

Distance bounds for algebraic geometric codes

Iwan Duursma*, Radoslav Kirov*, and Seungkook Park†


October 31, 2018

Abstract

Various methods have been used to obtain improvements of the Goppa lower bound for the minimum distance of an algebraic geometric code. The main methods divide into two categories and all but a few of the known bounds are special cases of either the Lundell-McCullough floor bound or the Beelen order bound. The exceptions are recent improvements of the floor bound by Güneri-Stichtenoth-Taskin, and Duursma-Park, and of the order bound by Duursma-Park and Duursma-Kirov. In this paper we provide short proofs for all floor bounds and most order bounds in the setting of the van Lint and Wilson AB method. Moreover, we formulate unifying theorems for order bounds and formulate the DP and DK order bounds as natural but different generalizations of the Feng-Rao bound for one-point codes.

Introduction

Various methods have been used to obtain improvements of the Goppa lower bound for the minimum distance of an algebraic geometric code. The best known lower bounds appear in the diagram below. Apart from the basic bounds, they divide into floor bounds, order bounds, and bounds of mixed type.



*Dept. of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign ({duursma,rkirov2}@math.uiuc.edu)

†School of Computational Sciences, Korea Institute for Advanced Study (napsk71@kias.re.kr)

In the first part of the paper, we recall the AB method and show how it improves as well as unifies bounds. Without the AB method, the best bounds in each category - the floor bound d_{GST} [13], the mixed bound d_{GST2} [13], and the order bound d_B [2] - are not comparable. The codes in Table 1, constructed with the Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8 , illustrate that the bounds d_{GST} , d_{GST2} and d_B , can not be compared in general. Their improvements $d_{ABZ} \geq d_{GST}$ (Section 2), $d_{ABZ+} \geq d_{GST2}$ (Section 3), and $d_{ABZ'} \geq d_B$ (Section 4) satisfy $d_{ABZ'} \geq d_{ABZ+} \geq d_{ABZ}$, for any given code. Thus, for the improved bounds, bounds of order type improve bounds of mixed type which in turn improve bounds of floor type.

Code	d_{GST}	d_{GST2}	d_B	d_{ABZ}	d_{ABZ+}	$d_{ABZ'}$
$C_\Omega(D, G = 28P + 2Q)$	8	8	7	8	8	8
$C_\Omega(D, G = 30P)$	7	6	8	7	7	8
$C_\Omega(D, G = 30P + Q)$	7	8	8	8	8	8
$C_\Omega(D, G = 30P + 2Q)$	9	9	9	10	10	10

Table 1: Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8

The best bounds overall are the order bounds d_{DP} [7] and d_{DK} [6]. In the second part of the paper we present a framework to derive bounds of order type including the bounds d_{DP} and d_{DK} . In Section 5 and Section 6 we outline our approach and we develop our main tools (Proposition 5.4, Theorem 5.5, and Theorem 6.1). Theorem 7.1 in Section 7 gives a general order bound that includes the bound d_{DK} . The bounds d_{DP} and d_B follow as special cases but in a form that is different from their original formulation. In Section 8 we show that the different formulations are equivalent. In Section 9 we indicate how bounds in this paper can be computed efficiently. In the remainder of this introduction, we briefly discuss each of the three types of bounds.

(Floor bounds) For a divisor H with $L(H) \neq 0$, its floor is the unique divisor $\lfloor H \rfloor$ that is minimal with the property $L(H) = L(\lfloor H \rfloor)$ [20]. The difference $E_H = H - \lfloor H \rfloor$ is called the fixed part of the divisor H [23]. Maharaj, Matthews and Pirsic [21] showed that, for a geometric Goppa code $C_\Omega(D, H + \lfloor H \rfloor)$, the actual minimum distance exceeds the Goppa minimum distance by at least the degree of the fixed part E_H of H (the bound d_{MMP}). This generalizes results in [5], [15]. Lundell and McCullough [19] gave a further generalization (the bound d_{LM}) that includes as special cases other bounds in [5], [15], as well as bounds in [12], [17]. Recently, Güneri, Stichtenoth, and Taskin [13], and Duursma and Park [7] gave further improvements d_{GST} and d_{ABZ} , respectively. The d_{GST} bound further exploits the floor bound method. The d_{ABZ} bound uses an argument similar to the AB method of van Lint and Wilson [26]. In Section 2, we compare the improvements and show that $d_{ABZ} \geq d_{GST} \geq d_{LM}$.

(Order bounds) The Feng-Rao decoding algorithm for one-point codes corrects errors up to half the Goppa designed minimum distance [10], [9]. Soon after the algorithm was presented it became clear that in many cases it corrects beyond half the Goppa designed minimum distance. An analysis of the actual performance of the algorithm led Kirfel and Pellikaan to define the Feng-Rao bound d_{FR} for the minimum distance of one-point codes [17]. For Hermitian one-point codes, the bound agrees with the actual minimum distance of the code [27], [17]. Later, the bound was connected to order domains and became known as the order bound [14]. The formulation of the order bound for general codes from curves (the bound d_B) is due to Beelen [2]. The bound d_B agrees, for all Hermitian two-point codes, with the actual minimum distance of the code [16], [2], [24]. Using an approach similar to that in [14], Carvalho, Munuera, da Silva, and Torres [4] formulated an order bound d_{CMST} for multi-point codes. All order bounds for a code use a filtration of subcodes of the code. For the Feng-Rao bound the filtration is determined by the choice of a point P and takes the form

$$C_\Omega(D, G) \supset C_\Omega(D, G + P) \supset C_\Omega(D, G + 2P) \supset \cdots \supset \{0\}$$

The bounds in [14], [4] follow this choice. Beelen allows the addition of different points at different steps in the filtration. This is essential in order to attain the actual minimum distance of Hermitian two-point codes and in general greatly improves the order bound. The improved bounds $d_{ABZ'}$, d_{DP} [7] and d_{DK} [6] satisfy $d_{DK} \geq d_{DP} \geq d_{ABZ'} \geq d_B$ and $d_{ABZ'} \geq d_{ABZ}$. The bound $d_{ABZ'}$ provides a connection between the families of floor bounds and order bounds. It shows that in general order bounds provide better bounds than floor bounds. With hindsight, the bounds d_{DP} and d_{DK} are each natural generalizations of the Feng-Rao bound. The bound d_{DP} generalizes the performance aspect of the bound. Decoding up to half the bound d_{DP} is possible in much the same way as the original Feng-Rao decoding algorithm [7]. The bound d_{DK} generalizes the bound itself, but in a way that is no longer compatible with the original decoding algorithm. And decoding up to half the bound d_{DK} is an open problem.

(Mixed bounds) The Garcia-Kim-Lax bound d_{GKL} [11] resembles floor bounds but in some cases improves on them. The bound uses extra assumptions and the original proof has some characteristics of the order bound. In particular, the proof deals separately with words in $C_\Omega(D, G) \setminus C_\Omega(D, G + P)$ as in the first step of the filtration that is used in the order bound. Güneri, Stichtenoth and Taskin [13] give a generalization d_{GST2} of the bound d_{GKL} that includes and improves the bound d_{LM} . We give a further improvement $d_{ABZ+} \geq d_{GST2}$ that shows the role of mixed bounds as an intermediate between floor bounds and order bounds. In particular, $d_{ABZ'} \geq d_{ABZ+} \geq d_{ABZ}$. Improvements of mixed bounds over similar floor bounds are in general small. The improvement of d_{GST2} over d_{LM} is at most one and the improvement of d_{ABZ+} over d_{ABZ} is at most two. We also show that the bound d_{GKL} can be obtained as a special case of the bound d_B .

1 Algebraic geometric codes

The following notation will be used. Let X/\mathbb{F} be an algebraic curve (absolutely irreducible, smooth, projective) of genus g over a finite field \mathbb{F} . Let $\mathbb{F}(X)$ be the function field of X/\mathbb{F} and let $\Omega(X)$ be the module of rational differentials of X/\mathbb{F} . Given a divisor E on X defined over \mathbb{F} , let $L(E) = \{f \in \mathbb{F}(X) \setminus \{0\} : (f) + E \geq 0\} \cup \{0\}$, and let $\Omega(E) = \{\omega \in \Omega(X) \setminus \{0\} : (\omega) \geq E\} \cup \{0\}$. Let K represent the canonical divisor class. For n distinct rational points P_1, \dots, P_n on X and for disjoint divisors $D = P_1 + \dots + P_n$ and G , the geometric Goppa codes $C_L(D, G)$ and $C_\Omega(D, G)$ are defined as the images of the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_L : L(G) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{F}^n, & f &\mapsto (f(P_1), \dots, f(P_n)), \\ \alpha_\Omega : \Omega(G - D) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{F}^n, & \omega &\mapsto (\text{res}_{P_1}(\omega), \dots, \text{res}_{P_n}(\omega)). \end{aligned}$$

The condition that G has support disjoint from D is not essential and can be removed by modifying the encoding maps α_L and α_Ω locally at the coordinates $P \in \text{supp } G \cap \text{supp } D$ [25]. The Hamming distance between two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{F}^n$ is $d(x, y) = |\{i : x_i \neq y_i\}|$. The minimum distance of a nontrivial linear code \mathcal{C} is $d(\mathcal{C}) = \min \{d(x, y) : x, y \in \mathcal{C}, x \neq y\}$.

Proposition 1.1. (*Goppa bound d_{GOP}*).

$$\begin{aligned} d(C_L(D, G)) &\geq \deg(D - G), & \text{and} \\ d(C_\Omega(D, G)) &\geq \deg(G - K). \end{aligned}$$

Every algebraic geometric code can be represented in either of the two forms but the choice of the representation is irrelevant for our bounds. Two codes $C_L(D, G^*)$ and $C_\Omega(D, G)$ are equivalent if $G + G^* \sim K + D$ [25]. Our bounds depend on the divisor class C , where $C = D - G$ for a code $C_L(D, G)$ and $C = G - K$ for a code $C_\Omega(D, G)$. The codes $C_\Omega(D, G)$ and $C_L(D, G^*)$ share the same divisor class $C = G - K = D - G^*$ and thus bounds that depend only on the divisor class C are independent of the choice of the representation of the code. The divisor D , which is the same for $C_\Omega(D, G)$ and for $C_L(D, G^*)$, only plays a minor role in the bounds. For each bound there is a finite set S of points such that the bound holds whenever D is disjoint from S . In particular, the Goppa bound becomes $d \geq \deg C$, for $S = \emptyset$. The Goppa bound is also called the designed minimum distance of the code and we call the divisor C the designed minimum support of the code.

