

# Proof of Uniform Partitioning Theorem for LBC

T. Ganesan

gana@ieee.org

SPC Lab, Dept. of ECE

Mar 12th, 2011



# Outline

- 1 Introduction
  - Preliminaries
- 2 Properties of Uniform codes
  - Uniform Distance
- 3 Uniform Partitioning Theorem
  - Proof



- 1 Introduction
  - Preliminaries
- 2 Properties of Uniform codes
  - Uniform Distance
- 3 Uniform Partitioning Theorem
  - Proof



# Linear Block Codes

- A Linear Block Code (LBC) is a collection of  $n$ -tuples from a finite or infinite alphabet from a field such that they form a group as per the *addition* defined in the field.
- The smallest Hamming weight of non-zero codeword is the *minimum distance* of the code.
- LBC can be partitioned into uniform sub-sets called *cosets*.
  - The  $0^{th}$  coset is a sub-code by itself.



# Definitions

- **Uniform set:** A set is said to be **uniform** if the distance between any pair of elements is a constant.
- **Maximal uniform set:** A uniform set  $U$  is said to be **maximal**, if it is the largest possible set in terms of cardinality, for the given length and uniform distance.
- **Non-trivial uniform set:** A uniform set  $U$  is said to be **non-trivial** if it contains atleast 3 non-zero elements.



# Pair-wise Partitioning Lemma(1)

## Lemma I.1

*For any LBC, there exists a disjoint code-word pair set (partitioning) such that distance between the code-word pairs is constant. In fact, there exists at least one code-word pair partition for every Hamming weight in the code's distance spectrum.*



## Pair-wise Partitioning Lemma(2)-Proof

- **Proof:** Consider  $dinD(\mathcal{C})$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $D(\mathcal{C})$  be the distance spectrum of  $\mathcal{C}$ .
  - $\mathcal{D}_H(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{c}_1) = d$ .
- Add any code-word  $\mathbf{c}_2 \neq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_2 \neq \mathbf{c}_1$ , to both.
  - $\mathcal{D}_H(\mathbf{c}_2, \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2) = d$ .
- We can create disjoint code pairs with distance  $d$  for every Hamming weight in the distance spectrum of  $\mathcal{C}$ .



- 1 Introduction
  - Preliminaries
  
- 2 Properties of Uniform codes
  - Uniform Distance
  
- 3 Uniform Partitioning Theorem
  - Proof





# Uniform Partitioning of LBC

- We seek to partition an LBC such that

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{i=1}^L \mathbf{C}_i, \quad (1)$$

such that  $\mathbf{C}_i \cap \mathbf{C}_j = \{\phi\}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq L$ ,  $i \neq j$ , where  $L$  is the number of constituent uniform sub-sets and  $\mathbf{C}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$  are non-trivial uniform sub-codes.

- We focus on binary LBCs only.



# Even Uniform Distance(1)

## Lemma II.1

*The distance  $d_u$  for any non-trivial uniform linear code  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is even.*

*Moreover, the uniform code is linear if and only if  $d_u = 2\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1)$  for any two non-zero  $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1 \in \mathbf{C}_0$ .*



## Even Uniform Distance(2)-Proof

**Proof:** Let  $\mathbf{C}_0$  be a linear uniform code with distance  $d_u$ . There exists

- $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathbf{C}_0$  such that  $\mathbf{c}_2 = \mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1$  and  $\mathbf{c}_i \neq \mathbf{0}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ .
- Consider the Hamming weight of  $\mathbf{c}_2$  :

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_2) = \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0) + \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_1) - 2\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1) \quad (2)$$

$$d_u = 2[d_u - \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1)] \quad (3)$$

- To prove the converse, let  $\mathbf{C}_0$  be a uniform code with  $d_u = 2\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1)$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1) = 2[d_u - \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1)] = d_u, \quad (4)$$

and hence  $\mathbf{c}_2 \in \mathbf{C}_0$ .



## Even Uniform Distance(3)

### Lemma II.2

*The uniform distance of a non-trivial linear uniform code and its even parity extension code are the same.*

**Proof:** The even parity extension of a code results in code-words with even Hamming weight. From Lemma II.1, code-words in the linear uniform code all have an even weight. Hence, parity extension simply results in appending a 0 to the code-words, which does not change the distance property of the code.



# Existence Condition(1)

## Lemma II.3

*Let  $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2$  belong to a uniform linear code with distance  $d_u$  and*

*$\mathbf{c}_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ , for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ . Then,  $\mathbf{c}_0 = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2$  if and only if*

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \mathbf{c}_2) = 0.$$



# Existence Condition(1)-Proof

**Proof:** Consider the sum  $\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2$ . Using Lemma II.1, one can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2) &= d_u + d_u - 2\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * (\mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2)) \\ &= 2d_u - 2\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_2) = 2[d_u - d_u + 2\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \mathbf{c}_2)] \\ &= 4\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \mathbf{c}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

which shows that if  $\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_1 * \mathbf{c}_2 * \mathbf{c}_3) = 0$ , then  $\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ . To prove the converse, let  $\mathbf{c}_2 = \mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1$ . Then,

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \mathbf{c}_2) = \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1) = \mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{0}).$$



## Existence Condition(2)

### Corollary 1

*If  $\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \mathbf{c}_2) = d_u/4$ , then  $\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2) = d_u$ , where  $\mathbf{c}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_1$  and  $\mathbf{c}_2$  belong to a uniform linear code  $\mathbf{C}_0$  with at least 8 code-words.*

Follows directly from (5) and Lemma II.1.



