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Abstract—In this work, we consider tilings of the Hamming cube and look for metrics determined by a weight and which is compatible with the support of vectors (TS-metrics) which turn the known tilings into perfect codes. We determine which tilings with small tiles or high rank can be a perfect code for some TS-metric and we characterize all such TS-metrics. Finally, we show some procedures to obtain new perfect codes (it means, new tilings and TS-metrics) using existing ones.

I. INTRODUCTION

Perfect codes is an important topic of study in coding theory, since it satisfies an optimality condition: the coincidence between the packing and covering radii. Finding perfect codes is a difficult issue. For the Hamming metric, there is a complete characterization of its parameters, which are the parameters of a trivial code, a Hamming code [11] and Golay codes [8]. In [13], a more recent survey was made by Olof in 2008 [12].

Besides Van Lint’s good survey of perfect codes from 1975 [15], our main reference for this text. In that work, the authors present a complete classification of small tilings (for tiles with up to eight elements) and tilings with tiles of high rank. This is the starting point of our first approach. They also show that tilings are invariant by concatenation, and we use it for our second step.

In this work we are concerned with perfect codes when considering a particular but reasonable family of metrics on $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ (called TS-metrics), the metrics that are defined by a weight which preserves the support of vectors, in the sense that the natural ordering of the supports (under the inclusion) is compatible with the ordering of the weights. These two properties are quite natural to be asked when considering linear binary error correcting codes.

There are two large families of TS-metrics, namely the poset metrics and the combinatorial metrics, introduced respectively by R. Brualdi at. al in [2] 1995] and E. Gabidulin in [7] 1973]. In this more general setting, the only family of metrics in which perfect codes were studied are the so called poset metrics. A recent account of it can be found in [14] Chapter 6.3.1].

Our approach have two steps that are simple to explain.

1) If we have a tiling of the Hamming cube and each tile is a ball for a given metric $d$, then the center of the balls constitute a $d$-perfect code. So, we consider known tilings of the Hamming cube and ask which of these tilings can be a metric ball of a TS-metric. For those that satisfy this condition, we try to classify (up to equivalence) all such metrics.

2) The second step asks to construct new perfect codes out of existing ones. To be more precise, given a $d_1$-perfect code on $\mathbb{F}_2^{n_1}$ and a $d_2$-perfect code on $\mathbb{F}_2^{n_2}$ we try to find a metric $d$ that turns the concatenation of the two codes into a $d$-perfect code in $\mathbb{F}_2^{n_1+n_2}$.

The main source of existing tilings of the Hamming cube, and of ways to construct tilings out of existing ones is [5]. Throughout this paper, let $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ be the $n$-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{F}_2$, $[n] = \{1, ..., n\}$ and $\text{supp}(x) := \{i \in [n] : x_i \neq 0\}$ the support of $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. We let $\omega_H$ and $d_H$ denote the Hamming weight and metric, respectively.

A. TS-metrics

The Hamming metric has two important properties, expressed in the next two definitions.

Definition 1: A metric $d : \mathbb{F}_2^n \times \mathbb{F}_2^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be translation-invariant if

$$d(x + z, y + z) = d(x, y)$$

for every $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$.

It is well known and worth noting that a metric is translation-invariant iff it is defined by a weight $\omega$.

Definition 2: A weight function $\omega$ is said to preserve the support of vectors if $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(y) \implies \omega(x) \leq \omega(y)$.

A translation-support metric (TS-metric) is a metric that is translation-invariant and which preserves the support of vectors.

Being invariant by translations is a key property for decoding linear codes, since syndrome decoding depends exclusively on this property.

