F_1^{(s)} - \frac{(s-1)(n-s)}{q} \right).$$

Since  $F_s^{(s)} = \prod_{i=1}^s x_i \geq 0$ , the above equality shows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^s x_i - \frac{s(s-1)}{2} = F_1^{(s)} \geq \frac{(s-1)(n-s)}{q}.$$

This proves the lower bound on  $\sum_{i=1}^s x_i$ . Equality occurs if and only if  $F_s^{(s)} = \prod_{i=1}^s x_i = 0$ . Since  $0 \leq x_1 < \dots < x_s$ , the latter is equivalent to  $x_1 = 0$ .  $\square$

Next, we turn to the upper bound on  $\sum_{i=1}^s x_i$ . By Lemma 4.3 and Eq. (4.1) with the fact that  $\lambda_i = \frac{|C|}{q^i}$ , we have:

$$(4.5) \quad \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)}(n)_{s-j} = |C| \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} \frac{(n)_{s-j}}{q^{s-j}}.$$

Since  $C$  is an  $s$ -distance set,  $|C| \leq \sum_{k=0}^s \binom{n}{k} (q-1)^k =: M$  holds with equality if and only if  $C$  is a tight  $2s$ -design. Since both sides of Eq. (4.5) are positive, it yields

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)}(n)_{s-j} \leq M \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j F_j^{(s)} \frac{(n)_{s-j}}{q^{s-j}}.$$

Substituting Eq. (4.4) into Eq. (4.6) and simplifying it with  $(n)_{s-j}(n-s+j-1)_{j-1} = \frac{(n)_s}{(n-s+j)}$  and  $(n)_s > 0$  gives

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^s \left( \frac{M}{q^{s-j}} - 1 \right) \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{(n-s+j)q^{j-1}} \binom{s-1}{j-1} F_1^{(s)} \\ & \leq \sum_{j=0}^s \left( \frac{M}{q^{s-j}} - 1 \right) \frac{(-1)^{j+1}(n-s)}{(n-s+j)q^j} \left( (s-1) \binom{s-1}{j-1} - \binom{s-1}{j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we simplify the inequality in Eq. (4.7).

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $M = \sum_{k=0}^s \binom{n}{k} (q-1)^k$ . Then:*

- (1)  $\sum_{j=1}^s \left( \frac{M}{q^{s-j}} - 1 \right) \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{(n-s+j)q^{j-1}} \binom{s-1}{j-1} = \frac{(q-1)^s}{sq^{s-1}},$
- (2)  $\sum_{j=0}^s \left( \frac{M}{q^{s-j}} - 1 \right) \frac{(-1)^{j+1}(n-s)}{(n-s+j)q^j} \left( (s-1) \binom{s-1}{j-1} - \binom{s-1}{j} \right) = \frac{(n-s)(q-1)^s}{q^s}.$

*Proof.* (1) is equivalent to

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{k=0}^s \left( \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{\binom{n}{k} - \binom{j}{k}}{n-j} \right) (-1)^{(s-j)+1} \binom{s-1}{j} \right) (q-1)^k = \frac{(q-1)^s}{s}.$$

Note that  $\frac{\binom{n}{k} - \binom{j}{k}}{n-j}$  is a polynomial in  $j$  provided that  $k < n$ . Then using the binomial identity for the Stirling numbers of the second kind

$$\sum_{j=0}^m (-1)^j \binom{m}{j} j^k = 0$$

for  $0 \leq k < m$ , we get that the inner sum on the left-hand side of Eq. (4.8) is equal to 0 if  $k < s$ .

Recall Melzak's formula [28] which states that, for a polynomial  $f(x)$  of degree  $n$ , we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \frac{f(y-k)}{x+k} = \frac{f(x+y)}{x \binom{x+n}{n}}$$

where  $x \neq -k$  ( $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ ). Thus, the inner sum for  $k = s$  in Eq. (4.8) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \left( \frac{\binom{n}{s} - \binom{j}{s}}{n-j} \right) (-1)^{(s-j)+1} \binom{s-1}{j} &= (-1)^{s+1} \binom{n}{s} \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \frac{1}{n-j} (-1)^j \binom{s-1}{j} \\ &= (-1)^{s+1} \binom{n}{s} \cdot (-1)^{s+1} \frac{1}{n \binom{n-1}{s-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{s}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves part (1). Part (2) is similarly proven.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1 for the upper bound.* By Lemma 4.7, the inequality in Eq. (4.7) simplifies to

$$\sum_{i=1}^s x_i \leq \frac{(n-s)s}{q} + \frac{s(s-1)}{2}.$$

This proves the upper bound on  $\sum_{i=1}^s x_i$ , with equality if and only if  $|C| = M$ , i.e.,  $C$  is a tight  $2s$ -design.  $\square$

We give without proof the following analogue of [25, Proposition 4.1].

