

On spherical 4-distance 7-designs

Peter Boyvalenkov

Institute of Mathematics and Informatics,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences,
8 G Bonchev Str., 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
peter@math.bas.bg

Navid Safaei

Research Institute of Policy Making,
Sharif University of Technology,
Tehran, Iran
navid_safaei@gsme.sharif.edu

Abstract—We investigate spherical 4-distance 7-designs by studying their distance distributions. We compute these distance distributions and use their product (an integer) to derive certain divisibility conditions relating the dimension n and the cardinality M of our designs. It follows that n divides $12M$ and $n+1$ divides $4M^2$. This result provides a good base for computer experiments to support the folklore conjecture that the only spherical 4-distance 7-designs are the tight spherical 7-designs. We then proceed with a computer assisted proof of this conjecture in all dimensions $n \leq 1000$.

Keywords—Spherical designs, few distance sets, distance distribution.

I. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{S}^{n-1} be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n . A finite set $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is called a spherical code. Spherical designs were introduced by Delsarte, Goethals and Seidel [4] as a special class of spherical codes with good combinatorial and integration properties.

Definition 1. [4] A spherical code $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is called a spherical τ -design if the quadrature formula

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) d\mu(x) = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{x \in C} f(x)$$

is exact for all polynomials $f(x) = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ of degree at most τ . Here the measure μ is normalized, i.e. $\mu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) = 1$. The maximal positive integer τ such that C is a spherical τ -design is called strength of C .

A spherical τ -design $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is called *tight* if it attain the Delsarte-Goethals-Seidel bound [4]

$$|C| \geq \binom{n+k-1-\varepsilon}{n-1} + \binom{n+k-2}{n-1},$$

where $\tau = 2k - \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$.

For a spherical code C we consider the set of distinct inner products of points of C ,

$$A(C) := \{\langle x, y \rangle : x, y \in C, x \neq y\},$$

and denote by $s := |A(C)|$ their number. The code C is called then an s -distance set.

Designs with large strength τ and small number of distances s are clearly interesting. It is well known [4] that $\tau \leq 2s$ or even $\tau \leq 2s - 1$ if $A(C) \cup \{1\}$ is symmetric with respect to 0. Levenshtein [6] proved that if $\tau \geq 2s - 1$ or $\tau \geq 2s - 2$ and $-1 \in A(C)$, then C is maximal (and attains what is called now Levenshtein bounds).

In this paper we consider the case $(s, \tau) = (4, 7)$. We prove that all 4-distance 7-designs have cardinality which has some good divisibility properties. We prove that the dimension n divides $12M$ and, in some cases even better, n divides M .

All these results are collected towards the following conjecture which could be quite old but we have not seen it explicitly written.

Conjecture 2. Let $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $n \geq 2$, be a spherical 4-distance 7-design. Then C is a tight spherical 7-design. In particular, $|C| = 2 \binom{n+2}{3}$.

Tight spherical 7-designs are possible only in dimensions $n = 3k^2 - 4$, $k \geq 2$, and are known only for $k = 2$ and $k = 3$, where the corresponding designs are unique up to isometry of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Further nonexistence results for tight spherical 7-designs were obtained in [1], [8].

In this paper we provide a computer assisted proof of Conjecture 2 in all dimensions $n \leq 1000$ based on the results from Section 3. This result is confirmed in dimensions $n \leq 215$ by a brute force approach based on formulas from Section 2.

II. PRELIMINARIES

We collect some facts about 4-distance 7-designs which follow from general results in [4], [6], [2]. The exposition is similar to [3], where we considered 3-distance 5-designs.

Let $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be a spherical 4-distance 7-design with cardinality $M = |C|$ and

$$A(C) = \{a, b, c, d\},$$

where $-1 \leq a < b < c < d < 1$. For $x \in C$ let

$$(X, Y, Z, T) = (A_a(x), A_b(x), A_c(x), A_d(x))$$

be the distance distribution of C with respect of x , i.e.,

$$A_a(x) = |\{y \in C : \langle x, y \rangle = a\}|,$$

etc. It is well known [4] that the distance distribution does not depend on x (this fact follows whenever $s - 1$ does not exceed τ).

