

# LOCALLY RECOVERABLE CODES WITH AVAILABILITY FROM A FAMILY OF FIBERED SURFACES

CECÍLIA SALGADO<sup>1</sup> AND LARA VICINO<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We construct Locally Recoverable Codes (LRCs) with availability 2 from a family of fibered surfaces. To obtain the locality and availability properties, and to estimate the minimum distance of the codes, we combine techniques coming from the theory of one-variable function fields and from the theory of fibrations on surfaces. When the locality parameter is  $r = 3$ , we obtain a sharp bound on the minimum distance of the codes. In that case, we give a geometric interpretation of our codes in terms of doubly elliptic surfaces. In particular, this provides the first instance of an error correcting code constructed using a (doubly elliptic) K3 surface.

*Keywords:* Locally Recoverable Codes, availability, AG codes, one-variable function fields, fibered surfaces.

*Subject classifications:* 14H05, 14G50, 94B27.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Locally Recoverable Codes* (LRCs for short) are a type of error-correcting codes particularly suited for applications in distributed storage systems, where data is split and stored across multiple servers. Indeed, one of the most common issues in such systems is the scenario of a server failure, which entails that portions of data become suddenly unavailable. However, if data is encoded by means of an LRC, then the retrieval of missing information is possible by accessing only a small portion of the remaining data, which makes the recovery procedure fast and cost-effective. For this reason, LRCs have been extensively studied over the last two decades, in particular those with additional properties like *availability* or *hierarchical locality*, which add an extra layer of data protection by ensuring that there are multiple subsets of information symbols that can be used to retrieve a missing symbol.

Initially studied in [11, 8, 10, 12, 29], LRCs have since been obtained with several different techniques, including constructions as evaluation codes from algebraic varieties over finite fields. These constructions as Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes allow to interpret and deduce properties of the obtained LRCs by studying geometric properties of the underlying varieties. Several examples of constructions of LRCs as AG codes can be found in the literature, for instance from covering maps of curves [2], fiber products of curves [19, 20], elliptic and Hirzebruch surfaces [23], Artin-Schreier surfaces [6] and projective bundles [1].

In this paper, we construct locally recoverable codes with availability from a particular family of fibered surfaces. Our construction is partially inspired by [1], where a family of asymptotically good LRCs with availability was obtained from projective space bundles. Indeed, the idea underlying our approach is to consider a surface admitting two distinct fibrations to a projective line and to construct LRCs by evaluating a suitably chosen space of functions on such surface at points that lie on a curve contained in the surface that is horizontal to both fibrations, i.e., intersects all fibers. We choose the curve in such a way that each evaluation point has two disjoint recovery sets, each contained in the fiber of one of the two distinct fibrations

---

<sup>1</sup>FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING - BERNOULLI INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN, GRONINGEN 9747AG, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail addresses:* c.salgado@rug.nl, l.vicino@rug.nl.

that contains the said point. Since two distinct fibers (of the same fibration) do not intersect, the recovery sets obtained in this way are naturally disjoint.

Note that, in this way, the codes we obtain can also be directly interpreted as AG codes from a curve, which makes it possible to use the theory of one-variable function fields and Newton arcs of curves to study their properties. However, since the ideas for obtaining locality and availability in our construction were inspired by viewing our codes as evaluation codes on a surface, in the spirit of [23] and [1], we choose to also adopt the framework of working on the surface, with explicit coordinates, in  $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ . A further reason for this is to shed light on an interpretation of our construction, described in Section 5, where we consider a particular surface in the family that we describe and outline a different recovery procedure, based on the surface having two genus 1 fibrations. This can be seen as a natural generalization of the results contained in [23, Section VI].

For certain alphabets and certain values of the locality parameter  $r$ , the codes that we construct can be compared to those obtained in [28, Section IV], although the comparison is not straightforward. Indeed, for a fixed alphabet, it is not a priori clear whether our construction and the construction in [28, Section IV] can produce a code of the same length and with the same locality parameter  $r$ . Moreover, while the construction in [28, Section IV] is solely based on the additive and multiplicative structure of the field, our construction builds up on the study of the splitting of certain places in some function field extensions. While our construction has the downside of being less flexible and of requiring, in general, larger alphabet sizes, it has the advantage of making it possible to obtain a lower bound for the minimum distance which is sharp for  $r = 3$  (which is the most directly relevant case for applications).

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2, we recall several background notions that are used throughout the paper. We start with definitions on locally recoverable codes and AG codes, and we then recall some results from the theory of one-variable function fields and Newton arcs. We conclude the section by including some essential results on fibered surfaces. In Section 3, we outline our construction of LRCs from a family of fibered surfaces. In Section 4, we study the parameters (dimension, locality, availability, minimum distance) of the codes obtained in the previous section, presenting explicit examples in Table 1. Finally, in Section 5, we outline a reinterpretation of the construction from one of the surfaces in our family, showing how, in this case, a different recovery procedure can be devised by using specific properties of the surface, which in this case is a K3 surface with two genus 1 fibrations.

## 2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we introduce the notations and background theory that are used throughout the paper. We start by recalling some definitions on Locally Recoverable Codes and Algebraic Geometry codes, then we proceed to recall some results on Newton arcs of algebraic curves. We conclude the section with a collection of definitions and facts on fibrations and fibered surfaces.

**2.1. Locally Recoverable Codes.** Let  $q = p^s$ , with  $p$  a prime number and  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , and let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be the finite field with  $q$  elements. A linear  $[n, k, d]_q$  error-correcting code  $C$  over the alphabet  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is a linear  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ . In what follows, we simply refer to such an object as a *code*. The vectors in  $C$  are called *codewords*. The positive integer  $n$  is the *length* of the code  $C$ , while  $k$  is the *dimension* of  $C$ , which is its dimension as an  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -vector space. The integer  $d$  is called the *minimum distance* of  $C$ , and it is the parameter measuring how many errors or erasures the code can detect and correct: the larger the minimum distance, the more errors or erasures can be detected and corrected. The parameters  $n, k, d$  of a code  $C$  are related by the celebrated *Singleton bound*  $d \leq n - k + 1$ , which gives a tradeoff between the distance and the dimension of  $C$ .

In this paper, we study a particular type of codes having the properties of *locality* and *availability*.

**Definition 2.1.** A code  $C \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$  is a Locally Recoverable Code (LRC) with locality  $r$  if and only if for all codewords  $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C$  and for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there exists a subset  $I_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}$  of cardinality  $|I_i| = r$  and a function  $\varphi_i : \mathbb{F}_q^r \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  such that  $c_i = \varphi_i(\mathbf{c}|_{I_i})$ .

We say that an LRC  $C$  has availability  $\mathbf{a}$  with locality  $(r_1, \dots, r_{\mathbf{a}})$  if and only if for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  there exist  $I_{i1}, \dots, I_{i\mathbf{a}} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}$  with  $|I_{ij}| = r_j$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}$ , and  $I_{ij} \cap I_{ik} = \emptyset$  for any  $j \neq k$ , and for all  $\mathbf{c} \in C$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_i = \varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{c}|_{I_{ij}})$  for some function  $\varphi_{ij} : \mathbb{F}_q^{r_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ .

Given an LRC with no availability, losing a symbol of a recovery set compromises the locality property of the code. For this reason, the property of availability of an LRC can be seen as adding an extra layer of data protection, since there are multiple disjoint recovery sets for each symbol of every codeword.

In the paper, we construct and study the parameters of a certain class of LRCs with availability  $\mathbf{a} = 2$ . More precisely, we obtain these codes as evaluation codes constructed from a family of algebraic surfaces over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In the following subsection, we introduce some essential background notions on Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes.

**2.2. Algebraic Geometry codes.** *Algebraic Geometry (AG) codes* are evaluation codes obtained from algebraic varieties over finite fields. They were first introduced by V.D. Goppa between the 70's and the 80's, see [14, 15, 16, 17, 18], with a construction from curves over finite fields. In this paper, we construct AG codes from certain surfaces, according to the following Theorem 2.2, which generalises the one introduced by V.D. Goppa for curves.

**Definition 2.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a quasi-projective variety over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and denote by  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  the set of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -rational points of  $\mathcal{X}$  and by  $\mathbb{F}_q(\mathcal{X})$  the ( $\mathbb{F}_q$ -rational) function field of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $S := \{P_1, \dots, P_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  be a subset of cardinality  $|S| = n$  and  $V$  be a finite-dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_q(\mathcal{X})$ . Define the linear evaluation map*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_S : V &\longrightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n \\ f &\longmapsto (f(P_1), \dots, f(P_n)). \end{aligned}$$

The Algebraic Geometry (AG) code  $C(\mathcal{X}, S, V)$  is defined as  $C(\mathcal{X}, S, V) := \text{im } \text{ev}_S$ , that is,

$$C(\mathcal{X}, S, V) = \{(f(P_1), \dots, f(P_n)) \mid f \in V\}.$$

A code  $C(\mathcal{X}, S, V)$  as in Theorem 2.2 has length  $n = |S|$  and dimension  $k = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} V - \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \ker \text{ev}_S$ . In particular, if the evaluation map  $\text{ev}_S$  is injective, then the dimension of  $C(\mathcal{X}, S, V)$  is simply  $k = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} V$ .

Since AG codes are constructed by evaluating functions on an algebraic variety, they have the peculiar feature that their parameters and properties can be understood and studied in terms of properties of the underlying variety. For instance, bounds on the value of the minimum distance  $d$  of an AG code  $C(\mathcal{X}, S, V)$  can be derived by studying the vanishing of the functions in  $V$  at the points in  $S$ . If one can show that any function in  $V$  has at most  $N$  distinct zeros in the set  $S$ , then the lower bound  $d \geq n - N$  follows. In Section 4.2, we use such a strategy to prove a lower bound on the minimum distance of the codes constructed in Section 3.

Moreover, when constructing LRCs as AG codes, certain features of the underlying variety can be instrumental to devise recovery procedures and obtain further properties such as, for instance, the availability property (see Section 3 and Section 4).

**2.3. Newton arcs.** Let  $F$  be a one-variable function field over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , i.e., the function field of some curve  $\mathcal{X}$  over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In this subsection, we recall some fundamental definitions and results on the *Newton arc* associated to a polynomial in  $F[T]$  with respect to some place of  $F$ . An extensive exposition of the theory and results summarised in this subsection can be found in the (unpublished) notes by P. Beelen [4]. On the other hand, a corresponding exposition in the setting of number fields can be found in [9]. Further references on Newton arcs and polygons of curves are [7, 5]. Regarding the theory and notations on one-variable function fields, we instead refer to [27], where Kummer's theorem can be found in [27, Theorem 3.3.7].

**Definition 2.3** ([4]). Let  $Q$  be a place of  $F$  and  $\varphi(T) := \sum_{i=0}^m a_i T^i \in F[T]$  a polynomial of degree  $m \geq 0$ . The support set of  $\varphi(T)$  at  $Q$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(T),Q} := \{(i, v_Q(a_i)) \mid 0 \leq i \leq m, a_i \neq 0\},$$

where  $v_Q(a_i)$  denotes the valuation of the function  $a_i$  at the place  $Q$ . When the place to which the support set refers to is clear, we simply write  $\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(T)}$ .

**Definition 2.4** ([4]). Let  $Q$  be a place of  $F$ ,  $\varphi(T) := \sum_{i=0}^m a_i T^i \in F[T]$  a polynomial of degree  $m \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(T),Q}$  as in Theorem 2.3. For any  $\rho, c \in \mathbb{Q}$ , consider the half plane  $H_{\rho,c}$  defined by

$$H_{\rho,c} := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \rho i + j \geq c\}$$

and observe that, for any  $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$ , there exists a unique  $\tilde{c}$  such that  $\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(T),Q} \subseteq H_{\rho,\tilde{c}}$  and there exists a point in  $\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(T),Q}$  with  $\rho i + v_Q(a_i) = \tilde{c}$ . For a given value of  $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$ , we call the half plane  $H_{\rho,\tilde{c}}$  the best-fitting half plane with respect to  $\rho$  and we define the lower convex hull of  $\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(T),Q}$  as  $\Delta_Q(\varphi(T)) := \cap_{\rho \in \mathbb{Q}} H_{\rho,\tilde{c}}$ .

Then, the boundary of  $\Delta_Q(\varphi(T))$  consists of a finite number of line segments, namely: two vertical ones defined by  $i = m$  and  $i = a$ , where  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is the smallest possible integer such that  $T^a \mid \varphi(T)$ , and finitely many other non-vertical segments.