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(2s-1)$ -design in  $H(n, q)$  with degree  $s$ . Define  $S'(C) = \{n - \partial(x, y) \mid x, y \in C, x \neq y\}$  and set  $S'(C) = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_s$ . Then for all  $m \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \geq m(m-1),$$

*with equality if and only if  $x_i = 2i - 2$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .*

*Remark 4.9.* It is tempting to conjecture a stronger inequality  $\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \geq \frac{qm(m-1)}{2}$ . However, a counterexample to this is given by tight 3-designs in  $H(n, q)$ ,  $q \geq 3$ .

**4.2. Application: feasible parameters and examples.** A tuple of parameters  $(|C|, n, q, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s)$  of a (putative)  $t$ -design  $C$  in  $H(n, q)$  with  $t \geq 2s-2$  determines the second eigenmatrix  $Q$  of the Delsarte scheme  $(C, \{S_i\}_{i=0}^s)$  (see Theorem 2.6), whence one can compute the intersection numbers and the Krein parameters of the scheme. We call such a tuple *feasible* if the intersection numbers are nonnegative integers and the Krein parameters are nonnegative.

We list some feasible tuples of parameters for  $(2s-1)$ -designs with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$  for  $s \in \{2, 3, 4\}$  in Tables 1, 2, 3, respectively. To find these parameters, we carried out the following procedure:

- for each  $q$  and  $n$  in the given ranges, compute the lower  $L$  and upper  $U$  bounds for  $|C|$  by Eq. (1.1) and Eq. (2.2), respectively;
- for each value of  $|C|$ ,  $L \leq |C| \leq U$ , divisible by  $q^{2s-1}$ , compute the first eigenmatrix  $P = |C|Q^{-1}$ , where  $Q$  is defined in Lemma 2.6, with  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$  being treated as indeterminates;



- the first row of  $P$  gives the valencies of the Delsarte scheme, whence one can compute the numbers of pairs  $(x, y) \in C \times C$  such that  $\partial(x, y) = \alpha_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ ;
- with this information in hand, simplify the left-hand side of the equation in Lemma 2.4(3) to get a polynomial  $p_i$  in  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ ;
- compute a Gröbner basis of the ideal in  $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s]$  generated by the polynomials  $p_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ ;
- by the elimination property, if the set of solutions to the equations in Lemma 2.4(3) is finite, the Gröbner basis contains exactly one univariate polynomial (say, in  $\alpha_s$ ), whose roots are the values of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$  (note that each  $\alpha_i$  should satisfy  $\alpha_i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ ). Once these values are determined, we can check the feasibility conditions. The case when the equations have infinitely many solutions can be handled separately; in fact:
  - for  $s \in \{2, 3\}$ , it did not occur in our computations at all;
  - for  $s = 4$ , in all cases that occurred, the largest polynomial of the basis factorized as  $g(\alpha_4) \cdot \prod_{i < j} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)$ , where  $g$  is a univariate polynomial.

