

The classification of orthogonal arrays OA(2048,14,2,7) and some completely regular codes*

Denis S. Krotov[†]

Abstract

We describe the classification of orthogonal arrays OA(2048, 14, 2, 7), or, equivalently, completely regular $\{14; 2\}$ -codes in the 14-cube (30848 equivalence classes). In particular, we find that there is exactly one almost-OA(2048, 14, 2, 7+1), up to equivalence. As derived objects, OA(1024, 13, 2, 6) (202917 classes) and completely regular $\{12, 2; 2, 12\}$ - and $\{14, 12, 2; 2, 12, 14\}$ -codes in the 13- and 14-cubes, respectively, are also classified.

MSC: 05B15, 94B25.

Keywords: binary orthogonal array, completely regular code, binary 1-perfect code.

1 Introduction

Orthogonal arrays are combinatorial structures important both for practical applications like design of experiments or software testing and theoretically, because of many relations with coding theory, cryptography, design theory, etc., see e.g. [7]. The classification of orthogonal arrays with given parameters is a problem that attracts attention of many researchers, see e.g. [3], [4], [24], [21] and the bibliography there. The main result of the current work is the classification of orthogonal arrays OA(2048, 14, 2, 7), whose cardinality is

*This is the accepted version of the article published in Discrete Math. 347(5) 2024, 113923(1-8), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2024.113923>

[†]Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia. e-mail: dk@ieee.org

the largest over all orthogonal arrays that have ever been computationally classified.

Let us introduce some concepts and notations. The n -cube Q_n is a graph whose vertex set is the set $\{0, 1\}^n$ of binary words of length n , which forms a vector space over \mathbb{F}_2 ; two such words are adjacent in Q_n if and only if they differ in exactly one position. A binary *orthogonal array* $\text{OA}(N, n, 2, t)$ is a multiset of vertices of Q_n of cardinality N such that every subgraph isomorphic to Q_{n-t} contains $N/2^t$ words from the array. The considered parameters $\text{OA}(2048, 14, 2, 7)$ attain the Friedman bound [6]

$$N \geq 2^n \left(1 - \frac{n}{2(t+1)}\right) \quad (1)$$

and hence any such array is simple (without multiple elements) and, moreover, completely regular. Binary orthogonal arrays with small parameters lying on the Friedman bound have been classified in a sequence of works, see Table 1 (only integer parameters with $t < n - 1$ and satisfying the necessary condition $t \leq 2n/3 - 1$ [5] are included). The classification of $\text{OA}(1024, 12, 2, 7)$, $\text{OA}(1536, 13, 2, 7)$, and $\text{OA}(2048, 15, 2, 7)$ was essentially based on such arrays being completely regular codes ($\text{OA}(2048, 15, 2, 7)$ are 1-perfect codes). In this paper, we further develop the technique for classification of completely regular codes to characterize all orthogonal arrays $\text{OA}(2048, 14, 2, 7)$. In particular, we firstly use an ILP solver to speed up the classification of intermediate objects, called local codes, and partition the class of all $\text{OA}(2048, 14, 2, 7)$ into two subclasses, depending on containing a special subconfiguration, specific for the considered parameters. As derived arrays, we also classify $\text{OA}(1024, 13, 2, 6)$.

A set C of vertices (code) of a graph G is called *completely regular* with *covering radius* ρ and *intersection array* $\{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{\rho-1}; c_1, \dots, c_\rho\}$ if the partition $(C = C^{(0)}, C^{(1)}, \dots, C^{(\rho)})$ of the vertex set with respect to the distance from C satisfies the following property: every vertex from $C^{(i)}$ has exactly b_i neighbors in $C^{(i+1)}$ and c_i neighbors in $C^{(i-1)}$ (it is implied that $b_\rho = c_0 = 0$), see, e.g., the survey [2]. A completely regular code with intersection array $\{n; 1\}$ in Q_n is called 1-perfect. For a code C in Q_n , the following two operations, which result in a code in Q_{n-1} , are defined. The *puncturing* is removing the symbol in some fixed position from all codewords; the *shortening* is the same, but we keep only the codewords that contained some fixed symbol, 0 or 1, in the deleted position. The *weight* of a binary word is the number of 1s in it. By $\text{even}(C)$ and $\text{odd}(C)$, we denote the even- and odd-weight subcodes

Parameters	Number of arrays	Parameters	Number of arrays
OA(2, 3, 2, 1)	1	OA(1, 2, 2, 0)	1
OA(16, 6, 2, 3)	1	OA(8, 5, 2, 2)	1
OA(16, 7, 2, 3)	1	OA(8, 6, 2, 2)	1
OA(128, 9, 2, 5)	2 [10]	OA(64, 8, 2, 4)	3 [24]
OA(1024, 12, 2, 7)	16 [17]	OA(512, 11, 2, 6)	37 [17]
OA(1536, 13, 2, 7)	1 [14]	OA(768, 12, 2, 6)	3 [14]
OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)	<u>30848</u> Th. 3.1	OA(1024, 13, 2, 6)	<u>202917</u> Th. 3.2
OA(2048, 15, 2, 7)	5983 [19]	OA(1024, 14, 2, 6)	38408 [19]
OA(8192, 15, 2, 9)	?	OA(4096, 14, 2, 8)	?

