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#### Abstract

Pellikaan (1989) has given a noneffective maximal decoding algorithm of a geometric code. To this end. our purpose is the determination of the minimal integer $s$, such that the maps $\Psi_{y-k}(k=1,2)$, defined in Pellikaan (1989), are surjective. Then. on the one hand, we show that the theta divisor of the jacobian variety of an algebraic curve provides partial answers. On the other hand, for the Klein quartic defined over $F_{8}$. we determine explicitly divisors of degree 8 which allows us to decode up to 5 errors.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\%$ be an algebraic projective curve, absolutely irreducible, nonsingular, of genus g. $(g \geq 2)$, defined over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ with $q$ elements, where $q$ is a power of a prime integer.

We denote by $\operatorname{Div}(\chi)$ the abelian group of the divisors on the curve $\chi$ and by Pic ${ }^{\prime \prime}(\not)$ the group Div $(\%)$ modulo the principal divisors made up of the divisors of degree zero.

It is known [11] that there exists an abelian variety $J(\chi)$ of dimension $g$ and an injective map $\varphi: \chi \rightarrow J(\%)$ such that the extension of $\chi$ to $\operatorname{Div}(\%)$ establishes an isomorphism between $\operatorname{Pic}^{0}(\chi)$ and $J(\chi)$. Moreover, if $O$ is a rational point of $\chi$ over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, then $\varphi$ can be defined by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi: \not \chi & \rightarrow J(\not \chi) \\
P & \mapsto \varphi(P)=[P-O] .
\end{aligned}
$$

where $[P-O]$ designates the class of the degree zero divisor $P-O$ in $\operatorname{Pic}^{0}(\chi)$.

[^0]We denote by $\mathbb{D}_{\boldsymbol{r}}(\chi)$ the effective divisors of degree $r$ of the curve $\chi$ and by $\varphi_{r}$ the extension of $\varphi$ to $\mathbb{D}_{r}(\not \chi)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{r}: \mathbb{D} D_{r}(\chi) & \rightarrow J(\chi) \\
D & \mapsto \varphi_{r}(P)=[D-r \cdot O] .
\end{aligned}
$$

The direct image of $\varphi_{r}$ is a sub-variety $\mathbb{W}_{r}$ of dimension $r$ if $0<r<g$, and of dimension $g$ if not. In particular, $\mathbb{W}_{g-1}$ defines a divisor on $J(\chi)$ called Theta and denoted $\Theta$. If $J(\chi)$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_{4}$, then the same holds for $\Theta$ together with all its translate spaces [11, Theorem 4, p. 99].

Here, we investigate the maps

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{g-k}^{s}: \mathbb{D}_{g-k}^{s}(\chi) & \rightarrow J^{s-1}(\chi) \\
\quad\left(D_{1}, \ldots, D_{s}\right) & \mapsto\left(\left[D_{2}-D_{1}\right], \ldots,\left[D_{s}-D_{s-1}\right]\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

More precisely, following [13], first of all we set out to determine over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, the minimum exponent integer $s$, if there any, such that $\Psi_{g-k}^{s}$ is not surjective $\left(s \in \mathbb{N}^{*}\right.$, $k=1,2$ ). Over the algebraic closure of $F_{q}, \bar{F}_{q}$, these maps are not surjective as far as $s$ is large enough. Then, for the purpose of decoding, whenever an algebraic-geometric code is defined on $\chi$ with designed minimum distance $d^{*}$ we look for divisors $F_{i}$, $i \in\{1, \ldots, s\}$ of degree $g+\left\lfloor\left(d^{*}-1\right) / 2\right\rfloor$ such that the $(s-1)$-uple of $J^{s-1}(\chi)$ represented by

$$
\left(\left[F_{2}-F_{1}\right], \ldots,\left[F_{s}-F_{s} \quad 1\right]\right)
$$

has no inverse image through $\Psi_{\xi-k}^{s}$.
In the case of the Klein quartic defined over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$, for a given code with designed minimum distance 11 , we show that $s=3$ fulfills the first condition above and we determine explicitly a suitable 3 -uple of divisors of degree $g+\left\lfloor\left(d^{*}-1\right) / 2\right\rfloor=8$.

Our approach here is a concrete one, based on the inspection of the linear series on the curve $\gamma$; it is used for the first time as far as we known, so as to bring a touch of some effectiveness to the Pellikaan algorithm, which seemed to be lacking at first sight. Needless to say the more recent decoding algorithm such as those from Feng and Rao [6], Duursma [2,3] and Ehrhardt [4,5] are admittedly more performing in particular as far as complexity is concerned.

## 2. The map $\Psi_{g}^{s}$ 1

Lemma 2.1. Let $\Theta^{s}$ defined as the self-intersection number of s copies of the divisor $\Theta$. Over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ we have

$$
\Theta^{s} \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \forall\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{\mathrm{s}}\right) \in J^{s}(\chi), \Theta_{u_{1}} \cap \Theta_{a_{2}} \cap \cdots \cap \Theta_{a_{\mathrm{s}}} \neq \emptyset
$$

where $\Theta_{a_{i}}=\left\{t+a_{i} \mid t \in \Theta\right\}$.

Proof. We know that there exists $s$ translate spaces $\Theta_{a_{1},}, \Theta_{a_{2}}, \ldots, \Theta_{a_{s}}$ such that $\Theta_{a_{i}} \cap \Theta_{a_{2}} \cap \cdots \cap \Theta_{a^{*}}$ is well defined [12]. Moreover, for all other translates, $\Theta_{b_{1}}$, $\Theta_{b,}, \ldots, \Theta_{h}$, we have

$$
\operatorname{dim}\left(\Theta_{h_{1}} \cap \Theta_{b_{2}} \cap \cdots \cap \Theta_{b_{s}}\right) \geq \operatorname{dim}\left(\Theta_{a_{i}} \cap \Theta_{a_{2}} \cap \cdots \cap \Theta_{a_{s}}\right)
$$

with an equality in the case when $\Theta_{b_{1}} \cap \Theta_{r_{2}} \cap \cdots \cap \Theta_{b_{0}}$ is well defined. Hence the lemma follows immediately.

