On a class of binary cyclic codes with an increasing gap between the BCH bound and the van Lint–Wilson bound

VALERIY LOMAKOV

vl@guap.ru

St. Petersburg State University of Aerospace Instrumentation 190000, Bolshaya Morskaya, 67, St. Petersburg, Russia

Abstract. A class of binary cyclic $(2^{2(\ell+1)} - 1, 2^{\ell+2}(2^{\ell} - 1))$ -codes is characterized. The BCH bound implies that the minimum distance is greater than four for these codes, but the van Lint–Wilson bound asserts that $\geq 2(\ell + 1)$.

1 Introduction

Every nonnegative integer can be uniquely represented in base two, namely in the form

$$v = \nu_0 + \nu_1 2 + \nu_2 2^2 + \nu_3 2^3 + \dots$$
(1)

with ν_i from the finite field GF(2). Let B(v) designate the binary representation of v:

$$v \leftrightarrow B(v) = \nu_0 \nu_1 \nu_2 \cdots \leftrightarrow \langle i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots \rangle, \tag{2}$$

where $\langle i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots \rangle$ is the subset of indices such that $\nu_{i_j} = 1, j \ge 0$.

Let W be the infinite set of all nonnegative integers which are the sum of distinct powers of four [1], i.e. $\{0, 1, 4, 5, 16, 17, 20, 21, 64, 65, 68, 69, 80, 81 \dots \}$. The following lemma states that every $w \in W$ can be represented in exactly one way as $w = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \omega_{2i} 2^{2i}$, $\omega_i \in GF(2)$.

Lemma 1. Suppose $w, w' \in W$. Then w = w' if and only if $w_{2i} = w'_{2i}$, $i \ge 0$.

The proof is based on the observation that $B(w) = \omega_0 0 \omega_2 0 \omega_4 \dots$ and $B(w') = \omega'_0 0 \omega'_2 0 \omega'_4 \dots$ and the uniqueness of the binary representation of a nonnegative integer. One consequence of the lemma is that W with the usual definition of \leq is a totally ordered set.

Definition 1. For each $\ell \geq 0$, let W_{ℓ} be the first $2^{\ell+1}$ elements of W; that is

$$W_{\ell} = \left\{ w \, | \, w = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \omega_{2i} 2^{2i} \right\}.$$
(3)

Note that it follows from this definition that for each $w \in W_{\ell}$ the Hamming weight of $B(w) = \omega_0 0 \omega_2 0 \dots \omega_{2\ell} 000 \dots$ is at most $\ell + 1$. For simplicity of notation, we use $B_{\ell}(w) = \omega_0 \omega_1 \omega_2 \dots \omega_{2\ell} \omega_{2\ell+1}$ instead of B(w) for $w < 2^{2(\ell+1)}$.

Lomakov

2 Definition

Let α be a primitive *n*th root of unity in the extension field $GF(2^{2(\ell+1)})$ of GF(2). A cyclic code of length *n* over GF(2) is generated by a generator polynomial $g(x) \in GF(2)[x]$. The minimum distance of the cyclic code is denoted by *d*.

We can also describe a cyclic code by the set of zeros of g(x). If R is a subset of $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $g(\alpha^v) = 0$ for all $v \in R$, then we shall say that R is a defining set for the cyclic code. If R is the maximal defining set for the cyclic code, we shall call it complete and denote by Z. The dimension k of a cyclic code is equal to n - |Z| [2, §7.3].

Definition 2. For $\ell \geq 1$, consider a cyclic code of length $n = 2^{2(\ell+1)} - 1$ over the alphabet GF(2) whose defining set $R = W_{\ell}$.

3 Dimension

A binary cyclic code must have 2v in R whenever v is in R. Consider the set $2W_{\ell}$. Any $w \in 2W_{\ell}$ must be of the form $w = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} \omega_{2i} 2^{2i+1}$ and it has the following binary representation: $B_{\ell}(w) = 0\omega_0 0\omega_2 \dots 0\omega_{2\ell}$.

Lemma 2. Suppose that $s(v) = 2v \pmod{n}$. Then functions $s : W_{\ell} \to 2W_{\ell}$ and $s : 2W_{\ell} \to W_{\ell}$ are bijective functions.

