

THERE ARE NO GOOD INFINITE FAMILIES OF TORIC CODES

JASON P. BELL, SEAN MONAHAN, MATTHEW SATRIANO, KAREN SITU, AND ZHENG XIE

ABSTRACT. Soprunov and Soprunova introduced the notion of a good infinite family of toric codes. We prove that such good families do not exist by proving a more general Szemerédi-type result: for all $c \in (0, 1]$ and all positive integers N , subsets of density at least c in $\{0, 1, \dots, N - 1\}^n$ contain hypercubes of arbitrarily large dimension as n grows.

1. Introduction

After the pioneering work of Hamming in the 1940s and 50s [Ham50], error-correcting codes have been of central importance for our modern technologies, and have had wide connections to theoretical areas of mathematics such as number theory and algebraic geometry. Following the foundational work of Goppa [Gop81; Gop82] on algebraic-geometric codes – extending the famous Reed-Solomon code [RS60] – Tsfasman and Vlăduț [TV91] established a framework for constructing error-correcting codes from algebraic varieties. Applying this framework to the class of toric varieties has seen great success due to the combinatorial nature of these objects which is well-suited for performing explicit computations.

Toric codes were first introduced by Hansen [Han00; Han02] and have subsequently been studied by a number of authors, including Joyner, Little, Schenck, Schwarz, Ruano, Soprunov, and Soprunova [Joy04; LS06; LS07; Rua07; SS09; SS10]. These codes are built from the following data. Fix a prime power q , which determines a finite field \mathbb{F}_q , and let P be an integral polytope which is contained in the hypercube $[0, q - 2]^n$ in \mathbb{R}^n . One can construct the *toric code* $C_P := C_P(\mathbb{F}_q)$ associated to P as the image of an explicit injective linear map $\mathbb{F}_q\{P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{(q-1)^n}$; see, for example, [Dol+22, Section 2] for more details. For simplicity, we often refer to just the polytope P rather than the code C_P .

There are three key quantities associated to an error-correcting code, which have pleasant descriptions in the case of the toric code C_P : the *block length*, which is simply $(q - 1)^n$; the *dimension*, which is the number of lattice points in P , i.e. $|P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n|$; and the *minimum distance*, which is the minimum Hamming distance over all nonzero vectors in C_P (see [Dol+22, Definition 2.4]).

To determine if a toric code is “good” from a coding-theoretic perspective, one considers the relationships between these three quantities. In particular, one wants both the dimension and the minimum distance to be large relative to the block length. That is, one wants the *relative minimum distance*

$$d(P) := \frac{\text{minimum distance of } C_P}{(q - 1)^n}$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14G50, 14M25, 11B30, 94B05.

Key words and phrases. Toric codes, Szemerédi’s Theorem, Lovasz local lemma.

and the *information rate*

$$R(P) := \frac{|P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n|}{(q-1)^n}$$

to be large.¹ The difficulty in finding good toric codes is that $d(P)$ and $R(P)$ are inversely related: as one becomes larger, the other becomes small.

In [SS10], Soprunov and Soprunova consider infinite families of toric codes with a fixed value of q . Since they do not write down a formal definition, we refer to [Dol+22]. Recall that q is a fixed prime power.

Definition 1.1 ([Dol+22, Definition 3.1]). An *infinite family of toric codes* is a sequence $\{P_i\}_i$ of nonempty integral convex polytopes satisfying $P_i \subseteq [0, q-2]^{n_i} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ such that $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, and the sequences $\{d(P_i)\}_i$ and $\{R(P_i)\}_i$ converge.

Note that Soprunov and Soprunova mainly consider the case where $n_i = i$, so Definition 1.1 is more general. They are interested in infinite families of toric codes which are good in the sense mentioned above.

Definition 1.2 ([SS10, Section 4], cf. [Dol+22, Definition 3.2]). An infinite family of toric codes $\{P_i\}_i$ is called *good* if both $d(P_i)$ and $R(P_i)$ approach positive constants as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Soprunov and Soprunova showed that certain explicit constructions of toric codes did not produce good families, and they say, “It would be interesting to find an infinite good family of toric codes”. This motivated the work of Dolorfino et al. [Dol+22] in which they conjecture that there are *no* good infinite families of toric codes. To support this conjecture, they introduce the following statistic for polytopes.

