

MINIMUM DISTANCE FUNCTIONS OF GRADED IDEALS AND REED-MULLER-TYPE CODES

JOSÉ MARTÍNEZ-BERNAL, YURIKO PITONES, AND RAFAEL H. VILLARREAL*

ABSTRACT. We introduce and study the *minimum distance function* of a graded ideal in a polynomial ring with coefficients in a field, and show that it generalizes the minimum distance of projective Reed-Muller-type codes over finite fields. This gives an algebraic formulation of the minimum distance of a projective Reed-Muller-type code in terms of the algebraic invariants and structure of the underlying vanishing ideal. Then we give a method, based on Gröbner bases and Hilbert functions, to find lower bounds for the minimum distance of certain Reed-Muller-type codes. Finally we show explicit upper bounds for the number of zeros of polynomials in a projective nested cartesian set and give some support to a conjecture of Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann and López.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $S = K[t_1, \dots, t_s] = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} S_d$ be a polynomial ring over a field K with the standard grading and let $I \neq (0)$ be a graded ideal of S of Krull dimension k . The *Hilbert function* of S/I is:

$$H_I(d) := \dim_K(S_d/I_d), \quad d = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $I_d = I \cap S_d$. By a theorem of Hilbert, there is a unique polynomial $h_I(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ of degree $k-1$ such that $H_I(d) = h_I(d)$ for $d \gg 0$. The degree of the zero polynomial is -1 .

The *degree* or *multiplicity* of S/I is the positive integer

$$\deg(S/I) := \begin{cases} (k-1)! \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} H_I(d)/d^{k-1} & \text{if } k \geq 1, \\ \dim_K(S/I) & \text{if } k = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let \mathcal{F}_d be the set of all zero-divisors of S/I not in I of degree $d \geq 0$:

$$\mathcal{F}_d := \{f \in S_d \mid f \notin I, (I:f) \neq I\},$$

where $(I:f) = \{h \in S \mid hf \in I\}$ is a quotient ideal. Notice that $\mathcal{F}_0 = \emptyset$.

The main object of study here is the function $\delta_I: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by

$$\delta_I(d) := \begin{cases} \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(I,f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_d\} & \text{if } \mathcal{F}_d \neq \emptyset, \\ \deg(S/I) & \text{if } \mathcal{F}_d = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

We call δ_I the *minimum distance function* of I . If I is a prime ideal, then $\mathcal{F}_d = \emptyset$ for all $d \geq 0$ and $\delta_I(d) = \deg(S/I)$. We show that δ_I generalizes the minimum distance function of projective Reed-Muller-type codes over finite fields (Theorem 4.7). This abstract algebraic formulation of the minimum distance gives a new tool to study these type of linear codes.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 13P25; Secondary 14G50, 94B27, 11T71.

Key words and phrases. Reed-Muller-type codes, minimum distance, vanishing ideals, degree, Hilbert function. The first and third author were supported by SNI. The second author was supported by CONACyT.

*Corresponding author.

To compute $\delta_I(d)$ is a difficult problem. For certain family of ideals we will give lower bounds for $\delta_I(d)$ which are easier to compute.

Fix a monomial order \prec on S . Let $\Delta_\prec(I)$ be the *footprint* of S/I consisting of all the *standard monomials* of S/I , with respect to \prec , and let $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$ be a Gröbner basis of I . Then $\Delta_\prec(I)$ is the set of all monomials of S that are not a multiple of any of the leading monomials of g_1, \dots, g_r (Lemma 2.5). A polynomial f is called *standard* if $f \neq 0$ and f is a K -linear combination of standard monomials.

If $\Delta_\prec(I) \cap S_d = \{t^{a_1}, \dots, t^{a_n}\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\prec,d} = \{f = \sum_i \lambda_i t^{a_i} \mid f \neq 0, \lambda_i \in K, (I: f) \neq I\}$, then using the division algorithm [4, Theorem 3, p. 63] we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_I(d) &= \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_d\} \\ &= \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_{\prec,d}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{F}_d \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{\prec,d} \neq \emptyset$. If $K = \mathbb{F}_q$ is a finite field, then the number of standard polynomials of degree d is $n^d - 1$, where n is the number of standard monomials of degree d . Hence, we can compute $\delta_I(d)$ for small values of n and q (Examples 7.1 and 7.2).

Upper bounds for $\delta_I(d)$ can be obtained by fixing a subset $\mathcal{F}'_{\prec,d}$ of $\mathcal{F}_{\prec,d}$ and computing

$$\delta'_I(d) = \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}'_{\prec,d}\} \geq \delta_I(d).$$

Typically one uses $\mathcal{F}'_{\prec,d} = \{f = \sum_i \lambda_i t^{a_i} \mid f \neq 0, \lambda_i \in \{0, 1\}, (I: f) \neq I\}$ or a subset of it.

Lower bounds for $\delta_I(d)$ are harder to find. Thus, we seek to estimate $\delta_I(d)$ from below. So, with this in mind, we introduce the *footprint function* of I :

$$\text{fp}_I(d) = \begin{cases} \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(\text{in}_\prec(I), t^a)) \mid t^a \in \Delta_\prec(I)_d\} & \text{if } \Delta_\prec(I)_d \neq \emptyset, \\ \deg(S/I) & \text{if } \Delta_\prec(I)_d = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

where $\text{in}_\prec(I) = (\text{in}_\prec(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_\prec(g_r))$ is the initial ideal of I , $\text{in}_\prec(g_i)$ is the initial monomial of g_i for $i = 1, \dots, s$, and $\Delta_\prec(I)_d = \Delta_\prec(I) \cap S_d$.

The contents of this paper are as follows. In Section 2 we present some of the results and terminology that will be needed throughout the paper.

Some of our results rely on a degree formula to compute the number of zeros that a homogeneous polynomial has in any given finite set of points in a projective space (Lemma 3.2).

In Section 4 we study δ_I and present an alternative formula for δ_I , pointed out to us by Vasconcelos, valid for unmixed graded ideals (Theorem 4.4). If $\mathcal{F}_d \neq \emptyset$ for $d \geq 1$ and I is unmixed, then, by Lemma 4.1, $\text{fp}_I(d)$ is a lower bound of $\delta_I(d)$, but even in this case $\text{fp}_I(d)$ could be negative (Example 7.3). For this reason we will sometimes make extra assumptions requiring that $\dim(S/I) \geq 1$ and that t_i is a zero-divisor of S/I for $i = 1, \dots, s$ (cf. Lemma 2.7).

One of our first main results gives some general properties of δ_I for an interesting class of graded ideals and show its relation to fp_I :

Theorem 4.5. *Let $I \subset S$ be an unmixed graded ideal of dimension ≥ 1 such that t_i is a zero-divisor of S/I for $i = 1, \dots, s$. The following hold.*

- (i) $\mathcal{F}_d \neq \emptyset$ for $d \geq 1$.
- (ii) $\delta_I(d) \geq \text{fp}_I(d)$ for $d \geq 1$.
- (iii) $\deg(S/(I, t^a)) \leq \deg(S/(\text{in}_\prec(I), t^a)) \leq \deg(S/I)$ for any $t^a \in \Delta_\prec(I) \cap S_d$.
- (iv) $\text{fp}_I(d) \geq 0$.
- (v) $\delta_I(d) \geq \delta_I(d+1) \geq 0$ for $d \geq 1$.
- (vi) If I is a radical ideal and its associated primes are generated by linear forms, then there is $r \geq 1$ such that $\delta_I(1) > \dots > \delta_I(r) = \delta_I(d) = 1$ for $d \geq r$.

The study of δ_I was motivated by the notion of minimum distance of linear codes in coding theory. For convenience we recall this notion. Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field. A *linear code* is a linear subspace of K^m for some m . The *basic parameters* of a linear code C are *length*: m , *dimension*: $\dim_K(C)$, and *minimum distance*:

$$\delta(C) := \min\{\|v\| : 0 \neq v \in C\},$$

where $\|v\|$ is the number of non-zero entries of v .

The minimum distance of affine Reed-Muller-type codes has been studied using Gröbner bases techniques; see [2, 8, 9] and the references therein. Of particular interest to us is the *footprint technique* introduced by Geil [8] to bound from below the minimum distance. In this work we extend this technique to projective Reed-Muller-type codes, a special type of linear codes that generalizes affine Reed-Muller-type codes [15]. These projective codes are constructed as follows.

Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field with q elements, let \mathbb{P}^{s-1} be a projective space over K , and let \mathbb{X} be a subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} . The *vanishing ideal* of \mathbb{X} , denoted $I(\mathbb{X})$, is the ideal of S generated by the homogeneous polynomials that vanish at all points of \mathbb{X} . In this case the Hilbert function of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ is denoted by $H_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$. We can write $\mathbb{X} = \{[P_1], \dots, [P_m]\} \subset \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$ with $m = |\mathbb{X}|$.

Fix a degree $d \geq 0$. For each i there is $f_i \in S_d$ such that $f_i(P_i) \neq 0$. There is a K -linear map given by

$$ev_d: S_d \rightarrow K^m, \quad f \mapsto \left(\frac{f(P_1)}{f_1(P_1)}, \dots, \frac{f(P_m)}{f_m(P_m)} \right).$$

The image of S_d under ev_d , denoted by $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$, is called a *projective Reed-Muller-type code* of degree d on \mathbb{X} [5, 12]. The *basic parameters* of the linear code $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ are:

- (a) *length*: $|\mathbb{X}|$,
- (b) *dimension*: $\dim_K C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$,
- (c) *minimum distance*: $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) := \delta(C_{\mathbb{X}}(d))$.

The *regularity* of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$, denoted $\text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$, is the least integer $r \geq 0$ such that $H_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ is equal to $h_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d)$ for $d \geq r$. As is seen below, the knowledge of the regularity of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ is important for applications to coding theory. According to [10] and Proposition 2.15, there are integers $r \geq 0$ and $r_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$1 = H_{\mathbb{X}}(0) < H_{\mathbb{X}}(1) < \dots < H_{\mathbb{X}}(r-1) < H_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = |\mathbb{X}|$$

for $d \geq r = \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$, and

$$|\mathbb{X}| = \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(0) > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(1) > \dots > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(r_1-1) > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(r_1) = \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = 1 \quad \text{for } d \geq r_1,$$

respectively. The integer r_1 is called the *minimum distance regularity* of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$. In general $r_1 \leq r$ (see the discussion below). Using the methods of [19, 23], the regularity of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ can be effectively computed when \mathbb{X} is parameterized by monomials, but r_1 is very difficult to compute.

The Hilbert function and the minimum distance are related by the Singleton bound:

$$1 \leq \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) \leq |\mathbb{X}| - H_{\mathbb{X}}(d) + 1.$$

In particular, if $d \geq \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X})) \geq 1$, then $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = 1$. The converse is not true (Example 7.4). Thus, potentially good Reed-Muller-type codes $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ can occur only if $1 \leq d < \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$. There are some families where $d \geq \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X})) \geq 1$ if and only if $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = 1$ [14, 20, 21], but we do not know of any set \mathbb{X} parameterized by monomials where this fails. If \mathbb{X} is parameterized by monomials we say that $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ is a *projective parameterized code* [19, 23].

A main problem in Reed-Muller-type codes is the following. If \mathbb{X} has nice algebraic or combinatorial structure, find formulas in terms of s, q, d , and the structure of \mathbb{X} , for the *basic parameters*

of $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$: $H_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$, $\deg(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$, $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$, and $\text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$. Our main results can be used to study this problem, especially when \mathbb{X} is parameterized by monomials or when \mathbb{X} is a projective nested cartesian set (see Definition 6.1).

