

## Index code

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

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

$msg$	$EC$
-------	------

example:

$msg = 0110110$   $(k=2^3-1)$   
indices 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2= 010  $\oplus$

3= 011  $\oplus$

5= 101  $\oplus$

6= 110

$EC = 010$

transmission = 0110110010

Question  $|EC| = O(\dots)$ ?

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

$|EC| = O(m)$

since  $\lfloor \log_2(2^m - 1) \rfloor + 1 = m$

So we add logarithmically many bits:  $n = 2^m - 1 + O(m)$

(worse than  $O(1)$  for parity, better than  $O(k)$  for repetition):

Question:  $d=?$

**$d \geq 2$ :** 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)

**$d \leq 2$ :** 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**.

<i>msg</i>	<i>EC1</i>	<i>EC2</i>
------------	------------	------------

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*.

Since **d=3** we can fix 1 error.

**Decoding algorithm** (assumes at most 1 error has occurred):

```
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' ⊕ EC1              # or ⊕EC2, doesn't matter. Index of error.
5.     i = int(i,2)               #to decimal
6.     return msg[:i-1] + msg[i-1] + msg[i:]    #bit i flipped
```

Example:

**encoding:** 0110110 → 0110110010010

**error:** 0110110010010 → 0110010010010

**decoding:** 0110010010010

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

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

**return:** 0110110

Which is true for the case of 2 errors?

- a) Our algorithm will never return the correct msg
- b) Our algorithm will sometimes return the correct msg
- c) Our algorithm will always return the correct msg

The answer is b):

A case in which we'll return the correct msg: 2 errors in the same EC (will return msg on line 3).

A case in which we'll return a wrong msg: mis-fixing when 2 errors in msg.

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

$$EC': 3 \oplus 6 = 011 \oplus 110 = 101$$

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.

<i>msg</i>	<i>EC1</i>	<i>EC2</i>	<i>p</i>
------------	------------	------------	----------

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

Proof outline: 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).

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

Question: How should we interpret each of these scenarios? Assume that at most 2 errors have occurred.

EC = EC1 = EC2 ?	Parity OK ?	#errors
True	True	0
True	False	1*
False	True	2
False	False	1

\* if error was in parity bit

How would 3 errors look like?

EC = EC1 = EC2 ?	Parity OK ?
True/False	False

For example: When 3 errors in msg yield the same EC:

**error:** 0110110010010  $\rightarrow$  1000110010010 0

We might consider 3 errors as 1, and insert a fourth error.