The Newton arc  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$  of  $\varphi(T)$  with respect to  $Q$  is defined to be the union of the non-vertical segments in the boundary of  $\Delta_Q(\varphi(T))$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_h$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , be the distinct non-vertical line segments in the boundary of  $\Delta_Q(\varphi(T))$ , and denote by  $\rho(\mathcal{L}_i)$  the slope of the segment  $\mathcal{L}_i$ . The Newton arc  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$  of  $\varphi(T)$  with respect to  $Q$  can hence be uniquely described as  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T)) = \cup_{i=1}^h \mathcal{L}_i$ , where the segments  $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_h$  are listed in order of strictly increasing slope, i.e.,  $\rho(\mathcal{L}_1) < \dots < \rho(\mathcal{L}_h)$ .




FIGURE 1. General shape of the Newton arc of a polynomial  $\varphi(T)$  with respect to a place  $Q$  of  $F$ .

Let now  $\mathcal{O}_Q$  be the DVR associated to the place  $Q$ . Then, given any  $\varphi(T) \in F[T]$ , there always exists some element  $f \in F \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $f\varphi(T) \in \mathcal{O}_Q[T]$  and the valuation of at least one coefficient of  $f\varphi(T)$  at  $Q$  is zero. The Newton arc  $\Gamma_Q(f\varphi(T))$  with respect to  $Q$  of the polynomial  $f\varphi(T) \in F[T]$  obtained in this way is then just a vertical translate of  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$ . In particular, the slopes of the segments of  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$  are the same as those of the segments of  $\Gamma_Q(f\varphi(T))$ . Hence, to study the Newton arc of  $\varphi(T)$  with respect to a place  $Q$ , we can always study instead the Newton arc of  $f\varphi(T) \in \mathcal{O}_Q[T]$  with respect to  $Q$ .

We henceforth assume, without loss of generality, that  $\varphi(T) \in \mathcal{O}_Q[T]$ . Note that we can rewrite  $\varphi(T)$  as

$$\varphi(T) = \sum_{i=0}^m c_i t_Q^{\alpha_i} T^i,$$

where  $c_i \in \mathcal{O}_Q^*$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, m$ ,  $t_Q$  is a local parameter at  $Q$  and  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the line segment of  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$  with starting point  $(i, \alpha_i)$  and end point  $(j, \alpha_j)$ . We define the following monic polynomial associated to  $\mathcal{L}$

$$(1) \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(T) := \bar{c}_j^{-1} \sum_{\ell : (\ell, \alpha_{\ell}) \in \mathcal{L}} \bar{c}_{\ell} T^{\ell-i} \in (\mathcal{O}_Q/Q)[T],$$

where  $\bar{c}_{\ell}$  is the the reduction of  $c_{\ell}$  modulo  $Q$ , for all  $\ell = 0, \dots, m$ .

While the polynomial  $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  depends on the choice of the local parameter  $t_Q$ , its degree  $(j-i)$  does not depend on this choice. Moreover, with the notations introduced before, let  $\rho(\mathcal{L})$  denote the slope of the segment  $\mathcal{L}$ . Then we can write uniquely  $\rho(\mathcal{L}) = -a/b$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $b > 0$  and  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ . If  $\mathcal{L}$  has starting point  $(i, \alpha_i)$  and end point  $(j, \alpha_j)$ , we then have that

$$-\frac{a}{b} = \frac{\alpha_{\ell} - \alpha_i}{\ell - i}$$

for all  $\ell$  such that  $(\ell, \alpha_{\ell}) \in \mathcal{L}$ , and since  $\alpha_{\ell} - \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ , we conclude that  $b \mid (\ell - i)$  for all  $\ell$ . This means that  $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  can be written as a polynomial in  $T^b$ , that is,

$$(2) \quad \gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(T) = \delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T^b),$$

where the polynomial  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T) \in (\mathcal{O}_Q/Q)[T]$  is defined by Eq. (2).

Like the polynomial  $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$ , also the polynomial  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  depends on the choice of the local parameter  $t_Q$ . However, it can be shown that the factorization pattern of  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  is actually not affected by the choice of the local parameter, i.e., that the degree, separability and multiplicity of the irreducible factors of  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  do not change, disregarding the choice of the local parameter at  $Q$ . This is of importance for the following result, which we use in Section 4.2.

**Theorem 2.5** ([4]). *Let  $F' := F(s)$  be an extension of  $F$  of degree  $[F' : F] = m$ . Furthermore, let  $Q$  be a place of  $F$  and  $t_Q$  a local parameter at  $Q$ . Let  $\varphi(T) \in F[T]$  be a polynomial of degree  $m$  such that  $\varphi(s) = 0$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a line segment of the Newton arc  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$  of  $\varphi(T)$  with respect to  $Q$ , with slope  $\rho(\mathcal{L}) = -a/b$ , with  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $b > 0$  and  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ . Let  $\delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) \in (\mathcal{O}_Q/Q)[T]$  be an irreducible monic factor of  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  and let  $\psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) \in \mathcal{O}[T]$  be a monic polynomial such that*

$$\bar{\psi}_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) = \delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) \quad \text{and} \quad \deg \psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) = \deg \delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T),$$

*where  $\bar{\psi}_{\mathcal{L},i}(T)$  denotes the polynomial in  $(\mathcal{O}_Q/Q)[T]$  whose coefficients are the reduction modulo  $Q$  of the coefficients of  $\psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(T)$ .*

*Then there exists a place  $P_{\mathcal{L},i}$  of  $F'$  lying over  $Q$  such that  $bv_{P_{\mathcal{L},i}}(s) = ae(P_{\mathcal{L},i} \mid Q)$  and  $\psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(t_Q^{-a}s^b) \in P_{\mathcal{L},i}$ . Here  $e(P_{\mathcal{L},i} \mid Q)$  denotes the ramification index of  $P_{\mathcal{L},i}$  over  $Q$ . Moreover, all places  $P_{\mathcal{L},i}$  obtained in this way are distinct.*

Theorem 2.5 has, as a consequence, the following corollary, which we make use of in the discussion in Section 4.2.

**Corollary 2.6** ([4]). *Let  $F' := F(s)$  be an extension of  $F$  of degree  $[F' : F] = m$ . Furthermore, let  $Q$  be a place of  $F$  and  $t_Q$  a local parameter at  $Q$ . Let  $\varphi(T) \in F[T]$  be a polynomial of degree  $m$  such that  $\varphi(s) = 0$ .*

*If for each edge  $\mathcal{L}$  of the Newton arc  $\Gamma_Q(\varphi(T))$  the polynomial  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  is squarefree as an element of  $(\mathcal{O}_Q/Q)[T]$ , then for each edge  $\mathcal{L}$  and for each irreducible factor  $\delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T)$  of  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}}(T)$  there exists exactly one place  $P_{\mathcal{L},i}$  of  $F'$  lying over  $Q$  such that  $v_{P_{\mathcal{L},i}}(s) + \rho(\mathcal{L})e(P_{\mathcal{L},i} \mid Q) = 0$  and  $\psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(t_Q^{-a}s^b) \in P_{\mathcal{L},i}$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $b > 0$ ,  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$  and  $\rho(\mathcal{L}) = -a/b$ . Here, with notations as in Theorem 2.5,  $\psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) \in \mathcal{O}[T]$  is a monic polynomial such that*

$$\bar{\psi}_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) = \delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) \quad \text{and} \quad \deg \psi_{\mathcal{L},i}(T) = \deg \delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T).$$

*Furthermore, the place  $P_{\mathcal{L},i}$  satisfies*

$$e(P_{\mathcal{L},i} \mid Q) = b \quad \text{and} \quad f(P_{\mathcal{L},i} \mid Q) = \deg \delta_{\mathcal{L},i}(T),$$

where  $e(P_{\mathcal{L},i} | Q)$  denotes the ramification index and  $f(P_{\mathcal{L},i} | Q)$  denotes the relative degree of  $P_{\mathcal{L},i}$  over  $Q$ . All places of  $F'$  lying over  $Q$  are obtained in this way.

**2.4. Fibered surfaces.** In this subsection, we collect some definitions on fibered surfaces that provide the essential background for Section 5.

**Definition 2.7.** *Given a smooth, projective, and algebraic surface  $X$ , a smooth, projective and algebraic curve  $B$ , a proper morphism with connected general fiber  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  is called a fibration. A morphism  $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$  such that  $\pi \circ \sigma = \text{id}_B$ , where  $\text{id}_B$  is the identity morphism on  $B$ , is called a section of the fibration  $\pi$ . The curve  $B$  is called the base of the fibration  $\pi$ .*

**Definition 2.8.** *Given a fibration  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ , a multisection for  $\pi$  is a geometrically integral curve  $C \subseteq X$  such that  $\pi|_C : C \rightarrow B$  is finite of degree at least 2 and flat. The degree of a multisection  $C$  is the degree of the map  $\pi|_C$  above.*

Throughout this subsection, we reserve the letters  $X, B, \pi$  for an algebraic surface, an algebraic curve, and a fibration  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$ , respectively.

**Example 2.9.** *Among the simplest class of fibered surfaces are ruled surfaces. These are equipped with a morphism  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  such that  $\pi^{-1}(t) \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$  for all  $t \in B$ .*

*If, moreover, the base of the fibration  $B \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ , then the surface is rational, i.e., it is birational to  $\mathbb{P}^2$ . These are called Hirzebruch surfaces. There are infinitely many such surfaces, denoted by  $\mathbb{F}_n$ , where  $n$  is the natural number such that there is a unique rational section to the fibration with self-intersection  $-n$ .*

*LRCs on Hirzebruch surfaces were studied in particular in [23, Section V].*

One of the most prominent classes of fibered surfaces are *elliptic surfaces*, i.e., surfaces endowed with a fibration of genus one curves that admits a section. Indeed, such a structure allows for a twofold description of the same object, namely via the fibers of the morphism and as an elliptic curve over the function field of the base of the fibration.

**Definition 2.10.** *A triple  $(X, B, \pi)$  is called an elliptic surface if the following hold:*

- a)  $\pi^{-1}(t)$  is a smooth curve of genus 1, for all but finitely many  $t \in B$ ;
- b) there is a section  $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ ;
- c) there is at least one singular fiber for  $\pi$ .

*The set of sections of  $\pi$  is an abelian group which we denote by  $\text{MW}(X, \pi)$ .*

Note that condition c) implies that ruled surfaces of the type  $E \times B$ , where  $E$  is an elliptic curve, are excluded from our definition of elliptic surface. If  $\pi : X \rightarrow B$  satisfies condition a), but it does not necessarily admit a section, then it is called a *genus 1 fibration*.

**Example 2.11.** *(Elliptic surfaces with a rational base)*

*Let  $(X, \mathbb{P}^1, \pi)$  be an elliptic surface. Then  $X$  admits a model with an equation as follows, which is called a Weierstrass equation:*

$$(3) \quad y^2 + a_1(t, s)xy + a_3(t, s)y = x^3 + a_2(t, s)x^2 + a_4(t, s)x + a_6(t, s)$$

*where  $a_i(t, s)$  are homogeneous polynomials of degrees  $im$ , respectively and such that at least one  $v(a_i(t, s)) < i$  at each place of  $\mathbb{P}^1$ .*

If the characteristic of the field of definition is not 2 nor 3 then we can always transform Eq. (3) in a *short Weierstrass* equation of the form

$$y^2 = x^3 + a(t, s)x + b(t, s),$$

with  $\deg a(t, s) = 4m$ ,  $\deg b(t, s) = 6m$  and such that  $v(a(t, s)) < 4$  or  $v(b(t, s)) < 6$ . Given an elliptic surface with an equation in this form, the finitely many singular fibers lie above  $(t : u) \in \mathbb{P}^1$  such that  $4a(t, u)^3 + 27b(t, u)^2 =: \Delta(t, u) = 0$ .

Among surfaces with fibrations, several admit multiple fibrations. As already mentioned in Section 1, this extra structure is also useful in coding theory when constructing LRCs as AG codes from such surfaces.

**Example 2.12.** *The simplest example of algebraic surface with multiple fibrations is the ruled surface  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ . The two rulings are two evident fibrations on rational curves on the surface. LRCs with availability on  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundles were constructed in [1].*

**Example 2.13.** *The only class of surfaces that are not of product type and admit multiple elliptic fibrations are K3 surfaces, [25, Lemma 12.18.]. For instance, the surface*

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{E}_3 : y^2 = x^3 - x^2(t^4 + 1) + xt^4.$$

*admits two genus 1 fibrations that are evident from the equation above, namely one over the  $t$ -line, which we denote by  $\Pi_t$ , and a second one over the  $x$ -line, which we denote by  $\Pi_x$  (see also Theorem 3.8, where with a slight abuse we use the same notations for  $\Pi_t$  and  $\Pi_x$ ). The former is an elliptic fibration, while the latter is a genus 1 fibration without section and therefore it cannot be put in Weierstrass form over the  $x$ -line.*

### 3. CODE CONSTRUCTION

In this section, we present a construction of LRCs with availability 2 from a family of fibered surfaces. We start by introducing the family of surfaces considered, and by discussing how we choose the set of evaluation points for the codes.