Proof. We first observe that s(v) is a cyclic right-shift function under $B_{\ell}(v)$ because $B_{\ell}(s(v)) = \nu_{2\ell+1}\nu_0 \dots \nu_{2\ell}$. Set $w \in W_{\ell}$, then $B_{\ell}(w) = \omega_0 0\omega_2 0 \dots \omega_{2\ell} 0$. Hence $B_{\ell}(s(w)) = 0\omega_0 0\omega_2 \dots 0\omega_{2\ell}$ and $s(w) \in 2W_{\ell}$. Set $w \in 2W_{\ell}$, then $B_{\ell}(w) = 0\omega_0 0\omega_2 \dots 0\omega_{2\ell}$. Hence $B_{\ell}(s(w)) = \omega_{2\ell} 0\omega_0 0 \dots \omega_{2\ell-2} 0$ and $s(w) \in W_{\ell}$. Combining these statements with Lemma 1 gives that s(v) is the bijective function with domain W_{ℓ} and codomain $2W_{\ell}$, and vice versa.

By extension, we will use the notation $s^j(v)$ to denote the *j*th cyclic rightshift function. That is $s^2(v) = s(s(v)) = \nu_{2\ell}\nu_{2\ell+1}\nu_0 \dots \nu_{2\ell-1}$, etc.

Corollary 1. $|W_{\ell}| = |2W_{\ell}|$.

Corollary 2. $W_{\ell} \cap 2W_{\ell} = \{0\}$, and consequently $|W_{\ell} \cap 2W_{\ell}| = 1$.

Proof. The proof uses the fact that $B(w) = \omega_0 0 \omega_2 0 \dots \omega_{2\ell} 0 = 0 \nu_0 0 \nu_2 \dots 0 \nu_{2\ell} = B(v)$ if and only if $\omega_{2i} = \nu_{2i} = 0, \ 0 \le i \le \ell$, and so w = v = 0, where $w \in W_\ell$ and $v \in 2W_\ell$.

Corollary 3. $|W_{\ell} \cup 2W_{\ell}| = 2|W_{\ell}| - 1.$

Proof. The proof is immediate because $|W_{\ell} \cup 2W_{\ell}| = |W_{\ell}| + |2W_{\ell}| - |W_{\ell} \cap 2W_{\ell}| = 2|W_{\ell}| - 1.$

We will denote by w^* the maximal element in W_{ℓ} :

$$w^* = \max\{w \mid w \in W_\ell\}.$$
(4)

Since $B_{\ell}(w^*) = 1010...10$, we have $w^* = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} 2^{2i}$. On the other hand, $B_{\ell}(2w^*) = 0101...01$, and this gives that $2w^* = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} 2^{2i+1}$ is the maximal element in $2W_{\ell}$.

Lemma 3. If $w \in W_{\ell}$, then $w \leq \frac{1}{3}n$.

Proof. By definition, $n = 2^{2(\ell+1)} - 1$. Hence we see that

$$3w^* = w^* + 2w^* = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} 2^{2i} + \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} 2^{2i+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{2\ell+1} 2^i = n.$$
(5)

This implies that $w^* = \frac{1}{3}n$, which proves the lemma because $w \le w^*$.

Corollary 4. If $w \in 2W_{\ell}$, then $w \leq \frac{2}{3}n$.

Corollary 5. The maximal elements in the sets W_{ℓ} and $2W_{\ell}$ are $w^* = \frac{1}{3}n$ and $2w^* = \frac{2}{3}n$, respectively.

Lemma 4. The code has the complete defining set $Z = W_{\ell} \cup 2W_{\ell}$.

Proof. Z is the union of cyclotomic cosets [2, §7.5]. The cyclotomic coset containing w consists of $w, 2w \pmod{n}, 2^2w \pmod{n}, 2^3w \pmod{n}, \ldots$ for binary codes. In other words, it consists of the integers $w, s(w), s^2(w), s^3(w), \ldots$. From Lemma 2, in the case where $w \in W$ we have $s^j(w) \in W_\ell$ for even values of j and $s^j(w) \in 2W_\ell$ for odd values of j. Similarly, in the case where $w \in 2W_\ell$ we have $s^j(w) \in W_\ell$ for odd values of j and $s^j(w) \in 2W_\ell$ for even values of j. Further, from Lemma 3 and Corollary 4 we conclude that $w \pmod{n} \equiv w$ for all $w \in (W_\ell \cup 2W_\ell)$. Finally, there is no $w \in W_\ell$ for which $s^j(w) \pmod{n} \notin (W_\ell \cup 2W_\ell)$, and this is precisely the assertion of the lemma because $R = W_\ell$.

Now we are ready to estimate the dimension of the code.

Theorem 1. The dimension of the code is $k = 2^{\ell+2}(2^{\ell} - 1)$.