Definition 1.3 ([Dol+22, Definition 4.1]). Given an integral convex polytope P , let

$$M(P) := \max\{m \mid \exists \text{ a unimodular affine transformation } A \text{ such that } A([0, 1]^m) \subseteq P\}.$$

That is, $M(P)$ measures the dimension of the largest unit hypercube contained in P . The expectation is that, if $M(P)$ is large, then the number of lattice points in P should be large. In [Dol+22, Proposition 4.2] they show that, for any infinite family of toric codes $\{P_i\}_i$, if the sequence $\{M(P_i)\}_i$ is unbounded, then $d(P_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, this implies that if $\{M(P_i)\}_i$ is unbounded, then $\{P_i\}_i$ is *not* a good family. Thus, to determine if there are good infinite families of toric codes, one may restrict to the case where $\{M(P_i)\}_i$ is bounded. In this case, Dolorfino et al. make the following conjecture, which would imply that $\{P_i\}_i$ is *not* a good family in the case where $\{M(P_i)\}_i$ is bounded.

Conjecture 1.4 ([Dol+22, Conjecture 4.3]). *If $\{P_i\}_i$ is an infinite family of toric codes such that $\{M(P_i)\}_i$ is bounded, then $R(P_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.*

Our first main theorem addresses this conjecture.

Theorem 1.5. *Conjecture 1.4 is true. Therefore, there are no good infinite families of toric codes (in the sense of Definition 1.2).*

¹Note that we use $d(P)$ for the relative minimum distance, even though some sources such as [Dol+22] use $d(C_P)$ to denote the minimum distance and $\delta(C_P)$ for the relative minimum distance. We prefer to reserve δ for the density of a subset.

In fact, Theorem 1.5 follows from a more general theorem regarding subsets of large density, which we now describe. Given an inclusion of finite sets $X \subseteq Y$, we let $\delta_Y(X) := \frac{|X|}{|Y|}$ be the *density* of X in Y ; frequently Y is understood from context, in which case $\delta_Y(X)$ is written simply as $\delta(X)$.

There is a general principle, central both in additive combinatorics and ergodic theory, that sufficiently dense sets should have structure. A well-known instance of this philosophy is Szemerédi's Theorem [Sze75] which shows that dense subsets in \mathbb{Z} have arithmetic progressions. In the context of toric codes, the information rate $R(P)$ is precisely the density of $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ in $\{0, 1, \dots, q-2\}^n$.

The following theorem is our main result. Notice that Theorem 1.7 holds for arbitrary finite sets, not just polytopes, and we are able to replace the prime power q with any integer $N \geq 2$.

Notation 1.6. If S is a finite set of points in \mathbb{Z}^n , we let $M(S) := M(\text{Conv}(S))$, where $\text{Conv}(S) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the convex hull of S and $M(\text{Conv}(S))$ is interpreted via Definition 1.3.

Theorem 1.7. Fix $N \geq 2$ and $c \in (0, 1)$, and let

$$f_N(n, c) := \inf\{M(S) \mid S \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}^n, \delta(S) \geq c\}.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_N(n, c)}{\log_2 n} = 1.$$

Remark 1.8. Theorem 1.5 follows from Theorem 1.7 by taking $N = q - 1$ and viewing the polytope $P_i \subseteq [0, q-2]^{n_i}$ as the finite set of lattice points $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n_i} \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}^{n_i}$. In fact, Theorem 1.7 tells us that, for any infinite family of toric codes $\{P_i\}_i$ where $\{R(P_i)\}_i$ converges to a value in $(0, 1)$, the sequence $\{M(P_i)\}_i$ grows logarithmically in n_i .

Our paper adds to the literature of Szemerédi-style results, proving that for $n \gg 0$, dense subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}^n$ must contain arbitrarily large hypercubes (up to a unimodular transformation).

Notice that Theorem 1.7 does not include the cases of $c = 0$ or $c = 1$. When $c = 1$, we have $f_N(n, 1) = n$ for all n . On the other hand, in the case when $c = 0$, we show the following.

