

On Binary Shadow Codes

Amir Tasbihi and Frank R. Kschischang

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

University of Toronto

Emails: {tasbihi, frank}@ece.utoronto.ca

September 4, 2024

Abstract

We generalize the shadow codes of Cherubini and Micheli to include basic polynomials having arbitrary degree, and show that restricting basic polynomials to have degree one or less can result in improved lower bounds on the minimum distance of the code. However, even these improved lower bounds suggest that shadow codes have considerably inferior distance-rate characteristics compared with the concatenation of a Reed–Solomon outer code and a first-order Reed–Muller inner code.

1 Introduction

Cherubini and Micheli [1] have recently introduced a new class of low-rate binary linear codes called *shadow codes*. These codes are obtained by evaluating a product of basic polynomials over \mathbb{F}_q (a field of odd characteristic) at a set of points where each basic polynomial is guaranteed to be nonzero. The resulting vector of nonzero values is mapped to a vector over \mathbb{F}_2 via a homomorphism from the multiplicative group of \mathbb{F}_q to the additive group of \mathbb{F}_2 . Cherubini and Micheli consider shadow codes where the basic polynomials are irreducible of degree at least two.

In this note, we briefly discuss general properties of shadow codes and generalize the construction to include basic polynomials having arbitrary degree. Restricting basic polynomials to degree one or less results in an improved lower bound on the minimum distance of the the code. Despite these enhancements, those lower bounds suggest that shadow codes improve upon the well-known Delsarte–Goethals codes [2,

Ch. 15] only in the regime of extremely long block lengths and in this regime the concatenation of a Reed–Solomon outer code with a first-order Reed–Muller inner code leads to superior code parameters.

Throughout this paper we use the following notation. The set of natural numbers (excluding zero) is denoted as \mathbb{N} . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $[n] \triangleq \{1, \dots, n\}$. For a prime-power q , the finite field of size q is denoted with \mathbb{F}_q and its algebraic closure is denoted as $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. Moreover, $\mathbb{F}_q^* \triangleq \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \{0\}$. This set forms a group under \mathbb{F}_q multiplication. The Hamming weight of a vector \mathbf{v} is denoted as $\text{wt}(\mathbf{v})$. The minimum Hamming distance between distinct codewords in a code C is denoted as $d_{\min}(C)$. For an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ denotes the ring of multivariate polynomials with indeterminates x_1, \dots, x_n over \mathbb{F}_q . For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the *affine variety* defined by any m polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_m \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is denoted as $\mathcal{V}_q(P_1, \dots, P_m)$; thus,

$$\mathcal{V}_q(P_1, \dots, P_m) \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n : P_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = 0, \forall i \in [m]\}. \quad (1)$$

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Absolutely Irreducible Polynomials

For any prime-power q and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is said to be *irreducible* if whenever $P = AB$, for some polynomials A and $B \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, then either A or B is a constant field element. Any univariate irreducible polynomial over \mathbb{F}_q splits (*i.e.*, decomposes as a product of degree-one polynomials) in some extension field of \mathbb{F}_q ; however, the situation is different for multivariate polynomials. Indeed, it is possible for a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ to be irreducible over all algebraic extensions of \mathbb{F}_q , *i.e.*, irreducible over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. Such a polynomial is then said to be *absolutely irreducible* over \mathbb{F}_q .

Example 1. *The polynomial $P(x, y) = x^2 + y$ is absolutely irreducible over \mathbb{F}_3 . On the other hand, while $G(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$ is irreducible over \mathbb{F}_3 , it is not absolutely irreducible since $G(x, y) = (x - \alpha^2 y)(x + \alpha^2 y)$, where α is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_9 .*

The following lemma will be used to prove Theorem 1 which provides a special class of absolutely irreducible polynomials, extensively used throughout the paper.

Lemma 1. *Any irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ has distinct roots in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. Moreover, distinct irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ do not have a common root in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$.*

Proof. See [3, p. 520, Prop. 9]. □

Theorem 1. For any finite field \mathbb{F}_q and any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $P_1, \dots, P_m \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be distinct monic irreducible polynomials. Then, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$, the polynomial

$$Q(x, y) = y^2 - \gamma \prod_{i=1}^m P_i(x)$$

is absolutely irreducible.

