

On the second Hamming weight of some Reed-Muller type codes

CÍCERO CARVALHO¹

Faculdade de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Av. J. N. Ávila 2121, 38.408-902 - Uberlândia - MG, Brazil.

Abstract. We study affine cartesian codes, which are a Reed-Muller type of evaluation codes, where polynomials are evaluated at the cartesian product of n subsets of a finite field \mathbb{F}_q . These codes appeared recently in a work by H. López, C. Rentería-Marquez and R. Villareal (see [11]) and, independently, in a generalized form, in a work by O. Geil and C. Thomsen (see [9]). Using a proof technique developed by O. Geil (see [8]) we determine the second Hamming weight (also called next-to-minimal weight) for particular cases of affine cartesian codes and also some higher Hamming weights of this type of code.

Keywords. Affine variety codes, affine cartesian codes, Hamming weights

AMS Classification: 11T71, 13P25, 94B60,

1 Introduction

Affine variety codes are evaluation codes which were introduced by J. Fitzgerald and R. F. Lax in [7] and their construction is as follows. Let $I \subset \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_n] =: \mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ be an ideal and set $I_q := I + (X_1^q - X_1, \dots, X_n^q - X_n)$. Then the affine variety $V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(I)$ defined by I in \mathbb{F}_q^n coincides with the affine variety $V_{\overline{\mathbb{F}_q}}(I_q)$ defined by I_q in $\overline{\mathbb{F}_q}^n$ (where $\overline{\mathbb{F}_q}$ denotes an algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_q). Let $V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(I) = \{P_1, \dots, P_m\}$ and denote by $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]/I_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$ the evaluation morphism $\varphi(f + I_q) = (f(P_1), \dots, f(P_m))$.

Definition 1.1 Let L be an \mathbb{F}_q -vector subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]/I_q$. The *affine variety code* $C(L)$ is the image $\varphi(L)$.

¹The author is partially supported by CNPq grants 302280/2011-1 and 470416/2011-4, and by FAPEMIG proc. PPM-00127-12 email: cicero@ufu.br
To appear in Finite Fields and Their Applications.

In [11] López, Rentería-Marquez and Villareal defined affine cartesian codes, a special type of affine variety codes, in the following way. Let A_1, \dots, A_n be non-empty subsets of \mathbb{F}_q and let $X := A_1 \times \dots \times A_n \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Let $f_i = \prod_{c \in A_i} (X_i - c)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and let $I = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, clearly the set of zeroes of I is X . Furthermore, f_i is a factor of $X_i^q - X_i = \prod_{c \in \mathbb{F}_q} (X_i - c)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ so $I = I_q$. From $X_i^q \equiv X_i \pmod{I}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ we get $f^q \equiv f \pmod{I}$ for any $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ hence I is radical: in fact, if $f^r \in I$ then $f^s \in I$, where $s \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ is such that $s \equiv r \pmod{q}$, so that $f^q \in I$ and a fortiori $f \in I$. A similar reasoning shows that the ideal generated by I in $\overline{\mathbb{F}_q}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is radical so from Nullstellensatz I is the ideal of the set X (this was proved in a different way in [11, Lemma 2.3]).

Definition 1.2 Let d be a positive integer, the *affine cartesian code* $C(d)$ is the image, by φ , of the classes in $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]/I$ of the zero polynomial and of polynomials having degree up to d .

A very important particular case of such codes is of course when $A_i = \mathbb{F}_q$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, for then we have the so-called generalized Reed-Muller codes.

Let $d_i := \#(A_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, in their study of affine cartesian codes López et al. proved that we may assume $2 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ and that the dimension of $C(d)$ is equal to

$$\binom{n+d}{d} - \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n+d-d_i}{d-d_i} + \dots + (-1)^j \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_j \leq n} \binom{n+d-d_{i_1}-\dots-d_{i_j}}{d-d_{i_1}-\dots-d_{i_j}} + \dots + (-1)^n \binom{n+d-d_1-\dots-d_n}{d-d_1-\dots-d_n}$$

where we set $\binom{a}{b} = 0$ if $b < 0$ (see [11, Thm. 3.1]). The length of $C(d)$ is clearly $d_1 \cdot \dots \cdot d_n$. In [11] it is also proved that the minimum distance $d_{\min}(C_d)$ of $C(d)$ is equal to 1 if $d \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$, and there is a formula for $d_{\min}(C_d)$ when $1 \leq d < \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$.