Table 1: Small parameters OA($N, n, 2, t$) and OA($N/2, n - 1, 2, t - 1$), $N = 2^n(1 - n/2(t + 1))$, $t \leq 2n/3 - 1$

of the code C , respectively. The all-zero (all-one) word is denoted by $\bar{0}$ ($\bar{1}$).

Orthogonal arrays attaining bound (1) are simple, independent (there are no two adjacent vertices in the array), and completely regular with intersection array $A = \{n; 2(t + 1) - n\}$, see e.g. [15]. For brevity, we will call them A -codes (in our case, $\{14; 2\}$ -codes). Two codes C, C' in Q_n are *equivalent* if $C = \sigma(C')$ for some automorphism of Q_n .

In Section 2, we describe the classification technique; the results are shown in Section 3. In Section 4, we consider some properties of the classified OA(2048, 14, 2, 7), including the property of being “the best possible”, almost-OA(2048, 14, 2, 7 + 1). The resulting data is available at [12].

2 Computation

The classification approach is based on the concept of local codes. We say that a set $P \subset \{0, 1\}^{14}$ is an r -local code if

- (I) (*locality condition*) P consists of words of weight $\leq r$;
- (II) (*up-to-equivalence condition*) $\bar{0}$ is not in P ;
- (III) (*exact cover condition*) the neighborhood of every vertex \bar{v} of weight less than r satisfies the local condition from the definition of a $\{14; 2\}$ -code: if $\bar{v} \in P$, then \bar{v} has no neighbors in P ; if $\bar{v} \notin P$, then \bar{v} has exactly 2 neighbors in P ;

(IV) (*boundary inequality condition*) each word in $\{0, 1\}^{14}$ has at most 2 neighbors in P .

It is easy to see that up to equivalence (this motivates the name of condition (II)) every $\{14; 2\}$ -code C includes an r -local code R , defined as the set of codewords of C of weight at most r (i.e., (I) immediately holds). Indeed, (III) holds by the definition of completely regular code and because all C -neighbors of a vertex \bar{v} of weight $< r$ are in R . We cannot say the same for a vertex v of “boundary” weight r or $r + 1$; however, our quotient matrix guarantees that such a vertex cannot have more than 2 code neighbors, which yields (IV) (for different quotient matrix, one can find different boundary inequalities to reduce the number of local codes, see e.g. [13]). Finally if (II) is not satisfied by C itself, then it is satisfied for some code equivalent to C .

Straightforwardly from definitions, we have the following key fact.

Lemma 2.1. *Any $\{14; 2\}$ -code that does not contain $\bar{0}$ is a 14-local code. In particular, any $\{14; 2\}$ -code is equivalent to a 14-local code. If C is an r' -local code and R consists of all codewords of C of weight at most r , where $0 \leq r < r'$, then R is an r -local code.*

In the last case, we say that C is an r' -continuation of R .

If for each r -local code we can construct all its $(r + 1)$ -continuations, then all local codes and finally $\{14; 2\}$ -codes can be classified recursively. However, it turns out that the step from 2-local to 3-local codes does not finish in a reasonable computational time. To handle this problem, we add an intermediate step based on $(2, 3)$ -codes, defined as follows. A set $P \subset \{0, 1\}^{14}$ is an (r_0, r_1) -local code if

- (0) $r_1 \in \{r_0, r_0 + 1\}$ (the case $r_1 = r_0 + 2$ also has sense but is not used in the current study);
- (I') (*locality condition*) each codeword of P starts with 0 and has weight at most r_0 or starts with 1 and has weight at most r_1 ;
- (II') (*up-to-equivalence condition*) P contains $10\dots 0$ (and hence does not contain $\bar{0}$);
- (III') (*exact cover condition*) the neighborhood of every vertex $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{14})$ of weight less than r_{v_1} satisfies the local condition from the definition of a $\{14; 2\}$ -code: if $\bar{v} \in P$, then \bar{v} has no neighbors in P ; if $\bar{v} \notin P$, then \bar{v} has exactly 2 neighbors in P ;

(IV) (*boundary inequality condition*) each word in $\{0, 1\}^{14}$ has at most 2 neighbors in P .

