

AMDS Symbol-Pair Codes from Repeated-Root Cyclic Codes

Junru Ma *

Abstract: Symbol-pair codes are proposed to guard against pair-errors in symbol-pair read channels. The minimum symbol-pair distance is of significance in determining the error-correcting capability of a symbol-pair code. One of the central themes in symbol-pair coding theory is the constructions of symbol-pair codes with largest possible minimum pair distance. Maximum distance separable (MDS) and almost maximum distance separable (AMDS) symbol-pair codes are optimal and sub-optimal regarding to the Singleton bound, respectively. In this paper, six new classes of AMDS symbol-pair codes are explicitly constructed through repeated-root cyclic codes and one class of such codes has unbounded lengths and the minimum symbol-pair distance can reach 13.

Keywords: MDS symbol-pair codes, AMDS symbol-pair codes, minimum symbol-pair distance, constacyclic codes, repeated-root cyclic codes

1 Introduction

Due to the development of modern high-density data storage systems, the reading process may be lower than that of the process used to store the data. Symbol-pair code was proposed by Cassuto and Blaum to protect against pair-errors over symbol-pair channels in [1]. Cassuto and Blaum studied symbol-pair codes on pair-error correctability conditions, code construction, decoding methods and asymptotic bounds in [1,2]. Later, Cassuto and Litsyn [3] established that codes for pair-errors exist with strictly higher rates compared to codes for the Hamming metric with the same relative distance. From now on, researchers further investigated symbol-pair codes, including the construction of symbol-pair codes [5,6,8,9,12,14,17–19,21], some decoding

*Corresponding author

Junru Ma is with Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics, Hubei Key Laboratory of Applied Mathematics, Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, Hubei, China.

E-mails: majunru@hubu.edu.cn(J.Ma).

algorithms of symbol-pair codes [15, 20, 26, 28, 29] and the symbol-pair weight distribution of some linear codes [10, 11, 13, 22, 27].

The minimum symbol-pair distance plays an important role in determining the error-correcting capability of a symbol-pair code. It is shown in [1] that a code \mathcal{C} with minimum symbol-pair distance d_p can correct up to $\lfloor \frac{d_p-1}{2} \rfloor$ symbol-pair errors. In 2012, Chee et al. [6] derived a Singleton bound on symbol-pair codes. Compared with classical error-correcting codes, the symbol-pair codes achieving the Singleton bound are called MDS symbol-pair codes. AMDS symbol-pair codes are sub-optimum regarding to the Singleton bound, which yields that it is valuable to construct AMDS symbol-pair codes. Compared with other linear codes, cyclic codes are easier to realize coding and decoding. Cyclic codes are one of the powerful tools to construct symbol-pair codes with largest minimum symbol-pair distance. In this paper, six new classes of AMDS symbol-pair codes with $d_p \in \{4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13\}$ on repeated-root cyclic codes are derived and one class of such codes has unbounded lengths.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some basic notations and results on symbol-pair codes and constacyclic codes. By means of repeated-root cyclic codes, we investigate AMDS symbol-pair codes in Section 3. In Section 4, we make some conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review some basic notations and results on symbol-pair codes and constacyclic codes, which will be applied in the sequel.

2.1 Symbol-pair Codes

Let $q = p^m$ and \mathbb{F}_q denote the finite field with q elements, where p is a prime and m is a positive integer. Throughout this paper, let \star be an element in \mathbb{F}_q^* and $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the all-zero vector. Let n be a positive integer. From now on, we always take the subscripts modulo n . For any vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ in \mathbb{F}_q^n , the symbol-pair read vector of \mathbf{x} is defined by

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}) = ((x_0, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_{n-2}, x_{n-1}), (x_{n-1}, x_0)).$$

Denote by \mathbb{Z}_n the residue class ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. The *symbol-pair weight* of \mathbf{x} is

$$w_p(\mathbf{x}) = |\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \mid (x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq (0, 0)\}|.$$

For any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, the *symbol-pair distance* between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} is

$$d_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = |\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \mid (x_i, x_{i+1}) \neq (y_i, y_{i+1})\}|.$$

A code \mathcal{C} is said to have *minimum symbol-pair distance* d_p if

$$d_p = \min \{d_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}\}.$$

Elements of \mathcal{C} are called *codewords* in \mathcal{C} . It is shown in [1, 2] that for any $0 < d_H(\mathcal{C}) < n$,

$$d_H(\mathcal{C}) + 1 \leq d_p(\mathcal{C}) \leq 2 \cdot d_H(\mathcal{C}). \quad (1)$$

Similar to classical error-correcting codes, the size of a symbol-pair code satisfies the following Singleton bound.

Lemma 1. ([5]) *Let $q \geq 2$ and $2 \leq d_p \leq n$. If \mathcal{C} is a symbol-pair code with length n and minimum symbol-pair distance d_p , then $|\mathcal{C}| \leq q^{n-d_p+2}$.*

The symbol-pair code achieving the Singleton bound is called a *maximum distance separable* (MDS) symbol-pair code. For a linear code of length n , dimension k and minimum symbol-pair distance d_p , if $d_p = n - k + 1$, then it is called an *almost maximum distance separable* (AMDS) symbol-pair code.

