

DUAL CODES OF PRODUCT SEMI-LINEAR CODES

LUIS FELIPE TAPIA CUITIÑO AND ANDREA LUIGI TIRONI

ABSTRACT. Let \mathbb{F}_q be a finite field with q elements and denote by $\theta : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ an automorphism of \mathbb{F}_q . In this paper, we deal with linear codes of \mathbb{F}_q^n invariant under a semi-linear map $T : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ for some $n \geq 2$. In particular, we study three kind of their dual codes, some relations between them and we focus on codes which are products of module skew codes in the non-commutative polynomial ring as a subcase of linear codes invariant by a semi-linear map T . In this setting we give also an algorithm for encoding, decoding and detecting errors and we show a method to construct codes invariant under a fixed T .

INTRODUCTION

Recently there has been a lot of interest on algebraic codes in the setting of skew polynomial rings which form an important family of non-commutative rings. Skew polynomial rings have found applications in the construction of algebraic codes, where codes are defined as ideals (submodules) in the quotient rings (modules) of skew polynomial rings.

The main motivation for considering these codes is that polynomials in skew polynomial rings exhibit many factorizations and hence there are many more ideals in a skew polynomial ring than in the commutative case.

Furthermore, the research on codes in this setting has resulted in the discovery of many new codes with better Hamming distance than any previously known linear code with same parameters.

Inspired by the recent works [2], [3] and [4], in §1 we introduce the notion of T -codes, that is, linear codes invariant under a semi-linear transformation T , and we characterize them from an algebraic point of view (see Theorem 6). In §2, as a consequence of Theorem 12 and Proposition 13, we introduce the definition of *product semi-linear T -codes*, a generalization of the module skew codes and a subcase of linear codes invariant under a semi-linear transformation T (see Definitions 14 and 16, and Remark 18). In particular, we show that in the commutative case any invariant code by means of an invertible linear transformation is isomorphic as a vector space to a product of module codes (see Theorem 12). In §3 we study the main properties of the Euclidean dual codes (Theorem 23, Proposition 25 and Remark 24), the quasi-Euclidean and the Hermitian dual codes (Definitions 39 and 51, Theorems 40 and 56) and the main relations among them (Theorem 53 and Corollaries 55 and 57). Finally, in §4 we give an algorithm for encoding, decoding and detecting errors by a product semi-linear code (Algorithm 2), while in §5 we show a method to construct codes invariant under a semi-linear transformation (e.g., see Proposition 66 for the commutative case).

Date: November 7, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 12Y05, 16Z05; Secondary: 94B05, 94B35.
 Key words and phrases: finite fields, dual codes, skew polynomial rings, semi-linear maps.

1. NOTATION AND BACKGROUND MATERIAL

Let \mathbb{F}_q be a finite field with q elements and denote by θ an automorphism of \mathbb{F}_q . Let us recall here that if $q = p^s$ for some prime number p , then the map $\tilde{\theta} : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ defined by $\tilde{\theta}(a) = a^p$ is an automorphism on the field \mathbb{F}_q which fixes the subfield with p elements. This automorphism $\tilde{\theta}$ is called the *Frobenius automorphism* and it has order s . Moreover, it is known that the cyclic group it generates is the full group of automorphisms of \mathbb{F}_q , i.e. $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \langle \tilde{\theta} \rangle$. Therefore, any $\theta \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is defined as $\theta(a) := \tilde{\theta}^t(a) = a^{p^t}$, where $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and t is an integer such that $0 \leq t \leq s$. Furthermore, when θ will be the identity automorphism $id : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$, we will write simply $\theta = id$.

If $n \geq 2$ is an integer, then we denote by \mathbb{F}_q^n the vector space

$$\mathbb{F}_q^n := \underbrace{\mathbb{F}_q \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q}_{n\text{-times}}.$$

It is well known that a semi-linear map $T : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is the composition of an automorphism θ of \mathbb{F}_q with an \mathbb{F}_q -linear transformation M , i.e. $(\vec{v})T := (\vec{v})\Theta \circ M$, where $(v_1, \dots, v_n)\Theta := (\theta(v_1), \dots, \theta(v_n))$ and M is an $n \times n$ matrix with coordinates in \mathbb{F}_q . In this case we call T a θ -semi-linear map, or a θ -semi-linear transformation.

For any $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and any T as above, let $[\vec{v}]$ denote the T -cyclic subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n spanned by $\{\vec{v}, (\vec{v})T, (\vec{v})T^2, \dots\}$.

Vector subspaces $\mathcal{C}_T \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ invariant by a θ -semi-linear transformation T will be called here *semi-linear T -codes*, or *T -codes* for simplicity.

The main result of [7] allows us to decompose the vector space \mathbb{F}_q^n into a direct sum of very special vector subspaces and to find a normal canonical form for any θ -semi-linear transformation.

Definition 1. We say that two θ -semi-linear maps $T = \Theta \circ M$ and $T' = \Theta \circ M'$ of \mathbb{F}_q^n are θ -similar if there exists an invertible matrix C such that $T = C^{-1}T'C$. In this case we simply write $T \sim_\theta T'$.

By choosing the basis of \mathbb{F}_q^n to be the union of appropriate bases

$$\left\{ \vec{u}_i, (\vec{u}_i)T, (\vec{u}_i)T^2, \dots, (\vec{u}_i)T^{\dim[\vec{u}_i]-1} \right\}$$

of T -cyclic subspaces $[\vec{u}_i]$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, it follows immediately the existence of a normal canonical form for any θ -semi-linear map T .

Theorem 2 ([7], Theorem 5). *Let θ and T be an automorphism of \mathbb{F}_q and a θ -semi-linear transformation on \mathbb{F}_q^n , respectively. Then*

$$\mathbb{F}_q^n = [\vec{u}_1] \oplus \dots \oplus [\vec{u}_r],$$

for T -cyclic subspaces $[\vec{u}_i]$ satisfying $\dim[\vec{u}_1] \geq \dim[\vec{u}_2] \geq \dots \geq \dim[\vec{u}_r]$. Moreover, if $T = \Theta \circ M$ then

$$T \sim_\theta \Theta \circ \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r),$$

where each M_i is a matrix $n_i \times n_i$ of the following form

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & 1 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & 1 \\ \hline a_{i,0} & a_{i,1} & \dots & a_{i,n_i-1} \end{array} \right)$$

with $n_i \geq 1$ and such that $\sum_{i=1}^r n_i = n$.

Remark 3. By Theorem 2, we know that any θ -semi-linear transformation $T = \Theta \circ M$ is θ -similar to

$$D := \Theta \circ \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r) = (\Theta \circ M_1, \dots, \Theta \circ M_r),$$

i.e. there exists an invertible matrix

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ \vdots \\ C_r \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } C_i := \begin{pmatrix} \vec{u}_i \\ (\vec{u}_i)T \\ \vdots \\ (\vec{u}_i)T^{n_i-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, r,$$

such that

$$T = C^{-1}DC = C^{-1}(\Theta \circ \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r))C = C^{-1}(\Theta \circ M_1, \dots, \Theta \circ M_r)C,$$

where $n_i := \dim[\vec{u}_i]$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and each $\Theta \circ M_i$ is the θ -semi-linear transformation on $\mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ such that $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^r n_i = n$. This gives a one-to-one correspondence between linear codes invariant under T and linear codes invariant under D . Therefore we can construct any semi-linear D -code $\mathcal{C}_D := \mathcal{C}_T C^{-1}$ from a semi-linear T -code \mathcal{C}_T , and vice versa.

The proof of the below result is immediate.

Lemma 4. *We have the following two properties:*

- (1) $\Theta \circ \overline{M}_\theta = \overline{M} \circ \Theta$, for any matrix $\overline{M} = [m_{ij}]$, where $\overline{M}_\theta := [\theta(m_{ij})]$;
- (2) $(\vec{a} \Theta^{-1}) \cdot \vec{b} = 0 \iff \vec{a} \cdot (\vec{b} \Theta) = 0, \forall \vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

Remark 5. Let $T = \Theta \circ M$ be a θ -semi-linear transformation. If M is an $n \times n$ matrix with coordinates in $\mathbb{F}_q^\theta \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$, the subfields of \mathbb{F}_q fixed by θ , then M admits a rational normal form (obtained by the Magma [1] command `RationalForm(M)`), i.e. there exists an invertible matrix C with coordinates in \mathbb{F}_q^θ such that $M = C^{-1}M'C$, where $M' := \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_k)$ and each M_i is a $n_i \times n_i$ matrix as in Theorem 2 defined over \mathbb{F}_q^θ . Thus we have

$$CTC^{-1} = C(\Theta \circ M)C^{-1} = \Theta \circ CMC^{-1} = \Theta \circ M' = D$$

and in this case it is easy to find a matrix C which transforms a T -code into a D -code, and vice versa. Typical examples of this situation are the skew quasi-cyclic codes, where the matrix M is a permutation matrix P such that $P = P_\theta = P_{\theta^{-1}}$.

Consider the ring structure defined on the following set:

$$R := \mathbb{F}_q[X; \theta] = \{a_s X^s + \dots + a_1 X + a_0 \mid a_i \in \mathbb{F}_q \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

The addition in R is defined to be the usual addition of polynomials and the multiplication is defined by the basic rule $X \cdot a = \theta(a)X$ for any $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and extended to all elements of R by associativity and distributivity. The ring R is known as skew polynomial ring and its elements are skew polynomials. Moreover, it is a right Euclidean ring whose left ideals are principals.

From now on, together with the same notation as above, we will always assume the following

Hypothesis (*): $T = \Theta \circ M$ is a fixed θ -semi-linear transformation of \mathbb{F}_q^n which is θ -similar to $D := \Theta \circ \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r)$ by a matrix C and $f_j := (-1)^{n_j}(X^{n_j} -$

$\sum_{i=0}^{n_j-1} a_{j,i} X^i \in R$ is the characteristic polynomial of M_j with $a_{j,0} \neq 0$, where the coefficients $a_{j,i}$ are given by Theorem 2 for every $j = 1, \dots, r$ and $i = 0, \dots, n_j - 1$.

Denote by $\pi_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j} \rightarrow R/Rf_j$ the linear transformation which sends a vector $\vec{c}_j = (c_0, \dots, c_{n_j-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j}$ to the polynomial class $c_j(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_j-1} c_i X^i$ of R/Rf_j .

Moreover, consider the linear map

$$\pi : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r} \rightarrow R_n := R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r,$$

where $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r)$ and the linear transformation $\pi_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j} \rightarrow R/Rf_j$ is defined as above for each $j = 1, \dots, r$.

Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code and define the linear code

$$\mathcal{C}C^{-1} := \{ \vec{c} C^{-1} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \}.$$

We can obtain now the following characterization of any T -code in \mathbb{F}_q^n .

Theorem 6. *With the same notation as in (*), let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code and put $\mathcal{C}' := \mathcal{C}C^{-1}$. Then*

\mathcal{C} is a T -code $\iff \mathcal{C}'$ is a linear code invariant under $D \iff \pi(\mathcal{C}')$ is a left R -submodule of R_n .

Proof. From Remark 3, we know that any T -code can be written as $\mathcal{C}'C$, where \mathcal{C}' is a linear code invariant by D , and vice versa. So it is sufficient to show that a linear code \mathcal{C}' is invariant under D if and only if $\pi(\mathcal{C}')$ is a left R -submodule of R_n . Let \mathcal{C}' be a linear code invariant by D . Note that $\pi(\mathcal{C}')$ is an abelian group with respect to the sum. Moreover, observe that $X \cdot \pi(\vec{v}) = \pi(\vec{v}D) \in \pi(\mathcal{C}')$ for any $\vec{v} \in \mathcal{C}'$. By an inductive argument and linearity, this implies that $g \cdot \pi(\vec{v}) \in \pi(\mathcal{C}')$ for any $g \in R$, that is, $\pi(\mathcal{C}')$ is an R -submodule of R_n . On the other hand, let $\pi(\mathcal{C}')$ be an R -submodule of R_n . Then $\mathcal{C}' = \pi^{-1}(\pi(\mathcal{C}'))$ is a vector subspace of \mathbb{F}_q^n and for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}'$ we have $\vec{c}D = \pi^{-1}(X \cdot \pi(\vec{c})) \in \pi^{-1}(\pi(\mathcal{C}')) = \mathcal{C}'$, since $X \cdot \pi(\vec{c}) \in \pi(\mathcal{C}')$. \square

Remark 7. If $T = \Theta \circ M_1$, where M_1 is a matrix as in Theorem 2 with $a_{1,0} \neq 0$, then C in (*) is the identity matrix and the above result becomes a geometric characterization of the module θ -codes (see [2, Definition 1 and Proposition 1]) associated to the polynomial $f_1 := (-1)^{n_1}(X^{n_1} - a_{1,n_1-1}X^{n_1-1} - \dots - a_{1,0})$. Moreover, if $\theta = id$, then Theorem 6 generalizes [8, (2.1)].

Example 8. In \mathbb{F}_4^6 , where $\mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]$ with $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$, consider the matrix

$$D = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} E & O \\ \hline O & E \end{array} \right), \quad \text{where } E = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } O = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the semi-linear transformation $\Theta \circ D$. The code $\mathcal{C} = \langle (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) \rangle$ is invariant by $\Theta \circ D$, $\mathcal{C} \cong \langle (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0) \rangle = \langle (1, 1, 1) \rangle \times \langle (0, 0, 0) \rangle$, but $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$ for any θ -code $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_4^3$ invariant by $\Theta \circ E$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Remark 9. Remark 3 and Theorem 6 say that there is a one-to-one correspondence between T -codes and left R -submodules of R_n .

