

Griesmer type bounds for additive codes over finite fields, integral and fractional MDS codes *

Simeon Ball, Michel Lavrauw and Tabriz Popatia

Abstract

In this article we prove Griesmer type bounds for additive codes over finite fields. These new bounds give upper bounds on the length of maximum distance separable (MDS) codes, codes which attain the Singleton bound. We will also consider codes to be MDS if they attain the fractional Singleton bound, due to Huffman. We prove that this bound in the fractional case can be obtained by codes whose length surpasses the length of the longest known codes in the integral case. For small parameters, we provide exhaustive computational results for additive MDS codes, by classifying the corresponding (fractional) subspace-arcs. This includes a complete classification of fractional additive MDS codes of size 243 over the field of order 9.

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{F}_q denote the finite field with q elements, where q is a prime power. An *additive code* of length n over \mathbb{F}_{q^h} is a subset C of $\mathbb{F}_{q^h}^n$ with the property that for all $u, v \in C$ the sum $u + v \in C$. It is easy to prove that an additive code is linear over some subfield, which we will assume to be \mathbb{F}_q . We use the notation

$$[n, r/h, d]_q^h$$

to denote an additive code of length n over \mathbb{F}_{q^h} , of size q^r and minimum distance d , which is linear over \mathbb{F}_q . Our motivation comes from the fact that additive codes which are contained in their symplectic dual can be used to construct quantum stabiliser codes [20], [19]. Additive codes over small fields which have additional properties such as cyclicity have been studied in [7], [8], [10], [11], [12], [14]. Most relevant to this article, where MDS codes are featured, are the articles [5], [18] and [21]. Recall that an additive code is *linear over* \mathbb{F}_{q^h} if $u \in C$ implies $\lambda u \in C$ for all $u \in C$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}$. In our notation here, a $[n, k, d]_q^1$ code is linear. For an additive code C , the minimum distance d is equal to the minimum weight, so this is equivalent to saying that each non-zero vector in C has at least d non-zero coordinates.

*9 October 2024. The first and third author are supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities grant PID2020-113082GB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and grant PID2023-147202NB-I00. *Mathematics Subject Classification (2010)*: 94B65, 51E21, 15A03, 94B05.

The Griesmer bound [17] for linear codes states that, if there is a $[n, k, d]_q^1$ code then

$$n \geq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil. \quad (1)$$

This bound can be reformulated as follows,

$$n \geq k + d - m + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil, \quad (2)$$

where $m \leq k$ is such that

$$q^{m-2} < d \leq q^{m-1},$$

or $m = k$ if $q^k < d$. We will prove that similar bounds hold for additive codes over finite fields, see Theorem 9 and Theorem 12. We will also show that simply replacing k by $\lceil r/h \rceil$ or $\lfloor r/h \rfloor$ in (1) does not lead to a valid bound for additive codes by constructing additive codes that invalidate these natural generalisations. We will be particularly interested in codes of length n and minimum distance d which meet the Singleton bound

$$|C| \leq |A|^{n-d+1},$$

which holds for all codes over an alphabet A , and is not limited to linear or additive codes. Codes which attain this bound are called *maximum distance separable codes*, or simply MDS codes. MDS codes are an important class of codes, which are implemented in many applications where we can allow $|A|$ to be large. As observed in previous articles, [18, Theorem 10], the Singleton bound for an $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ -code can be reformulated as

$$\lceil r/h \rceil \leq n - d + 1,$$

since n and d are always integers, and we call codes which attain this bound for $r/h \notin \mathbb{N}$, *fractional MDS codes* and for $r/h \in \mathbb{N}$, *integral MDS codes*.

2 Additive Reed-Solomon codes and bounds on linear MDS codes

The most commonly implemented MDS codes are the Reed-Solomon codes

$$\{(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_q), c_{k-1}) \mid f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i x^i, c_i \in \mathbb{F}_q\},$$

where a_1, \dots, a_q denote the elements of \mathbb{F}_q and $n = q + 1$. It follows immediately that $d = n - (k - 1)$ since a polynomial of degree $k - 1$ has at most $k - 1$ zeros.

Our first observation is that Reed-Solomon codes extend to additive, not necessarily linear, codes as follows.

Lemma 1. *If S_0, \dots, S_{k-1} are additive subsets of \mathbb{F}_{q^h} and*

$$C = \{(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_{q^h}), c_{k-1}) \mid f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} c_i x^i, c_i \in S_i\},$$

then C is a fractional MDS code over \mathbb{F}_{q^h} if and only if

$$q^{kh} > \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} |S_i| > q^{(k-1)h}.$$

Proof. By construction $|C| = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} |S_i|$. Since the sets S_i are additive, it follows that C is an additive code, and the condition $q^{kh} > |C| = q^r > q^{(k-1)h}$ implies $\lceil r/h \rceil = k$, and so C is a fractional MDS code since $d = n - (k - 1)$. \square

There are constructions of additive MDS codes which are based on restricting the evaluation set [21], rather than restricting the set of coefficients as we have done here. In this paper, we are interested in finding the longest MDS codes and in particular, we would like to construct additive codes which are longer than their linear counterparts.

The Griesmer bound gives two important bounds for linear MDS codes. These results are well-known, but we list these as theorems since we will obtain similar bounds for additive MDS codes.

Theorem 2. *If $k \geq 2$ and there is a $[n, k, d]_q^1$ linear MDS code then*

$$d \leq q, \quad \text{and} \quad n \leq q + k - 1.$$

Proof. The Griesmer bound for a linear $[n, k, d]_q^1$ MDS code C can be rewritten as

$$n - d = k - 1 \geq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil.$$

It follows that if $k \geq 2$ then $d \leq q$ and so, since C is MDS, $n = d + k - 1 \leq q + k - 1$. \square

Theorem 3. *If $n \geq k + 2$ and there is a $[n, k, d]_q^1$ linear MDS code then*

$$k \leq q - 1.$$

Proof. Since the dual of a linear MDS code is a linear $[n, n - k, k + 1]$ MDS code, Theorem 2 implies that if $n \geq k + 2$ then $k \leq q - 1$. \square

Interestingly, we will see that these restrictions do not carry over to additive codes. We will provide examples which better these bounds. Motivated by this fact we prove Griesmer type bounds for additive codes and then consider the consequences of these bounds for MDS codes. We will obtain similar bounds to Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, which will apply to additive codes, in Theorem 14 and Theorem 16.

3 Additive codes over finite fields

An $[n, k, d]_q$ linear code C can be defined as the rowspace of a $k \times n$ matrix called a *generator matrix* for C . An $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive code C can then be defined as the \mathbb{F}_q -space spanned by the rows of G , an $r \times n$ matrix with entries in \mathbb{F}_{q^h} , again called a *generator matrix* for C . We will always set $k = \lceil r/h \rceil$.

