

---

# HOW ARITHMETIC AND GEOMETRY MAKE ERROR CORRECTING CODES BETTER

by

Alain Couvreur

---

**Abstract.** — This note completes a talk given at the conference *Curves over Finite Fields: past, present and future* celebrating the publication the book *Rational Points on Curves over Finite Fields* by J.-P. Serre and organised at Centro de ciencias de Benasque in june 2021. It discusses a part of the history of algebraic geometry codes together with some of their recent applications. A particular focus is done on the “multiplicative” structure of these codes, *i.e.* their behaviour with respect to the component wise product. Some open questions are raised and discussed.

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Prerequisites in coding theory.....	2
2. Algebraic geometry codes.....	3
3. Component wise product.....	4
4. Decoding.....	6
5. Code-based cryptography and McEliece encryption scheme.....	7
6. Secret sharing.....	8
7. A concluding remark.....	11
Acknowledgement.....	11
References.....	12

## Introduction

The story of algebraic geometry codes is a fascinating one for both mathematicians and computer scientists. It lies at the crossroad of coding theory, number theory and algebraic geometry and testifies of the need for such interactions between different communities to provide efficient but also elegant solutions to practical problems.

Coding theory began in the 50’s after the works of Claude Shannon [Sha48] and Richard Hamming [Ham50]. The former developing a stochastic approach for error correction and building the foundations of information theory and the latter proposing a more combinatorial point of view. The original motivations came from the need for error correction in computations and communications. Our history is full of technologies who would never have been as efficient as they were without error correcting codes. One can for instance mention NASA’s program Mariner 9 whose objective was to transmit pictures from Mars and where the error tolerance has been guaranteed by Reed–Muller codes.

Today, coding theory has become a rich and wide mathematical theory with strong connections with combinatorics, probabilities, arithmetic, geometry and algorithmics. More importantly, the field of applications of coding theory impressively broadened in 70 years and introducing codes as objects permitting good communications across noisy channels would be indisputably a very

restrictive description. Coding theory finds now numerous other applications, for instance in symmetric cryptography, in public key cryptography or in cloud storage. Results from coding theory are also used to address problems in other mathematical areas such as combinatorics or number theory, or in theoretical computer science with famous results such as the celebrated PCP theorem [ALM<sup>+</sup>98].

Inside coding theory, algebra always played a particular rule. The use of algebraic structures to design codes is almost as old as coding theory itself. Reed–Muller codes [Ree54] have been designed using multivariate polynomials over  $\mathbf{F}_2$ , then Reed–Solomon ones [RS60] are constructed thanks to univariate polynomials and Berlekamp [Ber68, Ber15] developed a decoding algorithm based on algebraic features. Interestingly, Berlekamp’s interest on algebraic codes encouraged him to focus on some computational aspects of finite fields which lead him to discover his famous algorithm for factorizing polynomials over finite fields. In summary, algebra had an indisputable impact on the development of coding theory but the converse is also true.

Algebraic geometry enters the game in the early 80’s with Goppa’s seminal article [Gop81], followed by the unexpected and rather counter intuitive result proved by Tsfasman, Vlăduț and Zink [TVZ82] showing that, some codes from modular or Shimura curves have better parameters than random codes. This breakthrough motivated the impressive development of the theory of algebraic geometry codes which today represent a broad and rich research area with a significant number of independent applications. The present article presents a part of this story. Then a particular focus is done on the behaviour of algebraic geometry codes with respect to the component wise product and its various applications, to decoding, cryptanalysis or secret sharing.

## 1. Prerequisites in coding theory

The central objects of our study are linear error correcting codes. In the sequel, we denote by *code* any linear subspace  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathbf{F}_q^n$  endowed with the *Hamming metric*. The latter being defined as

$$\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{F}_q^n, \quad d_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left| \left\{ i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid x_i \neq y_i \right\} \right|.$$

The *Hamming weight* of a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{F}_q^n$  is defined as  $w_H(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0})$ .

Given a code  $\mathcal{C}$ , its *parameters* denoted  $[n, k, d]_q$  are respectively:

- its *length*  $n$ , *i.e* the dimension of its ambient space  $\mathbf{F}_q^n$ ;
- its *dimension*  $k$  as an  $\mathbf{F}_q$ –linear space;
- its *minimum distance*  $d_{\min}(\mathcal{C})$  or  $d$  when there is no ambiguity on the considered code, is the minimum Hamming distance between two distinct elements of  $\mathcal{C}$  which can be formally defined as

$$d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \left| \left\{ i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid c_i \neq 0 \right\} \right|.$$

A *decoding algorithm* takes as input an ambient vector  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{F}_q^n$  and outputs a word  $\mathbf{c}$  close to  $\mathbf{y}$  (preferently the closest one) or fails (for instance if  $\mathbf{y}$  is too far from any element of  $\mathcal{C}$ ). Finally, given a code  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$  one sometimes need to consider its *dual*  $\mathcal{C}^\perp$  which is its orthogonal space with respect to the canonical inner product:

$$\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i.$$

If it is elementary to generate a code, the estimate of its minimum distance such as the design of an efficient (let us say polynomial time) decoding algorithm are very difficult tasks<sup>(1)</sup> which turn out to be intractable for the majority of the codes. Actually, the aforementioned problems are solvable only for very particular codes which are equipped with a particular structure. For this sake, algebra provides remarkable constructions. The most elementary one being that of Reed and Solomon [RS60].

---

1. The decoding problem has even been proved to be NP–complete in [BMvT78].

**Definition 1 (Reed–Solomon codes).** — Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be an  $n$ -tuple of distinct elements of  $\mathbf{F}_q$  and a positive integer  $k < n$ , we define

$$RS_k(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n)) \mid f \in \mathbf{F}_q[X], \deg f < k\}.$$

Such a code is known to have parameters  $[n, k, n - k + 1]$  and the proof of that fact rests essentially on the elementary property that a nonzero polynomial of degree  $< k$  has less than  $k$  distinct roots. Moreover, these codes are optimal in the sense that they reach the so called *Singleton bound* asserting that any  $[n, k, d]$  code satisfies

$$(1) \quad d \leq n - k + 1.$$

Finally, after the works of Berlekamp [WB83, Ber15], such codes benefit from a decoding algorithm correcting in polynomial time an amount of errors up to half the minimum distance. Using fast arithmetic, decoding can actually be performed in quasi-linear time. Finally, after the works of Sudan and Guruswami–Sudan in the late 90’s [Sud97, GS99] it is now known that correcting efficiently an amount of errors beyond half the minimum distance is possible for such codes at the cost of possibly (and rarely) returning a list of closest vectors instead of a single one.