Remark 10. In the commutative case, i.e. $\theta = id$, the Chinese Remainder Theorem says that if $(f_1), \dots, (f_k)$ are ideals of R which are pairwise coprime, that is $(f_i) + (f_j) = R$ for all $i \neq j$, then $I := (f_1) \cap \dots \cap (f_k) = (f_1) \cdot \dots \cdot (f_k)$ and the quotient

ring R/I is isomorphic to the product ring $R/(f_1) \times \dots \times R/(f_k)$ via the isomorphism $f : R/I \rightarrow R/(f_1) \times \dots \times R/(f_k)$ such that $f(a + I) := (a + (f_1), \dots, a + (f_k))$.

In the non-commutative case there exists an analogous of the above result. When $\theta \neq id$, if Rf_1, \dots, Rf_k are pairwise coprime two-sided ideals of R , then

$$R/(Rf_1 \cap \dots \cap Rf_k) \cong R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_k$$

as R -modules and $I := Rf_1 \cap \dots \cap Rf_k$ can be replaced by a sum over all orderings of Rf_1, \dots, Rf_k of their product (or just a sum over enough orderings, using inductively that $J \cap K = JK + KJ$ for coprimes ideals J, K). In both situations, we have a method to find all the R -submodules of $R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_k$ via R/I .

Corollary 11. *Assume that $\theta = id$ and write $T = M$ with $M = C^{-1}M_1C$, where M_1 is as in (*). If $f_1 = \prod_{i=1}^s p_i^{e_i}$ is the factorization of the polynomial f_1 in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$, where p_1, \dots, p_s are distinct monic irreducible polynomials and $e_i \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, then there exist $\prod_{i=1}^s (e_i + 1)$ T -codes $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{\deg f_1}$.*

Proof. The statement follows from Remark 3 and Theorem 6 by counting the number of all monic divisors of f_1 . \square

By using the computer algebra system Magma [1], the following MAGMA program enables us to find all the right divisors of any polynomial $f \in \mathbb{F}_a[X; \theta]$:

```
F<w>:=GF(a);
E:=[x : x in F | x ne 0];
RightDivisors := function(qq,g)
  R<x>:=TwistedPolynomials(F:q:=qq);
  f:=R!g;
  n:=Degree(f);
  S:=CartesianProduct(E, CartesianPower(F,n-1));
  dd:=[];
  for ss in S do
    ll:=[ss[1]] cat [p : p in ss[2]];
    q,r:=Quotrem(f,R!ll);
    if r eq R![0] then
      dd := dd cat [[q,R!ll]];
    end if;
  end for;
  return dd;
end function;
```

Finally, we have the following two results.

Theorem 12. *Suppose that $\theta = id$. Then any R -submodule S of $R_n = R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ is R -isomorphic to a product $S_1 \times \dots \times S_r$, where each S_j is an R -submodule of R/Rf_j for every $j = 1, \dots, r$. In particular, any D -code $\mathcal{C}_D \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with $D = \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r)$ is isomorphic to a product code $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ as a vector subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_D = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r) \widehat{C}$ for some invertible matrix \widehat{C} , where each $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ is a linear code invariant by M_i , M_i being the $n_i \times n_i$ matrix of Theorem 2.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the first part of the statement for $r \geq 2$, since the second one follows immediately from this by putting $n_i := \deg f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$.

If each polynomial $f_j \in R$ is written as a product $F_{j_1}^{a_{j_1}} \cdots F_{j_{t_j}}^{a_{j_{t_j}}}$ of distinct irreducible polynomials F_{j_k} for some integers $a_{j_i} \geq 1$, then by the Chinese Remainder Theorem we can obtain via isomorphisms a decomposition A of $R_n = R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ such that

$$A := (R/RF_{11}^{a_{11}} \times \dots \times R/RF_{1t_1}^{a_{1t_1}}) \times \dots \times (R/RF_{r1}^{a_{r1}} \times \dots \times R/RF_{rt_r}^{a_{rt_r}}) \cong R_n.$$

Let S be an R -submodule of R_n . Then, up to isomorphisms, S corresponds to an R -submodule S' of A . Thus we have to prove only that every R -submodule S' of A is isomorphic to a product $S_{11} \times \dots \times S_{rt_r} \subseteq A$ of R -submodules $S_{ij_i} \subseteq R/RF_{ij_i}^{a_{ij_i}}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $j_i = 1, \dots, t_i$.

So, let W be an R -submodule of A . Then W is R -isomorphic to a direct sum $Rg_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Rg_k$ of non-zero distinct cyclic R -submodules Rg_i of A with $g_i \in A$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Consider the surjective R -homomorphism $\pi_i : R \rightarrow Rg_i$ and note that $Rg_i \cong R/(\text{Ker } \pi_i)$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$. Since R is a principal ideal domain, we see that $\text{Ker } \pi_i = (p_i)$ for some $p_i \in R$. Let F be the product $F_{11}^{a_{11}} \cdots F_{st_s}^{a_{st_s}}$ of all distinct polynomials with the respective maximum powers which appear in the decompositions $F_{j_1}^{a_{j_1}} \cdots F_{j_{t_j}}^{a_{j_{t_j}}}$ of the polynomials f_j . Then we deduce that $F \in \text{Ker } \pi_i = (p_i)$, i.e. for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ there exists a polynomial q_i such that $F = q_i p_i$. This implies that $p_i = F_{11}^{c_{11}} \cdots F_{st_s}^{c_{st_s}}$ for some integers c_{jt_j} such that $0 \leq c_{jt_j} \leq a_{jt_j}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, s$. So we conclude that

$$Rg_i \cong R/(p_i) = R/(F_{11}^{c_{11}} \cdots F_{st_s}^{c_{st_s}}) \cong R/F_{11}^{c_{11}} \times \dots \times R/F_{st_s}^{c_{st_s}} \subseteq A,$$

i.e. $Rg_i \cong RF_{11}^{a_{11}-c_{11}}/F_{11}^{a_{11}} \times \dots \times RF_{st_s}^{a_{st_s}-c_{st_s}}/F_{st_s}^{a_{st_s}} \cong S_{11} \times \dots \times S_{rt_r} \subseteq A$, where $\{0\} \subseteq S_{ij_i} \subseteq R/RF_{ij_i}^{a_{ij_i}}$ is an R -submodule for every $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $j_i = 1, \dots, t_i$. \square

Proposition 13. *Suppose that $\theta \neq id$. If $R_n = R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ with Rf_1, \dots, Rf_r pairwise coprime two-sided ideals of R , then any R -submodule S of $R_n = R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ is R -isomorphic to a product $S_1 \times \dots \times S_r$, where each S_j is an R -submodule of R/Rf_j for every $j = 1, \dots, r$. In particular, under the above hypothesis, any D -code $\mathcal{C}_D \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is isomorphic to a product code $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ as a vector subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$, i.e. $\mathcal{C}_D = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)\widehat{C}$ for some invertible matrix \widehat{C} , where each $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ is a linear code invariant by $\Theta \circ M_i$, M_i being the $n_i \times n_i$ matrix of Theorem 2.*

Proof. Let S be an R -submodule of R_n . Then S is R -isomorphic to a direct sum $Rg_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Rg_k$ of non-zero distinct cyclic R -submodules Rg_i of R_n with $g_i \in R_n$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Write $g_i = (g_{i1}, \dots, g_{ir})$ and consider the polynomial $F := f_1 \cdots f_r$. Denote by F_h the product F without the factor f_h . Then we get

$$F_h g_i = (0, \dots, 0, F_h g_{ih}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Since the (right) $\gcd(f_h, F_h) = 1$, we know that there exist two polynomials $a, b \in R$ such that $af_h + bF_h = 1$. Hence $bF_h g_i = (0, \dots, 0, g_{ih}, 0, \dots, 0)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $h = 1, \dots, r$. Therefore we have

$$Rg_i = R(g_{i1}, 0, \dots, 0) \oplus \dots \oplus R(0, \dots, 0, g_{ir}) \cong (Rg_{i1}, \dots, Rg_{ir})$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, k$, i.e. $S \cong Rg_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Rg_k \cong (S_1, \dots, S_r)$ for some R -submodules $S_j \subseteq R/Rf_j$, where $j = 1, \dots, r$. \square

2. PRODUCT SEMI-LINEAR CODES

Let us recall here the following

Definition 14 (see [2]). An f_j -module θ -code (or simply a *module θ -code*) \mathcal{C}_j is a linear code in $\mathbb{F}_q^{n_j}$ which corresponds via $\pi_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j} \rightarrow R/Rf_j$ to a left R -submodule $Rg_j/Rf_j \subset R/Rf_j$ in the basis $1, X, \dots, X^{n_j-1}$, where g_j is a right divisor of f_j in R . The length of the code \mathcal{C}_j is $n_j = \deg(f_j)$ and its dimension is $k_j = \deg(f_j) - \deg(g_j)$. For simplicity, we will denote this code $\mathcal{C}_j = (g_j)_{n_j, q}^{k_j, \theta}$ and when there will not be any confusion, we will call an f_j -module θ -code simply a *module θ -code*.

Remark 15. When $\theta = id$, Definition 14 coincides with the one of a generalized cyclic code with respect to a polynomial f_j (see [8] and [10]).

Therefore, from Theorem 12, Proposition 13 and Definition 14, it follows naturally the below definition.

Definition 16. Let $\mathcal{C}_T \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a semi-linear T -code invariant by a θ -semi-linear map T as in (*). We say that \mathcal{C}_T is a *product semi-linear T -code*, or a *product T -code*, if $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$, where any $\mathcal{C}_j \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j}$ is an f_j -module θ -codes with respect to $\Theta \circ M_j$ and $f_j = (-1)^{n_j}(X^{n_j} - \sum_{k=0}^{n_j-1} a_{j,k}X^k)$ is as in (*) for every $j = 1, \dots, r$ and $n = \sum_{j=1}^r n_j$.

Remark 17. When C is the identity matrix and $r = 1$, then Definition 16 is nothing else than the definition of an f_1 -module θ -code.

Remark 18. When either $\theta = id$, or $\theta \neq id$ and $R_n = R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ with Rf_1, \dots, Rf_r pairwise coprime two-sided ideals of R , Theorem 12 and Proposition 13 show that any T -code \mathcal{C}_T is isomorphic to a product T -code as vector spaces, i.e. for any T -code $\mathcal{C}_T \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ there exists an invertible matrix C' such that $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)CC'$ for some T -product code $(\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$.

From Definition 16 we deduce that a generator matrix of a product semi-linear code $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_1 & & & \\ & G_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & G_r \end{pmatrix} \cdot C,$$

where $k_i := \dim \mathcal{C}_i$, $\sum_{i=1}^r k_i = \dim \mathcal{C}_T$ and each block

$$G_i := \begin{pmatrix} \vec{g}_i \\ (\vec{g}_i)(\Theta \circ M_i) \\ \vdots \\ (\vec{g}_i)(\Theta \circ M_i)^{k_i-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a $k_i \times n_i$ generator matrix of the module θ -code $\mathcal{C}_i = (g_i)_{n_i, \theta}^{k_i}$, where $\vec{g}_i = \pi_i^{-1}(g_i)$ and $\pi_i : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i} \rightarrow R/Rf_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Definition 19. A linear code \mathcal{C} is a code of type $[n, k]_q$ if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{C} = k$.

The following result gives in the commutative case a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of T -codes \mathcal{C}_T of type $[n, k]_q$.

Proposition 20. *Suppose that $\theta = id$ and let $T = M$ be a linear transformation over \mathbb{F}_q^n as in (*). Let $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{N_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{N_s}$ be a decomposition of \mathbb{F}_q^n as in the proof of Theorem 12 and denote by π the corresponding isomorphism*

$$\pi : \mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{N_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{N_s} \rightarrow R/RF_1^{\alpha_1} \times \dots \times R/RF_s^{\alpha_s},$$

where $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s)$ and $\pi_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{N_j} \rightarrow R/RF_j$ are the usual isomorphisms and the F_j 's are irreducible (not necessarily distinct) polynomials on R such that $N_j = \alpha_j \deg F_j \geq 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Then

$$\exists \text{ a } T\text{-code of type } [n, k]_q \iff k = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \deg F_i, \text{ where } 0 \leq a_i \leq \alpha_i.$$

Proof. Note that for every $i = 1, \dots, s$ an R -submodule of $R/RF_i^{\alpha_i}$ is of type $RF_i^h/RF_i^{\alpha_i} \cong R/RF_i^{\alpha_i-h}$ for some integer h such that $0 \leq h \leq \alpha_i$. Moreover, observe that by Remark 3 the set of the T -codes \mathcal{C}_T is in one-to-one correspondence with the set of linear codes \mathcal{C}_D invariant by the linear transformation $D := \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r)$ of type $[n, k]_q$. Let $\mathcal{C}_T \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a T -code of type $[n, k]_q$. Then $\mathcal{C}_T C^{-1}$ is a linear code \mathcal{C}_D invariant by the linear transformation $D := \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r)$. With the same notation as in the statement, $\pi(\mathcal{C}_D)$ is an R -submodule of $R/RF_1^{\alpha_1} \times \dots \times R/RF_s^{\alpha_s}$. Since by Theorem 12 every R -submodule of $R/RF_1^{\alpha_1} \times \dots \times R/RF_s^{\alpha_s}$ is isomorphic to $I_1 \times \dots \times I_s$ with I_j an R -submodule of $R/RF_j^{\alpha_j}$ for every $j = 1, \dots, s$, we conclude that $k := \dim \mathcal{C}_T = \dim \mathcal{C}_D = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \deg F_i$, where $0 \leq a_i \leq \alpha_i$. On the other hand, assume that $k = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i \deg F_i$ with $0 \leq a_i \leq \alpha_i$. Then the product code

$$\begin{aligned} & \pi_1^{-1}(RF_1^{\alpha_1-a_1}/RF_1^{\alpha_1}) \times \dots \times \pi_s^{-1}(RF_s^{\alpha_s-a_s}/RF_1^{\alpha_s}) = \\ & = \pi^{-1}(RF_1^{\alpha_1-a_1}/RF_1^{\alpha_1} \times \dots \times RF_s^{\alpha_s-a_s}/RF_1^{\alpha_s}) \end{aligned}$$

is a T -code of type $[n, k]_q$. □

3. DUAL CODES OF PRODUCT T -CODES

In this section we study three kind of dual codes of product semi-linear T -codes and some main relations between them.