The basic parameters of projective Reed-Muller-type codes have been computed in some cases. If $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$, $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ is the *classical projective Reed-Muller code*. Formulas for its basic parameters were given in [21, Theorem 1]. If \mathbb{X} is a projective torus (see Definition 2.11), $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ is the *generalized projective Reed-Solomon code*. Formulas for its basic parameters were given in [20, Theorem 3.5]. If \mathbb{X} is the image of a cartesian product of subsets of K , under the map $K^{s-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$, $x \rightarrow [x, 1]$, then $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ is an *affine cartesian code* and formulas for its basic parameters were given in [9, 14].

We give a formula, in terms of the degree, for the number of zeros in $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$ of any homogeneous polynomial (Lemma 3.2). As a consequence we derive our second main result:

Theorem 4.7. *If $|\mathbb{X}| \geq 2$, then $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = \delta_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d) \geq 1$ for $d \geq 1$.*

In particular, if \prec is a monomial order on S , then

$$(1.1) \quad \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_{\prec, d}\}.$$

This description allows us to compute the minimum distance of Reed-Muller-type codes for small values of q and s (Corollary 4.8) and it gives an algebraic formulation of the minimum distance in terms of the algebraic properties and invariants of the vanishing ideal. The formula of Eq. (1.1) is more interesting from the theoretical point of view than from a computational perspective. Indeed, if t_i is a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ for all i , then one has:

$$\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) \geq \text{fp}_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } d \geq 1.$$

This inequality gives a lower bound for the minimum distance of any Reed-Muller-type code over a set \mathbb{X} parameterized by relatively prime monomials because in this case t_i is a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$ (Corollary 4.9). Using SAGE [18] and a generator matrix of $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ one can compute the minimum distance of $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ in a more efficient way than by using our formula at least in the case that $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ arises from an affine Reed-Muller type code [15].

Let d_1, \dots, d_s be a non-decreasing sequence of positive integers with $d_1 \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$, and let L be the ideal of S generated by the set of all $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ such that $1 \leq i < j \leq s$. It turns out that the ideal L is the initial ideal of the vanishing ideal of a projective nested cartesian set (see the discussion below). In Section 5 we study the ideal L and show some degree equalities as a preparation to show some applications.

Projective nested cartesian codes were introduced and studied in [3] (see Definition 6.1). This type of evaluation codes generalize the classical projective Reed-Muller codes [21]. As an application we will give some support for the following interesting conjecture.

Conjecture 6.2. (Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann, and López [3]) *Let A_1, \dots, A_s be subsets of K and let $C_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ be the d -th projective nested cartesian code on the set $\mathcal{X} = [A_1 \times \dots \times A_s]$ with $d_i = |A_i|$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Then its minimum distance is given by*

$$\delta_{\mathcal{X}}(d) = \begin{cases} (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s & \text{if } d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1), \\ 1 & \text{if } d \geq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1) + 1, \end{cases}$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s - 2$ and ℓ are integers such that $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

Let \prec be the lexicographical order on S with $t_1 \prec \cdots \prec t_s$. Carvalho et. al. found a Gröbner basis for $I(\mathcal{X})$ whose initial ideal is L , and obtained formulas for the regularity and the degree of the coordinate ring $S/I(\mathcal{X})$ [3] (Proposition 6.3).

They showed the conjecture when the A_i 's are subfields of \mathbb{F}_q , and essentially showed that their conjecture can be reduced to:

Conjecture 6.4. (Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann, and López [3]) *If $f \in S_d$ is a standard polynomial such that $(I(\mathcal{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathcal{X})$, $1 \leq d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1)$, and $V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)$ is the zero set of f in \mathcal{X} , then*

$$|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s - 2$ and ℓ are integers such that $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

Let $f \neq 0$ be a standard polynomial, with respect to \prec , of degree $d \geq 1$ with $d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1)$ and $(I(\mathcal{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathcal{X})$, and let $\text{in}_{\prec}(f) = t^a$ be its initial monomial. We can write

$$t^a = t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_s^{a_s},$$

with $1 \leq r \leq s$, $a_r \geq 1$, $0 \leq a_i \leq d_i - 1$ for $i > r$.

We show an explicit upper bound for the number of zeros of f in \mathcal{X} :

Theorem 6.5. $|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X})), t^a)) =$

$$\begin{cases} \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) & \text{if } a_r \leq d_r, \\ \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{r+1} - a_{r+1}) \cdots (d_s - a_s) & \text{if } a_r \geq d_r + 1. \end{cases}$$

Then we use Theorem 6.5 to give some support for Conjecture 6.4:

Theorem 6.6. *If t_1 divides $t^a = \text{in}_{\prec}(f)$, then*

$$|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s - 2$ and ℓ are integers such that $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

As a consequence we show that the minimum distance of $C_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ proposed in Conjecture 6.2 is in fact the minimum distance of certain evaluation linear code (Corollary 6.9). Finally in Section 7, we show some examples that illustrate how some of our results can be used in practice.

For all unexplained terminology and additional information, we refer to [1, 4, 6] (for the theory of Gröbner bases, commutative algebra, and Hilbert functions), and [16, 26] (for the theory of error-correcting codes and linear codes).

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we present some of the results that will be needed throughout the paper and introduce some more notation. All results of this section are well-known. To avoid repetitions, we continue to employ the notations and definitions used in Section 1.

Let $S = K[t_1, \dots, t_s] = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} S_d$ be a graded polynomial ring over a field K , with the standard grading, and let $(0) \neq I \subset S$ be a graded ideal. We will use the following multi-index notation: for $a = (a_1, \dots, a_s) \in \mathbb{N}^s$, set $t^a := t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_s^{a_s}$. The multiplicative group of K is denoted by K^* . As usual, \mathfrak{m} will denote the maximal ideal of S generated by t_1, \dots, t_s , and $\text{ht}(I)$ will denote the height of the ideal I . By the dimension of I (resp. S/I) we mean the Krull dimension of S/I . The Krull dimension of S/I is denoted by $\dim(S/I)$.

One of the most useful and well-known facts about the degree is its additivity:

Proposition 2.1. (Additivity of the degree [17, Proposition 2.5]) *If I is an ideal of S and $I = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_m$ is an irredundant primary decomposition, then*

$$\deg(S/I) = \sum_{\text{ht}(\mathfrak{q}_i) = \text{ht}(I)} \deg(S/\mathfrak{q}_i).$$

Theorem 2.2. (Hilbert [1, Theorem 4.1.3]) *Let $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal of dimension k . Then there is a polynomial $h_I(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ of degree $k - 1$ such that $H_I(d) = h_I(d)$ for $d \gg 0$.*

If $f \in S$, the *quotient ideal* of I with respect to f is given by $(I : f) = \{h \in S \mid hf \in I\}$. The element f is called a *zero-divisor* of S/I if there is $\bar{0} \neq \bar{a} \in S/I$ such that $f\bar{a} = \bar{0}$, and f is called *regular* on S/I if f is not a zero-divisor. Notice that f is a zero-divisor if and only if $(I : f) \neq I$. An associated prime of I is a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of S of the form $\mathfrak{p} = (I : f)$ for some f in S .

Theorem 2.3. [27, Lemma 2.1.19, Corollary 2.1.30] *If I is an ideal of S and $I = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_m$ is an irredundant primary decomposition with $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{q}_i) = \mathfrak{p}_i$, then the set of zero-divisors $\mathcal{Z}(S/I)$ of S/I is given by*

$$\mathcal{Z}(S/I) = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{p}_i,$$

and $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_m$ are the associated primes of I .

In the introduction we defined the regularity of the coordinate ring of a finite set in a projective space. This notion is defined for any graded ideal.

Definition 2.4. The *regularity* of S/I , denoted $\text{reg}(S/I)$, is the least integer $r \geq 0$ such that $H_I(d)$ is equal to $h_I(d)$ for $d \geq r$.

If $I \subset S$ is Cohen-Macaulay and $\dim(S/I) = 1$, then $\text{reg}(S/I)$ is the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of S/I in the sense of [7]. If $\dim(S/I) = 0$, then $\text{reg}(S/I)$ is the least positive integer d such that $\mathfrak{m}^d \subset I$.

The footprint of an ideal. Let \prec be a monomial order on S and let $(0) \neq I \subset S$ be an ideal. If f is a non-zero polynomial in S , then one can write

$$f = \lambda_1 t^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + \lambda_r t^{\alpha_r},$$

with $\lambda_i \in K^*$ for all i and $t^{\alpha_1} \succ \cdots \succ t^{\alpha_r}$. The *leading monomial* t^{α_1} of f is denoted by $\text{in}_{\prec}(f)$. The *initial ideal* of I , denoted by $\text{in}_{\prec}(I)$, is the monomial ideal given by

$$\text{in}_{\prec}(I) = (\{\text{in}_{\prec}(f) \mid f \in I\}).$$

A monomial t^a is called a *standard monomial* of S/I , with respect to \prec , if t^a is not the leading monomial of any polynomial in I . The set of standard monomials, denoted $\Delta_{\prec}(I)$, is called the *footprint* of S/I . The image of the standard polynomials of degree d , under the canonical map $S \mapsto S/I$, $x \mapsto \bar{x}$, is equal to S_d/I_d , and the image of $\Delta_{\prec}(I)$ is a basis of S/I as a K -vector space (see [27, Proposition 3.3.13]). In particular, if I is graded, then $H_I(d)$ is the number of standard monomials of degree d .

A subset $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$ of I is called a *Gröbner basis* of I if

$$\text{in}_{\prec}(I) = (\text{in}_{\prec}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\prec}(g_r)).$$

Lemma 2.5. [2, p. 2] *Let $I \subset S$ be an ideal generated by $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$, then*

$$\Delta_{\prec}(I) \subset \Delta_{\prec}(\text{in}_{\prec}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\prec}(g_r)),$$

with equality if \mathcal{G} is a Gröbner basis.

Proof. Take t^a in $\Delta_{\prec}(I)$. If $t^a \notin \Delta_{\prec}(\text{in}_{\prec}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\prec}(g_r))$, then $t^a = t^c \text{in}_{\prec}(g_i)$ for some i and some t^c . Thus $t^a = \text{in}_{\prec}(t^c g_i)$, with $t^c g_i$ in I , a contradiction. The second statement holds by the definition of a Gröbner basis. \square

Theorem 2.6. (Division algorithm [4, Theorem 3, p. 63]) *If f, g_1, \dots, g_r are polynomials in S , then f can be written as*

$$f = a_1 g_1 + \dots + a_r g_r + h,$$

where $a_i, h \in S$ and either $h = 0$ or $h \neq 0$ and no term of h is divisible by one of the initial monomials $\text{in}_{\prec}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\prec}(g_r)$. Furthermore if $a_i g_i \neq 0$, then $\text{in}_{\prec}(f) \geq \text{in}_{\prec}(a_i g_i)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$ be a Gröbner basis of I . If for some i , the variable t_i does not divide $\text{in}_{\prec}(g_j)$ for all j , then t_i is a regular element on S/I .*

Proof. Assume that $t_i f \in I$. By the division algorithm we can write $f = g + h$, where $g \in I$ and h is 0 or a standard polynomial. It suffices to show that $h = 0$. If $h \neq 0$, then $t_i \text{in}_{\prec}(h) \in \text{in}_{\prec}(I)$. Hence, using our hypothesis on t_i , we get $\text{in}_{\prec}(h) \in \text{in}_{\prec}(I)$, a contradiction. \square

This lemma tells us that if t_i is a zero-divisor of S/I for all i , then any variable t_i must occur in an initial monomial $\text{in}_{\prec}(g_j)$ for some j .