$ C $	$n$	$q$	$\alpha_1$	$\alpha_2$	$(v, k, \lambda, \mu)$	Comment, see [8]
16	5	2	2	4	(16, 5, 0, 2)	$\exists!$ , [13, Ex. TF3]
392	46	2	21	28	(392, 115, 18, 40)	$\exists?$
1080	78	2	36	45	(1080, 364, 88, 140)	$\exists?$
800	85	2	40	50	(800, 204, 28, 60)	$\exists?$
784	116	2	56	70	(784, 116, 0, 20)	$\exists?$
1600	205	2	100	120	(1600, 205, 0, 30)	
8400	222	2	105	120	(8400, 3367, 1190, 1456)	
4032	261	2	126	144	(4032, 1015, 182, 280)	
13872	286	2	136	153	(13872, 5720, 2128, 2520)	
7776	300	2	144	162	(7776, 2600, 736, 936)	
81	10	3	6	9	(81, 20, 1, 6)	$\exists!$ , [13, Ex. TF3]
243	11	3	6	9	(243, 110, 37, 60)	$\exists$ , [13, Ex. RT6]
729	56	3	36	45	(729, 112, 1, 20)	$\exists!$ , [13, Ex. FE2]
7803	235	3	153	170	(7803, 1692, 261, 396)	
64	6	4	4	6	(64, 18, 2, 6)	$\exists$ , Example 4.14(3)
256	17	4	12	16	(256, 51, 2, 12)	$\exists$ , [13, Ex. TF3]
4096	78	4	56	64	(4096, 1287, 326, 440)	$\exists$ , [13, Ex. FE3]
625	26	5	20	25	(625, 104, 3, 20)	$\exists$ , [13, Ex. TF3]
28125	267	5	210	225	(28125, 6764, 1363, 1710)	
216	8	6	6	8	(216, 75, 18, 30)	$\nexists$ Corollary 3.5
1296	37	6	30	36	(1296, 185, 4, 30)	$\exists?$

TABLE 1. Feasible parameters for non-tight 3-designs with degree 2 in  $H(n, q)$  for  $n \leq 300$  and  $2 \leq q \leq 6$ .

$ C $	$n$	$q$	$\alpha_1$	$\alpha_2$	$\alpha_3$	Comment
32	6	2	2	4	6	the dual of the repetition code
1024	22	2	8	12	16	the doubly shortened code of the extended Golay code
729	12	3	6	9	12	the dual code of the extended Golay code

TABLE 2. Feasible parameters for 5-designs with degree 3 in  $H(n, q)$ ,  $2 \leq n \leq 200$ ,  $2 \leq q \leq 10$ .

$ C $	$n$	$q$	$\alpha_1$	$\alpha_2$	$\alpha_3$	$\alpha_4$	Comment
128	8	2	2	4	6	8	the dual of the repetition code
4096	24	2	8	12	16	24	the extended Golay code, oa.4096.12.2.7 in [33]

TABLE 3. Feasible parameters for 7-designs with degree 4 in  $H(n, q)$ ,  $8 \leq n \leq 100$ ,  $2 \leq q \leq 10$ .

As for Table 1, it is clear that the Delsarte scheme with  $s = 2$  classes corresponds to a strongly regular graph; the parameters are given in the second to last column.

Recall that a linear code  $C \leq \mathbb{F}_q^n$  is said to be **projective** if any two of its coordinates are linearly independent, i.e., the dual code  $C^\perp$  has minimum distance  $d_{C^\perp} \geq 3$ . If  $\dim C = k$ , then the columns of the generator matrix of  $C$  give a set  $\mathcal{O}$  of  $n$  points in the projective geometry  $\text{PG}(k-1, q)$ . A code  $C$  is called a **two-weight** code if every nonzero vector from  $C$  has weight (support)  $w_1$  or  $w_2$ . It is well known that the matrix whose rows consist of the vectors of  $C$  is an  $\text{OA}(|C|, n, q, d_{C^\perp} - 1)$ . Thus, a projective two-weight code in  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  gives rise to a 2-design with degree 2 in  $H(n, q)$  (see [13] and [10, Chapter 7] for more results on projective two-weight codes and strongly regular graphs). Furthermore, it has strength 3 if and only if  $d_{C^\perp} \geq 4$  holds if and only if no 3 points of  $\mathcal{O}$  are on a line, i.e.,  $\mathcal{O}$  is a projective  $n$ -cap. Projective  $n$ -caps were classified in a series of papers by Calderbank, Tzanakis and Wolfskill and others (see [10, Section 7.1.9.J]):

- (i) an ovoid of  $\text{PG}(3, q)$ , [13, Ex. TF3];
- (ii) the Coxeter 11-cap of  $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ , [13, Ex. RT6];
- (iii) the Hill 56-cap of  $\text{PG}(5, 3)$ , [13, Ex. FE2];
- (iv) a 78-cap of  $\text{PG}(5, 4)$ , [13, Ex. FE3];
- (v) a 430-cap of  $\text{PG}(6, 4)$ .