By a *local code*, we will mean an r -local code for some r or an (r_0, r_1) -local code for some (r_0, r_1) . Since the first coordinate plays a special role in the definition of (r_0, r_1) -local codes, we define equivalence of them differently. Two (r_0, r_1) -local codes P and P' are equivalent if there is a permutation π of coordinates that fixes the first coordinate (and hence the codeword $10\dots 0$) and sends P to P' . In particular, two equivalent 3-local codes can be nonequivalent as $(3, 3)$ -local codes.

Now, we describe the general line of the classification.

- We start with representatives of the 5 equivalence classes of $(2, 2)$ -local codes, see Section 2.1.
- For each of the 5 representatives from the step above, construct all $(2, 3)$ -continuations, see Section 2.2.
- Classify the found $(2, 3)$ -continuations up to equivalence, keep representatives of each equivalence class, see Section 2.3.
- Validate the computations with the orbit-stabilizer theorem (see Section 2.6).
- For each of the representatives from the step above, construct all $(3, 3)$ -continuations; classify them up to equivalence; validate.
- Classify the found $(3, 3)$ -local codes up to equivalence as 3-local codes (see Section 2.4).
- For each of the representatives of $(i - 1)$ -local codes, $i = 4, 5, \dots, 14$, from the step above, construct all i -continuations; classify them up to equivalence; validate.

Finally we find all nonequivalent $\{14; 2\}$ -codes.

Remark 2.2. Actually, using the self-complementary property of a completely regular code, one can reconstruct a $\{14; 2\}$ -code from a 7-local partition and even from a 6-local partition (the reconstruction is unique if exists, but the empiric fact that a 6-local partition always has a continuation is not yet theoretically explained). However, because of the uniqueness of the continuation at last steps, this observation does not lead to an essential time gain.

The approach described above is still time consuming (but definitely doable in hundreds core-years), and to make the search (approximately four–five times) faster, we divide the class of $\{14; 2\}$ -codes into two subclasses, called square codes and square-free codes, see Section 2.5. With this modified approach, we only need to continue a small part of all 3-local codes, which essentially quickens the most time-consuming step of the computation. In several subsections below, we describe details of each step of the classification.

2.1 $(2, 2)$ -Local codes

There is one class of 1-local codes, as well as $(1, 2)$ -local codes, with the representative $\{10\dots 0, 0\dots 01\}$.

Proposition 2.3. *There are five classes of $(2, 2)$ -local codes (as well as 2-local codes).*

Proof. Consider a $(2, 2)$ -local code P . Apart from the codeword $10\dots 0$, there is one another weight-1 codeword, say $0\dots 01$. These two words have no codeword neighbors. Each of the 12 other weight-1 words has exactly 2 weight-2 codeword neighbors. On the other hand, every weight-2 codeword has exactly 2 weight-1 neighbors. Considering the 12 weight-1 non-code words as vertices and the weight-2 codewords as edges, we have a 2-regular graph of order 12. From (IV), we see that it does not have 3-cycles. There are exactly 5 equivalence classes of 2-regular triangle-free graphs of order 12, with cycle structures $4 + 4 + 4$, $4 + 8$, $5 + 7$, $6 + 6$, 12 . \square

We call the corresponding $(2, 2)$ -local codes $L_{4,4,4}$, $L_{4,8}$, $L_{5,7}$, $L_{6,6}$, and L_{12} .

2.2 Continuation by exact covering

We first describe how to construct all r -local codes $P_{r-1} \cup R_r$ that continue a given $(r - 1)$ -local code P_{r-1} . To build such a continuation, we need to find a set R_r of vertices of weight r such that it satisfies (IV) and the union $P_{r-1} \cup R_r$ satisfies (III) for all vertices \bar{v} of weight $r - 1$ (indeed, for all vertices \bar{v} of weight less than $r - 1$, (III) is satisfied because P_{r-1} is an $(r - 1)$ -local code). In particular, (III) means that the vertices from R_r are not adjacent to elements of P_{r-1} . We start with defining the set S of *candidates*, which is the set of all vertices of weight r that are not adjacent to any element of

P_{r-1} . We also define the set T of all weight- $(r-1)$ words that are not in P_{r-1} . Next, we construct a $|T| \times |S|$ $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix M whose rows and columns are indexed by elements of T and S respectively and such that 1 in the entry (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) means that \bar{x} and \bar{y} are adjacent. For each vertex \bar{x} from T , we define the *deficiency* $\delta_{\bar{x}}$ as 2 minus the number of its neighbors in P_{r-1} . Now, $P_{r-1} \cup R_r$ satisfying (III) is equivalent to each \bar{x} from T having exactly $\delta_{\bar{x}}$ neighbors in $R_r \subset S$. Equivalently, the sum of columns of M indexed by R_r equals the deficiency vector $(\delta_{\bar{x}})_{\bar{x} \in T}$. Finding such set of columns is an instance of the exact covering problem (which motivates the name of condition (III)), with multiplicities $\delta_{\bar{x}}$ of the covered elements. All solutions can be found by Donald Knuth's Algorithm X with dancing links [11], which is implemented in the library `libexact` [9]. Using this software, we can find all solutions of the exact covering problem, and it remains to choose those that satisfy (IV). Alternatively, it is possible to modify Algorithm X to take into account the additional inequalities that come from condition (IV). Empirically, this could give some speed gain, but it was not critical because the most of computing time was spent for filtering the 3-local codes by an ILP solver, as described in the rest of this section.