Proof. Were $Q(x, y)$ irreducible in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$, there would be polynomials A and $B \in \overline{\mathbb{F}}_q[x]$ such that

$$Q(x, y) = (y - A(x))(y + B(x)) \tag{2a}$$

$$= y^2 + (B(x) - A(x))y - A(x)B(x), \tag{2b}$$

which implies that $A = B$. Therefore,

$$\gamma \prod_{i=1}^m P_i(x) = A^2(x), \tag{3}$$

implying that all roots of $\prod_{i=1}^m P_i(x)$ have a multiplicity at least two. However, since the P_i 's are distinct, this contradicts Lemma 1. \square

Somewhat counterintuitively, while a univariate irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ does not have zeros in \mathbb{F}_q , a multivariate (absolutely) irreducible polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ may have zeros in \mathbb{F}_q^n ! The following theorem expresses bounds on the number of zeros of a class of irreducible polynomials.

Theorem 2. Let k be a positive integer and $P \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be a polynomial with ℓ distinct zeros in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$, for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$R(x, y) = y^k - P(x) \tag{4}$$

is absolutely irreducible. Then, the number of zeros of R , i.e., $|\mathcal{V}_q(R)|$, satisfies

$$\left| |\mathcal{V}_q(R)| - q \right| \leq (k-1)(\ell-1)\sqrt{q}. \tag{5}$$

Proof. See [4, Sec. 2.11]. \square

Corollary 1. Let $Q(x, y)$ and $P_i(x)$, $i \in [m]$, be as defined in Theorem 1 and let $d = \sum_{i \in [m]} \deg(P_i)$. Then,

$$\left| |\mathcal{V}_q(Q)| - q \right| \leq (d-1)\sqrt{q}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. From Lemma 1, $\prod_{i=1}^m P_i(x)$ has d distinct zeros and from Theorem 1, $Q(x, y)$ is absolutely irreducible. The corollary then follows from Theorem 2. \square

2.2 Delsarte–Goethals Codes

The Delsarte–Goethals (DG) codes [5] are a class of low-rate binary nonlinear codes obtained as a union of carefully selected cosets of the first-order Reed–Muller code $RM(1, m)$ in the second-order Reed–Muller code $RM(2, m)$, where m is even. The DG code $DG(m, d)$ (for $m = 2t + 2 \geq 4$) is a code of length 2^{2t+2} containing $2^{(2t+1)(t-d+2)+2t+3}$ codewords and having minimum Hamming distance $2^{2t+1} - 2^{2t+1-d}$. The code $DG(m, 1)$ coincides with $RM(2, m)$ (the second-order Reed–Muller code), while for $2 \leq d \leq t + 1$, $DG(m, d)$ is a nonlinear subcode of $RM(2, m)$. DG codes are well described in the classical text of MacWilliams and Sloane [2, Ch. 15].

3 Binary Shadow Codes

In this section, we briefly discuss binary shadow codes. For a thorough rigorous discussion of shadow codes, see [1].

3.1 Definition and Properties

Let k be a positive integer and q be a power of an odd prime number. Let $\lg : \mathbb{F}_q^* \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ be *the* nontrivial homomorphism between the multiplicative group of \mathbb{F}_q and the additive group of \mathbb{F}_2 . Thus, for any primitive $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\lg(\alpha^k) = k \pmod{2}$. Note that a field element $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_q$ is a zero of \lg if and only if β is a nonzero perfect square.

Let \mathcal{E} , called the *evaluation set*, be any non-empty subset of \mathbb{F}_q and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be the set of all polynomials which do not vanish at any point of \mathcal{E} , *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}} \triangleq \{P \in \mathbb{F}_q[x] : P(\beta) \neq 0, \forall \beta \in \mathcal{E}\}. \quad (7)$$

Clearly, all irreducible polynomials of degree $\neq 1$ belong to $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$; therefore, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}} \neq \{\}$. Moreover, one may see that $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$ forms a monoid under polynomial multiplication with the zero-degree polynomial 1 as its identity.

Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$ be any finite set such that (i) all non-constant polynomials in \mathcal{B} are monic and irreducible, and (ii) \mathcal{B} contains at most one polynomial of degree zero and that polynomial, if contained in \mathcal{B} , takes the form $P(x) = \alpha$, for a primitive $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q$. We refer to the elements of \mathcal{B} as *basic* polynomials. Since $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ is a *unique factorization domain*, each polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ can be factored uniquely as a product of monic irreducible polynomials, multiplied by some integer power of α . Let $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the set

of all polynomials whose factorization as the product of monic irreducible polynomials has only basic factors, *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}} \triangleq \left\{ \prod_{P \in \mathcal{B}} P(x)^{n_P} : n_P \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a submonoid of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Let $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}} : \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{|\mathcal{E}|}$ be a function defined as

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(P) \triangleq \left(\lg(P(\beta)) : \beta \in \mathcal{E} \right), \quad (9)$$

for any $P(x) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$. Note that for any two polynomials $P(x)$ and $Q(x) \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$ we have $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(PQ) = \Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(P) + \Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(Q)$; thus, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a monoid homomorphism.

Definition 1. *The binary shadow code $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})$ is the image of the monoid $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$ under homomorphism $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}$, *i.e.*,*

$$C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}) \triangleq \Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}). \quad (10)$$

For any evaluation set \mathcal{E} and any set \mathcal{B} of basic polynomials, let

$$\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}) \triangleq |\mathcal{E}| - \frac{q}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{q}}{2}(d_{\mathcal{B}} - 1), \quad (11)$$

where $d_{\mathcal{B}} \triangleq \deg(\prod_{P \in \mathcal{B}} P)$ is called the *total degree*. The following theorem provides some fundamental properties of $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})$.

Theorem 3 (Properties of a binary shadow code).

- (a) $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})$ is a linear code of length $|\mathcal{E}|$.
- (b) $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}) = \text{span}(\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{B}))$.
- (c) If $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}) > 0$ then $\dim(C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})) = |\mathcal{B}|$.
- (d) $d_{\min}(C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})) \geq \Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})$.

Proof. (a) $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a submonoid of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a monoid homomorphism on $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{E}}$. Therefore, $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})$ is closed under binary addition of its elements.

- (b) Follows from the definition of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B}}$ in (8).

- (c) We show that if $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}) > 0$ then the vectors in the spanning set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{B})$ are linearly independent. Had they been linearly dependent, then there would be a nonzero binary vector $\mathbf{b} = (b_P : P \in \mathcal{B}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{|\mathcal{B}|}$ such that $\sum_{P \in \mathcal{B}} b_P \Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(P) = \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the zero vector. Therefore, the polynomial $A(x) = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{B}} P(x)^{b_P}$ evaluates to nonzero perfect squares at all points of \mathcal{E} . Assume that for an $\eta \in \mathcal{E}$, $A(\eta) = \beta^2$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$. Then, the polynomial $Q(x, y) = y^2 - A(x)$ has zeros at (η, β) and $(\eta, -\beta)$. Indeed, each evaluation point contributes twice in the zeros of Q . As a result, Q has at least $2|\mathcal{E}|$ roots in \mathbb{F}_q^2 , *i.e.*,

$$|\mathcal{V}_q(Q)| \geq 2|\mathcal{E}|. \quad (12)$$

Due to Theorem 1, Q is absolutely irreducible; thus, Corollary 1 implies that

$$|\mathcal{V}_q(Q)| \leq q + (d_{\mathcal{B}} - 1)\sqrt{q}. \quad (13)$$

From (12) and (13) one concludes that $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}) \leq 0$ which is a contradiction. Thus, the vectors in the spanning set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(\mathcal{B})$ are linearly independent and $\dim(C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})) = |\mathcal{B}|$.

- (d) For any nonzero codeword \mathbf{v} , there is a nonzero binary vector $\mathbf{b} = (b_P : P \in \mathcal{B}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{|\mathcal{B}|}$ such that $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{B}} b_P \Lambda_{\mathcal{E}}(P)$. Let $m_{\mathbf{v}}$ denote the number of zero entries of \mathbf{v} . Using similar arguments as in the proof of part (c), we see that the absolutely irreducible polynomial

$$Q(x, y) = y^2 - \prod_{P \in \mathcal{B}} P(x)^{b_P} \quad (14)$$

has at least $2m_{\mathbf{v}}$ zeros in \mathbb{F}_q^2 . Therefore, (13) implies that

$$m_{\mathbf{v}} \leq \frac{q}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{q}}{2}(d_{\mathcal{B}} - 1). \quad (15)$$