Let  $r \geq 3$  be an odd integer, let  $q$  be a prime power such that  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r+1}$ , and let  $\mathbb{F}_q$  be the finite field with  $q$  elements. Let

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{E}_r : y^2 = x^3 - x^2(t^{r+1} + 1) + xt^{r+1}$$

and

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{M}_r : \begin{cases} y^2 = x^3 - x^2(t^{r+1} + 1) + xt^{r+1} \\ y = x^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 \end{cases}$$

in  $\mathbb{A}_{(x,y)}^2 \times \mathbb{A}_t^1$  over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , where  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . In the following discussion, we consider compactifications  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$  of, respectively,  $\mathcal{E}_r$  and  $\mathcal{M}_r$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{[x:y:z]}^2 \times \mathbb{P}_{[t:w]}^1$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r)$  the ( $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -rational) function field of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$ , which in the affine chart where  $z \neq 0$  and  $w \neq 0$  can be described as  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t/w, x/z)$ .

**Remark 3.1.** *For less cumbersome notations, we henceforth adopt the slightly abusive notation  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r) = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)$ , in the chart  $z \neq 0$  and  $w \neq 0$ , i.e., we simply write  $x$  instead of  $x/z$  and  $t$  instead of  $t/w$ .*

**Remark 3.2.** *The assumption  $r$  odd and  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r+1}$  implies in particular that  $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}) \neq 2$ .*

Our goal is to define an evaluation code on  $\mathcal{E}_r$  with locality  $r$  and availability  $\mathfrak{a} = 2$ , see Theorem 2.1.

Let  $\zeta$  be a primitive  $r+1$ -th root of unity in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . The existence of  $\zeta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  is guaranteed by the assumption  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r+1}$ , which actually ensures that  $\zeta \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . To introduce more convenient notations for the discussion below, we start by rewriting Eq. (6) as follows. Let

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{P}_t(T) := T^{r+1} + 2T^{\frac{r+1}{2}} - T^3 + T^2(t^{r+1} + 1) - Tt^{r+1} + 1 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)[T],$$

then Eq. (6) can be rewritten as

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{M}_r : \begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_t(x) = 0 \\ y = x^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that, for any fixed  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , the polynomial  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T)$  is an element of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[T]$ . Moreover, the polynomial  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ . Indeed, let  $u := -(x^{(r+1)/2} + 1)^2 - x^2 + x^3)/(x(x-1))$ . Note first that the function field extension  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)$ , with defining equation  $t^{r+1} = u$ , is a Kummer extension of

degree  $r + 1$ , which directly follows from the fact that  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r + 1}$  and that in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)$  the valuation of  $u$  at the place  $(x = 0)$  is  $v_{(x=0)}(u) = -1$ . It is then not difficult to see that

$$\deg (t^{r+1})_{\infty}^{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t,x)} = 2(r + 1) + r^2 - 1 = (r + 1)^2.$$

Hence, since  $[\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x) : \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})] = \deg (t^{r+1})_{\infty}^{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t,x)} = (r + 1)^2$  and  $[\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x) : \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)] = r + 1$ , we have that  $[\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x) : \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})] = r + 1$ , which implies in particular that the polynomial  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  defining the extension is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$ . With a similar argument, noting that  $[\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x) : \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)] = \deg (t)_{\infty}^{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t,x)} = r + 1$ , it also follows that  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ . See Fig. 2 for a diagram summarising this discussion.




FIGURE 2. Some subfields of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)$ .

With the notations just introduced above, let now  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$  denote, respectively, the compactification of  $\mathcal{E}_r$  and  $\mathcal{M}_r$  in  $\mathbb{P}_{[x:y:z]}^2 \times \mathbb{P}_{[t:w]}^1$ .

For a point  $P := [\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$  we define two associated subsets of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} H_P &:= \{[\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \zeta^i \bar{t} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}) \mid i = 1, \dots, r\}, \\ V_P &:= \{[x : x^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}) \mid \mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(x) = 0 \wedge x \neq \bar{x}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, we call *nice* a point  $P \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$  satisfying the following condition:

$$(10) \quad |H_P| = |V_P| = r.$$

**Definition 3.3.** A point  $P := [\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$  is said to be *nice* if its associated subsets defined in Eq. (9) satisfy Eq. (10).

As evaluation points of the code, we wish to select a subset of affine  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -rational points of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$  that are *nice*.

Observe that, by Kummer theory, from Eq. (6) it follows immediately that if  $\bar{x} \neq 0, 1$  and  $(\bar{x}^{(r+1)/2} + 1)^2 + \bar{x}^2 - \bar{x}^3 \neq 0$ , then  $|H_P| = r$ . On the other hand, it is less straightforward to understand when  $|V_P| = r$ . Indeed, this is equivalent to studying the problem of whether, given  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , the polynomial

$$\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T) := T^{r+1} + 2T^{\frac{r+1}{2}} - T^3 + T^2(\bar{t}^{r+1} + 1) - T\bar{t}^{r+1} + 1 \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[T]$$

splits into  $r + 1$  distinct linear factors over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . The following lemma gives a sufficient condition on  $m$  to guarantee the existence of at least one  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T)$  splits completely over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ .



**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $q, r, \mathcal{M}_r$  and  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  as defined above. For fixed  $q$  and  $r$ , for any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  such that*

$$(11) \quad \frac{q^m}{m} \geq 2(r+1)!$$

*there exists at least one  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T)$  splits into  $r+1$  distinct factors over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ .*

*Proof.* We start by observing that there exists  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T)$  splits into  $r+1$  distinct factors over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  if and only if the place  $(t^{r+1} = \bar{t}^{r+1})$  of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$  splits completely in the function field extension  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_t(x) = 0$  is the defining equation.

Let  $E$  be the Galois closure of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$ . By the Tchebotarev Density Theorem (see for instance [22, Theorem 9.13B]), for each  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  the cardinality of the set of places of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$  that split completely in  $E$  is  $q^m/(m \cdot |G|) + O(q^{m/2}/m)$ , where  $G$  is the Galois group of  $E/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$ . As  $|G| \leq (r+1)!$ , if  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  is such that  $q^m/m \geq 2(r+1)!$  then there is at least one place different that the pole of  $t$  completely splitting in  $E/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$ , since

$$\frac{q^m}{m \cdot |G|} \geq \frac{q^m}{m \cdot (r+1)!} \geq 2.$$

To conclude the proof it is now sufficient to note that any place of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$  which splits completely in  $E/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$  must also split completely in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t^{r+1})$ .  $\square$

Henceforth, we call *nice* any  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  for which  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T)$  splits completely into distinct factors over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ .

**Definition 3.5.** *An element  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  is said to be nice if the polynomial  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T)$  (see Eq. (7)) splits completely into distinct factors over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ .*

**Remark 3.6.** *Theorem 3.4 shows that it is always possible, for any fixed  $q$  and  $r$ , to choose a field of definition  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  of  $\mathcal{E}_r$  and  $\mathcal{M}_r$  such that there exists at least one nice  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . However, from the lemma it is not a priori clear how large the smallest  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  satisfying Eq. (11) is. Observe that, for any  $r$ , when  $q \geq 2(r+1)!$  then  $m = 1$ . Furthermore, since we are assuming  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r+1}$ , in particular we have  $q \geq r+2$ , which directly implies  $q^a \geq (r+2)^a$ , for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . We can use this to estimate, for any  $q$  and  $r$ , a range of possible values for  $m$ , by computing the smallest  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $(r+2)^a \geq 2(r+1)! \cdot a$ .*

*For example, if  $r = 3$ , then  $q \geq 5$  and it can be directly checked that  $5^3 < 2 \cdot 4! \cdot 3$ , while  $5^4 \geq 2 \cdot 4! \cdot 4$ . Hence, the smallest  $m$  that satisfies Eq. (11) for all  $q$  is at most  $m = r+1 = 4$ . Moreover, when  $q \geq 2 \cdot 4! = 48$ , then we have that the smallest  $m$  that works is  $m = 1$ .*

*Similarly, if  $r = 5$ , then  $q \geq 7$  and  $7^4 < 2 \cdot 6! \cdot 4$ , while  $7^5 \geq 2 \cdot 6! \cdot 5$ , hence the smallest  $m$  that works for any  $q$  and  $r = 5$  is at most  $m = r = 5$ .*

*In general, for  $r \geq 7$ , we have as above that  $q \geq r+2$  for any admissible  $q$ , which implies in particular  $q^{r-1} \geq (r+2)^{r-1}$ , and it holds*

$$(12) \quad (r+2)^{r-1} \geq 2(r+1)! \cdot (r-1),$$

*that is,  $r-1$  is an upper bound for  $m$ . To see why Eq. (12) holds, it is sufficient to directly check that it is true for  $r = 7$  and then to note that, for  $r \geq 7$ , both  $(r+2)^{r-1}$  and  $2(r+1)! \cdot (r-1)$  are strictly increasing functions of  $r$ , and  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (r+2)^{r-1}/(2(r+1)! \cdot (r-1)) = \infty$ . This yields that, for any  $q$ , the smallest  $m$  that works for  $r \geq 7$  is  $m \leq r-1$ . Note that, as  $r$  increases, the upper bound for  $m$  increases as well. Indeed, for  $r$  fixed, the real-variable function*

$$R_r(x) = (r+2)^x - 2(r+1)! \cdot x$$

*has a global minimum at  $x_0^r := \log 2(r+1)!/\log(r+2)$ , where  $R_r(x_0^r) < 0$ , and is then strictly increasing for  $x > x_0^r$ , with  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} R_r(x) = \infty$ , which means  $R_r(x)$  has exactly one root  $\tilde{x}^r > x_0^r$ . So the upper bound for  $m$ , for  $r$  fixed, is given by  $m \leq \tilde{x}^r$ . Since, for  $r_2 > r_1$ , we have that  $\log 2(r_2+1)!/\log(r_2+2) > \log 2(r_1+1)!/\log(r_1+2)$ , this means that  $x_0^{r_2} > x_0^{r_1}$ , and hence  $\tilde{x}^{r_2} > \tilde{x}^{r_1}$ .*

Nice elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  (see Theorem 3.5) and nice points in  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$  (see Theorem 3.3) are closely related.

Indeed, note first that the existence of a nice  $\bar{t}$  directly implies the existence of  $r+1$  nice elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , namely  $\bar{t}, \zeta\bar{t}, \dots, \zeta^r\bar{t}$ , since  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T) \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\zeta^i\bar{t}}(T)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . This means that the existence of a nice  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  ensures the existence of  $(r+1)^2$  nice points  $P$  of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$ . Indeed, any nice  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  directly yields  $r+1$  nice points  $P_i := [\bar{x}_i : \bar{x}_i^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r+1$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(\bar{x}_i) = 0$ . Since, for any  $i$ ,  $V_{P_i} = \bigcup_{j \neq i} \{P_j\}$ , it is immediate to see that  $|V_{P_i}| = r$  for all  $i$ . On the other hand, for any  $i = 1, \dots, r+1$ , each point in the set  $H_{P_i}$ , is also a nice point since  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T) \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\zeta^i\bar{t}}(T)$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . This means that, for any nice  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , we have the following set of  $(r+1)^2$  nice points of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ :

$$(13) \quad S_{\bar{t}} := \{[x : x^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \zeta^j\bar{t} : 1] \mid j = 0, \dots, r, \mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(x) = 0\}.$$

Henceforth, we denote by

$$(14) \quad \mathcal{G}_m := \left\{ \bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m} \mid \mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(T) = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ \forall i \neq j, \alpha_i \neq \alpha_j}}^{r+1} (T - \alpha_i) \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^m},$$

i.e., the subset of elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  which are nice. Note that  $|\mathcal{G}_m| = (r+1)M$ , for some  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , since if  $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  is nice then also  $\zeta^j\bar{t} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  is nice, for all  $j = 1, \dots, r$ . This means that  $\mathcal{G}_m$  can be partitioned into  $M$  many subsets

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_m &= \bigcup_{\ell=1}^M \mathcal{G}_m^{(\ell)} \\ &= \bigcup_{\ell=1}^M \{\zeta^j\bar{t}^{(\ell)} \mid j = 1, \dots, r+1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where there exists  $j \in \{1, \dots, r+1\}$  with  $\bar{t}^{(\ell)} = \zeta^j\bar{t}^{(k)}$  if and only if  $\ell = k$ .

**Definition 3.7.** Let  $q$  and  $r$  be as above, and let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  be a positive integer satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. Let  $\mathcal{E}_r$  and  $\mathcal{M}_r$  be defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , and choose subsets  $\mathcal{G}_m^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_m^{(b)}$  of  $\mathcal{G}_m$ , where  $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $1 \leq b \leq M$ . Let  $B := \bigcup_{\ell=1}^b \mathcal{G}_m^{(\ell)}$ .

