

HIGHER WEIGHT SPECTRA AND BETTI NUMBERS OF REED-MULLER CODES $RM_q(2, 2)$

SUDHIR R. GHORPADE, TRYGVE JOHNSEN, RATI LUDHANI, AND RAKHI PRATI HAR

ABSTRACT. We determine the higher weight spectra of q -ary Reed-Muller codes $C_q = RM_q(2, 2)$ for all prime powers q . In other words, we determine all possible support weights of subcodes of C_q of an arbitrary dimension. This is equivalent to finding the usual weight distributions of all extension codes of C_q over every field extension of \mathbb{F}_q of finite degree. To obtain our results we will utilize connections between the higher weight spectra and certain properties of the Stanley-Reisner rings of a series of matroids associated to each code C_q . In the process, we are able to explicitly determine all the graded Betti numbers of matroids associated to C_q and its elongations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Reed-Muller codes have been a focal point for many researchers. The binary Reed-Muller codes $RM(d, m)$ of order d and length 2^m were first studied by D. E. Muller and I. S. Reed in 1954. The study of q -ary Reed-Muller codes $RM_q(d, m)$ of order d and length q^m was pioneered by Kasami-Lin-Peterson (1968) and Delsarte-Goethals-MacWilliams (1970) in their seminal papers [21] and [5] where they refer to these as generalized Reed-Muller codes. Determination of weight distributions of Reed-Muller codes, i.e., explicit descriptions of all possible nonzero Hamming weights w and the corresponding number A_w of codewords of $RM_q(d, m)$ of weight w , is a problem of considerable interest. A complete solution in the case of binary second order code $RM(2, m)$ was given in 1970 by Sloane and Berlekamp [27]. Answers in the case of $RM(3, m)$ for small values of m (e.g., $m \leq 9$) or the case of $RM(m - j, m)$ for small values of j (e.g., $j \leq 6$) are known, but the general case is open. See, e.g., Carlet and Solé [4] and the recent preprint [23] by Lou and Wang. One may also refer to the recent preprints of Markov and Borrisov [24] and of Jain, Rameshwar and Kashyap [11] where the binary codes $RM(4, 9)$ and $RM(3, 10)$ as well as $RM(4, 10)$ are considered. In the q -ary case, a weight distribution of $RM_q(2, m)$ was proposed by McEliece [25] in 1969, but it appears that there were some mistakes in the computations and a precise version has been given recently by Li [22].

Sudhir Ghorpade is partially supported by the grant DST/INT/RUS/RSF/P-41/2021 from the Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India.

Trygve Johnsen was partially supported by the project Pure Mathematics in Norway, funded by Bergen Research Foundation and Tromsø Research Foundation and the UiT-project Mascot.

Rati Ludhani is supported by Prime Minister's Research Fellowship PMRF-192002-256 at IIT Bombay.

Rakhi Pratihari was partially funded by French Agence Nationale de la Recherche in the context of Plan France 2030 with reference ANR-22-PETQ-0008.

We consider in this paper a much more general problem of determining the higher weight spectra, i.e., explicit descriptions of all possible nonzero support weights w of subcodes of $\text{RM}_q(d, m)$ of a given dimension r and the corresponding number $A_w^{(r)}$ of subcodes of $\text{RM}_q(d, m)$ of dimension r and support weight w . Here r varies over positive integers $\leq \dim \text{RM}_q(d, m)$. The problem of weight distribution mentioned earlier corresponds to the case $r = 1$ of this more general problem. The best known result in this direction seems to be the determination of all the generalized Hamming weights of $\text{RM}_q(d, m)$, or in other words, the determination, for each positive integer $r \leq \dim \text{RM}_q(d, m)$, of the first nonzero value $d_r(C)$ of w for which $A_w^{(r)} \neq 0$. This was done by Heijnen and Pellikaan [7] in 1998 (see also the related works of Beelen and Datta [2] and Beelen [1]). However, the general problem of the determination of higher weight spectra of $\text{RM}_q(d, m)$ seems intractable even in the case of $d = 2$ for arbitrary positive integers m . We make a beginning here by considering the q -ary code $C_q := \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$, which is a $[q^2, 6, q^2 - 2q]$ -code if $q \geq 3$. When $q = 2$, the code C_q is trivial and it is simply \mathbb{F}_2^4 . We can also think of C_q as the linear code obtained by evaluating conics (i.e., quadratic polynomials in 2 variables) at all points of the two-dimensional affine space over \mathbb{F}_q . Our main theorem is a complete description of the higher weight spectra of C_q for any prime power q and a precise statement is given in Theorem 4 in the next section. Our secondary aim is to give a complete description of the graded Betti numbers of Stanley-Reisner rings of the matroids associated to C_q and also of the elongations of these matroids. It may be noted that the notion of these Betti numbers for linear codes was introduced about a decade ago in [12], and one may refer to [6] for a brief introduction and examples of computations. We note, in particular, that explicit determination of the graded Betti numbers is usually a hard problem, and thus our results on Betti numbers of matroids related to $\text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ may be of some independent interest.

One of our motivation is the recent work of the second named author and H. Verdure [13] on the determination of higher weight spectra of a related class of linear code $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$, viz., the second order projective Reed-Muller code of length $q^2 + q + 1$ (which is also called a Veronese code in [13] since it corresponds to the quadratic Veronese embedding of \mathbb{P}^2 in \mathbb{P}^5). This was done partly by exploiting a classification of conics in the projective plane over \mathbb{F}_q . Such a classification is known in the literature on finite geometry (see, e.g., [8]). We attempt a similar approach, which requires a classification of conics in the affine plane over \mathbb{F}_q . But this doesn't appear to be readily available and seems rather involved. For instance, while conics in \mathbb{P}_q^2 can be one of 4 classes, the conics in \mathbb{A}_q^2 get subdivided into 10 classes. As in [13], we determine the higher weight spectra of the code $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ by finding the generalized weight polynomials $P_j(Z)$ of the code C_q for $0 \leq j \leq q^2$, and its evaluations at powers of q . These polynomials $P_j(Z)$ are found using a coarser variant, denoted $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$, of the graded Betti numbers of Stanley-Reisner rings of the matroid associated to C_q and also of the elongations of this matroid. This strategy is explained in greater detail in Section 3. It may be noted that the problem of determination of higher weight spectra $A_w^{(r)}$ corresponds in the special cases $r = 1$ or $r = 2$ to some geometric questions about counting certain curves over finite fields with prescribed rational intersection points. In this set-up, the question has been considered by Kaplan and Matei [20] (see Remark 47).

We remark that the work in [13] for the higher weight spectra of $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$ has been extended to the case of $\text{PRM}_q(2, 3)$ in [14] for the case $q = 2$, and very recently in [19] for the case $q = 3$. However as far as we know, barring the easy case of $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ (see, e.g., Example 31) and the results of Kaplan and Matei [20] mentioned above, the higher weight spectra of Reed-Muller codes of second order do not seem to have been studied (see, however, Remark 48 in this connection).

2. DEFINITIONS AND MAIN RESULTS

Throughout this paper, we let q be a prime power and \mathbb{F}_q the finite field with q elements. For any nonnegative integer n , we denote by \mathbb{P}_q^n the n -dimensional projective space over \mathbb{F}_q . Following [13], we let ν_q be the Veronese map that maps \mathbb{P}_q^2 into \mathbb{P}_q^5 , i.e., ν_q maps $(x : y : z)$ to $(x^2 : xy : xz : y^2 : yz : z^2)$, and let V_q be the image of ν_q . Then V_q is the set of \mathbb{F}_q -rational points of a non-degenerate smooth surface of degree 4. The cardinality $|V_q|$ of V_q is $|\mathbb{P}_q^2| = q^2 + q + 1$. Fix some order for the points of V_q , and for each such point, fix a coordinate 6-tuple that represents it. For the points corresponding to $(x : y : z)$ with $z \neq 0$, we always pick the representative with $z = 1$. Let G_q be the $(6 \times q^2)$ matrix, whose columns are the coordinate 6-tuples of the points of V_q , taken in the fixed order, deleting the $q + 1$ columns with $z = 0$. The deletion of these columns is the essential difference between the codes studied here, and the ones in [13], and, as we will see, it makes the problem more complicated to study.

Definition 1. For $q \geq 3$, the q -ary *Reed-Muller code* $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ is the linear code with generator matrix G_q . For $q = 2$, the *Reed-Muller code* $C_2 = \text{RM}_2(2, 2)$ is the linear code with generator matrix G'_2 , where G'_2 is the $(4 \times q^2)$ matrix obtained from G_2 by removing rows 2 and 4, which correspond to xz and yz , respectively.

Remark 2. The first 2 in $\text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ refers to the maximal degree 2 of the polynomials in x, y that are evaluated to obtain entries in G_q , and the second 2 refers to the number of variables x, y that appear, which is 2 after we have set $z = 1$ everywhere. It is elementary and well-known that C_q is a $[q^2, 6, q^2 - 2q]$ -code if $q \geq 3$ and C_2 is a binary $[4, 4, 1]$ -code; in fact, $C_2 = \mathbb{F}_2^4$. See, for example, [5].

Definition 3. Let n be a positive integer and let k be a nonnegative integer with $k \leq n$. For a linear $[n, k]_q$ -code C in \mathbb{F}_q^n and for a codeword $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in C$, let $\text{Supp}(\mathbf{w})$ be the set of indices $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ where $w_i \neq 0$. For a set T of codewords, let $\text{Supp}(T)$ be the union of the $\text{Supp}(\mathbf{w})$, for $\mathbf{w} \in T$. Let $\text{wt}(\mathbf{w})$ be the cardinality of $\text{Supp}(\mathbf{w})$, and $\text{wt}(T)$ the cardinality of $\text{Supp}(T)$.

- For each $r = 0, 1, \dots, k$, let $d_r(C)$ be the smallest integer w , such that there exists a r -dimensional subcode D of C with $\text{wt}(D) = w$. We call $d_r(C)$ the r -th *generalized Hamming weight* or the r -th *higher weight* of C .
- For each $r = 0, 1, \dots, k$ and for each $w = d_r(C), \dots, n$, let $A_w^{(r)}(C)$ be the number of linear subcodes D of dimension r of C , with $\text{wt}(D) = w$. (If w is outside the range $[d_r(C), n]$ we set $A_w^{(r)}(C) = 0$.) The ordered multiset $\{A_w^{(r)}(C)\}$, for $w = d_r(C), \dots, n$, is called the r -th *weight spectrum* of C , and we call the multiset of r -th weight spectra for $r = 0, 1, \dots, k$ as the *higher weight spectra* of C . Note that $d_0(C) = 0$ and $A_0^{(0)}(C) = 1$.

- For $0 \leq r \leq k$, we denote by $W_r(X, Y)$ the polynomial

$$\sum_{w=0}^n A_w^{(r)}(C) X^{n-w} Y^w.$$

This is called the r -th *higher weight polynomial* of the code C .

One of our main result is the following complete description of the higher weight spectra for the Reed-Muller code $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ for all prime powers q .

Theorem 4. *Let $A_w^{(r)} = A_w^{(r)}(C_q)$ for $0 \leq r \leq \dim C_q$.*

- (a) *If $q \geq 7$, then for the $[q^2, 6, q^2 - 2q]$ -code C_q , we have*

$$A_0^{(0)} = 1, \quad A_{q^2-2q}^{(1)} = \frac{q^3 - q}{2}, \quad A_{q^2-2q+1}^{(1)} = \frac{q^4 + q^3}{2},$$

$$A_{q^2-q-1}^{(1)} = \frac{q^5 - 2q^4 + q^3}{2}, \quad A_{q^2-q-1}^{(2)} = q^4 - q^2,$$

$$A_{q^2-q}^{(1)} = q^4 + q^2 + 2q, \quad A_{q^2-q}^{(2)} = 2q^3 + 3q^2 + q, \quad A_{q^2-q}^{(3)} = q^2 + q,$$

$$A_{q^2-q+1}^{(1)} = \frac{q^5 - q^3}{2},$$

$$A_{q^2-4}^{(2)} = \frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 5q^6 + q^5 - 6q^4 + 3q^3}{24},$$

$$A_{q^2-3}^{(2)} = \frac{4q^7 - 9q^6 + q^5 + 9q^4 - 5q^3}{6}, \quad A_{q^2-3}^{(3)} = \frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 + q^3}{6},$$

$$A_{q^2-2}^{(2)} = \frac{q^8 - 2q^7 + 13q^6 - 9q^5 - 14q^4 + 11q^3}{4}, \quad A_{q^2-2}^{(3)} = \frac{q^7 + q^5 - 2q^3}{2},$$

$$A_{q^2-2}^{(4)} = \frac{q^4 - q^2}{2},$$

$$A_{q^2-1}^{(1)} = \frac{q^4 - q^3}{2}, \quad A_{q^2-1}^{(2)} = \frac{2q^8 + 4q^7 - 5q^6 + 29q^5 + 15q^4 - 27q^3 + 6q^2}{6},$$

$$A_{q^2-1}^{(3)} = \frac{2q^8 + 3q^6 + 3q^5 + 5q^4 + 3q^3}{2}, \quad A_{q^2-1}^{(4)} = q^6 + q^5 + q^3 + 2q^2, \quad A_{q^2-1}^{(5)} = q^2,$$

$$A_{q^2}^{(1)} = \frac{q^3 - q + 2}{2}, \quad A_{q^2}^{(2)} = \frac{9q^8 + 8q^7 + 21q^6 - 19q^5 + 42q^4 + 59q^3 - 24q^2 + 24}{24},$$

$$A_{q^2}^{(3)} = \frac{6q^9 + 9q^7 + 8q^6 + 7q^5 + 4q^4 + 14q^3 + 6q^2 + 6}{6},$$

$$A_{q^2}^{(4)} = \frac{2q^8 + 2q^7 + 2q^6 + 2q^5 + 5q^4 + 2q^3 + q^2 + 2q + 2}{2},$$

$$A_{q^2}^{(5)} = q^5 + q^4 + q^3 + q + 1,$$

and $A_{q^2}^{(6)} = 1$, while all other $A_w^{(r)}$ are zero.

- (b) For the $[25, 6, 15]$ -code C_5 , we have: For $w \neq q^2 - q + 1 = q^2 - 4 = 21$, all nonzero $A_w^{(r)}$ are given by the same formulas in q , as in (a). Furthermore, $A_{21}^{(1)} = 1500$, $A_{21}^{(2)} = 6500$, and $A_{21}^{(r)} = 0$ for $r = 3, 4, 5, 6$.
- (c) For the $[16, 6, 8]$ -code C_4 , we have: For $w \neq q^2 - q = q^2 - 4 = 12$ and $w \neq q^2 - q + 1 = q^2 - 3 = 13$, all nonzero $A_w^{(r)}$ are given by the same formulas in q , as in (a). Furthermore, $A_{12}^{(1)} = 280$, $A_{12}^{(2)} = 1020$, $A_{12}^{(3)} = 20$, and $A_{12}^{(r)} = 0$, for $r = 4, 5, 6$ and $A_{13}^{(1)} = 480$, $A_{13}^{(2)} = 5280$, $A_{13}^{(3)} = 480$, and $A_{13}^{(r)} = 0$ for $r = 4, 5, 6$.
- (d) For the $[9, 6, 3]$ -code C_3 , we have: For $w \neq q^2 - q - 1 = q^2 - 4 = 5$, $w \neq q^2 - q = q^2 - 3 = 6$, and $w \neq q^2 - q + 1 = q^2 - 2 = 7$, all nonzero $A_w^{(r)}$ are given by the same formulas in q , as in (a). Furthermore, $A_5^{(1)} = 54$, $A_5^{(2)} = 126$, and $A_5^{(r)} = 0$, for $r = 3, 4, 5, 6$, and $A_6^{(1)} = 96$, $A_6^{(2)} = 588$, $A_6^{(3)} = 84$, and $A_6^{(r)} = 0$, for $r = 4, 5, 6$, and $A_7^{(1)} = 108$, $A_7^{(2)} = 2160$, $A_7^{(3)} = 1188$, and $A_7^{(r)} = 0$ for $r = 4, 5, 6$.
- (e) For the $[4, 4, 1]$ -code C_2 , we have: $A_1^{(1)} = 4$, $A_2^{(1)} = 6$, $A_3^{(1)} = 4$, $A_4^{(1)} = 1$, $A_2^{(2)} = 6$, $A_3^{(2)} = 16$, $A_4^{(2)} = 13$, $A_3^{(3)} = 4$, $A_4^{(3)} = 11$, $A_4^{(4)} = 1$, and all other $A_w^{(r)}$ are zero.

Corollary 5. Assume that $q \geq 3$ and $1 \leq r \leq 6$. The r -th higher weight polynomial of $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ is given by

$$\sum_{w=0}^{q^2} A_w^{(r)} X^{q^2-w} Y^w$$

where for each $0 \leq w \leq q^2$, the coefficient $A_w^{(r)}$ is defined as in Theorem 4(a).

3. ABOUT THE PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Our proof of the theorem above have 3 main steps. For each value of q :

- (1) Find the \mathbb{N} -graded minimal free resolutions of the Stanley-Reisner ring of the matroid associated to a parity check matrix of C_q , and each of the 5 elongations of this matroid. (These terms will be explained in Section 4.)
- (2) Use Step (1) and the procedure described in [16] to find the so-called generalized weight polynomials $P_j(Z)$, for $j = 0, \dots, q^2$, for each of the codes C_q . These polynomials P_j are such that $P_j(q^m)$ gives the number of codewords of weight j of the extension code $C_q \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$. Concretely, we will calculate the polynomials $P_j(Z)$ by using the formula:

$$P_j(Z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^6 (\phi_j^{(\ell)} - \phi_j^{(\ell-1)}) Z^\ell,$$

where the $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$ are certain integers that we obtain from the \mathbb{N} -graded minimal free resolutions of the above-mentioned matroid and its elongations. The notation will be explained in detail in Section 4.

