

Asymptotic Properties of Quasi-Group Codes

Yun Fan, Liren Lin

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Asymptotic property of linear codes	4
2.1	About linear codes and asymptotic properties	4
2.2	Random linear codes	7
3	Fundamentals on group codes	10
4	Balanced codes	19
5	Asymptotic property of quasi-abelian codes	22
6	Quasi-cyclic codes of fractional index	29
6.1	Quasi-abelian codes of index 2	29
6.2	Quasi-cyclic codes of fractional index	32
7	Self-dual quasi-abelian codes of index 2	34
7.1	Self-dual quasi-FG codes of index 2	36
7.2	Self-orthogonal quasi-FG codes of index 2	41
8	Dihedral group codes	43
9	Appendix: About probabilistic method	50

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field with cardinality q , and n be a positive integer. In coding theory, any sequence $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{F}^n$ is said to be a *word* of length n over \mathbb{F} ; and the number of the indexes i that $a_i \neq 0$, denoted by $w(a)$, is called the *weight* of a . For $a, b \in \mathbb{F}^n$, the *distance* between a, b is defined as $d(a, b) := w(a - b)$.

Any subspace C of \mathbb{F}^n , denoted by $C \leq \mathbb{F}^n$, is called a *linear code* of length n over the finite field \mathbb{F} , and, any $c \in C$ is called a *code word*. Let $C \leq \mathbb{F}^n$. The dimension $\dim C$ is called the *information length* of C , while the fraction $R(C) = \dim C/n$ is called the *rate* of C . And, $d(C) := \min\{d(c, c') \mid c \neq c' \in C\}$ is said to be the *minimal distance* of C , while the fraction $\Delta(C) := d(C)/n$ is called the *relative minimal distance* of C .

The good codes possess large rate and large relative minimum distance. A class of codes is said to be *asymptotically good* if there exists a positive real number δ such that, for any positive integer N we can find a code in the class with code length greater than N , and with both the rate and the relative minimum distance greater than δ .

In 1950's the linear codes over a finite field are proved to be asymptotically good ([16, 41]): for any N there exist linear codes of code length $n > N$ with rate and relative minimal distance attaining the (asymptotic) GV-bound (cf. Definition 2.3 and Figure 2.1 below). Later, the GV-bound is proved to be a phase transition point for the linear codes, i.e., in an asymptotic sense, the parameters of most (not only "there exist") linear codes attain the GV-bound ([38]). However, the algorithmic performance of linear codes is unsatisfactory, because the syndrome tables (for decoding the linear codes) have size about $\exp(n)$ (cf. [19, §1.11]).

In general, rich mathematical structures attached to codes enhance the properties of the codes, including the improvements of the algorithmic properties. Let G be a finite group of order n , and $\mathbb{F}G$ be the group algebra (i.e., the \mathbb{F} -vector space with basis G and equipped with a multiplication induced by the group multiplication of G). Any element of $\mathbb{F}G$ is identified with a word of \mathbb{F}^n in a natural way. Any left ideal C of $\mathbb{F}G$, denoted by $C \leq \mathbb{F}G$, is called a *group code* ($\mathbb{F}G$ -code). If G is a cyclic group (abelian group, dihedral group, respectively), then $C \leq \mathbb{F}G$ is called a *cyclic code* (*abelian code*, *dihedral code*, respectively). For any integer $t \geq 1$, the outer direct sum $\mathbb{F}G \times \cdots \times \mathbb{F}G$ (with t copies) is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module; any $\mathbb{F}G$ -submodule of it is called a *quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code of index t* . Similarly, if G is cyclic (abelian, respectively), then quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes of index t are said to be *quasi-cyclic* (*quasi-abelian*, respectively,) codes of index t . Please see Section 3 for more details.

Cyclic codes are extensively studied since 1950's. The cyclic structure improves very much the algorithms for cyclic codes (cf. [19, §4.6]), and upgrade the mathematical properties of cyclic codes as well. The well-known BCH codes, a subclass of cyclic codes discovered around 1960 ([6, 18]), have satisfactory rate and relative minimal distance if the code length is moderate; and have better algorithms ([37, 3, 31]), e.g., the complexity of the Berlekamp-Massey algorithm for BCH codes ([3, 31]) is only $O(n^3)$ (n is the code length). However, if the code lengths go to infinity but keep the rates of BCH codes greater than a positive real number, then the relative minimal distances of the BCH codes go to zero; in other words, BCH codes are not asymptotically good ([26]).

Nearly at the same time (around 1967), it was found that, if consider the cyclic codes with such code length, whose any prime divisor is coprime to $\text{char } \mathbb{F}$

(the characteristic of \mathbb{F}) and less than a given number (though the code length itself goes to infinity), then such cyclic codes are not asymptotically good ([4]). Later, another subclass of the cyclic codes of length $n = mp^k$ with $k \rightarrow \infty$, where $p = \text{char } \mathbb{F}$ and m is fixed and coprime to p (such codes are the so-called *repeated-root cyclic codes*), is proved to be asymptotically bad ([7, 20]). And, one more asymptotically bad subclass of cyclic codes is shown in [29].

Therefore, it is a long-standing mysterious open question that: *whether or not the cyclic codes over a finite field are asymptotically good?*

However, from a long time ago the quasi-cyclic codes of index 2 are proved to be asymptotically good ([8, 9, 22]). What is more, even if another interesting mathematical property “*self-duality*” (cf. Eq.(2.1) below) is attached, the binary self-dual quasi-cyclic codes of index 2 are still proved to be asymptotically good ([30]). And, the asymptotic goodness of self-dual quasi-cyclic codes (but with index $t \rightarrow \infty$) are also obtained ([10, 28]).

The dihedral groups are non-abelian but near to cyclic groups (they have cyclic subgroups of index 2). In [2], the binary dihedral codes are proved to be asymptotically good; and, the binary quasi-abelian codes of fixed index $t \geq 2$ are also proved to be asymptotically good. The asymptotic goodness of quasi-abelian codes of fixed index $t \geq 2$ has been extended to any q -ary case in [24]. And the asymptotic goodness of dihedral codes has been extended to any q -ary case recently in [12].

This chapter consists of some of our studies after 2010 on the asymptotic properties of several classes of quasi-group codes. We’ll explain the studies in a consistent and self-contained style.

We begin with the classical results on linear codes in Section 2.

Section 3 is a brief sketch about group codes and quasi-group codes.

A general result on the volumes of subsets of the so-called balanced codes is described in Section 4.

In Section 5, for an abelian group G , the quasi-FG codes of index $t \rightarrow \infty$ are considered, and the GV-bound is proved to be a phase transition point of the parameters of the quasi-FG codes; in particular, such codes are asymptotically good.

In Section 6, we first prove that the quasi-abelian codes of index 2 is asymptotically good (the asymptotic goodness of quasi-abelian codes of any fixed index $t \geq 2$ mentioned above can be proved in a similar way); then we exhibit the asymptotic goodness of the quasi-cyclic codes of *fractional index* in a concise and uniform way.

The self-dual (self-orthogonal) quasi-abelian codes of index 2 are investigated in Section 7, they are still asymptotically good (the self-dual ones exist if and only if $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ (Corollary 7.4 below), while the self-orthogonal ones exist unconditionally). But, in our study their parameters do not attain the GV-bound (as a comparison, the asymptotic good quasi-abelian codes of index 2 mentioned above have parameters attaining the GV-bound).

Finally the story on dihedral codes is described in Section 8. We not only

extend the asymptotic goodness of dihedral codes to any q -ary case (as mentioned above), and investigate more precisely the algebraic properties of the asymptotic good dihedral codes as well.

We treat the several topics in a consistent random style. To make the chapter self-contained, we put a sketch about the probabilistic method used in this chapter in Appendix (Section 9).

At the end of each section (except for the sections 3 and 9), few comments on the references related to the story of the section are remarked.

2 Asymptotic property of linear codes

We sketch preliminaries about linear codes and asymptotic properties, then turn to a kind of random linear codes.

2.1 About linear codes and asymptotic properties

In this chapter \mathbb{F} is always a finite field with cardinality $|\mathbb{F}| = q$, which is a prime power. By $|S|$ we denote the cardinality of any set S .

Let n be a positive integer. Let $\mathbb{F}^n = \{a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_i \in \mathbb{F}\}$, which is an \mathbb{F} -vector space of dimension n . Any sequence $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{F}^n$ is said to be a *word* of length n over \mathbb{F} . For $a \in \mathbb{F}^n$, $w(a) := |\{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, a_i \neq 0\}|$ is called the *Hamming weight* of a . For $a, b \in \mathbb{F}^n$, the *Hamming distance* is defined as $d(a, b) := w(a - b)$.

Any non-empty subset $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ is called a *code over \mathbb{F} of length n* . And $d(C) := \min\{d(c, c') \mid c \neq c' \in C\}$ is called the *minimum distance* of C . If a code C is given, any word in C is called a *code word*.

Any subspace C of \mathbb{F}^n , denoted by $C \leq \mathbb{F}^n$, is called a *linear code over \mathbb{F} of length n* ; more precisely, C is said to be an $[n, k, d]$ code over \mathbb{F} , where $k = \dim C$ and $d = d(C)$. Note that \mathbb{F}^n is equipped with the so-called *euclidean inner product*:

$$\langle a, b \rangle = a_1 b_1 + \dots + a_n b_n, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{F}^n. \quad (2.1)$$

Set $C^\perp := \{a \in \mathbb{F}^n \mid \langle c, a \rangle = 0, \forall c \in C\}$. If $C = C^\perp$ ($C \subseteq C^\perp$, respectively), then C is said to be *self-dual* (*self-orthogonal*, respectively). On the other hand, C is called a *linear complementary dual* (LCD in short) code if $C \cap C^\perp = 0$.

Exercise 1. If $C \leq \mathbb{F}^n$, then $d(C) = w(C)$, where $w(C) := \min\{w(c) \mid 0 \neq c \in C\}$ is called the *minimum weight* of the linear code C .

When we consider asymptotic properties of codes (with code length $n \rightarrow \infty$), the following relative versions are convenient:

- Denote $R(C) = \log_q |C|/n$ ($= \dim C/n$ if C is linear), called the *rate* of C .
- For $a \in \mathbb{F}^n$, $w(a)/n$ is called the relative weight of a .

- Denote $\Delta(C) = d(C)/n$, called the *relative minimum distance* of C . If C is a linear code, then $\Delta(C) = d(C)/n = w(C)/n$, which is also called the *relative minimum weight* of C .

The bigger both the rate and the relative minimum distance are, the better the codes are.

Definition 2.1. A code sequence C_1, C_2, \dots is said to be *asymptotically good* if the lengths n_i of C_i goes to infinity and there is a positive real number δ such that $R(C_i) > \delta$ and $\Delta(C_i) > \delta$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$.

A class of codes is said to be *asymptotically good* if there exists an asymptotically good code sequence C_1, C_2, \dots within the class.

Lemma 2.2. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an integer N such that, if a code C has length $n > N$ and $\Delta(C) > 1 - q^{-1}$, then $R(C) < \varepsilon$.

Proof. By Plotkin Bound (Exercise 2 and its notation), $\frac{1}{M} \geq \frac{\Delta - (1 - q^{-1})}{\Delta}$. Since $\Delta(C) > 1 - q^{-1}$, we have that $M \leq \frac{\Delta}{\Delta - (1 - q^{-1})} = \frac{dq}{dq - (q-1)n} \leq dq \leq nq$. So $R(C) = \frac{\log_q M}{n} \leq \frac{1 + \log_q n}{n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. \square

Exercise 2. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$, $M = |C|$, $d = d(C)$, $\Delta = \frac{d}{n}$.

(1) Let $T = \sum_{c \neq c' \in C} d(c, c')$ be the total sum of distances between code words of C . Then $2T \geq M(M-1)d$.

(2) Let $\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & \cdots & c_{1j} & \cdots & c_{1n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ c_{M1} & \cdots & c_{Mj} & \cdots & c_{Mn} \end{pmatrix}$ be the matrix whose rows are all code

words of C . For $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$, let $t_{\alpha,j}$ denote the number of entries in the j -th column of \mathcal{M} that equals α . Then $2T = nM^2 - \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} t_{\alpha,j}^2$. (**Hint:** in the j -th column, the pair (α, α') for $\alpha \neq \alpha' \in \mathbb{F}$ appears $t_{\alpha,j}t_{\alpha',j}$ times; and $\sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha' \in \mathbb{F}} t_{\alpha,j}t_{\alpha',j} = \frac{1}{2}((\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} t_{\alpha,j})^2 - (\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} t_{\alpha,j}^2))$.)

(3) $2T \leq (1 - q^{-1})nM^2$. (**Hint:** $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} t_{\alpha,j}^2 / |\mathbb{F}| \geq (\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} t_{\alpha,j} / |\mathbb{F}|)^2$.)

(4) (Plotkin Bound) $\frac{1}{M} \geq \frac{\Delta - (1 - q^{-1})}{\Delta}$. (**Hint:** combine (1) and (3).)

Therefore, to consider asymptotic properties, in Definition 2.1 only the real number $\delta \in [0, 1 - q^{-1}]$ makes sense.

Definition 2.3. The following is called the q -entropy function:

$$h_q(\delta) = \delta \log_q(q-1) - \delta \log_q \delta - (1-\delta) \log_q(1-\delta), \quad \delta \in [0, 1 - q^{-1}], \quad (2.2)$$

which is an increasing and concave function on the interval $[0, 1 - q^{-1}]$ with $h_q(0) = 0$ and $h_q(1 - q^{-1}) = 1$. And $g_q(\delta) = 1 - h_q(\delta)$ is called the *asymptotic GV-bound*, or *GV-bound* for short.

Exercise 3. $h_q(\delta)$ is an increasing concave function on the interval $[0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$ with $h_q(0) = 0$ and $h_q(1 - q^{-1}) = 1$; while $g_q(\delta)$ is a decreasing convex function on the interval $[0, 1 - \frac{1}{q}]$ with $g_q(0) = 1$ and $g_q(1 - q^{-1}) = 0$. (Figure 2.1.)




Figure 2.1: Graphs of $h_q(\delta)$ and $g_q(\delta)$

Let $\delta \in (1, 1 - q^{-1})$. We denote

$$(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta} = \{a \mid a \in \mathbb{F}^n, w(a) \leq \delta n\}, \quad (2.3)$$

which is known as the *Hamming ball* with radius $\lfloor \delta n \rfloor$ centred at 0.

Exercise 4. The cardinality $|(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}| = \sum_{i=0}^t \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i$, where $\binom{n}{i}$'s denote the binomial coefficients, and $t = \lfloor \delta n \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer less or equal δn (so $t \approx \delta n$ and in the following we'll write $\sum_{i=0}^{\delta n}$).

Lemma 2.4. *Let $0 < \delta < 1 - \frac{1}{q}$. Then $q^{n(h_q(\delta) - \frac{\log_q(n+1)}{n})} \leq |(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{nh_q(\delta)}$.*

(**Remark:** That is, $|(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}| = q^{n(h_q(\delta) - o(1))}$, where $o(1)$ is a non-negative infinitesimal; more precisely, there are $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots$ such that $0 \leq \varepsilon_n \leq \frac{\log_q(n+1)}{n}$, and $|(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}| = q^{n(h_q(\delta) - \varepsilon_n)}$.)

Proof. Since $q^{nh_q(\delta)} = (q^{h_q(\delta)})^n = (q-1)^{\delta n} \delta^{\delta n} (1-\delta)^{(1-\delta)n}$, we have

$$\frac{|(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}|}{q^{nh_q(\delta)}} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{\delta n} \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i}{(q-1)^{\delta n} \delta^{\delta n} (1-\delta)^{(1-\delta)n}} = \sum_{i=0}^{\delta n} \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i (1-\delta)^n \left(\frac{\delta}{(q-1)(1-\delta)} \right)^{\delta n}.$$

Because $\delta \leq 1 - \frac{1}{q}$, we have $\frac{\delta}{q-1} \leq 1 - \delta$, hence $\frac{\delta}{(q-1)(1-\delta)} \leq 1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}|}{q^{nh_q(\delta)}} &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{\delta n} \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i (1-\delta)^n \left(\frac{\delta}{(q-1)(1-\delta)} \right)^i = \sum_{i=0}^{\delta n} \binom{n}{i} \delta^i (1-\delta)^{n-i} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \delta^i (1-\delta)^{n-i} = (\delta + 1 - \delta)^n = 1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the following Exercise 5(3),

$$\begin{aligned} |(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}| &= \sum_{i=0}^{\delta n} \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i \geq \binom{n}{\delta n} (q-1)^{\delta n} = \binom{n}{\delta n} q^{\delta n \log_q(q-1)} \\ &\geq q^{n(-\delta \log_q \delta - (1-\delta) \log_q(1-\delta) - \frac{\log_q(n+1)}{n})} \cdot q^{\delta n \log_q(q-1)} \\ &= q^{n(\delta \log_q(q-1) - \delta \log_q \delta - (1-\delta) \log_q(1-\delta) - \frac{\log_q(n+1)}{n})}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, $|(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}| \geq q^{n(h_q(\delta) - \frac{\log_q(n+1)}{n})}$. □

Exercise 5. Let $0 < \delta < 1$. Consider $1 = (\delta + (1 - \delta))^n = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \delta^i (1 - \delta)^{n-i}$.

- (1) For $0 \leq i \leq n$, $\binom{n}{i} \delta^i (1 - \delta)^{n-i} \leq \binom{n}{\delta n} \delta^{\delta n} (1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)n}$. (Hint: consider the ratio $\binom{n}{i} \delta^i (1 - \delta)^{n-i} / \binom{n}{i+1} \delta^{i+1} (1 - \delta)^{n-i-1}$.)
- (2) $(n + 1) \cdot \binom{n}{\delta n} \delta^{\delta n} (1 - \delta)^{(1-\delta)n} \geq \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} \delta^i (1 - \delta)^{n-i} = 1$.
- (3) $\binom{n}{\delta n} \geq q^n \left(-\delta \log_q \delta - (1 - \delta) \log_q (1 - \delta) - \frac{\log_q(n+1)}{n} \right)$.

2.2 Random linear codes

Now we study the asymptotic properties of a kind of random linear codes. Some fundamentals about probabilistic methods are sketched in Appendix (Section 9).

Definition 2.5. Assume that $0 < r < 1$, $k = \lfloor rn \rfloor$, and $0 < \delta < 1 - \frac{1}{q}$. Let $\mathbb{F}^{k \times n} = \{M = (m_{ij})_{k \times n} \mid m_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}\}$, where $(m_{ij})_{k \times n}$ denotes the $k \times n$ matrix over \mathbb{F} with (i, j) -entries m_{ij} . We consider $\mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$ as a probability space with equal probability for each sample $M \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$; and take the following notation.

- (1) $C_M = \{bM \mid b \in \mathbb{F}^k\} \leq \mathbb{F}^n$ is a *random linear code* over the probability space $\mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$, where $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{F}^k$. In a notation of Shannon's information theory, C_M for $M \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times t}$ is called a *random linear code ensemble*; cf. [33, ch.6].
- (2) Both $\Delta(C_M)$ and $R(C_M)$ are random variables; then $R(C_M) \leq \frac{k}{n} \leq r$, and $R(C_M) = \frac{k}{n} \iff \text{rank}(M) = k$.
- (3) For each $b \in \mathbb{F}^k$, $X_b = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < \frac{w(bM)}{n} \leq \delta; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$ is a 0-1 random variable.
- (4) $X = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{F}^k} X_b$ is a non-negative integer random variable, which stands for the number of the non-zero code words in C_M with relative weight $\leq \delta$. Thus $\Delta(C_M) \leq \delta$ if and only if $X \geq 1$; i.e., for the probabilities we have

$$\Pr(\Delta(C_M) \leq \delta) = \Pr(X \geq 1). \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 2.6. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(X) = \begin{cases} 0, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ \infty, & r > g_q(\delta); \end{cases}$ where $E(X)$ denotes the expectation (cf. Definition 9.3) of the random variable X defined in Definition 2.5(4).

Proof. By Definition 2.5(3), $X_0 = 0$ hence $E(X_0) = 0$. Let $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k$. We compute $E(X_b)$. Note that $\mathbb{F}^{k \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$, $M \mapsto bM$, is a surjective linear map, and the size of the kernel equals $|\mathbb{F}^{k \times n}| / |\mathbb{F}^n| = q^{kn-n}$. Thus for any $a \in \mathbb{F}^n$ there are exactly q^{kn-n} elements $M \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$ such that $bM = a$; and $X_b = 1$ if and only if $0 < \frac{w(a)}{n} \leq \delta$. So (cf. Eq.(9.1))

$$E(X_b) = \Pr(X_b = 1) = \frac{(|\mathbb{F}^n|^{\leq \delta} - 1) \cdot q^{kn-n}}{|\mathbb{F}^{k \times n}|} = \frac{(|\mathbb{F}^n|^{\leq \delta} - 1)}{q^n};$$

and by Lemma 2.4,

$$E(X_b) = \frac{q^{n(h_q(\delta) - o(1))} - 1}{q^n} = q^{-n(1 - h_q(\delta) + o(1))} = q^{-n(g_q(\delta) + o(1))}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $o(1)$ is a non-negative infinitesimal. By the linearity of the expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{F}^k - \{0\}} \mathbb{E}(X_b) = (q^k - 1)q^{-n(g_q(\delta) + o(1))} = q^{-n(g_q(\delta) - \frac{k}{n} + o(1))}.$$

Note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k}{n} = r$. So $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^{-n(g_q(\delta) - r + o(1))}$, from which the lemma follows at once. \square

Theorem 2.7. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta) = \begin{cases} 1, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ 0, & r > g_q(\delta). \end{cases}$

Proof. If $r < g_q(\delta)$, by Eq.(2.4), Markov Inequality(Lemma 9.5) and Lemma 2.6,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) \leq \delta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X) = 0.$$

That is, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta) = 1$.

In the following, we assume that $r > g_q(\delta)$, and apply Lemma 9.7 to show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) = 1$; by Eq.(2.4), it implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta) = 0$.