2.2 Constacyclic Codes

In this subsection, we review some basic concepts of constacyclic codes. For any $\eta \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$, the η -constacyclic shift τ_η on \mathbb{F}_q^n is defined as

$$\tau_\eta(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = (\eta x_{n-1}, x_0, \dots, x_{n-2}).$$

A linear code \mathcal{C} is an η -constacyclic code if $\tau_\eta(\mathbf{c}) \in \mathcal{C}$ for any $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{C}$. An η -constacyclic code is a *cyclic code* if $\eta = 1$. Each codeword $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{C}$ can be identified with a polynomial

$$c(x) = c_0 + c_1 x + \dots + c_{n-1} x^{n-1}.$$

In this paper, we always regard the codeword \mathbf{c} in \mathcal{C} as the corresponding polynomial $c(x)$. There is a unique monic polynomial $g(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ with $g(x) \mid (x^n - \eta)$ and

$$\mathcal{C} = \langle g(x) \rangle = \{f(x)g(x) \pmod{x^n - \eta} \mid f(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]\}.$$

We refer $g(x)$ as the *generator polynomial* of \mathcal{C} and the dimension of \mathcal{C} is $n - \deg(g(x))$.

Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle g(x) \rangle$ be a repeated-root cyclic code of length lp^e over \mathbb{F}_q with $\gcd(l, p) = 1$ and

$$g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^r m_i(x)^{e_i}$$

the factorization of $g(x)$ into distinct monic irreducible polynomials $m_i(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ of multiplicity e_i . For any $0 \leq t \leq p^e - 1$, we denote $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_t$ the simple-root cyclic code of length l over \mathbb{F}_q with generator polynomial

$$\bar{g}_t(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r, e_i > t} m_i(x).$$

If this product is $x^l - 1$, then $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_t$ contains only the all-zero codeword and we set $d_H(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_t) = \infty$. If all $e_i (1 \leq i \leq s)$ satisfy $e_i \leq t$, then $\bar{g}_t(x) = d_H(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_t) = 1$.

The following lemma indicates that the minimum Hamming distance of \mathcal{C} can be obtained by the minimum Hamming distance $d_H(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_t)$, which is useful to derive the minimum Hamming distance of codes in Sections 3.

Lemma 2. ([4]) *Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length lp^e over \mathbb{F}_q , where l and e are positive integers with $\gcd(l, p) = 1$. Then*

$$d_H(\mathcal{C}) = \min \{P_t \cdot d_H(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_t) \mid 0 \leq t \leq p^e - 1\} \quad (2)$$

where

$$P_t = w_H((x-1)^t) = \prod_i (t_i + 1) \quad (3)$$

with t_i 's being the coefficients of the p -adic expansion of t .

In this paper, we will employ repeated-root cyclic codes to construct new AMDS symbol-pair codes. The following lemmas will be frequently applied in our later proof.

Lemma 3. ([21]) *Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length lp^e over \mathbb{F}_q and $c(x) = (x^l - 1)^t v(x)$ an arbitrary nonzero codeword in \mathcal{C} , where l and e are positive integers with $\gcd(l, p) = 1$, $0 \leq t \leq p - 1$ and $(x^l - 1) \nmid v(x)$. If $w_H(c(x)) = d_H(\mathcal{C})$, then*

$$w_H(c(x)) = P_t \cdot N_v.$$

Here P_t is defined as (3) in Lemma 2 and $N_v = w_H(v(x) \bmod (x^l - 1))$.

Lemma 4. ([21]) *Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code over \mathbb{F}_q with length $3p$ and $g(x) = (x-1)^5(x-\omega)^3(x-\omega^2)^2$ the generator polynomial of \mathcal{C} , where $3 \mid (p-1)$ and ω is a primitive third root of unity in \mathbb{F}_p . Then \mathcal{C} is an MDS $(3p, 12)$ symbol-pair code.*

Lemma 5. ([8]) *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[n, k, d_H]$ constacyclic code over \mathbb{F}_q with $2 \leq d_H < n$. Then we have $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq d_H + 2$ if and only if \mathcal{C} is not an MDS code, i.e., $k < n - d_H + 1$.*

Lemma 6. ([8]) *Let \mathcal{C} be an $[lp^e, k, d_H]$ repeated-root cyclic code over \mathbb{F}_q and $g(x)$ the generator polynomial of \mathcal{C} , where $\gcd(l, p) = 1$ and $l, e > 1$. If $d_H(\mathcal{C})$ is prime and one of the following two conditions is satisfied*

$$(1) \ l < d_H(\mathcal{C}) < lp^e - k;$$

$$(2) \ x^l - 1 \text{ is a divisor of } g(x) \text{ and } 2 < d_H(\mathcal{C}) < lp^e - k,$$

then $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq d_H(\mathcal{C}) + 3$.

3 Constructions of AMDS Symbol-Pair Codes

By utilizing repeated-root cyclic codes, we construct six new classes of AMDS symbol-pair codes with $d_p \in \{4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13\}$ in this section. Among these codes, one class has unbounded lengths.

Now we begin with a class of AMDS symbol-pair codes with unbounded lengths.