Note that $\text{wt}(\mathbf{v}) = |\mathcal{E}| - m_{\mathbf{v}}$; therefore, for any nonzero codeword \mathbf{v} , $\text{wt}(\mathbf{v}) \geq \Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B})$. \square

3.2 Shadow Codes of Degree 2

Cherubini and Micheli in [1] suggest using a set \mathcal{B}_2 of degree-2 irreducible basic polynomials. We refer to that scheme as a *shadow code of degree 2*. Since there is no linear basic polynomial in a shadow code of degree 2, we may allow $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{F}_q$. In that case, the length of the code is $n = q$, $d_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 2|\mathcal{B}_2|$, and if $\Delta(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{B}_2) > 0$ then the dimension of the code is $k = |\mathcal{B}_2|$. Therefore, $d_{\min}(C(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{B}_2))$ satisfies

$$d_{\min}(C(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{B}_2)) \geq \Delta(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{B}_2) = \frac{n}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}(2k - 1) \quad (16)$$

and the positivity of $\Delta(\mathbb{F}_q, \mathcal{B}_2)$ implies that

$$k \leq \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{n} - 1}{2} \right\rceil. \quad (17)$$

4 Shadow Codes of Degree at Most 1

Corollary 1 suggests that a smaller total degree $d_{\mathcal{B}}$ tightens the lower bound on $d_{\min}(C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}))$, as discussed in Theorem 2-(d). Therefore, by choosing the basic polynomials among linear irreducible polynomials we may get a larger lower bound on minimum distance.

For any evaluation set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{F}_q$, let the set of basic polynomials be selected as

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \{(x - \lambda) : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_q \setminus \mathcal{E}\} \cup \{\alpha\}. \quad (18)$$

In this case, we refer to the code $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1)$ as a *shadow code of degree at most 1*. The inclusion of α in \mathcal{B}_1 not only increases the dimension by one, but it means that the all-ones word is a codeword (thus the complement of every codeword is a codeword).

Assume that for a positive $\gamma < 1$, $|\mathcal{E}| = \gamma q$ and, as a result, $|\mathcal{B}_1| = (1 - \gamma)q + 1$. Therefore, the length of the code is $n = \gamma q$, the total degree is $d_{\mathcal{B}_1} = (1 - \gamma)q$, and if $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1) > 0$ then the dimension of the code is $k = (1 - \gamma)q + 1$. In such a case, one may see that $q = n + k - 1$ and $\gamma = n/(n + k - 1)$. We then have

$$d_{\min}(C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1)) \geq \Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1) = \frac{n - k + 1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{n + k - 1}}{2}(k - 2). \quad (19)$$

The following theorem expresses a bound on k which guarantees the positivity of $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1)$.

Theorem 4. *Consider $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1)$, a shadow code of degree at most 1 and length $n \geq 3$. If $k \leq \sqrt{n} + 0.5$ then $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1) > 0$.*

Proof. Let the polynomial $S(n, k)$ be defined as

$$S(n, k) \triangleq k^3 + (n - 6)k^2 + (10 - 2n)k + (2n - 5 - n^2). \quad (20)$$

One may see that $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1) > 0$ if and only if $S(n, k) < 0$. Note that for a fixed n , $S(n, k)$ is a cubic polynomial in k . Moreover, $S(n, 0) < 0$ and $S(n, n) > 0$ for $n \geq 3$. Thus, for a fixed n , $S(n, k)$ has a positive real zero $k_0(n) \in (0, n)$. Using *Cardano's method* [3, Sec. 14.7], one may see that

$$k_0(n) = \sqrt[3]{\xi(n) + \omega(n)} + \sqrt[3]{\xi(n) - \omega(n)} - \frac{n - 6}{3} \quad (21)$$




Figure 1: $k_0(n)$, the upper bound on the code dimension in a shadow code of degree at most 1 to have $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1) > 0$, and its approximation.

where

$$\xi(n) = \frac{-2n^3 + 45n^2 - 72n + 27}{54}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$\omega(n) = \frac{(n-1)\sqrt{-12n^3 + 177n^2 - 174n - 15}}{18}. \quad (23)$$

