

# CLASSIFICATION OF 8-DIVISIBLE BINARY LINEAR CODES WITH MINIMUM DISTANCE 24

SASCHA KURZ

**ABSTRACT.** We classify 8-divisible binary linear codes with minimum distance 24 and small length. As an application we consider the codes associated to nodal sextics with 65 ordinary double points.

**Keywords:** triply even codes, divisible codes, classification, nodal sextics

**MSC:** Primary 94B05.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Doubly even codes were subject to extensive research in the last years. For applications and enumeration results we refer e.g. to [12]. More recently, triply even codes were studied, see e.g. [4, 20]. These two classes of binary linear codes are special cases of so-called  $\Delta$ -divisible codes, where all weights are divisible by  $\Delta$ . Being introduced by Ward, see [38] for a survey, they have many applications. A recent example is the maximum size of partial spreads, i.e., sets of  $k$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_q^v$  with trivial intersection and maximum possible cardinality. All currently known upper bounds for partial spreads can be deduced from non-existence results for  $q^{k-1}$ -divisible projective codes, see [18, 19]. For some enumeration results for projective  $2^r$ -divisible codes we refer to [17]. It has been observed in [19] that among the linear codes with maximum possible minimum distance  $d$  there are often examples which are  $q^r$ -divisible, provided that  $q^r$  divides  $d$ . Here we study the special case of triply even, i.e., 8-divisible binary linear codes with minimum distance  $d = 24$ . We exhaustively enumerate all such codes for small lengths. While those classification results are of cause of interest in coding theory, there is another motivation coming from algebraic geometry. A *nodal surface* is a hypersurface of degree  $s$  in  $\mathbb{P}_3(\mathbb{C})$  with  $\mu$  ordinary double points (nodes) as its only singularities. The maximum number  $\mu(s)$  of nodes was determined by Cayley [9] and Schläfli [33] for  $s = 3$  and by Kummer [25] for  $s = 4$ , respectively. In [3] Beauville concluded the existence of a binary linear code  $C$  in  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$  with certain further properties from the existence of a nodal surface with  $m \geq n$  nodes. This connection allowed him to overcome the general upper bound of Basset [2] and especially to determine  $\mu(5) = 31$ . The coding theoretic approach was used in [21] to obtain  $\mu(6) < 66$ , so that  $\mu(6) = 65$  due to the existence of the so-called Barth sextic [1]. In [30, Theorem 5.5.9] a unique irreducible 3-parameter family of 65-nodal sextics containing the Barth sextic was determined. For the next case only  $99 \leq \mu(7) \leq 104$  is known, see [27] and [34], respectively. The following general properties of the associated code  $C$  of a nodal surface with degree  $s$  and  $m$  nodes are known. For the dimension  $k$  of  $C$  a general argument of Beauville [3] gives  $k \geq m - \lceil s^3/2 \rceil + 2s^2 - 3s + 1$ , see [21, Proposition 4.3]. If  $s$  is odd, then  $C$  is doubly even and triply even otherwise, see [7, Proposition 2.11]. The minimum distance  $d$  satisfies  $d \geq 2\lceil s(s-2)/2 \rceil$ , see [13, Theorem 1.10]. In some cases further weights can be excluded. For a more extensive overview on the history and technical details of nodal surfaces with many nodes we refer the interested reader e.g. to [28].

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe algorithms for the exhaustive generation of linear codes and apply them for 8-divisible binary linear codes with minimum distance 24 and small parameters. As an application codes of



considered as the set of automorphisms. Here we restrict ourselves to the automorphisms of the corresponding multiset of points which ignores permutations of identical columns. The automorphism group of our example has order  $\#\text{Aut} = 23224320$ . The code was obtained in [10] and has the following nice description, see [21]: It is a subcode of the second order Reed-Muller code  $R(2,6)$  containing the first order Reed-Muller code  $R(1,6)$  as a subcode. The cosets of  $R(1,6)$  in it correspond to the symplectic forms  $B_a$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{64}$ , given by  $B_a(x,y) = \text{tr}((ax^4 + a^{16}x^{16})y)$ .

One way to generate linear  $[n,k,W]_q$  codes with weights in some set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is to start from an  $[n',k-1,W]_q$  subcode, where  $n' \leq n-1$ , and to append another row to the generator matrix. This approach consists of two steps. First one has to determine candidates for the additional row of the generator matrix that lead to an  $[n,k]_q$  code with weights in  $W$  and then one has to filter out the non-isomorphic copies, c.f. [6]. We start by formulating the first part as an enumeration problem of integral points in a polyhedron:

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $G$  be a systematic generator matrix of an  $[n,k]_2$  code whose weights are  $\Delta$ -divisible and are contained in  $[a \cdot \Delta, b \cdot \Delta]$ . By  $c(u)$  we denote the number of columns of  $G$  that equal  $u$  for all  $u$  in  $\mathbb{F}_2^k \setminus \mathbf{0}$ ,  $c(\mathbf{0}) = n' - n$ , and let  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  be the set of feasible solutions of*

$$\Delta y_h + \sum_{v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{k+1} : v^\top h = 0} x_v = n - a\Delta \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{F}_2^{k+1} \setminus \mathbf{0} \quad (2)$$

$$x_{(u,0)} + x_{(u,1)} = c(u) \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \quad (3)$$

$$x_{e_i} \geq 1 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq k+1 \quad (4)$$

$$x_v \in \mathbb{N} \quad \forall v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{k+1} \quad (5)$$

$$y_h \in \{0, \dots, b-a\} \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{F}_2^{k+1} \setminus \mathbf{0}, \quad (6)$$

where  $e_i$  denotes the  $i$ th unit vector in  $\mathbb{F}_2^{k+1}$  and  $n' \geq n+1$ . Then, for every systematic generator matrix  $G'$  of an  $[n',k+1]_2$  code  $C'$  whose first  $k$  rows coincide with  $G$  we have a solution  $(x,y) \in \mathcal{S}(G)$  such that  $G'$  has exactly  $x_v$  columns equal to  $v$  for each  $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{k+1}$ .

*Proof.* Let such a systematic generator matrix  $G'$  be given and  $x_v$  denote the number of columns of  $G'$  that equal  $v$  for all  $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{k+1}$ . Since  $G'$  is systematic, Equation (4) is satisfied. As  $G'$  arises by appending a row to  $G$ , also Equation (3) is satisfied. Obviously, the  $x_v$  are non-negative integers. The conditions (2) and (6) correspond to the restriction that the weights are  $\Delta$ -divisible and contained in  $\{a\Delta, \dots, b\Delta\}$ .  $\square$

We remark that also every solution in  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  corresponds to an  $[n',k+1]_2$  code  $C'$  with generator matrix  $G'$  containing  $C$  as a subcode. The method can also be easily adopted to field sizes  $q > 2$  by simply counting 1-dimensional subspaces in  $C$  and  $x$  instead of vectors. Half of the constraints (2) are automatically satisfied since  $C$  satisfies all constraints on the weights. If there are further forbidden weights in  $\{i\Delta : a \leq i \leq b\}$  then, one may also use the approach of Lemma 1, but has to filter out the integer solutions that correspond to codes with forbidden weights. Another application of this first generate, then filter strategy is to remove some of the constraints (2), which speeds up, at least some, lattice point enumeration algorithms.

For the first part, i.e., the application of Lemma 1, we use an implementation of the LLL lattice point enumeration algorithm, see [39]. For the filtering of non-isomorphic copies we have used the software `Q-Extension` [6] or `CodeCan` [14]. It remains to specify the choice of the parameters  $n$ ,  $n'$ , and  $k$ . In order to generate  $[n',k+1]_2$  codes all  $[n,k]_2$  codes with  $n < n'$  have to be known, so that the generation is performed with increasing dimension  $k$ . However, this way we get a lot of isomorphic copies since a  $[n',k+1]_2$  code  $C'$  usually contains several non-isomorphic  $[n,k]_2$  subcodes  $C$ . To slightly reduce this effect, we assume that every column of the generator matrix of  $C$  is contained at least  $n' - n$

times, since otherwise there exists a  $[\hat{n}, k]_2$  code  $\hat{C}$  with  $\hat{n} > n$  that can be extended to  $C'$ . In other words, we assume that the vector of the effective lengths in the generation path of a code is weakly decreasing. We remark that more sophisticated assumptions on the order of the generation of subcodes can be made to even better overcome the problem of the generation of a huge number of isomorphic codes. However, in order to be even resistant to a some local hardware failures in our computations, we have decided not to implement those.