Theorem 1. *Let q be a power of prime p , $s \geq 1$, l a positive integer with $l \mid (q^2 - 1)$ and $l \geq (q + 1)$. Then there exists an AMDS $(lp^s, 4)_q$ symbol-pair code.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length lp^s over \mathbb{F}_q with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)(x - \delta)(x - \delta^q)$$

where δ is a primitive l -th root of unity in \mathbb{F}_{q^2} . By Lemma 2, one can derive that the parameter of \mathcal{C} is $[lp^s, lp^s - 3, 2]$. Since \mathcal{C} is not MDS, Lemma 5 yields that $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq 4$. Note that by inequality (1), one can obtain

$$d_H(\mathcal{C}) + 1 \leq d_p(\mathcal{C}) \leq 2 \cdot d_H(\mathcal{C}) = 4.$$

It follows that $d_p(\mathcal{C}) = 4$, which induces that \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(lp^s, 4)_q$ symbol-pair code. This concludes the desired result. \square

In what follows, according to Lemma 6, we derive a class of AMDS symbol-pair codes with $n = 4p$ and $d_p = 6$.

Theorem 2. *Let p be an odd prime. Then there exists an AMDS $(4p, 6)_p$ symbol-pair code.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length $4p$ over \mathbb{F}_p with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)(x^4 - 1).$$

It follows from Lemma 2 that \mathcal{C} is a $[4p, 4p - 5, 3]$ cyclic code. By Lemma 6, one can immediately get $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq 6$ since $(x^4 - 1) \mid g(x)$ and $2 < 3 = d_H(\mathcal{C}) < 4p - (4p - 5) = 5$. Note that

$$d_p(\mathcal{C}) \leq 2 \cdot d_H(\mathcal{C}) = 6.$$

Hence \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(4p, 6)_p$ symbol-pair code. This completes the proof. \square

In the sequel, four constructions of AMDS symbol-pair codes with length $3p$ are provided. The first one possesses the minimum pair-distance 7 for any prime $p \geq 5$.

Theorem 3. *Let $p \geq 5$ be an odd prime. Then there exists an AMDS $(3p, 7)_p$ symbol-pair code.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length $3p$ over \mathbb{F}_p with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)^4 (x^2 + x + 1).$$

According to Lemma 2, one can obtain that \mathcal{C} is a $[3p, 3p - 6, 4]$ cyclic code. Since \mathcal{C} is not MDS, by Lemma 5, one can deduce that $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq 6$.

Suppose that there exists a codeword $c(x)$ in \mathcal{C} with Hamming weight 5 such that $c(x)$ has five consecutive nonzero entries. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$c(x) = c_0 + c_1 x + c_2 x^2 + c_3 x^3 + c_4 x^4$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $0 \leq i \leq 4$. This is impossible since the generator polynomial of \mathcal{C} is $g(x)$ and $\deg(g(x)) = 6$. Hence there does not exist a codeword $c(x)$ in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (5, 6)$.

In order to prove that \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 7)_p$ symbol-pair code, we need to determine that there does not exist a codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (4, 6)$ and $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (4, 7)$.

Let $c(x) = (x^3 - 1)^t v(x)$ be a codeword in \mathcal{C} with Hamming weight 4, where $0 \leq t \leq p - 1$, $(x^3 - 1) \nmid v(x)$ and $v(x) = v_0(x^3) + x v_1(x^3) + x^2 v_2(x^3)$. Denote $N_v = w_H(v(x) \bmod (x^3 - 1))$. Then Lemma 3 (i) indicates that $4 = (1 + t) N_v$. There are two cases to be considered: $(N_v, t) = (1, 2)$ or $(N_v, t) = (2, 1)$.

Now we first derive that there does not exist a codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (4, 6)$. If $(N_v, t) = (1, 2)$, then it is routine to check that the symbol-pair weight of $c(x)$ is greater than 6. If $(N_v, t) = (2, 1)$ and $c(x)$ has symbol-pair weight 6, then suppose

$$c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^{3i} + a_3 x^{3i+1}$$

for some positive integer i with $1 \leq i \leq p - 1$ and $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$. It follows from $3 \mid (p - 1)$ that $p \nmid 3i$. The fact $c^{(2)}(1) = c^{(3)}(1) = 0$ yields

$$\begin{cases} 3i(3i - 1)a_2 + 3i(3i + 1)a_3 = 0, \\ 3i(3i - 1)(3i - 2)a_2 + 3i(3i + 1)(3i - 1)a_3 = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

which implies $3i(3i + 1)a_3 = 0$. If $p \nmid (3i + 1)$, then (4) indicates $p \nmid (3i - 1)$, a contradiction. Thus $a_3 = 0$, which is impossible.

For the remaining case, we claim that there exists a codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (4, 7)$. If $c(x)$ has symbol-pair weight 7, then assume

$$c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^i + a_3 x^j$$

for some integers i, j with $3 \leq i < j - 1 < n - 2$ and $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$. It follows from $c(1) = c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(2)}(1) = c^{(3)}(1) = 0$ that

$$\begin{cases} 1 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 0, \\ a_1 + i a_2 + j a_3 = 0, \\ i(i-1) a_2 + j(j-1) a_3 = 0, \\ i(i-1)(i-2) a_2 + j(j-1)(j-2) a_3 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Denote by A the corresponding coefficient matrix of \mathbb{F}_p -linear system of equations (5). Then

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & i & j & 0 \\ 0 & i(i-1) & j(j-1) & 0 \\ 0 & i(i-1)(i-2) & j(j-1)(j-2) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & i-1 & j-1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & (j-i)(j-1) & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & ij \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, (5) has nonzero solutions if $p \mid j$ or $p \mid i$, $p \mid (j-1)$ and there exists a codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (4, 7)$.

Consequently, \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 7)_p$ symbol-pair code. The proof is completed. \square

In the following, a class of AMDS symbol-pair codes with $n = 3p$ and $d_p = 8$ is proposed.

