

Classification of extremal and s -extremal binary self-dual codes of length 38

Carlos Aguilar-Melchor, Philippe Gaborit, Jon-Lark Kim, Lin Sok and Patrick Solé

Abstract—In this paper we classify all extremal and s -extremal binary self-dual codes of length 38. There are exactly 2744 extremal [38, 19, 8] self-dual codes, two s -extremal [38, 19, 6] codes, and 1730 s -extremal [38, 19, 8] codes. We obtain our results from the use of a recursive algorithm used in the recent classification of all extremal self-dual codes of length 36, and from a generalization of this recursive algorithm for the shadow. The classification of s -extremal [38, 19, 6] codes permits to achieve the classification of all s -extremal codes with $d = 6$.

Keywords: Classification, recursive construction, extremal, self-dual codes, s -extremal, shadow

I. INTRODUCTION

Self-dual codes are one of the most interesting classes of linear codes. They have close connections with group theory, lattice theory, design theory, and modular forms. It is well known that self-dual codes are asymptotically good [22]. There has been an active research on the classification of self-dual codes over finite fields and over rings in general (see [25], [23] for details). In particular, the classification of binary self-dual codes was started by Pless [24] and has been actively studied by many authors (see [19] for a survey of optimal self-dual codes over small alphabets).

Recently, using a recursive method, Aguilar and Gaborit classified all 41 extremal [36, 18, 8] binary self-dual codes. These results were pushed further by Harada and Munemasa [17] who, besides the 41 extremal codes of [1], also give a complete classification of all self-dual codes of length 36.

A natural question is hence to consider the case of length 38. A simple computation on the mass formula shows that there are at least 13,644,433 inequivalent binary self-dual [38, 19] codes [17]. It is hence natural to consider the case of special subclasses of self-dual codes. The most interesting such subclass is the class of extremal codes. Given the classification of all [36, 18, 6] self-dual codes of [17], we apply an optimized recursive algorithm as in [1] to derive the classification of all 2744 extremal self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes.

C. Aguilar-Melchor and P. Gaborit are with XLIM-DMI, UMR 6172, Université de Limoges, 123, Av. Albert Thomas, 87000 Limoges, France. carlos.aguilar@xlim.fr, gaborit@unilim.fr

J.-L. Kim, Department of Mathematics, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA. jl.kim@louisville.edu

Lin Sok, Department of Comelec, Telecom ParisTech, 46 rue Barrault 75013 Paris, France. lin.sok@telecom-paristech.fr

Patrick Solé, CNRS/LTCl, UMR 5141, Telecom ParisTech 46 rue Barrault 75 634 Paris cedex 13, France and MECAA, Math Dept of King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia patrick.sole@telecom-paristech.fr

Another subclass of interesting self-dual codes with combinatorial properties is the class of s -extremal codes: these codes are self-dual codes whose weight enumerator is uniquely determined, depending on the condition on a high weight of the shadow. The notion of codes (and lattices) with long shadows was first developed by Elkies [11]. This notion was generalized by Bachoc and Gaborit in [2] who introduced the notion of s -extremal codes. These codes exist depending on conditions on their length and their minimum distance. The classification of s -extremal codes with $d = 4$ was done by Elkies. The case of $d = 6$ was mainly considered in [2], but two lengths remained to be classified. One is length 36, which was classified in [1], and the other is length 38, which is what we classify in this paper. Our classification is based on a generalization of the subtraction algorithm in the case of the shadow. It permits us to use the recursive algorithm by showing that in certain cases for n even, the subtraction of (11) from a $[2n + 2, n + 1, d + 2]$ self-dual code with shadow weight $s + 1$ leads to a $[2n, n, d]$ self-dual code with shadow weight s . This result is interesting in itself.

