Forum of Mathematics, Sigma (2025), **Vol. 13**:e136 1–18
doi:10.1017/fms.2025.10058

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Unimodular Hunting II

Bill Allombert [1] and Gaëtan Chenevier [2]

[1]Institut de Mathématiques de Bordeaux, CNRS, INRIA, Université de Bordeaux, 351 cours de la Libération, Talence, F 33 405, France; E-mail: Bill.Allombert@math.u-bordeaux.fr.
[2]Département de mathématiques et applications, CNRS, École Normale Supérieure-PSL, 45 rue d'Ulm, Paris, 75230 CEDEX, France; E-mail: gaetan.chenevier@math.cnrs.fr (corresponding author).

Received: 27 November 2024; **Accepted:** 8 May 2025

2020 Mathematical Subject Classification: *Primary* – 11H55; *Secondary* – 11E41, 11F60, 11H56, 11Y40

Abstract

Pursuing ideas in [6], we determine the isometry classes of unimodular lattices of rank 28, as well as the isometry classes of unimodular lattices of rank 29 without nonzero vectors of norm ≤ 2. We also provide some invariant that allows to distinguish these lattices and to independently check with a computer that our lists are complete.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**
2 Notation and terminology **4**
3 The invariant BV **5**
4 Finding $\mathbb{Z}$-basis made of short vectors **7**
5 The Biased Neighbor Enumeration algorithm **9**
5.1 Review of the visible root system of a neighbor 9
5.2 The BNE algorithm 10
5.3 Further remarks and details on the various steps of BNE 11
6 Some examples **12**
6.1 The root system $7\mathbf{A}_1\,3\mathbf{A}_2\,\mathbf{A}_7$ in dimension 28 12
6.2 The root system $4\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2\,2\mathbf{A}_3\,\mathbf{D}_4$ in dimension 28 12
6.3 The root system $16\mathbf{A}_1\,\mathbf{E}_6$ in dimension 28 13
6.4 The root system $8\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2$ in dimension 28 13
6.5 The empty root system in dimension 29 14
References **18**

1. Introduction

For $n \geq 1$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_n$ the set of unimodular integral lattices in the standard Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, and by X_n the set of isometry classes of elements of $\mathcal{L}_n$. In the recent work [6], the second author studied the cyclic Kneser neighbors of the standard lattice $\mathrm{I}_n := \mathbb{Z}^n$ and classified the elements of X_n for $n = 26$ and 27, developing a method initiated by Bacher and Venkov [2, 3]. Let $\mathrm{X}_n^{\emptyset} \subset \mathrm{X}_n$ be the subset of classes of lattices $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ with no nonzero vector $v \in L$ such that $v.v \leq 2$. The main result of this paper is the following.

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that no alterations are made and the original article is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained prior to any commercial use and/or adaptation of the article.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *Number # of classes of lattices L in $X_{29}^{\emptyset}$ with $|O(L)| = \mathtt{ord}$.*

ord	2	4	6	8	12	16	20	24	32	36	40	48	60
#	8081	1465	6	293	28	91	1	21	32	1	3	15	1
ord	64	72	80	96	120	128	144	160	192	232	256	288	320
#	12	1	1	11	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1
ord	384	768	864	960	1024	1536	2400	2592	3072	5184	6144	18432	24000
#	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Theorem 1.1. *We have $|X_{28}| = 374062$ and $|X_{29}^{\emptyset}| = 10092$.*

We refer to Chapters 16 to 18 in [7], and to [6], for some historical background on these questions, especially in lower dimensions. Recall that King's refinements of the Minkowski-Siegel-Smith mass formulae in [10] gave the (not too far!) lower bounds $|X_{28}| > 327972$ and $|X_{29}^{\emptyset}| > 8911$. The 38 lattices in $X_{28}^{\emptyset}$ had already been determined by Bacher and Venkov in [3]. As we have $|X_{27}| = 17059$, the assertion about $|X_{28}|$ is also equivalent to $|X'_{28}| = 357003$, where $X'_n \subset X_n$ denotes the subset consisting of classes of lattices with no norm 1 vectors. Similarly, it follows from our determination of $|X_{29}^{\emptyset}|$ that there are exactly 10130 classes of lattices in X_{29} with no *root* (i.e., no vector of norm 2).

As in [6], our aim is not only to determine X_{28} and $X_{29}^{\emptyset}$ but also to provide representatives of each isometry class as a (cyclic) d-neighbor of the standard lattice $I_n := \mathbb{Z}^n$. We briefly recall their concrete definition and refer to *loc. cit.* for more details. Let $d \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\gcd(d, x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1$. Then $M_d(x) := \{v \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n v_i x_i \equiv 0 \bmod d\}$ is an index d sublattice of I_n. Setting $e = 1$ for d odd, $e = 2$ otherwise, and assuming furthermore x is *d-isotropic* – that is $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \equiv 0 \bmod ed$ – then there are exactly e unimodular lattices $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ with $L \cap I_n = M_d(x)$; they have the form

$$N_d(x') := M_d(x) + \frac{x'}{d}\mathbb{Z}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $x' \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfies $x'.x' \equiv 0 \bmod d^2$ and $x' \equiv x \bmod d$. For d odd, this unique lattice is denoted $N_d(x)$ or $N_d(x; 0)$. For d even, it only depends on the $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ defined by $2x'.x \equiv x.x + \epsilon d^2 \bmod 2d^2$, and is denoted $N_d(x; \epsilon)$.

Theorem 1.2. *A list of (d, x, ϵ) such that the $N_d(x; \epsilon)$ are representatives for the isometry classes in X'_{28} and $X_{29}^{\emptyset}$ are given in [1].*

As we shall explain later in this introduction, we will also provide algorithms allowing to directly check with a computer that those lists are complete. Let us first comment on these lists, starting with the 10092 elements in $X_{29}^{\emptyset}$. The statistics for the order of their isometry groups are given in Table 1. In particular, about 80 % of them have trivial isometry group $\{\pm 1\}$.

Arguing as in [6, Sect. 12] (in particular, using [9]), we checked that only two of these 10092 lattices have a non-solvable isometry group.[1] This is very little compared to case of lower dimensions (see *loc. cit.*). Their isometry groups have order 2400 and 960, and are respectively isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times S_5 \times D_{10}$ and $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/4 \times S_5$. These two lattices are furthermore *exceptional* in the sense of Bacher and Venkov (i.e., have a characteristic vector of norm 5) (see §2 for the unexplained terminology in this introduction). Actually, exactly 105 lattices in X_{29} are exceptional, and the statistics for the order of their isometry groups are given by Table 2.

We now consider the 357003 rank 28 unimodular lattices with no norm 1 vectors. According to King, there are 4722 possible root systems for them: see [6] Table 1.2. The actual number of classes in X'_{28} whose root system has a given rank is given in Table 3.

[1] Actually, there are only five L such that $|O(L)|$ is both $\equiv 0 \bmod 4$ and not of the form $p^a q^b$ with p, q primes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. *Number # of exceptional lattices L in* $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ *with* $\mathtt{ord} = |\mathrm{O}(L)|$.

ord	2	4	8	12	16	20	32	40	48	64	80	96	192	960	1024	2400	24000
#	20	31	24	2	10	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 3. *Number # of classes in* X'_{28} *whose root system has rank* $\mathtt{rk}$.

rk	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
#	38	42	205	393	1008	1701	3236	5025	8231	11532
rk	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
#	16257	20600	25874	29560	32985	34058	34223	31510	28198	22988
rk	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
#	18030	12702	8544	4925	2806	1288	662	191	191	

Table 4. *Number # of lattices L in* X'_{28} *with* $\mathtt{i} = \mathrm{i}(L)$.

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
#	38	20560	121684	126661	55585	20919	6712	2935	960	516	168	142	45	35
i	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
#	8	20	3	3	1	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Table 5. *The isometry groups G of the 4 lattices in* X'_{28} *whose reduced isometry group has a 'new' Jordan-Hölder factor, using* `GAP`*'s notations*.

$\lvert G\rvert$	9170703360	348364800	4838400	58240
G	$(\mathbb{Z}/2 \,.\, \mathrm{PSp}_6(3)) : \mathbb{Z}/2$	$\mathbb{Z}/2 \times (\mathrm{O}_8^+(2) : \mathbb{Z}/2)$	$(((\mathbb{Z}/2 \,.\, \mathrm{HJ}) : \mathbb{Z}/2) : \mathbb{Z}/2) : \mathbb{Z}/2$	$\mathbb{Z}/4 \times \mathrm{Sz}(8)$

We also found it convenient[2] to split these lattices L according to the integer $\mathrm{i}(L)$ defined as the maximal integer $i \geq 1$ such that the root lattice A_{i-1} may be embeded into L: see Table 4. For instance, we have $\mathrm{i}(L) = 1$ (resp. 2, 3) if, and only if, the root system of L is empty (resp. $r\mathbf{A}_1$, resp. $r\mathbf{A}_2$ $s\mathbf{A}_1$ with $r \geq 1$).

Only 238 of the 357003 lattices in X'_{28} have a non-solvable *reduced isometry group* (see §2 below). Four of them have a Jordan-Hölder factor not appearing for unimodular lattices of smaller rank. Those four lattices have an empty root system, and thus belong the Bacher-Venkov list; their isometry groups are described in Table 5.

We finally discuss the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The basic ingredients are similar to those described in the introduction of [6]: systematic study of all the cyclic Kneser d-neighbors of I_n for $d = 2, 3, \ldots$ (in the spirit of the 'coupon-collector' problem), bet on fine enough isometry invariants, splitting according to root systems thanks to King's results [10], use of clever visible root systems to bias the search, and case-by-case more specific methods for the remaining lattices with small masses (suitable 2-neighbors, exceptional lattices, 'addition of D_m', visible isometries).

However, compared to the work *loc. cit.*, the computations here are of a much larger scale, as the number of lattices in Theorem 1.1 already indicates. There are in particular 4722 different root systems R such that X_{28}^R is nonempty, and during our search, we were forced to study several hundreds of them case by case. In the last Section 6, we give five examples of such a study (including $R = \emptyset$ in dimension 29) in order to illustrate some techniques that we used. Beyond this difference of scale, let us insist now on a few important novelties that made the computations of this paper possible.