Preserving the support of vectors is a property that is crucial in coding theory (for binary codes), once it means that making extra errors can not lead to a better situation, in the sense that making an error on the coordinate $i$ in a message can not be

\[1\] A function $\omega : \mathbb{F}_2^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a weight if it satisfies the following axioms: (1) $\omega(x) \geq 0$ for every $x$; (2) $\omega(x) = 0$ if, and only if, $x = 0$; (3) $\omega(x + y) \leq \omega(x) + \omega(y)$. A weight determines a metric by defining $d(x, y) = \omega(x - y)$. 

worse than making two errors, one on the coordinate \(i\) and the other on \(j\).

We present now the two principal families of TS-metrics which will be explored in this work.

1) Poset Metric: The poset metrics were introduced by Brualdi et al. in [2].

Let \(P = ([n], \preceq)\) be a partially ordered set (poset). An ideal \(I\) in a poset \(P = ([n], \preceq)\) is a nonempty subset \(I \subseteq [n]\) such that, for \(a \in I\) and \(b \in [n]\), if \(b \preceq a\) then \(b \in I\). We denote by \(\langle A \rangle_P\) the ideal generated by \(A \subseteq [n]\). The subscript \(P\) may be omitted when there is no risk of ambiguity.

An element \(a\) of an ideal \(I \subseteq [n]\) is called a maximal element of \(I\) if \(a \preceq b\) for some \(b \in I\) implies \(b = a\).

We say that \(b\) covers \(a\) if \(a \preceq b, a \neq b\) and there is no extra element \(c \in [n]\) such that \(a \preceq c \preceq b\).

**Definition 3:** The \(P\)-weight of a vector \(x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\) is defined by

\[
\omega_P(x) = |\|\text{supp}(x)\||_P,
\]

where \(|A|\) is the cardinality of \(A\).

The \(P\)-weight clearly preserves the support, since \(A \subset B\) implies \(\langle A \rangle \subset \langle B \rangle\). The \(P\)-distance in \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\) is the metric induced by \(\omega_P\):

\[
d_P(x, y) = \omega_P(x - y).
\]

2) Combinatorial Metric: The combinatorial metrics were introduced by Gabidulin in [7].

Let \(\mathbb{P}_n = \{A : A \subset [n]\}\) be the power set of \([n]\). We say that a family \(A \subset \mathbb{P}_n\) is a covering of a set \(X \subset [n]\) if \(X \subset \bigcup_{A \in A} A\).

If \(\mathcal{F}\) is a covering of \([n]\), then the \(\mathcal{F}\)-combinatorial weight of \(x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\) is the integer-valued map \(\omega_{\mathcal{F}}\) defined by

\[
\omega_{\mathcal{F}}(x) = \min\{|A| : A \subset \mathcal{F}, A \text{ is a covering of } \text{supp}(x)\}.
\]

The distance defined as \(d_{\mathcal{F}}(x, y) = \omega_{\mathcal{F}}(x - y)\) is called \(\mathcal{F}\)-combinatorial metric.

We denote by \(\mathbb{T}\mathcal{S}(n), \mathbb{P}(n)\) and \(\mathbb{C}(n)\) the sets of all metrics TS, poset and combinatorial, respectively.

**B. Perfect codes**

Given a metric \(d\) on \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\), the ball of radius \(r\) and center \(x\) is \(B_d(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : d(x, y) \leq r\}\). A code \(C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n\) is a \((d, r)\)-perfect code if \(\bigcup_{c \in C} B_d(c, r) = \mathbb{F}_2^n\) and \(B_d(c_i, r) \cap B_d(c_j, r) = \emptyset, \forall c_i, c_j \in C, c_i \neq c_j\).

We approach now the first of our key definitions.

**Definition 4:** Given a subset \(S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n\), we say that \(S\) is a TS-ball if \(S\) is a ball for some TS-metric, that is, \(S = B_d(x, r)\), for some \(x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\), \(r > 0\) and \(d \in \mathbb{T}\mathcal{S}(n)\). If \(C\) is a \((d, r)\)-perfect code for some \(d \in \mathbb{T}\mathcal{S}(n)\) we say that it is a TS-perfect code. In case the radius \(r\) is not taken into consideration, we say \(C\) is \(d\)-perfect.