In the next section we will determine the exact value of the second Hamming weight, also called next-to-minimal weight, for some particular cases of $C(d)$ as well as some higher Hamming weights of these codes (see Theorems 2.4 to 2.6

and Corollary 2.7). In the case of generalized Reed-Muller codes, the study of the values for the second Hamming weight was started by J.-P. Cherdieu and R. Rolland (see [3]), and the complete determination of these values has been recently done by A. A. Bruen (see [2]). Bruen discovered that these weights had already been determined in the Ph.D. thesis of D. Erickson (see [6]) for many values of d , and showed how the remaining cases can be obtained from earlier works by him. The values of the weights for these remaining cases also follow from results in [8] or in [12]. The characterization of the second weight codewords of generalized Reed-Muller codes has just been completed by E. Leducq (see [10] and the references therein for earlier results on this subject).

2 Main results

Given an ideal $J \subset \mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ and a monomial order \prec in the set of monomials of $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ we denote by $\Delta(J)$ the *footprint* of I with respect to \prec , i.e. $\Delta(J)$ is the set of monomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ which are not leading monomials of polynomials in J . From the definition of Gröbner basis (with respect to \prec) we get that a monomial is in $\Delta(J)$ if and only if it is not a multiple of any of the leading monomials of the polynomials in a Gröbner basis for J . If $J = (g_1, \dots, g_r)$ and we denote by $\Delta(\text{lm}(g_1), \dots, \text{lm}(g_r))$ the set of monomials of $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ which are not a multiple of the leading monomial of g_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ then $\Delta(J) \subset \Delta(\text{lm}(g_1), \dots, \text{lm}(g_r))$ (we will use this fact in the proofs of Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.4). A well-known property of the footprint is that the classes of the elements of $\Delta(J)$ are a basis for $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]/J$ as an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space (see e.g. [1, Prop. 6.52]). Also, when $\Delta(J)$ is a finite set we get $\#(V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(J)) \leq \#(\Delta(J))$, and equality holds when J is a radical ideal (see [1, Thm. 8.32]).

In what follows we will use the graded-lexicographic order \prec which is defined on the monomials of $\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ by setting $X_1^{m_1} \dots X_n^{m_n} \prec X_1^{t_1} \dots X_n^{t_n}$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i < \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$ or, if $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i = \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$, then the leftmost nonzero entry in $(t_1 - m_1, \dots, t_n - m_n)$ is positive. Observe that using this order we get $\text{lm}(f_i) = X_i^{d_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and since $X_i^{d_i}$ and $X_j^{d_j}$ are relatively prime for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have that $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ is a Gröbner basis for $I = I_q$ (see [4,

Prop. 4, p. 104]), thus

$$\Delta(I) = \{X_1^{a_1} \cdots X_n^{a_n} \mid 0 \leq a_i < d_i \forall i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Given $F \in \mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ let $R \in \mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]$ be its remainder in the division by $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$, then $\varphi(F + I) = \varphi(R + I)$ and from the division algorithm we get that $\deg R \leq \deg F$. This shows that

$$C(d) = \varphi(\langle \Delta(I)_{\leq d} \rangle)$$

where $\langle \Delta(I)_{\leq d} \rangle$ is the \mathbb{F}_q -vector space generated by $\Delta(I)_{\leq d} = \{M \in \Delta(I) \mid \deg(M) \leq d\}$. We note that this gives a proof that $d_{\min}(C(d)) = 1$ if $d \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$: in fact one may show that there are polynomials F_1, \dots, F_m (where $m := d_1 \cdots d_n$) such that $F_i(P_j) = \delta_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ (see e.g. [5, p. 406]) so that φ is surjective and a fortiori an isomorphism because $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathbb{F}_q[\mathbf{X}]/I) = \#(\Delta(I)) = m$, so from $\Delta(I) = \Delta(I)_{\leq d}$ for all $d \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$ we get $C(d) = \mathbb{F}_q^m$ for all $d \geq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$.

We will need the following two lemmas in the proof of the main results.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $0 < d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ and $0 \leq s \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$ be integers. Let $m(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i - a_i)$, where $0 \leq a_i < d_i$ is an integer for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then*

$$\min\{m(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_1 + \dots + a_n \leq s\} = (d_{k+1} - \ell) \prod_{i=k+2}^n d_i$$

where k and ℓ are uniquely defined by $s = \sum_{i=1}^k (d_i - 1) + \ell$, with $0 \leq \ell < d_{k+1} - 1$ (if $s < d_1 - 1$ then take $k = 0$ and $\ell = s$, if $k + 1 = n$ then we understand that $\prod_{i=k+2}^n d_i = 1$).