Then the nine numbers a, b, c, d, X, Y, Z, T , and $|C| = M$ satisfy the following system of eight equations

$$a^i X + b^i Y + c^i Z + d^i T = f_i M - 1, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, 7, \quad (1)$$

where $f_i = 0$ for odd i , $f_0 = 1$, $f_2 = 1/n$, $f_4 = 3/n(n+2)$ and $f_6 = 15/n(n+2)(n+4)$. The cardinality M is restricted by

$$2 \binom{n+2}{3} \leq M \leq \binom{n+3}{4} + \binom{n+2}{3}. \quad (2)$$

The lower bound in (2) comes from C being a 7-design, and the upper bound (so-called absolute bound) follows from C being a 4-distance set. Both bounds were proved in [4]. We will assume that C is not a tight spherical 7-design, i.e.

$$M > 2 \binom{n+2}{3} = \frac{n(n+1)(n+2)}{3}.$$

In what follows we will use for short the notations

$$A = 6M - n(n+1)(n+5),$$

$$B = 3M - n(n+1)(n+2).$$

The numbers a, b, c, d are the roots of the equation

$$f(t) = 0, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) = & (n+2)(n+4)At^4 + n(n-1)(n+1)(n+2)(n+4)t^3 \\ & - 9(n+2)(4M - n(n+1)(n+3))t^2 \\ & - 3n(n-1)(n+1)(n+2)t + 6B. \end{aligned}$$

This fact already involves the Levenshtein framework from [6], [7] and the polynomial $f(t)$ is, in the notations from [6], equal to

$$(t - \alpha_0)(t - \alpha_1)(t - \alpha_2)(t - \alpha_3)$$

up to a multiplicative constant, where $\alpha_0 = a$, $\alpha_1 = b$, $\alpha_2 = c$, $\alpha_3 = d$, in a turn to our notations. We also note that $b < 0 < c$ and

$$|a| > |d| > |b| > |c| \quad (4)$$

(see [2] for the general case of s -distance $(2s-1)$ -designs).

It is straightforward to resolve the Vandermonde-like system of equations from (1) with odd $i = 1, 3, 5, 7$. The solution

$$\begin{aligned} X &= -\frac{(1-b^2)(1-c^2)(1-d^2)}{a(a^2-b^2)(a^2-c^2)(a^2-d^2)}, \\ Y &= -\frac{(1-a^2)(1-c^2)(1-d^2)}{b(b^2-a^2)(b^2-c^2)(b^2-d^2)}, \\ Z &= -\frac{(1-a^2)(1-b^2)(1-d^2)}{c(c^2-a^2)(c^2-b^2)(c^2-d^2)}, \\ T &= -\frac{(1-a^2)(1-b^2)(1-c^2)}{d(d^2-a^2)(d^2-b^2)(d^2-c^2)} \end{aligned}$$

is unique because of the inequalities (4) (see [2] for a treatment of the general case of s -distance $(2s-1)$ -designs).

III. DIVISIBILITY RESULTS FOR M

A. Computation of $XYZT$ in terms of n and M

The integers X, Y, Z , and T can be involved in different symmetric expressions. We tried many reasonable combinations but succeeded to get results only from the investigation of $XYZT$ as shown below.

Thus, we consider the product

$$XYZT = \frac{f(1)^3 f(-1)^3}{abcdDF^2},$$

where

$$D = a_0^6 ((a-b)(a-c)(a-d)(b-c)(b-d)(c-d))^2$$

is the discriminant of f ,

$$a_0 = (n+2)(n+4)A$$

is its leading coefficient and

$$F = (a+b)(a+c)(a+d)(b+c)(b+d)(c+d).$$

Expressing the necessary symmetric functions of a, b, c, d obtained via (3) we find that

$$abcd = \frac{6B}{(n+2)(n+4)A},$$

$$f(1)f(-1) = a_0^2 \cdot \frac{12(n-1)^2(n+1)^2 B}{(n+2)^2(n+4)^2 A^2},$$

$$\frac{f(1)f(-1)}{F} = a_0^2 \cdot \frac{MA}{n^2(n+1)(n+2)}$$

(the last expression was computed by subtracting the equations with $i = 2$ and $i = 4$ of the system (1)), and the most complicated

$$D = a_0^6 \cdot \frac{108(n+1)^2 R(n, M)}{(n+2)^3(n+4)^5 A^6},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R(n, M) = & 2^{14} 3^6 M^6 - 2^{13} 3^7 n(n+1)(n+3)M^5 \\ & + 2^9 3^5 n^2(n+1)(n^4 + 93n^3 + 629n^2 + 1339n + 818)M^4 \\ & - 2^7 3^4 n^3(n+1)^2(13n^5 + 436n^4 + 3688n^3 + 12782n^2 \\ & \quad + 19163n + 9998)M^3 \\ & + 2^2 3^3 n^4(n+1)^3(n+2)(n+7)^2(5n^4 + 447n^3 + 3303n^2 \\ & \quad + 7873n + 5652)M^2 \\ & - 2^2 3^3 n^5(n+1)^4(n+2)^2(n+5)^2(n+7)^3(3n+5)M \\ & + n^6(n+1)^5(n+2)^3(n+5)^3(n+7)^4. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these we obtain