3.1. Euclidean duals. In [2] the authors prove that the Euclidean dual code of a module θ -code is a module θ -code if and only if it is a θ -constacyclic code. Moreover, they establish that a module θ -code which is not θ -constacyclic code is a shortened θ -constacyclic code and that its Euclidean dual is a punctured θ -constacyclic code. This enables them to give a form of the parity-check matrix for module θ -codes.

Let us only observe here that there exists an alternative method to find a parity-check matrix for any module θ -code.

Proposition 21. *Let $\mathcal{C}_j = (g_j)_{n_j, \theta}^{k_j} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j}$ be a module θ -code. For any integer i such that $0 \leq i \leq k_j - 1$, write in R*

$$X^{n_j-k_j+i} = q_i g_j + r_i, \text{ with } 0 \leq \deg r_i < n_j - k_j.$$

Denote by S the following matrix

$$S := \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{n_j-k_j}(\pi_j^{-1}(r_0)) \\ \rho_{n_j-k_j}(\pi_j^{-1}(r_1)) \\ \vdots \\ \rho_{n_j-k_j}(\pi_j^{-1}(r_{k_j-1})) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\pi_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j} \rightarrow R/Rf_j$ and $\rho_{n_j-k_j}$ is the projection map onto the first $n_j - k_j$ coordinates, i.e.

$$\rho_{n_j-k_j}(v_1, \dots, v_{n_j-k_j}, v_{n_j-k_j+1}, \dots, v_{n_j}) := (v_1, \dots, v_{n_j-k_j}).$$

Then a generator matrix G_j of \mathcal{C}_j is

$$G_j := (-S \mid I_{k_j})$$

and a parity check matrix H_j is given by

$$H_j := (I_{n_j-k_j} \mid S_t),$$

where $I_{n_j-k_j}$ is the $(n_j - k_j) \times (n_j - k_j)$ identity matrix and S_t is the transpose matrix of S .

Proof. Since $\deg r_i < n_j - k_j$, note that $\pi_j^{-1}(X^{n_j-k_j+i} - r_i) \in \mathcal{C}_j$ are linearly independent for $0 \leq i \leq k_j - 1$. Thus $(-S \mid I_{k_j})$ is a generator matrix G_j for the code \mathcal{C}_j . Moreover, since $(\mathcal{C}_j^\perp)^\perp = \mathcal{C}_j$, we see that the matrix $H_j := (I_{n_j-k_j} \mid S_t)$ as in the statement is a parity check matrix for \mathcal{C}_j . \square

The following MAGMA program enables us to find all the polynomials r_i of Proposition 21 in $\mathbb{F}_a[X; \theta]$:

```
F<w>:=GF(a);
PcMatrix:=function(qq,g,n)
R<x>:=TwistedPolynomials(F:q:=qq);
g:=R!g;
d:=Degree(g);
ll:=[];
for i in [0.. n-d-1] do
c,b:=Quotrem(R![0,1]^(d+i),g);
ll:=ll cat [b];
end for;
return ll;
end function;
```

Remark 22. Proposition 21 works also for any module (θ, δ) -code (see [3, Definition 1]), where $\delta : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ is a derivation, and it allows us to obtain directly a generator and a parity-check matrix in standard form for any module (θ, δ) -code.

Theorem 23. Let $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)\widehat{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code, $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ being a linear code and $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$. If \widehat{C} is an invertible matrix, then

$$\mathcal{C}_T^\perp = (\mathcal{C}_1^\perp \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^\perp)\widehat{C}_t^{-1},$$

where \widehat{C}_t is the transpose matrix of \widehat{C} and $\mathcal{C}_i^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ is the Euclidean dual code of \mathcal{C}_i for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. Furthermore, a parity check matrix of \mathcal{C}_T is

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & H_r \end{pmatrix} \cdot \widehat{C}_t^{-1}$$

where $h_i := \dim \mathcal{C}_i^\perp$, $\sum_{i=1}^r h_i = \dim \mathcal{C}_T^\perp$ and H_i is the $h_i \times n_i$ parity check matrix of \mathcal{C}_i given by Proposition 21 for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Proof. Put $\mathcal{C} := (\mathcal{C}_1^\perp \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^\perp) \widehat{C}_t^{-1}$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{C} &= \dim(\mathcal{C}_1^\perp \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^\perp) = \sum_{i=1}^r \dim \mathcal{C}_i^\perp = \sum_{i=1}^r (m_i - \dim \mathcal{C}_i) = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r m_i - \sum_{i=1}^r \dim(\mathcal{C}_i) = n - \dim \mathcal{C}_T = \dim \mathcal{C}_T^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\vec{v} \in \mathcal{C}$. Since $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}_1^\perp \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^\perp) \widehat{C}_t^{-1}$, we deduce that $\vec{v} = \vec{w} \widehat{C}_t^{-1}$ for some vector $\vec{w} = (\vec{c}_1^\perp, \dots, \vec{c}_r^\perp) \in (\mathcal{C}_1^\perp \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^\perp)$. Thus for every $\vec{c} = (\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_r) \widehat{C}_t \in \mathcal{C}_T$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{v} \cdot \vec{c} &= \vec{w} \widehat{C}_t^{-1} \vec{c}_t = (\vec{c}_1^\perp, \dots, \vec{c}_r^\perp) \widehat{C}_t^{-1} ((\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_r) \widehat{C}_t)_t = \\ &= (\vec{c}_1^\perp, \dots, \vec{c}_r^\perp) (\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_r)_t = \vec{c}_1^\perp \cdot \vec{c}_1 + \dots + \vec{c}_r^\perp \cdot \vec{c}_r = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_T^\perp$. Since $\dim \mathcal{C} = \dim \mathcal{C}_T^\perp$, we conclude $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_T^\perp$.

Finally, the second part of the statement follows easily from the first one. \square

Remark 24. In the commutative case, the above result is useful to construct the Euclidean dual code of any product T -code and to calculate its minimum Hamming distance (see Remark 3 and Theorem 12). In fact, under the hypothesis that either $\theta = id$, or $\theta \neq id$ and $R_n = R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ with Rf_1, \dots, Rf_r pairwise coprime two-sided ideals of R , Theorem 23 together with Remark 18, Theorem 12 and Proposition 13 allow us to find the Euclidean dual code of a T -code.

Finally, we obtain the following characterization of Euclidean dual codes of T -codes.

Proposition 25. *Let $\mathcal{C}_T \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a T -code invariant under a θ -semi-linear transformation $T = \Theta \circ \overline{M}$. Then the Euclidean dual code \mathcal{C}_T^\perp is a T' -code, where $T' = \Theta^{-1} \circ (\overline{M}_t)_{\theta^{-1}}$.*

Proof. If $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{C}_T^\perp$, then for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}_T$ we have

$$(\vec{a} \overline{M}_t) \cdot (\vec{c} \Theta) = \vec{a} (\vec{c} \Theta \circ \overline{M})_t = \vec{a} \cdot (\vec{c} T) = 0.$$

Thus by Lemma 4 we deduce that

$$(\vec{a} T') \cdot \vec{c} = (\vec{a} \Theta^{-1} \circ (\overline{M}_t)_{\theta^{-1}}) \cdot \vec{c} = (\vec{a} \overline{M}_t \circ \Theta^{-1}) \cdot \vec{c} = 0,$$

for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}_T$, i.e. \mathcal{C}_T^\perp is invariant under the semi-linear transformation T' . \square

3.2. Quasi-Euclidean duals. In this subsection we introduce the new concept of quasi-Euclidean dual codes and some of their properties related to the Euclidean dual codes. Before to do this, we have to define a special injective map for module θ -codes.

3.2.1. *An injective map for an f -module θ -code.* Given a polynomial $f \in R$ of degree $n \geq 2$, we present here an algorithm to show that there exists always a suitable integer $m \geq n$ such that $X^m - 1$ is a right multiple of f . This will allow us to construct an immersion map of the code space \mathbb{F}_q^n into an \mathbb{F}_q^m which will be useful for the definition of quasi-Euclidean dual codes of a product T -code.

From now on, write

$$f = (-1)^n (X^n - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_i X^i) \in R$$

and consider the right division

$$X^n - 1 = f \cdot q_n + r_n,$$

where $q_n, r_n \in R$ and $0 \leq \deg r_n < \deg f$. Assume that r_n is not equal to zero, otherwise we are done.

Let k be an integer such that $k > n$ and consider again the right divisions

$$X^k - 1 = f \cdot q_k + r_k,$$

where $q_k, r_k \in R$ and $0 \leq \deg r_k < \deg f = n$. Since there are at most q^{n+1} distinct polynomials r_k , we see that for some $k_2 > k_1 \geq n$ we get $r_{k_1} = r_{k_2}$. Thus we obtain that

$$X^{k_1} \cdot (X^{k_2-k_1} - 1) = (X^{k_2-k_1} - 1) \cdot X^{k_1} = f \cdot (q_{k_2} - q_{k_1}).$$

Put $q' := q_{k_2} - q_{k_1}$ and note that $q' \neq 0 \in R$. This shows that $X = 0$ is a root of $f \cdot q'$. Since $f(0) \neq 0$, we deduce that $q'(0) = 0$. Hence $q' = q_1 \cdot X$ for some $q_1 \in R$.

Thus we have

$$(X^{k_2-k_1} - 1) \cdot X^{k_1} = f \cdot q_1 \cdot X$$

and since R has no zero divisors, we can deduce that

$$(X^{k_2-k_1} - 1) \cdot X^{k_1-1} = f \cdot q_1$$

where $q_1 \in R$. By an inductive argument, we can conclude that

$$X^{k_2-k_1} - 1 = f \cdot q''$$

for some $q'' \in R$. This shows that there exists always an integer $t \geq n$ such that $X^t - 1 = f \cdot q_f$ for some non-zero $q_f = \sum_{i=0}^{m-n} q_i X^i \in R$.

From now on, we denote by m the minimum integer such that $m \geq n$ and $X^m - 1$ is a right multiple of f , i.e.

$$(**) \{?\} \quad m := \min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid X^i - 1 = f \cdot p \text{ for some } p \in R\} .$$

In this case, we write

$$X^m - 1 = f \cdot q_f .$$

Moreover, by the above construction, we have

$$n \leq m \leq q^n + n - 2.$$

Let us introduce the following ring isomorphism $\Theta : R \rightarrow R$ defined as

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^t a_i X^i \right) \Theta := \sum_{i=0}^t \theta(a_i) X^i .$$

Lemma 26. *Put*

$$m^* := \min \{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid X^j - 1 = p \cdot f^* \text{ for some } p \in R\},$$

where $f^* := 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \theta^i(f_{n-i})X^i \in R$. Then $m^* = m$.

Proof. Let $X^m - 1 = f \cdot q_f$. By [2, Lemma 1(1)] we know that $X^m - 1 = (1 - X^m)^* = (f \cdot (-q_f))^* = q' \cdot f^*$ for some $q' \in R$. This implies that $m \geq m^*$. On the other hand, let $X^{m^*} - 1 = q_{f^*} \cdot f^*$. By [2, Lemma 1] we see that

$$\begin{aligned} X^{m^*} - 1 &= (1 - X^{m^*})^* = ((-q_{f^*}) \cdot f^*)^* = \\ &= ((f^*)^*) \Theta^{m^*-n} \cdot q'' = ((f) \Theta^n) \Theta^{m^*-n} \cdot q'' = (f) \Theta^{m^*} \cdot q'' \end{aligned}$$

for some $q'' \in R$. Hence we get

$$X^{m^*} - 1 = (X^{m^*} - 1) \Theta^{-m^*} = ((f) \Theta^{m^*} \cdot q'') \Theta^{-m^*} = f \cdot (q'') \Theta^{-m^*},$$

i.e. $m^* \geq m$. This gives $m^* = m$. \square

The following Magma [1] program enables us to calculate the integer m as in (**) for any polynomial $f \in \mathbb{F}_a[X; \theta]$:

```
F<w>:=GF(a);
PeriodNC:=function(qq,g)
  R<x>:=TwistedPolynomials(F;q:=qq);
  f:=R!g;
  n:=Degree(f)-1;
  repeat n:=n+1;
    _,r:=Quotrem(X^n-1,f);
    until r eq R![0];
  return n;
end function;
```

Remark 27. If $\theta = id$, then the characteristic and minimal polynomial of

$$A_c := \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & 1 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & 1 \\ \hline f_0 & f_1 & \dots & f_{n-1} \end{array} \right)$$

are both equal to $f = (-1)^n (X^n - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_i X^i) \in R$. Let $m' := \min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid A_c^i = I\}$ and note that the polynomial $X^{m'} - 1$ is satisfied by A_c . Therefore, it follows that there exists a polynomial $q_f = \sum_{i=0}^{m'-n} q_i X^i \in R$ such that $X^{m'} - 1 = f \cdot q_f$. This gives $m = m'$, that is, $m = \min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid A_c^i = I\}$. In this case, the following Magma [1] program gives us directly the integer $m = m'$ in $\mathbb{F}_a[X]$:

```
F<w>:=GF(a);
P<x>:=PolynomialRing(F);
PeriodC := function(f)
  return Order(CompanionMatrix(f));
end function;
```

The following example shows that Remark 27 does not hold in general when θ is not equal to the identity of \mathbb{F}_q .

