Designs, Codes and Cryptography (2026) 94:157
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-026-01888-w

Steiner 3-designs as extensions

Michael Kiermaier[1] · **Vedran Krčadinac**[2] · **Alfred Wassermann**[1]

Received: 3 October 2025 / Revised: 20 April 2026 / Accepted: 30 May 2026 /
Published online: 7 July 2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract
In this article, we construct a Steiner system with the parameters $S(3, 6, 42)$, settling one of the smallest open parameter sets of Steiner 3-designs. Furthermore, we establish the existence of rotational Steiner quadruple systems on 46 and 92 points. Our construction method is based on extending Steiner 2-designs using prescribed extension groups. We also consider extensions to designs of higher strength. The article includes a table and a discussion of the status of all admissible parameters for Steiner 3-designs on at most 50 points.

Keywords Steiner system · Block design · Automorphism group

Mathematics Subject Classification 05B05

1 Introduction

Steiner systems are among the most fascinating objects in Design Theory, if not all of Combinatorics. They have a long history [15] and many applications, as well as connections to other important combinatorial structures [8]. A *Steiner system* $\mathcal{D} = (X, \mathcal{B})$ with parameters $S(t, k, v)$ comprises a set X of v *points*, and a set $\mathcal{B}$ of k-element subsets of X called *blocks* such that every t-subset of points is contained in exactly one block. Alternatively, $\mathcal{D}$ is called a *Steiner t-design* and the parameters are written as t-$(v, k, 1)$.

A necessary condition for the existence of Steiner systems is that

$$\binom{k-i}{t-i} \text{ divides } \binom{v-i}{t-i}, \quad \text{for all } i \in \{0, \ldots, t\}. \tag{1}$$

Communicated by M. Lavrauw.

✉ Michael Kiermaier
michael.kiermaier@uni-bayreuth.de

Vedran Krčadinac
vedran.krcadinac@math.hr

Alfred Wassermann
alfred.wassermann@uni-bayreuth.de

[1] Department of Mathematics, University of Bayreuth, 95440 Bayreuth, Germany

[2] Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Bijenička cesta 30, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

Given a point $P \in X$, the *derived design* $\mathrm{der}_P \mathcal{D}$ has $X \setminus \{P\}$ as points and $\{B \setminus \{P\} \mid B \in \mathcal{B},\ P \in B\}$ as blocks, and is a Steiner system $S(t-1, k-1, v-1)$ (for $t \geq 1$). Fisher's inequality states that any non-empty combinatorial design of strength 2 has at least as many blocks as points [4, 18]. In the case of a Steiner system $S(2, k, v)$, this condition reduces to $v \geq k^2 - k + 1$. The application to the derived design of a $S(3, k, v)$ design yields $v \geq k^2 - 3k + 4$. We refer to [2, 7] for other results and background material about combinatorial designs.

It was proved by probabilistic arguments that Steiner t-designs exist for all t [19, 32]. However, explicit examples are known only for $t \leq 5$, and only finitely many explicit examples are known for $t \geq 4$. Many known designs were constructed by prescribing groups of automorphisms and using computational methods, such as the Kramer–Mesner method [40]. In the recent paper [35], this method was fine-tuned for Steiner systems. Implementations of the different computational steps are available in the GAP [56] package *Prescribed Automorphism Groups* [41]. The paper [35] focuses on Steiner 2-designs, but the method can be used for arbitrary $S(t, k, v)$ designs, subject to time and memory limitations.

The purpose of this paper is to construct explicit examples of small Steiner 3-designs. There are 25 admissible parameter sets $S(3, k, v)$ with $v \leq 50$. Previously, designs were known for 20 of these parameter sets, nonexistence was established for one, and existence was an open problem for the remaining four. Our main result is the construction of a design with parameters $S(3, 6, 42)$, settling one of the open cases. Furthermore, we establish the existence of rotational Steiner quadruple systems for $v = 46$ and $v = 92$, and we construct many new Steiner designs with parameters for which existence was already known. We made all constructed designs available in GAP-readable format, compatible with the DESIGN [53] package. They can be accessed as a Zenodo data set [33] and through our web page https://web.math.hr/~krcko/results/steiner3.html.

In Sect. 2, we present a table of admissible parameters $S(3, k, v)$ with $v \leq 50$, containing information on the number of non-isomorphic designs and extensibility. Examples of the newly established designs are given by listing the prescribed groups and base blocks (Theorems 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3).

In Sect. 3, we describe a procedure for extending Steiner systems with prescribed extension groups, based on the Kramer–Mesner method. The new $S(3, 6, 42)$ design was constructed in this way. We also tried constructing designs for the remaining three open parameter sets $S(3, 6, 46)$, $S(3, 5, 41)$, and $S(3, 5, 50)$. No such design could be found, but many new Steiner 2-designs for the derived parameters $S(2, 5, 45)$, $S(2, 4, 40)$, and $S(2, 4, 49)$ were constructed in this process Theorems 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

Finally, in Sect. 4, we discuss extensions of $S(3, k, v)$ designs to t-designs of strength $t > 3$. Using the procedure from the previous section, we prove that the new $S(3, 6, 42)$ design does not extend to a 4-design if any nontrivial extension group is assumed Theorem 4.1. We also prove that the only known $S(5, 7, 28)$ design does not extend to a 6-design (Theorem 4.2).