Theorem 4. *Let p be an odd prime with $3 \mid (p-1)$. Then there exists an AMDS $(3p, 8)_p$ symbol-pair code.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length $3p$ over \mathbb{F}_p with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x-1)^4 (x-\omega)^2 (x-\omega^2)$$

where ω is a primitive third root of unity in \mathbb{F}_p . It can be checked that $\omega \neq -2$. By Lemma 2, we get that \mathcal{C} is a $[3p, 3p-7, 5]$ cyclic code. By Lemma 6, one can immediately get $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq 8$ since $(x^3-1) \mid g(x)$ and $2 < 5 = d_H(\mathcal{C}) < 3p - (3p-7) = 7$.

To derive that \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 8)_p$ symbol-pair code, it suffices to show that there exists a codeword in \mathcal{C} with symbol-pair weight 8. Now we show that there exists codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (6, 8)$.

For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^{3i+1} + a_5 x^{3i+2}$ with $2 \leq i \leq p-2$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 5$. It follows from $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = 0$ that

$$a_1 = -a_4, \quad a_2 = -a_5, \quad a_3 = -1, \quad a_4 = -\frac{\omega}{i}, \quad a_5 = \frac{\omega+1}{i}$$

due to $p \nmid 3i$. Then $c^{(2)}(1) = c^{(3)}(1) = 0$ induces

$$\begin{cases} 2a_2 + 6a_3 + 3i(3i+1)a_4 + (3i+2)(3i+1)a_5 = 0, \\ 6a_3 + 3i(3i+1)(3i-1)a_4 + 3i(3i+1)(3i+2)a_5 = 0 \end{cases}$$

which yields that

$$\omega = -\frac{3i+1}{2} = -\frac{3i(i+1)}{3i+1}.$$

Hence $3i^2 + 1 = 0$. It follows that in this subcase, there exists a codeword

$$c(x) = 1 + \frac{3i+3}{3i+1}x + \frac{3i-2}{3i+1}x^2 - x^3 - \frac{3i+3}{3i+1}x^{3i+1} - \frac{3i-2}{3i+1}x^{3i+2}$$

with Hamming weight 6 and symbol-pair weight 8.

Therefore, there exists a codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (6, 8)$. As a result, \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 8)_p$ symbol-pair code. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 5. *Let p be an odd prime with $3 \mid (p-1)$. Then there exists an AMDS $(3p, 12)_p$ symbol-pair code.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length $3p$ over \mathbb{F}_p with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x-1)^5(x-\omega)^3(x-\omega^2)^3$$

where ω is a primitive third root of unity in \mathbb{F}_p . By Lemma 2, one can immediately get $d_H(\mathcal{C}) = 6$. Since the code in Lemma 4 is a subcode of \mathcal{C} and the minimum symbol-pair distance of the code in Lemma 4 is 12, one can derive that $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq 12$. Combining with $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \leq 2d_H(\mathcal{C}) = 12$, one can obtain that \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 12)_p$ symbol-pair code. \square

Theorem 6. *Let p be an odd prime with $3 \mid (p-1)$. Then there exists an AMDS $(3p, 13)_p$ symbol-pair code.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length $3p$ over \mathbb{F}_p with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x-1)^6 (x-\omega)^3 (x-\omega^2)^3$$

where ω is a primitive third root of unity in \mathbb{F}_p . By Lemma 2, one can immediately get $d_H(\mathcal{C}) = 7$. Since the code in Lemma 4 is a subcode of \mathcal{C} and the minimum symbol-pair distance of the code in Lemma 4 is 12, one can derive that $d_p(\mathcal{C}) \geq 12$. It can be checked that there does not exist codeword in \mathcal{C} with Hamming weight 7 and symbol-pair weight 12.

In the sequel, we determine that there does not exist codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (8, 12)$, $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (9, 12)$ and $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (10, 12)$.

Firstly, assume that there exists a codeword $c(x)$ in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (8, 12)$. There are five subcases to be considered:

- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^{l_1} + a_6 x^{l_2} + a_7 x^{l_3}$ with $7 \leq l_1 + 1 < l_2 < l_3 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 7$.
 - If $\mathcal{CS}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \notin \{(0, 0, 2), (0, 1, 2), (0, 2, 2), (1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 2)\}$, then it can be checked that by $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = 0$, one can immediately get $a_2 = 0$, a contradiction.
 - If $\mathcal{CS}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \in \{(0, 0, 2), (0, 1, 2), (0, 2, 2), (1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 2)\}$, then $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$ yields that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 4$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^{l_1} + a_5 x^{l_1+1} + a_6 x^{l_2} + a_7 x^{l_3}$ with $7 \leq l_1 + 2 < l_2 < l_3 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 7$.
 - If $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (2, 0, 0), (2, 0, 2)\}$, then by $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = 0$, one can immediately derive $a_1 = 0$ or $a_2 = 0$, a contradiction.
 - If $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \notin \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (2, 0, 0), (2, 0, 2)\}$, then $c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$ implies that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^{l_1} + a_4 x^{l_1+1} + a_5 x^{l_1+2} + a_6 x^{l_2} + a_7 x^{l_3}$ with $7 \leq l_1 + 3 < l_2 < l_3 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 7$. For any $7 \leq l_1 + 3 < l_2 < l_3 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$, $c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$ implies that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^{l_1} + a_4 x^{l_1+1} + a_5 x^{l_2} + a_6 x^{l_2+1} + a_7 x^{l_3}$ with $6 \leq l_1 + 2 < l_2 < l_3 - 2 \leq 3p - 4$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 7$.