Example 28. In \mathbb{F}_4^3 , where $\mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]$ with $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$, consider the polynomial $f = X^3 + \alpha X + 1$ associated to the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & \alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and define $\theta(x) = x^2$ for any $x \in \mathbb{F}_4$. It follows that $\min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid A_c^i = I\} = 21$. Moreover, we have $X^{21} - 1 = f \cdot q + r$, where

$$q = X^{18} + \alpha^2 X^{16} + X^{15} + \alpha X^{14} + X^{13} + X^{10} + \alpha^2 X^8 + X^7 + \alpha X^6 + X^5 + X^2 + \alpha^2$$

and $r = X^2 + \alpha^2 X + \alpha \neq 0$. This shows that $m \neq \min \{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid A_c^i = I\}$. Moreover, we get $m = 8 (< 21)$. Hence $X^8 - 1 = (X^3 + \alpha X + 1) \cdot q_f$ with $q_f = X^5 + \alpha^2 X^3 + X^2 + \alpha X + 1$.

In connection with the above arguments, we have the following results.

Proposition 29. *Let m be an integer as in (**) and let P be the $m \times m$ matrix*

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & 1 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{array} \right).$$

Denote by $\vec{q}_f := (q_0, \dots, q_{m-n}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}_q^m$, where the q_i 's are the coefficients of $q_f \in R$ as in (**). Then there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}_q^n & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathbb{F}_q^m \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ R_n & \xrightarrow{j} & R_m \end{array}$$

such that $\pi' \circ i = j \circ \pi$, where $R_n := R/Rf$, $R_m := R/R(X^m - 1)$, $i(\vec{v}) := \vec{v}Q$ with Q the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \vec{q}_f \\ (\vec{q}_f)(\Theta \circ P) \\ (\vec{q}_f)(\Theta \circ P)^2 \\ \dots \\ (\vec{q}_f)(\Theta \circ P)^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $j(a + Rf) := (a \cdot q_f) + R(X^m - 1)$ for any $a \in R$.

Proof. By using the canonical basis of \mathbb{F}_q^n , the statement follows easily from the linearity of the maps i, j, π and π' . \square

Proposition 30. *With the same notation as in Proposition 29, for any $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$i((\vec{c})(\Theta \circ A_c)^k) = (i(\vec{c}))(\Theta \circ P)^k,$$

where A_c is the matrix defined in Remark 27.

Proof. Let $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. By Proposition 29, we have the following two commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{c} & \xrightarrow{i} & i(\vec{c}) \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ \pi(\vec{c}) & \xrightarrow{j} & j(\pi(\vec{c})) \end{array}$$

where $j(\pi(\vec{c})) = \pi'(i(\vec{c}))$, and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\vec{c})(\Theta \circ A_c)^k & \xrightarrow{i} & i((\vec{c})(\Theta \circ A_c)^k) \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ X^k \cdot \pi(\vec{c}) & \xrightarrow{j} & j(X^k \cdot \pi(\vec{c})) \end{array}$$

where $j(X^k \cdot \pi(\vec{c})) = \pi'(i((\vec{c})(\Theta \circ A_c)^k))$. Since π' is an isomorphism, by the commutative diagram of Proposition 29, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} i((\vec{c})(\Theta \circ A_c)^k) &= (\pi')^{-1}(j(X^k \cdot \pi(\vec{c}))) = (\pi')^{-1}(X^k \cdot \pi(\vec{c}) \cdot q_f) = \\ &= (\pi')^{-1}(X^k \cdot j(\pi(\vec{c}))) = (\pi')^{-1}(X^k \cdot \pi'(i(\vec{c}))) = (\pi')^{-1} \circ \pi'((i(\vec{c}))(\Theta \circ P)^k), \end{aligned}$$

that is, $i((\vec{c})(\Theta \circ A_c)^k) = (i(\vec{c}))(\Theta \circ P)^k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Remark 31. The maps i and j in Proposition 29 are injective. Moreover, Proposition 30 shows that the image via i of an f -module θ -code in \mathbb{F}_q^n is a module θ -cyclic code in \mathbb{F}_q^m , where m is defined as in (**) (or as in Remark 27).

Let s be the order of θ . From the above results, we can deduce the following two consequences.

Corollary 32. *Let m be as in (**). If $m = as + r$, $0 \leq r < s$, then $(\vec{q}_f)\Theta^r = \vec{q}_f$.*

Proof. Since $X^m - 1 = f \cdot q_f$ and f, q_f are monic polynomials, by [2, Lemma 2(2)] we see that $X^m = 1 + (q_f)\Theta^m \cdot f$. Since $(\Theta \circ P)^m = \Theta^m \circ P^m = \Theta^m$ and Θ^s is the identity, from the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \vec{e}_1(\Theta \circ A_c)^m & \xrightarrow{i} & i(\vec{e}_1)(\Theta \circ P)^m \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\ X^m = 1 & \xrightarrow{j} & j(1) = q_f \end{array}$$

we conclude that $\vec{q}_f = (\pi')^{-1}(q_f) = i(\vec{e}_1)(\Theta \circ P)^m = (\vec{q}_f)\Theta^m = (\vec{q}_f)\Theta^r$. \square

Corollary 33. *Let $f = (-1)^n(X^n - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_i X^i) \in R$. If*

$$(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{n-1})\Theta^t \neq (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{n-1})$$

for every integer t such that $0 < t < s$, then the order s of Θ divides m .

Proof. Since $X^m - 1 = f \cdot q_f$, from Corollary 32 it follows that

$$f \cdot q_f = X^m - 1 = (X^m - 1)\Theta^m = (f)\Theta^m \cdot (q_f)\Theta^m = (f)\Theta^m \cdot q_f,$$

i.e. $f = (f)\Theta^m$. Let $m = as + r$ with $0 \leq r < s$.

Assume now that $r \neq 0$. Then we get $f = (f)\Theta^m = (f)\Theta^r$, that is,

$$(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{n-1})\Theta^r = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{n-1})$$

for some $0 < r < s$, but this is a contradiction. Thus $r = 0$ and s divides m . \square

Example 34. In \mathbb{F}_4^5 , where $\mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]$ with $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$ and θ is the Frobenius map, consider the following two polynomials:

$$(1) f = X^5 + X^3 + X^2 + 1; \quad (2) g = X^5 + X^2 + 1.$$

Note that in both cases the hypothesis of Corollary 33 is not satisfied. Moreover, we have $m = 12$ in case (1) and $m = 31$ in case (2).

Finally, let us give here also some results about the integer m in (**) when θ is the identity of \mathbb{F}_q .

Remark 35. Let $\mathbb{F}_q \subseteq \mathbb{K}$ be a finite extension of \mathbb{F}_q such that $f = \prod_{i=1}^n (X - a_i)$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{K}$ and A_c is diagonalizable over \mathbb{K} . If $m_i := \min \{h_i \mid a_i^{h_i} = 1\}$, then $m = \text{lcm}(m_1, \dots, m_n)$.

Remark 36. Let $p := \text{Char}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. If the polynomial f has a root of multiplicity ≥ 2 , then $X^m - 1$ has a root of multiplicity ≥ 2 . This shows that $\text{gcd}(m, p) \neq 1$ and since p is a prime number, we get $m \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

The next two results give a more simple computation of m .

Proposition 37. Denote by $\vec{f} := (f_0, \dots, f_{n-1})$ and let

$$k := \min \left\{ h \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid \vec{f}A_c^h = \vec{e}_1 \right\}.$$

Then $m = n + k$. In particular, we have $\deg q_f = k$.

Proof. For any $h = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{e}_h A_c^{n+k} &= ((\vec{e}_h A_c^{n-h+1})A_c^k)A_c^{h-1} = ((\vec{e}_n A_c)A_c^k)A_c^{h-1} = \\ &= (\vec{f}A_c^k)A_c^{h-1} = \vec{e}_1 A_c^{h-1} = \vec{e}_h. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $A_c^{n+k} = I$ and for the minimality of m we deduce that $m \leq n + k$. Furthermore, since $A_c^m = I$ we get $\vec{e}_1 = ((\vec{e}_1 A_c^{n-1})A_c)A_c^{m-n} = (\vec{e}_n A_c)A_c^{m-n} = \vec{f}A_c^{m-n}$, that is, $\vec{f}A_c^{m-n} = \vec{e}_1$. So, by definition of k we can conclude that $k \leq m - n$, i.e. $m \geq n + k$. Finally, observe that $\deg q_f = m - n := k$. \square

Let p_0 be the order of $\det A_c$. Since $A_c^m = I$, it follows that $(\det A_c)^m = 1$, i.e. $m \equiv 0 \pmod{p_0}$ with p_0 the order of $\det A_c$. Denote by $B := A_c^{p_0}$. From this it follows immediately also the following

Proposition 38. Let m' be the minimum integer such that $B^{m'}$ is the identity matrix. Then $m = p_0 m'$. In particular, we have $\deg q_f = p_0 m' - n$.

When $\theta = \text{id}$, all the above results give the following

Algorithm 1:

Input: f

- Define $a_0 := \det A_c$;
- Compute the order p_0 of a_0 ;
- Define $B := A_c^{p_0}$;
- Find the rational canonical form B' of B ;

- For any diagonal block B_i , $i = 1, \dots, s$, of B' compute $m'_i = \min \{h \mid B_i^h = I\}$.

Output: $m = \text{lcm}(m'_1, \dots, m'_s) \cdot p_0$.

The following Magma [1] program is an application of Algorithm 1 in $\mathbb{F}_a[X]$:

```

F<w>:=GF(a);
P<x>:=PolynomialRing(F);
Period := function(f)
  d:=Degree(f);
  A:=CompanionMatrix(f);
  p:=Order(Determinant(A));
  _,_,E:=PrimaryRationalForm(A^p);
  ll:=[];
  for j in [1..#E] do
    ll := ll cat [Order(CompanionMatrix(E[j][1]))];
  end for;
  return LCM(ll);
end function;

```

3.2.2. *Definition and basic properties of quasi-Euclidean dual codes.* Under the hypothesis (*), write $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ with $r \geq 1$ and $n = \sum_{k=1}^r n_k$. From Proposition 29, we know that for every $k = 1, \dots, r$ there exists a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}_q^{n_k} & \xrightarrow{i_k} & \mathbb{F}_q^{m_k} \\
 \pi_k \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi'_k \\
 R/Rf_k & \xrightarrow{j_k} & R/R(X^{m_k} - 1)
 \end{array}$$

Consider the further commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}_q^n & & \\
 \varphi := C^{-1} \downarrow & \searrow \bar{i} & \\
 \mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r} & \xrightarrow{i} & \mathbb{F}_q^{m_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{m_r} = \mathbb{F}_q^m \\
 \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' \\
 R_n & \xrightarrow{j} & R_m
 \end{array}$$

where $n = \sum_{i=1}^r n_i$, $m = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i$ with the m_i 's as in (*), $f_i = (-1)^{n_i} (X^{n_i} - \sum_{j=0}^{n_i-1} f_{i,j} X^j) \in R$,

$$R_n := R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r,$$

$$R_m := R/R(X^{m_1} - 1) \times \dots \times R/R(X^{m_r} - 1),$$

$i(\vec{v}) := \vec{v}\widehat{Q}$ with

$$\widehat{Q} := \begin{pmatrix} Q_1 & & & \\ & Q_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & Q_r \end{pmatrix}$$

and all the Q_i 's are matrices $n_i \times m_i$ as in Proposition 29, $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r)$ with $\pi_i : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i} \rightarrow R/Rf_i$, $\pi' = (\pi'_1, \dots, \pi'_r)$ with $\pi'_i : \mathbb{F}_q^{m_i} \rightarrow R/R(X^{m_i} - 1)$ and

$$j(p_1, \dots, p_r) := (p_1 \cdot q_{f_1}, \dots, p_r \cdot q_{f_r})$$

with all the q_{f_i} 's polynomials in R as in Proposition 29.

Denote by \mathcal{I} the image of $\bar{i} = i \circ \varphi$ and define

$$B := C^{-1} \widehat{Q} \widehat{Q}_t (C^{-1})_t,$$

where M_t is the transpose of a matrix M . Note that B is a symmetric matrix.

Let $r := \text{rk} B$ be the rank of B and observe that

$$r = \text{rk}(\widehat{Q} \cdot \widehat{Q}_t) = n - \dim(\text{Ker } \widehat{Q}_t \cap \mathcal{I})$$

with $0 \leq r \leq n$.