$$XYZT = \frac{M^3(n-1)^2(n+4)^4 A^7}{54n^4(n+1)^2 R(n, M)}. \quad (5)$$

We investigate below the integrality of $XYZT$.

B. Divisibility properties of M

For a prime p and a nonzero integer x , we will denote by $v_p(x)$ the largest power of p which divides x (i.e., the power of p in the canonical representation of x ; for example $v_2(24) = 3$, $v_3(24) = 1$ and $v_5(24) = 0$).

The power of p in the numerator and denominator of $XYZT$ in (5) will be denoted for short by $v_p(\text{num})$ and $v_p(\text{den})$, respectively. Since $XYZT$ is a positive integer, the inequality $v_p(\text{den}) \leq v_p(\text{num})$ holds true for every p .

Lemma 3. *If $XYZT$ is an integer, then the following statements hold true:*

- a) if $\gcd(n, 6) = 1$, then n divides M ;
- b1) if $\gcd(n, 3) = 1$, n is even but $v_2(n) \notin \{2, 1 + v_2(M)\}$, then n divides M ;
- b2) if $\gcd(n, 3) = 1$, and $v_2(n) = 2$, then n divides $4M$;
- b3) if $\gcd(n, 3) = 1$, and $v_2(n) = 1 + v_2(M)$, then n divides $2M$;
- c1) if $\gcd(n, 2) = 1$, 3 divides n but $v_3(n) \neq 1 + v_3(M)$, then n divides M ;
- c2) if $\gcd(n, 2) = 1$ and $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$, then n divides $3M$;
- d1) if 6 divides n , $v_3(n) \neq 1 + v_3(M)$, and $v_2(n) \notin \{2, 1 + v_2(M)\}$, then n divides M ;
- d2) if 6 divides n , $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$, and $v_2(n) \notin \{2, 1 + v_2(M)\}$, then n divides $3M$;
- d3) if 6 divides n , $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$, and $v_2(n) = 1 + v_2(M)$, then n divides $6M$;
- d4) if 6 divides n , $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$, and $v_2(n) = 2$, then n divides $12M$.

Proof. Considering the numerator of $XYZT$ from (5) modulo n we find that n divides $2^{15}3^7M^{10}$. Hence $v_2(n) \leq 10v_2(M) + 15$, $v_3(n) \leq 10v_3(M) + 7$ and $v_p(n) \leq 10v_p(M)$ for every prime $p > 3$.

Assume that $v_p(n) > v_p(M)$ for some prime $p > 3$. Then it follows that p divides M , $v_p(A) = v_p(M)$, and we have $v_p(\text{num}) = 10v_p(M)$. For the power of p in the denominator we see that $v_p(R(n, M)) = 6v_p(M)$, whence $v_p(\text{den}) = 4v_p(n) + 6v_p(M)$. Thus

$$10v_p(M) \geq 4v_p(n) + 6v_p(M) > 10v_p(M),$$

a contradiction. Therefore $v_p(M) \geq v_p(n)$ for all primes $p > 3$. This proves a) and makes obvious the statements in b2), b3), c2), d3) and d4). Note also that the conclusions modulo 2 in d1) will imply d2). Thus, it remains to prove b1), c1), and d1), where the primes $p = 2$ and $p = 3$ are only relevant.

Assume now that n is even, $v_2(n) \notin \{1 + v_2(M), 2\}$, and $v_3(n) \neq 1 + v_3(M)$. We will argue by contradiction, assuming that $v_2(n) > 1 + v_2(M)$. Then it follows that $v_2(n + 4) = 2$ and, therefore,

$$v_2(\text{num}) = 10v_2(M) + 15.$$

For the denominator we first see that

$$v_2(R(n, M)) \geq \min\{6v_2(M) + 14, 5v_2(M) + v_2(n) + 13, 4v_2(M) + 2v_2(n) + 10, 3v_2(M) + 3v_2(n) + 8, 2v_2(M) + 4v_2(n) + 5, 5v_2(n) + v_2(M) + 4, 6v_2(n) + 9\}.$$

It is easy to see that $v_2(n) > 1 + v_2(M)$ implies that each term in the minimum is greater than or equal to $6v_2(M) + 13$. We conclude that

$$v_2(\text{den}) \geq 4v_2(n) + 1 + 6v_2(M) + 13 > 10v_2(M) + 18.$$

Therefore,

$$10v_2(M) + 18 < v_2(\text{num}) = 10v_2(M) + 15,$$

a contradiction. Hence $v_2(n) \leq v_2(M)$, which completes, in particular, the proof of b1).