- If $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 2), (2, 2, 0), (2, 2, 2)\}$, then by $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = 0$, one can immediately derive $1 = 0$, $a_1 = 0$ or $a_2 = 0$.
- If $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \in \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 2), (2, 2, 0), (2, 2, 2)\}$, then $c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$ implies that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^{l_1} + a_3 x^{l_1+1} + a_4 x^{l_2} + a_5 x^{l_2+1} + a_6 x^{l_3} + a_7 x^{l_3+1}$ with $5 \leq l_1 + 2 < l_2 < l_3 - 2 \leq 3p - 5$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 7$.

- If $\mathcal{CS}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \in \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 2), (1, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2)\}$, then by $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = 0$, one can immediately derive $1 = 0$ or $a_1 = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$.
- If $\mathcal{CS}(l_1, l_2, l_3) \in \{(0, 1, 1), (0, 1, 2), (0, 2, 2), (1, 2, 2)\}$, then $c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$ implies that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- If $\mathcal{CS}(l_1, l_2, l_3) = (0, 0, 0)$, then $c(1) = c(\omega) = c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(2)}(1) = c^{(2)}(\omega) = 0$ induces

$$\begin{cases} 3i a_2 + 3j a_4 + 3k a_6 = 3i a_3 + 3j a_5 + 3k a_7 = 0, \\ 3j(3j - 3i) a_4 + 3k(3k - 3i) a_6 = 3j(3j - 3i) a_5 + 3k(3k - 3i) a_7 = 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The fact $c^{(3)}(1) = 0$ indicates

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 3i(3i - 1)(3i - 2) a_2 + 3i(3i - 1)(3i + 1) a_3 + 3j(3j - 1)(3j - 2) a_4 \\ &\quad + 3j(3j - 1)(3j + 1) a_5 + 3k(3k - 1)(3k - 2) a_6 + 3k(3k - 1)(3k + 1) a_7 \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$a_4 + a_5 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a_6 + a_7 = 0$$

due to (6). It follows from $c^{(4)}(1) = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 3i(3i - 1)(3i - 2)(3i - 3) a_2 + 3i(3i - 1)(3i - 2)(3i + 1) a_3 \\ &\quad + 3j(3j - 1)(3j - 2)(3j - 3) a_4 + 3j(3j - 1)(3j - 2)(3j + 1) a_5 \\ &\quad + 3k(3k - 1)(3k - 2)(3k - 3) a_6 + 3k(3k - 1)(3k - 2)(3k + 1) a_7. \end{aligned}$$

By (6), one can get

$$3k(3k - 3i)(3k - 3j) a_6 = 0.$$

This implies $a_6 = 0$, a contradiction.

Secondly, assume that there exists a codeword $c(x)$ in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (9, 12)$. There are six subcases to be considered:

- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 + a_6 x^6 + a_7 x^{l_1} + a_8 x^{l_2}$ with $8 \leq l_1 < l_2 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 8$.

– If $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2) = \{1, 2\}$, then $c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = c^{(2)}(1) = c^{(2)}(\omega) = c^{(2)}(\omega^2) = 0$ induces

$$\begin{cases} 3a_3 + 6a_6 = 0, \\ 6a_3 + 30a_6 = 0. \end{cases}$$

which indicates that $a_6 = 0$, a contradiction.

– If $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2) \neq \{1, 2\}$, then by a similar arguments to the previous $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2) = \{1, 2\}$, one can obtain a contradiction and we omit it here.

- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 + a_6 x^{l_1} + a_7 x^{l_1+1} + a_8 x^{l_2}$ with $8 \leq l_1 + 1 < l_2 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 8$. It can be checked that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^{l_1} + a_6 x^{l_1+1} + a_7 x^{l_1+2} + a_8 x^{l_2}$ with $8 \leq l_1 + 2 < l_2 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 8$. It can be checked that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^{l_1} + a_6 x^{l_1+1} + a_7 x^{l_2} + a_8 x^{l_2+1}$ with $7 \leq l_1 + 1 < l_2 - 1 \leq 3p - 4$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 8$. It can be checked that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^{l_1} + a_5 x^{l_1+1} + a_6 x^{l_1+2} + a_7 x^{l_1+3} + a_8 x^{l_2}$ with $8 \leq l_1 + 3 < l_2 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 8$. It can be checked that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^{l_1} + a_5 x^{l_1+1} + a_6 x^{l_1+2} + a_7 x^{l_2} + a_8 x^{l_2+1}$ with $7 \leq l_1 + 2 < l_2 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 8$. It can be checked that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 7$, a contradiction.

Thirdly, assume that there exists a codeword $c(x)$ in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (10, 12)$.

There are three subcases to be considered:

- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 + a_6 x^6 + a_7 x^7 + a_8 x^8 + a_9 x^l$ with $10 \leq l \leq 3p - 2$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 9$.

- If $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, then $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$ induces

$$\begin{cases} a_2 + a_5 + a_8 = 0, \\ 2a_2 + 5a_5 + 8a_8 = 0, \\ 60a_5 + 336a_8 = 0. \end{cases}$$

which indicates that $a_8 = 0$, a contradiction.