2 A table of admissible parameters

Table 1 contains all admissible parameters $S(3, k, v)$ with $v \leq 50$. Admissibility means that the divisibility conditions (1) and Fisher's inequality for the derived designs are satisfied. In our range, the only admissible parameter set eliminated by the latter condition is $S(3, 7, 22)$. The first two columns contain v and k, followed by the number b of blocks. The fourth column

Table 1 Steiner 3-designs with at most 50 points

v	k	b	Nd	$t_{\max} \geq$	$t_{\max} \leq$	References	Comments
8	4	14	1	3	3	[1, 59]	$AG_2(3, 2)$
10	4	30	1	5	5	[1, 55, 59]	Möb(3)
14	4	91	4	3	3	[49]	
16	4	140	1,054,163	3	3	[31, 51]	$AG_2(4, 2)$
17	5	68	1	3	3	[59]	Möb(4)
20	4	285	$\geq$ 60,077	3	15		
22	4	385	$\geq$ 52,240	5	17	[14]	
22	6	77	1	5	5	[59]	
26	4	650	$\geq$ 52,170	3	21	[5]	
26	5	260	$\geq$1	5	8	[14, 23]	
26	6	130	1	3	3	[6, 12, 55]	Möb(5)
28	4	819	$\geq$ 1,028,387	3	3	[5]	Spherical
32	4	1240	$\geq$ 1516	3	27		$AG_2(5, 2)$
34	4	1496	$\geq$ 1569	5	29	[3]	
37	7	222	0	1	1		Möb(6)
38	4	2109	$\geq$ 1547	3	3		
40	4	2470	$\geq$ 1557	3	35		
41	5	1066	?	2	16		
42	6	574	$\geq$1	3	9		Theorem 2.3
44	4	3311	$\geq$ 1504	3	39		
46	4	3795	$\geq$ 1559	5	41	[22]	
46	6	759	?	2	3		
50	4	4900	$\geq$ 1535	3	45		
50	5	1960	?	2	20		
50	8	350	1	3	3	[13, 55]	Möb(7)

labeled 'Nd' contains the number of $S(3, k, v)$ designs up to isomorphism, or a lower bound if the exact number is not known. Let $t_{\max}$ be the largest integer t such that an $S(t, k+t-3, v+t-3)$ design exists. Note that, by taking derived designs, all $S(t, k+t-3, v+t-3)$ designs with $t \leq t_{\max}$ do exist. The fifth and the sixth columns contain the sharpest known lower and upper bounds on $t_{\max}$, respectively. The last two columns contain references and comments.

We first discuss the parameters from Table 1 belonging to known infinite families of Steiner 3-designs. The most widely studied family are Steiner quadruple systems $S(3, 4, v)$, abbreviated as SQS(v). Two comprehensive surveys are [29, 47]. Designs SQS(v) are known to exist for all admissible v, i.e. for $v \equiv 2, 4 \pmod 6$, $v \geq 8$. This was first proved in [26], and simplifications were given in [27, 28, 45, 60]. A subfamily with parameters $S(3, 4, 2^n)$, $n \geq 3$ are the n-dimensional affine spaces $AG_2(n, 2)$ over the binary field, with planes as blocks. This family was already described by Kirkman [36]. Another subfamily are the spherical geometries of order $q = 3$ with parameters $S(3, 4, 3^n+1)$, $n \geq 2$, discussed below.

The uniqueness of SQS(8) and SQS(10) designs was proved in [1, 59]. In [49], it was computationally proved that there are exactly four SQS(14) designs up to isomorphism. A computer enumeration of SQS(16) designs was performed in [31], requiring about 12 years

of CPU time. We repeated the calculation using different software and confirmed the number 1,054,163 of SQS(16) designs up to isomorphism; see Sect. 3 for more details. In [46], it was established that there are at least 10^{17} non-isomorphic SQS(20) designs, making a computer enumeration infeasible. Asymptotic estimates for the number of non-isomorphic SQS(v) designs for sufficiently large admissible v are known [16, 44].

In Table 1, we give rough lower bounds on the number of SQS(v) designs for $20 \leq v \leq 50$, based on explicitly constructed examples. We expect the actual numbers 'Nd' to be orders of magnitude larger: Our lower bounds are mainly a consequence of resource limitations. To ensure the designs could be stored in the data set [33], we had to impose an arbitrary stopping point on the search. For $v \geq 32$, we decided to terminate the search when the number of constructed designs exceeded 1500. The designs were constructed by prescribing groups of automorphisms and using the implementation of the Kramer–Mesner method from [41], described in [35]. *Nauty/Traces* [48] was used for isomorphism tests and to compute the full automorphism groups.

We aimed to choose the prescribed groups large enough to make the computation feasible, while still producing many non-isomorphic designs. For some parameters, there is a "classical" design $\mathcal{D}$ with a large full automorphism group. For example, one SQS(28) design is the spherical geometry for $q = n = 3$, with full automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2, 27) \rtimes C_6$ of order 58,968. One example of an SQS(32) design is $\mathrm{AG}_2(5, 2)$, with $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{AGL}(5, 2)$ of order 319,979,520. We can take subgroups $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$ and construct designs with G as prescribed group, possibly getting other designs besides $\mathcal{D}$. When there is no such "classical" design, we prescribed extensions of regular permutation representations of groups of orders v and $v - 1$, utilizing the GAP [56] library of small groups.

An SQS(v) design is called *cyclic* and denoted by CSQS(v) if it has an automorphism acting as a v-cycle on the point set. Moreover, it is called *rotational* and denoted by RoSQS(v) if it has an automorphism acting as a $(v - 1)$-cycle on the point set. In the latter case, this automorphism has a unique fixed point, which will usually be denoted by ∞. Designs of type CSQS(v) and RoSQS(v) have been extensively studied, but the sets of all values v for which they exist have not been fully determined. For CSQS(v) designs, there is only one undecided value v below 100, which is $v = 94$ [17, Theorem 4.6]. We were not able to construct a CSQS(94) design with our method, nor to rule it out. For RoSQS(v) designs, there were seven open values below 100, namely $v = 46, 56, 70, 82, 86, 92$, and 98 [30, Table I]. We succeeded to construct rotational designs RoSQS(46) and RoSQS(92). Examples can be downloaded from [33], and here we describe one of each by giving base blocks.