**C. Tiles, tilings and polyhedrominoes**

We are interested in building perfect codes out of tilings of the Hamming cube, so we need some basic definitions about tilings and polyhedrominoes.

A path in \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\), with initial point \(x\) and final point \(y\), is a sequence \(y = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n\), where \(d_H(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1, x = x_0\) and \(y = x_n\). The length of \(\gamma\) is defined by \(|\gamma| = t\). A path \(\gamma\) is called a geodesic path if it is a path of minimum length between the initial and final points. A path \(\gamma\) from \(x\) to \(y\) is a geodesic path if, and only if, \(d_H(x, y) = |\gamma|\).

**Definition 5:** A set \(D \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n\) is a polyhedromino if for all \(x, y \in D\) there is a (possibly not unique) geodesic path \(\gamma \subset D\) connecting \(x\) to \(y\).

In graph theory, given a graph \(G\) and a subgraph \(H\), an \(H\)-tiling in \(G\) is a collection of vertex-disjoint copies of \(H\) in \(G\), that is, \(G\) is tiled (covered) by translated copies of \(H\). For finite fields, the idea is the same and it is presented below.

**Definition 6:** A tiling of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\) is a pair \((D, C)\), where \(D, C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n\) and \(C\) is a subset such that

\[
\bigcup_{c \in C} c + D = \mathbb{F}_2^n \quad \text{and} \quad (c_1 + D) \cap (c_2 + D) = \emptyset, \quad \forall c_1, c_2 \in C, c_1 \neq c_2.
\]

Despite the fact that the role of \(D\) and \(C\) are interchangeable, we shall call \(D\) as a tile and \(C\) the code of the tiling, since this is the role it will play in the context of coding theory. In the case where \(D\) is a polyhedromino, we say \((D, C)\) is a poly-tiling of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\).

Since we are working with translation-invariant metrics, it is always possible to translate all the elements of both \(D\) and \(C\) in order to have \(0 \in D\) and \(0 \in C\). Then, throughout this paper, wlog, we may assume that \(0 \in D\) and \(0 \in C\).

Notice that we are considering only translated copies of \(D\), which is very reasonable in the context of TS-metrics, since in this case all the translated copies of the tile are isometric. Also, as we shall see, it is also reasonable the use of polyhedrominoes to tile \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\).

Tilings and perfect codes are two distinct research areas. Tilings are frequently studied in the context of graph theory and notice that a particular case of graph is the Hamming graph. Next proposition establishes a connection between tilings and perfect codes.

**Proposition 1:** Given \((D, C)\) a tiling of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\), suppose that \(D = B_d(0, r)\) for some \(d \in \mathbb{T}\mathcal{S}(n)\). Then:

1) \(D\) is a polyhedromino;
2) \(C\) is a \((d, r)\)-perfect code.

**Proof:** The proof follows directly from the definitions and it is omitted due to lack of space.

In case the conditions of the proposition holds, we say that the tiling \((D, C)\) determines a TS-perfect code.

A trivial (and not interesting) way of obtaining a poly-tiling is to consider \(I \subset [n]\) and \(D_I = \{x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) : x_i = 0, i \in I\}\). It is also trivial to see that given a tiling \((D, C)\), we have that \(|D| \cdot |C| = |\mathbb{F}_2^n|\).

**Definition 7:** [3] The pair \((D, C)\) is a tiling of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\) if \(D \cup C = \mathbb{F}_2^n\) and \(2D \cap 2C = \{0\}\), where both \(D\) and \(C\) contain the element 0.

It is not difficult to see that the definitions [6] and [7] are equivalent.

### III. Obtaining perfect codes out of tilings

The starting point of this section is the work [3], where small tilings of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\) were classified, where “small” means tiles with size up to 8. Since a tiling \((D, C)\) satisfies \(|D| = |C| = 2^n\), by a “small” tile we mean a tile with cardinality 1, 2, 4 or 8.