The uniqueness of the example in (iv) and the existence of (v) remain longstanding open problems in finite geometry and coding theory, unresolved for more than 40 years. Recently, Bamberg [2] showed that the answer to the latter question is negative if the answer to the former one is affirmative; the proof is based on a certain 9-class association scheme. In fact, the Delsarte scheme of the design corresponding to a projective two-weight code is a translation scheme and thus admits the dual scheme (see [9, Section 2.10.B]). The Bamberg scheme is a fission of this dual scheme for the only known example in (iv). Interestingly, it admits a 4-class fusion with the same parameters as the fission scheme of the Delsarte scheme of the design from Theorem 3.3; we did not check whether these two schemes are isomorphic.

Since a projective two-weight code is linear, the number of points must be divisible by a power of  $q$ . This shows that in many open cases from Table 1 such designs cannot be obtained from codes<sup>3</sup>. We wonder whether the fission schemes of their Delsarte schemes may help to rule out their existence.

The degree sets of some examples in Tables 1, 2, 3 feature a symmetry property. We will characterize these examples in the theorems below. More precisely, we consider codes  $C$  in  $H(n, 2)$  having the property that both  $n \in S(C)$  and  $n - a \in S(C)$  whenever  $n \neq a \in S(C)$ . These codes include the class of *self complementary codes*, see [1] for linear programming bounds and related association schemes. Before

<sup>3</sup>For  $n = 8$ ,  $q = 6$ , note that a strongly regular graph may still exist, see [8].

stating the results, we prepare a lemma for extremal designs  $C$  with the degree set  $S(C)$  such that  $a \in S(C) \cup \{0\}$  implies  $n - a \in S(C) \cup \{0\}$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $C$  be a  $(2s - 1)$ -design with degree  $s$  in  $H(n, q)$ . If, for every  $a \in S(C) \cup \{0\}$ , one has  $n - a \in S(C) \cup \{0\}$ , then  $q = 2$ .*

*Proof.* As in Theorem 4.1, define the set  $S'(C) = \{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$  with  $x_1 < \dots < x_s$ . By our assumptions,  $x_1 = 0$  and the set  $S(C) \cup \{0\}$  is symmetric with respect to  $n/2$ , hence Theorem 4.1 shows that

$$\frac{(s-1)n}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^s x_i = \frac{(s-1)(n-s)}{q} + \frac{s(s-1)}{2},$$

whence it follows that  $q = 2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let  $n, q$  be positive integers such that  $n$  is even and  $n \geq 4, q \geq 2$ . Any 3-design  $C$  in  $H(n, q)$  with degree 2 and degree set  $S(C) = \{n/2, n\}$  is isomorphic to the Hadamard code of a Hadamard matrix of order  $n$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.10,  $q = 2$ . By Theorem 2.6, the Delsarte scheme of  $C$  has the first eigenmatrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & |C| - 2 & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{|C|}{n} - 2 & 1 - \frac{|C|}{n} \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.4(3), the only possible value for  $|C|$  is  $|C| = 2n$ . It is easily seen that  $C$  is the Hadamard code of a Hadamard matrix of order  $n$ , and vice versa.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.12.** *Let  $n, q$  be positive integers such that  $n \geq 6, q \geq 2$ . Any 5-design  $C$  in  $H(n, q)$  with degree 3 and degree set  $S(C) = \{a, n - a, n\}$  for some  $a$  with  $a < n/2$  is isomorphic to the dual of the binary repetition code of length 6.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.10,  $q = 2$ . By Theorem 2.6, the Delsarte scheme of  $C$  has the first eigenmatrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{4n(a-n)+n|C|(-2a+n+1)}{4(2a^2-3an+n^2)} & \frac{n(2a(|C|-2)+|C|(-2n+n+1))}{4a(2a-n)} & |C| - 1 + \frac{(n-1)n|C|}{4a(a-n)} \\ 1 & \frac{2n(a-n)+|C|(n-a)}{2(2a^2-3an+n^2)} & \frac{a(|C|-2n)}{2a(2a-n)} & -1 \\ 1 & \frac{2n(a-n)+|C|}{2(2a^2-3an+n^2)} & \frac{|C|-2an}{2a(2a-n)} & -\frac{|C|}{2a(a-n)} - 1 \\ 1 & \frac{n}{2a-n} & \frac{2a}{n-2a} + 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.4(3), the only possible values for  $|C|$  and  $a$  are  $(|C|, a) = (n^2 - n + 2, (n - \sqrt{n-2})/2)$ . Thus,  $n = m^2 + 2$  for a positive integer  $m$  and the first eigenmatrix becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{2}(m^2+1)(m^2+2) & \frac{1}{2}(m^2+1)(m^2+2) & 1 \\ 1 & -\frac{1}{2}m(m^2+1) & \frac{1}{2}m(m^2+1) & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{m^2+2}{m} & -\frac{m^2+2}{m} & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the  $(4,1)$ -entry must be an integer,  $m = 1$  or  $2$ . Then  $(n, |C|, a) = (3, 8, 1)$  or  $(6, 32, 2)$ . The first case  $n = 3$  cannot afford the assumption  $n \geq 6$ . For the second case  $n = 6$ , it is easy to see that  $C$  is the dual of the binary repetition code.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.13.** *Let  $n, q$  be positive integers such that  $n$  is even and  $n \geq 8, q \geq 2$ . Any 7-design  $C$  in  $H(n, q)$  with degree 4 and degree set  $S(C) = \{a, n/2, n-a, n\}$  for some  $a$  with  $a < n/2$  is isomorphic to either the dual of the binary repetition code of length 8 or the extended Golay code of length 24.*