Theorem 1.9. Let $N \geq 2$ be a positive integer and suppose that for each $n \geq 0$ we have a subset $S_n \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}^n$. If

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_N(|S_n|)}{n} = 1,$$

then $\limsup_n M(S_n) = \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore this is optimal in the following sense: given $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a family of subsets $S_n \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}^n$ with $\{M(S_n)\}_n$ uniformly bounded and $\frac{\log_N(|S_n|)}{n} > 1 - \epsilon$ for every n .

The quantity $\limsup_i \frac{\log_N(|P_i \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n_i}|)}{n_i}$ is known as the *entropy* $\text{ent}(\{P_i\}_i)$; see [CMS03, Equation (2)]. Thus, Theorem 1.9 yields the following corollary which shows that, even if one replaces the condition on $\{R(P_i)\}_i$ in Definition 1.2 with the condition that $\text{ent}(\{P_i\}_i) = 1$, then such infinite families of toric codes still do not exist.

Corollary 1.10. *Let $\{P_i\}_i$ be an infinite family of toric codes. If $\text{ent}(\{P_i\}_i) = 1$, then $d(P_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Theorem 1.9 shows that $\limsup_i M(P_i) = \infty$, and [Dol+22, Proposition 4.2] shows this implies $d(P_i) \rightarrow 0$. \square

The remainder of this paper is dedicated to proving Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.9.

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank Ajneet Dhillon, Brett Nasserden, Sayantan Roy-Chowdhury, Owen Sharpe, and Sophie Spirkl. We would like to especially thank Jim Geelen for enlightening conversations. The first and third-named authors were partially supported by Discovery Grants from the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC); in addition, the third-named author was supported by a Mathematics Faculty Research Chair from the University of Waterloo. This paper is the outcome of an NSERC-USRA project; we thank NSERC for their support.

2. Lower bound for the growth rate of f_N

Throughout this paper, $N \geq 2$ is fixed so we suppress it in the notation f_N . All logarithms without an explicit base are taken with base N . For any non-negative integer k , we let

$$[k] := \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}.$$

Our goal in this section is to give the following lower bound for f .

Proposition 2.1. *For all $c \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(n, c)}{\log_2(n)} \geq 1.$$

We begin with a preliminary result which says that if we have sufficiently many sets of density at least c , then there must be a sufficiently large intersection.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $c \in (0, 1]$, $t \geq \frac{2}{c}$, and we have subsets $X_1, \dots, X_t \subseteq [k]$ each of density at least c . Then there exist distinct i and j such that*

$$\delta(X_i \cap X_j) \geq \frac{2}{(\frac{2}{c} + 1)^2}$$

Proof. Shrinking our collection of sets, if necessary, we may assume $t = \lceil \frac{2}{c} \rceil$. Then the inclusion-exclusion principle says

$$k \geq \sum_i |X_i| - \sum_{i < j} |X_i \cap X_j|.$$

Dividing by k and letting $m = \max_{i < j} \delta(X_i \cap X_j)$, we see

$$m \binom{t}{2} \geq \sum_i \delta(X_i) - 1 \geq tc - 1.$$

Since $tc \geq 2$ and $\binom{t}{2} \leq \frac{t^2}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}(\frac{2}{c} + 1)^2$, we see $m \geq \frac{2}{(\frac{2}{c} + 1)^2}$, as desired. \square

Next, we relate $M(S)$ for a given set S to the M -value of a set living in a lower-dimensional space by considering elements in S with a specified “prefix”.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $S \subseteq [N]^n$, $1 \leq r < n$, and $a, b \in [N]^r$ distinct. We let*

$$T_x := \{p \in [N]^{n-r} \mid x \times p \in S\}$$

for $x \in \{a, b\}$. Then

$$M(S) \geq M(T_a \cap T_b) + 1.$$

Proof. Let $m = M(T_a \cap T_b)$. By definition, we have an affine injection $\iota: \{0, 1\}^m \rightarrow T_a \cap T_b$. We extend this to a map $\iota': \{0, 1\}^{m+1} \rightarrow S$ where $\iota'(0, y) = a \times \iota(y)$ and $\iota'(1, y) = b \times \iota(y)$. Note that ι' is an injection because ι is injective and $a \neq b$. Furthermore, ι' is an affine map; indeed, there exists a matrix A and vector z such that $\iota(y) = Ay + z$, hence

$$\iota'(w, y) = \begin{bmatrix} b - a & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w \\ y \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} a \\ z \end{bmatrix}.$$

As a result, $M(S) \geq m + 1$. □

Combining the above two lemmas, we obtain an inductive lower bound on f .