[2]Almost all unimodular lattices L in our lists with $\mathrm{i}(L) = i$ are of the form $\mathrm{N}_d(x; \epsilon)$ where the pair (d, x) has index i in the sense of Section 5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. The choice of invariant. It is crucial for our method to have at our disposal an invariant which is both fine enough to distinguish all of our lattices, and fast to compute. For a lattice L and $i \geq 0$, we set

$$\mathrm{R}_{\leq i}(L) = \{v \in L \mid v.v \leq i\},\ \mathrm{R}_i(L) = \{v \in L \mid v.v = i\} \text{ and } \mathrm{r}_i(L) = |\mathrm{R}_i(L)|. \tag{1.2}$$

Unimodular lattices of rank ≤ 29 tend to be generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by their $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}$, which is thus a natural candidate for an invariant. However, we are not aware of any classification of finite metric sets of the form $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}(L)$ or $\mathrm{R}_3(L)$, contrary to the case of $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 2}(L)$ (which is the theory of root systems). In §3, we define, for an integral lattice L, an invariant that we denote $\mathrm{BV}(L)$ and which only depends on $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}(L)$. It is a variant of one of the invariants used by Bacher and Venkov in their classification of $\mathrm{X}_{28}^{\emptyset}$ and $\mathrm{X}_{27}^{\emptyset}$ – hence the notation. It proved much more efficient than those used in [6]. Indeed, a surprising fact, which eventually follows from our computations, but for which we do not yet have a theoretical explanation, is the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Let L and L' be two rank n unimodular lattices with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = \mathrm{r}_1(L') = 0$. Assume either $n \leq 28$, or $n = 29$ and $\mathrm{r}_2(L) = \mathrm{r}_2(L') = 0$. Then L and L' are isometric if, and only if, we have $\mathrm{BV}(L) = \mathrm{BV}(L')$.*

In particular, L and L' are isometric if, and only if, $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}(L)$ and $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}(L')$ are isometric.

2. Algorithmic improvements. In §4, we discuss a simple probabilistic algorithm whose aim is to find a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis consisting of small vectors of a given lattice, and which allowed to substantially shorten the computation of the order of the (reduced) isometry groups of our lattices. In §5, we give some details about the Biased Neighbor Enumeration algorithm informally described in [6, §1.10] and that we repeatedly used in our search.

The programs used to perform the computations were written in the GP language with some critical parts in C using the libpari library. They were run on the two clusters PlaFRIM and Cinaps. We used the parallel programming interface of GP to make efficient use of the clusters, by allowing to switch between POSIX threads and MPI depending on the hardware available.

The total CPU time was about 72 years. Fortunately, it may be checked independently, and a posteriori, that the given lists are complete: it is enough to verify that our lattices have distinct BV invariants and that the sum of their masses, in dimensions 28 and 29, coincides with the masses of X'_{28} and $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ respectively. By [10], the mass of $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ is 49612728929/11136000, and by [7, Chap. 16 §2], that of X'_{28} is the rational number

$$\frac{1722914776839913679032185321786744287148737}{16573175467523436999761427022479360000000}.$$

See [1] for the relevant `PARI/GP` source code for checking our lists are complete. This is much shorter, and 'only' requires a few hours in dimension 29, and about two weeks in dimension 28.[3] It simultaneously proves Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.[4]

2. Notation and terminology

We use mostly classical notation and terminology. Let L be an integral Euclidean lattice. The (finite) isometry group of L is denoted by $\mathrm{O}(L)$. The notations $\mathrm{R}_{\leq i}(L)$, $\mathrm{R}_i(L)$ and $\mathrm{r}_i(L)$ have been introduced in Formula (1.2). We refer, for example, to [6] §2, §4.3 and §9 for complements.

– The *norm* of a vector $v \in L$ is $v.v$. The lattice L is even if we have $v.v \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $v \in L$, odd otherwise. A *characteristic vector* of L is a vector $\xi \in L$ such that $\xi.v \equiv v.v \bmod 2$ for all $v \in L$. For $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ odd, the norm of such a vector is $\equiv n \bmod 8$, and we denote by $\mathrm{Exc}(L)$ the set of characteristic vectors of L of norm < 8. Following [3] §3, a lattice $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is called *exceptional* if we have $\mathrm{Exc}(L) \neq \emptyset$.

[3]This verification, as well as the computations discussed throughout the following sections, was run on a system with four 20-core Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6148 CPU running at 2.40GHz, with 384GB of RAM.

[4]The determination of X_{28} also provides an independent verification of King's computations in [10].

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- The *root system* of L is the finite metric set $R := \mathrm{R}_2(L)$; this is an ADE root system.[5] The *Weyl group* of L is the subgroup $\mathrm{W}(L) \subset \mathrm{O}(L)$ generated by the orthogonal symetries about each $\alpha \in \mathrm{R}_2(L)$. This is a normal subgroup isomorphic to the classical Weyl group $\mathrm{W}(R)$ of R. We define the *reduced isometry group* of L to be $\mathrm{O}(L)/\mathrm{W}(L)$.
- For an arbitrary ADE root system S, we denote by $\mathrm{Q}(S)$ the even lattice it generates (*root lattices*). We use bold fonts $\mathbf{A}_n, \mathbf{D}_n, \mathbf{E}_n$ to denote isomorphism classes of root systems of that names, with the conventions $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{D}_0 = \mathbf{D}_1 = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{D}_2 = 2\mathbf{A}_1$. We also denote by A_n ($n \geq 1$), D_n ($n \geq 2$) and E_n ($n = 6, 7, 8$) the standard corresponding root lattices.
- The *mass* of any collection $\mathcal{L}$ of lattices, denoted $\operatorname{mass}\mathcal{L}$, is defined as the sum, over representatives L_i of the isometry classes of lattices in $\mathcal{L}$, of $1/|\mathrm{O}(L_i)|$. In particular, if L is a (single) integral euclidean lattice, the mass of L is $1/|\mathrm{O}(L)|$. We also define the *reduced mass* of L as $\frac{|\mathrm{W}(L)|}{|\mathrm{O}(L)|}$.
- We denote by $\mathrm{X}_n^R \subset \mathrm{X}_n$ the subset of isometry classes of lattices L in $\mathcal{L}_n$ with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$ and $\mathrm{R}_2(L) \simeq R$. The *reduced mass* of X_n^R is also defined as $\operatorname{rmass}\mathrm{X}_n^R := |\mathrm{W}(R)| \operatorname{mass}\mathrm{X}_n^R$. We have the interesting lower bound $|\mathrm{X}_n^R| \geq m \operatorname{rmass}\mathrm{X}_n^R$, with $m = 1$ if R has rank n and $\mathrm{W}(R)$ contains -1, and $m = 2$ otherwise. It follows from [10] that, for all $n \leq 30$ and all R, we know the rational $\operatorname{rmass}\mathrm{X}_n^R$ (see also [6, §6]).
- A subgroup M of a lattice L is *saturated* if the quotient group L/M is torsion free, or equivalently, if M is a direct summand of L as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module.
- We finally recall a few specific features of unimodular lattices in dimension $n \equiv 4 \bmod 8$ (such as $n = 28$), as well as the description of exceptional lattices in this case given in [6, §9]. Assume $n \equiv 4 \bmod 8$ and $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$. As is well-known, there are exactly two other L' in $\mathcal{L}_n$ having the same *even part*;[6] we call these two L' the *companions* of L. Assume $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$. Then L is exceptional if, and only if, it has a companion L' with $\mathrm{r}_1(L') \neq 0$. In this case, this L' is unique: we call it the *singular* companion of L and denote it $\operatorname{sing}(L)$. The following proposition holds by Proposition 9.4 and Remark 9.5 *loc. cit.*

Proposition 2.1. *Assume $n \equiv 4 \bmod 8$ and denote by $\mathcal{A}$ the set of isometry classes of exceptional L in $\mathcal{L}_n$ with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$, and by $\mathcal{B}$ the set of isometry classes of nonexceptional L in $\mathcal{L}_n$ with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) \neq 0$. Then we have a natural bijection $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}, [L] \mapsto [\operatorname{sing}(L)]$. Moreover, for $L \in \mathcal{A}$ and $L' := \operatorname{sing}(L)$, we have $|\mathrm{Exc}(L)| = \mathrm{r}_1(L')$, $\mathrm{R}_2(L) = \mathrm{R}_2(L')$ and $|\mathrm{O}(L')| = 2|\mathrm{O}(L)|$.*

In particular, we always have $|\mathrm{Exc}(L)| = 2m$ with $0 \leq m \leq n$ for $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$.

3. The invariant BV

Let G be an arbitrary finite graph with set of vertices V. Let A be the adjacency matrix of G, a $V \times V$ matrix.[7] Consider the square $S := A^2$ of A, say $S = (s_{u,v})_{(u,v)\in V\times V}$. For $v \in V$, we define

$$\mathrm{C}(G; v) = \{\{\, s_{u,v} \mid u \in V \}\}$$

as the multiset of entries of the column v of the matrix S. In other words, $\mathrm{C}(G; v)$ is the multiset of *numbers of length* 2 *paths in G starting at v and ending at another given vertex*.

Definition 3.1. Let G be a graph with finite set of vertices V. For $v \in V$, we define $\mathrm{BV}(G)$ as the multiset $\{\{\mathrm{C}(G; v) \mid v \in V\}\}$. This is a multiset of multisets of integers, and it is an invariant of the isomorphism class of G.

Assume now L is an Euclidean integral lattice. For $i \geq 0$, we view the finite set $\mathrm{R}_{\leq i}(L) = \{v \in L \mid v.v \leq i\}$ as a metric set (or better, as an *Euclidean set* as in [6, §4.1]). We denote by[8] $\mathrm{G}(L)$ the

[5] In this papers, roots are always assumed to have norm 2.
[6] The even part of an odd integral lattice L is the index 2 sublattice $\{x \in L \mid x.x \equiv 0 \bmod 2\}$.
[7] In the application below, G will be undirected, and for all $v, v' \in V$, we will have at most one edge between v and v'.
[8] This is a variant of the graph also denoted by $\mathrm{G}(L)$ in [6] §4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 6. *The number # of $L \in X_{28}$ with $r_1(L) = 0$ such that the number of vertices of $G(L)$ lies in the interval $[N, N + 200[$.*

N	0	200	400	600	800	1000	1200	1400	1600	1800	2000	2200	2400	2600	2800	3000	3200
#	12	24	66	273	1801	22889	269512	53898	6805	1269	297	84	51	12	5	1	4

undirected graph whose vertices are the nonzero pairs $\{\pm v\}$ with $v \in R_{\leq 3}(L)$, and with an arrow between $\{\pm v\}$ and $\{\pm w\}$ if, and only if, $v.w \equiv 1 \bmod 2$.