The elements of G are elements of \mathbb{F}_{q^h} , which we can write out over a basis \mathcal{B} for \mathbb{F}_{q^h} over \mathbb{F}_q to obtain a $r \times nh$ matrix \tilde{G} whose elements are from \mathbb{F}_q , and whose columns are grouped together in n blocks of h columns. Each block of h columns spans a projective subspace of $\text{PG}(r-1, q)$ of (projective) dimension at most $h-1$. We define $\mathcal{X}_G(C)$ to be the multiset of subspaces which we obtain from the n blocks of h columns of \tilde{G} in this way. The fact that $\mathcal{X}_G(C)$ is independent of the choice of the basis \mathcal{B} is easily seen by observing that each element of the multiset $\mathcal{X}_G(C)$ is obtained as the column space of one of the blocks in \tilde{G} , which is an $r \times h$ matrix. A change of basis might change the matrix, but not its column space. Unless the choice of the generator matrix is not clear from the context, we usually just write $\mathcal{X}(C)$ instead of $\mathcal{X}_G(C)$.

Definition 4. A *projective $h - (n, r, d)_q$ system* is a multiset \mathcal{S} of n subspaces of $\text{PG}(r-1, q)$ of dimension at most $h-1$ such that each hyperplane of $\text{PG}(r-1, q)$ contains at most $n-d$ elements of \mathcal{S} and some hyperplane contains exactly $n-d$ elements of \mathcal{S} .

Theorem 5. If C is an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code, then $\mathcal{X}(C)$ is a projective $h - (n, r, d)_q$ system, and conversely, each projective $h - (n, r, d)_q$ system defines an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code.

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as the proof for the integral case, see Theorem 4 in [5]. If H is a hyperplane of $\text{PG}(r-1, q)$ with dual coordinates $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$, then the fact that the codeword aG has weight at least d is equivalent to the condition that H contains at most $n-d$ elements of $\mathcal{X}(C)$. \square

We say an additive code C is *unfaithful* if not all the elements of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ are of dimension $h-1$, and *faithful* otherwise.

Remark 6. Note that one can always extend the subspaces of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ so that they have dimension $h-1$. By Theorem 5, this can be done arbitrarily without the minimum distance decreasing. Thus, an unfaithful additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code C can always be converted in a faithful additive $[n, r/h, \geq d]_q^h$ code.

The above notion of an unfaithful code is defined in terms of the corresponding projective system. The coding-theoretic interpretation of the notion is as follows.

Lemma 7. An additive code C over \mathbb{F}_{q^h} is unfaithful if and only if there is a coordinate position in which the values of \mathbb{F}_{q^h} , which appear in the codewords of C , are contained in an \mathbb{F}_q -subspace of dimension at most $h-1$.

Proof. Let C be an additive code with generator matrix G , and corresponding projective system $\mathcal{X}(C)$. Let \tilde{G} denote the $r \times nh$ matrix obtained from G as described above.

Suppose that C is unfaithful and that the i -th block B of h columns of \tilde{G} determines an element of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ of dimension at most $h - 2$. Then the h columns of B are linearly dependent, i.e. there exists a nonzero $y \in \mathbb{F}_q^h$ such that $By^T = 0$. In other words, the rows of B , considered as vectors in \mathbb{F}_q^h are orthogonal to some fixed nonzero vector y . Since the i -th coordinate $c_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^h$ of a codeword c of C , is a linear combination of the rows of B , when considered as a vector in \mathbb{F}_q^h , the claim follows. The reverse implication follows by reversing the above argument. \square

Remark 8. Consider an additive subcode C_0 of an additive code C . We can choose a basis for the code C so that the first r_0 rows of \tilde{G} span C_0 . The subspaces of $\mathcal{X}(C_0)$ are obtained from the subspaces of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ by projecting from π , the subspace spanned by the last $r - r_0$ coordinates. Then C_0 is faithful if and only if C is faithful and all the elements of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ do not intersect, are skew to, π .

4 A bound for additive codes over finite fields

The geometric approach described in the previous section will be used to prove the following bound for additive codes.

Theorem 9. *If there is a $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive code then*

$$n \geq \lceil r/h \rceil + d - m + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil,$$

where $r = (k - 1)h + r_0$, $k = \lceil r/h \rceil$, $1 \leq r_0 \leq h$,

$$f(q, m) = \frac{q^{(m-2)h+r_0}(q^h - 1)}{q^{(m-2)h+r_0} - 1}$$

for all m such that $2 \leq m \leq k$ and is maximised when m is such that

$$q^{(m-2)h+r_0} < d \leq q^{(m-1)h+r_0}.$$

and $m = k$ if

$$d > q^r.$$

Proof. Let C be an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code, with generator matrix G , and let \tilde{G} and $\mathcal{X}(C)$ be as described above.

By performing elementary row operations, we can suppose that \tilde{G} is in row-echelon form. Let m be an integer such that $2 \leq m \leq k$. Consider the sub-matrix of \tilde{G} formed by the last $(m - 1)h + r_0$ rows. Since \tilde{G} is in row-echelon form the first

$$s = (r - (m - 1)h - r_0)/h = k - m$$

blocks of h columns of this sub-matrix are all zero.

Let \tilde{G}_1 be the submatrix of \tilde{G} formed by the last $(m-1)h + r_0$ rows and the last $n-s$ blocks of columns. Then \tilde{G}_1 generates an additive $[n-s, m-1+r_0/h, \geq d]_q^h$ code C_1 .

Let \mathcal{X}_1 be the multi-set of size $n-s$ of the subspaces of dimension at most $h-1$ in $\text{PG}((m-1)h + r_0 - 1, q)$ spanned by the $n-s$ blocks of columns of \tilde{G}_1 .

A hyperplane of $\text{PG}((m-1)h + r_0 - 1, q)$ contains at most $n-s-d$ of the subspaces of \mathcal{X}_1 , since the non-zero codewords $u\tilde{G}_1$ of C_1 have weight at least d .

Each subspace of \mathcal{X}_1 is contained in at least

$$(q^{(m-2)h+r_0} - 1)/(q-1)$$

hyperplanes. Since there are

$$(q^{(m-1)h+r_0} - 1)/(q-1)$$

hyperplanes in $\text{PG}((m-1)h + r_0 - 1, q)$ we have

$$(q^{(m-2)h+r_0} - 1)(n-s) \leq (q^{(m-1)h+r_0} - 1)(n-s-d). \quad (3)$$

This implies

$$n \geq s + d + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil.$$

from which the bound follows using $s = k - m$.

It remains to prove that the bound is maximised by choosing $m = m_0$, where m_0 is such that

$$q^{(m_0-2)h+r_0} < d \leq q^{(m_0-1)h+r_0}.$$

Let

$$B(m) = \lceil r/h \rceil + d - m + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil.$$

Then

$$B(m+1) - B(m) = -1 + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, (m+1))} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil$$

and therefore

$$-1 + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, (m+1))} - \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil - 1 \leq B(m+1) - B(m) \leq -1 + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, (m+1))} - \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil.$$

For $m \geq m_0$ we have that

$$B(m+1) - B(m) \leq -1 + \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^{(m-1)h+r_0}} \right\rceil = -1 + 1 = 0.$$

For $m \leq m_0 - 1$ we have that

$$B(m+1) - B(m) \geq -2 + \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^{(m-1)h+r_0}} \right\rceil \geq -2 + 2 = 0.$$

This shows that the bound is maximised for $m = m_0$. \square

In the integral case the bound in Theorem 9 gives a bound similar to (2), the Griesmer bound for linear codes. Observe that the only difference from the Griesmer bound is that the ceiling function appears outside the sum and not inside.