Given any $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k$. By the linearity of the expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X|X_b = 1) = \sum_{b' \in \mathbb{F}^k} \mathbb{E}(X_{b'}|X_b = 1) = \sum_{0 \neq b' \in \mathbb{F}^k} \mathbb{E}(X_{b'}|X_b = 1). \quad (2.6)$$

Let $0 \neq b' \in \mathbb{F}^k$. The expectation $\mathbb{E}(X_{b'})$ is obtained in Eq.(2.5); in particular, $\mathbb{E}(X_{b'}) = \mathbb{E}(X_b)$. Further, there are two cases:

- b' and b are linearly dependent. The probability of this case is $\frac{q-1}{q^k-1}$. In this case $b'M$ and bM are also linearly dependent, hence $w(b'M) = w(bM)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{b'}|X_b = 1) = \Pr(X_{b'} = 1|X_b = 1) = 1.$$

- b' and b are linearly independent. The probability of this case is $1 - \frac{q-1}{q^k-1} = \frac{q^k-q}{q^k-1}$. In this case, for any $a', a \in \mathbb{F}^n$ there is a matrix $M \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$ such that $(b'M, bM) = (a', a)$. When M is running on $\mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$, $(b'M, bM)$ is running on $\mathbb{F}^n \times \mathbb{F}^n$ uniformly. Thus the events “ $X_{b'} = 1$ ” and “ $X_b = 1$ ” are independent, hence (cf. the note after Lemma 9.1)

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{b'}|X_b = 1) = \Pr(X_{b'} = 1|X_b = 1) = \mathbb{E}(X_{b'}) = \mathbb{E}(X_b).$$

By Total Probability Formula (Lemma 9.2),

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{b'}|X_b = 1) = 1 \cdot \frac{q-1}{q^k-1} + \mathbb{E}(X_b) \cdot \frac{q^k-q}{q^k-1} = \frac{(q-1) + (q^k-q)\mathbb{E}(X_b)}{q^k-1}.$$

Combining it with Eq.(2.6), for any $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k$ we have:

$$\mathbb{E}(X|X_b = 1) = \sum_{0 \neq b' \in \mathbb{F}^k} \frac{(q-1) + (q^k-q)\mathbb{E}(X_b)}{q^k-1} = (q-1) + (q^k-q)\mathbb{E}(X_b).$$

By Lemma 9.7,

$$\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \sum_{0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k} \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_b)}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_b=1)} = \sum_{0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k} \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_b)}{(q-1)+(q^k-q)\mathbb{E}(X_b)}.$$

Given $0 \neq c \in \mathbb{F}^k$. Then $\mathbb{E}(X_b) = \mathbb{E}(X_c)$ for any $0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k$. We get

$$\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \frac{(q^k - 1)\mathbb{E}(X_c)}{(q - 1) + (q^k - q)\mathbb{E}(X_c)} = \frac{1}{\frac{q-1}{(q^k-1)\mathbb{E}(X_b)} + \frac{q^k-q}{q^k-1}}.$$

Clearly, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q^k - q}{q^k - 1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q^{rn} - q}{q^{rn} - 1} = 1$. By the linearity of the expectation again,

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{0 \neq b \in \mathbb{F}^k} \mathbb{E}(X_b) = (q^k - 1)\mathbb{E}(X_c).$$

Because $r > g_q(\delta)$, by Lemma 2.6 we get $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (q^k - 1)\mathbb{E}(X_c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X) = \infty$.

Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{q-1}{(q^k-1)\mathbb{E}(X_b)} + \frac{q^k-q}{q^k-1}} = 1.$$

That is, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) = 1$. □

As explained in Definition 2.5(2), the rate $R(C_M) \leq \frac{k}{n} \leq r$, and $R(C_M) = \frac{k}{n}$ if and only if $\text{rank}(M) = k$. We take $N \in \mathbb{F}^{k \times n}$ such that $\text{rank}(N) = k$. Then C_N is a random linear code over \mathbb{F} of length n and dimension k .

Theorem 2.8. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_N) > \delta) = \begin{cases} 1, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ 0, & r > g_q(\delta). \end{cases}$

Proof. The probability $\Pr(\Delta(C_N) > \delta)$ is written as a conditional probability:

$$\Pr(\Delta(C_N) > \delta) = \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta \mid \text{rank}(M) = k).$$

By Total Probability Formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta) &= \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta \mid \text{rank}(M) = k) \Pr(\text{rank}(M) = k) \\ &\quad + \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta \mid \text{rank}(M) < k) \Pr(\text{rank}(M) < k). \end{aligned}$$

By Exercise 6 below,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\text{rank}(M) < k) = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\text{rank}(M) = k) = 1.$$

Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta \mid \text{rank}(M) = k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_M) > \delta).$$

So, the theorem follows from Theorem 2.7 at once. □

Exercise 6. Let M be a random $k \times n$ matrix over \mathbb{F} , where $k = \lfloor rn \rfloor$ with $r \in (0, 1)$.

(1) $\text{rank } M < k$ if and only if all the column vectors of M belong to one and the same $(k-1)$ -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}^k .

(2) Let $W \leq \mathbb{F}^k$ be a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subspace. Then the probability that all the column vectors of M belong to W is equal to $\frac{1}{q^n}$. (Hint: the probability that a random vector of \mathbb{F}^k belongs to W equals $q^{k-1}/q^k = 1/q$.)

(3) The number of the $(k-1)$ -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}^k is equal to $\frac{q^k-1}{q-1}$. (Hint: $(k-1)$ -dimensional subspaces are 1-1 corresponding to the 1-dimensional subspaces; the number of 1-dimensional subspaces is equal to $(q^k-1)/(q-1)$.)

(4) $\Pr(\text{rank}(M) < k) \leq q^k/q^n$, hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\text{rank}(M) < k) = 0$.

(Hint: $\Pr(\text{rank}(M) < k) \leq \sum_W \Pr(\text{all columns of } M \text{ belong to } W)$, where the subscript W runs over $(k-1)$ -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}^k .)

As a consequence of the first equality (the case “ $r < g_q(\delta)$ ”) of Theorem 2.8, we have:

Corollary 2.9. *If $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$ and $0 < r < g_q(\delta)$, then there exist linear codes C_1, C_2, \dots with the length n_i of C_i going to infinity such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} R(C_i) = r$ and $\Delta(C_i) > \delta$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.*

In other words, there are asymptotically good linear code sequences whose parameters attain the GV-bound.

Remark 2.10. We conclude this section by some remarks.

(1) The first inequality of Theorem 2.8 is just the well-known GV-bound in [16], [41]; see Corollary 2.9. While the second inequality of Theorem 2.8 was proved in [38]. The argument we stated here is based on [13].

(2) As we have seen, Theorem 2.8 follows from Theorem 2.7 easily. The theorems imply that, if $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$ is given, then $g_q(\delta)$ is a threshold point (phase transition point) for the event “ $\Delta(C_M) > \delta$ ”. Another explanation: if r is fixed, then the random variable $\Delta(C_M)$ is asymptotically distributed at the point $g_q^{-1}(r)$, where $g_q^{-1}(\cdot)$ denotes the inverse function of $g_q(\cdot)$.

(3) The argument for the first inequality of Theorem 2.7 is usually called the *first moment method*; while the so-called *second moment method* is used to prove the second inequality, which is more complicated than the first moment method. See Section 9 Appendix please.

3 Fundamentals on group codes

From now on, \mathbb{F} is always a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$, and G is always a finite group of order n . As usual, 1_G (or 1 for short) denotes the identity of G .

Let $\mathbb{F}G = \{ \sum_{x \in G} a_x x \mid a_x \in \mathbb{F} \}$ be the \mathbb{F} -vector space with basis G . The multiplication of the group G is linearly extended to a multiplication of $\mathbb{F}G$:

$$\left(\sum_{x \in G} a_x x \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{y \in G} b_y y \right) = \sum_{z \in G} \left(\sum_{xy=z} a_x b_y \right) z. \quad (3.1)$$

Then $\mathbb{F}G$ is a (finite) ring, more precisely, an n -dimensional \mathbb{F} -algebra, called the *group algebra* of G over \mathbb{F} . Any element $\sum_{x \in G} a_x x \in \mathbb{F}G$ can be viewed as a word $(a_x)_{x \in G} \in \mathbb{F}^n$ of length n , i.e., the entries of the word labelled by G and the x -th entry of the word equals a_x . Then $\mathbb{F}G$ is \mathbb{F} -linearly isomorphic to \mathbb{F}^n . For $a = \sum_{x \in G} a_x x, b = \sum_{x \in G} b_x x \in \mathbb{F}G$, the euclidean inner product of a, b is defined as (see Eq.(2.1)): $\langle a, b \rangle = \sum_{x \in G} a_x b_x$.

Definition 3.1. Any left ideal C of $\mathbb{F}G$, denoted by $C \leq \mathbb{F}G$, is called a *group code* of the group G over the field \mathbb{F} , or an $\mathbb{F}G$ -code for short. With the euclidean inner product as above, self-orthogonal $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes, self-dual $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes and LCD $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes etc. are defined as usual.

If G is abelian, then $\mathbb{F}G$ is commutative, and “left ideal”, “right ideal” and “ideal (two-sided ideal)” are the same, and the $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes are called *abelian codes*. In particular, the $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes are called *cyclic codes* if G is a cyclic group.

Similarly, the $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes are called *dihedral codes* if G is a dihedral group.

Example 3.2. Let $G = \{1, x, \dots, x^{n-1}\}$, with $x^n = 1$, be a cyclic group of order n . The $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes are just well-known *cyclic codes* of length n over \mathbb{F} , which are extensively studied and applied for a very long time, e.g., see [19]. An element $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j x^j \in \mathbb{F}G$ is viewed as a word $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^n$. And, $x(a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_{n-1} x^{n-1}) = a_{n-1} + a_0 x + \dots + a_{n-2} x^{n-1}$. So, multiplying by x transforms $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$ to $(a_{n-1}, a_0, \dots, a_{n-2})$; i.e., multiplying by x is a cyclic permutation $\rho = (0, 1, \dots, n-1)$ on the entries of the words of length n . Then $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}G$ is an ideal if and only if C is a linear subspace of \mathbb{F}^n and

$$c = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in C \implies \rho(c) = (c_{n-1}, c_0, \dots, c_{n-2}) \in C. \quad (3.2)$$

In fact, it is another common definition: “ C is called a cyclic code if C is a linear subspace of \mathbb{F}^n and Eq.(3.2) holds.”

As exhibited in Introduction, it is a long-standing open problem: *are the cyclic codes over a finite field asymptotically good?*

Remark 3.3. For any finite group G of order n , we have an explanation for $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes similar to Eq.(3.2). List the elements of G as

$$G = \{x_0 = 1, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}.$$

Any $a = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j x_j \in \mathbb{F}G$ corresponds to a sequence $\vec{a} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^n$. Any $x_i \in G$ provides a permutation ρ_i :

$$x_i \mapsto \rho_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & j & \dots & n-1 \\ 0' & 1' & \dots & j' & \dots & (n-1)' \end{pmatrix},$$

where $x_i x_j = x_{j'}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. In particular, $0' = i$ because $x_i x_0 = x_i$. The map $x_i \mapsto \rho_i$ is called the *Cayley representation* of the group G , and ρ_i is called the *Cayley permutation* of x_i . Clearly, ρ_0 is the identity permutation. Then

$$x_i a = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j x_i x_j = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j x_{j'};$$

i.e., $x_i a$ corresponds to the sequence $\rho_i(\vec{a})$ which is obtained by ρ_i -permuting on the sequence $\vec{a} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$. Assume that the group G is generated by x_1, \dots, x_r , $0 < r < n$. Then $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}G$ is a left ideal ($\mathbb{F}G$ -code) if and only if C is a subspace of \mathbb{F}^n and

$$\vec{c} \in C \implies \rho_i(\vec{c}) \in C, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, r.$$

Example 3.4. Assume that $G = \{x_0 = 1, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ generated by two elements x_1, x_2 . Then, $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}G$ is a left ideal ($\mathbb{F}G$ -code) if and only if C is a linear subspace of \mathbb{F}^n and:

$$\vec{c} \in C \implies \rho_1(\vec{c}), \rho_2(\vec{c}) \in C.$$

A very simple non-cyclic example: let $q = 2$ and $G = \{1, a, b, ab\}$ be the Klein four group, i.e., G is abelian and generated by two elements a, b of order 2. Then $x_0 = 1, x_1 = a, x_2 = b, x_3 = ab$, $\rho_1 = (01)(23)$, $\rho_2 = (02)(13)$. Consider two subspaces:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{(0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0)\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^4, \\ B &= \{(0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1)\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^4. \end{aligned}$$

Then A is not an $\mathbb{F}G$ -code, because $\rho_2(1, 1, 0, 0) = (0, 0, 1, 1) \notin A$. While B is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -code, because $\rho_1(B) = B$ and $\rho_2(B) = B$.

Remark 3.5. We recall some general notation about rings. In this chapter, any ring R has identity $1_R \neq 0$ (or $1 \neq 0$ in short); subrings and ring homomorphisms are always identity-preserving; and R^\times denotes the *multiplicative unit group* of all units (invertible elements) of R . We say that M is a (*left*) R -module if M is an additive group (abelian group with operation “+”) and there is a map $R \times M \rightarrow M$, $(r, m) \mapsto rm$ (the image is denoted by rm), such that

- $r(m + m') = rm + rm', \quad \forall r \in R, m, m' \in M$;
- $(r + r')m = rm + r'm, \quad \forall r, r' \in R, m \in M$;
- $(rr')m = r(r'm), \quad \forall r, r' \in R, m \in M$;
- $1_R m = m, \quad \forall m \in M$.

R -modules are just R -vector spaces once R is a field. The R -submodules, quotient modules, module homomorphisms (or R -homomorphisms), etc. can be defined similarly to the subspaces, quotient spaces, linear transformations of vector spaces, etc. Both the image and the kernel of an R -module homomorphism are R -submodules. The sum $M_1 + \dots + M_t$ of submodules M_i of an R -module M is also defined similarly. We say that M is a direct sum of M_1, \dots, M_t and write $M = M_1 \oplus \dots \oplus M_t$ if for any $a \in M$ there are unique $a_i \in M_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ such that $a = a_1 + \dots + a_t$.

Exercise 7. If there is a surjective ring homomorphism $\tilde{R} \rightarrow R$, then any R -module M is also an \tilde{R} -module.

The map $R \times R \rightarrow R$, $(r, m) \mapsto rm$ (the multiplication of r and m), satisfies the above four conditions. So R is an R -module, called the *(left) regular R -module*. The R -submodules of the regular module R are just left ideals of R .

A left ideal (two-sided ideal) I of R is said to be *complementary* if there is a left ideal (two-sided ideal) I' of R such that $R = I \oplus I'$ (i.e., any $r \in R$ is uniquely written as $r = a + a'$ with $a \in I$ and $a' \in I'$; or equivalently, $R = I + I'$ and $I \cap I' = 0$). An element $e \in R$ is called an *idempotent* if $e^2 = e$. An idempotent e is said to be central if $e \in Z(R)$, where $Z(R)$ denotes the center of R , which is a subring of R .

Exercise 8. (1) A left ideal I of R is complementary if and only if I is generated by an idempotent e (i.e., $I = Re$). (Hint: if $R = I \oplus I'$, then $1 = e + e'$ for unique $e \in I$, $e' \in I'$, then $e = e^2 + ee'$, hence $e^2 = e$ and $ee' = 0$; similarly, $e'^2 = e'$ and $e'e = 0$.)

(2) A two-sided ideal I of R is complementary if and only if I is generated by a central idempotent e (i.e., $I = Re$). (Hint: if $R = I \oplus I'$, by (1), $1 = e + e'$, $I = Re$ and $I' = Re'$; for any $a \in R$, $a = ae + ae' = ea + e'a$, $ae \in I$, $ea \in I$, $ae' \in I'$, $e'a \in I'$; so $ae = ea$; $e \in Z(R)$.)

In a ring R , e_1, \dots, e_m are said to be a *complete system of central idempotents* if e_1, \dots, e_m are non-zero central idempotents, $e_i e_j = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq m$, and $1 = e_1 + \dots + e_m$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let R be a ring. The following two are equivalent to each other:*

- (1) $R = R_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R_m$ with $R_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ being two-sided ideals of R .
- (2) There is a complete system of central idempotents e_1, \dots, e_m such that $R_i = Re_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

If it is the case, then each $R_i = Re_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is a ring with identity e_i (but not a subring of R in general because $e_i \neq 1_R$ in general), and for any left ideal L , $L = Le_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Le_m$ with each $Le_i = L \cap R_i$ being a left ideal of R_i .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2). By the direct sum in (1), we have unique $e_i \in R_i$ such that $1_R = e_1 + \dots + e_m$. Then $ae_1 + \dots + ae_m = a1_R = a = 1_R a = e_1 a + \dots + e_m a$ with $ae_i, e_i a \in R_i$. By the direct sum again, we get $ae_i = e_i a$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Letting a run over R , we see that $e_i \in Z(R)$. Taking $a = e_j$, we obtain that: $e_i e_j = e_j$ if $i = j$, and $e_i e_j = 0$ if $i \neq j$. Finally, taking $a \in R_i$, we get that $a = ae_i$; hence $R_i = Re_i$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1). As $e_i \in Z(R)$, $R_i = Re_i$ is a two-sided ideal. For any $a \in R$, $a = a1_R = ae_1 + \dots + ae_m$. Thus $R = R_1 + \dots + R_m$. Assume that $a = a_1 + \dots + a_m$ with $a_i \in R_i = Re_i$; we show that $a_j = ae_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$, hence the sum is a direct sum. First, $a_i = be_i$ for some $b \in R$, hence $a_i = be_i = be_i e_i = a_i e_i$ (in other words, e_i is the identity of R_i); then $ae_j = a_1 e_1 e_j + \dots + a_j e_j e_j + \dots + a_m e_m e_j = a_j e_j = a_j$.

Assume that (1), (2) hold. In the above proof we have seen that R_i is a ring with identity e_i . For $a \in L \cap R_i$, $a = ae_i \in Le_i$. Thus $Le_i = L \cap R_i$. Finally, for any $a \in L$, $a = a1_R = ae_1 + \dots + ae_m \in Le_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Le_m$. So $L = Le_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Le_m$. \square

In the above lemma, $R_i = Re_i$ is called the e_i -component of R , Le_i is called the e_i -component of L , ae_i is called the e_i -component of a , etc.

An idempotent e of a ring R is said to be *primitive* if $e \neq 0$, and there are no idempotents $e' \neq 0 \neq e''$ such that $e = e' + e''$ and $e'e'' = 0 = e''e'$. And e is said to be a *central primitive* (or *primitive central*) idempotent of R if e is a primitive idempotent of the subring $Z(R)$.

Exercise 9. (1) If e, e' are central idempotents of a ring R and e is primitive central, then either $ee' = e$ or $ee' = 0$. (Hint: $e = e'e + (e - e'e)$, $e'e(e - e'e) = 0$.)

(2) If e, e' are both primitive central idempotents, then either $e = e'$ or $ee' = 0$.

(3) If e_1, \dots, e_m are a complete system of primitive central idempotents of R , then e_1, \dots, e_m are all the distinct primitive central idempotents of R . (Hint: for any primitive central idempotent e , $e = e1 = ee_1 + \dots + ee_m$; cite (2) above.)

(4) If R is a finite ring, then the primitive central idempotent exists. (Hint: if 1 is not primitive central, then $1 = e + e'$, $ee' = 0$, $e \neq 0 \neq e'$; so $R = Re \oplus Re'$, $|Re| < |R|$.)

Lemma 3.7. Let R be a finite ring. Then e_1, \dots, e_m are a complete system of primitive central idempotents of R if and only if e_1, \dots, e_m are all the distinct primitive central idempotents of R .

Proof. If e_1, \dots, e_m are all distinct primitive central idempotents of R , then, by Exercise 9, $e_i e_j = 0$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq m$; and, setting $e := e_1 + \dots + e_m$, we must have $e = 1$; because: otherwise by Lemma 3.6 we have $R = Re \oplus Re'$ with $e' = 1 - e \neq 0$ and Re' is a finite ring with identity e' , hence Re' has a primitive central idempotent other than any e_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$. \square

A ring R is said to be *simple* if R has no ideals other than 0 and R . A ring R is said to be *semisimple* if any left ideal of R is complementary.

Exercise 10. A commutative simple ring is a field. (Hint: $Ra = R$ for any $0 \neq a \in R$.)

Theorem 3.8. If R is a finite commutative semisimple ring and e_1, \dots, e_m are all the primitive central idempotents, then:

(1) $R = Re_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Re_m$, and Re_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, are finite fields.

(2) For any ideal $0 \neq I \leq R$, $I = \bigoplus_{e \in E_I} Re = Re_I$, where $E_I = \{e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, Ie_i \neq 0\}$ and $e_I = \sum_{e \in E_I} e$. In particular, I is a ring with identity e_I .

(3) Set $E'_I = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\} - E_I$ and $I' = \bigoplus_{e' \in E'_I} Re'$, then $R = I \oplus I'$, hence the quotient module $R/I \cong I'$.

Proof. (1). The first conclusion follows from Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.6. Any non-zero ideal J of Re_i is an ideal of R , by Exercise 8(1), $J = Re$ for an idempotent $e \neq 0$. Since $e \in J \subseteq Re_i$, $e_i e = e \neq 0$. But e_i is primitive, by Exercise 9, $e_i = e_i e$. So, $e = e_i$ and $J = Re_i$. Thus, Re_i is a commutative simple ring, hence is a field (by Exercise 10).

(2). By Lemma 3.6, $I = (I \cap Re_1) \oplus \dots \oplus (I \cap Re_m)$. Since Re_i is a field, $I \cap Re_i = 0$ or Re_i . Let $E_I = \{e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, I \cap Re_i = Re_i\}$. Then $I = \bigoplus_{e \in E_I} Re = Re_I$.

(3) follows from (1) and (2) immediately, \square

A remark: the finiteness assumption in Lemma 3.7 and Theorem 3.8 can be replaced by the so-called Artin's condition.

Turn to the group algebra $\mathbb{F}G$, where \mathbb{F} is a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$ and G is a finite group of order $n > 1$.

Exercise 11. (1) $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}G, \alpha \mapsto \alpha 1_G$, is an injective ring homomorphism.

(2) $G \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}G)^\times, g \mapsto \sum_{x \in G} \gamma_x x$, where $\gamma_x = \begin{cases} 1, & x = g; \\ 0, & x \neq g; \end{cases}$ is an injective group homomorphism.

By Exercise 11 we can think of that $\mathbb{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}G$ and $G \subseteq \mathbb{F}G$.

Exercise 12 (The universal property of group algebras). Let R be any ring.

(1) If $\rho : \mathbb{F}G \rightarrow R$ is a ring homomorphism, then $\rho(\mathbb{F})$ is a subring of R which is isomorphic to \mathbb{F} , $\rho|_G : G \rightarrow R^\times$ is a group homomorphism, and $\rho(G)$ commutes with $\rho(\mathbb{F})$ element-wise.

(2) If $Z(R)$ has a subring isomorphic to \mathbb{F} (the subring is denoted by \mathbb{F} again, such a ring R is called an \mathbb{F} -algebra), and $\tau : G \rightarrow R^\times$ is a group homomorphism, then $\rho : \mathbb{F}G \rightarrow R, \rho(\sum_{x \in G} a_x x) = \sum_{x \in G} a_x \tau(x)$, is a ring homomorphism.

Lemma 3.9 (Maschck Theorem). *If $\gcd(n, q) = 1$, then $\mathbb{F}G$ is semisimple.*

Proof. Let L be a left ideal of $\mathbb{F}G$. There is an \mathbb{F} -subspace S of $\mathbb{F}G$ such that $\mathbb{F}G = L \oplus S$ (subspace direct sum). Assume that $\rho : \mathbb{F}G \rightarrow L$ is the projection from $\mathbb{F}G$ onto L with kernel S . Set $\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x \rho x^{-1}$, i.e., for $a \in \mathbb{F}G$, $\bar{\rho}(a) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x \rho(x^{-1}a)$. Then $\bar{\rho}(\mathbb{F}G) \subseteq L$; and, for $b \in L$, $\bar{\rho}(b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x \rho(x^{-1}b) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x(x^{-1}b) = b$. So, $\bar{\rho}$ is a projection of $\mathbb{F}G$ onto L . For any $y \in G$, $y \bar{\rho} y^{-1} = \bar{\rho}$, i.e., $y \bar{\rho} = \bar{\rho} y$. Thus $\bar{\rho}$ is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -endomorphism of $\mathbb{F}G$. Let L' be the kernel of $\bar{\rho}$. Then L' is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -submodule and $\mathbb{F}G = L \oplus L'$. \square

Theorem 3.10. *Let G be an abelian group of order $n > 1$ with $\gcd(n, q) = 1$.*

(1) $e_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x$ is a primitive idempotent and $\mathbb{F}G e_0 = \mathbb{F} e_0 \cong \mathbb{F}$.

