

The uncertainty principle over finite fields

Martino Borello

*Université Paris 8, Laboratoire de Géométrie, Analyse et Applications, LAGA,
Université Sorbonne Paris Nord, CNRS, UMR 7539, F-93430, Villetaneuse, France*

Patrick Solé

Aix Marseille University, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, I2M, Marseille, France

Abstract

In this paper we study the uncertainty principle (UP) connecting a function over a finite field and its Mattson-Solomon polynomial, which is a kind of Fourier transform in positive characteristic. Three versions of the UP over finite fields are studied, in connection with the asymptotic theory of cyclic codes. The *naive* version is the direct analogue over finite fields of the Donoho-Stark bound over the complex numbers. A connection with Ramsey Theory is pointed out. It is strong enough to show that there exist sequences of cyclic codes of length n , arbitrary rate, and minimum distance $\Omega(n^\alpha)$ for all $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. The *strong* version for a given finite field \mathbb{F}_q is shown to hold only for primes $p > q + 2$ for which q is primitive, depending on the MDS Conjecture. The *weak* version is shown to be impossible in some cases.

Keywords: uncertainty principle, cyclic codes, Mattson-Solomon polynomial, BCH bound, asymptotically good codes

2010 MSC: 43A99, 94B15, 20C05

1. Introduction

The uncertainty principle (UP) is a very famous inequality in Physics [5], and Signal Processing [3]. It compares the supports of functions and of their complex-valued Fourier transforms. In a paper of 2017 [4], a connection between UP and the asymptotic performance of cyclic codes was pointed out. Note that the existence of an asymptotically good family of cyclic codes is a problem open for more than half a century [11]. The reference [4] is an

attempt to motivate further research into, and eventually solve this very hard problem. In a recent note [9], a connection with Ramsey Theory, and the Szemerédi theorem was derived. See [14] for a general survey on the UP.

In the present paper, we replace the classical Discrete Fourier transform ([3, §2]) by a vectorial version of the Mattson-Solomon polynomial ([8, Ch.8, §6]). In contrast with all the results in [14], this transform takes its values in a finite field. We study three versions of the UP for this kind of transform. The first version is the straight analogue of the Donoho-Stark bound of [3] and we call this the *naive* version. It allows us to construct sequences of cyclic codes with nonzero rate and minimum distance growing like a power α of the length with $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. It also gives an alternate proof of the results of [9], based on the familiar BCH bound, and a generalization based on the Hartmann-Tzeng bound on the minimum distance of cyclic codes ([6, Theorem 4.5.6]). The *strong* version of the UP over finite fields is defined in prime lengths by analogy with the bound of [12] for the classical Fourier transform. It was proved in [4] to hold over \mathbb{F}_q in prime length p when q is primitive modulo p . Assuming the MDS Conjecture [8, Chap. 11], we prove that this is the only case that happens if $p > q + 2$. The *weak* version of the UP is a similar statement for all primes p depending on two real parameters λ and ϵ . Here, we show that, if this version holds over \mathbb{F}_q , then $\lambda < \frac{q-1}{q}$.

The material is organized as follows: the next section collects background material; Section 3 is dedicated to the naive version of UP and the Ramsey Theory connection; Section 4 is about the strong version; Section 5 contains numerical results related to the weak version; Section 6 concludes the article. An Appendix building on the naive version shows the existence of cyclic codes of all rates with minimum distance $\Omega(n^\alpha)$, for all $0 < \alpha < 1/2$.

2. Background

Throughout the paper, \mathbb{F}_q denotes a finite field of cardinality q , where q is a prime power.

2.1. Linear codes and asymptotics

The **(Hamming) weight** of $x \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is denoted by $w_H(x)$. The minimum nonzero weight d of a linear code is called the **minimum distance**. A **linear code** is a subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n . Its parameters are written as $[n, k, d]$ where k is its **dimension** as an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space. If \mathcal{C}_n is a sequence of linear codes of

parameters $[n, k_n, d_n]$, the **rate** R and **relative distance** δ are defined as

$$R := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k_n}{n} \text{ and } \delta := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d_n}{n}.$$