*Proof.* As in the preceding theorems,  $q = 2$  and computing the first eigenmatrix of the Delsarte scheme of  $C$  shows that  $(|C|, a) = (n(n^2 - 3n + 8)/3, (n - \sqrt{3n - 8})/2)$ . Thus,  $n = (m^2 + 8)/3$  for a positive integer  $m$  and the first eigenmatrix becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{n^2(m^4+7m^2+10)}{54m^2} & \frac{2(m^8+11m^6+87m^4+221m^2-320)}{243m^2} & \frac{n^2(m^4+7m^2+10)}{54m^2} & 1 \\ 1 & \frac{n(m^4+7m^2+10)}{54m} & 0 & -\frac{m^6+15m^4+66m^2+80}{162m} & -1 \\ 1 & \frac{n(m^4-2m^2-8)}{27m^2} & -\frac{2(m^6+6m^4+57m^2-64)}{81m^2} & \frac{m^6+6m^4-24m^2-64}{81m^2} & 1 \\ 1 & -\frac{n}{m} & 0 & \frac{n}{m} & -1 \\ 1 & -\frac{n^2}{m^2} & \frac{2(m^4+7m^2+64)}{9m^2} & -\frac{n^2}{m^2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the  $(4,1)$ -entry must be an integer,  $m \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$ . Then  $(n, |C|, a) = (3, 8, 1)$ ,  $(4, 16, 1)$ ,  $(8, 128, 2)$ ,  $(24, 4096, 8)$ . The first two cases  $n \in \{3, 4\}$  do not afford the assumption  $n \geq 8$ . For the third case  $n = 8$ , it is easy to see that  $C$  is the dual of the binary repetition code of length 8. For the last case,  $C$  is the extended Golay code of length 24.  $\square$

*Example 4.14.* Here we list all known infinite families of  $(2s-1)$ -designs of degree  $s$  in Hamming schemes:

- (1) the dual of the binary repetition code of length  $2s$  is a tight  $(2s-1)$ -design in  $H(2s, 2)$  with degree  $s$  for any  $s$ ;
- (2) a Hadamard code of length  $4n$  is a tight 3-design in  $H(4n, 2)$  with degree set  $\{2n, 4n\}$ .
- (3) for any prime power  $q = 2^m$ , there is a tight 3-design in  $H(q+2, q)$  with degree set  $\{q, q+2\}$ .
- (4) for any prime power  $q$ , there is a nontight 3-design in  $H(q^2+1, q)$  with degree set  $\{q^2 - q, q^2\}$ , see [13, Example TF3].

*Acknowledgments.* We are grateful to Jason Williford for pointing out the connection between the scheme from Theorem 3.4 and linked systems of symmetric designs.