Corollary 10. *If there is a $[n, k, d]_q^h$ additive code then*

$$n \geq k + d - m + \left\lceil \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{d}{q^{jh}} \right\rceil,$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$q^{(m-2)h} < d \leq q^{(m-1)h} \leq q^r.$$

Proof. Since

$$\frac{1}{f(q, m)} = \frac{1}{q^{(m-1)h}} (1 + q^h + \dots + q^{(m-2)h}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{1}{q^{jh}},$$

the bound follows from Theorem 9. □

In the non-integral (fractional) case that $r/h \notin \mathbb{N}$, we get a slightly weaker bound using the same reasoning as above.

Corollary 11. *If there is a $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive code then*

$$n \geq \lceil r/h \rceil + d - m + \left\lceil \sum_{j=1}^{m-2} \frac{d}{q^{jh}} \right\rceil,$$

where $r = (k-1)h + r_0$, $k = \lceil r/h \rceil$, $1 \leq r_0 \leq h$,

$$q^{(m-2)h+r_0} < d \leq q^{(m-1)h+r_0} \leq q^r.$$

Proof. Since

$$\frac{1}{f(q, m)} > \frac{1}{q^{(m-2)h+r_0}} \frac{q^{(m-2)h+r_0} - q^{r_0}}{q^h - 1} = \frac{1}{q^{(m-2)h}} (1 + q^h + \dots + q^{(m-3)h}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m-2} \frac{1}{q^{jh}},$$

the bound follows from Theorem 9. □

5 A second bound for additive codes over finite fields

Inspired by the bound for $q = 4$ from [9] and [16], in this section we prove another bound for additive codes over finite fields. We then show that this new bound is generally not as good as the bound in Theorem 9 for $d < q^r$.

Theorem 12. *If there is a $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive code then*

$$n \geq d + \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r-h} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_h\}$ be a basis for \mathbb{F}_{q^h} over \mathbb{F}_q and let G be an $r \times n$ matrix over \mathbb{F}_{q^h} whose \mathbb{F}_q row span is an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code. Then we can write

$$G = \sum_{i=0}^h G_i e_i$$

where G_i is a $r \times n$ matrix over \mathbb{F}_q .

Let $\hat{G}_j, j \in \{1, \dots, (q^h-1)/(q-1)\}$, be the distinct elements of the projective subspace

$$\langle G_1, \dots, G_h \rangle.$$

In other words, the matrix

$$\hat{G}_j = \sum_{i=1}^h c_{ij} G_i$$

for some point $c_j = (c_{1j}, \dots, c_{hj})$ in $PG(h-1, q)$.

Consider the linear code generated by the $r \times (n(q^h-1)/(q-1))$ matrix

$$\hat{G} = (\hat{G}_1, \dots, \hat{G}_{(q^h-1)/(q-1)}).$$

If the m -th coordinate of the codeword uG is zero then the m -th coordinate of G_i is zero, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$, and therefore the m -th coordinate of $u\hat{G}_j$ is zero for all $j \in \{1, \dots, (q^h-1)/(q-1)\}$.

Suppose that the m -th coordinate of the codeword uG is non-zero. Then

$$a = (uG_1, \dots, uG_h)$$

is a non-zero vector of \mathbb{F}_q^h . If the point c_j is orthogonal to a then the m -th coordinate of $u\hat{G}_j$ is zero.

Since c_j runs through all points in $PG(h-1, q)$, the m -th coordinate of $u\hat{G}_j$ is zero for $(q^{h-1}-1)/(q-1)$ values of $j \in \{1, \dots, (q^h-1)/(q-1)\}$ and therefore non-zero for q^{h-1} coordinates.

Thus, if the weight of uG is w then weight of $u\hat{G}$ is wq^{h-1} .

Therefore, \hat{G} generates a $[\frac{(q^h-1)}{q-1}n, r, dq^{h-1}]$ linear code over \mathbb{F}_q .

Applying the Griesmer bound for linear codes gives

$$\frac{(q^h-1)}{q-1}n \geq \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \left\lceil \frac{dq^{h-1}}{q^j} \right\rceil = \frac{(q^h-1)}{q-1}d + \sum_{j=1}^{r-h} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil.$$

□

6 Comparing the bounds in Theorem 9 and Theorem 12

In this section we will compare the bounds in Theorem 9 and Theorem 12.

Theorem 13. *If d is such that*

$$q^{(m-2)h+r_0} < d \leq q^{(m-1)h+r_0},$$

for some $m \in \{2, \dots, \lceil r/h \rceil\}$ and

$$(\lceil r/h \rceil - m)(q^h - 1) \geq (r - h)(q - 1) + q^h - q$$

then the bound in Theorem 9 is better than the bound in Theorem 12.

Proof. Let

$$b_1 = \lceil r/h \rceil + d - m + \left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil,$$

the bound in Theorem 9 and let

$$b_2 = d + \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r-h} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil,$$

the bound in Theorem 12.

Since $d \leq q^{(m-1)h+r_0}$, and recalling that $r = (k-1)h + r_0$ and $k = \lceil r/h \rceil$,

$$b_2 \leq d + ((k-m-1)h+1) \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} + \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} \sum_{j=1}^{(m-1)h+r_0-1} \left\lceil \frac{d}{q^j} \right\rceil.$$

and so

$$b_2 \leq d + (r-h) \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} + \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} \sum_{j=1}^{(m-1)h+r_0-1} \frac{d}{q^j}$$

and

$$b_2 \leq d + (r-h) \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} + \frac{d(q^{h-1}-1)}{q^{(m-1)h+r_0-1}(q^h-1)} + \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} \sum_{j=1}^{(m-2)h+r_0} \frac{d}{q^j}$$

Meanwhile,

$$b_1 \geq k + d - m + d \frac{(q^{(m-2)h+r_0}-1)}{(q^h-1)q^{(m-2)h+r_0}},$$

and so

$$b_1 \geq k + d - m + \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} \sum_{j=1}^{(m-2)h+r_0} \frac{d}{q^j}.$$

If $b_1 < b_2$ then

$$k - m < (r-h) \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} + \frac{d(q^{h-1}-1)}{q^{(m-1)h+r_0-1}(q^h-1)} < (r-h) \frac{q-1}{q^h-1} + \frac{q(q^{h-1}-1)}{(q^h-1)}.$$

□

Although the bound in Theorem 9 is generally better than the bound in Theorem 12, as indicated by Theorem 13, there are instances in which the bound in Theorem 12 is better than the bound in Theorem 9. For example, for $r = 5$, $q = 2$, $h = 3$ and $d = 6$, Theorem 9 implies $n \geq 7$, whereas Theorem 12 implies $n \geq 8$.

7 Bounds on additive MDS codes over finite fields

Theorem 9 has the following corollary for MDS codes.

Theorem 14. *If there is a $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive MDS code then*

$$d \leq q^h - 1 + \frac{q^h - 1}{q^{r_0} - 1}$$

and

$$n \leq k - 2 + q^h + \frac{q^h - 1}{q^{r_0} - 1},$$

where $k = \lceil r/h \rceil$, $r = (k - 1)h + r_0 > h$ and $1 \leq r_0 \leq h$.