(3) Use Step (2) to find the $A_w^{(i)}$, using the well known formula

$$P_w(q^e) = \sum_{r=0}^e A_w^{(r)} \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^e - q^i) \quad \text{for } e \geq 0,$$

(given in [9], as pointed out in [17]) repeatedly, starting with $e = 0$.

The last two main steps are rather “mechanical” and do only involve straightforward, but tedious computations.¹ Hence we will devote most of our attention to Step (1). A vital ingredient there is the following result. Here, and hereafter, by a *conic* in \mathbb{P}_q^2 we mean the set of zeros in \mathbb{P}_q^2 of a nonzero homogeneous polynomial of degree 2 in 3 variables with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_q .

Proposition 6. *In \mathbb{P}_q^2 , for all prime powers $q \geq 2$, the $\frac{q^6-1}{q-1}$ conics are as follows:*

1. $q^2 + q + 1$ double lines with $q + 1$ \mathbb{F}_q -rational points,
2. $\frac{q(q+1)(q^2+q+1)}{2}$ pairs of two distinct lines with $2q + 1$ \mathbb{F}_q -rational points,
3. $q^5 - q^2$ irreducible conics with $q + 1$ \mathbb{F}_q -rational points,
4. $\frac{q(q-1)(q^2+q+1)}{2}$ conics (pairs of Galois-conjugate lines defined over $\mathbb{F}_{q^2} \setminus \mathbb{F}_q$) that just possess a single \mathbb{F}_q -rational point each.

This result can be found, for instance, in [8, p. 140].

Remark 7. The values of the $A_w^{(1)}$, for all w , and all prime powers $q \geq 3$, will be derived from Proposition 6, and the additional analysis below, where for each of the 4 conic types listed in Proposition 6, one finds out how they intersect the line L at infinity given by $z = 0$. This is because the supports of the (one-dimensional subspaces of) codewords corresponding to the conics above are the complements in $\mathbb{A}_q^2 = \mathbb{P}_q^2 - L$ of the zero sets of the conics. More precisely, for $q \geq 3$ and $w \geq 0$,

$$A_w^{(1)} = |\{C : C \text{ conic in } \mathbb{P}_q^2 \text{ with } |C \cap \mathbb{A}_q^2| = q^2 - w\}|.$$

Proposition 8. *The $\frac{q^6-1}{q-1}$ conics in \mathbb{P}_q^2 can be further classified as follows:*

1. The $q^2 + q + 1$ double lines in \mathbb{P}_q^2 are divided into 2 categories:
 - (a) 1 double line $z^2 = 0$, with no points in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
 - (b) $q^2 + q$ other double lines, each with q zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
2. The $\frac{q(q+1)(q^2+q+1)}{2}$ pairs of two distinct lines are divided into 3 categories:
 - (c) $q^2 + q$ line pairs of the type $Fz = 0$, where F is a linear form not proportional to z . These conics have q zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
 - (d) $\frac{q(q+1)(q^2+q+1)}{2} - (q^2 + q) - \frac{q(q^2-1)}{2} = \frac{q^4+q^3}{2}$ line pairs that intersect outside L . These conics have $2q - 1$ zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
 - (e) $\frac{q(q^2-1)}{2}$ line pairs, each of which intersect at a single point of the line L at infinity. Such line pairs have $2q$ zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 , where they appear as parallel lines.

¹A large computational part were done in computer algebra software Sage-Math [26]. We made the code used for the computations available at: https://cocalc.com/share/public_paths/d522a7e92b8dbd8d99c4f47521709c6a5dd5e9d6

3. The $q^5 - q^2$ irreducible conics are divided into 3 categories:
- (f) $\frac{q^3(q^2-1)}{2}$ conics, each intersecting L in two distinct points over \mathbb{F}_q . The “finite parts” can be thought of as hyperbolas in \mathbb{A}_q^2 . These conics have $q - 1$ zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
 - (g) $q^2(q^2 - 1)$ conics being tangent to L at one \mathbb{F}_q rational point. The “finite parts” can be thought of as parabolas in \mathbb{A}_q^2 . These conics have q zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
 - (h) $\frac{q^3(q-1)^2}{2}$ conics that have no \mathbb{F}_q -rational point on L . It is natural to think of these conics as ellipses. These conics have $q + 1$ zeros in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
4. The $\frac{q(q-1)(q^2+q+1)}{2}$ conics that just possess a single \mathbb{F}_q -rational point each, are divided into 2 categories:
- (i) $\frac{q^2(q^2-q)}{2}$ conics, where the single point is not on the line L at infinity. These conics have 1 point each in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .
 - (j) $\frac{(q+1)(q^2-q)}{2} = \frac{q^3-q}{2}$ conics, where the single point is on the line L at infinity. These conics have 0 points each in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .

Proof. The cases (a)–(e), and (i), (j) are results of straightforward counting. In the case (f), one looks at the incidence set

$$\{(\text{irreducible conic } C \text{ in } \mathbb{P}_q^2, \text{ line in } \mathbb{P}_q^2) : \text{the line intersects } C \text{ in 2 points}\}.$$

This incidence set clearly has $(q^5 - q^2)\binom{q+1}{2}$ points. Projecting down on the right factor, one finds that there are

$$\frac{(q^5 - q^2)\binom{q+1}{2}}{q^2 + q + 1} = \frac{q^5 - q^3}{2}$$

irreducible conics that intersect a fixed line in 2 points. Since the line at infinity is no exception, we obtain (f).

To prove (g), one looks at a similar incidence set:

$$\{(\text{irreducible conic } C \text{ in } \mathbb{P}_q^2, \text{ line in } \mathbb{P}_q^2) : \text{the line is tangent to } C\}.$$

This incidence set clearly has $(q^5 - q^2)(q + 1)$ points. Projecting down on the right factor, one finds that there are

$$\frac{(q^5 - q^2)(q + 1)}{q^2 + q + 1} = q^4 - q^2$$

irreducible conics that are tangent to a fixed line, in particular to the line L .

To prove (h), one takes the number $q^5 - q^2$ of all irreducible conics in \mathbb{P}_q^2 , and subtracts it by the numbers of conics from (f) and (g). The number $q^5 - q^2$ is obtained by first calculating the number of collections of 5 points in \mathbb{P}_q^2 , no 3 of which are collinear, and then dividing this number by $\binom{q+1}{5}$. \square

Corollary 9. (a) For $q \geq 3$, the first weight spectrum of C_q is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{q^2-2q}^{(1)} &= \frac{q(q^2-1)}{2}, & A_{q^2-q+1}^{(1)} &= \frac{q^3(q^2-1)}{2}, \\ A_{q^2-2q+1}^{(1)} &= \frac{q^4+q^3}{2}, & A_{q^2-1}^{(1)} &= \frac{q^4-q^3}{2}, \\ A_{q^2-q-1}^{(1)} &= \frac{q^3(q-1)^2}{2}, & A_{q^2}^{(1)} &= \frac{q^3-q+2}{2}, \\ A_{q^2-q}^{(1)} &= q^4+q^2+2q, & A_w^{(1)} &= 0, \text{ for all other } w. \end{aligned}$$

(b) For $q = 2$, we have:

$$A_1^{(1)} = 4, \quad A_2^{(1)} = 6, \quad A_3^{(1)} = 4, \quad A_4^{(1)} = 1, \quad \text{and } A_w^{(1)} = 0 \text{ for all other } w.$$

Proof. From Proposition 8, we see that the number of zeros in \mathbb{P}_q^2 of a conic in \mathbb{P}_q^2 can be 0, 1, $q-1$, q , $q+1$, $2q-1$ or $2q$. When $q \geq 3$, these values are pairwise distinct and also different from q^2 . This readily yields the assertions in (a). [For instance, parts 1(b), 2(c) and 3(g) of Proposition 8 show that $A_{q^2-q}^{(1)} = (q^2+q) + (q^2+q) + q^2(q^2-1) = q^4 + q^2 + 2q$.] When $q = 2$, it suffices to note that $C_2 = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$, and moreover, for any positive integer w ,

$$A_w^{(1)} = |\{\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbb{F}_2)^4 : \text{wt}(\mathbf{w}) = w\}|.$$

Thus the result in (b) follows from a straightforward counting. \square

Remark 10. If we had to use Proposition 8 when $q = 2$, then our definition of C_2 would require us to consider restricted class of conics given by nonzero homogeneous polynomials of degree 2 in 3 variables with no term in xz or yz . Thus we would need a variant of Proposition 8 for such conics. But it is much simpler to argue directly by observing that $C_2 = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$.

Remark 11. The preceding proposition and corollary are included for completeness, and in order to give an overview for later use. A result equivalent to Corollary 9 is given in [20, Proposition 2.12]. Also, in [20, Lemma 4.3/Theorem 4.4], results are given that can be used to deduce our formulas for $A_w^{(2)}$. But as far as we know, there is no prior determination of general formulas for the $A_w^{(r)}$ for $r \geq 3$ and $q \geq 7$.

We now embark on an analysis of codewords that have an inclusion-minimal support. This is equivalent to studying which of the conics listed above have inclusion-maximal zero sets in \mathbb{A}_q^2 over \mathbb{F}_q . This analysis has no implication for the determination of the $A_w^{(1)}$, but the results will be useful for calculating the $A_w^{(r)}$, with $r \geq 2$, using the methods of Section 4.

Proposition 12. For $q \geq 7$, the inclusion-maximal zero sets of conics in \mathbb{A}_q^2 over \mathbb{F}_q are precisely those listed in (e), (d), (h), (g), and (f) of Proposition 8, with $2q$, $2q-1$, $q+1$, q , and $q-1$ zeros each, respectively.

Proof. The zero sets of the conics in Proposition 8(a), (b), (i), and (j) (namely, \emptyset , a line, a point, and \emptyset) are properly contained in zero sets of some other conics, e.g., those in Proposition 8(e); so these are not inclusion-maximal. The zero sets of type (e) in Proposition 8 are cardinality-maximal and therefore inclusion-maximal. Moreover, since $q \geq 7$, the zero sets of type (d) in Proposition 8 are also inclusion-maximal, since q points on each line determine that line uniquely, and a line pair

of intersecting lines cannot then be contained in any other line pair, in particular not in one consisting of parallel lines, like in Proposition 8(e).

It remains to study the irreducible conics in Proposition 8(f), (g), (h). The most “critical” one is type (f), which has only $q - 1$ points in its zero set in \mathbb{A}_q^2 . But for $q \geq 7$, we have $q - 1 \geq 6$. These 6 points cannot be contained in a line pair. If it were so, then one of these lines must contain at least 3 points. By Bezout’s theorem the conic, taken from (f), must then be reducible, which it isn’t. Hence, the conics from Proposition 8(f) are not contained in line pairs from Proposition 8(d) and (e). The same argument applies to the conics from Proposition 8(g) and (h); so neither of them are contained in line pairs from Proposition 8(d) and (e). Since the conics from Proposition 8(h) are cardinality-maximal among those conics that are not line pairs, it is now clear that they are inclusion-maximal also. But it is also clear that the conics from Proposition 8(g) cannot be contained in conics from (h), and that the conics from Proposition 8(f) cannot be contained in the conics from (g) or (h). This is because all irreducible conics, which we treat here, have at least 5 (in fact 6) \mathbb{F}_q -rational points in \mathbb{A}_q^2 , and 5 points on an irreducible conic always define the conic uniquely. Moreover, two of them intersect in at most 4 points by Bezout’s theorem. This gives the conclusion. \square

The techniques of the proof above also give:

Corollary 13. *Suppose q is a prime power with $q < 7$.*

- (a) *For $q = 5$, the inclusion-maximal zero sets of conics in \mathbb{A}_q^2 over \mathbb{F}_q are precisely those listed in Proposition 8(e), (d), (h), and (g) with $2q$, $2q - 1$, $q + 1$, and q zeros each, respectively.*
- (b) *For $q = 4$, the inclusion-maximal zero sets of conics in \mathbb{A}_q^2 over \mathbb{F}_q are precisely those listed in Proposition 8(e), (d), (h) with $2q$, $2q - 1$, $q + 1$ zeros each, respectively.*
- (c) *For $q = 3$, the inclusion-maximal zero sets of conics in \mathbb{A}_q^2 over \mathbb{F}_q are precisely those listed in Proposition 8(e) and (d), with $2q$ and $2q - 1$ zeros each, respectively.*
- (d) *For $q = 2$, the zero set of conics in Proposition 8(e) is all of \mathbb{A}_q^2 , which then gives rise to the zero codeword, while the conics in Proposition 8(d), (h) give zero sets of cardinality $2q - 1 = q + 1 = n - 1 = 3$, which are maximal among those not giving the whole plane. Hence they give inclusion-minimal non-zero codewords. None of the other types give zero sets that are maximal among those not giving the whole plane.*

Proof. For $q = 5$, the $q - 1 = 4$ points in Proposition 8(f) are contained in a line pair. Also, for $q = 4$, the $q = 4$ points in Proposition 8(g) are contained in a line pair. Likewise, for $q = 3$, the $q + 1 = 4$ points in Proposition 8(h) are contained in a line pair. For $q = 2$, the assertions in (d) are obvious. \square

4. MATROIDS

In this section, we shall review some basic facts about matroids, and highlight their connections with linear codes and Betti numbers of associated Stanley-Reisner rings. Much of this section is similar to the corresponding one in [13]. Throughout this section, we let E denote a finite set. We begin with one of the several equivalent definitions of the basic notion of a matroid.

Definition 14. A (finite) *matroid* M on the finite ground set E is an ordered pair (E, \mathcal{I}) , where \mathcal{I} is a collection of subsets of E having the following properties:

1. $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$.
2. If $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I_2 \subseteq I_1$, then $I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$.
3. If $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|I_1| < |I_2|$, then there exists an element $y \in I_2 \setminus I_1$ such that $I_1 \cup \{y\} \in \mathcal{I}$.

The subsets of E that are elements of \mathcal{I} , are called *independent sets* of the matroid M . A subset of E that is not independent is called a *dependent set*. An inclusion-maximal set in \mathcal{I} is called a *basis* of the matroid M . The third property in Definition 14 implies that any two bases of a matroid have the same cardinality.

Definition 15. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid on E .

- Given any subset σ of E , the *rank* of σ , denoted $r(\sigma)$, is the largest cardinality of an independent set contained in σ , while the *nullity* of σ is $n(\sigma) = |\sigma| - r(\sigma)$. We write $\text{rk}(M) = r(E)$ and call it the *rank* of M . It is not difficult to see that $0 \leq n(\sigma) \leq |E| - \text{rk}(M)$ for any $\sigma \subseteq E$.
- Given any subset σ of E , if we let $\mathcal{I}_\sigma = \{\tau \in \mathcal{I} : \tau \subseteq \sigma\}$, then (E, \mathcal{I}_σ) is a matroid, which is denoted by M_σ and called the *restriction* of M to σ .
- A *circuit* of M is a minimal dependent set of M .
- For each integer $i = 0, \dots, |E| - \text{rk}(M)$, we let

$$N_i = \{\sigma : \sigma \subseteq E \text{ and } n(\sigma) = i\} \quad \text{and} \quad d_i(M) = \min\{|\sigma| : \sigma \in N_i\}.$$

We may call $d_i(M)$ the i -th *generalized Hamming weight* of M .

We remark that the rank and nullity functions in a matroid $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ satisfy the following basic property for any subsets σ, τ of E .

$$r(\sigma \cup \tau) + r(\sigma \cap \tau) \leq r(\sigma) + r(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad n(\sigma \cup \tau) + n(\sigma \cap \tau) \geq n(\sigma) + n(\tau).$$

In particular, taking $\tau = E \setminus \sigma$, we obtain $0 \leq n(\sigma) \leq |E| - \text{rk}(M)$ for any $\sigma \subseteq E$.

Definition 16. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid on E . If we let \mathcal{I}^* denote the collection of subsets J of E such that $J \cap B = \emptyset$ for some basis B of M , then $M^* = (E, \mathcal{I}^*)$ is a matroid of rank $|E| - \text{rk}(M)$ and it is called the *dual* of M . It can be shown that the rank function of M^* , denoted by r^* , is given by

$$r^*(\sigma) = r(E \setminus \sigma) + |\sigma| - r(E) \quad \text{for any } \sigma \subseteq E. \quad (1)$$

Example 17. Given any positive integers s, n with $s \leq n$, let $U(s, n)$ be the corresponding *uniform matroid*, namely, (E, \mathcal{I}) , where $E = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and \mathcal{I} consists of all subsets σ of E such that $|\sigma| \leq s$. Clearly, $U(s, n) = (E, \mathcal{I})$ is a matroid with $\text{rk}(U(s, n)) = s$ and $d_i(U(s, n)) = s + i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - s$. Also, it is easy to see that the dual of $U(s, n)$ is $U(n - s, n)$.

Example 18. Let C is a linear $[n, k]_q$ -code and let H be a parity check matrix of C . Suppose M is the *vector matroid* corresponding to H , i.e., $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$, where $E = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and \mathcal{I} consists of subsets σ of E such that the columns of H indexed by σ are linearly independent. Then M is a matroid with $\text{rk}(M) = n - k$ and $d_i(C) = d_i(M_C)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ (see e.g. [12]). The matroid M is independent of the choice of a parity check matrix of C , and we may denote it by M_C and call it the *parity check matroid* of C . It is easy to see that the dual of M_C is the vector matroid corresponding to a generator matrix of C .

One way to construct new matroids from a given matroid is to consider its elongations, which are defined as follows. We will see later that these elongations are an important tool in order to find the higher weight spectra.