# Rate-1 Code Partitioning(1)

## Lemma II.4

There exists a non-trivial uniform sub-code  $\mathbf{C}_u \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n \ni$

$$d_u = \begin{cases} \frac{n}{2} & \text{if } n = 4k \\ \frac{n-1}{2} & \text{if } n = 4k + 1 \\ \frac{n+2}{2} & \text{if } n = 4k + 2 \\ \frac{n+1}{2} & \text{if } n = 4k + 3, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 1$ . Moreover, subset  $\mathbf{C}_0^F \in \mathbf{C}_u$  exists which spans a vector space with dimension at least 2.





## Rate-1 Code Partitioning(2)-Proof

**Proof:** Consider the cardinality for  $n = 4k$ ,

- First, we show that a non-trivial uniform sub-code  $\mathbf{C}_u \subset \mathbb{F}_2^n$  exists with distance  $d_u$  given in (6) and then show that a linear subset  $\mathbf{C}_0^F$  can be obtained from this sub-code.
  - Let  $M_{n=4k+i}$  denote the cardinality of the uniform set with code-words of length  $n = 4k + i$  for  $k \geq 1$ , and  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ .
- Hadamard matrices exist for  $n = 1, 2$  and  $4k$  [1].
  - $\Rightarrow$  there exist uniform codes with distance  $d_u = n/2$ . i.e.,  
 $M_{4k} \geq n$  and  $d_u = n/2$ .



## Rate-1 Code Partitioning(2)-Proof Continued

Consider the cardinality for  $n = 4k + 3$ ,

- Hadamard code has the all zero vector as one of its columns.
- Hadamard code can be shortened by 1 bit without loss of the properties of the code.
  - $M_{4k+3} \geq n$  and  $d_u = \frac{n+1}{2}$ .
  - Moreover, for  $d_u = \frac{n+1}{2}$  the Plotkin bound is known to achieve the equality for uniform codes.

$$M_{Plotkin} \leq \frac{2d_u}{n - 2d_u},$$

- $M_{4k+3} = n + 1$ .



## Rate-1 Code Partitioning(2)-Proof Continued

To compute a bound of the cardinality for  $n = 4k + 1$ ,

- Consider appending any non-zero column of Hadamard code for  $n = 4k$  to the same code as  $[\mathbf{H}_n | \mathbf{h}_i]$
- Each column of Hadamard code has  $n/2$  non-zero values, half of the extended code has the same Hamming weight and the other half of the extended code-words have their Hamming weight increased by 1.
  - $n/2$  code-words of the extended code with  $n = 4k + 1$  have

$$d_u = \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

- $M_{4k+1} \geq \frac{n}{2}$ .



## Rate-1 Code Partitioning(2)-Proof Continued

To compute the cardinality for  $n = 4k + 2$ ,

- Consider the 1 bit shortened code from  $n = 4k + 3$ . From Thm. 2 in [2], it follows that  $M_{4k+2} \geq \left\lceil \frac{d_u M_{4k+3}}{n} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rceil$  and  $d_u = \frac{n+2}{2}$ . For  $n \geq 4$ , this lower bound is greater than or equal to 2.
- Thus, we have shown that a uniform sub-code of  $\mathbf{C}_u$  exists with even-valued  $d_u$  given by (6) and that the cardinality of the sub-code is at least 2 for  $k \geq 1$ .
- Now, consider any two non-zero code-words and their sum. This creates a non-trivial uniform code.



## Rate-1 Code Partitioning(2)-Proof Continued

- $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1$  and  $\mathbf{0}$  can be used to form  $\mathbf{C}_0^F$ , which is now a non-trivial linear uniform sub-code of  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$  with uniform distance  $d_u$  given by (6).
- $\mathbf{C}_0^F$  has a cardinality of at least 4 including the all zero code-word  $\mathbf{0}$ . Hence, the dimension of the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{C}_0^F$  is at least 2.



- 1 Introduction
  - Preliminaries
  
- 2 Properties of Uniform codes
  - Uniform Distance
  
- 3 Uniform Partitioning Theorem**
  - Proof



# Uniform Partitioning Theorem

## Theorem III.1

*For a binary LBC  $\mathcal{C}$ , if  $\mathbf{C}_0 \triangleq \mathbf{C}_0^F \cap \mathcal{C}$  is non-trivial for some  $\mathbf{C}_0^F$  satisfying the properties in Lemma II.4, the following hold:*

- (i)  $\mathbf{C}_0$  and its cosets tile  $\mathcal{C}$  and one can build a linear maximal uniform partitioning of  $\mathcal{C}$  from the cosets of  $\mathbf{C}_0$ ,*
- (ii) The cardinality of  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is bounded as  $2^2 \leq |\mathbf{C}_0| \leq 2^{\lfloor \log_2 n+1 \rfloor}$ , and*