A family of codes is said to be **good** iff it contains a sequence with rate and relative distance such that $R \cdot \delta \neq 0$. The **binary entropy function** $H(x)$ of the real variable x is defined (see [8, p.308]) for $0 < x < 1$,

$$H(x) := -x \log_2(x) - (1 - x) \log_2(1 - x).$$

2.2. Cyclic Codes

Consider the quotient ring $R(\mathbb{F}_q, n) := \frac{\mathbb{F}_q[x]}{(x^n - 1)}$. We will identify each class of $R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ with the unique polynomial of degree less than n contained in it. The ring $R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ is principal, and we denote by $C(f)$ the ideal with generator f . It is well-known that every ideal of $R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ has a unique monic generator of minimal degree, and this is a divisor of $x^n - 1$. Whenever we will consider an ideal $C(f)$, we will implicitly assume that f is such generator. The polynomials of $R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the words of \mathbb{F}_q^n , by the formula

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_i x^i \mapsto (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}).$$

The (Hamming) weight of a polynomial is the (Hamming) weight of the corresponding vector. A **cyclic code** is an ideal in $R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$ or its image in \mathbb{F}_q^n via the above map.

The **zeros** of $C(f)$ are the roots of f in the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_q . The dimension of $C(f)$ is $n - \deg(f)$, and $\deg(f)$ equals the number of zeros of $C(f)$ [8]. The well-known **BCH-bound** [8] states that if among the zeros of f there exists $\delta - 1$ consecutive powers of a primitive n -th root of unity, then the minimum distance of $C(f)$ is at least δ .

2.3. An invariant of fields

We introduce here, following [4], the invariant of fields

$$\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, n) := \min\{d(C(f)) + \dim C(f) \mid f \in R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)\}.$$

As observed in [4], $\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p) \leq p + 1$ for any prime p . Moreover, equality holds if q is a primitive root modulo p or if q is a power of p ([4, Propositions 4.3. and 4.4.]). In next sections we will prove some properties of this invariant for finite fields.

3. Naive version of UP

3.1. Lower bound

We require a finite field version of a result due to Donoho et al. [3] in characteristic zero. Let ζ denote a primitive root of unity of order n in the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_q .

Lemma 1 (Naive UP). *For any $f \neq 0$ in \mathbb{F}_q^n ,*

$$w_H(f) \cdot w_H(\hat{f}) \geq n,$$

where $\hat{f} := (f(\zeta), f(\zeta^2), \dots, f(\zeta^n))$.

Proof. Let $w := w_H(f)$. By the BCH bound, \hat{f} cannot have w consecutive zeros.

Suppose first that w divides n . Partition the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into n/w intervals of consecutive indices of length w . In each of these intervals there is at least one index where \hat{f} is nonzero. Thus, we have exhibited n/w nonzeros of \hat{f} . The desired inequality follows in that case.

Equality holds if \hat{f} has exactly one nonzero for each interval. Moreover, these nonzeros must be equally spaced, since otherwise there would be more than w consecutive zeros between some pairs of nonzero elements of \hat{f} .

If w does not divide n , then there is no way of distributing fewer than $\lceil n/w \rceil$ nonzero elements among n places without leaving a gap of at least w consecutive zeros. Thus $w_H(\hat{f}) \geq \lceil n/w \rceil$. \square

Remark: The constant n is best possible in view of the example of f equal to the all-one vector (in this case $w_H(\hat{f}) = 1$).

3.2. Ramsey Theory

In [9] a connection between the uncertainty problem over finite fields and Ramsey Theory is pointed out. We give here a slight generalization, and a reinterpretation in terms of Coding Theory. We require a pair of definitions.

Definition 1. An **arithmetic progression** of length m in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is any subset of the form $\{a + kb \mid k \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}\}$ with $b \neq 0$.

Definition 2. The **Szemerédi function** $r_m(n)$ is the largest size of a subset of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ not containing an arithmetic progression of length m .

Proposition 1. For $n \geq 1$ we have $\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, n) \geq \min\{m + r_m(n) \mid 1 \leq m \leq n\}$.

Proof. Let $f \in R(\mathbb{F}_q, n)$. Then in the notation of the proof of Lemma 1, we have

$$\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, n) \geq w_H(f) + w_H(\widehat{f}) \geq m + r_m(n),$$

where we have let $m = w_H(f)$ and have used the BCH bound to bound $w_H(\widehat{f})$. \square

Remark: Unfortunately it seems that the function $r_m(n)$ is only known for m fixed and $n \rightarrow \infty$, [13]. The fact that then $r_m(n) = o(n)$ is the celebrated Szemerédi Theorem. Any result on $r_m(n)$ when m grows proportionally to n with $n \rightarrow \infty$ would impact on the UP over finite fields.