This section is divided into four parts: In Section III-A we obtain all small tilings \((D, C)\) presented in [3] and determines each of those \(C\) is a TS-perfect code; In Section III-B we give necessary and sufficient conditions for a tiling of large rank to be a TS-perfect code; Finally, in Section III-C we classify all TS-metrics that turn \(D\) into a ball or equivalently, turn \(C\) into a TS-perfect code.

#### A. Classifying small tiles that determine TS-perfect codes

We denote by \(e_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\) the vector with \(\text{supp}(e_i) = \{i\}\).

**Proposition 2:** Let \(B = B_d(0, r) \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n\) be a TS-ball with 2 or 4 elements. Then, \(B\) is the following set:

\[
B_1 = \{0, e_i\}, \\
B_2 = \{0, e_i, e_j, e_{k}\}, i, j, k \text{ distincts} \\
B_3 = \{0, e_i, e_j, e_k + e_j\}, i \neq j.
\]

**Proof:** The tiles listed are all polyhedronic, where \(\text{dim}(V) = \text{rank}(V)\). The proof consists in exhibiting a TS-metric for each case. The last column of Tables I and II exhibits an appropriate TS-metric for which \(D\) is a ball. Each case should be directly verified.

**Remark 1:** The tiles \(D\) listed in Tables I and II are considered as subsets of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\), where \(s = \text{rank}(D)\). In Section III-B we show a process used to extend them to \(\mathbb{F}_2^n, n \geq s\).

#### B. Classifying tiles with large rank that determine TS-perfect codes

In [3], the authors proved that a set \(D_n(x) = \{e_i; i \in [n] \cup \{0, x\}\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n\) with \(\text{supp}(x) \subseteq \text{supp}(y)\) such that \(\omega_H(x) \geq 2\) is a tile if, and only if, \(\omega_H(x) \notin \{n - 1, n - 2\}\). We shall determine a necessary and sufficient condition for it to define a TS-perfect code.

**Proposition 4:** Suppose that \((D_n(x), C_n(x))\) is a tiling of \(\mathbb{F}_2^n\). Then, there is a TS-metric that turns it into a perfect code if, and only if, \(\omega_H(x) = 2\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tile</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D_1^2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5 + e_2, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_1^3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_6, e_7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I – Tiles of type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tile</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D_2^4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5 + e_2, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_2^5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5 + e_2, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_3, e_1 + e_3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_2^6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_1 + e_4, e_1 + e_4, e_1 + e_4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_2^7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5, e_1 + e_2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II – Tiles of type 2
is not difficult to prove that trivial relations follow:

\( P \) to extend it to a metric defined by a poset

\( F \) of \( F_0 \) and we define \( F = \{ \{ i \}; i \in [n] \} \cup \{ \{ j, k \} \} \) and we have that \( D_n(x) = B_{d_2}(0, 1) \) and, by Proposition 1, we have that \( (D_n(x), C_n(x)) \) is a \( d_F \)-perfect code.

C. Extending tilings from \( F_2^n \) to \( F_2^{n+1} \)

Given \( a = (a_1, a_2, ..., a_n) \in F_2^n \) and \( b = (b_1, b_2, ..., b_m) \in F_2^m \), \( a \mid b = (a_1, a_2, ..., a_n, b_1, b_2, ..., b_m) \) and \( A \mid B = \{ a \mid b; \ a \in A, \ b \in B \} \).

In the previous section we considered tilings \( (D, C) \) of \( F_2^n \) where \( s = \text{rank}(D) \). Since \( F_2^n \) can be seen as a linear subspace of \( F_2^m \) for \( n \geq s \), we can extend this to a tiling \( (D^*, C^*) \) of \( F_2^m \). We denote \( 0_1 \) the null element in \( F_2^n \) and let \( D^* = D \cup 0_{n-s} \) and \( C^* = C \cup F_2^{m-n} \). As can be found in Remark 1, we have that \( (D^*, C^*) \) is a tiling of \( F_2^m \). We remark that \( |D^*| = |D| \).