Sho Suda's research is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K03410.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Araya, M. Harada, and S. Suda. Quasi-unbiased Hadamard matrices and weakly unbiased Hadamard matrices: a coding-theoretic approach. *Math. Comput.*, 86(304):951–984, 2017.
- [2] J. Bamberg. On the 430-cap of  $PG(6, 4)$  having two intersection sizes with respect to hyperplanes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 92:495–503, 2024.
- [3] E. Bannai and R. M. Damerell. Tight spherical designs I. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 31:199–207, 1980.
- [4] E. Bannai and R. M. Damerell. Tight spherical designs II. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 21:13–30, 1980.
- [5] E. Bannai and T. Ito. *Algebraic Combinatorics I: Association Schemes*. Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA, 1984.
- [6] R. C. Bose and K. A. Bush. Orthogonal arrays of strength two and three. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 23:508–524, 1952.
- [7] P. Boyvalenkov, H. Nozaki, and N. Safaei. Rationality of the inner products of spherical  $s$ -distance  $t$ -designs for  $t \geq 2s - 2$ ,  $s \geq 3$ . *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 646:107–118, 2022.

- [8] A. E. Brouwer. Parameters of strongly regular graphs. <https://aeb.win.tue.nl/graphs/srg/srgtab.html>.
- [9] A. E. Brouwer, A. E. Cohen, and A. Neumaier. *Distance-regular graphs*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [10] A. E. Brouwer and H. Van Maldeghem. *Strongly Regular Graphs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2022.
- [11] K. A. Bush. Orthogonal arrays of index unity. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 23:426–434, 1952.
- [12] A. R. Calderbank and J.-M. Goethals. On a pair of dual subschemes of the Hamming scheme  $H_n(q)$ . *European J. Combin.*, 6:133–147, 1985.
- [13] A. R. Calderbank and W. M. Kantor. The geometry of two-weight codes. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 18:97–122, 1986.
- [14] P. J. Cameron, J.-M. Goethals, and J. J. Seidel. Strongly regular graphs having strongly regular subconstituents. *J. Algebra*, 55:257–280, 1978.
- [15] L. Chihara. On the zeros of the askey–wilson polynomials, with applications to coding theory. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 18(1):191–207, 1987.
- [16] K. Coolsaet and A. Jurišić. Using equality in the Krein conditions to prove nonexistence of certain distance-regular graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 115:1086–1095, 2008.
- [17] P. Delsarte. An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory. *Philips Res. Rep.*, 10(Suppl.), 1973.
- [18] P. Delsarte. Association schemes and  $t$ -designs in regular semilattices. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 20(2):230–243, 1976.
- [19] P. Delsarte, J.-M. Goethals, and J. J. Seidel. Spherical codes and designs. *Geom. Dedicata*, 6:363–388, 1977.
- [20] A. L. Gavriluk, J. Lansdown, A. Munemasa, and S. Suda. Roux schemes which carry association schemes locally. 2025. arXiv:2507.18960.
- [21] A. L. Gavriluk, S. Suda, and J. Vidali. On tight 4-designs in Hamming association schemes. *Combinatorica*, 40:345–362, 2020.
- [22] A. L. Gavriluk, J. Vidali, and J. S. Williford. On few-class  $Q$ -polynomial association schemes: feasible parameters and nonexistence results. *Ars Math. Contemp.*, 20:103–127, 2021.
- [23] A. S. Hedayat, N. J. A. Sloane, and J. Stufken. *Orthogonal arrays, theory and applications*. Springer, New York, 1999.
- [24] Y. Hong. On the nonexistence of nontrivial perfect  $e$ -codes and tight  $2e$ -designs in Hamming schemes  $H(n, q)$  with  $e \geq 3$  and  $q \geq 3$ . *Graphs Combin.*, 2:145–164, 1986.
- [25] Y. Ionin and M. Shrikhande.  $(2s - 1)$  designs with  $s$  intersection numbers. *Geom. Dedicata*, 48:247–265, 1993.
- [26] B. G. Kodalen. Linked systems of symmetric designs. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2(1):119–147, 2019.
- [27] V. Krčadinac and R. Vlahović Kruc. Schematic 4-designs. *Discrete Math.*, 346:113385, 2023.
- [28] Z. A. Melzak. Problem 4458. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 58:636, 1951.
- [29] R. Mukerjee and S. Kageyama. On existence of two symbol complete orthogonal arrays. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 66:176–181, 1994.
- [30] R. Noda. On orthogonal arrays of strength 3 and 5 achieving Rao’s bound. *Graphs Combin.*, pages 277–282, 1986.
- [31] C. R. Rao. Factorial experiments derivable from combinatorial arrangements of arrays. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.*, 9:128–139, 1947.
- [32] D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri and R. M. Wilson. On  $t$ -designs. *Osaka J. Math.*, 12:737–744, 1975.
- [33] N. J. A. Sloane. A library of orthogonal arrays. <http://neilsloane.com/oadir/>.
- [34] S. Suda. Coherent configurations and triply regular association schemes obtained from spherical designs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 117(8):1178–1194, 2010.
- [35] S. Suda.  $Q$ -polynomial coherent configurations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 643:166–195, 2022.
- [36] M. Urlep. Triple intersection numbers of  $Q$ -polynomial distance-regular graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 33:1246–1252, 2012.
- [37] E. R. Van Dam. Three-Class Association Schemes. *J. of Alg. Combin.*, 10:69–107, 1999.
- [38] J. Vidali. Using symbolic computation to prove nonexistence of distance-regular graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 25(4):#P4.21, 2018.