## 2. Algebraic geometry codes

Reed–Solomon codes are also known to have a drawback: they should be defined over a field which is at least as large as the length of the code. On the other hand, many computer science applications look for long codes over very small fields. This issue has been addressed in the early 80’s by the Russian mathematician V.D. Goppa [Gop81] who suggested to replace polynomials by functions<sup>(2)</sup> in a Riemann–Roch space of a given curve  $\mathcal{X}$  and the evaluation values  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  by some rational points of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

**Definition 2.** — Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a smooth projective absolutely irreducible curve over a field  $\mathbf{F}_q$ . Let  $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_n)$  be an ordered  $n$ -tuple of distinct rational points of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $G$  be a rational divisor on  $\mathcal{X}$  whose support avoids<sup>(3)</sup>  $\mathcal{P}$ . The algebraic geometry code (AG code) associated to the triple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(f(P_1), \dots, f(P_n)) \mid f \in L(G)\},$$

where  $L(G)$  denotes the Riemann–Roch space associated to  $G$ .

This code construction is of deep interest for many reasons. First, because of their excellent parameters and second, because the algebraic decoding algorithms existing for Reed–Solomon naturally extend to AG codes.

**Proposition 3.** — In the context of Definition 2, let  $g$  be the genus of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, the code  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$  has parameters  $[n, k, d]$  where

$$\begin{aligned} k &\geq \deg G + 1 - g \quad \text{with equality if} \quad \deg G > 2g - 2; \\ d &\geq n - \deg G. \end{aligned}$$

Reed–Solomon codes are nothing but codes from  $\mathbf{P}^1$  and, as already mentioned, their main drawback is that for a fixed base field  $\mathbf{F}_q$  the length of a Reed–Solomon code is bounded from above by  $|\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbf{F}_q)| = q + 1$ . On the other hand, for AG codes, the length is allowed to reach the number  $|\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{F}_q)|$  of rational points, which can be arbitrarily large. Considering sequences of curves whose number of rational points goes to infinity, it is possible to design sequences of codes

2. Actually, Goppa’s original publication proposed to design codes by evaluating residues of some differential forms living in some Riemann–Roch space of differentials. However, its presentation can easily be reformulated into an equivalent one with rational functions.

3. This restriction on the support of  $G$  can easily be relaxed. See [CR21, Rem. 15.3.8].

whose length goes to infinity while the dimension and the minimum distance are linear in the length. Indeed, regarding Proposition 3, the parameters of an AG code satisfy

$$k + d \geq n + 1 - g.$$

Set  $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{k}{n}$  and  $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d}{n}$  then,

$$(2) \quad R + \delta \geq 1 + \frac{1}{n} - \frac{g}{n}.$$

Introducing the *Ihara constant*

$$A(q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \limsup_{g \rightarrow +\infty} \max_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{F}_q)|}{g},$$

where the max is taken over all the curves of genus  $g$ , we deduce the existence of sequences of codes whose asymptotic rates and relative distances satisfy

$$(3) \quad R + \delta \geq 1 - \frac{1}{A(q)}.$$

In the early 80's, Tsfasman, Vlăduț and Zink [TVZ82] and independently Ihara [Iha81] proved that  $A(q) \geq \sqrt{q} - 1$  when  $q$  is a square and this quantity is reached by some sequences of modular curves for  $q = p^2$  with  $p$  prime and by some sequences of Shimura curves for general squares  $q$ . Later on, Drinfeld and Vlăduț [VD83] proved that  $A(q) \leq \sqrt{q} - 1$  for any prime power  $q$ , showing that the aforementioned lower bound for  $q$  square was actually optimal. These results lead to an impressive breakthrough in coding theory since for a square  $q \geq 49$  this lower bound exceeds the famous Gilbert Varshamov bound which is satisfied by “almost any code”. In short, some sequences of AG codes are asymptotically better than random codes, a particularly striking and unexpected result. Inequality (3) is usually referred to as the *Tsfasman–Vlăduț–Zink bound* and, because of its famous coding theoretic consequences, has been the first stone of an impressive line of works in order to obtain better estimates for the Ihara constant when  $q$  was not a square. Hundreds of papers have been published in this direction by using either class field towers or the so-called *recursive towers* introduced by Garcia and Stichtenoth [GS95]. Actually, the point of this paper is not to develop the presentation of these lines of works which would require a fully independent study. See for instance [B22]. The objective of the previous discussion was only to explain why AG codes became so famous in the 80's. They now represent a wide research area and it is worth mentioning that their interest and their applications actually exceed the single question of which optimal pairs  $(R, \delta)$  are reachable.

Indeed, in many situations where Reed–Solomon codes have been proposed as a first solution, AG codes appear immediately after as a more flexible option permitting to circumvent the issues raised by the inherent drawback of Reed–Solomon codes : their bounded length for a fixed alphabet. This appears for instance in cloud computing where *Locally Recoverable Codes* (LRC) are introduced in order to address the practical issues raised by server failures in data centers. In [TB14], Tamo and Barg propose a construction derived from Reed–Solomon codes which turns out to be optimal with respect to some Singleton-like bound but requiring the length to be bounded. Later on, Barg, Tamo and Vlăduț [BTV17] propose an AG-based construction providing the expected flexibility in terms of blocklength. We refer the reader to [CR21, § 15.9] for further details.

In the sequel, we discuss other coding theoretic issues where AG codes have been involved. We also discuss open coding theoretic questions where the use of algebraic geometry could be crucial.