(2) Let $E = \{e_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x, e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ be the set of all the primitive idempotents of $\mathbb{F}G$. Then the simple ideals $\mathbb{F}_i := \mathbb{F}G e_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ are field extensions over \mathbb{F} with $\dim \mathbb{F}_i = d_i \geq 1$, and

$$\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}_0 \oplus \mathbb{F}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{F}_m. \quad (3.3)$$

(3) For any ideal ($\mathbb{F}G$ -code) C of $\mathbb{F}G$, $C = \bigoplus_{e \in E_C} \mathbb{F}G e = \mathbb{F}G e_C$, where $E_C = \{e_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq m, C e_i \neq 0\}$ and $e_C = \sum_{e \in E_C} e$. In particular, C is a ring with identity e_C .

(4) Set $E'_I = E - E_I$ and $C' = \bigoplus_{e' \in E'_I} \mathbb{F}G e'$, then $\mathbb{F}G = C \oplus C'$, hence the quotient module $\mathbb{F}G/C \cong C'$.

Proof. (1). For $y \in G$, $y e_0 = e_0$. So $e_0 e_0 = e_0$, and $\mathbb{F}G e_0 = \{f e_0 \mid f \in \mathbb{F}\} = \mathbb{F} e_0$.

(2), (3) and (4) follow from Lemma 3.9 and Theorem 3.8 immediately. \square

Definition 3.11. By \mathbb{Z}_n we denote the residue integer ring modulo $n > 1$. Assume that $\gcd(n, q) = 1$, i.e., $q \in \mathbb{Z}_n^\times$. Let $\langle q \rangle_n$ be the cyclic subgroup of the multiplicative unit group \mathbb{Z}_n^\times generated by q . For $q^i \in \langle q \rangle_n$, the map $a \mapsto aq^i$ for $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ is a permutation of \mathbb{Z}_n . So the group $\langle q \rangle_n$ acts on \mathbb{Z}_n . The $\langle q \rangle_n$ -orbits of \mathbb{Z}_n are called the q -cosets of \mathbb{Z}_n . For $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, the q -coset Q_a containing a is $Q_a = \{a, qa, q^2a, \dots\}$. In particular, $\{0\}$ is a q -coset, called the *trivial q -coset*. By $\mu_q(n)$ we denote the minimal size of non-trivial q -cosets of \mathbb{Z}_n .

Exercise 13. Keep the notation in Theorem 3.10. Further assume that G is cyclic.

(1) The $\mathbb{F}G e_i$'s for $e_i \in E$ are 1-1 corresponding to the q -cosets Q_i 's of \mathbb{Z}_n such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbb{F}G e_i) = |Q_i|$. (Hint: $\mathbb{F}G e_i$ corresponds to a monic irreducible factor $f_i(X)$ of $X^n - 1$ such that $\mathbb{F}G e_i \cong \mathbb{F}[X]/\langle f_i(X) \rangle$; the monic irreducible factors $f_i(X)$ of $X^n - 1$ are 1-1 corresponding to the q -cosets Q_i of \mathbb{Z}_n such that $f_i(X) = \prod_{k \in Q_i} (X - \xi^k)$ where ξ is a primitive n -th root of 1; cf. [19, §3.7, §4.1].)

(2) If $n' | n$ and $n' > 1$, then $\mu_q(n') \geq \mu_q(n)$. (Hint: The cyclic group G' of order n' is a quotient group of the cyclic group G of order n ; by Exercise 12(2), there is a surjective homomorphism $\mathbb{F}G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}G'$; cite Theorem 3.10(4).)

(3) ([2]) $\mu_q(n) = \min \{ \mu_q(p) \mid p \text{ runs over the prime divisors of } n \}$. (Hint: let $n \nmid a$, $Q = \{a, aq, \dots, aq^{d-1}\}$ be a q -coset with size $d = \mu_q(n)$; there are p and $r > s \geq 0$ such that $p^r | n$, $p^s | a$; then $\{ \frac{a}{p^s}, \frac{a}{p^s}q, \dots, \frac{a}{p^s}q^{d-1} \}$ is a q -coset of \mathbb{Z}_p with size $\leq d$; so $\mu_q(n) \geq \mu_q(p)$.)

(4) For a prime p , $\mu_q(p) = \text{ord}_p(q)$, where $\text{ord}_p(q) = |\langle q \rangle_p|$ is the order of q in the multiplicative unit group \mathbb{Z}_p^\times . (Hint: the non-trivial q -cosets are the cosets of the subgroup $\langle q \rangle_p$ in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times .)

Lemma 3.12. Keep notation in Theorem 3.10, in particular, $d_i = \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathbb{F}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $\min\{d_1, \dots, d_m\} = \mu_q(n)$.

Proof. This result was proved in [2] for binary case. We show an alternative proof for the general case. Note that, by Exercise 13(1), the conclusion holds for finite cyclic group G .

Let $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\rho_i : \mathbb{F}G = \bigoplus_{j=0}^m \mathbb{F}G e_j \rightarrow \mathbb{F}G e_i = \mathbb{F}_i$ be the projection. Since \mathbb{F}_i is a finite field, \mathbb{F}_i^\times is a cyclic group; by Exercise 12(1), $G' := \rho_i(G)$ is a cyclic group of order $n' > 1$ with $n' | n$ (if $n' = 1$ then $\rho_i(x) = 1$ for all $x \in G$, hence $i = 0$). By Exercise 12(2) we get a surjective homomorphism: $\mathbb{F}G' \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_i$. By Theorem 3.10(4), \mathbb{F}_i is isomorphic to a simple ideal of $\mathbb{F}G'$. Since G' is cyclic, $d_i \geq \mu_q(n')$. Then, by Exercise 13(2), $d_i \geq \mu_q(n)$, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$.

By Exercise 13(3), there is a prime $p | n$ and $\mu_q(n) = \mu_q(p)$. Then G has a quotient group G' of order p , hence G' is cyclic and $\mathbb{F}G'$ has a non-trivial simple ideal I' such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} I' = \mu_q(p)$. By Exercise 12(2), we have a surjective homomorphism $\mathbb{F}G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}G'$. By Theorem 3.10(4), there is an i with $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $I' \cong \mathbb{F}_i$ (as $\mathbb{F}G$ -modules). Thus, $d_i = \mu_q(p) = \mu_q(n)$. \square

Lemma 3.13. There exist positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots coprime to q such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0$.

Proof. By Exercise 14, there exist primes p_1, p_2, \dots such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q p_i}{\mu_q(p_i)} = 0$. \square

Remark 3.14. (1). Though p_1, p_2, \dots in the proof are primes, the integers n_1, n_2, \dots in the lemma are not necessarily primes; for example, taking $n_i = p_i^2$, by Exercise 13(3) we still have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0$.

(2). By Exercise 13(3) again, the integers n_1, n_2, \dots in the lemma are almost odd; because: $\mu_q(2) = 1$ hence $\mu_q(n) = 1$ for any even n .

Exercise 14. Let $t > q$ be an integer, and $\pi(t)$ be the number of the primes $\leq t$. Set

$$\mathcal{G}_t = \{\text{prime } p \mid q < p \leq t, \mu_q(p) \geq (\log_q t)^2\};$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}}_t = \{\text{prime } p \mid q < p \leq t, \mu_q(p) < (\log_q t)^2\}.$$

(1) If $r < (\log_q t)^2$, $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \overline{\mathcal{G}}_t$ such that $\mu_q(p_i) = r$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, then $k < (\log_q t)^2$. (Hint: “ $\mu_q(p_i) = r$ ” implies “ $p_i \mid (q^r - 1)$ ”; hence $q^r - 1 = p_1 \cdots p_k s$.)

(2) The natural density $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{G}_t|}{\pi(t)} = 1$. (Hint: by Gauss’ Lemma, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(t)}{t/\ln t} = 1$;
by (1), $|\overline{\mathcal{G}}_t| < (\log_q t)^4$; so $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\overline{\mathcal{G}}_t|}{\pi(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\overline{\mathcal{G}}_t|}{t/\ln t} = 0$.)

We’ll see that $\mu_q(n)$ plays a key role in discussion of asymptotic properties of group codes.

Definition 3.15. (1) Mapping $x \in G$ to $x^{-1} \in G$ is an anti-automorphism of the group G . For $a = \sum_{x \in G} a_x x \in \mathbb{F}G$, let $\bar{a} = \sum_{x \in G} a_x x^{-1}$. Then mapping $a \mapsto \bar{a}$ is an anti-automorphism of $\mathbb{F}G$ of order 2 (i.e., it is bijective linear transformation and Exercise 15(1) holds). We call the anti-automorphism $a \mapsto \bar{a}$ by “bar map”. Note that the bar map is an automorphism if G is abelian.

(2) For $a = \sum_{x \in G} a_x x \in \mathbb{F}G$, the map $\sigma: \mathbb{F}G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, $a \mapsto a_{1_G}$ (1_G is the identity of G), is a linear form on $\mathbb{F}G$.

Exercise 15. (1) $\overline{\bar{a}} = a$, $\overline{ab} = \bar{b}\bar{a}$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{F}G$.

(2) $\sigma(\bar{a}) = \sigma(a)$, $\sigma(ab) = \sigma(ba)$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{F}G$.

(3) $\langle a, b \rangle = \sigma(a\bar{b}) = \sigma(\bar{a}b)$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{F}G$. ($\langle a, b \rangle$ denotes the inner product.)

(4) $\langle da, b \rangle = \langle a, \bar{d}b \rangle$, for $a, b, d \in \mathbb{F}G$.

Lemma 3.16. Assume that C, D are $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes.

(1) $C^\perp := \{a \in \mathbb{F}G \mid \langle c, a \rangle = 0, \forall c \in C\}$ is still an $\mathbb{F}G$ -code.

(2) $\langle C, D \rangle = 0$ if and only if $C\bar{D} = 0$ ($C\bar{D} := \{c\bar{d} \mid c \in C, d \in D\}$).

(3) If both C, D are generated by one element, i.e., $C = \mathbb{F}G e$ and $D = \mathbb{F}G f$, then $\langle C, D \rangle = 0$ if and only if $e\bar{f} = 0$.

Proof. (1) follows from Exercise 15(4).

(2). By Exercise 15(3), $C\bar{D} = 0$ implies that $\langle C, D \rangle = 0$. Conversely, assume that $c\bar{d} \neq 0$ for $c \in C, d \in D$; then $c\bar{d} = \sum_{x \in G} \lambda_x x$ with $\lambda_z \neq 0$ for some $z \in G$; then $z^{-1}c \in C$ and $\langle z^{-1}c, d \rangle = \sigma(z^{-1}c\bar{d}) = \lambda_z \neq 0$.

(3) holds by (2) immediately. \square

Definition 3.17. The product $(\mathbb{F}G)^2 := \mathbb{F}G \times \mathbb{F}G = \{(a, b) \mid a, b \in \mathbb{F}G\}$ is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module. Any submodule C of $(\mathbb{F}G)^2$, denoted by $C \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^2$, is called a *quasi-group code* (or *quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code*) of *index 2*. If G is cyclic (abelian), then $C \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^2$ is also called a *quasi-cyclic* (*quasi-abelian*) code of index 2.

More generally, for any integer $t \geq 1$, the quasi-group codes (quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes) of *index t* can be defined similarly. Quasi-group codes (quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes) of index t are also called *t -quasi-group codes* (*t -quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes*).

In particular, the quasi-group codes of index 1 are just group codes.

Exercise 16. Let $(a, b), (a', b') \in (\mathbb{F}G)^2$. And $\langle -, - \rangle$ denotes the inner product.

- (1) $\langle (a, b), (a', b') \rangle = \sigma(a\bar{a}' + b\bar{b}')$, where σ is defined in Definition 3.15(2).
- (2) $\langle \mathbb{F}G(a, b), \mathbb{F}G(a', b') \rangle = 0$ if and only if $a\bar{a}' + b\bar{b}' = 0$, where $\mathbb{F}G(a, b) = \{(da, db) \mid d \in \mathbb{F}G\} \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^2$ is the quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code of index 2 generated by (a, b) .

Lemma 3.18. Let $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^2$, and $C_{a,b} = \mathbb{F}G(a, b) \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^2$.

- (1) As $\mathbb{F}G$ -modules, $C_{a,b} \cong \mathbb{F}G/\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{F}G}(a, b)$, where $\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{F}G}(a, b) = \{d \in \mathbb{F}G \mid da = db = 0\}$. In particular, $\dim C_{a,b} = n - \dim \text{Ann}_{\mathbb{F}G}(a, b)$.
- (2) $C_{a,b}$ is self-orthogonal if and only if $a\bar{a} + b\bar{b} = 0$.
- (3) $C_{a,b}$ is self-dual if and only if $a\bar{a} + b\bar{b} = 0$ and $\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{F}G}(a, b) = 0$.

Proof. (1) $\mathbb{F}G \rightarrow C_{a,b}, d \mapsto (da, db)$, is a surjective homomorphism.

(2) follows from Exercise 16(2).

(3) follows from the above (1) and (2). □

In many cases the finite group G we considered is assumed to be abelian, hence $\mathbb{F}G$ is a commutative ring. We sketch a few fundamentals of linear algebra over a commutative ring R with identity for later quotations. By $R^{k \times t}$ we denote the set of all $k \times t$ matrices over R ; and $R^t = R^{1 \times t}$ as usual.

Exercise 17. Let R be a commutative ring with identity. $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_h \in R^t$ are said to be *linearly independent* if the linear combination $\alpha_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + \dots + \alpha_h \mathbf{a}_h \neq 0$ provided $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_h \in R$ are not all zero. A matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{k \times t} \in R^{k \times t}$, $k \leq t$, is said to be of *full rank* if the rows of A are linearly independent.

(1) $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in R^k$ is linearly independent if and only if $\text{Ann}_R(b_1, \dots, b_k) = 0$, where $\text{Ann}_R(b_1, \dots, b_k) = \{a \in R \mid ab_1 = \dots = ab_k = 0\}$.

(2) Given $A \in R^{k \times t}$. Then $\tau_A : R^k \rightarrow R^t, b \mapsto bA$, is an R -homomorphism (recall that $R^k = R^{1 \times k}$); τ_A is injective if and only if the matrix A over R is of full rank.

(3) Given $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in R^k$. Then $\tau_b : R^{k \times t} \rightarrow R^t, A \mapsto bA$, is an R -homomorphism and the image $\text{Im}(\tau_b) = (I_b)^t$, where $I_b := Rb_1 + \dots + Rb_k$. Further, if R is semisimple, then τ_b is surjective (i.e., $I_b = R$) if and only if $b \in R^k$ is linearly independent. (Hint: if $I_b = R$ then $\text{Ann}_R(b_1, \dots, b_k) = \text{Ann}_R(I_b) = 0$; conversely, if $I_b \neq R$ then $R = I' \oplus I_b$ with $0 \neq I' \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(b_1, \dots, b_k)$.)

Because of Theorem 3.10, the following knowledge would be useful.

Exercise 18. Assume that a commutative ring $R = \mathbb{F}_1 \oplus \mathbb{F}_2$ is a direct sum of two finite fields \mathbb{F}_1 and \mathbb{F}_2 with $|\mathbb{F}_i| = q^{d_i}$, i.e., any $a \in R$ can be uniquely written as $a = a^{(1)} + a^{(2)}$

with $a^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_i$, and $a + b = (a^{(1)} + b^{(1)}) + (a^{(2)} + b^{(2)})$, $a \cdot b = (a^{(1)} \cdot b^{(1)}) + (a^{(2)} \cdot b^{(2)})$. Assume that $1 \leq k \leq t$.

(1) Let $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in R^k$, and $b = b^{(1)} + b^{(2)}$ with $b^{(i)} = (b_1^{(i)}, \dots, b_k^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{F}_i^k$. Then b is linearly independent if and only if $b^{(i)} \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$.

(2) Let $a, b, \dots, d \in R^k$, and $a = a^{(1)} + a^{(2)}$, $b = b^{(1)} + b^{(2)}$, \dots , $d = d^{(1)} + d^{(2)}$ as above. Then a, b, \dots, d are linearly independent if and only if $a^{(i)}, b^{(i)}, \dots, d^{(i)}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_i for $i = 1, 2$.

(3) Any $A = (a_{ij})_{k \times t} \in R^{k \times t}$ can be written as $A = A^{(1)} \oplus A^{(2)}$ with $A^{(i)} = (a_{ij}^{(i)})_{k \times t} \in \mathbb{F}_i^{k \times t}$. And, A has full rank if and only if $A^{(i)}$ has full rank for $i = 1, 2$.

(4) Select $A \in R^{k \times t}$ randomly. Then $\Pr(A \text{ has full rank}) \geq (1 - \frac{q^{d_1 k}}{q^{d_1 t}})(1 - \frac{q^{d_2 k}}{q^{d_2 t}})$. (Hint: cf. Exercise 6(4).)

(5) Extend (1)–(4) to the direct sum of m finite fields $R = \mathbb{F}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{F}_m$.

4 Balanced codes

In this section, \mathbb{F} is a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$, $n > 1$ is an integer, $\delta \in [0, 1 - q^{-1}]$ is a real number.

For an index set $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_d\}$, $\mathbb{F}^I = \{(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_d}) \mid a_{i_j} \in \mathbb{F}\}$. As usual, $\mathbb{F}^n = \mathbb{F}^I$ with $I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For any subset $I' \subseteq I$, there is a natural projection $\rho_{I'} : \mathbb{F}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{I'}$.

Definition 4.1. Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n = \mathbb{F}^I$ with $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$. If there are subsets I_1, \dots, I_s (with repetition allowed) of I and integers k, t such that

- (1) the cardinality $|I_j| = k$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$;
- (2) for any $i \in I$, the number of such subscripts j that $i \in I_j$ equals t ;
- (3) for any $j = 1, \dots, s$, the projection $\rho_j : \mathbb{F}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{I_j}$ maps C bijectively onto \mathbb{F}^{I_j} ;

then, following [39], we say that C is a *balanced code* over \mathbb{F} of length n and *information length* k , and I_1, \dots, I_s form a *balanced system of information index sets* of C .

Note that the phrase “balanced codes” might be used for other concepts in literature, e.g., in [21].

Remark 4.2. If $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ is a balanced code, then, for any $a \in \mathbb{F}^n$, $a + C = \{a + c \mid c \in C\}$ is a balanced code too. Because: if the projection $\rho_j : \mathbb{F}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{I_j}$ maps C bijectively onto \mathbb{F}^{I_j} , then ρ_j also maps $a + C$ bijectively onto \mathbb{F}^{I_j} .

Theorem 4.3. Let C be a balanced code over \mathbb{F} of length n and information length k , $B \subseteq C$ and $\omega = \sum_{b \in B} \frac{w(b)}{n|B|}$ (the average relative weight of B). If $0 \leq \omega \leq 1 - q^{-1}$, then

$$|B| \leq q^{kh_q(\omega)}. \quad (4.1)$$

We'll prove the theorem after Lemma 4.7 below. We state here a corollary and describe how to apply the theorem and the corollary to quasi-group codes. For any $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$, we denote

$$C^{\leq \delta} = \{c \mid c \in C, \frac{w(c)}{n} \leq \delta\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Corollary 4.4. *If C is a balanced code over \mathbb{F} of length n and information length k , then $|C^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{kh_q(\delta)}$.*

Proof. The average relative weight of $C^{\leq \delta}$ is at most δ , and $h_q(\cdot)$ is an increasing function in $[0, 1 - q^{-1}]$. The corollary follows from Theorem 4.3 at once. \square

In particular, \mathbb{F}^n is itself a balanced code and $(\mathbb{F}^n)^{\leq \delta}$ is just the Hamming ball centered at 0 with radius $\lfloor \delta n \rfloor$, see Eq.(2.3). Corollary 4.4 is an extension of (part of) Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 4.5 ([2, Lemma 2.2]). *Group codes are balanced codes.*

Proof. Let G be a finite group, $C \leq \mathbb{F}G$ be an $\mathbb{F}G$ -code. Then G is an \mathbb{F} -basis of $\mathbb{F}G$. Let $I \subseteq G$ be an information index set of the linear code C , i.e., the projection $\rho_I : \mathbb{F}G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}I$ maps C bijectively onto $\mathbb{F}I$. Then one can check that xI , $x \in G$, form a balanced system of information index sets of C . \square

For $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$, the product $C^{n'}$ of n' copies of C in $(\mathbb{F}^n)^{n'}$ is as follows:

$$C^{n'} = \{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{n'}) \mid \mathbf{c}_i \in C, i = 1, \dots, n'\} \subseteq (\mathbb{F}^n)^{n'} = \mathbb{F}^{nn'}. \quad (4.3)$$

Lemma 4.6. *Let C be a balanced code of \mathbb{F}^n with information length k . Then $C^{n'}$ is a balanced code of $\mathbb{F}^{nn'}$ with information length kn' ; in particular, if $0 \leq \delta \leq 1 - q^{-1}$ then $|(C^{n'})^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{kn'h_q(\delta)}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{F}^n = \mathbb{F}^I$ where $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We write

$$I^{n'} = \{1^{(1)}, \dots, n^{(1)}, \dots, 1^{(n')}, \dots, n^{(n')}\}.$$

Then $\mathbb{F}^{nn'} = \mathbb{F}^{I^{n'}}$. Assume that subsets I_1, \dots, I_s of I form a balanced system of information index sets of C . For each $I_j = \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$, we have a subset $I_j^{n'}$ of $I^{n'}$ as follows:

$$I_j^{n'} = \{j_1^{(1)}, \dots, j_k^{(1)}, \dots, j_1^{(n')}, \dots, j_k^{(n')}\}.$$

Then one can check that $I_1^{n'}, \dots, I_s^{n'}$ form a balanced system of information index sets of the product code $C^{n'}$. \square

The following lemma is a key step for proving Theorem 4.3.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$, $\omega = \sum_{b \in B} \frac{w(b)}{n|B|}$. If $0 \leq \omega \leq 1 - q^{-1}$, then*

$$|B| \leq q^{nh_q(\omega)}. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Set $M = |B|$. Let $\mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & \cdots & b_{1j} & \cdots & b_{1n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ b_{M1} & \cdots & b_{Mj} & \cdots & b_{Mn} \end{pmatrix}$ be the matrix whose rows are all $b_i = (b_{i1}, \dots, b_{in}) \in B$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$, let $t_{\alpha,j}$ denote the number of entries in the j -th column of \mathcal{B} that equals α . For the j -th column of \mathcal{B} , $1 \leq j \leq n$, we have a random variable X_j taking values in \mathbb{F} with distribution $p_j(\alpha) = \Pr(X_j = \alpha) = t_{\alpha,j}/M$. By Definition 9.8, Eq.(9.2) and Lemma 9.9, the joint variable (X_1, \dots, X_n) and the information entropies with base q satisfy that

$$H_q(X_1, \dots, X_n) \leq H_q(X_1) + \cdots + H_q(X_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} -p_j(\alpha) \log_q p_j(\alpha). \quad (4.5)$$

For any $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{F}^n$, we see that the joint distribution

$$p(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \Pr((X_1, \dots, X_n) = (a_1, \dots, a_n)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M}, & (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in B; \\ 0, & (a_1, \dots, a_n) \notin B. \end{cases}$$

By Definition 9.8,

$$H_q(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{F}^n} -p(a_1, \dots, a_n) \log_q p(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \log_q M. \quad (4.6)$$

On the other hand, it can be checked directly that

$$\omega = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}^\times} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{p_j(\alpha)}{n}; \quad 1 - \omega = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{p_j(0)}{n}. \quad (4.7)$$

Since $-x \log_q x$ is a concave function, by Jensen Inequality (Exercise 28),

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}^\times} -p_j(\alpha) \log_q p_j(\alpha)}{n(q-1)} \leq -\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}^\times} p_j(\alpha)}{n(q-1)} \log_q \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}^\times} p_j(\alpha)}{n(q-1)}.$$

By Eq.(4.7),

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}^\times} -p_j(\alpha) \log_q p_j(\alpha) \leq n(\omega \log_q(q-1) - \omega \log_q \omega). \quad (4.8)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n -p_j(0) \log_q p_j(0) \leq -n(1-\omega) \log_q(1-\omega). \quad (4.9)$$

Combining Eq.(4.8), Eq.(4.9), Eq.(4.6) and Eq.(4.5),

$$\log_q M \leq n(\omega \log_q(q-1) - \omega \log_q \omega - (1-\omega) \log_q(1-\omega)) = nh_q(\omega).$$

which is just the inequality (4.4). \square

A Proof of Theorem 4.3. Assume that $C \subseteq \mathbb{F}^I$ with $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$, and I_1, \dots, I_s is a balanced system of information index sets of C as in Definition 4.1, and $B \subseteq C$, $\omega = \sum_{b \in B} \frac{w(b)}{M^n}$ where $M = |B|$. By (1) and (2) of Definition 4.1,

$$ks = |I_1| + \cdots + |I_s| = nt.$$

Let

$$V = \mathbb{F}^{I_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{F}^{I_s} = \{(v_1, \dots, v_s) \mid v_j \in \mathbb{F}^{I_j}, j = 1, \dots, s\},$$

which is an \mathbb{F} -vector space of dimension $ks = nt$; i.e., $V = \mathbb{F}^{ks}$. By (3) of Definition 4.1, we have an \mathbb{F} -isomorphism

$$\rho: C^s \longrightarrow V, \quad (c_1, \dots, c_s) \longmapsto (\rho_1(c_1), \dots, \rho_s(c_s)).$$

where $C^s = C \times \cdots \times C$ (s copies) as in Eq.(4.3). For $B^s \subseteq C^s$, denote $\widehat{B} = \rho(B^s) \subseteq V$. Then $|\widehat{B}| = |B|^s = M^s$.

