## **On Symmetrized Weight Compositions**

Ali Assem Nefertiti Megahed

June 5, 2015

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ



- An **alphabet** *A* is a finite left module over a finite ring *R* with unity.
- A code of length **n** is just a submodule of **A**<sup>**n**</sup>. The **Hamming** weight counts the number of non-zero components in a tuple.

# **Two Notions of Equivalence**

Consider two codes  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  of length *n*. We **may think** the two codes refer to **the same thing** in each of the following :

If  $C_1 \cong C_2$  as (left) *R*-submodules of  $A^n$  through an isomorphism that **preserves** Hamming weight (distance!),

or

if  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are monomially equivalent.

# Is this true?

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

## Harvard, 1962

In her PhD thesis, **MacWilliams** proved the Hamming weight **EP** (later this was called being **MacWilliams**!) for **field alphabets**.

• The **alphabet** *A* has the **Extension Property** (EP) with respect to Hamming weight if every **monomorphism** preserving Hamming weight extends to a **monomial transformation**.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)



In [7], H.Ward and J.Wood **reproved** this via a **character theoretic** proof.

Key Word: generating characters

Now the question arises: To what extent can this proof be generalized ?! Can it work for arbitrary rings?

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Nakayama's Definitions On Frobeniusean Algebras, 1939-1941

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

## **Character Modules**

A finite ring *R* is **Frobenius iff** <sub>*R*</sub> *R* is **cyclic**.
soc(*A*) is **cyclic** if and only if *A* can be **embedded into** <sub>*R*</sub> *R*.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

## Yes Frobenius is needed !!

**1-(Wood [8] 1999):** Every finite **Frobenius** ring has the extension property with respect to the Hamming weight.

Besides, Wood proved a partial converse (for commutative rings) in the same paper.

**2-(Greferath, Nechaev, Wisbauer [3] 2004):** More generally, if *A* is a Frobenius **bi-module** over the finite ring *R*, then *A* has the extension property with respect to Hamming weight.

**3-(Wood [10] 2009):** Wood reproved this same result following the style appearing in his 1999's paper.

One more thing was proved...

# **Necessary and Sufficient**

RA is MacWilliams if and only if

- 1. A is **pseudo-injective**, and
- 2. A can be **embedded** in the character group  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}$  of  $\mathbf{R}$  (or equivalently, **soc**( $\mathbf{A}$ ) is **cyclic**).

# What Happens with Non-Cyclic Socles?

## **One Year Earlier...**

**Theorem:** Let  $R = M_m(\mathbb{F}_q)$  be the ring of all  $m \times m$  matrices over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and let  $A = M_{m,k}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  be the left *R*-module of all  $m \times k$  matrices over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . If  $\mathbf{k} > \mathbf{m}$ , there exist linear codes  $C_+, C_- \subset A^N, N = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 + q^i)$ , such that they are isomorphic through a weight preserving map **which does not** extend to a monomial transformation.

## **Just Remember**

that all this displayed so far concerns Hamming weight, so,

## Once again for swc?!

• For any  $G \leq \operatorname{Aut}_R(A)$ , define an **equivalence relation**  $\sim$  on  $A: a \sim b$  if  $a = b\tau$  for some  $\tau \in G$ . Let A/G denote the orbit space of this relation. The *G-symmetrized weight composition* is a function swc :  $A^n \times A/G \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  defined by,

$$\operatorname{swc}(x, a) = |\{i : x_i \sim a\}|,\$$

where  $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in A^n$  and  $a \in A/G$ . Thus, **swc** counts the number of components in each orbit.

## **Analogies Deduced**

• In 2013, in [2], N. Elgarem, N. Megahed and J.Wood proved that the embeddability in  $\widehat{\mathbf{R}}$  (cyclic socle) is sufficient for satisfying the extension property with respect to the **G-symmetrized weight composition** for any subgroup *G* of  $\operatorname{Aut}_R(A)$ ,

but the **necessity** remained a **question**.

## A seemingly doomed trial suggests bridging to Hamming weight ...

・ロト・ 日本・ 日本・ 日本・ 日本・ うらく

# Midway (Annihilator Weight)

**Define** an **equivalence relation**  $\approx$  on *A*:

 $a \approx b$  if  $Ann_a = Ann_b$ .

The *Annihilator weight*, denoted *aw*, is then defined so that it counts the number of components in each orbit (i.e. having the same annihilator).

## Lemma

In a **pseudo-injective** module,  $\approx$  and  $\sim_{\operatorname{Aut}_R(A)}$  make the **same** partition.

#### Theorem

Let **R** be a principal ideal ring,  ${}_{R}A$  a pseudo-injective module, and let **C** be a submodule of  $A^{n}$  for some *n*. Then a monomorphism  $f : C \to A^{n}$  ( $C \subseteq A^{n}$ ) preserves Hamming weight if and only if it preserves Aut<sub>R</sub>(A)-swc.

### Theorem

If  $_{\mathbf{R}}\mathbf{A}$  is pseudo-injective, then  $\mathbf{A}$  has the extension property with respect to  $\operatorname{Aut}_{R}(A)$ -swc if and only if  $\operatorname{soc}(\mathbf{A})$  is cyclic.

### Example:

If *L* is any finite field, and  $K \subseteq L$  is a subfield. The *K*-module  $_{K}L$  is pseudo-injective (by an extended basis argument). Thus the alphabet  $_{K}L$  has the extension property with respect to  $\operatorname{Aut}_{K}(L)$ -**swc** if and only if K = L.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

## **References:**

[1]H. Q. Dinh, and S. R. Lopez-Permouth, On the Equivalence of Codes over Rings and Modules, Finite Fields Appl., Vol. 10, no.4, 2004, p. 615-625.

[2]N .ElGarem, N. Megahed, and J.A. Wood, The extension Theorem with respect to Symmetrized Weight Compositions, 4th international castle meeting on coding theory, 2014

[3]M. Greferath, A. Nechaev, and R. Wisbauer, Finite Quasi-Frobenius Modules and Linear Codes, J. Algebra Appl. Vol. 3, no. 3, 2004, p. 247-272.

[4]T. Honold, Characterization of Finite Frobenius Rings, Archiv der Mathematik, Basel, Vol. 76, no. 6, 2001, p. 406-415.

## **References:**

[5]T. K. Lee and Y. Zhou, *Modules which are invariant under automorphisms of their injective hulls*, J. Alg. and App. 12, 2 (2013).

[6]Noyan Er, S. Singh, Ashish K. Srivastava, *Rings and modules whichare stable under automorphisms of their injective hulls*, arXiv: 1301.5841v1 [math.RA] 24 Jan 2013.

[7]H. N. Ward, and J. A. Wood, Characters and the Equivalence of Codes, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, Vol. 73, 1996, p. 348-352.

[8]J. A. Wood, Duality for Modules over Finite Rings and Applications to Coding Theory, Amer. J. of Math., Vol. 121, 1999, p. 555-575.

## **References:**

[9]J. A. Wood, Code Equivalence Characterizes Finite Frobenius Rings, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 136, 2008, p. 699-706.

[10]J. A. Wood, Foundations of Linear Codes Defined over Finite Modules: The Extension Theorem and MacWilliams Identities, Codes over Rings, Proceedings of the CIMPA Summer School, Ankara, Turkey, 18-29 August 2008, (Patrick Solé) Series on Coding Theory and Cryptology, Vol. 6, World Scientific, Singapore, 2009, p. 124-190.

# **Thank You**