If \( (D, C) \) is a tiling of \( F_2^n \) and \( d \in TS(s) \) turns \( D \) into a metric ball \( B_d(0, r) \) in \( F_2^n \) (or equivalently, turns \( C \) into a \( d \)-perfect code), we wish to extend \( d \) to a metric \( d^* \) which turns \( D^* \) into a metric ball \( B_{d^*}(0, r') \) in \( F_2^m \).

Theorem 2: Given \( D = B_d(0, r), d \in TS(s) \), there is \( d^* \in TS(n) \) such that \( D^* = B_{d^*}(0, r) \).

Proof: Given a weight \( \omega \) on \( F_2^n \), let \( M(\omega) = \max\{\omega(x); x \in F_2^n\} \). We define, for \( x \in F_2^n \), \( n \geq s \)

\[
\omega_{n,s}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\omega(x) & \text{if } \text{supp}(x) \subseteq [s] \\
M(\omega) + 1 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

It is not difficult to see that \( \omega_{n,s}(x) \) is a weight. Let \( d \) and \( d_{n,s} \) be the metrics determined by \( \omega \) and \( \omega_{n,s} \), respectively. It is not difficult to prove that \( d \) preserves the support of vectors if, and only if, \( d_{n,s} \) does it. Moreover,

\[
B_{d_{n,s}}(0, r) = B_d(0, r) \mid \{0_{n-s}\}
\]

for every \( r \leq M(\omega) \). So, if \( (D, C) \) determines a perfect code, so does \( (D^*, C^*) \).

Remark 1: In the two cases considered in Theorem 1, where the metrics were determined by a poset \( P \) over \( [s] \), it is possible to extend it to a metric defined by a poset \( P^* \) over \( [n] \) as follows: \( P_1^* \) is defined by the (non-trivial) relations \( 1 \leq 2 \leq 3 \) and \( 3 \leq i \) for all \( i \geq 4 \). The poset \( P_2^* \) is defined by the (non-trivial) relations \( i \leq j \) for all \( i \leq 7 < j \). These are actually the minimal poset metrics which extends the original ones and it is not difficult to classify all the poset extensions that do it.

For the cases in Table 1 the extension follows by directly applying Theorem 2.

D. Classifying the TS-metrics which turn a tiling into a perfect code

If \( (D, C) \) determines a perfect code, there is \( d \in TS \) that turns \( D \) into a metric ball. Actually, there are infinitely many such metrics, so when we wish to classify all such metrics, we mean up to an equivalence relation. The most natural equivalence relation in the context of coding theory is to say that two metrics on \( F_2^n \) are equivalent if they determine the same minimum distance decoding for every code \( C \subseteq F_2^n \) and every received message \( x \in F_2^n \). To be more precise:

Definition 8: Two metrics (or distances) \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \) defined over \( F_2^n \) are \emph{decoding equivalent}, denoted by \( d_1 \sim d_2 \), if

\[
\arg \min \{d_1(x, c) : c \in C \} = \arg \min \{d_2(x, c) : c \in C \},
\]

for any code \( C \subseteq F_2^n \) and any \( x \in F_2^n \).

It is not difficult to see that \( d_1 \sim d_2 \) if, and only if, \( d_1(x, y) < d_1(x, z) \iff d_2(x, y) < d_2(x, z) \), for all \( x, y, z \in F_2^n \). Details about this equivalence relation can be found in [5] and [6].

Let \( M \subseteq F_2^N \times F_2^N \), \( N = 2^n \) be a distance matrix where \( m_{x,y} = d(x, y) \) and \( d \in TS(n) \). Our goal is to determine necessary and sufficient conditions (on the matrix \( M \)) to determine a TS-metric that turns a tiling \( (D, C) \) into a perfect code. This is what is done in the next proposition.