Proof. Indeed, k = n - |Z|. Lemma 4 gives $|Z| = |W_{\ell} \cup 2W_{\ell}|$. From Corollary 3 we obtain $|Z| = 2|W_{\ell}| - 1$. By Definition 1, we know that $|W_{\ell}| = 2^{\ell+1}$. Summing up, we have

$$k = n - |Z| = (2^{2(\ell+1)} - 1) - (2 \cdot 2^{\ell+1} - 1) = 2^{\ell+1}(2^{\ell} - 1).$$
(6)

248

Lomakov

4 The BCH bound

A cyclic code of length n is a BCH code [3] of designed distance δ_{BCH} if, for some nonnegative integers a and c, where gcd(c, n) = 1, the set

$$S = \{a + ic \pmod{n} \mid 0 \le i \le \delta_{BCH} - 2\}$$

$$\tag{7}$$

is a subset or equal to Z and $|S| = \delta_{BCH} - 1$. This lower bound δ_{BCH} on the minimum distance is the so-called BCH bound of the cyclic code.

In this section we will examine δ_{BCH} , but before we need some lemmas.

Lemma 5. Suppose $w \in Z$. Then $3w \pmod{n} \in Z$ if and only if either w = 0, or $w = w^*$, or $w = 2w^*$.

Proof. If $w \in Z$, then $w \in W_{\ell}$ or $w \in 2W_{\ell}$. Therefore $B_{\ell}(w) = \omega_0 0 \omega_2 0 \dots \omega_{2\ell} 0$ and $B_{\ell}(2w) = 0 \omega_0 0 \omega_2 \dots 0 \omega_{2\ell}$ for $w \in W_{\ell}$ or $B_{\ell}(w) = 0 \omega_0 0 \omega_2 \dots 0 \omega_{2\ell}$ and $B_{\ell}(2w) = \omega_{2\ell} 0 \omega_0 0 \dots \omega_{2\ell-2} 0$ for $w \in 2W_{\ell}$. Since $3w = w + 2w \pmod{n}$, $B_{\ell}(3w) = \omega_0 \omega_0 \omega_2 \omega_2 \dots \omega_{2\ell} \omega_{2\ell}$ or $B_{\ell}(3w) = \omega_{2\ell} \omega_0 \omega_0 \omega_2 \dots \omega_{2\ell-2} \omega_{2\ell}$. Finally $3w \pmod{n} \in Z$ if and only if $3w = 0 \pmod{n}$, in other words, if and only if $\omega_{2i} = 0$ or $\omega_{2i} = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2\ell$. This gives the assertion of the lemma. \Box

Corollary 6. Suppose $w \in Z$ and $3w \neq 0 \pmod{n}$. Then there is one and only one partition $w + 2w = 3w \pmod{n}$ over Z.

Corollary 7. Suppose $w \le n$ and $w = 0 \pmod{n}$. Then there are two and only two partitions $0 + 0 = w^* + 2w^* = w \pmod{n}$ over Z.

These corollaries immediately follow from the binary representation of w, $2w \pmod{n}$ and $3w \pmod{n}$ and the definition of w^* .

Lemma 6. The BCH bound of the code is $\delta_{BCH} \ge 4$.

Proof. Let a = 0 and c = 1. Then $S = \{0, 1, 2\}$ is a subset of Z for $\ell \ge 1$ and we have $\delta_{BCH} \ge 4$ by the BCH bound (7).

Lemma 7. The BCH bound of the code is $\delta_{BCH} < 5$.

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $\delta_{BCH} \geq 5$. It follows from (7) that $S = \{a, a + c \pmod{n}, a + 2c \pmod{n}, a + 3c \pmod{n}\}$ is a subset or equal to Z. We will show that there is no a and c such that |S| = 4.

Let $b = a+c \pmod{n}$ and $w = a+3c \pmod{n}$. This means that $w = 3b-2a \pmod{n}$, so that $w + 2a = 3b \pmod{n}$. We only have the cases where $3b \neq 0 \pmod{n}$ and $3b = 0 \pmod{n}$.

Consider first the case $3b \neq 0 \pmod{n}$. Then w = b and $2a = 2b \pmod{n}$ by Corollary 6 implying that (a) $S = \{a, a, a, a\}$. Or $w = 2b \pmod{n}$ and $2a = b \pmod{n}$, hence (b) $S = \{a, 2a \pmod{n}, 3a \pmod{n}, 4a \pmod{n}\}$. Using Lemma 5 we deduce that a = 0 and $S = \{0, 0, 0, 0\}$, or $a = w^*$ and $S = \{w^*, 2w^*, 0, w^*\}$, or $a = 2w^*$ and $S = \{2w^*, w^*, 0, 2w^*\}$. Now suppose that $3b = 0 \pmod{n}$. We apply Lemma 5 and see that this equation has three possible values of b in Z, namely 0, w^* and $2w^*$.