Proof. An additive MDS code implies that $n = \lceil r/h \rceil + d - 1$. Therefore, Theorem 9 implies

$$\left\lceil \frac{d}{f(q, m)} \right\rceil \leq m - 1$$

where

$$f(q, m) = \frac{q^{(m-2)h+r_0}(q^h - 1)}{q^{(m-2)h+r_0} - 1}$$

and for all $m \in \{2, \dots, k\}$.

Since $r > h$ implies $k \geq 2$, we can set $m = 2$ and the first inequality implies

$$d \leq f(q, 2).$$

The bound on n then follows by substituting in the (fractional) Singleton bound. □

We can improve on these bounds in the case that the MDS code is unfaithful.

Theorem 15. *If there is an unfaithful $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive MDS code then*

$$d \leq q^h + \frac{q^h - q^{r_0+1}}{q^{r_0} - 1}$$

and

$$n \leq q^h + k - 1 + \frac{q^h - q^{r_0+1}}{q^{r_0} - 1},$$

where $r = (k - 1)h + r_0 > h$ and $1 \leq r_0 \leq h$.

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 9, we have that $m = 2$ and $s = k - 2$, and at least one of the subspaces in \mathcal{X}_1 has dimension at most $h - 2$. Thus, the inequality (3) becomes

$$(q^{r_0} - 1)(n - (k - 2) - 1) + (q^{r_0+1} - 1) \leq (q^{h+r_0} - 1)(n - (k - 2) - d).$$

Since $d = n - k + 1$, we have

$$d \leq \frac{q^{h+r_0} - q^{r_0+1}}{q^{r_0} - 1} = q^h + \frac{q^h - q^{r_0+1}}{q^{r_0} - 1}.$$

□

Recall that in Theorem 2 we had that $d \leq q^h$, so the bound in Theorem 14 is the same when $r_0 = h$ and slightly weaker when $r_0 \neq h$. In Theorem 3, we saw that the Griesmer bound allowed us to bound k for linear MDS codes, as long we assumed that $n \geq k + 2$, or equivalently, assuming $d \geq 2$. For additive MDS codes we obtain a similar bound, with roughly the same hypothesis.

Theorem 16. *If there is an $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ additive MDS code C and $n \geq \lceil r/h \rceil + 2$ then*

$$\lceil r/h \rceil \leq q^h - 1 + (h - r_0) \frac{q^h - q^{h-1}}{q^h - 1},$$

where $r = (k - 1)h + r_0$ and $1 \leq r_0 \leq h$.

Proof. As before, let $\mathcal{X}(C)$ be the multiset of n subspaces of $\text{PG}(r - 1, q)$. Since $n \geq k + 2$, we can truncate the code C to a code of length $k + 2$. Since C is MDS, any k subspaces of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ span $\text{PG}(r - 1, q)$, thus the truncation of the code has size q^r . Furthermore, the truncation is MDS, so we obtain an additive $[k + 2, r/h, 3]_q^h$ MDS code C_0 .

Since $d = 3$, any two codewords must be distinct on one of the first k coordinates, thus there are subsets S_i of \mathbb{F}_{q^h} and maps f and g from

$$(S_1, \dots, S_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q^h}$$

such that

$$C_0 = \{(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k, f(u_1, \dots, u_k), g(u_1, \dots, u_k)) \mid u_i \in S_i\}.$$

Since C_0 is additive, the subsets S_i must be additive subsets and the maps f and g must be additive maps.

Since, $|C_0| = q^r = q^{(k-1)h+r_0}$,

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |S_i| = q^r.$$

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, let

$$\pi_i = \{(f(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0), g(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0)) \mid u_i \in S_i\}.$$

Since S_i is an additive subset, π_i is an \mathbb{F}_q subspace of $\mathbb{F}_{q^h}^2$.

For $i \neq j$, the distance between

$$u = (0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0, f(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0), g(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0))$$

$$v = (0, \dots, 0, v_j, 0, \dots, 0, f(0, \dots, 0, v_j, 0, \dots, 0), g(0, \dots, 0, v_j, 0, \dots, 0))$$

is at least 3, which implies

$$\pi_i \cap \pi_j = \{0\}.$$

Since, u has weight at least 3, π_i has trivial intersection with both

$$\pi_0 = \{(0, x) \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}\}$$

and

$$\pi_\infty = \{(x, 0) \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}\}.$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Therefore, we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k (|S_i| - 1) \leq q^{2h} - 2q^h + 1.$$

Since,

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |S_i| = q^r,$$

and each $|S_i|$ is a power of q , the sum is minimised when $|S_i| \in \{q^h, q^{h-1}\}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |S_i| \geq (k - h + r_0)q^h + (h - r_0)q^{h-1}.$$

Combining the above two inequalities, gives the bound. □

8 The dual of an additive code

The dual of an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code C is defined by

$$C^\perp = \{v \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}^n \mid \text{tr}_{q^h \rightarrow q}(u \cdot v) = 0, \text{ for all } u \in C\},$$

where $\text{tr}_{q^h \rightarrow q}$ denotes the trace function from \mathbb{F}_{q^h} to \mathbb{F}_q . Since an \mathbb{F}_q -basis for C defines r equations for the \mathbb{F}_q -subspace C^\perp , the dual code is an additive $[n, n - r/h, d^\perp]_q^h$ code. Note that as an \mathbb{F}_q -vector space the vector space $\mathbb{F}_{q^h}^n$ has dimension hn and so $|C^\perp| = q^{nh-r}$.

Theorem 17. *Let C be an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code, and let d^\perp denote the minimal distance of C^\perp . Then C is unfaithful if and only if $d^\perp = 1$.*

Proof. Recall that in Section 4, we defined a multiset of subspaces $\mathcal{X}(C)$ of $\text{PG}(r-1, q)$ from an additive code C of size q^r , corresponding to the blocks of size h of the expanded matrix $\tilde{G} \in \mathbb{F}_q^{r \times nh}$ obtained from the generator matrix $G \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}^{r \times n}$ of C . Without loss of generality we may assume that the first block of h columns of \tilde{G} spans a subspace of dimension at most $h-2$. Then the rank of this $r \times h$ matrix is strictly smaller than h and so its columns are linearly dependent. This implies that there exists a nonzero element $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}$ such that $(x, 0, \dots, 0) \in C^\perp$.

To prove the other direction, assume $d^\perp = 1$. Without loss of generality assume that $(x, 0, \dots, 0) \in C^\perp$, with $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h} \setminus \{0\}$. This implies that the first block of \tilde{G} consist of h columns which are linearly dependent, and therefore the corresponding element of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ has dimension at most $h-2$. Hence C is unfaithful. \square

Theorem 18. *Let C be an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code, and let d^\perp denote the minimal distance of C^\perp . Then C is faithful with $d \geq 2$ if and only if C^\perp is faithful with $d^\perp \geq 2$.*

Proof. If C is unfaithful then by Theorem 17, $d^\perp = 1$. Hence C is faithful. The other direction follows by replacing C with C^\perp . \square

The following is [5, Theorem 4.3], see also [21, Theorem 3.3].

Theorem 19. *The dual of an integral additive MDS code is an additive MDS code.*

In the fractional case, as pointed out in [21, Example 3.1] the dual of a fractional MDS code is not necessarily MDS. Here, we aim to give a precise condition on when the dual of a fractional MDS code is MDS.