Let $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B$. Let $b_i \neq 0$, i.e., the i -th entry of b contributes 1 to the total weight of B . By (2) of Definition 4.1, there are t subscripts $1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_t \leq s$ such that $i \in I_{j_h}$, $h = 1, \dots, t$. For each j_h , there are M^{s-1} words $(\dots, b, \dots) \in B^s$ with b appears in j_h -th position. Thus, the contribution of the i -th entry b_i of b to the total weight of \widehat{B} is $M^{s-1}t$.

The total weight of B equals $Mn\omega$. Then the total weight of \widehat{B} is

$$Mn\omega \cdot M^{s-1}t = M^s nt\omega.$$

Note that $nt = ks = \dim V$. So the average relative weight of \widehat{B} equals ω . Applying Lemma 4.7 to $\widehat{B} \subset V$, we get

$$M^s = |\widehat{B}| \leq q^{ksh_q(\omega)}.$$

That is, $|B| = M \leq q^{kh_q(\omega)}$. The proof of Theorem 4.3 is completed. \square

Remark 4.8. The binary version of Theorem 4.3 (Corollary 4.4) was proved in [32], [39] and [40]. The general versions stated here are proved in [11]. Because of Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, Theorem 4.3 (in particular, Corollary 4.4) can be cited to study the weights or distances of quasi-group codes.

5 Asymptotic property of quasi-abelian codes

In this section:

- \mathbb{F} is a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$;
- n is a fixed positive integer such that $\gcd(n, q) = 1$;
- G is an abelian group of order n ;
- $r \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$ are real numbers;
- $t > 1$ is an integer, and $k = \lfloor rt \rfloor$.

We consider the *quasi-FG codes of index t* , i.e., any $\mathbb{F}G$ -submodule

$$C \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^t = \overbrace{\mathbb{F}G \times \cdots \times \mathbb{F}G}^{t \text{ copies}} = \{a = (a_1, \dots, a_t) \mid a_i \in \mathbb{F}G\}.$$

The order n of G is sometimes called the *coindex* of the quasi-abelian code C in literature. Each element $a = (a_1, \dots, a_t) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^t$ is identified with a concatenated word $((a_{1x})_{x \in G}, \dots, (a_{tx})_{x \in G})$ of length nt over \mathbb{F} , the Hamming weight $w(a) = w(a_1, \dots, a_t) = w(a_1) + \dots + w(a_t)$.

We consider the set of $k \times t$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}G$:

$$(\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} = \left\{ A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1t} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{k1} & \cdots & a_{kt} \end{pmatrix} \mid a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}G \right\}, \quad (5.1)$$

as a probability space with each sample being chosen uniformly at random (i.e., at equal probability). For $A = (a_{ij})_{k \times t} \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t}$ (i.e., A is a random $k \times t$ matrix over $\mathbb{F}G$), we write $A = (A_1, \dots, A_t)$ with $A_j = (a_{1j}, \dots, a_{kj})^T$ being the j 'th column of the matrix A , where the superscript “ T ” stands for the transpose. Then we have a *random quasi-abelian code* C_A of index t as follows:

$$C_A = \{bA = (bA_1, \dots, bA_t) \mid b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k\}, \quad (5.2)$$

where $bA_j = b_1 a_{1j} + \dots + b_k a_{kj} \in \mathbb{F}G$. In particular, if $G = 1$ is trivial then $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} = \mathbb{F}^{k \times t}$ and C_A is just the usual random linear code defined in Definition 2.5.

After the random quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code C_A is defined, both the rate $R(C_A) = \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} C_A}{nt}$ and the relative minimum distance $\Delta(C_A) = \frac{w(C_A)}{nt}$ are random variables. We consider the asymptotic behaviors of them with $t \rightarrow \infty$ (hence $k \rightarrow \infty$). The following is the main result which shows, similar to Theorem 2.7 on linear codes, that the GV-bound $g_q(\delta)$ (Definition 2.3) is a phase transition point for the random quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $A \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t}$ and $C_A = \{bA \mid b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k\}$ where $k = \lfloor rn \rfloor$. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_A) > \delta) = \begin{cases} 1, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ 0, & r > g_q(\delta). \end{cases}$$

Before proving it, we show some consequences of the theorem.

By Exercise 17(2), $\tau_A : (\mathbb{F}G)^k \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}G)^t$, $b \mapsto bA$, is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -module homomorphism and $C_A = \text{Im}(\tau_A)$; so the rate

$$R(C_A) \leq \frac{k}{t}; \quad \text{and} \quad R(C_A) = \frac{k}{t} \iff A \text{ is of full rank.}$$

Since $\gcd(n, q) = 1$, Theorem 3.10 and its notation are applied. We have $\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}_0 \oplus \mathbb{F}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{F}_m$ with \mathbb{F}_i being field extensions over \mathbb{F} with $\dim \mathbb{F}_i = d_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$, see Eq.(3.3). By Exercise 18(4),

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(A \text{ has full rank}) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=0}^m (1 - \frac{q^{d_i k}}{q^{d_i t}}) = 1. \quad (5.3)$$

Similarly to Theorem 2.8, we get

Theorem 5.2. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_A) > \delta \mid R(C_A) = \lfloor rt \rfloor / t) = \begin{cases} 1, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ 0, & r > g_q(\delta). \end{cases}$

As shown in Remark 2.10, the first part (the case $r < g_q(\delta)$) of the theorem implies that the quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes attain the GV-bound asymptotically.

Corollary 5.3. *If $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$ and $0 < r < g_q(\delta)$, then there exist quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ -codes C_i of index t_i such that the code sequence C_1, C_2, \dots satisfies that $t_i \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} R(C_i) = r$ and $\Delta(C_i) > \delta$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.*

Now we turn to prove Theorem 5.1. And, also as shown in Remark 2.10, only the first moment method is not enough to prove the theorem, we have to apply the second moment method to prove the second part (the case $r > g_q(\delta)$) of it. We begin with fixing some notation.

Definition 5.4. (1) For $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k$ we define a 0-1 variable

$$X_b = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < w(bA) \leq \delta nt; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) Let $X = \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} X_b$, which is a non-negative integer variable. Then X stands for the number of the non-zero $bA \in C_A$ with relative weight $\leq \delta$. So

$$\Pr(\Delta(C_A) \leq \delta) = \Pr(X \geq 1). \quad (5.4)$$

(3) For $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k$, we set $I_b = \mathbb{F}Gb_1 + \dots + \mathbb{F}Gb_k$ which is the ideal of $\mathbb{F}G$ generated by b_1, \dots, b_k , and denote $d_b = \dim I_b$.

(4) For any ideal I of $\mathbb{F}G$, set $d_I = \dim I$, hence $\dim I^k = d_I k$; and set

$$I^{k*} = \{b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in I^k \mid I_b = I\}.$$

In particular, $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*} = \{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k \mid I_b = \mathbb{F}G\}$.

Then $(\mathbb{F}G)^k$ can be written as a disjoint union as follows:

$$(\mathbb{F}G)^k = \{0\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{0 \neq I \leq \mathbb{F}G} I^{k*} \right), \quad (5.5)$$

where the subscript “ $0 \neq I \leq \mathbb{F}G$ ” means that I runs over the non-zero ideals of $\mathbb{F}G$. By Exercise 17(3), Eq.(3.3) and Exercise 18(1), $\frac{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^k|} = \prod_{i=0}^m \frac{|\mathbb{F}_i^{k*}|}{|\mathbb{F}_i^k|}$; hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^k|} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{i=0}^m (1 - q^{-d_i k}) = 1. \quad (5.6)$$

Lemma 5.5. (1) For $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k$, $E(X_b) \leq q^{-d_b t g_q(\delta)} - q^{-d_b t} < q^{-d_b t g_q(\delta)}$.

(2) For $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$, $E(X_b) = (|\mathbb{F}^{nt}|^{\leq \delta} - 1) / q^{nt}$. And the following hold:

$$(2.1) \ E(X_b) = E(X_{b'}), \ \forall b, b' \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}.$$

$$(2.2) \ q^{nk} E(X_b) \geq q^{nt \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta) - \frac{\log_q(nt+1)}{nt} \right)} - 1, \ \forall b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}.$$

Proof. Since $\tau_b : (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}G)^t$, $A \mapsto bA$, is an $\mathbb{F}G$ -homomorphism (Exercise 17(3)) and $|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t}| = q^{nkt}$ and $|(I_b)^t| = q^{d_b t}$, the number of the pre-images in $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t}$ of any $a \in (I_b)^t$ is equal to $\frac{q^{nkt}}{q^{d_b t}}$. By Definition 5.4(1), we get that

$$E(X_b) = (|((I_b)^t)^{\leq \delta}| - 1) \cdot \frac{q^{nkt}}{q^{d_b t}} / q^{nkt} = (|((I_b)^t)^{\leq \delta}| - 1) / q^{d_b t}. \quad (5.7)$$

(1). By Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, $|((I_b)^t)^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{d_b t g_q(\delta)}$. (1) is obtained.

(2). For $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$ we have $I_b = \mathbb{F}G$ and $d_b = n$. The equality in (2) follows from Eq.(5.7). (2.1) is trivial. By Lemma 2.4, $|(\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta}| \geq q^{n t g_q(\delta) - \log_q(nt+1)}$, hence $E(X_b) \geq q^{-n t g_q(\delta) - \log_q(nt)} - q^{-nt}$. Since $\frac{q^{nk}}{q^{nt}} \leq 1$, (2.2) holds. \square

Theorem 5.6. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E(X) = \begin{cases} 0, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ \infty, & r > g_q(\delta). \end{cases}$

Proof. Assume that $r < g_q(\delta)$. By Lemma 9.4 and Eq.(5.5) we obtain

$$E(X) = E\left(\sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} X_b\right) = \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} E(X_b) = \sum_{0 \neq I \leq \mathbb{F}G} \sum_{b \in I^{k*}} E(X_b).$$

For any ideal I of $\mathbb{F}G$ and $b \in I^{k*}$, $d_b = d_I$, $|I^{k*}| \leq |I^k| = q^{d_I k}$, by Lemma 5.5(1) we have

$$\sum_{b \in I^{k*}} E(X_b) \leq q^{d_I k} q^{-d_I t g_q(\delta)} = q^{d_I t \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta)\right)}.$$

Since $k = [rt]$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta)\right) = r - g_q(\delta) < 0$. Note that $\mathbb{F}G$ has only finitely many ideals, we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E(X) = \sum_{0 \neq I \leq \mathbb{F}G} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{b \in I^{k*}} E(X_b) = 0.$$

Next we assume that $r > g_q(\delta)$. Fixing a $b_1 \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$, from Eq.(5.5) and Lemma 5.5(2) we have:

$$E(X) \geq \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}} E(X_b) = |(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}| \cdot E(X_{b_1}) = \frac{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^k|} \cdot q^{nk} E(X_{b_1}).$$

Since $k \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, by Eq.(5.6), we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^k|} = 1$. Note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{k}{n} - g_q(\delta)\right) = r - g_q(\delta) > 0$, by Lemma 5.5(2.2), we obtain that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E(X) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^k|} \left(q^{nt \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta) - \frac{\log_q(nt+1)}{nt}\right)} - 1 \right) = \infty.$$

The proof of the theorem is finished. \square

Lemma 5.7. For any $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$, $\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \frac{|\mathbb{F}G^{k*}| \cdot E(X_b)}{E(X) |X_b=1|}$.

Proof. Since $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$ is a part of $(\mathbb{F}G)^k$, by Lemma 9.7 we get that

$$\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_b)}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_b=1)} \geq \sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}} \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_b)}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_b=1)}.$$

In Lemma 5.5(2.1) we have seen that the value of $\mathbb{E}(X_b)$ is independent of the choice of the element $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$. We now claim that $\mathbb{E}(X|X_b = 1)$ is independent of the choice of $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$, which completes the proof of the lemma. Set

$$\mathcal{A}(a, b) = \{A \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} \mid 1 \leq w(aA), w(bA) \leq nt\delta\}, \quad a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k.$$

By the linearity of expectations (Lemma 9.4) and the conditional probability formula (Lemma 9.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X|X_b = 1) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} X_a \mid X_b = 1\right) = \sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \mathbb{E}(X_a|X_b = 1) \\ &= \sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \frac{\Pr(X_a=1 \ \& \ X_b=1)}{\Pr(X_b=1)} = \sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \frac{|\mathcal{A}(a, b)|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t}|} \cdot \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(X_b)} \\ &= \frac{1}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_b)} \sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} |\mathcal{A}(a, b)|. \end{aligned}$$

For any $b' \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$, by the definition of $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}$, there exists an invertible $k \times k$ matrix Q over $\mathbb{F}G$ such that $b' = bQ$. It is easy to verify that $|\mathcal{A}(a, b)| = |\mathcal{A}(a, b'Q^{-1})| = |\mathcal{A}(aQ, b')|$. By Lemma 9.4(2.1), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(X|X_{b'} = 1) = \frac{1}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_{b'})} \sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} |\mathcal{A}(a, b')| = \frac{1}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_b)} \sum_{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} |\mathcal{A}(aQ, b)|.$$

Noting that aQ runs over $(\mathbb{F}G)^k$ when a runs over $(\mathbb{F}G)^k$, we obtain that $\mathbb{E}(X|X_{b'} = 1) = \mathbb{E}(X|X_b = 1)$. \square

In the following we fix

$$c = (0, \dots, 0, 1) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k*}, \quad (5.8)$$

and estimate the value of the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1)$ for $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k$. Set

$$\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k-1}, \quad I_{\bar{b}} = \mathbb{F}Gb_1 + \dots + \mathbb{F}Gb_{k-1}, \quad d_{\bar{b}} = \dim_F I_{\bar{b}}.$$

Lemma 5.8. (1) $\mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1) \leq q^{-d_{\bar{b}}tg_q(\delta)}$.

(2) If $\bar{b} \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{(k-1)*}$, then $\mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1) = \mathbb{E}(X_c) \leq q^{-ntg_q(\delta)}$.

Proof. (1). For any $A \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t}$, we denote by \underline{A}_i the i 'th row of A . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1) &= \frac{|\{A \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} \mid 1 \leq w(bA), w(\underline{A}_k) \leq nt\delta\}|}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} \\ &= \frac{|\{A \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} \mid 1 \leq w(bA) \leq nt\delta, 0 \neq \underline{A}_k \in ((\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta}\}|}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)}. \end{aligned}$$

where $((\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta} = \{a \in (\mathbb{F}G)^t \mid w(a) \leq nt\delta\}$, see Eq.(4.2). Given any non-zero $a_\delta = (a_{k1}, \dots, a_{kt}) \in ((\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta}$, we denote

$$\mathcal{A}(c)_{a_\delta} = \{A \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{k \times t} \mid \underline{A}_k = a_\delta\}.$$

Any $b = (b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k$ induces a map:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\tau}_b : \mathcal{A}(c)_{a_\delta} &\longrightarrow (\mathbb{F}G)^t, \\ A &\longmapsto bA = b_1 \underline{A}_1 + \dots + b_{k-1} \underline{A}_{k-1} + b_k a_\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

It is easy to see that the image of the map $\bar{\tau}_b$ is a coset of $I_b^t \subseteq (\mathbb{F}G)^t$ as follows

$$I_b^t + b_k a_\delta, \quad \text{with cardinality } |I_b^t + b_k a_\delta| = |I_b^t| = q^{d_b t}, \quad (5.10)$$

and the number of the pre-images in $\mathcal{A}(c)_{a_\delta}$ of any $a \in I_b^t + b_k a_\delta$ is equal to $\frac{q^{n(k-1)t}}{q^{d_b t}} = q^{n(k-1)t - d_b t}$, which is independent of the choices of a_δ and a . Hence, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_b | X_c = 1) = \frac{\sum_{0 \neq a_\delta \in ((\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta}} (|(I_b^t + b_k a_\delta)^{\leq \delta}| - \lambda_{a_\delta}) q^{n(k-1)t - d_b t}}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)}, \quad (5.11)$$

where

$$\lambda_{a_\delta} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \in I_b^t + b_k a_\delta; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

By Lemma 4.5, Lemma 4.6, Remark 4.2 and Corollary 4.4, we see that $I_b^t + b_k a_\delta$ is a balanced code, and $|(I_b^t + b_k a_\delta)^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{d_b t h_q(\delta)}$, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_b | X_c = 1) &\leq \frac{(|((\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta}| - 1) \cdot q^{d_b t h_q(\delta)} q^{n(k-1)t - d_b t}}{q^{nkt} \mathbb{E}(X_c)} \\ &= \frac{q^{nt} \mathbb{E}(X_c) \cdot q^{d_b t h_q(\delta)} q^{n(k-1)t - d_b t}}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} = q^{-d_b n g_q(\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

(2). Assume that $\bar{b} \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{(k-1)*}$. Then $d_{\bar{b}} = n$, $I_{\bar{b}}^t = (\mathbb{F}G)^t$ and $I_{\bar{b}}^t + b_k a_\delta = (\mathbb{F}G)^t$; in particular, $\lambda_{a_\delta} = 1$ in Eq.(5.12). So we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(X_b | X_c = 1) = \frac{(|((\mathbb{F}G)^t)^{\leq \delta}| - 1) \cdot q^{nt} \mathbb{E}(X_c) q^{n(k-1)t - d_b t}}{q^{nkt} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} = \mathbb{E}(X_c).$$

We are done. \square

We are ready to complete a proof of Theorem 5.1.

A proof of Theorem 5.1.

By Eq.(5.4), we need to prove that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) = \begin{cases} 0, & r < g_q(\delta); \\ 1, & r > g_q(\delta). \end{cases}$

If $r < g_q(\delta)$, then by Markov Inequality (Lemma 9.5) and Theorem 5.6,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X) = 0.$$

Next we assume that $r > g_q(\delta)$. By Lemma 5.7, it is enough to prove that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(X|X_c = 1)}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1)}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} = 1, \quad (5.13)$$

where $c = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ as in Eq.(5.8). Since $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k-1} = \bigcup_{I \leq \mathbb{F}G} I^{(k-1)*}$ (see Eq.(5.5)), but this time we consider $(\mathbb{F}G)^{k-1}$, we have

$$\sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1) = \sum_{I \leq \mathbb{F}G} \sum_{\bar{b} \in I^{(k-1)*}} \sum_{b_k \in \mathbb{F}G} \mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1),$$

where $b = (b_1, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k)$ and $\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{k-1})$. Thus

$$\frac{\sum_{b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^k} \mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1)}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} = \sum_{I \leq \mathbb{F}G} S_I, \quad (5.14)$$

where

$$S_I = \frac{\sum_{\bar{b} \in I^{(k-1)*}} \sum_{b_k \in \mathbb{F}G} \mathbb{E}(X_b|X_c = 1)}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)}, \quad I \leq \mathbb{F}G.$$

We compute $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_I$ for ideals I of $\mathbb{F}G$ in two cases.

Case 1: $I = \mathbb{F}G$, hence $I^{(k-1)*} = (\mathbb{F}G)^{(k-1)*}$. By Lemma 5.8 we have

$$S_I = \frac{|\mathbb{F}G|^{(k-1)*} \cdot q^n \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*} \cdot \mathbb{E}(X_c)} = \frac{|\mathbb{F}G|^{(k-1)*}}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k-1}} \cdot \frac{|\mathbb{F}G|^k}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*}}.$$

By Eq.(5.6), we get ($k \rightarrow \infty$ while $t \rightarrow \infty$)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} S_I = 1.$$

Case 2: $I \neq \mathbb{F}G$. Then $d_{\bar{b}} = d_I = \dim_F I < n$ for any $\bar{b} \in I^{(k-1)*}$, and $|I^{(k-1)*}| \leq |I^{(k-1)}| = q^{d_I(k-1)}$. By Lemma 5.5(2.2) and Lemma 5.8(1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_I &\leq \frac{q^{d_I(k-1)} q^n \cdot q^{-d_I t g_q(\delta)}}{\frac{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*}}{|\mathbb{F}G|^k} \left(q^{nt \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta) - \frac{\log_q(nt+1)}{nt} \right)} - 1 \right)} \\ &\leq q^n \cdot \frac{|\mathbb{F}G|^k}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*}} \cdot \frac{q^{d_I t \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta) \right)}}{q^{nt \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta) - \frac{\log_q(nt+1)}{nt} \right)} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $k = \lfloor rn \rfloor$ and $1 > r > g_q(\delta)$, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{k}{t} - g_q(\delta) \right) = r - g_q(\delta) > 0$.

Recalling that $d_I < n$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathbb{F}G|^k}{|\mathbb{F}G|^{k*}} = 1$ (see Eq.(5.6)), we get that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} S_I = 0.$$

Finally, since there are only finitely many ideals of $\mathbb{F}G$, by Eq.(5.14) and the limits obtained in the above two cases, Eq.(5.13) is proved.

Remark 5.9. The results in this section are published in [11]. In [11] we didn't assume that the order of the abelian group G is coprime to q ; i.e., the group algebra $\mathbb{F}G$ may be not semisimple (in the non-semisimple case the direct summands $\mathbb{F}Ge_i$ in Eq.(3.3) may be local rings). To make this chapter self-contained, here we avoid the non-semisimple case. However, the arguments here are in fact valid for the non-semisimple case.