Finally, assume that $v_3(n) > 1 + v_3(M)$ for the proofs of c1) and d1). Then

$$v_3(\text{num}) = 10v_3(M) + 7.$$

On the other hand,

$$v_3(R(n, M)) \geq \min\{6v_3(M) + 6, 5v_3(M) + v_3(n) + 7, 4v_3(M) + 2v_3(n) + 5, 3v_3(M) + 3v_3(n) + 4, 2v_3(M) + 4v_3(n) + 3, v_3(M) + 5v_3(n) + 3, 6v_3(n)\}.$$

It is easy to deduce that all terms in the last minimum are greater than or equal to $6v_3(M) + 6$. Therefore,

$$v_3(\text{den}) \geq 3 + 4v_3(n) + 6v_3(M) + 7 > 10v_3(M) + 14,$$

whence

$$10v_3(M) + 14 < v_3(\text{num}) = 10v_3(M) + 7,$$

which is impossible. This completes the proof. \square

We can bring some parts of the above lemma together. For example we can combine parts c1), c2) as follows: if $\gcd(n, 2) = 1$ and $3|n$, then $n|3M$. More general, we present a reformulation that is focused on the divisibility properties of M .

Corollary 4. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be a spherical 4-distance 7-design of cardinality $|C| = M$. Then n divides M if one of the following is fulfilled:*

- a) $\gcd(n, 6) = 1$;
- b) $2|n$, $\gcd(n, 3) = 1$, and $v_2(n) \notin \{2, 1 + v_2(M)\}$;
- c) $\gcd(n, 2) = 1$, $3|n$, and $v_3(n) \neq 1 + v_3(M)$;
- d) $6|n$, $v_3(n) \neq 1 + v_3(M)$, and $v_2(n) \notin \{2, 1 + v_2(M)\}$.

Further, n divides $2M$ if $\gcd(n, 3) = 1$ and $v_2(n) = 1 + v_2(M)$; n divides $4M$ if $\gcd(n, 3) = 1$ and $v_2(n) = 2$; n divides $3M$ if $\gcd(n, 2) = 1$ and $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$ or $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$ and $v_2(n) = 1 + v_2(M)$; n divides $6M$ if $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$ and $v_2(n) = 1 + v_2(M)$; and n divides $12M$ if $v_3(n) = 1 + v_3(M)$ and $v_2(n) = 2$. In particular, n divides $12M$.

We proceed with divisibility with respect to the prime divisors of $n + 1$ as instructed from (5).

Lemma 5. *If $XYZT$ is an integer, then the following statements hold true:*

- a) *if $\gcd(n+1, 6) = 1$, then $n+1$ divides M^2 ;*
- b) *if $n+1$ is even and $\gcd(n+1, 3) = 1$, then $n+1$ divides $16M^2$;*
- c) *if $n+1$ is odd and 3 divides $n+1$, then $n+1$ divides $3M^2$;*
- d) *if 6 divides $n+1$, then $(n+1)^2$ divides $48M^4$.*

Proof. Considering the numerator in (5) modulo $n+1$ we conclude that $n+1$ divides $2^9 \cdot 3^{11} M^{10}$.

If a prime $p > 3$ divides $n+1$, then it divides M . We assume for a contradiction that there exists a prime $p > 3$ such that $v_p(n+1) > 2v_p(M)$. Then the power of p in the numerator is

$$v_p(\text{num}) = 10v_p(M).$$

Further, it also follows from our assumption that $v_p(R(n, M)) = 6v_p(M)$, whence

$$v_p(\text{den}) = 6v_p(M) + 2v_p(n+1).$$

Therefore

$$6v_p(M) + 2v_p(n+1) \leq 10v_p(M),$$

which is impossible when $v_p(n+1) > 2v_p(M)$. This completes the proof of a) and leaves the proofs of b), c) and d) only up to considerations of the powers of 2 and 3.

