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## Weight and Distance of Binary Vectors

Hamming weight (w)

- Number of non-zero elements in a cordword

Hamming distance (d)

- Number of elements in 2 codewords in which they differ
Example:
$\mathrm{U} \quad=100101101 \rightarrow \mathrm{w}(\mathrm{U})=5$
$V \quad=011110100 \rightarrow w(V)=5, d(U, V)=6$
$U+V \quad=111011001 \rightarrow w(U+V)=6$
Hamming weight of a codeword is equal to its
Hamming distance from the all-zeros vector



## Minimum Distance of a Linear Code

The smallest distance among all pairs of codeword ( $\mathrm{d}_{\text {min }}$ )

- Determine the minimum distance
- Examine the weight of each codewords, and pick the minimum, that is $d_{\text {min }}$
- Minimum distance gives a measure of the code's minimum capability and characterizes the code's strength.


## Error Detection and Correction

An example

- Assume $d_{\text {min }}$ between $U$ and $V=5$
- Case r1, 1 bit error from U, decoder will correct the vector $r 1$ to $U$ code words
- Case r2, 2 distances error from U and 3 distance errors from V , decoder will choose U
- Case r3, 3 distances error from U and 2 distances error from $V$, decoder will choose V



## Error Detection and Correction (2)

The decoder corrects the vector to the nearest code word
The error-correcting capability $t$ of a code is defined as:

$$
t=\left\lfloor\frac{d_{\min }-1}{2}\right\rfloor
$$

where $\lfloor x\rfloor$ means the largest integer not to exceed $x$.
The error-detecting capability can be defined by :

$$
e=d_{\min }-1
$$

## Example

A code with $d_{\min }=7(t=3, e=6)$ can be used to simultaneously detect and correct in any one of the following ways:

A code can be used for the simultaneous correction of $\alpha$ errors and detection of $\beta$ errors, where $\beta \geq \alpha$, provide that its minimum distance is:

$$
d_{\text {min }} \geq \alpha+\beta+1
$$

- When $t$ or fewer errors occur, the code is capable of detecting and correcting them
- When more than $t$ but fewer than e $e+1$ errors occur the code is capable of detection them but correcting only a subset of them.


## Erasure Correction

Some receiver might be designed to declare a symbol erased when it is received ambiguously.

- Given minimum distance $d_{\text {min }}$, any pattern of $p$ or fewer erasures can be corrected if $d_{\text {min }} \geq p+1$.
- Any pattern of $\alpha$ errors and $y$ erasures can be corrected simultaneously if $d_{\text {min }} \geq 2 \alpha+\gamma+1$


## Activity 1

Consider the codeword set of $(6,3)$, suppose the codeword 110011 was transmitted and that two leftmost digits were

| Message vector | Codeword |
| :---: | :---: |
| 000 | 000000 |
| 100 | 110100 |
| 010 | 011010 |
| 110 | 101110 |
| 001 | 101001 |
| 101 | 011101 |
| 011 | 110011 |
| 111 | 000111 | declared by the receiver to be erasures. Verify that the received flawed sequence xx0011 can be corrected

## The Standard Array

Standard array for $[n, k]$ code is a $2^{n-k}$ by $2^{k}$ matrix

- The $1^{\text {st }}$ row list all codewords with 0 codewords on the extreme left
- Each row is a coset with the coset leader in the first column
- The entry in the i-th row and j-th column is the sum of the $i$-th coset leader and $j$-th codeword


## An Example of $(6,3)$ Code

| 000000 | 110100 | 011010 | 101110 | 101001 | 011101 | 110011 | 000111 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 000001 | 110101 | 011011 | 101111 | 101000 | 011100 | 110010 | 000110 |
| 000010 | 110110 | 011000 | 101100 | 101011 | 011111 | 110001 | 000101 |
| 0000100 | 110000 | 011110 | 101010 | 101101 | 011001 | 110111 | 000011 |
| 0001000 | 111100 | 010010 | 100110 | 100001 | 010101 | 111011 | 001111 |
| 010000 | 100100 | 001010 | 111110 | 111001 | 001101 | 100011 | 010111 |
| 100000 | 010100 | 111010 | 001110 | 001001 | 111101 | 010011 | 100111 |
| 010001 | 100101 | 001011 | 111111 | 111000 | 001100 | 100010 | 010110 |

## Estimating Code Capability

Plotkin bound is an upper bound on the $t$-bit errorcorrection capability

$$
d_{\min } \leq \frac{n \times 2^{k-1}}{2^{k}-1}
$$

In general, a linear ( $n, k$ ) code must meet all upper bounds involving error correction capability (or minimum distance).

- For high-rate code, if the Hamming bound is met, then Plotkin bound will also be met.

For low-rate code, it is other way around.

## Estimating Code Capability

Standards array allow the visualization of important performance issues, such as possible trade-offs between error correction and detection
Hamming bound is one of the bounds on error-
correction capability
Number of parity bits:

$$
n-k \geq \log _{2}\left[1+\binom{n}{1}+\binom{n}{2}+\ldots+\binom{n}{t}\right]
$$

or number of cosets:

$$
\begin{equation*}
2^{n-k} \geq\left[1+\binom{n}{1}+\binom{n}{2}+\ldots+\binom{n}{t}\right] \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Design of a $(n, k)$ Code

How to choose $n$ and $k$ ?

