NEIGHBORHOODS OF BINARY SELF-DUAL CODES

CAROLIN HANNUSCH AND SÁNDOR ROLAND MAJOR

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce the neighborhood of binary self-dual codes. Further, we show that for code length divisible by 8 such a neighborhood consists of three self-dual codes, two of them are doubly-even and one is always singly-even. We investigate the relationship between neighboring codes. Finally, we prove that no better Type I code exists than the best possible Type II code of the same length.

1. Introduction

Neighbors of codes were first introduced by Brualdi and Pless in [1]. Later, neighbors were used to find extremal \((64,32,12)\) codes in [2] and to find new codes of length 68 in [3]. Recently, the graph of neighboring codes was investigated [4]. In the current paper we use the definition of neighboring codes in order to introduce the definition of a neighborhood, which is a set of binary self-dual codes. We investigate especially the neighborhood of doubly-even self-dual codes, which means in these cases the code length is necessarily divisible by 8. The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we draw up the main definitions and preliminary results which were essential for our work. In Section 3 we prove some auxiliary results which will be used in our proofs. In Section 4 we investigate the relation of neighboring self-dual codes. Finally, in Section 5 we give some properties of neighborhoods and their members.

2. Preliminaries

Let \(\mathbb{F}_2\) denote the finite field of two elements and let \(n\) be a positive integer. Then a subspace of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\) is called a binary linear code. We denote a linear code by \(C\). Then its dual code \(C^\perp\) is defined as

\[
C^\perp = \{ x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n | x \cdot c = 0 \ \forall c \in C \},
\]

where \(\cdot\) denotes the usual scalar product of two vectors. A code is called self-orthogonal if \(C \subseteq C^\perp\) and self-dual if \(C = C^\perp\). It is a well known fact that the dimension of a self-dual code of length \(n\) is \(\frac{n}{2}\).

The weight of a codeword \(c \in C\) is the number of its nonzero coordinates. The minimum weight (or minimum distance) of a code \(C\) is the smallest nonzero weight of its codewords. We denote the minimum distance of \(C\) by \(d(C)\). If a code \(C\) is a \(k\)-dimensional subspace of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\) with minimum distance \(d\), then we say that \(C\) is an \((n,k,d)\)-code.

Self-dual binary codes can be classified into Type I and Type II codes [5]. A self-dual binary code is said to be of Type II if all of its codewords have weight divisible by 4. If it has also codewords with weight divisible by 2, then \(C\) is said to be of Type I. Type I codes are also called singly-even codes and Type II codes are also
called doubly-even codes. It is well known that Type II codes only exist for length divisible by 8 \[6\].

We know that the minimum distance of a binary self-dual code is bounded by
\[d(C) \leq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{8} \right\rfloor + 2 \text{ if } C \text{ is a Type I code and } d(C) \leq 4 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{24} \right\rfloor + 4 \text{ if } C \text{ is a Type II code} \] \([7], [6]\). If a code reaches equality in this bound, then the code is called extremal. Especially for larger codelengths it seems that equality cannot be reached in many cases. Codes with the highest possible minimum distance are called optimal codes. The search for extremal and optimal binary codes is a difficult task for many codelengths \(n\) and several researchers have contributed to this theory, see e.g. \([8], [9]\). There are still many open problems about extremal and optimal binary codes \([5]\).

