

PUZZLE GROUPS AND COMPLETELY TRANSITIVE CODES

NICK GILL, NEIL I. GILLESPIE, AND JASON SEMERARO

ABSTRACT. To each simple $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design \mathcal{D} with the property that \mathcal{D} is “pliable” (any two lines intersect in at most two points), one associates a ‘puzzle group’. This generalises a construction of the group M_{12} from \mathbb{P}_3 due to Conway.

We introduce a new infinite family of puzzle groups isomorphic with $O_{2m}^{\pm}(2)$ generated from designs which arise from orbits under the 2-transitive actions of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on $2^{m-1} \cdot (2^m \pm 1)$ points. It is shown that the incidence matrices associated to these designs generate a new family of completely transitive \mathbb{F}_2 -linear codes with minimum distance 4 and covering radius 3.

We also give a new characterization of M_{12} (as a puzzle group) and prove that, for a fixed $\lambda > 0$, there are finitely many puzzle groups which are neither the full alternating or symmetric group and which are associated to a pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent work with A. Nixon [19], we introduced the notion of a *puzzle group*. To construct such an object we start with a simple $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design \mathcal{D} that is ‘pliable’, i.e. that has the property that any two lines intersect in at most two points. For a point ∞ in \mathcal{D} , the puzzle group $\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D})$ is an invariant consisting of a certain set of permutations of the point set of \mathcal{D} which can be ‘read off’ from the lines in \mathcal{D} ; in particular the puzzle group naturally occurs as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Sym}(n - 1)$.

The concept of a puzzle group is a direct generalization of Conway’s famous construction of the Mathieu group M_{12} using a ‘game’ played on \mathbb{P}_3 , the finite projective plane of order 3 [10]. Thus, by viewing \mathbb{P}_3 as a pliable $2 - (13, 4, 1)$ design, the group M_{12} can be constructed as a puzzle group inside $\mathrm{Sym}(12)$. A number of other examples were constructed in [19]. In this paper we are interested in constructing more examples of puzzle groups and in working towards a full classification.

Constructing examples: One of the main results in [19] suggests that those designs whose puzzle groups are neither the full symmetric or alternating group are rare [19, Theorem C]. In this paper, we demonstrate the existence of an infinite family of designs with this property which arise from the two 2-transitive actions of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on quadratic forms for $m \geq 3$. As a byproduct, we construct a new infinite family of completely transitive \mathbb{F}_2 -linear codes with covering radius 3.

Classifying puzzle groups: We prove two main results - Theorems D and E below - that give classifications of puzzle groups subject to certain extra suppositions.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20B15, 20B25, 05B05.

Key words and phrases. primitive groups, symmetric generation, completely regular codes, completely transitive codes, symplectic groups, puzzle groups.

Both results have interesting implications: Theorem D gives a new characterization of M_{12} as a puzzle group; Theorem E yields a proof of [19, Conjecture 8.1], which asserts that for each $\lambda > 0$ there exist only finitely many simple pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ designs whose puzzle groups are neither the full symmetric or alternating group.

1.1. The main theorems. In order to construct a new infinite family of puzzle groups we study the action of the group $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on the set Ω of quadratic forms. The set Ω is in bijection with the vector space $V \cong \mathbb{F}_2^{2m}$ on which $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ naturally acts, allowing us to denote quadratic forms by θ_a for some $a \in V$. The induced action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on Ω splits into two orbits, and of particular importance to us will be the induced action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on sets of size 3 within each of these orbits. Since $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts linearly on these triples, one can extend this action to an orbit on certain 4-subsets. It turns out that this set always forms the block set of a 2-design:

Theorem A. *Let $m \geq 3$ and Let Ω^0, Ω^1 be the two orbits of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ under its natural action on quadratic forms. Then for each $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on 3-subsets of elements of Ω^ε splits into two orbits, $\mathcal{O}_0^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{O}_1^\varepsilon$ and $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts imprimitively on each of these. Furthermore, writing*

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon := \{ \{ \theta_a, \theta_b, \theta_c, \theta_{a+b+c} \} \mid \{ \theta_a, \theta_b, \theta_c \} \in \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^\varepsilon \},$$

we have that $\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon := (\Omega^\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon)$ is a pliable $2 - (f_\varepsilon(m), 4, f_\varepsilon(m-1) - 1)$ design where

$$f_\varepsilon(m) := |\Omega^\varepsilon| = 2^{m-1} \cdot (2^m + (-1)^\varepsilon).$$

It turns out that this is not the first time that the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on the set of associated quadratic forms has been used to construct designs with special properties [34].

We use the designs \mathcal{D}^ε that we obtain in Theorem A to construct an infinite class of (isomorphism types of) puzzle groups. Recall that $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}$ denotes the set of all move sequences associated with a design \mathcal{D} (see Section 2.1 for a full discussion of $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}$). We prove the following:

Theorem B. *Let $m \geq 3$. Then for each $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ (as subsets of $\mathrm{Sym}(\Omega^\varepsilon)$), and for each $\infty \in \Omega^\varepsilon$,*

$$\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon) = \mathrm{stab}_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)}(\infty) \cong \begin{cases} \mathrm{O}_{2m}^+(2), & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0; \\ \mathrm{O}_{2m}^-(2), & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1. \end{cases}$$

Recall that to any design \mathcal{D} and prime $p > 0$ one may associate the code $C_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathcal{D})$, the \mathbb{F}_p -rowspan of the incidence matrix of \mathcal{D} . In [19], using GAP [18] we constructed examples of primitive puzzle groups that do not contain the full alternating group. In each case, we also constructed $C_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\mathcal{D})$ for $p = 2$ or 3 , and discovered that the code was *completely transitive*, and therefore, also *completely regular* (see Definitions 2.1 and 2.2 below).

The following result, Theorem C, asserts that the same is true of the \mathbb{F}_2 -linear codes $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)$ constructed using the designs considered in Theorem B. Theorem C also describes the covering radius and intersection array of these codes (see Definition 2.2).

Theorem C. *For each $m \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)$ is a completely transitive $[f_\varepsilon(m), f_\varepsilon(m) - (2m + 1), 4]$ code with covering radius 3 and intersection array*

$$(f_\varepsilon(m), f_\varepsilon(m) - 1, f_\varepsilon(m) - 2f_\varepsilon(m - 1); 1, 2f_\varepsilon(m - 1), f_\varepsilon(m)).$$

Completely regular and completely transitive codes have been studied extensively, and the existence and enumeration of such codes are open hard problems (see [6, 15, 29] and more recently [3, 4, 5, 20, 30, 31, 32]). In [19, Question 8.4] we ask whether every primitive puzzle group that does not contain the full alternating group comes from a design \mathcal{D} whose incidence matrix generates a completely transitive \mathbb{F}_p -linear code for some prime $p > 0$. On combining Theorems B and C we obtain an affirmative answer to this question in the case when $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^\varepsilon$.

The remainder of the paper is concerned with (abstract) puzzle groups and our next main result classifies all puzzle groups that satisfy a particular group-theoretic condition. For a pliable design \mathcal{D} with point set Ω , the puzzle group $G := \pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is generated by elements of the form $[\infty, a, b, \infty]$ for $a, b \in \Omega \setminus \{\infty\}$ (see Section 2.1 for full discussion on $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$). The next result is dependent on the Classification of Finite Simple Groups (CFSG) through its use of Theorem 6.1.

Theorem D. *Suppose that \mathcal{D} is a simple pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design and that $G := \pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is the associated puzzle group. Suppose, furthermore, that $[\infty, a, b, \infty] = 1$ whenever ∞ is collinear with $\{a, b\}$. Then one of the following is true:*

- (1) \mathcal{D} is a Boolean design and G is trivial;
- (2) $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{P}_3$ (the projective plane of order 3) and $G \cong M_{12}$; or
- (3) G contains $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$.

Theorem D is a generalization of [19, Theorem B] (concerning designs associated with trivial puzzle groups) as well as a generalization of the classification of puzzle groups associated with simple pliable $2 - (n, 4, 1)$ designs (when $\lambda = 1$ the extra supposition is automatically satisfied).

Theorem D is closely connected to our final main result, Theorem E, below. Indeed we will use Theorem E (2) to prove Theorem D, and then will use Theorem D to prove Theorem E (4).

Theorem E. *Suppose that \mathcal{D} is a simple pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design, and that $G := \pi_\infty(\mathcal{D})$ is the associated puzzle group, considered as a permutation group via its natural embedding in $\text{Sym}(n - 1)$.*

- (1) If $n > 4\lambda + 1$, then G is transitive;
- (2) if $n > 9\lambda + 1$, then G is primitive;
- (3) if $n > 144\lambda^2 + 120\lambda + 26$, then G contains $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$;
- (4) If $n > 9\lambda^2 - 12\lambda + 5$, then one of the following holds:
 - (a) G contains $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$;
 - (b) $\lambda = 1$, $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{P}_3$ (the projective plane of order 3), and $G \cong M_{12}$.

Note that only the fourth item of Theorem E is dependent on CFSG. Secondly, note that if G contains $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$ (as in part (3) of the theorem), then

$$G = \begin{cases} \text{Alt}(n - 1), & \text{if } \lambda \text{ is odd;} \\ \text{Sym}(n - 1), & \text{if } \lambda \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

1.2. Classifying puzzle groups. Theorem E provides a powerful tool in the program to classify puzzle groups for arbitrary λ and n . Such a classification was completed in [19] for $\lambda \leq 2$ and in Section 7.3 we make some remarks about the case $\lambda = 3$. What about the general case?

Firstly note that Theorem E has an immediate corollary:

Corollary 1.1. *Let λ be a positive integer. There are a finite number of (isomorphism classes of) groups that crop up as puzzle groups associated with a simple pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design.*

Corollary 1.1 makes an interesting companion to Theorem C which implies that if λ is allowed to vary, then there are an infinite number of (isomorphism classes) of groups that crop up as puzzle groups.

One might naturally ask whether the bounds in Theorem E can be substantially improved as this would be an obvious aid to a classification. Unfortunately the relative dearth of examples of puzzle groups makes this question difficult to answer: the only infinite families of puzzle groups that have been constructed to this point and that do not contain $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$ are the Boolean designs (for which $n = 2\lambda + 2$ and the puzzle group is trivial [19]) and the examples in Theorem D (for which $n < 5\lambda$ and the puzzle group is primitive). The parameters in these examples are a long way from the bounds given in Theorem E suggesting, perhaps, that there is plenty of room for improvement.

In a different direction we note that both Theorem D and Theorem E (4) suggest that the puzzle group M_{12} of Conway is particularly special. Indeed we have another reason to think this might be the case.

Suppose that G is a primitive puzzle group associated with a design \mathcal{D} and suppose that \mathcal{D} is not \mathbb{P}_3 , the projective plane of order 3, and that G does not contain $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$. We have a number of examples of primitive puzzle groups (the infinite family of Theorem D, along with the small examples listed in [19]; for the purposes of this discussion we may also include the conjectured examples discussed in Section 8) and in all of these examples we have the remarkable fact that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ coincides as a set with a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(n)$. For example, for the family of Theorem D, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is equal as a set to the group $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ mentioned in the statement of the theorem.

There is more: in all of these examples the set $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a transitive subgroup of $\text{Sym}(n)$ with $G = \pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D})$ the stabilizer of the point ∞ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Since, by supposition, $\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D})$ is primitive, this implies that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a **2-primitive** permutation group (i.e. a primitive group with a stabilizer primitive on its non-trivial orbit). What is more, in all of these examples, the elements of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ are automorphisms of the design \mathcal{D} . We conjecture that this behaviour is general.