Proof: We start by observing that the minimum must be attained when $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = s$. Thus, let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, with $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = s$ be such that $a_{i_1} < d_{i_1} - 1$ for some $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If there exists $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i_1 < i_2$, $a_{i_2} > 0$ and $a_{i_1} + a_{i_2} \leq d_{i_1} - 1$, then denoting by \mathbf{a}' the n -tuple obtained from \mathbf{a} by replacing a_{i_1} by $a_{i_1} + a_{i_2}$ and a_{i_2} by 0, we get that

$$m(\mathbf{a}) - m(\mathbf{a}') = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} + (d_{i_2} - d_{i_1}) a_{i_2}) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_1, i_2}}^n (d_i - a_i) \geq 0$$

so that $m(\mathbf{a}') \leq m(\mathbf{a})$, and note that $m(\mathbf{a}') < m(\mathbf{a})$ if $a_{i_1} > 0$. If there exists $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i_1 < i_2$, $a_{i_2} > 0$ and $a_{i_1} + a_{i_2} > d_{i_1} - 1$, then denoting by \mathbf{a}'' the n -tuple obtained from \mathbf{a} by replacing a_{i_1} by $d_{i_1} - 1$ and a_{i_2} by $a_{i_2} - (d_{i_1} - a_{i_1} - 1)$ we get that

$$m(\mathbf{a}) - m(\mathbf{a}'') = (d_{i_1} - a_{i_1} - 1)(d_{i_2} - a_{i_2} - 1) \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_1, i_2}}^n (d_i - a_i) \geq 0$$

so that $m(\mathbf{a}'') \leq m(\mathbf{a})$. This proves that m attains its minimum at $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ where $a_i = d_i - 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $a_{k+1} = \ell$ and $a_j = 0$ for $j > k + 1$. \square

Lemma 2.2 *Let $2 \leq s \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ be integers, with $n \geq 2$. Let $q(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i - a_i)$ where $0 \leq a_i < s$ is an integer for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then*

$$\min\{q(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_1 + \dots + a_n \leq s\} = (d_1 - (s - 1))(d_2 - 1) \prod_{i=3}^n d_i.$$

Proof: As in the previous Lemma we observe that the minimum must be attained when $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = s$. Thus, let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, with $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = s$ and assume that $a_1 < s - 1$. If there exists $i_2 \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_{i_2} > 0$ and $a_1 + a_{i_2} \leq s - 1$ then denoting by \mathbf{a}' the n -tuple obtained from \mathbf{a} by replacing a_1 by $a_1 + a_{i_2}$ and a_{i_2} by 0, we get that

$$m(\mathbf{a}) - m(\mathbf{a}') = (a_1 a_{i_2} + (d_{i_2} - d_1) a_{i_2}) \prod_{\substack{i=2 \\ i \neq i_2}}^n (d_i - a_i) \geq 0$$

so $m(\mathbf{a}) \geq m(\mathbf{a}')$ and $m(\mathbf{a}) > m(\mathbf{a}')$ if $a_1 \neq 0$. If there exists $i_2 \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_1 + a_{i_2} > s - 1$ then we must have $a_1 > 0$ and $a_{i_2} = s - a_1$, denoting by \mathbf{a}'' the n -tuple obtained from \mathbf{a} by replacing a_1 by $s - 1$ and a_{i_2} by 1 we get

$$m(\mathbf{a}) - m(\mathbf{a}'') = (d_{i_2} - d_1 + a_1 - 1)(s - a_1 - 1) \prod_{\substack{i=2 \\ i \neq i_2}}^n (d_i - a_i) \geq 0.$$

This shows that if q attains its minimum at $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ then we may assume that $a_1 = s - 1$ and now it is easy to check that we can also assume $a_2 = 1$. \square

As mentioned in the introduction, in [11] the authors find a formula for the minimum distance of affine cartesian codes is determined (see [11, Thm. 3.8]). The determination of this formula occupies most of the paper, the result being preceded by several technical lemmas. In following we present a simple proof of this result which we will use in the main results. We also note that in [9, Prop. 5] there is a formula for the minimum distance of certain codes which may be seen as a generalization of affine cartesian codes.