Theorem 2.2. Oter $\mathbb{F}_{q}, \Psi_{G}^{*}$ is surjective if and only if $\Theta^{s} \neq 0$.
Proof. Obviously, $\Psi_{y=1}^{*}$ is surjective if and only if

$$
\begin{align*}
& \forall\left(E_{1}, E_{2}, \ldots E_{s}, 1\right) \in J^{s} \quad 1(\chi), \exists\left(D_{1}, D_{2}, \ldots, D_{s}\right) \in \mathbb{D}_{g-1}^{s}(\chi) \\
& \text { such that } \forall i \in\{1, \ldots, s-1\}, \varphi_{y-1}\left(D_{s}\right)=\varepsilon_{s} i+\varphi_{y-1}\left(D_{s-i}\right)  \tag{1}\\
& \text { with } c_{i}=\sum_{k=i}^{s} E_{k}^{1} .
\end{align*}
$$

In addition to that, from Lemma 2.1,

$$
\Theta^{s} \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \forall\left(E_{1}, \ldots, E_{s}, 1\right) \in J^{s-1}(\not \subset) . \exists \zeta \in \Theta \cap \Theta_{\varepsilon_{1}} \cap \Theta_{\varepsilon_{i} \cap} \cap \cdots \cap \Theta_{\varepsilon_{d s s}} .
$$

In vicw of $\Theta=\mathbb{W}_{g-1}, \Theta^{s} \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \forall\left(E_{1}, \ldots . E_{s-1}\right) \in J^{s-1}(\not \chi), \exists\left(D_{1}, \ldots, D_{s}\right) \in$ $\left.\square_{g}^{s} 1 \%\right) . \exists \stackrel{y}{l} \in J(\%)$ such that $\forall i \in\{1, \ldots, s-1\}, \xi=\varphi_{g} \quad\left(D_{s}\right)=i_{s-i}+\varphi_{g} 1\left(D_{s-i}\right)$.

Hence, from (1), the theorem is established. $\square$
Corollary 2.3. Over $\vec{F}_{q}, \Psi_{g}^{*}$, is surjective whereas $\Psi_{g}^{g+1} 1_{1}$ is not.
Proof. Over an algebraically closed ficld, it is known that $\Theta^{g}=g!$ Thus, $\Theta^{y} \neq 0$ and $\Theta^{4+1}=0$ and we are done.

Remark. Over $\bar{F}_{q}$, it was already known that $\Psi_{y-1}^{g+1}$ was not surjective. Actually, by [13].

$$
\operatorname{dim}_{9}\left(\mathbb{D}_{g-1}^{y+1}(\not \chi)\right)<\operatorname{dim}_{\because,}\left(J^{y}(\not \chi)\right)
$$

Comments. (1) Vladut [16] has produced curves such that over $\mathbb{F}_{2}, \mathbb{F}_{3}$ and $\mathbb{F}_{4}$, $\Psi_{\because-}^{\prime}$ is suriective for every $s \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$.

He has also showed that for any curve considered over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, with $q \geq 37$ or, $q \geq 16$ and $g$ large enough, $\Psi_{g=1}^{2 y}$ is not surjective [16].
(2) Carbonne and Thiong-Ly [1] have shown that the curves whose zeta-function over $F_{4}$ have numerator of the form

$$
P(T)=(1-\sqrt{q} \cdot T)^{2 g}
$$

satisfy

$$
\left.\# D_{g}^{4},(\chi)<=J^{y} \quad 1(\not)\right)
$$

and consequently $\Psi_{g-1}^{g}$ is not surjective in this case, which gives a strictly smaller value for $s$ than in the case over $\mathbb{F}_{4}$.
(3) At last, we prove in the sequel that in the case of the Klein quartic defined over $\mathbb{F}_{8}, \Psi_{g-1}^{g}$ is not surjective and so the value found for $s$ comes again smaller than the one found over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_{q}$, as well as the one found over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ by means of the zeta-function.

## 3. The map $\Psi_{g-2}^{s}$

Theorem 3.1. Over $\vec{F}_{q}$, if $\Theta^{2 s} \neq 0$ then $\Psi_{y-2}^{s}$ is surjective.

Proof. We have $\Psi_{g-2}^{s}$ is surjective if and only if

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \forall\left(E_{1}, E_{2}, \ldots, E_{s-1}\right) \in J^{s-1}(\chi), \exists\left(D_{1}, D_{2}, \ldots, D_{s}\right) \in \mathbb{D}_{g-1}^{s}(\chi) \\
& \text { such that } \forall i \in\{1, \ldots, s-1\}, \varphi_{q-2}\left(D_{s}\right)=\varepsilon_{s-1}+\varphi_{g-1}\left(D_{s-i}\right) \\
& \text { with } \varepsilon_{i}=\sum_{k=i}^{s-1} E_{k} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 2.1,

$$
\text { if } \Theta^{2 s} \neq 0 \text { then } \forall\left(E_{1}, \ldots, E_{s-1}\right) \in J^{s-1}(\chi), \exists \xi \in \Theta \cap \Theta_{\varepsilon_{1}}^{2} \cdots \cap \Theta_{\varepsilon a_{s}}^{2} .
$$

The Poincaré formula, $\Theta^{q-d} /(g-d) \approx \mathbb{W}_{d}$ holds over an algebraically closed field, where $\approx$ stands for the algebraic equivalence of divisors [13]. In particular, $\Theta^{2} \approx 2 \cdot W_{g-2}$. Thus, if $\Theta^{s} \neq 0$ then $\forall\left(E_{1}, \ldots, E_{s-1}\right) \in J^{s-1}(\chi), \exists\left(D_{1}, \ldots, D_{s}\right) \in$ $\mathbb{D}_{g-1}^{s}, \exists \xi \in J(\chi)$ such that $\forall i \in\{1, \ldots, s-1\}, \xi=2 \varphi_{g-2}\left(D_{s}\right)=2 \varepsilon_{s-i}+2 \varphi_{g-2}\left(D_{s-i}\right)$.

Hence the theorem follows from (2).
Theorem 3.2. Over $\overrightarrow{\mathbb{F}}_{q}, \Psi_{y-2}^{\lfloor q / 2}$ is surfective whereas $\Psi_{g-2}^{\lfloor\text {gi: }\rfloor+1}$ is not.