### 3. Component wise product

In the last decades, an apparently elementary operation which took an increasing importance in coding theory is the component wise product of vectors or codes, *i.e.* the multiplication operation in  $\mathbf{F}_q^n$  regarded as a product of rings:

$$\forall \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{F}_q^n, \quad \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (a_1 b_1, \dots, a_n b_n).$$

This operation extends to codes where, to keep a linear structure, the product of two codes is defined as the span of the products of their vectors

**Definition 4.** — Given two codes  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ ,

$$\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{B} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Span}_{\mathbf{F}_q} \{ \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B} \}.$$

Importing such a ring structure over  $\mathbf{F}_q^n$  is actually rather natural when studying codes such as AG codes which are obtained by evaluation of functions living in a ring. Reconsidering Definition 2 and denoting by  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}}$  the semi-local ring  $\bigcap_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, P}$ , the evaluation map

$$\text{ev}_{\mathcal{P}} : \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F}_q^n \\ f & \longmapsto & (f(P_1), \dots, f(P_n)) \end{cases}$$

is a ring homomorphism from  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}}$  to  $\mathbf{F}_q^n$  equipped with the  $\star$  product. Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$  is nothing but the image of  $L(G)$  by this map. In summary, considering the  $\star$  product is natural in order to take into account the rich algebraic structure of AG codes coming from the parent curve.

In the last decades the  $\star$  product took an increasing importance in coding theory. For instance, we explain in § 4 and 6 that the design of algebraic decoding algorithms or the properties of some secret sharing schemes can easily be interpreted in terms of this operation. The reader interested in an in-depth study of the arithmetic of this operation together with some of its applications is encouraged to look at the excellent survey [Ran14].

For now, and because of the underlying algebraic geometric structure, AG codes have a very peculiar behaviour with respect to the  $\star$  product. Indeed, for a general code  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ , we have

$$(4) \quad \dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \leq \min \left\{ n, \binom{\dim \mathcal{C} + 1}{2} \right\}.$$

Moreover, it is proved in [CCMZ15] that for a random code the above inequality is an equality with a high probability. Typically, the  $\star$ -square of a random code either fills in its ambient space or has the same dimension as the symmetric square  $S^2\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  (note that there is a surjective canonical map  $S^2\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$ ). For non symmetric products, one can observe very similar behaviours. Namely, given two codes  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ , we have

$$\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{D} \leq \min \left\{ n, \dim \mathcal{C} \cdot \dim \mathcal{D} - \binom{\dim \mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{D}}{2} \right\},$$

where again the inequality is typically an equality when  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$  are random.

On the other hand, the behaviour of AG codes with respect to the  $\star$  operation strongly differs from that of random codes.

**Theorem 5.** — Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}$  be as in Definition 2 and  $F, G$  be two rational divisors of  $\mathcal{X}$  then

$$\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, F) \star \mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, F + G).$$

Moreover, the above inclusion is an equality when  $\deg F \geq 2g$  and  $\deg G \geq 2g + 1$ .

*Proof.* — This is a direct consequence of [Mum70, Thm. 6]. See [CMCP17, Cor. 9].  $\square$

In particular, for a random code  $\mathcal{R}$  whose square does not fill in the ambient space, according to (4) and the subsequent discussion, the dimension of  $\mathcal{R} \star \mathcal{R}$  is quadratic in  $\dim \mathcal{R}$ . On the other hand, for an AG code  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$  from a genus  $g$  curve  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $2g < \deg G < \frac{n}{2}$ , Theorem 5 together with Riemann–Roch Theorem entail

$$\dim \mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G) \star \mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G) = 2 \dim \mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G) - 1 + g.$$

In short, for low genera, the dimension of the square of an AG code is somehow linear in the original dimension instead of being quadratic for random codes. This significant difference is actually a strength for AG codes for instance in order to perform an efficient error correction. On the other hand, as explained further in § 5, it is also a weakness making AG codes bad candidates for public

key encryption. The subsequent sections discuss several consequences of this observation on the behaviour of AG codes with respect to the  $\star$ -product.

#### 4. Decoding

The design of efficient decoding algorithms for AG codes is an important part of the theory starting in the late 80's with the work of Justesen, Larsen, Jensen, Havemose and Høholdt [JLJ<sup>+</sup>89] and culminating around 2000 with the works of Guruswami and Sudan [GS99] on the list decoding of Reed–Solomon and AG codes. We refer the reader to the excellent surveys [HP95, BH08] for further details on this history.

Interestingly, the first works on the decoding of AG codes [JLJ<sup>+</sup>89, SV90] strongly involved the arithmetic of the underlying curve. A few years later, Pellikaan [Pel92] and independently Kötter [Köt92] noticed that one could get rid from geometry in the algorithm's description and only take into account the non generic behaviour of AG codes with respect to the  $\star$ -product. This point of view leads to an observation, the very reason why AG codes are equipped with polynomial time decoders while arbitrary codes are not is their peculiar behaviour with respect to the  $\star$ -product.

**4.1. Algebraic decoding in a nutshell.** — The decoding paradigm presented by Pellikaan, is now known as *Error Correcting Pairs*. We give here a rather unusual presentation of this algorithm that we expect to be somehow more elementary to understand.

Consider a code  $\mathcal{C}$  and a received vector  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e}$  where  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbf{F}_q^n$  has weight  $w_H(\mathbf{e}) \leq t$ , where  $w_H(\cdot)$  is defined in § 1 and  $t$  is a constant that will be clarified further. Obviously,  $\mathbf{y}$  should be considered as known while  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{e}$  are not. The key of algebraic decoding is to introduce an auxiliary code  $\mathcal{A}$  in order to localise the error positions. The code  $\mathcal{A}$  should be chosen so that  $\dim \mathcal{A} > t$  and the product  $\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C}$  is “not too large”. In particular  $\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C} \subsetneq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ .

The first step of the algorithm consists in computing the space

$$K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C}\}.$$

This space can be computed by Gaussian elimination with the very knowledge of  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}$  while, by definition of  $\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C}$  it actually equals

$$K = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Next, the hope is that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in K$ , the product  $\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{e}$  is 0. This is in particular what should happen when the minimum distance of  $\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C}$  exceeds  $t$  since  $w_H(\mathbf{a} \star \mathbf{e}) \leq w_H(\mathbf{e}) \leq t$ . In this situation, any  $\mathbf{a} \in K$  actually vanishes at any nonzero position of  $\mathbf{e}$  and hence one can expect that the common zero positions of the elements of  $K$  permit to identify the nonzero positions of  $\mathbf{e}$ . Once the errors are localised, decoding turns out to be solvable by the resolution of a linear system.