Definition 3.2. If L is an Euclidean integral lattice, we define $BV(L)$ as the multiset of multisets of integers $BV(G(L))$.

By construction, $BV(L)$ is an invariant of the isometry class of $R_{\leq 3}(L)$, and hence of L. We choose the notations BV for *Bacher-Venkov*, as this definition is inspired from some polynomial invariants defined in [3] (see Remark 3.3).

Remark 3.3 (The Bacher-Venkov polynomials). Assume we are in the special case $R_{\leq 2}(L) = \emptyset$. If we choose distinct $\pm u$ and $\pm v$ in $R_3(L)$, we have either $u.v = 0$ or $u.v = \pm 1$, as $u.v = 2$ implies $u - v \in R_2(L)$. For $v \in R_3(L)$, Bacher and Venkov define in [3, p.15] the polynomial $m_v(x)$ as the sum, over all $w \in R_3(L)$ with $w.v = 1$, of $x^{n(v,w)}$, with $n(v, w) = |\{\xi \in R_3(L) \mid v.\xi = w.\xi = -1\}|$. If, in this definition of $m_v(x)$, we rather sum over all $w \in R_3(L)$, the obtained polynomial contains the same information as the multiset $C(G(L); v)$.

We now give a few information about the graph $G(L)$ for $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ with $r_1(L) = 0$ and $n = 28, 29$. Its number of vertices is $\frac{1}{2}(r_2(L) + r_3(L))$, and we know from [10] the possibilities for $R_2(L)$.

(a) (**The case** $n = 28$) A theta series computation shows $r_3(L) = 2240 + 8\,r_2(L) - 256\,|\mathrm{Exc}(L)|$ (see [3, §4] and [6, Prop. 4.8]). Here, $|\mathrm{Exc}(L)|$ is the number of characteristic vectors of norm 4 of L; it satisfies $0 \leq |\mathrm{Exc}(L)| \leq 56$. We refer to Proposition 2.1 for this inequality, and to Section 2 for the notion of singular companion used in the following example.

Example 3.4 (The case $r_3 = 0$). There are exactly 15 classes of lattices $L \in \mathcal{L}_{28}$ with $r_1(L) = r_3(L) = 0$. Indeed, the formula above for $r_3(L)$ shows $|\mathrm{Exc}(L)| \geq 10$ (in particular, L is exceptional). Let L' denote the singular companion of L, say $L' \simeq I_m \perp U$ with U unimodular of rank $28 - m$ with $r_1(U) = 0$ and $2m = |\mathrm{Exc}(L)|$. We have $r_3(L) = 0$ if and only if $r_2(U) = 2\,m\,(33 - m) - 280$. We easily conclude using the classification of unimodular lattices of rank ≤ 23. The extreme cases are $L' = I_{28}$ ($m = 28$, for which $L = D_{28} + \mathbb{Z}\frac{1}{2}(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$) and $L' = I_5 \perp U$ with U the short Leech lattice ($m = 5$). These 15 lattices have different root systems – namely, $\mathbf{D}_{28}$, $\mathbf{D}_{20}\,\mathbf{E}_8$, $\mathbf{D}_{12}\,\mathbf{D}_{16}$, $\mathbf{D}_{14}\,2\mathbf{E}_7$, $\mathbf{A}_{15}\,\mathbf{D}_{13}$, $\mathbf{D}_{12}\,2\mathbf{D}_8$, $\mathbf{A}_{11}\,\mathbf{D}_{11}\,\mathbf{E}_6$, $\mathbf{D}_{10}\,3\mathbf{D}_6$, $2\mathbf{A}_9\,\mathbf{D}_{10}$, $2\mathbf{A}_7\,\mathbf{D}_5\,\mathbf{D}_9$, $5\mathbf{D}_4\,\mathbf{D}_8$, $4\mathbf{A}_5\,\mathbf{D}_8$, $7\mathbf{A}_3\,\mathbf{D}_7$, $22\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{D}_6$ and $\mathbf{D}_5$.

As an indication, it follows from our final computations that $G(L)$ has between 20 and 3388 vertices, and 1318 in average, for $L \in \mathcal{L}_{28}$ with $r_1(L) = 0$. Better, for 97% of these lattices this number lies in $[1000, 1600[$, as shown by Table 6.

The average number of edges of those graphs is $\simeq 470\,000$. Another interesting property[9] is that $R_{\leq 3}(L)$ does generate L over $\mathbb{Z}$ for most lattices, as indicated by Table 7. For example, the only lattice such that $R_{\leq 3}(L)$ does not generate a finite index subgroup of L is the exceptional lattice with companion $I_5 \perp U$, with $U \in X_{23}^{\emptyset}$ the Odd Leech lattice (already encountered in Example 3.4).

(b) (**The case** $n = 29$) For L in $\mathcal{L}_{29}$ with $r_1(L) = r_2(L) = 0$, a theta series computation shows $r_3(L) = 1856 - 128\,|\mathrm{Exc}(L)|$, where $\mathrm{Exc}(L)$ is the number of characteristic vectors of norm 5 in L. It is a fact, that we shall not explain here, that we always have $|\mathrm{Exc}(L)| \leq 2$. So we have either $\frac{1}{2}r_3(L) = 928$ in the nonexceptional case, and $\frac{1}{2}r_3(L) = 800$ otherwise. The situation here is thus much more uniform than in the case $n = 28$. Also, the graph $G(L)$ turns out to have 259 840 edges in the nonexceptional case, and 198 400 otherwise, and in all cases, $R_3(L)$ does generate L over $\mathbb{Z}$.

[9] It may be possible to explain part of these observations by using harmonic theta series arguments as in [13], but we shall not pursue this (unnecessary) direction here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 7. *The number # of $L \in X_{28}$ with $r_1(L) = 0$ such that $R_{\leq 3}(L)$ generates a sublattice of index d in L.*

d	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	16	20	24	25
#	356462	364	16	58	5	8	3	18	7	1	9	2	9	5	1	2
d	27	32	36	49	64	72	125	128	243	256	729	2048	4096	8192	∞	other
#	2	8	1	2	3	4	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0

Some computational aspects of BV. It is straightforward in principle to compute $BV(L)$ from a given Gram matrix M of the integral lattice L. Indeed, we can use the Fincke-Pohst algorithm to find a column matrix V whose raws are the $\pm v$ with $v \in L$ such that $0 < v.v \leq 3$. The adjacency matrix A of $G(L)$, which is symmetric and with coefficients 0 or 1, is determined by $A \equiv {}^tV\,M\,V \bmod 2$ (a fast computation). More lengthy is then the computation of $S = A^2$, since the size of A is typically a thousand or more. To save time, this squaring is computed only modulo some large enough prime (we used 1009), and is performed using only single-word arithmetic.[10] In practice, the slightly weaker invariant than $BV(L)$ consisting of the *set* (rather than multiset) of the multisets $C(G(L); v)$ (with $v \in V$) proved equally strong, and this what we implemented in our computations. Finally, we apply a hash function to the resulting invariant to get a 64bit identifier. This allows us not only to quickly discard lattices with already known identifiers, but also to store the list of known identifiers in a compact way. The choice of 1009 and of the hash function here is arbitrary; all that matters is that the resulting invariant is fine enough to distinguish all the lattices we consider, which can be only determined a posteriori.

Here are a few CPU time information in our range:

- For each of the 346 299 lattices $L \in X_{28}$ with $r_1(L) = 0$ and such that the number of vertices of $G(L)$ is in $[1000, 1600[$, the average CPU time to compute $BV(L)$ is about `1.5 s`. For the worst (and actually irrelevant!) case with 3388 vertices, the CPU time is approximately `35 s`.
- For each of the 10092 lattices $L \in X_{29}^{\emptyset}$, the average CPU time to compute $BV(L)$ is about `1.2 s`.

4. Finding $\mathbb{Z}$-basis made of short vectors

An important ingredient in our computation is the Plesken-Souvignier algorithm [12], which computes $|O(L)|$ from the Gram matrix of a given $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $e = (e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ of L. For this algorithm to be efficient (and not too memory consuming), it is crucial to have $m(e) := \mathrm{Max}\{e_i.e_i \mid i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ as small as possible, and also highly desirable to have $|\{1 \leq i \leq n \mid e_i.e_i = m(e)\}|$ small. The LLL algorithm, although very fast and useful, does not provide in general a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of L which is good enough in these respects.

Example 4.1. For our 10092 elements in $X_{29}^{\emptyset}$, the LLL algorithm produces for 6570 of them a basis e with $m(e) = 4$, for 3512 a basis with $m(e) = 5$, and in the 10 remaining cases a basis e with $m(e) = 6$. As already said, those lattices are actually generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by their $R_{\leq 3}$, and hence may (and actually do) have a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis e with $m(e) = 3$.

In order to search for better lattice bases, we used the following simple probabilistic algorithm. Its main function `reduce` takes as an input an integral Euclidean lattice L of rank d, an integer b, and another integer t ('number of tries'). It returns either 0 (failure) or a basis e of L with $m(e) = b$.

1. Compute the set S of vectors $\pm v$ in L with $0 < v.v \leq b$.
2. If S does not generate L over $\mathbb{Z}$, return 0.
3. Compute the set R of vectors $\pm v$ in L with $0 < v.v \leq b - 1$.
4. Compute the rank[11] r of R and set $k_0 = \mathrm{Max}(1, d - r)$.

[10] While GP normally use multiprecision integer arithmetic, we used single word arithmetic (using `t_VECSMALL`) whenever appropriate in all of our programs.

[11] This step is especially useful in the case $b = 3$, but may be ignored in situations where we know that R is big (in which case we set $k_0 = 1$).