### 3. Auxiliary results

Let \(a\) and \(b\) be two codewords (i.e. binary vectors) of the same length. We denote the numbers of coordinates, which are 1 in both codewords by \(\mu(a, b)\), i.e.
\[\mu(a, b) = \# \{i \mid a[i] = b[i] = 1, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}.\]

The weight of a codeword is the number of its nonzero coordinates. We denote the weight of a codeword \(a\) by \(w(a)\). It is well known that
\[w(a + b) = w(a) + w(b) - 2\mu(a, b).\]

**Lemma 1.** Let \(a, b, c\) be codewords of the same length. Then
\[\mu(a + b, c) = \mu(b, c) + \mu(a, b + c) - \mu(a, b).\]

**Proof.** Using the following equations in the given order, the proposition can be directly shown:

1. \[w(a + b + c) = w(a + b) + w(c) - 2\mu(a + b, c)\]
2. \[w(a + b) = w(a) + w(b) - 2\mu(a, b)\]
3. \[w(a + b + c) = w(a) + w(b + c) - 2\mu(a, b + c)\]
4. \[w(b + c) = w(b) + w(c) - 2\mu(b, c)\]

\(\square\)

### 4. Neighbors

In \([1]\) the definition of neighbors among self-dual codes was introduced as follows.

**Definition 1.** Two self-dual codes of length \(n\) are called neighbors, provided their intersection is a code of dimension \(\frac{n}{2} - 1\).

It is well known that every singly-even code has a maximal doubly-even subcode of codimension 1. Investigating the neighbors of a singly-even self-dual code, when the intersection is the maximal doubly-even subcode, leads us to the following fact. Throughout the paper, we denote the all-1 codeword by \(\mathbf{1}\). If \(C\) is a singly-even self-dual code of length divisible by 8 and \(C_{max} \subseteq C\) is its maximal doubly-even subcode, then \(\mathbf{1} \in C\).

**Theorem 1.** Let \(C\) be a singly-even self-dual binary \((n, k, d)\)-code, where \(n \equiv 0 \mod 8\). Then \(C\) either has a doubly-even self-dual neighbor or a singly-even self-dual neighbor.
Thus there exists \( \gamma \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( C \equiv C_{\max} \mod 8 \), which is impossible. Thus \( \gamma \) is self-dual. Further, there are \( 2^{k-1} \) singly-even codewords in \( C_{\max} \) which have the form \( c + \gamma_1 \) for some \( c \in C \). Since \( |C_{\max}| = 2^{k+1} \), we have \( 2^{k-1} \) more codewords in \( C_{\max} \) which are orthogonal to \( C_{\max} \) and have even weight. Thus there exists \( \gamma_2 \in C_{\max} \setminus C \) and \( C_1 = \langle C_{\max}, \gamma_2 \rangle \) is also a self-dual code. If \( \gamma_1 \) was orthogonal to \( \gamma_2 \), then there would exist a \( k+1 \) dimensional self-orthogonal code, which is impossible. Thus \( \gamma_1 \not\perp \gamma_2 \) and \( C_1 = \langle C_{\max}, \gamma_2 \rangle \) is a self-dual code, different from \( C \).

**Proof.** Let \( C_1 \) be a binary singly-even self-dual \((n,k,d)\)-code and \( C_2 \) a binary doubly-even self-dual \((n,k,d)\)-code. If \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are neighbors, i.e. they have the same maximal doubly-even subcode \( C_{\max} \), then all singly-even codewords in \( C_{\max}^\perp \) have weight \( w \), where \( d \leq w \leq n-d \).

**Theorem 2.** Let \( C_1 \) be a binary singly-even self-dual \((n,k,d)\)-code and \( C_2 \) a binary doubly-even self-dual \((n,k,d)\)-code. If \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are neighbors, i.e. they have the same maximal doubly-even subcode \( C_{\max} \), then all singly-even codewords in \( C_{\max}^\perp \) have weight \( w \), where \( d \leq w \leq n-d \).