Now assume that we want to construct all $(r, r+1)$ -local codes $P \cup R$ that continue a given (r, r) -local code P (constructing $(r+1, r+1)$ -continuations of a $(r, r+1)$ -local code is similar). We need to find a set R of vertices of weight $r+1$ with the first symbol 1 such that $P \cup R$ satisfies (IV) and (III'). Condition (III') is sufficient to be checked for all vertices \bar{v} of weight r with the first symbol 1 (indeed, for all other vertices, (III') is satisfied because P is an (r, r) -local code). In particular, (III') means that the vertices from R are not adjacent to elements of P . We define the set S of *candidates*, which is the set of all vertices of weight $r+1$ with the first symbol 1 that are not adjacent to any element of P . We also define the set T of all weight- r words that are not in P and have the first symbol 1. The rest is similar to the case of r -local partitions: we construct a $|T| \times |S|$ matrix, solve the corresponding exact covering problem, and choose only solutions that satisfy (IV). One reasonable improvement follows from the possibility to check (IV) partially at the step of choosing candidates. Indeed, it is possible that some candidate (recall that it has 1 in the first position) is adjacent to a vertex with 0 in the first position that already has 2 neighbors in P . Clearly, there is no reason to include such a candidate in S because every solution with it will be rejected as not satisfying (IV).

The most time consuming step of the classification was from 3-local to

4-local codes, because the number of nonequivalent 3-local codes is huge, see Table 2. Evaluating the CPU time necessary to solve such amount of exact covering problems showed that it was out of reasonable resources. However, it could be observed that the most of 3-local codes have no continuation, and another software, integer linear programming (ILP) solver called *BOP* from *Google OR-Tools* [22], was used to quickly decide whether a 3-local code has a 4-continuation. Since it did not provide more than one solution for each problem, the rest of the work for continuable 3-local codes was done with `libexact`. This additional filtering step took around 1300 CPU days and speeded up the process approximately 10 times or even better. Another optimization was related with the partition of the classified objects into two subclasses, see Section 2.5.

2.3 Isomorph rejection

An important step, traditionally called the *isomorph rejection*, is choosing nonequivalent representatives from the set of all found solutions, intermediate or final. A standard technique to deal with equivalence, see [8, Sect. 3.3], is to represent codes by graphs and use a software [18] to deal with graph isomorphism. With this technique, for each code A one can construct the *canonically labeled graph* $\text{Canon}(A)$ such that two codes are equivalent if and only if their canonically labeled graphs coincide. The same software finds the order of the automorphism group of the graph, i.e., in our case, the order of the automorphism group of the corresponding code. This can be used for validating the results of the computation, as discussed in Section 2.6.

2.4 From (3, 3)- to 3-local codes

While at the first steps of the classification, it was computationally hard to jump from 2-local to 3-local codes, and it required to consider (2, 3)-local codes as an intermediate step, it was found empirically that for reconstructing codewords of weight more than 3 such additional subdivision is not reasonable anymore. So, after classifying (3, 3)-local codes, they were used to classify 3-local codes (which differ from (3, 3)-local codes only by the concept of equivalence), and then work with r -local codes, $r = 3, 4, 5, \dots$

Each equivalence class of 3-local codes can be represented at most twice in the collection of nonequivalent (3, 3)-local codes. The procedure to choose only one representative for each equivalence class is as follows. Assume

