



Aalto University
School of Science
and Technology

Coding Theory on Non-Standard Alphabets

A Brief Introduction into Traditional Coding Theory

Marcus Greferath

Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis
Aalto University School of Sciences
marcus.greferath@aalto.fi

May 2023

Definition: Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q -linear code of length n .

- ▶ For every element $f \in \mathbb{F}_q$ we reserve an indeterminate x_f and form the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[x_f \mid f \in \mathbb{F}]$.
- ▶ Define the **complete (weight) enumerator** of C to be the polynomial

$$W(C) := \sum_{c \in C} \prod_{i=1}^n x_{c_i}.$$

- ▶ In the bivariate polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ we define the **Hamming weight enumerator**

$$W_H(C) = \sum_{c \in C} x^{n-w_H(c)} y^{w_H(c)}.$$

- **Remark:** We obtain the Hamming weight enumerator from the complete enumerator by applying the **identification homomorphism** $\mathbb{C}[x_f \mid f \in \mathbb{F}_q] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ that extends

$$x_f \mapsto \begin{cases} x & : f = 0, \\ y & : \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- **Example:** Consider the binary linear $[7, 3, 4]$ -code C generated by the matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Listing all words reveals the complete and Hamming weight enumerator as

$$W(x, y) = W_H(x, y) = x^7 + 7x^3y^4.$$

- For $\mathbb{F}_4 = \{0, 1, a, a^2\}$ consider the famous \mathbb{F}_4 -linear hexacode C generated by the matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & a & a \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & a & 1 & a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a & a & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Its complete enumerator in $\mathbb{C}[x, e, u, v]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W(C) = & x^6 + 15x^2(e^2u^2 + e^2v^2 + u^2v^2) \\ & + 15e^2u^2v^2 + e^6 + u^6 + v^6, \end{aligned}$$

while its Hamming weight enumerator is

$$W_H(D) = x^6 + 45x^2y^4 + 18y^6.$$

- ▶ Let $\chi : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ be a non-trivial character. We consider the \mathbb{C} -algebra homomorphism

$$M : \mathbb{C}[x_r | r \in \mathbb{F}_q] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[x_r | r \in \mathbb{F}_q], \quad f \mapsto Mf$$

extending the assignment

$$x_r \mapsto Mx_r := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}} \chi(rs)x_s.$$

- ▶ Let $C \leq_R R^n$ be an \mathbb{F}_q -linear code, with complete enumerator

$$W(C) := \sum_{c \in C} \prod_{i=1}^n x_{c_i}.$$

Let C^\perp denote the dual code of C .

- ▶ **Theorem:** With notation introduced above, there holds

$$W(C^\perp) = \frac{1}{|C|} M W(C).$$

- ▶ Now consider the \mathbb{C} -algebra homomorphism

$$N : \mathbb{C}[x, y] \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y], \quad f \mapsto Nf$$

extending the assignment

$$x \mapsto Nx := x + (q - 1)y \quad \text{and} \quad y \mapsto Ny := x - y.$$

- ▶ Let C be an \mathbb{F}_q -linear code of length n with Hamming weight enumerator

$$W_H(C) := \sum_{c \in C} x^{n-w_H(c)} y^{w_H(c)}.$$

- ▶ With notation introduced above, there holds

$$W_H(C^\perp) = \frac{1}{|C|} N W_H(C).$$

- ▶ **Example:** Consider the binary linear $[7, 3, 4]$ -code C generated by the matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Its Hamming weight enumerator is

$$W_H(C) = x^7 + 7x^3y^4.$$

Its dual code C^\perp is a $[7, 4]$ code.

- ▶ We compute the Hamming weight enumerator of C^\perp as

$$\begin{aligned}W_H(C^\perp) &= \frac{1}{8}[(x+y)^u + 7(x+y)^3(x-y)^4] \\ &= x^7 + 7x^4y^3 + 7x^3y^4 + y^7.\end{aligned}$$

- ▶ This particularly shows that $d_{\min}(C^\perp) = 3$.
- ▶ Have another look at the \mathbb{F}_4 -linear hexacode C generated by the matrix

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & a & a \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & a & 1 & a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a & a & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

with Hamming weight enumerator

$$W_H(C) = x^6 + 45x^2y^4 + 18y^6.$$

- ▶ Its dual code C^\perp has the Hamming weight enumerator

$$\begin{aligned}W_H(C^\perp) &= \frac{1}{4^3} [(x + 3y)^6 + 45(x + 3y)^2(x - y)^4 + 18(x - y)^6] \\ &= x^6 + 45x^2y^4 + 18y^6,\end{aligned}$$

which means, C and C^\perp have the same Hamming weight enumerators.