Definition 20. *Let J be a subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. The geometric quotient at J of an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code C is a code C/J of length $n - |J|$ defined as*

$$C/J = \{u_J \mid u \in C, \text{ and } u_j = 0, \text{ for all } j \in J\} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{q^h}^{n-|J|},$$

where u_J denotes the vector obtained from u by deleting the coordinate positions belonging to the subset J . We say a geometric quotient is non-obliterating if $|C/J| \geq q^h$. Note that an obliterating quotient always yields an unfaithful additive code.

The code C/J is sometimes referred to as a projection or a shortening of the code C , which can be confused with puncturing or truncation. The motivation for calling it the geometric quotient is the following theorem. This theorem generalises [2, Lemma 3.11] from the integral case that $r/h \in \mathbb{N}$ to the fractional case.

Theorem 21. *Let C be an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code with projective system $\mathcal{X}(C)$. If J is a subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and U_J is the subspace of $\text{PG}(r-1, q)$ spanned by the elements of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ corresponding to the positions in J , then C_J is an additive code of length $n_J = n - |J|$, with \mathbb{F}_q -dimension $r_J = r - \dim U_J$, and with projective system in the quotient geometry*

$$\text{PG}(r-1, q)/U_J \cong \text{PG}(r - \dim U_J - 1, q)$$

consisting of the subspaces $\langle A, U_J \rangle / U_J$, $A \in \mathcal{X}(C) \setminus U_J$.

Proof. Let C be an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code with projective system $\mathcal{X}(C)$, and with generator matrix G consisting of columns $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$.

First suppose $J = \{j\}$. Consider any nonzero codeword aG of C , $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$. Then $aG \in C/J$ if and only if $v_j \in a^\perp$. Let χ denote the extension of the map used to map the columns of G to the elements of $\mathcal{X}(C)$, with respect to some fixed \mathbb{F}_q -basis for \mathbb{F}_q^h . Then $\chi(v_j) \in \mathcal{X}(C)$ is a subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^r of dimension $m_j \leq h$, and since $a \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$, the condition $v_j \in a^\perp$ is equivalent to the condition that a^\perp contains $\chi(v_j)$. So the code C/J is an additive code of dimension $r - m_j$ over \mathbb{F}_q , and its codewords are of the form aG where a^\perp contains $\chi(v_j)$, i.e. $a^\perp + \chi(v_j)$ is a hyperplane in the quotient space $\mathbb{F}_q^r / \chi(v_j)$. Consider the map

$$\eta : \mathbb{F}_q^r \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{r-m_j} : v \mapsto \chi^{-1}(\varphi(\chi(v) + \chi(v_j)))$$

where φ denotes the natural isomorphism $\mathbb{F}_q^r / \chi(v_j) \cong \mathbb{F}_q^{r-m_j}$, and let G_J denote the $(r - m_j) \times (n - 1)$ matrix with columns $\eta(v_i)$, $i \neq j$. Then G_J is a generator matrix for C_J , and the multiset $\mathcal{X}(C_J)$ consists of the subspaces $\langle \chi(v_i), \chi(v_j) \rangle$, $i \neq j$, in the quotient of $\text{PG}(r - 1, q)$ by $\chi(v_j)$. The case $|J| > 1$ follows by repeating the argument $|J|$ times. \square

Theorem 22. *Let C be an additive MDS code. The dual code C^\perp is an additive faithful MDS code if and only if every non-obliterating geometric quotient of C is faithful.*

Proof. Let C be an additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code, where $d = n - \lceil r/h \rceil + 1$. Suppose that every non-obliterating geometric quotient of C is faithful and C^\perp is not a faithful MDS code. If C^\perp is unfaithful then by Theorem 17, C has minimum distance 1, which contradicts the fact that C is MDS. Thus, it follows that C^\perp is not MDS. Let \tilde{G} be the $r \times hn$ matrix with entries in \mathbb{F}_q obtained from a generator matrix G for C as before. Since C^\perp is not MDS there is a codeword $u \in C^\perp$ of weight at most $m \leq \lfloor r/h \rfloor$. Consider the restriction of \tilde{G} to these m blocks of h columns, and let π_1, \dots, π_m denote the corresponding elements of $\mathcal{X}(C)$ (subspaces of $\text{PG}(r - 1, q)$). Since $u \in C^\perp$, at least one of the π_i meets the span

$$\Sigma = \langle \pi_j : j \in J \rangle, \quad J = \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i\}$$

of the remaining elements nontrivially. Since Σ has dimension at most $(m - 1)h - 1$, and $r - (m - 1)h \geq h$, the quotient C/J is non-obliterating. Moreover the quotient π_i / Σ has dimension at most $h - 2$. Thus, we have a non-obliterating quotient C/J which is unfaithful.

Conversely, suppose C^\perp is an additive faithful MDS code and that there is a non-obliterating geometric quotient C/J of C , which is unfaithful. Suppose J has size $m - 1$.

Since the geometric quotient is non-obliterating $m - 1 \leq \lfloor r/h \rfloor - 1$. Since the geometric quotient is unfaithful, there is a further coordinate which together with the coordinates corresponding to J give m blocks whose mh columns do not span an mh -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^r . This implies that there is a codeword of weight $m \leq \lfloor r/h \rfloor$ in C^\perp , contradicting the assumption that C^\perp is MDS. \square

9 Constructions of additive MDS codes over finite fields

In the next theorem we will construct some additive MDS codes which prove that the bound in Theorem 14 is attainable if r_0 divides h and $k = 2$. Observe that Theorem 2 implies that for linear codes with $k = 2$,

$$n \leq q^h + 1,$$

so the following construction exceeds the bound for linear codes.

Theorem 23. *If r_0 divides h then there is a $[n, 1 + (r_0/h), n - 1]_q^h$ additive MDS code where*

$$n = q^h + \frac{q^h - 1}{q^{r_0} - 1}.$$

Proof. Let A be the set of representatives for $\mathbb{F}_{q^{h+r_0}}/\mathbb{F}_{q^{r_0}}$, i.e. each $a \in A$ corresponds to a point of $\text{PG}(h/r_0, q^{r_0})$.

Let w be a primitive element of $\mathbb{F}_{q^{h+r_0}}$ and let $\{1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{h/r_0-1}\}$ be a basis for \mathbb{F}_{q^h} over $\mathbb{F}_{q^{r_0}}$.

For each $x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{h+r_0}}$, we define a codeword whose coordinates are indexed by $a \in A$ and whose entry is

$$\sum_{j=0}^{h/r_0-1} \text{tr}(xaw^j)\alpha^j$$

where tr is the trace from $\mathbb{F}_{q^{h+r_0}}$ to $\mathbb{F}_{q^{r_0}}$.

Thus $|C| = q^{h+r_0}$ and $n = (q^{h+r_0} - 1)/(q^{r_0} - 1)$, so it suffices to prove that $d = n - 1$.

Equivalently, we need to prove that there is a unique a such that

$$0 = \sum_{j=0}^{h/r_0-1} \text{tr}(xaw^j)\alpha^j$$

Since $\{1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{h/r_0-1}\}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_{q^{r_0}}$ it follows that for all $j \in \{0, \dots, h/r_0 - 1\}$,

$$0 = \text{tr}(xaw^j).$$

These equations define h/r_0 independent hyperplanes in $\text{PG}(h/r_0, q^{r_0})$, so there is a unique point which is in the intersection of these hyperplanes. \square

A similar construction can be used to prove that the bound in Theorem 14 is also attainable when $k = 3$ and $q = 2$.