Theorem 2.8. (Macaulay [27, Corollary 3.3.15]) *If I is a graded ideal of S , then S/I and $S/\text{in}_{\prec}(I)$ have the same Hilbert function and the same degree and regularity.*

Vanishing ideals of finite sets. The *projective space* of dimension $s - 1$ over the field K , denoted \mathbb{P}_K^{s-1} , or simply \mathbb{P}^{s-1} , is the quotient space

$$(K^s \setminus \{0\}) / \sim$$

where two points α, β in $K^s \setminus \{0\}$ are equivalent under \sim if $\alpha = c\beta$ for some $c \in K^*$. It is usual to denote the equivalence class of α by $[\alpha]$.

For a given a subset $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$ define $I(\mathbb{X})$, the *vanishing ideal* of \mathbb{X} , as the ideal generated by the homogeneous polynomials in S that vanish at all points of \mathbb{X} , and given a graded ideal $I \subset S$ define its *zero set* relative to \mathbb{X} as

$$V_{\mathbb{X}}(I) = \{[\alpha] \in \mathbb{X} \mid f(\alpha) = 0, \forall f \in I \text{ homogeneous}\}.$$

In particular, if $f \in S$ is homogeneous, the zero set $V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)$ of f is the set of all $[\alpha] \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $f(\alpha) = 0$, that is $V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)$ is the set of zeros of f in \mathbb{X} .

Lemma 2.9. *Let \mathbb{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} , let $[\alpha]$ be a point in \mathbb{X} , with $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s)$ and $\alpha_k \neq 0$ for some k , and let $I_{[\alpha]}$ be the vanishing ideal of $[\alpha]$. Then $I_{[\alpha]}$ is a prime ideal,*

$$I_{[\alpha]} = (\{\alpha_k t_i - \alpha_i t_k \mid k \neq i \in \{1, \dots, s\}\}), \deg(S/I_{[\alpha]}) = 1,$$

$\text{ht}(I_{[\alpha]}) = s - 1$, and $I(\mathbb{X}) = \bigcap_{[\beta] \in \mathbb{X}} I_{[\beta]}$ is the primary decomposition of $I(\mathbb{X})$.

If \mathbb{X} is a subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} it is usual to denote the Hilbert function of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ by $H_{\mathbb{X}}$.

Proposition 2.10. [10] *If $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$ is a finite set, then*

$$1 = H_{\mathbb{X}}(0) < H_{\mathbb{X}}(1) < \dots < H_{\mathbb{X}}(r - 1) < H_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = |\mathbb{X}|$$

for $d \geq r = \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$.

Definition 2.11. The set $\mathbb{T} = \{[(x_1, \dots, x_s)] \in \mathbb{P}^{s-1} \mid x_i \in K^* \forall i\}$ is called a *projective torus*.

Projective Reed-Muller-type codes. Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field, let \mathbb{X} be a subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} , and let P_1, \dots, P_m be a set of representatives for the points of \mathbb{X} with $m = |\mathbb{X}|$. In this paragraph all results are valid if we assume that K is any field and that \mathbb{X} is a finite subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} instead of assuming that K is finite. However the interesting case for coding theory is when K is finite.

Fix a degree $d \geq 0$. For each i there is $f_i \in S_d$ such that $f_i(P_i) \neq 0$. Indeed suppose $P_i = [(a_1, \dots, a_s)]$, there is at least one k in $\{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $a_k \neq 0$. Setting $f_i(t_1, \dots, t_s) = t_k^d$ one has that $f_i \in S_d$ and $f_i(P_i) \neq 0$. There is a K -linear map:

$$\text{ev}_d: S_d = K[t_1, \dots, t_s]_d \rightarrow K^{|\mathbb{X}|}, \quad f \mapsto \left(\frac{f(P_1)}{f_1(P_1)}, \dots, \frac{f(P_m)}{f_m(P_m)} \right).$$

The map ev_d is called an *evaluation map*. The image of S_d under ev_d , denoted by $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$, is called a *projective Reed-Muller-type code* of degree d over \mathbb{X} [5, 12]. It is also called an *evaluation code* associated to \mathbb{X} [11].

Definition 2.12. The *basic parameters* of the linear code $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ are its *length* $|\mathbb{X}|$, *dimension* $\dim_K C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$, and *minimum distance*

$$\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) := \min\{\|v\| : 0 \neq v \in C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)\},$$

where $\|v\|$ is the number of non-zero entries of v .

Lemma 2.13. (a) *The map ev_d is well-defined, i.e., it is independent of the set of representatives that we choose for the points of \mathbb{X} .* (b) *The basic parameters of the Reed-Muller-type code $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ are independent of f_1, \dots, f_m .*

Proof. (a): If P'_1, \dots, P'_m is another set of representatives, there are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$ in K^* such that $P'_i = \lambda_i P_i$ for all i . Thus, $f(P'_i)/f_i(P'_i) = f(P_i)/f_i(P_i)$ for $f \in S_d$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$.

(b): Let f'_1, \dots, f'_m be homogeneous polynomials of S of degree d such that $f'_i(P_i) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and let

$$\text{ev}'_d: S_d \rightarrow K^{|\mathbb{X}|}, \quad f \mapsto \left(\frac{f(P_1)}{f'_1(P_1)}, \dots, \frac{f(P_m)}{f'_m(P_m)} \right)$$

be the evaluation map relative to f'_1, \dots, f'_m . Then $\ker(\text{ev}_d) = \ker(\text{ev}'_d)$ and $\|\text{ev}_d(f)\| = \|\text{ev}'_d(f)\|$ for $f \in S_d$. It follows that the basic parameters of $\text{ev}_d(S_d)$ and $\text{ev}'_d(S_d)$ are the same. \square

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\mathbb{Y} = \{[\alpha], [\beta]\}$ be a subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} with two elements. The following hold.*

- (i) $\text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{Y})) = 1$.
- (ii) *There is $h \in S_1$, a form of degree 1, such that $h(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $h(\beta) = 0$.*
- (iii) *For each $d \geq 1$, there is $f \in S_d$, a form of degree d , such that $f(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $f(\beta) = 0$.*
- (iv) *If \mathbb{X} is a subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} with at least two elements and $d \geq 1$, then there is $f \in S_d$ such $f \notin I(\mathbb{X})$ and $(I(\mathbb{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathbb{X})$.*

Proof. (i): As $H_{\mathbb{Y}}(0) = 1$ and $|\mathbb{Y}| = 2$, by Proposition 2.10, we get that $H_{\mathbb{Y}}(1) = |\mathbb{Y}| = 2$. Thus $S/I(\mathbb{Y})$ has regularity equal to 1.

(ii): Consider the evaluation map

$$\text{ev}_1: S_1 \longrightarrow K^2, \quad f \mapsto (f(\alpha)/f_1(\alpha), f(\beta)/f_2(\beta)).$$

By part (i) this map is onto. Thus $(1, 0)$ is in the image of ev_1 and the result follows.

(iii): It follows from part (ii) by setting $f = h^d$.

(iv): By part (iii), there are distinct $[\alpha], [\beta]$ in \mathbb{X} and $f \in S_d$ such that $f(\alpha) \neq 0$, $f(\beta) = 0$. Then $f \notin I(\mathbb{X})$. Notice that $f(\beta) = 0$ if and only if $f \in I_{[\beta]}$. Hence, by Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 2.9, f is a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$, that is, $(I(\mathbb{X}): f) \neq I(\mathbb{X})$. \square

The next result was shown in [19, Proposition 5.2] and [24, Proposition 2.1] for some special types of Reed-Muller-type codes (cf. Theorem 4.5(vi)). In [19] (resp. [24]) it is assumed that \mathbb{X} is contained in a projective torus (resp. \mathbb{X} is not contained in a hyperplane and that there is $f \in S_d$ not vanishing at any point of \mathbb{X}).

Proposition 2.15. *There is an integer $r \geq 0$ such that*

$$|\mathbb{X}| = \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(0) > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(1) > \cdots > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(r) = 1 \quad \text{for } d \geq r.$$

Proof. Assume that $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) > 1$, it suffices to show that $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d+1)$. Pick $g \in S_d$ such that $g \notin I(\mathbb{X})$ and

$$|V_{\mathbb{X}}(g)| = \max\{|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| : \text{ev}_d(f) \neq 0; f \in S_d\}.$$

Then $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = |\mathbb{X}| - |V_{\mathbb{X}}(g)| \geq 2$. Thus there are distinct points $[\alpha], [\beta]$ in \mathbb{X} such that $g(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $g(\beta) = 0$. By Lemma 2.14, there is a linear form $h \in S_1$ such that $h(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $h(\beta) = 0$. Hence the polynomial hg is not in $I(\mathbb{X})$, has degree $d+1$, and has at least $|V_{\mathbb{X}}(g)| + 1$ zeros. Thus $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) > \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d+1)$, as required. \square

The following summarizes the well-known relation between projective Reed-Muller-type codes and the theory of Hilbert functions.

Proposition 2.16. ([12], [19]) *The following hold.*

- (i) $H_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = \dim_K C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ for $d \geq 0$.
- (ii) $\deg(S/I(\mathbb{X})) = |\mathbb{X}|$.
- (iii) $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = 1$ for $d \geq \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$.
- (iv) $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ is a Cohen–Macaulay reduced graded ring of dimension 1.
- (v) $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d) \neq (0)$ for $d \geq 1$.

3. COMPUTING THE NUMBER OF ZEROS USING THE DEGREE

In this section we give a degree formula to compute the number of zeros that a homogeneous polynomial has in any given finite set of points in a projective space over any field.