We define the set

$$\begin{aligned} S_B &:= \bigcup_{\bar{t} \in B} S_{\bar{t}} \\ &= \{P_{i,j}^{(\ell)} := [\bar{x}_i^{(\ell)} : (\bar{x}_i^{(\ell)})^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t}_j^{(\ell)} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m}) \mid \ell = 1, \dots, b, i = 1, \dots, r+1, j = 1, \dots, r+1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where, for  $\ell$  fixed,  $\bar{t}_j^{(\ell)} := \zeta^j\bar{t}^{(\ell)}$ . Then we have that  $|S_B| = b(r+1)^2$ .

With these notations in place, we can conveniently redefine for any point  $P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})} \in S_B$  the subsets introduced in Eq. (9) as

$$(16) \quad H_i^{(\bar{\ell})} := \{P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})} \mid j = 1, \dots, r+1 \wedge j \neq \bar{j}\}$$

and

$$(17) \quad V_{\bar{j}}^{(\bar{\ell})} := \{P_{i,\bar{j}}^{(\bar{\ell})} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1 \wedge i \neq \bar{i}\}.$$

**Remark 3.8.** There are multiple ways to interpret the nice points in  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ . Indeed, on the one hand, nice points correspond exactly to rational places of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)$  that lie over a completely splitting place both in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$  and  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)$ . The function field extensions  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$  and  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)$

can be seen as obtained from the pullback of rational maps  $\pi_t : \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{[t:w]}^1$  and  $\pi_x : \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{[x:z]}^1$ , respectively, where  $\pi_t : [\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \longmapsto \bar{t}$  is the projection onto the  $t$ -coordinate and  $\pi_x : [\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \longmapsto \bar{x}$  is the projection onto the  $x$ -coordinate. In this setting, given a nice point  $P := [\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \bar{t} : 1] \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ , we hence have that  $H_P = \pi_x^{-1}([\bar{x} : 1]) \setminus \{P\}$  and  $V_P = \pi_t^{-1}([\bar{t} : 1]) \setminus \{P\}$ . Moreover, the set  $\mathcal{G}_m$  corresponds to the set of affine points of  $\mathbb{P}_{[t:w]}^1$  whose preimage under  $\pi_t$  consists of exactly  $r+1$   $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -rational points of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$ .

On the other hand, one can consider the two fibrations

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_t : \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r &\longrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{[t:w]}^1, \\ \Pi_x : \bar{\mathcal{E}}_r &\longrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{[x:z]}^1, \end{aligned}$$

where, similarly as above,  $\Pi_t, \Pi_x$  are the projection onto the  $t$ -coordinate, resp. the  $x$ -coordinate. Observe that such maps are in fact proper morphisms with connected general fiber. Given a nice point  $P \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ , note that it can be also regarded as a point of  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_r(\mathbb{F}_{q^m})$ . This inspires the notation for the sets  $H_P$  and  $V_P$  introduced in Eq. (9) (see also Eq. (16) and Eq. (17)). We call the fibration  $\Pi_t$  vertical and the fibration  $\Pi_x$  horizontal, hence since  $H_P = \Pi_x^{-1}([\bar{x} : 1]) \setminus \{P\}$  and  $V_P = \Pi_t^{-1}([\bar{t} : 1]) \setminus \{P\}$ , in what follows we refer to  $H_P$  as the horizontal set associated to  $P$  and as  $V_P$  as the vertical set associated to  $P$ .

In our code construction, this terminology comes in handy to convey the intuition behind the recovery procedure outlined in Theorem 4.2. See Fig. 3 for a visual intuition of a set  $S_{\bar{t}}$  of points as in Eq. (13).

Note that, with slight abuse of notation, in the following sections we simply write  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t})$  (resp.  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})$ ) for the fiber over the point  $[\bar{t} : 1]$  (resp.  $[\bar{x} : 1]$ ), and we refer to  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t})$  as a vertical (resp.  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})$  as a horizontal) fiber.

**Definition 3.9.** Let  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$  odd and  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r+1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}_r$  as in Eq. (5) and  $\mathcal{M}_r$  as in Eq. (6) be defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , where  $m$  is a positive integer satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. Let  $\mathcal{G}_m$  as in Eq. (14) and choose subsets  $\mathcal{G}_m^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_m^{(b)}$  of  $\mathcal{G}_m$ , where  $|\mathcal{G}_m| = (r+1)M$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $1 \leq b \leq M$ . Let  $B := \cup_{\ell=1}^b \mathcal{G}_m^{(\ell)}$  and  $S_B$  as in Theorem 3.7.

Furthermore, consider the  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -vector space

$$(18) \quad L := \langle x^i t^j, x^{r-1} t^h \mid i = 1, \dots, r-2, j = 0, \dots, r-1, h = 0, \dots, r-2 \rangle,$$

and the linear evaluation map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_{S_B} : L &\longrightarrow (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^n \\ f &\longmapsto \left( f(P_{1,1}^{(1)}), \dots, f(P_{r+1,r+1}^{(b)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For more compact notations, we also write  $\text{ev}_{S_B}(f) = \left( f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,r+1}^{\ell=1,\dots,b}$ . We define an AG code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  of length  $n := |S_B| = b(r+1)^2$  on  $\mathcal{E}_r$  as the image of  $\text{ev}_{S_B}$ , that is,

$$(19) \quad \mathfrak{C}(B, L) := \left\{ \left( f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,r+1}^{\ell=1,\dots,b} \mid f \in L \right\}.$$

**Remark 3.10.** The elements in the vector space  $L$  defined in Eq. (18) are polynomials in  $x$  and  $t$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  and such that, for any  $f \in L \setminus \{0\}$ , both  $\deg_x f \leq r-1$  and  $\deg_t f \leq r-1$ . More precisely, any element  $f(x, t) \in L$  can be written as

$$f(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} a_{ij} x^i t^j + x^{r-1} \sum_{h=0}^{r-2} b_h t^h,$$

$a_{ij}, b_h \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . Moreover, from Eq. (18), it is also clear that the dimension of  $L$  as an  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -vector space is  $(r-2)r + (r-1) = r(r-1) - 1$ .




FIGURE 3. Visual intuition behind the code construction: the picture gives an idea of how to visualise the set  $S_{\bar{t}}$  of  $(r+1)^2$  nice points obtained from a nice  $\bar{t}$ . Each point lies on exactly one vertical fiber  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\zeta^j \bar{t})$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, r$ , and on exactly one horizontal fiber  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})$ , where  $\bar{x}$  is one of the distinct  $r+1$  solutions of  $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(x) = 0$ . In the picture, the vertical fibers are depicted in red, the horizontal ones in blue and the curve  $\mathcal{M}_r$  as the dotted curve in black. With notations as in Theorem 3.7, each point  $P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})}$  is marked with two colours, that help visualising its two corresponding sets  $H_i^{(\bar{\ell})}$  and  $V_j^{(\bar{\ell})}$ . Indeed, for any point  $P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})}$ , the remaining points with the same contour colour are those in the set  $V_j^{(\bar{\ell})}$ , while the remaining points with the same filling colour are those in the set  $H_i^{(\bar{\ell})}$ . Note that the intersection of each vertical and horizontal fiber consists only of 2 points. This is represented in the picture by leaving some white space around the third point where, in the two-dimensional drawing, each vertical and each horizontal fiber appear to be overlapping.

**Remark 3.11.** Theorem 3.6 gives upper bounds for the smallest  $m$  satisfying Eq. (11). While Eq. (11) gives a lower bound on the number of subsets  $M$  of  $\mathcal{G}_m$ , to theoretically guarantee that a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  has a certain length it might be necessary to choose larger values of  $m$ . Indeed, from Theorem 3.4, it follows in particular that the larger the value of  $m$ , the larger the lower bound for the number  $M$  of sets of nice elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , see Eq. (14) and Eq. (15). More precisely, from Eq. (11) it follows that  $M \geq \lfloor q^m / (m(r+1)!) \rfloor - 1$ . This means that, for instance, to obtain a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  of length at least  $2(r+1)^2$  it is sufficient to choose the smallest  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  such that  $\lfloor q^m / (m(r+1)!) \rfloor - 1 \geq 2$ .

We now investigate the dimension, minimum distance, locality and availability of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ .

## 4. PARAMETERS OF THE CODES

In this section, we investigate the dimension, minimum distance, locality and availability of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  as in Theorem 3.9. Throughout the section, for less cumbersome notations, we simply denote the set of evaluation points  $S_B$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  by  $S$ .

**4.1. Dimension, locality and availability.** We start by computing the dimension of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *A code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  defined in Theorem 3.9 has dimension  $k = r(r-1) - 1$ .*

*Proof.* To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that the map  $\text{ev}_S$  is injective, so that  $k := \dim \mathfrak{C} = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}} L$ , since, as observed in Theorem 3.10,  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_{q^m}} L = r(r-1) - 1$ .

We start by noting that any element  $f \in L$  can be written as  $f = \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} a_s(t)x^s$ , where  $a_s(t) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[t]$  is a polynomial of degree  $\deg a_s(t) \leq r-1$  for all  $s = 1, \dots, r-1$ . Let now  $f = \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} a_s(t)x^s \in \ker(\text{ev}_S)$ , and observe that  $\text{ev}_S(f) = (0, \dots, 0)$  implies in particular that, for any  $\ell = 1, \dots, b$  and any  $j = 1, \dots, r+1$ ,  $\text{ev}_S|_{V_j^{(\ell)}}(f) = (0, \dots, 0)$ . Now, by assumption,  $f(x, \bar{t}_j^{(\ell)})$  is a univariate polynomial of degree at most  $r-1$  having  $r+1$  distinct zeros, namely  $\bar{x}_i^{(\ell)}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, r+1$ . This implies that  $a_s(\bar{t}_j^{(\ell)}) = 0$  for all  $s = 1, \dots, r-1$ . Since, for all  $s = 1, \dots, r-1$  this happens for all  $j = 1, \dots, r+1$ , this implies in particular that  $a_s(t) \equiv 0$  as a polynomial in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[t]$ , for all  $s = 1, \dots, r-1$ . This shows that  $f = \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} a_s(t)x^s \equiv 0$  as a polynomial in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x, t]$ , and hence the evaluation map  $\text{ev}_S$  is injective. The dimension  $k$  of the code is therefore equal to the dimension of  $L$  as a vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , that is  $k = r(r-1) - 1$ .  $\square$

The following lemma, concerning the locality and availability of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ , is inspired by (and can be seen as the natural counterpart of) [1, Lemma 3.4].

**Lemma 4.2.** *A code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  as in Theorem 3.9 has locality  $r$  and availability 2. More precisely, for any  $f \in L \setminus \{0\}$ , each symbol  $f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})})$  of the codeword  $\mathfrak{c} := \left(f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)})\right)_{i,j=1,\dots,r+1}^{\ell=1,\dots,b}$  has two distinct recovery sets, namely*

$$\begin{aligned} f(H_i^{(\bar{\ell})}) &:= \left\{ f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})}) \mid j = 1, \dots, r+1 \wedge j \neq \bar{j} \right\}, \\ f(V_j^{(\bar{\ell})}) &:= \left\{ f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})}) \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1 \wedge i \neq \bar{i} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to  $f(H_i^{(\bar{\ell})})$  (resp.  $f(V_j^{(\bar{\ell})})$ ) as a horizontal (resp. vertical) recovery set for  $f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})})$  (see Eq. (16) and Eq. (17)).

*Proof.* Consider  $f = \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} a_s(t)x^s \in L \setminus \{0\}$ , where  $a_s(t) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[t]$  is a polynomial of degree  $\deg a_s(t) \leq r-1$  for all  $s = 1, \dots, r-1$ , and the codeword  $\mathfrak{c}$  obtained by evaluating  $f$  at the points in  $S$ , that is,

$$\mathfrak{c} := \left(f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)})\right)_{i,j=1,\dots,r+1}^{\ell=1,\dots,b}.$$

If  $\mathfrak{c}$  has a missing symbol, which without loss of generality we can assume to be  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$ , then we proceed as follows.