- If $\mathcal{V}(l) = 1$, then by a similar arguments to the previous $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, one can obtain a contradiction and we omit it here.
- If $\mathcal{V}(l) = 2$, then by a similar arguments to the previous $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, one can obtain a contradiction and we omit it here.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 + a_6 x^6 + a_7 x^7 + a_8 x^l + a_9 x^{l+1}$ with $9 \leq l \leq 3p - 3$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 9$. It can be checked that no matter $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, $\mathcal{V}(l) = 1$ or $\mathcal{V}(l) = 2$, there exists a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 + a_6 x^6 + a_7 x^l + a_8 x^{l+1} + a_9 x^{l+2}$ with $8 \leq l \leq 3p - 4$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 9$. It can be checked that no matter $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, $\mathcal{V}(l) = 1$ or $\mathcal{V}(l) = 2$, one can obtain that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 9$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^5 + a_6 x^l + a_7 x^{l+1} + a_8 x^{l+2} + a_9 x^{l+3}$ with $7 \leq l \leq 3p - 5$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 9$. It can be checked that no matter $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, $\mathcal{V}(l) = 1$ or $\mathcal{V}(l) = 2$, one can obtain that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 9$, a contradiction.
- For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + a_3 x^3 + a_4 x^4 + a_5 x^l + a_6 x^{l+1} + a_7 x^{l+2} + a_8 x^{l+3} + a_9 x^{l+4}$ with $8 \leq l \leq 3p - 4$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 9$. It can be checked that no matter $\mathcal{V}(l) = 0$, $\mathcal{V}(l) = 1$ or $\mathcal{V}(l) = 2$, one can obtain that $a_i = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 9$, a contradiction.

To prove that \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 13)_p$ symbol-pair code, it suffices to determine that there exists a codeword in \mathcal{C} with symbol-pair weight 13. Now we prove that there exist codeword in \mathcal{C} with $(w_H(c(x)), w_p(c(x))) = (8, 13)$.

For the subcase of $c(x) = 1 + a_1 x + a_2 x^{l_1} + a_3 x^{l_1+1} + a_4 x^{l_2} + a_5 x^{l_2+1} + a_6 x^{l_3} + a_7 x^{l_4}$ with $7 \leq l_1 + 4 < l_2 + 2 < l_3 < l_4 - 1 \leq 3p - 3$, $\mathcal{V}(l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4) = (0, 0, 0, 1)$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 7$.

It follows from $c(1) = c(\omega) = c(\omega^2) = 0$ that

$$\begin{cases} 1 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_7 = 0, \\ 1 + a_1 \omega + a_2 + a_3 \omega + a_4 + a_5 \omega + a_6 + a_7 \omega = 0, \\ 1 + a_1 \omega^2 + a_2 + a_3 \omega^2 + a_4 + a_5 \omega^2 + a_6 + a_7 \omega^2 = 0 \end{cases}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{cases} 1 + a_2 + a_4 + a_6 = 0, \\ a_1 + a_3 + a_5 + a_7 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

It can be checked that $a_1 = a_4$, $a_2 = a_3$, $a_6 = a_7$, $a_5 = 1$, $l_2 = 2l_1$, $l_4 = l_3 + 4$ is a solution of the equations (7). By $c^{(1)}(1) = c^{(1)}(\omega) = c^{(1)}(\omega^2) = 0$, one can obtain that

$$\begin{cases} a_1 + l_1 a_2 + (l_1 + 1) a_3 + l_2 a_4 + (l_2 + 1) a_5 + l_3 a_6 + l_4 a_7 = 0, \\ a_1 + l_1 a_2 \omega^2 + (l_1 + 1) a_3 + l_2 a_4 \omega^2 + (l_2 + 1) a_5 + l_3 a_6 \omega^2 + l_4 a_7 = 0, \\ a_1 + l_1 a_2 \omega + (l_1 + 1) a_3 + l_2 a_4 \omega + (l_2 + 1) a_5 + l_3 a_6 \omega + l_4 a_7 = 0 \end{cases}$$

which yields

$$\begin{cases} a_1 + (l_1 + 1) a_3 + (l_2 + 1) a_5 + l_4 a_7 = 0, \\ l_1 a_2 + l_2 a_4 + l_3 a_6 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

By $a_1 = a_4$, $a_2 = a_3$, $a_6 = a_7$, $a_5 = 1$, $l_2 = 2l_1$, $l_4 = l_3 + 4$ and (8), one can get

$$l_2 (a_1 - 1) = 3a_6. \quad (9)$$

It follows from $c^{(2)}(1) = c^{(2)}(\omega) = c^{(2)}(\omega^2) = 0$ that

$$\begin{cases} l_1 (l_1 - 1) a_2 + l_1 (l_1 + 1) a_3 + l_2 (l_2 - 1) a_4 + l_2 (l_2 + 1) a_5 + l_3 (l_3 - 1) a_6 + l_4 (l_4 - 1) a_7 = 0, \\ l_1 (l_1 - 1) a_2 \omega + l_1 (l_1 + 1) a_3 \omega^2 + l_2 (l_2 - 1) a_4 \omega + l_2 (l_2 + 1) a_5 \omega^2 + l_3 (l_3 - 1) a_6 \omega \\ + l_4 (l_4 - 1) a_7 \omega^2 = 0, \\ l_1 (l_1 - 1) a_2 \omega^2 + l_1 (l_1 + 1) a_3 \omega + l_2 (l_2 - 1) a_4 \omega^2 + l_2 (l_2 + 1) a_5 \omega + l_3 (l_3 - 1) a_6 \omega^2 \\ + l_4 (l_4 - 1) a_7 \omega = 0 \end{cases}$$

which leads to

$$\begin{cases} l_1 (l_1 - 1) a_2 + l_2 (l_2 - 1) a_4 + l_3 (l_3 - 1) a_6 = 0, \\ l_1 (l_1 + 1) a_3 + l_2 (l_2 + 1) a_5 + l_4 (l_4 - 1) a_7 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