Definition 19. Let $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid on E and let ℓ be a nonnegative integer. Define $M^{(\ell)} = (E, \mathcal{I}^{(\ell)})$, where

$$\mathcal{I}^{(\ell)} = \{I \cup \sigma : I \in \mathcal{I} \text{ and } \sigma \subseteq E \text{ with } |\sigma| \leq \ell\}.$$

Then $M^{(\ell)}$ is a matroid on E and it is called the ℓ -th elongation matroid of M .

We note that if M and ℓ are as in Definition 19, then $M^{(0)} = M$, whereas if $\ell \geq |E| - \text{rk}(M)$, then $M^{(\ell)}$ is the trivial matroid on E in which every subset of E is independent. Also, the rank and nullity functions $r^{(\ell)}, n^{(\ell)}$ on $M^{(\ell)}$ are given by

$$r^{(\ell)}(\sigma) = \begin{cases} r(\sigma) + \ell & \text{if } r(\sigma) + \ell \leq |\sigma|, \\ |\sigma| & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad n^{(\ell)}(\sigma) = \begin{cases} n(\sigma) - \ell & \text{if } n(\sigma) \geq \ell, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\text{rk}(M^{(\ell)}) = \min(|E|, \ell + \text{rk}(M))$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(\ell)} = \{\sigma \subseteq E : n(\sigma) \leq \ell\}$.

Example 20. If $M = U(s, n)$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq n - s$, then $M^{(\ell)} = U(s + \ell, n)$.

We now fix the notation and terminology for the matroid associated to the code that we are interested in.

Definition 21. Let $E_q = \{1, 2, \dots, q^2\}$ and let $M_q = (E_q, \mathcal{I}_q)$ be the parity check matroid of the Reed-Muller code $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$. We may identify E_q with \mathbb{A}_q^2 , for a fixed ordering of the points of the affine plane.

Next, we review some basic facts about (abstract) simplicial complexes and their Stanley-Reisner rings. We will also state some useful properties of simplicial complexes arising from matroids.

Let Δ be a simplicial complex on E (which means Δ is a collection of subsets of E such that if $\sigma \in \Delta$ and $\tau \subseteq \sigma$, then $\tau \in \Delta$). The elements of Δ are called *faces*, and maximal elements under inclusion are called *facets*. If for each nonnegative integer i , we let f_i denote the number of faces of Δ of cardinality i , then the alternating sum $\sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^{i+1} f_i$ is called the *Euler characteristic* of Δ and denoted by $\chi(\Delta)$. If E is nonempty, then one may use the alternative expression $\chi(\Delta) = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i D_i$, where D_i is the number of dependent sets of cardinality i contained in E , i.e., $D_i = |\{\tau \subseteq E : |\tau| = i \text{ and } \tau \notin \Delta\}|$. This is because if $E \neq \emptyset$, then $|E| \geq 1$ and

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i D_i - \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^{i+1} f_i = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i (D_i + f_i) = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i \binom{|E|}{i} = (1-1)^{|E|} = 0.$$

Note that if $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ is a matroid on E , then the collection \mathcal{I} of independent sets for M forms a simplicial complex, called a *matroid complex*; the Euler characteristic of this simplicial complex may be denoted by $\chi(M)$ rather than $\chi(\mathcal{I})$.

Now let us fix a field \mathbb{k} and let S be the polynomial ring over \mathbb{k} in $|E|$ indeterminates indexed by E , say $\{X_e : e \in E\}$. The *Stanley-Reisner ideal* I_Δ of Δ is the ideal of S generated by the monomials corresponding to non-faces, i.e.,

$$I_\Delta = \langle \mathbf{x}^\sigma : \sigma \subseteq E \text{ and } \sigma \notin \Delta \rangle, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{x}^\sigma = \prod_{e \in \sigma} X_e \text{ for any } \sigma \subseteq E.$$

The *Stanley-Reisner ring* of Δ is $R_\Delta = S/I_\Delta$. We denote by \mathbb{N}^E the set of all ordered tuples of nonnegative integers indexed by the elements of E . Likewise,

by $\{0, 1\}^E$ we denote the set of all ordered tuples indexed by E of elements from $\{0, 1\}$. Note that $\{0, 1\}^E$ can (and will) be identified with the set of all subsets of E . Now I_Δ is a monomial ideal of S and thus R_Δ is a \mathbb{N}^E -graded finitely generated S -module. As such it has a minimal free resolution of the form

$$0 \longleftarrow R_\Delta \xleftarrow{\partial_0} S_0 \xleftarrow{\partial_1} S_1 \longleftarrow \cdots \xleftarrow{\partial_l} S_l \longleftarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

where each S_i is a \mathbb{N}^E -graded free S -module of the form

$$S_i = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^E} S(-\alpha)^{\beta_{i,\alpha}}.$$

Here $\beta_{i,\alpha}$ are independent of the choice of the minimal free resolution and they are called the \mathbb{N}^E -graded Betti numbers of Δ . It can be seen that $\beta_{i,\alpha} = 0$ if $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^E - \{0, 1\}^E$. Thus in the direct sum above, one can restrict α to elements of $\{0, 1\}^E$, or equivalently, subsets of E . For any nonnegative integers d and i , we let

$$\beta_{i,d} = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} \beta_{i,\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_i = \sum_{d \geq 0} \beta_{i,d}. \quad (3)$$

We call $\beta_{i,d}$ and β_i the \mathbb{N} -graded and ungraded Betti numbers of Δ respectively. The minimal free resolution (2) associated to R_Δ is said to be *pure* of type (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_l) if for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, l$, the Betti number $\beta_{i,j}$ is nonzero if and only if $j = d_i$.

The following two results, taken from [12], will be useful:

Theorem 22. *Let M be a matroid on E , and let $\Delta = \mathcal{I}$ be the simplicial complex on E formed by the set of independent sets of M .*

(a) *Let $\sigma \subseteq E$. Then the corresponding \mathbb{N}^E -graded Betti numbers of Δ satisfy:*

$$\beta_{i,\sigma} \neq 0 \iff \sigma \text{ is minimal in } N_i \quad (\text{for any } i \geq 0).$$

(b) *If $\sigma \in N_i$, then $\beta_{i,\sigma} = (-1)^{r(\sigma)-1} \chi(M_\sigma)$.*

(c) *If M is the matroid of a parity check matrix of a linear $[n, k]_q$ -code C , then $d_i(C) = \min\{j : \beta_{i,\sigma} \neq 0 \text{ for some } \sigma \subseteq E \text{ of cardinality } j\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

Corollary 23. *Let M be a matroid on E .*

(a) *Let $\sigma \subseteq E$. Then*

$$\beta_{0,\sigma} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma = \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{1,\sigma} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma \text{ is a circuit,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(b) *The resolution has length exactly $k = |E| - \text{rk}(M)$, that is: $N_k \neq \emptyset$, but $N_i = \emptyset$ for $i > k$.*

We also note a useful consequence of the above results for pure resolutions.

Corollary 24. *Suppose $|E| = n$ and M is a matroid on E of rank $n - k$. Let R_Δ be the Stanley-Reisner ring of the simplicial complex of independent sets in M .*

(a) *A minimal free resolution of R_Δ is pure of type (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_k) if and only if every minimal element of N_i has cardinality d_i , for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$.*

(b) *If a minimal free resolution of R_Δ is pure of type (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_k) , then for $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, every minimal free resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring of the simplicial complex of independent sets in $M^{(\ell)}$ is pure of type $(0, d_{\ell+1}, \dots, d_k)$.*

Proof. From (3) and part (a) of Theorem 22, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{a minimal free resolution of } R_\Delta \text{ is pure of type } (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_k) \\ \iff & |\sigma| = d_i \text{ whenever } \sigma \subseteq E \text{ is such that } \beta_{i,\sigma} \neq 0 \text{ (for any } i \geq 0) \\ \iff & \text{every minimal element of } N_i \text{ has cardinality } d_i \text{ (for any } i \geq 0). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (a). Observe that if the equivalent conditions in (a) hold, then $d_0 = 0$. Now (b) follows from (a) by noting that for any $0 \leq \ell \leq k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k - \ell$, the set $N_i^{(\ell)}$ of subsets of E whose nullity with respect to the ℓ -th elongation matroid $M^{(\ell)}$ is i , is precisely $N_{i+\ell}$. \square

We now recall a useful variant of a fundamental result from commutative algebra.

Proposition 25. *The \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers $\beta_{i,j}$ of the Stanley-Reisner ring $R_\Delta = S/I_\Delta$ of a simplicial complex Δ associated to a matroid of rank $n - k$ on a ground set with n elements satisfy the Boij-Söderberg equations:*

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^i j^s \beta_{i,j} = 0, \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, k-1. \quad (4)$$

In particular, if the minimal free resolutions of R_Δ are pure of type (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_k) , then (4) implies the Herzog-Kühl formula:

$$\beta_{i,d_i} = \beta_{0,d_0} \left| \prod_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq i}} \frac{d_j}{(d_j - d_i)} \right| \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (5)$$

Proof. From [3], it follows that the equations (4) hold if and only if R_Δ is Cohen-Macaulay. But it is well known that a matroid complex is shellable, and therefore the corresponding Stanley-Reisner ring R_Δ is Cohen-Macaulay. The formula in (5) follows from (4) using elementary linear algebra (see, e.g., [10]). \square

Here is a coarser form of \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers that will be useful for us.

Definition 26. For Δ and $\beta_{i,j}$ as in Proposition 25, we define $\phi_j = \phi_j(\Delta)$ by

$$\phi_j = \sum_{i=0}^k (-1)^i \beta_{i,j} \quad \text{for } j = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

We get a neater version of the equations in Proposition 25 if we express them with the ϕ_j . In other words, equations (4) can be rewritten as follows.

Corollary 27. *If Δ is as in Proposition 25 and $\phi_j = \phi_j(\Delta)$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$, then*

$$\sum_{j=0}^n j^s \phi_j = 0 \quad \text{for } s = 0, 1, \dots, k-1. \quad (6)$$

We may refer to the equations (4) as well as (6) as the *Boij-Söderberg equations*.

Remark 28. To obtain the generalized weight polynomials and the higher weight spectra of the code C_q , we only need to know the ϕ_j , and not necessarily the $\beta_{i,j}$, for M_q and its elongations. This can be an advantage sometimes, not least because (6) give us linearly independent equations (regarding ϕ_j as variables), which is not necessarily the case with the equations (4) (where one regards $\beta_{i,j}$ as variables).

Here are some more basic notions related to matroids and a useful relation with Betti numbers.

Definition 29. Let M be a matroid on E .

- A *cycle* of M is a subset of E which is inclusion minimal in N_i for some $i \geq 0$. The set of all cycles of M forms a lattice (with respect to the inclusion relation) and we denote it by L_M .
- The *Möbius function* of M , denoted $\mu = \mu_M$, is an integer valued function on L_M , which is defined recursively as follows.

$$\mu(\emptyset) = 1 \quad \text{and for } \sigma \in L_M \text{ with } \sigma \neq \emptyset, \quad \mu(\sigma) = - \sum_{\tau} \mu(\tau),$$

where the sum is taken over all $\tau \in L_M$ such that $\tau \subsetneq \sigma$.

We remark that the lattice L_M of cycles in a matroid M is opposite of the lattice of flats of the dual matroid M^* . The following relation with Betti numbers is well known. See, for example, [28] or [15].

Proposition 30. *Let M be a matroid on E . Then for $0 \leq i \leq |E| - \text{rk}(M)$,*

$$\beta_{i,\sigma} = |\mu(\sigma)| \quad \text{for any inclusion minimal element } \sigma \text{ of } N_i.$$

In particular, $\mu(\sigma) = -1$, and $\beta_{1,\sigma} = 1$ for every circuit σ in M .

With the technical tools above, we are well equipped to take up the first part of main step 1, sketched in the beginning of this section. In the next sections, we will find the \mathbb{N} -graded resolution and Betti numbers of the Stanley-Reisner rings associated to C_q . We see now that this can be done by identifying the minimal elements σ of each N_i , and by calculating $\beta_{i,\sigma} = (-1)^{r(\sigma)-1} \chi(M_\sigma)$ for each of them, and then summing up using the formula $\beta_{i,d} = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} \beta_{i,\alpha}$. If we are able to identify and find only a (large) part of the \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers, then Proposition 25 helps us to find the rest.

We end this section with a simple example of first order Reed-Muller code, and show how its higher weight spectra and the \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers of the Stanley-Reisner rings of its associated matroid as well as the elongations of this matroid can be computed. This is done partly as a warm up and partly to serve as a handy reference and also to highlight the fact mentioned in the Introduction that $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ is indeed the first nontrivial example of a q -ary Reed-Muller code whose higher weight spectra and Betti numbers are hitherto unknown.

Example 31. The Reed-Muller code $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ is obtained by evaluations of polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_m]$ of degree ≤ 1 at points of \mathbb{F}_q^m . This evaluation map is injective and thus $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ is a linear $[q^m, m+1]$ -code. Moreover, for $0 \leq i \leq m+1$, the i -dimensional subcodes of $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ correspond to the images of the \mathbb{F}_q -linear spans of i linearly independent linear polynomials, say f_1, \dots, f_i , in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_m]$. Consequently, the support of such an i -dimensional subcode is given by $\mathbb{F}_q^m \setminus Z(f_1, \dots, f_i)$, where $Z(f_1, \dots, f_i)$ denotes the set of common zeros in \mathbb{F}_q^m of f_1, \dots, f_i . Now $|Z(f_1, \dots, f_i)|$ is q^{m-i} or 0 according as the system $f_1 = \dots = f_i = 0$ of i linearly independent linear equations is consistent or inconsistent. Thus the higher weight spectra of $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ is as follows:

$$A_0^{(0)}(\text{RM}_q(1, m)) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad A_{q^m - q^{m-i}}^{(i)}(\text{RM}_q(1, m)) = q^i \begin{bmatrix} m \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq m,$$

and

$$A_{q^m}^{(i)}(\text{RM}_q(1, m)) = \begin{bmatrix} m+1 \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q - q^i \begin{bmatrix} m \\ i \end{bmatrix}_q = \begin{bmatrix} m \\ i-1 \end{bmatrix}_q \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m+1,$$

and all other $A_w^{(i)}(\text{RM}_q(1, m))$ are zero. This shows that

$$d_i(\text{RM}_q(1, m)) = q^m - q^{m-i} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad d_{m+1}(\text{RM}_q(1, m)) = q^m.$$

From [6, Theorem 4.1], we know that every \mathbb{N} -graded minimal free resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring associated to $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ is pure of type $(d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{m+1})$, where $d_i = d_i(\text{RM}_q(1, m))$ for $0 \leq i \leq m+1$. Further, by Corollary 24 (b) and the Herzog-Kühl formula (5), we see that for $0 \leq \ell \leq m+1$, the Betti numbers of the ℓ -th elongation of the matroid associated to $\text{RM}_q(1, m)$ are given by $\beta_{0,0}^{(\ell)} = 1$ and

$$\beta_{m+1-\ell, d_{m+1}}^{(\ell)} = \prod_{j=1+\ell}^m \left| \frac{d_j}{d_j - d_{m+1}} \right| = \prod_{j=1+\ell}^m \left(\frac{q^m - q^{m-j}}{q^{m-j}} \right) = \prod_{j=1+\ell}^m (q^j - 1)$$

and for $1 \leq i \leq m - \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{i, d_{i+\ell}}^{(\ell)} &= \prod_{\substack{j=1+\ell \\ j \neq i+\ell}}^{m+1} \left| \frac{d_j}{d_j - d_{i+\ell}} \right| = \left| \frac{q^m}{q^{m-i-\ell}} \right| \prod_{\substack{j=1+\ell \\ j \neq i+\ell}}^m \left| \frac{q^m - q^{m-j}}{q^{m-i-\ell} - q^{m-j}} \right| \\ &= q^{i+\ell} \prod_{j=1+\ell}^{i-1+\ell} \frac{q^{m-j}(q^j - 1)}{q^{m-i-\ell}(q^{i+\ell-j} - 1)} \prod_{j=i+1+\ell}^m \frac{q^{m-j}(q^j - 1)}{q^{m-j}(q^{j-i-\ell} - 1)} \\ &= q^{i+\ell} \prod_{j=1+\ell}^{i-1+\ell} \frac{q^{i+\ell-j}(q^j - 1)}{(q^{i+\ell-j} - 1)} \prod_{j=i+1+\ell}^m \frac{(q^j - 1)}{(q^{j-i-\ell} - 1)} \\ &= q^{\frac{i(i+1)}{2} + \ell} \prod_{j=1+\ell}^{i-1+\ell} \frac{(q^j - 1)}{(q^{i+\ell-j} - 1)} \prod_{j=1+\ell}^{m-i} \frac{(q^{i+j} - 1)}{(q^{j-\ell} - 1)} \end{aligned}$$

and all other $\beta_{i,j}^{(\ell)}$ are zero.

5. IDENTIFYING THE MINIMAL SETS OF N_i , FOR $i = 1, \dots, 6$

In this section, we consider the matroid $M_q = (E_q, \mathcal{I}_q)$ corresponding to the Reed-Muller code $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$, where $E_q = \{1, \dots, q^2\}$. We may denote E_q simply by E in this section, and we may tacitly identify E with \mathbb{A}_q^2 . We will denote by r and n the rank function and the nullity function of M_q , respectively. The sets N_i , as in Definition 15 will be the ones corresponding to the matroid M_q . Our aim is to find an \mathbb{N} -graded minimal free resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring associated to \mathcal{I}_q . To this end, it is clear from Theorem 22 that it would be useful to find the inclusion-minimal sets of N_i , for $i = 1, \dots, 6$, since the local contributions $\beta_{i,\sigma}$ to the Betti numbers $\beta_{i,j}$ come from inclusion-minimal members of N_i , of cardinality j . A crucial result for identifying members of N_i in general, and the inclusion-minimal ones in particular, is the following.