Definition 39. Let T be a semi-linear transformation of \mathbb{F}_q^n as in (*). We define the quasi-Euclidean scalar product \cdot_* on \mathbb{F}_q^n as $\vec{a} \cdot_* \vec{b} := \vec{a} B \vec{b}_t$ for any $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, and we denote by \mathcal{C}^* the linear *quasi-Euclidean dual code* of a linear code \mathcal{C} with respect to \cdot_* , i.e.

$$\mathcal{C}^* := \{ \vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \vec{x} \cdot_* \vec{c} = 0 \text{ for every } \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \}.$$

Theorem 40. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code. Then we have the following properties:

- (i) $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C} \cdot B)^\perp$;
- (ii) $\dim \mathcal{C}^* = \dim \mathcal{C}^\perp + \dim(\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Ker } B)$;
- (iii) $\mathcal{C}^* B = \mathcal{C}^\perp \cap (\text{Im } B)$, where $\text{Im } B := \{ \vec{y} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \vec{y} = \vec{x} B \text{ for some } \vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \}$;
- (iv) $(\mathcal{C}^*)^* = \mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B$, where $\text{Ker } B := \{ \vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \vec{x} B = \vec{0} \}$;
- (v) $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*) = \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap \mathcal{I} = \bar{i}(\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B)^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$;
- (vi) $(\mathbb{F}_q^n)^* = \text{Ker } B = (\text{Im } B)^\perp$, $(\text{Ker } B)^* = \mathbb{F}_q^n$, $(\text{Ker } B)^{**} = \text{Ker } B$.

Proof. (i) To prove $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C} \cdot B)^\perp$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{w} \in (\mathcal{C} \cdot B)^\perp &\iff \vec{w} \cdot (\vec{c} B) = 0, \quad \forall \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \\ &\iff \vec{w} B_t \vec{c}_t = 0, \quad \forall \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \\ &\iff \vec{w} B \vec{c}_t = 0, \quad \forall \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \\ &\iff \vec{w} \cdot_* \vec{c} = 0, \quad \forall \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \\ &\iff \vec{w} \in \mathcal{C}^*. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) This follows easily from

$$\dim(\mathcal{C} \cdot B) = \dim \mathcal{C} - \dim(\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Ker } B)$$

and $\dim \mathcal{C}^* = n - \dim(\mathcal{C} \cdot B)$.

(iii) If $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{C}^* B$, then $\vec{x} \in \text{Im } B$ and $\vec{x} = \vec{c}^* B$ for some $\vec{c}^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Hence for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ we get

$$\vec{x} \cdot \vec{c} = \vec{c}^* B \cdot \vec{c} = \vec{c}^* \cdot_* \vec{c} = 0,$$

i.e. $\mathcal{C}^* B \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\perp \cap (\text{Im } B)$. On the other hand, let $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{C}^\perp \cap (\text{Im } B)$. Then $\vec{y} = \vec{v} B \in \mathcal{C}^\perp$ for some $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Thus for any $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\vec{v} \cdot_* \vec{c} = \vec{v} B \vec{c}_t = \vec{y} \cdot \vec{c} = 0,$$

that is, $\mathcal{C}^\perp \cap (\text{Im } B) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^* B$.

(iv) Let $\vec{x} = \vec{c} + \vec{b} \in \mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B$. Then for every $\vec{c}^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$ by (i) we have

$$\vec{x} \cdot_* \vec{c}^* = \vec{x} B \vec{c}_t^* = (\vec{c} B + \vec{b} B) \cdot \vec{c}^* = (\vec{c} B) \cdot \vec{c}^* = 0,$$

i.e. $\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B \subseteq (\mathcal{C}^*)^*$. Let $\vec{v} \in (\mathcal{C}^*)^*$. Then for any $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{C}^*$ we get

$$\vec{v} B \cdot \vec{x} = \vec{v} B \vec{x}_t = \vec{v} \cdot_* \vec{x} = 0,$$

i.e. $\vec{v} B \in (\mathcal{C}^*)^\perp = \mathcal{C} B$. Thus there exists a $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\vec{v} B = \vec{c} B$. This implies that $(\vec{v} - \vec{c}) B = \vec{0}$, that is, $\vec{v} - \vec{c} \in \text{Ker } B$ and $\vec{v} = \vec{c} + \vec{b}$ for some $\vec{b} \in \text{Ker } B$.

(v) If $\vec{x} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*)$, then $\vec{x} = \bar{i}(\vec{v}) = \vec{v} C^{-1} \widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{I}$ for some $\vec{v} \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Hence for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\vec{b} \in \text{Ker } B$, we have

$$\vec{x} \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{c} + \vec{b}) = \vec{x} \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{c}) + \vec{x} \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{b}) = \vec{v} \cdot_* \vec{c} + \vec{v} \cdot (\vec{b} B) = 0,$$

that is, $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*) \subseteq \bar{i}(\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B)^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$. Now, let $\vec{x} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B)^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$, i.e. $\vec{x} = \bar{i}(\vec{v}) = \vec{v} C^{-1} \widehat{Q} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B)^\perp \subseteq \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp$ for some $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. Thus for every $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\vec{v} \cdot_* \vec{y} = \vec{v} B \vec{y}_t = (\vec{v} C^{-1} \widehat{Q})(\vec{y} C^{-1} \widehat{Q})_t = \vec{x} \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{y}) = 0,$$

i.e. $\vec{v} \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Hence we get $\vec{x} = \bar{i}(\vec{v}) \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*)$, that is, $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B)^\perp \cap \mathcal{I} \subseteq \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*)$.

Let us prove now that $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*)$ is also equal to $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$. Let $\vec{x} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*)$. Then $\vec{x} = \bar{i}(\vec{c}^*) \in \mathcal{I}$ for some vector $\vec{c}^* \in \mathcal{C}^*$. Therefore for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\vec{x} \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{c}) = \bar{i}(\vec{c}^*) \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{c}) = \vec{c}^* \cdot_* \vec{c} = 0,$$

i.e. $\vec{x} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$. On the other hand, let $\vec{y} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$. Then $\vec{y} = \bar{i}(\vec{z}) \in \mathcal{I}$ for some $\vec{z} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and for every $\vec{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ we get

$$0 = \bar{i}(\vec{c}) \cdot \vec{y} = \bar{i}(\vec{c}) \cdot \bar{i}(\vec{z}) = \vec{c} \cdot_* \vec{z}.$$

Hence $\vec{z} \in \mathcal{C}^*$, i.e. $\vec{y} \in \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*)$.

(vi) Since $(\{\vec{0}\})^* = \mathbb{F}_q^n$, the equalities $(\mathbb{F}_q^n)^* = (\text{Im } B)^\perp$ and $(\mathbb{F}_q^n)^* = \text{Ker } B$ follow easily from (i) with $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and from (iv) with $\mathcal{C} = \{\vec{0}\}$ respectively. Finally, by taking $\mathcal{C} = \text{Ker } B$, the equalities $(\text{Ker } B)^* = \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $(\text{Ker } B)^{**} = \text{Ker } B$ are immediate consequences of (i) and (iv), respectively. \square

Corollary 41. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code. If $r = n$, then we have*

- (j) $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}^\perp \cdot B^{-1}$;
- (jj) $\dim \mathcal{C}^* = \dim \mathcal{C}^\perp$;
- (jjj) $(\mathcal{C}^*)^* = \mathcal{C}$;
- (jv) $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C}^*) = \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap \mathcal{I}$;
- (v) $(\mathbb{F}_q^n)^* = \{\vec{0}\}$, $(\{\vec{0}\})^* = \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

Remark 42. When $r = n$, by Corollary 41 (j) we can easily obtain a generator matrix of \mathcal{C}^* by multiplying the parity check matrix of \mathcal{C} with the matrix B^{-1} . Moreover, when $r = 0$, we see that B is the null matrix and in this case \widehat{Q} represents a generator matrix of an euclidean self-orthogonal code \mathcal{C} (i.e. $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^\perp$) of dimension n in \mathbb{F}_q^n .

Remark 43. From Theorem 40 (vi), it follows that $\text{Ker } B \subseteq \{\vec{v}\}^*$ for any $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. In particular, we deduce that $\text{Ker } B \subseteq \mathcal{C}^*$ for any linear code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

Example 44. In \mathbb{F}_4^3 , where $\mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]$ with $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$, consider the following four polynomials:

- (1) $f_0 = X^3 + X^2 + 1$; (2) $f_1 = X^3 + \alpha^2 X^2 + \alpha^2 X + \alpha$;
 (3) $f_2 = X^3 + X^2 + \alpha X + \alpha^2$; (4) $f_3 = X^3 + \alpha^2$.

Note that $m = 7$ for the first case, while $m = 6$ for the other cases. Then

$$X^6 - 1 = f_1 \cdot q_{f_1} = f_2 \cdot q_{f_2} = f_3 \cdot q_{f_3}, \quad X^7 - 1 = f_0 \cdot q_{f_0}$$

where

$$q_{f_0} = X^4 + X^3 + X^2 + 1, \quad q_{f_1} = X^3 + \alpha X^2 + \alpha^2 X + \alpha^2, \\ q_{f_2} = X^3 + X^2 + \alpha X + \alpha, \quad q_{f_3} = X^3 + \alpha.$$

Therefore this gives

$$Q_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & \alpha & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha & \alpha & \alpha^2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \alpha & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha^2 & \alpha^2 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & \alpha & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha^2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$B_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 1 & \alpha \\ 1 & \alpha^2 & 1 \\ \alpha & 1 & \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha^2 & 0 \\ \alpha^2 & 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\text{rk } B_i = i$ for $i = 0, \dots, 3$. Observe that from Remark 42 it follows that Q_0 is the generator matrix of an euclidean self-orthogonal code (in fact, an euclidean self-orthogonal cyclic code) of type $[7, 3]_4$ with minimum Hamming distance equal to three.

Corollary 45. *Let \mathcal{C} be a linear code in \mathbb{F}_q^n . Then*

$$\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^* \iff \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp,$$

i.e. \mathcal{C} is self-orthogonal with respect to \cdot_ if and only if $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C})$ is self-orthogonal with respect to \cdot .*

Proof. Since \bar{i} is injective, the statement is an immediate consequence of Theorem 40 (v) and the following equivalence: $\bar{i}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp \cap \mathcal{I} \iff \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \bar{i}(\mathcal{C})^\perp$. \square

Lemma 46. *For any $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\bar{i}(\vec{c} T^k) = \bar{i}(\vec{c})(\Theta \circ \hat{P})^k,$$

where

$$\hat{P} := \begin{pmatrix} P_1 & & & \\ & P_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & P_r \end{pmatrix}$$

and the P_i 's are the $m_i \times m_i$ matrices as in Proposition 29 for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the statement for $k = 1$. Thus, for every $\vec{c} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, let $\vec{v} = (\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_r) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ be the vector such that $\vec{c} = \vec{v}C$. By definition and Proposition 30 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{i}(\vec{c}T) &= i(\vec{c}TC^{-1}) = i(\vec{c}C^{-1}(\Theta \circ D)CC^{-1}) = i((\vec{v})(\Theta \circ D)) = \\ &= i((\vec{v}_1\Theta \circ M_1, \dots, \vec{v}_r\Theta \circ M_r)) = ((\vec{v}_1)(\Theta \circ M_1)Q_1, \dots, (\vec{v}_r)(\Theta \circ M_r)Q_r) = \\ &= (i_1(\vec{v}_1\Theta \circ M_1), \dots, i_r(\vec{v}_r\Theta \circ M_r)) = (i_1(\vec{v}_1)(\Theta \circ P_1), \dots, i_r(\vec{v}_r)(\Theta \circ P_r)) = \\ &= (i_1(\vec{v}_1), \dots, i_r(\vec{v}_r))(\Theta \circ \hat{P}) = (\vec{v}_1Q_1, \dots, \vec{v}_rQ_r)(\Theta \circ \hat{P}) = \\ &= (\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_r)\hat{Q}(\Theta \circ \hat{P}) = (\vec{v})\hat{Q}(\Theta \circ \hat{P}) = i(\vec{v})(\Theta \circ \hat{P}), \end{aligned}$$

that is, $\bar{i}(\vec{c}T) = i(\vec{v})(\Theta \circ \hat{P}) = \bar{i}(\vec{c})(\Theta \circ \hat{P})$. \square

Corollary 47. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a linear code. Then*

$$\mathcal{C} \text{ is a } T\text{-code} \iff \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ is a linear code invariant under } \Theta \circ \hat{P}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 46 it follows that

$$\mathcal{C} \text{ is a product } T\text{-code} \iff \varphi(\mathcal{C}) \text{ is a linear code invariant by } \Theta \circ D \iff i(\varphi(\mathcal{C})) = \bar{i}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ is a linear code invariant by } \Theta \circ \hat{P}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 48. *Let $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)\hat{C}C$ be a linear code in $\mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$, where \hat{C} is an invertible matrix and $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ is a linear code for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. If there exists an invertible matrix \bar{C} such that $\hat{C}(\hat{Q}\hat{Q}_t) = (\hat{Q}\hat{Q}_t)\bar{C}$, then $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)\bar{C}_t^{-1}C$, where $\mathcal{C}_i^* \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ is the quasi-Euclidean dual code of \mathcal{C}_i for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. In particular, if $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ is a product T -code, then $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)C$.*

Proof. By Theorem 40(i) and Theorem 23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^* &= (\mathcal{C}B)^\perp = ((\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)\hat{C}CB)^\perp = ((\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)\hat{C}\hat{Q}\hat{Q}_tC_t^{-1})^\perp = \\ &= ((\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)\hat{Q}\hat{Q}_t\bar{C}_t^{-1})^\perp = ((\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)CBC_t\bar{C}_t^{-1})^\perp = \\ &= ((\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)CB)^\perp C^{-1}\bar{C}_t^{-1}C = ((\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C)^* C^{-1}\bar{C}_t^{-1}C = \\ &= (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)CC^{-1}\bar{C}_t^{-1}C = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)\bar{C}_t^{-1}C, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)\bar{C}_t^{-1}C$. \square

Finally, we have the following

Proposition 49. *Let $\mathcal{C}_T \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a semi-linear T -code invariant under a θ -semi-linear transformation $T = \Theta \circ \widehat{M}$. If there exists a matrix \widehat{M} such that $B_\theta \widehat{M} = \widehat{M}B$, then the quasi-Euclidean dual code \mathcal{C}_T^* is a T' -code, where $T' = \Theta^{-1} \circ (\widehat{M}_t)_{\theta^{-1}}$.*

Proof. Note that the linear code $\mathcal{C}_T B$ is invariant under the θ -semi-linear transformation $\Theta \circ \widehat{M}$. Thus we can conclude by Theorem 40 (i) and Proposition 25. \square

3.3. Hermitian duals. Assume that the order s of $\theta \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ divides m_i for every $i = 1, \dots, r$, i.e.

$$(\diamond\diamond) \{?\} \quad m_i = m'_i \cdot s, \quad m'_i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Note that assumption $(\diamond\diamond)$ is always satisfied when $\theta = id$.