Proposition 2.4. *For $c \in (0, 1]$ and $n > \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil$, we have*

$$f(n, c) \geq f(n - \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil, 2c^2(c + 4)^{-2}) + 1.$$

Proof. Let $S \subseteq [N]^n$ with $\delta(S) \geq c$. For each $1 \leq r < n$, let

$$k_r := \left| \left\{ a \in [N]^r \mid \delta(T_a) \geq \frac{c}{2} \right\} \right|$$

with T_a defined as in Lemma 2.3. Since $S = \coprod_a (a \times T_a)$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} c \leq \delta(S) &= \frac{1}{N^n} \sum_a |T_a| = \frac{1}{N^r} \sum_a \delta(T_a) \\ &\leq \frac{k_r}{N^r} + \frac{N^r}{N^r} \cdot \frac{c}{2} = \frac{k_r}{N^r} + \frac{c}{2}; \end{aligned}$$

the first inequality on the second line uses the bound $\delta(T_a) \leq 1$ for all a with $\delta(T_a) \geq \frac{c}{2}$, of which there are k_r , and uses the bound $\delta(T_a) \leq \frac{c}{2}$ for the remaining a , of which there are at most N^r .

It follows that for $r \geq \log(8c^{-2})$, we have

$$k_r \geq \frac{c}{2} N^r \geq \frac{2}{c/2}.$$

Hence, considering those a with $\delta(T_a) \geq \frac{c}{2}$, Lemma 2.2 tells us there exist $a \neq b$ with $\delta(T_a \cap T_b) \geq \frac{2c^2}{(c+4)^2}$. It follows then from Lemma 2.3 that

$$M(S) \geq M(T_a \cap T_b) + 1 \geq f(n - r, 2c^2(c + 4)^{-2}) + 1.$$

In particular, we may take $r = \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil$. □

We turn now to the proof of the main result of this section.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. For all sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{1}{1 + \log_2(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{6})} \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

since the Taylor expansion shows $(1 + \log_2(1 + \frac{x}{6}))^{-1} = 1 - \frac{x}{6 \log 2} + O(x^2)$ as $x \rightarrow 0$. By definition, $f(n, c) \geq f(n, c')$ if $c' \leq c$. Thus, we may freely replace c by a smaller value. In particular, we may assume

$$\log c \leq \frac{3}{\epsilon} \min \left(\log \frac{2}{25}, -(1 + \log 8) \right).$$

Letting $\alpha := 2 + \frac{\epsilon}{3}$, the above two inequalities imply

$$\frac{2c^2}{(c+4)^2} \geq \frac{2c^2}{25} \geq c^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad n - \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil \geq n + \alpha \log c.$$

Then Proposition 2.4 tells us if $n > \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil$, then

$$f(n, c) \geq f(n - \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil, 2c^2(c+4)^{-2}) + 1 \geq f(n - \lceil \log(8c^{-2}) \rceil, c^\alpha) + 1.$$

Thus, if we let

$$h: \mathbb{R} \times (0, 2^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times (0, 2^{-1}], \quad h(x, y) := (x + \alpha \log c, c^\alpha),$$

we find

$$f(n, c) \geq \max\{m \mid x\text{-coordinate of } h^m(n, c) \geq 1\}.$$

Since $h^m(x, y) = (x + \frac{\alpha^{m+1}-1}{\alpha-1} \log y, y^{\alpha^m})$, we see

$$f(n, c) \geq \left\lfloor \log_\alpha \left(\frac{(1-n)(\alpha-1)}{\log c} + 1 \right) \right\rfloor - 1.$$

For $n \geq 2$, we have $\log_\alpha(\frac{n}{n-1}) \leq \log_\alpha 2$, and so

$$f(n, c) \geq \log_\alpha \left(\frac{(n-1)(\alpha-1)}{\log(c^{-1})} \right) - 1 \geq \log_\alpha n - \beta(c)$$

where

$$\beta(c) := \log_\alpha 2 + \log_\alpha \log(c^{-1}) - \log_\alpha(\alpha-1) + 2$$

is a constant depending only on c .