Proof. While

$$
\operatorname{dim}_{\widetilde{\Gamma}_{q}}\left(\mathbb{\mathbb { D } _ { g } ^ { s } \quad 2 ) ( \chi ) ) = ( g - 2 ) \cdot s \quad \text { and } \quad \operatorname { d i m } _ { J _ { q } } ( J ^ { s - 1 } ( \chi ) ) = g \cdot ( s - 1 ) . , ~ . ~}\right.
$$

we have, as soon as $s>g / 2$.

$$
\left.\operatorname{dim}_{\bar{F}_{q}}\left(\mathbb{D}_{g-2}^{s}\right)(\chi)\right)<\operatorname{dim}_{F_{q}}\left(J^{s-1}(\chi)\right)
$$

Thus $\Psi_{g-2}^{i g / 2\rfloor+1}$ is not surjective.
$\Theta^{g}=g$ ! hence $\Theta^{2\lfloor g / 2\rfloor} \neq 0$ and $\Psi_{y-2}^{(g / 2\rfloor}$ is surjective.

Corollary 3.3. Over $\overrightarrow{\mathbb{F}}_{q}, \Psi_{y-2}^{s}$ is surjective if and only if $\Theta^{2 s} \neq 0$.
Proof. It is a consequence of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, of $\Theta^{y}=g!$ and of $\Theta^{2} \approx 2 \cdot \mathbb{W}_{g-2}$.

Comments. Carbonne and Thiong-Ly [1], have shown that the curves whose zetafunction have numerator over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ of the form

$$
P(T)=(1-\sqrt{q} \cdot T)^{2 q}
$$

satisfy

$$
=\mathbb{D}_{3}\left(\frac{y}{2}-1\right) 2+1(\not)<\# J_{2}^{L(4)-1)-1}(\chi) .
$$

consequently $\Psi_{g-2}^{\operatorname{Lg}-2^{-1}}$ is not surjective in this case. In particular, when $y$ is odd, $\psi_{g}^{g}{ }_{2}^{2 \cdot 2}$ is not surjective which gives a strictly smaller value for $s$ than in the case over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_{q}$.

Theorem 3.4. For all curves defined oter $E_{q}$, with $q \geq 37$ or $q \geq 16$ and 9 large enough,

$$
a_{q}=<h \frac{q+3}{2 . q \cdot(q-1)}
$$

with $h=\# J(\chi)$ and $a_{g-2}= \pm \mathbb{D}_{4,2}(\chi)$ So $\Psi_{y-2}^{y}$ is not surjectice.
Proof. We use here the same notations as in [13. Part 3]:

$$
a_{y-2}=\sum_{i-j=y: 2} \frac{a^{i+1}-1}{q-1} p_{j}=\frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{j=0}^{4-2}\left(q^{q}{ }^{1 \cdot j} p_{j}-p_{j}\right) .
$$

In view of $p_{g+i} / q^{i}=p_{g-i}$ for $i \in\{1, \ldots, g\}$

$$
a_{y-2}=\frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q}\left(\frac{p_{2 g}}{q}-p_{j}\right)=\frac{1}{q-1}\left[\frac{1}{q}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{2 q} p_{j}-\sum_{j=0}^{q-1} p_{j}\right)-\sum_{j=0}^{q-2} p_{j}\right] .
$$

Since $h=\sum_{j=0}^{g-2} p_{j}$,

$$
a_{g-2}=\frac{1}{q-1}\left[\frac{1}{q} h-\frac{q+1}{q} \sum_{j=0}^{g-2} p_{j}-\frac{1}{q}\left(p_{g-1}+p_{g}+q p_{g \cdot 1}\right)\right] .
$$

Passing to the modulus.

$$
a_{g-2} \leq \frac{1}{q}\left[\frac{1}{q} h-\frac{q+1}{q} \sum_{j=0}^{q-2}\left|p_{j}\right|+\frac{q+1}{q}\left|p_{g-1}\right|+\frac{\left|p_{q}\right|}{q}\right] .
$$

so

$$
a_{q-2} \leq \frac{1}{q(q-1)}\left[h+(q+1) \sum_{j=0}^{g}\left|p_{j}\right|\right] .
$$

For $j \in\left\{1, \ldots, 2 g^{\prime},\left|p_{j}\right| \leq C \sum_{2 q}^{j} q^{j / 2}\right.$. Then

$$
a_{g-2} \leq \frac{1}{q(q-1)}\left[h+(q+1) \sum_{j=0}^{g} C_{2 g}^{j} q^{j / 2}\right]
$$

From the Newton formula it yields that

$$
a_{g-2} \leq \frac{1}{q(q-1)}\left[h+(q+1) q^{g 2} 2^{2, q-1}\right] .
$$

Firstly from [13],

$$
h \geq\left(q^{1 / 2}-1\right)^{2, \varphi},
$$

hence,

$$
\frac{a_{g-2}}{h} \leq \frac{1}{q(q-1)}\left[1+\frac{(q+1)}{2}\left(\frac{4 q^{1 / 2}}{\left(q^{1 / 2}-1\right)^{2}}\right)^{u}\right]
$$

Secondly from [16],

$$
h \geq \frac{\left(4 q^{1 / 2}\right)^{q}}{f_{q}(g)}
$$

with

$$
\left.f_{4}(g)=\max _{\{ } 1, b\right\}\left(4 q^{-1 / 2)^{q}} q^{1+2 q q[(b) 1)(q} 11\right]\left(\frac{q-1}{q}\right)^{x_{1}(g \quad 1) q}
$$

hence

$$
\frac{a_{g-2}}{h} \leq \frac{1}{q(q-1)}\left[1+\frac{(q+1)}{2} f_{q}(q)\right] .
$$

Again by [16], we know that for $q \geq 37,\left[\left(4 q^{12} /\left(q^{1: 2}-1\right)^{2}\right)^{q}\right]<1$ or that for $q \geq 16$, $f_{q}(g)$ tends to 0 for $g \rightarrow x$. We can conclude.

## 4. Explicit search for divisors establishing the nonsurjectivity of $\Psi_{g}^{y}{ }_{1}$ for the Klein quartic over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$

We are concerned with the Klein quartic $\mathscr{K}$, whose equation is

$$
X^{3} Y+Y^{3} Z+Z^{3} X=0
$$

We work over the field $\mathbb{F}_{8}=\mathbb{F}_{2}[\alpha]$. where $\alpha$ is root of the primitive polynomial $X^{3}+X+1=0$.
$\mathscr{K}$ is nonsingular of genus 3 . Let $\mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$ be the set of the 24 rational points $P_{i}$, $i \in\{1, \ldots, 24\}$, over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$ which attains the Serre upper bound.