**Proof.** There exist \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C_{\max}^\perp \) such that \( C_1 = \langle C_{\max}, \gamma_1 \rangle \) and \( C_2 = \langle C_{\max}, \gamma_2 \rangle \). Thus \( w(\gamma_1) \equiv 2 \mod 4 \) and \( w(\gamma_2) \equiv 0 \mod 4 \). Now we denote \( S := C_{\max} \setminus (C_1 \cup C_2) \). Then \( |S| = 2^{k-1} \). Then all codewords of \( C_1 \setminus C_{\max} \) have the form \( c + \gamma_1 \) for some \( c \in C_{\max} \) and all codewords of \( C_2 \setminus C_{\max} \) have the form \( c + \gamma_2 \) for some \( c \in C_{\max} \). Further all codewords of \( S \) have the form \( c + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \) for some \( c \in C_{\max} \). Since \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are self-dual we have \( \gamma_1 \not\perp \gamma_2 \). Thus \( \mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \equiv 1 \mod 2 \). Then

\[
(1) \quad w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) = w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2) - 2\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \equiv 2 + 0 - 2 \equiv 0 \mod 4
\]

Since \( \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \in C_{\max}^\perp \) we have \( \mu(a, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv 0 \mod 2 \) for all \( c \in C_{\max} \). Thus

\[
(2) \quad w(c + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) = w(a) + w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) - 2\mu(c, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv 0 + 0 - 0 \equiv 0 \mod 4
\]

which means that \( S \) consists only of codewords with doubly-even weight. Since \( |C_{\max}^\perp| = 2^{k+1} = |S| + |C_2| + |C_1 \setminus C_{\max}| = 2^{k-1} + 2^k + 2^{k-1} \), the number of singly-even codewords in \( C_{\max}^\perp \) is \( 2^{k-1} \). Therefore, for all singly-even codewords \( c \in C_{\max}^\perp \), implies \( c \in C_1 \).

Theorem 2 is applied in a computer search package for binary self-dual codes [10]. When building up a generator matrix for an \((n,k,d)\)-code, the number of singly-even codewords in the dual of an \((n,\kappa,\delta)\)-code with \( \kappa \leq k \) and \( \delta \geq d \) can be checked easily.

5. NEIGHBORHOODS OF CODES

Investigating the neighbors of self-dual codes leads us to some interesting facts about the relation of neighboring codes. We find out that codes with the same maximal subcode have a special relation to each other. Therefore we come up to the definition of a neighborhood for binary self-dual codes.

We extend the definition of neighbors to a set of codes, which are pairwise neighbors. We will call this set of codes a neighborhood. It is well known that a Type I code has a maximal doubly-even subcode of codimension 1. We will denote this maximal doubly-even subcode by \( C_{\max}^\perp \).
The proposition follows directly from the following fact. We know that even subcode will be denoted by $C \mod 4$ or $w(C)$ is of Type II. Now, let us assume indirectly that all weight. Then by Theorem 3. Actually, in the next theorem we prove that only the 2. case holds.

Remark 1. The neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of a self-dual code always consists of three codes.

For the convenience of the reader we will use the same notation in all statements and proofs. We denote the members of $\mathcal{N}$ by $C_1, C_2$ and $C_3$. Their coinciding doubly-even subcode will be denoted by $C_{max}$. Then $C_1 = \langle C_{max}, \gamma_1 \rangle$, $C_2 = \langle C_{max}, \gamma_2 \rangle$ and $C_3 = \langle C_{max}, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \rangle$ for suitable $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in C_{max}$. Furthermore, we assume that $w(\gamma_2) \equiv w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv 0 \mod 4$. Since $\mu(\gamma_2, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv 1 \mod 2$, we have $w(\gamma_1) \equiv 2 \mod 4$. Thus $C_1$ is a singly-even code and $C_2, C_3$ are doubly-even codes.

**Proposition 1.** Given a neighborhood of self-dual codes $\mathcal{N} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$. Then one of the following holds

1. all of its members are singly-even
2. two of its members are doubly-even and one is singly-even.

**Proof.** The proposition follows directly from the following fact. We know that $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$ are not orthogonal and both can have singly-even weight or doubly-even weight. Then by $w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) = w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2) - 2\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ we get $w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv w(\gamma_1) \mod 4$ or $w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv w(\gamma_2) \mod 4$.