Theorem 2.1 *There exists a* RoSQS(46) *design.*

Proof Let G be the group $\mathbb{Z}_{45} = \{0, \ldots, 44\}$ with addition modulo 45. Then the union of the G-orbits of the 4-subsets listed below forms a RoSQS(46) design:

{0, 1, 2, 21}	{0, 1, 3, 24}	{0, 1, 4, 22}	{0, 1, 5, 42}	{0, 1, 6, 41}
{0, 1, 7, 31}	{0, 1, 8, 27}	{0, 1, 9, 19}	{0, 1, 10, 13}	{0, 1, 11, ∞}
{0, 1, 12, 37}	{0, 1, 14, 35}	{0, 1, 15, 25}	{0, 1, 16, 40}	{0, 1, 17, 26}
{0, 1, 18, 28}	{0, 1, 23, 33}	{0, 1, 29, 38}	{0, 1, 30, 34}	{0, 1, 32, 36}
{0, 1, 39, 43}	{0, 2, 4, 35}	{0, 2, 5, 29}	{0, 2, 6, 26}	{0, 2, 7, 28}
{0, 2, 8, 14}	{0, 2, 9, 36}	{0, 2, 10, 17}	{0, 2, 11, 40}	{0, 2, 12, 22}
{0, 2, 13, 31}	{0, 2, 15, 19}	{0, 2, 16, ∞}	{0, 2, 18, 38}	{0, 2, 20, 24}
{0, 2, 25, 39}	{0, 2, 27, 34}	{0, 2, 30, 42}	{0, 2, 32, 37}	{0, 3, 6, 13}

$\{0, 3, 7, \infty\}$	$\{0, 3, 9, 30\}$	$\{0, 3, 11, 32\}$	$\{0, 3, 12, 16\}$	$\{0, 3, 14, 38\}$
$\{0, 3, 15, 37\}$	$\{0, 3, 17, 20\}$	$\{0, 3, 18, 39\}$	$\{0, 3, 19, 22\}$	$\{0, 3, 23, 34\}$
$\{0, 3, 25, 40\}$	$\{0, 4, 9, 26\}$	$\{0, 4, 11, 28\}$	$\{0, 4, 12, 21\}$	$\{0, 4, 17, 31\}$
$\{0, 4, 18, 37\}$	$\{0, 4, 19, 39\}$	$\{0, 4, 20, 34\}$	$\{0, 4, 23, 38\}$	$\{0, 4, 29, 40\}$
$\{0, 5, 11, 19\}$	$\{0, 5, 12, 28\}$	$\{0, 5, 14, 36\}$	$\{0, 5, 17, 32\}$	$\{0, 5, 18, 25\}$
$\{0, 5, 20, 37\}$	$\{0, 5, 23, \infty\}$	$\{0, 5, 24, 35\}$	$\{0, 5, 27, 39\}$	$\{0, 5, 31, 38\}$
$\{0, 6, 15, 38\}$	$\{0, 6, 16, 22\}$	$\{0, 6, 17, 23\}$	$\{0, 6, 18, 36\}$	$\{0, 6, 19, \infty\}$
$\{0, 6, 20, 32\}$	$\{0, 7, 15, 29\}$	$\{0, 7, 17, 33\}$	$\{0, 8, 16, 32\}$	$\{0, 8, 19, 35\}$
$\{0, 8, 21, 33\}$	$\{0, 8, 25, \infty\}$	$\{0, 9, 21, \infty\}$	$\{0, 9, 22, 35\}$	$\{0, 15, 30, \infty\}$

Theorem 2.2 *There exists a* RoSQS(92) *design.*

Proof Let G be the subgroup of the symmetric group on $\mathbb{Z}_{91}$ generated by $x \mapsto x + 1$ and $x \mapsto 4x$. Then, G is of order 546 and isomorphic to a semidirect product $C_{91} \rtimes C_6$. The union of the G-orbits of the 4-subsets listed below forms a RoSQS(92) design:

$\{0, 1, 2, 13\}$	$\{0, 1, 3, 52\}$	$\{0, 1, 4, 29\}$	$\{0, 1, 5, 31\}$	$\{0, 1, 6, 17\}$
$\{0, 1, 7, 59\}$	$\{0, 1, 8, 26\}$	$\{0, 1, 9, 48\}$	$\{0, 1, 10, 66\}$	$\{0, 1, 11, \infty\}$
$\{0, 1, 14, 39\}$	$\{0, 1, 15, 27\}$	$\{0, 1, 16, 43\}$	$\{0, 1, 18, 76\}$	$\{0, 1, 19, 58\}$
$\{0, 1, 20, 85\}$	$\{0, 1, 21, 40\}$	$\{0, 1, 22, 61\}$	$\{0, 1, 24, 36\}$	$\{0, 1, 25, 60\}$
$\{0, 1, 28, 79\}$	$\{0, 1, 32, 84\}$	$\{0, 1, 33, 63\}$	$\{0, 1, 34, 45\}$	$\{0, 1, 35, 83\}$
$\{0, 1, 37, 55\}$	$\{0, 1, 38, 71\}$	$\{0, 1, 41, 47\}$	$\{0, 1, 44, 70\}$	$\{0, 1, 46, 67\}$
$\{0, 1, 50, 77\}$	$\{0, 1, 54, 80\}$	$\{0, 1, 56, 89\}$	$\{0, 1, 57, 62\}$	$\{0, 1, 64, 78\}$
$\{0, 1, 72, 82\}$	$\{0, 1, 73, 81\}$	$\{0, 1, 75, 86\}$	$\{0, 2, 5, 71\}$	$\{0, 2, 7, 44\}$
$\{0, 2, 8, 30\}$	$\{0, 2, 9, 33\}$	$\{0, 2, 10, 67\}$	$\{0, 2, 11, 14\}$	$\{0, 2, 12, 34\}$
$\{0, 2, 20, 42\}$	$\{0, 2, 24, 48\}$	$\{0, 2, 32, 57\}$	$\{0, 2, 35, 72\}$	$\{0, 2, 36, 61\}$
$\{0, 2, 37, \infty\}$	$\{0, 2, 41, 56\}$	$\{0, 2, 43, 63\}$	$\{0, 2, 55, 60\}$	$\{0, 2, 59, 81\}$
$\{0, 3, 9, 21\}$	$\{0, 3, 18, 51\}$	$\{0, 3, 31, 53\}$	$\{0, 3, 36, 72\}$	$\{0, 3, 43, 76\}$
$\{0, 3, 50, 56\}$	$\{0, 3, 55, 84\}$	$\{0, 5, 11, 66\}$	$\{0, 5, 14, 61\}$	$\{0, 5, 30, 85\}$
$\{0, 5, 33, 77\}$	$\{0, 5, 41, 82\}$	$\{0, 5, 47, 65\}$	$\{0, 5, 49, 70\}$	$\{0, 7, 21, 63\}$
$\{0, 7, 28, 42\}$	$\{0, 7, 36, \infty\}$	$\{0, 13, 26, 52\}$	$\{0, 13, 65, \infty\}$	$\{0, 15, 73, \infty\}$