- ▶ This observation would usually raise the suspicion that D actually is a self-dual code, however this is not the case.
- ▶ We call C a **formally self-dual** code if $W_H(C) = W_H(C^\perp)$.
- ▶ If C is equivalent to C^\perp , then we call C an **iso-dual** code.

Existence Bounds and Code Families

- ▶ One of the foremost problems of Coding theory is the **maximization** of $M = |C|$, whenever the length n and the minimum distance d is given.
- ▶ Alternatively, we seek to **maximize** d , once n and M have been specified.
- ▶ A third version is to **minimize** n , when M and d are given.
- ▶ **Sphere-Packing Bound:** If C is an (n, M, d) code over a q -element alphabet, and $t = \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor$ then

$$M \cdot \sum_{i=0}^t \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i \leq q^n.$$

- ▶ Codes that meet the sphere-packing bound with equality, are called **perfect** codes.
- ▶ **Theorem:** The parameter triples of all perfect codes are known.
 - ▶ For q -ary alphabets, these are $(n = \frac{q^r-1}{q-1}, q^{n-r}, 3)$, where r is a positive integer, and q is a prime power.
 - ▶ In the binary and ternary case we have the parameters $(23, 2^{12}, 7)$ and $(11, 3^6, 5)$.
- ▶ All other perfect codes have trivial parameter, i.e. are 1-element, repetition, or full space codes.

- ▶ **Singleton Bound:** For every (n, M, d) code over a q -element alphabet, there holds

$$M \leq q^{n+1-d}.$$

- ▶ Codes that meet the Singleton bound with equality, are called **maximum distance separable** codes (MDS).
- ▶ The characterization of all MDS codes is a still open problem.
- ▶ We refer to the famous **MDS conjecture**: If C is an $[n, k, d]$ MDS code over \mathbb{F}_q then if $k \leq q$ then $n \leq q + 1$ except in a certain set of cases, where $n \leq q + 2$.

- ▶ **Gilbert Bound:** There exists a code with parameters (n, M, d) over \mathbb{F}_q that satisfies

$$M \geq \frac{q^n}{\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{i} (q-1)^i}.$$

- ▶ **Varshamov Bound:** There exists a linear code with parameters $[n, k, d]$ provided, that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \binom{n-1}{i} (q-1)^i < q^{n-k}.$$

- ▶ Although the proof for the Gilbert bound is **greedy-based** in principle, it does not provide an efficient scheme of construction.

- ▶ Let \mathbb{F}_q be the underlying finite field, and recall the \mathbb{C} -algebra homomorphism

$$N : \mathbb{C}[x, y] \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}[x, y], \quad f \mapsto Nf$$

extending the assignment

$$x \mapsto Nx := x + (q - 1)y \quad \text{and} \quad y \mapsto Ny := x - y.$$

- ▶ Define the **Krawtchouk polynomials** implicitly by

$$N(x^{n-z}y^z) = \sum_{i=0}^n P_i(z)x^{n-i}y^i.$$

- ▶ Alternatively, their explicit form is:

$$P_i(z) = P_i(z, q, n) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^j (q-1)^{k-j} \binom{z}{j} \binom{n-z}{k-j}.$$

- **Linear Programming Bound:** Let C be an (n, M, d) -code. With the above notation, we have: holds:

$$M \leq \max_A \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$$

where the max is taken over all $A := (A_i)_{i=0}^n$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &\geq 0 \\ A_i &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 < i < d \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^n A_j P_i(j) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 0, \dots, n$$

- ▶ Let $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{F}_q^r)$ be the projective space of rank r over \mathbb{F}_q .
- ▶ Each point of this space is of the form $\mathbb{F}_q x$ where $0 \neq x \in \mathbb{F}_q^r$.
- ▶ Choose a generator x in each of these points in such a way, that its first non-zero entry is a 1.
- ▶ Sort the $\frac{q^r-1}{q-1}$ chosen vectors lexicographically order and put them into an $r \times \frac{q^r-1}{q-1}$ matrix $H = H(q, r)$.
- ▶ **Definition:** The code checked by H is called **Hamming Code** of rank r over the field \mathbb{F}_q . Its parameters are $[n := \frac{q^r-1}{q-1}, n - r, 3]$.

- ▶ For \mathbb{F}_3 and $r = 3$, we have the Hamming matrix

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where we have assumed $0 < 1 < 2$.