Note that although $\omega(n)$ might assume complex values, $k_0(n)$ is a positive real number. Thus, for $n \geq 3$, $S(k, n) < 0$ if $k < k_0(n)$. A very tight lower bound on $k_0(n)$ which might even be considered as an approximation for $k_0(n)$ is $\sqrt{n} + 0.5$. Fig. 1 shows the $k_0(n)$ function and its approximation. \square

5 RS-RM Concatenation

Fix a positive integer m . A natural way to construct a low-rate binary coding scheme is to concatenate an outer (N, K) Reed–Solomon (RS) code over $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ with an inner binary $(2^m, m+1)$ first-order Reed–Muller (RM) code. As shown in Fig. 2, each of the N symbols of an RS codeword is mapped to a single RM codeword of length 2^m , resulting in a binary codeword of length $N2^m$.

More precisely, recall that $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ is an $(m+1)$ -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_2 . Let $\Theta : \mathbb{F}_2^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ be any vector space isomorphism, and let $\Theta^{-1} : \mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{m+1}$ be its inverse. For example, if α is a primitive element of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$, the map Θ taking a vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{m+1}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m+1}$ to $\Theta(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} v_i \alpha^{i-1} \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ is such an isomorphism. We refer to \mathbf{v} as the *coordinate vector* of $\Theta(\mathbf{v})$.




Figure 2: Encoder for a concatenated RS-RM code. Above each arrow is a vector belonging to the vector space written beneath the arrow. The block labeled RS is a linear RS encoder, and the blocks labeled RM are linear RM encoders. The S/P and P/S units are serial-to-parallel and parallel-to-serial converters, respectively.

For any $N \in [2^{m+1}]$ and any $K \in [N]$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\text{RS}}(N, K)$ be an RS code of length N , dimension K , and minimum Hamming distance $N - K + 1$ over $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$. For any message vector $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}^K$, let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_N) \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{RS}}(N, K)$ denote its corresponding codeword. We assume that the RS encoding map is linear. Let $\mathbf{v}_i = \Theta^{-1}(s_i) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{m+1}$ denote the coordinate vector of $s_i \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$, for $i \in [N]$. Each coordinate vector \mathbf{v}_i serves as a message vector for $\text{RM}(1, m)$, a binary first-order RM code of length 2^m , dimension $m + 1$, and minimum distance 2^{m-1} . We assume that the RM encoding map is linear. We denote the overall concatenated code by $\mathcal{C}_{\text{con}}(N, K, m)$.

Theorem 5. $\mathcal{C}_{\text{con}}(N, K, m)$ is a binary linear $(N2^m, K(m + 1))$ code with

$$d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{con}}(N, K, m)) \geq (N - K + 1)2^{m-1}. \quad (24)$$

Proof. The mapping between elements of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ and vectors over \mathbb{F}_2^{m+1} is linear. As a result the overall code is linear. The dimension and the length of the overall code are clear due to the described structure.

Let \mathbf{s} be a nonzero codeword of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{RS}}(N, K)$. Since Θ is an isomorphism, the zero of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ has the all-zero coordinate vector over \mathbb{F}_2 . Thus, each nonzero entry of \mathbf{s} , say $s_i \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$, will be mapped to a nonzero RM codeword \mathbf{c}_i . As a result, the corresponding codeword $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_N)$ has a weight

$$\text{wt}(\mathbf{c}) \geq \text{wt}(\mathbf{s}) d_{\min}(\text{RM}(1, m)) \geq (N - K + 1)2^{m-1},$$

which implies (24). □

Corollary 2. Let $R_{\text{RS}} = K/N$ denote the rate of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{RS}}(N, K)$. Then, the rate R_{con} and the relative distance δ_{con} of $\mathcal{C}(N, K, m)$ satisfy

$$R_{\text{con}} = R_{\text{RS}} \frac{m + 1}{2^m}, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\delta_{\text{con}} \geq \frac{1 - R_{\text{RS}}}{2}. \quad (26)$$

Proof. The rate is clear. For the relative distance we have

$$\delta_{\text{con}} \geq \frac{(N - K + 1)2^{m-1}}{N2^m} = \frac{N - K + 1}{2N} \geq \frac{N - K}{2N} = \frac{1 - R_{\text{RS}}}{2}. \quad \square$$

6 RS-RM Concatenation versus Shadow Codes

In this section, we compare the lower bounds on relative distance of the proposed concatenated RS-RM code and a shadow code of degree ≤ 1 . To have a fair comparison, we assume that both codes have the same length n and rate R . Note that for a given n , in order to have an RS-RM concatenation we must have $2^{2m+1} \geq n$. This sets a lower bound on m . We choose $\mathcal{C}_{\text{RS}}(N, K)$ and $\text{RM}(1, m)$ codes in the concatenated scheme such that their lengths over their corresponding fields agree, *i.e.*, $N = 2^m$. In this case, $n = 4^m$.