6 Quasi-cyclic codes of fractional index

In this section we study the asymptotic properties of the so-called *quasi-cyclic codes of index $1/\alpha$* , where α is a positive integer. We introduced such *fractional index* so as to refine the indexes between 1 and 2 of quasi-cyclic codes ([14, 15]). A special case is that $\alpha = 1$, i.e., quasi-cyclic codes of index 2. Thus we study the asymptotic property of the quasi-abelian codes of index 2 firstly, and then turn to the quasi-cyclic codes of index $1/\alpha$.

6.1 Quasi-abelian codes of index 2

Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$. Let $n > 1$ be an integer with $\gcd(n, q) = 1$, and G be any abelian group of order n . Let $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$.

Denote $(\mathbb{F}G)^2 = \mathbb{F}G \times \mathbb{F}G$. For $(a, a') \in (\mathbb{F}G)^2$ we have a quasi-abelian code of index 2:

$$C_{a,a'} = \{(ba, ba') \mid b \in \mathbb{F}G\} \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^2. \quad (6.1)$$

Then $(\mathbb{F}G)^2 = (\mathbb{F}G)^{1 \times 2}$ and $C_{a,a'}$ are the special case of Eq.(5.1) and Eq.(5.2) for $k = 1$ and $t = 2$. Note that in Section 5 we considered the asymptotic properties of $\Delta(C_A)$ and $R(C_A)$ when n is fixed and $t \rightarrow \infty$; whereas we are now concerned with the asymptotic properties of $\Delta(C_{a,a'})$ and $R(C_{a,a'})$ when $k = 1$ and $t = 2$ but $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For $b \in \mathbb{F}G$, we denote $I_b = \mathbb{F}Gb$ and $d_b = \dim I_b$, and define

$$X_b = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < w(ba, ba') \leq 2n\delta; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad X = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{F}G} X_b. \quad (6.2)$$

Then Eq.(5.4) still holds; and by Lemma 5.5(1) we have

$$E(X_b) < q^{-2d_b g_q(\delta)}. \quad (6.3)$$

Let $I \leq \mathbb{F}G$. By Lemma 3.12, if $I \neq \mathbb{F}Ge_0 = \mathbb{F}e_0$ then $\dim I \geq \mu_q(n)$, where $\mu_q(n)$ is defined in Definition 3.11. For any ℓ with $\mu_q(n) \leq \ell \leq n$, let

$$\Gamma_\ell = \{I \mid I \leq \mathbb{F}G, \dim I = \ell\}, \quad I^* = \{a \mid a \in I, I_a (= \mathbb{F}Gb) = I\}.$$

Refining Eq.(5.5), we have

$$\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}e_0 \cup \left(\bigcup_{\ell=\mu_q(n)}^n \bigcup_{I \in \Gamma_\ell} I^* \right). \quad (6.4)$$

Lemma 6.1. $|\Gamma_\ell| \leq n^{\ell/\mu_q(n)}$.

Proof. For $I \in \Gamma_\ell$, by Theorem 3.10(3), I is a direct sum of some of \mathbb{F}_i 's for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Except for \mathbb{F}_0 , the summands of I are of dimension $\geq \mu_q(n)$. There are at most $\ell/\mu_q(n)$ summands. Thus $|\Gamma_\ell| \leq (m+1)^{\ell/\mu_q(n)} \leq n^{\ell/\mu_q(n)}$. \square

Exercise 19. Let $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. If $g_q(\delta) > \gamma$ then $\delta < (1 - \gamma)(1 - q^{-1})$. (Hint: $g_q(\cdot)$ is convex, $g_q(\delta) > \gamma g_q(0) + (1 - \gamma)g_q(1 - q^{-1}) \geq g_q(\gamma \cdot 0 + (1 - \gamma)(1 - q^{-1})) = g_q((1 - \gamma)(1 - q^{-1}))$; and $g_q(\cdot)$ is decreasing.)

Lemma 6.2. If $g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)} > 0$, then $E(X) \leq q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)})}$.

Proof. Since $g_q(\delta) > \frac{1}{2}$, by Exercise 19 we get that $\delta < \frac{1}{2}(1 - q^{-1}) < \frac{1}{2}$. For $b \in \mathbb{F}e_0$, recalling that $e_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x$, we see that $w(ba, ba') = 0, n$ or $2n$, hence $E(X_b) = 0$, see the definition of X_b in Eq.(6.2). By the linearity of expectations and Eq.(6.4), we have

$$E(X) = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{F}G} E(X_b) = \sum_{\ell = \mu_q(n)}^n \sum_{I \in \Gamma_\ell} \sum_{b \in I^*} E(X_b). \quad (6.5)$$

Let $I \in \Gamma_\ell$; for $b \in I^*$, $d_b = \dim I_b = \dim I = \ell$; hence, by Eq.(6.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b \in I^*} E(X_b) &\leq \sum_{b \in I^*} q^{-2\ell g_q(\delta)} = |I^*| \cdot q^{-2\ell g_q(\delta)} \\ &\leq q^\ell q^{-2\ell g_q(\delta)} = q^{-2\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2})}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$E(X) \leq \sum_{\ell = \mu_q(n)}^n \sum_{I \in \Gamma_\ell} q^{-2\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2})} = \sum_{\ell = \mu_q(n)}^n |\Gamma_\ell| \cdot q^{-2\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2})}.$$

By Lemma 6.1,

$$E(X) \leq \sum_{\ell = \mu_q(n)}^n n^{\frac{\ell}{\mu_q(n)}} q^{-2\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2})} = \sum_{\ell = \mu_q(n)}^n q^{-2\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)})}.$$

Since $g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)} > 0$ and $\ell \geq \mu_q(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(X) &\leq \sum_{\ell = \mu_q(n)}^n q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)})} \leq n \cdot q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)})} \\ &= q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}) + \log_q n} = q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)})}. \end{aligned}$$

We are done. \square

Lemma 6.3. The rate $R(C_{a,a'}) \leq \frac{1}{2}$; and

$$(1 - q^{-2})q^{-q^{\log_q(2n) - 2\mu_q(n)}} \leq \Pr(R(C_{a,a'}) = \frac{1}{2}) \leq 1 - q^{-2}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.18 and Exercise 17(3),

$$\mathbb{R}(C_{a,a'}) \leq \frac{1}{2}; \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}(C_{a,a'}) = \frac{1}{2} \iff (a, a') \in (\mathbb{F}G)^{2*}.$$

By Eq.(3.3) (and note that $d_0 = 1$),

$$\Pr(\mathbb{R}(C_{a,a'}) = \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{|(\mathbb{F}G)^{2*}|}{|(\mathbb{F}G)^2|} = \prod_{i=0}^m \frac{|\mathbb{F}_i^{2*}|}{|\mathbb{F}_i^2|} = \frac{q^2-1}{q^2} \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{q^{2d_i}-1}{q^{2d_i}}.$$

Since $d_i \geq \mu_q(n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $m < n$,

$$\Pr(\mathbb{R}(C_{a,a'}) = \frac{1}{2}) \geq (1-q^{-2}) \prod_{i=1}^m (1-q^{-2\mu_q(n)}) \geq (1-q^{-2}) \cdot (1-q^{-2\mu_q(n)})^n. \quad (6.6)$$

And

$$(1 - q^{-2\mu_q(n)})^n = (1 - q^{-2\mu_q(n)})^{q^{2\mu_q(n)} \frac{n}{q^{2\mu_q(n)}}}.$$

The sequence $(1-t^{-1})^t$ for $t = 2, 3, \dots$ is increasing and $(1-2^{-1})^2 = 2^{-2} \geq q^{-2}$. Thus

$$(1 - q^{-2\mu_q(n)})^n \geq (q^{-2})^{\frac{n}{q^{2\mu_q(n)}}} = q^{-\frac{2n}{q^{2\mu_q(n)}}} = q^{-q^{\log_q(2n) - 2\mu_q(n)}}.$$

Combining it with Eq.(6.6), we finished the proof of the lemma. \square

Exercise 20. If $k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_m$ be integers and $k_1 \geq \log_q m$ then

- (1) $(q^{k_1} - 1) \dots (q^{k_m} - 1) \geq q^{k_1 + \dots + k_m - 2}$; (Hint: $\frac{(q^{k_1}-1)\dots(q^{k_m}-1)}{(q^{k_1})\dots(q^{k_m})} = \prod_{i=1}^m (1 - \frac{1}{q^{k_i}})$
 $\geq (1 - \frac{1}{q^{k_1}})^m \geq (1 - \frac{1}{q^{k_1}})^{q^{k_1}}$; $(1-t^{-1})^t$ is increasing and $(1-2^{-1})^2 = 2^{-2} \geq q^{-2}$.)
- (2) $(q^{k_1} + 1) \dots (q^{k_m} + 1) \leq q^{k_1 + \dots + k_m + 2}$. (Hint: $(1+t^{-1})^t < 2^2 \leq q^2$.)

By Lemma 3.13 we have positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots coprime to q such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0.$$

Theorem 6.4. Assume that $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{1}{2}$, and integers n_1, n_2, \dots are as above. For $i = 1, 2, \dots$, let G_i be any abelian group of order n_i , and $C_{a,a'}^{(i)}$ be the random 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G_i$ -codes as in Eq.(6.1). Then

- (1) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{a,a'}^{(i)}) > \delta) = 1$.
- (2) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\mathbb{R}(C_{a,a'}^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{2}) = 1 - q^{-2}$.

Proof. (1). Since $g_q(\delta) > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0$, we can take a positive real number ε such that

$$g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} > \varepsilon, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots$$

Note that $\mu_q(n_i) \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 6.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{a,a'}^{(i)}) \leq \delta) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X) \\ &\leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} q^{-2\mu_q(n_i)} \left(g_q(\delta) - \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

(2). Since $\frac{\mu_q(n_i)}{\log_q n_i} \rightarrow \infty$ (with $i \rightarrow \infty$), $\log_q(2n_i) - 2\mu_q(n_i) \rightarrow -\infty$; hence

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} q^{-q^{\log_q(2n_i) - 2\mu_q(n_i)}} = 1.$$

And (2) follows from Lemma 6.3 at once. \square

Corollary 6.5. *Keep the notation as in Theorem 6.4. Then*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{a,a'}^{(i)}) > \delta \mid R(C_{a,a'}^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{2}) = 1.$$

Proof. By Exercise 27(2), it follows from Theorem 6.4 at once. \square

Theorem 6.6. *Assume that $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{1}{2}$; and positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots satisfy that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0$; and G_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ are abelian group of order n_i . Then for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ there exist 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G_i$ codes $C^{(i)}$ such that*

- $R(C^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$;
- $\Delta(C^{(i)}) > \delta$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.

In conclusion, there are asymptotically good quasi-abelian codes of index 2 attaining the GV-bound.

6.2 Quasi-cyclic codes of fractional index

In this subsection, \mathbb{F} is a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$, $n > 1$ and $\gcd(n, q) = 1$, and $\delta \in (0, 1 - q^{-1})$ as before. Assume that α is a positive integer; and:

- $G = \{1, x, \dots, x^{n-1}\}$ is a cyclic group of order n ;
- $\tilde{G} = \{1, \tilde{x}, \dots, \tilde{x}^{\alpha n - 1}\}$ is a cyclic group of order αn .

There is a natural surjective group homomorphism $\tilde{G} \rightarrow G$, $\tilde{x}^i \mapsto x^i$. By Exercise 12(2), we have a natural surjective algebra homomorphism

$$\mathbb{F}\tilde{G} \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}G, \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha n - 1} a_i \tilde{x}^i \longmapsto \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha n - 1} a_i x^i = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1} a_{i+jn} \right) x^i.$$

Thus, $\mathbb{F}G$ is an $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -module, and any $\mathbb{F}G$ -module is also an $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -module.

Definition 6.7. Any $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -submodule C of the $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -module

$$\mathbb{F}\tilde{G} \times \mathbb{F}G = \{(\tilde{a}, a) \mid \tilde{a} = \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha n - 1} \tilde{a}_i \tilde{x}^i \in \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}, a = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i \in \mathbb{F}G\},$$

denoted by $C \leq \mathbb{F}\tilde{G} \times \mathbb{F}G$, is said to be a *quasi-cyclic code of index $1/\alpha$* .

In particular, if $\alpha = 1$ then quasi-cyclic codes of index $1/\alpha$ are quasi-cyclic codes of index 2. In Subsection 6.1, we have seen that there exist asymptotically good 2-quasi-abelian code sequences attaining GV-bound. With that good asymptotic property we can exhibit a good asymptotic property of quasi-cyclic codes of fractional index.

We write $a = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i \in \mathbb{F}G$ as $a(x) \in \mathbb{F}G$. And the multiplication $a(x)b(x)$ is the same as polynomial multiplication but modulo $x^n - 1$.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $\varphi = 1 + \tilde{x}^n + \cdots + \tilde{x}^{n(\alpha-1)} \in \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$. Then*

$$\tilde{\varphi} : \mathbb{F}G \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}, \quad a(x) \longmapsto a(\tilde{x})\varphi,$$

is an $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -module injective homomorphism, and

$$w(\tilde{\varphi}(a(x))) = \alpha w(a(x)), \quad \forall a(x) \in \mathbb{F}G. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof. For any $a(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i \in \mathbb{F}G$,

$$\tilde{\varphi}(a(x)) = a(\tilde{x})\varphi = a(\tilde{x}) + a(\tilde{x})\tilde{x}^n + \cdots + a(\tilde{x})\tilde{x}^{n(\alpha-1)},$$

which is corresponding to the word

$$(a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{n-1}, a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{n-1}, \cdots, a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{F}^{\alpha n}.$$

So, $\tilde{\varphi}$ is an injective \mathbb{F} -linear map, and Eq.(6.7) holds. For the $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$, in $\mathbb{F}G$ the ‘‘module multiplication’’ of $a(x)$ by \tilde{x} is

$$\tilde{x} \circ a(x) = x(a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_{n-1} x^{n-1}) = a_{n-1} + a_0 x + \cdots + a_{n-2} x^{n-1}.$$

Note that in $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ we have $(\tilde{x}^n - 1)\varphi = \tilde{x}^{n\alpha} - 1 = 0$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{x} \circ a(x)) &= (a_{n-1} + a_0 \tilde{x} + \cdots + a_{n-2} \tilde{x}^{n-1})\varphi \\ &= (\tilde{x}a(\tilde{x}) - a_{n-1}(\tilde{x}^n - 1))\varphi = \tilde{x}a(\tilde{x})\varphi = \tilde{x}\tilde{\varphi}(a(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tilde{\varphi}$ is an $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -module homomorphism. □

By Lemma 6.8, we have an injective $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -module homomorphism

$$\Phi : \mathbb{F}G \times \mathbb{F}G \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}\tilde{G} \times \mathbb{F}G, \quad (a(x), a'(x)) \longmapsto (\tilde{\varphi}(a(x)), a'(x)). \quad (6.8)$$

Lemma 6.9. *Let $C_{a,a'}$ be the 2-quasi-FG code in Eq.(6.1). Denote $\tilde{C}_{a,a'} = \Phi(C_{a,a'}) \leq \mathbb{F}\tilde{G} \times \mathbb{F}G$. Then $\tilde{C}_{a,a'}$ is a $1\frac{1}{\alpha}$ -quasi-cyclic code and*

- (1) $R(\tilde{C}_{a,a'}) = \frac{2}{\alpha+1}R(C_{a,a'})$;
- (2) $\Delta(\tilde{C}_{a,a'}) \geq \frac{2}{\alpha+1}\Delta(C_{a,a'})$.

Proof. Since Φ is an $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -homomorphism, $\tilde{C}_{a,a'}$ is an $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ -submodule of $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G} \times \mathbb{F}G$.

- (1). Because Φ is injective, $\dim \tilde{C}_{a,a'} = \dim C_{a,a'}$. So

$$R(\tilde{C}_{a,a'}) = \frac{\dim \tilde{C}_{a,a'}}{\alpha n + n} = \frac{2}{\alpha+1} \cdot \frac{\dim C_{a,a'}}{2n} = \frac{2}{\alpha+1}R(C_{a,a'}).$$

- (2). Denote $\tilde{d} = d(\tilde{C}_{a,a'})$, $d = d(C_{a,a'})$. By Eq.(6.7), $\tilde{d} \geq d$. Then

$$\Delta(\tilde{C}_{a,a'}) = \frac{\tilde{d}}{\alpha n + n} \geq \frac{2}{\alpha+1} \cdot \frac{d}{2n} = \frac{2}{\alpha+1}\Delta(C_{a,a'}).$$

We are done. □

From Theorem 6.6 we get the following at once.

Theorem 6.10. *Assume that $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{1}{2}$; and positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots satisfy that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0$. Then for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ there exist quasi-cyclic codes $\tilde{C}^{(i)}$ of index $1\frac{1}{\alpha}$ over \mathbb{F} such that*

- the length of $\tilde{C}^{(i)}$ equals $(\alpha + 1)n_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$;
- $R(\tilde{C}^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{\alpha+1}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$;
- $\Delta(\tilde{C}^{(i)}) > \frac{2\delta}{\alpha+1}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.

In conclusion, quasi-cyclic codes of index $1\frac{1}{\alpha}$ are asymptotically good. But, if $\alpha > 1$, we cannot get a sequence of the codes whose parameters attain the GV-bound.

Remark 6.11. (1) It is well-known for a very long time that binary quasi-cyclic codes of index 2 are asymptotically good (and attain the GV-bound), see [8, 9, 22]. In [2], binary quasi-abelian codes of fixed index $t \geq 2$ are proved to be asymptotically good. In the dissertation [24], the asymptotic goodness of quasi-abelian codes of fixed index $t \geq 2$ are extended to any q -ary case. In this section we present a proof of this asymptotic goodness for index 2.

(2) Quasi-cyclic codes of index $1\frac{1}{2}$ and $1\frac{1}{3}$ are introduced and proved to be asymptotically good in [14, 15]; and the results are extended to quasi-cyclic codes of general fractional index in [34]. In this section, based on the result on the asymptotic goodness for quasi-abelian codes of index 2, we take a more concise argument to prove the asymptotic goodness of quasi-cyclic codes of index $1\frac{1}{\alpha}$ for any q and any positive integer α .

7 Self-dual quasi-abelian codes of index 2

In this section we always assume:

- \mathbb{F} is a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$;
- $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$;
- $n > 1$ is an odd integer, $\gcd(n, q) = 1$ and $\mu_q(n) > 2 \log_q n$, where $\mu_q(n)$ is defined in Definition 3.11;
- G is an abelian group of order n .

We refine the notation about $\mathbb{F}G$ in Section 3 for the further study.

By Theorem 3.10, $E = \{e_0 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{x \in G} x, e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ is the set of all primitive idempotents of $\mathbb{F}G$, and $\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}e_0 \oplus \mathbb{F}Ge_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{F}Ge_m$ as in Eq.(3.3); each $\mathbb{F}_i := \mathbb{F}Ge_i$ is a field extension of \mathbb{F} . The bar map in Definition 3.15: $\mathbb{F}G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}G$, $a \mapsto \bar{a}$, is an automorphism of $\mathbb{F}G$ of order 2; hence $\bar{E} = E$, i.e., bar map induces a permutation of order ≤ 2 of the primitive idempotents. Then we can write the set E of all primitive idempotents of $\mathbb{F}G$ as

$$E = \{e_0\} \cup \{e_1, \dots, e_r\} \cup \{e_{r+1}, \bar{e}_{r+1}, \dots, e_{r+s}, \bar{e}_{r+s}\}, \quad (7.1)$$

where $\bar{e}_i = e_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, $\bar{e}_{r+j} \neq e_{r+j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$ and $1 + r + 2s = m$. For $i = 1, \dots, r$, $\overline{\mathbb{F}Ge_i} = \mathbb{F}Ge_i$. For $j = 1, \dots, s$, the restriction of the “bar” map to A_{r+j} induces a map:

$$\mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j} \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}G\bar{e}_{r+j}, \quad a \longmapsto \bar{a}, \quad (7.2)$$

which is an \mathbb{F} -algebra isomorphism. And $\mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j} + \mathbb{F}G\bar{e}_{r+j}$ are invariant by the automorphism “bar”. So in the following we set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{e}_{r+j} &= e_{r+j} + \bar{e}_{r+j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, s; \\ \hat{E} &= \{e_0, e_1, \dots, e_r, \hat{e}_{r+1}, \dots, \hat{e}_{r+s}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

Remark 7.1. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$, $\mathbb{F}Ge_i = \mathbb{F}_i$ is a finite field. However, for $j = 1, \dots, s$, $\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j} = \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j} + \mathbb{F}G\bar{e}_{r+j}$ which is isomorphic to a direct sum of two copies of the finite field \mathbb{F}_{r+j} , see Exercise 21. And

$$1 = \sum_{e \in \hat{E}} e; \quad \bar{e} = e, \quad \forall e \in \hat{E}; \quad ee' = \begin{cases} e, & e = e'; \\ 0, & e \neq e'; \end{cases} \quad \forall e, e' \in \hat{E}; \quad (7.4)$$

For any $e \in \hat{E}$, the “bar” map induces an automorphism of the algebra $\mathbb{F}Ge$.

Exercise 21. Let $\mathbb{F}_{r+j} = \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j}$ which is a field, and $R = \mathbb{F}_{r+j} \times \mathbb{F}_{r+j}$. For $(a, b) \in R$, set $\overline{(a, b)} = (b, a)$. Then:

- (1) $(a, b) \mapsto \overline{(a, b)}$ is an automorphism of the ring R .
- (2) $\iota : R \rightarrow \mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j}$, $(a, b) \mapsto a + \bar{b}$, is a ring isomorphism, and $\iota(\overline{(a, b)}) = \overline{\iota(a, b)}$ for any $(a, b) \in R$. (Hint: cf. Eq.(7.2).)

For any ideal $A \leq \mathbb{F}G$, denote $A^\flat = \{a \mid a \in A, \bar{a} = a\}$. For $j = 1, \dots, s$, the restriction of the bar map to $\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j}$ is an automorphism of $\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j}$ of order 2 described in Eq.(7.2) and Exercise 21; in particular,

$$(\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j})^\flat = \{a + \bar{a} \mid a \in \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j}\}, \quad \dim(\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j})^\flat = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j}. \quad (7.5)$$

Lemma 7.2. For $i = 1, \dots, r$, $\mathbb{F}Ge_i \rightarrow \mathbb{F}Ge_i$, $a \mapsto \bar{a}$, is an automorphism of the field $\mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}Ge_i$ of order 2; in particular, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}_i = \dim \mathbb{F}Ge_i$ is even and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}_i^\flat = \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}_i$.