Steiner systems $S(3, q+1, q^n+1)$ are known as *spherical geometries* or *inversive spaces*. They exist for all $n \geq 2$ and prime powers q [59]. The most studied case is $n = 2$, called *inversive* or *Möbius planes* and denoted by Möb(q) in Table 1. Classical inversive planes are called *Miquelian* because they are characterized by Miquel's theorem [11, Theorem 6.1.5]. The only known non-Miquelian examples have orders $q = 2^{2e+1}$, $e \geq 1$, and are associated with the ovoids of Tits [57].

The uniqueness of Möb(q) was proved for $q = 4$ in [59], for $q = 5$ in [6, 12], and for $q = 7$ in [13]. For $q = 3, 5, 7$, uniqueness also follows from a theorem of Thas [55] and the uniqueness of affine planes AG$(2, q)$. For similar results about larger orders q, see [52] and the references therein. Designs Möb(6) do not exist because their derived designs would be affine planes of order 6.

There are three "sporadic" designs in Table 1, not belonging to the infinite families discussed above. The first is the twice derived Witt 5-design with parameters $S(3, 6, 22)$, also

known to be unique by [59]. The second has parameters $S(3, 5, 26)$ and was investigated in [23], where the question was raised whether this design is in fact unique. In Sect. 3, we explore the possibility of a computational approach to this question, which remains open. The third sporadic example is the following new $S(3, 6, 42)$ design.

Theorem 2.3 *There exists an $S(3, 6, 42)$ design.*

Proof Let $G = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \leq S_{42}$ be the permutation group generated by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= (1, 2, 4)(3, 9, 7)(5, 6, 8)(10, 11, 13)(12, 18, 16)(14, 15, 17)(19, 38, 34)\\ &\quad (20, 39, 36)(21, 37, 35)(22, 42, 32)(23, 40, 31)(24, 41, 33)(28, 30, 29),\\ \beta &= (1, 10)(2, 11)(3, 12)(4, 16)(5, 17)(6, 18)(7, 13)(8, 14)(9, 15)(19, 23)\\ &\quad (20, 24)(21, 22)(25, 35)(26, 36)(27, 34)(28, 33)(29, 31)(30, 32)\\ &\quad (38, 39)(41, 42).\end{aligned}$$

This is a group of order 432 isomorphic to AGL(2, 3). Then the union of the G-orbits of the 6-subsets listed below is an $S(3, 6, 42)$ design:

$$\begin{array}{lll}\{1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12\} & \{1, 2, 4, 20, 36, 39\} & \{1, 2, 13, 17, 31, 34\}\\ \{1, 10, 19, 22, 25, 30\} & \{1, 11, 20, 21, 29, 34\} & \{19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24\}\\ \{19, 22, 31, 36, 38, 42\} & & \end{array}$$

The group G from the proof of Theorem 2.3 is the full automorphism group of the design $\mathcal{D}$. It partitions the point set into two orbits, one of size 18 and the other of size 24. The unusual action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$ might be the reason why $\mathcal{D}$ remained undiscovered for so long. Another Steiner design constructed from a non-transitive group is the $S(5, 6, 36)$ design from [3], where a permutation group comprising two copies of the natural action of PGL(2, 17) on 18 points was used. Our new design has $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D}) \cong \mathrm{AGL}(2, 3)$, suggesting a connection with the affine plane of order 3.

Steiner systems $S(t, k, v)$ are special cases of (v, k, t)-covering designs [21]. Since each t-subset is covered exactly once, Steiner systems are covering designs with the minimal number of blocks. Thus, the Steiner system $S(3, 6, 42)$ is a $(42, 6, 3)$-covering design meeting the optimal bound of 574 blocks. The previous known best bound was 644, see the "La Jolla Covering Designs Repository" [20].

Three parameter sets in Table 1 remain open with regards to existence: $S(3, 5, 41)$, $S(3, 6, 46)$, and $S(3, 5, 50)$. In the next section, we describe the computational approach that led to the discovery of the $S(3, 6, 42)$ design and our attempts to construct designs for the remaining open parameter sets.

3 Extending designs with prescribed groups

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an $S(t, k, v)$ design with a group G of automorphisms fixing a point ∞. Then the derived design $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{der}_\infty \mathcal{E}$ is also G-invariant. In this situation, we refer to $\mathcal{E}$ as an *extension* of $\mathcal{D}$ and to G as an *extension group*. Clearly, G must be a subgroup of both $\mathrm{Aut}\,\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}\,\mathcal{E}$. For example, a rotational SQS(v) design is the extension of a cyclic Steiner triple system STS($v - 1$) with C_{v-1} as extension group. We use the customary abbreviation STS(v) for $S(2, 3, v)$ designs, known as Steiner triple systems.

Our strategy for constructing Steiner 3-designs is to extend Steiner 2-designs with prescribed extension groups. Typically, we first classify $S(2, k-1, v-1)$ designs $\mathcal{D}$ with a fixed

prescribed group G. Depending on the parameters, this is a significantly smaller computation than classifying the corresponding 3-designs directly. Then, for each such design $\mathcal{D}$, we add ∞ to all blocks of $\mathcal{D}$ and then compute all extensions to a G-invariant $S(3, k, v)$ design $\mathcal{E}$. The G-invariance of $\mathcal{E}$ precisely means that the extension consists of complete G-orbits of k-subsets that do not contain ∞. For a fixed $\mathcal{D}$, this also requires less computation than a full classification of G-invariant designs $\mathcal{E}$, because the blocks through ∞ are already given. The k-subset orbits covering any 3-subset already covered by $\mathcal{D}$ can be discarded, reducing the size of the Kramer–Mesner system. The extension process is a modification of the standard Kramer–Mesner algorithm and is available in the package [41] as the command `ExtendSteinerDesign`.