we have a $(3, 3)$ -local code A . It has exactly two codewords of weight 1, with 1 in the first (condition (II')) and some i th positions, respectively. By a coordinate permutation that swaps the two positions corresponding to the weight-1 codewords (we denote this operation by σ), we get another local code $\sigma(A)$. As a $(3, 3)$ -local code, it can be equivalent to A or not. For A and $\sigma(A)$, we construct canonically labeled graphs $\text{Canon}(A)$ and $\text{Canon}(\sigma(A))$ (see Section 2.3). Then, we compare these graph with respect to the lexicographic ordering (which depends on the computer realization, but we need an arbitrary fixed linear order on the set of graphs). If $\text{Canon}(A) \leq \text{Canon}(\sigma(A))$, then we keep A in the collection of representatives; if $\text{Canon}(A) > \text{Canon}(\sigma(A))$, we remove it. In the last case, the equivalence class containing $(3, 3)$ -local code $\sigma(A)$ must be represented by some B in our classification of $(3, 3)$ -local codes, where $\text{Canon}(\sigma(A)) = \text{Canon}(B)$. It follows that $\text{Canon}(B) < \text{Canon}(\sigma(B)) = \text{Canon}(A)$ in this case, which means that we will keep B in the collection of representatives when we process it. As a result, if the equivalence class of 3-local codes was represented twice, by A and B , as $(3, 3)$ -local codes, we keep only one of A, B ; if it was represented once, by A , then $\text{Canon}(A) = \text{Canon}(\sigma(A))$, and we keep A . This procedure is not very fast as it requires calculation of two canonical labeled graphs for each representative, but it does not require much memory and is well parallelizable. It took 124 days of CPU time.

2.5 Square and square-free partitions

We say that a code or a local code is *square* (*square-free*) if it includes (does not include) a quadruple $\{\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}, \bar{v}\}$ of vertices equivalent to $\{0\dots 00011, 0\dots 00101, 0\dots 01010, 0\dots 01100\}$. We see that $L_{4,4,4}$ and $L_{4,8}$ are square, while $L_{5,7}, L_{6,6}, L_{12}$ are square-free. Moreover,

Lemma 2.4. *For every square $\{14; 2\}$ -code C , there is an equivalent code that is a continuation of $L_{4,4,4}$ or $L_{4,8}$.*

Based on this, we separately classify square codes as continuations of $L_{4,4,4}$ and $L_{4,8}$ and square-free codes as continuations of $L_{5,7}, L_{6,6}$, and L_{12} (keeping at each step only square-free representatives of local codes).

2.6 Validation

In each step of the classification, by double-counting the total number of found continuations with the help of the orbit-stabilizer theorem (see [8, Sect. 10.2] for the general strategy), we can partially validate the results of this step. In our case, the validation is based on the following straightforward fact.

Proposition 2.5. *Let C_0 be an r -local code, and let C_1 be an r' -local code continuing C_0 , $r' \geq r$. Then the number of r' -continuations of C_0 that are equivalent to C_1 equals $|\text{Sym}(C_0)|/|\text{Sym}(C_1)|$, where $\text{Sym}(C_i)$ is the set of all coordinate permutations that stabilize C_i set-wise.*

Proposition 2.5 is used to confirm the results of finding $(r+1)$ -continuations of each given representative C_0 of r -local partitions. During the computation, we find all possible $(r+1)$ -continuations and hence their number. After the isomorph rejection, we find nonequivalent representatives of $(r+1)$ -continuations, and with Proposition 2.5 find again the total number of continuations. In the case of any random or systematic mistake in the computing, the results of the calculation the number of continuations in two different ways will be different with very high probability. Checking this equality is one of standard ways to confirm the results of classification of combinatorial structures.

The same approach was used to check the results of the continuation of (r_0, r_1) -local codes, with the only difference that instead of $\text{Sym}(C_i)$ we used $\text{Sym}_0(C_i)$ consisting of all permutations from $\text{Sym}(C_i)$ that fix the first coordinate.

A slightly different realization of the same principle was used to validate the final classification of $\{14; 2\}$ -codes. For each such code C , we denote by $\text{Loc}_6(C)$ the set of all 6-local codes that have a continuation equivalent to C . Nonequivalent representatives of $\text{Loc}_6(C)$ can be easily found as follows: for each translation $c + C$, $c \notin C$, remove all codewords of weight more than 6; keep only nonequivalent representatives. Checking that all equivalence classes of such 6-local partitions (derived from the resulting $\{14; 2\}$ -codes) were found during the classification of all 6-local partitions additionally confirms that no 6-local partitions were missed. Indeed, the set of all possible 6-local partitions is the union of $\text{Loc}_6(C)$ over all $\{14; 2\}$ -codes C . If, as the result of a wrong classification, we found a proper subset of this

set, missing the rest, then the probability that the found subset is also the union of $\text{Loc}_6(C)$ over some $\{14; 2\}$ -codes C is very small.

The validation approach from the paragraph above was separately applied for square and square-free (see the definition in Section 2.5) $\{14; 2\}$ -codes C . The union of $\text{Loc}_6(C)$ over square-free codes C consists of 110 equivalence classes. For square codes, we count only nonequivalent 6-local partitions that continue $L_{4,4,4}$ or $L_{4,8}$; their number 5099717 in $\bigcup \text{Loc}_6(C)$ is also in agree with what was found, see Table 2.