Conjecture 1. *Suppose that \mathcal{D} is a pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design with associated puzzle group G . Moreover, suppose that \mathcal{D} is not \mathbb{P}_3 and that G is primitive but does not contain $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$. Then $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$, the set of move sequences of \mathcal{D} coincides (as a set) with a 2-primitive subgroup H of $\text{Sym}(n)$ and the puzzle group $G = \pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D})$ is equal to the stabilizer in H of the point $\infty \in \mathcal{D}$. What is more H is a subgroup of the automorphism group of \mathcal{D} .*

We remark that all 2-primitive permutation groups are known thanks to CFSG and the list is rather short (see [24] for some discussion). Thus this conjecture implies a very strong restriction on the structure of a primitive puzzle group and a proof would be a very significant step towards a classification.

1.3. Structure of the paper. The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides the necessary background from design theory, group theory and coding theory. In Section 3 we give a precise description of the action of $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on quadratic forms, introduce the designs $\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon}$ and prove Theorem A. The puzzle groups $\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D}^{\varepsilon})$

are studied in Section 4 where we establish Theorem B. In Section 5 we study the codes $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^c)$ in detail and give a proof of Theorem C.

Sections 6 and 7 are devoted to the study of puzzle groups; in particular in Section 6 we prove Theorem D before proving Theorem E in Section 7. Section 7.3 contains a discussion of the classification of puzzle groups with $\lambda = 3$. In Section 8 we speculate over the existence of designs which could yield further infinite families of puzzle groups and completely regular codes.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Block designs and puzzle groups. Recall that a *balanced incomplete block design* (Ω, \mathcal{B}) , or $t - (n, k, \lambda)$ design, is a finite set Ω of size n , together with a finite multiset \mathcal{B} of subsets of Ω each of size k (called *lines*), such that any subset of Ω of size t is contained in exactly λ lines. A $t - (n, k, \lambda)$ design is *simple* if there are no repeated lines. For any 2-design $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$, and distinct points $a, b \in \Omega$ we define

$$(2.1) \quad \overline{a, b} := \{x \in \Omega \mid \text{there exists } \ell \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } x, a, b \in \ell\}$$

In particular, note that $a, b \in \overline{a, b}$. Let \mathcal{D} be a simple $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design (Ω, \mathcal{B}) . Assume in addition that \mathcal{D} is *pliable*, that is any pair of lines intersect in at most two points. To each $x, y \in \Omega$, we associate an *elementary move* which is the permutation

$$[x, y] := (x, y) \prod_{i=1}^{\lambda} (x_i, y_i) \in \text{Sym}(\Omega),$$

where $\{x, y, x_i, y_i\}$ is a line for each $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$. Since \mathcal{D} is pliable, this product is well-defined and $[x, y] = [y, x]$. A *move sequence* is a product of elementary moves

$$[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k] := [a_0, a_1] \cdot [a_1, a_2] \cdots [a_{k-1}, a_k]$$

where $a_{i-1}, a_i \in \Omega$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$.

A move sequence $[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k]$ is called *closed* if $a_0 = a_k$. The *puzzle set* $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the set of all move sequences, that is

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} := \{[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k] \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}^+; a_{i-1}, a_i \in \Omega \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

For each $\infty \in \Omega$, define the *puzzle group*:

$$\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D}) := \{[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k] \in \mathcal{L} \mid a_0 = a_k = \infty\},$$

i.e. the set of all closed move sequences which start and end at ∞ . It is an easy exercise to confirm that $\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D})$ is a group. We recall that $\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D})$ is generated by elements of the form $[\infty, a, b, \infty]$ for $a, b \in \Omega \setminus \{\infty\}$ [19, Lemma 3.1] and that if ∞_1 and ∞_2 are distinct elements of Ω , then $\pi_{\infty_1} \cong \pi_{\infty_2}$ [19, Theorem A], i.e. ‘the puzzle group of a design \mathcal{D} ’ is well-defined up to isomorphism.

2.2. Permutation groups. Let G be a group acting on a non-empty set Ω . The action is *transitive* if for any $x, y \in \Omega$ there exists $g \in G$ such that $x^g = y$ and *t-transitive* if the induced action on the set of all t -tuples of distinct elements of Ω is transitive for some $t > 0$.

Suppose that the action of G on Ω is transitive. A *system of imprimitivity* is a partition of Ω into ℓ subsets $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_{\ell}$ each of size k such that $1 < k, \ell < n$, and so that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and all $g \in G$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that

$$\Delta_i^g = \Delta_j.$$

The sets Δ_i are called *blocks*. We say that G acts *imprimitively* if there exists a system of imprimitivity. If no such set exists then G acts *primitively* on Ω .

2.3. Linear Codes. Let C be a linear binary code of length n , i.e. C is a subspace of the vector space $(\mathbb{F}_2)^n$. Recall that elements of C are called *codewords*.

We define the *binary Hamming graph* $\Gamma = H(n, 2)$ to be the finite graph with vertex set $V(\Gamma) = (\mathbb{F}_2)^n$, such that an edge exists between two vertices if and only if they differ in precisely one entry. Observe that C is a subset of the vertex set of Γ .

For all pairs of vertices $\alpha, \beta \in V(\Gamma)$, the *Hamming distance* between α and β , denoted by $d(\alpha, \beta)$, is defined to be the number of entries in which the two vertices differ. We let $\Gamma_k(\alpha)$ denote the set of vertices in $H(n, 2)$ that are at distance k from α .

We are now able to define the *minimum distance*, d , of C to be the smallest distance between distinct codewords of C . For any $\gamma \in V(\Gamma)$, we define

$$d(\gamma, C) = \min\{d(\gamma, \beta) : \beta \in C\}$$

to be the *distance of γ from C* . The *covering radius* of C , which we denote by ρ , is the maximum distance that any vertex in $H(n, 2)$ is from C . We let C_i denote the set of vertices that are at distance i from C ; then $C_0 = C$ and $\{C, C_1, \dots, C_\rho\}$ forms a partition of $V(\Gamma)$ called the *distance partition of C* .

The automorphism group of Γ , $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, is the semi-direct product $B \rtimes L$ where $B \cong \text{Sym}(2)^n$ and $L \cong \text{Sym}(n)$, see [6, Theorem 9.2.1]. Let $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in B$, $\sigma \in L$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in V(\Gamma)$. Then g and σ act on α in the following way:

$$(2.3) \quad \alpha^g = (\alpha_1^{g_1}, \dots, \alpha_n^{g_n}), \quad \alpha^\sigma = (\alpha_{1\sigma^{-1}}, \dots, \alpha_{n\sigma^{-1}}).$$

The *automorphism group of C* , denoted by $\text{Aut}(C)$, is the setwise stabiliser of C in $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$. In this paper, we construct a family of codes with the following symmetrical property.

Definition 2.1. Let C be a code with distance partition $\{C = C_0, C_1, \dots, C_\rho\}$. We say C is *X -completely transitive*, or simply *completely transitive*, if there exists $X \leq \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that C_i is an X -orbit for $i = 0, \dots, \rho$.

It is known that completely transitive codes are necessarily completely regular [20].

Definition 2.2. A binary code C with covering radius ρ is *completely regular* if for all $i \geq 0$, every vector $\alpha \in C_i$ has the same number c_i of neighbours in C_{i-1} and the same number b_i of neighbours in C_{i+1} . Also, define $a_i = n - b_i - c_i$ and note that $c_0 = b_\rho = 0$. For such a code, define $(b_0, \dots, b_{\rho-1}; c_1, \dots, c_\rho)$ to be the *intersection array* of C .

Recall that the *dimension* of C is the dimension of C regarded as a vector space over \mathbb{F}_2 . We say that C is an $[n, k, d]$ code if it has minimum distance d and dimension k . We will need the following result from [32].

Lemma 2.3. *Let C be a linear completely regular $[n, k, d]$ code with covering radius ρ and intersection array $(b_0, \dots, b_{\rho-1}; c_1, \dots, c_\rho)$. Let μ_i denote the number of cosets of C of weight i , where $i = 0, \dots, \rho$. Then the following equality holds:*

$$b_i \mu_i = c_{i+1} \mu_{i+1}, \quad i = 0, \dots, \rho - 1.$$

3. THE ACTION OF $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ ON QUADRATIC FORMS

The notation and terminology in this section will be based on that found in [16, Section 7.7]. We start with the standard construction for the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on quadratic forms. Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer and $V := \mathbb{F}_2^{2m}$ be a vector space equipped with the standard basis and consider the block matrices

$$e = \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & I_m \\ 0_m & 0_m \end{pmatrix}, \quad f = \begin{pmatrix} 0_m & I_m \\ I_m & 0_m \end{pmatrix} = e + e^T.$$

We write elements of V as row matrices and, therefore, define $\varphi(u, v)$ to be the alternating bilinear form given by $\varphi(u, v) := uv^T$. We let Ω be the set of all quadratic forms $\theta(u)$ with the property that

$$\varphi(u, v) = \theta(u + v) + \theta(u) + \theta(v),$$

i.e. Ω is the set of quadratic forms whose polarisation is equal to φ . Now we define $\theta_0(u) := ueu^T \in \Omega$, and by results in [16, Section 7.7], any other element of Ω is of the form

$$\theta_a(u) := \theta_0(u) + \varphi(u, a),$$

where a is a fixed element of V .

Recall that $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2) := \{A \in \mathrm{GL}_{2m}(2) \mid AfA^T = f\}$ acts on Ω (on the right) via $\theta^x(u) := \theta(ux^{-1})$ for each $\theta \in \Omega$ and $x \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$. Recall ([16, Corollary 7.7A]) that the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on Ω splits into two distinct orbits

$$\Omega^0 := \{\theta_a \mid a \in V^0\}, \quad \Omega^1 := \{\theta_a \mid a \in V^1\}$$

where

$$V^0 := \{a \in V \mid \theta_0(a) = 0\}, \quad V^1 := \{a \in V \mid \theta_0(a) = 1\}.$$

Given the form φ and an element $c \in V$, we define the *transvection* t_c as follows:

$$(u)t_c := u + \varphi(u, c)c, \text{ for all } u, c \in V.$$

Recall that the set of all transvections generates $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ (see, for instance, [39, Theorem 8.5]). The following result is [16, Lemma 7.7A].

Lemma 3.1. *The following hold:*

(i) *For all $a, c \in V$,*

$$\theta_a^{t_c} = \begin{cases} \theta_a, & \text{if } \theta_a(c) = 1; \\ \theta_{a+c}, & \text{if } \theta_a(c) = 0 \end{cases}$$

(ii) *For each $a, b \in V$ there is at most one $c \in V$ such that t_c maps θ_a onto θ_b . Such a c exists if and only if $\theta_0(a) = \theta_0(b)$ (and then $c = a + b$).*

As an immediate consequence, we obtain:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$ and $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ a subset of V^ε for some odd integer $k > 0$. Then, for each $g \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k (\theta_{v_i})^g = \left(\theta_{\sum_{i=1}^k v_i} \right)^g.$$

Proof. We begin by considering the case where $g = 1$. Since k is odd,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{v_i}(u) = \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_0(u) + \sum_{i=1}^k \varphi(u, v_i) = \theta_0(u) + \varphi(u, \sum_{i=1}^k v_i) = \theta_{\sum_{i=1}^k v_i}(u).$$

We now turn to the general case. Since the transvections generate $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$, it suffices to consider the case $g = t_c$ for some $c \in V$. We calculate,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{v_i}(u)^{t_c} &= \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{v_i + (1 + \theta_{v_i}(c))c}(u) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_0(u) + \varphi(u, v_i + (1 + \theta_{v_i}(c))c) \\ &= \theta_0(u) + \varphi(u, \sum_{i=1}^k v_i + c + c \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_{v_i}(c)) \\ &= \theta_0(u) + \varphi(u, \sum_{i=1}^k v_i + (1 + \theta_{\sum_{i=1}^k v_i}(c))c) = \left(\theta_{\sum_{i=1}^k v_i} \right)^{t_c}(u). \end{aligned}$$

□

We now show how to decompose elements of V into a sum of elements in V^ε , which will prove useful in the sequel.