The paper is organized as follows: Section II gives preliminaries and background for self-dual codes, Section III compares the different method to extend a self-dual code in a purpose of classification. In Section IV we show that there are exactly 2744 extremal [38, 19, 8] binary self-dual codes. In Section V we prove that there are only two s -extremal [38, 19, 6] codes and 1730 s -extremal [38, 19, 8] codes. The last section describes the covering radii of self-dual codes of length 38.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We refer to [20] for basic definitions and results related to self-dual codes. All codes in this paper are binary. A linear $[n, k]$ code C of length n is a k -dimensional subspace of $GF(2)^n$. An element of C is called a *codeword*. The (Hamming) weight $\text{wt}(\mathbf{x})$ of a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the number of non-zero coordinates in it. The *minimum distance* (or *minimum weight*) $d(C)$ of C is $d(C) := \min\{\text{wt}(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in C, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}\}$. The *Euclidean inner product* of $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ in $GF(2)^n$ is $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$. The *dual* of C , denoted by C^\perp is the set of vectors orthogonal to every codeword of C under the Euclidean inner product. If $C = C^\perp$, C is called *self-dual*. A self-dual code is called *Type II* (or *doubly-even*) if every codeword has weight divisible by 4, and *Type I* (or *singly-even*) if there exists a codeword whose weight is congruent to 2 (mod 4).

Two codes over $GF(2)$ are said to be *equivalent* if they differ only by a permutation of the coordinates. Let C be a

binary self-dual code of length n and minimum distance $d(C)$. Then $d(C)$ satisfies the following (see [25]).

$$d(C) \leq \begin{cases} 4 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{24} \right\rfloor + 4, & \text{if } n \not\equiv 22 \pmod{24}, \\ 4 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{24} \right\rfloor + 6, & \text{if } n \equiv 22 \pmod{24}. \end{cases}$$

A self-dual code meeting one of the above bounds is called *extremal*. A code is called *optimal* if it has the highest possible minimum distance for its length and dimension.

By the well known Gleason's theorem, the weight enumerator $W_C(x, y)$ of a Type I code can be written as follows (for rational coefficients c_i):

$$W_C(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/8 \rfloor} c_i (x^2 + y^2)^{\frac{n}{2}-4i} \{x^2 y^2 (x^2 - y^2)^2\}^i.$$

An important notion associated to a Type I code is the *shadow* S of a code C , defined by $S = C_0^\perp \setminus C$, where C_0 is the doubly-even subcode of C . In [9], Conway and Sloane show that for a weight enumerator $W_C(x, y)$ given above, the weight enumerator W_S of S satisfies

$$W_S(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/8 \rfloor} c_i (-1)^i 2^{\frac{n}{2}-6i} (xy)^{\frac{n}{2}-4i} (x^4 - y^4)^{2i}.$$

This notion of shadow permits to give more information on potential weight enumerators of self-dual codes, and is also used to define s -extremal codes (see [2] or Sec. V).

The main tool to classify self-dual codes is based on the so-called mass formula. It is known from [24] that self-dual binary codes (Type I or Type II) of length n satisfy a formula (a mass formula):

$$N(n) = \sum_j \frac{n!}{|Aut(C_j)|},$$

where the sum is made over all inequivalent self-dual codes (Type I or Type II) of length n , $|Aut(C)|$ denotes the order of the automorphism group of a code C , and $N(n)$ is the number of Type I or Type II codes. In particular, for Type I codes, $N(n) = \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} (2^i + 1)$ and for Type II codes $N(n) = \prod_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-2} (2^i + 1)$.

Therefore, for $n = 38$,

$$N(38) = \prod_{i=1}^{18} (2^i + 1) = \sum_j \frac{38!}{|Aut(C_j)|}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 13644432.20346 &< \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{18} (2^i + 1)}{38!} \\ &= \sum_j \frac{1}{|Aut(C_j)|} \\ &\leq \#(\text{all inequivalent self-dual codes}) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as there is no mass formula for extremal self-dual codes, it might be also difficult to classify all extremal binary [38, 19, 8] codes. However, using the recursive construction [1] which was used in classifying all extremal binary [36, 18, 8] codes, we are successful in classifying all extremal binary [38, 19, 8] codes.

A very interesting tool for self-dual codes is the subtraction procedure of (11) on two coordinates of a code. This procedure permits to construct a $[2n, n, d' \geq d]$ self-dual code from a $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ self-dual code. It works as follows: suppose one starts from a $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ self-dual code C for $d \geq 2$. Let i and j be two different coordinates of the columns of C . Since $d+2 \geq 3$ and C is self-dual, any two columns of C are independent (if not, there should be a codeword of weight 2 in C , a contradiction). This implies that the coordinates of the two columns of the codewords of C contain (00), (10), (01) and (00). For the subtraction procedure of (11) on columns i and j , one first keeps all codewords which are either (00) or (11) on columns i and j , and then deletes columns i and j for these codewords. Let C' be the obtained code. Since $d+2 > 2$ and by an argument similar to the shortening of a code, the dimension of C' is n . Moreover since the scalar product of any two codewords of C is 0, the scalar product of any two codewords of C' is also 0. Now as the minimum distance of C is $d+2$, the minimum distance d' of C' is either d either $d+2$ (depending on the fact that columns i and j intersect or not with codewords of C of weight $d+2$). Overall C' is a $[2n, n, d' \geq d]$ self-dual code.