Proposition 2.3 *The minimum distance of the affine cartesian code $C(d)$ defined over $X = A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n$, with $d_i := \#(A_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, is $d_{\min} = (d_{k+1} - \ell) \prod_{i=k+2}^n d_i$, where $d < \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$ and k and ℓ are uniquely defined by $d = \sum_{i=1}^k (d_i - 1) + \ell$, with $0 \leq \ell < d_{k+1} - 1$ (if $d < d_1 - 1$ then take $k = 0$ and $\ell = s$, if $k + 1 = n$ we understand that $\prod_{i=k+2}^n d_i = 1$).*

Proof: Let $F \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a polynomial which is a sum of monomials in $\Delta(I)_{\leq d}$ and let $J_F := (F, f_1, \dots, f_n)$, the weight of the codeword $\varphi(F + I)$ then satisfies $w(\varphi(F + I)) = \prod_{i=1}^n d_i - \#(V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(J_F))$. Since $\#(V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(\text{lm}(F), X_1^{d_1}, \dots, X_n^{d_n}))$ we get that $\prod_{i=1}^n d_i - \#(\Delta(\text{lm}(F), X_1^{d_1}, \dots, X_n^{d_n}))$ is a lower bound for $w(\varphi(F + I))$. Let $\text{lm}(F) = X_1^{a_1} \cdots X_n^{a_n}$, from $\#(\Delta(\text{lm}(F), X_1^{d_1}, \dots, X_n^{d_n})) = \prod_{i=1}^n d_i - \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i - a_i)$ we get $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i - a_i)$. Letting (a_1, \dots, a_n) run over all n -tuples such that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \leq d$ we get from Lemma 2.1 that $(d_{k+1} - \ell) \prod_{i=k+1}^n d_i$ is a lower bound for the minimum distance of $C(d)$. To see that this lower bound is attained we write $A_i = \{\alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{id_i}\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and let $G(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{a_i} (X_i - \alpha_{ij})$, then $G(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is a polynomial with leading monomial equal to $X_1^{a_1} \cdots X_n^{a_n}$ which has $\prod_{i=1}^n d_i - \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i - a_i)$ zeroes, all in X . \square

We will now determine the second Hamming weight of codes $C(d)$ for several particular cases of this code. We start with the case where all the sets in the cartesian product have the same cardinality a and $2 \leq d < a$ (hence $a \geq 3$). The proof of the following theorem is an enhancement of the proofs of [8, Prop. 2 and Thm. 3].

Theorem 2.4 *Let $A_i \subset \mathbb{F}_q$ such that $\#(A_i) = a \geq 3$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, with $n \geq 2$ and let $2 \leq d < a$. The second Hamming weight of $C(d)$ is $(a - (d - 1))(a - 1)a^{n-2}$.*

Proof: We write $A_i = \{\alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{ia}\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let $1 \leq t < a$. Let $F \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a polynomial of degree t and let $J_F = (F, f_1, \dots, f_n)$. As in the proof of Proposition 2.3 we have that $w(\varphi(F+I)) = \prod_{i=1}^n d_i - \#(V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(J_F))$. Let $M := X_1^{a_1} \cdots X_n^{a_n}$ be the leading monomial of F (so that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = t$ because we are using the graded-lexicographic order). We deal first with the case where $t \geq 2$.

a) Assume that $a_i < t$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. From

$$\#(V_{\mathbb{F}_q}(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(M, X_1^{d_1}, \dots, X_n^{d_n})) = \prod_{i=1}^n d_i - \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i - a_i)$$

and Lemma 2.2 we get $w(\varphi(F+I)) \geq (d_1 - (t-1))(d_2 - 1) \prod_{i=3}^n d_i$. This bound is effectively attained, for example, when $F = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} (X_1 - \alpha_{1i}) \right) (X_2 - \alpha_{21})$.