Lemma 3.3. *For each $v \in V$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$ there exist distinct $x, y \in V^\varepsilon$ such that $v = x + y$.*

Proof. We prove this in a series of cases. In each case, let e_i denote the i 'th basis vector for $1 \leq i \leq 2m$. Let $y = x + v$ and $\delta := \theta_0(v)$.

- (a) If $\delta = 0$, $\varepsilon = 0$ let $x := 0$.
- (b) If $\delta = 0$, $\varepsilon = 1$ then
 - (i) if $v_i = v_{i+m}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $x := e_i + e_{i+m}$;
 - (ii) if $v_i \neq v_{i+m}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, fix any i , let j be such that either $v_{j-m} = 1$ or $v_{j+m} = 1$ and let $x := e_i + e_{i+m} + e_j$.
- (c) If $\delta = 1$, $\varepsilon = 0$ let $1 \leq i \leq m$ be such that $v_i = v_{i+m} = 1$ and let $x := e_i$.
- (d) If $\delta = 1$, $\varepsilon = 1$ let $1 \leq i \leq m$ be such that $v_i = v_{i+m} = 1$. Then
 - (i) if $v_j = v_{j+m}$ for some $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $j \neq i$, let $x := e_j + e_{j+m} + e_i$;
 - (ii) if $v_j \neq v_{j+m}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $j \neq i$, let j be such that $v_{j-m} = 1$ or $v_{j+m} = 1$ and let $x := e_i + e_{i+m} + e_j$.

□

Corollary 3.4. *Let $v \in V^\varepsilon$. Then v can be written as the sum of three distinct elements of $V^{1-\varepsilon}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.3, $v = x + y$ for some $x, y \in V^{1-\varepsilon}$. Again, by Lemma 3.3, $y = y_1 + y_2$ for some $y_1, y_2 \in V^{1-\varepsilon}$ and so $v = x + y_1 + y_2$. Now if any of x, y_1, y_2 are equal, then $v \in V^{1-\varepsilon}$, which is a contradiction. □

3.1. The action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on 3-subsets. In [16, Theorem 7.7A], the authors deduce that $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts 2-transitively on Ω^ε for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$. In fact, more is true:

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{F}_2$ and $m \geq 3$. The action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on 3-subsets of elements in Ω^ε splits into two orbits, $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{O}_1^\varepsilon$, defined as follows:*

$$\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon := \left\{ \{ \theta_{v_1}, \theta_{v_2}, \theta_{v_3} \} \mid v_j \in V^\varepsilon, \theta_0(v_1 + v_2 + v_3) = \delta \right\}.$$

Furthermore, for each $v \in V^\delta$, the sets

$$\Delta_v^\varepsilon := \left\{ \{ \theta_{v_1}, \theta_{v_2}, \theta_{v_3} \} \in \mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon \mid \sum_{i=1}^3 v_i = v \right\}$$

form blocks of imprimitivity for the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon$.

We will prove Theorem 3.5 shortly. In order to do so we need a definition from [16]: Let $a \in V, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$ and set

$$L(a, \varepsilon) := \{ v \in V \mid \varphi(v, a) = \varepsilon \}.$$

Observe that $L(a, 0)$ is a subspace of V for all $a \in V$. Before the proof of Lemma 7.7B in [16], it is shown that

$$\dim \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^k L(a_i, 0) \right) = 2m - k,$$

whenever $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ are linearly independent. The following is a generalisation of [16, Lemma 7.7B].

Lemma 3.6. *Let $m \geq 4$ and let a, b, c be linearly independent vectors in V . For any $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3 \in \mathbb{F}_2$, θ_0 is not constant on*

$$L(a, \varepsilon_1) \cap L(b, \varepsilon_2) \cap L(c, \varepsilon_3).$$

Proof. By assumption, $U := L(a, 0) \cap L(b, 0) \cap L(c, 0)$ is a subspace of dimension $2m - 3 > 3$ in V , so there is $d \in U$ which is linearly independent of a, b and c . This means we may choose

$$w \in L(a, \varepsilon_1) \cap L(b, \varepsilon_2) \cap L(c, \varepsilon_3) \cap L(d, \varepsilon_4)$$

for any $\varepsilon_4 \in \mathbb{F}_2$. The fact that $d \in U$ implies that $w, w + d \in L(a, \varepsilon_1) \cap L(b, \varepsilon_2) \cap L(c, \varepsilon_3)$, so that on setting $\varepsilon_4 := \theta_0(d) + 1$, we have:

$$\theta_0(w + d) = \theta_0(w) + \theta_0(d) + \varphi(w, d) = \theta_0(w) + 1,$$

as needed. \square

We can now prove Theorem 3.5:

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon, \delta \in \mathbb{F}_2$. We first prove that $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon, \mathcal{O}_{1-\delta}^\varepsilon$ are the two distinct orbits of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on 3-subsets of Ω^ε . By Lemma 3.2, both $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{O}_{1-\delta}^\varepsilon$ are fixed setwise by $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$. When $m = 3$, a GAP [18] calculation verifies that each is in fact an $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ -orbit. Thus we assume from now on that $m \geq 4$.

Since $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts 2-transitively on Ω^ε , it is sufficient to prove that whenever $a, b, c, d \in V^\varepsilon$, there is an element x of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ which fixes θ_c, θ_d but maps θ_a to θ_b if and only if $\theta_0(a + c + d) = \theta_0(b + c + d)$. (Recall that $\{\theta_a, \theta_c, \theta_d\}$ and $\{\theta_b, \theta_c, \theta_d\}$ are both elements in $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon$, or both elements in $\mathcal{O}_{1-\delta}^\varepsilon$, if and only if $\theta_0(a + c + d) = \theta_0(b + c + d)$.)

In order to prove this fact, we will show that there is $w \in V^\varepsilon$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad \theta_c(a+w) = \theta_c(b+w) = \theta_a(a+w) = \theta_a(b+w) = 1$$

if and only if $\theta_0(a+c+d) = \theta_0(b+c+d)$. Note that, since $w \in V^\varepsilon$, we easily deduce that

$$\theta_a(a+w) = \theta_w(b+w) = 0.$$

This, along with (3.2) and Lemma 3.1, implies that we may take $x = t_{a+w} \cdot t_{b+w}$ and we are done.

Thus it remains to show that there is $w \in V^\varepsilon$ satisfying (3.2). One easily checks that (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(w, a+c) &= 1 + \varphi(a, c); \\ \varphi(w, a+d) &= 1 + \varphi(a, d); \\ \varphi(w, b+c) &= 1 + \varphi(b, c); \\ \varphi(w, b+d) &= 1 + \varphi(b, d). \end{aligned}$$

Since the vectors $\{a+c, b+c, a+d\}$ are linearly independent, Lemma 3.6 implies that θ_0 is not constant on

$$L(a+c, 1 + \varphi(a, c)) \cap L(b+c, 1 + \varphi(b, c)) \cap L(a+d, 1 + \varphi(a, d))$$

(notice that this assertion holds even if $d = a+b+c$ by [16, Lemma 7.7B].) Thus whatever value ε takes, there exists $w \in V^\varepsilon$ satisfying the conditions in (3.2) if and only if $\varphi(w, b+d) = 1 + \varphi(b, d)$ holds above. But $\theta_0(a+c+d) = \theta_0(b+c+d)$ if and only if $\varphi(b, c) + \varphi(b, d) = \varphi(a, c) + \varphi(a, d)$ which is if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(w, b+d) &= \varphi(w, b) + \varphi(w, d) = \varphi(b, c) + \varphi(w, c) + \varphi(a, d) + \varphi(w, a) \\ &= \varphi(b, d) + \varphi(a, c) + \varphi(w, c) + \varphi(w, a) = 1 + \varphi(b, d), \end{aligned}$$

as required. This proves the first assertion in Theorem 3.5.

It remains to prove the last statement. Let $v \in V^\delta$, $\{\theta_{v_1}, \theta_{v_2}, \theta_{v_3}\} \in \Delta_v^\varepsilon$ and $c \in V$. By Lemma 3.2,

$$\theta_{v_1}^{t_c} + \theta_{v_2}^{t_c} + \theta_{v_3}^{t_c} = \theta_{v_1+v_2+v_3}^{t_c},$$

so that either $(\Delta_v^\varepsilon)^{t_c} \cap \Delta_v^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ or $(\Delta_v^\varepsilon)^{t_c} \cap \Delta_w^\varepsilon = \Delta_v^\varepsilon$ according to whether $\theta_v(c) = 0$ or 1 respectively. Since $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ is transitive on $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon$, $\Delta := \{\Delta_v^\varepsilon \mid v \in V^\delta\}$ forms a system of imprimitivity for the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on $\mathcal{O}_\delta^\varepsilon$ (in fact the action of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ on Δ is equivalent to its action on Ω^δ) and the proof is complete. \square

3.2. Construction of \mathcal{D}^ε . For $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, define \mathcal{B}^ε as in the statement of Theorem A:

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon := \{\{\theta_a, \theta_b, \theta_c, \theta_{a+b+c}\} \mid \{\theta_a, \theta_b, \theta_c\} \in \mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^\varepsilon\}.$$

Lemma 3.7. $\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon := (\Omega^\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon)$ is a simple plicable $2 - (|\Omega^\varepsilon|, 4, \lambda^\varepsilon)$ design for some $\lambda^\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. Clearly \mathcal{B}^ε contains no repeated lines (by definition). Moreover, given any $\ell \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon$, any three points in ℓ uniquely determine the fourth, so the intersection of any two lines has size at most 2. As $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon^\varepsilon$ is an $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ -orbit, we deduce from Lemma 3.2 that \mathcal{B}^ε is a $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ -orbit on the 4-subsets of Ω^ε . Since $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts 2-transitively on Ω^ε , $\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon := (\Omega^\varepsilon, \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon)$ is a $2 - (|\Omega^\varepsilon|, 4, \lambda^\varepsilon)$ design for some $\lambda^\varepsilon > 0$ by [19, Lemma 4.3]. \square

In order to complete the proof of Theorem A, it remains to calculate the values of $|\Omega^\varepsilon|$ and λ^ε . It is well known that $n^\varepsilon := |\Omega^\varepsilon| = |V^\varepsilon| = 2^{m-1}(2^m + (-1)^\varepsilon)$. One proof of this comes from a (probably well known) inductive construction for V^ε , which we now describe.

For $k > 0$ let V_k denote the \mathbb{F}_2 -vector space of dimension $2k$, and as before, $V_k^\varepsilon = \{v \in V_k \mid \theta_0(v) = \varepsilon\}$ where θ_0 is defined over the appropriate dimension. For each $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2$, $k > 0$ and $v = (v_1, v_2) \in V_k$ (here each v_i is an \mathbb{F}_2 -vector of length k), let $v_{xy} = (x, v_1, y, v_2) \in V_{k+1}$. Moreover, let $(V_k^\varepsilon)^{xy} := \{v_{xy} \mid v \in V_k^\varepsilon\} \subseteq V_{k+1}$.

Lemma 3.8. *For each $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$,*

$$V_{k+1}^\varepsilon = (V_k^\varepsilon)^{00} \cup (V_k^\varepsilon)^{01} \cup (V_k^\varepsilon)^{10} \cup (V_k^{1-\varepsilon})^{11}.$$

In particular, $|V_{k+1}^\varepsilon| = 3|V_k^\varepsilon| + |V_k^{1-\varepsilon}|$ and $|V_m^\varepsilon| = 2^{m-1}(2^m + (-1)^\varepsilon)$.