Assume that b = 0. Then it follows from Corollary 7 that w = 0 and a = 0and S is the same as in case (a), or $w = w^*$ and $2a = 2w^* \pmod{n}$ and $S = \{w^*, 0, 2w^*, w^*\}$, or $w = 2w^*$ and $2a = w^* \pmod{n}$ and $S = \{2w^*, 0, w^*, 2w^*\}$.

In case $b = w^*$ we have that w = 0 and a = 0 and $S = \{0, w^*, 2w^*, 0\}$, or $w = w^*$ and $2a = 2w^* \pmod{n}$ and this is similar to case (a), or $w = 2w^*$ and $2a = w^* \pmod{n}$ and it gives case (b).

We finally consider the case where $b = 2w^*$. The possible values are w = 0and a = 0 and $S = \{0, 2w^*, w^*, 0\}$, or $w = w^*$ and $2a = 2w \pmod{n}$ and Smust be as in case (b), or $w = 2w^*$ and $2a = w^* \pmod{n}$ and this is similar to case (a).

Applying Corollary 5, we can now make a list of all possibilities for S: $\{a, a, a, a\}, \{\frac{1}{3}n, \frac{2}{3}n, 0, \frac{1}{3}n\}, \{\frac{2}{3}n, \frac{1}{3}n, 0, \frac{2}{3}n\}, \{\frac{1}{3}n, 0, \frac{2}{3}n, \frac{1}{3}n\}, \{\frac{2}{3}n, 0, \frac{1}{3}n, \frac{2}{3}n\}, \{0, \frac{1}{3}n, \frac{2}{3}n, 0\}, \{0, \frac{2}{3}n, \frac{1}{3}n, 0\}, \{0, \frac{2}{3}n, \frac{1}{3}n, 0\}, \text{ where } a \in Z.$ Thus in all cases, $a = a + 3c \pmod{n}$. So it follows that $|S| \leq 3$, and this completes the proof.

Theorem 2. The BCH bound of the code is $\delta_{BCH} = 4$.

Proof. Lemma 6 and Lemma 7 immediately yield the theorem.

5 The van Lint–Wilson bound

We first inductively define the notation of an independent set with respect to S, as follows [4, §5]: (1) the empty set is independent with respect to S, (2) if A is independent with respect to S, and $A \subseteq S$, and $b \notin S$, then $A \cup \{b\}$ is independent with respect to S, and (3) if A is independent with respect to S and 0 < c < n, then $\{c + a \mid a \in A\}$ is independent with respect to S. The maximal size of a set which is independent with respect to Z is called the van Lint–Wilson bound δ_{LW} of a cyclic code.

We will examine δ_{LW} of the code, and this is aided by the following lemma.

Lemma 8. Suppose a is odd and c is even. Then $2^a + 2^c \notin Z$.

Proof. If $w \in Z$, then $w \in W_{\ell}$ or $w \in 2W_{\ell}$. Consequently, we can write $B_{\ell}(w) \leftrightarrow \langle i_0, i_1, i_2, \ldots \rangle$ where i_j are even if $w \in W_{\ell}$ or odd if $w \in 2W_{\ell}$. But $B_{\ell}(2^a + 2^c) \leftrightarrow \langle a, c \rangle$ with odd a and even c. Therefore $2^a + 2^c \notin Z$.

Theorem 3. The van Lint–Wilson bound of the code is $\delta_{LW} \geq 2(\ell+1)$.

Proof. Since the van Lint–Wilson bound is a generalization of the BCH bound [4, §5] and $\delta_{BCH} = 4$ by Theorem 2, we only need to show that $\delta_{LW} \ge 2(\ell + 1)$ for $\ell \ge 2$. We construct the sequence $A_0 = \emptyset, A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_{2\ell+2}$ of subsets of $GF(2^{2(\ell+1)})$ that are independent with respect to Z. In order to simplify the notation, we will use the index representation $\langle \ldots \rangle$ of an integer.