We can generalize further by replacing arithmetic progression by their 2D analogues that is to say sets of the shape

$$A(m, s) = \{a + kb + rc \mid k \in \{0, \dots, m-1\} \text{ and } r \in \{0, \dots, s-1\}\}.$$

Define then the function $r_{m,s}(n)$ as the largest size of a subset of $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ not containing an $A(m, s)$.

Proposition 2. For $n \geq 1$ we have

$$\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, n) \geq \min\{m + r_{m,s}(n) \mid m \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } s \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Proposition 1, up to the replacement of the BCH bound by the Hartmann-Tzeng bound [8, p. 206]. \square

4. Strong version of UP

The following version of UP is the one stated in [4].

Definition 3. A finite field \mathbb{F}_q satisfies the **(strong) uncertainty principle** if, for all primes p , we have $\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p) = p + 1$.

As we have already mentioned, in [4, Prop. 4.3] it is shown that \mathbb{F}_q satisfies strong UP if q is primitive mod p . We show below that is almost the only case.

Theorem 1. Assume the MDS conjecture [8, Res. Prob. 11.4]. If q is not primitive modulo p and if $p > q + 2$ then $\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p) \leq p$.

Proof. By the hypothesis we know that there are polynomials $f|x^p - 1$ in $R(\mathbb{F}_q, p)$ such that $1 < \deg(f) < p - 1$. Let $[p, k, d]$ be the parameters of the cyclic code $C(f)$. Let $g \in C(f)$ of weight d . The code $C(g) \subseteq C(f)$ is certainly not the repetition code, since $k > 1$. Its parameters $[p, k' \leq k, d]$ satisfy $d + k' \geq \mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p)$ and if, arguing by contradiction, $\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p) > p$, we see that $d \geq p - k' + 1$, entailing that $C(g)$ is MDS. But we know, by [8, Chapt. 11], that MDS codes of parameters $[N, K, D]$ with $1 < K < N$ only exist for lengths at most $q + 2$. This is the so-called MDS Conjecture that is now proved in many cases [1, 2]. Note that codes of parameters $[N, 1, N]$ and $[N, N - 1, 2]$ exist for all lengths N . \square

5. Weak version of UP

The following is Definition 5.3 in [4].

Definition 4. A finite field \mathbb{F}_q satisfies the (ϵ, λ) -uncertainty principle, if, for all primes p we have

$$\mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p) \geq \lambda p \tag{1}$$

$$\text{ord}_p(q) < \epsilon p. \tag{2}$$

The following data for $q = 2$ shows that if \mathbb{F}_2 satisfies this principle then $\lambda \leq 0.392$. We have omitted, in the following table, the primes p such that $\text{ord}_p(2) = p - 1$.

p	7	17	23	31	39	41	43	47	51	57	71	73	79	89	97
$\mu(\mathbb{F}_2, p)$	7	14	19	21	16	30	28	35	20	22	53	37	59	45	66

Similar data for $q = 3$ imply that $\lambda < 0.705$.

In [4, Th. 5.4] it is shown that finite fields satisfying this definition enjoy sequences of asymptotically good cyclic codes. We give below a refinement to that statement. Namely, we show that, in that case $\lambda < \frac{q-1}{q}$.

Proposition 3. If \mathbb{F}_q satisfies the (ϵ, λ) -uncertainty principle then $\lambda < \frac{q-1}{q}$.

Proof. By combining [4, Th. 5.4] with the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1, we see that under the hypothesis, there are sequences of cyclic codes of length p over \mathbb{F}_q , of rate R and relative distance δ such that

$$p\lambda < \mu(\mathbb{F}_q, p) < p\delta + pR.$$

In particular this implies that

$$\lambda < \min\{\delta + \alpha_q(\delta) \mid \delta \in (0, 1)\},$$

where $\alpha_q(\delta)$ is the largest possible rate of a code of relative distance δ . But we know, by the asymptotic Plotkin bound [6, Th.2.10.2], that

- for $0 < \delta < \frac{q-1}{q}$, we have $\alpha_q(\delta) < 1 - \frac{q\delta}{q-1}$, and
- for $\frac{q-1}{q} \leq \delta < 1$, we have $\alpha_q(\delta) = 0$.