Proof. Clearly each of $(V_k^\varepsilon)^{00}$, $(V_k^\varepsilon)^{01}$, $(V_k^\varepsilon)^{10}$ and $(V_k^{1-\varepsilon})^{11}$ is contained in V_{k+1}^ε . Conversely any element of V_{k+1}^ε must lie in one of these sets. Thus, since these sets are pairwise disjoint, $|V_{k+1}^\varepsilon| = 3|V_k^\varepsilon| + |V_k^{1-\varepsilon}|$. Obtaining an explicit formula for $|V_k^\varepsilon|$ is now safely left as an exercise. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let λ^ε be the number of lines that contain any pair of points in the design \mathcal{D}^ε . Then*

$$\lambda^\varepsilon = 2^{m-2}(2^{m-1} + (-1)^\varepsilon) - 1.$$

Proof. Let $\theta_w, \theta_z \in \Omega^\varepsilon$, and recall from (2.1) the definition of $\overline{\theta_w, \theta_z}$. Then $\theta_v \in \overline{\theta_w, \theta_z}$ if and only if $\theta_0(w + z + v) = \varepsilon$. As \mathcal{D}^ε is pliable, $2 + 2\lambda^\varepsilon = |\overline{\theta_w, \theta_z}|$, and so

$$2 + 2\lambda^\varepsilon = |\{v \in V_m^\varepsilon \mid \theta_0(w + z + v) = \varepsilon\}|.$$

Since $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts 2-transitively on Ω^ε , we can assume that $w = 0$ and $z = e_1$, or $w = e_1 + e_2 + e_{m+2}$ and $z = e_2 + e_{m+2}$ for $\varepsilon = 0$ or 1 respectively. In particular, we can assume that $w + z = e_1$. Now, for $v \in V_m^\varepsilon$, $\theta_0(e_1 + v) = \varepsilon$ if and only if $v_{m+1} = 0$. Hence, by Lemma 3.8,

$$\{v \in V_m^\varepsilon \mid \theta_0(w + z + v) = \varepsilon\} = (V_{m-1}^\varepsilon)^{00} \cup (V_{m-1}^\varepsilon)^{10},$$

and so $2 + 2\lambda^\varepsilon = 2|V_{m-1}^\varepsilon| = 2^{m-1}(2^{m-1} + (-1)^\varepsilon)$. Rearranging this gives the result. \square

Proof of Theorem A. Theorem A follows as an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.5 and Lemmas 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9. \square

4. TWO NEW INFINITE FAMILIES OF PUZZLE GROUPS

In this section, our goal is a description of the puzzle groups $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)$ and puzzle sets $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ appearing in Theorem B. Taken together, the results of this section yield a proof of Theorem B. First recall the notation $[x, y]$ of Section 2.1 for a pair $\{x, y\}$ of points in a simple pliable $2 - (n, 4, \lambda)$ design.

Lemma 4.1. *For each $x_0, y_0 \in V^\varepsilon$, the action of $t_{x_0+y_0}$ on Ω^ε induces the permutation $[\theta_{x_0}, \theta_{y_0}]$.*

Proof. Our goal is to show that $t_{x_0+y_0}$ induces the permutation

$$\prod_{i=0}^{\lambda^\varepsilon} (\theta_{x_i}, \theta_{y_i}),$$

where $\{\theta_{x_0}, \theta_{y_0}, \theta_{x_i}, \theta_{y_i}\}$ are the lines in \mathcal{B}^ε containing $\{\theta_{x_0}, \theta_{y_0}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \lambda^\varepsilon$. Note that $\theta_0(x_0 + y_0 + x_i) = \varepsilon$ and $x_i + y_i = x_0 + y_0$, so writing $c := x_0 + y_0$ we have $\theta_{x_i}(c) = \theta_{y_i}(c) = 0$. Hence by Lemma 3.1,

$$\theta_{x_i}^{t_c} = \theta_{x_i + (1 + \theta_{x_i}(x_i + y_i)) \cdot x_i + y_i} = \theta_{y_i},$$

and similarly for y_i .

Finally, if $z \in V^\varepsilon$ is such that $\theta_0(c + z) = 1 - \varepsilon$ then

$$\theta_z(c) = \theta_0(c) + \varphi(c, z) = \theta_0(c + z) + \theta_0(z) = 1 - \varepsilon + \varepsilon = 1,$$

so that $\theta_z^{t_c} = \theta_z$. The lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 4.2. *If $a, b, c \in V^\varepsilon$ are such that $\theta_0(a + b + c) = 1 - \varepsilon$ then $(t_{a+b})^{t_{a+c}} = t_{b+c}$ and hence*

$$[\theta_a, \theta_c][\theta_a, \theta_b][\theta_a, \theta_c] = [\theta_b, \theta_c].$$

Proof. By [16, p.246], we have that $(u)t_v = u + \varphi(u, v)v$ for all $u, v \in V$, and $x^{-1}t_v x = t_{vx}$ for all $x \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$. Thus, given that $\theta_0(a) = \theta_0(b) = \theta_0(c) = \varepsilon$ and $\theta_0(a + b + c) = 1 - \varepsilon$, it is straightforward to show that $(a + b)t_{a+c} = b + c$. \square

For the remainder of this section we identify (via an abuse of notation) for each $v \in V^\varepsilon$ the form θ_v with its corresponding vector v . Thus we will write “ $v \in \Omega^\varepsilon$ ” rather than “ $\theta_v \in \Omega^\varepsilon$ ” and so on. In order to avoid confusion, we recall the notation

$$\overline{a, b} = \{x \in \Omega^\varepsilon \mid x + a + b \in \Omega^\varepsilon\}$$

for the set of forms collinear with $\{a, b\}$ in \mathcal{D}^ε . Note that the condition $\infty \notin \overline{a, b}$ is equivalent to the condition $\theta_0(a + b + \infty) = 1 - \varepsilon$.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\infty, a, b \in \Omega^\varepsilon$ be such that $\infty \notin \overline{a, b}$. Then*

$$[\infty, a, b, \infty] = [a, b].$$

Proof. Two applications of Lemma 4.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} [\infty, a, b, \infty] &= [\infty, a][a, b][b, \infty] = [\infty, a][a, b][\infty, a][\infty, a][b, \infty] \\ &= [\infty, b][\infty, a][b, \infty] = [a, b], \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

We now apply Corollary 4.3 to show that the permutation induced by any move sequence in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ can be generated via a move sequence which starts with an element of our choosing:

Lemma 4.4. *For each $g \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ and $\infty \in \Omega^\varepsilon$, for some $l > 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq l$ there exist $b_i \in \Omega^\varepsilon$ such that $g = [\infty, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l]$.*

Proof. Write $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ for short. We prove this by induction on the length k of an expression for an element $g := [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k] \in \mathcal{L}$. If $k = 2$ then there are two cases to consider. If $\infty \in \overline{a_1, a_2}$ then $[a_1, a_2] = [\infty, \infty + a_1 + a_2]$, otherwise $[a_1, a_2] = [\infty, a_1, a_2, \infty]$ by Corollary 4.3. Now assume that $k > 2$. If $\infty \in \overline{a_1, a_2}$ then by induction there exist $l > 0$ and $b_i \in \Omega$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$ such that $[a_2, \dots, a_k] = [\infty + a_1 + a_2, b_1, \dots, b_l]$ and hence $g = [\infty, \infty + a_1 + a_2, b_1, \dots, b_l]$. If $\infty \notin \overline{a_1, a_2}$ then there exist $l > 0$ and $b_i \in \Omega$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$ such that $[a_2, \dots, a_k] = [\infty, b_1, \dots, b_l]$ so that $g = [\infty, a_1, a_2, \infty, b_1, \dots, b_l]$. The result follows. \square

Corollary 4.5. *$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ is a group.*

Proof. $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ clearly contains the trivial move sequence and $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r]^{-1} = [a_r, a_{r-1}, \dots, a_1]$ for each $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r] \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$. It remains to show that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ is closed under composition.

For $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq l$ let $a_i, b_j \in \Omega^\varepsilon$ and write $g := [a_1, \dots, a_k]$ and $h := [b_1, \dots, b_l]$. By Lemma 4.4, there exist $s > 0$ and $c_1, \dots, c_s \in \Omega^\varepsilon$ such that $[b_1, \dots, b_l] = [a_k, c_1, \dots, c_s]$ so we have $g \cdot h = [a_1, \dots, a_k, c_1, \dots, c_s] \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$, as required. \square

Proof of Theorem B. Write $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon}$ for short. Since, by Corollary 4.5, \mathcal{L} is a group, it is a consequence of Lemmas 4.1 and 3.3 that \mathcal{L} is a subgroup of $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ generated by transvections, and hence $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2) = \mathcal{L}$. Now, Lemma 4.4 and [19, Lemma 3.1] show that \mathcal{L} may be written as a disjoint union

$$\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{a \in \Omega^\varepsilon} \pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon) \cdot [\infty, a].$$

Hence $|\mathcal{L}| = |\Omega^\varepsilon| \cdot |\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)|$ and since $\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon) \subseteq \text{stab}_{\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)}(\infty)$ we also have an equality

$$\pi_\infty(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon) = \text{stab}_{\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)}(\infty) \cong \begin{cases} \text{O}_{2m}^+(2), & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0; \\ \text{O}_{2m}^-(2), & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1. \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof. \square

5. TWO NEW INFINITE FAMILIES OF COMPLETELY TRANSITIVE CODES

This section is concerned with the \mathbb{F}_2 -linear codes $C^\varepsilon := C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)$ associated to the incidence matrices of the designs \mathcal{D}^ε of Theorem A. (Recall that $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D}^\varepsilon)$ is the \mathbb{F}_2 -rowspan of the the incidence matrix of \mathcal{D}^ε .) We first introduce some notation which will allow us to describe elements of C^ε succinctly. For $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, let W^ε be the $|\Omega^\varepsilon|$ -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_2 with entries indexed by Ω^ε . Therefore, each $\alpha_S \in W^\varepsilon$ can be uniquely identified with a subset $S \subseteq \Omega^\varepsilon$, that is, α_S is the characteristic vector of S . Thus, we note that $\text{supp}(\alpha_S) = S$. Using this notation

$$C^\varepsilon = \langle \alpha_S \mid S \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon \rangle.$$

We observe that for each α_S in this generating set of C^ε ,

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{\theta_a \in S} a = 0.$$

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\alpha_{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{Y}}$ be two vertices in W^ε that satisfy (5.1). Then $\alpha_{\mathcal{X}} + \alpha_{\mathcal{Y}}$ also satisfies (5.1). In particular, (5.1) holds for all $\alpha_S \in C^\varepsilon$.*

Proof. As $\text{supp}(\alpha_{\mathcal{X}} + \alpha_{\mathcal{Y}}) = \mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{Y}$, the symmetric difference of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , it follows that

$$\sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{Y}} a = \sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{X} \Delta \mathcal{Y}} a + \sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}} 2a = \sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{X}} a + \sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{Y}} a = 0.$$

Since (5.1) holds for all α_S such that $S \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon$, the assertion now follows. \square

Corollary 5.2. *C^ε consists entirely of codewords even weight and has minimum distance $d = 4$. Moreover, the set of codewords of weight 4 is in bijection with \mathcal{B}^ε and*

$$C^\varepsilon = \langle \alpha_S \mid |\mathcal{S}| = 4, \sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{S}} a = 0 \rangle.$$