b) Assume now that $a_j = t$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $\{F, f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ is a Gröbner basis for J_F then $\#(\Delta(J_F)) = ta^{n-1}$ and $w(\varphi(F+I)) = a^n - ta^{n-1} = (a-t)a^{n-1}$; from Proposition 2.3 we get that this is the minimum distance of $C(t)$. If $\{F, f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ is not a Gröbner basis for J_F then the S -polynomial $S(F, f_j) = X_j^{a-t}F - f_j$ must have a nonzero remainder R in the division by $\{F, f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ (otherwise $\{F, f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ would be a Gröbner basis because any other pair of distinct polynomials $\{g_1, g_2\}$ in $\{F, f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ has leading monomials which are relatively prime - see [4, pags. 103 and 104]). Let $L := X_1^{b_1} \cdots X_n^{b_n}$ be the leading monomial of R , from the division algorithm we get $b_j < t$, $b_i < a$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $i \neq j$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i \leq \deg(S(F, f_j)) \leq a$. Thus $J_F = (F, f_1, \dots, f_n) = (R, F, f_1, \dots, f_n)$ so that

$$\#(\Delta(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(L, X_j^t, X_1^a, \dots, X_n^a)) = ta^{n-1} - (t - b_j) \prod_{i=1, i \neq j}^n (a - b_i)$$

Now we apply Lemma 2.1 with $d_1 = t$, $d_i = a$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$ and $s = a$, and writing $a = (t-1) + (a - (t-1))$ we get that an upper bound for the number of zeroes of F in X is $ta^{n-1} - (t-1)a^{n-2}$ so the minimum distance of $\varphi(F+I)$ is lower bounded by $a^n - ta^{n-1} + (t-1)a^{n-2} = (a-1)(a-t+1)a^{n-2}$. This proves that for $2 \leq t < a$ the possible values for $w(F+I)$, where F is a polynomial of

degree t are in the set $\{(a-t)a^{n-1}\} \cup \{w \in \mathbb{N} \mid w \geq (a-1)(a-t+1)a^{n-2}\}$ where $(a-t)a^{n-1}$ and $(a-1)(a-t+1)a^{n-2}$ are realized as weights.

In the case where $t = 1$ we have $M = X_j$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ so that $\#(\Delta(M, X_1^a, \dots, X_n^a)) = a^n - (a-1)a^{n-1}$, thus $w(F+I) \geq (a-1)a^{n-1}$.

Now we put the above results together to calculate the second smallest weight of $C(d)$, where $2 \leq d < a$, and find that it is equal to $(a-1)(a-d+1)a^{n-2}$. This is because $(a-1)(a-d+1)a^{n-2} < (a-1)(a-t+1)a^{n-2}$ and $(a-1)(a-d+1)a^{n-2} < (a-t)a^{n-1}$ for all $1 \leq t < d$, and of course $(a-d)a^{n-1} < (a-1)(a-d+1)a^{n-2}$. \square

Setting $a = q$ in the above theorem we get the values for the second Hamming weight of the generalized Reed-Muller codes when $2 \leq d < q$ (cf. [8]).

In the next theorem we treat the case where we have the cartesian product of two subsets of \mathbb{F}_q with distinct cardinalities.

Theorem 2.5 *Let $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{F}_q$ be such that $3 \leq \#(A_1) =: d_1 < d_2 := \#(A_2)$ and let $2 \leq d < d_1$. The second Hamming weight of $C(d)$ is $(d_1 - d + 1)(d_2 - 1)$.*

Proof: We follow the same procedure of the above proof, and although the beginning is similar the development is a bit more elaborate. We write $A_i = \{\alpha_{i1}, \dots, \alpha_{id_i}\}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and let $1 \leq t < d_1$. Let $F \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, X_2]$ be a polynomial of degree t and let $J_F = (F, f_1, f_2)$. Then $w(\varphi(F+I)) \geq d_1 d_2 - \#(\Delta(J_F))$. Let $M := X_1^{a_1} \cdot X_2^{a_2}$ be the leading monomial of F (hence $a_1 + a_2 = t$). We deal first with the case where $t \geq 2$.

a) Assume that $a_i < t$ for $i = 1, 2$. From $\#(\Delta(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(M, X_1^{d_1}, X_2^{d_2})) = d_1 d_2 - \prod_{i=1}^2 (d_i - a_i)$ and Lemma 2.2 we get $w(\varphi(F+I)) \geq (d_1 - (t-1))(d_2 - 1)$. This bound is effectively attained, for example, when $F = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t-1} (X_1 - \alpha_{1i}) \right) (X_2 - \alpha_{21})$.

b) Assume now that $a_j = t$ for $j = 1$ or $j = 2$. If $\{F, f_1, f_2\}$ is a Gröbner basis for J_F then $\#(\Delta(J_F)) = t d_2$, if $a_1 = t$ or $\#(\Delta(J_F)) = t d_1$, if $a_2 = t$ so that $w(\varphi(F+I)) \geq d_1 d_2 - t d_2$ if $a_1 = t$ or $w(\varphi(F+I)) \geq d_1 d_2 - t d_1$ if $a_2 = t$. According to Proposition 2.3 $(d_1 - t)d_2$ is the minimum distance of $C(t)$, and it is easy to check that $(d_2 - t)d_1$ is also realized as the weight of a codeword. We assume now that $\{F, f_1, f_2\}$ is not a Gröbner basis for J_F , and we treat separately the cases where $M = X_1^t$ and $M = X_2^t$.