We have cross checked<sup>1</sup> our algorithms and implementations with the case of 4-divisible codes treated by Miller et al. [12], [https://rlmill.github.io/de\\_codes](https://rlmill.github.io/de_codes). For all such codes with  $n \leq 28$  and  $k \leq 7$  our numbers coincide. Note that there are 1452663 4-divisible  $[28, 7]_2$  codes. In the meantime the algorithmic approach described above is implemented in more generality, see [26] for the details.

We remark that other approaches for classifying linear codes can e.g. be found in [23, Section 7.3] or [5, 6, 15].

In tables (1)-(3) we have stated the number of 8-divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  codes with minimum distance 24, dimension  $k \leq 13$ , and small lengths. Note that blank entries on the left of each row correspond to a zero, while blank entries on the right of each row correspond to values that are not computed due to the exponential growth of the number of codes.

k/n	24	32	36	40	42	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54
1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2			1	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
3					1	1	0	2	0	4	0	3	0	6	0	8
4							1	1	2	4	1	4	5	15	5	23
5									1	4	1	6	5	30	15	92
6										1	1	2	5	21	29	160
7												1	1	4	7	58
8													1	0	0	1

TABLE 1. Number of 8-divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  codes with minimum distance 24 – part 1.

k/n	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62
1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	0
3	0	15	0	10	0	23	0	21
4	19	68	13	78	40	201	41	259
5	88	411	180	992	687	3384	1478	8040
6	303	1813	2026	11696	14870	83368		
7	143	1493	3604	34945	93503	852947		
8	4	55	61	1486	10971	376697	1900541	
9		2	0	4	14	618	19362	2410702
10						6	8	682
11								3

TABLE 2. Number of 8-divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  codes with minimum distance 24 – part 2.

<sup>1</sup>The  $[\leq 60, 7, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  codes have also been generated by solely using Q-Extension. As the  $[\underline{n}, k, \{24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64\}]_2$  codes contain the  $[\underline{n}, k, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  codes, we have another cross check.

The computations were performed on a linux cluster of the university of Bayreuth set up in 2009. This elderly computing cluster consists of roughly 250 nodes with Intel Xeon E5 processors with 8 physical cores, 2.3 gigacycles, and 24 gigabyte RAM each. For our computations we could ran up to 400 jobs in parallel. The entire computation took less than a CPU year in total.

k/n	63	64	65	66
1	0	1	0	0
2	0	6	0	0
3	0	41	0	25
4	108	557	84	644
5	4617	22267	8647	46571
6				
7				
8				
9				
10	978528			
11	28	704571		
12	1	8	1	
13		1	0	0

TABLE 3. Number of 8-divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  codes with minimum distance 24 – part 3.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $C$  is an 8-divisible  $[\leq 65, 12, 24]_2$  code, then  $C$  is isomorphic to one of the following ten cases:*

- (1)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [63, 12, 24]_2$

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} 001100001110000011111010000111111001001010010000110000000000 \\ 101001111110000001101110100001001101000110110000001000000000 \\ 00010011101110001111011100100001000011000011011010000100000000 \\ 01000111111110011001100001001100100010001101000001000100000000 \\ 110001110000010111001111011000011100100011000010100000010000000 \\ 000000011000110111100011010011101110010001011110000000001000000 \\ 01001111000111110101000011010010001110111011111111000000100000 \\ 001000110111101100001111110000000001100110000111100000000010000 \\ 000111110001100011000000001100011111100001100001111000000001000 \\ 00000000111110000011111111100000000011111100000011000000000100 \\ 0000000000000011111111111110000000000000001111111000000000010 \\ 00010 \\ 001 \end{array} \right)$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 630z^{24} + 3087z^{32} + 378z^{40}$$

$$\# \text{Aut} = 362880$$



(5)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [64, 12, 24]_2$

(1001001100101000010111111010100111001011000000000111101111111000)  
 0110001011001000000011110011110011000100000000000111110100010000  
 0000101100110001100110000000000000110110000010101111011000011010  
 0000001010101000110101111111000000010100000010101000110000010011  
 0000000001111000000110110000111101110010000000000111101010000110  
 0000011111111000101000001111111100000101000000000000010100110000  
 0000000000000101101010100101001101100110000010011101101010101000  
 000000000000000111111011100011000110011100011100101111000000000  
 000000000000000011001111000011111100000001001100101101111100000  
 000000000000000011110000111111110000000001011111010100110011000  
 0000000000000000110011111111000011001111000110110110000110000000  
 0000000000000001111111100111111111111111100000000000011111111000)

$W(z) = 1z^0 + 528z^{24} + 3038z^{32} + 528z^{40} + 1z^{64}$

*non-projective*

(6)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [64, 12, 24]_2$

(1000011011010011000001010110011000101001100000100001000001100110)  
 0001100111110110000000000100000001100000001100011101001100111001  
 0000101011110100001000010101001000010001111001000011000000110011  
 0000111110100001000010100011001001110001100001000000100101010110  
 0001001111111011011010110011001000010101110111000000011001011001  
 0001001011011011000010010100000000000110011000010000000011111111  
 010101010101101001000101001000111010010111010110100000000000000  
 000011001100110010001111011101010110100111100100000000000000000  
 000011000011110001110000011101001001011111100011100000000000000  
 00001111111111110110110010010011000110001000001000000000000000  
 00000011110011000110001100001110100110001111110110000000000000  
 00111111111111110110111011000000110011001111001100000000000000)

$W(z) = 1z^0 + 502z^{24} + 3087z^{32} + 506z^{40}$

(7)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [64, 12, 24]_2$

(1000110000011001010001010110000011110010000001001011010001100001)  
 00001100000111110101001010001111100110010111110110100101101100001  
 0000101010111100010011000110011011100010000110011011100110110111  
 0000000010001011011110011011101101110000001110101101101101101100  
 0000000010001011011001100011101101110000010001001110010010010000  
 0000000010100100111010001110011011101000001000110101001000100100  
 0000110000000110110010001001111011000101010001001101001010010000  
 0100111010001100010001001100111000110000001001011001010010000100  
 0010100010001100010010001101000011110110000110011001001001001000  
 000111100000000111101101100000000000110000011011001111011000000  
 0000000110011111100011000110011011000000000011011000011011000000  
 000000000111100000000011110011011110000001111000001100011001100)

$W(z) = 1z^0 + 496z^{24} + 3102z^{32} + 496z^{40} + 1z^{64}$

$$(8) [\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{64}, 12, 24]_2$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1000000100111001010000110001011010010100100100001111010110000000 \\ 000011110000010101100011000101101010011011111001010111101001010 \\ 0000000000000000110001010101011100100100010110101101010011011010 \\ 0100110100110011000000000000000000001110011001101100101011010101 \\ 0000001101010011000101010100000101100100011000110100000110010011 \\ 000000000000000000001101101100101110010011010011011001110010110 \\ 0000001101010011000001100000110011110001010111111011100100111111 \\ 0010010000111010000001100000110011011000100100110001010101001001 \\ 0001100000110101000001100000110011100100011000110000101101000110 \\ 000000001111111100000000000000000000000011111110000000111101111 \\ 000000000000000000001111000000111111110000001111000000111101111 \\ 000000000000000000000000000000000000000111111110000001111100001111 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 496z^{24} + 3102z^{32} + 496z^{40} + 1z^{64}$$

$$(9) [\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{64}, 12, 24]_2$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1000000010111010000111000000101100000000111000101001010101000111 \\ 0010101000001011111110100000101111001101110000110110010110111000 \\ 000000000011001010110001100001100110011011000000000011001011111 \\ 0000100010101001011010000100100010001001010100100011010001110101 \\ 0010000010011001010001001010100101100010000001111000110110000110 \\ 0000001010110011011110110001100010111111010010111011000010101100 \\ 0110000000011000000110011000000000000110011001111000001111110011 \\ 0001100000011000011000011000000111100111100110011000001100000011 \\ 000001100001100110000001100000001100000011110011000111100111100 \\ 00000001100110011111111000000001100000001100111100000000111100 \\ 000000000111100000000111100000011111111000000000000111111110000 \\ 0000000000000111111111111000000111111111110000000000000000000000 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 496z^{24} + 3102z^{32} + 496z^{40} + 1z^{64}$$

$$(10) [\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{65}, 12, 24]_2$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 10000100000000011011001000111010011110101000101111001010000000000 \\ 10100100011000001001000110100110111111001000001100011010000000000 \\ 01000010011100011000000100110100110000011111011110001001000000000 \\ 11110100001110110100000011010110100001011100000100001000100000000 \\ 011010110000011000110100010000110010100011111000010111000010000000 \\ 00101001110111101011000001011000000110111001001000100000001000000 \\ 00011000111111100000111110001000100010001010101001100000000100000 \\ 0000011100101110011111000101010000001111001100000011000000010000 \\ 00011111000111100000001111001101111110000111100111111000000001000 \\ 00000000111111100000000000111100011110000000011111111000000000100 \\ 000000000000000000001111111111111000000011111111111111000000000010 \\ 00000000000000000000000000000000000000011111111111111111100000000001 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 390z^{24} + 3055z^{32} + 650z^{40}$$

$$\# \text{Aut} = 15600$$

There is a unique 8-divisible  $[\leq 66, 13, 24]_2$  code, see the  $[\underline{64}, 13, 24]_2$  code at the beginning of Section 2. No 8-divisible  $[\leq 67, \geq 14, 24]_2$  code exists.