## APPENDIX A. NONTIGHT 3-DESIGNS WITH DEGREE 2

Let  $C$  be a nontight 3-design with degree 2 in  $H(n, q)$ . Set  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ ,  $\alpha_0 = 0$ . Then the fission scheme of 4 classes has the following second eigenmatrix:

$$(A.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & E_{0,0} & E_{0,1} & E_{0,2} & E_{1,0} & E_{1,1} \\ \begin{array}{l} A_{0,0} \\ A_{0,1} \\ A_{0,2} \\ A_{1,1} \\ A_{1,2} \end{array} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_0) & |C| - q \sum_{\ell=0}^1 K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_0) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_0) & q-1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1) & -q \sum_{\ell=0}^1 K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_1) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1) & q-1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_2) & -q \sum_{\ell=0}^1 K_{n-1,q,\ell}(\alpha_2) & (q-1)K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_2) & q-1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & 0 & -K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & -1 \\ 1 & K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_2 - 1) & 0 & -K_{n-1,q,1}(\alpha_2 - 1) & -1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}.$$

There is a one-parameter family with  $(|C|, n, \alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (q^4, q^2 + 1, q^2 - q, q^2)$  [10, Theorem 7.1.1].

The eigenmatrices for the corresponding 4-class scheme are

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & q(q^2 - 1) & q - 1 & (q - 1)^2 q^2 & (q - 1)q^2 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & (q - 1)q & -(q - 1)q \\ 1 & -q & q - 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -q & q \\ 1 & q(q^2 - 1) & q - 1 & -(q - 1)q^2 & -q^2 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & (q - 1)q^2 & q(q^2 - 1) & (q - 1)^2 q^2 & q - 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -q & 0 & q - 1 \\ 1 & -q^2 & q(q^2 - 1) & -(q - 1)q^2 & q - 1 \\ 1 & q & 0 & -q & -1 \\ 1 & -(q - 1)q & 0 & (q - 1)q & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

## APPENDIX B. DETERMINANT OF THE SECOND EIGENMATRIX

Here we strengthen [12, Theorem 1] by Calderbank and Goethals for  $(2s - 1)$ -design with degree  $s$ . We adhere to the notation introduced in Section 3.

**Lemma B.1.** (See the proof of [12, Theorem 1]) *Let  $M = (K_{n,q,k}(\alpha_i))_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq s \\ 0 \leq k \leq s-1}}$ .*

*Then*

$$\det M = \frac{q^{s(s-1)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} i!}.$$

Recall that the entries of the first eigenmatrix are algebraic integers.

**Lemma B.2.** *If the second eigenmatrix  $Q$  of a  $D$  classes symmetric association scheme with  $v$  vertices has only integer entries, then  $\det Q$  divides  $v^{D+1}$ .*

*Proof.* If the entries of the second eigenmatrix  $Q = \frac{1}{v}P^{-1}$  are all integral, then those of the first eigenmatrix  $P$  are all rational and hence must be integral as well. Taking the determinant of the equation  $PQ = vI$ , we obtain  $\det P \det Q = v^{D+1}$ . Therefore,  $\det Q$  divides  $v^{D+1}$ , which yields the conclusion.  $\square$

As a corollary of the lemmas above, Calderbank and Goethals showed the following theorem.