By $a_1 = a_4$, $a_2 = a_3$, $a_6 = a_7$, $a_5 = 1$, $l_2 = 2l_1$, $l_4 = l_3 + 4$ and (7), one can derive

$$(2l_3 - 2l_1 + 3) a_6 = 0$$

which leads to

$$2l_3 + 3 = 2l_1 \quad (11)$$

since $a_6 \neq 0$. It follows from $c^{(3)}(1) = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & l_1(l_1 - 1)(l_1 - 2)a_2 + l_1(l_1 + 1)(l_1 - 1)a_3 + l_2(l_2 - 1)(l_2 - 2)a_4 \\ & + l_2(l_2 + 1)(l_2 - 1)a_5 + l_3(l_3 - 1)(l_3 - 2)a_6 + l_4(l_4 - 1)(l_4 - 2)a_7 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By $c^{(4)}(1) = 0$, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} & l_1(l_1 - 1)(l_1 - 2)(l_1 - 3)a_2 + l_1(l_1 + 1)(l_1 - 1)(l_1 - 2)a_3 + l_2(l_2 - 1)(l_2 - 2)(l_2 - 3)a_4 \\ & + l_2(l_2 + 1)(l_2 - 1)(l_2 - 2)a_5 + l_3(l_3 - 1)(l_3 - 2)(l_3 - 3)a_6 + l_4(l_4 - 1)(l_4 - 2)(l_4 - 3)a_7 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The fact $c^{(5)}(1) = 0$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & l_1(l_1 - 1)(l_1 - 2)(l_1 - 3)(l_1 - 4)a_2 + l_1(l_1 + 1)(l_1 - 1)(l_1 - 2)(l_1 - 3)a_3 \\ & + l_2(l_2 - 1)(l_2 - 2)(l_2 - 3)(l_2 - 4)a_4 + l_2(l_2 + 1)(l_2 - 1)(l_2 - 2)(l_2 - 3)a_5 \\ & + l_3(l_3 - 1)(l_3 - 2)(l_3 - 3)(l_3 - 4)a_6 + l_4(l_4 - 1)(l_4 - 2)(l_4 - 3)(l_4 - 4)a_7 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists a codeword in \mathcal{C} with symbol-pair weight 13.

Therefore, \mathcal{C} is an AMDS $(3p, 13)_p$ symbol-pair code. This proves the desired conclusion. \square

In the sequel, we give several examples to illustrate the results in Theorems 1-6.

Example 1. (1) Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length 12 over \mathbb{F}_3 with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)(x - \omega^2)(x - \omega^6)$$

where ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_9 with $\omega^2 + 2\omega + 2 = 0$. It can be verified by MAGMA that \mathcal{C} is a $[12, 9, 2]$ code and the minimum pair-distance of \mathcal{C} is 4, which coincides with Theorem 1 by taking $l = 4$, $s = 1$ and $q = 3$.

(2) Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length 12 over \mathbb{F}_3 with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)(x^4 - 1).$$

Then it can be verified by MAGMA that \mathcal{C} is a $[12, 7, 3]$ code and the minimum pair-distance of \mathcal{C} is 6, which coincides with Theorem 2.

(3) Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length 15 over \mathbb{F}_5 with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)^4(x^2 + x + 1).$$

It can be checked by MAGMA that \mathcal{C} is a $[15, 9, 4]$ code and the minimum pair-distance of \mathcal{C} is 7, which is consistent with Theorem 3.

(4) Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length 21 over \mathbb{F}_7 with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)^4 (x - 2)^2 (x - 4).$$

Then it can be verified by MAGMA that \mathcal{C} is a $[21, 14, 5]$ code and the minimum pair-distance of \mathcal{C} is 8, which coincides with Theorem 4.

(5) Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length 21 over \mathbb{F}_7 with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)^5 (x - 2)^3 (x - 2^2)^3.$$

It can be verified by MAGMA that \mathcal{C} is a $[21, 10, 6]$ code and the minimum symbol-pair distance of \mathcal{C} is 12, which is consistent with Theorem 5.

(6) Let \mathcal{C} be a repeated-root cyclic code of length 21 over \mathbb{F}_7 with generator polynomial

$$g(x) = (x - 1)^6 (x - 2)^3 (x - 2^2)^3.$$

It can be verified by MAGMA that \mathcal{C} is a $[21, 9, 7]$ code and the minimum symbol-pair distance of \mathcal{C} is 13, which is consistent with Theorem 6.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we propose six classes of AMDS symbol-pair codes over \mathbb{F}_p with p an odd prime by employing repeated-root cyclic codes.

- $[lp^s, lp^s - 3, 2]$ code with $d_p = 4$;
- $[4p, 4p - 5, 3]$ code with $d_p = 6$;
- $[3p, 3p - 6, 4]$ code with $d_p = 7$;
- $[3p, 3p - 7, 5]$ code with $d_p = 8$;
- $[3p, 3p - 10, 6]$ code with $d_p = 12$.
- $[3p, 3p - 11, 7]$ code with $d_p = 13$.