Proof. For any $1 \neq x \in G$, $\bar{x} = x^{-1} \neq x$ (because $|G| = n$ is odd). So, for $a = \sum_{x \in G} a_x x \in \mathbb{F}G$, $\bar{a} = a$ if and only if $a_x = a_{x^{-1}}$ for all $1 \neq x \in G$. Thus $\dim(\mathbb{F}G)^\flat = 1 + \frac{n-1}{2}$. Note that

$$(\mathbb{F}G)^\flat = (\mathbb{F}Ge_0)^\flat + \sum_{i=1}^r (\mathbb{F}Ge_i)^\flat + \sum_{j=1}^s (\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j})^\flat.$$

It is trivial that $(\mathbb{F}Ge_0)^\flat = \mathbb{F}Ge_0 = \mathbb{F}e_0$. For $j = 1, \dots, s$, we have seen in Eq.(7.5) that $\dim(\mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j})^\flat = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathbb{F}G\hat{e}_{r+j}$. For $i = 1, \dots, r$, the bar map induces an automorphism of order ≤ 2 on the finite field $\mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}Ge_i$. Thus $\dim(\mathbb{F}Ge_i)^\flat \geq \frac{1}{2} \dim(\mathbb{F}Ge_i)$. Because $\dim(\mathbb{F}G)^\flat = 1 + \frac{n-1}{2}$, for each i with $1 \leq i \leq r$, the equality $\dim(\mathbb{F}Ge_i)^\flat = \frac{1}{2} \dim(\mathbb{F}Ge_i)$ has to be held. \square

Let $k_0 = \dim \mathbb{F}Ge_0 = 1$. In the following we denote:

$$\widehat{E}^\dagger = \widehat{E} - \{e_0\} = \{e_1, \dots, e_r, \widehat{e}_{r+1}, \dots, \widehat{e}_{r+s}\}. \quad (7.6)$$

For any $e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger$, by Eq.(7.5) and Lemma 7.2, $\dim \mathbb{F}Ge$ is even; so, instead of d_i in Theorem 3.10, we denote $k_e = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathbb{F}Ge$, and set k_i as:

$$\begin{aligned} k_i &:= k_e = \frac{1}{2} \dim \mathbb{F}Ge_i, \quad \text{for } e = e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, r; \\ k_{r+j} &:= k_e = \dim \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j}, \quad \text{for } e = \widehat{e}_{r+j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, s; \\ \text{hence } \frac{n-1}{2} &= k_1 + \dots + k_r + k_{r+1} + \dots + k_{r+s}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

Note that: $\min\{k_e \mid e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger\} \geq \lceil \frac{1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil$, hence $k_e > \log_q n$ for all $e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger$ (because we have assumed that $\mu_q(n) > 2 \log_q n$).

Exercise 22. $\min\{k_e \mid e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger\} \geq \lceil \frac{1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil$.

7.1 Self-dual quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes of index 2

We consider the following \mathcal{D} as a probability space with equal probability for every sample:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(1, b) \mid b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^\times, \overline{bb} = -1\}. \quad (7.8)$$

By Lemma 3.18(3), we have the self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes $C_{1,b}$ as follows:

$$C_{1,b} = \{(a, ab) \mid a \in \mathbb{F}G\}, \quad (1, b) \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (7.9)$$

Lemma 7.3. *Let \mathcal{D} be as above. Then $|\mathcal{D}| = s_0 \prod_{i=1}^r (q^{k_i} + 1) \prod_{j=1}^s (q^{k_{r+j}} - 1)$,*

$$\text{where } s_0 = \begin{cases} 1, & q \equiv 0 \pmod{2}; \\ 2, & q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}; \\ 0, & q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}; \end{cases} \quad \text{in particular, } s_0 q^{\frac{n-1}{2}-2} \leq |\mathcal{D}| \leq q^{\frac{n-1}{2}+3}.$$

Proof. Any $a \in \mathbb{F}G$ is uniquely written as

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a_0 + a_1 + \dots + a_r + a_{r+1} + \dots + a_{r+s}, \\ \text{where } a_i &= ae_i \in \mathbb{F}Ge_i = \mathbb{F}e_i, \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, r, \\ a_{r+j} &= a\widehat{e}_{r+j} \in \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j} + \mathbb{F}G\overline{e}_{r+j} \cong \mathbb{F}_{r+j} \times \mathbb{F}_{r+j}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, s. \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

For the last line please see Exercise 21. And, for $a, b \in \mathbb{F}G$,

$$ab = a_0b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^r a_i b_i + \sum_{j=1}^s a_{r+j} b_{r+j}. \quad (7.11)$$

Thus, for $b \in (\mathbb{F}G)^\times$, $\overline{bb} = -1$ if and only if

$$b_i \overline{b}_i = -e_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, r; \quad b_{r+j} \overline{b}_{r+j} = -\widehat{e}_{r+j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, s. \quad (7.12)$$

By Exercise 23 below, we have the following three conclusions.

Case 1: $i = 0$; then there are s_0 choices of $b_0 \in (\mathbb{F}G e_0)^\times$ such that $b_0 \bar{b}_0 = -e_0$.

Case 2: $1 \leq i \leq r$; then there are $q^{k_i} + 1$ choices of $b_i \in (\mathbb{F}G e_i)^\times$ such that $b_i \bar{b}_i = -e_i$.

Case 3: $1 \leq j \leq s$; then there are $q^{k_{r+j}} - 1$ choices of $b_{r+j} \in (\mathbb{F}G \widehat{e}_{r+j})^\times$ such that $b_{r+j} \bar{b}_{r+j} = -\widehat{e}_{r+j}$.

We get

$$|\mathcal{D}| = s_0 \prod_{i=1}^r (q^{k_i} + 1) \prod_{j=1}^s (q^{k_{r+j}} - 1).$$

By Exercise 20(2) we have (recall that $s_0 \leq 2 \leq q$):

$$|\mathcal{D}| \leq s_0 \prod_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} (q^{k_e} + 1) \leq qq^{2 + \sum_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} k_e} = q^{\frac{n-1}{2} + 3}.$$

And by Exercise 20(1),

$$|\mathcal{D}| \geq s_0 \prod_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} (q^{k_e} - 1) \geq s_0 q^{-2 + \sum_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} k_e} = s_0 q^{\frac{n-1}{2} - 2}.$$

The lemma is proved. \square

Exercise 23. (1) The number of the solutions in \mathbb{F} of the equation $X^2 = -1$ is equal to s_0 , where s_0 is the same as in Lemma 7.3. (Hint: \mathbb{F}^\times is a cyclic group of order $q-1$; if $-1 \neq 1$ then any solution of $X^2 = -1$ in \mathbb{F}^\times is an element of order 4.)

(2) Let \mathbb{F}_i be the finite field with $|\mathbb{F}_i| = q^{2k_i}$ as in Eq.(7.7), $\bar{u} = u^{q^{k_i}}$ for $u \in \mathbb{F}_i$. Then the number of the solutions in \mathbb{F}_i of the equation $X\bar{X} = -1$ is equal to $q^{k_i} + 1$. (Hint: $X\bar{X} = X^{q^{k_i}+1}$; \mathbb{F}_i^\times is a cyclic group of order $q^{2k_i} - 1 = (q^{k_i} + 1)(q^{k_i} - 1)$; if $-1 = 1$ then we are done; otherwise $2|(q^{k_i} - 1)$ and there is an element in \mathbb{F}_i^\times of order $2(q^{k_i} + 1)$.)

(3) Let \mathbb{F}_{r+j} be the finite field with $|\mathbb{F}_{r+j}| = q^{k_{r+j}}$ and $R = \mathbb{F}_{r+j} \times \mathbb{F}_{r+j}$ as in Exercise 21. Then the number of the solutions in R of the equation $X\bar{X} = -1$ is equal to $q^{k_{r+j}} - 1$. (Hint: (a, b) is a solution of $X\bar{X} = -1$ in R iff $ab = ba = -1$ in \mathbb{F}_{r+j} ; choose $a \in \mathbb{F}_{r+j}^\times$ freely, and then $b = -a^{-1}$ is uniquely determined.)

Corollary 7.4. *Self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes exist if and only if $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$, if and only if $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.*

Proof. For cyclic G , this result was proved in [27]. We show a proof appeared in [25] for general abelian G . By Lemma 7.3, $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. If $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ then $C_{1,b}$ in Eq.(7.9) is a self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code. Finally, assume that C is a self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code; then, by Exercise 24(3) below, $e_0 C$ is self-dual in $e_0(\mathbb{F}G)^2 = \mathbb{F}e_0 \times \mathbb{F}e_0$, hence $X^2 = -1$ has solutions in \mathbb{F} ; by Exercise 23(1), $s_0 \geq 1$, i.e., $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. \square

Exercise 24. Denote $1^\dagger = 1 - e_0$. Let $C \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^2$.

(1) $(\mathbb{F}G)^2 = e_0(\mathbb{F}G)^2 \oplus 1^\dagger(\mathbb{F}G)^2$ is an orthogonal direct sum. (Hint: similar to the proof of Exercise 16: $e_0 1^\dagger = 0$, hence $\langle e_0(\mathbb{F}G)^2, 1^\dagger(\mathbb{F}G)^2 \rangle = 0$.)

(2) $C = e_0 C \oplus 1^\dagger C$, and $C^\perp = (e_0 C)^{\perp e_0} \oplus (1^\dagger C)^{\perp 1^\dagger}$, where $(e_0 C)^{\perp e_0}$ denotes the orthogonal subspace of $e_0 C$ in $e_0(\mathbb{F}G)^2$; and it is similar for $(1^\dagger C)^{\perp 1^\dagger}$.

(3) $C = C^\perp$ is self-dual if and only if $e_0 C = (e_0 C)^{\perp e_0}$ and $1^\dagger C = (1^\dagger C)^{\perp 1^\dagger}$.

Remark 7.5. Thus, from now on till to the end of this subsection, we assume that $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, so that $s_0 \geq 1$, $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ and we can consider the asymptotic properties of the self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes $C_{1,b}$ in Eq.(7.9). For $(a, d) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^2$, we define a 0-1 random variable $X_{(a,d)}$ over \mathcal{D} as follows:

$$X_{(a,d)} = \begin{cases} 1, & (a, d) \in C_{1,b} \text{ and } 1 \leq w(a, d) \leq 2n\delta; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (7.13)$$

By the definition, we see that if $(a, d) = 0$ or $w(a, d) > 2\delta n$ then $X_{(a,d)} = 0$ (zero variable); otherwise, the expectation

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{(a,d)}) = |\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}|/|\mathcal{D}|, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{D}_{(a,d)} = \{(1, b) \in \mathcal{D} \mid (a, d) \in C_{1,b}\}. \quad (7.14)$$

We further define an integer variable X over \mathcal{D} as follows:

$$X = \sum_{0 \neq (a,d) \in (\mathbb{F}G \times \mathbb{F}G)^{\leq \delta}} X_{(a,d)}. \quad (7.15)$$

Then

$$\Pr(\Delta(C_{1,b}) \leq \delta) = \Pr(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}(X), \quad (7.16)$$

where the second inequality follows from Markov Inequality (Lemma 9.5).

For $a \in \mathbb{F}G$, denote

$$E_a = \{e \in E \mid ea \neq 0\}, \quad \widehat{E}_a^\dagger = \{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger \mid ea \neq 0\}.$$

Lemma 7.6. *Let $(a, d) \in (\mathbb{F}G)^2$ and $\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}$ be as in Eq.(7.14). If $\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)} \neq \emptyset$ then $E_a = E_d$ and $|\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}| \leq q^{\frac{n-1}{2} - \ell_a + 3}$.*

Proof. Given $(1, g) \in \mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}$; i.e. $(a, d) \in C_{1,g}$, hence $(a, d) = (a, ag)$; so $d = ag$. Since $g \in (\mathbb{F}G)^\times$, for $e \in E$, $ed \neq 0$ if and only if $ea \neq 0$; that is, $E_a = E_d$. Then $(1, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}$ if and only if $(a, ab) = (a, d) = (a, ag)$, i.e., $ab = ag$. By the notation in Eq.(7.10) and Eq.(7.11),

$$(1, b) \in \mathcal{D}_{(a,d)} \iff \begin{cases} a_i b_i = a_i g_i, & i = 0, 1, \dots, r; \\ a_{r+j} b_{r+j} = a_{r+j} g_{r+j}, & j = 1, \dots, s. \end{cases}$$

Case 1: $i = 0$. If $a_i = 0$ then, by Exercise 23(1), there are s_0 choices of b_0 such that $a_0 b_0 = a_0 g_0$. Otherwise, $a_0 \neq 0$ and there is a unique b_0 such that $a_0 b_0 = a_0 g_0$. So, there are t_0 choices of b_0 such that $a_0 b_0 = a_0 g_0$, where

$$t_0 = \begin{cases} s_0, & a_0 = 0; \\ 1, & a_0 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Case 2: $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}G e_i$ and \mathbb{F}_i is a field with $|\mathbb{F}_i| = q^{2k_i}$.

Subcase 2.1: $e_i \in \widehat{E}_a^\dagger$. Then $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_i^\times$, there is a unique $b_i \in \mathbb{F}_i$ such that $a_i b_i = a_i g_i$.

Subcase 2.2: $e_i \notin \widehat{E}_a^\dagger$. Then $a_i = 0$ and hence $a_i b_i = a_i g_i = 0$; there are $q^{k_i} + 1$ choices of $b_i \in \mathbb{F}_i$ such that $a_i b_i = a_i g_i$, cf. Exercise 23(2).

Case 3: $1 \leq j \leq s$. Then $a_{r+j} \in \mathbb{F}G\widehat{e}_{r+j} = \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j} + \mathbb{F}G\bar{e}_{r+j}$, where $\mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j} = \mathbb{F}_{r+j}$ and $|\mathbb{F}_{r+j}| = q^{kr+j}$. We write $a_{r+j} = a' + a''$ with $a' \in \mathbb{F}Ge_{r+j}$ and $a'' \in \mathbb{F}G\bar{e}_{r+j}$. And $b_{r+j} = b' + b''$, $g_{r+j} = g' + g''$ in the same way. Then $(a' + a'')(b' + b'') = a_{r+j}b_{r+j} = a_{r+j}g_{r+j} = (a' + a'')(g' + g'')$, i.e.,

$$a'b' = a'g' \quad \text{and} \quad a''b'' = a''g''. \quad (7.17)$$

Subcase 3.1: $\widehat{e}_{r+j} \in \widehat{E}_a^\dagger$. Then $(a' + a'')(e_{r+j} + \bar{e}_{r+j}) \neq 0$, hence one of a' and a'' is nonzero, say $a' \neq 0$. There is a unique b' such that $a'b' = a'g'$. Note that $b'\bar{b}'' = -1$ (see the hint for Exercise 23(3)), i.e., b' and b'' determined each other (it is the same for g' and g''). There is a unique $b_{r+j} = b' + b''$ such that Eq.(7.17) holds.

Subcase 3.2: $\widehat{e}_{r+j} \notin \widehat{E}_a^\dagger$. Then $a' = a'' = 0$, hence Eq.(7.17) always holds. By Exercise 23(3), there are $q^{kr+j} - 1$ choices of $b_{r+j} = b' + b''$ such that Eq.(7.17) holds.

Summarizing the above three cases, we get

$$|\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}| = t_0 \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r, e_i a \neq 0} (q^{k_i} + 1) \prod_{1 \leq j \leq s, \widehat{e}_{r+j} a \neq 0} (q^{kr+j} - 1).$$

Since $t_0 \leq 2 \leq q$ and $q^{kr+j} - 1 < q^{kr+j} + 1$,

$$|\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}| \leq q \prod_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger - \widehat{E}_a^\dagger} (q^{k_e} + 1) \leq qq^{2 + \sum_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger - \widehat{E}_a^\dagger} k_e} = q^{3 + \frac{n-1}{2} - \ell_a}.$$

We are done. □

For any $a \in \mathbb{F}G$, we set

$$L_a = \bigoplus_{e \in \widehat{E}_a^\dagger} \mathbb{F}Ge, \quad \ell_a = \frac{1}{2} \dim L_a = \sum_{e \in \widehat{E}_a^\dagger} k_e; \quad \tilde{L}_a = \mathbb{F}e_0 \oplus L_a. \quad (7.18)$$

Note that $L_a \neq I_a$ and $\ell_a \neq d_a$ in general (where $I_a = \mathbb{F}Ga$ and $d_a = \dim I_a$ are defined in Definition 5.4(3) for $k = 1$). But $I_a \subseteq \tilde{L}_a$ and $\dim \tilde{L}_a = 2\ell_a + 1$.

Further, for an integer ℓ with $\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil \leq \ell \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$, we set:

$$\Omega_{2\ell} = \{L \mid L \text{ is a direct sum of some of } \mathbb{F}Ge\text{'s for } e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger, \dim L = 2\ell\}; \quad (7.19)$$

and for $L \in \Omega_{2\ell}$ we set (where L_a is defined in Eq.(7.18)):

$$\tilde{L} = \mathbb{F}e_0 \oplus L, \quad \tilde{L}^* = \{a \in \tilde{L} \mid L_a = L \text{ (equivalently, } \ell_a = \ell)\}. \quad (7.20)$$

Similarly to Eq.(6.4) and Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}e_0 \cup \left(\bigcup_{\ell = \lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \bigcup_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \tilde{L}^* \right); \quad |\Omega_{2\ell}| \leq n^{2\ell/\mu_q(n)}. \quad (7.21)$$

Lemma 7.7. *If $g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)} > 0$, then $E(X) \leq q^{-2\mu_q(n)}(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}) + 6$.*

Proof. For $(a, d) \in (\mathbb{F}G \times \mathbb{F}G)^{\leq \delta}$, if $d \notin \tilde{L}_a$, then $\hat{E}_d^\dagger \neq \hat{E}_a^\dagger$, hence $E_d \neq E_a$ and, by Lemma 7.6, $\mathbb{E}(X_{(a,d)}) = 0$. Next, if $a \in \mathbb{F}e_0$ then, similarly to Eq.(6.5), we can get that $\mathbb{E}(X_{(a,d)}) = 0$. Thus, by Eq.(7.21), we can rewrite Eq.(7.15) as:

$$X = \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \sum_{(a,d) \in (\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}} X_{(a,d)}.$$

Let $L \in \Omega_{2\ell}$. Then $\dim(\tilde{L} \times \tilde{L}) = 2(2\ell + 1) = 4\ell + 2$ and, by Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, $|(\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}| \leq |(\tilde{L} \times \tilde{L})^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{(4\ell+2)h_q(\delta)}$. For $(a, d) \in \tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*$, by Eq.(7.20), $\ell_a = \ell$. By Eq.(7.14), Lemma 7.6, Lemma 7.3 and Remark 7.5 (which shows that $s_0 \geq 1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(a,d) \in (\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}} \mathbb{E}(X_{(a,d)}) &= \sum_{(a,d) \in (\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}} |\mathcal{D}_{(a,d)}| / |\mathcal{D}| \\ &\leq \sum_{(a,d) \in (\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}} q^{\frac{n-1}{2} - \ell_a + 3} / q^{\frac{n-1}{2} - 2} = |(\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}| \cdot q^{5-\ell} \\ &\leq q^{(4\ell+2)h_q(\delta)} \cdot q^{-\ell+5} = q^{4\ell h_q(\delta) - \ell + 5 + 2h_q(\delta)} \leq q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4}) + 6}, \end{aligned}$$

where $2h_q(\delta) < 1/2$ because $g_q(\delta) > 3/4$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X) &= \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \sum_{(a,d) \in (\tilde{L}^* \times \tilde{L}^*)^{\leq \delta}} \mathbb{E}(X_{(a,d)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4}) + 6} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} |\Omega_{2\ell}| \cdot q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4}) + 6}. \end{aligned}$$

By Eq.(7.21),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X) &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} n^{2\ell/\mu_q(n)} q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4}) + 6} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)}) + 6}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)} > 0$ and $4\ell \geq 2\mu_q(n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X) &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)}) + 6} \\ &\leq nq^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)}) + 6} = q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}) + 6}. \end{aligned}$$

We are done. \square

By Lemma 3.13 and Remark 3.14, we have odd positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots coprime to q such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0. \quad (7.22)$$

Theorem 7.8. *Assume that $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$, and integers n_1, n_2, \dots are as above. For $i = 1, 2, \dots$, let G_i be any abelian group of order n_i , and $C_{1,b}^{(i)}$ be the random self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G_i$ codes defined in Eq.(7.9).*

Then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{1,b}^{(i)}) > \delta) = 1$.

Proof. Take a positive real number ε such that

$$g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} > \varepsilon, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots.$$

Note that $\mu_q(n_i) \rightarrow \infty$. By Eq.(7.16) and Lemma 7.7,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{1,b}^{(i)}) \leq \delta) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X \geq 1) \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X) \\ &\leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} q^{-2\mu_q(n_i)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)}) + 6} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We are done. \square

Theorem 7.9. *Assume that $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$, and positive odd integers n_1, n_2, \dots satisfy that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0$. Let G_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ be abelian groups of order n_i . Then for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ there exist self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G_i$ codes $C^{(i)}$ such that $\Delta(C^{(i)}) > \delta$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.*

Of course, we can take all the G_i to be cyclic, so that: *if $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ then the self-dual 2-quasi-cyclic codes are asymptotically good.*

7.2 Self-orthogonal quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes of index 2

In this subsection we remove the assumption “ $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ ” in Remark 7.5, and consider a kind of self-orthogonal 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes of dimension $n - 1$, which always exist and will be proved asymptotically good.

Remark 7.10. By Corollary 7.4, the existence of self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes is conditional. The obstacle for this existence is the e_0 -components. So, following \widehat{E}^\dagger defined in Eq.(7.6), in this subsection we take the following notation.

- $1^\dagger = 1 - e_0$ as in Exercise 24, i.e., $1^\dagger = \sum_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} e$.
- $\mathbb{F}G^\dagger = 1^\dagger(\mathbb{F}G) = \bigoplus_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} \mathbb{F}Ge$ which is a ring with identity 1^\dagger ;
hence the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{F}G^\dagger)^\times = \prod_{e \in \widehat{E}^\dagger} (\mathbb{F}Ge)^\times$.
- $\mathcal{D}^\dagger = \{(1^\dagger, b^\dagger) \mid b^\dagger \in (\mathbb{F}G^\dagger)^\times, b^\dagger \overline{b^\dagger} = -1^\dagger\}$.
- $C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger} = \{(a^\dagger, a^\dagger b^\dagger) \mid a^\dagger \in \mathbb{F}G^\dagger\} \leq (\mathbb{F}G)^\dagger$. By Lemma 3.18, C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger} is a self-orthogonal 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ code of dimension $n - 1$ (as $\text{Ann}(1^\dagger, b^\dagger) = \mathbb{F}e_0$).
- $X_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)} = \begin{cases} 1, & (a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger} \text{ and } 1 \leq w(a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \leq 2n\delta; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in (\mathbb{F}G^\dagger)^2$.
- Set $\mathcal{D}_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}^\dagger = \{(1^\dagger, b^\dagger) \in \mathcal{D}^\dagger \mid (1^\dagger, b^\dagger) \in C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger}\}$; then

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}) = |\mathcal{D}_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}^\dagger| / |\mathcal{D}^\dagger|.$$

- $X^\dagger = \sum_{0 \neq (a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in (\mathbb{F}G^\dagger \times \mathbb{F}G^\dagger) \leq \delta} X_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}$; then

$$\Pr(\Delta(C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger}) \leq \delta) = \Pr(X^\dagger \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}(X^\dagger).$$

Similarly to Lemma 7.3 (just note that Case 1 in its proof is no longer present here, hence s_0 disappeared), we have

Lemma 7.11. $|\mathcal{D}^\dagger| = \prod_{i=1}^r (q^{k_i} + 1) \prod_{j=1}^s (q^{k_{r+j}} - 1)$; hence $|\mathcal{D}^\dagger| \geq q^{\frac{n-1}{2}-2}$.

Thus the self-orthogonal 2-quasi-FG codes of dimension $n-1$ always exist.