For some parameters  $n$  and  $k$  there exists a unique code that eventually admits an easy description. We give a few examples. For dimensions  $1 \leq k \leq 3$  the 8-divisible optimal codes are more or less trivial. The  $[\underline{45}, 4, 24]_2$  is given by the points of a solid. The  $[\underline{51}, 8, 24]_2$  code is obtained via the concatenation of an ovoid in  $\text{PG}(3, \mathbb{F}_4)$  with the binary  $[3, 2]$  simplex code [19, Lemma 24]. Note that this code is a two-weight code with weights 24 and 32.



In some cases the 8-divisible codes attain the maximal possible minimum distance  $d = 24$  for  $[n, k]_2$  codes. In Table 4 we list for dimensions  $k \leq 13$  the lengths  $n$  and the corresponding counts for which the maximum, using the bounds from `www.codetables.de` [16], is attained. We remark that, according to those tables, for  $[\underline{61}, 11]_2$  codes it is unknown whether minimum distance 25 can be achieved. Similarly, for  $[\underline{63}, 12]_2$  it is unknown whether the minimum distance 25 or 26 can be attained. In Section B in the appendix we completely list the generator matrices and key parameters of the corresponding codes. We remark that if a linear code over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  meets the Griesmer bound and the minimum distance is divisible by  $q^r$ , where  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ , then the weight of each codeword is divisible by  $q^r$ , see [37, Theorem 1].

**Proposition 1.** (1) Every  $[\leq \underline{62}, k, \{24, 32\}]_2$  code satisfies  $k \leq 8$ . The counts for dimension  $k = 8$  are given by  $[\underline{51}, 8]_2$ : 1,  $[\underline{54}, 8]_2$ : 1,  $[\underline{55}, 8]_2$ : 2,  $[\underline{56}, 8]_2$ : 3,  $[\underline{57}, 8]_2$ : 11,  $[\underline{58}, 8]_2$ : 13,  $[\underline{59}, 8]_2$ : 33, and  $[\underline{60}, 8]_2$ : 12.  
 (2) Every  $[\leq \underline{63}, k, \{24, 32, 56\}]_2$  code satisfies  $k \leq 9$ . For dimension  $k = 9$  there exist only two non-isomorphic  $[\underline{56}, 9, \{24, 32, 56\}]_2$  codes, which both contain a unique codeword of weight 56.

In [31, Lemma 2.2] it has been proven that each  $[\leq \underline{67}, k, \{24, 32, 56\}]_2$  code has dimension  $k \leq 10$ , see also [31, Lemma 2.1] and [35, Lemma 2.6] for the two-weight code case  $W = \{24, 32\}$ .

k	n
1	24:1
2	36:1
3	42:1, 44:1
4	45:1, 46:1, 47:2, 48:4
5	47:1, 48:4, 49:1, 50:6
6	48:1, 49:1, 50:2, 51:5
7	50:1, 51:1, 52:4, 53:7, 54:58
8	51:1, 54:1, 55:4, 56:55
9	56:2

TABLE 4. Number of optimal 8-divisible codes per dimension and length.

While the possible lengths of  $q^r$ -divisible linear codes over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  have been completely characterized in [24, Theorem 4], see also Section 4, the problem becomes harder if one restricts to projective codes or prescribes the dimension. A few partial results in that direction have been obtained in [17, 19]. An upper bound on the maximum possible dimension of a  $\Delta$ -divisible linear code was proven in [36].

### 3. CODES OF NODAL SURFACES

The codes of nodal surfaces with degree  $s$  and the maximum number  $m = \mu(s)$  of nodes are more or less trivial for  $s \leq 5$ . For  $s = 3$  the code is a  $[\underline{4}, 1, 4]_2$  code and spanned by a single codeword of weight 4. For  $s = 4$  the code is a  $[\underline{16}, 5, 8]_2$  code with weight enumerator  $W(z) = 1z^0 + 30z^8 + 1z^{16}$ , which corresponds to the points of an affine solid. For  $s = 5$  the code is a  $[\underline{31}, 5, 16]_2$  code with weight enumerator  $W(z) = 1z^0 + 31z^{16}$ , which corresponds to the points of  $\mathbb{F}_2^5$ , i.e., the simplex code  $\mathcal{S}(5)$ . The situation changes for  $s = 6$ . From a general upper bound  $m = \mu(6) \leq 66$  can be concluded. The dimension argument mentioned in the introduction gives  $k \geq m - 53$ , i.e.,  $k \geq 13$  for  $m = 66$  and  $k \geq 12$  for  $m = 65$ . The codes of sextics, i.e., nodal surfaces of degree  $s = 6$  have a minimum distance  $d \geq 24$  and are 8-divisible. In [21, Section 7] it is shown that there is no codeword of weight 48. A codeword of weight 64 can only be contained if the

dimension of the code is  $k = 11$ , see [21, Section 9]. So, for  $m \in \{65, 66\}$  there cannot be a codeword of weight 64. In [8, Theorem 1.6] it is shown that there is no codeword of weight 64 in a code corresponding to a sextic normal surface with only rational double points as singularities. Thus, for  $m \geq 65$  the weights are contained in  $\{24, 32, 40, 56\}$ . For every weight  $w \in \{24, 32, 40, 56\}$  there is a sextic whose corresponding code contains a codeword of weight  $w$ , see [8]. Obviously, each  $[\underline{n}, k, 24]_2$  code with at least two codewords of weight 56, i.e.,  $a_{56} \geq 2$ , satisfies  $n \geq 56 + 24/2 = 68$ . Thus, in order to classify the  $[\underline{n}, \geq 12, \{24, 32, 40, 56\}]_2$  codes, it satisfies to classify the  $[\underline{n}, \geq 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  codes and to eventually enlarge them with a unique codeword of weight 56. Using the algorithmic approach presented in Section 2 we obtain the counts stated in Table 5 and Table 6.

k/n	24	32	36	40	42	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54
1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2			1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
3					1	1	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	5	0	6
4							1	1	2	3	1	4	5	13	5	20
5									1	3	1	6	5	28	15	85
6										1	1	2	5	20	29	153
7												1	1	4	7	54
8													1	0	0	1

TABLE 5. Number of  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  codes with weights in  $\{24, 32, 40\}$  – part 1.

k/n	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64
3	0	7								
4	16	43	13							
5	80	321	180	784						
6	286	1557	2026	10360	14011					
7	130	1176	3604	31470	91163	650496				
8	3	17	61	1127	10631	247845	1818544			
9				3	14	400	18024	1270327		
10						3	7	394	77954	
11								1	9	47

TABLE 6. Number of  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  codes with weights in  $\{24, 32, 40\}$  – part 2.