Theorem 3: Let \( (D, C) \) be a tiling of \( F_2^n \). Let \( d \) be a TS-metric for which \( D = B_d(0, r) \). Let \( M = (m_{x,y}) \subseteq F_2^N \times F_2^N \) be a \( N \times N \) matrix, with \( N = 2^n \), satisfying the following conditions:

1. \( m_{x,0} = d(x, 0) \) for \( x \in D \).
2. \( m_{x,0} > r \) for \( x \notin D \).
3. \( m_{x,y} = m_{y-x,0} \) for all \( x, y \in F_2^N \).

Then, the following holds:

i) The matrix \( M \) defines a distance which is decoding-equivalent to a metric \( d_M \) that is translation-invariant metric.

ii) The tile \( D \) is a metric ball of the metric \( d_M \), to be more precise, \( D = B_{d_M}(0, r) \).

iii) It is possible choose the values of \( m_{x,y} > r \) for \( x \notin D \) in such a way that the metric \( d_M \in TS(N) \). Any TS-metric \( d' \) which turns \( D \) into a metric ball is equivalent to a metric described by a matrix \( M \) satisfying conditions 1, 2, 3.

Proof: We briefly sketch the main steps in the proof. The existence of a metric follows from the symmetry of the matrix (since on a binary space \( x - y = y - x \) and the fact that on a finite space any distance is equivalent to a metric (see [4], Chapter 1.1)). The translation invariance follows from the fact that the first row determines all the others. Second item follows from the fact that \( m_{x,0} \leq r \) if, and only if, \( x \in D \). The third is done constructively and the last one follows from the algorithm presented in [5] to obtained a reduced form of a metric.

IV. CONCATENATION OF TILINGS: EXTENDING PERFECT CODES TO LARGER DIMENSIONS

In this section, we present some constructions to obtain new perfect codes out of a given pair of perfect codes. The principal tool to achieve the mentioned goal is the concatenation of tiles. We present here two main results. In Theorem 4 we consider
concatenation of tiles that are balls of same radius of two arbitrary TS-metrics and in Theorem 5 we may consider balls of different radii.

Since we are working with poly-tilings, the first step is to prove that the concatenation of poly-tilings results in a poly-tiling. That is what is stated in the next two results. The proof of both will be omitted due to space limitations, but they follow directly from the definitions.

**Proposition 5:** Let $D_1 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_m^n$ and $D_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_n^m$ and let $D = D_1 \uplus D_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_m^{n+m}$ be the concatenation of $D_1$ and $D_2$. Then, $D$ is a polyhedromino if, and only if, $D_1$ and $D_2$ are polyhedrominoes.

In [3] proof of Theorem 7.5, it was shown that given two tilings $(D_1, C_1)$ and $(D_2, C_2)$ of $\mathbb{F}_m^n$ and $\mathbb{F}_n^n$, respectively, the concatenation between $(D_1, C_1)$ and $(D_2, C_2)$ results in a tiling $(D, C)$ of $\mathbb{F}_m^{n+m}$. The same holds for poly-tilings. From this and Proposition 5 we have the following:

**Corollary 1:** Let $(D_1, C_1)$ and $(D_2, C_2)$ be poly-tilings of $\mathbb{F}_m^n$ and $\mathbb{F}_n^n$, respectively. Then, $(D_1 \uplus D_2, C_1 \uplus C_2)$ is a poly-tiling if, and only if, $(D_1, C_1)$ and $(D_2, C_2)$ are poly-tilings.

Notice that the concatenation of two sets can be seen as direct product between them. Then, it would be natural to consider the product metric. But, in a general case, the concatenated tile $D$ is not a metric ball in the product metric. For that reason, we define others metrics to accomplish our goal.

From here on, given $x \in \mathbb{F}_m^{n+m}$, express $x = x_1 \uplus x_2$, where $x_1 \in \mathbb{F}_m^n, x_2 \in \mathbb{F}_n^m$.