Define a ‘‘conjugation’’ map Φ on $R_m := R/R(X^{m_1} - 1) \times \dots \times R/R(X^{m_r} - 1)$ such that

$$\Phi((a_{i_1} X^{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_r} X^{i_r})) := (\Phi_1(a_{i_1} X^{i_1}), \dots, \Phi_r(a_{i_r} X^{i_r})),$$

where

$$\Phi_k(a_{i_k} X^{i_k}) := \theta^{-i_k}(a_{i_k}) X^{m_k - i_k} \in R/R(X^{m_k} - 1)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, r$, which is extended to all elements of R_m by linearity of addition.

We then define a product of two elements $\vec{p}(X) = (p_1(X), \dots, p_r(X)) \in R_m$ and $\vec{t}(X) = (t_1(X), \dots, t_r(X)) \in R_m$ by

$$\vec{p}(X) *_{\hat{P}} \vec{t}(X) := (p_1(X) \Phi_1(t_1(X)), \dots, p_r(X) \Phi_r(t_r(X))).$$

By the above commutative diagram, we can also define a Hermitian product of two elements $\vec{a}(X) := (a_1(X), \dots, a_r(X))$ and $\vec{b}(X) := (b_1(X), \dots, b_r(X))$ of $R_n := R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ by

$$\langle \vec{a}(X), \vec{b}(X) \rangle := j(\vec{a}(X)) *_{\hat{P}} j(\vec{b}(X)).$$

The next two results are now an immediate generalization of [9, Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.3].

Proposition 50. *Assume that $(\diamond\diamond)$ holds. Let $\vec{a} = (\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_r), \vec{b} = (\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_r) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ and denote by*

$$\vec{a}(X) := (\pi_1(\vec{a}_1), \dots, \pi_r(\vec{a}_r)) := (a_1(X), \dots, a_r(X))$$

and

$$\vec{b}(X) := (\pi_1(\vec{b}_1), \dots, \pi_r(\vec{b}_r)) := (b_1(X), \dots, b_r(X))$$

their polynomial representation in $R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ via $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r)$ respectively. If $(\diamond\diamond)$ holds, then

$$\vec{a}_i \cdot_{*i} \vec{b}_i (\Theta \circ M_i)^{h_i} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq h_i \leq m_i - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, r \iff \langle \vec{a}(X), \vec{b}(X) \rangle = \vec{0}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $r = 1$, since the statement will follow easily by applying the below argument to each component of $\langle \vec{a}(X), \vec{b}(X) \rangle \in R_m$. Moreover, for simplicity we omit the subindexes.

Since $\theta^m = id$, the condition $\langle a(X), b(X) \rangle = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} j(a(X)) *_{\hat{P}} j(b(X)) = 0 &\iff a(X) q_f \Phi(b(X) q_f) = 0 \\ &\iff \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a'_i X^i \right) \Phi \left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} b'_k X^k \right) = 0 \\ &\iff \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a'_i X^i \right) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \theta^{-k}(b'_k) X^{m-k} \right) = 0 \\ &\iff \sum_{h=0}^{m-1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a'_{i+h} \theta^h(b'_i) \right) X^h = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the subscript $i + h$ is taken modulo m . Comparing the coefficients of X^h on both sides of the last equation, we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a'_{i+h} \theta^h(b'_i) = 0, \text{ for all } 0 \leq h \leq m-1.$$

By Proposition 30 the above equation is equivalent for all $0 \leq h \leq m-1$ to

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{a}' \cdot \vec{b}'(\Theta^h \circ P^h) = 0 &\iff \vec{a}' \cdot \vec{b}'(\Theta \circ P)^h = 0 \\ &\iff i(\vec{a}) \cdot i(\vec{b})(\Theta \circ P)^h = 0 \\ &\iff i(\vec{a}) \cdot i(\vec{b})(\Theta \circ M)^h = 0 \\ &\iff \vec{a}Q \cdot (\vec{b}(\Theta \circ M)^h)Q = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\vec{a} \cdot_* \vec{b}(\Theta \circ M)^h = 0$ for all $0 \leq h \leq m-1$. \square

Let I be a subset of R_n . We define the dual $I^{<,\>}$ of I in R_n taken with respect to the Hermitian product \langle, \rangle as

$$I^{<,\>} := \{ \vec{a}(X) \in R_n \mid \langle \vec{a}(X), \vec{t}(X) \rangle = \vec{0}, \forall \vec{t}(X) \in I \}.$$

Definition 51. Let T be a semi-linear transformation of \mathbb{F}_q^n as in (*). We define the *Hermitian dual code* \mathcal{C}^ν of a linear code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with respect to \langle, \rangle as the linear code

$$\mathcal{C}^\nu := \{ \vec{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n \mid \langle \vec{x}(X), \vec{c}(X) \rangle = 0 \text{ for every } \vec{c} \in \mathcal{C} \}.$$

Remark 52. If $I \subseteq R_n$ is a left R -submodule, then $I^{<,\>}$ is again a left R -submodule of R_n . Consequently, from Theorem 6 we can deduce that if \mathcal{C}' is a code invariant under D as in (*), then $\mathcal{C}'^\nu = \pi^{-1}(\pi(\mathcal{C}')^{<,\>})$ is again a code invariant by D .

From Proposition 50 we can deduce the following results which relate the quasi-Euclidean duals with the Hermitian dual codes of product T -codes.

Theorem 53. Let $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ be a product T -code and define the isomorphism $\bar{\pi} = \pi \circ \varphi$. If (\diamond) holds, then

$$\bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T^*) = \bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T)^{<,\>}.$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$, from Corollary 48 we deduce that $\mathcal{C}_T^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)C$. Thus it is sufficient to prove that

$$\pi(\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*) = \pi(\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)^{<,\>}.$$

Moreover, without loss of generality, we can assume that $r = 1$. Therefore, let $\pi(\vec{b}) = \pi_1(\vec{b}) \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1^*)$ for some $\vec{b} \in \mathcal{C}_1^*$. Then for every $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $h \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we have $\vec{b} \cdot_* \vec{a}(\Theta \circ M_1)^h = 0$. Thus by Proposition 50 we get $\langle \pi_1(\vec{b}), \pi_1(\vec{a}) \rangle = 0$ for all $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{C}_1$, i.e. $\pi_1(\vec{b}) \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1)^{<,\>}$. Hence $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1^*) \subseteq \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1)^{<,\>}$. Finally, let $b(X) \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1)^{<,\>}$. Then we get $\langle b(X), \pi_1(\vec{a}) \rangle = 0, \forall \vec{a} \in \mathcal{C}_1$. By Proposition 50 with $h = 0$, this implies that $\pi_1^{-1}(b(X)) \cdot_* \vec{a} = 0, \forall \vec{a} \in \mathcal{C}_1$, i.e. $\pi_1^{-1}(b(X)) \in \mathcal{C}_1^*$. This shows that $b(X) = \pi_1(\pi_1^{-1}(b(X))) \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1^*)$, that is, $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1)^{<,\>} \subseteq \pi_1(\mathcal{C}_1^*)$. \square

Remark 54. Let $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ be a product T -code. Then from Theorem 53 we deduce that $\varphi(\mathcal{C}_T^*) = (\varphi(\mathcal{C}_T))^\nu$. In particular, if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r$ is a product of module θ -codes \mathcal{C}_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$, then we have $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}^\nu$.

Corollary 55. Let $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ be a product T -code, where C is as in (*). If $(\diamond\circ)$ holds, then

$$\mathcal{C}_T = \mathcal{C}_T^* \iff \bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T) = \bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T)^{<, >},$$

i.e., \mathcal{C}_T is self-dual with respect to \cdot_* $\iff \bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T)$ is self-dual with respect to $<, >$.

Proof. Since $\bar{\pi}$ is an isomorphism, this follows immediately from Theorem 53. \square

Theorem 56. Let $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ be a product T -code, where $\mathcal{C}_i = (g_i)_{n_i, q}^{k_i, \theta}$ is an f_i -module θ -codes for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. If $(\diamond\circ)$ holds, then $\mathcal{C}_T^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)C$ is a product T -code, where $\mathcal{C}_i^* = (\mathcal{C}_i B_i)^\perp$ with $B_i := Q_i(Q_i)_t$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Furthermore, a generator matrix for \mathcal{C}_T^* is given by

$$G^* := \begin{pmatrix} G_1^* & & & \\ & G_2^* & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & G_r^* \end{pmatrix} \cdot C,$$

where

$$G_i^* := \begin{pmatrix} \pi_i^{-1}(g_i^*) \\ \pi_i^{-1}(g_i^*)(\Theta \circ M_i) \\ \vdots \\ \pi_i^{-1}(g_i^*)(\Theta \circ M_i)^{s_i-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

with $s_i := \dim \mathcal{C}_i^*$, $g_i^* q_{f_i} = \text{l.l.c.m.}(h_i^\perp, q_i) \pmod{(X_i^{m_i} - 1)}$, $h_i^\perp = \sum_{j=0}^{k_i} \theta^i(h_{k_i-j})X^j$ and $X^{m_i} - 1 = g_i q_{f_i} (\sum_{j=0}^{k_i} h_j X^j)$, is the generator matrix of the quasi-Euclidean code \mathcal{C}_i^* for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ is a product T -code, then $\bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T)$ is a left R -submodule of R_n . Hence $\bar{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_T)^{<, >}$ is a left R -submodule. By Proposition 48 and Theorems 53 and 6, we conclude that $\mathcal{C}_T^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)C$ is a product T -code.

Consider the following commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_k & \xrightarrow{i_k} & i_k(\mathcal{C}_k) \\ \pi_k \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi'_k \\ (g_k) & \xrightarrow{j_k} & (g_k q_{f_k}) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}_k^* & \xrightarrow{i_k} & i_k(\mathcal{C}_k^*) \\ \pi_k \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi'_k \\ (g_k^*) & \xrightarrow{j_k} & (G_k) \end{array}$$

for every $k = 1, \dots, r$. By Proposition 30 we see that $i_k(\mathcal{C}_k)$ is a θ -cyclic code. So from [4, Theorem 8] we know that $i_k(\mathcal{C}_k)^\perp$ is again a θ -cyclic code generated by the skew polynomial $h_k^\perp := h_k^* \in R$ such that $X^{m_k} - 1 = g_k q_{f_k} h_k$, where h^* is as in [2, Definition 3]. Since $\mathcal{I}_k := \text{Im } i_k$ is generated by $q_{f_k} \in R$, from Theorem 40 (v) it follows that $\pi'_k(i_k(\mathcal{C}_k^*)) = (h_k^\perp) \cap (q_{f_k})$, i.e. $\pi'_k(i_k(\mathcal{C}_k^*)) = (G_k)$ with $G_k = \text{l.l.c.m.}(h_k^\perp, q_{f_k})$. From Proposition 29 we deduce that $\pi_k(\mathcal{C}_k^*) = (g_k^*)$ with g_k^* such that $G_k = g_k^* q_{f_k}$. \square

Corollary 57. Let $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ be a product T -code, where C is as in (*). If $(\diamond\circ)$ holds, then

$$\mathcal{C}^* \text{ is a product } T\text{-code} \iff \mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B \text{ is a product } T\text{-code.}$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{C}^* = (\mathcal{C}_1^* \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r^*)C$ is a product T -code. Then by Proposition 40 (iv) and Corollary 56 we see that $\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B = (\mathcal{C}^*)^*$ is a product T -code. Finally, assume that $\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B$ is a product T -code. Then by Theorem 40 (vi) and Corollary 56, we deduce that $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C}^* \cap (\text{Ker } B)^* = (\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B)^*$ is a product T -code. \square

Let us note here that the converse of Corollary 56 is not true in general, as the following example shows.

Example 58. In \mathbb{F}_4^3 , where $\mathbb{F}_4 = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]$ with $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$, consider the polynomial $f_2 = X^3 + X^2 + \alpha X + \alpha^2$. Then from Example 44 we know that $m = 6$ and

$$B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha^2 & 0 \\ \alpha^2 & 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & \alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\text{rk } B_2 = 2$. Consider the linear code $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{F}_4^3$ generated by the vectors $\vec{e}_2 = (0, 1, 0)$ and $\vec{e}_3 = (0, 0, 1)$. Since

$$(\vec{e}_3) \Theta \circ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \alpha^2 & \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \vec{e}_3 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \alpha^2 & \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix} = (\alpha^2, \alpha, 1) \notin \mathcal{C},$$

we see that \mathcal{C} is not an f_2 -module θ -code. On the other hand, since $\text{Ker } B_2$ is generated by the vector $(\alpha^2, 0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{C} \cap \text{Ker } B_2 = \{\vec{0}\}$, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{C} + \text{Ker } B_2 = \mathcal{C} \oplus \text{Ker } B_2 = \mathbb{F}_4^3$$

is an f_2 -module θ -code. By Corollary 57 we get that \mathcal{C}^* is an f_2 -module θ -code.