Proof. As C^ε is generated by codewords with weight 4, it follows that it consists entirely of codewords with even weight. Suppose there exists $\alpha_S \in C^\varepsilon$ with weight 2, so $\mathcal{S} = \{\theta_a, \theta_b\}$ for some $a \neq b$. Then Lemma 5.1 implies that $a + b = 0$, a contradiction, hence $d = 4$. Now let α_S be any weight 4 vertex in W^ε that satisfies (5.1), with $\mathcal{S} = \{\theta_a, \theta_b, \theta_c, \theta_e\}$. As $\theta_0(e) = \varepsilon$ and $e = a + b + c$, we deduce that $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon$, so $\alpha_S \in C^\varepsilon$. Now, by Lemma 5.1, all codewords of weight 4 satisfy (5.1), which proves the second statement. \square

5.1. Covering radius and complete transitivity. The next result gives a succinct description of the codewords of C^ε .

Lemma 5.3. *Let $m \geq 4$ and $\alpha_S \in W^\varepsilon$. Then $\alpha_S \in C^\varepsilon$ if and only if $|\mathcal{S}| = 2k$ for some $k \geq 2$ and $\sum_{\theta_a \in \mathcal{S}} a = 0$.*

Proof. The forward implication is a consequence of Lemma 5.1 and Corollary 5.2, and the reverse implication for $k = 2$ also follows from Corollary 5.2. Thus consider the reverse implication for $k \geq 3$. First, suppose that we have verified the claim when $k = 3$ and assume (by induction) that the claim holds for all \mathcal{S} with $|\mathcal{S}| = 2\ell$ and $\ell < k$. Write $\alpha := \alpha_S$ for short and assume that $k > 3$. If there exist $\theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\theta_0(x + y + z) = \varepsilon$ then $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}'} \in C^\varepsilon$ where $\mathcal{S}' = \{\theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z, \theta_{x+y+z}\}$. Since $|\text{supp}(\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'})| < 2k$, it follows from Lemma 5.1 that $\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'}$ satisfies the inductive hypothesis. Thus $\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'} \in C^\varepsilon$, and so $\alpha \in C^\varepsilon$.

We are thus reduced to the case where

$$(5.2) \quad \theta_0(x + y + z) = 1 - \varepsilon \text{ for all } \theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Now, for any $\theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z, \theta_s \in \mathcal{S}$, there exist $t, u \in V^\varepsilon$ such that $x + y + z + s = t + u$ by Lemma 3.3. Furthermore, by (5.2), we must have $\{x, y, z, s\} \cap \{t, u\} = \emptyset$. By induction, $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}'} \in C^\varepsilon$ where $\mathcal{S}' = \{\theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z, \theta_s, \theta_t, \theta_u\}$. Moreover, $|\text{supp}(\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'})| < |\mathcal{S}|$, therefore, as before, $\alpha \in C^\varepsilon$.

It thus remains to verify the claim in the case where $k = 3$. Since $6 > 4 = 2^2$ at least 3 of the vectors associated with the forms in \mathcal{S} are linearly independent. Since the sum of 6 distinct vectors in \mathbb{F}_2^3 cannot be 0, at least 4 of the vectors associated with the forms in \mathcal{S} are linearly independent. Further, an identical argument to that given in the first paragraph shows that we may assume (5.2) holds for \mathcal{S} .

Let $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ be the four linearly independent vectors, so that $\mathcal{S} = \{\theta_{a_1}, \theta_{a_2}, \theta_{a_3}, \theta_{a_4}, \theta_r, \theta_s\}$ for some $\theta_r, \theta_s \in \Omega^\varepsilon$. By the pigeonhole principle there exist two equal elements in the set $\{\varphi(a_1, a_3), \varphi(a_2, a_3), \varphi(a_4, a_3)\}$, $\varphi(a_1, a_3)$ and $\varphi(a_2, a_3)$ say. By Lemma 3.6 we may choose

$$x \in L(a_1 + a_2, \theta_0(a_1 + a_2)) \cap L(a_3, \varphi(a_1, a_3) + 1) \cap L(a_3 + a_4, \theta_0(a_3 + a_4)),$$

so that $\theta_0(x) = \varepsilon$. This implies that $x \notin \{a_1, a_2\}$ and since

$$\theta_0(x + a_1 + a_2) = \theta_0(x) + \theta_0(a_1 + a_2) + \varphi(x, a_1 + a_2) = \theta_0(x) = \varepsilon,$$

$\mathcal{S}' = \{\theta_x, \theta_{x+a_1+a_2}, \theta_{a_1}, \theta_{a_2}\}$ is the support of some codeword $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}'}$. Now, as (5.2) holds, 0 or 1 elements in the set $\{x, x + a_1 + a_2\}$ lie in $\{a_3, a_4, r, s\}$. If it is 1 then we must have $\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'} \in C^\varepsilon$, so that $\alpha \in C^\varepsilon$. If it is 0 then

$$\text{supp}(\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'}) = \{\theta_x, \theta_{x+a_1+a_2}, \theta_{a_3}, \theta_{a_4}, \theta_r, \theta_s\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_0((x + a_1 + a_2) + r + s) &= \theta_0(x + a_3 + a_4) \\ &= \theta_0(x) + \theta_0(a_3 + a_4) + \varphi(x, a_3 + a_4) = \theta_0(x) = \varepsilon\end{aligned}$$

so that $\alpha + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'} = \alpha_{\mathcal{T}} + \alpha_{\mathcal{U}}$ where

$$\mathcal{T} := \{\theta_{x+a_1+a_2}, \theta_r, \theta_s, \theta_{x+a_1+a_2+r+s}\} \text{ and } \mathcal{U} := \{\theta_x, \theta_{a_3}, \theta_{a_4}, \theta_{x+a_3+a_4}\}.$$

Clearly both $\alpha_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{U}}$ lie in C^ε , so that $\alpha \in C^\varepsilon$ in this case also. This completes the proof. \square

Next, recall from Section 2 the notation

$$C_i^\varepsilon := \{\beta \in W^\varepsilon \mid \min_{\alpha \in C^\varepsilon} d(\beta, \alpha) = i\}.$$

Our next result shows that $C_i^\varepsilon = \emptyset$ for all $i \geq 4$ (so C_i^ε has covering radius 3) from which we can quickly deduce that C^ε is a completely transitive code.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $m \geq 4$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$. For each $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}} \in W^\varepsilon$ with $\mathcal{S} := \text{supp}(\alpha_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $v := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{S}} a$, one of the following holds:*

- (i) $|\mathcal{S}|$ is even, $v = 0$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}} \in C_0^\varepsilon$;
- (ii) $|\mathcal{S}|$ is odd, $v \in V^\varepsilon$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}} \in C_1^\varepsilon$;
- (iii) $|\mathcal{S}|$ is even, $v \neq 0$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}} \in C_2^\varepsilon$;
- (iv) $|\mathcal{S}|$ is odd, $v \in V^{1-\varepsilon}$ and $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}} \in C_3^\varepsilon$.

Consequently, C^ε has covering radius 3.

Proof. Suppose that $|\mathcal{S}|$ is even. If $v = 0$, then by Lemma 5.3 $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}} \in C^\varepsilon$ and (i) holds, so we may assume that $v \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.3, $v = x + y$ for distinct elements $x, y \in V^\varepsilon$. Set $\alpha' := \alpha_{\mathcal{S}} + \alpha_{\mathcal{S}'}$, where $\mathcal{S}' = \{\theta_x, \theta_y\}$, so that

$$\text{supp}(\alpha') = \mathcal{S} \Delta \mathcal{S}' \text{ and } \sum_{\theta_a \in \text{supp}(\alpha')} a = 0.$$

In particular, $\alpha' \in C^\varepsilon$ and $d(\alpha_{\mathcal{S}}, \alpha') = 2$. Now (iii) follows because C^ε has minimum distance $d = 4$.

Next suppose that $|\mathcal{S}|$ is odd. If $v \in V^\varepsilon$ then $\alpha' = \alpha_{\mathcal{S}} + \alpha_{\{\theta_v\}}$ is a codeword with $d(\alpha_{\mathcal{S}}, \alpha') = 1$ so that (ii) holds. If $v \in V^{1-\varepsilon}$ then by Corollary 3.4, there exist $x, y, z \in V^\varepsilon$ such that $v = x + y + z$. In this case $\alpha' = \alpha_{\mathcal{S}} + \alpha_{\{\theta_x, \theta_y, \theta_z\}}$ is a codeword with $d(\alpha_{\mathcal{S}}, \alpha') = 3$ and (iv) holds. \square

Corollary 5.5. *For each $m \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, C^ε is a completely transitive code with covering radius 3.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.4, C^ε has covering radius 3 for $m \geq 4$, and using GAP [18], we verify this to hold when $m = 3$ also. Thus we need to show that $\text{Aut}(C^\varepsilon)$ is transitive on C_i^ε for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Since C^ε is generated by the rows of the incidence matrix of \mathcal{D}^ε , and because \mathcal{D}^ε is a $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ -orbit, it follows that $\text{Aut}(C^\varepsilon) \geq N_{C^\varepsilon} \rtimes \text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$, where N_{C^ε} is the group of translations of C^ε . As N_{C^ε} acts regularly on C^ε , $\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts 2-transitively on entries and C^ε has minimum distance $d = 4$, we deduce that C^ε , C_1^ε and C_2^ε are all $\text{Aut}(C^\varepsilon)$ -orbits. Let $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in C_3^\varepsilon$. As $\text{Aut}(C^\varepsilon)$ acts transitively on C^ε , we can assume that $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Gamma_3(0) \cap C_3^\varepsilon$. (Recall that $\Gamma_i(\alpha) = \{\beta \in W^\varepsilon \mid d(\beta, \alpha) = i\}$.) It is straightforward to show that both $\Gamma_3(0) \cap C_1$

and $\Gamma_3(0) \cap C_3$ are non-empty sets. Thus $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ has at least 2 orbits on $\Gamma_3(0)$. But, by Theorem 3.5, $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ has exactly two orbits on $\Gamma_3(0)$. Hence there exists $g \in \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ such that $\nu_1^g = \nu_2$, proving that C_3^ε is an $\mathrm{Aut}(C^\varepsilon)$ -orbit, and therefore, C^ε is completely transitive. \square

5.2. Dimension and a proof of Theorem C. By Proposition 5.4, we must have

$$(5.3) \quad 2^{n^\varepsilon} = |W^\varepsilon| = |C^\varepsilon| \sum_{i=0}^3 \mu_i.$$

where $n^\varepsilon = |\Omega^\varepsilon|$ and μ_i denotes the number of cosets of C^ε of weight i . Thus, in the next result, we calculate μ_i for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ which allows us to determine the dimension of C^ε .