Its canonical linear serie $K$ is the unique $g_{4}^{2}$ cut out by the lines of the plane. It has no $g_{2}^{1}$ and therefore is non hyperelliptic. Futhermore, it possesess $g_{3}^{1}$ without fixed points, of the form $K-A$, with $A \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$. Then $\mathscr{K}$ will be called trigonal [9].

Fig. 1 review all the elements of $\mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$.
Any curve considered in the scquel will be defined over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$. For such a curve $\%$, we denote by $\mathscr{K} \cdot \mathscr{G}$ the associated intersection divisor, rational over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$.

| $P_{1}$ | $P_{2}$ | P, | $P_{7}$ | $P_{s}$ | $P_{1}$ | ${ }^{2}$ | $p_{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(\begin{array}{l}0 \\ 0 \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}1 \\ x \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}1 \\ x^{2} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}1 \\ \chi^{+} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x \\ 1 \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x \\ x^{2} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x \\ x^{p} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{3} \\ x^{3} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ |


| $P 9$ | $P_{10}$ | $P_{11}$ | $P_{12}$ | $P_{13}$ | $P_{14}$ | $P_{15}$ | $P_{1 n}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{3} \\ x^{2} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{5} \\ x^{5} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{2} \\ 1 \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{2} \\ x^{+} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{2} \\ x^{s} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{\prime \prime} \\ x^{3} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{10} \\ x^{\prime \prime} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{n} \\ x^{+} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ |


| $P_{1}$, | $P_{\text {1* }}$ | $P_{10}$ | $P_{20}$ | $P_{21}$ | $P_{z}$ | $P_{23}$ | $P_{2+}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{4} \\ 1 \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{+} \\ x \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{4} \\ x^{3} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}x^{5} \\ x \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{5} \\ x^{6} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{c}x^{5} \\ x^{5} \\ 1\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}1 \\ 0 \\ 0\end{array}\right)$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}0 \\ 1 \\ 0\end{array}\right)$ |

Fig. 1. The points of $\mathscr{A}\left(F_{x}\right)$.
Lemma 4.1. The nine lines of the projective plane passing through $P_{1}$ will he denoted by:

$$
L_{i}: Y+x^{i} X=0, \quad i c\{0, \ldots, 6\}
$$

$$
L_{7}: X+Z=0, \quad L_{8}: Y+Z=0
$$

We hate

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{H} \cdot L_{i}=P_{23}+Q_{a_{i}}+Q_{b_{1}}+Q_{c_{i}}, \quad i \in\{0, \ldots, 6\} \\
& \mathscr{K} \cdot L_{7}=P_{1}+3 P_{23}, \quad \mathscr{K} \cdot L_{8}=3 P_{1}+P_{24} .
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
Q_{a}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
i^{2} x^{3} \\
i^{3} x^{3} \\
1
\end{array}\right) . \quad Q_{b}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
i^{2} x^{6} \\
i^{3} x^{6} \\
1
\end{array}\right), \quad Q_{c}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
i^{2} x^{5} \\
i^{3} \alpha^{5} \\
1
\end{array}\right)
$$

Thus these nine lines coter all the 24 elements of $\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$. We shall say that $P_{1}, P_{23}$, $P_{24}$ is a flex triangle.

The group of automorphisms of $\mathscr{H}$ is maximal with respect to the Hurwitz bound, with its $168=84(g-1)$ elements. Besides, it occurs as a lincar projective group defined over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$ [see 10]. This is why the configuration of Lemma 4.1 described for $P_{1}$ carries over to any other point of $\mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$. In particular, every point of $\mathscr{K}\left(F_{8}\right)$ is a flex point and there are eight flex triangles.

We proceed with the two charts shown in Figs. 2 and 3.
We set

$$
D_{0}=\sum_{i=2}^{22} P_{i} \quad \text { and } \quad G_{0}=5\left(P_{1}+P_{23}+P_{24}\right)
$$

| $P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{0}, P_{21}$ | $P_{1}, P_{3}, P_{1}, P_{12}$ | $P_{1}, P_{4}, P_{1+}, P_{1 \times}$ | $P_{1}, P_{5}, P_{9}, P_{19}$ | $P_{1}, P_{2}, P_{11}, P_{10}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $P_{1}, P_{4}, P_{5}, P_{22}$ | $P_{1}, P_{13}, P_{1}, P_{21}$ | $P_{2}, P_{3}, P_{4}, P_{24}$ | $P_{2}, P_{5}, P_{13}, P_{\text {in }}$ | $P_{2}, P_{7}, P_{19}, P_{22}$ |
| $P_{2}, P_{9}, P_{12}, P_{15}$ | $P_{2}, P_{10}, P_{14}, P_{1}=$ | $P_{2}, P_{14}, P_{261}, P_{23}$ | $P_{3}, P_{5}, P_{14}, P_{21}$ | $P_{3}, P_{6}, P_{4}, P_{23}$ |
| $P_{3}, P_{7}, P_{8}, P_{13}$ | $P_{3}, P_{11}, P_{19}, P_{20}$ | $P_{3}, P_{16}, P_{1 \times}, P_{22}$ | $P_{4}, P_{0}, P_{8}, P_{20}$ | $P_{4}, P_{7}, P_{4}, P_{17}$ |
| $P_{4}, P_{10}, P_{11}, P_{21}$ | $P_{4}, P_{12}, P_{10}, P_{23}$ | $P_{4}, P_{13}, P_{15}, P_{14}$ | $P_{5}, P_{6}, P_{7}, P_{24}$ | $P_{5}, P_{8}, P_{12}, P_{18}$ |
| $P_{5} . P_{10} . P_{15} . P_{20}$ | $P_{s} . P_{1,}, P_{1} \ldots, P_{23}$ | $P_{1,} P_{1 \ldots} . P_{1 \ldots} P_{14}$ | $P_{6,}, P_{1,} . P_{15} . P_{15}$ | $P_{6}, P_{12}, P_{1-, ~} P_{23}$ |
| $P_{7}, P_{12}, P_{14}, P_{20}$ | $P_{7}, P_{15}, P_{21}, P_{23}$ | $P_{8}, P_{4}, P_{11}, P_{2+}$ | $P_{8}, P_{1+}, P_{19}, P_{23}$ | $P_{8,}, P_{10}, P_{17}, P_{21}$ |
| $P_{1,}, P_{11}, P_{14}, P_{22}$ | $P_{1,}, P_{13}, P_{1 \times}, P_{21}$ | $P_{1,1,} P_{13}, P_{2,}, P_{23}$ | $P_{11}, P_{12}, P_{13}, P_{2+}$ | $P_{1+}, P_{15}, P_{16,}, P_{2+}$ |
| $P_{17}, P_{18}, P_{1 \ldots}, P_{24}$ | $P_{20}, P_{21}, P_{22}, P_{24}$ |  |  |  |