Lomakov

Let $a_0 = 0$, $a_1 = n - 2^0$, $a_2 = 2^{2(\ell-1)} - 2^0$, $a_3 = 2^{2(\ell-2)} - 2^{2(\ell-1)}$, ..., $a_\ell = 2^2 - 2^4$, $a_{\ell+1} = n - 2^2$, $a_{\ell+2} = 2^{2(\ell-1)} - 2^0$, $a_{\ell+3} = 2^{2(\ell-2)} - 2^{2(\ell-1)}$, ..., $a_{2\ell} = 2^2 - 2^4$, $a_{2\ell+1} = n - 2^2$ and $b_0 = 2^1 + 2^0$, $b_1 = 2^{2\ell} + 2^1$, $b_2 = 2^{2\ell-1} + 2^0$, $b_3 = 2^{2\ell-3} + 2^0$, ..., $b_\ell = 2^2 + 2^1$, $b_{\ell+1} = 2^{2\ell} + 2^1$, $b_{\ell+2} = 2^{2\ell-1} + 2^0$, $b_{\ell+3} = 2^{2\ell-3} + 2^0$, ..., $b_{2\ell} = 2^2 + 2^1$, $b_{2\ell+1} = 2^1 + 2^0$. (Remark: $b_j \notin Z$ for all $0 \le j \le 2\ell + 1$ by Lemma 8.) Then

$$\begin{split} &A_{1} = \{\langle 0,1 \rangle\}, \\ &A_{2} = \{\langle 1 \rangle, \langle 1,2\ell \rangle\}, \\ &A_{3} = \{\langle 0,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-1),2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2\ell-1 \rangle\}, \\ &A_{4} = \{\langle 0,2(\ell-2) \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-2),2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-2) \rangle, \langle 0,2\ell-3 \rangle\}, \\ & \cdots \\ &A_{\ell+1} = \{\langle 0,2 \rangle, \langle 0,2,2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \dots, \langle 0,2,4 \rangle, \langle 1,2 \rangle\}, \\ &A_{\ell+2} = \{\langle 0 \rangle, \langle 0,2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \dots, \langle 0,4 \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle, \langle 1,2\ell \rangle\}, \\ &A_{\ell+3} = \{\langle 2(\ell-1) \rangle, \langle 2(\ell-1),2\ell \rangle, \langle 2\ell-1 \rangle, \dots, \langle 4,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \\ &\quad \langle 0,2(\ell-1),2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2\ell-1 \rangle\}, \\ &A_{\ell+4} = \{\langle 2(\ell-2) \rangle, \langle 2(\ell-2),2\ell \rangle, \langle 2(\ell-2),2(\ell-1) \rangle, \dots, \langle 4,2(\ell-2) \rangle, \\ &\quad \langle 0,2(\ell-2) \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-2),2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-2) \rangle, \langle 0,2\ell-3 \rangle\}, \\ & \cdots \\ &A_{2\ell+1} = \{\langle 2 \rangle, \langle 2,2\ell \rangle, \langle 2,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \dots, \langle 2,4 \rangle, \langle 0,2 \rangle, \langle 0,2,2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \\ &\quad \dots, \langle 0,2,4 \rangle, \langle 1,2 \rangle\}, \\ &A_{2\ell+2} = \{0, \langle 2\ell \rangle, \langle 2(\ell-1) \rangle, \dots, \langle 4 \rangle, \langle 0 \rangle, \langle 0,2\ell \rangle, \langle 0,2(\ell-1) \rangle, \dots, \langle 0,4 \rangle, \\ &\quad \langle 1 \rangle, \langle 0,1 \rangle\}. \end{split}$$

It easy to see that $A_j \setminus \{b_{j-1}\} \subseteq Z$ for all $1 \leq j \leq 2\ell + 2$ because the elements of these sets are the sums of even powers of two, i. e. in W_ℓ , or a power of two (see $\langle 1 \rangle$ in $A_{\ell+2}$ and $A_{2\ell+2}$). Since the independent set $A_{2\ell+2}$ has the cardinality $2(\ell+1)$, we have $\delta_{LW} \geq 2(\ell+1)$.

Corollary 8. The minimum distance of the code is $d \ge 2(l+1)$.

References

- N. G. de Bruijn, Some Direct Decompositions of the Set of Integers, Math. Comput., 18, 537–546, 1964.
- [2] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977.
- [3] R. C. Bose and D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri, On a Class of Error Correcting Binary Group Codes, *Inform. Contr.*, 3, 68–79, 1960.
- [4] J. H. van Lint and R. M. Wilson, On the Minimum Distance of Cyclic Codes, *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, **32**, 23–40, 1986.