ERRATA

Erratum to: On Completely Regular Codes

J. Borges^{a,*}, J. Rifà^{a,**}, and V. A. Zinoviev^{b,***}

^a Department of Information and Communications Engineering, School of Engineering, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, Spain ^b Kharkevich Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia e-mail: *joaquim.borges@uab.cat, **josep.rifa@uab.cat, ***zinov@iitp.ru

Received April 30, 2019; revised April 30, 2019; accepted May 21, 2019

Abstract—We correct mistakes in the formulations of Theorem 19 and Proposition 17 of the original article, published in vol. 55, no. 1, 1–45.

DOI: 10.1134/S0032946019030098

In the original article, the authors made the following mistakes in formulations.

1. Theorem 19 should read as follows:

Theorem 19 [60, 61]. If C is a perfect nontrivial e-code in the Johnson scheme J(n, w), $w \le n/2$, then its length n is upper bounded as follows:

$$n \leq \frac{2e+1}{e}(w-1).$$

2. Proposition 17 should read as follows:

Proposition 17. If C is a nontrivial perfect e-code in J(n, w), then w is lower bounded as follows:

$$w \ge \begin{cases} e^2 + 3e + 1 & \text{if } w > n/2 \text{ [61],} \\ \frac{1}{2}e(e+1)(e+2) + 2e + 2 & \text{if } w < n/2 \text{ and } n \text{ odd [53],} \\ e(e+1)(e+2) + 2e + 2 & \text{if } w < n/2 \text{ and } n \text{ even [53],} \\ 2e^2 + 4e + 1 & \text{if } w = n/2 \text{ [53].} \end{cases}$$

The authors apologize for the mistakes.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1134/S0032946019010010.