Suppose first that we wish to recover  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  using the vertical recovery set  $f(V_1^{(1)})$ . Since the points in  $V_1^{(1)}$  all lie on the same vertical fiber  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$ , for less cumbersome notations, throughout the rest of the first part of the proof we simply write  $t = \bar{t}_1^{(1)}$  and  $x_i = \bar{x}_i^{(1)}$ . Then, to recover  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  from the values  $f(P_{i,1}^{(1)})$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, r+1$ , (that is, from the values in  $f(V_1^{(1)})$ ) and from the coordinates of the points in  $V_1^{(1)}$ ,

we consider the matrices

$$\mathfrak{X} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & x_1^2 & \dots & x_1^{r-1} \\ 1 & x_2 & x_2^2 & \dots & x_2^{r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_r & x_r^2 & \dots & x_r^{r-1} \\ 1 & x_{r+1} & x_{r+1}^2 & \dots & x_{r+1}^{r-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ a_{r-1}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_v := \begin{pmatrix} f(P_{1,1}^{(1)}) \\ f(P_{2,1}^{(1)}) \\ \vdots \\ f(P_{r+1,1}^{(1)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathfrak{X}} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_2 & x_2^2 & \dots & x_2^{r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_r & x_r^2 & \dots & x_r^{r-1} \\ 1 & x_{r+1} & x_{r+1}^2 & \dots & x_{r+1}^{r-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{F}_v := \begin{pmatrix} f(P_{2,1}^{(1)}) \\ \vdots \\ f(P_{r+1,1}^{(1)}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\hat{\mathfrak{X}}$  is the matrix obtained from  $\mathfrak{X}$  by deleting the first row and, similarly,  $\hat{F}_v$  is obtained from  $F$  by deleting its first row. With these notations, observe that  $ev_S|_{V_1^{(1)}}(f) = F_v^T = (\mathfrak{X}A)^T$ . Moreover, the matrix  $\hat{\mathfrak{X}}$  is a Vandermonde matrix of size  $r \times r$ , with determinant  $\det(\hat{\mathfrak{X}}) = \prod_{2 \leq i < j \leq r+1} (x_i - x_j)$ . Since, by construction, all the points in  $S$  having the same  $t$ -coordinate, i.e. lying on the same vertical fiber  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$ , have distinct  $x$ -coordinates (i.e. they lie on distinct horizontal fibers), it follows that  $\det(\hat{\mathfrak{X}}) \neq 0$ . Hence, since the matrix  $\hat{\mathfrak{X}}$  is invertible, from  $\hat{F}_v = \hat{\mathfrak{X}}A$  we can compute  $A$  as  $A = \hat{\mathfrak{X}}^{-1}\hat{F}_v$ . In this way, we can now compute the missing symbol  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  as

$$f(P_{1,1}^{(1)}) = \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} a_s(t)x_1^s.$$

Suppose now that we wish to recover  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  using instead the horizontal recovery set  $f(H_1^{(1)})$ . We start by observing that the function  $f = \sum_{s=1}^{r-1} a_s(t)x^s$  can be rewritten as  $f = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} d_s(x)t^s$ , for  $d_s(x) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x]$  with  $\deg d_s(x) \leq r-1$ . Now, similarly to the notations set above, since the points in  $H_1^{(1)}$  all lie on the same horizontal fiber  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x}_1^{(1)})$ , for less cumbersome notations we simply write  $x = \bar{x}_1^{(1)}$  and  $t_j = \bar{t}_j^{(1)}$ . We then proceed in a similar spirit as before, considering the following matrices:

$$\mathfrak{T} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t_1 & t_1^2 & \dots & t_1^{r-1} \\ 1 & t_2 & t_2^2 & \dots & t_2^{r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & t_r & t_r^2 & \dots & t_r^{r-1} \\ 1 & t_{r+1} & t_{r+1}^2 & \dots & t_{r+1}^{r-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad D := \begin{pmatrix} d_0(x) \\ d_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ d_{r-1}(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad F_h := \begin{pmatrix} f(P_{1,1}^{(1)}) \\ f(P_{1,2}^{(1)}) \\ \vdots \\ f(P_{1,r+1}^{(1)}) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathfrak{T}} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & t_2 & t_2^2 & \dots & t_2^{r-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & t_r & t_r^2 & \dots & t_r^{r-1} \\ 1 & t_{r+1} & t_{r+1}^2 & \dots & t_{r+1}^{r-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{F}_h := \begin{pmatrix} f(P_{1,2}^{(1)}) \\ \vdots \\ f(P_{1,r+1}^{(1)}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

As above, we note that  $ev_S|_{H_1^{(1)}}(f) = F_h^T = (TD)^T$ . Moreover, the matrix  $\hat{\mathfrak{T}}$  is a Vandermonde matrix of size  $r \times r$ , with determinant  $\det(\hat{\mathfrak{T}}) = \prod_{2 \leq i < j \leq r+1} (t_i - t_j)$ . Since, by construction, all the points in  $S$  having the same  $x$ -coordinate, i.e. lying on the same horizontal fiber  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x}_1^{(1)})$ , have distinct  $t$ -coordinates (i.e. they lie on distinct vertical fibers), it follows that  $\det(\hat{\mathfrak{T}}) \neq 0$ . Hence, since the matrix  $\hat{\mathfrak{T}}$  is invertible, from

$\hat{F}_h = \hat{\mathfrak{T}}D$  we can compute  $D$  as  $D = \hat{\mathfrak{T}}^{-1}\hat{F}_h$ . In this way, we can now compute the missing symbol  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  as

$$f(P_{1,1}^{(1)}) = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} d_s(x)t_1^s.$$

□

**4.2. Estimates on the minimum distance.** In this subsection, after discussing a general known upper bound for the minimum distance of the codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ , we derive a lower bound for the minimum distance of these codes, which is computed by studying the valuation of the functions in  $L$  at certain places of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r)$ .

From [31, Eq. (16)], we have the following Singleton-type upper bound for the minimum distance  $d$  of an LRC with length  $n$ , dimension  $k$ , locality  $r$  and availability 2:

$$(20) \quad d \leq n - \left( k - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{r} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{r^2} \right\rfloor \right).$$

For a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ , which has length  $n = b(r+1)^2$  (see Theorem 3.9) and dimension  $k = r(r-1) - 1$  by Theorem 4.1, this bound reads as

$$d \leq b(r+1)^2 - \left( r^2 - r - 2 + \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-2}{r} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-2}{r^2} \right\rfloor \right),$$

hence noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-2}{r} \right\rfloor &= \left\lfloor \frac{(r(r-1)-2)+1}{r} \right\rfloor - 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-1}{r} \right\rfloor = r-2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-2}{r^2} \right\rfloor &= \left\lfloor \frac{(r(r-1)-2)+1}{r^2} \right\rfloor - 1 \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-1}{r^2} \right\rfloor = 0, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d &\leq b(r+1)^2 - \left( r^2 - r - 2 + \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-2}{r} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{r(r-1)-2}{r^2} \right\rfloor \right) \\ &= b(r+1)^2 - (r^2 - r - 2 + r - 2) \\ &= b(r+1)^2 - (r^2 - 4). \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the rest of this section, we investigate a lower bound for  $d$ . The underlying idea is to look at the valuations of the functions in  $L$  at places of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r)$  corresponding to points of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$  that are not evaluation points of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ . More precisely, we study the valuations of the elements of  $L$  at the places of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r)$  lying over the pole of  $t$ . In Theorem 4.9, we find a lower bound on  $d$  that turns out to be sharp when  $r = 3$ , except when  $b = 1$ . However, when  $b = 1$ , we are able to actually compute the minimum distance in all cases, see Theorem 4.10. Explicit examples for  $r = 3$  are collected in Table 1.

We start by studying the splitting behaviour of  $(t = \infty)$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x, t)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ . To this aim, we determine the Newton arc of  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  with respect to  $(t = \infty)$ .

From observations in Section 3, we already know that  $[\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x) : \mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)] = r+1$  and that the extension  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x, t)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$  is defined by  $\mathcal{P}_t(x) = 0$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  (see Eq. (7)) is an irreducible polynomial of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)[T]$ .

Let now  $\mathcal{O}_{(t=\infty)}$  be the DVR associated to the place  $(t = \infty)$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$  and consider

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T) := \frac{1}{t^{r+1}} \mathcal{P}_t(T) = \frac{1}{t^{r+1}} T^{r+1} + \frac{2}{t^{r+1}} T^{\frac{r+1}{2}} - \frac{1}{t^{r+1}} T^3 + \frac{t^{r+1} + 1}{t^{r+1}} T^2 - T + \frac{1}{t^{r+1}} \in \mathcal{O}_{(t=\infty)}[T].$$

Modulo a vertical translation, the Newton arc of  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  with respect to  $(t = \infty)$  coincides with that of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)$ , meaning that the slopes of the segments that form the two arcs are the same (see Section 2.3). Therefore, determining the Newton arc of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)$  also yields the Newton arc of  $\mathcal{P}_t(T)$  and is enough to deduce the splitting behaviour of  $(t = \infty)$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *For any  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$ , the Newton arc of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)$  with respect to  $(t = \infty)$  consists of three line segments  $\mathcal{L}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_3$  with slopes  $\rho(\mathcal{L}_1) = -(r+1)/1$ ,  $\rho(\mathcal{L}_2) = -0/1$  and  $\rho(\mathcal{L}_3) = ((r+1)/2)/((r-1)/2)$ . Furthermore, each segment has the following associated polynomials:*

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathcal{L}_1}(T) &= -T + 1, & \delta_{\mathcal{L}_1}(T) &= T - 1, \\ \gamma_{\mathcal{L}_2}(T) &= -T + 1, & \delta_{\mathcal{L}_2}(T) &= T - 1, \\ \gamma_{\mathcal{L}_3}(T) &= T^{(r+1)-2} + 1 = T^{r-1} + 1 = (T^{(r-1)/2})^2 + 1, & \delta_{\mathcal{L}_3}(T) &= T^2 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The lemma follows simply by observing that the support set (see Theorem 2.3)  $\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)}$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)$  at  $(t = \infty)$  is, for  $r \geq 5$ ,

$$\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)} = \{(0, r+1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (3, r+1), ((r+1)/2, r+1), (r+1, r+1)\},$$

while for  $r = 3$  is

$$\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)} = \{(0, r+1), (1, 0), (2, 0), (3, r+1), (r+1, r+1)\}.$$

In both cases, the shape of the Newton arc is hence the same. Note that the way in which we write the slopes in the statement is instrumental to make explicit their expression as fractions  $-a/b$ , where  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $b > 0$ ,  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ , so that for all  $i = 1, 2, 3$  it is immediate to obtain the polynomials  $\gamma_{\mathcal{L}_i}(T)$  and  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}_i}(T)$ , as defined in Section 2.3.  $\square$




FIGURE 4. Newton arc of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t(T)$  with respect to  $(t = \infty)$ .



By Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6, there are only two possibilities for the splitting behaviour of  $(t = \infty)$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ , which are described in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let notations be as in Theorem 4.3. Then:*



- (1) If  $-1$  is a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , the place  $(t = \infty)$  has four places lying over it in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ , namely two places  $P_1, P_2$  with  $e(P_i|(t = \infty)) = 1$  and  $f(P_i|(t = \infty)) = 1$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , and two places  $P_3, P_4$  with  $e(P_i|(t = \infty)) = (r-1)/2$  and  $f(P_i|(t = \infty)) = 1$ , for  $i = 3, 4$ .
- (2) If  $-1$  is not a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , the place  $(t = \infty)$  has three places lying over it in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$ , namely two places  $P_1, P_2$  with  $e(P_i|(t = \infty)) = 1$  and  $f(P_i|(t = \infty)) = 1$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , and one place  $P_3$  with  $e(P_3|(t = \infty)) = (r-1)/2$  and  $f(P_3|(t = \infty)) = 2$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows directly from Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 2.6, simply by observing that if  $-1$  is a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  then the polynomial  $\delta_{\mathcal{L}_3}(T) = T^2 + 1$  splits over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , while it is irreducible in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  if  $-1$  is not a square. In case (1), the place  $P_1$  corresponds to the line segment  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , the place  $P_2$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $P_3, P_4$  correspond to  $\mathcal{L}_3$ . In case (2), similarly, the place  $P_1$  corresponds to the line segment  $\mathcal{L}_1$ , the place  $P_2$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $P_3$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_3$ .  $\square$


 FIGURE 5. Splitting of  $(t = \infty)$  in case (1) of Theorem 4.4

 FIGURE 6. Splitting of  $(t = \infty)$  in case (2) of Theorem 4.4

**Remark 4.5.** By the law of quadratic reciprocity,  $-1$  is a square modulo  $q^m$  if and only if  $q^m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . If  $r = 3$ , since we are assuming  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{r+1}$ , we are hence always in case (1) of Theorem 4.4.

We now compute the valuations of the generators of the vector space  $L$  (see Theorem 3.9) at the places of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)$  lying over  $(t = \infty)$ , both in cases (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.4. Observe that, to this aim, it is enough to compute the valuation of  $x$  at  $P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4$  (resp.  $P_1, P_2, P_3$ ), since each generator of  $L$  is a monomial involving powers of  $x$  and  $t$ , and we already know the valuation of  $t$  at  $P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4$  (resp.  $P_1, P_2, P_3$ ) from Theorem 4.4.

**Lemma 4.6.** Let notations be as in Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.4. Moreover, as before let  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r)$  be the function field of  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$ , described as  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)$  in Theorem 3.1.