In [31, 49], SQS(14) and SQS(16) designs were classified by extending STS(13) and STS(15) designs, respectively. To get a full classification, all non-isomorphic STS designs must be extended with the trivial extension group. The 80 non-isomorphic STS(15) designs were determined in [25]. In [31], extending each STS(15) design was set up as an instance of the exact cover problem, and D. E. Knuth's *dancing links* algorithm [37] was used to solve these problems.

For a given {0, 1}-matrix, the *exact cover problem* is to find a subset of columns whose sum is exactly 1 in every row. In Knuth's terminology [37], the rows are called *items* and the columns are called *options*.

We repeated the calculation using the *ssxcc* [38] implementation of the more recent *dancing cells* algorithm [39]. The obtained systems SQS(16) need to be checked for isomorphism, but this requires less CPU time than the extension phase. We used the `BlockDesignFilter` command from [41], relying on *nauty/Traces* [48]. We got the same total number of non-isomorphic SQS(16) designs and distribution by full automorphism group orders as in [31, Table 1].

One could attempt to prove the uniqueness of the $S(3, 5, 26)$ design in this manner. The derived designs have parameters $S(2, 4, 25)$ and were classified in [54]; there are 18 examples up to isomorphism. However, in this case the extension phase seems infeasible, because each $S(2, 4, 25)$ design gives rise to a very large exact cover problem, i.e. each problem has 2100 items and 16,380 options, out of which 210 are to be chosen. We couldn't solve these exact cover problems with the resources available to us. For comparison, the 80 exact cover problems in the classification of SQS(16) designs have 420 items and 945 options, out of which 105 are to be chosen.

When a complete classification is out of reach, prescribing a nontrivial extension group G may reduce the computation to manageable size. An added benefit is that we have a natural way of choosing G: It must be a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$. For example, 15 non-isomorphic $S(2, 5, 41)$ designs are known, with full automorphism group orders given in Table 2. Among them are all designs with automorphisms of order 3, classified in [42]. The known $S(2, 5, 41)$ designs are included in the Zenodo data set [33]. Two of the designs, with $|\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})| = 24$ and $|\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})| = 18$, extend to an $S(3, 6, 42)$ design $\mathcal{E}$. For both designs $\mathcal{D}$, the full automorphism group can be used as extension group. The group of order 24 is large enough to construct the $S(3, 6, 42)$ design $\mathcal{E}$ even without prescribing the derived subdesign, but it would be difficult to guess its action on 42 points without the knowledge of the derived design. The group is isomorphic to $\mathrm{SL}(2, 3)$ and acts in five orbits of sizes 1, 1, 8, 8, and 24. Instead of guessing, we get the extension groups from the prescribed derived subdesigns $\mathcal{D}$. We examined all known $S(2, 5, 41)$ designs with $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$, $|G| \geq 10$ as extension groups, and found only one $S(3, 6, 42)$ design up to isomorphism, given in Theorem 2.3.

We tried to construct designs for the remaining three open parameter sets from Table 1 by following the same procedure, but no designs were found. Derived designs of a hypothetical

Table 2 Distribution of the known $S(2, 5, 41)$ designs by full automorphism group orders

$\lvert\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})\rvert$	Nd
205	1
120	2
24	2
20	1
18	4
12	1
9	1
6	2
2	1

Table 3 Distribution of the known $S(2, 5, 45)$ designs by full automorphism group orders

$\lvert\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})\rvert$	Nd
360	1
160	1
72	6
40	1
32	3
24	3
16	16
8	142
6	2
4	221
2	648
1	28

$S(3, 6, 46)$ design have parameters $S(2, 5, 45)$. Previously, 65 non-isomorphic $S(2, 5, 45)$ designs were known [9]; see also [10] and references therein. We managed to construct over 1000 new examples by prescribing various groups of orders 16 and 8, and by applying so-called paramodifications [50].

Theorem 3.1 *There exist at least* 1072 *non-isomorphic* $S(2, 5, 45)$ *designs. Their distribution by orders of full automorphism groups is given in Table* 3.

These designs, as well as the ones from Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, are also available in [33]. We systematically ran the extension algorithm on the known examples and extension groups of orders $|G| > 10$, and even on most groups of orders 8 and 10 barring a few hard cases, but we didn't get any $S(3, 6, 46)$ designs. The search would take too long for smaller extension groups.

Derived designs of $S(3, 5, 41)$ designs have parameters $S(2, 4, 40)$. The classical example is PG(3, 3); we managed to construct many more examples by prescribing various groups of automorphisms and using the Kramer–Mesner method.

Theorem 3.2 *There exist at least* 10,791 *non-isomorphic* $S(2, 4, 40)$ *designs. Their distribution by orders of full automorphism groups is given in Table* 4.

Table 4 Distribution of the known $S(2, 4, 40)$ designs by full automorphism group orders

$\lvert\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})\rvert$	Nd	$\lvert\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})\rvert$	Nd	$\lvert\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})\rvert$	Nd
12,130,560	1	486	13	96	22
151,632	1	480	1	81	43
15,552	1	468	1	80	3
10,368	1	432	13	78	13
7776	1	384	1	72	467
5184	4	324	153	64	1
3888	5	320	1	60	1
2916	1	288	12	54	11
2592	5	256	3	48	163
2106	3	216	21	40	25
1944	2	192	3	39	194
1458	1	162	19	36	5346
1296	18	160	3	32	29
972	11	156	3	27	6
864	2	144	82	26	176
648	57	120	1	24	2782
576	2	108	169	20	894

Table 5 Distribution of the known $S(2, 4, 49)$ designs by full automorphism group orders

$\lvert\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})\rvert$	Nd
147	14
144	2
72	2
49	222
48	332
45	288
42	479
36	1672
30	1498
27	7432
20	9879
14	260

While trying to extend these designs to $S(3, 5, 41)$ designs, we could eliminate all extension groups of orders greater than 40. Some groups of order 40 require a lot of computation and we couldn't examine them exhaustively. This is also true for groups of orders less than 40. To construct $S(3, 5, 50)$ designs by the same method, $S(2, 4, 49)$ designs are required. Again, we first applied the usual Kramer–Mesner approach to the parameters $S(2, 4, 49)$ with various prescribed groups.