When $M = X_1^t$ we must have that the S -polynomial $S(F, X_1) = X_1^{d_1-t}F - X_1^{d_1}$ has a nonzero remainder in the division by $\{F, X_1^{d_1}, X_2^{d_2}\}$ (because X_1^t and $X_2^{d_2}$ are relatively prime), so let $L := X_1^{b_1}X_2^{b_2}$ be the leading monomial of this remainder. From the division algorithm we get $b_1 < t$, $b_2 < d_2$ and $b_1 + b_2 \leq d_1$. We have $\#(\Delta(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(L, M, X_1^{d_1}, X_2^{d_2})) = td_2 - (t - b_1)(d_2 - b_2)$ so $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq d_1d_2 - td_2 + (t - b_1)(d_2 - b_2)$. We now use Lemma 2.1 to find the minimum of $(t - b_1)(d_2 - b_2)$, observing the restrictions on b_1 and b_2 , and get $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq d_1d_2 - td_2 + d_2 - d_1 + t - 1 = (d_2 - 1)(d_1 - t + 1)$.

When $M = X_2^t$ we have that the S -polynomial $S(F, X_2) = X_2^{d_2-t}F - X_2^{d_2}$ has a nonzero remainder in the division by $\{F, X_1^{d_1}, X_2^{d_2}\}$ and again we denote by $L = X_1^{b_1}X_2^{b_2}$ the leading monomial of this remainder. From the division algorithm we get $b_1 < d_1$, $b_2 < t$ and $b_1 + b_2 \leq d_2$, but from $b_1 < d_1$ and $b_2 < t$ we also get $b_1 + b_2 \leq d_1 + t - 2$, thus $b_1 + b_2 \leq r := \min\{d_2, d_1 + t - 2\}$. As before we note that $\#(\Delta(J_F)) \leq \#(\Delta(L, M, X_1^{d_1}, X_2^{d_2})) = td_1 - (d_1 - b_1)(t - b_2)$ so that $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq d_1d_2 - td_1 + (d_1 - b_1)(t - b_2)$. Now we want to apply Lemma 2.1 to find the minimum of $(t - b_2)(d_1 - b_1)$, observing the restrictions on b_1 and b_2 . If $r = d_1 + t - 2$ then from $d_1 + t - 2 = (t - 1) + (d_1 - 1)$ we get that the minimum is 1, hence $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq d_1(d_2 - t) + 1$. If $r = d_2$ then $d_2 \leq d_1 + t - 2$ so $d_2 - t + 1 \leq d_1 - 1$, thus from $d_2 = (t - 1) + d_2 - t + 1$ and Lemma 2.1 we get that the minimum is $d_1 - d_2 + t - 1$, which implies that $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq (d_1 - 1)(d_2 - t + 1)$.

This completes the analysis of the case where $t \geq 2$. In the case where $t = 1$ we have that either $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq (d_1 - 1)d_2$ or $w(\varphi(F + I)) \geq d_1(d_2 - 1)$.

From what is done so far we get that if $2 \leq t < d_1$ then $w(\varphi(F + I)) \in \{(d_1 - t)d_2\} \cup \{v \in \mathbb{N} \mid v \geq (d_2 - 1)(d_1 - t + 1)\}$ because $(d_2 - 1)(d_1 - t + 1) - d_1(d_2 - t) = -(t - 1)(d_2 - d_1 - 1) \leq 0$ and $(d_2 - 1)(d_1 - t + 1) - (d_1 - 1)(d_2 - t + 1) = -(t - 2)(d_2 - d_1) \leq 0$.