We remark that no 11-dimension binary linear code with weights in  $\{24, 32, 40\}$  can be extended with a codeword of weight 56. Computing the 12- and 13-dimensional binary linear code with weights in  $\{24, 32, 40\}$  we can state:

**Theorem 2.** *If  $C$  is a  $[\leq 65, 12, \{24, 32, 40, 56\}]_2$  code, then  $C$  is isomorphic to one of the following three cases:*

(1)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{63}, 12, 24]_2$

```
(
0011000011100000011111010000111111001001010010000110000000000
1010011111100000011011101000010011010001101100000010000000000
000100111011100011110111001000010000110000110110100001000000000
010001111111100110011000010011001000100011010000010001000000000
110001110000010111001111011000011100100011000010100000010000000
00000001100011011110001101001110111001000101111000000001000000
01001111000111110101000011010010001110111011111111000000100000
00100011011110110000111111000000000110011000011110000000010000
000111110001100011000000001100011111100001100001111000000001000
0000000011111000001111111110000000001111110000001100000000100
000000000000011111111111111000000000000001111111000000000010
00000000000000000000000000000000111111111111111111000000000001
)
```

$W(z) = 1z^0 + 630z^{24} + 3087z^{32} + 378z^{40}$

#Aut = 362880

(2)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{64}, 12, 24]_2$

```
(
0000110001101110000100100100100011011000011011011110100000000000
1011110000100110010000001100010000111101001110111000010000000000
101011000100101011001000000010111110000001100101011001000000000
1111100000001100000010100100111101000011011011101000000100000000
0111000000001010110110001100011000000110111100110011000010000000
0000000100001001111110011010010101001101010101010101000001000000
0101011111010000010001111001110011000100100000101100000000100000
0011010011001000001111110011111101111101001101110000000010000
0000101111000110000000000111101111000011001111000011000000001000
000001111100000111111111111110000011111100000011111100000000100
000000000011111111111111111000000000011111111111100000000010
00000000000000000000000000000000111111111111111111100000000001
)
```

$W(z) = 1z^0 + 502z^{24} + 3087z^{32} + 506z^{40}$

#Aut = 5760

(3)  $[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{65}, 12, 24]_2$

```
(
10000100000000110110010001110100111101010001011110010100000000000
10100100011000001001000110100110111111001000001100011010000000000
01000010011100011000000100110100110000011111011110001001000000000
11110100001110110100000011010110100001011100000100001000100000000
01101011000001100011010001000011001010001111000010111000010000000
0010100111011110101100000101100000011011100100100010000000100000
00011000111111100000111110001000100010001010101001100000000100000
0000011100101110011111000101010000001111001100000011000000010000
00011111000111100000001111001101111110000111100111111000000001000
000000001111110000000000011110001111000000001111111000000000100
00000000000000000000000000000000111111111111111111000000000010
000000000000000000000000000000001111111111111111111000000000001
)
```

$W(z) = 1z^0 + 390z^{24} + 3055z^{32} + 650z^{40}$

#Aut = 15600

No  $[\leq 66, \geq 13, \{24, 32, 40, 56\}]_2$  code exists.

Of course Theorem 2 is implied by Theorem 1. Thus, we can also allow codewords of weight 48 without changing the result of Theorem 2.

So, we have computationally reproven  $\mu(6) < 66$ , c.f. [21]. More precisely, [21, Theorem 8.1] and [31, Theorem A] show that no  $[\leq 66, 13, \{24, 32, 40, 56\}]_2$  code exists. For  $m = 65$  nodes we have extracted an exhaustive list of three possible candidates of codes.

Having our classification at hand it is pretty easy to determine the corresponding code since number (3) is the unique code that admits an automorphism of order 5 without a fixed point - a property that also applies to the Barth sextic. It would be nice to have a short tailored argument to show that codes number (1) and (2) cannot correspond to a nodal surface. A computer verification of that fact is presented in appendix A. As a consequence, the code of each nodal sextic with 65 nodes is given by (3). Indeed, the Barth sextic is a member of a 3-parameter family of nodal sextics with 65 nodes, see [30, Theorem 5.5.9].

Up to isomorphism there exists a unique  $[64, 11]_2$  subcode that can be obtained via shortening:

$$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [64, 11, 24]_2$$

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} 100000101000001110000110110110010000001101111100011010000000000 \\ 1101001010001111101000010100010010011000001101000011101000000000 \\ 0010001001001110010000110001000011010110011111100010100100000000 \\ 1111011010000100010101101101000011001001000011000010100010000000 \\ 0111100101100001001011000000110111000111000000100101100001000000 \\ 0001000100111000111111010011110010000011000110001100000000100000 \\ 0000011100011100011111000000001110111100100100011100000000010000 \\ 0000000011100100000111001111111100000111000100000111000000001000 \\ 0000111111000111111100000000000111111100001111111000000000100 \\ 0000000000111111111100 \\ 00 \\ 00 \end{array} \right)$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 246z^{24} + 1551z^{32} + 250z^{40}$$

$$\# \text{Aut} = 240$$

#### 4. THEORETICAL ARGUMENTS

The classification results from Section 2 and Section 3 have been obtained by extensive computer calculations, so that it would be nice to have short theoretical arguments for some of these findings. First we note that the MacWilliams identities of a  $[\underline{n}, k]_2$  code, see Equation (1), for the coefficients of  $y^0$ ,  $y^1$ ,  $y^2$ , and  $y^3$  can be rewritten to (see also [35]):

$$\sum_{i>0} a_i = 2^k - 1, \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} i a_i = 2^{k-1} n, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} i^2 a_i = 2^{k-1} (a_2^* + n(n+1)/2), \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} i^3 a_i = 2^{k-2} (3(a_2^* n - a_3^*) + n^2(n+3)/2). \quad (10)$$

We also speak of the first four MacWilliams identities. In this special form, those equations are also known as the first four (Pless) power moments [32].

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $C$  be a binary 8-divisible linear code with minimum distance  $d \geq 24$ , dimension  $k = 12$  and effective length  $n \leq 65$ , then  $a_{40} \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 63$ .*

*Proof.* Solving the first four MacWilliams identities for  $a_{24}$ ,  $a_{32}$ ,  $a_{40}$ , and  $a_{48}$  gives

$$a_{40} = \frac{205}{2} n^2 - 6808n - \frac{1}{2} n^3 + (208 - 3n)a_2^* + 3a_3^* + 6a_{56} + 20a_{64} + 147420$$

and

$$a_{40} + a_{48} = 71n^2 - \frac{14504}{3} n - \frac{1}{3} n^3 + (144 - 2n)a_2^* + 2a_3^* + 2a_{56} + 10a_{64} + 106470.$$

Since  $a_2^*, a_3^*, a_{56}, a_{64} \geq 0$ ,  $208 - 3n \geq 0$ ,  $144 - 2n \geq 0$  we have

$$a_{40} \geq \frac{205}{2}n^2 - 6808n - \frac{1}{2}n^3 + 147420$$

and

$$a_{40} + a_{48} \geq 71n^2 - \frac{14504}{3}n - \frac{1}{3}n^3 + 106470.$$

For  $54 \leq n \leq 60$  we have  $a_{40} + a_{48} < 0$ , which is impossible. If either  $n \leq 53$  or  $61 \leq n \leq 65$ , then  $a_{40} \geq 1$ . Thus,  $a_{40} \geq 1$ . Consider the residual code  $C'$  of a codeword of weight 40.  $C'$  has dimension 11 and is doubly-even, i.e., its length is at least 23.  $\square$

We remark that all lengths  $63 \leq n \leq 65$  can be attained by suitable codes, see Theorem 2. Next we look at the restrictions that are implied solely by  $q^r$ -divisibility of a code.

**Lemma 3.** ([19, Lemma 7])

Let  $C$  be a  $q^r$ -divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_q$  code and  $\mathcal{P}$  be the corresponding multiset of points in  $\mathbb{F}_q^k$ . Then for  $0 \leq l \leq \min(k-1, r)$  let  $\mathcal{P}^l$  be the set of points that is contained in an arbitrary  $(k-l)$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_q^k$  and  $C^l$  be the corresponding linear code. With this, the code  $C^l$  is  $q^{r-l}$ -divisible.

As a consequence the effective length of  $C^l$  is divisible by  $q^{k-l}$ , which is perfectly reflected by the first three rows of tables (1)-(3) and (5)-(6).

**Lemma 4.** ([24, Lemma 6])

For  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ , there is a  $q^r$ -divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_q$  code with suitable dimension  $k$  and effective length

$$n = s_q(r, i) := \frac{q^{r+1} - q^i}{q-1} = \sum_{j=i}^r q^j = q^i + q^{i+1} + \dots + q^r.$$

The numbers  $s_q(r, i)$  have the property that they are divisible by  $q^i$ , but not by  $q^{i+1}$ . This allows us to create kind of a positional system upon the sequence of base numbers

$$S_q(r) = (s_q(r, 0), s_q(r, 1), \dots, s_q(r, r)).$$

**Lemma 5.** ([24, Lemma 7])

Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . There exist  $a_0, \dots, a_{r-1} \in \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$  and  $a_r \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $n = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i s_q(r, i)$ . Moreover this representation is unique.

The unique representation  $n = \sum_{i=0}^r a_i s_q(r, i)$  of Lemma 5 will be called the  $S_q(r)$ -adic expansion of  $n$ . The number  $a_r$  will be called the *leading coefficient* of the  $S_q(r)$ -adic expansion.

**Theorem 3.** ([24, Theorem 4])

Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . The following are equivalent:

- (i) There exists a  $q^r$ -divisible  $[\underline{n}, k]_q$  for a suitable dimension  $k$ .
- (ii) The leading coefficient of the  $S_q(r)$ -adic expansion of  $n$  is non-negative.