(1) Suppose that  $-1$  is a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . Then

$$(22) \quad v_{P_1}(x) = r+1, \quad v_{P_2}(x) = 0, \quad v_{P_3}(x) = v_{P_4}(x) = -\frac{r+1}{2}.$$

(2) Suppose that  $-1$  is not a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . Then

$$(23) \quad v_{P_1}(x) = r+1, \quad v_{P_2}(x) = 0, \quad v_{P_3}(x) = -\frac{r+1}{2}.$$

*Proof.* Both Eq. (22) and Eq. (23) follow directly from Theorem 2.5, Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 4.3.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** By Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 4.4, we can determine the valuation at  $P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4$  (resp.  $P_1, P_2, P_3$ ) of all the generators of  $L$ . In case (1) of Theorem 4.4, we have

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{P_1}(x^i t^j) &= (r+1)i - j, \\ v_{P_2}(x^i t^j) &= -j, \\ v_{P_3}(x^i t^j) &= v_{P_4}(x^i t^j) = -\frac{r+1}{2}i - \frac{r-1}{2}j, \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r-2$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, r-1$ , while

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{P_1}(x^{r-1} t^h) &= (r+1)(r-1) - h, \\ v_{P_2}(x^{r-1} t^h) &= -h, \\ v_{P_3}(x^{r-1} t^h) &= v_{P_4}(x^{r-1} t^h) = -\frac{r^2-1}{2} - \frac{r-1}{2}h, \end{aligned}$$

for  $h = 0, \dots, r-2$ , and, similarly, in case (2) of Theorem 4.4 we have

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{P_1}(x^i t^j) &= (r+1)i - j, \\ v_{P_2}(x^i t^j) &= -j, \\ v_{P_3}(x^i t^j) &= -\frac{r+1}{2}i - \frac{r-1}{2}j, \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r-2$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, r-1$ , while

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{P_1}(x^{r-1} t^h) &= (r+1)(r-1) - h, \\ v_{P_2}(x^{r-1} t^h) &= -h, \\ v_{P_3}(x^{r-1} t^h) &= -\frac{(r-1)^2}{2} - \frac{r-1}{2}h, \end{aligned}$$

for  $h = 0, \dots, r-2$ .

From Eq. (24), Eq. (25), Eq. (26) and Eq. (27), it follows that, both in case (1) and (2) of Theorem 4.4, the place  $P_1$  is a common zero of all the generators of  $L$ , and hence it is a common zero of all the functions in  $L$ . More precisely, we have that

$$(28) \quad \min_{f \in L \setminus \{0\}} \{v_{P_1}(f)\} = (r+1) - (r-1) = 2.$$

On the other hand, observe that the valuations of the generators of  $L$  at all the other places  $P_2, P_3, P_4$  (resp.  $P_2, P_3$ ) are negative.

**Remark 4.8.** As observed in the beginning of Section 3,  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t, x)/\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(x)$  is a Kummer extension of degree  $r+1$ . By Theorem 4.6, if  $-1$  is a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  then

$$(29) \quad (x) = (r+1)P_1 - \frac{r+1}{2}P_3 - \frac{r+1}{2}P_4,$$

while, if  $-1$  is not a square in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  then

$$(30) \quad (x) = (r+1)P_1 - \frac{r+1}{2}P_3.$$

From this and Theorem 4.7, we can compute the maximum possible order of vanishing of a function in  $L$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\mathcal{M}_r)$ . Indeed, this is exactly the maximum of the degrees of the pole divisors of the monomials generating

*L. We have*

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg (x^i t^j)_\infty &= i(r+1) + jr, \\ \deg (x^{r-1} t^h)_\infty &= (r-1)(r+1) + hr, \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r-2$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, r-1$ ,  $h = 0, \dots, r-2$ , and hence

$$(32) \quad \max_{f \in L \setminus \{0\}} \{\deg (f)_\infty\} = \deg (x^{r-1} t^{r-2})_\infty = 2r^2 - 2r - 1.$$

By Theorem 4.7 and Theorem 4.8, the following lower bound for the minimum distance  $d$  of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  holds.

**Proposition 4.9.** *Let  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  be an  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -linear code of length  $n = b(r+1)^2$  as in Theorem 3.9, where  $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . The following lower bound for the minimum distance  $d$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  holds:*

$$(33) \quad d \geq n - (2r^2 - 2r - 1 - 2) = n - (2r^2 - 2r - 3) = r^2(b-2) + r(2b+2) + b + 3.$$

*Proof.* By construction, the minimum weight  $w_H(\mathbf{c}_f)$  of the codeword  $\mathbf{c}_f \in \mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ , obtained by evaluating  $f \in L \setminus \{0\}$  at the points in  $S_B$ , is exactly  $n - \#\{\text{zeros of } f \text{ in } S_B\}$ . The number of zeros of  $f$  contained in  $S_B$  is at most the total possible number of zeros of  $f$  on  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r$ , which in turn is at most the degree of the pole divisor  $(f)_\infty$  of  $f$  in  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(\bar{\mathcal{M}}_r)$ , that is,

$$w_H(\mathbf{c}_f) = n - \#\{\text{zeros of } f \text{ in } S_B\} \geq n - \#\{\text{zeros of } f \text{ on } \bar{\mathcal{M}}_r\} \geq n - \deg (f)_\infty.$$

By Eq. (32) in Theorem 4.8,

$$\max_{f \in L \setminus \{0\}} \{\deg (f)_\infty\} = 2r^2 - 2r - 1,$$

and, by Eq. (28) in Theorem 4.7,

$$\min_{f \in L \setminus \{0\}} \{v_{P_1}(f)\} = 2,$$

hence, for any  $f \in L \setminus \{0\}$  the associated codeword  $\mathbf{c}_f$  has weight

$$w_H(\mathbf{c}_f) \geq n - \deg (f)_\infty \geq n - (2r^2 - 2r - 1 - 2).$$

Note that the last inequality follows from Eq. (32) and Eq. (28), since  $P_1$  is a zero of all the functions in  $L$  and is not contained in  $S_B$ . Hence, the bound in Eq. (33) on the minimum distance follows.  $\square$

Observe that, if  $b \geq 2$ , the bound obtained in Theorem 4.9 is  $d \geq r^2(b-2) + r(2b+2) + b + 3 \geq 6r + 5 > 0$  for any possible value of  $r$ . On the other hand, if  $b = 1$ , the bound in Eq. (33) is  $d \geq -r^2 + 4r + 4$ , which is positive only for  $r = 3$ . However, if  $b = 1$ , we can actually compute the value of the minimum distance  $d$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  for any  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$  odd (i.e., as in the assumptions of Theorem 3.9).

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3}$  odd and let  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  be a code over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  as in Theorem 3.9, with locality  $r$ . If  $b = 1$ , then the minimum distance  $d$  is  $d = n - (r^2 + 2r - 7) = (r+1)^2 - (r^2 + 2r - 7) = 8$ .*

*Proof.* When  $b = 1$ , the set of evaluation points of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is simply one set of *nice* points as in Eq. (13), namely

$$S_{\bar{t}} := \{[\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \zeta^j \bar{t} : 1] \mid j = 0, \dots, r, \mathcal{P}_{\bar{t}}(\bar{x}) = 0\}.$$

Observe that, by definition of  $S_{\bar{t}}$ , there are exactly  $r+1$  distinct values  $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{r+1}$  attained by the  $x$ -coordinates of points in  $S_{\bar{t}}$ . Consider the function

$$(34) \quad f_{\min} := x \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} (t - \zeta^j \bar{t}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-3} (x - \bar{x}_i) \in L \setminus \{0\},$$

and note that  $f_{\min}$  has exactly  $r^2 + 2r - 7$  distinct zeros in  $S_{\bar{t}}$ . Indeed, each function  $t - \zeta^j \bar{t}$  has exactly  $r+1$  zeros in  $S_{\bar{t}}$ , namely the points  $[\bar{x} : \bar{x}^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \zeta^j \bar{t} : 1]$  with  $i = 1, \dots, r+1$ , and similarly each function  $x - \bar{x}_i$  vanishes on  $S_{\bar{t}}$  only at the  $r+1$  points  $[\bar{x}_i : \bar{x}_i^{\frac{r+1}{2}} + 1 : 1; \zeta^j \bar{t} : 1]$ , with  $j = 1, \dots, r+1$ .

On the other hand, by Theorem 4.8, the function  $x$  has only one zero, namely  $P_1$ , which is not a point of  $S_{\bar{t}}$ . Therefore, each of the  $r-1$  factors in  $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(t - \zeta^j \bar{t})$  has  $r+1$  distinct zeros in  $S_{\bar{t}}$ , and so does each of the  $r-3$  factors in  $\prod_{i=1}^{r-3}(x - \bar{x}_i)$ . However, for each factor  $x - \bar{x}_i$ ,  $r-1$  zeros have already been counted as zeros of the  $r-1$  factors in  $\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(t - \zeta^j \bar{t})$ , hence we have that the function  $f_{min}$  has in total  $(r-1)(r+1) + (r-3)((r+1) - (r-1)) = r^2 + 2r - 7$  distinct zeros in  $S_{\bar{t}}$ , as claimed. Hence the codeword  $\mathbf{c}_{f_{min}}$  associated to  $f_{min}$  has weight exactly

$$(35) \quad w_H(\mathbf{c}_{f_{min}}) = n - (r^2 + 2r - 7) = (r+1)^2 - (r^2 + 2r - 7) = 8.$$

We claim that  $w_H(\mathbf{c}_{f_{min}})$  is actually the minimum weight of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ , and we show this by proving that there is no function in  $L \setminus \{0\}$  with more than  $r^2 + 2r - 7$  distinct zeros in  $S_{\bar{t}}$ .

Note that a function  $f(x, t) = \sum_{m=1}^{r-1} a_m(t)x^m \in L \setminus \{0\}$  which, for a fixed  $\bar{t}$ , has  $r+1$  distinct solutions as a polynomial  $f(x, \bar{t})$  in  $x$ , must be such that  $(t - \bar{t}) \mid a_m(t)$  for all  $m = 1, \dots, r-1$ , since the degree of  $f(x, \bar{t})$  in  $x$  is at most  $r-1$ . Hence, such an  $f$  can be written as  $f = c \cdot (t - \bar{t}) \cdot \tilde{f}(x, t)$ , where  $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$ ,  $\tilde{f} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x, t]$ ,  $\deg_t \tilde{f} \leq r-2$ . Since we wish to maximize the number of points in  $S_{\bar{t}}$  on which  $f(x, t) = \sum_{m=1}^{r-1} a_m(t)x^m \in L \setminus \{0\}$  vanishes, we then need to have that  $f$  vanishes for exactly  $r-1$  distinct values of  $\bar{t}$  (see Eq. (34)), which, iterating the reasoning above, means that  $f = c \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(t - \zeta^j \bar{t}) \cdot \tilde{f}(x)$ .

Observe now that, symmetrically,  $f = c \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(t - \zeta^j \bar{t}) \cdot \tilde{f}(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{r-1} d_m(x)t^m$ , for  $d_m(x) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x]$  with  $\deg d_m(x) \leq r-1$ . Then, if  $f$  has one more vanishing point in  $S_{\bar{t}}$  with a certain  $x$ -coordinate  $\bar{x}$  (i.e., if  $f$  vanishes at  $r$  distinct points with such an  $x$ -coordinate), it has to vanish on the whole subset of points of  $S_{\bar{t}}$  with  $x$ -coordinate  $\bar{x}$ . Indeed,  $f(\bar{x}, t)$  is a polynomial in  $t$  of degree  $r-1$  with  $r$  distinct roots, which implies that  $f(\bar{x}, t)$  has to vanish identically on all the points of  $S_{\bar{t}}$  with  $x$ -coordinate equal to  $\bar{x}$ . Therefore, if  $f$  vanishes at more than  $r-1$  points with a fixed  $x$ -coordinate, then it vanishes at all the  $r+1$  points of  $S_{\bar{t}}$  with the same  $x$ -coordinate and, as above, we have that  $(x - \bar{x}) \mid d_m(x)$  for all  $m = 0, \dots, r-1$ . Therefore, for  $f \in L \setminus \{0\}$  to vanish on the largest possible number of points of  $S_{\bar{t}}$ , we necessarily have that

$$(36) \quad f = c \cdot x \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-1}(t - \zeta^j \bar{t}) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{r-3}(x - \bar{x}_j),$$

where  $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$  and  $j$  can be at most  $r-3$  because otherwise the monomial  $x^{r-1}t^{r-1} \notin L$  would appear in the expression of  $f$ . This hence shows that any nonzero function in  $L$  with the largest possible number of vanishing points in  $S_{\bar{t}}$  is exactly of the form in Eq. (36). Therefore, there is no function in  $L \setminus \{0\}$  with more than  $r^2 + 2r - 7$  distinct zeros in  $S_{\bar{t}}$  and the minimum distance  $d$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is exactly  $d = w_H(\mathbf{c}_{f_{min}}) = n - (r^2 + 2r - 7) = (r+1)^2 - (r^2 + 2r - 7) = 8$ .  $\square$

We have thus determined the minimum distance  $d$  for a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  with  $b = 1$ . In the following subsection, we conclude the discussion on the codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  by showing that, when  $b \geq 2$ , the bound obtained in Eq. (33) is sharp for  $r = 3$ , since there are examples where the bound is attained (see Table 1).

