

= Explicit Construction of Codes - IV :=

Distance Bound of BCH (n, s, q, L) .

$$H' = \begin{bmatrix} \beta^l & x^0 & x^1 & x^2 & \dots & x^j & \dots & x^{n-1} \\ \beta^{l+1} & & & & & \vdots & & \\ \beta^{l+2} & & & & & \vdots & & \\ \vdots & & & & & \vdots & & \\ \beta^{l+i} & & & & & \vdots & & \\ & & & & & \beta^{(l+i)j} & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & & \\ \beta^{l+\delta-2} & & & & & & & \end{bmatrix}$$

As we know parity matrix of BCH (n, s, t, l) is

$$H = \Psi(H')$$
 where $\Psi(H')$ is the matrix

we get applying the mapping $\Psi: \mathbb{F}_q^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$, defined in Eq. 1, on the entries of H' . Also, if a set of columns S in H' are linearly independent, then the set of columns S in H are also linearly independent.

$\Rightarrow$ if any set of $\leq l$ columns are linearly independent in H' ,
then any set of $\leq l$ columns are linearly independent in H .

the field $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, which is an extension of $\mathbb{F}_q$. However, our codewords are over $\mathbb{F}_q$. So, using that linear dependence argument for H' over $\mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, we cannot say that the distance of $BCH(n, s, q, k)$ is exactly $= s$.

Distance vs. Dimension Tradeoff for BCH codes:

Assume that $l=0$, $q=2$ & $n=2^m-1$, i.e., BCH($n, \delta, 2, 0$) with $n=2^m-1$, i.e., primitive BCH codes over binary alphabets & β is a primitive element in $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$.

The number of rows of H is at most $m \cdot (s-1)$

$$\delta-1 \leq \text{rank}(H) \leq m \cdot (\delta-1)$$

$$\Rightarrow n - (\delta - 1) \log_2(n+1) \leq \text{dimension of BCH}(n, \delta, 2, 0) \leq n - \delta + 1.$$

Q4: Can we get better lower bound for dimension of $\text{BCH}(n, s, 2, 0)$, i.e., better upper bound for $\text{rank}(H)$?

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 = \beta^0 & & & & & & \\ & \beta^1 & & & & & \\ & \beta^2 & & & & & \\ & \vdots & & & & & \\ & \beta^i & & & & & \\ & \vdots & & & & & \\ & \beta^{s-2} & & & & & \end{bmatrix} \begin{matrix} x^0 & x & x^2 & x^3 & \dots & x^j & \dots & x^{n-1} \end{matrix} = H'$$

Using natural association b/w F_{2^m} & F_{2^m}

$$x^j \dots x^{n-1} \quad \psi: F_{2^m} \rightarrow F_{2^m}$$

$$\psi: \mathbb{F}_2^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{m'}$$

$$\begin{matrix} & x^0 & x^1 & x^2 & \dots & x^j & \dots & x^{n-1} & & \psi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \beta^1 \\ \beta^2 \\ \vdots \\ \beta^i \\ \vdots \\ \beta^{s-1} \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{1}^T \\ 1^T \\ 1^T \\ \vdots \\ 1^T \\ \vdots \\ 1^T \end{bmatrix} & & & & & & & & \end{matrix} = H$$

Since 1 is represented by $(1, 0, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$

←————→
(m-1) · many zeroes

from 2nd row to m^{th} row all are zero.

$\Rightarrow$ they contribute nothing to the rank of H

$$\Rightarrow \text{rank}(H) \leq m \cdot (\delta-1) - (m-1) = m(\delta-2) + 1$$
$$\Rightarrow n - m(\delta-2) - 1 \leq \dim \text{BCH}(n, \delta, 2, 0) \leq n - \delta + 1.$$

Q5: we further improve the lower bound of $\dim \text{BCH}(n, \delta, 2, \sigma)$
i.e., further improving the upper bound of $\text{rank}(\mathcal{H})$?

Answer: Yes!

Claim 2: Let $f(x)$ be a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$. Let $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, s-2\}$ s.t. $f(\beta^i) = 0$. Then, $f(\beta^{2^i}) = 0$.

