

**ON THE NONEXISTENCE OF UNKNOWN PERFECT
6- AND 8-CODES IN HAMMING SCHEMES $H(n, q)$
WITH q ARBITRARY**

YIMING HONG

(Received July 8, 1983)

0. Introduction

The first important study for the (non-)existence of perfect e -codes in the Hamming schemes $H(n, q)$ with arbitrary q was made by E. Bannai [1]. In his paper, Bannai determined the asymptotic locations of the zeros of Lloyd's polynomials as $\beta = \sqrt{(n-e)(q-1)}/q \rightarrow \infty$. (See 1.3.). Derived from this, he proved that, for each e , there exists a number $\beta_0(e)$ such that if $\beta \geq \beta_0(e)$, then there is no nontrivial perfect e -code in $H(n, q)$ for $q > 2$. In this paper, we will use Bannai's idea and explicitly calculate such numbers $\beta_0(e)$ for $e=6$ and 8. Namely, we will prove that we can take $\beta_0(6)=15$ and $\beta_0(8)=18$ under the assumption that $q \geq 30$. The remaining cases $\beta < \beta_0(e)$ (and $q \geq 30$) are also treated. Since the cases $q < 30$ are already determined (see 1.2.), we then get the following theorem.

Theorem A. *There exists no nontrivial perfect e -code in Hamming schemes $H(n, q)$ for $e=6$ or 8 with q arbitrary.*

As explained in section 1.2., the nonexistence of nontrivial perfect e -codes in $H(n, q)$ for all $e \geq 3$ was almost completed by Best [2]. He used Bannai's idea [1] to prove this nonexistence for $e=7$ and $e \geq 9$. The cases $e=3, 4$, and 5 were previously solved by Reuvers [7]. Thus theorem A fills the gap (of $e=6$ and 8) and we get:

Theorem B (see 1.1.2 and 1.2). *For $e \geq 3$, the only perfect e -codes in $H(n, q)$ are the trivial codes (of size 1 or 2) and the binary Golay code ($q=2, n=23, e=3$).*

We conclude this section with the following open problem.

For $e=1$ or 2, the existence or classification of perfect e -codes still remains open. As far as the author knows, for $e=2$, only the ternary Golay code ($q=3, n=11, e=2$) is known. For $e=1$, there are many of them known [12], and the classification seems very difficult.