III. CONSTRUCTION METHODS

There exist several methods to construct self-dual codes of length $n+2$ from self-dual codes of length n . In this section we recall these methods; the recursive construction, the building-up construction and the Harada-Munemasa construction. We eventually compare them.

A. The recursive construction

In [1], Aguilar and Gaborit give a recursive construction of binary self-dual codes. This algorithm can be seen as the reverse operation of the subtraction procedure of (11) given above. We recall that a subtraction procedure produces a self-dual $[2n, n, d' \geq d]$ code C' from a self-dual $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ code C . The recursive algorithm starts from a self-dual $[2n, n, d]$ code C' and constructs (up to permutation) all self-dual $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ codes which by subtraction of (11) on certain two columns give the code C' . The idea of the recursive algorithm is very simple and consists of extending the code C' with 11 for all codewords of weight d , then constructing all possibilities with (00) or (11) for a basis of remaining codewords, and eventually checking for addition of a vector strictly contained in the shadow of the extended code. This approach is very useful in classifying extremal self-dual $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ codes because it is sufficient to know (up to permutation) a classification of $[2n, n, \geq d]$ self-dual codes. Indeed, any $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ code gives a $[2n, n, d]$ code by subtraction of (11) on adequate columns, conversely applying the 'reverse subtraction' procedure to the set of all $[2n, n, d]$ codes (up to permutation) permits to construct a set of codes which contains (up to permutation) all $[2n+2, n+1, d+2]$ codes.

We now recall the recursive algorithm (with a correction of $n-k$ in Step 2) from [1] into $\frac{n}{2} - k$:

Recursive algorithm

Input: S_n , the set of $[n, \frac{n}{2}, d]$ self-dual codes up to permutation

Output: The set of $[n+2, \frac{n}{2}+1, d+2]$ self-dual codes

For each code C_n of S_n do:

- 1) List all the words of weight d and construct the subcode C_d of dimension k generated by these words. Construct a generator matrix G_d of C_d composed only with words of weight d .
- 2) Let E be a code of dimension $\frac{n}{2} - k$ with generator matrix G_E such that $C_n = C_d + E$, constructs the extended codes C with generator matrices:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc|c} 1 & 1 & \\ \vdots & \vdots & G_d \\ 1 & 1 & \\ a_1 & a_1 & \\ \vdots & \vdots & G_E \\ a_{\frac{n}{2}-k} & a_{\frac{n}{2}-k} & \end{array} \right] \quad (1)$$

such that $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$, $(1 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{2} - k)$.

- 3) Complete all the previous codes C by nonzero elements of C^\perp/C in order to obtain a self-dual code D and check for codes with minimum distance $d+2$. For codes with weight $d+2$ check for the equivalence with already obtained self-dual $[n+2, \frac{n}{2}+1, d+2]$ codes.
-

The main result of [1] is the following:

Theorem 1: Applying the previous recursive algorithm to the set of all inequivalent (up to permutation) binary self-dual $[n, n/2, d]$ codes permits to find all inequivalent self-dual binary $[n+2, n/2+1, d+2]$ codes.

B. The building-up construction

There are other constructions generating self-dual codes of length $n+2$ from self-dual codes of length n . In particular, we compare the above construction with two constructions; the building-up construction [21] by Kim, and Harada-Munemasa's construction [17] since both constructions generate all self-dual codes of length $n+2$ from the set of all self-dual codes of length n .

Theorem 2: ([21, building-up]) Let $G_0 = (\mathbf{r}_i)$ be a generator matrix (may not be in standard form) of a self-dual code C_0 over $GF(2)$ of length n , where \mathbf{r}_i is a row of G_0 for $1 \leq i \leq n/2$. Let \mathbf{x} be a vector in $GF(2)^n$ with an odd weight. Define $y_i := \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n/2$, where \cdot denotes the usual inner product. Then the following matrix

$$G = \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} 1 & 0 & \mathbf{x} \\ y_1 & y_1 & \\ \vdots & \vdots & G_0 \\ y_{n/2} & y_{n/2} & \end{array} \right] \quad (2)$$

generates a self-dual code C over $GF(2)$ of length $n+2$.