An ideal $I \subset S$ is called *unmixed* if all its associated primes have the same height and I is called *radical* if I is equal to its radical. The radical of I is denoted by $\text{rad}(I)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $I \subset S$ be a radical unmixed graded ideal. If $f \in S$ is homogeneous, $(I: f) \neq I$, and \mathcal{A} is the set of all associated primes of S/I that contain f , then $\text{ht}(I) = \text{ht}(I, f)$ and*

$$\deg(S/(I, f)) = \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{A}} \deg(S/\mathfrak{p}).$$

Proof. As f is a zero-divisor of S/I and I is unmixed, there is an associated prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of S/I of height $\text{ht}(I)$ such that $f \in \mathfrak{p}$. Thus $I \subset (I, f) \subset \mathfrak{p}$, and consequently $\text{ht}(I) = \text{ht}(I, f)$. Therefore the set of associated primes of (I, f) of height equal to $\text{ht}(I)$ is not empty and is equal to \mathcal{A} . There is an irredundant primary decomposition

$$(3.1) \quad (I, f) = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r \cap \mathfrak{q}'_{r+1} \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}'_t,$$

where $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{q}_i) = \mathfrak{p}_i$, $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r\}$, and $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{q}'_i) > \text{ht}(I)$ for $i > r$. We may assume that the associated primes of S/I are $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_m$. Since I is a radical ideal, we get that $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{p}_i$. Next we show the following equality:

$$(3.2) \quad \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_m = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r \cap \mathfrak{q}'_{r+1} \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}'_t \cap \mathfrak{p}_{r+1} \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_m.$$

The inclusion “ \supset ” is clear because $\mathfrak{q}_i \subset \mathfrak{p}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. The inclusion “ \subset ” follows by noticing that the right hand side of Eq. (3.2) is equal to $(I, f) \cap \mathfrak{p}_{r+1} \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_m$, and consequently it contains $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{p}_i$. Notice that $\text{rad}(\mathfrak{q}'_j) = \mathfrak{p}'_j \not\subset \mathfrak{p}_i$ for all i, j and $\mathfrak{p}_j \not\subset \mathfrak{p}_i$ for $i \neq j$. Hence localizing Eq. (3.2) at the prime ideal \mathfrak{p}_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$, we get that $\mathfrak{p}_i = I_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap S = (\mathfrak{q}_i)_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap S = \mathfrak{q}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Using Eq. (3.1) and the additivity of the degree the required equality follows. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let \mathbb{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} over a field K and let $I(\mathbb{X}) \subset S$ be its graded vanishing ideal. If $0 \neq f \in S$ is homogeneous, then the number of zeros of f in \mathbb{X} is given by*

$$|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| = \begin{cases} \deg S/(I(\mathbb{X}), f) & \text{if } (I(\mathbb{X}): f) \neq I(\mathbb{X}), \\ 0 & \text{if } (I(\mathbb{X}): f) = I(\mathbb{X}). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $[P_1], \dots, [P_m]$ be the points of \mathbb{X} with $m = |\mathbb{X}|$, and let $[P]$ be a point in \mathbb{X} , with $P = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s)$ and $\alpha_k \neq 0$ for some k . Then the vanishing ideal $I_{[P]}$ of $[P]$ is a prime ideal of height $s - 1$,

$$I_{[P]} = (\{\alpha_k t_i - \alpha_i t_k \mid k \neq i \in \{1, \dots, s\}\}), \quad \deg(S/I_{[P]}) = 1,$$

and $I(\mathbb{X}) = \bigcap_{i=1}^m I_{[P_i]}$ is a primary decomposition (see Lemma 2.9). In particular $I(\mathbb{X})$ is an unmixed radical ideal of dimension 1.

Assume that $(I(\mathbb{X}): f) \neq I(\mathbb{X})$. Let \mathcal{A} be the set of all $I_{[P_i]}$ that contain the polynomial f . Then $f(P_i) = 0$ if and only if $I_{[P_i]}$ is in \mathcal{A} . Hence, by Lemma 3.1, we get

$$|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| = \sum_{[P_i] \in V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)} \deg S/I_{[P_i]} = \sum_{f \in I_{[P_i]}} \deg S/I_{[P_i]} = \deg S/(I(\mathbb{X}), f).$$

If $(I(\mathbb{X}): f) = I(\mathbb{X})$, then f is a regular element of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$. This means that f is not in any of the associated primes of $I(\mathbb{X})$, that is, $f \notin I_{[P_i]}$ for all i . Thus $V_{\mathbb{X}}(f) = \emptyset$ and $|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| = 0$. \square

4. THE MINIMUM DISTANCE FUNCTION OF A GRADED IDEAL

In this section we study the minimum distance function δ_I of a graded ideal I and show that it generalizes the minimum distance function of a projective Reed-Muller-type code. To avoid repetitions, we continue to employ the notations and definitions used in Sections 1 and 2.

The next result will be used to bound the number of zeros of polynomials over finite fields (see Corollary 4.3) and to study the general properties of δ_I .

Lemma 4.1. *Let $I \subset S$ be an unmixed graded ideal and let \prec be a monomial order. If $f \in S$ is homogeneous and $(I: f) \neq I$, then*

$$\deg(S/(I, f)) \leq \deg(S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I), \text{in}_{\prec}(f))) \leq \deg(S/I),$$

and $\deg(S/(I, f)) < \deg(S/I)$ if I is an unmixed radical ideal and $f \notin I$.

Proof. To simplify notation we set $J = (I, f)$ and $L = (\text{in}_{\prec}(I), \text{in}_{\prec}(f))$. We denote the Krull dimension of S/I by $\dim(S/I)$. Recall that $\dim(S/I) = \dim(S) - \text{ht}(I)$. First we show that S/J and S/L have Krull dimension equal to $\dim(S/I)$. As f is a zero-divisor of S/I and I is unmixed, there is an associated prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of S/I such that $f \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $\dim(S/I) = \dim(S/\mathfrak{p})$.

Since $I \subset J \subset \mathfrak{p}$, we get that $\dim(S/J)$ is $\dim(S/I)$. Since S/I and $S/\text{in}_{\prec}(I)$ have the same Hilbert function, and so does S/\mathfrak{p} and $S/\text{in}_{\prec}(\mathfrak{p})$, we obtain

$$\dim(S/\text{in}_{\prec}(I)) = \dim(S/I) = \dim(S/\mathfrak{p}) = \dim(S/\text{in}_{\prec}(\mathfrak{p})).$$

Hence, taking heights in the inclusions $\text{in}_{\prec}(I) \subset L \subset \text{in}_{\prec}(\mathfrak{p})$, we obtain $\text{ht}(I) = \text{ht}(L)$.

Pick a Gröbner basis $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_r\}$ of I . Then J is generated by $\mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ and by Lemma 2.5 one has the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\prec}(J) &= \Delta_{\prec}(I, f) \subset \Delta_{\prec}(\text{in}_{\prec}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\prec}(g_r), \text{in}_{\prec}(f)) = \\ &\Delta_{\prec}(\text{in}_{\prec}(I), \text{in}_{\prec}(f)) = \Delta_{\prec}(L) \subset \Delta_{\prec}(\text{in}_{\prec}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\prec}(g_r)) = \Delta_{\prec}(I). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\Delta_{\prec}(J) \subset \Delta_{\prec}(L) \subset \Delta_{\prec}(I)$. Recall that $H_I(d)$, the Hilbert function of I at d , is the number of standard monomials of degree d . Hence $H_J(d) \leq H_L(d) \leq H_I(d)$ for $d \geq 0$. If $\dim(S/I)$ is equal to 0, then

$$\deg(S/J) = \sum_{d \geq 0} H_J(d) \leq \deg(S/L) = \sum_{d \geq 0} H_L(d) \leq \deg(S/I) = \sum_{d \geq 0} H_I(d).$$

Assume now that $\dim(S/I) \geq 1$. By the Hilbert theorem, H_J , H_L , H_I are polynomial functions of degree equal to $k = \dim(S/I) - 1$. Thus

$$k! \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} H_J(d)/d^k \leq k! \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} H_L(d)/d^k \leq k! \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} H_I(d)/d^k,$$

that is $\deg(S/J) \leq \deg(S/L) \leq \deg(S/I)$.

If I is an unmixed radical ideal and $f \notin I$, then there is at least one minimal prime that does not contain f . Hence, by Lemma 3.1, it follows that $\deg(S/(I, f)) < \deg(S/I)$. \square

Remark 4.2. Let $I \subset S$ be an unmixed graded ideal of dimension 1. If $f \in S_d$, then $(I : f) = I$ if and only if $\dim(S/(I, f)) = 0$. In this case $\deg(S/(I, f))$ could be greater than $\deg(S/I)$.

Corollary 4.3. Let \mathbb{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} , let $I(\mathbb{X}) \subset S$ be its vanishing ideal, and let \prec be a monomial order. If $0 \neq f \in S$ is homogeneous and $(I(\mathbb{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathbb{X})$, then

$$|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| = \deg(S/(I(\mathbb{X}), f)) \leq \deg(S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathbb{X})), \text{in}_{\prec}(f))) \leq \deg(S/I(\mathbb{X})),$$

and $\deg(S/(I(\mathbb{X}), f)) < \deg(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$ if $f \notin I(\mathbb{X})$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 4.1. \square

The next alternative formula for the minimum distance function is valid for unmixed graded ideals. It was pointed out to us by Vasconcelos.

Theorem 4.4. Let $I \subset S$ be an unmixed graded ideal and let \prec be a monomial order on S . If $\Delta_{\prec}(I)_d^p$ is the set of homogeneous standard polynomials of degree d and $\mathfrak{m}^d \not\subset I$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_I(d) &= \min\{\deg(S/(I : f)) \mid f \in S_d \setminus I\} \\ &= \min\{\deg(S/(I : f)) \mid f \in \Delta_{\prec}(I)_d^p\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The second equality is clear because by the division algorithm any $f \in S_d \setminus I$ can be written as $f = g + h$, where $g \in I$ and $h \in \Delta_{\prec}(I)_d^p$, and $(I : f) = (I : h)$. Next we show the first equality. If $\mathcal{F}_d = \emptyset$, $\delta_I(d) = \deg(S/I)$ and for any $f \in S_d \setminus I$, one has that $(I : f)$ is equal to I .

Thus equality holds. Assume that $\mathcal{F}_d \neq \emptyset$. Take $f \in \mathcal{F}_d$. Using that I is unmixed, it is not hard to see that S/I , $S/(I: f)$, and $S/(I, f)$ have the same dimension. There are exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow (I: f)/I &\longrightarrow S/I \longrightarrow S/(I: f) \longrightarrow 0, \text{ and} \\ 0 \longrightarrow (I: f)/I &\longrightarrow (S/I)[-d] \xrightarrow{f} S/I \longrightarrow S/(I, f) \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the additivity of Hilbert functions, we get

$$(4.1) \quad H_I(i) - H_{(I: f)}(i) = H_I(i-d) - H_I(i) + H_{(I, f)}(i) \text{ for } i \geq 0.$$

By definition of $\delta_I(d)$ it suffices to show the following equality

$$(4.2) \quad \deg(S/(I: f)) = \deg(S/I) - \deg(S/(I, f)).$$

If $\dim S/I = 0$, then using Eq. (4.1) one has

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} H_I(i) - \sum_{i \geq 0} H_{(I: f)}(i) = \sum_{i \geq 0} H_I(i-d) - \sum_{i \geq 0} H_I(i) + \sum_{i \geq 0} H_{(I, f)}(i).$$

Hence, using the definition of degree, the equality of Eq. (4.2) follows. If $k = \dim S/I - 1 \geq 0$, by the Hilbert theorem, H_I , $H_{(I, f)}$, and $H_{(I: f)}$ are polynomial functions of degree k . Then dividing Eq. (4.1) by i^k and taking limits as i goes to infinity, the equality of Eq. (4.2) holds. \square

We come to one of our main results.

Theorem 4.5. *Let \prec be a monomial order and let $I \subset S$ be an unmixed ideal of dimension ≥ 1 such that t_i is a zero-divisor of S/I for $i = 1, \dots, s$. The following hold.*

- (i) *The set $\mathcal{F}_d = \{f \in S_d : f \notin I, (I: f) \neq I\}$ is not empty for $d \geq 1$.*
- (ii) *$\delta_I(d) \geq \text{fp}_I(d)$ for $d \geq 1$.*
- (iii) *$\deg S/(I, t^a) \leq \deg S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I), t^a) \leq \deg S/I$ for any $t^a \in \Delta_{\prec}(I) \cap S_d$.*
- (iv) *$\text{fp}_I(d) \geq 0$.*
- (v) *$\delta_I(d) \geq \delta_I(d+1) \geq 0$ for $d \geq 1$.*
- (vi) *If I is a radical ideal and its associated primes are generated by linear forms, then there is an integer $r \geq 1$ such that*

$$\delta_I(1) > \dots > \delta_I(r) = \delta_I(d) = 1 \text{ for } d \geq r.$$

Proof. (i): Since $\dim(S/I) \geq 1$, there is $1 \leq \ell \leq s$ such that t_{ℓ}^d is not in I , and $(I: t_{\ell}^d) \neq I$ because t_{ℓ}^d is a zero-divisor of S/I . Thus t_{ℓ}^d is in \mathcal{F}_d .