Proposition 1.2. (*Base point bound d_{BPT}*) *If the divisor C has a base point P , i.e. $L(C) = L(C - P)$, then a code with designed minimum support C and defined with a divisor D disjoint from P has distance $d \geq \deg C + 1$.*

Proof. There exists a word in the code of weight $w = \deg C$ if and only if $C \sim P_{i_1} + \dots + P_{i_w}$ for w distinct points $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_w} \in \text{supp}(D)$. The existence of such a word would imply $L(C) \neq L(C - P)$. Therefore $d > \deg C$. \square

The bound applies to a code $C_\Omega(D, G)$ with $G = A + B + P$ such that $L(A + P) = L(A)$ and $L(B + P) = L(B)$, which is essentially the case considered in [12, Theorem 2.1].

Lemma 1.3. *For a given divisor G and a point P , there exist divisors A and B such that $G = A + B + P$ and $L(A + P) = L(A)$ and $L(B + P) = L(B)$ if and only if $L(C) = L(C - P)$, for $G \sim K + C$.*

Proof. The if part is clear, for we can choose $A = C - P$ and $B = K$. For the only if part we use $K - C + P \sim (K - A) + (K - B)$. And since $L(K - A) \neq L(K - A - P)$ and $L(K - B) \neq L(K - B - P)$, $L(K - C + P) \neq L(K - C)$, or $L(C) = L(C - P)$. \square

2 Floor bounds

We present the ABZ floor bound of Duursma and Park [7] and show that it includes the bounds d_{LM} and d_{GST} . The following lemma contains the main idea.

Lemma 2.1. *Given a divisor G , let η be a nonzero differential with divisor $(\eta) = G - D' + E$, such that $D', E \geq 0$ and $E \cap D' = \emptyset$. For divisors A, B , and Z , such that $G = A + B + Z$, and such that $Z \geq 0$ and $Z \cap D' = \emptyset$,*

$$\deg D' \geq l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D').$$

Proof. With $E, Z \geq 0$ and $E \cap D' = Z \cap D' = \emptyset$, the natural maps

$$\begin{aligned} L(A)/L(A - D') &\longrightarrow L(A + E)/L(A + E - D'), \\ L(B)/L(B - D') &\longrightarrow L(B + Z)/L(B + Z - D'), \end{aligned}$$

are well defined and injective. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \deg D' &= l(A + E) - l(A + E - D') + i(A + E - D') - i(A + E) \\ &= l(A + E) - l(A + E - D') + l(B + Z) - l(B + Z - D') \\ &\geq l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D'). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Remark 2.2. The condition $Z \geq 0$ can be replaced with the weaker condition $L(B) \subseteq L(B + Z)$, which does not affect the proof. However, the weaker condition does not produce better lower bounds. Namely, suppose that $G = A + B + Z$ is a decomposition such that $L(B) \subseteq L(B + Z)$ and $Z \cap D' = \emptyset$. Let $Z = Z^+ - Z^-$, with $Z^+, Z^- \geq 0$, $Z^+ \cap Z^- = \emptyset$. Then $L(B) = L(B) \cap L(B + Z) = L(B - Z^-)$. The decomposition $G = A + (B - Z^-) + Z^+$ meets the condition $Z^+ \geq 0$ and $Z^+ \cap D' = \emptyset$ and gives the same lower bound,

$$\begin{aligned} &l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B - Z^-) - l(B - Z^- - D') \\ &= l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D'). \end{aligned}$$

When written out in terms of linear algebra, i.e. after removing the connection to curves, the bound is essentially an application of the AB bound for linear codes [26]. We briefly formulate the connection. For two vectors a, b in \mathbb{F}^n , let $a * b = (a_1 b_1, \dots, a_n b_n)$ denote the Hadamard or coordinate-wise product of the two vectors.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ be \mathbb{F} -linear codes of length n such that $\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B} \perp \mathcal{C}$, i.e. such that $a * b \perp c$, for all $a \in \mathcal{A}, b \in \mathcal{B}, c \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$,*

$$\text{wt}(c) := \dim(c * \mathbb{F}^n) \geq \dim(c * \mathcal{A}) + \dim(c * \mathcal{B}).$$

For $G = A + B + Z$, and $D = P_1 + P_2 + \dots + P_n$, such that $Z \geq 0$ and $Z \cap D = \emptyset$, let $c \in \mathcal{C} = C_\Omega(D, G)$ have support in $D' \leq D$. For $\mathcal{A} = C_L(D, A)$ and $\mathcal{B} = C_L(D, B)$, $\mathcal{A} * \mathcal{B} \perp \mathcal{C}$. With $c * \mathcal{A} \simeq C_L(D', A)$ and $c * \mathcal{B} \simeq C_L(D', B)$,

$$\deg D' \geq \dim c * \mathcal{A} + \dim c * \mathcal{B} = l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D').$$

The definition of the codes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{C} does not require that the divisors A, B and G are disjoint from D , if we modify the encoding map α_L . In that case the inclusion $C_L(D, A) * C_L(D, B) \subseteq C_L(D, G)$ remains valid for the modified codes with the assumption $D \cap Z = \emptyset$.

For $G = K + C$, Lemma 2.1 gives a lower bound for $\deg D'$ that depends only on C and the choice of the divisors A and B in $G = A + B + Z$.

Theorem 2.4. *(ABZ bound [7, Theorem 2.4]) Let $G = K + C = A + B + Z$, for $Z \geq 0$. For D with $D \cap Z = \emptyset$,*

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq l(A) - l(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C).$$

Proof. A word $c \in C_\Omega(D, G)$ has support D' only if there exists a nonzero differential $\eta \in \Omega(G - D') \simeq L(D' - C)$. With Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \deg D' &\geq l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D') \\ &\geq l(A) - l(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C). \end{aligned}$$

□

Replacing A with $\lfloor A \rfloor$ and B with $\lfloor B \rfloor$ can only improve the lower bound for $\deg D'$. And in general the bound is optimal for choices of A and B such that $A = \lfloor A \rfloor$ and $B = \lfloor B \rfloor$. However, it can be useful to apply the bound with $A \neq \lfloor A \rfloor$ or $B \neq \lfloor B \rfloor$ if such a choice reduces the support of the divisor Z . The choice may then give the same bound with a less restrictive condition $D \cap Z = \emptyset$.

G	A	B	Z	d_{ABZ}	Condition for D
22P+6Q	14P	8P	6Q	6	$Q \notin \text{supp } D$
22P+6Q	13P	8P	P+6Q	6	$P, Q \notin \text{supp } D$

Table 2: Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8 ($\lfloor 14P \rfloor = 13P$)

We give two other forms for the lower bound in the theorem. Equation (2) shows that the lower bound reduces to the Goppa designed minimum distance $\deg C$ whenever $Z = 0$. Equation (3) shows that the lower bound never exceeds $\deg C + \deg Z$.

$$l(A) - l(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C) \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \deg C + i(A) - i(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C) \\ &= \deg C + l(B + Z - C) - l(B + Z) + l(B) - l(B - C) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \deg C + \deg Z + i(B + Z - C) - l(B + Z) + l(B) - i(B - C) \\ &= \deg C + \deg Z + l(A) - l(A + Z) + l(B) - l(B + Z). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

With added assumptions for the divisors A and B we obtain as special cases of the theorem the bounds d_{LM} and d_{GST} .

Corollary 2.5. *(the bound d_{LM} [19, Theorem 3]) Let $G = K + C = A + B + Z$, for $Z \geq 0$, such that $L(A + Z) = L(A)$ and $L(B + Z) = L(B)$. For D with $D \cap Z = \emptyset$,*

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq \deg C + \deg Z.$$

Proof. Use Equation (3) with $L(A + Z) = L(A)$ and $L(B + Z) = L(B)$. □

The original floor bound by Maharaj, Matthews and Pirsic [21] corresponds to $A + Z = B + Z = H$ and $A = B = \lfloor H \rfloor$.

Corollary 2.6. *(the bound d_{GST} [13, Theorem 2.4]) Let F be an algebraic function field of genus g with full constant field \mathbb{F}_q . Let $D = P_1 + \dots + P_n$, where the P_i 's are distinct rational places of the function field F/\mathbb{F}_q and suppose that $\bar{A}, B, C', Z \in \text{Div}(F)$ satisfy the following conditions:*

1. $(\text{supp}(\bar{A}) \cup \text{supp}(B) \cup \text{supp}(C') \cup \text{supp}(Z)) \cap \text{supp}(D) = \emptyset$,
2. $L(\bar{A}) = L(\bar{A} - Z)$ and $L(B) = L(B + Z)$,
3. $L(C') = L(B)$.

If $G = \bar{A} + B$, then the minimum distance d of the code $C_\Omega(D, G)$ satisfies

$$d \geq \deg G - (2g - 2) + \deg Z + (i(\bar{A}) - i(G - C')).$$

Proof. After replacing C' with $\min(C', B)$ if necessary, we may assume that $B = C' + Z'$, for $Z' \geq 0$. The bound is the special case of Theorem 2.4 obtained with the decomposition $G = A + B + Z = (\bar{A} - Z) + C' + (Z + Z')$. We obtain the bound in the given form using Equation (3) with $L(B + Z) = L(B)$.

$$\begin{aligned} d &\geq \deg G - (2g - 2) + \deg(Z + Z') + l(\bar{A} - Z) - l(\bar{A} + Z') \\ &= \deg G - (2g - 2) + \deg Z + \deg Z' + l(\bar{A}) - l(\bar{A} + Z') \\ &= \deg G - (2g - 2) + \deg Z + i(\bar{A}) - i(\bar{A} + Z'). \end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.7. For $G = K + C = 26P + (4P + Q)$, the choice $A = 13P, B = 16P, Z = P + Q$ gives $d_{LM} = d_{GST} = d_{GOP} + \deg Z = 7$. The choice $A = 13P, B = 13P, Z = 4P + Q$ gives $d_{ABZ} = 8$. In both cases, the choices are optimal.