**Theorem B.3.** ([12, Theorem 1]) *If  $C$  is a  $(2s - 2)$ -design with degree  $s$  and  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$  in  $H(n, q)$ , then*

$$\frac{q^{s(s-1)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} i!}$$

*is an integer dividing  $|C|^s$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from Lemma B.2, Lemma B.1, and Theorem 2.6.  $\square$

**Lemma B.4.** *Let  $Q$  be the second eigenmatrix as in Theorem 3.3(2). Then*

$$\det Q = \pm |C| q^s \left( \frac{q^{s(s-1)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} i!} \right)^2$$

*and  $(\det Q)/|C|$  is an integer.*

*Proof.* Compute the determinant of the second eigenmatrix  $Q$  as follows. Denote  $K_{n-1,q,j}(x)$  by  $K_j(x)$  for short. For  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , add the  $i$ -th column to the  $(s+1+i)$ -th column to obtain:

$$\begin{vmatrix} K_0(\alpha_0) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_0) & |C| - q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_\ell(\alpha_0) & qK_0(\alpha_0) & \cdots & qK_{s-1}(\alpha_0) \\ K_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1) & -q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_\ell(\alpha_1) & qK_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & qK_{s-1}(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s) & -q \sum_{\ell=0}^{s-1} K_\ell(\alpha_s) & qK_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & qK_{s-1}(\alpha_s) \\ K_0(\alpha_1 - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s - 1) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

then sum the last  $s$  columns up and add them to the  $(s+1)$ -th column:

$$= q^s \begin{vmatrix} K_0(\alpha_0) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_0) & |C| & K_0(\alpha_0) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_0) \\ K_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1) & 0 & K_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s) & 0 & K_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s) \\ K_0(\alpha_1 - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s - 1) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \pm q^s |C| \begin{vmatrix} K_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1) & K_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s) & K_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s) \\ K_0(\alpha_1 - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1 - 1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s - 1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{vmatrix} \\
&= \pm q^s |C| \begin{vmatrix} K_0(\alpha_1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s) \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} K_0(\alpha_1 - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_1 - 1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ K_0(\alpha_s - 1) & \cdots & K_{s-1}(\alpha_s - 1) \end{vmatrix} \\
&\text{(by Lemma B.1)} \\
&= \pm q^s |C| \left( \frac{q^{s(s-1)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} i!} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

The fact that  $(\det Q)/|C|$  is an integer follows from the second equality in the above equation.  $\square$

**Theorem B.5.** *If  $C$  is a nontight  $(2s-1)$ -design with degree  $s$  and  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s\}$  in  $H(n, q)$ , then*

$$q^s \left( \frac{q^{s(s-1)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^{s-1} i!} \right)^2$$

*is an integer dividing  $|C|^{2s}$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from Lemma B.2, Lemma B.4, and Theorem 3.3.  $\square$

**Remark B.6.** Let  $q = p^m$  where  $p$  is a prime. Let  $C$  be a linear code of length  $n$  with dimension  $k$  over the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with  $q$  elements. Assume that  $C$  is a 5-design with degree 3 in  $H(n, q)$ . By [12, Corollary 3], the three distances of  $C$  are  $\alpha_1 = (a-1)p^t$ ,  $\alpha_2 = ap^t$ ,  $\alpha_3 = (a+1)p^t$  for some integers  $a, t$ . Then Theorem B.3 shows that  $k \geq m + t$ , while Theorem B.5 shows  $k \geq \frac{3}{2}m + t$ .

**Remark B.7.** A theorem for tight designs, similar to Theorem B.5, is stated as follows: If  $C$  is a tight  $(2s-1)$ -design with degree  $s$  and  $S(C) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s = n\}$ , then

$$q^s \left( \frac{q^{(s-1)(s-2)/2} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s-1} (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^{s-2} i!} \right)^2$$

is an integer dividing  $|C|^{2s-1}$ .

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE, U.S.A.  
Email address: a.gavrilyuk@memphis.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL DEFENSE ACADEMY OF JAPAN, KANAGAWA, JAPAN  
Email address: ssuda@nda.ac.jp