Remark 59. If $(\diamond\diamond)$ holds, then $\text{Ker } B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ is a T -code such that $\text{Ker } B = (\text{Ker } B_1 \times \dots \times \text{Ker } B_r)$, $\text{Ker } B^\perp = \text{Im } B$, $(\text{Ker } B^\perp)^\perp = \text{Ker } B$ and $\text{Ker } B^* = \mathbb{F}_q^n$, $(\text{Ker } B^*)^* = \text{Ker } B$. In particular, $\text{Ker } B \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ does not contain any T -code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ with $\mathcal{C}^* \neq \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

4. AN ENCODING AND DECODING ALGORITHM

Given a θ -semi-linear transformation $T = \Theta \circ M$ and a product T -code $\mathcal{C}_T \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ of dimension $k < n$, a classical codification of a message $\vec{M} \in \mathbb{F}_q^k$ is given by $\vec{M}G_T C^{-1}$, where G_T is a generator matrix of \mathcal{C}_T and C is the invertible matrix such that $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$. Note that $\vec{M}G_T \in \mathcal{C}_T$ and

$$\vec{m} := \vec{M}G_T C^{-1} \in \mathcal{C}_T C^{-1} = \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r$$

for some f_i -module θ -codes $\mathcal{C}_i = (g_i)$, where the g_i 's are right divisors of the f_i 's respectively (see Remark 3 and assumption (*)). However, this encoding method is not systematic, i.e. it is not strictly related with an easy decoding algorithm.

So, let us give here a non-trivial and systematic encoding method for product T -codes. Let $\vec{M} \in \mathbb{F}_q^k = \mathbb{F}_q^{k_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{k_r}$ be the original message such that $\vec{M} = (\vec{M}_1, \dots, \vec{M}_r)$, where $\vec{M}_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^{k_i}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. Let $\mathcal{C}_T = (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r)C$ be a product T -code such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{C}_i = k_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, r$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n_i}$ with $n_i \geq k_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. Therefore, consider the natural injective map $i_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{k_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j}$ such that $i_j(a_1, \dots, a_{k_j}) := (a_1, \dots, a_{k_j}, 0, \dots, 0)$ for any $j = 1, \dots, r$, and define the injective map

$$i := (i_1, \dots, i_r) : \mathbb{F}_q^{k_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{k_r} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}.$$

Define $\vec{m} := i(\vec{M}) = ((\vec{M}_1, \vec{0}), \dots, (\vec{M}_r, \vec{0})) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ and denote by $m = (m_1, \dots, m_r) \in R_n$ the representation of the message $\vec{m} = i(\vec{M}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n = \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$, via the vector isomorphism

$$\pi := (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_r) : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r} \rightarrow R_n := R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r .$$

At this point, we can encode the original message $\vec{m} := i(\vec{M})$ by working equivalently on either (i) R_n , or (ii) $\mathbb{F}_q^n := \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$.

(i) Multiply the original messages m_i by $X^{n_i - k_i}$, where $m_i = m_{i,0} + m_{i,1}X + \dots + m_{i,k_i-1}X^{k_i-1}$ and $k_i = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q} \mathcal{C}_i$. The result is $X^{n_i - k_i} \cdot m_i = \theta^{n_i - k_i}(m_{i,0})X^{n_i - k_i} + \theta^{n_i - k_i}(m_{i,1})X^{n_i - k_i + 1} + \dots + \theta^{n_i - k_i}(m_{i,k_i-1})X^{n_i - 1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Write $X^{n_i - k_i} \cdot m_i = q_i g_i + r_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$, where $\deg r_i < n_i - k_i$. Since $q_i g_i \in \mathcal{C}_i$, we can encode the original message $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ by

$$\vec{m}' := (\pi_1^{-1}(X^{n_1 - k_1} \cdot m_1 - r_1), \dots, \pi_r^{-1}(X^{n_r - k_r} \cdot m_r - r_r)) \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r .$$

Since $\deg r_i < n_i - k_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$, observe that all the information about the original messages m_i is contained in the last powers $X^{n_i - k_i}, \dots, X^{n_i - 1}$ of $X^{n_i - k_i} \cdot m_i - r_i \in \pi_i(\mathcal{C}_i)$.

(ii) Define the map

$$\bar{\Theta} : \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r} \\ (\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_r) & \longmapsto & (\vec{x}_1(\Theta \circ M_1)^{n_1 - k_1}, \dots, \vec{x}_r(\Theta \circ M_r)^{n_r - k_r}) \end{array} ,$$

where the M_i 's are matrices as in Theorem 2. By applying $\bar{\Theta}$ to \vec{m} we have

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{m}\bar{\Theta} &= ((\vec{M}_1, \vec{0})(\Theta \circ M_1)^{n_1 - k_1}, \dots, (\vec{M}_r, \vec{0})(\Theta \circ M_r)^{n_r - k_r}) \\ &= ((\vec{0}, (\vec{M}_1)\Theta^{n_1 - k_1}), \dots, (\vec{0}, (\vec{M}_r)\Theta^{n_r - k_r})) \end{aligned}$$

If $\vec{m}' := ((\vec{c}_1, (\vec{M}_1)\Theta^{n_1 - k_1}), \dots, (\vec{c}_r, (\vec{M}_r)\Theta^{n_r - k_r}))$ is such that $\vec{m}'H_t = \vec{0}$, where

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} H_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & H_r \end{pmatrix}$$

is the parity check matrix of $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r$ and the matrices $H_i = (I_{n_i - k_i} \mid (T_i)_t)$ are given by Proposition 21 for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then $\vec{m}' \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r$ is the encoded message of $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$.

Now, let \vec{m}'' be the received message. If during the transmission of the encoded message \vec{m}' there were not errors, i.e. $\vec{m}'' \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r$, then in both cases (i) and (ii) we can decode $\vec{m}'' = (\vec{m}_1'', \dots, \vec{m}_r'')$ by applying $\Theta^{-n_i + k_i}$ to each component \vec{m}_i'' of \vec{m}'' . The original components \vec{m}_i of $\vec{m} = (\vec{m}_1, \dots, \vec{m}_r)$ will be given by the last k_i coordinates of $(\vec{m}_i'')\Theta^{-n_i + k_i}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Finally, if there were errors during the transmission of the message \vec{m}' , i.e. $\vec{m}'' \notin \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r$, then by assuming that the error \vec{e} , defined as

$$\vec{e} := \vec{m}'' - \vec{m}' \in \vec{m}'' + (\mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_r),$$

where \vec{m}'' and \vec{m}' are the received and the encoded messages respectively, has small weight $wt(\vec{e})$, we can use the below error detecting and correcting algorithm inspired by [6] and then the above decoding procedure.

A Meggitt type error correcting algorithm.

Put $d_{min} := \min_{i=1, \dots, r} \{d(\mathcal{C}_i)\}$, where $d(\mathcal{C}_i) := d_i$ is the minimum Hamming distance of the code \mathcal{C}_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$, and assume that

$$wt(\vec{e}) \leq \frac{d_{min} - 1}{2}.$$

Let $\pi_j : \mathbb{F}_q^{n_j} \rightarrow R/Rf_j$ be the usual isomorphism for every $j = 1, \dots, r$.

For any vector $\vec{v} = (\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_r) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ put $\pi(\vec{v}) := (\pi_1(\vec{v}_1), \dots, \pi_r(\vec{v}_r))$ and define the syndrome of $\pi(\vec{v})$ as follows:

$$S(\pi(\vec{v})) := (R_{g_1}(\pi_1(\vec{v}_1)), \dots, R_{g_r}(\pi_r(\vec{v}_r))),$$

where $R_{g_i}(\pi_i(\vec{v}_i))$ is the rest of the division of $\pi_i(\vec{v}_i)$ by g_i for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Observe that $S(\pi(\vec{m}')) = (0, \dots, 0)$. Hence $S(\pi(\vec{e})) = S(\pi(\vec{m}''))$. Denote by t_i the polynomials in R such that $t_i \cdot X = 1$ in R/Rf_i for every $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Algorithm 2:

Input: $\vec{m}'' = (\vec{m}''_1, \dots, \vec{m}''_r)$

- **Step 1:** Compute all the syndromes

$$S(\pi(\vec{e}^j)) = S((\pi_1(\vec{e}^j_1), \dots, \pi_r(\vec{e}^j_r))),$$

where $\pi_i(\vec{e}^j_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_i-1} e'_{j,i} X^j$ is such that $wt(\vec{e}^j_i) = wt(\pi_i(\vec{e}^j_i)) \leq \frac{d_i-1}{2}$ with d_i the minimum Hamming distance of \mathcal{C}_i and $e'_{i, n_i-1} \neq 0$;

- **Step 2:** Compute $S(\pi(\vec{m}''))$ and define $\vec{s} := S(\pi(\vec{m}''))$;
- **Step 3:** If $\vec{s} = \vec{0} \in R/Rf_1 \times \dots \times R/Rf_r$ then write $\vec{e} = \vec{0}$;
- **Step 4:** If \vec{s} is equal to some of the syndromes $S(\pi(\vec{e}^j))$ of Step 1, then write $\vec{e} = \vec{e}^j$;
- **Step 5:** If \vec{s} is not in the list of Step 1, then

$$\vec{m}'' = \vec{m}' + \vec{e}^j$$

for some error $\vec{e}^j = (\vec{e}^j_1, \dots, \vec{e}^j_r) \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{F}_q^{n_r}$ such that $wt(\vec{e}^j) \leq \frac{d_{min}-1}{2}$ and $\pi(\vec{e}^j) = (\sum_{j=0}^{h_1} e''_{j,1} X^j, \dots, \sum_{j=0}^{h_r} e''_{j,r} X^j)$ with $e''_{h_i,i} \neq 0$, $h_i \leq n_i - 1$ and $h_k < n_k - 1$ for some $k = 1, \dots, r$. Since θ is an automorphism of \mathbb{F}_q , there exists an integer $\delta_k := n_k - h_k - 1$ such that

$$\vec{e}_k := X^{\delta_k} \cdot \left(\sum_{j=0}^{h_k} e''_{j,k} X^j \right),$$

i.e. $\pi_k(\vec{E}_k) := \vec{e}_k = \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-1} \bar{e}_{j,k} X^j$ is such that $wt(\vec{E}_k) \leq \frac{d_k-1}{2}$ and $\bar{e}_{n_k-1,k} \neq 0$. Thus the syndrome

$$S((\pi_1(\vec{e}^j_1), \dots, \vec{e}_k, \dots, \pi_r(\vec{e}^j_r)))$$

is as in Step 1, where $\pi_i(\vec{e}^j_i) = \sum_{j=0}^{n_i-1} e'_{j,i} X^j$ is such that $wt(\pi_i(\vec{e}^j_i)) \leq \frac{d_i-1}{2}$ and $e'_{i, n_i-1} \neq 0$ for $i \neq k$. Then write

$$\vec{e} = (\vec{e}^j_1, \dots, \pi_k^{-1}(t_k^{\delta_k} \cdot \vec{e}_k), \dots, \vec{e}^j_r);$$

Output: $\vec{m}' = \vec{m}'' - \vec{e}$.

5. A METHOD TO CONSTRUCT T -CODES

Observe that to construct a product T -code (see Definition 16) it is sufficient to construct module θ -codes (see Definition 14).

Note that in R there are exactly $q^{r-1}(q-1)$ different polynomials of the form $g = g_0 + g_1X + \dots + g_{r-1}X^{r-1} + X^r$ with $g_0 \neq 0$. Thus if h is another monic polynomial of degree r , then it follows that $(g) \neq (h)$ whenever $g \neq h$. Furthermore, for any given monic polynomial $g \in R$ of degree $r < n$ as above there exists a polynomial $f \in R$ of degree n such that g is a (right) divisor of f . This shows that there exist $q^{r-1}(q-1)$ module θ -codes with parameters of $[n, n-r]_q$.

From now on, a linear code \mathcal{C} of type $[n, k]_q$ with Hamming distance equal to d will be called simply a code of type $[n, k, d]_q$.

So, let us give here the following

Definition 60.

$$D_q^\theta(n, k) := \max \{d \mid \exists \text{ a module } \theta\text{-code of type } [n, k, d]_q\}$$

Similarly to [8, Proposition 3.1], we can obtain the following

Proposition 61.

$$D_q^\theta(n, k) \geq D_q^\theta(n+1, k+1).$$

Proof. Let $g = g_0 + g_1X + \dots + g_{n-k}X^{n-k}$ be the generator polynomial of a module θ -code $\mathcal{C}_{n+1, k+1}$ with parameters $[n+1, k+1, D_q^\theta(n+1, k+1)]$. Observe that g_0 and g_{n-k} are distinct to zero and that the generator matrix $G_{n+1, k+1}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{n+1, k+1}$ has the form

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|cccccc} g_0 & g_1 & \dots & g_{n-k} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \hline 0 & & & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ 0 & & & & & & \end{array} \right),$$

where $G_{n, k}$ is the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \theta(g_0) & \dots & \theta(g_{n-k}) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \theta^2(g_0) & \dots & \theta^2(g_{n-k}) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \theta^k(g_0) & \dots & \theta^k(g_{n-k}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the minimum (Hamming) distance decided by $G_{n, k}$ is at least $D_q^\theta(n+1, k+1)$. Define $G := \theta(g_0) + \theta(g_1)X + \dots + \theta(g_{n-k})X^{n-k}$. Then G is the generator polynomial of a module θ -code $\mathcal{C}_{n, k}$ of type $[n, k, d]_q$ with $d \geq D_q^\theta(n+1, k+1)$. Hence we get $D_q^\theta(n, k) \geq d \geq D_q^\theta(n+1, k+1)$. \square

Remark 62. If \mathcal{C} is a module θ -code of type $[n, k, \Delta]_q$ with distance $\Delta \geq 1$, then we have $D_q^\theta(n, k) \geq \Delta$. Therefore by Proposition 61 we see that for any integer δ such that $0 \leq \delta < k$ there exists at least a module θ -code \mathcal{C}' of type $[n-\delta, k-\delta, d]_q$ with $d \geq \Delta$. Thus the above result can be useful to ensure the existence and the construction of module θ -codes of type $[n, k, d]_q$ with distance d greater than or equal to some fixed value Δ and small values for n and k .