Remarkably, among these codes, a class of AMDS symbol-pair codes with unbounded lengths is derived and the minimum symbol-pair distance can reach 13.

References

- [1] Y. Cassuto, M. Blaum, “Codes for symbol-pair read channels,” Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT), pp. 988-992, 2010
- [2] Y. Cassuto, M. Blaum, “Codes for symbol-pair read channels,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 57, no. 12, pp. 8011-8020, 2011
- [3] Y. Cassuto, S. Litsyn, “Symbol-pair codes: algebraic constructions and asymptotic bounds,” Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT), pp. 2348-2352, 2011
- [4] G. Castagnoli, J. L. Massey, P. A. Schoeller, N. von Seemann, “On repeated-root cyclic codes,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 337-342, 1991
- [5] Y. M. Chee, L. Ji, H. M. Kiah, C. Wang, J. Yin, “Maximum distance separable codes for symbol-pair read channels,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 7259-7267, 2013
- [6] Y. M. Chee, H. M. Kiah, C. Wang, “Maximum distance separable symbol-pair codes,” Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT), pp. 2886-2890, 2012
- [7] B. Chen, H. Q. Dinh, Y. Fan, S. Ling, “Polynomial constacyclic codes,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 4895-4904, 2015
- [8] B. Chen, L. Lin, H. Liu, “Constacyclic symbol-pair codes: Lower bounds and optimal constructions,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 7661-7666, 2017
- [9] B. Ding, G. Ge, J. Zhang, T. Zhang, Y. Zhang, “New constructions of MDS symbol-pair codes,” Des. Codes Cryptogr., vol. 86, no. 4, pp. 841-859, 2018
- [10] H. Q. Dinh, B. T. Nguyen, A. K. Singh, S. Sriboonchitta, “Hamming and Symbol-Pair Distances of Repeated-Root Constacyclic Codes of Prime Power Lengths Over $p^m + up^m$,” IEEE Commun. Letters, vol. 22, no. 12, pp. 2400-2403, 2018
- [11] H. Q. Dinh, B. T. Nguyen, A. K. Singh, S. Sriboonchitta, “On the Symbol-Pair Distance of Repeated-Root Constacyclic Codes of Prime Power Lengths,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 2417-2430, 2018
- [12] H. Q. Dinh, B. T. Nguyen, S. Sriboonchitta, “MDS Symbol-Pair Cyclic Codes of Length $2p^s$ over p^m ,” IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 240-262, 2020
- [13] H. Q. Dinh, X. Wang, H. Liu, S. Sriboonchitta, “On the symbol-pair distances of repeated-root constacyclic codes of length $2p^s$,” Discret Math., vol. 342, no. 11, pp. 3062-3078, 2019

- [14] O. Elishco, R. Gabrys, E. Yaakobi, “Bounds and Constructions of Codes Over Symbol-Pair Read Channels,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 1385-1395, 2020
- [15] S. Horii, T. Matsushima, S. Hirasawa, “Linear programming decoding of binary linear codes for symbol-pair read channels,” *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1944-1948, 2016
- [16] W. C. Huffman, V. Pless, “Fundamentals of Error-Correcting Codes,” Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003
- [17] X. Kai, S. Zhu, P. Li, “A Construction of New MDS Symbol-Pair Codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 11, pp. 5828-5834, 2015
- [18] X. Kai, S. Zhu, Y. Zhao, H. Luo, Z. Chen, “New MDS Symbol-Pair Codes from repeated-root codes,” *IEEE Commun. Letters*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 462-465, 2018
- [19] S. Li, G. Ge, “Constructions of maximum distance separable symbol-pair codes using cyclic and constacyclic codes,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 359-372, 2017
- [20] S. Liu, C. Xing, C. Yuan, “List Decodability of Symbol-Pair Codes,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 4815-4821, 2019
- [21] J. Ma, J. Luo, “MDS Symbol-Pair Codes from Repeated-Root Cyclic Codes,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 90, no. 1, pp. 121-137, 2022
- [22] J. Ma, J. Luo, “New MDS Symbol-Pair Codes from Repeated-Root Cyclic Codes over Finite Fields,” *arXiv:2010.04329*
- [23] J. Ma, J. Luo, “On symbol-pair weight distribution of MDS codes and simplex codes over finite fields,” *Cryptogr. Commun.*, 2021, 13(1): 101-115
- [24] F. J. MacWilliams, N. J. A. Sloane, “The theory of error-correcting codes,” The Netherlands, North. Holland, Amsterdam, 1977
- [25] J. L. Massey, D. J. Costello, J. Justesen, “Polynomial Weights and Code Constructions,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT-19, no. 1, pp. 101-110, 1973
- [26] M. Morii, M. Hiroto, M. Takita, “Error-trapping decoding for cyclic codes over symbol-pair read channels,” *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 681-685, 2016
- [27] Z. Sun, S. Zhu, L. Wang, “The symbol-pair distance distribution of a class of repeated-root cyclic codes over p^m ,” *Cryptogr. Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 643-653, 2018

- [28] M. Takita, M. Hiroto, M. Morii, "Syndrome Decoding of Symbol-Pair Codes," *IEICE Transactions-A*, vol. 98, no. 12, pp. 2423-2428, 2015
- [29] E. Yaakobi, J. Bruck, P. H. Siegel, "Decoding of cyclic codes over symbol-pair read channels," *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2891-2895, 2012