Lemma 32. *Assume that $q \geq 3$. Then the nullity of any $\sigma \subseteq E$ is equal to the \mathbb{F}_q -vector space dimension of the space of affine conics in \mathbb{A}_q^2 passing through $E \setminus \sigma$. More precisely,*

$$n(\sigma) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \{f \in \mathbb{F}_q[x, y]_{\leq 2} : f(P) = 0 \text{ for all } P \in E \setminus \sigma\},$$

where $\mathbb{F}_q[x, y]_{\leq 2}$ denotes the space of polynomials in two variables of degree at most 2 with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_q .

Proof. The dual matroid of M_q is the vector matroid corresponding to a generator matrix, say G_q of C_q . Let r^* denotes the rank function of this dual matroid and let $\sigma \subseteq E$. Then in view of (1), we see that

$$n(\sigma) = |\sigma| - r(\sigma) = r^*(E) - r^*(E \setminus \sigma) = \text{rank}(G_q) - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \langle G_q^j : j \in E \setminus \sigma \rangle,$$

where G_q^j denotes the j -th column of G_q . Since $q \geq 3$, we must have

$$\text{rank}(G_q) = \dim C_q = 6 = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathbb{F}_q[x, y]_{\leq 2}.$$

Also, the space $\langle G_q^j : j \in E \setminus \sigma \rangle$ spanned by the columns of G_q indexed by the elements of $E \setminus \sigma$ can be viewed as the image of the projection map, say π , that sends a codeword $(c_j)_{j \in E}$ of C_q to $(c_j)_{j \in E \setminus \sigma}$. Hence the Rank-Nullity Theorem shows that $n(\sigma)$ is the dimension of the kernel of π . Since $q \geq 3$, each codeword c of C_q corresponds to a unique $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[x, y]_{\leq 2}$ with $c = (f(P))_{P \in E}$. So the kernel of π can be identified with the space $\{f \in \mathbb{F}_q[x, y]_{\leq 2} : f(P) = 0 \text{ for all } P \in E \setminus \sigma\}$. This proves the lemma. \square

We are now ready to give our important theorem which categories and counts the minimal element of N_i for all $1 \leq i \leq q^2$.

Theorem 33. *The matroid M_q satisfies:*

- (a) *For $q \geq 7$, the minimal elements of N_1 are the complements of those listed in Proposition 12. For $2 \leq q \leq 5$, the minimal subsets of N_1 are the complements of those listed in Corollary 9. For all $q \geq 2$, these sets are described in detail in Proposition 8.*
- (b) *Assume that $q \geq 3$.*
The minimal elements of N_2 are (all the) the $(q^2 + q)(q^2 - q)$ complements of $\{\text{all } q \text{ points on a line}\} \cup \{\text{an additional point}\}$, and (all the) the $q^2(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)/24$ complements of “quadrilaterals” (four points such that no three of them are collinear).
The minimal elements of N_3 are (all the) the $q^2 + q$ complements of q points on a line, and the $q^2(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)/6$ complements of (all the) the “triangles” (three non-collinear points).
The minimal elements of N_4 are (all the) the $\binom{q^2}{2}$ complements of point pairs.
The minimal elements of N_5 are (all the) the q^2 complements of a single point.
The only (minimal) element of N_6 is E .
- (c) *For $q = 2$, the inclusion minimal elements of N_i , for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 4$ are the subsets of $(\mathbb{F}_2)^2$ of cardinality i .*

Proof. (a) This follows by Proposition 12 and Corollary 9.

(b) Assume that $q \geq 4$. We first determine minimal sets of N_2 . All sets σ of cardinality at most $q^2 - q - 2$ is the complement of a set of cardinality at least $q + 2$, which, in case it lies on a conic, must lie on a line pair, which it defines uniquely. Hence the nullity of σ is 0 or 1.

Let $E \setminus \sigma$ of cardinality $q + 1$ be such that it lies on a conic (a necessary condition for σ to have positive nullity, by Lemma 32). If it lies on an irreducible conic, it cannot lie on any other conic by Bezout’s theorem, since $q + 1 \geq 8 > 2 \times 2 = 4$.

Thus $n(\sigma) = 1$, by Lemma 32. Hence a necessary condition for σ to have nullity 2 is that $E \setminus \sigma$ lies on a line pair, which it does not define uniquely. If there are at least 2 points from $E \setminus \sigma$ on each line in such a pair, then the lines are indeed defined uniquely. Hence the only possibility for σ to have nullity at least 2 is that $E \setminus \sigma$ consists of all q points on the line, and 1 point outside the line. In that case it indeed has nullity exactly 2. Moreover, if we add one point to $E \setminus \sigma$, then the other line of a line pair containing the extended set, is also defined uniquely, so the nullity of its complement, strictly contained in σ is 1. Hence σ is minimal in N_2 . There are clearly $(q^2 + q)(q^2 - q)$ choices of such pairs of a line and a point outside the line, and therefore of such minimal σ of cardinality $q^2 - q - 1$.

Now consider any $E \setminus \sigma$, such that its cardinality satisfies $5 \leq |E \setminus \sigma| \leq q$ (or $q^2 - q \leq |\sigma| \leq q^2 - 5$ if one prefers), and such that $E \setminus \sigma$ lies on a conic. If $E \setminus \sigma$ lies on an irreducible conic, then $n(\sigma) = 1$, since $E \setminus \sigma$ cannot lie on two conics, by Bezout's theorem. If $E \setminus \sigma$ lies on a line, then $n(\sigma) = 3$ by Lemma 32, a case which will be studied later. If $E \setminus \sigma$ lies on a line pair, then $n(\sigma) = 1$ if the line pair is defined uniquely, so this case can be excluded. This implies that all but one of the points in $E \setminus \sigma$ are on one of the lines of the line pair, while the last point is outside it. But then, since $|E \setminus \sigma| < q + 1$, this $E \setminus \sigma$ is strictly contained in the set of *all* points on the line, and the given point outside it, a complement of a set with nullity 2, which we found above. Hence σ is not minimal in N_2 .

If $|E \setminus \sigma| = 4$, all arguments are the same as in the case $5 \leq |E \setminus \sigma| \leq q$, except in the case when $E \setminus \sigma$ lies on an irreducible cubic. In this case, $n(\sigma) = 2$. Indeed, we can not have all 4 points, and not even 3 of them, on a line, by Bezout's theorem, and since 5 points determines the conic uniquely, the 4 points must impose 4 independent conditions on the 6-dimensional affine system of conics. Hence we conclude that with $E \setminus \sigma$ being 4 points, no 3 of which are on a line, $n(\sigma) = 2$. Now to check minimality, remove a point from σ , i.e. add a fifth point to $E \setminus \sigma$. It is clear that passing through these 5 points give 5 independent conditions on conics: If a line pair contains them, we must have 3 of them on a line, and no irreducible conic contains them, and the line pair is uniquely determined since there are no 4 points on one line. If no line pair contains them, then it also holds that two irreducible conics cannot contain them, by Bezout's theorem again. Hence σ is a minimal set in N_2 . There are $\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)(q^2-3q+3)}{24}$ choices of such quadrilaterals $E \setminus \sigma$, and therefore of such minimal σ .

If $|E \setminus \sigma| \leq 3$ i.e. $\sigma \geq q^2 - 3$, we utilize the fact that $r(E) = q^2 - 6$ to conclude $n(\sigma) = |\sigma| - r(\sigma) \geq |\sigma| - r(E) \geq (q^2 - 3) - (q^2 - 6) = 3$. Thus σ cannot be in N_2 . This settles the N_2 -part of the proof.

Let us determine the inclusion-minimal elements of N_3 . Note that the nullity of σ is at most 2 if $E \setminus \sigma$ is of cardinality at least $q + 1$, as we saw in the analysis of the N_2 -case above. On the other hand, if $E \setminus \sigma$ has q points on a line, then $n(\sigma) = 3$ by Lemma 32. Since adding a point to $E \setminus \sigma$ reduces the nullity of σ to 2, the set σ of the complement of the q points on the line is indeed minimal in N_3 . There are $q^2 + q$ such lines in \mathbb{A}_q^2 .

Let $4 \leq |E \setminus \sigma| \leq q - 1$. If $E \setminus \sigma$ is on a line, then σ cannot be minimal in N_3 . This is because it (although having nullity 3) is strictly contained in the set of *all* points on the line, which we have seen is the complement of a set in N_3 . If the points of $E \setminus \sigma$ are not on a line, then they impose at least 4 independent conditions on conics, and $n(\sigma) \leq 2$, as we saw in the analysis in the N_2 -case (3, but not 4 points

on a line give a fixed line and a line through a fixed point, while a configuration of 4 points, no three of them on a line, also give 4 independent conditions on conics, as we saw above).

If $|E \setminus \sigma| \leq 2$, then $n(\sigma) \geq |\sigma| - r(E) \geq (q^2 - 2) - (q^2 - 6) = 4$. Thus the only case remains to be studied is $|E \setminus \sigma| = 3$. Since 3 points always impose independent conditions on conics, we have $n(\sigma) = 3$, regardless of the condition that these 3 points are collinear or not. But if they are collinear, they are contained in the set of q points on a line, a set which is the complement of a set of nullity 3, as we saw above. Hence σ is not minimal in N_3 in this case. But the complement σ of a set $E \setminus \sigma$ of 3 non-collinear points both has nullity 3 and is minimal in N_3 , since, as we have seen, we add a fourth point, we get 4 independent conditions on conics. Clearly, there are $\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)}{6}$ choices of $E \setminus \sigma$, and therefore of σ .

Since we have $n(\sigma) = 3$, for all sets σ of cardinality $q^2 - 3$, and nullity 6 for E , we must have nullity $6 - i$ for all sets of cardinality $q^2 - i$, for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. This implies that all sets of cardinality $q^2 - i$ are minimal in N_{6-i} , for $i = 0, 1, 2$, and that there are no other (minimal) sets σ than these ones of these nullities. Clearly then, there are $\binom{q^2}{2}$ minimal sets in N_4 , there are q^2 minimal sets in N_5 , and one minimal set, viz., E , in N_6 .

Now assume that $q = 3$. Let $\sigma \subseteq E$. If $|E \setminus \sigma| \geq q + 2 = 5$, the same argument as above shows that $n(E \setminus \sigma) = 1$. If $|E \setminus \sigma| = q + 1 = 4$, then $E \setminus \sigma$ will be a set of 4 points with either no 3 of which are collinear, or 3 points on one line and 1 point outside the line. Note that the case of all 4 points on one line is not possible since a line in \mathbb{A}_q^2 has exactly $q = 3$ points. One can prove that σ in both the cases are of nullity 2 and are also minimal in N_2 , with the proof following along the same lines as that in the case of $q \geq 4$, and hence the same number of such configurations. For $|E \setminus \sigma| \leq q = 3$, the same arguments work to obtain the inclusion-minimal sets of nullity i , where $i \geq 2$, and hence the number of configurations.

(c) This is trivial, since M_2 is the uniform matroid $U(0, 4)$. \square

Remark 34. One observes that for $q = 3$ the minimal sets of nullity 2 are simply the complements of any set of 4 points. Moreover, the minimal sets of nullity 3 are simply the complements of any set of 3 points, so sets of the same nullity i have the same cardinality, whenever $i \geq 2$ in this case. For $q \geq 4$ we get two different cardinalities $q^2 - q - 1$ and $q^2 - 4$ for minimal elements of N_2 , and two different cardinalities $q^2 - q$ and $q^2 - 3$ for minimal elements of N_3 (and at least 3 different cardinalities for minimal elements of N_1).

6. MINIMAL FREE RESOLUTIONS FOR M_q

In this section we assume $q \geq 7$. We will return to the cases $q \leq 5$ in Section 9.

Proposition 35. *Assume that $q \geq 7$. For $0 \leq j \leq q^2$, the nonzero \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers $\beta_{1,j}$ of C_q are as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{1,q^2-q+1} &= \frac{q^3(q^2-1)}{2}, & \beta_{1,q^2-2q+1} &= \frac{q^4+q^3}{2}, \\ \beta_{1,q^2-q} &= q^4 - q^2, & \beta_{1,q^2-2q} &= \frac{q^3-q}{2}. \\ \beta_{1,q^2-q-1} &= \frac{q^3(q-1)^2}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Follows from Corollary 23 and Theorem 33(a). \square

At the moment, either using the direct analysis in Proposition 12 and Theorem 33, or the results in the appendix, we may conclude that (for $q \geq 7$) a minimal resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring for the matroid M_q is

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \longleftarrow R_\Delta \xleftarrow{\partial_0} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1} S(-q^2 + q - 1)^{\frac{q^3(q^2-1)}{2}} \oplus S(-q^2 + q)^{q^4 - q^2} \oplus \\
\oplus S(-q^2 + q + 1)^{\frac{q^3(q-1)^2}{2}} \oplus S(-q^2 + 2q - 1)^{\frac{q^4 + q^3}{2}} \oplus S(-q^2 + 2q)^{\frac{q^3 - q}{2}} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_2} S(-q^2 + q + 1)^{(q^4 - q^2)\beta_{2,\theta}} \oplus S(-q^2 + 4)^{\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)(q^2-3q+3)}{24}\beta_{2,\gamma}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3} \\
S(-q^2 + q)^{(q^2+q)\beta_{3,\alpha}} \oplus S(-q^2 + 3)^{\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)}{6}\beta_{3,\delta}} \xleftarrow{\partial_4} S(-q^2 + 2)^{\binom{q^2}{2}\beta_{4,\epsilon}} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_5} S(-q^2 + 1)^{q^2\beta_{5,\omega}} \xleftarrow{\partial_6} S(-q^2)^{\beta_{6,E}} \longleftarrow 0. \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\theta, \gamma, \alpha, \delta, \epsilon$, and ω are complements of the union of a line and a point outside it, 4 points such that no 3 of them are collinear, a line, 3 non-collinear points, a point pair, and a point, respectively.

Remark 36. Following parts (a) and (c) of Theorem 22, the least possible size of the minimal elements of N_i give the generalized Hamming weights $d_i = d_i(C_q)$ for $1 \leq i \leq \dim C_q$. Thus we see from Theorem 33 that for $q \geq 3$, the generalized Hamming weights $d_i = d_i(C_q)$ are given as follows.

$$d_1 = q^2 - 2q, \quad d_2 = q^2 - q - 1, \quad d_3 = q^2 - q, \quad d_4 = q^2 - 2, \quad d_5 = q^2 - 1, \quad d_6 = q^2.$$

Such generalized Hamming weights were found for all Reed-Muller codes by Heijnen and Pellikaan [7]; so this is just a special case of the result of that work.

There are 7 unknown (so far) entities in the minimal free resolution above:

$$\beta_{2,\theta}, \beta_{2,\gamma}, \beta_{3,\alpha}, \beta_{3,\delta}, \beta_{4,\epsilon}, \beta_{5,\omega}, \beta_{6,E},$$

or, if one prefers,

$$\beta_{2,q^2-q-1}, \beta_{2,q^2-4}, \beta_{3,q^2-q}, \beta_{3,q^2-3}, \beta_{4,q^2-2}, \beta_{5,q^2-1}, \beta_{6,q^2}.$$

The equations of Proposition 25 and Corollary 27 only give 6 independent equations. Hence we need to find at least one more $\beta_{i,j}$ using other methods.

Lemma 37. $\beta_{2,\theta} = q$, where θ is the complement of the union of a line and a point outside the line.