In summary, correcting  $t$  errors for a code  $\mathcal{C}$  is possible as soon as there exists an auxiliary code  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

- (i)  $\dim \mathcal{A} > t$ ;
- (ii)  $d_{\min}(\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C}) > t$ ;
- (iii)  $d_{\min}(\mathcal{A}) + d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}) > n$ .

*Sketch of proof.* — First, note that  $K$  contains the so-called *shortening* of  $\mathcal{A}$  at the error positions, *i.e.* the subcode of  $\mathcal{A}$  of words vanishing where  $\mathbf{e}$  does not. Under Condition (i), this shortening of  $\mathcal{A}$  is nonzero and hence  $K \neq 0$ . Next, because of this previous discussion, Condition (ii) asserts that  $K$  actually equals this *shortening* of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Finally, Condition (iii) permits to make sure that, once the error positions are known, the resolution of a linear system will provide  $\mathbf{e}$  as the unique solution. See [HP95, Prop. 2.4] for further details.  $\square$

**Remark 6.** — Actually, Condition (ii) is rather restrictive and can be relaxed to  $\dim \mathcal{A} - t + \dim \mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C} \leq n$  which permits to typically expect that  $(K \star \mathbf{e}) \cap \mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C} = \{0\}$ , which is sufficient

to obtain that  $K$  is the shortening of  $\mathcal{A}$  we look for. Similarly, Condition (iii) may be removed. Relaxing these conditions is possible at the cost that the algorithm may fail for some rare error patterns  $e$ .

**Remark 7.** — Pellikaan’s original description of the so-called *Error Correcting pairs* involves two auxiliary codes  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  (see for instance [HP95, Def. 12.1]). One can actually prove that the code  $\mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{A} \star \mathcal{C})^\perp$  satisfies the conditions of Error Correcting Pairs.

**4.2. Back to AG codes.** — Now, if the code  $\mathcal{C}$  is the AG code  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$ , then, given a divisor  $F$  of degree  $\geq t + g$ , the code  $\mathcal{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, F)$  satisfies all the expected requirements as soon as  $n - \deg(F + G) > t$  which leads to

$$(5) \quad t \leq \frac{d^* - 1}{2} - \frac{g}{2},$$

where  $d^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n - \deg G$  is the *Goppa designed distance*, i.e. the lower bound on the minimum distance given by Proposition 3.

**4.3. The story continues.** — Somehow the “ $-g/2$ ” term in (5) seems disappointing since one can expect a unique decoding up to  $\frac{d-1}{2}$  errors. If the previous algorithm is proved to reach the decoding radius (5), it turns out to be able to correct “almost any” error pattern of weight up to half the designed distance (more or less because of Remark 6). During the 90’s, many publications targeted to get rid of this  $g/2$  term. This has been completed in [Ehr93] and [FR93] using two distinct approaches. Interestingly, if the radius (5) is reached using a rather generic algorithm which does almost not use the arithmetic of the underlying curves, the two aforementioned papers improve the decoding radius while considering again the curve’s arithmetic.

Later on, a new question has been raised: “*can one correct errors beyond half the minimum distance at the cost of possibly returning a list of codewords instead of a single one*”. A positive answer has been given by Sudan for Reed–Solomon codes [Sud97] and Guruswami and Sudan for AG codes [GS99]. The latter paper providing a polynomial time algorithm correcting up to the so-called *Johnson bound*, a radius under which any decoder is guaranteed to return a list whose size is polynomial in the code length.

The reason why all the aforementioned algorithms succeed to decode AG codes and not arbitrary ones, can somehow be understood in terms of the peculiar behaviour of these codes with respect to the  $\star$  product. See for instance [Ros18, CP20, PRS21].

## 5. Code-based cryptography and McEliece encryption scheme

Code-based cryptography dates back to 1978 with the seminal paper of McEliece [McE78] proposing a public key encryption scheme whose security is related to the hardness of the decoding problem. Informally, the principle is to take a code for which a decoding algorithm correcting up to  $t$  errors is known and to publish one of its bases. Encryption consists in encoding the plaintext into a codeword and add some randomly chosen error pattern of weight  $t$  while decryption consists in decoding, which is a possible task for the legitimate receiver.

In terms of security, one expects the published version of the code to be computationally indistinguishable from a random code. Thus, under this indistinguishability assumption an attacker cannot do better than trying to solve the decoding problem for an apparently random code. The latter problem is proved to be NP-complete [BMvT78] but more importantly, it is supposed to be hard *in average*, i.e. hard for randomly chosen inputs. Still, up to now the best known algorithms for generic decoding have a time complexity which is exponential in the weight of the error.

Among the various proposals to instantiate McEliece scheme, Reed–Solomon and AG codes have been proposed [Nie86, JM96]. It turns out that the algebraic structure of these codes and in particular their structure with respect to the component wise product mentioned in § 3, which is the key of the algebraic decoding as explained in § 4, also represents a strong weakness of these codes. Indeed, because of Theorem 5 and the subsequent discussion, the operation  $\mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  precisely provides a polynomial time distinguisher between AG codes and random ones making the

latter ones unusable for public key encryption. To turn this distinguisher into a full key recovery attack, we refer the reader to [CMCP17].

Therefore, if the raw use of AG codes is not a secure, it is still possible to use “deteriorate” versions of them for which decoding is still possible but with a much lower decoding radius  $t$ . For instance, one can consider some random subcodes of AG codes with a large enough codimension or take *subfield subcodes*, that is to say, start from an AG code in  $\mathbf{F}_{q^m}^n$  and only keep vectors whose entries are all in the subfield  $\mathbf{F}_q$ . In some sense, McEliece’s original proposal was based on the latter idea with a genus 0 underlying curve. We refer the reader to [CR21, § 15.7] for further details on the history of cryptanalysis of AG codes.

## 6. Secret sharing

In [Sha79], A. Shamir proposes a secure scheme for a set of players to share a secret so that a coalition of  $k$  of them can get the secret while any coalition of less than  $k$  players cannot get even a partial information on the secret. The scheme is based on Lagrange interpolation and can actually be interpreted in terms of codes. For  $n - 1$  players and a given secret  $s \in \mathbf{F}_q$ , take an  $[n, k, d]_q$  code  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ , choose an arbitrary vector  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$  whose last entry  $c_n = s$  and distribute the  $n - 1$  other entries to the players. The reconstruction and security properties of the scheme can actually be interpreted in terms of the minimum distance of  $\mathcal{C}$  and its dual  $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ .

**Lemma 8.** — *A coalition of  $r > n - d_{\min}(\mathcal{C})$  players can recover the secret while any coalition of  $r' < d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) - 1$  players cannot get any information on the secret.*

*Proof.* — Given  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ , denote by  $\mathcal{C}_I$  the image of  $\mathcal{C}$  under the canonical projection on the entries with index in  $I$ :

$$\mathbf{c} \mapsto \mathbf{c}_I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (c_i)_{i \in I}.$$

The first assertion is due to the fact that if  $|I| > n - d_{\min}(\mathcal{C})$ , then this canonical projection  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_I$  is injective. Hence, the knowledge of  $\mathbf{c}_I$  is enough to recover the whole vector  $\mathbf{c}$  and in particular the secret  $s = c_n$ .

On the other hand, if  $|I| < d_{\min}(\mathcal{C}^\perp) - 1$ , then one can prove that  $\mathcal{C}_{I \cup \{n\}} = \mathbf{F}_q^{|I|+1}$  and hence for any  $s' \in \mathbf{F}_q$  there exists  $\mathbf{c}' \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathbf{c}'_n = s'$  and  $\mathbf{c}'_I = \mathbf{c}_I$ . Thus, with the only knowledge of  $\mathbf{c}_I$ , the possible values of the secret are uniformly distributed.  $\square$

The coding theoretic interpretation of Shamir’s scheme rests on a  $k$ -dimensional Reed–Solomon code. It permits the secret recovery by any  $k$ -tuple of users while coalitions of  $r < k$  users cannot get any information on the secret.

Another interesting feature of Shamir’s scheme is that it is *linear*: if one wants to perform linear combinations of secrets, the users only have to perform separately the linear combination of their own shares and the result of a legal coalition will be the expected linear combination. Next, one could expect to be able to perform further arithmetic operations on the secrets such as multiplications. In such situations the code  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  enters the game again. This is at the core of the so-called *arithmetic secret sharing schemes* which can serve as a basis for secure *multiparty computation* protocols [CDM00]. Here we refer the reader to [CDN15, Chap. 12] and [CR21, § 15.8.4] for further details on the expected properties a code should have to provide a good arithmetic secret sharing scheme. Note that very similarly to other applications, Reed–Solomon codes — yielding Shamir’s scheme — are somehow optimal but suffer from the length restriction: the number of players cannot exceed the size of the ground field *i.e.* the cardinality of the set of secrets. Next, AG codes appear to be the best solution to address this limitation.

In this context, an open question remains: *which codes may be suitable for arithmetic secret sharing?* At least a first question could be *which codes  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfy the property that  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is “small”?* According to [CDM00, Thm. 12.19], the coding theoretic requirements to design a multiplicative secret sharing scheme consist in lower bounds on the minimum distances of  $\mathcal{C}^\perp$  and  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$ . According to Singleton bound (1), this entails a lower bound on the dimension of  $\mathcal{C}$  and an upper bound on that of  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$ . Then, finding codes  $\mathcal{C}$  of fixed dimension  $k$  such that  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  has the least possible



dimension is a question of interest and classifying such codes is a crucial question which remains widely open up to now and that is discussed in the sequel.

**6.1. Which codes have small squares?** — Let us focus on the following problem, *which codes  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$  of dimension  $k$  have a square of small dimension?* We first need to clarify what is meant by “small”. For this we need the following definition.

**Definition 9.** — A code  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$  is said to be *degenerate* if it is the direct sum of two subcodes with disjoint supports. Equivalently, there exist subcodes  $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$  such that  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1 \star \mathcal{A}_2 = \{0\}$ .

Now, according to [HLX02, Thm. 2.4], as soon as  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is *non degenerate*, there is an analog of Cauchy–Davenport formula in additive combinatorics which asserts that

$$\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \geq 2 \dim \mathcal{C} - 1.$$

Next, for any positive integer  $\gamma$ , what can one say about codes satisfying

$$(6) \quad \dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} = 2 \dim \mathcal{C} - 1 + \gamma?$$

The quantity  $\gamma$  should be “small” and inspired by additive combinatorics, one can first target Freiman–like results [TV06, Thm. 5.11] and study the case where  $\gamma \leq \dim \mathcal{C} - 3$ .

First, one can note that AG codes yield a solution of the raised problem. Indeed, Theorem 5 asserts that an AG code  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$  from a curve of genus  $\gamma$  with  $\deg G > 2\gamma$  precisely satisfies this property. However, they are not the only ones. It is also possible for some subcodes of AG codes from curves of genus  $< \gamma$  to satisfy (6). For instance, for  $\gamma = 1$ , Property (6) is clearly satisfied by AG codes from elliptic curves but also by some codes from a curve of genus 0 as explained in the example below.

**Example 10.** — Consider the projective line  $\mathbf{P}^1$ , denote by  $P_\infty$  the place at infinity and by  $\mathcal{P}$  an ordered sequence of distinct degree 1 finite places. The code  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathbf{P}^1, \mathcal{P}, kP_\infty)$  is nothing but a  $(k+1)$ –dimensional Reed–Solomon code and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be its subcode spanned by the evaluations of the functions  $1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^k$ , that is to say, removing  $x$ . The code  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  will be spanned by the evaluations of  $1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^{2k}$  and hence will have dimension  $2k = 2 \dim \mathcal{C}$  while being constructed from a genus 0 curve.

**Question 1.** — Let  $k$  be a positive integer and  $0 < \gamma \leq k - 3$ . Are there  $k$ –dimensional codes  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ , such that  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is non degenerate, satisfies

$$\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} = 2 \dim \mathcal{C} - 1 + \gamma$$

and  $\mathcal{C}$  is **not** contained in an AG code from a curve of genus  $g \leq \gamma$ ?