Theorem 24. *There is a $[2^{h+1}, 2 + (1/h), d]_2^h$ additive MDS code.*

Proof. Let w be a primitive element of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{h+1}}$ and let $\{1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{h-1}\}$ be a basis for \mathbb{F}_{2^h} over \mathbb{F}_2 .

For each $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{F}_{2^h} \times \mathbb{F}_{2^{h+1}}$, we define a codeword whose coordinates are indexed by $a \in \mathbb{F}_{2^{h+1}}$ and whose entry is

$$x_1 + \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \text{tr}(x_2 a w^j) \alpha^j$$

where tr is the trace from $\mathbb{F}_{2^{h+1}}$ to \mathbb{F}_2 .

Thus $|C| = 2^{2h+1}$ and $n = 2^{h+1}$, so it suffices to prove that $d = n - 2$.

Suppose that there are a_1, a_2, a_3 , distinct elements of $\mathbb{F}_{2^{h+1}}$ such that

$$0 = x_1 + \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \text{tr}(x_2 a_i w^j) \alpha^j,$$

for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Observe that if $x_2 = 0$ then $x_1 = 0$ and we have the zero codeword. Thus, we assume $x_2 \neq 0$.

Thus,

$$0 = \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \text{tr}(x_2 (a_1 - a_2) w^j) \alpha^j = \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \text{tr}(x_2 (a_1 - a_3) w^j) \alpha^j,$$

Since $\{1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{h-1}\}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{F}_2 it follows that

$$0 = \text{tr}(x_2 (a_1 - a_2) w^j) = \text{tr}(x_2 (a_1 - a_3) w^j),$$

for $j \in \{0, \dots, h-1\}$.

The equations

$$0 = \text{tr}(x_2 a w^j),$$

for $j \in \{0, \dots, h-1\}$, define h independent hyperplanes in $\text{PG}(h, 2)$, so there is a unique point a which is in the intersection of these hyperplanes.

This implies

$$x_2 (a_1 - a_2) = x_2 (a_1 - a_3).$$

Since $x_2 \neq 0$, this implies $a_2 = a_3$, a contradiction. \square

Although the codes constructed in Theorem 23 and Theorem 24 have very small rate, it is of interest that their length is superior to that of their linear counterparts. In the next section we classify additive MDS codes over small fields and observe, once more, that there are additive fractional MDS codes whose length exceeds the length of any known linear MDS code.

In the previous two constructions, we have that k is small. In the following construction, we look at the other extreme, when d is small. This effectively proves that the bound in Theorem 16 is tight.

Theorem 25. *Let π_0 and π_∞ be h -dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^{2h} = \pi_0 \oplus \pi_\infty$. If there are r_i -dimensional subspaces π_i such that $r_i \leq h$,*

$$\pi_i \cap \pi_j = \{0\}$$

for all distinct $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{\infty\}$ where

$$\sum_{i=1}^k r_i = r$$

then there is an $[[\lceil r/h \rceil + 2, r/h, 3]_q^h$ additive MDS code C .

Proof. We consider \mathbb{F}_q^{2h} as $\mathbb{F}_{q^h}^2$ and choose a suitable basis so that

$$\pi_0 = \{(0, x) \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}\}$$

and

$$\pi_\infty = \{(x, 0) \mid x \in \mathbb{F}_{q^h}\}.$$

Let S_j be an additive subset of \mathbb{F}_{q^h} of size q^{r_j} , for each $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

We define additive maps f and g from

$$(S_1, \dots, S_k) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{q^h}$$

such that

$$\pi_j = \{(f(0, \dots, 0, x_j, 0, \dots, 0), g(0, \dots, 0, x_j, 0, \dots, 0)) \mid x \in S_j\},$$

We define an additive code

$$C = \{(u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k, f(u_1, \dots, u_k), g(u_1, \dots, u_k)) \mid u_i \in S_i\}.$$

and note that $|C| = q^r$.

Let $u \in C$ be a codeword. We need to show that the weight of u is at least 3.

If the weight of (u_1, \dots, u_k) is at least 3 then the weight of u is at least 3.

If the weight of (u_1, \dots, u_k) and the weight u is 2 then we can suppose that there exists distinct i and j such that $u_i, u_j \neq 0$ and

$$f(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0, u_j, 0, \dots, 0) = g(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0, u_j, 0, \dots, 0) = 0.$$

Since f and g are additive, we have that

$$f(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0) = f(0, \dots, 0, -u_j, 0, \dots, 0)$$

and likewise for g , which implies that π_i and π_j have non-trivial intersection. Since this is not the case the weight of u is at least 3.

If the weight of (u_1, \dots, u_k) is 1 then suppose that $u_i \neq 0$ and that

$$f(0, \dots, 0, u_i, 0, \dots, 0) = 0.$$

This implies that π_i and π_0 have non-trivial intersection. Since this is not the case the weight of u is at least 3. The same argument holds for g and π_∞ .

Therefore, C has minimum weight 3, which implies that it has minimum distance 3. \square

The following theorem implies that the bound in Theorem 16 is attainable if $r_0 = h - 1$.

Theorem 26. *There is an $[\lceil r/h \rceil + 2, r/h, 3]_q^h$ additive MDS code C for all $\lceil r/h \rceil \leq q^h - 1$.*

Proof. Let $r = (k - 1)h + r_0$.

The non-zero vectors of \mathbb{F}_q^{2h} can be partitioned into $q^h + 1$ subspaces π_0, \dots, π_{q^h} of dimension h . We can then fix π_0 and π_∞ to be two of these subspaces and choose $r_i = h - 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, h - r_0$ and $r_i = h$ for $i = k - h + r_0$ using the remaining $q^h - 1$ subspaces.

Then we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k r_i = h(k - 1) + r_0$$

and the theorem follows from Theorem 25. □

10 Additive MDS codes over small finite fields

In this section we aim to classify all additive MDS codes over fields of size $q \leq 9$ and small enough values for r . In the integral case, these codes had already been classified in [5]. We continue this classification here, considering the fractional case too. We will only consider faithful MDS codes, since an unfaithful MDS code can always be converted into a faithful MDS code with the same parameters, as mentioned in Remark 6. We do this by classifying the projective systems corresponding to (fractional) additive codes as detailed in Theorem 5. In particular, a faithful $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ MDS code is equivalent to a set of $(h - 1)$ -dimensional subspaces of size n , any $\lceil r/h \rceil$ of which span $\text{PG}(r - 1, q)$. We may assume $n \geq \lceil r/h \rceil + 1$, since otherwise the condition is trivially satisfied.

A projective system corresponding to a fractional additive $[n, r/h, d]_q^h$ code is called a *fractional subspace-arc*. A fractional subspace-arc is *complete* if it can not be extended to a larger fractional subspace-arc. If $h = 2$ we speak of *line-arcs* and if $h = 3$ of *plane-arcs*.

In the following tables, the integral MDS codes are indicated by r in bold face. Constructions obtained from Theorem 23 are indicated by a †, and constructions obtained from Theorem 24 are indicated by a *.

The computational results were obtained using the GAP-package FinInG [15, 6].