- Assume required error-correcting capability is at least $t=2$, then $d_{\text {min }}=2 t+1=5$
- Assume $k=2$, i.e. $2^{k}=4$ codewords
- If Hamming bound is used, the min $n=7$.
- Checking for Plotkin bound, $n \geq 7.5$, so $n=8$
- The minimum dimensions of the code are $(8,2)$.


## Designing of $(8,2)$ Code

How to determine codeword?

- The number of code is $2^{k}=4$, and each code is 8 -bit
- The all-zero vector must be one of the codeword
- The closure property must be met
- Since $d_{\text {min }}=5$, the weight of each codeword, except for all-zero code), must also be at least 5
- Assume the code is systematic the rightmost 2 bits of each codeword are the message bits

| Message | Codewords |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00 | 00000000 |
| 01 | 11110001 |
| 10 | 00111110 |
| 11 | 11001111 |



## Algebraic Structure

Express codewords in polynomial form.

$$
U(X)=u_{0}+u_{1} X+u_{2} X^{2}+\ldots+u_{n-1} X^{n-1}
$$

- If $U(X)$ is an ( $n-1$ ) degree codeword polynomial, then $U^{(i)}(X)$, the remainder resulting from dividing $\mathrm{XiU}(\mathrm{X})$ by $\mathrm{X}^{n+1}$, is also a codeword.
- Simply,

$$
X^{i} U(X)=q(X)\left(X^{n}+1\right)+\underbrace{U^{(i)}(X)}_{\text {remainder }}
$$

- In terms of modulo expression

$$
U^{(i)}(X)=X^{i} U(X) \text { modulo }\left(X^{n}+1\right)
$$

## Activity 2

Let $U=1101$, for $n=4$. Express the codeword in polynomial form, and solve for the third end-around shift of the codeword.

## Cyclic Code Properties

Generate a cyclic code using a generator polynomial

- The generator polynomial $g(X)$ for an $(n, k)$ cyclic code is unique and is of the form

$$
g(X)=g_{0}+g_{1} X+g_{2} X^{2}+\ldots+g_{p} X^{p}
$$

- The message polynomial $m(X)$ is written as $m(X)=m_{0}+m_{1} X+m_{2} X^{2}+\ldots+m_{n-p-1} X^{n-p-1}$
- Every codeword polynomial in the ( $n, k$ ) cyclic code can be expressed as
$U(X)=\left(m_{0}+m_{1} X+m_{2} X^{2}+\ldots+m_{n-p-1} X^{n-p-1}\right) g(X)$
The generator polynomial $g(X)$ of an $(n, k)$ cyclic code is a factor of $X^{n}+1$, i.e. $X^{n}+1=g(X) h(X)$.


## Error Detection

Assume $U(X)$ is transmitted and $Z(X)$ is received $U(X)=m(X) g(X)$
$Z(X)=U(X)+e(X)$
where $e(X)$ is the error pattern polynomial
The decoder tests whether $Z(X)$ is a codeword polynomial, i.e. whether it is divisible by $g(X)$ with a zero remainder

- $Z(X)=q(X) g(x)+S(X)$, syndrome $S(X)$ is the remainder of $Z(X)$ divided by $g(X)$
- Also $U(X)+e(X)=q(X) g(x)+S(X)$
$\rightarrow e(X)=[m(X)+q(X)] g(X)+S(X)$


## Error Detection

$S(X)=Z(X)$ modulo $g(X)$
$S(X)=e(X)$ module $g(X)$
The syndrome contains the information needed for the correction of the error pattern.
The syndrome calculation is accomplished by a division circuit $\rightarrow$ feedback shift register

Syndrome is the remainder of $e(X)$ divided by $g(X)$



## Extended Golay Code

$(24,12)$ extended Golay Code, formed by adding an overall parity bit to the $(23,12)$ code.
The added parity bit increases the minimum distance $d_{\text {min }}$ from 7 to 8 .
These codes are considerably more powerful than the Hamming codes.
The error performance of the extended Golay code is seen to be significantly better than that of the Hamming codes.

## Hamming Codes

Invented by Richard Hamming in 1950
Simple class of block codes characterized by the structure
$(n, k)=\left(2^{m}-1,2^{m}-1-m\right)$ where $m=2,3, \ldots$

- Have a minimum distance of 3 .
- Capable of correcting all single errors or detecting all combinations of two or fewer errors within a block
- The bit error probability can be written as

$$
P_{B} \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n} j\binom{n}{j} p^{j}(1-p)^{n-j}
$$

or the following equivalent equation

$$
P_{B} \approx p-p(1-p)^{n-1}
$$

## BHC Codes

Boss-Chadhuri-Hocqenghem (BCH) codes are generalization of Hamming codes that allow multiple error correction.
They are a powerful class of cyclic codes that provides a large selection of block lengths, code rates, alphabet sizes, and errorcorrecting capability.