Proposition 5.6. *For each $m \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{F}_2$, let $f_\varepsilon(m) := 2^{m-1} \cdot (2^m + (-1)^\varepsilon)$. Then C^ε is a $[f_\varepsilon(m), f_\varepsilon(m) - (2m+1), 4]$ completely transitive code with intersection array*

$$(f_\varepsilon(m), f_\varepsilon(m) - 1, f_\varepsilon(m) - 2f_\varepsilon(m-1); 1, 2f_\varepsilon(m-1), f_\varepsilon(m)).$$

Proof. Write $n^\varepsilon := f_\varepsilon(m)$ for short. By Proposition 5.4 and Corollary 5.5, C^ε is completely transitive (and therefore completely regular) with covering radius 3. Let $(b_0, b_1, b_2; c_1, c_2, c_3)$ be the intersection array of C^ε . As C^ε has minimum distance $d = 4$, it follows that $b_0 = n^\varepsilon$, $b_1 = n^\varepsilon - 1$ and $c_1 = 1$. As C^ε is generated by codewords of weight 4, it consists entirely of codewords of even weight, hence it is straightforward to deduce that $a_i = 0$ (so $b_i + c_i = n^\varepsilon$) for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Therefore $c_3 = n^\varepsilon$. Now let $\nu \in C_2^\varepsilon$, and without loss of generality, assume that ν has weight 2. Clearly ν has exactly two neighbours of weight 1 in C_1^ε , so the number $c_2 - 2$ is equal to the number of weight 3 neighbours of ν that are also covered by a codeword of weight 4. By Corollary 5.2, the codewords of weight 4 form a $2 - (n^\varepsilon, 4, \lambda^\varepsilon)$ design where $\lambda^\varepsilon = 2^{m-2}(2^{m-1} + (-1)^\varepsilon) - 1 = f_\varepsilon(m-1) - 1$, so there exist λ^ε codewords of weight 4 that cover ν . Each contributes 2 neighbours of ν of weight 3 that are in C_1^ε . Hence $c_2 = 2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2$, and thus $b_2 = n^\varepsilon - 2\lambda^\varepsilon - 2$. Applying Lemma 2.3 to the intersection array gives

$$\mu_0 = 1, \quad \mu_1 = n^\varepsilon, \quad \mu_2 = \frac{n^\varepsilon(n^\varepsilon - 1)}{2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2}, \quad \mu_3 = \frac{(n^\varepsilon - 1)(n^\varepsilon - 2\lambda^\varepsilon - 2)}{2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2}.$$

Thus

$$2^{n^\varepsilon} = |W^\varepsilon| = |C^\varepsilon| \left(1 + n^\varepsilon + \frac{n^\varepsilon(n^\varepsilon - 1)}{2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2} + \frac{(n^\varepsilon - 1)(n^\varepsilon - 2\lambda^\varepsilon - 2)}{2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2} \right).$$

But

$$n^\varepsilon + \frac{(n^\varepsilon - 1)(n^\varepsilon - 2\lambda^\varepsilon - 2)}{2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2} = \frac{n^\varepsilon(n^\varepsilon - 1)}{2\lambda^\varepsilon + 2} + 1 = 2^{2m},$$

which implies that the dimension of C^ε is $n^\varepsilon - (2m+1)$. \square

Proof of Theorem C. This follows immediately from Propositions 5.4 and 5.6. \square

6. PUZZLE GROUPS WITH LARGE SUPPORT

In this section we prove Theorem D and hence throughout we operate under the suppositions of Theorem D: thus G is a puzzle group associated with a pliable $2 - (v, k, \lambda)$ design such that the element $[\infty, a, b, \infty] = 1$ whenever $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$.

6.1. Background results. We start by collecting a number of important background results.

For a permutation group H acting on a set of size d we write $\mu(H)$ for the smallest number of elements moved by a non-trivial element of H (i.e. $\mu(H)$ is the size of the smallest possible support of a non-trivial element of H). In what follows we will use the crucial fact that if H is primitive and doesn't contain $\text{Alt}(d)$, then $\mu(H)$ is bounded below by a function of d .

The following theorem is due to Liebeck and Saxl [23], and makes use of the Classification of Finite Simple Groups.

Theorem 6.1. *Let d be a positive integer and let H be a primitive subgroup of $\text{Sym}(d)$ that does not contain $\text{Alt}(d)$. Either $\mu(H) \geq \frac{1}{3}d$ or $(\text{Alt}(m))^r \trianglelefteq G \leq \text{Sym}(m) \wr \text{Sym}(r)$ where $m \geq 5$ and the wreath product acts, via the product action on $\Omega = \Delta^r$ and Δ is either the set of ℓ -subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ ($1 \leq \ell < \frac{1}{2}m$) or $m = |\Delta| = 6$. In particular, in all cases, $\mu(H) \geq 2(\sqrt{d} - 1)$.*

Observe that Theorem 6.1 implies that either $\mu(H) \geq \frac{1}{3}d$ or else we have that $d = \binom{m}{\ell}^r$ or 6^r .

We will also need Mihăilescu's theorem, formally the Catalan conjecture [27].

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose that a, b, p and q are positive integers, that $a, b > 1$ and that $p^a - q^b = 1$. Then $p^a = 9$ and $q^b = 8$.*

6.2. A structure result. Our main tool for proving Theorem D will be the following proposition that provides a detailed description of the structure of a design satisfying the suppositions of Theorem D.

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that \mathcal{D} is a pliable $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$ design, and that the associated puzzle group G contains no non-trivial elements of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$. Then $\lambda = 2^\alpha - 1$ for some positive integer α , and any two points a and b lie in a unique Boolean $3-(2^{\alpha+1}, 4, 1)$ subdesign $\mathcal{D}_{a,b}$. Moreover, writing $\Lambda := \{\overline{a, b} \mid a, b \in \Omega, a \neq b\}$, the pair (Ω, Λ) is a $2-(n, 2^{\alpha+1}, 1)$ design.*

For a definition of the Boolean $3-(2^k, 4, 1)$ design we refer the reader to [19, Section 2]. Notice that when $\alpha = 1$, Proposition 6.3 is true but gives no information: in this case we have $\lambda = 1$, the Boolean subdesign $\mathcal{D}_{a,b}$ is the trivial design containing 1 line and the pair (Ω, Λ) is just the original design \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 6.4. *Let (Ω, \mathcal{B}) be a pliable $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$ design, and let a, b, c be distinct points in Ω such that $c \in \overline{a, b}$ and $[c, a, b, c] = 1$. Then $\overline{a, c} = \overline{a, b} = \overline{b, c}$.*

Proof. Let $g = [c, a, b, c]$ and $x \in \overline{a, c}$, so $\{a, c, x, y\}$ is a line for some $y \in \Omega \setminus \{a, c, x\}$. If $x \notin \overline{a, b} \cup \overline{b, c}$, then $y^g = x$, which is a contradiction. If $x \notin \overline{a, b} \cap \overline{b, c}$, then one of $\{a, b, x, y\}$ or $\{b, c, x, y\}$ is a line, contradicting pliability. Thus, as $|\overline{a, c}| = |\overline{a, b}| = |\overline{b, c}| = 2\lambda + 2$, the result holds. \square

Let $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{B})$ be a $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$ design. Then, for $r, s \in \Omega$, with $r \neq s$, let $\mathcal{B}(r, s)$ denote the set of λ lines in \mathcal{B} that contain both r and s .

Lemma 6.5. *Let (Ω, \mathcal{B}) be a pliable $2-(n, 4, \lambda)$ design with the property that for all distinct pairs $a, b \in \Omega$ and for all $c \in \overline{a, b}$, $[c, a, b, c] = 1$. Then $\mathcal{D}_{a,b} = (\Omega_{a,b}, \mathcal{B}_{a,b})$ is an SQS($2\lambda + 2$), where $\Omega_{a,b} = \overline{a, b}$ and*

$$\mathcal{B}_{a,b} = \{\mathcal{B}(r, s) \mid r, s \in \overline{a, b}, r \neq s\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_{a,b}$ is a Boolean quadruple system of order $2^{\alpha+1}$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Consequently, $\lambda = 2^\alpha - 1$.

Proof. Let y, r, s be three distinct points in $\overline{a,b}$. We show that y, r, s lie in a unique element of $\mathcal{B}_{a,b}$. Suppose first that both a and b lie in the set $\{y, r, s\}$, with $r = a$ and $s = b$ say. As $y \in \overline{a,b}$, there exists a line $\ell \in \mathcal{B}$ (which is necessarily in $\mathcal{B}(a, b)$) that contains all three points, and by pliability, this line is unique. Secondly, suppose that at most one of a, b lies in $\{y, r, s\}$, so we may assume that $a, b \notin \{y, r, s\}$. Then $[r, a, b, r] = [s, a, b, s] = 1$, and by Lemma 6.4, $\overline{a, r} = \overline{a, b} = \overline{a, s}$, so $s \in \overline{a, r}$. Now, by supposition, $[s, a, r, s] = 1$, from which we deduce that $\overline{r, s} = \overline{a, b}$. Thus $y \in \overline{a, b} \setminus \{r, s\} = \overline{r, s} \setminus \{r, s\}$, and so y, r, s are contained in a line in \mathcal{B} (which is in $\mathcal{B}(r, s)$) and by pliability, this line is unique. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_{a,b}$ forms an $SQS(2\lambda + 2)$, and hence, a pliable $2 - (2\lambda + 2, 4, \lambda)$ design.

As $y \in \overline{r, s}$, $[y, r, s, y] = 1$ by supposition, and because y, r, s were arbitrary, we conclude that $\pi_x(\mathcal{D}_{a,b}) = 1$ for each $x \in \overline{a,b}$. Hence, $\mathcal{D}_{a,b}$ is a Boolean quadruple system of order 2^α for some $\alpha > 0$ by [19, Theorem B]. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.3. The first statement of the proposition is a consequence of Lemma 6.5. Thus it remains to show that the pair (Ω, Λ) is a $2 - (n, 2^{\alpha+1}, 1)$ design. But each pair of elements $a, b \in \Omega$ is contained in $\overline{a,b}$ and if there exist another pair $x, y \in \Omega$ such that $\overline{a,b} \in \overline{x,y}$ then $\overline{x,y} = \overline{a,b}$, as is shown in the proof of Lemma 6.5. Consequently $\overline{a,b}$ is the unique element of Λ that contains $\{a, b\}$. \square

6.3. Proving Theorem D. Our job now is to prove Theorem D, and to do this we will make heavy use of Proposition 6.3. We will also need to make use of Theorem E part (2), a short proof of which is given in Section 7.1. Note that although the proof of part (4) of Theorem E makes use of Theorem D, the earlier parts do not.

We begin by recording an immediate corollary.

Corollary 6.6. *Suppose that a puzzle group G contains no non-trivial elements of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a,b}$. Suppose, furthermore, that G does not contain $\text{Alt}(n-1)$. Then $\lambda = 2^\alpha - 1$ for some integer α and (setting $k = 2^{\alpha+1}$), $n = k, k^2 - k + 1, 2(k^2 - k) + 1, k^2$ or $2k^2 - k$. If $n = k$ then G is trivial; otherwise G is primitive.*

Proof. We apply Proposition 6.3 to deduce the existence of a $2 - (n, k, 1)$ design (Ω, Λ) . Suppose that the design is trivial, i.e. $n = k$. Then Proposition 6.3 implies that \mathcal{D} is the Boolean design and [19, Theorem B] implies that G is trivial.

Suppose next that the associated $2 - (n, k, 1)$ design is non-trivial, i.e. $n > k$. Observe that $k = 2\lambda + 2$ and now Fisher's inequality implies that

$$n > k^2 - k > 9\lambda + 1.$$

Thus, by Theorem E (2), G is primitive.

We know that G is generated by elements of the form $[\infty, a, b, \infty]$ and these have support at most $6\lambda + 2$. Combining this fact with the inequality $\mu(H) \geq 2(\sqrt{d} - 1)$ of Theorem 6.1 (and setting $d = n - 1$) we obtain

$$n \leq 9\lambda^2 + 12\lambda + 5 < 3k(k - 1).$$

We also have the conditions that $k - 1$ divides $n - 1$ and $k(k - 1)$ divides $n(n - 1)$. Note that k is a power of 2.