Proof. Method 1: Let θ be the complement of a line, say L , and a point outside it, say P , of cardinality $q^2 - q - 1$. Then all the codewords with support in θ have support in complements of line pairs and hence each dependent set contained in θ are contained in the complements of a line pair). This holds, since the only conics containing $E \setminus \theta$ are line pairs, and these line pairs even have one line fixed, the one contained in $E \setminus \theta$. Moreover, if $E \setminus \theta$ is strictly contained in a set which is contained in a line pair, then the line pair containing this set is uniquely determined, since it contains 2 points outside L . Now by Theorem 22(b),

$$\beta_{2,\theta} = |\chi(M_\theta)| = \left| \sum_{i=0}^{|\theta|} (-1)^i D_i \right|,$$

where D_i is the number of dependent sets of cardinality i , contained in θ . In our case, $D_{q^2-q-1} = 1$, since $|\theta| = q^2 - q - 1$, and θ is dependent. There are $q + 1$ line pairs containing $E \setminus \theta$, and for q of them, those with a line through P not parallel to L , it is possible to “fill in” s extra points, for $s = 1, \dots, q - 2$. This gives $\binom{q-2}{s}$ choices of dependent sets of cardinality $q^2 - q - 1 - s$ for each of the q line pairs. For the single line through P , parallel to L , it is possible to “fill in” s extra points, for $s = 1, \dots, q - 1$. This gives $\binom{q-1}{s}$ choices of dependent sets of cardinality $q^2 - q - 1 - s$. No other sets, than the ones obtained this way, are contained in a conic, and contains $E \setminus \theta$. Hence their complements constitute all dependent sets contained in θ . We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_{2,\theta}| &= |\chi(M_\theta)| \\ &= \left| (D_{q^2-q-1} + q \sum_{s=1}^{q-2} (-1)^s \binom{q-2}{s}) + \sum_{s=1}^{q-1} (-1)^s \binom{q-1}{s} \right| \\ &= \left| 1 + q \sum_{s=0}^{q-2} (-1)^s \binom{q-2}{s} - q + \sum_{s=0}^{q-1} (-1)^s \binom{q-1}{s} - 1 \right| \\ &= |1 - q - 1| = q, \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Method 2: We use Proposition 30 to find this graded Betti number. Let $E \setminus \theta$ be the union of a line L and a point P outside it, as above. Here $n(\theta) = 2$ and $|\theta| = q^2 - q - 1$. Thus the circuits contained in θ are the complements of the $q + 1$ line pairs consisting of L and a line through P (regardless of whether or not this line is parallel to L). Proposition 30 and the recursion for μ then gives: $\beta_{2,\theta} = |-(q+1) + 1| = q$, and consequently $\beta_{2,q^2-q-1} = q(q^4 - q^2) = q^5 - q^3$. \square

Corollary 38. *Assume that $q \geq 7$. For $0 \leq j \leq q^2$, the nonzero \mathbb{N} -graded Betti-numbers $\beta_{i,j}$ for $i \geq 2$, are*

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{2,q^2-q-1} &= q^5 - q^3, & \beta_{2,q^2-4} &= \frac{q^9 - 4q^8 + 5q^7 + q^6 - 6q^5 + 3q^4}{24}, \\ \beta_{3,q^2-q} &= q^5 - q^4 - 3q^3 + q^2 + 2q, & \beta_{3,q^2-3} &= \frac{q^9 - 5q^8 + 8q^7 - 9q^5 + 5q^4}{6}, \\ \beta_{4,q^2-2} &= \frac{q^9 - 6q^8 + 13q^7 - 5q^9 - 14q^5 + 11q^4}{4}, \\ \beta_{5,q^2-1} &= \frac{q^9 - 7q^8 + 20q^7 - 20q^6 - 15q^5 + 30q^4 - 9q^3}{6}, \\ \beta_{6,q^2} &= \frac{q^9 - 8q^8 + 29q^7 - 51q^6 + 18q^5 + 59q^4 - 60q^3 + 36q - 24}{24}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Combine the resolution above with Lemma 37 to find β_{2,q^2-q-1} , and use the 6 Boij-Söderberg equations to find the remaining 6 \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers $\beta_{i,j}$, using for example SageMath. \square

Corollary 39. *Let ϕ_j for $j = 0, \dots, q^2$ be as in Definition 26. Then for $q \geq 7$, the values of ϕ_j for $j = 0, \dots, q^2$ are as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_0 &= 1, \\ \phi_{q^2-2q} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-2q} = -\frac{q^3 - q}{2}, \\ \phi_{q^2-2q+1} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-2q+1} = -\frac{q^4 + q^3}{2}, \\ \phi_{q^2-q-1} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-q-1} + \beta_{2,q^2-q-1} = \frac{q^5 + 2q^4 - 3q^3}{2}, \\ \phi_{q^2-q} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-q} - \beta_{3,q^2-q} = -q^5 + 3q^3 - 2q, \\ \phi_{q^2-q+1} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-q+1} = -\frac{q^5 - q^3}{2}, \\ \phi_{q^2-4} &= \beta_{2,q^2-4} = \frac{q^9 - 4q^8 + 5q^7 + q^6 - 6q^5 + 3q^4}{24}, \\ \phi_{q^2-3} &= -\beta_{3,q^2-3} = -\frac{q^9 - 5q^8 + 8q^7 - 9q^5 + 5q^4}{6}, \\ \phi_{q^2-2} &= \beta_{4,q^2-2} = \frac{q^9 - 6q^8 + 13q^7 - 5q^6 - 14q^5 + 11q^4}{4}, \\ \phi_{q^2-1} &= -\beta_{5,q^2-1} = -\frac{q^9 - 7q^8 + 20q^7 - 20q^6 - 15q^5 + 30q^4 - 9q^3}{6}, \\ \phi_{q^2} &= \beta_{6,q^2} = \frac{q^9 - 8q^8 + 29q^7 - 51q^6 + 18q^5 + 59q^4 - 60q^3 + 36q - 24}{24},\end{aligned}$$

and all other ϕ_j are zero.

Proof. Follows directly from Definition 26 and the Betti numbers from resolution (7) and Corollary 38. \square

7. MINIMAL RESOLUTIONS FOR THE ELONGATIONS OF M_q

In this section, we again assume that $q \geq 7$. The set E and the spaces N_i will be as in the beginning of Section 5. Also, as in Section 5, we let r^* denote the rank function of the dual matroid of M_q . The key observations we will utilize in this section are the following.

Lemma 40. *Let ℓ be a nonnegative integer. For $i = 1, \dots, r^*(E) - \ell$, let $N_i^{(\ell)}$ be the set of all subsets of E whose nullity for the ℓ -th elongation matroid $M_q^{(\ell)}$ of M_q is i . Then we have the following.*

- (a) $N_i^{(\ell)} = N_{i+\ell}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r^*(E) - \ell$.
- (b) The inclusion-minimal elements of the $N_i^{(\ell)}$, and thus the only subsets σ of E that give rise to nonzero $\beta_{i,\sigma}^{(\ell)}$, are the inclusion-minimal elements of $N_{i+\ell}$, for $i = 1, \dots, r^*(E) - \ell$.

Proof. The assertion in (a) follows directly from Definition 19, and that in (b) is an immediate consequence of (a). \square

For a minimal \mathbb{N}^E -graded resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring of $M_q^{(1)}$ we can use the same minimal sets of N_2, \dots, N_6 (referring to M_q) that we have already found, but the Betti numbers, now called $\beta_{i,\sigma}^{(1)}$ will in general not be the same as

the $\beta_{i+1,\sigma}$. It is for example clear that all the $\beta_{i,\sigma}^{(1)}$ will be 1 for the σ in the original $N_2 = N_1^{(1)}$, since they are now circuits for the new matroid.

Therefore a minimal free resolution of $M_q^{(1)}$ (or of the corresponding Stanley-Reisner ring, say R_{Δ_1}) is of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \longleftarrow R_{\Delta_1} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(1)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(1)}} \\
S(-q^2 + q + 1)^{q^4 - q^2} \oplus S(-q^2 + 4)^{\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)(q^2-3q+3)}{24}} \xleftarrow{\partial_2^{(1)}} \\
S(-q^2 + q)^{(q^2+q)\beta_{2,\alpha}^{(1)}} \oplus S(-q^2 + 3)^{\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)}{6}\beta_{2,\delta}^{(1)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3^{(1)}} S(-q^2 + 2)^{\binom{q^2}{2}\beta_{3,\epsilon}^{(1)}} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_4^{(1)}} S(-q^2 + 1)^{q^2\beta_{4,\omega}^{(1)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_5^{(1)}} S(-q^2)^{\beta_{5,E}^{(1)}} \longleftarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have 5 unknown $\beta_{i,\sigma}^{(1)}$, and 5 Boij-Söderberg equations to determine them. Solving the equations in SageMath yields the following.

Corollary 41. *For $q \geq 7$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{q^2-q-1}^{(1)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-q-1}^{(1)} = -(q^4 - q^2), \\
\phi_{q^2-4}^{(1)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-4}^{(1)} = -\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)(q^2-3q+3)}{24}, \\
\phi_{q^2-q}^{(1)} &= \beta_{2,q^2-q}^{(1)} = q^4 - 2q^2 - q, \\
\phi_{q^2-3}^{(1)} &= \beta_{2,q^2-3}^{(1)} = \frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 7q^6 - q^5 - 8q^4 + 5q^3}{6}, \\
\phi_{q^2-2}^{(1)} &= -\beta_{3,q^2-2}^{(1)} = -\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 9q^6 - 7q^5 - 10q^4 + 11q^3}{4}, \\
\phi_{q^2-1}^{(1)} &= \beta_{4,q^2-1}^{(1)} = \frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 11q^6 - 17q^5 - 6q^4 + 27q^3 - 6q^2}{6}, \\
\phi_{q^2}^{(1)} &= -\beta_{5,q^2}^{(1)} = -\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 13q^6 - 31q^5 + 10q^4 + 59q^3 - 48q^2 - 24q + 24}{24}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same principles we see that a minimal resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring of $M_q^{(2)}$ (or of the corresponding Stanley-Reisner ring, say R_{Δ_2}) is of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \longleftarrow R_{\Delta_2} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(2)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(2)}} \\
S(-q^2 + q)^{(q^2+q)} \oplus S(-q^2 + 3)^{\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)}{2}} \xleftarrow{\partial_2^{(2)}} S(-q^2 + 2)^{\binom{q^2}{2}\beta_{2,\epsilon}^{(2)}} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_3^{(2)}} S(-q^2 + 1)^{q^2\beta_{3,\omega}^{(2)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_4^{(2)}} S(-q^2)^{\beta_{4,E}^{(2)}} \longleftarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

We then obtain, using the computer-system SageMath:

Corollary 42. *For $q \geq 7$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{q^2-q}^{(2)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-q}^{(2)} = -(q^2 + q), \\ \phi_{q^2-3}^{(2)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-3}^{(2)} = -\frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 + q^3}{6}, \\ \phi_{q^2-2}^{(2)} &= \beta_{2,q^2-2}^{(2)} = \frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 + q^3}{2}, \\ \phi_{q^2-1}^{(2)} &= -\beta_{3,q^2-1}^{(2)} = -\frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 - q^3}{2}, \\ \phi_{q^2}^{(2)} &= \beta_{4,q^2}^{(2)} = \frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 - 5q^3 + 6q^2 + 6q - 6}{6}.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore a minimal resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring of $M_q^{(3)}$ (or of the corresponding Stanley-Reisner ring, say R_{Δ_3}) is of the following form:

$$0 \leftarrow R_{\Delta_3} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(3)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(3)}} S(-q^2 + 2) \binom{q^2}{2} \xleftarrow{\partial_2^{(3)}}$$

$$S(q^2 + 1)^{q^2 \beta_{2,\omega}^{(3)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3^{(3)}} S(-q^2)^{\beta_{3,E}^{(3)}} \leftarrow 0.$$

We observe that this resolution, and by construction also, those of the Stanley-Reisner rings of $M_q^{(4)}$ and $M_q^{(5)}$, will be pure and linear, and therefore the resolutions of uniform matroids $U(q^2 - s, q^2)$, for $s = 3, 2, 1, 0$, respectively, and there are explicit, general and easy to find formulas for all their Betti numbers, by [12]. Thus by calculating Betti numbers from these results, we obtain the following minimal free resolutions of the Stanley-Reisner rings of $M_q^{(3)}$, $M_q^{(4)}$ and $M_q^{(5)}$ (or of the corresponding Stanley-Reisner rings, say R_{Δ_3} , R_{Δ_4} and R_{Δ_5}), respectively:

$$0 \leftarrow R_{\Delta_3} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(3)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(3)}} S(-q^2 + 2) \binom{q^2}{2} \xleftarrow{\partial_2^{(3)}} (-q^2 + 1)^{q^4 - 2q^2} \xleftarrow{\partial_3^{(3)}} S(-q^2)^{\frac{q^4 - 3q^2 + 2}{2}} \leftarrow 0,$$

$$0 \leftarrow R_{\Delta_4} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(4)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(4)}} S(-q^2 + 1)^{q^2} \xleftarrow{\partial_2^{(4)}} S(-q^2)^{q^2 - 1} \leftarrow 0,$$

$$0 \leftarrow R_{\Delta_5} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(5)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(5)}} S(-q^2) \leftarrow 0.$$

This gives:

Corollary 43. *For $q \geq 7$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{q^2-2}^{(3)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-2}^{(3)} = -\frac{q^4 - q^2}{2}, & \phi_{q^2-1}^{(4)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2-1}^{(4)} = -q^2, \\ \phi_{q^2-1}^{(3)} &= \beta_{2,q^2-1}^{(3)} = q^4 - 2q^2, & \phi_{q^2}^{(4)} &= \beta_{2,q^2}^{(4)} = q^2 - 1, \\ \phi_{q^2}^{(3)} &= -\beta_{3,q^2}^{(3)} = -\frac{q^4 - 3q^2 + 2}{2}, & \phi_{q^2}^{(5)} &= -\beta_{1,q^2}^{(5)} = -1.\end{aligned}$$

8. CALCULATION OF THE GENERALIZED WEIGHT POLYNOMIALS $P_w(Z)$ AND THE HIGHER WEIGHT SPECTRA $A_w^{(r)}$

In this section, we will give a proof in the case $q \geq 7$ of one of our main theorems, which was stated in Section 2. The first main step is the following.

Proposition 44. *For $q \geq 7$, the generalized weight polynomials $P_w(Z)$ of the Reed-Muller code $C_q = \text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ are given by the following.*

$$P_0(Z) = 1,$$

$$P_{q^2-2q}(Z) = \frac{q^3 - q}{2}(Z - 1),$$

$$P_{q^2-2q+1}(Z) = \frac{q^4 + q^3}{2}(Z - 1),$$

$$P_{q^2-q-1}(Z) = (q^4 - q^2)Z^2 - \left(\frac{q^5 + 4q^4 - 3q^3 - 2q^2}{2}\right)Z + \left(\frac{q^5 + 2q^4 - 3q^3}{2}\right),$$

$$P_{q^2-q}(Z) = (q^2 + q)Z^3 + (-q^4 + q^2)Z^2 + (q^5 + q^4 - 3q^3 - 2q^2 + q)Z - (q^5 - 3q^3 + 2q),$$

$$P_{q^2-q+1}(Z) = \frac{q^5 - q^3}{2}(Z - 1),$$

$$P_{q^2-4}(Z) = \left(\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 5q^6 + q^5 - 6q^4 + 3q^3}{24}\right)Z^2 - \left(\frac{q^9 - 3q^8 + q^7 + 6q^6 - 5q^5 - 3q^4 + 3q^3}{24}\right)Z + \left(\frac{q^9 - 4q^8 + 5q^7 + q^6 - 6q^5 + 3q^4}{24}\right),$$

$$P_{q^2-3}(Z) = \left(\frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 + q^3}{6}\right)Z^3 - \left(\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 8q^6 - 2q^5 - 9q^4 + 6q^3}{6}\right)Z^2 + \left(\frac{q^9 - 4q^8 + 4q^7 + 7q^6 - 10q^5 - 3q^4 + 5q^3}{6}\right)Z - \left(\frac{q^9 - 5q^8 + 8q^7 - 9q^5 + 5q^4}{6}\right),$$

$$P_{q^2-2}(Z) = \left(\frac{q^4 - q^2}{2}\right)Z^4 - \left(\frac{q^6 - q^5 + q^3 - q^2}{2}\right)Z^3 + \left(\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 11q^6 - 9q^5 - 12q^4 + 13q^3}{4}\right)Z^2 - \left(\frac{q^9 - 5q^8 + 9q^7 + 4q^6 - 21q^5 + q^4 + 11q^3}{4}\right)Z + \left(\frac{q^9 - 6q^8 + 13q^7 - 5q^6 - 14q^5 + 11q^4}{4}\right),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{q^2-1}(Z) &= q^2 Z^5 - (q^4 - q^2) Z^4 + \left(\frac{q^6 - q^5 + q^4 - q^3 - 4q^2}{2} \right) Z^3 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 14q^6 - 20q^5 - 9q^4 + 24q^3 - 6q^2}{6} \right) Z^2 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{q^9 - 6q^8 + 16q^7 - 9q^6 - 32q^5 + 24q^4 + 18q^3 - 6q^2}{6} \right) Z \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{q^9 - 7q^8 + 20q^7 - 20q^6 - 15q^5 + 30q^4 - 9q^3}{6} \right), \\
P_{q^2}(Z) &= Z^6 - q^2 Z^5 + \left(\frac{q^4 - q^2}{2} \right) Z^4 - \left(\frac{q^6 - q^5 + 2q^4 - 5q^3 - 3q^2 + 6q}{6} \right) Z^3 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 17q^6 - 35q^5 + 6q^4 + 39q^3 - 24q^2}{24} \right) Z^2 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{q^9 - 7q^8 + 25q^7 - 38q^6 - 13q^5 + 69q^4 - q^3 - 48q^2 + 12q}{24} \right) Z \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{q^9 - 8q^8 + 29q^7 - 51q^6 + 18q^5 + 59q^4 - 60q^3 + 36q - 24}{24} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

and all other $P_w(Z)$ are identically equal to zero.

Proof. We use the values of the $\phi_w^{(\ell)}$ that we have found in Corollaries 39, 41, 42 and 43 to substitute in

$$P_w(Z) = \sum_{\ell=0}^6 (\phi_w^{(\ell)} - \phi_w^{(\ell-1)}) Z^\ell,$$

obtained from [16]. Note that $\phi_w^{(6)} = 0$ for $0 \leq w \leq n$ here. \square

Now we can determine the higher weight spectra of C_q for $q \geq 7$.

Proof of Theorem 4(a). We use the values of the $P_w(Z)$ from Proposition 44, and the formula:

$$P_w(q^e) = \sum_{r=0}^e A_w^{(r)} \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^e - q^i), \quad \text{for } e \geq 0$$

given for example in [9] or [17, Proposition 6]. Moreover, since each term of this expression of $P_w(q^e)$ is positive, $A_w^{(r)}$ is zero for all the support weights w for which $P_w(Z)$ is zero. \square

Observe that the support weights w , which appear with non-zero $A_w^{(r)}$ for some $1 \leq r \leq 6$, are the ones that appear as cardinalities of an inclusion-minimal set in N_i for some i . One may wonder why this is true. For $i = 1$, for example, it is obvious that the supports of (one-dimension subspaces of C_q , generated by single non-zero) codewords with inclusion minimal support, are precisely the inclusion minimal elements of N_1 , the circuits of our matroid. But what about the other (non-minimal) codewords? Why should (the cardinalities of) their supports be

(equal to cardinalities of) the minimal elements of N_i for some $i \geq 2$? We present an alternative explanation of this outcome by the following lemma.