- ▶ $\mathbb{F}_4 = \{0, 1, a, a^2\}$, ordered as presented, meaning $0 < 1 < a < a^2$. For space reasons, we restrict to $r = 2$ and obtain

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & a & a^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

- ▶ Hamming codes satisfy the sphere packing bound with equality, and they form an example class of what we call **perfect** codes.
- ▶ Decoding the Hamming codes is easy. If $y = c + e$ is the received word, where c is the codeword and e is a single Hamming error, say $e = \lambda e_i$, then we compute the **syndrome**

$$s := yH^T = eH^T = \lambda e_i H^T = \lambda H_i^T,$$

where H_i is the i -th column of H .

- ▶ The error value of e is then the first nonzero entry of yH^T , for the position search for $\frac{s}{\lambda}$ in the lexicographically sorted check matrix H .

- ▶ **Example:** Let $q = 3$ and $r = 3$, so that H is the matrix in the above example. Assume, we have received the word $y = [1, 0, 2, 1, 2, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 2, 2, 2]$.
- ▶ Compute the syndrome $s := yH^T = [2, 0, 1]^T$ and conclude that the error value $\lambda = 2$.
- ▶ After dividing the syndrome by λ , we seek $\frac{s^T}{\lambda} = [1, 0, 2]^T$ among the columns of H and arrive at column 7.
- ▶ For this reason, the single error is a 2 in the 7th position of y . Consequently, the codeword we search for is

$$\begin{aligned} c &= y - [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0] \\ &= [1, 0, 2, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 2, 0, 2, 2, 2]. \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Let $q = 2$ and m be a natural number. For $0 \leq r \leq m$ we define the two-parametric family of codes $\text{RM}(r, m)$ by
 - ▶ $\text{RM}(0, m)$ is the repetition code of length 2^m .
 - ▶ $\text{RM}(m, m)$ is the full space code of length 2^m .
 - ▶ $\text{RM}(r, m) := \text{RM}(r, m-1) \oplus \text{RM}(r-1, m-1)$ for all $1 \leq r \leq m-1$. Here \oplus denotes the Plotkin sum that we studied earlier.
- ▶ **Definition:** The codes $\text{RM}(r, m)$ are called **Reed Muller Codes**.
- ▶ They are $[n, k, d]$ codes for

$$n = 2^m, \quad k = \sum_{i=0}^r \binom{m}{i}, \quad \text{and} \quad d = 2^{m-r}.$$

- ▶ **Example:** Find a generator matrix for $\text{RM}(2, 3)$!
- ▶ First, observe that $\text{RM}(2, 3) = \text{RM}(2, 2) \oplus \text{RM}(1, 2)$, and $\text{RM}(1, 2) = \text{RM}(1, 1) \oplus \text{RM}(0, 1)$.
- ▶ Writing down generator matrices $G_{r,m}$ for all components $\text{RM}(r, m)$, we start with

$$G_{2,2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad G_{1,1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$G_{0,1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

- Therefore, we obtain

$$G_{1,2} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} G_{1,1} & G_{1,1} \\ \hline 0 & G_{0,1} \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{cc|cc} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right].$$

- Finally, we arrive at

$$G_{2,3} = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} G_{2,2} & G_{2,2} \\ \hline 0 & G_{1,2} \end{array} \right] = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right].$$

- ▶ **Definition:** The cyclic code Gol_{23} of length 23 that is generated by the polynomial

$$x^{11} + x^9 + x^7 + x^6 + x^5 + x + 1 \in \mathbb{F}_2[x],$$

and the cyclic code Gol_{11} of length 11 generated by the polynomial

$$x^5 + x^4 - x^3 + x^2 - 1 \in \mathbb{F}_3[x]$$

are called **Golay Codes**.

- ▶ **Remark:** Gol_{23} and Gol_{11} are perfect codes with parameters $[23, 12, 7]$ and $[11, 6, 5]$, respectively.
- ▶ A result by van Lint and Tietäväinen (1973), says that any (non-trivial) perfect code must have the parameters of either the Hamming Codes or the two Golay Codes.

- ▶ The extended versions Gol_{24} and Gol_{12} have attracted a lot of interest for many combinatorial reasons. They are examples of self-dual codes.
- ▶ They are closely related to prominent structures in group theory, and can be used to construct very dense lattices.
- ▶ E. Viterbo and M. Elia have designed what are called algebraic decoders for the cyclic versions.
- ▶ There is a quite entertaining article by A. Barg describing the history around the discovery of the Golay codes.