Index code

msg of length $k = 2^m - 1$ bits.

msg EC

EC = bitwise XOR over indices of active (1) bits in msg (indices start at 1)

example:

$$msg = 0110110$$
 (k=2³-1) indices 1234567

2= 010 \oplus 3= 011 \oplus 5= 101 \oplus 6= $\frac{110}{6}$ EC= 010

transmission = 0110110010

Question |EC|= O(...)?

decimal x is represented by $\lfloor \log_2(x) \rfloor + 1$ bits.

$$|EC| = O(m)$$
 since $[\log_2(2^m - 1)] + 1 = m$

So we add logarithmically many bits: $n = 2^m - 1 + O(m)$ (worse than O(1) for parity, better then O(k) for repetition):

Question: d=?

d>=2: It is not possible to have 2 (legal) codewords of distance 1: If two msgs differ in 1 bit, their EC must be different (The ECs will differ exactly in the positions where the binary representation of the different bit contains 1) → overall: at least 2 differences between the two codewords.

d<=2: We give an example of two (legal) codewords of distance 2: 0000000000 and 0001000100. (any index which is power of 2 would work)

→d=2

Can detect 1 error, fix 0.

First improvement: transmit EC twice.

The new distance is **d=3**.

msg EC1 EC2

Proof is very similar to previous one. We need to show also that

two changes in msg cannot cancel each other, and must lead to at least one change in both EC1 and EC2.

d>=3: It is not possible to have 2 (legal) codewords of distance < 3:

- If two msgs differ in 1 bit, their EC1 must be different (The ECs will differ exactly in the positions where the binary representation of the different bit contains 1). The same holds for EC2. → overall: at least 3 differences between the two codewords.
- If two msgs differ in 2 bits, both their EC1 and EC2 will differ in at least one bit (because two different indices cannot cancel each other in the EC computation). → overall: at least 4 differences between the two codewords.

d<=3: We give an example of two (legal) codewords of distance 2: 00000000000000 and 0001000100100. (any index which is power of 2 would work)

→d=3

Can detect 2 error, fix 1.

Decoding algorithm (<u>assumes at most 1 error has occurred</u>):

decode (trans = msg+EC1+EC2):

1. compute EC' from msg

2. if EC' = EC1 or EC' = EC2 #if both, then 0 errors

3. return msg # no error in data

4. else: # EC1 = EC2, single error in msg

5. $i = EC' \oplus EC1$ # or $\oplus EC2$, doesn't matter. Index of error.

5. i = int(i,2) #to decimal

6. return $msg[:i-1] + \overline{msg[i-1]} + msg[i:]$ #bit i flipped

Example:

encoding: $0110110 \rightarrow 0110110\underline{010010}$

error: $0110110010010 \rightarrow 0110\overline{0}10010010$

decoding: 0110010010010

 $EC' = 2 \oplus 3 \oplus 6 = 010 \oplus 011 \oplus 110 = 111 \neq 010$

conclusion: error at bit $111 \oplus 010 = 101 (= 5)$

return: $0110\overline{1}10$

In case 2 errors have occurred, our algorithm may sometimes return the wrong msg.

Example: We use the same transmission from above, but with bits 2,5 flipped due to errors: 0010010010010

EC': 3⊕6 = 011⊕110 = 101

We would conclude a single error at $101 \oplus 010 = 111$ (which is 7 in decimal) and return 0010011 (now with 3 errors).

Second Improvement: add parity bit at the end.

msg EC1 EC2 p

Claim: The distance of the code is **d=4**.

<u>Proof outline:</u> Before, when d=3, the closest codewords were 3 bits apart. Because they differed in an odd number of bits, their parity bits are different, and so the total distance between them (including the parity) is now 4. In addition, the distance between all other codeword pairs cannot decrease following the addition of a new bit, and therefore the code distance increased by 1.

In general, if a certain code has distance d, the addition of a parity bit will create a new code with distance d', such that:

- If the original distance d was odd, then the new distance will be d' = d+1
- If the original distance d was even, then the new distance will be d' = d (distance will not change).

<u>Claim:</u> After the addition of the parity bit, the distance between every two codewords is always even.

Since **d=4**, we can detect 3 errors, fix 1 error.