The converse of the building-up construction holds as follows.

Theorem 3: ([21]) Any self-dual code C over $GF(2)$ of length n with minimum weight $d > 2$ is obtained from some self-dual code C_0 of length $n-2$ (up to equivalence) by the construction in Theorem 2.

The recursive construction is a special case of the building-up construction. The reason is as follows.

We show that the matrix in the form (1) together with a representative in C^\perp/C whose weight is > 2 can be written in the form (2) up to permutation equivalence. Suppose we are given the matrix in the form (1) above and let C be the code generated by this matrix. Then there are four cosets of C in C^\perp ; that is, C , $\mathbf{z}_1 + C$, $\mathbf{z}_2 + C$, and $\mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{z}_2 + C$ for some nonzeros $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in GF(2)^{n+2}$. We may assume that $\mathbf{z}_1 = (1, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ since \mathbf{z}_1 is nonzero and orthogonal to C . Then the minimum weight of $C \cup (\mathbf{z}_1 + C)$ is 2, which is excluded. Hence by permuting the first two columns of \mathbf{z}_2 if needed, we may put $\mathbf{z}_2 = (1, 0 | \mathbf{x})$ where $\mathbf{x} \in GF(2)^n$. As $C \cup (\mathbf{z}_2 + C)$ is designed to be self-dual, \mathbf{z}_2 is orthogonal to itself; hence \mathbf{x} is odd. Then as $\mathbf{z}_2 \cdot (1, 1 | \mathbf{r}_i) = 0$, where \mathbf{r}_i is a row of G_d in the form (1) for $1 \leq i \leq k$, we have $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i = 1$. Thus by letting $y_i := \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, we obtain the matrix of the form (2). This implies that the recursive construction is a special case of the building-up construction.

C. The Harada-Munemasa construction

In what follows, we recall Harada-Munemasa's construction [17]. We note that this is a binary version of Huffman's construction [18] for Hermitian self-dual codes over $GF(4)$.

Let G_1 be a generator matrix of a self-dual $[n, n/2, d]$ code C_1 . Then the matrix

$$G_2 := \left[\begin{array}{cc|c} a_1 & a_1 & \\ \vdots & \vdots & G_1 \\ a_{n/2-1} & a_{n/2-1} & \end{array} \right], \quad (3)$$

where $a_i \in GF(2)$ for $(1 \leq i \leq n/2 - 1)$, generates a self-orthogonal $[n+2, n/2]$ code C_2 . The matrix of the form (3) is a general form of (1) in the recursive construction. In order to reduce the possibilities of a_i 's, they [17] consider the orbits of the vector $a^T := (a_1, \dots, a_{n/2-1})^T$ under a certain subgroup of $GL(n/2 - 1, 2)$ to get equivalent self-dual codes of length $n+2$. After reducing the possibilities, as in the recursive construction, add to C_2 a coset $\mathbf{z}_2 + C_2$ from C_2^\perp/C_2 whose weight is > 2 to get a self-dual $[n+2, n/2+1, d' > 2]$ code. Unlike the recursive construction, Harada-Munemasa's construction does not necessarily give self-dual $[n+2, n/2+1]$ codes with minimum weight $d' = d+2$.

D. Comparison of the different methods

The recursive construction is specially interesting when one wants to classify extremal codes since it permits to obtain a partial classification for a given minimum distance while other constructions do need to start from a whole classification.

More precisely, the recursive construction is more efficient than the building-up construction in generating many self-dual codes with higher minimum weight. This is because the

recursive construction checks a relatively small number of possibilities of $a'_i s$ in Step 2), whose complexity is $2^{n/2-k}$, where $k \geq 1$ depends on the given code. From our experimental results, the dimensions k of subcodes of the 58671 [36, 18, 6] codes generated by linearly independent vectors of weight 6 lie between 2 and 18. We give the possible values of k and the number num of their subcodes in Table I.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF SELF-DUAL [36, 18, 6] CODES WHOSE SUBCODE GENERATED BY CODEWORDS OF WEIGHT 6 HAS DIMENSION k

dim k	num	dim k	num	dim k	num
2	148	8	4615	14	8170
3	5	9	911	15	5311
4	666	10	7165	16	6290
5	45	11	2299	17	4492
6	2165	12	8411	18	3615
7	263	13	4100		

We see from our table that there are much more subcodes of large dimension than those of small dimension and this clearly shows the efficiency of our recursive algorithm.