(ii): The set \mathcal{F}_d is not empty for $d \geq 1$ by part (i). Pick a polynomial F of degree d such that $\delta_I(d) = \deg(S/I) - \deg(S/(I, F))$, $F \notin I$, and $(I: F) \neq I$. We may assume that F is a sum of standard monomials of S/I with respect to \prec (this follows using a Gröbner basis of I and the division algorithm). Then, by Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\deg S/(I, F) \leq \deg S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I), \text{in}_{\prec}(F)) \leq \deg S/I,$$

where $\text{in}_{\prec}(F)$ is a standard monomial of S/I . Therefore $\delta_I(d) \geq \text{fp}_I(d)$ for $d \geq 1$.

(iii), (iv): Since any standard monomial of degree d is a zero-divisor, by Lemma 4.1, we get the inequalities in item (iii). Part (iv) follows at once from part (iii).

(v): The set \mathcal{F}_d is not empty for $d \geq 1$ by part (i). Then, by parts (ii) and (iv), $\delta_I(d) \geq 0$. Pick $F \in S_d$ such that $F \notin I$, $(I: F) \neq I$ and

$$\deg(S/(I, F)) = \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \notin I, f \in S_d, (I: f) \neq I\}.$$

There is $h \in S_1$ such that $hF \notin I$, because otherwise $\mathfrak{m} = (t_1, \dots, t_s)$ is an associated prime of S/I , a contradiction to the assumption that I is unmixed of dimension ≥ 1 . As F is a zero-divisor of S/I , so is hF . The ideals (I, F) and (I, hF) have height equal to $\text{ht}(I)$. Therefore taking Hilbert functions in the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (I, F)/(I, hF) \longrightarrow S/(I, hF) \longrightarrow S/(I, F) \longrightarrow 0$$

it follows that $\deg(S/(I, hF)) \geq \deg(S/(I, F))$. This proves that $\delta_I(d) \geq \delta_I(d+1)$.

(vi): By Lemma 4.1, $\delta_I(d) \geq 1$ for $d \geq 1$. Assume that $\delta_I(d) > 1$. By part (v) it suffices to show that $\delta_I(d) > \delta_I(d+1)$. Pick a polynomial F as in part (v). Let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_m$ be the associated primes of I . Then, by Lemma 3.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_I(d) &= \deg(S/I) - \deg(S/(I, F)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \deg(S/\mathfrak{p}_i) - \sum_{F \in \mathfrak{p}_i} \deg(S/\mathfrak{p}_i) \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence there are $\mathfrak{p}_k \neq \mathfrak{p}_j$ such that F is not in $\mathfrak{p}_k \cup \mathfrak{p}_j$. Pick a linear form h in $\mathfrak{p}_k \setminus \mathfrak{p}_j$; which exists because I is unmixed and \mathfrak{p}_k is generated by linear forms. Then $hF \notin I$ because $hF \notin \mathfrak{p}_j$, and hF is a zero-divisor of S/I because $(I: F) \neq I$. Noticing that $F \notin \mathfrak{p}_k$ and $hF \in \mathfrak{p}_k$, by Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\deg(S/(I, F)) = \sum_{F \in \mathfrak{p}_i} \deg(S/\mathfrak{p}_i) < \sum_{hF \in \mathfrak{p}_i} \deg(S/\mathfrak{p}_i) = \deg(S/(I, hF)).$$

Therefore $\delta_I(d) > \delta_I(d+1)$. □

Corollary 4.6. *If $I \subset S$ is a Cohen-Macaulay square-free monomial ideal, then there is an integer $r \geq 1$ such that*

$$\delta_I(1) > \dots > \delta_I(r) = \delta_I(d) = 1 \quad \text{for } d \geq r.$$

Proof. If I is prime, then I is generated by a subset of $\{t_1, \dots, t_s\}$, $\deg(S/I) = 1$, and $\mathcal{F}_d = \emptyset$ for all d . Hence $\delta_I(d) = 1$ for $d \geq 1$. Thus we may assume that I has at least two associated primes. Any Cohen-Macaulay ideal is unmixed [27]. Thus the degree of S/I is the number of associated primes of I . Hence, we may assume that all variables are zero-divisors of S/I and the result follows from Theorem 4.5(vi). □

The next result gives an algebraic formulation of the minimum distance of a projective Reed-Muller-type code in terms of the degree and the structure of the underlying vanishing ideal.

Theorem 4.7. *Let K be a field and let \mathbb{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} . If $|\mathbb{X}| \geq 2$, then*

$$\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = \delta_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d) \geq 1 \quad \text{for } d \geq 1.$$

Proof. Setting $I = I(\mathbb{X})$, by Lemma 2.14, the set $\mathcal{F}_d := \{f \in S_d : f \notin I, (I: f) \neq I\}$ is not empty for $d \geq 1$. Hence, using the formula for $V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)$ of Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$\max\{|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| : \text{ev}_d(f) \neq 0; f \in S_d\} = \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_d\}.$$

Therefore, using that $\deg(S/I) = |\mathbb{X}|$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) &= \min\{\|\text{ev}_d(f)\| : \text{ev}_d(f) \neq 0; f \in S_d\} \\ &= |\mathbb{X}| - \max\{|V_{\mathbb{X}}(f)| : \text{ev}_d(f) \neq 0; f \in S_d\} \\ &= \deg(S/I) - \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_d\} = \delta_I(d), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\text{ev}_d(f)\|$ is the number of non-zero entries of $\text{ev}_d(f)$. □

If I is a graded ideal and $\Delta_{\prec}(I) \cap S_d = \{t^{a_1}, \dots, t^{a_n}\}$, recall that $\mathcal{F}_{\prec, d}$ is the set of homogeneous standard polynomials of S/I of degree d which are zero-divisors of S/I :

$$\mathcal{F}_{\prec, d} := \{f = \sum_i \lambda_i t^{a_i} \mid f \neq 0, \lambda_i \in K, (I : f) \neq I\}.$$

The next result gives a description of the minimum distance which is suitable for computing this number using a computer algebra system such as *Macaulay2* [13].

Corollary 4.8. *If $K = \mathbb{F}_q$, $|\mathbb{X}| \geq 2$, $I = I(\mathbb{X})$, and \prec a monomial order, then*

$$\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = \deg S/I - \max\{\deg(S/(I, f)) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}_{\prec, d}\} \geq 1 \text{ for } d \geq 1.$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 4.7 because by the division algorithm any polynomial $f \in S_d$ can be written as $f = g + h$, where g is in I_d and h is a K -linear combination of standard monomials of degree d . Notice that $(I : f) = (I : h)$. \square

The expression for $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ of Corollary 4.8 gives an algorithm that can be implemented in *Macaulay2* [13] to compute $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ (see Example 7.2). However, in practice, we can only find the minimum distance for small values of q and d . Indeed, if $n = |\Delta_{\prec}(I) \cap S_d|$, to compute $\delta_{I(\mathbb{X})}$ requires to test the inequality $(I(\mathbb{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathbb{X})$ and compute the corresponding degree of $S/(I(\mathbb{X}), f)$ for the $n^q - 1$ standard polynomials of S/I .

Corollary 4.9. *Let K be a field, let \prec be a monomial order, and let \mathbb{X} be a finite subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} . If t_i is a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, then $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) \geq \text{fp}_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d) \geq 0$ for $d \geq 1$.*

Proof. The inequalities $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) \geq \text{fp}_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d) \geq 0$ follow from Theorems 4.5 and 4.7. \square

One can use Corollary 4.9 to estimate the minimum distance of any Reed-Muller-type code over a set \mathbb{X} parameterized by a set of relatively prime monomials because in this case t_i is a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathbb{X})$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$ and one has the following result that can be used to compute the vanishing ideal of \mathbb{X} using Gröbner bases and elimination theory.

Theorem 4.10. [23] *Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field. If \mathbb{X} is a subset of \mathbb{P}^{s-1} parameterized by monomials y^{v_1}, \dots, y^{v_s} in the variables y_1, \dots, y_n , then*

$$I(\mathbb{X}) = (\{t_i - y^{v_i} z\}_{i=1}^s \cup \{y_i^q - y_i\}_{i=1}^n) \cap S,$$

and $I(\mathbb{X})$ is a binomial ideal.

As an application, Corollary 4.9 will be used to study the minimum distance of projective nested cartesian codes [3] over a set \mathcal{X} . In this case t_i is a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathcal{X})$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$ and one has a Gröbner basis for $I(\mathcal{X})$ [3] (see Section 6).

5. DEGREE FORMULAS AND SOME INEQUALITIES

Let $S = K[t_1, \dots, t_s]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K , let d_1, \dots, d_s be a non-decreasing sequence of positive integers with $d_1 \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$, and let L be the ideal of S generated by the set of all $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ such that $1 \leq i < j \leq s$. In this section we show a formula for the degree of $S/(L, t^a)$ for any standard monomial t^a of S/L .

Lemma 5.1. *The ideal L is Cohen-Macaulay of height $s - 1$, has a unique irredundant primary decomposition given by*

$$L = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_s,$$

where $\mathfrak{q}_i = (t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}^{d_{i+1}}, \dots, t_s^{d_s})$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$, and $\deg(S/L) = 1 + \sum_{i=2}^s d_i \cdots d_s$.

Proof. Using induction on s and the depth lemma (see [27, Lemma 2.3.9]) it is seen that L is Cohen-Macaulay. In particular L is unmixed. Since the radical of L is generated by all $t_i t_j$ with $i < j$, the minimal primes of L are $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_s$, where \mathfrak{p}_i is generated by $t_1, \dots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_s$. The \mathfrak{p}_i -primary component of L is uniquely determined and is given by $LS_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap S$. Inverting the variable t_i in $LS_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ it follows that $LS_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \mathfrak{q}_i S_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$. As \mathfrak{q}_i is an irreducible ideal, it is \mathfrak{p}_i -primary and one has the equality $LS_{\mathfrak{p}_i} \cap S = \mathfrak{q}_i$. By the additivity of the degree we obtain the required formula for the degree of S/L . \square

Proposition 5.2. [27, Propositions 3.1.33 and 5.1.11] *Let $A = R_1/I_1$, $B = R_2/I_2$ be two standard graded algebras over a field K , where $R_1 = K[\mathbf{x}]$, $R_2 = K[\mathbf{y}]$ are polynomial rings in disjoint sets of variables and I_i is an ideal of R_i . If $R = K[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$ and $I = I_1 R + I_2 R$, then*

$$(R_1/I_1) \otimes_K (R_2/I_2) \simeq R/I \quad \text{and} \quad F(A \otimes_K B, x) = F(A, x)F(B, x),$$

where $F(A, x)$ and $F(B, x)$ are the Hilbert series of A and B , respectively.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $t^a = t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_s^{a_s}$ be a standard monomial of S/L with respect to a monomial order \prec . If $a_r \geq 1$, $a_i = 0$ for $i < r$, and $1 \leq r \leq s$, then $0 \leq a_i \leq d_i - 1$ for $i > r$ and*

$$\deg S/(L, t^a) = \begin{cases} \deg S/L - \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) - 1 & \text{if } r = s, a_s \leq d_s, \\ \deg S/L - 1 & \text{if } r = s, a_s \geq d_s + 1, \\ \deg S/L - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) & \text{if } r < s, a_r \leq d_r, \\ \deg S/L - (d_{r+1} - a_{r+1}) \cdots (d_s - a_s) & \text{if } r < s, a_r \geq d_r + 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. As $f = t^a$ is not a multiple of $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ for $i < j$, we get that $0 \leq a_i \leq d_i - 1$ for $i > r$. To show the formula for the degree we proceed by induction on $s \geq 2$. In what follows we will use the theory of Hilbert functions of graded algebras, as introduced in a classical paper of Stanley [22]. In particular, we will freely use the additivity of Hilbert series, a formula for the Hilbert series of a complete intersection [22, Corollary 3.3], the formula of Lemma 5.1 for the degree of S/L , and the fact that any monomial is a zero-divisor of S/L (this follows from Lemma 5.1). We split the proof of the case $s = 2$ in three easy cases.