**Lemma 6.** There is no binary 4-divisible linear code with an effective length  $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 9\}$ .

*Proof.* We have  $s_2(2, 0) = 7$ ,  $s_2(2, 1) = 6$ , and  $s_2(2, 2) = 4$ , so that we have the following  $S_2(2)$ -adic expansions of  $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 9\}$ :

- $1 = -3 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 6 + 1 \cdot 7$ ,
- $2 = -2 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 6 + 0 \cdot 7$ ,
- $3 = -1 \cdot 4 + 0 \cdot 6 + 1 \cdot 7$ ,
- $5 = -2 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 6 + 1 \cdot 7$ ,
- $9 = -1 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 6 + 1 \cdot 7$ .

Note that the leading coefficient is negative in all cases and apply Theorem 3.  $\square$

Restrictions on the dimension can be incorporated via *residual codes*.

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $C$  be an  $[\underline{n}, k]_q$  code and  $u \in C$  be a codeword of weight  $w$ . Let  $C_1$  be the code generated by the codewords of  $C$  restricted to those coordinates that are not contained in the support  $\text{supp}(w)$  and  $C_2$  be the code generated by the codewords of  $C$  restricted to those coordinates that are contained in  $\text{supp}(w)$ . Then, we have  $\dim(C_1) + \dim(C_2) = k$  and the effective lengths are given by  $n - w$  and  $w$ .*

The code  $C_1$  is called the *residual* code of  $C$  with respect to  $u$ . Note that if  $w$  is smaller than twice the minimum distance of  $C$ , then  $\dim(C_2) = 1$  and  $\dim(C_1) = k - 1$ . If  $w = 2d$ , e.g.,  $w = 48$  in our application, then a complete classification of the  $[\underline{w}, k', \{d, 2d\}]_q$  codes is known, see [22]. If  $C$  is  $q^r$ -divisible, then  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are  $q^{r-1}$ -divisible. The decomposition of  $C$  into codes  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  is the inverse of the so-called *construction X*, see e.g. [29, Ch. 18, Theorem 9].

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $C$  be a binary 8-divisible linear code with minimum distance  $d \geq 24$ , dimension  $k = 12$  and effective length  $n \leq 65$ , then:*

- (1) *If  $C$  contains a word  $c_{64}$  of weight 64, then  $n = 64$  and the other codewords have weights in  $\{24, 32, 40\}$ .*
- (2) *If  $C$  contains a word  $c_{56}$  of weight 56, then  $a_{56} = 1$ ,  $a_{64} = 0$ , and  $n \in \{63, 64\}$ .*

*Proof.* Due to Lemma 2 we can assume  $n \geq 63$ .

- (1) Clearly  $n \geq 64$ . By considering the residual code of  $c_{64}$ , Lemma 6 shows that  $n = 65$  is impossible. In  $\mathbb{F}_2^{64}$  the sum of  $c_{64}$  and a codeword of weight 48 or 56 is 16 or 8, respectively. Clearly the codeword of weight 64 is unique.
- (2) By considering the residual code of  $c_{56}$ , Lemma 6 shows that  $n = 65$  is impossible. As shown in (1), there is no codeword of weight 64. Due to  $d \geq 24$  two codewords of weight 56 have to intersect in at least 44 positions, which would imply  $n \geq 68$ . Thus, there is a unique codeword of weight 56. If there is a codeword  $c_{48}$  of weight 48, then  $n = 64$  and the supports of  $c_{56}$  and  $c_{48}$  intersect in a set of cardinality 40. □

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author likes to thank Iliya Bouyukliev for discussions on the usage of his software `Q-Extension` and a personalized version that is capable to deal with larger dimensions. He also benefited from many discussion with Alfred Wassermann and Michael Kiermaier. Further thanks go to Fabrizio Catanese for bringing the problem of nodal surfaces with many nodes to our attention and to point out that symmetries of a nodal surface carry over to the associated binary code. The author would also like to thank the *High Performance Computing group* of the University of Bayreuth for providing the excellent computing cluster and especially Bernhard Winkler for his support.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] W. Barth. Two projective surfaces with many nodes, admitting the symmetries of the icosahedron. *Journal of Algebraic Geometry*, 5(1):173–186, 1996.
- [2] A. Basset. The maximum number of double points on a surface. *Nature*, 73(1889):246, 1906.
- [3] A. Beauville. Sur le nombre maximum de points doubles d’une surface dans  $P^3$  ( $\mu(5) = 31$ ). *Journées de Géométrie algébrique d’Angers*, pages 207–215, 1979.
- [4] K. Betsumiya and A. Munemasa. On triply even binary codes. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 86(1):1–16, 2012.
- [5] A. Betten, M. Braun, H. Friepertinger, A. Kerber, A. Kohnert, and A. Wassermann. *Error-correcting linear codes: Classification by isometry and applications*, volume 18. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [6] I. Bouyukliev. What is Q-extension? *Serdica Journal of Computing*, 1(2):115–130, 2007.
- [7] F. Catanese. Babbage’s conjecture, contact of surfaces, symmetric determinantal varieties and applications. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 63(3):433–465, 1981.
- [8] F. Catanese and F. Tonoli. Even sets of nodes on sextic surfaces. *arXiv preprint math/0510499*, 2005.
- [9] A. Cayley. A memoir on cubic surfaces. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 159:231–326, 1869.

- [10] P. Delsarte and J.-M. Goethals. Alternating bilinear forms over  $\text{GF}(q)$ . *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 19(1):26–50, 1975.
- [11] S. Dodunekov and J. Simonis. Codes and projective multisets. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 5(1):37, 1998.
- [12] C. F. Doran, M. G. Faux, S. J. Gates, T. Hübsch, K. M. Iga, G. D. Landweber, and R. L. Miller. Codes and supersymmetry in one dimension. *Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 15(6):1909–1970, 2011.
- [13] S. Endraß. Minimal even sets of nodes. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 503:87–108, 1998. arXiv preprint alg-geom/9710025.
- [14] T. Feulner. The automorphism groups of linear codes and canonical representatives of their semilinear isometry classes. *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*, 3(4):363–383, 2009.
- [15] T. Feulner. Classification and nonexistence results for linear codes with prescribed minimum distances. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 70(1-2):127–138, 2014.
- [16] M. Grassl. Bounds on the minimum distance of linear codes and quantum codes. Online available at <http://www.codetables.de>, 2007. Accessed on 2018-10-15.
- [17] D. Heinlein, T. Honold, M. Kiermaier, S. Kurz, and A. Wassermann. Projective divisible binary codes. In *The Tenth International Workshop on Coding and Cryptography 2017: WCC Proceedings*. Saint-Petersburg, September 2017.
- [18] D. Heinlein, T. Honold, M. Kiermaier, S. Kurz, and A. Wassermann. On projective  $q^r$ -divisible codes. *arXiv preprint 1912.10147*, 2019.
- [19] T. Honold, M. Kiermaier, and S. Kurz. Partial spreads and vector space partitions. In *Network Coding and Subspace Designs*, pages 131–170. Springer, 2018.
- [20] T. Honold, M. Kiermaier, S. Kurz, and A. Wassermann. The lengths of projective triply-even binary codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2019.
- [21] D. B. Jaffe and D. Ruberman. A sextic surface cannot have 66 nodes. *Journal of Algebraic Geometry*, 6(1):151–168, 1997.
- [22] D. Jungnickel and V. D. Tonchev. The classification of antipodal two-weight linear codes. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, 50:372–381, 2018.
- [23] P. Kaski and P. R. Östergård. *Classification algorithms for codes and designs*, volume 15. Springer, 2006.
- [24] M. Kiermaier and S. Kurz. On the lengths of divisible codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, to appear.
- [25] E. E. Kummer. Über die Flächen vierten Grades mit sechzehn singulären Punkten. *Collected papers II*, pages 418–432, 1864.
- [26] S. Kurz. Lincode – computer classification of linear codes. *arXiv preprint 1912.09357*, 2019.
- [27] O. Labs. A septic with 99 real nodes. *arXiv preprint math/0409348*, 2004.
- [28] O. Labs. *Hypersurfaces with many singularities – History, Constructions, Algorithms, Visualization*. PhD thesis, Mainz, Germany, 2005.
- [29] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane. *The theory of error-correcting codes*. Elsevier, 1977.
- [30] K. F. P. Pettersen. *On nodal determinantal quartic hypersurfaces in  $\mathbb{P}^4$* . PhD thesis, Oslo, Norway, 1998.
- [31] R. Pignatelli and F. Tonoli. On Wahl’s proof of  $\mu(6) = 65$ . *arXiv preprint 0706.4358*, 2007.
- [32] V. Pless. Power moment identities on weight distributions in error correcting codes. *Information and Control*, 6(2):147–152, 1963.
- [33] L. Schläfli. On the distribution of surfaces of the third order into species, in reference to the absence or presence of singular points, and the reality of their lines. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, pages 193–241, 1863.
- [34] A. N. Varchenko. Semicontinuity of the spectrum and an upper bound for the number of singular points of the projective hypersurface. In *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, volume 270, pages 1294–1297, 1983.
- [35] J. Wahl. Nodes on sextic hypersurfaces in  $P^3$ . *J. Differential Geom*, 48(3):439–444, 1998.
- [36] H. N. Ward. A bound for divisible codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 38(1):191–194, 1992.
- [37] H. N. Ward. Divisibility of codes meeting the Griesmer bound. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 83(1):79–93, 1998.
- [38] H. N. Ward. Divisible codes – a survey. *Serdica Mathematical Journal*, 27(4):263–278, 2001.
- [39] A. Wassermann. Attacking the market split problem with lattice point enumeration. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 6(1):5–16, 2002.