On the other hand, the building-up construction [21] needs 2^{n-1} possibilities for the choice of odd vectors \mathbf{x} , generating all self-dual codes with various minimum distances. This complexity can be reduced to $2^{n/2}$ as remarked in [13], which is still higher than that of the recursive construction.

As described above, Harada-Munemasa's construction is effective if the given code has a large automorphism group in order to reduce the complexity of checking the equivalence. For example, if $n = 36$, then 41019 (respectively 11242) out of the 58671 self-dual [36, 18, 6] codes [17] have the automorphism group order 1 (respectively 2). Thus Harada-Munemasa's construction usually requires 2^{19} or 2^{18} possibilities to generate self-dual codes of length 38 with various minimum distances, given a [36, 18, 6] self-dual code.

Overall, we conclude that when we classify binary self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes, the recursive algorithm is much faster than the other two constructions.

IV. CLASSIFICATION OF THE [38, 19, 8] SELF-DUAL CODES

A. Construction of all [38, 19, 8] self-dual codes

There are two possible weight enumerators W_1, W_2 and shadow weight enumerators S_1, S_2 for an extremal self-dual [38, 19, 8] code [9].

$$W_1 = 1 + 171y^8 + 1862y^{10} + \dots \quad (4)$$

$$S_1 = 114y^7 + 9044y^{11} + 118446y^{15} + \dots; \quad (5)$$

$$W_2 = 1 + 203y^8 + 1702y^{10} + \dots \quad (6)$$

$$S_2 = y^3 + 106y^7 + 9072y^{11} + 118390y^{15} \quad (7)$$

In [9] two self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes with W_1 , denoted by R_3 and D_4 , were given, where $|\text{Aut}(R_3)| = 1$ and $|\text{Aut}(D_4)| = 342$. In [16] one self-dual [38, 19, 8] code C_{38} with W_2 was given with $|\text{Aut}(C_{38})| = 1$. Then Harada [15] gave 40 self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes with W_1 and W_2 and automorphism group orders 1, 2, 4, 8. Later, Kim [21] constructed 325 self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes with W_1 and W_2 and

automorphism group orders 1, 2, 3. Hence there are at least 368 inequivalent self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes. We show that there are exactly 2744 inequivalent self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes.

Starting from the 58671 [36, 18, 6] codes of [17], we apply the recursive algorithm of Section III-A. The more expensive part of the algorithm is the inequivalence testing of the differently constructed codes. In order to optimize the computation we separated the 58671 [36, 18, 6] codes into sets $S_{36,i}$ of 1000 codes. To each set, we apply the recursive algorithm to obtain a list $S_{38,i}$ of inequivalent [38, 19, 8] codes derived from the set $S_{36,i}$. Each set $S_{38,i}$ contains a number of inequivalent codes. Then we compared all the $S_{38,i}$ sets to eventually obtained a list of all inequivalent [38, 19, 8] self-dual codes. This method permits to avoid many costly inequivalence comparisons between codes, since separating the whole list of [36, 18, 6] codes permits to avoid inequivalence testing as the $S_{38,i}$ list starts from an empty list.

The whole process took about three weeks on a CPU 2.53GHz computer.

Now we obtain our main theorem below.

Theorem 4: There are exactly 2744 inequivalent extremal self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes.

In Table II, we describe all extremal self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes with respect to their orders, where $|\text{Aut}(C)|$ and num stand for the order of automorphism group and the number of codes respectively.

TABLE II
NUMBER OF EXTREMAL SELF-DUAL [38, 19, 8] CODES WITH RESPECT TO THEIR ORDERS

$ \text{Aut}(C) $	num	$ \text{Aut}(C) $	num	$ \text{Aut}(C) $	num
1	2253	9	1	36	1
2	322	12	8	144	1
3	36	14	1	168	2
4	68	18	1	216	1
6	17	21	1	342	1
8	15	24	14	504	1

As mentioned above, the previously known self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes have automorphism group orders 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, and 342. Hence we list several new self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes C_{38}^i with different automorphism group orders $|\text{Aut}(C_{38}^i)| = i = 6, 9, 12, 14, 18, 21, 24, 36, 144, 168, 216, 504$ in Appendix. To save space, we only give one code for each order. We also list C_{38}^{342} which is equivalent to the double-circulant code D_4 in [9]. The list of all extremal self-dual [38, 19, 8] codes can be obtained at http://www.unilim.fr/pages_perso/philippe.gaborit/SD/GF2/GF2I.htm.