According to Theorem 4, in order to use the bound (19) on $d_{\min}(C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1))$ the dimension of the code, k , must satisfy $k \leq 2^m$. Therefore, (25) implies that

$$R_{\text{RS}} \leq \frac{1}{m+1}. \quad (27)$$

From (19), the relative distance of the shadow code $C(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{B}_1)$ satisfies

$$\delta_{\text{sh}} \geq \frac{1 - R + 4^{-m}}{2} - \frac{2^m \sqrt{1 + R - 4^{-m}}}{2} (R - 2^{-2m+1}) \quad (28a)$$

$$\simeq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2^m}{2} (R - 2^{-2m+1}) \quad (28b)$$

$$= \frac{1 - R_{\text{RS}}(m+1) + 2^{-m+1}}{2}. \quad (28c)$$

By choosing R_{RS} close enough to the upper bound in (27) we may further simplify (28c) as

$$\delta_{\text{sh}} \geq \frac{1 - R_{\text{RS}}(m+1)}{2}. \quad (29)$$

Comparing (29) with (26) implies that the lower bound on δ_{con} is larger than the one on δ_{sh} . Appendix A considers the behaviour of these bounds in the region where $\delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is the regime for which shadow codes were originally intended [1].

7 Results

Figure 3 compares the relative distance versus rate of binary shadow codes, RS-RM concatenated code, Delsarte-Goethals codes, and first- and second-order Reed-Muller




Figure 3: Comparing binary shadow codes of degree at most 1 and degree 2, with the RS–RM concatenated, Delsarte–Goethals (DG), and first-order RM codes of the same length. The vertical axis denotes relative distance and the horizontal axis denotes the code rate. Also shown is the Gilbert–Varshamov (GV) bound [2, Ch. 1, Thm. 12]. For shadow codes, the indicated lines represent lower bounds on relative distance. The first- and second-order RM codes are shown with a single dot. For $n = 2^{10}$, actual code parameters for shadow codes and some randomly generated linear codes are also shown.

codes. For shadow codes, the indicated lines represent lower bounds on the achievable relative distance. It is clear from the figure that restricting basic polynomials to have degree at most one results in an improved lower bound on minimum distance compared with shadow codes having basic polynomials of degree two. However, the lower bounds for both schemes are considerably inferior to the RS–RM concatenated code. Neither of the shadow code lower bounds provides an improvement over Delsarte–Goethals codes, except at extremely long block lengths.

For $n = 2^{10}$ we also computed parameters of some random linear codes and some constructed shadow codes with basic polynomials having degree at most one. The results show that, at least for this block length, the lower bound on minimum distance for shadow codes is far from being tight. Further work is probably needed to provide improved bounds (or actual minimum distances). Further work would also be needed to develop an efficient decoding algorithm for shadow codes.

A The Regime where $\delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

From (19) we know that the relative minimum Hamming distance $\delta_{\text{sh}}(n, k)$ of an (n, k) shadow code of degree at most 1 satisfies

$$\delta_{\text{sh}}(n, k) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{k - 1 + (k - 2)\sqrt{n + k - 1}}{2n},$$

provided that the right-hand side is positive. The latter condition is guaranteed by Theorem 4 to hold when $k \leq \sqrt{n} + 0.5$. Suppose we select $k = n^a$ for some $a \in (0, 1/2]$. Since, in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{n^a - 1 + (n^a - 2)\sqrt{n + n^a - 1}}{2n} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a < \frac{1}{2}; \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } a = \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

we see that in the same limit

$$\delta_{\text{sh}}(n, n^a) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } a < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 0 & \text{if } a = \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, for example, the family of $(n, n^{0.49})$ shadow codes of degree at most one has relative distance converging to $\frac{1}{2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Putting $k = n^{1/2-\epsilon}$ for $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ gives $\delta_{\text{sh}}(n, n^{1/2-\epsilon}) = \frac{1}{2} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-\epsilon})$, as shown in [1].