#### APPENDIX A. THE EXTENDED CODE OF A NODAL SEXTIC

Actually, there are two codes associated with a nodal surface. Some authors, see e.g. [13], speak of even sets of nodes in the geometric context, which can be distinguished into strictly even nodes and weakly even nodes. The corresponding codes are called the (associated) code  $\mathcal{H}$  of the nodal surface and the extended code  $\mathcal{H}'$ . For nodal sextics with 65 ordinary double points  $\mathcal{H}$  can only be one of the three possibilities in Theorem 2.

The extended code  $\mathcal{K}'$  contains  $\mathcal{K}$  as a subcode and the lower bound for the dimension of  $\mathcal{K}'$  is one larger than for  $\mathcal{K}$ . For sextics one we additionally know that the weights of  $\mathcal{K}'$  are 4-divisible and have minimum distance at least 16, see e.g. [13, Theorem 1.10]. Moreover,  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  does not contain codewords of weight 20 or 24, see [13, Corollary 1.11]. This motivates the following coding theoretic statement:

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be one of the codes of Theorem 2 and  $\mathcal{K}'$  be a  $(\dim(\mathcal{K}) + 1)$ -dimensional binary code containing  $\mathcal{K}$  as a subcode such that the weights of the codewords in  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  are 4-divisible, at least 16 and not equal to 20 or 24. If the effective length  $n_{\text{eff}}(\mathcal{K}')$  of  $\mathcal{K}'$  satisfies  $n_{\text{eff}}(\mathcal{K}) < n_{\text{eff}}(\mathcal{K}') \leq 66$ , then  $\mathcal{K}$  is the code of effective length 65 in Theorem 2 and the maximum weight in  $\mathcal{K}'$  is exactly 44.*

*Proof.* We prove the statement computationally using integer linear programming. To that end let  $n$  be the effective length of  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $c'$  be a codeword with  $\langle \mathcal{K}, c' \rangle = \mathcal{K}'$ , such that  $n_{\text{eff}}(\mathcal{K}') = n + \delta$ , where  $1 \leq \delta \leq 66 - n$ . By assumption the entries of  $c'$  at position  $n + i$  are equal to 1 for  $1 \leq i \leq \delta$ . We model  $c'$  by the binary variables  $x_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , i.e., the  $i$ th component of  $c'$  equals  $x_i$ . If  $c'$  has weight  $\gamma$ ,  $c \in \mathcal{K}$  has weight  $\beta$ , and the number of common ones of  $c$  and  $c'$  is  $\alpha$ , then  $c' + c \in \mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  has weight  $\gamma + \beta - 2\alpha$ . If  $\Lambda$  is an upper bound for the weight of a codeword in  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$ , then

$$\frac{\gamma + \beta}{2} - \frac{\Lambda}{2} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\gamma + \beta}{2} - 8$$

due to the minimum distance of  $\mathcal{K}'$ , where  $\alpha = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n: c_i=1} x_i$  and  $\beta = \text{wt}(c)$ . In order to model the gap in the weight spectrum, i.e., if  $c' + c$  does not have weight 16 then the weight is at least 28, we introduce the binary variable  $y_c$  and require

$$\frac{\gamma + \text{wt}(c)}{2} - 8 - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{2} - 8\right) \cdot y_c \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n: c_i=1} x_i \leq \frac{\gamma + \text{wt}(c)}{2} - 8 - 6y_c, \quad (11)$$

for all  $c \in \mathcal{K}$  with  $\text{wt}(c) \neq 0$ . If  $y_c = 0$  then these conditions are equivalent to  $\text{wt}(c' + c) = 16$  and to  $28 \leq \text{wt}(c' + c) \leq \Lambda$  otherwise. Additionally we use the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \gamma - \delta$ , the target function  $\sum_{i=1}^n ix_i$ , and denote the corresponding integer linear program by  $\text{ILP}_{\gamma, \Lambda, \delta, \mathcal{K}}$ .

If for a given  $\mathcal{K}$  a code  $\mathcal{K}'$ , satisfying the mentioned restrictions, exists, then  $\text{ILP}_{\gamma, \gamma, \delta, \mathcal{K}}$  has a solution, where  $\gamma$  is the maximum weight in  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$ . Computationally we check that for  $\gamma \in \{16, 28, 32, \dots, 64\}$   $\text{ILP}_{\gamma, \gamma, \delta, \mathcal{K}}$  is feasible if and only if  $\gamma = 44$ ,  $\delta = 1$ , and  $\mathcal{K}$  has effective length 65.  $\square$

We remark that our ILP formulation is only a relaxation of the original problem for  $\mathcal{K}'$ , e.g.,  $\text{wt}(c + c') = 30 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  is not excluded by inequality (11). As a relaxation, we may ignore those constraints for some codewords  $c \in \mathcal{K}$  or use the symmetry group of  $\mathcal{K}$  (cf. the proof of Theorem 4). Since all ILPs can be solved in a few hours, which is negligible to the running times required in Section 2, we do not go into details here.



As an example we spell out the details of  $\text{ILP}_{44,44,1,\mathcal{K}}$ , where  $\mathcal{K}$  has effective length 65:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{i=1}^{65} ix_i \quad \text{subject to} \tag{12} \\
 & \sum_{i=1}^{65} x_i = 43 \\
 & 6y_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 65: c_i=1} x_i \leq 34 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) = 40, \\
 & 14y_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 65: c_i=1} x_i \geq 34 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) = 40, \\
 & 6y_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 65: c_i=1} x_i \leq 30 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) = 32, \\
 & 14y_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 65: c_i=1} x_i \geq 30 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) = 32, \\
 & 6y_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 65: c_i=1} x_i \leq 26 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) = 24, \\
 & 14y_c + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 65: c_i=1} x_i \geq 26 \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) = 24, \\
 & x_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq 65, \\
 & y_c \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) \in \{24, 32, 40\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We remark that in the general geometric context  $\mathcal{K}' = \mathcal{K}$  is possible, which is excluded by  $\dim(\mathcal{K}) < 13$  in our situation. Thus, Proposition 3 applies in the case of a nodal sextic with 65 ordinary double points, i.e.,  $\mathcal{K}$  has effective length 65 and is uniquely characterized in Theorem 2. We can even uniquely classify  $\mathcal{K}'$ :

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  be as in Proposition 3, then  $\mathcal{K}'$  is given by*

$$\left( \begin{array}{l}
 100001000000001101100100011101001111010100010111100101000000000000 \\
 101001000110000010010001101001101111100100000110001101000000000000 \\
 0100001001110001100000010011010011000001111101111000100100000000000 \\
 1111010000111011010000001101011010000101110000010000100010000000000 \\
 0110101100000110001101000100001100101000111100001011100001000000000 \\
 0010100111011110101100000101100000011011100100100010000000010000000 \\
 000110001111110000011111000100010001000101010100110000000010000000 \\
 000001110010111001111100010101000000011110011000000110000000100000 \\
 000111110001111000000011110011011111100001111001111110000000010000 \\
 0000000011111100000000001111000111100000000111111110000000001000 \\
 0000000000000000111111111111100000001111111111111110000000000100 \\
 00010 \\
 01110000001100000100100100001101000000010000010000010010000000001
 \end{array} \right).$$

*Proof.* First we note that the weight enumerator of  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  is given by  $W(z) = 26z^{16} + 650z^{28} + 1690z^{32} + 1300z^{36} + 300z^{40} + 130z^{44}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  is a  $[[13, 66, 16]]_2$  code, i.e., all conditions for  $\mathcal{K}'$  are satisfied.