The bound d_{GST} is formulated in Corollary 2.6 as an improvement of the bound d_{LM} . For a choice of divisors \bar{A} and B such that $d_{LM} = \deg C + \deg Z$, replacing B with C' such that $L(C') = L(B)$ gives an improvement $i(\bar{A}) - i(G - C')$ of the bound d_{LM} . In general however, good estimates for d_{GST} do not necessarily arise from improving good estimates for d_{LM} . In the example below, two different estimates for d_{LM} are both improved by replacing B with a divisor C' . The optimal estimate $d_{GST} = 6$ is the result of improving the weaker estimate $d_{LM} = 4$.

G	\bar{A}	B	Z	C'	d_{LM}	d_{GST}
22P+6Q	17P+2Q	5P+4Q	P+2Q	0	5	5
22P+6Q	14P+2Q	8P+4Q	2Q	8P	4	6

Table 3: Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8

The efficient computation of bounds is discussed in Section 9. To optimize the bound d_{GST} we use it in the form below. Corollary 2.8 uses fewer parameters than Corollary 2.6 and gives the bound directly without comparing it to d_{LM} .

Corollary 2.8. *Let $G = K + C$, and let B and Z be divisors such that $L(B + Z) = L(B)$ and $Z \geq 0$. For D with $D \cap Z = \emptyset$,*

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq \deg C + l(B + Z - C) - l(B - C).$$

Proof. Use Equation (2) with $L(B + Z) = L(B)$. □

The following theorem gives the same bound as that in Corollary 2.8 and Corollary 2.6 but using only a single parameter.

Theorem 2.9. *(One parameter formulation of d_{GST})* Let $G = K + C$. For divisors D and B such that $D \cap (B - \lfloor B \rfloor) = \emptyset$,

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq \deg C + l(B - C) - l(\lfloor B \rfloor - C).$$

Proof. Let $B = \lfloor B \rfloor + Z$, $Z \geq 0$. The theorem follows by applying Corollary 2.8. □

The comment after Theorem 2.4 applies. If B' is a divisor with $\lfloor B \rfloor \leq B' \leq B$ such that $L(B' - C) = L(\lfloor B \rfloor - C)$ and if $B - B'$ has smaller support than $B - \lfloor B \rfloor$ then Corollary 2.8 will give the same bound as Theorem 2.9 but with a weaker condition for D .

3 Mixed bounds

It is clear from the proof of Theorem 2.4 that the lower bound d_{ABZ} can be improved if we can show that $L(A - C) \neq L(A - D')$ or $L(B - C) \neq L(B - D')$. An interesting special case that can be explained in this way is the bound d_{GKL} by Garcia, Kim, and Lax [11]. In [13], Güneri, Stichtenoth, and Taskin present a second bound d_{GST2} that includes both the bound d_{GKL} and the bound d_{LM} . The bound d_{GST2} applies to codes $C_\Omega(D, G)$ and uses a decomposition $G = A + B + Z$ such that $L(A + Z) = L(A)$, $L(B + Z) = L(B)$, as in the bound d_{LM} . Moreover it is assumed that $B \leq A$. We formulate the bound d_{ABZ+} as an unrestricted generalization that applies to any decomposition $G = A + B + Z$.

Lemma 3.1. *For a given divisor C , let P be a point with $L(C) = L(C - P)$, and let $A' \leq A$ be a pair of divisors such that*

1. $L(A' - C) \neq L(A' - C - P)$ and $L(A') = L(A' - P)$, and
2. $L(A - C) \neq L(A - C - Q)$, for all Q with $A' \leq A - Q \leq A$.

Then $L(A - C) \neq L(A - D')$ for any divisor $D' \sim C + E$ such that $D' \cap P = \emptyset$ and $E \geq 0$.

Proof. The claim follows immediately from the second condition if $D' \geq C + Q$ for some Q with $A' \leq A - Q \leq A$. We may therefore assume that $(D' - C) \cap (A - A') = \emptyset$. With this assumption, the natural map

$$L(A' - C)/L(A' - D') \longrightarrow L(A - C)/L(A - D')$$

is well defined and injective. The first condition and $D' \cap P = \emptyset$ imply that $L(A' - D') = L(A' - P - D')$. And thus

$$\begin{aligned} l(A - C) - l(A - D') &\geq l(A' - C) - l(A' - D') \\ &= l(A' - P - C) - l(A' - P - D') + 1 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.2. (*ABZ+ bound*) Let $G = K + C = A + B + Z$, for $Z \geq 0$, and let $D' \sim C + E$ be a divisor such that $D' \cap Z = \emptyset$. Define $\delta(A) \in \{0, 1\}$ to be 1 if there exists a divisor $A' \leq A$ such that $\text{supp}(A - A') \subseteq \text{supp}(Z)$ and

1. $(\exists P \in Z) \ L(A' - C) \neq L(A' - C - P)$ and $L(A') = L(A' - P)$, and
2. $(\forall Q \in Z) \ L(A - C) \neq L(A - C - Q)$.

Then

$$\deg D' \geq l(A) - l(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C) + \delta(A) + \delta(B).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.4. With Lemma 3.1, it becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \deg D' &\geq l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D'), \\ &\geq l(A) - l(A - C) + \delta(A) + l(B) - l(B - C) + \delta(B). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.3. (*the bound d_{GST2} [13, Theorem 2.12]*) Let F be an algebraic function field of genus g with full constant field \mathbb{F}_q . Let $D = P_1 + \cdots + P_n$, where the P_i 's are distinct rational places of the function field F/\mathbb{F}_q and suppose that $\bar{A}, B, Z \in \text{Div}(F)$ satisfy the following conditions:

1. $(\text{supp}(\bar{A}) \cup \text{supp}(B) \cup \text{supp}(Z)) \cap \text{supp}(D) = \emptyset$,
2. $\text{supp}(\bar{A} - B) \subseteq \text{supp}(Z)$,
3. $Z \geq 0, L(\bar{A}) = L(\bar{A} - Z)$ and $L(B) = L(B + Z + Q)$ for all $Q \in \text{supp}(Z)$,
4. $B + Z + P \leq \bar{A}$ for some $P \in \text{supp}(Z)$.

If $G = \bar{A} + B$, then the minimum distance d of the code $C_\Omega(D, G)$ satisfies

$$d \geq \deg G - (2g - 2) + \deg Z + 1.$$

Proof. For $\bar{A} = A + Z$, the theorem applies with $G = K + C = \bar{A} + B = A + B + Z$ and $A' = B + P$. We write Condition 3 in the form

$$\begin{cases} L(\bar{A}) = L(\bar{A} - P), \\ L(B + P) = L(B), \\ L(B + Z) = L(B + Z + Q). \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} L(A' - C) \neq L(A' - C - P), \\ L(A') = L(A' - P), \\ L(A - C) \neq L(A - C - Q). \end{cases}$$

□

Compared with the corollary, the theorem does not require the conditions $L(A + Z) = L(A)$ and $L(B + Z) = L(B)$, and the choice of $A' \leq A$ is not restricted to the choice $A' = B + P$. The removal of the last restriction means that the argument can be applied with choices $A' \leq A$ and $B' \leq B$ with a potential gain of +2 instead of +1.

Example 3.4. For $G = K + C = 26P + (3P + Q)$, the choice $A = 10P, B = 18P, Z = P + Q$ gives $d_{LM} = d_{GST} = d_{GST_2} = d_{GOP} + \deg Z = 6$. The choice $A = 13P, B = 13P, Z = 3P + Q$ and $A' = B' = 11P$ gives $d_{ABZ} = 6, d_{ABZ^+} = 8$. In all cases, the choices are optimal.

4 The order bounds d_B and $d_{ABZ'}$

For the minimum distance of a code $C_\Omega(D, G)$, the ABZ bound (Theorem 2.4) gives

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq l(A) - l(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C),$$

where $G = K + C = A + B + Z$, such that $Z \geq 0$ and $D \cap Z = \emptyset$. For a point P disjoint from D , if $L(A) = L(A - P)$ and $L(A - C) \neq L(A - C - P)$ then replacing A with $A - P$ (and Z with $Z + P$) improves the lower bound by 1. It turns out that the lower bound improves by 1 for any divisor $A - iP, i \geq 0$, with the same properties. To see this we need to go back to the proof of the ABZ bound. The proof uses that a nonzero codeword has support D' such that $D' \sim C + E$, for $E \geq 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \deg D' &\geq l(A) - l(A - D') + l(B) - l(B - D'), \\ &\geq l(A) - l(A - C) + l(B) - l(B - C). \end{aligned}$$

As in the previous section, we obtain improvements for the ABZ bound from estimates for the differences $l(A - C) - l(A - D')$ and $l(B - C) - l(B - D')$. Let $\Delta'(A) \subset \{A - iP : i \geq 0\}$ be the subset of divisors $A' = A - iP$ with the property that $L(A') = L(A' - P)$ and $L(A' - C) \neq L(A' - C - P)$. We claim that, for a support D' with both D' and E disjoint from P ,

$$l(A - C) - l(A - D') \geq |\Delta'(A)|.$$

For A' such that $L(A') = L(A' - P)$ and for D' disjoint from P , $L(A' - D') = L(A' - D' - P)$. If moreover $L(A' - C) \neq L(A' - C - P)$ then

$$l(A' - C) - l(A' - D') = l(A' - C - P) - l(A' - D' - P) + 1.$$

For a general divisor A' and for E disjoint from P ,

$$l(A' - C) - l(A' - D') \geq l(A' - C - P) - l(A' - D' - P).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} l(A - C) - l(A - D') &= \sum_{i \geq 0} [(l(A - C - iP) - l(A - D' - iP)) \\ &\quad - (l(A - C - iP - P) - l(A - D' - iP - P))] \geq |\Delta'(A)|. \end{aligned}$$

We give a first formulation of the ABZ' bound.