3 Results

	$L_{4,4,4}, L_{4,8}$	$L_{5,7}, L_{6,6}, L_{12}$ (*: square-free)
(2, 3)-local	14 + 59	33 + 37 + 196
(3, 3)-local	73762927 + 1586116921	1280242055 + 543652569 + 7755763093
3-local: <i>all</i> ,	36904735 + 793121035	640150181 + 271854554 + 3877947089
<i>square-free</i> ,		166208491* + 71966561* + 1014622649*
<i>continuable</i>	17044 + 78904	25* + 30* + 679*
4-local	4753786 + 29233429	9* + 0* + 117*
5-local	15286921 + 16399650	9* + 0* + 101*
6-local	1688762 + 3410955	9* + 0* + 101*

Table 2: Intermediate results of the computation

The numbers of equivalence classes of local codes, found as intermediate results, are shown in Table 2; finding (3, 3)-local codes took 339 CPU days, 3-local codes 124 days, continuable 3-local codes 1293 days, 4-, 5-, and 6-local codes 50, 115, and 112 CPU days, respectively.

Theorem 3.1 (computational). *There are 30848 equivalence classes of orthogonal arrays $OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)$; eight of them are square-free. 14960 of them (4 square-free) are punctured 1-perfect codes. The total number of different $OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)$ is 541012580165257200 (267743838601839600 punctured 1-perfect codes).*

It is well known that every binary orthogonal array $OA(N, n, 2, t)$ of even strength t can be obtained by shortening $OA(2N, n + 1, 2, t + 1)$, see e.g. [1, Theorem 6.1]. Consequently, we can obtain the classification of

OA(1024, 13, 2, 6) from OA(2048, 14, 2, 7), by shortening each representative in each coordinate and comparing the results for equivalence.

Theorem 3.2 (computational). *There are 202917 equivalence classes of orthogonal arrays OA(1024, 13, 2, 6). 100473 of them are punctured shortened 1-perfect codes.*

It is known [14, Remark 2] that if C is a shortened orthogonal array attaining (1), then $\text{even}(C) \cup (\text{odd}(C) + \bar{1})$ and $\text{odd}(C) \cup (\text{even}(C) + \bar{1})$ are completely regular codes (in general they can be nonequivalent), in our case, with intersection array $\{12, 2; 2, 12\}$.

Finally, it is straightforward that since a $\{14; 2\}$ -code C is an independent set, both $\text{even}(C)$ and $\text{odd}(C)$ are $\{14, 12, 2; 2, 12, 14\}$ -codes (again, they can be nonequivalent), and we can classify such codes too.

Theorem 3.3 (computational). *In Q_{13} , there are 247904 equivalence classes of completely regular codes with intersection array $\{12, 2; 2, 12\}$. In Q_{14} , there are 36137 equivalence classes of completely regular codes with intersection array $\{14, 12, 2; 2, 12, 14\}$.*

4 Properties of OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)

4.1 Almost-OA(2048, 14, 2, 7 + 1)

We say that an orthogonal array is *almost-OA*($N, n, 2, t+1$) if it is OA($N, n, 2, t$) and every subgraph of Q_n isomorphic to Q_{n-t-1} contains $N/2^{t+1}$, $N/2^{t+1} - 1$, or $N/2^{t+1} + 1$ elements of the array.

To formulate the result of this section, we need to define a 1-perfect code P , obtained by shortening one very symmetric extended 1-perfect code P' in Q_{16} (a binary code is called an extended 1-perfect if puncturing it in any coordinate results in a 1-perfect code). The code P' is defined as the orbit of the all-zero word under the automorphism group of order 2048 with generators shown in Table 3. This group acts regularly on P' , which means that the code is *propelinear*, in the sense of [23]. Puncturing P' in any coordinate results in the same, up to equivalence, 1-perfect code; to be explicit, we denote by P the result of puncturing P' in the last coordinate.

Theorem 4.1. *Up to equivalence, there is exactly one almost-OA(2048, 14, 2, 7+1); it is the 1-perfect code P punctured in one of the first 8 positions.*

$$\begin{aligned}
& [0000000011111111, \text{Id}], & [1111111100000000, \text{Id}], \\
& [00001111\underbrace{00000011}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (89)(ab)(cd)(ef)], & [00000011\underbrace{00001111}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (01)(23)(45)(67)], \\
& [1100\underbrace{0000}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}\underbrace{11000000}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (45)(67)(cd)(ef)], & \\
& [00110011\underbrace{00000101}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (8a)(9b)(ce)(df)], & [00000101\underbrace{00110011}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (02)(13)(46)(57)], \\
& [01010101\underbrace{00010001}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (8c)(9d)(ae)(bf)], & [00010001\underbrace{01010101}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (04)(15)(26)(37)], \\
& [0000\underbrace{1100}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}\underbrace{10100000}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (23)(67)(ce)(df)], & [1010\underbrace{0000}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}\underbrace{00001100}_{\begin{smallmatrix} \curvearrowright \curvearrowright \end{smallmatrix}}, (46)(57)(ab)(ef)].
\end{aligned}$$

