

BOUNDS ON CODING THEORY FROM ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY

GUILHERME ZEUS DANTAS E MOURA

ABSTRACT. Coding theory is concerned with finding efficient ways to encode a message so that one may correct errors in the message. In algebraic coding theory, we study efficient codes generated from algebraic geometric methods.

In this paper, I will construct the Reed–Solomon codes, generalize them using projective curves, and understand the results from [1] on finding a bound better than the well-known Gilbert–Varshamov one.

1. CODING THEORY

Definition 1.1 (Code). A code C over an alphabet A is a subset of $A^n = A \times \cdots \times A$. We define n as the *length* of C . A code C over a field A is a *linear code* if C is a vector subspace of A^n . An element of a code C is called a *code word*.

In this paper, A is a finite field unless otherwise stated.

Definition 1.2 (Hamming distance). We define *Hamming distance* between $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), \mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in A^n$ as

$$(1.1) \quad \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \#(x_i \neq y_i \mid i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}),$$

in other words, the number of positions \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} differ.

Proposition 1.3. *Hamming distance is a metric over A^n , i.e., the following holds for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in A^n$:*

- $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0 \iff \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$;
- $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \text{dist}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x})$;
- $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) + \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y})$.

Definition 1.4 (Parameters of a code). If C is a linear code over A , we define *dimension* of C as $k = \dim_A(C)$ and *minimum distance* of C as $d = \min \{\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in C\}$. (If C is a nonlinear code over an alphabet with size q , we can coherently define $k = \log_q |C|$.) The length n , dimension k and minimum distance d are the *parameters* of C .

Suppose Alice wants to send a message to Bob through a noisy channel. They previously agree on a choice of code $C \subset A^n$, with parameters n, k, d . Alice will choose one of the $|A|^k$ code words and send it to Bob. Since the channel is not a perfect medium, some positions of the code may change; however, if less than $\frac{d}{2}$ of such changes occur, Bob can take the closest code word to the receiving message using Hamming distance and restore the original message.

Thus, a good code has two properties: it has large d with respect to n , in order to correct as many errors as possible; but also has large k with respect to n , so that Alice has a wider variety of possible messages to send and send more information.

Definition 1.5. If C is a code, its code rate is $R = k/n$ and its relative minimum distance is $\delta = d/n$. Note that $R, \delta \in [0, 1]$.

Therefore, a good code is one with large R — not much redundancy — and large δ — corrects many errors.

2. SINGLETON BOUND AND A PROMISING EXAMPLE

Theorem 2.1 (Singleton Bound). *If C is a code with parameters n, k, d , then*

$$(2.1) \quad k + d \leq n + 1,$$

or equivalently,

$$(2.2) \quad R + \delta \leq 1 + 1/n.$$

Proof. We will provide the proof for Theorem 2.1 when C is a linear code.

WRITE PROOF. \square

Definition 2.2 (Reed–Solomon Codes). Let q be a power of a prime, and $\mathbb{F}_q = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_q\}$ the field with q elements. Let k be an integer, and \mathcal{L}_k the set of all polynomials over \mathbb{F}_q with degree smaller than k . Let $k \leq n \leq q$ be an integer. The Reed–Solomon code $RS_q(n, k)$ over \mathbb{F}_q is

$$(2.3) \quad RS_q(n, k) = \{(f(\alpha_1), f(\alpha_2), \dots, f(\alpha_n)) \mid f \in \mathcal{L}_k\}.$$

Proposition 2.3. *The Reed–Solomon code $RS_q(n, k)$ is a linear code with length n , dimension k and minimum distance $n - k + 1$. Thus, any Reed–Solomon code meets the inequality of the Singleton Bound.*

Proof. $RS_q(n, k)$ is a subset of \mathbb{F}_q^n , thus it has length n . Note that \mathcal{L}_k is a vector space over \mathbb{F}_q . Note that $\{1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{k-1}\}$ is a choice of basis for this vector space, thus it has dimension k . Consider the map $\phi : \mathcal{L}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ given by

$$(2.4) \quad f \mapsto (f(\alpha_1), f(\alpha_2), \dots, f(\alpha_n)).$$

Note that the map ϕ is a linear transformation. Thus, its image $\text{Im } \phi = RS_q(n, k)$ is also a vector space. Additionally, if $\phi(f) = \phi(g)$, then $f - g$ has at least n roots, but has degree less than n ; thus $f - g$ is the zero polynomial, which implies $f = g$. Therefore, ϕ is also injective. This implies that the dimension of the domain \mathcal{L}_k is the same as the dimension of the image $RS_q(n, k)$, i.e., $\dim RS_q(n, k) = k$.

Finally, consider distinct $f, g \in \mathcal{L}_k$ and define $d = \text{dist}(\phi(f), \phi(g))$, $f - g$ has at least $n - d$ roots. Furthermore, $f - g$ is a non-zero polynomial with degree less than k , thus has at most $k - 1$ roots. Then, $k - 1 \geq \# \text{ roots} \geq n - d$. If we choose f, g such that d is the minimal distance, we get $k + d_{\min} \geq n + 1$, which together with [Singleton Bound](#) implies

$$(2.5) \quad k + d_{\min} = n + 1.$$

□

The Reed–Solomon codes are good codes in the sense that they have the largest possible sum $k + d$ for their length n . However, Reed–Solomon codes are limited because their length is at most the alphabet size.

3. GENERALIZED REED–SOLOMON CODES

We shall redefine the Reed–Solomon codes using language related to a projective line. There is a way to replace the “projective line” with a “projective plane curve” and create other codes, called *Generalized Reed–Solomon codes* or simply *algebraic geometric codes*. We want large R and δ , and these codes yield

$$(3.1) \quad R + \delta \geq 1 + 1/n - g/n,$$

where n is the number of rational points of a curve X , with genus g .

4. FINAL THOUGHTS

On equation (3.1), we observe that good algebraic geometric codes are generated by curves with a large ratio between n and g . On [1], the authors present a sequence of such curves, with n/g large enough to create a better bound than the Gilbert–Varshamov one.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. A. Tsfasman, S. G. Vlăduț, and Th. Zink. “Modular curves, Shimura curves, and Goppa codes, better than Varshamov–Gilbert bound”. In: *Math. Nachr.* 109.1 (1982), pp. 21–28. DOI: [10.1002/mana.19821090103](https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.19821090103).