Also, similarly to Lemma 7.6 (Case 1 in its proof is no longer necessary here, hence a constant is modified), we have

Lemma 7.12. Let $(a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in (\mathbb{F}G^\dagger)^2$. If $\mathcal{D}_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}^\dagger \neq \emptyset$ then $\widehat{E}_{a^\dagger}^\dagger = \widehat{E}_{d^\dagger}^\dagger$ and $|\mathcal{D}_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}^\dagger| \leq q^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\ell_{a^\dagger}+2}$.

Similar to Lemma 7.7, we have

Lemma 7.13. If $g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)} > 0$, then $\mathbb{E}(X^\dagger) \leq q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}) + 4}$.

Proof. It is similarly to the proof of Lemma 7.7 but with a little revision. Recall that $\Omega_{2\ell}$ is defined in Eq.(7.19) and $|\Omega_{2\ell}| \leq n^{2\ell/\mu_q(n)}$. Then

$$\mathbb{F}G^\dagger = \bigcup_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \bigcup_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} L^*, \quad \text{where } L^* = \{a^\dagger \in L \mid L_{a^\dagger} = L\}.$$

In other words, instead of \tilde{L}^* , here we need L^* . So

$$X^\dagger = \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \sum_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in (L^* \times L^*)^{\leq \delta}} X_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}.$$

For $L \in \Omega_{2\ell}$, $\dim L = 2\ell$, hence $|(L^* \times L^*)^{\leq \delta}| \leq |(L \times L)^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{4\ell h_q(\delta)}$; and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in (L^* \times L^*)^{\leq \delta}} \mathbb{E}(X_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}) &\leq |(L^* \times L^*)^{\leq \delta}| \cdot q^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\ell+2} / q^{\frac{n-1}{2}-2} \\ &\leq q^{4\ell h_q(\delta)} \cdot q^{-\ell+4} = q^{4\ell h_q(\delta) - \ell + 4} \leq q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4}) + 4}. \end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X^\dagger) &= \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \sum_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger) \in (L^* \times L^*)^{\leq \delta}} \mathbb{E}(X_{(a^\dagger, d^\dagger)}) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} q^{-4\ell(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4}) + 4}. \end{aligned}$$

The following computation is as the same as that for Lemma 7.7, and finally we can get that $\mathbb{E}(X^\dagger) \leq q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}) + 4}$. \square

Then we can get the following two theorems similarly to Theorem 7.8 and Theorem 7.9, except that the existence of the codes in the two theorems is unconditional.

Theorem 7.14. Assume that $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$, and odd integers n_1, n_2, \dots are as in Eq.(7.22). For $i = 1, 2, \dots$, let G_i be any abelian group of order n_i , and $C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger}^{(i)}$ be the random self-orthogonal 2-quasi-FG $_i$ codes of dimension $n_i - 1$ as in Remark 7.10. Then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{1^\dagger, b^\dagger}^{(i)}) > \delta) = 1$.

Theorem 7.15. *Assume that δ , odd integers n_1, n_2, \dots , and groups G_1, G_2, \dots are as in Theorem 7.14. Then for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ there exist self-orthogonal 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G_i$ codes $C^{(i)}$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} R(C^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\Delta(C^{(i)}) > \delta$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.*

Remark 7.16. In [30] the binary self-dual 2-quasi-cyclic codes are proved to be asymptotically good. The asymptotic goodness of self-dual quasi-cyclic codes (with index $\rightarrow \infty$) were obtained in [10], [28]. The condition of the existence of self-dual 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes was obtained in [27] for cyclic G , and in [25] for abelian G . In the dissertation [24], the asymptotic goodness of the self-dual 2-quasi abelian codes (provided $q \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$) has been obtained by a probabilistic method. In [1], based on the Artin's primitive element conjecture, Alahmadi, Özdemir and Solé proved that the self-dual double circulant codes (a kind of 2-quasi cyclic codes) are asymptotically good (if they exist); their method is by counting the codes. Recently, in [25] we introduced the 2-quasi- $\mathbb{F}G$ codes of type I, which are just the double circulant codes once G is cyclic; and, using a counting argument, we showed that the self-dual 2-quasi-abelian codes of type I are asymptotically good (provided they exist). By a similar counting method, in [25] we further proved the asymptotic goodness of the maximal self-orthogonal 2-quasi-abelian codes. The two results of [25] are presented in this section but the arguments here are in the random style consistent with the whole chapter.

8 Dihedral group codes

In this section we assume that:

- \mathbb{F} is a finite field with $|\mathbb{F}| = q$;
- $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$;
- $n > 1$ is an odd integer, $\gcd(n, q) = 1$ and $\mu_q(n) > 2 \log_q n$;
- \tilde{G} is a dihedral group of order $2n$, i.e., \tilde{G} has a normal cyclic subgroup $G = \{1, x, \dots, x^{n-1}\}$ of order n and a $y \in \tilde{G}$ such that $y^2 = 1, yxy^{-1} = x^{-1}$;
- $A = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$ is the group algebra of \tilde{G} over \mathbb{F} .

Then we have the following at once.

- In \tilde{G} , $yG = Gy$, and $\tilde{G} = G \cup yG$ is a disjoint union;
- $A = \mathbb{F}G \oplus \mathbb{F}Gy = \{a(x) + b(x)y \mid a(x), b(x) \in \mathbb{F}G\}$ ($\mathbb{F}G$ -module decomposition), where elements of $\mathbb{F}G$ are written as $a = a(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i$.

Because $yxy^{-1} = x^{-1}$, we have:

$$yay^{-1} = \bar{a} \quad (\text{equivalently, } ya = \bar{a}y, y\bar{a} = ay), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{F}G. \quad (8.1)$$

where $a \mapsto \bar{a}$ is the bar map (Definition 3.15).

Note that G is a cyclic group of order n . The notation in Eq.(7.1)—Eq.(7.7) is still applied to $\mathbb{F}G$. In particular, by Eq.(8.1), any $e \in \hat{E}$ is a central idempotent of $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$. There are two kinds of idempotents in \hat{E} : $e_i = \bar{e}_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$, and $\hat{e}_{r+j} = e_{r+j} + \bar{e}_{r+j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq s$. To simplify the story on dihedral codes, we'll consider one of the the two kinds by assuming that $s = 0$.

Exercise 25 ([23]). Let notation be as above, and $\langle q \rangle_n$ be the subgroup of \mathbb{Z}_n^\times generated by q , cf. Definition 3.11. Then $s = 0$ if and only if $-1 \in \langle q \rangle_n$. (Hint: $\mathbb{F}Ge_t \cong \mathbb{F}[X]/\langle f_t(X) \rangle$ with $f_t(X) = \prod_{k \in Q_t} (X - \xi^k)$ as in Exercise 13(1); considering the zero-sets of codes, one can show that $\bar{e}_t = e_t$ (equivalently, $\overline{\mathbb{F}Ge_t} = \mathbb{F}Ge_t$) iff $-Q_t := \{-k \mid k \in Q_t\} = Q_t$; if $-1 \notin \langle q \rangle_n$, then $Q_g := \langle q \rangle_n$ is itself a q -coset and $-Q_g \neq Q_g$.)

Remark 8.1. In the following we further assume that $-1 \in \langle q \rangle_n$ (there are infinitely many such integers n , see Eq.(8.14) below). Then, by Exercise 25, $s = 0$, and $1 = e_0 + e_1 + \cdots + e_r$ with $\bar{e}_i = e_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$ being all the primitive central idempotents of $\mathbb{F}G$; $e_i e_{i'} = 0$ for $0 \leq i \neq i' \leq r$; and,

$$\mathbb{F}G = \mathbb{F}_0 \oplus \mathbb{F}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{F}_r,$$

where $\mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}Ge_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$ are finite fields. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, $|\mathbb{F}_i| = q^{2k_i}$ and $|\mathbb{F}_i^b| = q^{k_i}$, where $\mathbb{F}_i^b = (\mathbb{F}Ge_i)^b$ is described in Lemma 7.2.

Turn to $A = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$, by Lemma 3.6,

$$A = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G} = A_0 \oplus A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_r, \quad \text{where } A_i = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_i. \quad (8.2)$$

By Lemma 3.16(3), $\langle A_i, A_{i'} \rangle = 0$ for $0 \leq i \neq i' \leq r$. So Eq.(8.2) is an orthogonal direct sum, hence the restriction of the inner product to any A_i , $0 \leq i \leq r$, is non-degenerate.

We show the structures of all A_i in Eq.(8.2), construct our dihedral codes, then exhibit their asymptotic properties. We begin with A_0 whose behaviour is different from the others.

Lemma 8.2. For $e_0 = \frac{1}{n}(1 + x + \cdots + x^{n-1})$, set $e_{00} = e_0 + e_0y$. Then $A_0 = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_0 = \mathbb{F}Ge_0 \oplus \mathbb{F}Ge_0y$, $C_0 := \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{00} = \{\lambda \sum_{z \in \tilde{G}} z \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{F}\} = \mathbb{F}e_{00}$ (“all-one code”), and the following hold:

(1) If q is odd, then $\frac{1}{2}e_{00}$ is a central idempotent, $\langle e_{00}, e_{00} \rangle = \frac{2}{n} \neq 0$, and $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_0 = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{00} \oplus \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{01}$, where $e_{01} = e_0 - e_0y$ and $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{01} = \mathbb{F}e_{01}$.

(2) If q is even, then $e_{00}^2 = 0$, $\langle C_0, C_0 \rangle = 0$, and $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_0/\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{00} \cong \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{00}$.

Proof. (1). $e_{00}^2 = 2e_0 + 2e_0y = 2e_{00}$; hence $(\frac{1}{2}e_{00})^2 = \frac{1}{4}(2e_{00}) = \frac{1}{2}e_{00}$. And $\frac{1}{2}e_{00}$ is central, since $ye_{00}y^{-1} = ye_0y^{-1} + y(e_0y)y^{-1} = e_{00}$. And $e_0 - \frac{1}{2}e_{00} = \frac{1}{2}e_{01}$. Finally, $ye_{01} = ye_0 - ye_0y = -e_0 + e_0y = -e_{01}$; hence $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{01} = \mathbb{F}e_{01}$.

(2). $e_{00}^2 = 2e_{00} = 0$. The map $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{00}$, $\tilde{a}e_0 \mapsto \tilde{a}e_{00}$, is a surjective homomorphism with kernel $\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_{00}$. \square

Keeping the notation in Remark 8.1, we are going on for $1 \leq i \leq r$. By $M_2(\mathbb{F})$ we denote the 2×2 matrix algebra over \mathbb{F} .

Lemma 8.3. $A_i \cong M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Proof. The binary case of the lemma was proved in [2]. We'll proof the lemma by constructing a specific isomorphisms (8.6) for later quotation.

Note that e_i is the identity of the ring $A_i = \mathbb{F}_i \oplus \mathbb{F}_i y$. By Lemma 7.2, \mathbb{F}_i is an extension over \mathbb{F}_i^b of degree $|\mathbb{F}_i : \mathbb{F}_i^b| = 2$, and $\alpha \mapsto \bar{\alpha}$ is an automorphism of \mathbb{F}_i of order 2. Note that $\mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}G e_i = (\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{F}x^j)e_i = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{F}(xe_i)^j$. So $xe_i \in \mathbb{F}_i - \mathbb{F}_i^b$, and $\mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}_i^b + \mathbb{F}_i^b(xe_i)$. Then the minimal polynomial $\varphi_{xe_i}(X)$ of xe_i over \mathbb{F}_i^b is an irreducible polynomial of degree 2, say $\varphi_{xe_i}(X) = X^2 + gX + h \in \mathbb{F}_i^b[X]$. Then $(xe_i)^2 + g(xe_i) + h = 0$; Since $\bar{g} = g$ and $\bar{h} = h$, $(\overline{xe_i})^2 + g(\overline{xe_i}) + h = (\overline{xe_i})^2 + g(xe_i) + h = 0$. Thus xe_i and $\overline{xe_i}$ are two roots of $\varphi_{xe_i}(X)$. So, $h = (xe_i)(\overline{xe_i}) = x\overline{xe_i}e_i = xx^{-1}e_i = e_i$, and

$$\varphi_{xe_i}(X) = X^2 + gX + 1, \quad \text{for a } g \in \mathbb{F}_i^b \text{ (note that } e_i = 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{F}_i^b), \quad (8.3)$$

where g and 2 are not both zero since $\varphi_{xe_i}(X) \in \mathbb{F}_i^b[X]$ is irreducible. Set:

$$\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -g \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -g & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b). \quad (8.4)$$

Then the characteristic polynomial of η is $\varphi_\eta(X) = X^2 + gX + 1 = \varphi_{xe_i}(X)$. We get a subalgebra $N = \mathbb{F}_i^b\varepsilon + \mathbb{F}_i^b\eta$ of $M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)$ and, mapping $e_i \mapsto \varepsilon$ and $xe_i \mapsto \eta$, we obtain a field isomorphism:

$$\mathbb{F}_i = \mathbb{F}_i^b e_i + \mathbb{F}_i^b x e_i \cong \mathbb{F}_i^b[X] / \langle \varphi_\eta(X) \rangle \cong \mathbb{F}_i^b \varepsilon + \mathbb{F}_i^b \eta = N \subseteq M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b). \quad (8.5)$$

Since $\dim_N M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b) = 2$, we get that

$$M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b) = N + N\nu = \mathbb{F}_i^b \varepsilon + \mathbb{F}_i^b \eta + \mathbb{F}_i^b \nu + \mathbb{F}_i^b \eta \nu.$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_i = \mathbb{F}G e_i + \mathbb{F}G e_i y = \mathbb{F}_i + \mathbb{F}_i(ye_i) = \mathbb{F}_i^b e_i + \mathbb{F}_i^b x e_i + \mathbb{F}_i^b y e_i + \mathbb{F}_i^b x y e_i.$$

Since $\nu^2 = \varepsilon$ and $\nu\eta\nu^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -g & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \eta^{-1}$, by mapping $ye \mapsto \nu$, $xye \mapsto \eta\nu$, we extend the isomorphism Eq.(8.5) to the following algebra isomorphism (where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{F}_i^b$):

$$\begin{aligned} (A_i =) \quad \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}e_i & \xrightarrow{\cong} M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b), \\ ae_i + bxe_i + cye_i + dxye_i & \longmapsto a\varepsilon + b\eta + c\nu + d\eta\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

We are done. \square

Some properties of 2×2 matrix algebras are listed below for later citation.

Exercise 26. (1) $M := M_2(\mathbb{F})$ has a subalgebra N which is a field with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} N = 2$. (Hint: element u of $\mathbb{F}_{q^2}^\times$ with order $q+1$ has minimal polynomial $\varphi_u(X) = X^2 + gX + 1 \in \mathbb{F}[X]$ cf. the proof of Eq.(8.3); take $\eta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -g \end{pmatrix}$; let $N = \mathbb{F}\varepsilon + \mathbb{F}\eta$, cf. Eq.(8.4), Eq.(8.5).)

(2) $L := M\varepsilon_{11}$, where $\varepsilon_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, is a simple left ideal of M , and $L = N\varepsilon_{11}$. (Hint: $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} L = 2$, and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} N\varepsilon_{11} = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} N = 2$; so $M\varepsilon_{11} = N\varepsilon_{11}$.)

(3) For any $\alpha, \beta \in N^\times$, $\alpha L\beta = \{\alpha c\beta \mid c \in L\} = L\beta$ is a simple left ideal of M . (Hint: α is invertible in M , so $\alpha M = M$; $\alpha L\beta = M\varepsilon_{11}\beta$ and $\text{rank}(\varepsilon_{11}\beta) = 1$)

(4) For $0 \neq c \in L$ and $a, b \in N^\times$, $ac = cb$ if and only if $a = b \in (\mathbb{F}\varepsilon)^\times$. (Hint: for $c = \varepsilon_{11}$, $(a_1\varepsilon + a_2\eta)\varepsilon_{11} = \varepsilon_{11}(b_1\varepsilon + b_2\eta)$ with $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{F}$ implies that $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 - b_1 & b_2 \\ a_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0$, hence $a_2 = 0 = b_2$ and $a_1 = b_1$; for general c , by (2), $c = d\varepsilon_{11}$ for a $d \in N^\times$.)

We refine now the notation in Remark 8.1 and construct our dihedral codes.

Remark 8.4. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, we have the isomorphisms $A_i \cong M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)$ in Eq.(8.6) (and cf. Exercise 26), and have the field $\mathbb{F}_i \subseteq A_i$ with $|\mathbb{F}_i| = q^{2k_i}$ corresponding to the field $N \subseteq M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)$ (cf. Eq.(8.5) and Exercise 26(1)); we denote

- $Z_i := Z(A_i) = \mathbb{F}_i^b$ corresponding to the center $Z(M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b))$, so $|Z_i| = q^{k_i}$;
- $C_i = A_i(e_i - ye_i)$, which is the simple left ideal of A_i corresponding to $L = M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)\varepsilon_{11}$, so $|C_i| = q^{2k_i}$.

(proof: by Eq.(8.4), $e_i - ye_i$ corresponds to $\varepsilon - \nu = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ g & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ whose first column is non-zero, see Eq.(8.3); hence $M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)(\varepsilon - \nu) = M_2(\mathbb{F}_i^b)\varepsilon_{11}$.)

And for the whole group algebra $A = \mathbb{F}\tilde{G}$, we set:

- $C = C_0 \oplus C_1 \oplus \dots \oplus C_r$ where $C_0 = \mathbb{F}e_{00}$ (“all-one code”) as in Lemma 8.2; so C is a dihedral code with $\dim_F C = n$.
- $K^* = \{e_0\} \times \mathbb{F}_1^\times \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_r^\times$, which is a subgroup of the multiplicative unit group A^\times ; so $|K^*| = \prod_{i=1}^r (q^{2k_i} - 1)$.

Definition 8.5. Consider $K^* \times K^*$ as a probability space with equal probability for each sample. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in K^* \times K^*$. By Exercise 26(3), we have a class of random dihedral codes.

- (1) $C_{\alpha, \beta} = \alpha C\beta$ is a random dihedral code with $R(C_{\alpha, \beta}) = \frac{1}{2}$;
- (2) $X_c = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 < \frac{w(\alpha c \beta)}{2n} \leq \delta; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad c \in C$;
- (3) $X = \sum_{c \in C} X_c$; hence $\Pr(\Delta(C_{\alpha, \beta} \leq \delta) = \Pr(X \geq 1) \leq E(X)$.

Lemma 8.6. (1) If q is even, then $\alpha C\beta = C\beta$ is a self-dual dihedral code.

(2) If q is odd, then $\alpha C\beta = C\beta$ is an LCD dihedral code of rate $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. Let $\beta = \sum_{i=0}^r \beta_i$ with $\beta_0 = e_0$ and $\beta_i = e_i\beta \in \mathbb{F}_i^\times$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Similarly, $\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^r \alpha_i$. Then $\alpha\beta = \sum_{i=0}^r \alpha_i\beta_i$ with $\alpha_0\beta_0 = e_0$ and $\alpha_i\beta_i \in \mathbb{F}_i^\times$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. So, by Exercise 26(3),

$$\alpha C\beta = \bigoplus_{i=0}^r \alpha_i C_i \beta_i = \bigoplus_{i=0}^r C_i \beta_i = C\beta.$$

Further, by the orthogonal direct sum Eq.(8.2),

$$(C\beta)^\perp = \bigoplus_{i=0}^r (C_i \beta_i)^{\perp_{A_i}}, \quad (8.7)$$

where $(C_i\beta_i)^{\perp A_i}$ denotes the orthogonal subspace of $C_i\beta_i$ in A_i . Note that $(C_i\beta_i) \cap (C_i\beta_i)^{\perp A_i}$ is a left ideal of A_i , hence it is either $C_i\beta_i$ or 0 (because $C_i\beta_i$ is a simple left ideal of A_i). By Lemma 3.16(2),

$$(C_i\beta_i) \cap (C_i\beta_i)^{\perp A_i} = \begin{cases} C_i\beta_i, & \text{if } C_i\beta_i\overline{C_i\beta_i} = 0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8.8)$$

For $i = 1, \dots, r$, $C_i\beta_i\overline{C_i\beta_i} = (A_i(e_i - ye_i)\beta_i)(\overline{\beta_i(e_i - ye_i)A_i})$; since $\overline{e_i} = e_i$ and $\overline{y} = y$, $C_i\beta_i\overline{C_i\beta_i} = A_i(e_i - ye_i)\beta_i\overline{\beta_i}(e_i - ye_i)A_i$. But, $\beta_i\overline{\beta_i} \in \mathbb{F}_i$ and $\overline{\beta_i\beta_i} = \beta_i\overline{\beta_i}$; thus $\beta_i\overline{\beta_i} \in \mathbb{F}_i^b = Z_i$ (cf. Lemma 7.2). Hence

$$(e_i - ye_i)\beta_i\overline{\beta_i}(e_i - ye_i) = (e_i - ye_i)(e_i - ye_i)\beta_i\overline{\beta_i} = 2(e_i - ye_i)\beta_i\overline{\beta_i}.$$

So, $C_i\beta_i\overline{C_i\beta_i} = 0$ if and only if q is even. For $i = 0$, by Lemma 8.2 we still have that $C_0\beta_0\overline{C_0\beta_0} = 0$ if and only if q is even. Then the lemma follows from Eq.(8.7) and Eq.(8.8) at once. \square

Given a $c \in C$; then $c = c_0 + c_1 + \dots + c_r$ with $c_i = e_i c \in C_i$; we denote:

$$\omega = \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq r, c_i \neq 0\}, \quad \ell_c = \sum_{i \in \omega} k_i, \quad \omega' = \{1, \dots, r\} - \omega. \quad (8.9)$$

Note that: if $\omega = \emptyset$ (equivalently, $\ell_c = 0$), then $c = c_0$, so $w(\alpha c \beta) = 0$ if $c = 0$, and $w(\alpha c \beta) = 2n$ otherwise; hence $E(X_c) = 0$ (see Definition 8.5(2)).

Lemma 8.7. $E(X_c) \leq q^{-4\ell_c g_q(\delta) + \ell_c + 5}$.

Proof. We can assume that $\omega \neq \emptyset$. Denote $K^*cK^* = \{\alpha c \beta \mid \alpha, \beta \in K^*\}$. Given $d \in K^*cK^*$. By f we denote the number of such pairs $(\alpha, \beta) \in K^* \times K^*$ that $\alpha c \beta = d$. We write $d = \alpha' c \beta'$ for a given $(\alpha', \beta') \in K^* \times K^*$. Then $\alpha c \beta = d$, i.e., $\alpha'^{-1} \alpha c = c \beta' \beta^{-1}$, if and only if

$$\alpha_i'^{-1} \alpha_i c_i = c_i \beta_i' \beta_i^{-1}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, r. \quad (8.10)$$

For $i = 0$ the above equality always holds. For $i = 1, \dots, r$, there are two cases.

Case 1: $i \in \omega$, i.e., $0 \neq c_i \in C_i$. By Exercise 26(4), $\alpha_i'^{-1} \alpha_i = \beta_i' \beta_i^{-1} \in Z_i^\times$. For any $z_i \in Z_i^\times$ we get a unique $\alpha_i = \alpha' z$ and $\beta_i = \beta' z^{-1}$ satisfying Eq.(8.10). Thus there are $|Z_i^\times| = q^{k_i} - 1$ pairs $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in \mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times$ satisfying Eq.(8.10).

Case 2: $i \in \omega'$, i.e., $c_i = 0$. Then any $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in \mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times$ satisfies Eq.(8.10). The number of such pairs equals $|\mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times| = (q^{2k_i} - 1)^2$.