Table 3: Generators of an automorphism group that acts regularly on the extended 1-perfect code P' . Each automorphism is written in the form $[\bar{v}, \pi]$, where \bar{v} is a translation vector and π is a coordinate permutation (the coordinates are represented by hexadecimal digits; the permutations are also indicated by arrows); the action of $[\bar{v}, \pi]$ on the vertices of Q_{16} is $\bar{x} \rightarrow \bar{v} + \pi(\bar{x})$.

The code P itself is not an almost-OA(2048, 15, 2, 7+1) (in a Q_7 -subgraph of Q_{15} , it can have 0, 7, 8, 9, or 16 codewords); in particular, there are no almost-OA(2048, 15, 2, 7+1) arrays (which can also be seen from column κ'_7 of [20, Table XIX]).

There is exactly one almost-OA(1024, 14, 2, 6+1), which is P shortened in one of the last 7 positions.

There are six almost-OA(1024, 13, 2, 6+1).

4.2 Distance-2 connected components

The *minimum-distance* graph of a code is a graph with the codewords as the vertices, two codewords being adjacent if and only if the distance between them is minimum over all pairs of codewords. Some information about the structure of connected components of the minimum-distance graph of a $\{14; 2\}$ -code was analysed. Note that such a code is punctured 1-perfect if and only if the minimum-distance graph is bipartite (to make a 1-perfect code, one can append one bipartite set with symbol 0 and the other bipartite set with symbol 1). Connected components correspond to so-called i -components in 1-perfect codes of length 15, which were analysed in details in [20]. Such a component of a $\{14; 2\}$ -code can have one of the sizes $1X$, $2X$, $4X$, $6X$, $7X$, $8X$, where $X = 128$. The proportion between sizes of

the components in the even-weight subcode can be one of 8, 1:7, 2:6, 1:1:6, 4:4, 2:2:4, 1:1:2:4, 1:1:1:1:4, 2:2:2:2, 1:1:2:2:2, 1:1:1:1:2:2, 1:1:1:1:1:1:1; in the odd-weight subcode it is always the same. In all proportions, the components of size at least $4X$ can be non-bipartite, with odd-girth 5, 7, or 9 for the size $8X$ and only 7 for smaller sizes (again, all characteristics of the even-weight and odd-weight components coincide, with only one exception with components of size $8X$, one bipartite and one not, of odd-girth 7). All components have girth 4, except some components of size $8X$ with girth 5 and some bipartite components of sizes $8X$ and $7X$ with girth 6. The even-weight and odd-weight subcodes can be nonequivalent; in the bipartite case this can only happen with components of size $8X$ and girth 4, while in the non-bipartite case, in all cases except components of size $7X$ (there are only 2 such non-bipartite codes) or of girth 5 (4 codes). All components are antipodal (contain \bar{x} and $\bar{x} + \bar{1}$ simultaneously), which has a theoretical explanation only in the bipartite case, see [16, Sect. VI].

4.3 Derived group divisible designs

A *group divisible design* (k, λ) -GDD of type m^l is the triple (S, G, B) from a set S (of *points*), a partition G of S into l subsets (*groups*) of size m , $|S| = lm$, and a collection B of k -subsets (*blocks*) of S such that two different points from S either belong to a common group and do not belong to a common block or belong to exactly λ common blocks and do not belong to a common group. If \bar{c} is a codeword of a $\{14; 2\}$ -code C , G and B are the sets of supports of weight-2 and weight-3 elements in $\bar{c} + C$, respectively, then $(\{1, \dots, 14\}, G, B)$ is a $(3, 2)$ -GDD design of type 2^7 , called *derived* from C .

Theorem 4.2. *There are 103966 (84852) nonisomorphic $(3, 2)$ -GDD designs of type 2^7 that are derived from arrays $OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)$ (respectively, only from punctured 1-perfect codes).*

There are 208 (170) arrays $OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)$ having only one derived $(3, 2)$ -GDD designs, up to isomorphism. There are 206 (170) $(3, 2)$ -GDD designs derived from such arrays.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Aleksandr Krotov for invaluable help with software, Aleksandr Buturlakin and Patric Östergård for insightful discussions, and the Su-

percomputing Center of the Novosibirsk State University for provided computational resources.

The work was funded by the Russian Science Foundation (22-11-00266), <https://rscf.ru/project/22-11-00266/>.