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5. For k from k_0 to d, for i from 1 to t, do
   5a. Choose k vectors $e_1, \dots, e_k$ randomly in S,
   5b. Choose $d-k$ vectors $e_{k+1}, \dots, e_d$ randomly in R,
   5c. If $e_1, \dots, e_d$ generates L over $\mathbb{Z}$, return $e_1, \dots, e_d$.
6. Return 0.

For a given integral lattice L, we start with a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis e given by the LLL algorithm, choose some t, and then apply $\texttt{reduce}(L, b, t)$ successively to $b = 1, \dots, \mathrm{m}(e) - 1$ until it returns some $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of L. If it fails, it means it did not beat the initial basis e given by LLL.

Remark 4.2. Step 2 and 5c of the function `reduce` amounts to checking that some determinant is ± 1. To save time, we may first check that this holds modulo 2 or other primes.

Example 4.3. For each lattice L in $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$, the `reduce` algorithm does find a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis consisting of norm 3 vectors of L in about `93 ms` (using $t = 1000$ is usually enough, and computing the set of norm 3 vectors already takes about `30 ms`). Using those bases, the average time to determine $|\mathrm{O}(L)|$ using the Plesken-Souvignier algorithm[12] is about `1.24 s`.

We now discuss the 357003 rank 28 unimodular lattices with no norm 1 vectors. As already explained in Table 7, 356462 of them are generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by their $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}$, and we did find a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of norm ≤ 3 vectors in all cases (for 99.8% of them, $\texttt{reduce}(L, 3, 100)$ is enough and takes about `160 ms`). For the 541 remaining lattices, 519 are generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by their $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 4}$, and we also found in all cases a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis consisting of norm ≤ 4 vectors using $\texttt{reduce}(L, 4, 10000)$.

The remaining 22 lattices are atypical, but not especially mysterious. They all have a root system of rank 28, except for two of them, whose root systems are respectively $2\mathbf{A}_7\,\mathbf{D}_{13}$ (rank 27) and $\mathbf{D}_5$ (which has only rank 5, but this lattice is the exceptional lattice with companion $\mathrm{I}_5 \perp$ OddLeech discussed in Example 3.4). For instance, for many of these 22 lattices, the sublattice generated by the root system $\mathrm{R}_2(L)$ is isometric to $\mathrm{D}_{m_1} \perp \mathrm{D}_{m_2} \perp \cdots \perp \mathrm{D}_{m_s}$ with $m_1 + \cdots + m_s = 28$, where $\mathrm{D}_m \subset \mathrm{I}_m$ is the standard root lattice of type $\mathbf{D}_m$ – namely, $\mathrm{D}_m = \mathrm{M}_2(1^m)$. But for $m \geq 1$, the dual lattice $\mathrm{D}_m^\sharp$ is given by

$$\mathrm{D}_m^\sharp = \mathrm{D}_m \coprod (\varepsilon_m + \mathrm{D}_m) \coprod (\eta_m^+ + \mathrm{D}_m) \coprod (\eta_m^- + \mathrm{D}_m)$$

with $\varepsilon_m = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and $\eta_m^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(1, \dots, 1, \pm 1)$. As is well-known, the minimum of $x \mapsto x.x$ on $\eta_m^\pm + \mathrm{D}_m$ is $m/4$ (resp. 1 on $\varepsilon_m + \mathrm{D}_m$). Assuming $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$, it follows that the small norm vectors of those L tend to generate proper sublattices of L. The two most striking cases are discussed in Example 4.4.

Example 4.4 (The two lattices not generated by their $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 5}$).

(a) There is a unique $L \in \mathrm{X}_{28}$ with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$ and root system $\mathbf{D}_{28}$. We may define it as $L = \mathrm{D}_{28} \coprod C$ with $C = \eta_{28}^+ + \mathrm{D}_{28}$. As $\min_{x \in C} x.x = 28/4 = 7$, it follows that L is generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by the set $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 7}(L)$, whereas $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 6}(L)$ generates the index 2 subgroup D_{28}. Note that $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 7}(L)$ is huge: it has 158 736 881 vectors!

(b) There is a unique $L \in \mathrm{X}_{28}$ with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$ and root system $\mathbf{D}_8\,\mathbf{D}_{20}$. Set $Q = \mathrm{D}_8 \perp \mathrm{D}_{20}$. We may define $L \subset Q^\sharp$ as the inverse image, under the natural map $Q^\sharp \to Q^\sharp/Q = \mathrm{D}_8^\sharp/\mathrm{D}_8 \oplus \mathrm{D}_{20}^\sharp/\mathrm{D}_{20}$, of the bilinear Lagrangian $\{0, \varepsilon_8 + \eta_{20}^+, \eta_8^+ + \varepsilon_{20}, \eta_8^- + \eta_{20}^-\}$ (see [7] Chapter 4 §3, as well as [6, §2], for generalities on 'glueing theory'). It follows that L is a union of 4 cosets of Q with respective minimum norm 0, $1 + 20/4 = 6$, $8/4 + 1 = 3$ and $8/4 + 20/4 = 7$. This shows that L is generated by $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 6}$ (with 21 827 953 vectors!) but not by $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 5}$.

These are the worst cases, since the 20 other lattices are generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by their $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 5}$ and we did find for all of them a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis consisting of norm ≤ 5 vectors using $\texttt{reduce}(L, 5, 10000)$. We refer to [1] for a list of Gram matrices that we found using these methods.

[12] We used the `PARI/GP` implementation `qfauto` of Souvignier's code, with flag $[0, 2]$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We finally discuss the computation of the order of the isometry group $\mathrm{O}(L)$ for L in X_{28}. It is enough to compute the order of the *reduced isometry group* $\mathrm{O}(L)/\mathrm{W}(L)$ of L (see Section 2). As already observed in [4], this is much more efficient, and can easily be done using features of the Plesken-Souvignier algorithm: see [6, §4.2]. Using the Gram matrices above for the lattices in X_{28}, this is quite fast. For instance, for 99.8% of the 356462 lattices generated over $\mathbb{Z}$ by their $\mathrm{R}_{\leq 3}$, the average time to determine their reduced isometry group is about `0.3 s`. Note that in the two extreme cases discussed in Example 4.4, the reduced isometry group is clearly trivial, so there is nothing to compute.

5. The Biased Neighbor Enumeration algorithm

In this section, we provide the details for the general algorithm informally described in [6, §1.10]. Its goal is to produce large quantities of cyclic d-neighbors of I_n having a given root system, by imposing in the enumeration of d-isotropic lines a suitably chosen *visible root system* in the sense of *loc. cit.* §5. We start with a few notation and terminology.

5.1. Review of the visible root system of a neighbor

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $j \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathrm{m}_j(x) \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ the number of coordinates of x which are equal to j. A pair (d, x), with $d \geq 1$ an integer and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, will be said to be *normalized* if we have $1 = x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \cdots \leq x_n \leq d/2$, as well as $\mathrm{m}_1(x) \geq \mathrm{m}_j(x)$ for all $1 \leq j < d/2$. We call $\mathrm{m}_1(x)$ the *index* of (d, x), and $\mathrm{m}_{d/2}(x)$ the *end*[13] of (d, x). Finally, the *type* of x, or of (d, x), is the partition of the integer n defined by the nonzero integers $\mathrm{m}_j(x)$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Example 5.1. Let $x = (1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 8, 9, 9, 10, 10, 10, 11, 11) \in \mathbb{Z}^{19}$ and $d = 22$. Then (d, x) is normalized, of type $3 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1$, index 3 and end 2. We also use the short notation $3^2\,2^4\,1^5$ for such a partition.

As the isometry group of the lattice $\mathrm{I}_n = \mathbb{Z}^n$ consists of the $2^n n!$ permutations and sign changes of coordinates, we deduce the following:

Fact 5.2. Let $d \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Assume $x_i \not\equiv 0 \bmod d$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and that there exists[14] $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $a := x_j$ is prime to d and satisfies $\mathrm{m}_a(x) \geq \mathrm{m}_i(x)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there is $\sigma \in \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{I}_n)$ and $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that (d, y) is normalized and satisfies $\sigma(x) \equiv ay \bmod d\mathbb{Z}^n$.

Assume now $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is d-isotropic and (d, x) is normalized. Recall that the *visible root system* of the d-neighbor $N := \mathrm{N}_d(x; \epsilon)$ of I_n is defined in [6] §5 as

$$R^{\mathrm{v}} := \mathrm{R}_2(N) \cap \mathrm{I}_n = \mathrm{R}_2(\mathrm{M}_d(x)).$$

As explained in §5.1 *loc. cit.*, it is straightforward to determine R^{v} from an inspection of the equal coordinates of x mod $d\mathbb{Z}^n$: if (d, x) has end e and type $n_1 + \cdots + n_s + e$, then we have

$$R^{\mathrm{v}} \simeq \mathbf{A}_{n_1-1}\mathbf{A}_{n_2-1}\cdots\mathbf{A}_{n_s-1}\mathbf{D}_e. \tag{5.1}$$

The actual root system R of N is the union of R^{v} and of the (typically more mysterious) roots belonging to the other $\mathrm{M}_d(x)$-cosets of N generated by the multiples of the 'glue vector' $\frac{x'}{d}$ of Formula 1.1. Several constraints force R^{v} to be different from R in general. For instance, as Formula (5.1) shows, R^{v} cannot contain any irreducible component of type $\mathbf{E}$, has at most one component of type $\mathbf{D}$, and has a limitation for its type $\mathbf{A}$ components as well (for instance, it has at most $n/2$ components of type $\mathbf{A}_1$). Another, more subtle, constraint is that R^{v} tends to generate a saturated sublattice in N (this holds at least when d is a large prime), which is not the case for R in general. We refer to *loc. cit.* Section 5 for a detailed study all of those constraints on R^{v}.

[13] Obviously, the end of (d, x) is nonzero only for d even and $x_n = d/2$.
[14] Note that this condition is automatically satisfied if d is prime.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.2. The BNE algorithm

We now describe in detail the Biased Neighbor Enumeration algorithm, later refered to as BNE, informally discussed in [6, §1.10]. It takes the following as inputs: an integer $n \geq 1$, an isomorphism class R of root systems, the reduced mass ρ of X_n^R, an integer $0 \leq e < n$ and an integer partition $n - e = \sum_{i=1}^{s} n_i$, with $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_s \geq 1$. If BNE terminates, it returns a list of $(d, x, \epsilon, \mu, \beta)$ where the lattices $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ are representatives of X_n^R, and where $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ has reduced mass μ and BV invariant β; it also proves that all the elements in X_n^R have distinct BV invariants.