From Proposition 3 we conclude that  $\mathcal{K}$  is the code of effective length 65 in Theorem 2 and that  $\mathcal{K}'$  has maximum weight 44, which is indeed attained. Now we add the constraints  $y_c = 1$  to the ILP formulation (12) for all  $c \in \mathcal{K} : \text{wt}(c) \in \{24, 40\}$ , i.e., we require  $\text{wt}(c + c') \neq 16$ . Since this ILP does not have a solution, we can conclude that  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  contains a codeword of weight 16.

Next we consider the 325 codewords of the dual code  $\mathcal{K}^\perp$  of weight 4, which is the minimum dual weight. An example is given by the codeword in  $\mathbb{F}_2^{65}$  that has its four ones

in coordinates  $\{1, 6, 21, 23\}$ , i.e., the corresponding columns of  $\mathcal{K}$  sum up to the all zero vector. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the set of 4-subsets of  $\{1, \dots, 65\}$  that correspond to the 325 codewords of the dual code  $\mathcal{K}^\perp$  of weight 4. Using  $\text{ILP}_{16,44,\mathcal{K}}$  we can check (by prescribing) that no solution can satisfy  $(x_1, x_6, x_{21}, x_{23}) \in \{(0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1)\}$ . It can be computationally checked that the automorphism group of  $\mathcal{K}$  (of order 15600) acts transitively on the set of 4-tuples  $(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)$  with  $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\} \in \mathcal{T}$ . Thus, the conditions

$$\sum_{i \in T} x_i + 2z_T = 2 \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (13)$$

where  $z_T \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , are satisfied for all integral solutions of  $\text{ILP}_{16,44,\mathcal{K}}$ . We can check that the code from the statement contains exactly 26 codewords of weight 16. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the corresponding set of 15-subsets of  $\{1, \dots, 65\}$  where the codewords have a one. If  $\sum_{i \in E} x_i = 15$  for an  $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{65}$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^{65} x_i = 15$  and  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $x$  is a solution of  $\text{ILP}_{16,44,\mathcal{K}}$  that corresponds to the code  $\mathcal{K}'$  from the statement. Thus we consider  $\text{ILP}_{16,44,\mathcal{K}}$  with the additional constraints (13) and

$$\sum_{i \in E} x_i \leq 14 \quad (14)$$

for all  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ . It turns out that no solution of that ILP exists so that we can conclude the statement.  $\square$

Note that we do not impose that the automorphism group of  $\mathcal{K}'$  contains the automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{K})$  of  $\mathcal{K}$ , when restricted to the first 65 coordinates. However, the final solution has this property. In general, for  $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{K})$  and  $x$  a solution of  $\text{ILP}_{16,44,\mathcal{K}}$  we have that  $\pi(x)$  is also a solution of  $\text{ILP}_{16,44,\mathcal{K}}$ , which might correspond to either the same or a different code  $\mathcal{K}'$ . We remark that all ILP computations took just a few minutes.

The unique possibility for  $\mathcal{K}'$  can also be constructed as follows. Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the code of effective length 65 in Theorem 2 and  $\mathcal{D}$  be the code generated by the codewords of weight 4 in  $K^\perp$ . It can be checked that  $\mathcal{K} \leq \mathcal{D}^\perp$  and  $\dim(\mathcal{D}^\perp) = 14$ . Moreover  $\mathcal{D}^\perp$  is partitioned by the cosets of  $\mathcal{K}$  into sets of codewords of  $\mathcal{D}^\perp$  whose weights are equivalent to either 0, 1, 2, or 3 modulo 4. Taking the unique code  $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$  of dimension 13 with  $\mathcal{K} \leq \overline{\mathcal{K}} \leq \mathcal{D}^\perp$  whose codewords have weights that are either congruent to 0 or 3 modulo 4 and adding a parity bit gives  $\mathcal{K}'$ .

We remark that some parts of the computations in the proofs of Proposition 3 and Theorem 4 can be replaced by theoretical reasoning's. For example, if  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  contains a codeword of weight 64, then the corresponding residual code  $\mathcal{R}$  in  $\mathcal{K}'$  is a 2-divisible linear code of effective length  $n + 1 - 64$ , where  $n$  is the effective length of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\mathcal{K}'$  are projective, also  $\mathcal{R}$  is projective. However, the smallest 2-divisible projective binary linear code has length 3, so that we obtain a contradiction. If we already know that  $\sum_{i \in T} x_i \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , see constraint (13), then we can conclude that  $\mathcal{K}'$  has to arise by adding a parity bit to  $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$  where  $\mathcal{K} \leq \overline{\mathcal{K}} \leq \mathcal{D}^\perp$  and  $\dim(\overline{\mathcal{K}}) = 13$ . For nodal sextics it is of some interest that  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  contains a codeword of weight 32. Of course this directly follows from Theorem 4. However, we can also apply the first four MacWilliams identities together with  $n = 66$ ,  $k = 13$ ,  $a_0 = 1$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^{15} a_i + \sum_{i>44} a_i + \sum_{i: i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}} a_i = 0$ ,  $a_{20} = 0$ ,  $a_{24} = 390$ ,  $a_{32} \geq 3055$ ,  $a_{40} \geq 650$ ,  $a_0^* = 1$ ,  $a_1^* = 0$ ,  $a_2^* = 0$ , and  $a_3^* = 0$  gives  $a_{32} \geq 3535$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  contains at least 480 codewords of weight 32.

Of course we can also apply the computational techniques of the proof of Proposition 3 to  $[\underline{n}, 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  or similar codes. It turns out that the unique  $[\underline{62}, 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  code does not allow a code  $\mathcal{K}'$  as specified in Proposition 3. The nine  $[\underline{63}, 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  codes do not allow a code  $\mathcal{K}'$  as specified in Proposition 3 with maximum weight strictly

larger than 44 in  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$ . However, for the  $[\underline{63}, 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  code

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 10000110011000001111110010111000000110110011001100001000000000 \\ 1111000011100010111010111000000000101110000110100100100000000 \\ 01110010001000101000100100011010010100100011101111010010000000 \\ 0101001001100000001100011101000110011010001110101110001000000 \\ 00110110100000010011001101000010110001110000111111000000100000 \\ 00101111100100000111011100101110010000001000010010110000010000 \\ 00100001100011010000111000011001101111001111110000000000010000 \\ 000111111000010011111110111110000111110001110100011100000001000 \\ 000000000111110000000001111110000000001111110011111100000000100 \\ 0000000000000011111111111111000000000000001111111100000000010 \\ 000000000000000000000000000000001111111111111111111110000000001 \end{pmatrix}$$

with weight enumerator  $W(z) = 1z^0 + 310z^{24} + 1551z^{32} + 186z^{40}$  we can add the codeword  $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{64}$  of weight 36 with

$$\{i : x_i = 1\} = \{2, 6, 9, 10, 17, 19, 22, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42, 44, \\ 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64\}$$

to obtain  $\mathcal{K}'$  such that  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  has weight enumerator  $W(z) = 896z^{28} + 1152z^{36}$  or the codeword  $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{64}$  of weight 40 with

$$\{i : x_i = 1\} = \{4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 38, 39, 41, \\ 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63\}$$

to obtain  $\mathcal{K}'$  such that  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  has weight enumerator  $W(z) = 768z^{28} + 384z^{32} + 768z^{36} + 128z^{40}$ . The other eight  $[\underline{63}, 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  codes do not allow a code  $\mathcal{K}'$ , as specified in Proposition 3, at all. For the stated code  $\mathcal{K}$  the possible maximum weights of  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  are either 36 or 40. In both cases the minimum distance of  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  is 28, i.e., no codewords of weight 16 can occur. (Computationally checked by minimizing  $\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{0\}} y_c$  in the corresponding ILP, i.e., the minimum is attained at target value 2047 in both cases.)