Case (1): Assume $s = 2$, $r = 1$. This case is independent of whether $a_1 \leq d_1$ or $a_1 \geq d_1 + 1$ because the two possible values of $\deg S/(L, f)$ coincide. There are exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow S/(t_1)[-d_2] \xrightarrow{t_2^{d_2}} S/(L, f) \longrightarrow S/(t_2^{d_2}, f) \longrightarrow 0, \\ 0 \longrightarrow S/(t_2^{a_2})[-a_1] \xrightarrow{t_1^{a_1}} S/(t_2^{d_2}, f) \longrightarrow S/(t_2^{d_2}, t_1^{a_1}) \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Taking Hilbert series we get

$$F(S/(L, f), x) = \frac{x^{d_2}}{1-x} + \frac{x^{a_1}(1+x+\cdots+x^{a_2-1})}{1-x} + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d_2-1} x^i \right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{a_1-1} x^i \right).$$

Writing $F(S/(L, f), x) = h(x)/(1-x)$ with $h(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and $h(1) > 0$, and noticing that $h(1)$ is the degree of $S/(L, f)$, we get

$$\deg S/(L, f) = 1 + a_2 = (d_2 + 1) - (d_2 - a_2) = \deg(S/L) - (d_2 - a_2).$$

Case (2): Assume $s = 2$, $r = 2$, $a_2 \leq d_2$. In this case (L, f) is equal to $(t_2^{a_2})$. Thus

$$\deg S/(L, f) = a_2 = (1 + d_2) - (d_2 - a_2) - 1 = \deg S/L - (d_2 - a_2) - 1.$$

Case (3): Assume $s = 2$, $r = 2$, $a_2 \geq d_2 + 1$. Taking Hilbert series in the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S/(t_1, t_2^{a_2-d_2})[-d_2] \xrightarrow{t_2^{d_2}} S/(L, f) \longrightarrow S/(t_2^{d_2}) \longrightarrow 0,$$

we obtain

$$F(S/(L, f), x) = x^{d_2}(1 + x + \cdots + x^{a_2-d_2-1}) + \frac{(1 + x + \cdots + x^{d_2-1})}{1-x}.$$

Thus we may proceed as in Case (1) to get $\deg(S/(L, f)) = d_2 = \deg(S/L) - 1$.

This completes the initial induction step. We may now assume that $s \geq 3$ and split the proof in three cases.

Case (I): Assume $r = s \geq 3$ and $a_s \leq d_s$. Thus $f = t_s^{a_s}$ and $a_i = 0$ for $i < s$. Setting L' equal to the ideal generated by the set of all $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ such that $2 \leq i < j \leq s$, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S/(t_2^{d_2}, \dots, t_{s-1}^{d_{s-1}}, t_s^{a_s})[-1] \xrightarrow{t_1} S/(L, t_s^{a_s}) \longrightarrow S/(L', t_s^{a_s}, t_1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Taking Hilbert series one has

$$F(S/(L, t_s^{a_s}), x) = xF(S/(t_2^{d_2}, \dots, t_{s-1}^{d_{s-1}}, t_s^{a_s}), x) + F(S/(L', t_s^{a_s}, t_1), x).$$

Hence, setting $S' = K[t_2, \dots, t_s]$, from the induction hypothesis applied to $S'/(L', t_s^{a_s})$, and using that $\deg S'/L' = \deg S/L - d_2 \cdots d_{s-1} d_s$ (see Lemma 5.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(S/(L, f)) &= d_2 \cdots d_{s-1} a_s + \deg(S'/L') - \sum_{i=3}^s d_i \cdots d_{s-1} (d_s - a_s) - 1 \\ &= \deg(S/L) - \sum_{i=2}^s d_i \cdots d_{s-1} (d_s - a_s) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case (II): Assume $r = s \geq 3$ and $a_s \geq d_s + 1$. Using the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S/(t_2^{d_2}, \dots, t_{s-1}^{d_{s-1}}, t_s^{d_s})[-1] \xrightarrow{t_1} S/(L, t_s^{a_s}) \longrightarrow S/(L', t_s^{a_s}, t_1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

we can proceed as in Case (I) to get $\deg(S/(L, f)) = \deg(S/L) - 1$.

Case (III): Assume $r < s$. Then, by assumption, $a_s < d_s$. Let L' be the ideal generated by the set of all $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ such that $1 \leq i < j \leq s-1$. Setting $f' = t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_{s-1}^{a_{s-1}}$ and $S' = K[t_1, \dots, t_{s-1}]$, there are exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow S/(t_1, \dots, t_{s-1})[-d_s] \xrightarrow{t_s^{d_s}} S/(L, f) \longrightarrow S/(L', f, t_s^{d_s}) \longrightarrow 0, \\ 0 \longrightarrow S/(L', f', t_s^{d_s-a_s})[-a_s] \xrightarrow{t_s^{a_s}} S/(L', f, t_s^{d_s}) \longrightarrow S/(L', t_s^{a_s}) \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence taking Hilbert series, and applying Proposition 5.2, we get

$$F(S/(L, f), x) = \frac{x^{d_s}}{1-x} + F(S'/(L', f'), x)F(K[t_s]/(t_s^{d_s-a_s}), x) + F(S'/L', x)F(K[t_s]/(t_s^{a_s}), x).$$

Writing $F(S/(L, f), x) = h(x)/(1-x)$ with $h(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and $h(1) > 0$, and noticing that $h(1)$ is the degree of $S/(L, f)$, the induction hypothesis applied to $S'/(L', f')$ yields the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \deg S/(L, f) &= 1 + \left(\deg S'/L' - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_{s-1} - a_{s-1}) \right) (d_s - a_s) + (\deg S'/L') a_s \\ &= 1 + (\deg S'/L') d_s - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) \text{ if } a_r \leq d_r. \end{aligned}$$

or the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \deg S/(L, f) &= 1 + (\deg S'/L' - (d_{r+1} - a_{r+1}) \cdots (d_{s-1} - a_{s-1})) (d_s - a_s) + \deg(S'/L') a_s \\ &= 1 + \deg(S'/L') d_s - (d_{r+1} - a_{r+1}) \cdots (d_s - a_s) \quad \text{if } a_r \geq d_r + 1. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof it suffices to notice that $\deg(S/L) = 1 + \deg(S'/L') d_s$. This equality follows readily from Lemma 5.1. \square

Remark 5.4. Cases (1), (2), and (3) can also be shown using Hilbert functions instead of Hilbert series, but case (III) is easier to handle using Hilbert series.

Lemma 5.5. *Let a_1, \dots, a_r, a, b, e be positive integers with $e \geq a$. Then*

- (a) $a_1 \cdots a_r \geq (a_1 + \cdots + a_r) - (r - 1)$, and
- (b) $a(e - b) \geq (a - b)e$.

Proof. Part (a) follows by induction on r , and part (b) is straightforward. \square

The next inequality is a generalization of part (a).

Lemma 5.6. *Let $1 \leq e_1 \leq \cdots \leq e_m$ and $0 \leq b_i \leq e_i - 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ be integers. Then*

$$(5.1) \quad \prod_{i=1}^m (e_i - b_i) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (e_i - b_i) - (k - 1) - \sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i \right) e_{k+1} \cdots e_m$$

for $k = 1, \dots, m$, where $e_{k+1} \cdots e_m = 1$ and $\sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i = 0$ if $k = m$.

Proof. Fix m and $1 \leq k \leq m$. We will proceed by induction on $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^k (e_i - b_i - 1)$. If $\sigma = 0$, then $e_i - b_i - 1 = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Thus either $1 - \sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i < 0$ or $1 - \sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i \geq 1$. In the first case the inequality is clear because the left hand side of Eq. (5.1) is positive and in the second case one has $b_i = 0$ for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$ and equality holds in Eq. (5.1). Assume that $\sigma > 0$. If $k = m$ or $b_i = 0$ for $i = k + 1, \dots, m$, the inequality follows at once from Lemma 5.5(a). Thus, we may assume $k < m$ and $b_j > 0$ for some $k + 1 \leq j \leq m$. To simplify notation, and without loss of generality, we may assume that $j = m$, that is, $b_m > 0$. If the right hand side of Eq. (5.1) is negative or zero, the inequality holds. Thus we may also assume that

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^k (e_i - b_i) - \sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i \geq k.$$

Hence there is $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ such that $e_\ell - b_\ell \geq 2$.

Case (1): Assume $e_\ell - b_\ell - b_m \geq 1$. Setting $a = e_\ell - b_\ell$, $e = e_m$, and $b = b_m$ in Lemma 5.5(b), we get

$$(5.3) \quad (e_\ell - b_\ell)(e_m - b_m) \geq (e_\ell - (b_\ell + b_m))e_m.$$

Therefore using Eq. (5.3), and then applying the induction hypothesis to the two sequences of integers

$$e_1, \dots, e_{\ell-1}, e_\ell, e_{\ell+1}, \dots, e_{m-1}, e_m; \quad b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell + b_m, b_{\ell+1}, \dots, b_{m-1}, 0,$$

we get the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{i=1}^m (e_i - b_i) &= \left(\prod_{i \notin \{\ell, m\}} (e_i - b_i) \right) (e_\ell - b_\ell)(e_m - b_m) \\
&\geq \left(\prod_{i \notin \{\ell, m\}} (e_i - b_i) \right) (e_\ell - (b_\ell + b_m))e_m \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{\ell \neq i=1}^k (e_i - b_i) + (e_\ell - (b_\ell + b_m)) - (k-1) - \sum_{i=k+1}^{m-1} b_i \right) e_{k+1} \cdots e_m \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (e_i - b_i) - (k-1) - \sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i \right) e_{k+1} \cdots e_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Case (2): Assume $e_\ell - b_\ell - b_m < 1$. Setting $r_\ell = e_\ell - b_\ell - 1 \geq 1$, one has

$$b_\ell + r_\ell = e_\ell - 1 \geq 1, \quad b_m - r_\ell \geq 1, \quad e_\ell - (b_\ell + r_\ell) = 1.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 5.5(a), one has

$$(5.4) \quad (e_\ell - b_\ell)(e_m - b_m) \geq (e_\ell - b_\ell) + (e_m - b_m) - 1 = (e_\ell - (b_\ell + r_\ell))(e_m - (b_m - r_\ell)).$$

Therefore using Eq. (5.4), and then applying the induction hypothesis to the two sequences of integers

$$e_1, \dots, e_{\ell-1}, e_\ell, e_{\ell+1}, \dots, e_{m-1}, e_m; \quad b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}, b_\ell + r_\ell, b_{\ell+1}, \dots, b_{m-1}, b_m - r_\ell,$$

we get the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{i=1}^m (e_i - b_i) &= \left(\prod_{i \notin \{\ell, m\}} (e_i - b_i) \right) (e_\ell - b_\ell)(e_m - b_m) \\
&\geq \left(\prod_{i \notin \{\ell, m\}} (e_i - b_i) \right) (e_\ell - (b_\ell + r_\ell))(e_m - (b_m - r_\ell)) \\
&\geq \left(\sum_{\ell \neq i=1}^k (e_i - b_i) + (e_\ell - (b_\ell + r_\ell)) - (k-1) - \sum_{i=k+1}^{m-1} b_i - (b_m - r_\ell) \right) e_{k+1} \cdots e_m \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (e_i - b_i) - (k-1) - \sum_{i=k+1}^m b_i \right) e_{k+1} \cdots e_m. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.7. *Let $1 \leq e_1 \leq \dots \leq e_m$ and $0 \leq b_i \leq e_i - 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ be integers. If $b_0 \geq 1$, then*

$$(5.5) \quad \prod_{i=1}^m (e_i - b_i) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (e_i - b_i) - (k-1) - b_0 - \sum_{i=k+2}^m b_i \right) e_{k+2} \cdots e_m$$

for $k = 0, \dots, m-1$, where $e_{k+2} \cdots e_m = 1$ and $\sum_{i=k+2}^m b_i = 0$ if $k = m-1$.