It follows that the function $\delta + \alpha_q(\delta)$ is $\leq f(\delta)$ where

- $f(\delta) = 1 - \frac{\delta}{q-1}$, for $0 < \delta < \frac{q-1}{q}$, and
- $f(\delta) = \delta$ for $\frac{q-1}{q} \leq \delta < 1$.

Thus the minimum of $f(\delta)$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is met at $\delta = \frac{q-1}{q}$, and equals $\frac{q-1}{q}$. \square

6. Conclusion and Open Problems

In reaction to the recent papers [4] and [10], we have considered the uncertainty principle when the Fourier transform takes its values over finite fields. The analogue of the DFT UP of Donoho-Stark [3] allowed us to construct long cyclic codes of length n and minimum distance $\Omega(n^\alpha)$, where $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. The proof is technical and relegated to an appendix. More suggestively, the naive UP yields an alternative proof of the results of [10], based on the BCH bound on the minimum distance of cyclic codes. A generalization based on the Hartmann-Tzeng bound has been sketched out. It would be very interesting to extend this approach to the van Lint-Wilson bound [7].

The other versions of the UP over finite fields remain conjectural. The strong version is almost never true, save in the case where q is primitive modulo p . The weak version can only hold if $\lambda < \frac{q-1}{q}$. Still it should not discourage the researchers to try and prove the weak version of UP for other values of λ .

More generally, it would be worthy to generalize all these results to abelian codes.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Alexis Bonnecaze for programming help.

References

- [1] S. Ball. *On sets of vectors of a finite vector space in which every subset of basis size is a basis*. J. Eur. Math. Soc., **14**, 733–748 (2012).
- [2] S. Ball, J. de Beule. *On sets of vectors of a finite vector space in which every subset of basis size is a basis II*. Design, Codes, Crypt. **65**, 5–14 (2012).
- [3] D.L. Donoho, P.B. Stark. *Uncertainty principles, and signal recovery*. SIAM J. Appl. Math. **49**, 906–931 (1989).
- [4] S. Evra, E. Kowalski, A. Lubotzky. *Good cyclic codes and the uncertainty principle*. L’Enseignement Mathématique, **63**, 305–332 (2017).
- [5] W. Heisenberg, W. *Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik*. Zeitschrift für Physik, **43 (34)**, 172–198 (1927).
- [6] W.C. Huffman, V. Pless. *Fundamentals of Error Correcting Codes*, Cambridge University Press (2003).
- [7] J. H. van Lint, R. M. Wilson. *On the minimum distance of cyclic codes*. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **32**, 23–40 (1986).
- [8] F.J. MacWilliams, N.J. A. Sloane. *The theory of Error Correcting Codes*. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1981).
- [9] S. Quader, A. Russell, R. Sundaram. *Small-Support Uncertainty Principles on Z/p over Finite Fields*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.05179> (2019).
- [10] M. Shi, R. Wu, P. Solé. *Asymptotically Good Additive Cyclic Codes Exist*. IEEE Communications Letters **22(10)**: 1980–1983 (2018).
- [11] C. Martinez-Perez, W. Willems. *Is the class of cyclic codes asymptotically good?*. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **52 (2)**, 696–700 (2006).

- [12] T. Tao. *An uncertainty principle for cyclic groups of prime order*, Mathematical Research Letters **12**, 121–127 (2005).
- [13] T. Tao and Van H Vu. *Additive combinatorics*. volume 105. Cambridge University Press (2006).
- [14] A. Widgerson, Y. Widgerson. *The uncertainty principle: variations on a theme*. arXiv:2006.11206 (2020).

Appendix

We construct a sequence of q -ary cyclic codes of rate $0 < R < 1$, and designed minimum distance. Let p be an arbitrary prime, and write $n = q^p - 1$. If x is an indeterminate then, from finite field theory [8, Chap. 4, Th. 10], we know that

$$x^n - 1 = \prod_{a \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} (x - a) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^s f_i,$$

where f_i runs over all irreducible polynomials in x of degree p , and where $n = q - 1 + sp$. Let $g_I = \prod_{i \in I} f_i$ with $|I| = s' = \lfloor s(1 - R) \rfloor$. Then the dimension of the cyclic code $C(g_I)$ of generator g is $n - ps'$, and it can be checked that

$$\frac{n - s'p}{n} \rightarrow R$$

when $p \rightarrow \infty$.