For  $\gamma = 0$ , it has been proved by Mirandola and Zémor [MZ15] that MDS codes (*i.e.* codes whose minimum distance reaches the Singleton bound (1)) which satisfy  $\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} = 2 \dim \mathcal{C} - 1$  are equivalent to Reed–Solomon codes. Interestingly, this fact was already known from an algebraic geometry point of view as Castelnuovo’s Lemma (see for instance [ACGH85, § III.2, p. 120]).

For larger  $\gamma$ ’s, the problem is still open. The following paragraphs discuss a possible geometric approach to study this problem. We acknowledge that this discussion raises more questions than answers.

**6.2. The quadratic hull of a code.** — At least a first question could be: *do such codes always arise from curves?* In [Ran21] a notion called *quadratic hull* of a code, associates an algebraic variety to an arbitrary code in the following manner. Given a  $k$ –dimensional code  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$ , consider a generator matrix  $G$  for  $\mathcal{C}$ , *i.e.* a  $k \times n$  matrix whose rows span  $\mathcal{C}$ . Assuming that the columns of  $G$  are pairwise independent, and regarding these columns as points of  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}$ , we associate to  $\mathcal{C}$  the corresponding  $n$ –tuple  $V(\mathcal{C})$  of elements of  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}(\mathbf{F}_q)$ . By this manner,  $\mathcal{C}$  can be regarded as an evaluation code: it is the code of evaluations of  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(1))$  at the points of  $V(\mathcal{C})$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  can be regarded in this way as the code of evaluations of  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(2))$  at these same

points! Let  $I_2(V(\mathcal{C}))$  be the space of quadratic forms vanishing on  $V(\mathcal{C})$ , we have the following exact sequence

$$(7) \quad 0 \longrightarrow I_2(V(\mathcal{C})) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(2)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow 0.$$

The *quadratic hull*  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is the variety defined by the homogeneous ideal of  $\mathbf{F}_q[X_0, \dots, X_{k-1}]$  spanned by  $I_2(V(\mathcal{C}))$ . Equivalently, it is the intersection of quadrics containing  $V(\mathcal{C})$ . Clearly,  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  contains  $V(\mathcal{C})$  but may contain further elements.

**Proposition 6.1.** — *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a curve of genus  $g$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$  be an ordered  $n$ -tuple of rational points of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $G$  be a divisor such that  $2g + 2 \leq \deg G < \frac{n}{2}$ . Then, the quadratic hull of  $\mathcal{C}_L(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, G)$  equals  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

*Proof.* — The proof can be found in [MCMMP14, Thm. 2], we adapt it here to the current notation and terminology. The condition  $\deg G \geq 2g + 2$  entails the very ampleness of  $G$  and, up to projective equivalence the corresponding embedding  $\varphi_G : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(L(G)) \simeq \mathbf{P}^{k-1}$  sends precisely  $\mathcal{P}$  onto  $V(\mathcal{C})$ . The curve  $\varphi_G(\mathcal{X})$  has embedding degree  $\deg G$  in  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}$  and hence, any quadric hypersurface containing  $V(\mathcal{C})$  contains the whole  $\mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, if not, the quadric hypersurface would intersect  $\varphi_G(\mathcal{X})$  at  $n > 2\deg G$  points (by assumption on  $\deg G$ ) which would contradict Bézout's Theorem. Therefore, the quadratic hull of  $\mathcal{C}$  contains  $\varphi_G(\mathcal{X})$ . Next, using Saint Donat's result [SD72], such an embedding of  $\mathcal{X}$  is an intersection of quadrics, which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Now the question is, *what if  $\mathcal{C}$  is not supposed to arise from a curve but  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is non degenerate and  $\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \leq 2\dim \mathcal{C} - 1 + \gamma$  with  $\gamma \leq \dim \mathcal{C} - 3$ ?* Is it possible that this code is not contained in an AG code from a curve of genus  $g \leq \gamma$ ? The point is that if  $\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is small, then  $\dim I_2(V(\mathcal{C}))$  is large and one could reasonably expect the quadratic hull to have a small dimension. Actually, one can prove the following statement.

**Theorem 11.** — *Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$  such that  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is non degenerate and  $\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \leq 3\dim \mathcal{C} - 4$ . Assume moreover that the quadratic hull  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is a reduced absolutely irreducible variety. Then,  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  is a curve.*

**Remark 12.** — The above statement is mentioned in [Ran21, § 2.11] where the proof is sketched.

To prove of Theorem 11 we need the following Lemma.

**Lemma 13.** — *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 11, let  $I_2(\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C}))$  be the subspace of  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(2))$  of quadratic forms vanishing on  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$ . Then,*

$$I_2(\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})) = I_2(V(\mathcal{C})).$$

*Proof.* — Using the hypothesis that  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  is reduced, the result is a direct consequence of Hilbert Nullstellensatz.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 11.* — Assuming that the quadratic hull is reduced and irreducible, one can define its field of functions  $K$ . After fixing an arbitrary choice of coordinates in  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}$ , one can regard  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(1))$  as a space of rational fractions and there is a canonical restriction map

$$H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(1)) \longrightarrow K$$

whose image is denoted by  $\mathcal{C}$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  has dimension  $k$ , the  $k \times n$  generator matrix  $G$  has full rank and hence its columns span  $\mathbf{F}_q^k$ . Consequently,  $V(\mathcal{C})$  spans  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}$  or equivalently is not contained in any hyperplane. Thus, so does  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  and hence, the above restriction map is an isomorphism:  $\mathcal{C}$  has dimension  $k$  and is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{C}$ . Moreover, since  $\mathcal{C}$  contains the restrictions to  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$  of a coordinate system of  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}$ , it generates the field  $K$  as an  $\mathbf{F}_q$ -algebra.