Thus considering the weights $w(\varphi(F + I))$ for all polynomials F of degree less or equal than d (where $2 \leq d < d_1$) we get that the second smallest weight is $(d_2 - 1)(d_1 - d + 1)$, this is because $(d_2 - 1)(d_1 - d + 1) < (d_2 - 1)(d_1 - t + 1)$ and $(d_2 - 1)(d_1 - d + 1) < (d_1 - t)d_2$ whenever $1 \leq t < d$, and $(d_1 - d)d_2 < (d_2 - 1)(d_1 - d + 1)$. \square

The following result deals with higher Hamming weights of the code $C(d)$. The

proof is an enhancement of the proof of [8, Thm. 4].

Theorem 2.6 *Let $2 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ be integers, with $n \geq 2$, and let d be an integer such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (d_i - 1) \leq d < \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$. Write $d = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$, with $0 \leq \ell < d_n - 1$. Then for $t \in \{1, \dots, \ell + 1\}$ the t -th weight of $C(d)$ is $d_n - \ell + (t - 1)$.*

Proof: For $t \in \{1, \dots, \ell + 1\}$ we have $C(d - (t - 1)) \subset C(d)$ so from Proposition 2.3 we get that in $C(d)$ there are words of weight $d_n - \ell, d_n - \ell + 1, \dots, d_n$, being $d_n - \ell$ the minimum distance of $C(d)$. This proves the theorem. \square

We now put the last three results together to determine the second Hamming weight of $C(d)$, for all $d \geq 2$, in the case where we have the cartesian product of two sets containing at least three elements each.

Corollary 2.7 *Let $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbb{F}_q$ be such that $3 \leq \#(A_1) =: d_1 \leq d_2 := \#(A_2)$ and let $2 \leq d$. Then second Hamming weight of $C(d)$ is equal to:*

- i) $(d_1 - d + 1)(d_2 - 1)$ if $2 \leq d < d_1$;*
- ii) $d_1 + d_2 - d$ if $d_1 \leq d \leq d_1 + d_2 - 2$;*
- iii) 2 if $d_1 + d_2 - 2 < d$.*

Proof: Item (i) is a direct consequence of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5. Item (ii) is a consequence of the above theorem, because writing $d = (d_1 - 1) + \ell$ we get that the second weight is $d_2 - \ell + 1 = d_1 + d_2 - d$. Item (iii) comes from the fact that $C(d) = \mathbb{F}_q^m$ whenever $d \geq d_1 + d_2 - 2$ as observed just before Lemma 2.1 (this is also proved in [11]). \square

References

- [1] T. Becker and V. Weispfenning, Gröbner Bases - A computational approach to commutative algebra, 2nd. pr., Berlin, Germany: Springer Verlag, 1998.
- [2] A.A. Bruen, Blocking sets and low-weight codewords in the generalized Reed-Muller codes, in: A.A. Bruen, D.L. Wehlau (Eds.) Error-Correcting Codes, Finite Geometries and Cryptography, Contemp. Math., vol. 523, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 2010, pp. 161-164.

- [3] J.-P. Cherdieu and R. Rolland, On the Number of Points of Some Hypersurfaces in \mathbb{F}_q^n , *Finite Fields Appl.* 2 (1996) 214-224.
- [4] D. Cox, J. Little and D. O'Shea, *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*, 3rd. ed., New York, Springer, 2007.
- [5] P. Delsarte, J.M. Goethals, and F.J. MacWilliams, On generalized Reed-Muller codes and their relatives, *Inform. Control* 16 (1970) 403-442.
- [6] D. Erickson, Counting zeros of polynomials over finite fields, Ph.D. thesis, Thesis of the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena California, 1974.
- [7] J. Fitzgerald and R.F. Lax, Decoding affine variety codes using Gobner bases, *Des. Codes and Cryptogr.* 13 (1998) 147-158.
- [8] O. Geil, On the second weight of generalized Reed-Muller codes, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 48 (2008) 323-330.
- [9] O. Geil and C. Thomsen, Weighted Reed-Muller codes revisited, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* 66 (2013) 195-220.
- [10] E. Leducq, Second weight codewords of generalized Reed-Muller codes, to appear in *Cryptogr. Commun.*, DOI: 10.1007/s12095-013-0084-z.
- [11] Hiram H. Lopez, Carlos Rentería-Marquez and Rafael H. Villarreal, Affine cartesian codes, to appear in *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, DOI: 10.1007/s10623-012-9714-2.
- [12] R. Rolland, The second weight of generalized Reed-Muller codes in most cases, *Cryptogr. Commun.* 2 (2010) 19-40.