We need to control the intersections of the $C(g_I)$'s when I varies.

Lemma 2. *Let $r \neq 0$ be an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{F}_q^n , of Hamming weight $\leq n^\alpha$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. There at most $\Lambda_n(1 + o(1))$ polynomials g_I with $|I| = s'$ such that $r \in C(g_I)$, where $\Lambda_n = 2^{\left(\frac{\delta n - n^{1-\alpha}}{\delta p}\right)H(R)}$.*

Proof. The number N of indexes I such that $r \in C(g_I)$, equals the number of s' -sets of f_i 's which divide $r(x)$ in polynomial notation.

Let ζ be a primitive n -th root of unity in the algebraic closure \mathbb{K} of \mathbb{F}_q , and $\widehat{r} = (r(\zeta), r(\zeta^2), \dots, r(\zeta^n))$. We have

$$N \leq \binom{\lfloor \frac{Z(r)}{p} \rfloor}{s'},$$

where

$$Z(r) := |\{\omega \in \mathbb{K} \mid \omega^n = 1 \text{ and } r(\omega) = 0\}| = n - w_H(\widehat{r}).$$

By Lemma 1, $w_H(\widehat{r}) \geq n^{1-\alpha}$, so that $Z(r) \leq n - n^{1-\alpha}$. Thus

$$N \leq \binom{\lfloor \frac{n-n^{1-\alpha}}{p} \rfloor}{s'} \leq 2^{\binom{n-n^{1-\alpha}}{p} H(R)},$$

where the upper bound is a consequence of [8, Chap. 10, Lemma 8]. \square

Theorem 2. *For every real number $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ there are sequences of cyclic codes $C(g_I)$ of rate R with minimum distance $\Omega(n^\alpha)$.*

Proof. The number of possible g_I 's is

$$\binom{s}{s'} \sim \frac{2^{sH(R)}}{\sqrt{2\pi sR(1-R)}}$$

for $s \rightarrow \infty$, by Stirling's approximation of the factorial.

If this number is greater than the product of Λ_n by the volume of the Hamming ball of radius n^α in length n , then there are codes $C(g_I)$ with minimum distance at least n^α .

The volume of the Hamming ball of radius n^α is bounded above by

$$(1 + \lfloor n^\alpha \rfloor) \binom{n}{\lfloor n^\alpha \rfloor} (q-1)^{\lfloor n^\alpha \rfloor}$$

(see the proof of [6, Lemma 2.10.3]), which is bounded above by a quantity asymptotically equivalent to

$$\frac{2^{nH(n^{\alpha-1}) + \log_2(n^\alpha) + n^\alpha \log_2(q-1)}}{\sqrt{2\pi n^\alpha (1 - n^{\alpha-1})}} \\ \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot n^{-n^\alpha(\alpha-1) + \frac{\alpha}{2}} \cdot e^{n^\alpha - n^{2\alpha-1}} \cdot (q-1)^{n^\alpha}$$

for $n \rightarrow \infty$. So, applying Lemma 2, the mentioned inequality happens if

$$2^{\binom{-(q^p-1)^{1-\alpha} + (q-1)}{p} H(R)} \cdot (q^p - 1)^{-(q^p-1)^\alpha(\alpha-1) + \frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ \cdot e^{(q^p-1)^\alpha - (q^p-1)^{2\alpha-1}} \cdot (q-1)^{(q^p-1)^\alpha} \cdot \left(\frac{q^p - q}{p}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{R(1-R)}}.$$

We can write the last inequality as $e^{f_{\alpha,q,R}(p)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{R(1-R)}}$, with

$$f_{\alpha,q,R}(p) = (1 - \alpha) \ln(q^p - 1)(q^p - 1)^\alpha - \ln(2)H(R) \frac{q^p}{p(q^p - 1)^\alpha} + o(pq^{\alpha p})$$

for $p \rightarrow \infty$, so that $f_{\alpha,q,R}(p) \rightarrow -\infty$ for $p \rightarrow \infty$ if $\alpha < 1/2$, and it grows to ∞ otherwise. \square