Lemma 45. *The supports of the linear subcodes of C_q are precisely the inclusion-minimal elements of N_j , i.e., the cycles of nullity j of the associated parity check matroid $M_q = (E, r)$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$.*

Proof. For any subset $\sigma \subseteq E$, consider the following subcode of C_q

$$C_q(\sigma) = \{c \in C_q : \text{Supp}(c) \subseteq \sigma\}.$$

By definition of the rank function r^* of the dual matroid M_q^* , $r^*(\sigma) = \dim C_q - \dim C_q(E \setminus \sigma)$ and thus the nullity of σ is

$$n(\sigma) = |\sigma| - r(\sigma) = r^*(E) - r^*(E \setminus \sigma) = \dim C_q(\sigma). \quad (8)$$

Now we assume that σ is an inclusion-minimal subset of N_j for some $1 \leq j \leq k$. Thus by (8), the subcode $C_q(\sigma)$ has dimension j . By definition, $\text{Supp}(C_q(\sigma)) \subseteq \sigma$ and $n(\text{Supp}(C_q(\sigma))) = j$. Therefore, if $\text{Supp}(C_q(\sigma))$ is strictly contained in σ , then it will contradict the inclusion-minimality of σ in N_j . Thus σ is the support of the subcode $C_q(\sigma)$ of C_q .

Conversely, let us assume that $\sigma = \text{Supp}(D)$ for some subcode D of C_q . Thus $D \subseteq C_q(\sigma)$ and from (8) it follows that $n(\sigma) = \dim C_q(\sigma)$. If σ is not minimal in N_j with $j = \dim C_q(\sigma)$, then $\text{Supp}(C_q(\sigma)) \subsetneq \sigma$. Indeed, in that case, if $\tau \subsetneq \sigma$ is an inclusion-minimal element in N_j with $j = \dim C_q(\sigma)$, then $n(\tau) = \dim C_q(\tau) = \dim C_q(\sigma)$ will imply $C_q(\sigma) = C_q(\tau)$ and

$$\text{Supp}(C_q(\sigma)) = \text{Supp}(C_q(\tau)) \subseteq \tau \subsetneq \sigma.$$

But then $\text{Supp}(D) \subseteq \text{Supp}(C_q(\sigma)) \subsetneq \sigma$ will contradict the assumption $\sigma = \text{Supp}(D)$. Therefore, σ is an inclusion-minimal element in N_j with $j = \dim C_q(\sigma)$. \square

9. THE CASES $q = 5, 4, 3, 2$

9.1. The case $q = 5$. For $q = 5$ the minimal sets in N_i , for $1, \dots, 6$, can be characterized exactly in the same way as those for $q \geq 7$, except for $i = 1$, when the complement of an irreducible conic intersecting L , the line at infinity, in 2 points, is no longer (a minimal set) in N_1 . In fact it is a special case of (the complement of) 4 points, no three of which are collinear, one of the two different configurations that give minimal sets in N_2 . Moreover, the argument in Lemma 37 for $\beta_{2,\theta} = q$ where θ is the complement of a line union a point outside the line, is exactly as for $q \geq 7$.

With this in view and inserting $q = 5$ in the resolution (7) with the Betti number from Lemma 37, we obtain a minimal free resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring for M_5 (or C_5) of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longleftarrow R_\Delta \xleftarrow{\partial_0} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1} S(-20)^{600} \oplus S(-19)^{1000} \oplus S(-16)^{375} \oplus S(-15)^{60} \\ \xleftarrow{\partial_2} S(-19)^{3000} \oplus S(-21)^{\beta_{2,21}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3} S(-20)^{\beta_{3,20}} \oplus S(-22)^{\beta_{3,22}} \\ \xleftarrow{\partial_4} S(-23)^{\beta_{4,23}} \xleftarrow{\partial_5} S(-24)^{\beta_{5,24}} \xleftarrow{\partial_6} S(-25)^{\beta_{6,E}} \longleftarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

We see that there are 9 possible different w appearing with $\phi_w \neq 0$. These are 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25. Compared with $q \geq 7$, we see that $q^2 - (q - 1) =$

21 and $q^2 - 4 = 21$ now coincide (the irreducible conics intersecting L in two points no longer enter the picture, but four points, among which no three are collinear, still do). So there is one ϕ_w less to consider.

With only 6 unknowns the 6 Boij-Söderberg equations give us the remaining $\beta_{i,\sigma}$, or $\beta_{i,j}$ if one prefers, or ϕ_j if one prefers. In particular, $\beta_{3,20} = 2160$ (20 is the only j such that ϕ_j depends on more than one $\beta_{i,j}$, as it also depends on $\beta_{1,20} = 600$).

For the first elongation all arguments for general $q \geq 7$ are also valid for $q = 5$, and one gets a minimal free resolution of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longleftarrow R_{\Delta_1} \xleftarrow{\partial_0^{(1)}} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1^{(1)}} S(-19)^{600} \oplus S(-21)^{6500} \xleftarrow{\partial_2^{(1)}} \\ S(-20)^{\beta_{2,20}^{(1)}} \oplus S(-22)^{\beta_{2,22}^{(1)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3^{(1)}} S(-23)^{\beta_{3,23}^{(1)}} \\ \xleftarrow{\partial_4^{(1)}} S(-24)^{\beta_{4,24}^{(1)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_5^{(1)}} S(-25)^{\beta_{5,25}^{(1)}} \longleftarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence 5 Boij-Söderberg equations in 5 unknowns will give us all the $\beta_{i,j}^{(1)}$ and all the $\phi_j^{(1)}$.

For the ℓ -th elongations, for $\ell = 2, \dots, 6$, one can argue exactly as for $q \geq 7$ and inserting $q = 5$ in the formulas found for the $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$, for all $\ell \geq 2$, we get our desired values for these variables also for $q = 5$.

Now we can prove our main result for $q = 5$.

Proof of Theorem 4(b). One finds $P_w(Z)$ using the values of $\phi_w^{(i)}$ for each $0 \leq w \leq n$ that we have found above as in the case $q \geq 7$ and use the formula, also as in the case $q \geq 7$,

$$P_w(q^e) = \sum_{r=0}^e A_w^{(r)} \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^e - q^i) \quad \text{for } e \geq 0,$$

to find the $A_w^{(r)}$. □

Remark 46. For $q \geq 7$, we have

$$A_{q^2-q+1}^{(1)} = \frac{q^5 - q^3}{2}, \quad A_{q^2-4}^{(2)} = \frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 5q^6 + q^5 - 6q^4 + 3q^3}{24},$$

and $A_{q^2-4}^{(1)} = A_{q^2-q+1}^{(2)} = 0$. Note that the nonzero parts of these formulas are “merged” for $q = 5$.

9.2. The case $q = 4$. For $q = 4$, the minimal sets in N_i , for $1, \dots, 6$, can be characterized exactly in the same way as those for $q = 5$, except for $i = 1$, when the complement of an irreducible conic intersecting L , the line at infinity, at exactly 1 point, is no longer (a minimal set) in N_1 . In fact it is a special case of (the complement of) 4 points, no three of which are collinear, one of the two different configurations that give minimal sets in N_2 . It can also be mentioned that the case of irreducible conics intersecting L in exactly 2 points, which gave rise to minimal sets in N_1 , for $q \geq 7$, but not for $q = 5$, now give 3 non-collinear points in \mathbb{A}^3 , and thus gives rise to a minimal set in N_3 . Moreover, the argument that $\beta_{2\delta} = q$ for δ the complement of a line union a point outside the line is exactly as for $q \geq 5$.

With this in view and inserting $q = 4$ in the resolution (7) with $\beta_{2,\theta}$, we then obtain a minimal free resolution of the Stanley-Reisner ring associated to M_4 (or C_4) of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \longleftarrow R_\Delta \xleftarrow{\partial_0} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1} \oplus S(-11)^{288} \oplus S(-9)^{160} \oplus S(-8)^{30} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_2} S(-11)^{960} \oplus S(-12)^{\beta_{2,12}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3} S(-12)^{\beta_{3,12}} \oplus S(-13)^{\beta_{3,13}} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_4} S(-14)^{\beta_{4,14}} \xleftarrow{\partial_5} S(-15)^{\beta_{5,15}} \xleftarrow{\partial_6} S(-16)^{\beta_{6,16}} \longleftarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We see that there are 8 possible different weights w appearing with $\phi_w \neq 0$. These are precisely 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. Compared with $q \geq 7$, we see that $q^2 - (q-1) = 13$ and $q^2 - q = 12$ are still there, but they do not anymore correspond to elements of N_1 .

With only 6 unknowns, the 6 Boij-Söderberg equations give us the remaining $\beta_{i,\sigma}$, or $\beta_{i,j}$ if one prefers, or ϕ_j if one prefers. The support cardinality 12 is the only j such that ϕ_j depends on more than one $\beta_{i,j}$. A separate calculation, identical with that in the case $q \geq 7$, gives $\beta_{3,12} = 600$. The calculation of $\phi_{12} = \beta_{2,12} - \beta_{3,12}$ via the Boij-Söderberg equations then also gives the value of $\beta_{2,12}$.

For the first elongation all arguments for general $q \geq 7$ are valid also for $q = 4$, and one gets a minimal free resolution of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \longleftarrow R_\Delta \xleftarrow{\partial_0} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1} S(-11)^{240} \oplus S(-12)^{840} \xleftarrow{\partial_2} \\
S(-12)^{\beta_{2,12}^{(1)}} \oplus S(-13)^{\beta_{2,13}^{(1)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3} S(-14)^{\beta_{3,14}^{(1)}} \\
\xleftarrow{\partial_4} S(-15)^{\beta_{4,15}^{(1)}} \xleftarrow{\partial_5} S(-16)^{\beta_{5,16}^{(1)}} \longleftarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We see that there are 6 possible different w appearing with $\phi_w \neq 0$. These are 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. Compared with $q \geq 7$, we see that $q^2 - q = 12$ and $q^2 - 4 = 12$ now coincide, so there is one $\phi_w^{(1)}$ less to consider. Hence the $\phi_{q^2-q}^{(1)}$ -part and the $\phi_{q^2-4}^{(1)}$ from $q \geq 7$ will come together. The 5 Boij-Söderberg equations in 5 unknowns will give us all the $\phi_j^{(1)}$ and $\beta_{i,j}^{(1)}$. Moreover $\beta_{2,12}^{(1)} = 220$ (the support cardinality 12 is the only j such that $\phi_j^{(1)}$ depends on more than one $\beta_{i,j}^{(1)}$ as it also depends on $\beta_{1,12}^{(1)} = 840$).

For the ℓ -th elongations, for $\ell = 2, \dots, 6$, one can argue exactly as for $q \geq 7$, and inserting $q = 4$ in the formulas found for the $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$, for all $\ell \geq 2$, we get our desired values for these variables also for $q = 4$. Now we can proceed to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 4(c). We find $P_w(Z)$ from the $\phi_w^{(i)}$ for each $0 \leq w \leq n$ that we have found above, similar to the case $q \geq 7$ and use the formula, also similar to the case $q \geq 7$,

$$P_w(q^e) = \sum_{r=0}^e A_w^{(r)} \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^e - q^i) \quad \text{for } e \geq 0,$$

to determine all the $A_w^{(r)}$. □

9.3. The case $q = 3$. For $q = 3$, the minimal sets in N_1 are the complements of the unions of two lines, and we still have the two different cases where the lines are parallel, and where they meet. Compared with the case $q = 4$ the $q + 1$ points on an irreducible conic, are now the complement of a minimal set in N_2 (complement of four points, among which no three are collinear), and no longer in N_1 .

The minimal sets of N_2 are still the complements of four points, among which no three are collinear, and the complement of the union of a line and a point outside the line. But now the cardinality of these two sets are the same, namely $q^2 - (q + 1) = q^2 - 4 = 5$.

The minimal sets of N_3 are still these complements of q points on a line, and the complement of the union of three non-collinear points. But now the cardinality of these two sets are the same, namely $q^2 - q = q^2 - 3 = 6$.

This implies that apart from the nullity 1-part of the minimal free resolution of the relevant Stanley-Reisner ring, which we know, the resolution is pure. It is of the following form:

$$0 \longleftarrow R_\Delta \xleftarrow{\partial_0} S \xleftarrow{\partial_1} S(-4)^{54} \oplus S(-3)^{12} \xleftarrow{\partial_2} \oplus S(-5)^{\beta_{2,5}} \xleftarrow{\partial_3} \\ S(-6)^{\beta_{3,6}} \longleftarrow S(-7)^{\beta_{4,8}} \xleftarrow{\partial_5} S(-8)^{\beta_{5,8}} \xleftarrow{\partial_6} S(-9)^{\beta_{6,9}} \longleftarrow 0.$$

So, we get 6 Boij-Söderberg equations to determine 5 unknowns.

For the ℓ -th elongations, for $\ell = 1, \dots, 5$, we get linear, pure resolutions, where the Betti numbers and $\phi^{(\ell)}$ can be found easily.

As an end result one obtains:

Proof of Theorem 4(d). One finds $P_w(Z)$ using the values of $\phi_w^{(i)}$ for each $1 \leq w \leq n$ that we have found above as in the case $q \geq 7$ and use the formula, also as in the case $q \geq 7$,

$$P_w(q^e) = \sum_{r=0}^e A_w^{(r)} \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^e - q^i) \quad \text{for } e \geq 0,$$

to find all the $A_w^{(r)}$. □

Remark 47. It is interesting to compare are results in the cases on $A_w^{(r)}$ in the cases $r = 1, 2$ with those of [20, Proposition 2.12] and the last part in [20, Lemma 4.3]. In [20, Proposition 2.12], Kaplan and Matei give a formula for what would be

$$X^{q^2} + (q - 1) \sum_w A_w^{(1)} X^{q^2-w} Y^w$$

in our language. In the last part of [20, Lemma 4.3], they give a formula which is equivalent to finding $\sum_w A_w^{(2)} X^{q^2-w} Y^w$. The interesting observation is that they give unified formulas for all $q \geq 3$ in [20], while we have had to treat free resolutions that are different for the cases $q \geq 7$, and three other cases $q = 5, 4, 3$. As a consequence of our work done to prove Theorem 4 for $q \geq 7$ and $q = 5, 4, 3$, which give the main result for the $A_w^{(r)}$, and further by Remark 46, we deduce that we also, in fact, have results that could be given by the same formulas in q , for all $q \geq 3$. This is true if we give them in the form of higher weight polynomials, i.e.,

$$W_r(X, Y) = \sum_w A_w^{(r)} X^{q^2-w} Y^w, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq r \leq 6,$$

obtained by inserting the values given in Theorem 4(a), originally intended only to be valid for $q \geq 7$. Theorem 4(b), (c), (d) give precisely the same result.

9.4. The case $q = 2$. Here the code is a subcode of $(\mathbb{F}_2)^4$. We evaluate quadratic polynomials xy , $x(y-1)$, $(x-1)y$, $(x-1)(y-1)$ at $(0,0)$, $(0,1)$, $(1,0)$, $(1,1)$, respectively and obtain the codewords

$$(0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0),$$

which constitute a basis for $(\mathbb{F}_2)^4$. Hence the evaluation map is surjective, and $C_2 = (\mathbb{F}_2)^4$.

Thus by direct inspection, we obtain $A_0^{(0)} = 1$, $A_1^{(1)} = 4$, $A_2^{(1)} = 6$, $A_3^{(1)} = 4$, $A_4^{(1)} = 1$, $A_2^{(2)} = 6$, $A_3^{(2)} = 16$, $A_4^{(2)} = 13$, $A_3^{(3)} = 4$, $A_4^{(3)} = 11$, $A_4^{(4)} = 1$, and all other $A_w^{(r)}$ are zero. Clearly, $C_2 = \mathbb{F}_2^4$ is an MDS code. Thus one can directly use the formulas in [16, Example 5.2] for the Betti numbers of $M_2^{(\ell)}$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq 4$. However, those formulas refer to the Betti numbers of the Stanley-Reisner ideal I , and in our case, treating instead the Stanley-Reisner ring S/I , we then get:

$$\beta_{0,0}^{(\ell)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} \binom{j-1}{s+\ell} \binom{n}{j} & \text{if } i = j - \ell - s \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i, j \geq 1.$$

Thus, the Betti numbers of $M_2^{(\ell)}$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq 4$ are given by the formulas

$$\beta_{0,0}^{(\ell)} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{i,j}^{(\ell)} = \begin{cases} \binom{j-1}{\ell} \binom{4}{j} & \text{if } i = j - \ell \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } i, j \geq 1.$$