1. Set $d = 2$ and define empty lists *inv* and *lat*.
2. Make the list L of all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with (d, x) normalized of type $n_1 + \cdots + n_s + e$, index n_1 and end e.
3. Only keep in L those x such that x is d-isotropic.
4. For each $x \in L$ and[15] $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$, compute the cyclic d-neighbor $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ of I_n.
5. Replace L with the list of $(x, \epsilon) \in L \times \{0, 1\}$, satisfying both $\mathrm{r}_1(\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)) = 0$ and $\mathrm{R}_2(\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)) \simeq R$.
6. Compute the (hashed) BV invariants β of all $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ with $(x, \epsilon) \in L$.
7. For each $(x, \epsilon) \in L$, if the BV invariant β of $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ is not in *inv*, do the following:
   7a. Add β to the list *inv*,
   7b. Compute the reduced mass μ of $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$,
   7c. Add $(d, x, \epsilon, \beta, \mu)$ to the list *lat*,
   7d. Set $\rho \leftarrow \rho - \mu$. If $\rho = 0$, return *lat*.
8. $d \leftarrow d + 1$ and go back to Step 2.

Let us first state an important criterion for BNE to terminate. We attach to e and the integer partition $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_s + e$ the isomorphism class of root system

$$V := \mathbf{A}_{n_1-1}\mathbf{A}_{n_2-1}\cdots\mathbf{A}_{n_s-1}\mathbf{D}_e.$$

It follows from Formula (5.1) that each $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ at Step 4 of BNE has a visible root system isometric to V. For an ADE root system S, and an integral lattice L, we denote by $\mathrm{emb}(S, L)$ the number of isometric embeddings[16] $\mathrm{Q}(S) \to L$ with saturated image. Following §5.9 *loc. cit.*, we say that a pair (R, S) of ADE root systems is *safe* if for any integral lattices L with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$ and $\mathrm{R}_2(L) \simeq R$, we have $\mathrm{emb}(S, L) \neq 0$.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume (R, V) is safe and that different classes in X_n^R have different* BV *invariants. Then the algorithm BNE terminates.*

Let us explain how this theorem follows from Theorem E of [6] (a special case of the results of [5]). By Fact 5.2 and Formula (5.1), Steps 2 and 3 enumerate representatives (d, x, ϵ) for almost all $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{I}_n)$-orbits of the cyclic d-neighbors $\mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ of I_n whose *visible root system* is isomorphic to V. In the case d is prime, all orbits are considered in these two steps. By the aforementioned Theorem E *loc. cit.*, for any given $L \in \mathrm{X}_n$, the proportion of d-neighbors of I_n having a given visible root system V, and which are isomorphic to L, tends to (an absolute constant times) $\mathrm{emb}(V, L)/|\mathrm{O}(L)|$ when the prime d goes to ∞. This number is nonzero when L is in X_n^R and (R, V) is safe, which shows that BNE terminates assuming BV is sharp – hence Theorem 5.3. We stress, however, that *there is no known upper bound on the integer d such that each $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is isometric to a d-neighbor of* I_n. This method for searching for unimodular lattices is probabilistic and a form of (non-uniform) *coupon collector problem*: see [6, §1.12] for a discussion along these lines.

Remark 5.4 (Choice of V). The root system R being given, it is always possible to choose V (that is, e and the n_i) such that (R, V) is safe. For instance, choosing $V = \emptyset$, that is, $e = 0$ and all n_i equal to 1, trivially works, although it is usually inefficient if R is large. Indeed, the algorithm will most likely find lattices with smaller root systems than R, as we have $\mathrm{emb}(V, L) = 1$ for all L. In practice, the game is rather to choose for R^{v} a sub-root system of R which is as large as possible, given the general

[15] We restrict to $\epsilon = 0$ for d odd or $e > 0$.
[16] See the general notation at the end of Section §1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

constraints for visible root systems alluded in §5.1: see Section 5 in [6] for a discussion of good and possible choices. See also the next section for a few representative examples.

Of course, the BNE algorithm is interesting even if it does not terminate, since it usually finds many lattices if not all. We finally give the *non-biased* version of BNE.

Remark 5.5 (The non-biased NE algorithm). The simpler, non-biased, variant NE of BNE is the case where we enumerate in Step 2 the pairs (d, x) of all possible types, and seek for all root systems at the same time. The only input of NE is the integer n and the map $M : R \mapsto$ reduced mass of X_n^R. It returns X'_n, and theoretically terminates if BV is sharp. The only difference is that in Step 5, we only keep (x, ϵ) if the root system R of $\mathrm{N}_d(x; \epsilon)$ satisfies $\mathrm{M}(R) \neq 0$, and Step 7d becomes $\mathrm{M}(R) \leftarrow \mathrm{M}(R) - \mu$. This is how we actually started our search of X_{28}. Although NE allows to determine quite many sets X_{28}^R when they are small, it becomes inefficient for the larger ones or when d grows as explained in [6] §1, in which case it is absolutely curcial to use BNE instead.

5.3. Further remarks and details on the various steps of BNE

Remark 5.6 (Step 2′: *lines versus vectors, and redundancies*). Let $x, x' \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be two d-isotropic vectors, say with (d, x) and (d, x') normalized of same type $n_1 + \cdots + n_s + e$. Denote by ℓ and $\ell' \subset \mathrm{I}_n \otimes \mathbb{Z}/d$ the $\mathbb{Z}/d$-line they generate, and say that (d, x) and (d, x') are *equivalent* if ℓ and ℓ' are in the same $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{I}_n)$-orbit. The d-neighbors defined by equivalent (d, x) and (d, x') are naturally isomorphic, creating unwanted redundancy in our algorithm. For a given (d, x), then there are exactly f equivalent pairs (d, x'), with

$$f := |\{\ 1 \leq i \leq d/2 \ \mid\ \mathrm{m}_i(x) = \mathrm{m}_1(x)\ \&\ \gcd(i, d) = 1\ \}|.$$

This is especially large in the case $n_i = 1$ for all i, and d is prime, for which we have $f = n$. We did not find any clever way to directly select a single element among those f ones, but did instead the following right after Step 2 in the algorithm: fix some total ordering $\prec$ on $\mathbb{Z}^n$, and for each $(d, x) \in L$, compute all equivalent $(d, x') \in L$, and only keep (d, x) in L if it is the biggest of them for $\prec$.

Remark 5.7 (Step 5). See, for example, Remark 4.4. in [6] for an algorithm to compute root systems.

Remark 5.8 (Step 7b). For this step, of course, we apply the ideas exposed in Section 4: for each $L := \mathrm{N}_d(x, \epsilon)$, we first search for a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of L made of small norm vectors with `reduce` beating LLL, and then we compute the order of the reduced isometry group $\mathrm{O}(L)/\mathrm{W}(L)$ by giving this basis to the Plesken-Souvignier algorithm as explained in [6, §4.2]. We emphasize that if we do not use the bases provided by `reduce`, certain automorphism computations can take hours, simply never finish, or alternatively require an insane amount of memory (e.g., several hundreds of GB). We do not want this to happen during the execution of BNE.

Remark 5.9 (Parallelization). Each of Steps 3 to 6 (as well as Step 7b) is straightforward to parallelize in practice. For memory reasons, we usually modify Step 2 by limiting the size of the list L and go to Step 3 when this limit is reached. If so, at the end of Step 7, we go back to Step 2 and pursue the enumeration of the remaining x until all of them have been considered, before going to Step 8. This way to present the algorithm is especially suited to determine the largest X_n^R (which are the most difficult ones). In those cases, most of the CPU time of BNE is spent on Step 6. This way of limiting the size of L also allows of course to use 'early abort' strategy and cut search time when a single lattice is missing (which eventually always happens!).

Remark 5.10 (Restrictions on d). We usually start with $d = 2s + 1$, since there are no normalized pairs (d, x) of type $n_1 + \cdots + n_s + e$ for smaller values of d. For some purposes, we may also restrict the enumeration of the (d, x) to d in certain congruence classes modulo some integers. For instance, in some hard cases, we sometimes restrict to d odd in order to optimize subsequent 2-neighbor computations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 8. *Hunting* X_{28}^R *with* $R = 7\mathbf{A}_1\, 3\mathbf{A}_2\, \mathbf{A}_7$ *and* $V = 6\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2\, \mathbf{A}_7$.

d	#iso	#found	#new_lat	rem_red_mass
23	55	0	0	5/24
24	267	2	1	1/8
25	558	10	1	1/12
26	1 888	20	0	1/12
27	3 024	29	1	0

Table 9. *Hunting* X_{28}^R *with* $R = 4\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2\, 2\mathbf{A}_3\, \mathbf{D}_4$ *and* $V = 3\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2\, 2\mathbf{A}_3\, \mathbf{D}_4$.

d	#iso	#found	#new_lat	rem_red_mass
24	295	78	36	773/16
26	2 082	341	66	293/16
28	12 217	1 623	44	13/8
30	55 083	4 980	6	7/16
32	154 458	10 992	4	0

We must also have d even in the case $e \neq 0$. In principle, we could take d large from the beginning, but this goes against our (guilty) wish to find neighbor forms $N_d(-)$ for our lattices in which the integer d is as small as possible.

6. Some examples

We start with a few simple examples for which the BNE algorithm directly works, and then provide a few more complicated ones. Note that there are usually many ways to find a given lattice, so some of the lattices described below may appear in a different neighbor form in our lists [1].

6.1. The root system $7\mathbf{A}_1\, 3\mathbf{A}_2\, \mathbf{A}_7$ *in dimension* 28

For this root system R, we know from King that the reduced mass of X_{28}^R is $5/24$ (whereas its mass is $|W(R)| = 1\,114\,767\,360$ times smaller), so we expect X_{28}^R to contain only very few lattices. We choose the visible root system $V := 6\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2\, \mathbf{A}_7$, that is $e = 0$ and the integer partition $8\, 3^2\, 2^6\, 1^2$ of 28. We have $s = 11$, so we may start at $d = 23$. The BNE algorithm terminates at $d = 27$ and returns the 3 lattices in X_{28}^R, with reduced masses $1/12$, $1/12$ and $1/24$, after about 7 minutes of CPU time.