Theorem 3.3 *There exist at least* 22,080 *non-isomorphic* $S(2, 4, 49)$ *designs. Their distribution by orders of full automorphism groups is given in Table* 5.

The cut-off order for the extension group is now 72. We could eliminate all extensions of the designs from Theorem 3.3 with $|G| \geq 72$, but as one can see from Table 5, these groups act on only 18 non-isomorphic $S(2, 4, 49)$ designs. There is no classical example with these parameters, and we did not find many designs $\mathcal{D}$ with large enough $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$ so that the extension process is computationally feasible.

4 Extending to higher strengths

In Table 1, the sixth column labeled '$t_{\max} \leq$' contains the largest strength t for which an $S(3, k, v)$ design could possibly be extended to an $S(t, k', v')$ design, according to the current knowledge of nonexistence results. Most entries follow from the divisibility conditions (1) on the parameters $S(t, k', v')$, with three exceptions. In [49] and in [51], it was proved by exhaustive computer searches that $S(4, 5, 15)$ and $S(4, 5, 17)$ designs do not exist. Designs with the parameters $S(4, 6, 18)$ were ruled out in [59, Satz 6] based on a case-by-case analysis. Hence, for the parameters $S(3, 4, 14)$, $S(3, 4, 16)$, and $S(3, 5, 17)$, the bound in the sixth column is $t_{\max} \leq 3$. The fifth column contains strengths of the largest known extensions. As it happens, all these (nontrivial) extensions are 5-designs, with parameters $S(5, 6, 12)$, $S(5, 6, 24)$, $S(5, 8, 24)$, $S(5, 7, 28)$, $S(5, 6, 36)$, and $S(5, 6, 48)$. Known designs with these parameters are also included in [33]. Not a single Steiner 4-design was discovered directly; all known examples are actually derived 5-designs.

A general criterion restricting extensibility is the following inequality for Steiner systems $S(t, k, v)$ from [58, Proposition 2.2]:

$$(t + 1)(k - t + 1) \leq v. \tag{2}$$

However, this criterion does not lead to any improvements in the upper bounds on $t_{\max}$ listed in Table 1. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, there is only a single parameter set known where Inequality (2) actually improves the combination of admissibility and Fisher's inequality, namely $S(3, 9, 65)$: the divisibility conditions (1) imply $t_{\max} \leq 12$, which is then improved to $t_{\max} \leq 9$ by (2). Notably, the further improvement $t_{\max} \leq 3$ has been shown in [24, p. 241].

We remark that the existence table in [8, Sect. 5.3] is organized differently: Admissible parameters $S(t, k, v)$ are grouped according to $k - t$ and $n = v - t$. There, all entries in the column labeled '$t \leq$' follow from necessary conditions on the parameters, while (non)existence results are given in separate columns labeled '$\exists$' and '$\nexists$'. The table was published in 2007, but only two entries need to be updated with new results. The first is the nonexistence of $S(4, 5, 17)$ designs from [51], and the second is the new $S(3, 6, 42)$ design from Theorem 2.3.

In view of the remark about Steiner 4-designs above, it would be noteworthy to extend some of the 3-designs from Table 1. The procedure of extending designs with prescribed groups, used in the previous section for $t = 3$, can be used without change for higher strengths. In the first place, we searched for extensions of the new $S(3, 6, 42)$ design $\mathcal{D}$ using subgroups $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{D})$ as extension groups. We eliminated all nontrivial subgroups, thereby proving the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1 *If the $S(3, 6, 42)$ design of Theorem 2.3 can be extended to an $S(4, 7, 43)$ design $\mathcal{E}$ by adding a point ∞, then the point stabilizer $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{E})_\infty$ is trivial.*

Eliminating the trivial extension group would require solving an exact cover problem with 103,320 items and 288,504 options, out of which 2952 are to be chosen. We could not




Fig. 1 Derived designs of the three known $S(5, 6, 24)$ designs

perform this computation, but we did manage to eliminate the trivial extension group for the following Steiner 5-design.

Theorem 4.2 *The Steiner system* $S(5, 7, 28)$ *constructed in* [14] *does not extend to a Steiner* 6*-design.*

Here, an exact cover problem with 343,980 items and 39,312 options, out of which 12,285 are to be chosen, was computationally proved to have no solutions. However, this result does not improve the '$t_{\max} \leq$' entry for $S(3, 5, 26)$ designs, because designs with these parameters are not known to be unique. Potentially, some other yet-undiscovered $S(3, 5, 26)$ design might admit an extension all the way to a Steiner 8-design.

The smallest parameters of a Steiner 3-design for which the extension problem is open are $S(3, 4, 20)$. We ran a lot of extension procedures using extension groups of orders $|G| \geq 10$, but did not find any $S(4, 5, 21)$ design. Our attempts to find other unknown extensions of the designs from Table 1 were also unsuccessful. Unfortunately, these calculations provide very little evidence that the sought-after Steiner 4-designs do not exist. We shall illustrate this with $S(3, 4, 22)$ designs, for which a few extensions are known.