Modulo 2 considerations are needed for b) and d) only. We assume $v_2(n+1) \geq 2v_2(M) + 5$ for a contradiction. This implies that $v_2(A) = 1 + v_2(M)$, $v_2(n-1) = 1$, and $n+4$ is odd. Therefore

$$v_2(\text{num}) = 10v_2(M) + 9.$$

To estimate the power of 2 in the denominator we observe that

$$v_2(R(n, M)) \geq \min\{6v_2(M) + 14, v_2(n+1) + 4v_2(M) + 9\} \text{ which should be integer. We were unable to get further divisibility conclusions from (6) but combinations of (5) and (6) could give something. However, the proofs of Lemmas 3 and 5 could be probably simplified by using (6) instead of (5).}$$

$$= 6v_2(M) + 14$$

to conclude that

$$v_2(\text{den}) \geq 6v_2(M) + 2v_2(n+1) + 15.$$

Hence,

$$2v_2(n+1) + 6v_2(M) + 15 \leq 10v_2(M) + 9,$$

i.e. $v_2(n+1) + 3 \leq 2v_2(M)$, which is impossible when $v_2(n+1) \geq 2v_2(M) + 5$. This completes the proof of b) and what concerns the power of 2 in d).

Finally, in our course to finish the proof in c) and d), we assume that $v_3(n+1) > 1 + 2v_3(M)$ for a contradiction. Similarly to above we see that $v_3(A) = 1 + v_3(M)$, $v_2(n+4) = 1$ and $v_3(n-1) = 0$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} v_3(\text{num}) &= 3v_3(M) + 7(1 + v_3(M)) + 4 \\ &= 10v_3(M) + 11. \end{aligned}$$

For the denominator we first see that

$$v_3(R(n, M)) \geq 6v_3(M) + 6$$

giving that

$$v_3(\text{den}) \geq 6v_3(M) + 2v_3(n+1) + 9,$$

which contradicts to our assumption. \square

In our computer investigation below we will use the following reformulation.

Corollary 6. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be a spherical 4-distance 7-design of cardinality $|C| = M$. Then $n+1$ divides $4M^2$.*

C. Further divisibility conditions

In [9], Nozaki proved necessary conditions for existence of spherical k -distance sets as a generalization of the classical Larman-Rogers-Seidel result on 2-distance sets [5]. We present his result here in our context to find another divisibility condition.

The Nozaki's Theorem 5.1 [9] states that the number

$$k_a := \frac{(1-b)(1-c)(1-d)}{(a-b)(a-c)(a-d)}$$

and its analogs for b , c and d are integers which sum up to 1 and their absolute values do not exceed

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{N^2}{2N-2} + \frac{1}{4}} \right|,$$

where

$$N = \binom{n+2}{3} + \binom{n+1}{2} = \frac{n(n+1)(n+5)}{6}.$$

Applying our technique (i.e. employing the equation (3)) to this, we obtain

$$k_a k_b k_c k_d = \frac{2M^3(n+1)(n+4)^2(n-1)^3 A^3}{R(n, M)}, \quad (6)$$

IV. COMPUTER ASSISTED INVESTIGATIONS OF THE INTEGRALITY CONDITIONS

We describe the computer investigations of the integrality of $XYZT$ based on the divisibility conditions from Lemmas 3 and 5 and general investigations of the integrality of $XYZT$ and $k_a k_b k_c k_d$ from (6).

For fixed $n \geq 3$ all positive integers M in the range defined by (2) are checked (with a strict inequality $M > 2\binom{n+2}{3}$ to skip the considerations of tight spherical 7-designs). We first determine whether the pair (n, M) satisfies the conditions of Lemmas 3 and 5 (i.e., whether $n|12M$ and $n+1|4M^2$). Then, for each such pair we check if $XYZT$ is integer. If the pair (n, M) passes this test (i.e., if the number $XYZT$ is integer) we compute the values of a, b, c, d as roots of the equation (3) and find the values of X, Y, Z , and T themselves. The last part can be realized via computation of k_a, k_b, k_c , and k_d as well.

This computation yields the following (computer-assisted) result.

Theorem 7. *There exist no spherical 4-distance 7-designs in dimensions $3 \leq n \leq 1000$ if*

$$M > 2 \binom{n+2}{3}.$$

In other words, the only possible spherical 4-distance 7-designs in dimensions $3 \leq n \leq 1000$ are the tight spherical 7-designs (see the comment after Conjecture 2).