B. An up-to-date table of the number of classified optimal self-dual codes

In the following we give an up-to-date table of the classification of optimal Type I self-dual codes, where being optimal means that this is the best possible minimum distance among self-dual codes of a given length. These codes may not be extremal in the classical sense. For instance, an extremal self-dual code of length 34 will have minimum distance 8 if exists,

TABLE III
NUMBER OF OPTIMAL TYPE I AND TYPE II CODES

n	d	num	n	d	num
2	2	1	22	6	1
4	2	1	24	8	1
6	2	1	26	6	1
8	4	1	28	6	3
10	2	1	30	6	13
12	4	1	32	8	8
14	4	1	34	6	938
16	4	3	36	8	41
18	4	2	38	8	2744
20	4	7			

but it is known that such a code cannot exist and the optimal minimum distance is 6. The highest length (up to now) for which Type I optimal codes are classified is length 38, which is done in this paper for the first time. Notice that it is length 48 for Type II codes. Complete references for the self-dual codes can be found for instance in [19] and [23], except for length 38.

V. CLASSIFICATION OF s -EXTREMAL CODES

In this section, we classify s -extremal codes of length 38 and $d = 8$ together with s -extremal codes of length 38 and $d = 6$.

A. s -extremal codes

The notion of s -extremal codes was introduced by Bachoc and Gaborit in [2]. This type of codes is related to the notion of self-dual codes with long shadows introduced by Elkies in [11]. We recall the definition of s -extremal codes from [2].

Let C be a Type I self-dual binary code of length n . We denote by C_0 the doubly-even subcode of C . We denote by \mathbf{x} an element of $C \setminus C_0$. The shadow S is defined by $S = C_0^\perp \setminus C$, we denote by \mathbf{y} an element of $S \setminus C$. We have $C_0^\perp = C_0 \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3$ for $C_1 = \mathbf{y} + C_0$, $C_2 = \mathbf{x} + C_0$ and $C_3 = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} + C_0$. Then it is well known that $C = C_0 \cup C_2$ and $S = C_1 \cup C_3$. We have moreover the following three facts [9]:

- 1) for any $\mathbf{y} \in S$, $\text{weight}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \frac{n}{2} \pmod{4}$
- 2) for any $\mathbf{y} \in S$ and $\mathbf{x} \in C_2 : \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 1$,
- 3) for any $\mathbf{y} \in S$ and $\mathbf{z} \in C_0 : \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{z} = 0$.

We denote the weight enumerators of C and S by W_C and W_S , respectively. From [9], there exist $c_0, \dots, c_{\lfloor n/8 \rfloor} \in R$ such that:

$$\begin{cases} W_C(x, y) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/8 \rfloor} c_i (x^2 + y^2)^{\frac{n}{2} - 4i} \{x^2 y^2 (x^2 - y^2)^2\}^i \\ W_S(x, y) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor n/8 \rfloor} c_i (-1)^i 2^{\frac{n}{2} - 6i} (xy)^{\frac{n}{2} - 4i} (x^4 - y^4)^{2i} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Let d be the minimum weight of C and s the minimum weight of its shadow.

Theorem 5: [2] Let C be a Type I self-dual binary code of length n with minimum weight d , and let S be its shadow with minimum weight s . Then, $2d + s \leq 4 + \frac{n}{2}$, unless $n \equiv 22 \pmod{24}$ and $d = 4\lfloor n/24 \rfloor + 6$, in which case $2d + s = 8 + \frac{n}{2}$.

A Type I code whose parameters (d, s) satisfy the equality in the previous bounds is called s -extremal. In that case, the polynomials W_C and W_S are uniquely determined.

A bound for n when the minimum weight d of an s -extremal code is divisible by 4 has been given in [12] and in [14], and a bound has also been given for $d = 6$ [2, Theorem 4.1] and $d \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ with $d > 6$ [14].