**Remark 4.11.** *It is not clear in which sense to study asymptotics of the family of codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ , since when the length  $n$  tends to infinity also  $r$  needs to tend to infinity, which means that the field of definition  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  cannot be fixed. Indeed,  $m$  depends on  $r$  and in particular, for  $q$  fixed, the smallest possible value of  $m$  for which the existence of a nice  $t \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$  is guaranteed becomes larger when  $r$  becomes larger, see Theorem 3.4.*

**4.3. Explicit examples with  $r = 3$ .** In this subsection, we consider several examples of codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  as in Theorem 3.9 with  $r = 3$ . These examples show that, when  $b \geq 2$ , the bound on  $d$  obtained in Eq. (33) is sharp. Moreover, in all these examples, when  $b \geq 2$  and the bound Eq. (33) is not sharp, the difference between the bound and the actual minimum distance of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is 1.

For any suitable choice of  $q$ ,  $m$  and  $b$  be as in Theorem 3.9, we denote by  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  a generator of the multiplicative group  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$ , i.e.  $\langle \mathbf{w} \rangle = \mathbb{F}_{q^m}^*$ , and by  $\zeta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  a primitive  $r+1$ -th root of unity. Each row of Table 1 contains the parameters of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  with  $r = 3$  defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ . The first and second

columns contain, respectively, the values of  $q$  and  $m$ . The third column contains the value of  $b$ , that is, the number of chosen subsets of  $\mathcal{G}_m$  (see Eq. (15)), and the fourth column contains the explicit expression of the set  $B$  (see Theorem 3.7), showing which *nice* elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  have been chosen for the construction of the set of evaluation points  $S_B$  of the code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ . Note that, for  $r$ ,  $q$  and  $m$  fixed, the code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is uniquely determined by the choice of the set of *nice* elements  $B$ , since the  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -vector space  $L$  depends only on  $r$ . This explains why, in the table, it is enough to specify  $q$ ,  $m$  and  $B$  to specify a certain code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ . The fifth column of the table contains the length  $n$  of the code, which is  $n = b(r+1)^2 = b \cdot 4^2$ . Observe that, as shown in Theorem 4.1, the dimension  $k$  of all the listed codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is  $k = r(r-1) - 1 = 5$ . The sixth column of Table 1 is left empty when  $b = 1$ , since the value of the minimum distance  $d$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is computed in Theorem 4.10 in this case. On the other hand, when  $b \geq 2$ , the sixth column contains the estimate  $\Delta$  for the minimum distance  $d$  of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  obtained from our bound Eq. (33). More precisely,

- if  $b = 1$ , by Theorem 4.10, the distance  $d$  of any code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  is exactly  $d = 8$ , for any admissible  $r$  as in Theorem 3.9. In this case, we leave the value corresponding to  $\Delta$  empty, as we already know the exact value of  $d$ .
- If  $b \geq 2$ , we set instead  $\Delta := n - (2r^2 - 2r - 1 - 2)$ , that is the bound obtained in Eq. (33). Note that  $\Delta = n - 9$  for  $r = 3$ .

Finally, the seventh column of the table contains the actual value  $d$  of the minimum distance of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ .

For  $q^m = 7^2, 9^2, 11^2, 13^2$ , Table 1 contains data for all the possible codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  with  $r = 3$  that can be obtained with the construction in Theorem 3.9, that is, all the possible subsets  $B$  of *nice* elements of  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  are considered. For  $q^m = 5^4$ , it can be verified that  $\mathcal{G}_m$  is partitioned in exactly 8 subsets  $\mathcal{G}_m^{(\ell)}$  as in Eq. (15), which give rise to  $2^8 - 1 = 255$  possible codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  as in Theorem 3.9, so we choose to include in the table only a few examples. Note that in all of the examples included with  $q^m = 5^4$  and  $b \geq 5$ , we find that the bound in Eq. (33) is sharp.

In all the examples in Table 1 with  $b = 1$ , we find  $\Delta = d$  as predicted by Theorem 4.9. Moreover, the examples in the rows in bold show that the bound in Eq. (33) is sharp, since in these cases we find  $\Delta = d$ . Furthermore, observe that in all the examples in the table we find that  $d - \Delta \leq 1$ .

## 5. CODES $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$ WITH $r = 3$ : A REINTERPRETATION WITH GENUS 1 FIBRATIONS

In this section, we expand on Theorem 3.8 and rephrase the construction proposed in Theorem 3.9 for  $r = 3$  in a more geometric perspective. This explains in which sense our construction can be viewed as a generalization of the results on LRCs from elliptic surfaces contained in [23, Section VI].

Let  $m$  be an integer satisfying Eq. (11) with  $r = 3$ , for some  $q$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}_3$  over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  be as in 5. Observe that  $\mathcal{E}_3$  admits two genus 1 fibrations, given by the projections  $\Pi_t$  and  $\Pi_x$  to the  $t$ -line and to the  $x$ -line, respectively. With a slight abuse, we refer here to the notations introduced in Theorem 3.8. The curve  $\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{M}_3$  is a multisection of degree  $r + 1 = 4$  for both fibrations. Hence, in the light of [23, Section VI], constructing a code on the points of  $\mathcal{M}$  whose space of functions is simultaneously a subspace of the Riemann-Roch spaces of  $4O_t$  and of  $4O_x$ , where  $O_t$  (resp.  $O_x$ ) is the zero section of the projection to the  $t$ -line (resp. the projection to the  $x$ -line), naturally yields a locally recoverable code with availability 2. Observe that Theorem 3.9 provides indeed an example of such construction. In what follows, we present a different take on the construction of Section 3, where we obtain the same codes as in Theorem 3.9 but are able to devise a recovery strategy different than the one discussed in Theorem 4.2.

We start by recalling Theorem 3.9 for the case  $r = 3$ .

**Definition 5.1.** *Let  $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  and let  $\mathcal{E}_3$  as in Eq. (5) and  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_3$  as in Eq. (6) be defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ , where  $m$  is a positive integer satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 3.4. Let  $\mathcal{G}_m$  as in Eq. (14) and choose subsets  $\mathcal{G}_m^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_m^{(b)}$  of  $\mathcal{G}_m$ , where  $|\mathcal{G}_m| = 4M$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $1 \leq b \leq M$ . Let  $B := \cup_{\ell=1}^b \mathcal{G}_m^{(\ell)}$  and  $S_B$  as in Theorem 3.7, with  $r = 3$ .*

$r = 3$						
$q$	$m$	$b$	$B$	$n$	$\Delta$	$d$
$7^2$	1	1	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{46} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
$7^2$	1	1	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^6 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
$7^2$	1	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{46}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^6 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
9	2	1	$\{\zeta^i \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
$11^2$	1	1	$\{\zeta^i \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
$11^2$	1	1	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{15} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
$11^2$	1	1	$\{\zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
$11^2$	1	2	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{15} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
$11^2$	1	2	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
$11^2$	1	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{15}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
$11^2$	1	3	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{15}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	48	39	40
13	2	1	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
13	2	1	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
13	2	1	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
13	2	1	$\{\zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	16	—	8
13	2	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
13	2	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
13	2	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
13	2	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
13	2	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
13	2	2	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	32	23	24
13	2	3	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	48	39	40
13	2	3	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	48	39	40
13	2	3	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	48	39	40
13	2	3	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	48	39	40
<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	$\{\zeta^i \mathbf{w}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{21}, \zeta^i 4 \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	<b>64</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>
5	4	3	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^9, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	48	39	40
5	4	4	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^9, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{33} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	64	55	56
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^9, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{33}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{39} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	<b>80</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^9, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{33}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{39}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{45} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	<b>96</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	$\{\zeta^i, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^9, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{13}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{33}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{39}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{45}, \zeta^i \mathbf{w}^{65} \mid i = 1, \dots, r+1\}$	<b>112</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>103</b>

TABLE 1. Each row of the table contains the value  $\Delta$  and the actual minimum distance  $d$  of a code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$  with  $r = 3$ . When  $b = 1$ , the value of  $\Delta$  is left empty as we theoretically know from Theorem 4.10 that  $d = 8$ . When  $b \geq 2$ ,  $\Delta$  is instead the lower bound for  $d$  determined in Eq. (33), namely  $\Delta := n - (2r^2 - 2r - 1 - 2) = n - 9$ .

Furthermore, consider the  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ -vector space

$$(37) \quad L := \langle xt^j, x^2t^h \mid j = 0, 1, 2, h = 0, 1 \rangle,$$

and the linear evaluation map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_{S_B} : L &\longrightarrow (\mathbb{F}_{q^m})^n \\ f &\longmapsto \left( f(P_{1,1}^{(1)}), \dots, f(P_{4,4}^{(b)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For more compact notations, we also write  $\text{ev}_{S_B}(f) = \left( f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,4}^{\ell=1,\dots,b}$ . We define an AG code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  of length  $n := |S_B| = b \cdot 4^2$  on  $\mathcal{E}_3$  as the image of  $\text{ev}_{S_B}$ , that is,

$$(38) \quad \mathfrak{C}(B, L) := \left\{ \left( f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,4}^{\ell=1,\dots,b} \mid f \in L \right\}.$$

Observe that the functions in  $L$  restrict both on vertical fibers  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t})$  and on horizontal fibers  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})$  as rational functions with a pole divisor of degree at most  $r + 1$ , since  $\deg(x)_\infty = 2$  (resp.  $\deg(t)_\infty = 2$ ) on any  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t})$  (resp. on  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})$ ). This allows us to propose an alternative recovery strategy for the codes  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  with  $r = 3$ , which is discussed in the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.2.** *A code  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  as in Theorem 3.9 has locality  $r = 3$  and availability 2. More precisely, for any  $f \in L \setminus \{0\}$ , each symbol  $f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})})$  of the codeword  $\mathbf{c} := \left( f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,4}^{\ell=1,\dots,b}$  has two distinct recovery sets, namely*

$$\begin{aligned} f(H_i^{(\bar{\ell})}) &:= \left\{ f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})}) \mid j = 1, \dots, 4 \wedge j \neq \bar{j} \right\}, \\ f(V_{\bar{j}}^{(\bar{\ell})}) &:= \left\{ f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})}) \mid i = 1, \dots, 4 \wedge i \neq \bar{i} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We refer to  $f(H_i^{(\bar{\ell})})$  (resp.  $f(V_{\bar{j}}^{(\bar{\ell})})$ ) as a horizontal (resp. vertical) recovery set for  $f(P_{i,j}^{(\bar{\ell})})$  (see Eq. (16) and Eq. (17)).

*Proof.* With notations as in Theorem 5.2, consider  $f = \sum_{s=1}^2 a_s(t)x^s \in L \setminus \{0\}$ , where  $a_s(t) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[t]$  is a polynomial of degree  $\deg a_s(t) \leq 2$  for all  $s = 0, 1, 2$ , and the codeword  $\mathbf{c}$  obtained by evaluating  $f$  at the points in  $S$ , that is,

$$\mathbf{c} := \left( f(P_{i,j}^{(\ell)}) \right)_{i,j=1,\dots,4}^{\ell=1,\dots,b}.$$

If  $\mathbf{c}$  has a missing symbol, which without loss of generality we can assume to be  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$ , we proceed as follows.

- (1) **Recovering from a vertical recovery set.** Suppose first that we wish to recover  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  using the vertical recovery set  $f(V_1^{(1)})$ . We start by observing that  $P_{1,1}^{(1)}$  and the points in the vertical set  $V_1^{(1)}$ , which lie in the intersection of the vertical fiber  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  and the multisection  $\mathcal{M}$ , are in particular the affine points of intersection of the elliptic curve  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  with the conic defined by  $y = x^2 + 1$  in  $\mathbb{A}_{(x,y)}^2$ . In fact, denoting by  $O$  the point at infinity of  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$ , the intersection divisor of the curves  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  and  $y = x^2 + 1$  in  $\mathbb{A}_{(x,y)}^2$  can be written as  $P_{1,1}^{(1)} + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} + 2O$ . Since  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  is in Weierstrass form and  $O$  is an inflection point, we have that  $P_{1,1}^{(1)} + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} + 2O = O$  in the group law of  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$ , which implies in particular that  $P_{1,1}^{(1)} + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} = O$ .