Consider the space

$$\mathcal{C} \cdot \mathcal{C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Span} \{uv \in K \mid u, v \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We have a canonical surjective map from the symmetric square  $S^2\mathcal{C}$  into  $\mathcal{C} \cdot \mathcal{C}$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is isomorphic to  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(1))$ , its symmetric square is isomorphic to  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(2))$ . In short,  $\mathcal{C} \cdot \mathcal{C}$  is the space of quadratic forms on  $\mathbf{P}^{k-1}$  restricted to  $\mathcal{H}_2(\mathcal{C})$ . Hence, the kernel of the

canonical surjective map  $S^2C \rightarrow C \cdot C$  is nothing but the space  $I_2(\mathcal{H}_2(C))$  of quadratic forms vanishing on  $\mathcal{H}_2(C)$ . By Lemma 13, we deduce that the latter kernel  $I_2(\mathcal{H}_2(C))$  is nothing but  $I_2(V(C))$ . In summary, we have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I_2(V(C)) & \longrightarrow & S^2C & \longrightarrow & C \cdot C \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \wr & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & I_2(V(C)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathbf{P}^{k-1}, \mathcal{O}(2)) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Consequently,  $C \cdot C$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$ . We already mentioned that  $C$  generates  $K$  as an  $\mathbf{F}_q$ -algebra and just proved that  $\dim C \cdot C \leq 3 \dim C - 4$ . Then, from [BCZ18, Thm. 4.2], the transcendence degree of  $K$  over  $\mathbf{F}_q$  cannot lie in the range  $\{2, \dots, k-1\}$  and hence should be 1. This proves that  $\mathcal{H}_2(C)$  is a curve.  $\square$

As a conclusion, we could get partial answers on the original problem if we were able to get criteria on the code for its quadratic hull to be a reduced irreducible variety.

**Question 2.** — *Given a code  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_q^n$  such that  $\mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C}$  is non degenerate and  $\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} \leq 3 \dim \mathcal{C} - 4$ , under which conditions the quadratic hull of  $\mathcal{C}$  is reduced and irreducible?*

Note that some conditions should hold for the hull to be irreducible as suggests the example below.

**Example 14.** — This example appears in [Ran21, § 7.9]. Let  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^3$  be the union of a plane and a line not contained in it. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of rational points of  $\mathcal{Y}$  and consider the code  $\mathcal{C}$  obtained as the set of evaluations of linear forms, *i.e.* the elements of  $H^0(\mathbf{P}^3, \mathcal{O}(1))$  at the elements of  $\mathcal{P}$ . For  $q$  large enough, it is simple to observe that any quadric containing  $\mathcal{P}$  contains  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Hence, the quadratic hull of the code equals  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Moreover, the dimension of the space of quadratic forms vanishing on  $\mathcal{Y}$  is 2 which entails that  $\dim \mathcal{C} \star \mathcal{C} = \dim H^0(\mathbf{P}^3, \mathcal{O}(2)) - 2 = 8 = 2 \dim \mathcal{C}$ . On the other hand, for  $q$  large enough, one can prove that  $\mathcal{P}$  cannot be contained in a curve of genus  $\leq 1$  since  $|\mathcal{P}| = q^2 + 2q + 1$  while Weil's bound asserts that curves of genus  $\leq 1$  have at most  $q + 1 + 2\sqrt{q}$  rational points.

## 7. A concluding remark

The present note dealt with codes from curves while one could also consider codes from higher dimensional varieties. The latter topic, without being as investigated in the literature as codes from curves remains of deep interest: we refer the reader to the survey [Lit08]. However, our focus was on the behaviour of codes with respect to the component wise product and codes from curves are very particular from this point of view. It can be related to the fact that Hilbert polynomials of curves are linear while they are quadratic for surfaces. Using this point of view, it seems that one cannot expect to decode codes from higher dimensional varieties as efficiently as codes from curves. Similarly, higher dimensional varieties are probably much less interesting for secret sharing applications. On the other hand, codes from higher dimensional varieties may remain of deep interest for other applications such as cloud storage and the design of locally recoverable codes.

## Acknowledgement

The author expresses his deep gratitude to Hugues Randriambololona for his very valuable comments.

## References

- [ACGH85] Enrico Arbarello, Maurizio Cornalba, Phillip Griffiths, and Joseph Daniel Harris. *Geometry of algebraic curves I*, volume 267. Springer-Verlag, First edition, 1985.
- [ALM<sup>+</sup>98] Sanjeev Arora, Carsten Lund, Rajeev Motwani, Madhu Sudan, and Mario Szegedy. Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems. *J. ACM*, 45(3):501–555, May 1998.
- [BCZ18] Christine Bachoc, Alain Couvreur, and Gilles Zémor. Towards a function field version of Freiman’s theorem. *Algebraic Combin.*, 1(4):501–521, 2018.
- [B22] Peter Beelen. A survey on recursive towers and Ihara’s constant. ArXiv:2203.03310, 2022.
- [BH08] Peter Beelen and Tom Høholdt. The decoding of algebraic geometry codes. In *Advances in algebraic geometry codes*, volume 5 of *Ser. Coding Theory Cryptol.*, pages 49–98. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2008.
- [Ber68] Elwyn R. Berlekamp. *Algebraic coding theory*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1968.
- [Ber15] Elwyn R. Berlekamp. *Algebraic coding theory*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, revised edition, 2015.
- [BMvT78] Elwyn Berlekamp, Robert McEliece, and Henk van Tilborg. On the inherent intractability of certain coding problems. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 24(3):384–386, May 1978.
- [BTV17] Alexander Barg, Itzhak Tamo, and Sergei G. Vlăduț. Locally recoverable codes on algebraic curves. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 63(8):4928–4939, 2017.
- [CCMZ15] Ignacio Cascudo, Ronald Cramer, Diego Mirandola, and Gilles Zémor. Squares of random linear codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 61(3):1159–1173, 2015.
- [CDM00] Ronald Cramer, Ivan Damgård, and Ueli Maurer. General secure multi-party computation from any linear secret-sharing scheme. In Bart Preneel, editor, *Advances in Cryptology — EUROCRYPT 2000*, volume 1807 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 316–334. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.
- [CDN15] Ronald Cramer, Ivan Damgård, and Jesper Nielsen. *Secure multiparty computation and secret sharing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [CMCP17] Alain Couvreur, Irene Márquez-Corbella, and Ruud Pellikaan. Cryptanalysis of McEliece cryptosystem based on algebraic geometry codes and their subcodes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 63(8):5404–5418, Aug 2017.
- [CP20] Alain Couvreur and Isabella Panaccione. Power error locating pairs. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 88:1561–1593, 2020.
- [CR21] Alain Couvreur and Hugues Randriambololona. Algebraic geometry codes and some applications. In W. Cary Huffman, Jon-Lark Kim, and Patrick Solé, editors, *Concise Encyclopedia of Coding Theory*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2021.
- [Ehr93] Dirk Ehrhard. Achieving the designed error capacity in decoding algebraic-geometric codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 39(3):743–751, 1993.
- [FR93] Gui-Liang Feng and T. R. N. Rao. Decoding algebraic-geometric codes up to the designed minimum distance. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 39(1):37–45, Jan 1993.
- [Gop81] Valerii D. Goppa. Codes on algebraic curves. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 259(6):1289–1290, 1981. In Russian.
- [GS95] Arnaldo Garcia and Henning Stichtenoth. A tower of Artin-Schreier extensions of function fields attaining the Drinfeld-Vladut bound. *Invent. Math.*, 121:211–222, 1995.
- [GS99] Venkatesan Guruswami and Madhu Sudan. Improved decoding of Reed-Solomon and Algebraic-Geometry codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 45(6):1757–1767, 1999.
- [Ham50] Richard W. Hamming. Error detecting and error correcting codes. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 29:147–160, 1950.
- [HLX02] X. Hou, K. H. Leung, and Q. Xiang. A generalization of an addition theorem of Kneser. *J. Number Theory*, 97:1–9, 2002.
- [HP95] Tom Høholdt and Ruud Pellikaan. On the decoding of algebraic-geometric codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 41(6):1589–1614, Nov 1995.
- [Iha81] Yasutaka Ihara. Some remarks on the number of rational points of algebraic curves over finite fields. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.*, 28:721–724, 1981.