Fig. 2. All the 42 collincarity positions between points and $\mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$.

| $P_{1}, P_{23}, P_{24}$ | $P_{2,}, P_{8,} P_{11}$ | $P_{3,} P_{15,} P_{17}$ | $P_{1}, P_{5}, P_{97}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $P_{6}, P_{13}, P_{14}$ | $P_{7,}, P_{16}, P_{18}$ | $P_{4,}, P_{16,} P_{24}$ | $P_{12,}, P_{19}, P_{21}$ |

Fig. 3. All the eight flex triangles through points of $\mathscr{K}\left(F_{y}\right)$.
and we define the code

$$
G_{s 2}\left(D_{0}, G_{0}\right)=\left\{\left(\operatorname{res}_{p_{2}}(\omega), \ldots, \operatorname{res}_{p_{2}}(\omega)\right) \in \mathbb{F}_{8}^{-21} \mid(1) \in \Omega\left(G_{0}-D_{0}\right)\right\}
$$

with the parameters

$$
n=21, \quad k=n-\operatorname{deg} G_{0}+g-1=8, \quad d \geq d^{*}=\operatorname{deg} G_{0}+2-2 g=11
$$

Following Pellikaan, in order to decode up to $t^{*}=\left\lfloor\left(d^{*}-1\right) / 2\right\rfloor=5$ errors, one has to find an integer $s$ and a $s$-uple ( $F_{1}, \ldots, F_{s}$ ), where the $F_{i}$ 's are divisors of degree $g+t^{*}=8$ such that for every $t^{*}$-uple,

$$
\mathscr{Z}=\left(Q_{1}, \ldots, Q_{5}\right) ; \quad Q_{j} \in \operatorname{supp} D_{0}, j \in\{1, \ldots, 5\}
$$

there exists $i, i \in\{1, \ldots, s\}$, such that the map

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi\left(F_{i}, 2\right): L\left(G_{0}-F_{i}\right) & \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{8}^{5} \\
f & \mapsto\left(f\left(Q_{1}\right), \ldots f\left(Q_{s}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

is surjective.
This is a key condition for decoding since it provides a practical way of determining a function $\bar{f} \neq 0$ whose set of zeros contains the set of locator of errors.

Moreover, we know that with $s \geq 2$ and $\operatorname{deg} G_{0} \geq 4 g-1$, if $\Psi_{g-1}^{s}$ is not surjective, then such an $s$-uple does exist [14, Proposition 5]. In our set-up, $s=3$ turns out to be suitable. So, it means we have to determine three divisors $F_{1}, F_{2}, F_{3}$ of degree 8 such that for every effective divisors $D_{1}, D_{2}, D_{3}$ of degree $g-1=2$ the situation

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{1}-F_{2} \equiv D_{1}-D_{2}, \quad F_{2}-F_{3} \equiv D_{2}-D_{3} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

cannot arise ( $\equiv$ stands for the linear equivalence for the divisors).

Lemma 4.2. The effective $\mathbb{F}_{8}$-divisors $F$ on $\mathscr{K}$ of degree 8 can be described following the three distinct pattern as:
(i) $F \equiv 2 K$,
(ii) $F \equiv 2 K+A-B ; A, B \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$,
(iii) $F \equiv K+\sum_{i=1}^{+} C_{i}, C_{i} \in \mathscr{H}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right), i \in\{1, \ldots .4\}$.

Proof. We can always find a cubic curve passing through any set of eight distinct points. Thus, for any divisor $F$ of degree $8.3 K \equiv F+D$ with $D$ divisor of degree 4 . Then it yields the three possibilities:
(i) $D \equiv K$, i.e. $F \equiv 2 K$.
(ii) $D \in g_{4}^{1}$ without fixed point. By [15, Proposition 3.14], every divisor of degree 4, $\mathbb{F}_{8}$-rational on $\mathscr{K}$ is linearly equivalent to

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}, \quad C_{i} \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right), i \in\{1, \ldots, 4\}
$$

and we can always find a conic curve passing through any set of four points so,

$$
2 K \equiv D+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i} \text { and } F \equiv K+\sum_{i=1}^{+} C_{i} .
$$

(iii) $D \in g_{3}^{1}+B, B \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$. Thus $D \equiv K-A+B, B \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$ and $\mathbb{F} \equiv 2 K+A-B$.

The first step is the search of the $F_{i}, i \in\{1,2,3\}$ as listed in (ii), that is, to say

$$
F_{1} \equiv 2 K+A-B, \quad F_{2} \equiv 2 K+G-H, \quad F_{3} \equiv 2 K+C-E
$$

with $A, B, C, E, G, H \in \mathscr{H}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$. We see easily that any equality of points in the set $\{A, B, C, E . G, H\}$ results in solutions to system (3). In all generality, the research grows messy due to the non unicity of the conics 8 and 8 ' introduced below. So, at this juncture, we investigate the more tractable situation:

$$
F_{1} \equiv 2 K+A-B, \quad F_{2}=K+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}, \quad F_{3} \equiv 2 K+C-E,
$$

where $A, B, C, E, C_{1}, C_{2}, C_{3}, C_{4} \in \mathscr{F}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$ are parameters at our disposal to be fixed to suit our purpose. Then we are led to investigate the system:

$$
D_{1}-D_{2} \equiv K+A-\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}-B, \quad D_{3}-D_{2} \equiv K+C-\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}-E
$$

equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
B+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i} \equiv D_{2}+\overline{D_{1}}+A, \quad E+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i} \equiv D_{2}+\overline{D_{3}}+C \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\overline{D_{1}}=K-D_{1} \quad \text { and } \quad \overline{D_{3}}=K-D_{3} .
$$

We choose $E, B, C_{1}, C_{2}, C_{3}$, and $C_{4}$ such that no quadruples of $\left\{E, C_{1}, C_{2}, C_{3}, C_{4}\right\}$ and $\left\{B, C_{1}, C_{2}, C_{3}, C_{4}\right\}$ are collincar.