Theorem 4.1. (*ABZ' bound*) Let d_{ABZ} be the ABZ bound for $d(C_\Omega(D, G))$ obtained with a choice of divisors A, B and Z . For a rational point P disjoint from D ,

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq \min\{d_{ABZ} + |\Delta'(A)| + |\Delta'(B)|, d(C_\Omega(D, G + P))\}.$$

Proof. The first argument in the minimum is a lower bound when E is disjoint from P , and the second argument is a lower bound when E is not disjoint from P . \square

We will give a different formulation in Section 6. An advantage of this formulation is the easy comparison with the ABZ bound for the same choice of A, B and Z . On the other hand, the best results for the ABZ bound and the ABZ' bound are in general obtained with different choices for A, B and Z . The formulation in Section 6 will be easier to compare with other order bounds and easier to optimize.

The special case $Z = 0$ of the order bound $d_{ABZ'}$ returns the Beelen bound d_B ([7], or Corollary 6.5). The special case $Z = 0$ of the floor bound d_{ABZ} returns the Goppa bound d_{GOP} . The bounds d_{GOP}, d_B are therefore in the same relation as the bounds $d_{ABZ}, d_{ABZ'}$ and follow from the latter as the special case $Z = 0$.

$$Z = 0 : d_{GOP} \longrightarrow d_B \qquad Z \geq 0 : d_{ABZ} \longrightarrow d_{ABZ'}$$

Example 4.2. The bounds in Table 4 all use a choice $A = B = 13P$ (so that $Z = 2P + 2Q, P + 2Q, P + Q$, respectively). In all cases this is an optimal choice. The gains for $d_{ABZ^+}, d_{ABZ'}$ in the second row use $A', B' \in \{11P\}$. The gains for $d_{ABZ^+}, d_{ABZ'}$ in the last row use $A', B' \in \{9P, 11P\}$. In particular, $d_{ABZ'} = 8$ uses $d_{ABZ'} = \min\{4 + 2 + 2, 8\} = 8$.

Code	d_{LM}	d_{GST}	d_{ABZ}	d_{GST2}	d_{ABZ+}	$d_{ABZ'}$
$C_{\Omega}(D, G = 28P + 2Q)$	8	8	8	8	8	8
$C_{\Omega}(D, G = 27P + 2Q)$	6	6	6	6	8	8
$C_{\Omega}(D, G = 27P + Q)$	4	4	4	4	6	8

Table 4: Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8

The bound d_{GKL} is stated in terms of H -Weierstrass gaps at a point P . It is a special case of the bound d_{GST2} [13, Corollary 2.13]. We formulate the bound and give two different proofs, showing that it is also a special case of the bound d_B .

Theorem 4.3. *(The bound d_{GKL} [11]) Let H be a divisor and let P be a rational point such that, for integers α, β, t with $\beta \geq \alpha + t$ and $t \geq 1$,*

$$L(H + \alpha P + tP) = L(H + \alpha P - P), \quad L(H + \beta P) = L(H + \beta P - tP).$$

Then, for $G = 2H + (\alpha + \beta - 1)P$ and for D disjoint from H and P , $d(C_{\Omega}(D, G)) \geq \deg G - (2g - 2) + t + 1$.

(The reduction $d_{GKL} \rightarrow d_{GST2}$) We apply the $ABZ+$ bound (Theorem 3.2). With $G = A + B + Z = (H + \alpha P - P) + (H + \beta P - tP) + tP$ and $B' = H + \alpha P \leq B$, we find $d(C_{\Omega}(D, G)) \geq \deg G - (2g - 2) + t + 1$.

(The reduction $d_{GKL} \rightarrow d_B$) We apply the ABZ' bound (Theorem 4.1) with $Z = 0$. For $i = 0, \dots, t$, let $G + iP = A + B + Z = (H + \alpha P + iP - P) + (H + \beta P) + 0$. Then

$$d(C_{\Omega}(D, G + iP)) \geq \min \{ \deg G - (2g - 2) + i + |\Delta'(A)| + |\Delta'(B)|, d(C_{\Omega}(G + iP + P)) \}.$$

With $H + \alpha P + iP, \dots, H + \alpha P + (t - 1)P, H + \beta P \in \Delta'(B)$, we obtain $|\Delta'(B)| \geq t - i + 1$, and thus

$$d(C_{\Omega}(D, G)) \geq \min \{ \deg G - (2g - 2) + t + 1, d(C_{\Omega}(D, G + tP + P)) \} \geq \deg G - (2g - 2) + t + 1.$$

5 Base point free semigroups

We will discuss in Section 7 the various order bounds. First we introduce, for divisors C and for sets of points S and S' , subsets of divisor classes $\Gamma(C; S, S')$. The sets capture the desired coding theory parameters in the language of divisors. Together with the results in the next section they allow us to present all order bounds in a unified framework.

Let X/\mathbb{F} be a curve over a field \mathbb{F} and let $\text{Pic}(X)$ be the group of divisor classes. Let $\Gamma = \{A : L(A) \neq 0\}$ be the semigroup of effective divisor classes. For a given rational point $P \in X$, let $\Gamma_P = \{A : L(A) \neq L(A - P)\}$ be the semigroup of effective divisor classes with no base point at P . For a finite set of points S , let $\Gamma_S = \cap_{P \in S} \Gamma_P$. By convention, let $\Gamma_\emptyset = \Gamma$.

Definition 5.1. For a divisor class C and for finite sets of rational points S and S' , let

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(C; S, S') &= \{A : A \in \Gamma_S \text{ and } A - C \in \Gamma_{S'}\}, \\ \gamma(C; S, S') &= \min\{\deg A : A \in \Gamma(C; S, S')\}.\end{aligned}$$

From the definition it is clear that $\Gamma(C; S, S')$ lives inside the semigroup Γ_S . Moreover, $\Gamma_{S \cup S'}$ acts on $\Gamma(C; S, S')$ via divisor addition, and for $S' \subseteq S$, $\Gamma(C; S, S')$ is a semigroup ideal in Γ_S . For the connection to coding theory, we have the following interpretation.

Lemma 5.2. (*[7, Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.2]*) For a given set of rational points S , and for algebraic geometric codes defined with a divisor $D = P_1 + \dots + P_n$ disjoint from S ,

$$\begin{aligned}d(C_L(D, G)) &\geq \gamma(D - G; S, \emptyset). \\ d(C_\Omega(D, G)) &\geq \gamma(G - K; S, \emptyset).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for a point P ,

$$\begin{aligned}\min \text{wt}(C_L(D, G) \setminus C_L(D, G - P)) &\geq \gamma(D - G; S, P). \\ \min \text{wt}(C_\Omega(D, G) \setminus C_\Omega(D, G + P)) &\geq \gamma(G - K; S, P).\end{aligned}$$

The case of a general set S' follows directly from the lemma.

Proposition 5.3. For given sets of rational points S and S' , and for algebraic geometric codes defined with a divisor $D = P_1 + \dots + P_n$ disjoint from S ,

$$\begin{aligned}\min \text{wt}(C_L(D, G) \setminus \bigcup_{P \in S'} C_L(D, G - P)) &\geq \gamma(D - G; S, S'). \\ \min \text{wt}(C_\Omega(D, G) \setminus \bigcup_{P \in S'} C_\Omega(D, G + P)) &\geq \gamma(G - K; S, S').\end{aligned}$$

Here it is agreed, for the case $S' = \emptyset$, that an empty union of vector spaces is the null space.

Proof. The case $S' = \emptyset$ is the first part of the lemma. The case $S' \neq \emptyset$ reduces to the second part of the lemma if we use $\cap_{P \in S'} \Gamma(C; S, P) = \Gamma(C; S, S')$. \square

The first case of Lemma 5.2 is particularly important for our approach to order bounds and for that reason we recall the proof. There exists a nonzero word in $C_L(D, G)$ with support in A , for $0 \leq A \leq D$, if and only if $L(G - D + A)/L(G - D) \neq 0$. Since S is disjoint

from D , it is also disjoint from A . Since A is effective, $L(A)$ contains the constants, but $L(A - P)$ does not, for all $P \in S$. So that $A \in \Gamma_S$. It is clear that $L(A - (D - G)) \neq 0$ and thus $A \in \Gamma(D - G; S, \emptyset)$. There exists a nonzero word in $C_\Omega(D, G)$ with support in A , for $0 \leq A \leq D$, if and only if $\Omega(G - A)/\Omega(G) \neq 0$ if and only if $L(K - G + A)/L(K - G) \neq 0$. The rest of the proof is similar to the previous case with $D - G$ replaced by $G - K$.

The bounds in Lemma 5.2 can be used for codes with $L(-C) = L(G - D) = 0$ or $L(-C) = L(K - G) = 0$. This includes all codes with a positive designed minimum distance. For codes with $L(-C) \neq 0$, we see that $0 \in \Gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ and $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset) = 0$. In order to obtain nontrivial lower bounds for such codes the set $\Gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ should be replaced with the subset

$$\Gamma^*(C; S, \emptyset) = \{A \in \Gamma_S : L(A - C) \neq L(-C)\},$$

and the lower bound $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ for the minimum distance with $\gamma^*(C; S, \emptyset)$, where the latter denotes the minimal degree for a divisor $A \in \Gamma^*(C; S, \emptyset)$. Details can be found in [7, Section 4]. Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 5.5 play a key role in the definition of the order bounds in Section 7.