Data availability

The dataset containing the results of the classifications of $OA(2048, 14, 2, 7)$ and $OA(1024, 13, 2, 6)$ is available in the IEEE DataPort repository [12], files $H(14,2)_((0,14)(2,12))^*.txt$, and $H(13,2)_((9,2,2)(12,0,1)(12,1,0))^*.txt$ in the archive `equitable_partitions*.zip`.

References

- [1] J. Bierbrauer, K. Gopalakrishnan, and D. R. Stinson. Orthogonal arrays, resilient functions, error-correcting codes, and linear programming bounds. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 9(3):424–452, Aug. 1996. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0895480194270950>.
- [2] J. Borges, J. Rifà, and V. A. Zinoviev. On completely regular codes. *Probl. Inf. Transm.*, 55(1):1–45, Jan. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S0032946019010010>.
- [3] P. Boyvalenkov, T. Marinova, and M. Stoyanova. Nonexistence of a few binary orthogonal arrays. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 217(2):144–150, Jan. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2016.07.023>.
- [4] D. A. Bulutoglu and K. J. Ryan. Integer programming for classifying orthogonal arrays. *Australas. J. Comb.*, 70(3):362–385, 2018.
- [5] D. G. Fon-Der-Flaass. A bound on correlation immunity. *Sib. Èlektron. Mat. Izv.*, 4:133–135, 2007. Online: <http://mi.mathnet.ru/eng/semr149>.
- [6] J. Friedman. On the bit extraction problem. In *Foundations of Computer Science, IEEE Annual Symposium on*, pages 314–319, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 1992. IEEE Computer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1992.267760>.

- [7] A. S. Hedayat, N. J. A. Sloane, and J. Stufken. *Orthogonal Arrays. Theory and Applications*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, NY, 1999. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1478-6>.
- [8] P. Kaski and P. R. J. Östergård. *Classification Algorithms for Codes and Designs*, volume 15 of *Algorithms Comput. Math.* Springer, Berlin, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-28991-7>.
- [9] P. Kaski and O. Pottonen. libexact user’s guide, version 1.0. Technical Report 2008-1, Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT, 2008.
- [10] D. Kirienko. On new infinite family of high order correlation immune unbalanced Boolean functions. In *Proceedings 2002 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, Lausanne, Switzerland, June 30 – July 5, 2002*, page 465. IEEE, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2002.1023737>.
- [11] D. E. Knuth. Dancing links. E-print cs/0011047, arXiv.org, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.cs/0011047>.
- [12] D. Krotov. Perfect and related codes. IEEE Dataport, 2022–2023. <https://doi.org/10.21227/w856-4b70>.
- [13] D. S. Krotov. Equitable $[[2, 10], [6, 6]]$ -partitions of the 12-cube. E-print 2012.00038, arXiv.org, 2020. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.00038>.
- [14] D. S. Krotov. On the $OA(1536, 13, 2, 7)$ and related orthogonal arrays. *Discrete Math.*, 343(2):111659/1–11, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2019.111659>.
- [15] D. S. Krotov. Completely regular codes as optimal structures. In *2023 XVIII International Symposium “Problems of Redundancy in Information and Control Systems” (REDUNDANCY)*, pages 82–87. IEEE, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Redundancy59964.2023.10330185>.
- [16] D. S. Krotov and V. N. Potapov. On multifold packings of radius-1 balls in Hamming graphs. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 67(6):3585–3598, June 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2020.3046260>.

- [17] D. S. Krotov and K. V. Vorob'ev. On unbalanced Boolean functions with best correlation immunity. *Electr. J. Comb.*, 27(1):#P1.45(1–24), 2020. <https://doi.org/10.37236/8557>.
- [18] B. D. McKay and A. Piperno. Practical graph isomorphism, II. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 60:94–112, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2013.09.003>.
- [19] P. R. J. Östergård and O. Pottönen. The perfect binary one-error-correcting codes of length 15: Part I—classification. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 55(10):4657–4660, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2009.2027525>.
- [20] P. R. J. Östergård, O. Pottönen, and K. T. Phelps. The perfect binary one-error-correcting codes of length 15: Part II—properties. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 56(6):2571–2582, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2010.2046197>.
- [21] S. Pang, J. Wang, D. K. J. Lin, and M.-Q. Liu. Construction of mixed orthogonal arrays with high strength. *Ann. Stat.*, 49(5):2870–2884, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1214/21-AOS2063>.
- [22] L. Perron and V. Furnon. OR-Tools, v9.8. <https://developers.google.com/optimization/>.
- [23] J. Rifa and J. Pujol. Translation-invariant propelinear codes. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 43(2):590–598, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.1109/18.556115>.
- [24] E. D. Schoen, P. T. Eendebak, and M. V. M. Nguyen. Complete enumeration of pure-level and mixed-level orthogonal arrays. *J. Comb. Des.*, 18(2):123–140, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcd.20236>.