The problem amounts to the following: Let 4 be the conic passing through $B+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}$ and with residue $D_{\mathrm{rex}}$, i.c.

$$
\mathscr{K} \cdot \mathscr{G}=B+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}+D_{\text {res }}
$$

Accordingly, 6 ' is the conic such that

$$
\mathscr{K} \cdot \mathscr{C}=E+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}+D_{\mathrm{res}}^{\prime} .
$$

$D_{1 c s}$ and $D_{1 c s}^{\prime}$ are divisors of degree 3. $\mathbb{F}_{8}$-rational. We note $\mathscr{F}_{\text {w }}$ the residues of all the conics passing through $D_{\text {res }}$ and $A$. and $\mathscr{O}_{\text {res }}^{\prime}$ the residues of all the conics passing through $D_{\text {res }}^{\prime}$ and $C$. Then, for any divisors $D_{2}, D_{1}$ and $D_{3}$ solutions of system (4), we have by the Brill Noether theorem,

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{2}+\overline{D_{1}} \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{res}}, \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which yields a set of possible $D_{2}$ denoted by 4 and

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{2}+\overline{D_{3}} \in \mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{res}}^{\prime} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

which yields another set $U^{\prime}$ of possible $D_{2}$.
Our final goal is to find

$$
A, B, C, E, C_{1}, C_{2}, C_{3}, C_{4} \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)
$$

such that

$$
\sin \theta^{\prime}=0,
$$

or else such that for all divisor $D$ of $\%$, there is no conic passing through $D_{\mathrm{res}}^{\prime}, D$ and $C$.
Let $\mathscr{y}$ and $D_{\text {res }}^{\prime}=\alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime} ; \chi^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime} \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$ be given. Then if we assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
K \equiv D_{2}+\alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every point $C \in \mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$, there exists a reducible conic passing through $D_{2}, \alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$, and $C$, namely the product of the lines $\left(\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(\beta^{\prime}, C\right)$. So we have $\mathscr{\sigma} \cap \gamma^{\prime} \neq 0$. This pattern (7) is consequently to be put aside.

Lemma 4.3. When

$$
B \notin\left\{A, E, \alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \because^{\prime}\right\} \quad \text { and } x^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime} \notin \operatorname{line}(A, E) .
$$

the pattern (7) camnot arise.
Proof. If we assume

$$
K=D_{2}+\alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}
$$

then by (6).

$$
K \equiv \bar{D}_{3}+C+\because^{\prime} .
$$

Therefore by (4).

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{+} C_{i} \equiv D_{2}+\bar{E}+\bar{i}^{\prime}
$$

where

$$
\bar{E}+\overline{i^{\prime}} \equiv K-\left(E+\eta^{\prime}\right)
$$

Returning to (5), we get

$$
B+D_{1} \equiv A+E+\because^{\prime}
$$

which defines a $y_{3}^{1}$. But the restriction set in the lemma have been suitably designed so as to make it impossible.

We take $B=P_{2}, \sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}=P_{+}+P_{9}+P_{19}+P_{20}$ and $A=P_{1}$. Let $\not \subset$ be the conic:

$$
X^{2}+x Y^{2}+x^{3} Z^{2}+x^{6} X Y+x^{5} X Z+x^{4} Y Z=0
$$

We have

$$
\mathscr{W} \cdot \mathscr{K}=B+\sum_{i=1}^{+} C_{i}+D_{\mathrm{res}}
$$

with

$$
D_{\mathrm{res}}=\alpha+\beta+\gamma=P_{14}+P_{1 \mathrm{~h}}+P_{19} .
$$

Let $\varnothing^{\prime}$ ' be the conic:

$$
X^{2}+x^{3} Y^{2}+x^{4} X Y+x^{2} X Z+\alpha^{3} Y Z=0
$$

We have

$$
\mathscr{C}^{\prime} \cdot \mathscr{K}=E+\sum_{i=1}^{4} C_{i}+D_{\mathrm{res}}^{\prime}
$$

with $E=P_{1}$ and $D_{\text {res }}^{\prime}=\alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\eta^{\prime}=P_{5}+P_{6}+P_{8}$. These points satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.3.

The nine conics $\mathscr{\theta}_{c}, c \in\left\{\propto, 0,1, \ldots, \chi^{6}\right\}$ passing through $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ and $A$ are the conics:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{C}_{c}: X^{2}+\left(\alpha^{3}+c x^{2}\right) Y^{2}+c X Y+\left(x^{2}+\left(x^{3}\right) X Z+\left(x^{3}+c x^{3}\right) Y Z=0,\right. \\
& \quad c \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, x^{6}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\mathscr{C}_{x}: \quad Y^{2}+\alpha^{5} X Y+\alpha X Z+\alpha^{3} Y Z=0 .
$$

We have to calculate $\mathscr{L}$. Listed below are the nine associated intersection divisors:

$$
C_{0} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+\mathscr{P}
$$

with $\mathscr{P}$ place of degree 4 over $\mathrm{E}_{8}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{C}_{1} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{17}+P_{19}+2 \cdot P_{22}, \\
& \mathscr{C}_{x} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{5}+P_{9}+P_{15}+P_{24}, \\
& \mathscr{C}_{a^{2}} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{12}+\mathscr{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\mathscr{P}$ place of degrec 3 over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{C}_{x^{3}} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{2}+2 \cdot P_{3}+P_{16}, \\
& \mathscr{F}_{x^{4}} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{20}+P_{21}, \\
& \mathscr{C}_{x^{5}} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{13}+\mathscr{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $: P$ place of degree 3 over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{C}_{x^{\prime \prime}} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{4}+P_{6}+P_{10}+P_{18}, \\
& \mathscr{甘}_{x} \cdot \mathscr{K} \equiv 2 K \equiv P_{1}+P_{14}+P_{16}+P_{19}+P_{7}+P_{8}+P_{11}+P_{23} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The set $\mathscr{\mathscr { L }}$ consists of the 32 divisors shown in Fig. 4.
Now the difficulty lies in finding out a point $\mathscr{C}$ of $\mathscr{K}\left(F_{8}\right)$ such that for every divisor $D$ of $\mathscr{\vartheta}$, the support of the residue with respect to the conics passing through $\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ and $D$ does not contain $\%$.

