

Solution of exercise sheet n° 6 :

**6-1.**

(a) The size of the matrix is given by  $n = 6$  and  $m = 4$ .  $n$  corresponds to the size of the codewords. The rank of  $H$  is equal to  $m = 4$  and corresponds to the number of parity bits. We define a codeword vector  $\mathbf{x}$  of components  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . The condition  $H\mathbf{x} = 0$  can be written in terms of the system of equations :

$$\begin{cases} x_1 + x_5 + x_6 = 0 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_6 = 0 \\ x_2 + x_3 + x_6 = 0 \\ x_1 + x_4 + x_6 = 0 \end{cases}$$

We find the following solutions :

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The minimal distance between the codewords is 3 thus one can only correct single errors.

(b) To correct 1 error and to detect two errors, the minimal Hamming distance has to be  $d = 4$ . This corresponds to having the 3 linearly independent columns of  $H$  (see exercise 6-3). In particular, the last column of  $H$  can neither be equal to another column of  $H$  nor equal to a linear combination of any two columns. There are 5 columns given and the number of linear combinations of two of them is  $\frac{5 \cdot (5-1)}{2} = 10$ . Remember that the column with all zeros is also forbidden, so this gives us  $5 + 10 + 1 = 16$  different forbidden columns. Because the  $h_{i,6}$  are bits, only  $2^4 = 16$  different combinations are possible, and they are all excluded by the argument above. Therefore the Hamming distance  $d$  can not be 4.

**6-2.**

(a) The first 3 columns of  $G_1$  are linearly independent and correspond to  $k = 3$  bits of information, while the last two columns correspond to  $m = 2$  parity bits. There are thus  $2^k = 8$  codewords. The Hamming matrix has 2 rows (number of parity bits) and 5 columns (lengths of the codewords) and contains at least two linearly independent columns.  $H$  can be found by solving the equation  $H\mathbf{w} = 0$  for a codeword  $\mathbf{w}$ . We can try a solution of the form :

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_{1,1} & h_{1,2} & h_{1,3} & 1 & 0 \\ h_{2,1} & h_{2,2} & h_{2,3} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

We find :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Since all codewords have at least two bits the minimal distance between the words is  $d = 2$ . This code allows the detection of single errors without correcting them.

(b)

In this case  $G_2$ ,  $n = 4$  and  $k = 1$ . The number of codewords is  $2^k = 2$ .  $m = n - k = 3$ , which corresponds to 3 parity bits. Therefore 3 columns of  $H$  can be written as the identity matrix. We find :

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The code has only two codewords :

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The Hamming distance is  $d = 4$ . This is a repetition code which corrects single errors and detects double errors.

Remark : The transmission rate is given by  $R = k/n$ . We observe that  $R_{G_1} = 3/5$ , but it does not permit to correct any error (can only detect single errors). In contrary  $R_{G_2} = 1/4$  but permits to correct single errors and detect double errors. There is a tradoff between the transmission rate and the possibility to correct errors.

**6-3.**

A Hamming code corrects up to  $e - 1$  errors and detects (but not necessarily correct) up to  $e$  errors iff the minimal Hamming distance is  $d = 2e$ . It remains to show that  $d = 2e$  is equivalent to the requirement that all sets of  $2e - 1$  columns of the parity matrix  $H$  are linearly independent.

If  $\mathbf{w}_i$  is a codeword one has  $H\mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{0}$ . Let  $\mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{w}_k + \mathbf{z}$ , thus the number of 1s in  $\mathbf{z}$  (the weight  $W(\mathbf{z})$ ) is equal to the distance  $d_{jk}$  between  $\mathbf{w}_j$  and  $\mathbf{w}_k$ . One has  $H\mathbf{w}_j = H\mathbf{w}_k + H\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $H\mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{0}$  since it is a codeword. One obtains  $H\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$ . This only holds if there are  $d_{jk}$  columns of  $H$  that are linearly dependent.

But the minimal Hamming distance is  $d = \min_{i,j} \{d_{ij}\}$ , that means :  $d$  is the smallest number of linearly **dependent** columns in  $H$ . This again means that one requires all sets of  $d - 1$  columns of  $H$  to be linearly independent. Thus,  $d = 2e$  is equivalent to require that all sets of  $2e - 1$  columns of  $H$  are linearly independent.

**6-4.**

Let  $\mathbf{w}_i$  be a codeword and  $W(\mathbf{w}_i)$  its weight. The weight can be written as  $W(\mathbf{w}_i) = d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{0})$ . We are going to use the distance property :  $d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) = d(\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_k, \mathbf{w}_j - \mathbf{w}_k)$ . By replacing  $k$  by  $j$  one obtains  $d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) = d(\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{0})$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j$  which is also a codeword because all codewords form a group.

**Proof.**

The definition of the minimal Hamming distance  $d = \min_{i,j} \{d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j)\}$  implies in particular  $\mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{0}$  ( $\mathbf{0}$  is always a codeword)  $\forall i : d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{0}) = W(\mathbf{w}_i) \geq d$ . But it also implies that there is at least one couple  $(l, m)$  such that  $d(\mathbf{w}_l, \mathbf{w}_m) = d$  (since there are at least two codewords which attain the minimum), which offers the possibility to write  $d(\mathbf{w}_l - \mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{0}) = d$ . There is thus a

$k$   $\mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{w}_l - \mathbf{w}_m$  satisfies  $W(\mathbf{w}_k) = d$ .

Inversely, if one assumes that  $W(\mathbf{w}) \geq d$  then  $\forall i, j \exists k : \mathbf{w}_k = \mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j$  such that  $d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) = d(\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{0}) = W(\mathbf{w}_k) \geq d$ . As there is a  $z$  such that  $W(\mathbf{w}_z) = d$ , one also has a pair  $(a, b)$  such that  $d(\mathbf{w}_a, \mathbf{w}_b) = d(\mathbf{w}_a - \mathbf{w}_b, \mathbf{0}) = W(\mathbf{w}_z) = d$ . One obtains thus  $d = \min_{i,j} \{d(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j)\}$ .