Proposition 5.4. *For $P \notin S'$,*

$$\Gamma(C; S, S') = \Gamma(C; S, S' \cup \{P\}) \cup \Gamma(C + P; S, S').$$

Proof. (\subseteq) Let $D \in \Gamma(C; S, S')$. For $P \notin S'$,

$$\begin{aligned} L(D - C) \neq L(D - C - P) &\Rightarrow D \in \Gamma(C; S, S' \cup \{P\}). \\ L(D - C) = L(D - C - P) &\Rightarrow D \in \Gamma(C + P; S, S'). \end{aligned}$$

(\supseteq) Clearly, $\Gamma(C; S, S' \cup \{P\}) \subseteq \Gamma(C; S, S')$. Let $D \in \Gamma(C + P; S, S')$. Since $P \notin S'$, $P \in \Gamma_{S'}$. Thus, using the semigroup property, $D - C - P \in \Gamma_{S'}$ implies $D - C \in \Gamma_{S'}$, which proves $\Gamma(C + P; S, S') \subseteq \Gamma(C; S, S')$. \square

The following theorem is proved by repeated application of the proposition.

Theorem 5.5. *For $T' \cup T = S'$,*

$$\Gamma(C; S, T') = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \Gamma(C + \lambda; S, S'),$$

where Λ is the semigroup generated by the points in T (including the zero divisor).

Note that both the proposition and the theorem translate into statements about γ if we replace Γ with γ and \cup with \min .

6 Main theorem

In this section we present a general method to obtain lower bounds for $\gamma(C; S, S')$. Combined with the properties of $\Gamma(C; S, S')$ from the previous section, the method gives lower bounds for the minimum distance. In the next section we will derive the bounds d_{DK} and d_{DP} in this way.

Theorem 6.1. *Given a divisor C and finite sets of rational points S and S' , let $\{A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be a sequence of divisors such that $A_i = A_{i-1} + P_i$, P_i a rational point, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and define subsets $\Delta, \Delta', I, I' \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \{i : A_i \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - C \notin \Gamma_{P_i}\}, & I &= \{i : P_i \in S\}, \\ \Delta' &= \{i : A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - C \in \Gamma_{P_i}\}, & I' &= \{i : P_i \in S'\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then $\gamma(C; S, S') \geq |\Delta \cap I'| + |\Delta' \cap I| - |\Delta'|$. In particular, $\gamma(C; S, S') \geq |\Delta|$ for $\Delta \subseteq I'$ and $\Delta' \subseteq I$.

Proof. For an arbitrary divisor $D \in \Gamma$,

$$\begin{aligned}\deg D &\geq (l(A_n) - l(A_n - D)) \\ &\geq (l(A_n) - l(A_n - D)) - (l(A_0) - l(A_0 - D)) \\ &= (l(A_n) - l(A_0)) - (l(A_n - D) - l(A_0 - D)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (l(A_i) - l(A_{i-1})) - \sum_{i=1}^n (l(A_i - D) - l(A_{i-1} - D)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (l(A_i) - l(A_i - P_i)) - \sum_{i=1}^n (l(A_i - D) - l(A_i - D - P_i)) \\ &= |\{i : A_i \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \notin \Gamma_{P_i}\}| - |\{i : A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \in \Gamma_{P_i}\}|.\end{aligned}$$

Let $D \in \Gamma(C; S, S')$ be of minimal degree. We show that

$$\begin{aligned}|\{i : A_i \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \notin \Gamma_{P_i}\}| &\geq |\Delta \cap I'|, \\ |\{i : A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \in \Gamma_{P_i}\}| &\leq |\Delta' \setminus I| = |\Delta'| - |\Delta' \cap I|.\end{aligned}$$

For $i \in I'$, $D - C \in \Gamma_{P_i}$. Using the semigroup property of Γ_{P_i} ,

$$\begin{aligned}i \in \Delta \cap I' &\Rightarrow A_i \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - C \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } D - C \in \Gamma_{P_i} \\ &\Rightarrow A_i \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \notin \Gamma_{P_i}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the first inequality. For $D \in \Gamma(C; S, S')$, if D and $D - C$ have a common base point P then $P \notin S \cup S'$ and $D - P \in \Gamma(C; S, S')$. Thus, for D of minimal degree, no such

common base point exists and $D \notin \Gamma_P$ implies $D - C \in \Gamma_P$, for any point P . We can now prove the second inequality.

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \in \Gamma_{P_i} \\
\Rightarrow & A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } D \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \\
\Rightarrow & A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - D \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } D \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } D - C \in \Gamma_{P_i} \\
\Rightarrow & A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } A_i - C \in \Gamma_{P_i} \text{ and } D \notin \Gamma_{P_i} \\
\Rightarrow & i \in \Delta' \setminus I.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The order bounds $d_B, d_{ABZ'}, d_{DP}, d_{DK}$ can all be obtained from the main theorem in combination with results from the previous section. Using the theorem with different formats for the sequence $\{A_i\}$ yields different bounds. The bounds d_{DP} and d_{DK} use a general format. The bound d_B uses the format $A_i = B + iP$, for a fixed B and for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. The special case $A_i = iP$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, is used in the Feng-Rao bound and the Carvalho-Munuera-daSilva-Torres bound.

Example 6.2. For $C = -3P + 6Q$, we apply the theorem with two different sequences.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_i = iP : & \quad \Delta = \{0, 8, 12, 13, 16, 24\}, & \Delta' = \{17, 19, 27\}. \\
A_i = iP + 3Q : & \quad \Delta = \{0, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 24\}, & \Delta' = \{7, 9, 15, 17\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The translated sequence yields an improved estimate $\gamma(C; P, P) \geq 7$.

The bound $d_{ABZ'}$ uses a sequence $\{A_i\}$ that contains the divisors $B + iP$, for $i \leq 0$, as well as the divisors $B + Z + iP$, for a fixed divisor $Z \geq 0$ and for $i > 0$.

Example 6.3. For $C = 2P + 2Q$, the two choices

$$\begin{aligned}
A_i = iP : & \quad \Delta = \{0, 8, 10, 13, 16, 21, 29\}, & \Delta' = \{14, 15, 27\}, \\
A_i = iP + 2Q : & \quad \Delta = \{0, 8, 13, 16, 19, 21, 29\}, & \Delta' = \{2, 14, 15, \},
\end{aligned}$$

both yield $\gamma(C; P, P) \geq 7$. This is not improved with a different choice of translated sequence. However, for the combined sequence

$$A_i = 0, \dots, 15P, 15P + Q, 15P + 2Q, \dots, 29P + 2Q,$$

we see that the divisors iP , for $i \in \{0, 8, 10, 13\}$, as well as the divisors $iP + 2Q$, for $i \in \{16, 19, 21, 29\}$, contribute to Δ and thus $\gamma(C; \{P, Q\}, P) \geq 8$. In this case $|\Delta'| = 4$, with contributions by $14P, 15P$ (both with $P_i = P$) and $15P + Q, 15P + 2Q$ (both with $P_i = Q$).

The bound $d_{ABZ'}$ is a special case of the bound d_{DP} . The latter applies the theorem with $S' = \{P\}$ but with no restrictions on the sequence $\{A_i\}$. The bound d_{DK} applies the main theorem with no restrictions on neither S and S' nor on the sequence $\{A_i\}$.

Example 6.4. For $C = -5P + 8Q$, the two choices

$$\begin{aligned} A_i = iP - 3Q : & \quad \Delta = \{10, 12, 13, 22, 23, 25\}, & \quad \Delta' = \{8, 16, 27\}, \\ A_i = iP - 2Q : & \quad \Delta = \{10, 12, 13, 22, 23, 25\}, & \quad \Delta' = \{8, 19, 27\}, \end{aligned}$$

both yield $\gamma(C; P, P) \geq 6$. An arbitrary combination of translates does not produce improvements for $\gamma(C; \{P, Q\}, P) \geq 6$. However, for the combined sequence

$$A_i = 10P - 3Q, \dots, 16P - 3Q, 16P - 2Q, \dots, 25P - 2Q,$$

the divisor $16P - 2Q$ contributes to Δ with $P_i = Q$. Together with the contributions $iP - 3Q$, for $i \in \{10, 12, 13\}$ and $iP - 2Q$, for $i \in \{22, 23, 25\}$ this gives $|\Delta| = 7$ and $\gamma(C; P, \{P, Q\}) \geq 7$. The contributions to Δ' come from $8P, 16P, 19P, 25P$ (all with $P_i = P$) and thus the lower bound holds with $S = \{P\}$.

The bounds $d_{DK} \geq d_{DP} \geq d_B$ use the main theorem with the restrictions

$$(DK) \ S, S' \text{ finite}, \quad (DP) \ S \text{ finite}, S' = \{P\}, \quad (B) \ S = S' = \{P\}.$$

The bound $d_{ABZ'}$ is a special case of the bound d_{DP} . Its main purpose is to connect the bounds of order type with the bounds of floor type via the relation $d_{ABZ'} \geq d_{ABZ}$. We first show how the bound $d_{ABZ'}$ follows from the main theorem and then that it agrees with the earlier formulation as an improvement of the floor bound. Recall from Theorem 4.1 that

$$d(C_\Omega(D, G)) \geq \min\{d_{ABZ} + |\Delta'(A)| + |\Delta'(B)|, d(C_\Omega(D, G + P))\} \quad (4)$$

Here $G = K + C = A + B + Z$, for $Z \cap D = \emptyset$, and for $P \notin D$. Let $\Delta(A) \subset \{A - iP : i \geq 0\}$ be the subset of divisors $A' = A - iP$ with the property that $L(A') \neq L(A' - P)$ and $L(A' - C) = L(A' - C - P)$.

Corollary 6.5. (*ABZ' bound [7]*) *Let $G = K + C = A + B + Z$, such that $Z \geq 0$. Then*

$$\gamma(C; \text{supp}(Z), P) \geq |\Delta(A)| + |\Delta(B)|.$$

Proof. Apply the main theorem with a sequence $\{A_i\}$ that contains the divisors $B + iP$, for $i \leq 0$, as well as the divisors $B + Z + iP$, for $i > 0$. \square

The relation between $\Delta(A)$ and $\Delta'(A)$ is such that $\Delta(A) = l(A) - l(A - C) + \Delta'(A)$. And thus the corollary can be stated as

$$\gamma(G - K; \text{supp}(Z), P) \geq d_{ABZ} + |\Delta'(A)| + |\Delta'(B)|.$$

Using Lemma 5.2 we recover the ABZ' bound in the form (4).