- [JLJ<sup>+</sup>89] Jørn Justesen, Knud J. Larsen, Helge E. Jensen, Allan Havemose, and Tom Høholdt. Construction and decoding of a class of algebraic geometry codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 35(4):811–821, July 1989.
- [JM96] Heeralal Janwa and Oscar Moreno. McEliece public key cryptosystems using algebraic-geometric codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 8(3):293–307, 1996.
- [Köt92] Ralf Köter. A unified description of an error locating procedure for linear codes. In *Proceedings Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory III*, pages 113–117. Hermes, 1992.
- [Lit08] John B. Little. Algebraic geometry codes from higher dimensional varieties. In *Advances in algebraic geometry codes*, volume 5 of *Ser. Coding Theory Cryptol.*, pages 257–293. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2008.
- [McE78] Robert J. McEliece. *A Public-Key System Based on Algebraic Coding Theory*, pages 114–116. Jet Propulsion Lab, 1978. DSN Progress Report 44.
- [MCMMP14] Irene Márquez-Corbella, Edgar Martínez-Moro, and Ruud Pellikaan. On the unique representation of very strong algebraic geometry codes. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 70(1-2):215–230, 2014.
- [Mum70] D. Mumford. Varieties defined by quadratic equations. In *Questions on algebraic varieties, C.I.M.E., III Ciclo, Varenna, 1969*, pages 29–100. Edizioni Cremonese, Rome, 1970.
- [MZ15] Diego Mirandola and Gilles Zémor. Critical pairs for the product Singleton bound. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 61(9):4928–4937, 2015.
- [Nie86] Harald Niederreiter. Knapsack-type cryptosystems and algebraic coding theory. *Problems of Control and Information Theory*, 15(2):159–166, 1986.
- [Pel92] Ruud Pellikaan. On decoding by error location and dependent sets of error positions. *Discrete Math.*, 106–107:369–381, 1992.
- [PRS21] Sven Puchinger, Johan Rosenkilde, and Grigory Solomatov. Improved power decoding of algebraic geometry codes. In *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 509–514, 2021.
- [Ran14] Hugues Randriambololona. On products and powers of linear codes under componentwise multiplication. In Stéphane Ballet, Marc Perret, and Alexey Zaytsev, editors, *Algorithmic Arithmetic, Geometry, and Coding Theory*, volume 637 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 3–77. American Mathematical Society, 2014.
- [Ran21] Hugues Randriambololona. The quadratic hull of a code and the geometric view on multiplication algorithms. In Stéphane Ballet, Gaetan Bisson, and Irene Bouw, editors, *Arithmetic, Geometry, Cryptography and Coding Theory*, *Contemp. Math.*, pages 267–296. American Mathematical Society, 2021.
- [Ree54] Irving S. Reed. A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme. *Transactions of the IRE Professional Group on Information Theory*, 4(4):38–49, 1954.
- [Ros18] Johan Rosenkilde. Power decoding Reed–Solomon codes up to the Johnson radius. *Adv. Math. Commun.*, 12(1):81–106, 2018.
- [RS60] Irving S. Reed and Gustave Solomon. Polynomial codes over certain finite fields. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 8(2):300–304, 1960.
- [SD72] Bernard Saint-Donat. Sur les équations définissant une courbe algébrique. *C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris*, 274:324–327, 487–489, 1972.
- [Sha48] Claude E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27:379–423, 623–656, 1948.
- [Sha79] Adi Shamir. How to share a secret. *Commun. ACM*, 22(11):612–613, November 1979.
- [Sud97] Madhu Sudan. Decoding of Reed–Solomon Codes beyond the Error-Correction Bound. *J. Complexity*, 13(1):180–193, 1997.
- [SV90] Aleksei N. Skorobogatov and Sergei G. Vlăduț. On the decoding of algebraic-geometric codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 36(5):1051–1060, Sep. 1990.
- [TB14] Itzhak Tamo and Alexander Barg. A family of optimal locally recoverable codes. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 60(8):4661–4676, 2014.
- [TV06] T. Tao and V. H. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105 of *Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- [TVZ82] Michael A. Tsfasman, Serge G. Vlăduț, and Th. Zink. Modular curves, Shimura curves, and Goppa codes, better than Varshamov-Gilbert bound. *Math. Nachr.*, 109:21–28, 1982.
- [VD83] Sergei G. Vlăduț and Vladimir G. Drinfeld. Number of points of an algebraic curve. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 17:53–54, 1983.
- [WB83] Lloyd R. Welch and Elwyn R. Berlekamp. Error correction for algebraic block codes, 1983. US patent number 4,633,470.

---

ALAIN COUVREUR, Inria • Laboratoire LIX, CNRS UMR 7161, École Polytechnique, 91120 Palaiseau, France  
*E-mail* : `alain.couvreur@inria.fr`