We will give some details describing intermediate steps of such calculations using tables such as Table 8. The first column contains d. The second column gives the number #iso of d-isotropic lines found after Steps 2 and 3, incorporating Step 2′ explained in Remark 5.6. The third column gives the size #found of the list L after Step 5. *The better we have chosen the visible root system* V, *the higher the ratio* #iso/#found *is*. The fourth column gives the number of new lattices found in L, and the last column, the remaining reduced mass ρ of X_n^R after Step 7: when 0, the algorithm terminates.

6.2. The root system $4\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2\, 2\mathbf{A}_3\, \mathbf{D}_4$ *in dimension* 28

As another example with a little more lattices, as well as a component of type $\mathbf{D}$, consider the case of the root system R of the title. The reduced mass of X_{28}^R is $1033/16$. We use the visible root system $V = 3\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2\, 2\mathbf{A}_3\, \mathbf{D}_4$, that is $e = 4$ and type $4^3\, 3^2\, 2^3\, 1^4$ (hence, d is even ≥ 24). The BNE algorithm terminates at $d = 36$. It returns the 156 lattices of X_{28}^R, with reduced mass $1/2$ (112 times), $1/4$ (26 times), $1/8$ (15 times) and $1/16$ (3 times), after about 24 h of CPU time: see Table 9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6.3. The root system $16\mathbf{A}_1\,\mathbf{E}_6$ *in dimension* 28

For this root system R, the reduced mass of X_{28}^R is $1/23040$; hence, there may well be a unique class in X_{28}^R. The difficulty here is that no possible visible root system is 'very close' to R, because of the presence of a component of type $\mathbf{E}$ and too many $\mathbf{A}_1$. The best idea here is to use the fact that $\mathbf{A}_5\mathbf{A}_1$ is a 2-kernel of $\mathbf{E}_6$ (see Example 5.22 in [6]) and to run `BNE` for the visible root system $V \simeq 10\mathbf{A}_1\,\mathbf{A}_5\,\mathbf{D}_2 \simeq 12\mathbf{A}_1\,\mathbf{A}_5$; hence, $e = 2$ and type $6\,2^{11}$ (this forces d even and ≥ 24). For each of the even integers $24 \leq d \leq 46$, it turns out that the values of `#iso` given by `BNE` are

$$0, 0, 4, 5, 42, 93, 344, 516, 1440, 2064, 5792, 7673,$$

but that in all cases, we have `#found` $= 0$. Nevertheless, for $d = 48$, we find `#iso` $= 17098$ and finally `#found` $= 1$! The found (and unique) lattice in X_{28}^R has reduced mass $1/23040$ and is $\mathrm{N}_{48}(x; 0)$ with

$$x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 3, 3, 6, 6, 8, 8, 10, 10, 12, 12, 14, 14, 16, 16, 18, 18, 20, 20, 22, 22, 24, 24) \in \mathbb{Z}^{28}.$$

The whole computation only takes about 13 minutes of CPU time (essentially because we computed a single BV invariant). The explanation for all those zeros values of `#found` above is that this choice of visible root system, although essentially the best we can take, will most likely find lattices with root system of the form $n\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_5$ with $n \geq 13$. Indeed, there are many lattices in X_{28} with root systems $13\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_5$ (including some with the large reduced mass $1/4$) and $17\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{A}_5$.

Remark 6.1. The root system $\mathbf{D}_5$ is also a 2-kernel of $\mathbf{E}_6$, and the lattice L above can also be found using the visible root system $11\mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{D}_5$ for $d = 50$ (within about 55 minutes). In the latter case, we have `#iso` $= 31790$, `#found` $= 7$, and obtained $L \simeq \mathrm{N}_{50}(y)$ with $y \in \mathbb{Z}^{28}$ defined as

$$y = (1, 1, 5, 5, 6, 6, 7, 7, 8, 8, 12, 12, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16, 21, 21, 22, 22, 23, 23, 25, 25, 25, 25, 25).$$

All other choices of visible root systems seem to require more computations.

6.4. The root system $8\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2$ *in dimension* 28

For this root system R, the reduced mass of X_{28}^R is $9694663/2880 \simeq 3366.2$, which already implies $|\mathrm{X}_{28}^R| \geq 6733$. Actually, as we shall see, we have $|\mathrm{X}_{28}^R| = 7603$, and this is actually the maximum of the $|\mathrm{X}_{28}^S|$ for all root systems S. This is one reason why we chosed this example, which is much harder than the previous ones.

We know from Section 5.9 [6] (and especially Example 5.14) that the pair (R, V) is safe for $V = 7\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2$, so we run `BNE` for this visible root system, that is $e \leq 1$ and type $3^2\,2^7\,1^8$ ($s = 17$). For the subsequent purpose of computing 2-neighbors, it is convenient to restrict our search to odd d. Table 10 gives a summary of what `BNE` finds for all odd d from $2s + 1 = 35$ to 43 (we add in the table a lower bound of the number `#rem_lat` of remaining lattices in X_{28}^R after Step 7 in the last column). This computation is already quite lengthy: it took about 1400 h of CPU time. It allowed to find 7506 different classes in X_{28}^R so far, with remaining reduced mass $899/36$. It would be natural to try to go on in order to find the remaining lattices – namely, by exploring $d = 45, 47$ and so on. . . This would unfortunately

Table 10. *Hunting* X_{28}^R *with* $R = 8\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2$ *and* $V = 7\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2$.

d	`#iso`	`#found`	`#new_lat`	`rem_red_mass`	`#rem_lat` $\geq$
35	2 039	710	518	8987263/2880	6 243
37	25 009	9 587	3 536	4199593/2880	2 918
39	293 217	99 546	2 958	497041/2880	347
41	1 280 597	367 529	451	21349/720	61
43	5 801 141	1 398 150	43	899/36	51

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

require much more CPU time. Instead, we may proceed as follows.

(a) Exceptional lattices in X_{28}^R. An inspection of the 7506 found lattices is that none of them is exceptional. We refer to Lemma 6.3 for an explanation of an analogous phenomenon for $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$. Our aim now is to determine the (classes) of exceptional unimodular lattices in X_{28}^R.

As we are in dimension $28 \equiv 4 \bmod 8$, exceptional lattices L in $\mathcal{L}_{28}$ with $\mathrm{r}_1(L) = 0$ may be described using their singular companion $L' := \mathrm{sing}(L)$, by Proposition 2.1. Write $L' \simeq \mathrm{I}_r \perp U$ with $r \geq 1$ and $U \in \mathcal{L}_{28-r}$ satisfying $\mathrm{r}_1(U) = 0$. In particular, $\mathbf{D}_r \simeq \mathrm{R}_2(\mathrm{I}_r)$ is an irreducible component of $\mathrm{R}_2(L') = \mathrm{R}_2(L)$ (recall $\mathbf{D}_1 = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{D}_2 = 2\mathbf{A}_1$). Going back to the root system $R \simeq 8\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2$, the only possibilities are thus either $r = 1$ and $\mathrm{R}_2(U) \simeq R$, or $r = 2$ and $\mathrm{R}_2(U) \simeq 6\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2$. But an inspection of the classification in [6] of X_{26} and X_{27} shows that there are exactly two possibilities for U for $r = 2$, and 89 for $r = 1$ (all being nonexceptional). Proposition 2.1 thus shows the following:

Lemma 6.2. *There are* $89+2 = 91$ *classes of exceptional lattices in* X_{28}^R. *The sum of their reduced mass is* $595/24 + 13/288 = 7153/288$.

Better, in the analysis above, if we have $U \simeq \mathrm{N}_d(x)$ with d odd and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{28-r}$, then we know from Lemma 11.1 and Proposition 11.6 in [6] that the corresponding L satisfies $L \simeq \mathrm{N}_{2d}(y; 0)$ where $y \in \mathbb{Z}^{28}$ has odd coordinates and satisfies $y_i \equiv x_i \bmod d$ for $i < 28 - r$, and $y_i = d$ for $i \geq 28 - r$. Neighbor forms for the $2 + 89$ different U are easily found with d odd using `BNE` in dimensions 26 and 27. For instance, the 2 classes U in X_{26} with root system $6\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2$ are those of the $\mathrm{N}_{35}(x)$ with $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{26}$ given by

$$x = \begin{cases} (1,\,1,\,1,\,2,\,3,\,4,\,5,\,6,\,7,\,8,\,9,\,10,\,11,\,11,\,12,\,12,\,13,\,13,\,14,\,14,\,15,\,15,\,16,\,17,\,17,\,17)\,, \\ (1,\,1,\,1,\,2,\,3,\,4,\,5,\,6,\,7,\,8,\,9,\,9,\,10,\,11,\,11,\,12,\,12,\,13,\,13,\,14,\,14,\,15,\,16,\,16,\,16,\,17)\,, \end{cases}$$

and their respective reduced mass is $1/288$ and $1/24$. In the end, we do obtain neighbor forms for all 91 exceptional lattices of Lemma 6.2.

(b) Strict 2 neighbors of rare lattices. After incorporating the 91 exceptional lattices above in X_{28}^R, the remaining reduced mass is $13/96$. The remaining lattices presumably all have a small reduced mass. In order to find them, we apply some ideas from the theory of *visible isometries* explained in [6, §7] (see especially §7.9):

(b1) The first idea is that if some $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ has a large isometry group, we expect that many 2-isotropic lines in $L/2L$ will be stable by a nontrivial isometry of L, hence producing a 2-neighbor having that isometry, and biasing the search.

(b2) A second idea is that in order to avoid computing all 2-neighbors of L (or $\mathrm{O}(L)$-orbits of them), it seems more promising to focus on those having the same visible root system as L viewed as neighbors of I_n; we call them the *strict* 2-neighbors of L. Concretely, if we have $L = \mathrm{N}_d(x)$ with d odd, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and (d, x) normalized, then the strict 2-neighbors of L are the $\mathrm{N}_{2d}(y; \epsilon)$ with $y \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $y \equiv x \bmod d$, as well as $y_1 = 1$ and, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ with $x_i = x_j$, the congruence $y_i \equiv y_j \bmod 2$.