It is clear from the definitions that $A \in \Gamma(C; S, S')$ if and only if $A - C \in \Gamma(-C; S', S)$, and thus $\gamma(C; S, S') - \gamma(-C; S', S) = \deg C$. The duality carries over to lower bounds for $\gamma(C; S, S')$ and $\gamma(-C; S', S)$ that are obtained with Theorem 6.1.

Lemma 6.6. *For a given divisor C , and for a sequence of divisors $\{A_i\}$ as in Theorem 6.1, let*

$$\gamma(C; S, S') \geq |\Delta \cap I'| + |\Delta' \cap I| - |\Delta'|.$$

Then

$$\gamma(-C; S', S) \geq |\Delta' \cap I| + |\Delta \cap I'| - |\Delta|.$$

Moreover, for a long enough sequence such that $\deg A_0 < \min\{0, \deg C\}$ and $\deg A_n > \max\{2g - 2, 2g - 2 + \deg C\}$, the difference between the two lower bounds $|\Delta| - |\Delta'| = \deg C$.

Proof. To obtain the bound for $\gamma(-C; S', S)$ we apply the theorem with the sequence $\{A_i - C\}$. This exchanges Δ and Δ' , and I and I' . The second claim reduces to the following statement:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta| - |\Delta'| &= |\{i : A_i \in \Gamma_{P_i}\}| - |\{i : A_i - C \in \Gamma_{P_i}\}| \\ &= (l(A_n) - l(A_0)) - (l(A_n - C) - l(A_0 - C)) \\ &= (l(A_n) - l(A_n - C)) - (l(A_0) - l(A_0 - C)). \end{aligned}$$

For divisors A_0 and A_n in the give range, the last difference equals $\deg C$. \square

Note that for an arbitrary sequence $\{A_i\}$ and for $C = C^+ - C^-$, where $C^+, C^- \geq 0$, the proof indicates that $|\Delta| - |\Delta'| \leq \deg C^+ + \deg C^-$. In general we expect the lower bound for $\gamma(C; S, S')$ to increase when S and S' are enlarged. On the other hand, for an effective divisor C without base points, $C \in \Gamma(C; S, S')$ and $\gamma(C; S, S') = \deg C$, for all S and S' . For an arbitrary effective divisor C , we show that Theorem 6.1 yields the best results when S contains the base points of C .

Lemma 6.7. *For a given effective divisor C and set S' , and for any sequence $\{A_i\}$, the lower bound in Theorem 6.1 attains its maximum for S equal to the set of base points of C .*

Proof. Clearly, for any sequence $\{A_i\}$, the set S is optimal if it contains $\{P_i : i \in \Delta'\}$. For $i \in \Delta'$, $A_i \notin \Gamma_{P_i}$ and $A_i - C \in \Gamma_{P_i}$. The semigroup property of Γ_{P_i} implies that $C \notin \Gamma_{P_i}$. For an effective divisor C there is no gain in assuming that S contain points other than the basepoints of C . \square

7 Order bounds in semigroup form

In this section we prove the order bounds d_{DK} , d_{DP} , and d_B using a combination of Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 6.1. To obtain lower bounds for the minimum distance d of an AG code, we use $d \geq \gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ (Lemma 5.2) and estimate $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$, where C is the designed minimum support of the code and the code is defined with divisor D disjoint from S . Theorem 6.1 gives us a way to obtain lower bounds for $\gamma(C; S, S')$ but the lower bounds are nontrivial only if $S' \neq \emptyset$. This is where we use Theorem 5.5. We have

$$\Gamma(C; S, \emptyset) = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} \Gamma(C + \lambda; S, S'),$$

where Λ' is the semigroup generated by the points in S' . Now Theorem 6.1 can be used to estimate $\gamma(C + \lambda; S, S')$, for $\lambda \in \Lambda'$.

Theorem 7.1. *(The bound d_{DK} [6]) Let C be a divisor and let S be a finite set of rational points. For any finite set S' of rational points,*

$$\gamma(C; S, \emptyset) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} \gamma(C + \lambda; S, S') \geq \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, S'),$$

where Λ' is the semigroup generated by the points in S' and $\gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, S')$ is a lower bound for $\gamma(C + \lambda; S, S')$.

It is helpful to interpret the data in the theorem as a directed graph with vertices a collection \mathcal{C} of divisors C and edges $(C, C + Q)$, for $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $Q \in S'$. If we label the vertex $C \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\gamma(C; S, S')$ then $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ is the minimum of all vertex labels $\gamma(C'; S, S')$ for $C' \geq C$. Among the estimates γ_B, γ_{DP} and γ_{DK} for $\gamma(C + \lambda; S, S')$ obtained with Theorem 6.1, only γ_{DK} uses sets S' of size larger than one. For the other two types we use

$$\Gamma(C + \lambda; S, S') = \bigcap_{Q \in S'} \Gamma(C + \lambda; S, Q)$$

in combination with estimates for $\gamma(C + \lambda; S, Q)$.

Corollary 7.2. *(The bounds d_B [2] and d_{DP} [7] in semigroup form)*

$$\gamma(C; S, \emptyset) \geq \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} (\max_{Q \in S'} \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q)),$$

where $\gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q)$ is a lower bound for $\gamma(C + \lambda; S, Q)$.

Proof.

$$\gamma(C + \lambda; S, S') = \max_{Q \in S'} \gamma(C + \lambda; S, Q) \geq \max_{Q \in S'} \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q)$$

□

For an interpretation of the corollary in graph terms we assign a label $\gamma(C; S, Q)$ to each edge $(C, C + Q)$ and then label the vertex C with the maximum of the labels on the outgoing edges $(C, C + Q)$, for $Q \in S'$. The difference between the bounds d_B and d_{DP} is not in Corollary 7.2 but in the way that each uses Theorem 6.1 to obtain the lower bounds $\gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q)$.

Example 7.3. For $C = -5P + 8Q$, we estimate $\gamma(C; \{P, Q\}, \emptyset)$ in two different ways. From Example 6.4, the labels for the edges $(C, C + P)$ and $(C, C + Q)$ are

$$\gamma_{DP}(-5P + 8Q; \{P, Q\}, P) = \gamma_{DP}(-5P + 8Q; \{P, Q\}, Q) = 6.$$

The estimates are critical in Corollary 7.2 which yields $\gamma(C; \{P, Q\}, \emptyset) \geq 6$. On the other hand, a direct estimate of the vertex label at C gives

$$\gamma_{DK}(-5P + 8Q; \{P, Q\}, \{P, Q\}) = 7.$$

And Theorem 7.1 yields $\gamma(C; \{P, Q\}, \emptyset) \geq 7$.

8 Order bounds in sequence form

The bounds d_B and d_{DP} in Corollary 7.2 use Theorem 5.5 and differ from their original formulation, which is based on repeated use of Proposition 5.4.

$$\Gamma(C; S, \emptyset) = \Gamma(C; S, Q) \cup \Gamma(C + Q; S, \emptyset).$$

In this section we compare the different formulations and show that they are in agreement.

Proposition 8.1. *(The bounds d_B [2] and d_{DP} [7] in sequence form) Let C be a divisor and let S be a finite set of rational points. For any subset S' of rational points, and for a long enough sequence of points $Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_r \in S'$,*

$$\gamma(C; S, \emptyset) \geq \min_{j=0, \dots, r} \gamma_*(C + R_j; S, Q_j).$$

Here $R_0 = 0$ and $R_j = R_{j-1} + Q_{j-1}$, for $j > 0$, and $\gamma_*(C + R_j; S, Q_j)$ is a lower bound for $\gamma(C + R_j; S, Q_j)$.

Proof. With Proposition 5.4,

$$\Gamma(C; S, \emptyset) = \cup_{j=0, \dots, r} \Gamma(C + R_j; S, Q_j) \cup \Gamma(C + R_r + Q_r; S, \emptyset).$$

□

As before, Theorem 6.1 can be used to estimate $\gamma(C + R_j; S, Q_j)$, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, r$. Extending the graph interpretation for the bounds d_B and d_{DP} given after Corollary 7.2, we interpret the label $\gamma(C + R_j; S, Q_j)$ for the edge $(C + R_j, C + R_j + Q_j)$ as the flow capacity along the edge. The order bound in sequence form estimates $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ as the maximum flow capacity of any long enough path $(C, C + Q_0, C + Q_0 + Q_1, \dots)$. The order bound in [4] estimates the labels $\gamma(C + R_j; S, Q_j)$ in the same way as the Beelen bound but assigns a special point $P \in S'$ and computes the maximum flow along a path $(C, C + P, C + 2P, \dots)$ with $Q_0 = Q_1 = \dots = Q_r = P$.

Example 8.2. The code $C_\Omega(D, K + 9P + Q)$, defined with the Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8 , has designed minimum support $C = 9P + Q$ and designed minimum distance $d_{GOP} = 10$. For D disjoint form P and Q , the actual distance of the code is at least 13. To see this using the Beelen bound it is important to choose $Q_0 = P$ and $Q_1 = Q_2 = Q$. The constant choices $Q_0 = Q_1 = Q_2 = P$ and $Q_0 = Q_1 = Q_2 = Q$ yield only $d \geq 11$ and $d \geq 12$, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \{ \gamma_B(9P + Q; P, P), \gamma_B(10P + Q; Q, Q), \gamma_B(10P + 2Q; Q, Q) \} &= \min \{ 13, 13, 14 \} = 13. \\ \min \{ \gamma_B(9P + Q; P, P), \gamma_B(10P + Q; P, P), \gamma_B(11P + Q; P, P) \} &= \min \{ 13, 11, 14 \} = 11. \\ \min \{ \gamma_B(9P + Q; Q, Q), \gamma_B(9P + 2Q; Q, Q), \gamma_B(9P + 3Q; Q, Q) \} &= \min \{ 12, 13, 13 \} = 12. \end{aligned}$$

In general, $\Gamma(C + P; S, Q) \subseteq \Gamma(C; S, Q)$ for $P \neq Q$, and thus $\gamma(C + P; S, Q) \geq \gamma(C; S, Q)$. Therefore, if $\gamma_*(C + P; S, Q)$ and $\gamma_*(C; S, Q)$ are lower bounds, then we can assume that $\gamma_*(C + P; S, Q) \geq \gamma_*(C; S, Q)$, for otherwise we would replace $\gamma_*(C + P; S, Q)$ with $\gamma_*(C; S, Q)$. With this assumption, the bounds in Corollary 7.2 and Proposition 8.1 agree.