# Uniform Partitioning Theorem - Continued

## Theorem III.1 -Continued

(iii)  $|\mathbf{C}_0| = 2^{j^*+1}$  if  $j^* \geq 1$  is the largest integer such that (a)  $\mathbf{C}_0$  has a subset  $\mathbf{C}_{j^*}$  with cardinality  $j^* + 1$  and non-zero entries such that

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \dots * \mathbf{c}_{j^*}) = \frac{d_u}{2^{j^*}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{j^*} \in \mathbf{C}_{j^*}$ , and (b) For  $l = 1, 2, \dots, j^* - 1$ , for all subsets  $\mathbf{C}_l$  of  $\mathbf{C}_{j^*}$  with cardinality  $l + 1$ ,

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 * \mathbf{c}_1 * \dots * \mathbf{c}_l) = \frac{d_u}{2^l}, \quad (8)$$

where, with a slight abuse of notation,  $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_l \in \mathbf{C}_l$ .





# Proof

- **Proof:** Note that,  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is linear and its cosets tile  $\mathcal{C}$  as it is an intersection of  $\mathcal{C}$  and a linear set.
- Let  $\mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$  represent a maximal linear uniform sub-code of  $\mathcal{C}$  with the same uniform distance as  $\mathbf{C}_0$ .
- There exists a unitary transform between the basis vectors of  $\mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_0$ . Therefore, without loss of generality, we can transform the code words in  $\mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$  such that it forms a superset of  $\mathbf{C}_0$  and preserves the uniform distance property.
  - That is, we have  $\mathbf{C}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$ .



## Proof-Continued

- Consider any code word  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$ ,  $\mathbf{c} \notin \mathbf{C}_0$ . Now,  $\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{C}_0$  forms a coset of  $\mathbf{C}_0$  and the coset belongs to  $\mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$  since it is linear.
- Thus,  $\mathbf{C}_0 \cup (\mathbf{C}_0 + \mathbf{c})$  is still a linear uniform set.
  - One can now repeat this procedure of combining the cosets of  $\mathbf{C}_0$  to obtain  $\mathbf{C}_0^{\max}$ .
- Thus, there exists  $\mathbf{C}_0^{\max} \supset \mathbf{C}_0$  with the same uniform distance.



## Proof-Continued

- The bounds on the cardinality of  $\mathbf{C}_0$  follow from the arguments presented in Lemma II.4.
  - The lower bound follows from the fact that when  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is a non-trivial set.
  - The upper bound follows from the fact that the number of elements is a power of 2 and using the Plotkin bound of  $n + 1$ .
- To find  $|\mathbf{C}_0|$ , it can be shown from (2) that

$$\mathcal{W}_H(\mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_{j^*}) = \sum_{k=1}^{j^*} 2^k (-1)^{k+1} \binom{j^*}{k} \frac{d_u}{2^k}, \quad (9)$$



## Proof-Continued

- Since  $\sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{k+1} \binom{n}{k} = 1$ , the summation in (9) equals  $d_u$ .
  - This shows that the Hamming weight of the sum  $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{j^*}$  is  $d_u$  (Due to Lemma II.3).
- Using a similar procedure, we can show the uniform distance property of any linear combination of the code-words  $\mathbf{c}_0, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{j^*}$ .
  - The cardinality of the set comprising all linear combinations of these  $j^* + 1$  vectors is  $2^{j^*+1}$ .



# Uniform Partitioning - Examples

- Hamming (7,4) code :  $\mathbf{C}_0 = \{0, 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13\}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_1 = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 15\}$ .
  - $d_u = \frac{n+1}{2} = 4$
- MLSR  $(6, 3, 3)_2$  code:  $\mathbf{C}_0 = \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_1 = \{0, 3, 4, 7\}$ .
  - $d_u = \frac{n+2}{2} = 4$ .
- Hadamard codes are themselves maximal uniform codes.
  - $d_u = \frac{n}{2}$ .
- MLSR  $(9, 4, 3)_2$  code :  $\mathbf{C}_0 = \{0, 2, 9, 11\}$ 
  - $d_u = \frac{n-1}{2} = 4$



# Code Partitioning Procedure

- 1 Find code-words in  $\mathcal{C}$  with Hamming weight  $d_u$  according to the code length  $n$ . Denote this sub-set as  $\mathbf{C}_u$ .
- 2 Find a sub-set of  $\mathbf{C}_u$  that is closed by using the linearity conditions given in Theorem. Call this sub-set as  $\mathbf{C}_0$ .
- 3 Now,  $\mathbf{C}_0$  and its cosets form a uniform partitioning of  $\mathcal{C}$ .



# References



J. H. Van Lint and R. M. Wilson,

*A Course in Combinatorics*,

Cambridge University Press, second edition, 2001.



A. E. Brouwer, J. B. Shearer, N. J. A. Sloane, and W. D. Smith,

“A new table of constant-weight codes,”

*IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 36, pp.

1344–1380, 1990.