Actually, in the next theorem we prove that only the 2. case holds.

**Theorem 3.** If $\mathcal{N}$ is a neighborhood of self-dual codes of length $n$, where $n$ is divisible by 8, then $\mathcal{N}$ contains exactly two doubly-even self-dual codes and one singly-even self-dual code.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{N} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ be a neighborhood of self-dual codes. If $C_2$ is of Type II, then by Proposition 1 we have that among $C_1$ and $C_3$ one is of Type I and one is of Type II. Now, let us assume indirectly that all $C_i \in \mathcal{N}$ are of Type I. Let $C_{max} \subseteq C_i$ denote the maximal doubly-even subcode of all $C_i \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then $C_{max}$ is permutation equivalent to a code generated by $G_{C_{max}} = (I_{k-1} A)$ for the unity matrix $I_{k-1}$ of dimension $k - 1$ and some matrix $A \in M_{k-1 \times k+1}(F_2)$. **First case:** If there are two columns in $A$ with numbers of 1’s $l_1$ and $l_2$ such that $l_1 \equiv l_2 \equiv 1 \mod 4$, and these two columns are orthogonal to each other, then because of $G_{C_{max}} = (A^T I_{k+1})$ we have that these two columns become rows of singly-even weight, but since they are orthogonal to each other, their sum has doubly-even weight. (Their sum is not contained in $C_{max}$, since the columns of $A$ are linearly independent.) Thus at least one $C_i$ is doubly-even. Then we know by Proposition 1 that two members of $\mathcal{N}$ will be doubly-even and one member will be singly-even.

**Second case:** Now we assume that these two columns are not orthogonal to each other. Let us denote the columns of $A$ with weight congruent to 3 mod 4 by $l_3, \ldots, l_{k+1}$. Then we define the vectors $v_i$ in the following way: $v_i[j] = 1 \Leftrightarrow l_i[j] = 1$ and $v_i[m] = 1$, where $l_i$ is the $m^{th}$ column of $G_{C_{max}}$. All other coordinates of $v_i$ are 0. Then $w(v_i) \equiv 3 + 1 \equiv 0 \mod 4$. Further, each $v_i$ is orthogonal to all codewords of $C_{max}$ and they have all doubly-even weight. If all $v_i \in C_{max}$, then they are a generating set for $C_{max}$ for dimensional reasons. Since two coordinates are 0 in all $v_i$, if we standardize the generator matrix by Gauss elimination, those two
If there are no two columns with weight 1, then the dual code of \( C \) would contain two codewords of weight 1, which is a contradiction to \( 1 \in C \). Thus the dual code of \( C_{\text{max}} \) would contain two codewords of weight 1, which is a contradiction to \( 1 \in C_{\text{max}} \).

**Theorem 4.** Let \( \mathcal{N} \) be a neighborhood of binary self-dual codes of length divisible by 8. If the singly-even member of \( \mathcal{N} \) has minimum distance 2, then the minimum distance of the doubly-even members coincide.

**Proof.** With the introduced notation we have \( d(C_1) = 2 \) and thus we can choose \( \gamma_1 \) such that \( w(\gamma_1) = 2 \). Let us denote the minimum distance of \( C_2 \) by \( d \). Then we have for all \( c \in C_{\text{max}} \)

\[
d \leq w(c + \gamma_2) \leq n - d.
\]

We know

\[
w(c + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) = w(c + \gamma_2) + w(\gamma_1) - 2\mu(c + \gamma_2, \gamma_1).
\]

Since \( c + \gamma_2 \) and \( \gamma_1 \) cannot be orthogonal, we have \( \mu(c + \gamma_2, \gamma_1) = 1 \). Thus \( w(c + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) = w(c + \gamma_2) \) for all \( c \in C_{\text{max}} \), which implies \( d(C_3) = d \).