Next,

$$\log_\alpha n = \frac{(\log_2 n)(\log 2)}{\log(2 + \frac{\epsilon}{3})} = \frac{\log_2 n}{1 + \log_2(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{6})} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \log_2 n,$$

where the last inequality uses Eq. (2.5). Hence,

$$f(n, c) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \log_2 n - \beta(c) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \log_2 n$$

for n sufficiently large. □

3. Proof of the main theorems

Having given a lower bound for f_N in Proposition 2.1, we can complete the proof of Theorem 1.7 by giving the following upper bound.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $c \in (0, 1]$, let $N \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a family of sets $S_n \subseteq [N]^n$ such that $\liminf_n \delta(S_n) \geq c$ and, for sufficiently large n , $M(S_n) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \log_2(n)$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove this in the case when $c = 1$. For $n \geq 3$, we let $c_n = 1 - 1/N^{\lfloor \log(\log(n)) \rfloor}$. Observe that for n sufficiently large we have

$$(3.2) \quad \log(4) + n(1 + \epsilon \log_2(n) + 1) < n^{1+\epsilon/2} \log(1/c_n),$$

since

$$\log(1/c_n) > 1/(2N^{\lfloor \log \log(n) \rfloor}) > 1/(2N^{2 \log(\log(n))}) > 1/(2 \log(n)^2)$$

for n large.

We let $n \geq 3$ be such that the inequality in Eq. (3.2) holds and we pick a positive integer r in the interval $((1 + \epsilon/2) \log_2(n), (1 + \epsilon) \log_2(n))$.

Observe that an injective affine linear map from $\{0, 1\}^r$ to $[N]^n$ is uniquely determined by the images of $e_1, \dots, e_r, e_1 + \dots + e_r$, where $e_i \in \{0, 1\}^r$ denotes the vector with a 1 in the i -th coordinate and zeros in every other coordinate. Since there are at most N^n choices for each vectors, we see there are at most $N^{n(r+1)}$ injective affine linear maps from $\{0, 1\}^r$ to $[N]^n$. We let $Q_1, \dots, Q_L \subseteq [N]^n$ with $L \leq N^{n(r+1)}$ denote the distinct images of these injective maps.

We now consider events X_1, \dots, X_L , where X_i is the event that a subset of $[N]^n$ of density c' contains the set Q_i . The set Q_i has size 2^r and so the probability that a subset of $[N]^n$ of density c_n contains Q_i is given by

$$\binom{N^n - 2^r}{N^n c_n - 2^r} \binom{N^n}{N^n c_n}^{-1} = \prod_{i=0}^{2^r-1} \frac{N^n c_n - i}{N^n - i}.$$

Since $c_n < 1$, we see that $(N^n c_n - i)(N^n - i)^{-1} < c_n$ for $i = 0, \dots, 2^r - 1$, and so the event X_i occurs with probability at most $c_n^{2^r}$. By the Lovasz Local Lemma [Spe94, Lecture 8], there is a nonzero chance that none of the events X_1, \dots, X_L occur, provided $4L \cdot c_n^{2^r} < 1$ and since $L \leq N^{n(r+1)}$, it is enough to have the inequality $\log(4) + n(r+1) < 2^r \log(1/c_n)$. Since $r > (1 + \epsilon/2) \log_2(n)$, we then see it is sufficient to have the inequality

$$\log(4) + n(1 + \epsilon \log_2(n) + 1) < n^{1+\epsilon/2} \log(1/c_n),$$

which holds for n large by Eq. (3.2).

It follows that for n sufficiently large there exists a set $S \subseteq [N]^n$ of density c_n that contains none of Q_1, \dots, Q_L and hence $M(S) < r < (1 + \epsilon) \log_2(n)$. The result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. The result follows immediately from the lower bound given in Proposition 2.1 and the upper bound given in Proposition 3.1. \square

We now prove Theorem 1.9.