In contrast, a first-order Reed–Muller code of length $n = 2^m$ has relative distance exactly $\frac{1}{2}$, but a much smaller dimension $k = 1 + m = 1 + \log_2(n)$. The Delsarte–Goethals code $DG(m = 2t + 2, d)$, with $2 \leq d \leq t + 1$ has relative distance $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{d+1}}$ which approaches $1/2$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ provided that d is any increasing function of t . However, the number of codewords is never more than that of the second-order Reed–Muller code of length $n = 2^m$, which has dimension $1 + \binom{m}{1} + \binom{m}{2}$, which scales as a quadratic polynomial in $m = \log_2(n)$. Thus shadow codes are far better than the first-order Reed–Muller and Delsarte–Goethals in the regime considered in this appendix.

However, the concatenation of a $(2^m, 2^m - K, 2^m - K + 1)$ Reed–Solomon code over $\mathbb{F}_{2^{m+1}}$ with a binary $(2^m, m + 1, 2^{m-1})$ first-order Reed–Muller code gives a binary $(2^{2m}, K(m + 1), (2^m - K + 1)2^{m-1})$ code having relative distance

$$\delta_{\text{con}}(m, K) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{K - 1}{2^{m+1}}.$$

In terms of the parameters $n = 2^{2m}$ and $k = K(m + 1)$, we have

$$\delta_{\text{con}}(n, k) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{k - \log_2 \sqrt{n} - 1}{\sqrt{n}(\log_2(n) + 2)}. \quad (30)$$

Suppose we set $k = n^a \log_2(n)$ for some $a \in (0, 1/2]$. We see, in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$\delta_{\text{con}}(n, n^a \log_2(n)) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } a < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 0 & \text{if } a = \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, for example, the family of $(n, n^{0.49} \log_2(n))$ concatenated RS-RM codes has relative distance converging to $\frac{1}{2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

According to (30), to achieve relative distance $\delta_{\text{con}}(n, k) = \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon$ we must set $k = \epsilon \sqrt{n}(\log_2 n + 2) + \log_2 \sqrt{n} + 1$, thus

$$\frac{k}{n} = \frac{\epsilon(\log_2 n + 2)}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\log_2 \sqrt{n} + 1}{n} = \Omega\left(\frac{\epsilon \log_2 n}{\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

In other words, for a fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the concatenated RS-RM codes achieve relative distance $\delta_{\text{con}} = 1 - \epsilon$ with code rate R_{con} scaling as $\Omega(\epsilon n^{-1/2} \log_2 n)$. If ϵ is scaled with n as $\epsilon = n^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, then the concatenated RS-RM codes achieve relative distance $\frac{1}{2} - n^{-\alpha}$ with rate $\Omega(n^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha)} \log_2 n)$.

To make a direct comparison between concatenated RS-RM and shadow codes, we can scale their rate according to the same function of block length. Fig. 4 shows the relative distance vs. rate for concatenated RS-RM concatenated code and the shadow codes of degree at most 1, both having dimension $k = n^{0.49}$. Although both schemes approach a relative distance of 1/2 at large block lengths, concatenated RS-RM code always have a greater relative distance guarantee. We must emphasize again, however, that the *actual* relative distance of shadow codes may be greater than the indicated lower bound.




Figure 4: Bounds on relative distance versus rate when both code families have dimension k scaling with block length n as $k = n^{0.49}$.

References

- [1] G. Cherubini and G. Micheli, “A new class of linear codes,” arXiv:2401.07986v1, Jan. 2024.
- [2] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. New York, NY, USA: North-Holland, 1977.
- [3] D. S. Dummit and R. M. Foote, *Abstract Algebra*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004.
- [4] W. M. Schmidt, *Equations over Finite Fields: An Elementary Approach*, 2nd ed. Heber City, UT, USA: Kendrick Press, 2004.
- [5] P. Delsarte and J. M. Goethals, “Alternating bilinear forms over $GF(q)$,” *J. Comb. Theory A*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 26–50, Jul. 1975.