Among the 494 lattices found above for $d = 41$ and $d = 43$, there are 12 lattices with reduced mass $\leq 1/32$. For each of these d-neighbors L, given as $L = \mathrm{N}_d(x)$, we compute all the *strict* 2-neighbors L' of L, with $L' = \mathrm{N}_{2d}(y, \epsilon)$ as in (b2) above. As we are in dimension $n = 28$ and L has a visible root system $7\mathbf{A}_1\, 2\mathbf{A}_2$, there are thus only $2^{28-2-7-4-1} = 65\,536$ choices for y, hence presumably 32 768 isotropic ones, a quite manageable quantity. The hope is to find the remaining lattices among those $2 \times 12 \times 32\,768 = 786\,432$ different 2-neighbors. It works! Indeed, in about 20 h of CPU time, we did find this way the 6 remaining elements of X_{28}^R. They have a reduced mass $1/96$, $1/64$ twice and $1/32$ three times, and are given by the values of (d, y, ϵ) in Table 11.

6.5. The empty root system in dimension 29

We finally discuss the determination of $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$. For such lattices, the mass and the reduced mass coincide so we usually omit the term 'reduced'. We know that the mass of $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ is $49612728929/11136000 \simeq 4455.2$, so we have at least 8911 isometry classes. The only possibility here is to take $V = \emptyset$, and we

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 11. *The last* $\mathrm{N}_{2d}(y;\epsilon)$ *found in* X_{28}^{R} *for* $R = 8\mathbf{A}_1\,2\mathbf{A}_2$.

$2d$	y	ϵ	red_mass
82	(1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 36, 7, 33, 33, 31, 31, 11, 12, 13, 13, 14, 14, 14, 15, 25, 23, 22, 22, 20, 20)	0	1/32
82	(1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 37, 37, 36, 7, 8, 8, 10, 10, 30, 29, 13, 13, 14, 14, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 19, 21, 21)	1	1/96
86	(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 4, 4, 6, 6, 36, 9, 9, 33, 32, 32, 12, 30, 29, 29, 29, 28, 16, 26, 19, 19, 23, 22, 22)	0	1/32
86	(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 4, 4, 6, 6, 36, 9, 9, 10, 32, 32, 12, 13, 29, 29, 29, 28, 16, 17, 19, 19, 20, 22, 22)	1	1/32
86	(1, 1, 1, 3, 3, 5, 37, 37, 36, 35, 9, 9, 11, 31, 31, 13, 14, 14, 14, 15, 16, 16, 26, 18, 18, 20, 22, 22)	1	1/64
86	(1, 1, 1, 39, 5, 5, 37, 7, 7, 35, 35, 10, 32, 32, 12, 13, 14, 14, 14, 28, 28, 27, 17, 17, 25, 24, 20, 20)	0	1/64

Table 12. *Hunting* $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ *with* $V = \emptyset$ *and odd* $59 \le d \le 83$.

d	#iso	#found	#new_lat	rem_red_mass	#rem_lat ≥
59	1	1	1	1710782101/384000	8 912
61 & 63	0	0	0	1710782101/384000	8 912
65	4	4	4	570063367/128000	8 909
67	19	19	19	568975367/128000	8 892
69	149	138	107	562979367/128000	8 798
71	654	598	527	530939367/128000	8 297
73	3 173	2 771	1 836	1254618101/384000	6 536
75	24 641	20 300	3 971	185034167/128000	2 893
77	70 121	55 094	2 774	276881503/1152000	482
79	206 343	153 700	605	40169503/1152000	71
81	1 029 214	725 560	96	26594503/1152000	48
83	2 321 088	1 548 714	24	25345453/1152000	46

choose $0 \le e \le 1$ and all n_i equal to 1. See Table 12 for a summary of what BNE finds for all *odd* d from $2s + 1 = 59$ to 83, after about 850 h of CPU time. At this step, we have found 9964 elements in $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$. For instance, the first of theses lattices, found for $d = 59$, is the lattice $\mathrm{N}_{59}(1, 2, 3, \ldots, 29)$ which incidentally belongs to the family studied in [6, §8]. However, an inspection of our list shows that we only found a single exceptional lattice so far, for $d = 83$. This can be partially explained by the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *Assume* $L \in \mathcal{L}_n$ *is a* p*-neighbor of* I_n *with* p *prime and empty visible root system, which forces* $p \ge 2n + 1$. *Then any characteristic vector* ξ *of* L *with* $\xi.\xi < n$ *satisfies* $\xi.\xi \ge \frac{4n^3-n}{3p^2}$.

Proof. By definition, we have $L = \mathrm{M}_p(x) + \mathbb{Z}\frac{x'}{p}$ for some p-isotropic $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and some $x' \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $x' \equiv x \bmod p$. As p is odd, the vector $p\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a characteristic vector of I_n, and hence has odd coordinates. Write $p\xi = kx + pm$ with $0 \le k < p$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We have $k > 0$, otherwise $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\xi.\xi \ge n$. So the coordinates of $p\xi$ are distinct mod p, since so are those of x by assumption. This proves $p^2\xi.\xi \ge \sum_{i=1}^{n}(2i-1)^2 = (4n^3 - n)/3$. □

Note that for $n = 29$ and $\xi.\xi = 5$, this forces $p \ge 83$, in accordance with what we found. Our first aim now is to seek for exceptional lattices in $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$. We cannot argue as in §6.4 (a) since $29 \not\equiv 4 \bmod 8$. Instead, we use the variant of BNE discussed in [6, §9.13–9.16]. The basic idea is to look for d-neighbors $N := \mathrm{N}_d(x;\epsilon)$ of I_{29} with empty root systems and such that the norm 5 vector $(0, \ldots, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) \in \mathrm{I}_{29}$ is a (visible!) characteristic vector of N. As explained *loc. cit.*, the trick is just to modify Step 2 of BNE and enumerate only d-isotropic $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{29}$, with d even, all of whose coordinates are odd, except the last 5 ones which are even and with sum $\equiv 0 \bmod d$. This forces $d \ge 94$, and Table 13 shows what we obtain after only about 60 h of CPU time. The last lattice, with mass 1/24000, came very late and is much harder to find than the others: this is $\mathrm{N}_{114}(x;0)$ with

$$x = (1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 45, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57).$$

Up to this point, we have found 10068 classes in $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$, with remaining mass 1481/5760. There are several methods that we can use to find the last ones. First, we run BNE for the empty visible root system,

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 13. *Hunting exceptional lattices in* $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$.

d	#iso	#found	#new_lat	rem_mass	#rem_lat
94	20	20	7	22177453/1152000	40
96	46	37	9	2697341/144000	39
98	82	74	26	1488341/144000	22
100	150	122	24	729281/144000	12
102	900	664	26	123131/144000	3
104	687	466	6	81431/144000	3
106	4 940	3 131	4	40631/144000	2
108	7 833	4 627	1	37031/144000	2
110	55 116	29 680	0	37031/144000	2
112	47 310	23 889	0	37031/144000	2
114	377 410	176 966	1	1481/5760	2

Table 14. *Hunting* $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ *with* $V = \emptyset$ *and even* $58 \leq d \leq 82$.

d	#iso	#found	#new_lat	rem_red_mass	#rem_lat ≥
58 – 70	1 207	1 112	0	1481/5760	2
72	4 445	3 847	2	1091/5760	2
74	16 304	13 423	0	1091/5760	2
76	65 591	51 666	3	589/3840	2
78	390 922	290 029	2	499/3840	2
80	1 065 081	752 393	7	941/15360	2
82	2 969 999	1 985 285	1	301/15360	2

$0 \leq e \leq 1$, and *even* $58 \leq d \leq 82$, which we have not done yet, and only finds 15 more lattices in about 1050 more hours, as shown by Table 14.

At this point, we have found 10 083 lattices, and the remaining mass is only 301/15360. It would be presumably quite lengthy to seek for the remaining lattices by simply pursuing `BNE`. A more direct way to find them is to use the theory of visible isometries as in §6.4 (b), and study 2-neighbors of the found lattices $L = \mathrm{N}_d(x)$ with large isometry groups and d odd. Note that as the root system is empty here, each 2 neighbor of such an L is strict, so we have no meaningful way to reduce the search as we did in §6.4. In such a situation with $\mathrm{O}(L)$ big, we should also gain much in principle in computing first the $\mathrm{O}(L)$-orbits of 2-isotropic lines in $L/2L$, since there is a huge number of such lines in dimension 29. In practice, this is not really necessary, and we prefer to only compute the neighbors associated to a large number of 2-isotropic lines of a given L, say here 2 000 000, and then try the next L if it fails.

This works pretty well! Indeed, the lattice $L = \mathrm{N}_d(x)$ in $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$, with d odd and largest isometry group, appears for $d = 83$ and satisfies $|\mathrm{O}(L)| = 1536$. Using this L as explained above, we do find 7 new lattices, with remaining mass 167/25920. The next 3 lattices with largest isometry groups did not provide new lattices, but the 2 after – namely, a 75-neighbor with mass 1/160, and a 81-neighbor with mass 1/128 – do give rise (each) to a new lattice, with respective masses 1/160 and 1/5184, and this concludes the proof! Those $7 + 1 + 1 = 9$ lattices $\mathrm{N}_{2d}(y; \epsilon)$ are given in the following table. The full computation here took about 480 h of CPU time.

The method above is essentially the one we used when we first computed $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$. Meanwhile, the second author found a more direct way to find d-neighbors of I_n with prescribed (and 'visible') isometries. This method is described in §7.5 and §7.7 of [6]. The basic idea is to fix $\sigma \in \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{I}_n)$ and to study to d-neighbors N of I_n with $\sigma \in \mathrm{O}(N)$ and having a given visible root system V, which translates into some conditions on the isotropic lines that we enumerate. This is especially suited to empty (or small) V. An example of application of these ideas to the determination of $\mathrm{X}_{28}^{\emptyset}$ is detailed in §7.6 *loc. cit*. The situation here is a bit similar, and goes as follows.