Proof. If $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, then $1 \leq k+1 \leq m$. Applying Lemma 5.6, and making the substitution $k \rightarrow k+1$ in Eq. (5.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^m (e_i - b_i) &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (e_i - b_i) - k - \sum_{i=k+2}^m b_i \right) e_{k+2} \cdots e_m \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (e_i - b_i) - (k-1) - b_0 - \sum_{i=k+2}^m b_i \right) e_{k+2} \cdots e_m, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds because $b_0 \geq 1$. \square

6. PROJECTIVE NESTED CARTESIAN CODES

In this section we introduce projective nested cartesian codes, a type of evaluation codes that generalize the classical projective Reed–Muller codes [21]. As an application we will give some support to a conjecture of Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann and López.

Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field, let A_1, \dots, A_s be a collection of subsets of K , and let

$$\mathcal{X} = [A_1 \times \cdots \times A_s]$$

be the image of $A_1 \times \cdots \times A_s \setminus \{0\}$ under the map $K^s \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{s-1}$, $x \rightarrow [x]$.

Definition 6.1. [3] The set \mathcal{X} is called a *projective nested cartesian set* if

- (i) $\{0, 1\} \subset A_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$,
- (ii) $a/b \in A_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq s$, $a \in A_j$, $0 \neq b \in A_i$, and
- (iii) $d_1 \leq \cdots \leq d_s$, where $d_i = |A_i|$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$.

If \mathcal{X} is a projective nested cartesian set, we call $C_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ a *projective nested cartesian code*.

Conjecture 6.2. (Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann, and López [3]) *Let $C_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ be the d -th projective nested cartesian code on the set $\mathcal{X} = [A_1 \times \cdots \times A_s]$ with $d_i = |A_i|$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Then its minimum distance is given by*

$$\delta_{\mathcal{X}}(d) = \begin{cases} (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s & \text{if } d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1), \\ 1 & \text{if } d \geq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1) + 1, \end{cases}$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s-2$ and ℓ are the unique integers such that $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

In what follows $\mathcal{X} = [A_1 \times \cdots \times A_s]$ denotes a projective nested cartesian set and $C_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ is its corresponding d -th projective Reed-Muller-type code. Throughout this section \prec is the lexicographical order on S with $t_1 \prec \cdots \prec t_s$ and $\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X}))$ is the initial ideal of $I(\mathcal{X})$.

Proposition 6.3. [3] *The initial ideal $\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X}))$ is generated by the set of all monomials $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ such that $1 \leq i < j \leq s$,*

$$\deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) = 1 + \sum_{i=2}^s d_i \cdots d_s, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(S/I(\mathcal{X})) = 1 + \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1).$$

Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann and López, showed the conjecture when the A_i 's are subfields of \mathbb{F}_q . They also showed that the conjecture can be reduced to:

Conjecture 6.4. (Carvalho, Lopez-Neumann, and López [3]) *If $0 \neq f \in S_d$ is a standard polynomial, with respect to \prec , such that $(I(\mathcal{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathcal{X})$ and $1 \leq d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1)$, then*

$$|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s - 2$ and ℓ are integers such that $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

We show a degree formula and use this to give an upper bound for $|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)|$.

Theorem 6.5. *Let \prec be the lexicographical order on S with $t_1 \prec \cdots \prec t_s$ and let $f \neq 0$ be a standard polynomial with $\text{in}_{\prec}(f) = t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_s^{a_s}$ and $a_r \geq 1$. Then $0 \leq a_i \leq d_i - 1$ for $i > r$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| &\leq \deg(S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X})), \text{in}_{\prec}(f))) \\ &= \begin{cases} \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) & \text{if } a_r \leq d_r, \\ \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{r+1} - a_{r+1}) \cdots (d_s - a_s) & \text{if } a_r \geq d_r + 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $(d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) = 1$ if $i > s$ and $a_i = 0$ for $i < r$.

Proof. By Proposition 6.3 the initial ideal of $I(\mathcal{X})$ is generated by the set of all $t_i t_j^{d_j}$ such that $1 \leq i < j \leq s$ and the degree of $S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X})))$ is equal to the degree of $S/I(\mathcal{X})$. As $\text{in}_{\prec}(f)$ is a standard monomial, it follows that $0 \leq a_i \leq d_i - 1$ for $i > r$. Notice that if f is not a zero-divisor of $S/I(\mathcal{X})$, then $V_{\mathcal{X}}(f) = \emptyset$. Thus the inequality follows at once from Corollary 4.3 and the equality follows from Proposition 5.3. \square

The next result gives some support for Conjecture 6.4.

Theorem 6.6. *Let \prec be the lexicographical order on S with $t_1 \prec \cdots \prec t_s$. If $0 \neq f \in S_d$ is a standard polynomial such that $1 \leq d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1)$ and t_1 divides $\text{in}_{\prec}(f)$, then*

$$|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s - 2$ and ℓ are integers such that $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2 we may assume that $(I(\mathcal{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathcal{X})$. Let $t^a = \text{in}_{\prec}(f)$ be the initial monomial of f . By Proposition 6.3, we can write

$$t^a = t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_s^{a_s},$$

with $a_1 \geq 1$, $0 \leq a_i \leq d_i - 1$ for $i > 1$. By Lemmas 3.2 and 4.1 it suffices to show that the following inequality holds

$$(6.1) \quad \deg(S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X})), t^a)) \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s.$$

If we substitute $-\ell = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) - \sum_{i=1}^s a_i$ in Eq. (6.1), and use the formula for the degree of $S/(\text{in}_{\prec}(I(\mathcal{X})), t^a)$ given in Theorem 6.5, we need only show that the following inequalities hold for $r = 1$:

$$(6.2) \quad \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) \geq$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=2}^{k+2} (d_i - a_i) - (k - 1) - a_1 - \sum_{i=k+3}^s a_i \right) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s \text{ if } a_r \leq d_r,$$

$$(6.3) \quad \prod_{i=r+1}^s (d_i - a_i) \geq \left(\sum_{i=2}^{k+2} (d_i - a_i) - (k - 1) - a_1 - \sum_{i=k+3}^s a_i \right) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s \text{ if } a_r \geq d_r + 1,$$

for $0 \leq k \leq s-2$, where $(d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) = 1$ if $i > s$ and $a_i = 0$ for $i < r$.

Assume $r = 1$. Then Eqs. (6.2) and (6.3) are the same. Thus we need only show the inequality

$$\prod_{i=2}^s (d_i - a_i) \geq \left(\sum_{i=2}^{k+2} (d_i - a_i) - (k-1) - a_1 - \sum_{i=k+3}^s a_i \right) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s,$$

for $0 \leq k \leq s-2$. This inequality follows making $m = s-1$, $e_i = d_{i+1}$, $b_i = a_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $b_0 = a_1$ in Proposition 5.7. \square

The following resembles Conjecture 6.2 when $d = 1$:

Conjecture 6.7. [25, Conjecture 4.9] *Let \mathbb{X} be a finite set of points in \mathbb{P}^{s-1} . If $I(\mathbb{X})$ is a complete intersection generated by f_1, \dots, f_{s-1} , with $e_i = \deg(f_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, s-1$, and $2 \leq e_i \leq e_{i+1}$ for all i , then $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(1) \geq (e_1 - 1)e_2 \cdots e_{s-1}$.*

Next we show that the corresponding conjecture is true for projective nested cartesian codes by proving that Conjecture 6.2 is true for $d = 1$.

Proposition 6.8. $\delta_{\mathcal{X}}(1) = d_2 \cdots d_s$.

Proof. It suffices to show that Conjecture 6.4 is true for $d = 1$, that is, if $0 \neq f \in S_1$ is a standard polynomial such that $(I(\mathcal{X}) : f) \neq I(\mathcal{X})$, then we must show the inequality

$$|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - d_2 \cdots d_s.$$

As $\text{in}_{\prec}(f) = t_r$ for some $1 \leq r \leq s$, we can write $\text{in}_{\prec}(f) = t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_s^{a_s}$, where $a_r = 1$, $a_i = 0$ for $i \neq r$, and $2 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_s$. Therefore, by Theorem 6.5, we get

$$|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| \leq \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s),$$

where $(d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) = 1$ if $i > s$. Hence the proof reduces to showing the inequality

$$\sum_{i=2}^{r+1} (d_i - a_i) \cdots (d_s - a_s) \geq d_2 \cdots d_s.$$

If $r = s$, this inequality follows readily by induction on $s \geq 2$. If $r < s$ the inequality also follows by induction on s by noticing that, in this case, both sides of the inequality have d_s as a common factor because d_s appears in all terms of the summation of the left hand side. \square

Let \mathcal{L}_d be the K -vector space generated by all $t^a \in S_d$ such that t_1 divides t^a and let C_d be the image of \mathcal{L}_d under the evaluation map ev_d . From the next result it follows that the minimum distance of $C_{\mathcal{X}}(d)$ proposed in Conjecture 6.2 is in fact the minimum distance of the evaluation linear code C_d .

Corollary 6.9. *Let \mathcal{L}_d be the K -vector space generated by all $t^a \in S_d$ such that t^a contains t_1 . If $1 \leq d \leq \sum_{i=2}^s (d_i - 1)$, then*

$$\max\{|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| : f \notin I(\mathcal{X}), f \in \mathcal{L}_d\} = \deg(S/I(\mathcal{X})) - (d_{k+2} - \ell + 1) d_{k+3} \cdots d_s,$$

where $0 \leq k \leq s-2$ and ℓ are integers, $d = \sum_{i=2}^{k+1} (d_i - 1) + \ell$, and $1 \leq \ell \leq d_{k+2} - 1$.