Theorem 6: ([12], [14])

Let C be an s -extremal code with parameters (s, d) of length n . If $d \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, then $n < 6d - 2$.

Theorem 7: ([14])

Let C be an s -extremal code with parameters (s, d) of length n . If $d > 6$ and $d \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, then $n < 21d - 82$.

Before proving our classification of s -extremal codes of length 38, we prove a result which permits in certain cases to relate the weight of the shadow of a code C with the weight of the shadow of a subtracted code by (11):

Theorem 8: If C is a $[4n + 2, 2n + 1, d + 2]$ self-dual code with $d \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, $d \neq 0$ and shadow weight $s \geq 3$, then there exist two coordinates of C on which the subtraction of (11) gives a self-dual $[4n, 2n, d]$ code C' with shadow weight $s - 1$.

Proof. Our proof is based on the existence of the following four vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$, and \mathbf{t} such that:

- 1) $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}'10)$, $\mathbf{y} \in S$ of weight s
- 2) $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}'11)$, $\mathbf{x} \in C_2$ of weight $d + 2$
- 3) $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}'11)$, $\mathbf{z} \in C_0$
- 4) $\mathbf{t} = (\mathbf{t}'10)$, $\mathbf{t} \in C_0$

Let $\mathbf{y} \in S$ of weight s and $\mathbf{x} \in C_2$ of weight $d + 2$. We have $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = 1$, that is, \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} meet in an odd number of positions. Then $x_i = 1 = y_i$ for some i . As the weight of \mathbf{x} is even, there is a j such that $x_j = 1$ and $y_j = 0$. Up to permutation, we may assume that $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}'11)$ and $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}'10)$. Now it remains to show that there exist \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{t} given above. To do this, note that $C_0^\perp = C \cup S$. Hence the minimum distance of $C_0^\perp = \min\{d + 2, s\} \geq 3$. Hence every two columns of a generator matrix of C_0 are linearly independent. (This means that C_0 has strength 2. See [20, p. 435] for the term.) Thus in each set of two columns of C_0 each binary 2-tuple occurs the same number $|C_0|/4$ of times. Therefore there exist $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}'11) \in C_0$ and $\mathbf{t} = (\mathbf{t}'10) \in C_0$.

Since the coordinates of \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{t} are respectively (11) and (10) on the last two positions, there exists a doubly-even code C_0'' of dimension $2n - 2$ such that the doubly-even subcode C_0 of C can be written:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{z}' & 1 & 1 \\ \mathbf{t}' & 1 & 0 \\ \hline & 0 & 0 \\ C_0'' & \vdots & \vdots \\ & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