Summarizing the two cases, we see that the number

$$f = \prod_{i \in \omega} |Z_i^\times| \cdot \prod_{i \in \omega'} |\mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times|,$$

which is independent of the choice of $d \in K^*cK^*$. Thus

$$E(X_c) = f \cdot |(K^*cK^*)^{\leq \delta}| / |K^* \times K^*|,$$

where the notation $(K^*cK^*)^{\leq \delta}$ is defined in Eq.(4.2). Note that $|K^* \times K^*| = \prod_{i=1}^r |\mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times|$. Combining it with the the above equation on f , we get

$$\mathbb{E}(X_c) = \frac{\prod_{i \in \omega} |Z_i^\times| \cdot |(K^*cK^*)^{\leq \delta}|}{\prod_{i \in \omega} |\mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times|}.$$

Since $K^*cK^* \subseteq C_0 \oplus (\bigoplus_{i \in \omega} A_i)$ and

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}} C_0 \oplus (\bigoplus_{i \in \omega} A_i) = 1 + \sum_{i \in \omega} 4k_i = 1 + 4\ell_c,$$

by Lemma 4.5 and Corollary 4.4, we have that

$$|(K^*cK^*)^{\leq \delta}| \leq |(C_0 \oplus (\bigoplus_{i \in \omega} A_i))^{\leq \delta}| \leq q^{(1+4\ell_c)h_q(\delta)}.$$

Next,

$$\prod_{i \in \omega} |Z_i^\times| = \prod_{i \in \omega} (q^{k_i} - 1) \leq \prod_{i \in \omega} q^{k_i} = q^{\sum_{i \in \omega} k_i} = q^{\ell_c}.$$

By Exercise 20 (recall that $2k_i \geq \mu_q(n) > \log_q n$ by our assumption),

$$\prod_{i \in \omega} |\mathbb{F}_i^\times \times \mathbb{F}_i^\times| = \prod_{i \in \omega} (q^{2k_i} - 1)^2 \geq q^{2(-2 + \sum_{i \in \omega} 2k_i)} = q^{4\ell_c - 4}.$$

Thus (note that $h_q(\delta) < 1$),

$$\mathbb{E}(X_c) \leq \frac{q^{\ell_c} \cdot q^{(1+4\ell_c)h_q(\delta)}}{q^{4\ell_c - 4}} \leq q^{-4\ell_c g_q(\delta) + \ell_c + 5}.$$

We are done. \square

Similarly to Eq.(7.19), for an integer ℓ with $\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil \leq \ell \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$, we set:

$$\Omega_{2\ell} = \{L \mid L \text{ is a direct sum of some of } C_1, \dots, C_r, \dim L = 2\ell\}; \quad (8.11)$$

and for $L \in \Omega_{2\ell}$ we further set:

$$\tilde{L} = C_0 \oplus L, \quad \tilde{L}^* = \{c \in \tilde{L} \mid \ell_c = \ell\}. \quad (8.12)$$

Similarly to Eq.(7.21), we have

$$C = C_0 \cup \left(\bigcup_{\ell = \lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \bigcup_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \tilde{L}^* \right); \quad |\Omega_{2\ell}| \leq n^{2\ell/\mu_q(n)}. \quad (8.13)$$

Lemma 8.8. *If $g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)} > 0$, then $\mathbb{E}(X) \leq q^{-2\mu_q(n)(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}) + 6}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 7.7. We have that $\mathbb{E}(X_c) = 0$ once $c \in C_0$, and

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \sum_{c \in C} \mathbb{E}(X_c) = \sum_{\ell = \lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} \sum_{c \in \tilde{L}^*} \mathbb{E}(X_c).$$

Given $L \in \Omega_{2\ell}$; by Eq.(8.12), $|\tilde{L}| = q^{2\ell+1}$ and $\ell_c = \ell$ for $c \in \tilde{L}^*$; we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{c \in \tilde{L}^*} \mathbb{E}(X_c) &\leq \sum_{c \in \tilde{L}^*} q^{-4\ell_c g_q(\delta) + \ell_c + 5} = \sum_{c \in \tilde{L}^*} q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta) + \ell + 5} \\ &= |\tilde{L}^*| \cdot q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta) + \ell + 5} \leq q^{2\ell+1} q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta) + \ell + 5} = q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta) + 3\ell + 6}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X) &\leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{(n-1)/2} \sum_{L \in \Omega_{2\ell}} q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta)+3\ell+6} \leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{(n-1)/2} n^{2\ell/\mu_q(n)} q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta)+3\ell+6} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{(n-1)/2} q^{-4\ell g_q(\delta)+3\ell+\frac{2\ell \log_q n}{\mu_q(n)}+6} = \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{(n-1)/2} q^{-4\ell \left(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)} \right) + 6}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)} > 0$ and $2\ell \geq \mu_q(n)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(X) \leq \sum_{\ell=\lceil \frac{1}{2}\mu_q(n) \rceil}^{(n-1)/2} q^{-2\mu_q(n) \left(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)} \right) + 6} \leq n q^{-2\mu_q(n) \left(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)} \right) + 6}.$$

That is, $\mathbb{E}(X) \leq q^{-2\mu_q(n) \left(g_q(\delta) - \frac{3}{4} - \frac{\log_q n}{2\mu_q(n)} \right) + 6}$. \square

Remark 8.9. In Exercise 14 we have seen that the natural density $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{G}_t|}{\pi(t)} = 1$.

Note that: for a prime $p > q$, the multiplicative group \mathbb{Z}_p^\times is a cyclic group of order $p-1$; so $\mu_q(p) = |\langle q \rangle_p|$, see Exercise 13(4); and -1 is the unique element of order 2 in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times ; in conclusion, $-1 \in \langle q \rangle_p$ if and only if $\mu_q(p)$ is even. It is known from [17] (for Dirichlet density) and [36] (for natural density) that the density of such primes $p > q$ that $\mu_q(p)$ is even is positive. Thus, we can find primes p_1, p_2, \dots in \mathcal{G}_t for $t \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q p_i}{\mu_q(p_i)} = 0$ and $-1 \in \langle q \rangle_{p_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Further, similar to Remark 3.14, we have odd positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots coprime to q such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q n_i}{\mu_q(n_i)} = 0; \quad \text{and} \quad -1 \in \langle q \rangle_{n_i}, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots; \quad (8.14)$$

and n_1, n_2, \dots are not necessarily primes (e.g., we can take $n_i = p_i^2$).

Theorem 8.10. Assume that $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$, and the integers n_1, n_2, \dots are as in Eq.(8.14). For $i = 1, 2, \dots$, let $C_{\alpha, \beta}^{(i)}$ be the random dihedral codes defined in Definition 8.5. Then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta(C_{\alpha, \beta}^{(i)}) > \delta) = 1$.

Proof. It is the same as the proof of Theorem 7.8. \square

Combining it with Lemma 8.6, we get the following at once.

Theorem 8.11. Assume that $\delta \in (0, 1 - \frac{1}{q})$ and $g_q(\delta) > \frac{3}{4}$, and the integers n_1, n_2, \dots are as in Eq.(8.14). For $i = 1, 2, \dots$, there exist dihedral codes $C^{(i)}$ of rate $\frac{1}{2}$ such that $\Delta(C^{(i)}) > \delta$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$, and, if q is even then $C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}, \dots$ are all self-dual codes; otherwise $C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}, \dots$ are all LCD codes.

Remark 8.12. Finite dihedral groups are non-abelian but near to cyclic groups, they have cyclic subgroups of index 2. The asymptotic goodness of binary dihedral codes was proved in [2]. And [5] studied the semidirect products of a cyclic group of order prime p by a cyclic group and showed the asymptotic goodness of such group codes. In [12] we extended the asymptotic goodness of dihedral codes to any q -ary case, and investigated more precisely the algebraic properties of the asymptotically good dihedral codes. In this section we present a simplified description of the results on q -ary dihedral codes.

9 Appendix: About probabilistic method

Here is a sketch about the probabilistic method used in this chapter. See, e.g., [35] for details please.

If \mathcal{P} is a finite set with a function $p : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (where \mathbb{R} denotes the real number field) satisfying that: $p(s) \geq 0, \forall s \in \mathcal{P}$; and $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}} p(s) = 1$; then we say that \mathcal{P} is a finite *probability space* with the probability function p .

In the following \mathcal{P} is a finite probability space. Any element of \mathcal{P} is called a *sample*. Any subset $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ is called an *event*, and $\Pr(E) = \sum_{s \in E} p(s)$ is called the probability of the event E . Note that, we usually took the probability space \mathcal{P} with equal probability for samples, i.e., $p(s) = p(s')$ for all $s, s' \in \mathcal{P}$, thus $\Pr(E) = \frac{|E|}{|\mathcal{P}|}$ in that case.

Let E, F be two events over \mathcal{P} . By $\Pr(E \cap F)$ we denote the probability that both E and F occur. By $\Pr(E \cup F)$ we denote the probability that E or F occurs. By $\Pr(E|F)$ we denote the conditional probability of E when F occurred. The following hold:

Lemma 9.1 (Conditional Probability Formula). $\Pr(E \cap F) = \Pr(E|F) \cdot \Pr(F)$.

If $\Pr(E \cap F) = \Pr(E) \cdot \Pr(F)$ (equivalently, $\Pr(E|F) = \Pr(E)$), then E and F are said to be *randomly independent*.

Lemma 9.2 (Total Probability Formula). If $E \cap F = \emptyset$ (*impossible event*) and $E \cup F = \mathcal{P}$ (*certain event*), then for any event G ,

$$\Pr(G) = \Pr(G|E) \cdot \Pr(E) + \Pr(G|F) \cdot \Pr(F).$$

Exercise 27. Let notation be as in Lemma 9.2.

- (1) If $\Pr(E) > 0$, then $\Pr(G|E) \geq \frac{\Pr(G) - \Pr(F)}{\Pr(E)}$.
- (2) If $\Pr(G) = 1$ and $\Pr(E) > 0$, then $\Pr(G|E) = 1$.

Definition 9.3. If $X : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function, then we say that X is a (*real*) *random variable* over \mathcal{P} ; and $\Pr(X=r) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}, X(s)=r} p(s)$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}$ is the *distribution* of X , and $E(X) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{R}} x \cdot \Pr(X=x)$ is called the *expectation* of X .

Let X, Y be real random variables, $r \in \mathbb{R}$. As functions from \mathcal{P} to \mathbb{R} , the $X+Y, XY, rX$ are defined, and are still random variables. It is checked directly

that

$$\begin{aligned} E(X + Y) &= E(X) + E(Y), & E(rX) &= rE(X); \\ E(X^2) &\geq 0, & E(X^2) = 0 &\iff X = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get:

Lemma 9.4. *The set of all real random variables form a real vector space, and,*

- $E(X)$ is a linear form of the real vector space;
- $\langle X, Y \rangle := E(XY)$ is an inner product of the real vector space.

In particular, from the usual linear algebra we have

Cauchy-Schwartz Inequality: $E(XY)^2 \leq E(X^2) \cdot E(Y^2)$.

If the variable X takes value either 0 or 1, we say that X is a 0-1 variable (*Bernoulli variable*). For a 0-1 variable X we have:

$$E(X) = 0 \cdot \Pr(X=0) + 1 \cdot \Pr(X=1) = \Pr(X=1). \quad (9.1)$$

For any event F there is a 0-1 variable $\mathbf{1}_F$ (called the *indicator variable* of F): for $s \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathbf{1}_F(s) = \begin{cases} 1, & s \in F; \\ 0, & s \notin F. \end{cases}$ In particular, $E(\mathbf{1}_F) = \Pr(F)$.

For a random variable X , the so-called *first moment method* uses the following inequality to bound the probability $\Pr(X \geq a)$ from above.

Lemma 9.5 (Markov Inequality). *Let X be a non-negative random variable. If $a > 0$, then $\Pr(X \geq a) \leq \frac{E(X)}{a}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{1}_{X \geq a} \leq \frac{X}{a}$, $\Pr(X \geq a) = E(\mathbf{1}_{X \geq a}) \leq E\left(\frac{X}{a}\right) = \frac{E(X)}{a}$. □

To estimate the lower bound of $\Pr(X \geq 1)$, the so-called *second moment method* is usually applied.

Lemma 9.6 (Cauchy Inequality). *Let X be a non-zero random variable. Then $\Pr(X \neq 0) \geq \frac{E(X)^2}{E(X^2)}$.*

Proof. Write $X = X \cdot \mathbf{1}_{X \neq 0}$. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$E(X)^2 = E(X \cdot \mathbf{1}_{X \neq 0})^2 \leq E(X^2) \cdot E(\mathbf{1}_{X \neq 0}^2) = E(X^2) \cdot \Pr(X \neq 0).$$

So $\Pr(X \neq 0) \geq \frac{E(X)^2}{E(X^2)}$. □

Cauchy Inequality. *Let X be a non-negative integer variable such that $X \neq 0$. Then $\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \frac{E(X)^2}{E(X^2)}$.*

The following is an useful inequality for our applications.

Lemma 9.7 ([35, Theorem 6.10]). Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where X_i 's are 0-1 variables. Then

$$\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_i)}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_i=1)}.$$

Proof. Let $Y = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{X}, & X > 0; \\ 0, & X = 0. \end{cases}$ Then $YX = \mathbf{1}_{X \geq 1}$. So

$$\Pr(X \geq 1) = \mathbb{E}(YX) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(YX_i).$$

By Total Probability Formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(YX_i) &= \mathbb{E}(YX_i|X_i = 0) \Pr(X_i = 0) + \mathbb{E}(YX_i|X_i = 1) \Pr(X_i = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(0|X_i = 0) \Pr(X_i = 0) + \mathbb{E}(Y|X_i = 1) \Pr(X_i = 1) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{X}|X_i = 1\right) \Pr(X_i = 1). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Jensen Inequality (see the following exercise) to the convex function $f(x) = \frac{1}{x}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{X}|X_i = 1\right) \geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_i = 1)}.$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}(YX_i) \geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_i = 1)} \cdot \Pr(X_i = 1) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_i)}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_i = 1)}.$$

Hence. $\Pr(X \geq 1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}(X_i)}{\mathbb{E}(X|X_i=1)}$. \square

Exercise 28 (Jensen Inequality). Let $f(x)$, $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$, be a convex function, i.e., for any $x, x' \in [\alpha, \beta]$, $\frac{f(x)+f(x')}{2} \geq f\left(\frac{x+x'}{2}\right)$.

(1) If p_1, \dots, p_n are non-negative real numbers such that $p_1 + \dots + p_n = 1$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [\alpha, \beta]$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i f(x_i) \geq f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i x_i\right)$.

(2) Let X be a random variable taking values in $[\alpha, \beta]$. Then $\mathbb{E}(f(X)) \geq f(\mathbb{E}(X))$.

Definition 9.8. Let X be a random variable taking values x_1, \dots, x_s (may be not real numbers) such that $\sum_{i=1}^s p_i = 1$, where $p_i = \Pr(X = x_i)$. Then p_1, \dots, p_s are called the *distribution* of X , and

$$H_\gamma(X) = \sum_{i=1}^s -p_i \log_\gamma p_i,$$

is called the *information entropy* of X with base γ ($\gamma > 1$ is a real number).

Let Y be another random variable taking values y_1, \dots, y_t with distribution p'_1, \dots, p'_t . We have the *joint random variable* (X, Y) taking values $\{(x_i, y_j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq t\}$ with distribution $p_{i,j} = \Pr((X, Y) = (x_i, y_j))$, $1 \leq i \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq t$. Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^t p_{i,j} = p_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, s; \quad \sum_{i=1}^s p_{i,j} = p'_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, t. \quad (9.2)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc|c}
p_{1,1} & \cdots & p_{1,t} & p_1 \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \vdots \\
p_{s,1} & \cdots & p_{s,t} & p_s \\
\hline
p'_1 & \cdots & p'_t &
\end{array}$$

Note that $p_{i,j} \neq p_i p'_j$ in general. If $p_{i,j} = p_i p'_j, \forall 1 \leq i \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq t$, then X and Y are said to be *randomly independent*.

For random variable X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k , the *joint random variable* (X_1, \dots, X_k) are defined similarly, and the following holds.

Lemma 9.9. $H_\gamma(X_1, \dots, X_k) \leq H_\gamma(X_1) + \dots + H_\gamma(X_k)$.

Proof. For $k = 2$, see Exercise 29 below. For $k > 2$, prove it recursively. \square

Exercise 29. Let X, Y and the joint (X, Y) be as in Eq.(9.2). Define

$$\begin{aligned}
H_\gamma(Y|X) &= \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^t -p_{i,j} \log_\gamma \frac{p_{i,j}}{p_i}; \\
I_\gamma(X;Y) &= \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^t -p_{i,j} \log_\gamma \frac{p_i p'_j}{p_{i,j}}.
\end{aligned}$$

(1) $H_\gamma(Y|X)$ and $I_\gamma(X;Y)$ are non-negative. (Hint: $\frac{p_{i,j}}{p_i} \leq 1$ hence $-\log_\gamma \frac{p_{i,j}}{p_i} \geq 0$; for $I_\gamma(X;Y)$, apply Exercise 28 to the convex function $-\log_\gamma x$.)

(2) $I_\gamma(X;Y) = H_\gamma(X) - H_\gamma(X|Y) = H_\gamma(Y) - H_\gamma(Y|X)$. (Hint: compute it directly.)

(3) $H_\gamma(X, Y) = H_\gamma(X) + H_\gamma(Y|X) = H_\gamma(Y) + H_\gamma(X|Y)$.

(4) $H_\gamma(X, Y) \leq H_\gamma(X) + H_\gamma(Y)$.

References

- [1] A. Alahmadi, F. Özdemir, P. Solé, On self-dual double circulant codes, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 86 (2018), 1257-1265.
- [2] L. M. J. Bazzi, S. K. Mitter, Some randomized code constructions from group actions, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52 (2006), 3210-3219.
- [3] E. R. Berlekamp, *Algebraic Coding Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968
- [4] S. D. Berman, Semisimple cyclic and abelian codes II, *Cybernetics*, 3(1967), 17-23.
- [5] M. Borello, W. Willems, Group codes over fields are asymptotically good, *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, 68 (2020), 101738.
- [6] R. C. Bose, D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri, On a class of error correcting binary group codes, *Inform. Control*, 3 (1960), 68-79.
- [7] G. Castagnoli, J. L. Massey, P. A. Scholler, N. von Seeman, On repeated-root cyclic codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 37:2 (1991), 337-342.

- [8] C.L. Chen, W.W. Peterson, E.J. Weldon, Some results on quasi-cyclic codes, *Information and Control*, 15 (1969), 407-423.
- [9] V. Chepyzhov, New lower bounds for minimum distance of linear quasi-cyclic and almost linear quasi-cyclic codes, *Problem Peredachi Informatsii*, 28 (1992), 33-44.
- [10] B. K. Dey, On existence of good self-dual quasi-cyclic codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 50 (2004), 1794-1798.
- [11] Yun Fan, Liren Lin, Thresholds of random quasi-abelian codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 61 (2015), 82-90.
- [12] Yun Fan, Liren Lin, Dihedral group codes over finite fields, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 67 (2021), 5016-5025.
- [13] Y. Fan, S. Ling, H. Liu, J. Shen, and C. Xing, Cumulative distance enumerators of random codes and their thresholds, [arXiv:1212.5679](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.5679), 2012.
- [14] Yun Fan, Hualu Liu, Quasi-cyclic Codes of Index $1\frac{1}{2}$, [arXiv:1505.02252](https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.02252), 2015.
- [15] Yun Fan, Hualu Liu, Quasi-cyclic codes of index $1\frac{1}{3}$, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 62 (2016), 6342-6347.
- [16] N. E. Gilbert, A comparison of signalling alphabets, *Bell Sys. Tech. Journal*, 31 (1952), 504-522.
- [17] Helmut Hasse, Über die Dichte der primzahlen p , für die eine vorgegebene ganzrationale zahl $a \neq 0$ von gerader bzw. ungerader ordnung mod p ist, *Math. Annalen*, 166 (1966), 19-23.
- [18] A. Hocquenghem, Codes correcteurs d'erreurs, *Chiffres*, 2 (1959), 147-156.
- [19] W. C. Huffman, V. Pless, *Fundamentals of Error-Correcting Codes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003.
- [20] Somphong Jitman, San Ling, Hongwei Liu, and Xiaoli Xie, Abelian codes in principal ideal group algebras, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 59:5 (2013), 3046-3058.
- [21] K. A. Schouhamer Immink and J. H. Weber, Very efficient balanced codes, *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, 28 (2010), 188-192.
- [22] T. Kasami, A Gilbert-Varshamov bound for quasi-cyclic codes of rate $1/2$, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 20 (1974), p679.
- [23] L. Kathuria, M. Raka, Existence of cyclic self-orthogonal codes: A note on a result of Vera Pless, *Adv. Math. Commun.*, 6 (2012), 499-503.

- [24] Liren Lin, *Random quasi-abelian codes and self-orthogonal negacyclic codes (in Chinese)*, Ph.D. dissertation, Central China Normal Univ., Wuhan, China, 2014.
- [25] Liren Lin, Yun Fan, Self-dual 2-quasi abelian codes, arXiv: 2108.07427, 2021.
- [26] S. Lin, E. J. Weldon Jr., Long BCH codes are bad, *Inform. Contr.*, 11(1967), 445-451.
- [27] S. Ling, P. Solé, On the algebraic structure of quasi-cyclic codes II: Chain rings, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 30 (2003), 113-130.
- [28] San Ling, P. Solé, Good self-dual quasi-cyclic codes exist, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 49 (2003), 1052-1053.
- [29] C. Martínez-Pérez, W. Willems, Is the class of cyclic codes asymptotically good? *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 52 (2006), 696-700.
- [30] C. Martínez-Pérez, W. Willems, Self-dual double-even 2-quasi-cyclic transitive codes are asymptotically good, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 53 (2007), 4302-4308.
- [31] J. L. Massey, "Shift-register synthesis and BCH decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 15 (1969), 122-127.
- [32] J. L. Massey, On the fractional weight of distinct binary n-tuples, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 20 (1974), 130.
- [33] M. Mézard, A. Montanari, *Information, Physics and Computation*, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [34] Jiafu Mi, Xiwang Cao, Asymptotically good quasi-cyclic codes of fractional index, *Discrete Mathematics*, 341 (2018), 308-314.
- [35] M. Mitzenmacher, E. Upfal, *Probability and Computing: Randomized Algorithms and Probabilistic Analysis*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2005.
- [36] R.W.K. Odoni, A conjecture of Krishnamurthy on decimal periods and some allied problems, *J. of Number Theory*, 13 (1981), 303-319.
- [37] W. W. Peterson, *Error-Correcting Codes*, Wiley, New York, 1961.
- [38] J. N. Pierce, Limit distribution of the minimum distance of random linear codes, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 13 (1967), 595-599.
- [39] P. H. Piret, An upper bound on the weight distribution of some codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 31 (1985), 520-521.
- [40] I. E. Shparlinsky, On weight enumerators of some codes, *Problemy Pere-dechi Inform.*, 22 (1986), 43-48.

- [41] R. R. Varshamov, Estimate of the number of signals in error-correcting codes (in Russian), *Dokl. Acad. Nauk*, 117 (1957), 739-741.

Yun Fan

School of Mathematics and Statistics

Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China

Email address: yfan@ccnu.edu.cn

Liren Lin

School of Mathematics and Statistics

Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, China

Email address: lr_lin86@163.com