10.1 Additive MDS codes over \mathbb{F}_4

In this case, $q = 2$ and $h = 2$. By Theorem 16, we have $k \leq 3$, so $r \leq 6$, and by Theorem 14, $n \leq 8$ if $r = 5$ and $n \leq 6$ if $r = 6$. The number of equivalence classes of (fractional) line-arcs are collected in Table 1.

The most interesting case is that of fractional line-arcs in $\text{PG}(4, 2)$, where the maximal size is 8. Amongst the representatives for the equivalent classes of these line-arcs, the only complete fractional

length n	3	4	5	6	7	8
$r = 3$	2	2	1	1	1^\dagger	-
$\mathbf{r} = 4$	1	1	1	-	-	-
$r = 5$	-	5	8	6	1	1^*
$\mathbf{r} = 6$	-	1	1	1	-	-

Table 1: The number of additive MDS codes over \mathbb{F}_4 .

line-arcs of size strictly smaller than 8 have size 6 and there are 5 of them. So there is only one non-complete fractional line-arc of size 6. This implies that each two of the fractional line-arcs of size 6 contained in the unique fractional line-arc of size 8 are equivalent.

10.2 Additive MDS codes over \mathbb{F}_8

In this case $q = 2$ and $h = 3$. So the projective systems are plane-arcs in $\text{PG}(r-1, 2)$. By Theorem 16, we have $k \leq 7$, if $r_0 \in \{2, 3\}$ and $k \leq 8$ if $r_0 = 1$. Table 2 contains the number of additive MDS codes for $r \leq 9$.

length n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$r = 4$	2	3	4	5	6	6	5	4	3	2	1	1	$1 (\geq 1^\dagger)$	-
$r = 5$	2	4	10	14	19	9	4	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
$\mathbf{r} = 6$	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
$r = 7$	-	33	1895											$\geq 1^*$
$r = 8$	-	6	165	15480						-	-	-	-	-
$\mathbf{r} = 9$	-	1	2	4	2	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 2: The number of MDS additive codes over \mathbb{F}_8 .

The maximal size of a plane-arc in $\text{PG}(5, 2)$ ($r = 6$) is 9 (integral case). Up to equivalence, there is a unique example for each size except in the case that $n = 5$, for which there are two inequivalent examples. As of now, the classification of fractional plane-arcs in $\text{PG}(6, 2)$ and $\text{PG}(7, 2)$ could not yet be completed.

10.3 Additive MDS codes over \mathbb{F}_9

The projective systems corresponding to these ternary codes are (fractional) line-arcs in $\text{PG}(r-1, 3)$. By Theorem 16, we have $k \leq 8$, so $r \leq 16$. Table 3 details the number of additive MDS codes for $r \leq 6$.

The maximal size of a fractional line-arc in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ is 12, and there are 6 examples up to projective

length n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$r = 3$	2	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	1	1	1^\dagger	-	-	-
$r = 4$	1	3	4	5	4	3	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
$r = 5$	2	6	48	1167	21248	145451	273753	96854	3039	6	0	0	-	-
$r = 6$	-	1	4	13	4	3	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	-

Table 3: The number of MDS additive codes over \mathbb{F}_9 .

equivalence. The number of examples of sizes 1 up to 12 is as in the following list

$$[1, 2, 2, 6, 48, 1167, 21248, 145451, 273753, 96854, 3039, 6]$$

up to projective equivalence. Amongst these, the numbers of complete fractional line-arcs in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ of sizes 1 up to 12 is as follows

$$[0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 342, 21787, 68725, 3003, 6].$$

So the smallest complete fractional line-arcs have size 8.

Remark 27. *Interestingly, each of the fractional line-arcs in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ of maximum size 12 consists of pairwise disjoint lines. However, there are complete fractional line-arcs of smaller size which do not satisfy this property. The number of PGL-equivalence classes of fractional line-arcs in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ which consist of pairwise disjoint lines is*

$$[1, 1, 1, 3, 27, 607, 12386, 100185, 227659, 91720, 3013, 6],$$

and amongst these, the number of complete fractional line-arcs is

$$[0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 2802, 63788, 2977, 6].$$

So the smallest complete fractional line-arc in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ consisting of pairwise disjoint lines has size 9.

Representatives of fractional line-arcs. Here we list the representatives of the six equivalence classes of fractional line-arcs of size 12 in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$ up to projective equivalence. Each list consists of twelve (2×5) matrices with entries from \mathbb{F}_3 , whose rows span a line in $\text{PG}(4, 3)$.

$$A_1 : \begin{bmatrix} 10000 \\ 01000 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10001 \\ 01010 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10002 \\ 01100 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10010 \\ 01101 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10011 \\ 01200 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10012 \\ 01210 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10100 \\ 01012 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10112 \\ 01222 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10122 \\ 01002 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10200 \\ 01220 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10220 \\ 01211 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 01011 \\ 00112 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_2 : \begin{bmatrix} 10000 \\ 01000 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10001 \\ 01010 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10002 \\ 01100 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10010 \\ 01101 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10011 \\ 01200 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10012 \\ 01210 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10100 \\ 01012 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10120 \\ 01001 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10112 \\ 01122 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10122 \\ 01112 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 11022 \\ 00102 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 12010 \\ 00112 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_3 : \begin{bmatrix} 10000 \\ 01000 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10001 \\ 01010 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10002 \\ 01100 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10010 \\ 01101 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10011 \\ 01200 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10012 \\ 01210 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10100 \\ 01012 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10120 \\ 01001 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10112 \\ 01122 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10122 \\ 01112 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 11022 \\ 00102 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 12010 \\ 00112 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_4 : \begin{bmatrix} 10000 \\ 01000 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10001 \\ 01010 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10002 \\ 01100 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10010 \\ 01101 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10011 \\ 01200 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10012 \\ 01210 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10100 \\ 01012 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10120 \\ 01120 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10102 \\ 00103 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 11020 \\ 00113 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 11023 \\ 00210 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 10101 \\ 00012 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A_5 : \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10000 \\ 01000 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10001 \\ 01010 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10002 \\ 01100 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10010 \\ 01101 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10011 \\ 01200 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10012 \\ 01220 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10100 \\ 01010 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10101 \\ 01110 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10102 \\ 01122 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10120 \\ 01110 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10122 \\ 01212 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 01011 \\ 00102 \end{smallmatrix} \right]$$

$$A_6 : \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10000 \\ 01000 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10001 \\ 01010 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10002 \\ 01100 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10010 \\ 01101 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10011 \\ 01200 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10012 \\ 01222 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10100 \\ 01020 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10101 \\ 01122 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10102 \\ 01022 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10120 \\ 01122 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10121 \\ 01222 \end{smallmatrix} \right], \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 10122 \\ 01222 \end{smallmatrix} \right]$$

Fractional additive MDS codes. Below we list the generator matrix $G_i \in \mathbb{F}_9^{5 \times 12}$ of the fractional additive $[12, 5/2, 10]_3^2$ MDS code C_i corresponding to the fractional line-arc A_i , $i = 1, \dots, 6$, listed above. The element ω is a primitive element of \mathbb{F}_9 with minimal polynomial $x^2 - x - 1$.