Denniston [14] established the existence of $S(5, 6, 24)$ designs by prescribing $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 23)$ as a group of automorphisms. It is known that there are exactly three non-isomorphic designs under these assumptions. Figure 1 describes the derived designs of these three 5-designs. The order of the largest possible extension group G is written above the arrow, and below are the indices $[\mathrm{Aut}\,\mathcal{D} : G]$ and $[\mathrm{Aut}\,\mathcal{E} : G]$. Thus, there are three non-isomorphic $S(3, 4, 22)$ designs which we know to be extensible to $S(4, 5, 23)$ designs by an extension group of order 11. However, finding these extensions computationally amounts to exact cover problems requiring too much CPU time to be solved exhaustively. Each problem has 630 items and 1758 options, out of which 126 are to be chosen. Worse still, there are exactly 26,035 non-isomorphic $S(3, 4, 22)$ designs with an automorphism of order 11. If we go from smaller to larger t, we have no easy way to distinguish the three extensible designs in the list of 26,035 systems $S(3, 4, 22)$ with a group of order 11. In this case, it is much easier to construct the $S(4, 5, 23)$ and $S(5, 6, 24)$ designs directly, because larger prescribed groups of orders 253 and 6072 can be used.

To conclude, we believe that we have mostly exhausted the useful applications of extending Steiner designs with prescribed groups, as outlined in Sects. 3 and 4. To make further progress, additional restrictions derived from new theoretical insights will be needed, or alternative computational techniques—such as the method of tactical decompositions [34, 43]—will have to be implemented and applied.

Acknowledgements Part of this work was done while Vedran Krčadinac was visiting the University of Bayreuth supported by a Scholarship from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). Vedran Krčadinac is partially supported by the European Union—NextGenerationEU through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan 2021–2026 Institutional Grants of University of Zagreb Faculty of Science (IK IA 1.1.3 Impact4Math). The authors wish to thank the anonymous reviewers for their time and valuable input.

Author Contributions All authors contributed equally.

Funding Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Data Availability We made all constructed designs available in GAP-readable format, compatible with the DESIGN [53] package. They can be accessed as a Zenodo data set [33] and through our web page https://web.math.pmf.unizg.hr/~krcko/results/steiner3.html.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

1. Barrau J.A.: On the combinatory problem of Steiner. K. Akad. Wet. Amst. Proc. Sect. Sci. **11**, 352–360 (1908).
2. Beth T., Jungnickel D., Lenz H.: Design Theory, vol. 1, 2nd edn Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1999) https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511549533.
3. Betten A., Laue R., Wassermann A.: A Steiner 5-design on 36 points. Des. Codes Cryptogr. **17**, 181–186 (1999). https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026427226213.
4. Bose R.C.: A note on Fisher's inequality for balanced incomplete block designs. Ann. Math. Stat. **20**(4), 619–620 (1949). https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729958.
5. Chang Y., Fan B., Feng T., Holt D.F., Östergård P.R.J.: Classification of cyclic Steiner quadruple systems. J. Comb. Des. **25**(3), 103–121 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1002/jcd.21530.
6. Chen Y.: The Steiner system $S(3, 6, 26)$. J. Geom. **2**, 7–28 (1972). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02148135.
7. Colbourn C.J., Dinitz J.H. (eds.): Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, 2nd edn Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (2007) https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420010541.
8. Colbourn C.J., Mathon R.: Steiner systems. In: Colbourn C.J., Dinitz J.H. (eds.) Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, 2nd edn, pp. 102–110. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (2007).
9. Crnković D., Zrinski T.: Constructing block designs with a prescribed automorphism group using genetic algorithm. J. Comb. Des. **30**(7), 515–526 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1002/jcd.21838.
10. Crnković D., Dumičić Danilović D., Rukavina S., Šimac M.: On some new Steiner 2-designs $S(2, 5, 45)$. Util. Math. **111**, 281–308 (2019).
11. Dembowski P.: Finite Geometries. Reprint of the 1968 Edition. Springer, Berlin (1997) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-62012-6.
12. Denniston R.H.F.: Uniqueness of the inverse plane of order 5. Manuscr. Math. **8**, 11–19 (1973). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01317572.
13. Denniston R.H.F.: Uniqueness of the inversive plane of order 7. Manuscr. Math. **8**, 21–26 (1973). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01317573.
14. Denniston R.H.F.: Some new 5-designs. Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **8**(3), 263–267 (1976). https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/8.3.263.
15. Doyen J., Rosa A.: An updated bibliography and survey of Steiner systems. Ann. Discret. Math. **7**, 317–349 (1980).
16. Doyen J., Vandensavel M.: Non isomorphic Steiner quadruple systems. Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. **23**, 393–410 (1971).
17. Feng T., Chang Y.: Constructions for cyclic 3-designs and improved results on cyclic Steiner quadruple systems. J. Comb. Des. **19**(3), 178–201 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1002/jcd.20264.
18. Fisher R.A.: An examination of the different possible solutions of a problem in incomplete blocks. Ann. Eugen. **10**(1), 52–75 (1940). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1809.1940.tb02237.x.
19. Glock S., Kühn D., Lo A., Osthus D.: The existence of designs via iterative absorption: hypergraph F-designs for arbitrary F. Mem. Am. Math. Soc. **284**, 1406 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/1406.
20. Gordon D.: La Jolla Coverings Repository. https://www.dmgordon.org/cover/. Accessed 2 Oct 2025.