From the 47  $[\underline{64}, 11, \{24, 32, 40\}]_2$  codes only the following two do allow a code  $\mathcal{K}'$ , as specified in Proposition 3:

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 000101011011111110000101000110000101001101000001101001000000000 \\ 010010000001110110010001000110000100111001101110100110100000000 \\ 100110010001000010100101011000010001011101101011100100010000000 \\ 010100000000111000110010111000010000111010100011101110001000000 \\ 110001100010011001100000011000001101110000010101011110000100000 \\ 000100100110001000010010110101000011010100110100111110000010000 \\ 0011000100011110000011101110111100010001000100000010000010000 \\ 00110000111111000000001110111110111101110111000001111110000001000 \\ 00001111111111000000000011110001111000011111111111111110000000100 \\ 00000000000000001111111111111000000111111111111111111110000000010 \\ 000000000000000000000000000000001111111111111111111111110000000001 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathcal{K} = \begin{pmatrix} 00000110100000010001101111000111010010111100011001001000000000 \\ 0111001100100010000011101000001011100100101101101010001000000000 \\ 000010111010101100011010011110010111010010010100000000100000000 \\ 011110111000101000110010101100101000010101001101000000010000000 \\ 1001110100000110100000011010000101011011000100111001100001000000 \\ 1101010010011110010001000110111100000011001100001000100000100000 \\ 0101010001111110001011000001110100001000000011000111100000010000 \\ 001100111111110000111000000010010111000111110111111100000001000 \\ 00001111111111000000011111110001111000000001111111100000000100 \\ 000000000000000111111111111100000001111111111111100000000010 \\ 00000000000000000000000000000001111111111111111111100000000001 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Both codes have weight enumerator  $W(z) = 1z^0 + 246z^{24} + 1551z^{32} + 250z^{40}$ , while the first group has an automorphism group of order 240 and the second code has an automorphism group of order 5760. Again, the minimum weight in  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  has to be 28. In both cases we found an example with weight enumerator  $W(z) = 672z^{28} + 352z^{32} + 864z^{36} + 160z^{40}$  of  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  by adding an additional codeword of weight 40:

$$\{i : x_i = 1\} = \{2, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, \\ 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65\}$$

and

$$\{i : x_i = 1\} = \{2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, \\ 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 50, 61, 62, 66, 65\}.$$

In  $\mathcal{K}' \setminus \mathcal{K}$  no maximum weight smaller than 40 or larger than 44 is possible. We remark that there do indeed exist  $[\leq 64, 11, \{24, 32, 40, 56\}]_2$  codes that contain a codeword of weight 56. There counts per effective length are given by  $62^1 63^{18} 64^{281}$ .

#### APPENDIX B. CLASSIFICATION OF THE OPTIMAL $[\underline{n}, k, 24]_2$ CODES THAT ARE 8-DIVISIBLE

In this appendix we list all  $[\underline{n}, k, 24]_2$  codes that achieve the optimal minimal Hamming distance and are 8-divisible. For each case we give a  $n \times k$ -generator matrix, the weight polynomial  $W(z)$ , and the order of the automorphism group of the corresponding multiset of points.

$$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [24, 1, 24]_2$$

$$11111111111111111111111111111111$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 1z^{24}$$

$$\#\text{Aut} = 1$$

$$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [36, 2, 24]_2$$

$$1111111111111111111111111100000000000010$$

$$111111111111100000000000011111111111101$$

$$W(z) = 1z^0 + 3z^{24}$$

$$\#\text{Aut} = 6$$

$$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [42, 3, 24]_2$$

$$11111111111111111111111111110000000000000000100$$

$$11111111111110000000000001111111111100000010$$

$$111111000000111111000001111110000011111001$$

$$1W(z) = z^0 + 7z^{24}$$

$$\#\text{Aut} = 168$$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [44, 3, 24]_2$   
 1111111111111111111111111100000000000000000100  
 111111111111000000000001111111111110000000010  
 111100000001111000000111111110001111111001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 6z^{24} + 1z^{32}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 24$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [45, 4, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000001000  
 1111111111110000000000011111111111100000000100  
 1111100000011111100000111110000011111000010  
 111000111000111000111001110001110011100110001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 15z^{24}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 20160$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [46, 4, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000001000  
 1111111111110000000000011111111111100000000100  
 11111000000111111000001111100000111110000010  
 1100001100001100001100011110011110111101110001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 14z^{24} + 1z^{32}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 1344$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [47, 4, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000001000  
 1111111111110000000000011111111111100000000100  
 11111000000111111000001111100000111110000010  
 100000100000100000100001111101111111111110001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 14z^{24} + 1z^{40}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 1344$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [47, 4, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000001000  
 1111111111110000000000011111111111100000000100  
 11111000000111111000001111100000111110000010  
 10000010000011100011100111000111001111111110001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 13z^{24} + 2z^{32}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 192$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [48, 4, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000001000  
 1111111111110000000000011111111111100000000100  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000010  
 000000110000110000000001111111101110111110001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 13z^{24} + 1z^{32} + 1z^{40}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 96$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [48, 4, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000001000  
 1111111111110000000000011111111111100000000100  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000010  
 0000001100001100001110110000111101110111110001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 12z^{24} + 3z^{32}$   
 $\# \text{Aut} = 48$



110000110000110000110001111001111011110111000010  
 001100111100111100001101100111100011000110100001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 28z^{24} + 3z^{32}$   
 $\#Aut = 64512$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [49, 5, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000000010000  
 1111111111110000000000001111111111110000000000001000  
 1111110000001111110000011111100000111110000000100  
 0000001100001100001111011000011110111101111100010  
 1100000011000011001100010111011101111011110000001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 26z^{24} + 5z^{32}$   
 $\#Aut = 120$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [50, 5, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000000010000  
 1111111111110000000000001111111111110000000000001000  
 11111100000011111100000111111000001111100000000100  
 0000001100001100000000011111111101111011111000010  
 1000000011101111011100111000100001110011100100001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 25z^{24} + 5z^{32} + 1z^{40}$   
 $\#Aut = 120$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [50, 5, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000000010000  
 1111111111110000000000001111111111110000000000001000  
 11111100000011111100000111111000001111100000000100  
 0000001100001100000000011111111101111011111000010  
 1100000011001111001110110000110001111011000100001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 25z^{24} + 5z^{32} + 1z^{40}$   
 $\#Aut = 120$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [50, 5, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000000010000  
 1111111111110000000000001111111111110000000000001000  
 11111100000011111100000111111000001111100000000100  
 00000011000011000011110110000111101111011111000010  
 10000000111010110010000111110110011110011100100001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 24z^{24} + 7z^{32}$   
 $\#Aut = 72$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [50, 5, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000000010000  
 1111111111110000000000001111111111110000000000001000  
 11111100000011111100000111111000001111100000000100  
 00000011000011000011110110000111101111011111000010  
 11000000110010100010001101110111011111011000100001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 24z^{24} + 7z^{32}$   
 $\#Aut = 48$

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [50, 5, 24]_2$   
 11111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000000010000  
 1111111111110000000000001111111111110000000000001000  
 11111100000011111100000111111000001111100000000100  
 00000011000011000011110110000111101111011111000010  
 11000000110010100010001101110111011111011000100001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 24z^{24} + 7z^{32}$   
 $\#Aut = 48$





000000110000110000111101100001111011110111110000100  
 100000001110101100100001111101100111100111001000010  
 010000001101010011010001111011010111010100111000001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 48z^{24} + 15z^{32}$   
 #Aut = 96

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{51}, 6, 24]_2$   
 111111111111111111111111000000000000000000000100000  
 1111111111100000000000111111111110000000000010000  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000001000  
 000000110000110000111101100001111011110111110000100  
 100000001110101100100001111101100111100111001000010  
 0110000010010000111100010110110111110111010000001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 48z^{24} + 15z^{32}$   
 #Aut = 12

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{51}, 6, 24]_2$   
 111111111111111111111111100000000000000000000100000  
 1111111111100000000000111111111110000000000010000  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000001000  
 000000110000110000111101100001111011110111110000100  
 100000001110101100100001111101100111100111001000010  
 011000001100010010010011011011110111110000111000001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 48z^{24} + 15z^{32}$   
 #Aut = 12

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{51}, 6, 24]_2$   
 111111111111111111111111100000000000000000000100000  
 1111111111100000000000111111111110000000000010000  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000001000  
 000000110000110000111101100001111011110111110000100  
 110000001100101000100011011101110111110110001000010  
 10100010001001111000001111001110110001101111000001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 48z^{24} + 15z^{32}$   
 #Aut = 720

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{51}, 6, 24]_2$   
 111111111111111111111111100000000000000000000100000  
 1111111111100000000000111111111110000000000010000  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000001000  
 000000110000110000111101100001111011110111110000100  
 11000000110000110011000111111100011000111101000010  
 00110000001110111011101001100110001110111001000001  
 $W(z) = 1z^0 + 48z^{24} + 15z^{32}$   
 #Aut = 360

$[\underline{n}, k, d]_q = [\underline{50}, 7, 24]_2$   
 111111111111111111111111100000000000000000000100000  
 1111111111100000000000111111111110000000000100000  
 111110000001111110000011111000001111100000010000  
 11100011100011100011100111000111001110011000001000  
 0001001000001001101101011010010011111111110000100  
 10001011011001010010111000110111101100010110000010  
 010010101101001010011111000010111100101110000001





























