Remark 48. We have noted earlier that the methods used in this paper for the determination of higher weight spectra and the Betti numbers of the Reed-Muller code $\text{RM}_q(2, 2)$ are inspired by the methods used in [13] for the projective Reed-Muller code $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$. In [13, Section V], suggested by Krishna Kaipa, one also sketched an alternative, quite different, method for finding the higher weight spectra of $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$. After we completed our work with the present paper, we observed that this alternative method has been applied by Kaipa and Pradhan [19] to (the different problem to) find all the higher weight spectra of projective Reed-Muller codes $\text{PRM}_3(2, 3)$ obtained from evaluating all homogeneous conics in 4 variables at all points of \mathbb{P}_q^3 , for $q = 3$. We note that the case of $\text{PRM}_2(2, 3)$, or of Veronese threefolds for $q = 2$, was settled earlier in [14]. The alternative method used in [19] may have a potential to be used in other cases too, including the determination of the higher weight spectra of (usual or non-projective) Reed-Muller codes. On the other hand, the methods used in [13, 14] as well as in this paper has the advantage that it not only yields the higher weight spectra, but also the Betti numbers of the matroid associated to the code and its elongations. In any event, there remain many more instances of Reed-Muller and projective Reed-Muller codes whose higher weight spectra and Betti numbers are not explicitly known.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was mainly done when the second named author visited IIT Bombay at Mumbai, India during August–November 2023. He wishes to thank the Department of Mathematics at IIT Bombay for its hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Beelen, A note on the generalized Hamming weights of Reed-Muller codes, *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.* **30** (2019), 233–242.
- [2] P. Beelen and M. Datta, Generalized Hamming weights of affine Cartesian codes, *Finite Fields Appl.*, **51** (2018), 130–145.
- [3] M. Boij and M. J. Söderberg, Graded Betti numbers of Cohen-Macaulay modules and the multiplicity conjectures, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*(2), **78** (2008), no. 1, 85–106.
- [4] C. Carlet and P. Solé, The weight spectrum of two families of Reed-Muller codes, *Discrete Math.*, **346** (2023), no. 10, Paper No. 113568, 7 pp.
- [5] P. Delsarte, J. M. Goethals and F. J. MacWilliams, On generalized Reed-Muller codes and their relatives, *Information and Control* **16** (1970), 403–442.
- [6] S. R. Ghorpade and P. Singh, Pure Resolutions, linear codes, and Betti numbers. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **224** (2020), no. 10, Art. 106385, 22 pp.
- [7] P. Heijnen and R. Pellikaan, Generalized Hamming weights of q -ary Reed-Muller codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **44** (1998), no. 1, 181–196.
- [8] J. W. P. Hirschfeld, *Projective Geometries Over Finite Fields*, 2nd ed., Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1998.
- [9] T. Hellese, T. Kløve and J. Mykkeltveit, The weight distribution of irreducible cyclic codes with block lengths $\frac{n_1(q^l-1)}{n}$, *Discrete Math.* **18**, no. 2, (1977), 179–211.
- [10] J. Herzog and M. Kühl, On the Betti numbers of finite pure and linear resolutions, *Comm. Algebra* **12** (1984), 1627–1646.
- [11] S. Jain, V. A. Rameshwar, and N. Kashyap, Estimating the weight enumerators of Reed-Muller codes via sampling, [arXiv:2403.05893](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.05893), 9 March 2024, 8 pp.
- [12] T. Johnsen and H. Verdure, Hamming weights and Betti numbers of Stanley-Reisner rings associated to matroids, *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.* **24** (2013), no.1, 73–93.
- [13] T. Johnsen and H. Verdure, Higher weight spectra of Veronese codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **66** (2020), no. 6, 3538–3546.
- [14] T. Johnsen and H. Verdure, Higher weight spectra of Veronese codes from threefolds, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **225** (2021), no. 7, Paper No. 106609, 11 pp.
- [15] T. Johnsen, R. Pratihari and H. Verdure, Weight spectra of Gabidulin rank-metric codes and Betti numbers, *São Paulo J. Math. Sci.* **17** (2023), 208–241.
- [16] T. Johnsen, J. N. Røksvold and H. Verdure, A generalization of weight polynomials to matroids, *Discrete Math.*, **339** (2016), 632–645.
- [17] R. Jurrius, Weight enumeration of codes from finite spaces, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **63** (2012), no. 3, 321–330.
- [18] R. Jurrius and G. R. Pellikaan, Codes, arrangements and matroids, in: *Algebraic Geometry Modeling in Information Theory*, Ser. Coding Theory Cryptol., **8**, World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, 2013, pp. 219–325.
- [19] K. Kaipa and P. Pradhan, Higher weight spectra of ternary codes associated to the quadratic Veronese 3-fold, [arXiv:2405.1201](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.1201), 20 May 2024, 32 pp.
- [20] N. Kaplan and V. Matei, Counting plane cubic curves over finite fields with a prescribed number of rational intersection points, *Eur. J. Math.*, **7**(2021), 1137–1181.
- [21] T. Kasami, S. Lin and W. W. Peterson, New Generalization of the Reed-Muller Codes—Part I: Primitive Codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **IT-14** (1968), 189–199.
- [22] S. Li, On the weight distribution of second order Reed-Muller codes and their relatives, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **87** (2019), no.10, 2447–2460.
- [23] Y. Lou and Q. Wang, Determining the weight spectrum of the Reed-Muller Codes $RM(m - 6, m)$, [arXiv:2406.03803](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03803), 6 June 2024, 15 pp.
- [24] M. Markov and Y. Borissov, Computing the weight distribution of the binary Reed-Muller code $\mathcal{R}(4; 9)$, [arXiv:2309.10462](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10462), 19 September 2023, 8 pp.
- [25] R. J. McEliece, Quadratic forms over finite fields and second-order Reed-Muller codes, *JPL space programs summary* **3** (1969), 37–58.
- [26] *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.6)*, The Sage Developers, 2022, <https://www.sagemath.org>.
- [27] N. J. A. Sloane and E. R. Berlekamp, Weight enumerator for second-order Reed-Muller codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **IT-16** (1970), 745–751.

- [28] R. P. Stanley, Cohen-Macaulay complexes, in: *Higher Combinatorics*, NATO Adv. Study Inst. Ser. C: Math. Phys. Sci., **31**, D. Reidel, Dordrecht-Boston, Mass., 1977, pp. 51–62.
- [29] C. Zanella, Linear Sections of the finite Veronese varieties and authentication systems defined Using geometry, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **13** (1998), 199–212.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY,
POWAI, MUMBAI 400076, INDIA
Email address: srg@math.iitb.ac.in

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UIT: THE ARCTIC UNIVERSITY OF NORWAY,
N-9037 TROMSØ, NORWAY
Email address: Trygve.Johnsen@uit.no

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY,
POWAI, MUMBAI 400076, INDIA
Email address: ratiludhani@gmail.com

INRIA SACLAY CENTRE, 1 RUE HONORE D'ESTIENNE D'ORVES, 91120 PALAISEAU, FRANCE
Email address: pratihar.rakhi@gmail.com

APPENDIX A. CONNECTION BETWEEN CYCLES OF MATROIDS ASSOCIATED TO PROJECTIVE AND GENERALIZED REED-MULLER CODES

Let m, d be nonnegative integers. We now give two results that gives a relationship between matroids associated to parity check matrices of projective Reed-Muller codes $\text{PRM}_q(d, m)$ (obtained from evaluating homogeneous polynomials of degree d in $m + 1$ variables including the zero polynomial, at representatives of all points of \mathbb{P}^m) and generalized Reed-Muller codes $\text{RM}_q(d, m)$ for $d < q$. These two results show how one can prove Theorem 33 in another, more indirect, way via known results about $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$. Let the rank functions of these matroids be r_1 and r_2 , respectively. The ground sets of these two matroids are $E_1 := \mathbb{P}_q^m$ and $E_2 := \mathbb{A}_q^m$, respectively. We sometimes wish to view them as $\{1, 2, \dots, q^m + q^{m-1} + \dots + 1\}$ and $\{1, 2, \dots, q^m\}$, respectively, assuming that the points in each set are ordered. The hyperplane at infinity, $\mathbb{P}_q^m - \mathbb{A}_q^m$, is denoted by H and has cardinality $q^{m-1} + q^{m-2} \dots + 1$. We think of H as given by an equation $x_H = 0$, and for all points outside H we assume $x_H = 1$, so that the remaining m homogeneous coordinates can also be viewed as affine coordinates on $E_2 = \mathbb{A}^m = \mathbb{P}^m - H = E_1 - H$.

Definition 49. For $0 \leq i \leq n - r_1(E_1)$, N'_i is the set of subsets τ of E_1 with nullity $n_1(\tau) = |\tau| - r_1(\tau) = i$, while for $0 \leq i \leq n - r_2(E_2)$, N_i is the set of subsets σ of E_2 with nullity $n_2(\sigma) = |\sigma| - r_2(\sigma) = i$.

An immediate generalization (See also [13, Lemma 20]) of Lemma 32 is the following.

Lemma 50. Assume that $d < q$. For any $\sigma \subseteq E_i$, for $i = 1, 2$, the nullity $n_i(\sigma)$ is equal to the affine dimension over \mathbb{F}_q of the set of polynomial expressions that define d -ics (in homogeneous coordinates in case of E_1) that pass through all the points of $E_i - \sigma$.

Our main results are presented in the following two propositions.

Proposition 51. Assume that $d < q$. Let $0 \leq i \leq r_1(E_1)$. If $\sigma_1 \subseteq E_1$ is such that $E_1 - \sigma_1$ is minimal in N'_i , then $E_2 - \sigma_2$ is minimal in N_j for some $j \geq i$ where $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1 \cap E_2$.

Proof. First we show that $E_2 - \sigma_2$ has nullity j with $j \geq i$. By Lemma 50,

$$n_1(E_1 - \sigma_1) = r_1^*(E_1) - r_2^*(\sigma_1) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \{\text{projective conics passing through } \sigma_1\}$$

and

$$n_2(E_2 - \sigma_2) = r_2^*(E_2) - r_2^*(\sigma_2) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \{\text{affine conics passing through } \sigma_2\}.$$

Since $r_2^*(E_2) = r_1^*(E_1) = \binom{m+d}{d}$ for $d < q$ and the set of projective d -ics passing through σ_2 can be identified with the set of affine d -ics passing through σ_2 , we have $n_2(E_2 - \sigma_2) \geq n_1(E_1 - \sigma_1)$, since the right hand side refer to the d -ics passing through the (not necessarily strictly) larger set σ_1 . Thus $j = n_2(E_2 - \sigma_2) \geq i$. Now we prove the minimality of $E_2 - \sigma_2$ in N_j . Assume that there exist $\tau \subseteq E_2$, strictly containing σ_2 , and $n_2(E_2 - \tau) = j$. Let $\tau' = \tau \cup (\sigma_1 \cap L)$. We claim that $n_1(E_1 - \tau') = i$. Note that if the claim is true, it will contradict the minimality of $E_1 - \sigma$ in N'_i and thus it will complete the proof of the Lemma. To prove the claim, observe that if $r_2^*(A) = r_2^*(B)$ with A contained in $B \subseteq E_1$, then the columns indexed by B in a generator matrix of $\text{PRM}_q(d, m)$ can be written as \mathbb{F}_q -linear combinations of columns indexed by A . As a direct consequence of this matroid dependence, it is clear that any element of τ can be written as \mathbb{F}_q -linear combination of the columns of σ_2 (both in a generator matrix for $\text{RM}_q(d, m)$ and $\text{PRM}_q(d, m)$ simultaneously, when in the last matrix in each column for E_2 we choose the representative with $x_H = 1$, where the hyperplane $H = \mathbb{P}^m - \mathbb{A}^m$ at infinity is given as $x_H = 0$), and thus any column of τ' can be written as \mathbb{F}_q -linear combination of those of σ_1 , and thus $r_1(\tau') = r_1^*(\sigma_1)$. So it proves the claim that $n_1(E_1 - \tau') = n_1(E_1 - \sigma_1) = i$. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

Proposition 52. *Assume that $d < q$. Let $1 \leq i \leq n - r_2(E_2)$ and let $\sigma \subseteq E_2$ be such that $E_2 - \sigma$ is minimal in N_i . Then there exists $\tau \subseteq E_1$ such that $E_1 - \tau$ is minimal in N'_i , and $\tau \cap E_1 = \sigma$.*

Proof. Let S be the set of affine d -ics passing through σ . Thus $n_2(E_2 - \sigma) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} S = i$ by Lemma 50. Let S_{hom} denote the set of projective d -ics corresponding to S . Let τ' be the projective zero set $V(S_{\text{hom}})$ in E_1 . Note that $\tau' \cap E_2 = \sigma$, since σ is contained in all the d -ics in S and if a strictly bigger subset σ' of E_2 than σ were contained in $\tau' \cap E_2$, then $n_2(E_2 - \sigma') = i$, contradicting the minimality of $E_2 - \sigma$ in N_i . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} n_1(E_1 - \tau') &= \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \{\text{projective d-ics passing through } \tau'\} \\ &\geq \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} S_{\text{hom}} = i. \end{aligned}$$

We also know that

$$\begin{aligned} n_1(E_1 - \tau') &= \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \{\text{projective d-ics passing through } \tau'\} \\ &\leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \{\text{affine d-ics passing through } \sigma\} = i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $n_1(E_2 - \tau') = i$. Define

$$\Lambda = \{\zeta \subseteq E_1 \mid \tau' \subseteq \zeta, \zeta \cap E_2 = \sigma, \text{ and } n_1(E_2 - \zeta) = i\}.$$

Then $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$, since $\tau' \in \Lambda$. Let τ be a maximal element of Λ under inclusion. Then we claim that $E_1 - \tau$ is minimal in N'_i . Assume the contrary, i.e., there exists $\tau_1 \subseteq E_1$ with τ strictly contained in τ_1 and $n_1(E_1 - \tau_1) = i$. Then

$$i = n_1(E_1 - \tau_1) \leq n_2((E_1 - \tau_1) \cap E_2) \leq n_2(E \setminus \sigma) = i.$$

Thus $n_1((E_1 - \tau_1) \cap E_2) = n_2(E_2 - (\tau_1 \cap E_2)) = i$. But then, because of the minimality of $E_2 - \sigma$ in N_i , we have $(E_1 - \tau_1) \cap E_2 = E_2 - \sigma$, i.e. $\tau_1 \cap E_2 = \sigma$. Hence $\tau_1 \in \Lambda$, which contradicts the maximality of τ in Λ . This proves the proposition. \square

In the special case of $d = m = 2$ we then get:

Proposition 53. *Assume that $q \geq 3$.*

(a) *For $1 \leq i \leq 6$, each of the minimal elements in N_i is the complement in \mathbb{A}_q^2 of $\sigma \cap \mathbb{A}_q^2$ for σ the complement in \mathbb{P}_q^2 of some minimal element of the set N'_i for the projective Reed-Muller code $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$. (The Veronese code studied in [13]).*

(b) *For $1 \leq i \leq 6$, the intersection $\sigma \cap \mathbb{A}_q^2$, for the complement σ in \mathbb{P}_q^2 of some minimal element in N'_i for the projective Reed-Muller code $\text{PRM}_q(2, 2)$, is the complement in \mathbb{A}_q^2 of a minimal element in N_j , for some $j \geq i$.*

Remark 54. If we use Proposition 53(a), and study the classification in [13] of minimal elements of the N'_i for the Veronese codes closely, we conclude that all the minimal elements of N_1 are complements in \mathbb{A}_q^2 of intersections with \mathbb{A}_q^2 of irreducible conics or line pairs in \mathbb{P}_q^2 . This is in perfect harmony with Proposition 12. But we also see that some intersections like $(L \cup M) \cap \mathbb{A}_q^2 = M - \{\text{pt}\}$ is a complement of sets of higher nullity (here 3), for L the line at infinity and M another line. Moreover, the minimal elements of N_2 are complements of intersections of line-point configurations in \mathbb{P}_q^2 with \mathbb{A}_q^2 , or complements of intersections of 4 points \mathbb{P}_q^2 with \mathbb{A}_q^2 (all points must then be in \mathbb{A}_q^2), provided no 3 of them are collinear. Furthermore, the minimal elements of N_3 are complements of intersections of lines in \mathbb{P}_q^2 with \mathbb{A}_q^2 , or complements of intersections of 3 points \mathbb{P}_q^2 with \mathbb{A}_q^2 (all points must then be in \mathbb{A}_q^2), provided that they are non-collinear. For $i = 4, 5, 6$ all minimal elements of N_i are complements of intersections of $6 - i$ points \mathbb{P}_q^2 with \mathbb{A}_q^2 (all points must then be in \mathbb{A}_q^2). All this is in perfect harmony with Theorem 33.

APPENDIX B. A COMPUTER-FREE METHOD TO FIND MORE BETTI NUMBERS

Referring to the minimal resolution described in the beginning of Section 6, we now show how one can find the \mathbb{N}^E -graded Betti numbers appearing there in a computer-free way. This we do, in order to further demonstrate the power of Theorem 22(b) and Proposition 30. Through the described resolution this leads to what we really wish to determine, the \mathbb{N} -graded Betti numbers of the code C_q .

We choose, however, only to present computer-free methods to prove (a) – (d) of the following result. The same methods could be used to prove (e) and (f), but the calculations are so involved that we drop computer-free proofs of those parts.

Lemma 55. *Assume that $q \geq 7$.*

- (a) *Let γ be the complement of a set of 4 points in \mathbb{A}_q^2 , no 3 of which lie on a line. Then $\beta_{2, \gamma} = q$.*
- (b) *$\beta_{3, \alpha} = q^3 - 2q^2 - q + 2$ where α is the complement of a line. This is, in general, true for $q \geq 3$.*
- (c) *$\beta_{3, \delta} = q^3 - 4q^2 + 5q$ where δ is the complement of a set of 3 non-collinear points.*
- (d) *$\beta_{4, \epsilon} = \frac{q^5 - 6q^4 + 14q^3 - 11q^2}{2}$ where ϵ is the complement of a set of 2 points.*

$$(e) \beta_{5,\omega} = \frac{q^7 - 7q^6 + 20q^5 - 20q^4 - 15q^3 + 30q^2 - 9q}{6} \text{ where } \omega \text{ is the comple-}$$

$$\text{ment of a point.}$$

$$(f) \beta_{6,E} = \beta_{6,q^2} = \beta_6 = \frac{q^9 - 8q^8 + 29q^7 - 51q^6 + 18q^5 + 59q^4 - 60q^3 + 36q - 24}{24}.$$

Proof. (a) The four points are contained in exactly $q + 1$ conics, irreducible or line pairs, but not double lines, over \mathbb{F}_q , a fact easily proved, for example using stick figures. The complements of the intersections of all these conics with \mathbb{A}_q^2 give minimal sets in N_1 , as we have seen in Proposition 12. Hence by Proposition 30,

$$\beta_{2,\gamma} = |\mu(\gamma)| = |(q + 1) - 1| = q.$$

(b) *Method 1:* All codewords with support inside α have support in complements of line pairs (and hence each dependent set contained in α are contained in the complements of a line pair). This holds, since the only conics containing $E \setminus \alpha$ are line pairs, by Bezout's theorem, and these line pairs even have one line fixed, namely $E \setminus \alpha$.