$$G_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & 1 & \omega^3 & 1 & \omega^6 & \omega^6 & \omega \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 1 & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega & \omega^3 & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^7 & \omega^2 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega & \omega & 1 & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^6 & \omega^6 & 0 & \omega & \omega^3 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega \\ 0 & 0 & \omega & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & 1 & 1 & \omega^7 & \omega^7 & \omega & \omega \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 1 & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega & 1 & \omega^6 & \omega^7 & 1 & \omega^2 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^2 & \omega^5 & \omega^6 & \omega^6 & \omega^5 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & 0 & 1 & \omega \\ 0 & 0 & \omega & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & 1 & \omega^7 & \omega & \omega & \omega & 1 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 1 & 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & \omega & \omega^7 & \omega^6 & \omega^2 & \omega^5 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^3 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & \omega & \omega^6 & \omega & \omega^6 & \omega^7 & \omega^7 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 1 & 1 & \omega^3 & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & \omega & \omega^7 & \omega^6 & \omega^7 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega^6 & 0 & \omega^2 & \omega^7 & \omega & \omega^2 & \omega^6 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & 1 & \omega^3 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & \omega^3 & \omega \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 1 & 1 & \omega^3 & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & \omega & \omega^7 & \omega^6 & \omega^7 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & \omega^6 & 0 & \omega^2 & \omega^7 & \omega & \omega^2 & \omega^6 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$G_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & \omega & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & \omega & \omega^6 & \omega & \omega^6 & \omega^7 & \omega^7 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 & 1 & 1 & \omega^3 & \omega^5 & \omega^5 & \omega & \omega^7 & \omega^6 & \omega^7 \\ 0 & 1 & \omega & \omega & 1 & \omega & \omega^5 & \omega^3 & \omega^2 & \omega^2 & 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}$$

11 Conclusion

In this article we introduced new bounds relating the parameters of an additive code over a finite field, Theorem 9 and Theorem 12. These bounds have similarities to the Griesmer bound for linear codes and can be obtained in a combinatorial manner. It is possible that similar bounds exist which may improve on our bounds here. In the case of MDS codes however, it is unlikely that any improvement would be obtained using solely combinatorial arguments. We have provided examples of fractional additive MDS codes which attain the bound, Theorem 23 and Theorem 24. We have also found examples over small fields which surpass the length of Reed-Solomon codes, most notably the $[12, 2.5, 10]_3^2$ additive codes mentioned in Remark 27. It would be of great interest if there are families of fractional MDS codes which are longer than the Reed-Solomon codes for larger values of r/h .

The length of the longest k -dimensional linear MDS codes is conjectured to be $q + 1$ apart from the exceptional cases that $k \in \{3, q - 1\}$, q is even and $n = q + 2$. The MDS conjecture was proved for q prime in [1]. For a recent list on the values of k for which the conjecture is known to be true for q non-prime, see [4]. It is probable that the MDS conjecture is true for all MDS codes over any

alphabet of size q , i.e. that $n \leq q + 1$, where the code has size q^k , apart from the previously mentioned exceptional cases that $k \in \{3, q - 1\}$, q is even and $n = q + 2$. Note that, for q odd, linear MDS codes of length q and $q + 1$ were classified by Segre in 1955, while the classification of linear MDS codes of length $q - 1$ and $q - 2$ was only recently completed, see [3].

There are examples of non-MDS fractional additive codes which outperform their linear counterparts constructed using cyclic codes in [16]. In [16], a $[63, 5, 45]_2^2$ additive code over \mathbb{F}_4 is constructed and no linear code is known with these parameters. We have checked that this additive code is not equivalent to any linear code. Note that a linear code with such parameters might exist. To our knowledge, the only integral additive code with a parameter set for which we know no such linear code exists is Mathon's $[21, 3, 18]_3^2$ code over \mathbb{F}_9 [13].

12 Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the referees and to Zhiyu Yuan for their comments and suggestions. The referee's comments led to considerable improvements to this article.

References

- [1] S. Ball, On sets of vectors of a finite vector space in which every subset of basis size is a basis, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **14** (2012) 733–748.
- [2] S. Ball and S. Adriaensen, On additive MDS codes with linear projections, *Finite Fields Appl.*, **91** (2023) 102255.
- [3] S. Ball and M. Lavrauw, Planar arcs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, **160** (2018) 261–287.
- [4] S. Ball and M. Lavrauw, Arcs in finite projective spaces, *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Science*, **6** (2019) 133–172.
- [5] S. Ball, G. Gamboa and M. Lavrauw, On additive MDS codes over small fields, *Adv. Math. Commun.*, **17** (2023) 828–844.
- [6] J. Bamberg, A. Betten, P. Cara, J. De Beule, M. Lavrauw, M. Neunhoeffler. FinInG - a GAP package for Finite Incidence Geometry, 1.01 2014, (<https://gap-packages.github.io/FinInG/>).
- [7] J. Bierbrauer, Cyclic additive and quantum stabilizer codes, in *Arithmetic of Finite Fields: First International Workshop* (eds. C. Carlet and B. Sunar), Madrid, (2007), 276–283.
- [8] J. Bierbrauer and Y. Edel, Quantum twisted codes, *J. Combin. Des.*, **8** (2000), 174–188.
- [9] J. Bierbrauer, S. Marcugini and F. Pambianco, Optimal Additive Quaternary Codes of Low Dimension *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **67** (2021) 5116–5118.

- [10] L. E. Danielsen, Graph-based classification of self-dual additive codes over finite fields, *Adv. Math. Commun.*, **3** (2009), 329–348.
- [11] L. E. Danielsen, On the classification of Hermitian self-dual additive codes over $\text{GF}(9)$, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **58** (2012), 5500–5511.
- [12] L. E. Danielsen and M. G. Parker, On the classification of all self-dual additive codes over $\text{GF}(4)$ of length up to 12, *J. Comb. Theory Ser. A*, **113** (2006), 1351–1367.
- [13] F. De Clerck, M. Delanote, N. Hamilton, and R. Mathon, Perp-systems and partial geometries, *Adv. Geom.*, **2** (2002) 1–12.
- [14] B. K. Dey and B. S. Rajan, \mathbb{F}_q -linear cyclic codes over \mathbb{F}_{q^m} : DFT approach, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, **34** (2005), 89–116.
- [15] The GAP Group, GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.13.1; 2024. (<http://www.gap-system.org>).
- [16] C. Guan, R. Li, Y. Liu and Z. Ma, Some Quaternary Additive Codes Outperform Linear Counterparts, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **69** (2023) 7122–7131.
- [17] J. H. Griesmer, A bound for error-correcting codes, *IBM Journal of Res. and Dev.*, **4** (1960) 532–542.
- [18] W. Cary Huffman, On the theory of \mathbb{F}_q -linear \mathbb{F}_{q^t} -codes, *Adv. Math. Commun.*, **7** (2013) 349–878.
- [19] A. Ketkar, A. Klappenecker, S. Kumar, and P. K. Sarvepalli, Nonbinary stabilizer codes over finite fields, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, **52** (2006) 4892–4914.
- [20] E. M. Rains, Nonbinary quantum codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **45** (1999), 1827–1832.
- [21] M. Yadav and A. Sharma, Some new classes of additive MDS and almost MDS codes over finite fields, *Finite Fields Appl.* **95** (2024) 102394.