We have the following collinear 4-tuples:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, P_{7}, P_{24}\right), \quad\left(\alpha^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}, P_{12}, P_{18}\right), \quad\left(\beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}, P_{4}, P_{20}\right) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

| $P_{1}++P_{14}$ | $P_{1}-+P_{22}$ | $P_{19}+P_{22}$ | $\underline{2} \cdot P_{22}$ | $P_{5}+P_{4}$ | $P_{5}+P_{15}$ | $P_{5}+P_{2+}$ | $P_{19}+P_{15}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $P_{41}+P_{2+}$ | $P_{15}+P_{2+}$ | $P_{2}+P_{3}$ | $P_{2}+P_{16}$ | $2 \cdot P_{3}$ | $P_{3}+P_{16}$ | $P_{1}+P_{1+}$ | $P_{1}+P_{20}$ |
| $P_{1}+P_{21}$ | $P_{1+}+P_{21}$ | $P_{1+}+P_{21}$ | $P_{20}+P_{21}$ | $P_{+}+P_{6}$ | $P_{+}+P_{11}$ | $P_{+}+P_{18}$ | $P_{6}+P_{11}$ |
| $P_{6}+P_{15}$ | $P_{11}+P_{1 n}$ | P. $P_{\text {P }}$ | $P_{-}+P_{11}$ | $P_{-}+P_{23}$ | $P_{九}+P_{11}$ | $P_{8}+P_{23}$ | $P_{11}+P_{23}$ |

Fig. 4. The sel of divisors \%.
We set $\# /=\left\{P_{7}, P_{24}, P_{12}, P_{18}, P_{4}, P_{20}\right\}$. There are 14 divisors $D_{2}$ such that $\left.\operatorname{supp}\left(D_{2}\right) \cap \not / \neq 0\right)$ listed as:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
P_{4}+P_{6,}, & P_{4}+P_{10,}, & P_{4}+P_{18,}, & P_{7}+P_{8,}, \\
P_{7}+P_{11}, & P_{7}+P_{23,}, & P_{18}+P_{6,} \\
P_{18}+P_{10}, & P_{20}+P_{1,}, & P_{20}+P_{14,}, & P_{20}+P_{21}, \\
P_{24}+P_{5,}, & P_{24}+P_{9,}, & P_{24}+P_{15}
\end{array}
$$

For each of them, the conic passing through $\chi^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \because^{\prime}$ and $D_{2}$ occurs as reducible, one of the line involved corresponding to one of the collinear 4-tuples of (8).

After some calculation, only the three points $P_{5}, P_{17}$ and $P_{23}$ among those of $\mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$ prove not to be caught in any support of residues with respect to these 14 conics. hence ${ }^{4}, \in\left\{P_{5}, P_{17}, P_{23}\right\}$.
(a) The five divisors $D_{2}$ :

$$
P_{2}+P_{10} . \quad P_{14}+P_{21} . \quad P_{11}+P_{23}, \quad P_{17}+P_{22}, \quad P_{1}+P_{21}
$$

are the only one among the 18 remaining divisors of $\gamma$ such that supp $\left(D_{2}\right)$ and $\alpha^{\prime}$ or $\beta^{\prime}$ or ${ }_{i}{ }^{\prime}$ are collinears. The five related conics are the union of two lines. The former being determined by one of these $D_{2}$. The latter by the two remaining points in $\left\{\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}\right\}$. With respect to these conics, $P_{1}$ - belongs to some support of the residues while $P_{5}$ and $P_{23}$ are not attained yet so $C \in\left\{P_{5}, P_{23}\right\}$.
(b) The conie

$$
X^{2}+x^{2} Y^{2}+x^{6} Z^{2}+x^{3} X Y+x^{4} X Z+x^{2} Y Z=0
$$

passes through $x^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \because^{\prime}, D_{2}=P_{9}+P_{15}$ and $P_{5}, P_{5}$ is then attained hence $C \in\left\{P_{23}\right\}$.
(c) Let us choose $C=P_{23}$. We get the following collinearity positions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(P_{23}, P_{17}, P_{11}, \alpha^{\prime}\right), \quad\left(P_{23}, P_{3}, P_{9}, \beta^{\prime}\right), \quad\left(P_{23}, P_{14}, P_{19}, \gamma^{\prime}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

We set $\not H_{,}=\left(P_{17}, P_{11}, P_{3}, P_{9}, P_{1+}, P_{19}\right)$. The conics passing through $\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}, P_{23}$ and one of the points of $\#$, are the union of two lines: the former determined by one of the collinearity positions of (9) and the latter by the two remaining points in \{ $\left.\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \because^{\prime}\right\}$. The divisors

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{17}+P_{19}, \quad P_{19}+P_{22} . \quad P_{5}+P_{9,}, \quad P_{9}+P_{15}, \quad P_{2}+P_{3 .} \\
& 2 \cdot P_{3,}, \quad P_{3}+P_{16,}, P_{1}+P_{14}, \quad P_{8}+P_{11}
\end{aligned}
$$

are the nine remaining divisors $D_{2}$ among the 13 left such that $\operatorname{supp}\left(D_{2}\right) \cap \psi_{x} \neq \emptyset$. However, for each of them, $\#\left[\operatorname{supp}\left(D_{2} \cap \psi_{x}\right)\right]=1 \neq 2$, therefore these divisors do not appear in the intersection with the conics above, which were the only one passing through $x^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ and $P_{23}$ liable to catch them. So the remaining possible divisors to solve system (3) are four.

$$
P_{5}+P_{15}, \quad P_{6}+P_{10}, \quad P_{8}+P_{13}, \quad 2 \cdot P_{22}
$$

out of the initial set $\mathscr{f}$ with 32 elements.
(d) Up to now, we have confined to exploit extensively rich collinearity configurations among points of $\mathscr{K}\left(\mathbb{F}_{8}\right)$ and we have got all out of it.