We see that all sets of type $E \setminus \alpha$ union a point outside the line are contained in line pairs. There are $q^2 - q$ such unions. Moreover, all sets of type $E \setminus \alpha$ union a set of 2 points outside the line also are contained in line pairs. There are $\binom{q^2 - q}{2}$ such unions. For the sets of type $E \setminus \alpha$ union a set of s points outside the line $E \setminus \alpha$, they come into play if and only if they are on a(nother) line. There are two kinds of lines, apart from $E \setminus \alpha$:

- (i) The $q - 1$ lines parallel to $E \setminus \alpha$. Each of them have q points outside $E \setminus \alpha$,
- (ii) The $(q^2 + q) - 1 - (q - 1) = q^2$ lines that intersect $E \setminus \alpha$ in one point each, and therefore have $q - 1$ points outside $E \setminus \alpha$.

Thus by Proposition 30, We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{3,\alpha} &= |\chi((M_q)_\alpha)| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^{|\alpha|} (-1)^i D_i \right| \\ &= \left| -(q^2 - q) + \binom{q^2 - q}{2} + (q - 1) \sum_{s=3}^q (-1)^s \binom{q}{s} + q^2 \sum_{s=3}^{q-1} (-1)^s \binom{q-1}{s} \right| \\ &= q^3 - 2q^2 - q + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, D_i represents the dependent sets of cardinality i in M_q which are contained in α .

Method 2 : Here we use Proposition 30 to prove the result. Let σ be the complement of a line L . The circuits contained in σ are the complements of the line pairs containing σ , each of which are formed by adding any other line in $E = \mathbb{A}_q^2$ to σ . There are $q^2 + q - 1$ such lines. The cycles of nullity 2 contained in σ are the complements of the unions of σ and any point P outside L . There are $q^2 - q$ choices of such a point P . The μ -values of all these cycles of nullity 2 are q , as we have seen in the proof of Lemma 37. Proposition 30 and Definition 29 then give

$$\beta_{3,\alpha} = |\mu(\sigma)| = |-(q^2 - q)q + (q^2 + q - 1) - 1| = q^3 - 2q^2 - q + 2.$$

(c) 3 points not on a line contained in complements of minimal sets in N_2 in 2 ways. These are contained in $q^2 - 3q + 3$ configurations of 4 points, no two of which are on a line, and in addition in 3 configurations of a line and a point outside the

line (take a line through 2 of the points plus the third point). As we have seen in Lemma 37 and part (a) above, each of these minimal elements of N_2 have μ -value q . Moreover, 3 points not on a line are contained in $q^2 + q + 1$ conics. These are either line pairs or irreducible conics, whose complements are then minimal in N_1 , by Proposition 12, for $q \geq 7$. Thus we obtain

$$\beta_{3,\delta} = |\mu(\delta)| = |-(q^2 - 3q + 6)q + (q^2 + q + 1) - 1| = |-q^3 + 4q^2 - 5q| = q^3 - 4q^2 + 5q.$$

(d) A set τ of two points is contained in $q^2 - q$ sets of 3 non-collinear points, and in exactly 1 line. The set τ is contained in $(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)/2$ configurations of 4 points, no 3 of which are collinear and in addition, in $q^2 + q$ configurations of a line and a point outside the line (here, in $q^2 - q$ cases the line connects the two points, and in $2q$ cases it passes through exactly one of them). Moreover, τ is contained in exactly $q^3 + q^2 + q + 1$ conics in \mathbb{P}_q^2 , but not all of them have \mathbb{A}_q^2 -complements minimal in N_1 . Those that do not, are the union of the line L at infinity and another line, spanned by τ , in addition to the double line through τ . All the other $q^3 + q^2 + q - 1$ conics in \mathbb{P}_q^2 intersect \mathbb{A}_q^2 in a conic of one of the types (e), (d), (f), (g), (h), giving complements of inclusion-minimal elements of N_1 .

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{4,\epsilon} &= |\mu(\epsilon)| \\ &= \left| 1 \cdot (q^3 - 2q^2 - q + 2) + (q^2 - q) \cdot (q^3 - 4q^2 + 5q) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)}{2} \cdot q - (q^2 + q) \cdot q + (q^3 + q^2 + q - 1) \cdot 1 - 1 \right| \\ &= \frac{q^5 - 6q^4 + 14q^3 - 11q^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

(e) We use Proposition 25 to obtain

$$\beta_{5,q^2-1} = \frac{q^9 - 7q^8 + 20q^7 - 20q^6 - 15q^5 + 30q^4 - 9q^3}{6},$$

and divide by the number of points, i.e. q^2 , to obtain the desired value.

(f) We use Proposition 25 directly to obtain β_{6,q^2} , and use the fact that the \mathbb{N}^n -graded Betti number $\beta_{6,E}$ is equal to the \mathbb{N} -graded Betti number β_{6,q^2} here. \square

Referring to the first minimal free resolution of Section 7, we will also show below how one may find four of the five unknown Betti numbers in a computer-free way. In principle we could have done that for the fifth one (part (e)) also, but drop it because of the tediousness of the calculations.

Lemma 56. *Assume that $q \geq 7$.*

- (a) $\beta_{2,\alpha}^{(1)} = q^2 - q - 1$ where α is the complement of a line.
- (b) $\beta_{2,\delta}^{(1)} = q^2 - 3q + 5$ where δ is the complement of 3 non-collinear points.
- (c) $\beta_{3,\epsilon}^{(1)} = \frac{q^4 - 4q^3 + 10q^2 - 11q}{2}$ where ϵ is the complement of two points.
- (d) $\beta_{4,\omega}^{(1)} = \frac{q^6 - 4q^5 + 11q^4 - 17q^3 - 6q^2 + 27q - 6}{6}$ where ω is the complement of a point.
- (e) $\beta_{5,E}^{(1)} = \beta_{5,q^2}^{(1)} = \beta_5^{(1)} = \frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 13q^6 - 31q^5 + 10q^4 + 59q^3 - 48q^2 - 24q + 24}{24}$.

Proof. (a) We have already seen that $E \setminus \alpha$ contains $q^2 - q$ sets of $E \setminus \theta$, which are complements of a line and a point outside the line, and no other minimal elements of N_2 (or $N_1^{(1)}$). Proposition 30 then gives the result.

(b) δ contains 3 minimal elements of N_2 of type θ defined in (a) and $q^2 - 3q + 3$ of type complement of 4 points, no 3 of which are collinear. Proposition 30 then gives the result again.

(c) We recall that a two-point set is contained in exactly one line and $q^2 - q$ sets of 3 non-linear points, and in no other complement of a minimal set in N_3 . Moreover it is contained in $(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)/2$ configurations of 4 points, of which no 3 are collinear, and in $q^2 + q$ point-line sets, as we have seen before, and in no other complements of minimal sets in N_2 . Then by Proposition 30, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{3,\epsilon}^{(1)} &= \left| 1 \cdot (q^2 - q - 1) + (q^2 - q) \cdot (q^2 - 3q + 5) - \frac{(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)}{2} \cdot 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (q^2 + q) \cdot 1 + 1 \right| \\ &= \frac{q^4 - 4q^3 + 10q^2 - 11q}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

(d) A one-point set is contained in $q^2 - 1$ two-point-sets, and in $q + 1$ lines, and in $(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)/2$ configurations of 3 non-collinear points. Moreover, it is contained in $(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)/6$ configurations of 4 points, no 3 of which are collinear. Finally, it is contained in $(q^3 - q) + (q^2 - 1) = q^3 + q^2 - q - 1$ point-line configurations. Hence, Proposition 30 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{4,\omega}^{(1)} &= |\mu^{(1)}(\omega)| \\ &= \left| (q^2 - 1) \cdot \left(\frac{q^4 - 4q^3 + 10q^2 - 11q}{2} \right) - (q + 1) \cdot (q^2 - q - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)}{2} \cdot (q^2 - 3q + 5) + \frac{(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)(q^2 - 3q + 3)}{6} \cdot 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (q^3 + q^2 - q - 1) \cdot 1 - 1 \right| \\ &= \frac{q^6 - 4q^5 + 11q^4 - 17q^3 - 6q^2 + 27q - 6}{6}. \end{aligned}$$

(e) We use Proposition 25 to obtain

$$\beta_{5,E}^{(1)} = \frac{q^8 - 4q^7 + 13q^6 - 31q^5 + 10q^4 + 59q^3 - 48q^2 - 24q + 24}{24}.$$

□

Referring to the minimal free resolution of $M_q^{(2)}$ in Section 7, we will show below how one may find all the three unknown Betti numbers in a computer-free way.

Lemma 57. (a) $\beta_{2,\epsilon}^{(2)} = q^2 - q$.

$$(b) \beta_{3,\omega}^{(2)} = \frac{q^4 - q^3 - q^2 - q}{2}.$$

$$(c) \beta_{4,E}^{(2)} = \beta_{4,q^2}^{(2)} = \beta_4^{(2)} = \frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 - 5q^3 + 6q^2 + 6q - 6}{6}.$$

Proof. Here we prefer to give a computer-free proof. Usage of the Proposition 25 and the computer program SAGE gives the same result:

(a) A two-point sets is contained in one line, and in $q^2 - q$ sets of 3 non-collinear points. Proposition 30 then gives the result.

(b) A one-point set is contained in $q^2 - 1$ two-point sets, and in $q + 1$ lines, and in $\frac{(q^2-1)(q^2-q)}{2}$ configurations of 3 non-collinear points. Hence Proposition 30 (using the analogous Möbius function $\mu^{(2)}$ for $M_q^{(2)}$) then gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{3,\omega}^{(2)} &= |\mu^{(2)}(\omega)| \\ &= \left| (q^2 - 1) \cdot (q^2 - q) - \frac{(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)}{2} \cdot 1 - (q + 1) \cdot 1 + 1 \right| \\ &= \frac{q^4 - q^3 - q^2 - q}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

(c) \emptyset is contained in q^2 points, $\binom{q^2}{2}$ point pairs, $q^2 + q$ lines and $\frac{q^2(q^2-1)(q^2-q)}{6}$ configurations of 3 non-collinear points. Hence Proposition 30 gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{4,E}^{(2)} &= |\mu^{(2)}(E)| \\ &= \left| q^2 \cdot \frac{q^4 - q^3 - q^2 - q}{2} - \binom{q^2}{2} \cdot (q^2 - q) + (q^2 + q) \cdot 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{q^2(q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q)}{6} \cdot 1 - 1 \right| \\ &= \frac{q^6 - q^5 - q^4 - 5q^3 + 6q^2 + 6q - 6}{6},\end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

Remark 58. In this appendix, we have referred to minimal resolutions appearing in Sections 6 and 7. There one always assumes $q \geq 7$. It should be remarked that in the cases $q = 3, 4, 5$ one can in principle use the same methods, in particular Proposition 30, to calculate the \mathbb{N}^E -graded Betti-numbers $\beta_{i,\sigma}$, for σ minimal in N_i . The desired values will then not necessarily be equal to the formulas for the corresponding σ_q for $q \geq 7$, involving q , specialized to $q = 3, 4$ or 5 .

As an example, the formula for $(\phi_{q^2-4}^{(0)} = \phi_{q^2-4})$, valid for $q \geq 7$, gives 32500 if one inserts $q = 5$. But the true value we have found for ϕ_{21} for $q = 5$, is 31000. The difference of 1500 is due to the $\frac{q^5-q^3}{2} = 1500$ irreducible conics that intersect the line at infinity at 2 distinct points, and contain 4 (other) points each in the affine plane. The complements of such conics are not minimal elements of N_1 if $q = 5$, and no longer appear in the calculation of the μ -value of the element in N_2 , which is the complement of the set of the 4 points in the affine plane.

The local Betti numbers will, however, for $q = 3, 4, 5$, in some cases be equal to the specialization of analogous formulas for $q \geq 7$; this may happen if all circuits contained in the analogous σ_q for $q \geq 7$ are complements of line pairs. Indeed, it happens for $\beta_{2,\delta}$, for δ the complement of a line and a point outside the line, which was instrumental in determining the ϕ_{q^2-q-1} for $q = 4, 5$. The ‘‘main problem’’ appear when σ_q , as we have seen, contains complements of irreducible conics, since not all complements of irreducible conics are circuits, for $q \leq 5$.

One could formulate this as an issue of the set of minimal elements of the N_i being homogeneous. For $q \geq 7$ all complements of 4 points, no three of which are

collinear, have the same local Betti numbers. For $q = 5$ there are two classes of such points; those where the set of the four points are complements in an irreducible conic, of a set of two points where the conic intersects the line at infinity, and those which are not of this kind.

It is therefore striking that we arrived at the following conclusion in Remark 47: All the polynomials

$$W_r(X, Y) = \sum_w A_w^{(r)} X^{q^2-w} Y^w,$$

for $r = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$ are obtained for $q = 3, 4, 5$ by calculating them for $q \geq 7$, and specializing to $q = 3, 4, 5$, respectively. This does not seem to be a consequence of our method, but true nevertheless.

APPENDIX C. CALCULATIONS OF BETTI NUMBERS AND THE $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$ FOR $q = 2, 3, 4, 5$

We tabulate below the values of $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$ and the Betti numbers $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(\ell)}$ for $q = 5, 4, 3, 2$ explicitly, the procedure for which is described in Section 9. In the case of Betti numbers, we also indicate the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of the minimal free resolutions of the corresponding matroids.

$j \backslash \ell$	0	1	2	3	4	5
15	- 60	0	0	0	0	0
16	-375	0	0	0	0	0
19	2000	-600	0	0	0	0
20	- 2760	570	-30	0	0	0
21	31000	-6500	0	0	0	0
22	-100000	30000	-2000	0	0	0
23	127500	-48000	6000	-300	0	0
24	-73250	32725	-5875	575	-25	0
25	15944	-8196	1904	-276	24	-1

TABLE 1. $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$ for $q = 5$

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	60	0	0	0	0	0
15	0	375	0	0	0	0	0
17	0	0	3000	2160	0	0	0
18	0	1000	0	0	0	0	0
19	0	600	31000	100000	127500	73250	15944

TABLE 2. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(0)}$ for $q = 5$ (19-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	1	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	600	570	0	0	0
20	0	6500	30000	48000	32725	8196

TABLE 3. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(1)}$ for $q = 5$ (20-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	0	0	0	0
19	0	30	0	0	0
21	0	2000	6000	5875	1904

TABLE 4. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(2)}$ for $q = 5$ (21-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3
0	1	0	0	0
22	0	300	575	276

TABLE 5. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(3)}$ for $q = 5$ (22-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2
0	1	0	0
23	0	25	24

TABLE 6. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(4)}$ for $q = 5$ (23-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1
0	1	0
24	0	1

TABLE 7. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(5)}$ for $q = 5$ (24-regular)

$j \backslash l$	0	1	2	3	4	5
8	-30	0	0	0	0	0
9	-160	0	0	0	0	0
11	672	-240	0	0	0	0
12	2520	-620	-20	0	0	0
13	-10080	4320	-480	0	0	0
14	12480	-6960	1440	-120	0	0
15	-6816	4624	-1376	224	-16	0
16	1413	-1125	435	-105	15	-1

TABLE 8. $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$ for $q = 4$

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	30	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	160	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	960	600	0	0	0
10	0	288	1920	10080	12480	6816	1413

TABLE 9. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(0)}$ for $q = 4$ (10-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	1	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	240	220	0	0	0
11	0	840	4320	6960	4624	1125

TABLE 10. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(1)}$ for $q = 4$ (11-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	0	0	0	0
11	0	20	0	0	0
12	0	480	1440	1376	435

TABLE 11. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(2)}$ for $q = 4$ (12-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3
0	1	0	0	0
13	0	120	224	105

TABLE 12. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(3)}$ for $q = 4$ (13-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2
0	1	0	0
14	0	16	15

TABLE 13. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(4)}$ for $q = 4$ (14-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1
0	1	0
15	0	1

TABLE 14. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(5)}$ for $q = 4$ (15-regular)

$j \backslash l$	0	1	2	3	4	5
3	-12	0	0	0	0	0
4	-54	0	0	0	0	0
5	324	-126	0	0	0	0
6	-600	420	-84	0	0	0
7	540	-540	216	-36	0	0
8	-243	315	-189	63	-9	0
9	44	-70	56	-28	8	-1

TABLE 15. $\phi_j^{(\ell)}$ for $q = 3$

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	54	324	600	540	243	44

TABLE 16. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(0)}$ for $q = 3$ (3-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	1	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	126	420	540	315	70

TABLE 17. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(1)}$ for $q = 3$ (4-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	0	0	0	0
5	0	84	216	189	56

TABLE 18. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(2)}$ for $q = 3$ (5-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3
0	1	0	0	0
6	0	36	63	28

TABLE 19. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(3)}$ for $q = 3$ (6-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2
0	1	0	0
7	0	9	8

TABLE 20. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(4)}$ for $q = 3$ (7-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1
0	1	0
8	0	1

TABLE 21. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(5)}$ for $q = 3$ (8-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	4	6	4	1

TABLE 22. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(0)}$ for $q = 2$ (0-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2	3
0	1	0	0	0
1	0	6	8	3

TABLE 23. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(1)}$ for $q = 2$ (1-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1	2
0	1	0	0
2	0	4	3

TABLE 24. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(2)}$ for $q = 2$ (2-regular)

$j \backslash i$	0	1
0	1	0
3	0	1

TABLE 25. $\beta_{i,i+j}^{(3)}$ for $q = 2$ (3-regular)