Denote by $\mathbb{F}_q^\theta \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$ the field fixed by θ . In what follows we try to construct vectors $\vec{v} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ such that $1 \leq \dim[\vec{v}] \leq k$ for some integer $k < n$, where $[\vec{v}] \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$

is the vector subspace generated by $\{\vec{v}, (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A_c), (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A_c)^2, \dots\}$ and A_c is the companion matrix of $f \in R$ as in Remark 27.

For simplicity, put $A := A_c$ and note that

$$(\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A_\theta) = (\vec{v})(A \circ \Theta)$$

for any $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{F}_q)^n$, where $A_\theta := [\theta(a_{ij})]$ if $A = [a_{ij}]$. This gives the following

Lemma 63. *For every integer $k \geq 1$, we have*

$$(\Theta \circ A)^k = \Theta^k \circ A_k,$$

where $A_k := A_{\theta^{k-1}} \cdot \dots \cdot A_{\theta^2} \cdot A_\theta \cdot A$ for $k \geq 2$ and $A_1 := A$.

Let h be an integer such that $1 \leq h \leq n - 1$ and consider the equation:

$$(\#) \quad (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A)^h x_h + \dots + (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A)^1 x_1 + (\vec{v})x_0 = \vec{0}.$$

If there exists a non-trivial vector \vec{v} and a non-zero $x_h \in \mathbb{F}_q$ which satisfies the above equation (#), we can deduce that $(\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A)^h$ can be written as a linear combination of vectors in $\{\vec{v}, (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A), \dots, (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ A)^{h-1}\}$, i.e. $1 \leq \dim[\vec{v}] \leq h$.

In order to simplify equation (#), we will consider only vectors $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^\theta)^n$. In this case, by Lemma 63 (#) becomes

$$(\#') \quad \vec{v} \cdot (A_h x_h + \dots + A_1 x_1 + I x_0) = \vec{0},$$

where $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^\theta)^n$. Thus the existence of a non-trivial vectors $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^\theta)^n$ which satisfy equation (#') implies the existence of non-trivial solutions x_h, \dots, x_1, x_0 of the equation

$$(\#'') \quad \det(A_h x_h + \dots + A_1 x_1 + I x_0) = 0.$$

So we can translate the problem of finding a vector $\vec{v} \neq \vec{0}$ in $(\mathbb{F}_q^\theta)^n$ which is a solution of (#) to the problem of finding non-trivial solutions x_h, \dots, x_1, x_0 in \mathbb{F}_q of (#''). Define

$$F_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h) := \det(A_h x_h + \dots + A_1 x_1 + I x_0).$$

We have the following

Lemma 64. *The polynomial $F_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h)$ is an homogeneous polynomial of degree n in the variables x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h .*

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_q$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_h(\lambda x_0, \lambda x_1, \dots, \lambda x_h) &= \det(A_h(\lambda x_h) + \dots + A_1(\lambda x_1) + I(\lambda x_0)) \\ &= \det(\lambda I) \cdot \det(A_h x_h + \dots + A_1 x_1 + I x_0) \\ &= \lambda^n \cdot F_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h), \end{aligned}$$

and this gives the statement. \square

From Lemma 64 it follows that the zero locus $Z(F_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h))$ of $F_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h)$ on the projective space $\mathbb{P}^h(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is well defined. Put

$$Z_{h,n} := Z(F_h(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h)) \subset \mathbb{P}^h(\mathbb{F}_q).$$

Then $Z_{h,n}$ is a hypersurface of $\mathbb{P}^h(\mathbb{F}_q)$, i.e. $\dim Z_{h,n} = h - 1$, of degree $n \geq h + 1$. Moreover, all the points of $Z_{h,n}$ represent no trivial solutions of (#''). This gives a relation between the construction of a module θ -code $\mathcal{C} = [\vec{v}]$ of dimension less or equal to h , where $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^\theta)^n \cap \text{Ker}(A_h x_h + \dots + A_1 x_1 + I x_0)$, with the existence of (rational) points on the hypersurface $Z_{h,n}$ of $\mathbb{P}^h(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Remark 65. The above procedure gives a method to construct an f -module θ -code. Moreover, when $\theta = id$ we know from [5] that the number N_q of \mathbb{F}_q -points of the hypersurface $Z_{h,n}$ is bounded for the following inequalities:

- (i) $N_q \leq (n-1)q + 1$ if $h = 2$, except for a curve $Z_{2,4}$ over \mathbb{F}_4 ;
- (ii) $N_q \leq (n-1)q^{h-1} + nq^{h-2} + \frac{q^{h-2}-1}{q-1}$ if $h \geq 3$.

For the general case of T -codes, an argument similar to the above can be directly applied to a semi-linear transformation $D := \Theta \circ \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r)$ instead of $\Theta \circ A_C$. Recall that any T -code \mathcal{C}_T can be obtained from a code \mathcal{C}_D invariant under D by the relation $\mathcal{C}_T = \mathcal{C}_D C$, where C is an invertible matrix such that $CTC^{-1} = D$. Therefore, to obtain a T -code it is sufficient to construct a code \mathcal{C}_D invariant under D . As above, this allows us to find (rational) solutions of the following equation

$$(\#\#) \quad (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ \overline{D})^h x_h + \dots + (\vec{v})(\Theta \circ \overline{D})^1 x_1 + (\vec{v})x_0 = \vec{0}$$

for some integer h such that $1 \leq h \leq n-1$, where $\overline{D} = \text{diag}(M_1, \dots, M_r)$. By considering only non-trivial vectors $\vec{v} \in (\mathbb{F}_q^\theta)^n$, $(\#\#)$ becomes simply

$$(\#\#\prime) \quad \vec{v} \cdot (\overline{D}_h x_h + \dots + \overline{D}_1 x_1 + Ix_0) = \vec{0}$$

which immediately implies the existence of non-trivial solutions $x_h, \dots, x_1, x_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q$ of the following equation

$$(\#\#\prime\prime) \quad \det(\overline{D}_h x_h + \dots + \overline{D}_1 x_1 + Ix_0) = 0,$$

where $\overline{D}_i = \text{diag}((M_1)_i, \dots, (M_r)_i)$ and $(M_j)_i$ is as in Lemma 63 for every $j = 1, \dots, r$ and $i = 1, \dots, h$. Observe that $(\#\#\prime\prime)$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \det(\text{diag}((M_1)_h x_h + \dots + (M_1)x_1 + Ix_0, \dots, (M_r)_h x_h + \dots + (M_r)x_1 + Ix_0)) = \\ & = \det((M_1)_h x_h + \dots + (M_1)x_1 + Ix_0) \cdot \dots \cdot \det((M_r)_h x_h + \dots + (M_r)x_1 + Ix_0) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$F(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h) := F_{1,h}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h) \cdot \dots \cdot F_{r,h}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h) = 0,$$

where $F_{i,h}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h) := \det((M_i)_h x_h + \dots + (M_i)x_1 + Ix_0)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, r$. In this case, the zero locus $Z(F(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h))$ of $F(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h)$ on the projective space $\mathbb{P}^h(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is a complete intersection of type (d_1, \dots, d_r) , where $d_i := \deg F_{i,h}(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_h)$, and its (rational) points are solutions of $(\#\#\prime\prime)$.

When $\theta = id$, the above arguments work also with M instead of $\Theta \circ A$ and give us a method to construct all the linear codes $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^n$ invariant under a matrix M as in (*). Indeed, for $h = n-1$ the equation $(\#\prime\prime)$ becomes simply

$$\det(M^{n-1}x_h + \dots + M^1x_1 + Ix_0) = 0.$$

Thus by any point $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in Z_{n-1,n}$ we can construct a polynomial $p = p(X) \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$ such that $\det p(M) = 0$.

By the following Magma [1] program we can find all the solutions of the equation $\det(M^{n-1}x_h + \dots + M^1x_1 + Ix_0) = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_q[X]$:

```
F<w>:=GF(a);
P<x>:=PolynomialRing(F);
PointsCode := function(M);
  k:=Parent(M[1,1]);
  n:=Nrows(M);
  P<[x]>:=ProjectiveSpace(k,n);
```

```

X:=Scheme(P,Determinant(&+[x[i+1]*M^i : i in [0..n]]));
pts:=Points(X);
ll:=[];
  for pp in pts do
    p:=Eltseq(pp);
    ll := ll cat [NullSpace(&+[p[i+1]*M^i : i in [0..n]])];
  end for;
return ll;
end function;

```

In fact, when $\theta = id$, we can say more about the above polynomial $p \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$.

Proposition 66. *Assume that $\theta = id$. Let $m \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be the minimal polynomial of an invertible matrix M . If $g = \gcd(p, m)$ for some polynomial $p \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$, then*

- (1) $\text{Ker } p(M) = \text{Ker } g(M)$;
- (2) $\text{Ker } p(M) \neq \vec{0} \iff g \neq 1$.

Proof. Note that $g = pa + mb$ for some polynomials $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$. Hence $g(M) = p(M)a(M)$ and $p(M) = g(M)b(M)$. This shows that $\text{Ker } p(M) \subseteq \text{Ker } g(M)$ and $\text{Ker } g(M) \subseteq \text{Ker } p(M)$ respectively, i.e. $\text{Ker } p(M) = \text{Ker } g(M)$.

Finally, to prove (2), first assume that $g = 1$. Then $g(M) = p(M)a(M)$ is the identity matrix. This shows that $\det p(M) \cdot \det a(M) = 1$, i.e. $\det p(M) \neq 0$, but this gives a contradiction. On the other hand, if $g \neq 1$ then $m = hg$ and $p = lg$ for some polynomials $h, l \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$. Hence $h(M)g(M)$ is the zero matrix. Since $\deg h < \deg m$ and m is the minimal polynomial of M , we deduce that $\det g(M) = 0$. Thus we get $\det p(M) = \det(l(M)g(M)) = 0$, i.e. $\text{Ker } p(M) \neq \vec{0}$. \square

CONCLUSION

In this paper we study the main properties of codes invariant by a semi-linear transformation of \mathbb{F}_q^n for $n \geq 2$ in the non-commutative ring $\mathbb{F}_q[X, \theta]$, where $\theta : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ is an automorphism of the finite field \mathbb{F}_q with q elements. In particular, we introduce the notion of product semi-linear codes and we study their Euclidean, quasi-Euclidean and Hermitian dual codes. The main ingredient here is the construction of an injective map which transforms a product semi-linear code into a skew cyclic code for taking advantages of the nice properties of these latter well-known codes. In addition, we show some connections between these three types of dual codes and we give an encoding and decoding algorithm with product semi-linear codes and a method to construct a code invariant under a semi-linear transformation of \mathbb{F}_q^n . It is hoped that all these results will be a future topic of interest for further studies on generalized cyclic codes and skew quasi-cyclic codes.

Acknowledgements. The authors would thank Prof. A. Laface for useful remarks about the MAGMA programs and for some interesting discussions about the final form of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [M][1] W. Bosma, J. Cannon and C. Playoust, *The Magma algebra system. I. The user language*, J. Symbolic Comput. **24** (1997), no. 3-4, 235–265.
- [BU1][2] D. Boucher and F. Ulmer, *A note on the dual codes of module skew codes*, Cryptography and coding, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. **7089**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, 230–243.
- [BU2][3] D. Boucher and F. Ulmer, *Linear codes using skew polynomials with automorphisms and derivations*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. 2013, DOI 10.1007/s10623-012-9704-4.
- [BU3][4] D. Boucher and F. Ulmer, *Codes as modules over skew polynomial rings*, Cryptography and coding, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. **5921**, Springer, Berlin, 2009, 38–55.
- [HK][5] M. Homma and S.J. Kim, *An elementary bound for the number of points of a hypersurface over a finite field*, Finite Fields Appl. **20** (2013), 76–83.
- [HP][6] W. Cary Huffman and V. Pless, *Fundamentals of error-correcting codes*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [J][7] N. Jacobson, *Pseudo-linear transformations*, Ann. of Math. (2) **38** (1937), no. 2, 484–507.
- [LL][8] Zhuo-Jun Liu and Dong-Dai Lin, *A class of generalized cyclic codes*, Acta Math. Appl. Sinica (English Ser.) **16** (2000), no. 1, 53–58.
- [LS][9] S. Ling and P. Solé, *On the algebraic structure of quasi-cyclic codes. I. Finite fields*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **47** (2001), no. 7, 2751–2760.
- [MacWS][10] F.J. MacWilliams, N.J.A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1977.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN, CASILLA 160-C, CONCEPCIÓN,
CHILE

E-mail address: ltapiac@udec.cl, atironi@udec.cl