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Notice that if we have an infinite subset T of \mathbb{N} and we have a family of sets $\{S_n\}_{n \in T}$ with $S_n \subseteq \{0, \dots, N-1\}^n$ such that $\lim \log(|S_n|)/n = 1$ then if we let $c_n = \delta(S_n)$, we have $c_n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$. Thus it suffices to show that $f(n, c_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ whenever $c_n \in (0, 1]$ is a sequence of positive numbers with $c_n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$.

To show this, suppose towards a contradiction that there exists an infinite subset T of \mathbb{N} and a sequence of positive real numbers $\{c_n\}_{n \in T}$ with $c_n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$ such that $\liminf f(n, c_n) < \infty$. Then we may select such a sequence $\{c_n\}$ with $\liminf f(n, c_n) = m < \infty$, with m minimal among all such sequences.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then since $c_n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$, we have $c_n > q^{-\epsilon n}$ for n sufficiently large. In particular, for n sufficiently large we have $\log(8c_n^{-2}) < \log(8) + 2\epsilon n < n$, and so by Proposition 2.4,

$$f(n, c_n) \geq f(n - \lceil \log(8c_n^{-2}) \rceil, 2c_n^2(c_n + 4)^{-2}) + 1.$$

We now let $b_n = 2c_n^2/(c_n + 4)^2$. Then $b_n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$ and since $n - \lceil \log(8c_n^{-2}) \rceil \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we see by minimality of m that $f(n - \lceil \log(8c_n^{-2}) \rceil, 2c_n^2(c_n + 4)^{-2}) \geq m$ for n sufficiently large. But this now gives that $f(n, c_n) \geq m + 1$ for n sufficiently large, a contradiction. It follows that $f(n, c_n) \rightarrow \infty$ whenever $c_n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$, giving the first part of Theorem 1.9.

To prove the assertion about optimality, we again use the Lovasz Local Lemma. We fix $\epsilon > 0$ and pick r such that $2^{r-1}/(r+3) > 1/\epsilon$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, there are at most $N^{n(r+1)}$ injective affine linear maps from $\{0, 1\}^r$ to $[N]^n$, and each one has image of size 2^r . We let $Q_1, \dots, Q_L \subseteq [N]^n$ with $L \leq N^{n(r+1)}$ denote the distinct images of these injective maps and let X_i be event that a subset of $[N]^n$ of density $c_n := N^{-\lfloor \epsilon n \rfloor}$ contains the set Q_i for $i = 1, \dots, L$.

As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the event X_i occurs with probability at most $c_n^{2^r}$. To show that there is a nonzero probability that no X_i occurs, by the Lovasz Local Lemma it suffices to show that $4Lc_n^{2^r} < 1$. Using the fact that $L \leq N^{n(r+1)}$, we see for n sufficiently large we have

$$\begin{aligned} 4Lc_n^{2^r} &\leq 4 \cdot N^{n(r+1)} N^{-2^r \lfloor \epsilon n \rfloor} \\ &\leq 4 \cdot N^{n(r+1)} \cdot N^{-2^r(\epsilon n - 1)} \\ &\leq N^2 \cdot N^{n(r+1) - 2^r \epsilon n / 2} \\ &\leq N^{n(r+3) - 2^{r-1} \epsilon n}, \end{aligned}$$

which is strictly smaller than 1 by our choice of r . It follows that for n large, there is a subset S_n of $\{0, \dots, N-1\}^n$ with density at least $N^{-\lfloor \epsilon n \rfloor}$ such that $M(S_n) \leq r$. In particular, $|S_n| \geq N^{(1-\epsilon)n}$, completing the proof. \square

References

- [CMS03] Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein, Antonio Machi, and Fabio Scarabotti. “On the entropy of regular languages”. In: vol. 307. 1. Words. 2003, pp. 93–102. DOI: [10.1016/S0304-3975\(03\)00094-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(03)00094-X).
- [Dol+22] Mallory Dolorfino, Cordelia Horch, Kelly Jabbusch, and Ryan Martinez. *On Good Infinite Families of Toric Codes or the Lack Thereof*. 2022. arXiv: [2201.08464](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.08464) [math.AG].
- [Gop81] V. D. Goppa. “Codes on algebraic curves”. In: *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR* 259.6 (1981), pp. 1289–1290. ISSN: 0002-3264.