Now if one subtracts (11) on the two last columns of C one obtains a code C' , such that its doubly-even subcode C_0' has dimension $2n - 1$, ($2n - 2$ vectors of C_0'' and the vector \mathbf{x}' - which cannot be null since $d + 2 \neq 2$), the subcode C_0' can be written as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}' \\ C_0'' \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G(C_{38}^{342}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1000000000001000000001010101111111011 \\ 01000000000001000000001010101111000100 \\ 0010000000000000000100001101101001111010 \\ 000100000000000000100001101100110111001 \\ 000010000000001000100101001000000101011 \\ 0000010000001000100101001111111100111 \\ 0000001000001000000101011100010011110 \\ 0000000100001000000101000011101101110 \\ 000000001000100000010100000110110011 \\ 00000000010001000000101011000101111100 \\ 0000000000100100000000010110001111010 \\ 00000000000101000000001101000010000110 \\ 00000000000011000000001111110000110000 \\ 0000000000000100100100101001110000101 \\ 00000000000000010100001001101011101101 \\ 00000000000000001100101100010101100111 \\ 0000000000000000010101001011000010001 \\ 00000000000000000001001001111110110101 \\ 0000000000000000000011111100110010111 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$G(C_{38}^{504}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1000000000000010010011000100100010110 \\ 01000000000000010010011000100100101001 \\ 001000000000000001001001011011100011000 \\ 0001000000000000010010010110110011010100 \\ 00001000000000000001001100101001110000 \\ 0000010000000000010011001101100001100 \\ 00000010000000010010000100000110000011 \\ 00000001000000010010000111111010110000 \\ 000000001000000000010111001101010101 \\ 0000000001000000000011000100101101110 \\ 00000000001000010000010100011110100100 \\ 000000000001000000001111101010101101 \\ 0000000000001001000001001000101011100 \\ 00000000000001001000001001000101011100 \\ 0000000000000101001000000010101100010 \\ 00000000000000011001001101010011110011 \\ 0000000000000000100001100010110101110 \\ 000000000000000001001100111111011001 \\ 00000000000000000001010010100011010010 \\ 000000000000000000001101100100000101 \end{bmatrix}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Aguilar Melchor and P. Gaborit, "On the classification of extremal [36, 18, 8] binary self-dual codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 4743–4750, 2008.
- [2] C. Bachoc and P. Gaborit, "Designs and self-dual codes with long shadows," *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, vol. 105, pp. 15–34, 2004.
- [3] K. Betsumiya, M. Harada and A. Munemasa, A complete classification of doubly even self-dual codes of length 40, arXiv:1104.3727v2, May 31, 2011 (arXiv:1104.3727v1, April 19, 2011).
- [4] W. Bosma and J. Cannon, *Handbook of Magma Functions*, Sydney, 1995.
- [5] S. Bouyuklieva and I. Bouyukliev, On the classification of binary self-dual codes, arXiv:1106.5930v1, June 29, 2011.
- [6] S. Buyuklieva, "New extremal self-dual codes of length 42 and 44," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1607–1612, 1997.
- [7] S. Buyuklieva and V. Yorgov, "Singly-even self-dual codes of length 40," *Des. Codes Cryptog.*, vol. 9, pp. 131–141, 1996.
- [8] G.D. Cohen, M.G Karpovsky, H.F Mattson, Jr. and J.R Schatz, "Covering radius-Survey and recent results," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 31, pp. 328–343, 1985.
- [9] J.H. Conway and N.J.A. Sloane, "A new upper bound on the minimal distance of self-dual codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, vol. 36, pp. 1319–1333, 1990.
- [10] S.T. Dougherty, T. A. Gulliver and M. Harada, "Extremal binary self-dual codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 2036–2047, 1997.
- [11] N. D. Elkies, "Lattices and codes with long shadows," *Math. Res. Lett.*, vol. 2, pp. 643–651, 1995.
- [12] P. Gaborit, "A bound for certain s-extremal lattices and codes," *Arch. Math (Basel)*, vol. 89, no. 2, pp. 143–151, 2007.
- [13] T.A. Gulliver, M. Harada, and J.-L. Kim, "Construction of some extremal self-dual codes," *Discrete Math*, vol. 263, pp. 81–91, 2003.
- [14] S. Han and J.-L. Kim, "Upper bound for the length of s-extremal codes over $\mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_4$ and $\mathbb{F}_2 + u\mathbb{F}_2$," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 418–422, 2008.
- [15] M. Harada, "New extremal self-dual codes of lengths 36 and 38," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, pp. 2541–2543, 1999.
- [16] M. Harada and H. Kimura, "On extremal self-dual codes," *Math. J. Okayama Univ.*, vol. 37, pp. 1–14, 1995.
- [17] M. Harada and A. Munemasa, "Classification of self-dual codes of length 36," arXiv:1012.5464v1 [math.CO], Dec. 30, 2010, preprint.
- [18] W.C. Huffman, "Characterization of quaternary extremal codes of lengths 18 and 20," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1613–1616, 1997.
- [19] W.C. Huffman, "On the classification and enumeration of self-dual codes," *Finite Fields Appl.* vol. 11, 451–490, 2005.
- [20] W.C. Huffman and V. Pless, *Fundamentals of Error-Correcting Codes*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [21] J.-L. Kim, "New extremal self-dual codes of lengths 36,38 and 58," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no.4, pp. 1575–1580, 2001.
- [22] F.J. MacWilliams, N.J.A. Sloane and J.G. Thompson, "Good self-dual codes exist," *Discrete Math.* vol. 3, pp. 153–162, 1972.
- [23] G. Nebe, E. Rains and N.J.A. Sloane, *Slef-Dual Codes and Invariant Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [24] V. Pless, "A classification of self-orthogonal codes over $GF(2)$," *Discrete Math.* vol. 3, pp. 209–246, 1972.
- [25] E. M. Rains and N. J. A. Sloane, "Self-dual codes," in *Handbook of Coding Theory*, ed. V. S. Pless and W. C. Huffman. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 177–294, 1998.