We go back right before the 2-neighbor argument above. At this step, the remaining mass is 301/15360. We have $15360 = 2^{10}\,3\,5$, so we know that we still need to find lattices in $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$ having

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 15. *The last nine lattices* $\mathrm{N}_{2d}(y;\epsilon)$ *found in* $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$.

$2d$	y	ϵ	mass
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 65, 19, 20, 21, 23, 58, 57, 27, 28, 29, 53, 31, 51, 33, 49, 35, 36, 45, 44, 43, 42)	1	1/864
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 67, 18, 64, 20, 62, 23, 58, 57, 27, 55, 54, 30, 31, 32, 33, 49, 35, 36, 38, 39, 43, 42)	0	1/1536
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 62, 23, 58, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 52, 32, 50, 49, 48, 47, 38, 39, 40, 42)	1	1/6144
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 64, 20, 21, 60, 58, 26, 56, 55, 54, 30, 31, 51, 50, 49, 35, 47, 38, 44, 40, 42)	0	1/96
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 65, 64, 20, 21, 23, 25, 57, 27, 55, 54, 53, 52, 32, 50, 49, 48, 36, 45, 39, 40, 42)	0	1/2592
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 63, 62, 23, 25, 26, 56, 28, 29, 53, 31, 51, 50, 34, 48, 47, 45, 39, 40, 42)	1	1/3072
166	(1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 68, 16, 65, 64, 20, 21, 60, 58, 57, 56, 28, 29, 53, 31, 51, 33, 34, 35, 47, 45, 39, 40, 42)	0	1/18432
150	(1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 65, 11, 12, 62, 61, 15, 59, 18, 56, 55, 22, 24, 25, 49, 48, 28, 46, 44, 43, 41, 35, 39, 38)	1	1/160
162	(1, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 65, 17, 18, 19, 20, 60, 22, 57, 55, 27, 52, 30, 49, 33, 47, 46, 36, 38, 42, 41)	1	1/5184

Table 16. *Another form for the last nine lattices* $\mathrm{N}_d(x)$ *found in* $\mathrm{X}_{29}^{\emptyset}$.

d	x	mass	char	p	d'
407	(1, 334, 38, 75, 223, 78, 4, 115, 152, 300, 375, 301, 5, 42, 190, 266, 118, 340, 7, 303, 45, 378, 82, 119, 267, 231, 121, 11, 308)	1/160	$\phi_5^5\phi_1^9$	11	37
315	(1, 226, 46, 92, 2, 137, 183, 93, 228, 94, 139, 229, 50, 275, 95, 141, 51, 186, 8, 233, 53, 190, 100, 235, 56, 147, 238, 14, 105)	1/2592	$\phi_3^8\phi_1^{13}$	7	45
315	(1, 226, 46, 92, 2, 137, 3, 48, 138, 274, 184, 4, 50, 275, 95, 276, 6, 96, 8, 233, 53, 190, 100, 235, 56, 147, 238, 14, 105)	1/864	$\phi_3^8\phi_1^{13}$	7	45
357	(1, 205, 256, 309, 156, 207, 106, 310, 4, 311, 209, 5, 211, 58, 109, 213, 111, 264, 164, 62, 215, 64, 268, 319, 14, 168, 322, 119, 273)	1/5184	$\phi_3^8\phi_1^{13}$	7	51
287	(1, 247, 165, 248, 125, 166, 3, 167, 208, 127, 86, 4, 169, 128, 46, 253, 212, 130, 8, 254, 172, 50, 9, 214, 10, 174, 215, 175, 217)	1/3072	$\phi_3^9\phi_1^{11}$	7	41
287	(1, 247, 165, 248, 125, 166, 3, 167, 208, 45, 209, 250, 169, 128, 46, 253, 212, 130, 213, 90, 131, 50, 9, 214, 10, 174, 215, 175, 217)	1/96	$\phi_3^9\phi_1^{11}$	7	41
301	(1, 44, 130, 260, 2, 88, 218, 261, 46, 134, 177, 263, 178, 6, 264, 136, 265, 222, 267, 9, 95, 225, 268, 53, 183, 226, 11, 98, 56)	1/6144	$\phi_3^9\phi_1^{11}$	7	43
329	(1, 142, 95, 143, 237, 96, 239, 51, 4, 99, 240, 193, 288, 100, 53, 148, 289, 242, 197, 9, 291, 199, 293, 152, 295, 107, 60, 14, 203)	1/18432	$\phi_3^9\phi_1^{11}$	7	47
483	(1, 139, 416, 347, 3, 417, 73, 4, 352, 145, 423, 354, 79, 355, 289, 82, 359, 152, 429, 222, 16, 292, 17, 431, 294, 434, 21, 91, 161)	1/1536	$\phi_2^{12}\phi_1^{17}$	7	67

isometries of prime order $q = 2, 3$ and 5. The characteristic polynomial of such an isometry is $\phi_q^k\,\phi_1^l$, with ϕ_m the m-th cyclotomic polynomial, and $k(q-1)+l = 29$. For fixed q and k, we choose an auxiliary odd prime $p \equiv 1 \bmod q$ and consider associated $d := pd'$ isotropic lines described in *loc. cit.* §7.5 for all odd integers $d' = 1, 3, \ldots$ and so on. These lines have the properties that the associated neighbors N have an empty visible root system and a (visible) isometry with characteristic polynomial $\phi_q^k\,\phi_1^l$. Better, they are tailored such that the following product of k disjoint q-cycles in $\mathrm{S}_{29} \subset \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{I}_{29})$,

$$\sigma_{q,k} \;=\; (1\,2\,\ldots\,q)\;(q+1\;\;q+2\;\;\ldots\;\;2q)\;\cdots\;((k-1)q+1\;\;(k-1)q+2\;\;\ldots\;\;kq),$$

lies in $\mathrm{O}(N)$. This requires $qk \le 29$. By studying those lines, we do also find the 9 remaining lattices, under the form given by Table 16 below. This is much faster: it only took less than 3 h to find the first 8 lattices, and about 7 h for the last one.

For instance, for the lattice $L = \mathrm{N}_{329}(x)$ above with mass 1/18432, we have

$$\begin{cases} x \bmod 7 \;=\; (1,2,4,3,6,5,1,2,4,1,2,4,1,2,4,1,2,4,1,2,4,3,6,5,1,2,4,0,0), \\ x \bmod 47 \;=\; (1,1,1,2,2,2,4,4,4,5,5,5,6,6,6,7,7,7,9,9,9,11,11,11,13,13,13,14,15), \end{cases}$$

so $\sigma_{3,9}^{-1}$ acts on $(\mathbb{Z}/7)x \subset (\mathbb{Z}/7)^{29}$ by multiplication by 2, and fixes x mod 47.

Remark 6.4. This second method also has drawbacks. As an example, consider the last lattice L in Table 16. Although we have $|\mathrm{O}(L)| = 1536 = 2^9 \cdot 3$, it is impossible to find it as a neighbor of I_{29} with a visible isometry of order 3. Indeed, we can check a posteriori that the order 3 elements of $\mathrm{O}(L)$ all have the same characteristic polynomial $\phi_3^{11}\phi_1^7$, whereas no element of $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{I}_{29})$ has this property since $11 \cdot 3 > 29$. They are other constraints, which luckily are not prohibitive to conclude here: see §7.7 *loc. cit.* for more about this.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Jacques Martinet and Olivier Taïbi for remarks or discussions, as well as the anonymous referee for all their comments. Experiments presented in this work were carried out using (a) the PlaFRIM experimental testbed, supported by Inria, CNRS (LABRI and IMB), Universite de Bordeaux, Bordeaux INP and Conseil Regional d'Aquitaine (see

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://www.plafrim.fr/), (b) the cluster cinaps of the LMO, Université Paris-Saclay. We warmly thank PlaFRIM and the LMO for sharing their machines.

Competing interest. The authors have no competing interests to declare.

Financial support. B. Allombert was supported by the CNRS and the ANR-NSF project CHARM (ANR-21-CE94-0003, CCF-2122230). G. Chenevier was supported by the CNRS and by the ANR project COLOSS (ANR-19-CE40-0015-02).

Database and supplementary material. All the data associated with this paper, including lists of neighbor forms of all of our lattices, as well as PARI/GP scripts to play with these lists and independently check their completeness, are available at the website [1], as well as a supplementary material to this article.

References

[1] B. Allombert & G. Chenevier, 'Database and PARI/GP source code for Unimodular Hunting II', http://gaetan.chenevier.perso.math.cnrs.fr/unimodular_lattices/index_uni_II.html. Also available as supplementary material to this article.
[2] R. Bacher, 'Tables de réseaux entiers unimodulaires construits comme k-voisins de $\mathbb{Z}^n$', *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **9**, 479–497 (1997).
[3] R. Bacher and B. Venkov, 'Réseaux entiers unimodulaires sans racine en dimension 27 et 28', in J. Martinet (ed), *Réseaux euclidiens, designs sphériques et formes modulaires* (Monogr. Enseign. Math) (in French) vol. 37 (L'Enseignement Mathématique, 2001), 212–267.
[4] G. Chenevier, 'The characteristic masses of Niemeier lattices', *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **32** (2020), 545–583.
[5] G. Chenevier, 'Statistics for Kneser p-neighbors', *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **150**(3) (2022), 473–516. With an appendix by O. Taïbi.
[6] G. Chenevier, 'Unimodular hunting', to appear in *Algebraic Geometry*.
[7] J.H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups*, (Grundlehren der Math. Wissenschaften) vol. 290, third edn. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999).
[8] U. Fincke and M. Pohst, 'Improved methods for calculating vectors of short length in a lattice, including a complexity analysis', *Math. Comp.* **44** (1985), 463–471.
[9] The GAP group, GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.10.2, https://www.gap-system.org (2019).
[10] O. King, 'A mass formula for unimodular lattices with no roots', *Math. Comp.* **72**(242) (2003), 839–863.
[11] The PARI Group, PARI/GP version 2.13.0, Bordeaux, 2014, https://pari.math.u-bordeaux.fr/.
[12] W. Plesken and B. Souvignier, 'Computing isometries of lattices', *J. Symbolic Comput.* **24**, 327–334 (1997).
[13] B. Venkov, 'Even unimodular Euclidean lattices in dimension 32', *J. Soviet Math.* **26** (1984), 1860–1867.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2025.10058 Published online by Cambridge University Press