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\{ \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q) : \lambda \in \Lambda', Q \in S' \}$ be a collection of lower bounds for the corresponding set of actual values $\{ \gamma(C + \lambda; S, Q) \}$ such that the estimates satisfy $\gamma_*(C + \lambda + P; S, Q) \geq \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q)$ whenever $P \neq Q$. Then*

$$\max_{Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_r \in S'} \left(\min_{j=0, \dots, r} \gamma_*(C + R_j; S, Q_j) \right) = \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda'} \left(\max_{Q \in S'} \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q) \right).$$

Proof. The two sides of the equality represent lower bounds for $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ obtained with Proposition 8.1 and Corollary 7.2, respectively. Denote the left side by γ_{seq} and the right side by γ_{sgp} . Clearly, $\gamma_{seq} \geq \gamma_{sgp}$ and it suffices to show that $\gamma_{sgp} \geq \gamma_{seq}$. Assume that there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda'$ with $\max_{Q \in S'} \gamma_*(C + \lambda; S, Q) < \gamma_{seq}$. Using $\gamma(C; S, Q) \leq \gamma(C + P; S, Q)$ for $P \neq Q$, we see that $\gamma(C + \lambda'; S, Q) < \gamma_{seq}$ for all $\lambda_Q \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda$, where λ_Q is the Q -component of λ . Every long enough path R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots contains some $R \leq \lambda$ with $R_Q = \lambda_Q$ for some Q . But then $\lambda_Q \leq R \leq \lambda$ and $\gamma(C + R; S, Q) < \gamma_{seq}$, a contradiction. \square

In Proposition 8.1, it is not clear how to choose an optimal sequence Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_r . It follows from Proposition 8.3 that, once it has been decided to choose the Q_i from a finite set S' , the choice of an optimal sequence can be made in a straightforward way, namely

Suzuki over \mathbb{F}_8					Suzuki over \mathbb{F}_{32}				
	d_{LM}	d_{ABZ}	d_B	d_{DK}		d_{LM}	d_{ABZ}	d_B	d_{DK}
d_{GOP}	228	228	228	228	d_{GOP}	6352	6352	6352	6352
d_{LM}	0	29	102	108	d_{LM}	0	2852	4729	4757
d_{ABZ}	0	0	94	98	d_{ABZ}	0	0	4683	4711
d_B	1	3	0	15	d_B	1	1	0	1565
d_{GOP}	4	5	6	6	d_{GOP}	8	21	33	33
d_{LM}	0	1	4	4	d_{LM}	0	15	28	28
d_{ABZ}	0	0	4	4	d_{ABZ}	0	0	24	24
d_B	1	1	0	1	d_B	1	1	0	6

Table 5: Comparison of bounds for 364 Suzuki codes over \mathbb{F}_8 ($g = 14$) and for 10168 Suzuki codes over \mathbb{F}_{32} ($g = 124$). Number of improvements of one bound over another (top), and the maximum improvement (bottom).

by following a greedy procedure as follows: For a sequence starting with Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_{i-1} , choose $Q_i \in S'$ such that the edge label $\gamma_*(C + R_i; S, Q_i)$ is maximal among $\gamma_*(C + R_i; S, Q)$, for $Q \in S'$.

Corollary 8.4. *The lower bound in Proposition 8.1 is optimal for a choice of Q_j , $j = 0, 1, \dots, r$, such that $\gamma_*(C + R_j; S, Q_j) = \max_{Q \in S'} \gamma_*(C + R_j; S, Q)$.*

Proof. The choice gives a lower bound $\gamma_{seq, greedy}$ satisfying $\gamma_{seq} \geq \gamma_{seq, greedy} \geq \gamma_{sgp}$. In Proposition 8.3 it was shown that $\gamma_{seq} = \gamma_{sgp}$ and therefore also $\gamma_{seq} = \gamma_{seq, greedy}$. \square

9 Computing the lower bounds

We present computational short-cuts that make it feasible to establish the various bounds in the paper for large numbers of codes from a given curve whose geometry is well understood. For two-point codes from Hermitian curves, Suzuki curves and Giulietti-Korchmaros curves, numerical results are available in interactive form at [18]. The comparison Table 5 gives a summary of the results for two-point codes on the Suzuki curves over \mathbb{F}_8 and \mathbb{F}_{32} . The Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8 has genus $g = 14$. For a given degree there are $m = 13$ two-point codes. For a designed distance in the range $0, 1, \dots, 2g - 1 = 27$ there are $2g \cdot m = 364$ two-point codes. For the Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_{32} the numbers are $g = 124$ and $m = 41$ for a total of $2g \cdot m = 10168$ two-point codes.

9.1 Floor bounds

If a floor bound is to be used for a code with designed minimum support C a choice of auxiliary divisors is needed, such as the divisors A and B in the ABZ bounds. In the generic case it is not clear how to choose divisors that produce the best bound. A natural approach is to choose C with support in a small set of points and to choose A and B among all divisors with support in those points. Important special cases are one-point codes with A, B and C supported in a point P , and two-point codes with A, B and C supported in points P and Q . In general let C belong to a family of divisors \mathcal{C} and A to a family of divisors \mathcal{A} . For the efficient optimization we use that \mathcal{A} has a natural partial ordering such that $A' \leq A$ if $A - A'$ is effective. For each of the bounds d_{ABZ} , d_{GST} , and d_{LM} , we first build a table with the dimension $l(A)$ of the Riemann-Roch space $L(A)$, for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. When \mathcal{A} consists of divisors supported in a point P or in points $\{P, Q\}$ this essentially asks for the Weierstrass nongaps, either for one-point divisors or more generally for two-point divisors. For Hermitian and Suzuki curves, two-point nongaps are known in closed form [22], [3], [8]. Parsing through all two-point divisors in increasing degree order we update $l(A)$ knowing $l(A - P)$ and whether there is a P -gap at A . For the bounds d_{GST} and d_{LM} we also store the floor $\lfloor A \rfloor$ for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$. For a given divisor C , the bounds can then be computed as follows.

The bound d_{ABZ} (Theorem 2.4): For given C , compute $f(A) = l(A) - l(A - C)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ in increasing order. For each A keep track of the quantity $F(A) = \max_{A' \leq A} f(A')$ and update d_{ABZ} with the greater of d_{ABZ} and $\deg C + F(A) - f(A)$.

The bound d_{GST} (Corollary 2.6, Theorem 2.9): For given C , compute $f(A) = l(A) - l(A - C)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ in increasing order. For each A update d_{GST} with the greater of d_{GST} and $\deg C + f(\lfloor A \rfloor) - f(A)$.

The bound d_{LM} (Corollary 2.5): For given C , compute $f(A) = l(A) - l(A - C)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ in increasing order. For each A and for all $\lfloor A \rfloor \leq A' \leq A$ such that $f(A') - f(A) = \deg A - \deg A'$ update d_{LM} with the greater of d_{LM} and $\deg C + f(A') - f(A)$.

Pairs $\lfloor A \rfloor \leq A' \leq A$ such that $f(A') - f(A) = \deg A - \deg A'$ satisfy $L(A) = L(A')$ and $L(K + C - A) = L(K + C - A')$. When A, A' are chosen from a two-point family $\mathcal{A} = \{mP + nQ\}$ the search over such pairs can be optimized as follows. As part of the precomputation we build a type of one dimensional ceiling divisor, that is a function $cl(A)$ returning the maximum a for which $l(A) = l(A + aP)$. For each non-negative b with $l(K + C - A + bQ) = l(K + C - A)$ we read off a coresponding $a = cl(K + C - A + bQ)$ and then update d_{LM} with the greater of d_{LM} and $\min\{a, fl_P\} + \min\{b, fl_Q\}$ where $fl_P = (A - \lfloor A \rfloor)_P$ and $fl_Q = (A - \lfloor A \rfloor)_Q$.

9.2 Order bounds

Order bounds for estimating the minimum distance of a given code have two steps. For a code with designed minimum support C and divisor D disjoint from S , the minimum distance is at least $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$. First the main theorem (Theorem 6.1) is used to obtain lower bounds for $\gamma(C + \lambda; S, S')$, for effective divisors λ with support in S' . Then Theorem 5.5 combines the lower bounds into a lower bound for $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$. By the nature of the order bound, the estimates in the first step can be used to obtain lower bounds for subcodes of the given code. When computing order bounds we therefore fix a partially ordered family \mathcal{C} of divisors C and simultaneously estimate the distance for all divisors $C \in \mathcal{C}$. In practice we have used families of two-point divisors of absolute degree $|\deg C| \leq 2g - 1$.

Order bound d_{DK} (Theorem 7.1): For each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, in decreasing order, compute $\gamma_{DK}(C; S, S')$, and let $d_{DK}(C)$ be the smaller of $\min_{Q \in S'} d_{DK}(C + Q)$ and $\gamma_{DK}(C; S, S')$.

Order bounds d_{DP}, d_B (Corollary 7.2, Proposition 8.1): For each $C \in \mathcal{C}$, in decreasing order, compute $\gamma_*(C; S, Q)$, for $Q \in S'$, and let $d_*(C) = \max_{Q \in S'} \{\min(d_*(C + Q), \gamma_*(C; S, Q))\}$.