Observe now that the elliptic curve  $\mathcal{E}_3 : y^2 = x^3 - x^2(t^4 + 1) + xt^4$  over  $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}(t)$  yields an elliptic fibration on a K3 surface, with generic fiber that has finite Mordell–Weil group. Indeed, the fibers of the projection  $\Pi_t$  to the  $t$ -line are clearly elliptic curves, and the induced fibration has a natural section, namely  $([0 : 1 : 0], t)$ . Therefore, the projection is indeed an elliptic fibration. Moreover, the underlying surface is K3 since the degree of the coefficients satisfy  $v(a_i(t)) \leq 2i$  and  $v(a_2(t)) = 4$  (see the discussion in [25, Subsect.4.10]). The fact that the Mordell–Weil group is finite is a direct application of the Shioda–Tate formula ([25, Cor. 6.13]), as we explain in what follows.

After an inspection of the discriminant, we obtain that the singular fibers are of types  $2I_8, 4I_2$ . Let  $\rho$  be the Picard number of  $\mathcal{E}_3$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{E}_3$  is K3, its Picard number satisfies  $1 \leq \rho \leq 20$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{r}$  be the rank of the Mordell–Weil group of the generic fiber of  $\Pi_t$ . Then, the Shioda–Tate formula yields

$$\rho = \mathfrak{r} + 2 + 2 \cdot 7 + 4 \cdot 1 = r + 20.$$

Since  $\rho \leq 20$  and  $\mathfrak{r} \geq 0$ , we conclude that  $\rho = 20$  and therefore  $\mathfrak{r} = 0$  as claimed.

We can hence apply [23, Lemma VI.2], which ensures that the evaluation points in the vertical set  $V_1^{(1)}$  sum to  $O$  in the group law of  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$ . To conclude it is then enough to note that, since no point in  $S_B$  coincides with  $O$  (by Theorem 5.1 and the fact that  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  is in Weierstrass form), we can apply [23, Lemma VI.1]. Indeed, the assumption that no point in  $V_1^{(1)}$  is  $O$ , while the sum of all the points in  $V_1^{(1)}$  is equal to  $O$ , is actually enough for the argument used in the proof of [23, Lemma VI.1]. This shows that the recoverability property holds for the vertical recovery sets.

- (2) **Recovering from a horizontal recovery set.** Suppose now that we wish to recover  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  using the horizontal recovery set  $f(H_1^{(1)})$ . Observe first that, differently from  $\Pi_t$ , the fibration  $\Pi_x$  does not admit a section. Indeed, write  $\Pi_x$  as a family of hyperelliptic curves in the following way:

$$(39) \quad y^2 = (t^4 - x)(-x^2 + x).$$

It can then be seen that the point  $[0 : 1 : 0]$  only splits in the desingularisation when  $-x^2 + x$  is a square. Therefore, even if there are several fibers that yield elliptic curves,  $\Pi_x$  does not admit a section. However, we note the following:

- i) The fibration (39) is a quadratic twist by  $\mathfrak{d}(x) = -x^2 + x$  of the rational elliptic fibration with Mordell–Weil rank 0 and singular fibers of types  $III, III^*$ :

$$(40) \quad y^2 = t^4 - x.$$

- ii) Since the twist happens above  $x = 0, 1$ , the fibration 39 has singular fibers of types  $2III^*$  and  $I_0^*$ .  
 iii) Furthermore, applying the Shioda–Tate formula ([25, Cor. 6.13]) to the jacobian fibration, we obtain that the Mordell–Weil rank of the generic fiber of the jacobian fibration is 0, and by [24, Thm 2.4] we conclude that the Mordell–Weil group is  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ .  
 iv) Now, from iii), we know that the trace of the image of  $\mathcal{M}$  in the jacobian fibration is contained in the 2-torsion of the generic fiber. By [26, Specialization thm.], the sum of the points in the intersection of the image of  $\mathcal{M}$  and the jacobian of an arbitrary fiber  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})$  of  $\Pi_x$  lies in the 2-torsion points of the fiber  $\Pi_x^{-1}(\bar{x})[2]$ .

By construction (see Theorem 5.1), the evaluation points of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  all lie on fibers of  $\Pi_x$  that are elliptic curves, i.e., that are above points  $\bar{x}$  such that  $-\bar{x}^2 + \bar{x}$  is a square. Since these fibers coincide with their jacobian, we hence have that, by iii) and iv) above, the hypotheses of [23, Lemma VI.1] and [23, Lemma VI.2] are satisfied, and hence the recovery procedure described in [23, Lemma VI.1] works in our case as well. This shows that the recoverability property of  $\mathfrak{C}(B, L)$  holds also for the horizontal recovery sets, concluding the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.** In the proof of Theorem 5.2, the recovery procedure from a vertical recovery set could also be proved without using [23, Lemmas VI.1 and VI.2], while still using a more geometric argument than the one in the proof of Theorem 4.2. Indeed, to show that  $f(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  can be uniquely recovered from the values of  $f$  at the points in the vertical set  $V_1^{(1)} = \{P_{2,1}^{(1)}, P_{3,1}^{(1)}, P_{4,1}^{(1)}\}$  one could also argue in the following way.

Let  $f_1, f_2$  be the restrictions to  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  of two rational functions in  $L \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $f_1(P_{i,1}^{(1)}) = f_2(P_{i,1}^{(1)})$ , for  $i = 2, 3, 4$ , and  $f_1(P_{1,1}^{(1)}) \neq f_2(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$ , and consider the function on  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  given by their difference  $g := f_1 - f_2$ . Observe that, since  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)}), 4O)$ , where  $\mathcal{L}(\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)}), 4O)$  denotes the Riemann–Roch



space of the divisor  $4O$  on  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$ , we also have that  $g \in \mathcal{L}(\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)}), 4O)$ . More precisely, the principal divisor of  $g$  on  $\Pi_t^{-1}(\bar{t}_1^{(1)})$  can be written as  $(g) = D + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} - \mathfrak{m}O$ , where  $D$  is an effective divisor whose support might contain  $P_{2,1}^{(1)}, P_{3,1}^{(1)}, P_{4,1}^{(1)}$ , but does not contain  $P_{1,1}^{(1)}$ , and  $\mathfrak{m} := \max\{\deg(f_1)_\infty, \deg(f_2)_\infty\}$ . Note that, by construction,  $3 \leq \mathfrak{m} \leq 4$ , which means that  $\mathfrak{m}$  can only be either 3 or 4.

- If  $\mathfrak{m} = 3$ , then the support of the divisor  $D$  must be empty, that is,  $(g) = P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} - 3O$ , which by Abel's Theorem (see [32, Corollary III 3.5]) implies that  $P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} = O$ . Since we already have that  $P_{1,1}^{(1)} + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} = O$ , this yields  $P_{1,1}^{(1)} = O$ , which is a contradiction.
- If instead  $\mathfrak{m} = 4$ , then the support of  $D$  must contain exactly one point  $P$ , that is,  $(g) = P + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} - 4O$ . By Abel's Theorem, this implies that  $P + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} = O$ . Combining this with  $P_{1,1}^{(1)} + P_{2,1}^{(1)} + P_{3,1}^{(1)} + P_{4,1}^{(1)} = O$ , we hence obtain that  $P = P_{1,1}^{(1)}$ , which means that  $P_{1,1}^{(1)}$  is a zero of  $g$ , implying that  $f_1(P_{1,1}^{(1)}) = f_2(P_{1,1}^{(1)})$  and contradicting our assumptions on  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ .

This shows that any two functions in  $L$  that coincide on the points in  $V_1^{(1)}$  also have the same value on  $P_{1,1}^{(1)}$ , hence the recoverability property holds for the vertical recovery sets.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by an NWO Open Competition ENW – XL grant (project "Rational points: new dimensions" - OCENW.XL21.XL21.011). We thank all the members of the consortium for the welcoming and stimulating atmosphere. Part of this work was done while C. Salgado was visiting the Institute for Advanced Study, in Princeton. It is a pleasure to thank the institute and its staff for the amazing work environment, and to acknowledge the support of the James D. Wolfensohn Fund and the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1926686.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] K. Aguilar, A. Álvarez, R. Ardila, P. S. Ocal, C. R. Avila, A. Várilly-Alvarado, *Locally recoverable algebro-geometric codes from projective bundles*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04201 (2024).
- [2] S. Ballentine, A. Barg, S. Vlăduț, *Codes with hierarchical locality from covering maps of curves*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **65.10** (2019), 6056–6071.
- [3] A. Barg, K. Haymaker, E.W. Howe, G.L. Matthews, A. Várilly-Alvarado, *Locally recoverable codes from algebraic curves and surfaces*, Algebraic Geometry for Coding Theory and Cryptography: IPAM, Los Angeles, CA, February 2016 (2017), 95–127.
- [4] P. Beelen, *Kummer theory and Newton polygons*, unpublished notes, Technical University of Denmark (2023).
- [5] P. Beelen, *Algebraic geometry and coding theory*, Phd Thesis 1 (Research TU/e / Graduation TU/e), Mathematics and Computer Science, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven (2001).
- [6] J. Berg, B. Malmskog, W. West, *Codes with Hierarchical Locality on Artin-Schreier Surfaces*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19533 (2024).
- [7] P. Beelen, R. Pellikaan, *The Newton Polygon of Plane Curves with Many Rational Points*, Designs, Codes and Cryptography **21** (2000), 41–67.
- [8] A. Dimakis, P. Godfrey, Y. Wu, M. Wainwright, K. Ramchandran, *Network Coding for Distributed Storage Systems* Transactions on Information Theory, IEEE **56** (2010), 4539–4551
- [9] L. El Fadil, *Prime ideal factorization in a number field via Newton polygons*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **71.2** (2021), 529–543.
- [10] P. Gopalan, C. Huang, H. Simitci, S. Yekhanin *On the locality of codeword symbols*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **58.11** (2012), 6925–6934.
- [11] J. Han, L.A. Lastras-Montano, *Reliable memories with subline accesses*, 2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (2007), 2531–2535.
- [12] C. Huang, M. Chen, J. Lin, *Pyramid codes: Flexible schemes to trade space for access efficiency in reliable data storage systems*, ACM Transactions on Storage (TOS) **9.1** (2013), 1–28.
- [13] D. Goss, *Basic structures of function field arithmetic*, Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, Heidelberg (2012).
- [14] V.D.Goppa, *A new class of linear correcting codes*, Problemy Peredachi Informatsii, **6**, n.3, (1970), 24–30.

- [15] V.D.Goppa, *A rational representation of codes and  $(L, g)$ -codes*, Problemy Peredachi Informatsii, **7**, n.3, (1971), 41–49.
- [16] V.D.Goppa, *Codes associated with divisors*, Problemy Peredachi Informatsii, **13**, n.1, (1977), 33–39.
- [17] V.D.Goppa, *Codes on algebraic curves*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, **259**, n.6, (1981), 1289–1290.
- [18] V.D.Goppa, *Algebraico-geometric codes*, Izvestiya Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk. Seriya Matematicheskaya, **46**, n.4, (1982), 762–781.
- [19] K. Haymaker, B. Malmskog, G.L. Matthews, *Locally recoverable codes with availability  $t \geq 2$  from fiber products of curves*, Advances in Mathematics of Communications **12**, n. 2, (2018), 317–336.
- [20] K. Haymaker, B. Malmskog, G.L. Matthews, *Algebraic hierarchical locally recoverable codes with nested affine subspace recovery*, Designs, Codes and Cryptography **93.1**, (2025), 111–132.
- [21] T. Høholdt, J.H. van Lint, and R. Pellikaan, *Algebraic geometry codes*, Handbook of coding theory, Vol. I, II, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1998), 871–961.
- [22] M. Rosen, *Number theory in function fields*, Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, Heidelberg (2013).
- [23] C. Salgado, A. Várilly-Alvarado, J. F. Voloch, *Locally recoverable codes on surfaces*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **67.9** (2021), 5765–5777.
- [24] I. Shimada, *On elliptic K3 surfaces* The Michigan Mathematical Journal **47** (3), (2005).
- [25] M. Schuett, T. Shioda, *Elliptic Surfaces*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 51–160 (2010)
- [26] J. Silverman, *The arithmetic of elliptic curves* 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. **106**, Springer, Dordrecht, (2009).
- [27] H. Stichtenoth, *Algebraic function fields and codes*, Springer Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Berlin, Heidelberg (2009).
- [28] I. Tamo, A. Barg, *A family of optimal locally recoverable codes*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **60.8** (2014), 4661–4676.
- [29] I. Tamo, A. Barg, *Bounds on locally recoverable codes with multiple recovering sets*, 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (2014), 691–695.
- [30] I. Tamo, A. Barg, S.G. Vlăduț, *Locally recoverable codes on algebraic curves* IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, **63**, Issue 8, (2017) 4928–4939
- [31] I. Tamo, A. Barg, A. Frolov, *Bounds on the parameters of locally recoverable codes*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **62.6** (2016), 3070–3083.
- [32] M.A. Tsfasman, S.G. Vlăduț, D. Nogin *Algebraic Geometric Codes: Basic Notions*, American Mathematical Society, USA (2007).