To end with the last step let us consider the four conics passing through $\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ and $P_{23}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Y^{2}+\alpha^{4} Z^{2}+\alpha^{6} X Y+X Z+x^{2} Y Z=0, \\
& Y^{2}+\alpha^{3} Z^{2}+X Y+x^{4} X Z+x^{5} Y Z=0, \\
& Y^{2}+\alpha^{2} Z^{2}+\alpha^{3} X Y+x^{3} Y Z=0, \\
& Y^{2}+\alpha^{2} X Y+\alpha Y Z+\alpha^{4} Y Z=0
\end{aligned}
$$

The support of their residues contains $P_{15}$ but not $P_{5}$ (respectively with ( $P_{10}, P_{6}$ ), $\left(P_{22}, P_{22}\right)$ and $\left(P_{8}, P_{13}\right)$ ) and so the four remaining divisors are not attained. Consequently, the theorem follows.

Theorem 4.4. Let $F_{1}, F_{2}, F_{3}$ be three divisors of degree 8, $F_{8}$-rational on $\mathbb{K}$. satisfying

$$
F_{1}=2 K+P_{1}-P_{2}, \quad F_{2} \equiv K+P_{4}+P_{9}+P_{19}+P_{20}, \quad F_{3} \equiv 2 K+P_{23}-P_{1}
$$

Then we have, for any 3 -uple $\left(D_{1}, D_{2}, D_{3}\right) \in \mathbb{D}_{2}^{3}(\mathscr{K})$, the system

$$
F_{1}-F_{2} \equiv D_{1}-D_{2}, \quad F_{2}-F_{3} \equiv D_{2}-D_{3}
$$

has no solution.

Checking. From now on $C=P_{23}$ is fixed, wae make sure that the orresponding set $\mathscr{S}^{\prime}$ satisfies $\mathscr{F}^{\circ} \mathscr{\varphi}^{\prime}=\emptyset$. The nine conics $\wp_{i}^{\prime}, c \in\left\{\propto, 0,1, \ldots, \alpha^{6}\right\}$, passing through $\alpha^{\prime}, \beta^{\prime}, \gamma^{\prime}$ and $C$ are the conics

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{O}_{c}: \quad Y^{2}+\left(1+c \alpha^{3}\right) Z^{2}+\left(\alpha^{5}+c \alpha^{6}\right) X Y+\left(\alpha^{5}+c \alpha^{2}\right) X Z+c Y Z=0, \\
& \quad c \subset\left\{0,1, \ldots, \alpha^{6}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\mathscr{B}_{x}: \quad Z^{2}+x^{3} X Y+x^{6} X Z+x^{4} Y Z=0
$$

Here. below are reviewed the nine intersection divisors:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{O}_{0} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\because^{\prime}+C+P_{4}+P_{11}+P_{17}+P_{20} . \\
& \mathscr{Z}_{1} \cdot \mathscr{\prime} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\because^{\prime}+C+P_{3}+P_{9}+P_{12}+P_{18} \text {, } \\
& { }^{\prime} \sigma_{x} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \gamma^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\eta^{\prime}+C+\mathscr{P}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $\mathscr{P}$ place of dcgree 4 over $\mathbb{『}_{8}$.

$$
\psi_{x^{\prime}} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\eta^{\prime}+C+P_{15}+P_{16}+P_{1 .} .
$$

with $\mathscr{P}_{1}$ place of degree 2 over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathscr{C}_{x^{\prime}} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv x^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}+C+P_{2}+P_{6}+P_{22}+P_{23} . \\
& \mathscr{九}_{x^{+}} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}+C+P_{1}+P_{5}+P_{8}+P_{13} . \\
& \mathscr{y}_{x^{\prime}} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}+C+P_{10}+P_{21}+\mathscr{P}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

with, $\mathcal{P}$ place of degree 2 over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$.

$$
\mathscr{H}_{x^{\prime \prime}} \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\because^{\prime}+C+\mathscr{p}
$$

with $: p$ place of degree 4 over $\mathbb{F}_{8}$.

$$
\psi_{1}, \cdot \mathscr{H} \equiv 2 K \equiv \alpha^{\prime}+\beta^{\prime}+\because^{\prime}+C+P_{7}+P_{14}+P_{10}+P_{24} .
$$

Then the set $\%$ ' of the 33 divisors shown in Fig. 5.
It is then checked $\mathscr{J}^{\prime} \mathcal{U}^{\prime}=0$ as primarily announced.
Corollary 4.5. By means of the divisors of Theorem 4.4 Pellikaan algorithm is made effectite We are now in position to decode $C_{9}\left(D_{0}, G_{0}\right)$ and so any yeometric code $C_{82}(D, G)$ as well, defined on the Klein quartic oter $F_{8}$, with odd degrect $G$ ) and $d^{*} \geq 11$, up to $\left\lfloor\left(d^{*}-1\right) / 2\right\rfloor$ crrors.

Corollary 4.6. For the Klein quartic defined orer $t_{8}$, the map $\Psi_{g-1}^{g}$ is not surjective.

| $P_{+}+P_{11}$ | $P_{+}+P_{1}{ }_{7}$ | $P_{4}+P_{2 \prime \prime}$ | $P_{11}+P_{21}$ | $P_{1}+P_{20}$ | $P_{3}+P_{9}$ | $P_{3}+P_{12}$ | $P_{\text {3 }}+P_{14}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $P_{99}+P_{12}$ | $P_{48}+P_{18}$ | $P_{12}+P_{1 K}$ | $P_{15}+P_{16}$ | $p_{1}$ | $P_{2}+P_{6}$ | $P_{2}+P_{22}$ | $P_{2}+P_{23}$ |
| $P_{01}+P_{22}$ | $P_{0}+P_{23}$ | $P_{22}+P_{23}$ | $P_{1}+P_{5}$ | $P_{1}+P_{*}$ | $P_{1}+P_{1,3}$ | $P_{5}+P_{8}$ | $P_{5}+P_{1,3}$ |
| $P_{6}+P_{13}$ | $P_{10}+P_{21}$ | $N_{2}$ | $P_{7}+P_{1+4}$ | $P_{-}+P_{10}$ | $P_{7}+P_{2+}$ | $P_{1+}+P_{14}$ | $P_{14}+P_{2+}$ |
| $P^{P_{1+}+P_{2+}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Fig. 5. The set of the divisors $\%$.

Remark. Through the zeta-function, it can be checked over $\mathbb{F}$, the smallest integer $s$ such that

$$
\left.\left.\pm \mathbb{D}_{( }\right)<\sharp J_{( }\right)
$$

is $g+1$. It implies that $\Psi$ is not surjective. Corollary 4.6 improves this result, which is as far as we know, the first example treated of this kind.
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