If n is odd, then $k(k-1)$ divides $n-1$ and we conclude that either $n = k^2 - k + 1$ or $2(k^2 - k) + 1$. If n is even, then $k-1$ divides $n-1$ and k divides n . Hence $n-1 = (1+ak)(k-1)$ for some $a > 0$ and we obtain that $n = k^2$ or $2k^2 - k$ as required. \square

Lemma 6.7. *Suppose that a puzzle group G contains no non-trivial elements of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$. Suppose, furthermore, that G is neither trivial nor does it contain $\text{Alt}(n-1)$, and that $\lambda > 1$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) G is primitive.
- (2) $\lambda = 2^\alpha - 1$ for some integer $\alpha \geq 2$ and (setting $k = 2^{\alpha+1}$),

$$n = k^2 - k + 1, 2(k^2 - k) + 1, k^2 \text{ or } 2k^2 - k.$$

- (3) There exist integers m, ℓ, r ($m \geq 5$, $1 \leq \ell < \frac{1}{2}m$) such that $n-1 = \binom{m}{\ell}^r$ or 6^r . Furthermore $(\text{Alt}(m))^r \trianglelefteq G \leq \text{Sym}(m) \wr \text{Sym}(r)$ where $m \geq 5$ and the wreath product acts, via the product action on $\Omega = \Delta^r$ and Δ is either the set of ℓ -subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$ or $m = |\Delta| = 6$.

Proof. We apply Corollary 6.6 and observe that, since G is not trivial, $n \neq k$. Thus G is primitive and (1) and (2) hold.

Now observe that $k = 2\lambda + 2$ and that G contains non-trivial elements with support of size at most $6\lambda + 2 = 3k - 4$. If $\lambda \neq 3$, then all four possible values for n are strictly greater than $9k - 11$, hence Theorem 6.1 yields (3).

If $\lambda = 3$, then three of the possible values for n are strictly greater than $9k - 11 = 61$ and Theorem 6.1 yields (3). To rule out the final case (when $n = k^2 - k + 1 = 57$) we use GAP [18] to confirm that none of the primitive groups of degree 56 contain non-trivial elements with support of size at most $6\lambda + 2 = 20$, thus this situation can be excluded entirely. \square

Lemma 6.8. *Let $k = 2^{\alpha+1}$ for some integer $\alpha \geq 2$, and suppose that $d = k^2 - k$ or $2(k^2 - k)$. Then $d \neq 6^r$ and if $d = \binom{m}{\ell}^r$ for positive integers m, ℓ and r with $\ell \leq \frac{m}{2}$, then either $(m, \ell, r) = (d, 1, 1)$ or else $(d, k) = (57, 8)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $d = s^r$ for some integer s and observe that d is a product of $k-1$ (an odd number) and a power of 2. Thus $k-1 = s_1^r$ for some integer s_1 . Now Theorem 6.2 implies that $r = 1$. One concludes immediately that $d \neq 6^r$.

Suppose that $d = \binom{m}{\ell}^r$. Observe that d is divisible by $2^{\alpha+1}$. It is trivial to observe that if $2^{\alpha+1}$ divides $\binom{m}{\ell}$, then $m \geq 2^{\alpha+1}$ and hence

$$k(k-1) > \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-\ell+1)}{\ell!}.$$

The inequality implies that either $\ell \leq 2$ or $k \leq 8$.

Suppose that $\ell \leq 2$. If $\ell = 2$ then $m(m-1) = 2^x(2^y - 1)$, for some integers x, y with $x > y$ which is absurd. Hence $\ell = 1$ and the result follows.

Finally, suppose that $k \leq 8$ and $\ell > 2$. Then one obtains immediately that $k = m = 8$, $\ell = 3$, $d = 57$ and the result follows. \square

Lemma 6.9. *Let $k = 2^{\alpha+1}$ for some integer $\alpha \geq 2$, and suppose that $d = k^2 - 1$ or $2k^2 - k - 1$. Then $d \neq 6^r$ and if $d = \binom{m}{\ell}^r$ for positive integers m, ℓ and r , then $r = 1$.*

Proof. Observe that d is odd, and thus $d \neq 6^r$. Suppose first that

$$d = k^2 - 1 = (k-1)(k+1) = s^r$$

for some positive integers r and s . Then, since $k - 1$ and $k + 1$ are coprime, we conclude that $k - 1 = s_1^r$ for some positive integer s_1 . Now Theorem 6.2 implies that $r = 1$ as required.

Assume, then that $d = 2k^2 - k - 1 = s^r$ for some integer r . There are two cases. First, suppose that $2k + 1$ and $k - 1$ are coprime. Then $k - 1 = s_1^r$ for some integer s_1 and Theorem 6.2 implies that $r = 1$.

Second, suppose that $2k + 1$ and $k - 1$ are not coprime; then their highest common factor is 3 and we conclude, moreover that $\alpha + 1$ is even. In this case $k - 1 = (\sqrt{k} - 1)(\sqrt{k} + 1)$ and one of these two factors is indivisible by 3.

Suppose first that $\sqrt{k} - 1$ is indivisible by 3. Then $\sqrt{k} - 1$ is coprime to $2k + 1$ and $\sqrt{k} + 1$ and we conclude that $\sqrt{k} - 1 = x^r$ for some integer x . Now Catalan's conjecture implies that $r = 1$ as required.

Suppose finally that $\sqrt{k} + 1$ is indivisible by 3. Then $\sqrt{k} + 1$ is coprime to $2k + 1$ and $\sqrt{k} - 1$ and we conclude that $\sqrt{k} + 1 = x^r$ for some integer x . Now Catalan's conjecture and the fact that $\sqrt{k} + 1$ is indivisible by 3 implies that $r = 1$ as required. \square

Lemma 6.10. *Suppose that G is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(m)$ and consider the natural action of G on the set of ℓ -subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Then a non-trivial element of G has support at least $2\binom{m-2}{\ell-1}$.*

Proof. Let g be a non-trivial element of G and let i be an element that is moved by G . Thus $i^g = j$ with $j \neq i$. Let $k = j^g$ and observe that, although it is possible to have $i = k$, we know that $j \neq k$.

Now observe that any set containing i but not j lies in the support of g , and there are $\binom{m-2}{\ell-1}$ of these. Similarly any set containing j but not k lies in the support of g , and there are $\binom{m-2}{\ell-1}$ of these. The two types of set are distinct hence the result follows. \square

We remark that if $g \in G$ is a transposition, then the support of g in the given action is of size exactly $2\binom{m-2}{\ell-1}$. We are ready to prove Theorem D.

Proof of Theorem D. If $\lambda = 1$, then the result is a consequence of [19, Theorem C]. If G is trivial, then the result is a consequence of [19, Theorem B]. Thus we assume that $\lambda > 1$ and that G is not trivial and we must show that G contains $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that G does not contain $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$. Then Lemma 6.7 implies that G is primitive and, for each value of λ , gives four possible values for n . For two of these values Lemma 6.8 implies immediately that either G contains $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$ (and we are done), or else $(n, k) = (57, 8)$. Now GAP [18] confirms that none of the primitive groups of degree 56 contain non-trivial elements with support of size at most $6\lambda + 2 = 20$, thus this situation is excluded.

We are left with the possibility that $n = k^2$ or $2k^2 - k$ where $k = 2\lambda + 2 \geq 8$. Now Lemma 6.9 implies that $\text{Alt}(m) \leq G \leq \text{Sym}(m)$ for some $m \geq 5$ and that the action of G as a puzzle group on $n - 1$ points is isomorphic to the natural action of G on the set of ℓ -subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$. We know that G contains elements with support of size at most $s = 6\lambda + 2 = 3k - 4$ and we observe that

$$n - 1 \geq k^2 - 1 \geq \frac{1}{9}s^2.$$

Now Lemma 6.10 implies that m and ℓ satisfy

$$\binom{m}{\ell} \geq \frac{4}{9} \binom{m-2}{\ell-1}^2.$$

This implies in turn that

$$m \geq \frac{4}{9} \binom{m-2}{\ell-1}$$

and one concludes immediately that either $m \leq 8$ or $\ell - 1 = 1$.

Suppose first that $m \leq 8$. Then $n - 1 = \binom{m}{\ell} \leq 70$ and we conclude that $k = 8$ and $n = k^2$. But there does not exist ℓ such that $n - 1 = 63 = \binom{m}{\ell}$ for any $m \leq 8$ so this case can be excluded.

Thus we conclude that $\ell = 2$. This implies that

$$n - 1 = (2k + 1)(k - 1) = \frac{1}{2}m(m - 1)$$

and so

$$(2k + 1)(2k - 2) = m(m - 1).$$

Since $(m, m - 1) = 1$, this is clearly impossible for $k \geq 8$ and the result is proved. \square

7. PROPERTIES OF PUZZLE GROUPS

In this section we prove Theorem E and throughout this we operate under the suppositions of Theorem E. Note that parts of this theorem are already known: when $\lambda = 1$ or 2 , Theorem E is an immediate consequence of [19, Theorem C]. Furthermore, part (1) of Theorem E is Lemma 6.1 of [19]. Thus, to prove Theorem E we can (and will) assume throughout that $n > 4\lambda + 1$ and so G is transitive.

7.1. The imprimitive case. In this section we suppose that G is imprimitive and that Δ is a block of size k ; we will prove part (2) of Theorem E. We need the following result from [19].

Lemma 7.1. *Let $n > 4\lambda + 1$ and suppose that G preserves a system of imprimitivity with ℓ blocks each of size k (so that $n - 1 = k\ell$). Then at least one of the following holds:*

- (i) *if $a, c \in \Omega$ lie in the same block of imprimitivity, then $\infty \in \overline{a, c}$;*
- (ii) *$n \leq \frac{6\ell}{\ell-1}\lambda + 1$.*

Proof of Theorem E (2). Suppose that $n > 9\lambda + 1$. We assume (for a contradiction) that G preserves a system of imprimitivity with ℓ blocks each of size k . Suppose first that case (i) of Lemma 7.1 holds and let $\Delta := \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ be a block of imprimitivity. Thus there exist points $d_2, \dots, d_k \in \Omega$ so that $\{\infty, c_1, c_i, d_i\}$ is a line for each $2 \leq i \leq k$. Define:

$$\Gamma := \overline{\infty, c_1} \cup \overline{c_1, d_2} \cup \overline{d_2, \infty},$$

and observe that since $\Delta \subseteq \overline{\infty, c_1}$, $\Delta \subset \Gamma$. Also note that

$$|\Gamma| \leq 3(2\lambda + 2) - 12 + 4 = 6\lambda - 2 < n.$$

Hence we may choose $e \in \Omega \setminus \Gamma$ and define $g := [\infty, c_1, e, \infty]$. Now, $\infty \notin \overline{c_1, e}$ so that $c_1^g = e$ and since $e \notin \Delta$, we must have $\Delta^g \cap \Delta = \emptyset$. Furthermore, since $d_2 \notin \overline{c_1, e} \cup \overline{e, \infty}$, necessarily, $\Delta^g = \{e, d_2, \dots, d_k\}$. In particular (by Lemma 7.1(ii)) $\infty \in \overline{e, d_2}$. But $e \notin \overline{d_2, \infty}$, a contradiction.

We conclude therefore that case (ii) of Lemma 7.1 holds, which is possible only if $\ell = 2$. This implies that G contains an element of support of size $2k = n - 1$ in its generating set, contradicting the fact that G is generated by elements with support of size at most $6\lambda + 2$ ([19, Lemma 7.3]). This completes the proof. \square

7.2. The primitive case. In this section we suppose n is large enough so that, by Theorem E (2), G is primitive and we prove the remaining parts of Theorem E. We recall that, for a primitive permutation group H we write $\mu(H)$ for the minimal size of the support of a non-trivial element of G . Our strategy will be to exploit the fact that puzzle groups naturally contain elements of small support.

We will make use of the following result of Babai [12], which is a weaker version of Theorem 6.1 that has the advantage of not depending on the Classification of Finite Simple Groups.

Theorem 7.2. *Let d be a positive integer and let H be a primitive subgroup of $\text{Sym}(d)$ that does not contain $\text{Alt}(d)$. Then we have that $\mu(H) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{d} - 1)$.*

The following result is part of Lemma 3.1 in [19].