In these dimensions, there are 321 pairs (n, M) that pass the tests of Lemmas 3 and 5 and, furthermore, $XYZT$ is an integer. This was verified by a simple Python program. There is no dimension with more than two suitable values of M and there are 12 dimensions with two possible values of M each.

Further, in all 321 cases none of X , Y , Z , and T is an integer. This was independently verified by a simple Maple program. With the last check, the non-integrality of the parameters k_a , k_b , k_c , and k_d was also verified.

It is up to computing power to proceed with this proof. We used only a general purpose laptop and stopped at $n = 1000$ as it already started to take about three hours of computation per dimension. It seems that dimensions $n \leq 2000$ are reachable by this approach and more powerful computers. All our programs and the most important intermediate data are available upon request.

Example 8. *The data from the first case that passes the integrality test of $XYZT$ is as follows. For $(n, M) = (7, 196)$ we have that $n = 7$ divides $2M = 392$ and $n + 1 = 8$ divides $4M^2 = 153664$, i.e. the conditions from Lemmas 3 and 5 are satisfied. Then*

$$XYZT = 1185921$$

from (5) and

$$k_a k_b k_c k_d = 121$$

from (6), i.e. our condition and the Nozaki's condition are satisfied and there is no contradiction so far. Thus we find the polynomial (3) as

$$f(t) = 49896t^4 + 33264t^3 - 18144t^2 - 9072t + 504,$$

whence the inner products are computed,

$$a \approx -0.821721, \quad b \approx -0.442124,$$

$$c \approx 0.0508952, \quad d \approx 0.546284.$$

This gives (with enough precision) the numbers

$$X \approx 5.63, \quad Y \approx 41.57, \quad Z \approx 93.84, \quad T \approx 53.95,$$

clearly non-integer. Therefore the existence question for spherical 4-distance 7-designs on \mathbb{S}^6 with 196 points is resolved in the negative.

We also completed a brute force investigation of both $XYZT$ and $k_a k_b k_c k_d$ in dimensions $n \leq 215$ with a Python program. There are 72 pairs that pass the $XYZT$ test and

27 pairs that pass the $k_a k_b k_c k_d$ test, the smallest one being $(n, M) = (7, 196)$ (it passes both tests, as mentioned in Example 8). It is clear that these 72 pairs are the same as these passing the test via Lemmas 3 and 5 since the lemmas are based on the investigation of the integrality of $XYZT$. In all these cases we compute X , Y , Z and T to see that they are not integers, confirming this way Theorem 7. The integrality of $k_a k_b k_c k_d$ is usually stronger, despite there are two cases that pass the $k_a k_b k_c k_d$ test while failing to pass the $XYZT$ test. The disadvantage of the integrality criterion of (6) is that one can not start with prime divisors of n and $n+1$. Of course, the strongest test is the integrality of X , Y , Z , and T but we do not see other approaches than brute force investigation of the formulas from Section 2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research of the first author was supported, in part, by a Bulgarian NSF contract KP-06-Russia/33.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Bannai, A. Munemasa, B. Venkov, The nonexistence of certain tight spherical designs, *Algebra i Analiz* **16**, 2004, 1-23.
- [2] P. Boyvalenkov, D. Danev, I. Landgev, On maximal spherical codes II, *J. Combin. Designs* **7**, 1999, 316-326.
- [3] P. Boyvalenkov, N. Safaei, On 3-distance spherical 5-designs, *Serdica Mathematical Journal* **46**, 2020, 165-174 (arXiv:2007.01895).
- [4] P. Delsarte, J.-M. Goethals, J. J. Seidel, Spherical codes and designs, *Geom. Dedicata* **6**, 1977, 363-388.
- [5] D.G. Larman, C.A. Rogers, J.J. Seidel, On two-distance sets in Euclidean space, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **9**, 1977, 261-267.
- [6] V. I. Levenshtein, Designs as maximum codes in polynomial metric spaces, *Acta Appl. Math.* **25**, 1992, 1-82.
- [7] V.I. Levenshtein, Universal bounds for codes and designs, *Handbook of Coding Theory*, V.S. Pless and W.C. Huffman, Eds., Elsevier, Amsterdam, Ch. 6 (1998) 499-648.
- [8] G. Nebe, B. Venkov, On tight spherical designs, *St. Petersburg Mathematical Journal* **24**, 2013, 485-491.
- [9] H. Nozaki, A generalization of Larman–Rogers–Seidel's theorem, *Discr. Math.* **311**, 2011, 792-799.