**Lemma 1:** Consider two metrics $d_1, d_2$ defined on $\mathbb{F}_m^n$ and $\mathbb{F}_n^n$ respectively and define $d_{max}(x,y) = \max\{d_1(x_1,y_1), d_2(x_2,y_2)\}$. Then $d_{max}$ is a metric on $\mathbb{F}_m^{n+m}$ and $d_1 \in TS(n), d_2 \in TS(m)$ implies $d_{max} \in TS(n+m)$.

The proof follows directly from the definition of a metric and it will be omitted due to lack of space.

Now we consider the concatenation of two balls with same radius.

**Theorem 4:** Let $(D_1, C_1), (D_2, C_2)$ be poly-tilings of $\mathbb{F}_m^n$ and $\mathbb{F}_n^n$, respectively. Suppose that $D_1 = B_{d_1}(0,r) = B_{d_1}(0,r)$ and $D_2 = B_{d_2}(0,r)$, where $d_1, d_2$ are TS-metrics. Let $(D, C) = (D_1 \uplus D_2, C_1 \uplus C_2)$. Then, $(D, C)$ is a poly-tiling of $\mathbb{F}_m^{n+m}$ and $D = B_{d_{max}}(0,r)$.

**Proof:** By Corollary 1 we have that $(D, C)$ is a poly-tiling. If $x \in D$ then $d_{max}(x,0) = \max\{d_1(x_1,0), d_2(x_2,0)\} \leq r$, since $x_1 \in D_1 \subseteq B_{d_1}(0,r)$ and $x_2 \in D_2 \subseteq B_{d_2}(0,r)$. Thus, $x \in B_{d_{max}}(0,r)$.

In Theorem 6 we show that the concatenation $D = D_1 \uplus D_2$ of two TS-balls (which are poly-tilings) of same radius (possibly determined by different metrics) is a TS-ball. A natural question arises: is it possible to have different radii and $D$ be a ball? To answer this question we start constructing a TS-weight, made out of a conditional sum of weights.

**Lemma 2:** Let $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ be TS-weights on $\mathbb{F}_m^n$ and $\mathbb{F}_n^n$ respectively. Given $r \leq m, s \leq n$, let $D_1 = B_{d_1}(0,r), D_2 = B_{d_2}(0,s)$ and $D = D_1 \uplus D_2$, where $d_i$ is the metric determined by $\omega_i$. For $r \leq s$ we define the $s$-sum

$$\omega_1 \oplus_s \omega_2(x) = \begin{cases} \omega_1(x_1) + \omega_2(x_2), & \text{if } x \in D \\ r + s + 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, $\omega_1 \oplus_s \omega_2$ is a weight and it preserves the support.

The proof follows directly from the definition of a weight and it will be omitted due to space limitations.

**Theorem 5:** Let $(D_1, C_1), (D_2, C_2)$ be TS-Perfect codes. Then, $(D, C) = (D_1 \uplus D_2, C_1 \uplus C_2)$ is a TS-perfect code.

**Proof:** The hypothesis of the theorem ensures that $D_1 = B_{d_1}(0,r)$ and $D_2 = B_{d_2}(0,s)$, where $d_1, d_2$ are TS-metrics, determined by weights $\omega_1, \omega_2$.

Corollary 1 ensures that $(D, C)$ is a poly-tiling of $\mathbb{F}_m^{n+m}$. We assume $r \leq s$. Let $\omega_1 \oplus_s \omega_2$ be defined as in Lemma 2. From the lemma, all is left to prove is that $D = \{x \in \mathbb{F}_m^{n+m} : \omega_1 \oplus_s \omega_2(x) \leq r + s \}$. From the definition of $\omega_1 \oplus_s \omega_2$ we have that $x \in D$ if, and only if, $\omega_1 \oplus_s \omega_2(x) \leq r + s$.
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