21. Gordon D.M., Stinson D.R.: Coverings. In: Colbourn C.J., Dinitz J.H. (eds.) Handbook of Combinatorial Designs, 2nd edn, pp. 365–373. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (2007).
22. Grannell M.J., Griggs T.S., Mathon R.A.: On Steiner systems $S(5, 6, 48)$. J. Comb. Math. Comb. Comput. **12**, 77–96 (1992). https://combinatorialpress.com/article/jcmcc/Volume12/vol-12-paper8.pdf.
23. Grannell M.J., Griggs T.S., Phelan J.S.: On Steiner systems $S(3, 5, 26)$. In: Colbourn C.J., Mathon R. (eds.) Combinatorial Design Theory, pp. 197–206. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1987). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-0208(08)72887-1.
24. Halder H.-R., Heise W.: Einführung in die Kombinatorik. Carl Hanser Verlag, Munich (1976) https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112577462.
25. Hall M. Jr., Swift J.D.: Determination of Steiner triple systems of order 15. Math. Tables Aids Comput. **9**, 146–152 (1955). https://doi.org/10.2307/2002050.
26. Hanani H.: On quadruple systems. Can. J. Math. **12**, 145–157 (1960). https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1960-013-3.
27. Hartman A.: A general recursive construction for quadruple systems. J. Comb. Theory A **33**(2), 121–134 (1982). https://doi.org/10.1016/0097-3165(82)90001-2.
28. Hartman A.: The fundamental construction for 3-designs. Discret. Math. **124**(1–3), 107–132 (1994). https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(92)00055-V.
29. Hartman A., Phelps K.T.: Steiner quadruple systems. In: Dinitz J.H., Stinson D.R. (eds.) Contemporary Design Theory: A Collection of Surveys, pp. 205–240. Wiley, New York (1992).
30. Ji L., Zhu L.: An improved product construction of rotational Steiner quadruple systems. J. Comb. Des. **10**(6), 433–443 (2002). https://doi.org/10.1002/jcd.10025.
31. Kaski P., Östergård P.R.J., Pottonen O.: The Steiner quadruple systems of order 16. J. Comb. Theory A **113**(8), 1764–1770 (2006). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2006.03.017.
32. Keevash P.: The existence of designs, Version 4 (2024, Preprint). https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.3665.
33. Kiermaier M., Krčadinac V., Wassermann A.: Small Steiner 3-designs (Data set). Zenodo (2025). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17153238. Accessed 25 Sep 2025.
34. Kiermaier M., Wassermann A.: Higher incidence matrices and tactical decomposition matrices. Glas. Mat. III **58**(78), 181–200 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3336/gm.58.2.03.
35. Kiermaier M., Krčadinac V., Tonchev V.D., Vlahović Kruc R., Wassermann A.: Some new Steiner designs $S(2, 6, 91)$. J. Algebr. Comb. **62**(38), 11 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10801-025-01468-6.
36. Kirkman T.P.: On a problem in combinations. Camb. Dublin Math. J. **2**, 191–204 (1847).
37. Knuth D.E.: Dancing links. In: Davies, J., Roscoe, B., Woodcock, J. (eds.) Millennial Perspectives in Computer Science, pp. 187–214. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke (2000). https://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0011047.
38. Knuth D.E.: Downloadable programs (2025). https://www-cs-faculty.stanford.edu/~knuth/programs.html. Accessed 25 Sep 2025.
39. Knuth D.E.: The Art of Computer Programming, Fascicle 7: Constraint Satisfaction, vol. 4. Addison-Wesley, Hoboken (2025).
40. Kramer E.S., Mesner D.M.: t-Designs on hypergraphs. Discret. Math. **15**, 263–296 (1976). https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(76)90030-3.
41. Krčadinac V.: PAG—Prescribed Automorphism Groups, Version 0.2.5 (GAP Package) (2025). https://vkrcadinac.github.io/PAG/. Accessed 25 Sep 2025.
42. Krčadinac V.: Steiner 2-designs $S(2, 5, 41)$ with automorphisms of order 3. J. Comb. Math. Comb. Comput. **43**, 83–99 (2002).
43. Krčadinac V., Nakić A., Pavčević M.O.: The Kramer–Mesner method with tactical decompositions: some new unitals on 65 points. J. Comb. Des. **19**, 290–303 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1002/jcd.20277.
44. Lenz H.: On the number of Steiner quadruple systems. Mitt. Math. Sem. Giess. **169**, 55–71 (1985).
45. Lenz H.: Tripling Steiner quadruple systems. Ars Comb. **20**, 193–202 (1985).
46. Lindner C.C., Rosa A.: There are at least 31,021 nonisomorphic Steiner quadruple systems of order 16. Util. Math. **10**, 61–64 (1976).
47. Lindner C.C., Rosa A.: Steiner quadruple systems—a survey. Discret. Math. **22**(2), 147–181 (1978). https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(78)90122-X.
48. McKay B.D., Piperno A.: Practical graph isomorphism, II. J. Symb. Comput. **60**, 94–112 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2013.09.003.
49. Mendelsohn N.S., Hung S.H.Y.: On the Steiner systems $S(3, 4, 14)$ and $S(4, 5, 15)$. Util. Math. **1**, 5–95 (1972).
50. Mezőfi D., Nagy G.P.: New Steiner 2-designs from old ones by paramodifications. Discret. Appl. Math. **288**, 114–122 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2020.08.026.
51. Östergård P.R.J., Pottonen O.: There exists no Steiner system $S(4, 5, 17)$. J. Comb. Theory A **115**, 1570–1573 (2008). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2008.04.005.

52. Penttila T.: Uniqueness of the inversive plane of order sixty-four. Des. Codes Cryptogr. **90**(3), 827–834 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-022-01014-6.
53. Soicher L.H.: DESIGN, the Design Package for GAP, Version 1.8.2 (GAP Package) (2024). https://gap-packages.github.io/design. Accessed 25 Sep 2025.
54. Spence E.: The complete classification of Steiner systems $S(2, 4, 25)$. J. Comb.Des. 4(4), 295–300 (1996). https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6610(1996)4:4%3C295::AID-JCD6%3E3.0.CO;2-A.
55. Thas J.A.: The affine plane $AG(2, q)$, q odd, has a unique one point extension. Invent. Math. **118**(1), 133–139 (1994). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01231529.
56. The GAP Group: GAP—Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.14.0. The GAP Group (2024). https://www.gap-system.org. Accessed 25 Sep 2025.
57. Tits J.: Ovoïdes et groupes de Suzuki. Arch. Math. **13**, 187–198 (1962). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01650065.
58. Tits J.: Sur les systèmes de Steiner associés aux trois "grands" groups de Mathieu. Rend. Mat. Appl. (5) **23**, 166–184 (1964).
59. Witt E.: Über Steinersche Systeme. Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hambg **12**, 265–275 (1938). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02948948.
60. Zhang X., Ge G.: A new existence proof for Steiner quadruple systems. Des. Codes Cryptogr. **69**(1), 65–76 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-012-9621-6.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.