Lemma 7.3. $G = \langle [\infty, a, b, \infty] \mid a, b \in \Omega \setminus \infty \rangle$. Furthermore the elements $[\infty, a, b, \infty]$ have support of size at most $6\lambda + 2$.

Proof of Theorem E. We have already proved parts (1) and (2): thus we must prove parts (3) and (4).

Suppose that $n > 144\lambda^2 + 120\lambda + 26$. Then Theorem E (2) implies that G is primitive. Suppose that G does not contain $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$. Then Theorem 7.2 and Lemma 7.3 imply that

$$6\lambda + 2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{n - 1} - 1).$$

Rearranging the inequality, one obtains a contradiction as required.

We are left with part (4). If $\lambda \leq 2$, then the result is a consequence of [19, Theorem C]. Suppose, then, that $\lambda \geq 3$ and that $n > 9\lambda^2 - 12\lambda + 5$. Then, in particular, $n > 9\lambda + 1$ and G is primitive. Suppose that G does not contain $\text{Alt}(n - 1)$.

Suppose, first, that G contains a non-trivial element of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$. Then g has support of size at most $6\lambda - 6$ and, combining this fact with the inequality $\mu(H) \geq 2(\sqrt{d} - 1)$ given by Theorem 6.1, we obtain a contradiction and the result is proved. Suppose, on the other hand, that G does contain a non-trivial element of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$. Then Theorem D gives the result. \square

7.3. The case $\lambda = 3$. In previous work with A. Nixon [19] puzzle groups associated with $2 - (n, k, \lambda)$ designs were completely classified for $\lambda \leq 2$. In this subsection we discuss the possibility of extending this classification to deal with the case $\lambda = 3$.

We assume throughout this section that G is the puzzle group of a $2 - (n, 4, 3)$ design. We state two lemmas dealing with the different possibilities for G .

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose that G is primitive. Then either $G \cong A_{n-1}$ or one of the following holds:*

- $n = 12$ and $G \in \{M_{11}, PSL_2(11), C_{11} \rtimes C_5, C_{11}\}$;
- $n = 13$ and $G \in \{M_{12}, M_{11}, PSL_2(11)\}$;
- $n = 16$ and $G \in \{PSL_4(2), S_6, A_7, A_6\}$;

- $n = 17$ and G is isomorphic to one of 19 primitive subgroups of $2^4.PSL_4(2)$;
- $n = 28$ and $G = PSp_4(3) \rtimes C_2$;
- $n = 29$ and $G \in \{PSp_6(2), S_8\}$.

Proof. Suppose, first, that G does not contain a non-trivial element of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$. Then Lemma 6.7 implies that $G \cong \text{Alt}(n-1)$ as required.

Suppose, on the other hand, that G contains a non-trivial element of the form $g = [\infty, a, b, \infty]$ where $\infty \in \overline{a, b}$. Then G contains an element with support of size at most 12; all primitive groups containing an element with support of size at most 15 have been known explicitly since long before CFSG (see, especially, [25, 26]; we refer to the library in GAP[18] for verification).

Now, of the list provided by GAP we are able to exclude all of these groups that are not subgroups of $\text{Alt}(n-1)$ and, for $n > 9$, the resulting groups are those listed in the lemma. The remaining values – when $n = 8$ or 9 – can be excluded directly since there is only one pliable design in each case, and neither yield a primitive puzzle group. \square

Lemma 7.5. *Suppose that G is intransitive. Then $n = 8, 9, 12$ or 13 . Suppose that G is transitive and imprimitive. Then $n = 9, 13, 17, 21$ or 25 .*

Proof. If G is intransitive, then the result follows from Theorem E (1). Now suppose that G is transitive and imprimitive. Then Theorem E (2) implies that $n \leq 28$. To complete the proof we use the fact that if a $2 - (n, 4, 3)$ design exists, then $n \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$ and, furthermore, that, since G is imprimitive, $n-1$ is not a prime. \square

Finally we remark that (using the Handbook of Combinatorial Designs [9]) it is easy to confirm that for $n = 8$ and $n = 9$ there is only one pliable $2 - (n, 4, 3)$ design. When $n = 8$ this design is the Boolean one and the associated puzzle group is trivial; when $n = 9$ the associated puzzle group is $\text{Alt}(4) \wr C_2$, a transitive, imprimitive group. In light of these facts and the preceding lemmas, the job of classifying puzzle groups associated with $2 - (n, 4, 3)$ designs is reduced to the situation where $12 \leq n \leq 29$.

8. ANOTHER INFINITE FAMILY OF PUZZLE GROUPS?

It turns out that one can apply similar methods to those in the present paper to construct codes associated to the affine groups $2^{2m}.\text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ for $m \geq 3$. We give a sketch of this procedure now, but leave the details to a subsequent paper. As usual, let $V := \mathbb{F}^{2m}$ so that $G := \text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ acts on V in the usual way. Let \mathcal{R} be the set of all triples of distinct vectors in V . Using Lemma 3.1 one can show that the action of G on \mathcal{R} splits into two orbits \mathcal{O} and $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{O}$ where

$$\mathcal{O} := \left\{ \{v_1, v_2, v_3\} \mid v_i \in V \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 3, \theta_0\left(\sum_{i=1}^3 v_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \theta_0(v_i) \right\}.$$

Using this, and the 2-transitivity of G , one can prove that $\mathcal{D} := (V, \mathcal{B})$ is a $2 - (2^{2m}, 4, 2^{2m-2} - 1)$ design where

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\} \mid v_i \in V \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq 4, \sum_{i=1}^4 v_i = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^4 \theta_0(v_i) = 0 \right\}.$$

GAP computations [18] carried out on the binary code $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D})$ for $m = 2, 3$ suggest that $C_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{D})$ is a completely regular $[2^{2m}, 2^{2m} - (2m + 2), 4]$ code with covering radius 4. Furthermore, this code appears to coincide with a subcode C of the extended Hamming code of length 2^{2m} considered in [4], where it is proved that C is completely transitive.

It seems that an analogue of Theorem C holds for \mathcal{D} too: GAP computations for $m = 2, 3$ suggest that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ coincides with $2^{2m} \cdot \text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$ (as a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(2^{2m})$) and that for each $\infty \in V$, $\pi_{\infty}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \text{Sp}_{2m}(2)$. Thus, if these assertions remain valid in general, \mathcal{D} gives rise to yet another infinite family of puzzle groups which are primitive but neither the full alternating or symmetric group.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. A. Bassalygo and V. A. Zinoviev. A remark on uniformly packed codes. *Problemy Peredači Informacii*, 13(3):22–25, 1977.
- [2] N. L. Biggs and A. T. White. *Permutation groups and combinatorial structures*, volume 33 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1979.
- [3] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev. On non-antipodal binary completely regular codes. *Discrete Math.*, 308(16):3508–3525, 2008.
- [4] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev. New families of completely regular codes and their corresponding distance regular coset graphs. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 70:139–148, (2014)
- [5] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev. On q -ary linear completely regular codes with $\rho = 2$ and antipodal dual. *Adv. Math. Commun.*, 4(4):567–578, 2010.
- [6] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier. *Distance-regular graphs*, volume 18 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [7] A.E. Brouwer. A note on completely regular codes. *Discrete Mathematics*, 83(1):115 – 117, 1990.
- [8] A. Chermak. Fusion systems and localities. *Acta Math.*, 211:47–139, 2013.
- [9] C. J. Colbourn and J. H. Dinitz. *Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, Second Edition (Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications)*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.
- [10] J. H. Conway. M_{13} . In *Surveys in combinatorics, 1997 (London)*, volume 241 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 1–11. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [11] J. H. Conway, R. T. Curtis, S. P. Norton, R. A. Parker, and R. A. Wilson. *Atlas of finite groups*. Oxford University Press, 1985.
- [12] L. Babai On the order of uniprimitive permutation groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 113 (2): 553–568, 1981.
- [13] J. H. Conway, N. D. Elkies, and J. L. Martin. The Mathieu group M_{12} and its pseudogroup extension M_{13} . *Experiment. Math.* 15, 2:223–236, 2006.
- [14] R. T. Curtis. *Symmetric generation of groups: With applications to many of the sporadic finite simple groups*, volume 111 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [15] P. Delsarte. An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory. *Philips Res. Rep. Suppl.*, (10):vi+97, 1973.
- [16] J. D. Dixon and B. Mortimer. *Permutation groups*, volume 163 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [17] O. Ekenta, H. G. Jang, and J. A. Siehler. Slide-and-swap permutation groups. *Involve*, 7(1):41–55, 2014.
- [18] The GAP Group, <http://www.gap-system.org>. *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.7.4*, 2014.
- [19] N. Gill, N. I. Gillespie, A. Nixon, and J. Semeraro. Puzzle Groups. *preprint*, 2014.
- [20] Giudici, M., Praeger, C.E.: Completely transitive codes in Hamming Graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics* 20(7), 647 – 662 (1999)
- [21] P. Guillot. An elementary approach to dessin d’enfants and the Grothendieck-Teichmüller group. 2013. <http://arXiv:1309.1968>.

- [22] T. P. Kirkman. On a problem in combinations. *Cambridge and Dublin Math. J.*, 2:191–204, 1847.
- [23] M. W. Liebeck and J. Saxl. Minimal degrees of primitive permutation groups, with an application to monodromy groups of covers of Riemann surfaces. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 63(2):266–314, 1991.
- [24] A. Mann, C. E. Praeger and Á.Seress. Extremely primitive groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.* 1(4): 623660, 2007.
- [25] W. A. Manning. The primitive groups of class $2p$ which contain a substitution of order p and degree $2p$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 4, 3:351–357, 1903.
- [26] W. A. Manning. On the primitive groups of classes six and eight. *Amer. J. Math.*, 3:235–256, 1910.
- [27] P. Mihăilescu. Primary cyclotomic units and a proof of Catalan’s conjecture. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 572:167–195, 2004.
- [28] J. Mulholland. Permutation puzzles: a mathematical perspective. <http://www.sfu.ca/~jtmulhol/math302/notes/302notes.pdf>.
- [29] A. Neumaier. Completely regular codes. *Discrete Math.*, 106/107:353–360, 1992. A collection of contributions in honour of Jack van Lint.
- [30] J. Rifà and V. A. Zinoviev. On a class of binary linear completely transitive codes with arbitrary covering radius. *Discrete Math.*, 309(16):5011–5016, 2009.
- [31] J. Rifà and V. A. Zinoviev. New completely regular q -ary codes based on Kronecker products. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 56(1):266–272, 2010.
- [32] J. Rifà and V. A. Zinoviev. On lifting perfect codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 57(9):5918–5925, 2011.
- [33] J. Scherphuis. Rotational puzzles on graphs. <http://www.jaapsch.net/puzzles/graphpuzz.htm>.
- [34] M. Wertheimer. Oval designs in quadrics. In *Finite geometries and combinatorial designs (Lincoln, NE, 1987)*, pages 287–297, Contemp. Math., 111, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1990.
- [35] H. Wielandt. *Finite permutation groups*. Academic Press, New York, 1964.
- [36] R. M. Wilson. Graph puzzles, homotopy, and the alternating group. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B*, 16:86–96, 1974.
- [37] C. Yang. Sliding puzzles and rotating puzzles on graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 311(14):1290–1294, 2011.
- [38] V. A. Zinoviev and J. Rifà. On new completely regular q -ary codes. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 43(2):34–51, 2007.
- [39] Taylor, D.E. *The geometry of the classical groups*. Helderman, Berlin, 1992.

ESCUELA DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD DE COSTA RICA, 11501 SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA
E-mail address: nickgill@cantab.net

HEILBRONN INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, U.K.
E-mail address: neil.gillespie@bristol.ac.uk

HEILBRONN INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, U.K.
E-mail address: js13525@bristol.ac.uk