Proof. Take $f \in \mathcal{L}_d \setminus I(\mathcal{X})$. Let \prec be the lexicographical order with $t_1 \prec \dots \prec t_s$ and let \mathcal{G} be the Gröbner basis of $I(\mathcal{X})$ given in [3, Proposition 2.14]. By the division algorithm, we can write $f = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i g_i + g$, where $g_i \in \mathcal{G}$ for all i and g is a standard polynomial of degree d . The polynomial g is again in $\mathcal{L}_d \setminus I(\mathcal{X})$. Indeed if $g \notin \mathcal{L}_d$, there is at least one monomial of g that do not contain t_1 , then making $t_1 = 0$ in the last equality, we get an equality of the form $0 = \sum_{i=1}^r b_i g_i + h$, where h is a non-zero standard polynomial of $I(\mathcal{X})$, a contradiction. Hence, by Theorem 6.6, the inequality \leq follows because $|V_{\mathcal{X}}(f)| = |V_{\mathcal{X}}(g)|$. To show equality notice that according to the proof of [3, Lemma 3.1], there is a polynomial f of degree d in $\mathcal{L}_d \setminus I(\mathcal{X})$ whose number of zeros in \mathcal{X} is equal to the right hand side of the required equality. \square

7. EXAMPLES

In this section we show some examples that illustrates how some of our results can be used in practice.

Example 7.1. Let K be the field \mathbb{F}_3 , let \mathbb{X} be the subset of \mathbb{P}^3 given by

$$\mathbb{X} = \{[e_1], [e_2], [e_3], [e_4], [(1, -1, -1, 1)], [(1, 1, 1, 1)], [(-1, -1, 1, 1)], [(-1, 1, -1, 1)]\},$$

where e_i is the i -th unit vector, and let $I = I(\mathbb{X})$ be the vanishing ideal of \mathbb{X} . Using Lemma 2.9 and *Macaulay2* [13], we get that I is the ideal of $S = K[t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4]$ generated by the binomials $t_1 t_2 - t_3 t_4$, $t_1 t_3 - t_2 t_4$, $t_2 t_3 - t_1 t_4$. Hence, using Theorem 4.4 and the procedure below for *Macaulay2* [13], we get

| | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|---|-----|
| d | 1 | 2 | 3 | ... |
| $\deg(S/I)$ | 8 | 8 | 8 | ... |
| $H_I(d)$ | 4 | 7 | 8 | ... |
| $\delta_I(d)$ | 4 | 2 | 1 | ... |

q=3

S=ZZ/q[t1,t2,t3,t4]

I=ideal(t1*t2-t3*t4,t1*t3-t2*t4,t2*t3-t1*t4)

M=coker gens gb I

h=(d)->min apply(apply(apply(apply(toList

(set(0..q-1))^*(hilbertFunction(d,M))-

(set{0})^*(hilbertFunction(d,M)),toList),x->basis(d,M)*vector x),

z->ideal(flatten entries z)),x-> degree quotient(I,x))

apply(1..2,h)--this gives the minimum distance in degrees 1,2

Example 7.2. Let \mathbb{X} be the set in \mathbb{P}^3 parameterized by $y_1 y_2, y_2 y_3, y_3 y_4, y_1 y_4$ over the field \mathbb{F}_3 . Using Corollary 4.8, Theorem 4.10, and the following procedure for *Macaulay2* [13] we get

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----|----|----|-----|
| d | 1 | 2 | 3 | ... |
| $ \mathbb{X} $ | 16 | 16 | 16 | ... |
| $H_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ | 4 | 9 | 16 | ... |
| $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ | 9 | 4 | 1 | ... |
| $\text{fp}_{I(\mathbb{X})}(d)$ | 6 | 3 | 1 | ... |

q=3

R=ZZ/q[y1,y2,y3,y4,z,t1,t2,t3,t4,MonomialOrder=>Eliminate 5];

f1=y1*y2, f2=y2*y3, f3=y3*y4, f4=y4*y1

J=ideal(y1^q-y1,y2^q-y2,y3^q-y3,y4^q-y4,t1-f1*z,t2-f2*z,t3-f3*z,t4-f4*z)

```

C4=ideal selectInSubring(1, gens gb J)
S=ZZ/q[t1,t2,t3,t4];
I=sub(C4,S)
M=coker gens gb I
h=(d)->degree M - max apply(apply(apply(apply(
toList (set(0..q-1))^**(hilbertFunction(d,M))-
(set{0})^**(hilbertFunction(d,M)), toList),x->basis(d,M)*vector x),
z->ideal(flatten entries z)),x-> if not
quotient(I,x)==I then degree ideal(I,x) else 0)--The function h(d)
--gives the minimum distance in degree d
h(1), h(2)
f=(x1) -> degree ideal(x1,leadTerm gens gb I)
fp=(d)->degree M - max apply(flatten entries basis(d,M),f)--The
--function fp(d) gives the footprint in degree d
L=toList(1..regularity M)
apply(L,fp)

```

Example 7.3. Let \mathbb{X} be a projective torus in \mathbb{P}^2 over the field $K = \mathbb{F}_3$. The vanishing ideal $I = I(\mathbb{X})$ is generated by $t_1^2 - t_3^2, t_2^2 - t_3^2$. The polynomial $F = (t_1 - t_2)^d$ is a zero-divisor of S/I because $(t_1 - t_3, t_2 - t_3)$ is an associated prime of S/I and $F \notin I$ because F does not vanish at $[(1, -1)]$. Hence, $\mathcal{F}_d \neq \emptyset$. If \prec is the lexicographical order $t_1 \succ t_2 \succ t_3$, then t_3^d is a standard monomial which is not a zero-divisor of S/I and $S/\text{in}_\prec(I)$. This causes $\text{deg}(S/(\text{in}_\prec(I), t_3^2))$ to be greater than $\text{deg}(S/I)$. Using *Macaulay2* [13] we obtain

| | | | |
|------------------|---|----|-----|
| d | 1 | 2 | ... |
| $ \mathbb{X} $ | 4 | 4 | ... |
| $H_I(d)$ | 3 | 4 | ... |
| $\delta_I(d)$ | 2 | 1 | ... |
| $\text{fp}_I(d)$ | 0 | -4 | ... |

Let $C_{\mathbb{X}}(d)$ be a projective Reed-Muller-type code. If $d \geq \text{reg}(S/I(\mathbb{X}))$, then $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(d) = 1$. The converse is not true as the next example shows.

Example 7.4. Let $\mathbb{X} = \{[(1, 1, 1)], [(1, -1, 0)], [(1, 0, -1)], [(0, 1, -1)], [(1, 0, 0)]\}$ and let I be its vanishing ideal over the finite field \mathbb{F}_3 . Using *Macaulay2* [13] we obtain that $\text{reg}(S/I) = 3$. Notice that $\delta_{\mathbb{X}}(1) = 1$ because the polynomial $t_1 + t_2 + t_3$ vanishes at all points of $\mathbb{X} \setminus \{[(1, 0, 0)]\}$.

The next example shows that δ_I is not in general non-increasing. This is why we often require that the dimension of I be at least 1 or that I is unmixed with at least 2 minimal primes.

Example 7.5. Let I be the ideal of $\mathbb{F}_5[t_1, t_2]$ generated by $t_1^7, t_2^5, t_1^2 t_2, t_1 t_2^3$. Using Corollary 4.8 and *Macaulay2* [13] we get that the regularity of S/I is 7, that is, $H_I(d) = 0$ for $d \geq 7$, and

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| d | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | ... |
| $\text{deg}(S/I)$ | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | ... |
| $H_I(d)$ | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | ... |
| $\delta_I(d)$ | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | ... |

Acknowledgments. We thank the referee for a careful reading of the paper and for the improvements suggested.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay Rings*, Revised Edition, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [2] C. Carvalho, On the second Hamming weight of some Reed-Muller type codes, *Finite Fields Appl.* **24** (2013), 88–94.
- [3] C. Carvalho, V. G. Lopez Neumann and H. H. López, Projective nested cartesian codes. Preprint 2014, [arXiv:1411.6819](https://arxiv.org/abs/1411.6819).
- [4] D. Cox, J. Little and D. O’Shea, *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [5] I. M. Duursma, C. Rentería and H. Tapia-Recillas, Reed-Muller codes on complete intersections, *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.* **11** (2001), no. 6, 455–462.
- [6] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra with a view toward Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **150**, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [7] D. Eisenbud, *The geometry of syzygies: A second course in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **229**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.
- [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] A. V. Geramita, M. Kreuzer and L. Robbiano, Cayley-Bacharach schemes and their canonical modules, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **339** (1993), no. 1, 163–189.
- [11] L. Gold, J. Little and H. Schenck, Cayley-Bacharach and evaluation codes on complete intersections, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **196** (2005), no. 1, 91–99.
- [12] M. González-Sarabia, C. Rentería and H. Tapia-Recillas, Reed-Muller-type codes over the Segre variety, *Finite Fields Appl.* **8** (2002), no. 4, 511–518.
- [13] D. Grayson and M. Stillman, *Macaulay2*, 1996. Available via anonymous ftp from math.uiuc.edu.
- [14] H. H. López, C. Rentería and R. H. Villarreal, Affine cartesian codes, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **71** (2014), no. 1, 5–19.
- [15] H. H. López, E. Sarmiento, M. Vaz Pinto and R. H. Villarreal, Parameterized affine codes, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **49** (2012), no. 3, 406–418.
- [16] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-correcting Codes*, North-Holland, 1977.
- [17] L. O’Carroll, F. Planas-Vilanova and R. H. Villarreal, Degree and algebraic properties of lattice and matrix ideals, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **28** (2014), no. 1, 394–427.
- [18] SAGE Mathematical Software, <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [19] C. Rentería, A. Simis and R. H. Villarreal, Algebraic methods for parameterized codes and invariants of vanishing ideals over finite fields, *Finite Fields Appl.* **17** (2011), no. 1, 81–104.
- [20] E. Sarmiento, M. Vaz Pinto and R. H. Villarreal, The minimum distance of parameterized codes on projective tori, *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.* **22** (2011), no. 4, 249–264.
- [21] A. Sørensen, Projective Reed-Muller codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **37** (1991), no. 6, 1567–1576.
- [22] R. Stanley, Hilbert functions of graded algebras, *Adv. Math.* **28** (1978), 57–83.
- [23] A. Tochimani and R. H. Villarreal, Vanishing ideals over rational parameterizations. Preprint, 2015, [arXiv:1502.05451v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.05451v1).
- [24] S. Tohăneanu, Lower bounds on minimal distance of evaluation codes, *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.* **20** (2009), no. 5–6, 351–360.
- [25] S. Tohăneanu and A. Van Tuyl, Bounding invariants of fat points using a coding theory construction, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **217** (2013), no. 2, 269–279.
- [26] M. Tsfasman, S. Vladut and D. Nogin, *Algebraic geometric codes: basic notions*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **139**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.
- [27] R. H. Villarreal, *Monomial Algebras, Second Edition*, Monographs and Research Notes in Mathematics, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2015.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DE ESTUDIOS AVANZADOS DEL IPN,
APARTADO POSTAL 14-740, 07000 MEXICO CITY, D.F.

E-mail address: `jmb@math.cinvestav.mx`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DE ESTUDIOS AVANZADOS DEL IPN,
APARTADO POSTAL 14-740, 07000 MEXICO CITY, D.F.

E-mail address: `ypitones@math.cinvestav.mx`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DE ESTUDIOS AVANZADOS DEL IPN,
APARTADO POSTAL 14-740, 07000 MEXICO CITY, D.F.

E-mail address: `vila@math.cinvestav.mx`