- [Gop82] V. D. Goppa. “Algebraic-geometric codes”. In: *Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR. Seriya Matematicheskaya* 46.4 (1982), pp. 762–781, 896. ISSN: 0373-2436.
- [Ham50] R. W. Hamming. “Error detecting and error correcting codes”. In: *The Bell System Technical Journal* 29 (1950), pp. 147–160. ISSN: 0005-8580. DOI: [10.1002/j.1538-7305.1950.tb00463](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1950.tb00463)
- [Han00] Johan P. Hansen. “Toric surfaces and error-correcting codes”. In: *Coding theory, cryptography and related areas (Guanajuato, 1998)*. Springer, Berlin, 2000, pp. 132–142. ISBN: 3-540-66248-0.
- [Han02] Johan P. Hansen. “Toric varieties Hirzebruch surfaces and error-correcting codes”. In: *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* 13.4 (2002), pp. 289–300. ISSN: 0938-1279,1432-0622. DOI: [10.1007/s00200-002-0106-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00200-002-0106-0).
- [Joy04] David Joyner. “Toric codes over finite fields”. In: *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* 15.1 (2004), pp. 63–79. ISSN: 0938-1279,1432-0622. DOI: [10.1007/s00200-004-0152-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00200-004-0152-x).
- [LS06] John Little and Hal Schenck. “Toric surface codes and Minkowski sums”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 20.4 (2006), pp. 999–1014. ISSN: 0895-4801,1095-7146. DOI: [10.1137/050637054](https://doi.org/10.1137/050637054).
- [LS07] John Little and Ryan Schwarz. “On toric codes and multivariate Vandermonde matrices”. In: *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* 18.4 (2007), pp. 349–367. ISSN: 0938-1279,1432-0622. DOI: [10.1007/s00200-007-0041-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00200-007-0041-1).
- [RS60] I. S. Reed and G. Solomon. “Polynomial codes over certain finite fields”. In: *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 8 (1960), pp. 300–304. ISSN: 0368-4245.
- [Rua07] Diego Ruano. “On the parameters of r -dimensional toric codes”. In: *Finite Fields and their Applications* 13.4 (2007), pp. 962–976. ISSN: 1071-5797,1090-2465. DOI: [10.1016/j.ffa.2007.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ffa.2007.02.001)
- [Spe94] Joel Spencer. *Ten lectures on the probabilistic method*. Second. Vol. 64. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1994, pp. vi+88. ISBN: 0-89871-325-0. DOI: [10.1137/1.9781611970074](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611970074).
- [SS09] Ivan Soprunov and Jenya Soprunova. “Toric surface codes and Minkowski length of polygons”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 23.1 (2008/09), pp. 384–400. ISSN: 0895-4801,1095-7146. DOI: [10.1137/080716554](https://doi.org/10.1137/080716554).
- [SS10] Ivan Soprunov and Jenya Soprunova. “Bringing toric codes to the next dimension”. In: *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 24.2 (2010), pp. 655–665. ISSN: 0895-4801,1095-7146. DOI: [10.1137/090762592](https://doi.org/10.1137/090762592).
- [Sze75] E. Szemerédi. “On sets of integers containing no k elements in arithmetic progression”. In: *Polska Akademia Nauk. Instytut Matematyczny. Acta Arithmetica* 27 (1975), pp. 199–245. ISSN: 0065-1036. DOI: [10.4064/aa-27-1-199-245](https://doi.org/10.4064/aa-27-1-199-245).
- [TV91] M. A. Tsfasman and S. G. Vlăduț. *Algebraic-geometric codes*. Vol. 58. Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series). Translated from the Russian by the authors. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1991, pp. xxiv+667. ISBN: 0-7923-0727-5. DOI: [10.1007/978-94-011-3810-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-3810-9).

JASON P. BELL, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
Email address: jpbell@uwaterloo.ca

SEAN MONAHAN, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
Email address: sean.monahan@uwaterloo.ca

MATTHEW SATRIANO, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
Email address: msatriano@uwaterloo.ca

KAREN SITU, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
Email address: k4situ@uwaterloo.ca

ZHENG XIE, DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
Email address: z6xie@uwaterloo.ca