To estimate $\gamma(C; S, S')$ (or $\gamma(C; S, Q)$) for a fixed C using Theorem 6.1, we need to choose a sequence of divisors A_i . It is not clear in general how to choose a sequence that produces the best bound. We choose the sequence A_i inside a given family \mathcal{A} and represent the divisors in \mathcal{A} as a directed grid graph where the divisors A_i are the vertices and edges (A_{i-1}, A_i) correspond to pairs $A_i = A_{i-1} + P_i$, with P_i a rational point. On such a graph we label the edges with 0 or 1 according to whether the estimate in Theorem 6.1 increases when we follow the particular edge. Using a graph path maximizing algorithm we can find the best bound for $\gamma(C; S, S')$ as a path with the most ones in one run through the graph. When the family \mathcal{A} is the family of all two-point divisors $\{mP + nQ\}$, the graph is a rectangular grid. In that case, the bound d_{DK} optimizes over all paths in the grid. The bound d_{DP} optimizes over all paths but only considers labels in one direction (say the P direction), ignoring the possible gains along edges in the other direction (the Q direction). Finally the bound d_B selects an optimal straight path in the grid.

To keep track of the estimates in the order bound we use a directed grid graph with vertices $C \in \mathcal{C}$, as in Sections 7 and 8. For each vertex $C \in \mathcal{C}$ we consider the graph with vertices $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and edges labeled with 0 or 1 as described above. A path maximizing algorithm for the graph on \mathcal{A} yields either $\gamma(C; S, S')$ (for order bounds in semigroup form) or $\gamma(C; S, Q)$ (for order bounds in sequence form). For order bounds in semigroup form, we label the vertex $C \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\gamma(C; S, S')$ and compute $\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ as the minimum of all labels $\gamma(C'; S, S')$ for $C' \geq C$ (Theorem 7.1). For order bounds in sequence form, we label the edge $(C, C + Q)$ with $\gamma(C; S, Q)$. If we interpret the label as the flow capacity along the edge then

$\gamma(C; S, \emptyset)$ is the maximum flow capacity of any long enough path $(C, C+Q_0, C+Q_0+Q_1, \dots)$ in the graph (Proposition 8.1). For the order bound in sequence form we may label the vertices $C \in \mathcal{C}$ with the maximum of the labels on the outgoing edges and then apply vertex minimization. By Proposition 8.3 this results in the same bound. Also, the labeling of the edges in the graph is such that a path of maximum flow can be found efficiently in a greedy way: At every vertex C continue the path along an edge $(C, C+Q)$ of maximum flow capacity. By Corollary 8.4 this results again in the same bound.

9.3 Examples

Table 6 gives a selection of two-point codes and their bounds for the Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8 . Codes are included to illustrate differences between bounds and to compare with known results. To select optimal codes we recommend using the tables [18]. The top part of the table lists all codes with $d_{GST} > d_{LM}$ and extends Table 1 in [13] (the entries with footnote 1). The middle part lists the remaining codes with $d_{GST2} > d_{LM}$ and extends Table 2 in [13] (the entries with footnote 2). The bound \tilde{d} refers to examples in [13, Table 3]. Columns A and B list divisors that optimize d_{ABZ+} . A footnote $+$ indicates that the choice is optimal for d_{ABZ+} but not for d_{ABZ} . A footnote f indicates that the choice is optimal for d_{ABZ} after A and B are replaced with their floors $\lfloor A \rfloor$ and $\lfloor B \rfloor$, respectively. All other choices simultaneously optimize d_{ABZ} and d_{ABZ+} .

References

- [1] Henning E. Andersen and Olav Geil. Evaluation codes from order domain theory. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 14(1):92–123, 2008.
- [2] Peter Beelen. The order bound for general algebraic geometric codes. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 13(3):665–680, 2007.
- [3] Peter Beelen and Nesrin Tutaş. A generalization of the Weierstrass semigroup. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 207(2):243–260, 2006.
- [4] Cícero Carvalho, Carlos Munuera, Ercilio da Silva, and Fernando Torres. Near orders and codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 53(5):1919–1924, 2007.
- [5] Cícero Carvalho and Fernando Torres. On Goppa codes and Weierstrass gaps at several points. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 35(2):211–225, 2005.
- [6] Iwan Duursma and Radoslav Kirov. An extension of the order bound for ag codes. In *Applied algebra, algebraic algorithms and error-correcting codes*, volume 5527 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 11–22. Springer, Berlin, 2009.

- [7] Iwan Duursma and Seungkook Park. Coset bounds for algebraic geometric codes, doi:10.1016/j.ffa.2009.11.006. *Finite Fields Appl.*
- [8] Iwan Duursma and Seungkook Park. Coset bounds for algebraic geometric codes, extended version. arXiv:0810.2789, 2008.
- [9] Iwan M. Duursma. Majority coset decoding. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 39(3):1067–1070, 1993.
- [10] Gui Liang Feng and T. R. N. Rao. Decoding algebraic-geometric codes up to the designed minimum distance. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 39(1):37–45, 1993.
- [11] Arnaldo García, Seon Jeong Kim, and Robert F. Lax. Consecutive Weierstrass gaps and minimum distance of Goppa codes. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 84(2):199–207, 1993.
- [12] Arnaldo García and R. F. Lax. Goppa codes and Weierstrass gaps. In *Coding theory and algebraic geometry (Luminy, 1991)*, volume 1518 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 33–42. Springer, Berlin, 1992.
- [13] Cam Güneri, Henning Sitchtenoth, and Ishan Taskin. Further improvements on the designed minimum distance of algebraic geometry codes. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 213(1):87–97, 2009.
- [14] Tom Høholdt, Jacobus H. van Lint, and Ruud Pellikaan. Algebraic geometry of codes. In *Handbook of coding theory, Vol. I, II*, pages 871–961. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.
- [15] Masaaki Homma and Seon Jeong Kim. Goppa codes with Weierstrass pairs. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 162(2-3):273–290, 2001.
- [16] Masaaki Homma and Seon Jeong Kim. The complete determination of the minimum distance of two-point codes on a Hermitian curve. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 40(1):5–24, 2006.
- [17] Christoph Kirfel and Ruud Pellikaan. The minimum distance of codes in an array coming from telescopic semigroups. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 41(6, part 1):1720–1732, 1995. Special issue on algebraic geometry codes.
- [18] Radoslav Kirov. Parameters on algebraic geometric codes, <http://agtables.appspot.com>.
- [19] Benjamin Lundell and Jason McCullough. A generalized floor bound for the minimum distance of geometric Goppa codes. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 207(1):155–164, 2006.

- [20] Hiren Maharaj and Gretchen L. Matthews. On the floor and the ceiling of a divisor. *Finite Fields Appl.*, 12(1):38–55, 2006.
- [21] Hiren Maharaj, Gretchen L. Matthews, and Gottlieb Pirsic. Riemann-Roch spaces of the Hermitian function field with applications to algebraic geometry codes and low-discrepancy sequences. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 195(3):261–280, 2005.
- [22] Gretchen L. Matthews. Weierstrass pairs and minimum distance of Goppa codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 22(2):107–121, 2001.
- [23] Rick Miranda. *Algebraic curves and Riemann surfaces*, volume 5 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.
- [24] Seungkook Park. Minimum distance of hermitian two-point codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, To appear.
- [25] Michael Tsfasman, Serge Vlăduț, and Dmitry Nogin. *Algebraic geometric codes: basic notions*, volume 139 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.
- [26] Jacobus H. van Lint and Richard M. Wilson. On the minimum distance of cyclic codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 32(1):23–40, 1986.
- [27] Kyeongcheol Yang and P. Vijay Kumar. On the true minimum distance of Hermitian codes. In *Coding theory and algebraic geometry (Luminy, 1991)*, volume 1518 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 99–107. Springer, Berlin, 1992.

G	A	B	d_{GOP}		d_{GST}		d_{GST2}		d_B		\tilde{d}	
			d_{LM}		d_{ABZ}		d_{ABZ+}		$d_{ABZ'}$		d_{DK}	
$(22, 4)^{1,f}$	14P	8P	0	3	4	4	3	4	5	5	-	5
$(21, 5)^{1,+}$	13P	8P	0	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	-	5
$(20, 6)^f$	14P	6P	0	4	5	5	4	5	6	6	-	6
$(20, 7)$	14P	6P	1	4	5	5	4	5	6	6	-	6
$(23, 4)^f$	15P	8P	1	4	5	5	4	5	6	6	-	6
$(21, 6)$	13P	8P	1	4	5	5	4	5	6	6	-	7
$(22, 6)$	14P	8P	2	5	6	6	5	6	7	7	-	7
$(24, 4)^{1,2}$	16P	8P	2	4	5	5	5	6	6	6	-	6
$(24, 5)^2$	16P	8P	3	5	6	6	6	7	7	7	-	7
$(24, 6)^{1,2}$	16P	8P	4	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	-	7
$(26, 4)$	16P	10P	4	6	7	7	6	7	8	8	-	8
$(24, 3)^2$	14P	10P	1	3	3	3	4	5	6	6	-	6
$(27, 0)$	13P	13P	1	2	2	2	3	4	6	6	-	6
$(30, 1)^2$	13P	13P	5	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
$(32, 1)^2$	13P	13P	7	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
$(40, 0)$	26P	13P	14	15	15	15	16	16	16	16	-	16
$(24, 2)^+$	16P	8P	0	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
$(25, 1)^+$	13P	12P	0	2	2	2	2	3	6	6	-	6
$(21, 7)$	13P	8P	2	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	-	7
$(21, 8)$	13P	8P	3	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	-	7
$(27, 1)$	13P	13P	2	4	4	4	4	6	7	8	6	8
$(28, 1)$	13P	13P	3	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	8	8
$(29, 1)$	13P	13P	4	6	6	6	6	8	8	8	8	8
$(28, 2)$	13P	13P	4	8	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	8
$(30, 2)$	13P	13P	6	9	9	10	9	10	9	10	10	10
$(30, 3)$	13P	13P	7	9	9	10	9	10	10	10	-	10
$(31, 1)^+$	21P	10P	6	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9
$(33, 1)^+$	23P	10P	8	10	10	10	10	10	11	11	11	11
$(33, 3)^+$	23P	10P	10	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	-	13
$(34, 3)$	24P	10P	11	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	-	13

Table 6: Selected two-point codes on the Suzuki curve over \mathbb{F}_8