**Theorem 5.** Let \( \mathcal{N} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\} \) be a neighborhood of self-dual codes of length divisible by 8. We assume that \( C_1 \) is singly-even and \( C_2 \) and \( C_3 \) are doubly-even. Then \( d(C_1) \leq \max\{d(C_2), d(C_3)\} \).

**Proof.** For technical reasons and to keep the proof as simplest as possible, we assume now that \( C_1 = \langle C_{\text{max}}, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \rangle \) is a singly-even code and \( C_2 = \langle C_{\text{max}}, \gamma_1 \rangle \), \( C_3 = \langle C_{\text{max}}, \gamma_2 \rangle \) are doubly-even codes. We assume indirectly that \( d = d(C_1) > \max\{d(C_2), d(C_3)\} \). Then for any \( c_i \in C_{\text{max}} \) we have

\[
d \leq w(c_i) \leq n - d
\]

and

\[
d \leq w(c_i + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \leq n - d \iff d \leq w(c_i + \gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2) - 2\mu(c_i + \gamma_1, \gamma_2) \leq n - d \iff
\]

\[
\max\{d(C_2), d(C_3)\} < d \leq w(c_i) + w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2) - 2\mu(c_i, \gamma_1) - 2\mu(c_i + \gamma_1, \gamma_2) \leq n - d
\]

\[
\iff 2\mu(c_i, \gamma_1) + 2\mu(c_i + \gamma_1, \gamma_2) \leq w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2)
\]

Then using Lemma 3 in the lefthand side we get

\[
2\mu(c_i, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) + 2\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \leq w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2).
\]

Since \( \mu(c_i, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \equiv 0 \mod 2 \) and \( \mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \equiv 1 \mod 2 \) we have

\[
2\mu(c_i, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) + 2\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) < w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2).
\]

Thus

\[
2\mu(c_i, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) < w(\gamma_1) + w(\gamma_2) - 2\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2).
\]

Thus \( w(c_i + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) > w(c_i) + w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) - w(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \), therefore \( w(c_i + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) > w(c_i) \) for each \( c_i \in C_{\text{max}} \) which is a contradiction, since if \( w(c_i) = n - d \), then \( w(c_i + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) > n - d \), which implies \( d(C_1) < d \), since \( 1 \in C_1 \).

**Corollary 1.** There is no better singly-even code than the best possible doubly-even code of the same length.
This answers a question of Rains and Sloane [11] who asked what is the smallest $n$, such that a Type I code of length $n$ is better than the best Type II code of the same length. Using the neighborhood approach we can see that such a code cannot exist. This shows that the neighborhood approach enables us to see binary self-dual codes in a different way and thus to see relations and properties which were not obvious before.

The existence of a Type I $(56, 28, 12)$-code is an open question [12]. It is known that Type II $(56, 28, 12)$-codes exist [13], [14], [15]. Considering our previous results, we come to the following fact.

**Corollary 2.** If there exists a Type I $(56, 28, 12)$-code, then it is a neighbor of a Type II $(56, 28, 12)$-code, since $12$ is the best possible minimum distance for length $56$.

6. Conclusion and further research

We are convinced that the investigation of binary self-dual codes through their neighborhoods opens new possibilities as well as in finding codes whose existence is not known yet, as well as to understand more the relations between codes and their properties.

By Theorem 5 we know that the minimum distance of a singly-even self-dual code cannot be greater than the minimum distance of its best doubly-even neighbor, but it can be equal.

There are three non-equivalent $(32, 16, 8)$ Type I codes [16]. All of them have a doubly-even neighbor with minimum distance $8$, which we computed by the program package TORCH [10]. Therefore the following research question arise.

**Problem 1.** Is there a condition for the code length $n$, such that the minimum distance of the best Type II code coincides with the minimum distance of its Type I neighbor?

**Problem 2.** Given a neighborhood $N = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ is it possible that all three minimum distances coincide, i.e. $d(C_1) = d(C_2) = d(C_3)$?
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