Proof:

Explanation:

General Scenario: $\mathbb{F}_q \leq \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$, $g(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$

is the minimal polynomial for α i.e., lowest degree irreducible polynomial with α as a root.

$\Rightarrow \alpha, \alpha^q, \alpha^{q^2}, \dots, \alpha^{q^{r-1}}$ are roots of $g(x)$ with $r = \deg(g)$

Also, $\forall h(x) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ with $h(\alpha) = 0 \Rightarrow g \mid h$

$\Rightarrow \alpha, \alpha^q, \alpha^{q^2}, \dots, \alpha^{q^{r-1}}$ are also roots of $h(x)$

Therefore, $f(\beta^i) = 0 \Rightarrow f(\beta^{2i}) = 0$

Detailed Proof: $f(x) = f_0 + f_1 x + f_2 x^2 + \dots + f_{n-1} x^{n-1}$, $f_i \in \mathbb{F}_2$

$$f(\beta^i) = f_0 + f_1 \beta^i + f_2 \beta^{2i} + \dots + f_{n-1} \beta^{(n-1)i} = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\beta^{2i}) &= f_0 + f_1 \beta^{2i} + f_2 \beta^{4i} + \dots + f_{n-1} \beta^{(n-1)2i} \\ &= (f_0 + f_1 \beta^i + f_2 \beta^{2i} + \dots + f_{n-1} \beta^{(n-1)i})^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow f(\beta^{2i}) = 0.$$

Claim 1 $\Rightarrow$ if $c \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ &

$$\begin{matrix} & x^0 & x^1 & x^2 & \dots & x^j & \dots & x^{n-1} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 = \beta^0 \\ \beta^1 \\ \beta^3 \\ \beta^5 \\ \vdots \\ \beta^{2i-1} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{matrix} & \left[\right. & & & & & & \\ & & H^2 & & & & & \\ & & & & & C & & \\ & & & & & & & \end{matrix} = 0$$

$\tilde{H}$ = Submatrix formed by rows of H' corresponding to $\beta^0 = 1$ & odd power of β

$$\Rightarrow H'c = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall c \in \mathbb{F}^n, \quad c \in \ker(\Psi(\tilde{H})) \Leftrightarrow c \in \mathcal{H} = \Psi(\mathcal{H}').$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{rank}(H) = \text{rank}(\Psi(\tilde{H})) \leq \text{no. of rows of } \Psi(\tilde{H})$$

$$= m \quad \text{if } \delta = 2t$$

$$n(t+1) \quad \text{if } \delta = 2t+1$$

Observe:

$$\begin{matrix} & X^0 & X^1 & X^2 & \dots & X^j & \dots & X^{n-1} \\ \beta^0 & \vdots & \vdots & & & & & \vdots \\ \beta^1 & & & & & & & \\ \beta^2 & & & & & & & \\ \beta^3 & & & & & & & \\ \beta^4 & & & & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & & \\ \beta^{2i-1} & & & & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & & & & \\ \beta^{2t-1} & & & & & & & \end{matrix} = \Psi(\tilde{H})$$

$\dim S = 2t+1$

Again since first m rows representing 1, like the previous case, from 2nd to m^{th} row are zero.

$$\Rightarrow \text{rank } H = \text{rank}(\tilde{H}) \leq m(t+1) - (m-1) = mt+1 \text{ if } g=2t+1$$

$$m_t - m_{t-1} = m(t-1) + 1 \text{ if } \delta = 2t$$

This implies that

Claim 3: The dimension of $BCH(n, \delta, 2, 0)$ with $n = 2^m - 1$ is at least $n - \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{2} \rfloor \cdot \log(n+1) - 1$

Q6: Is the asymptotic bound on dimension is optimal?

Using Hamming ball packing argument, we show that for $\delta = n^{\epsilon}$, for example, $\delta = \text{poly}(\log n)$, bound in claim 3 is optimal, i.e., we **cannot** improve the lower bound to $n - \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{2-\epsilon} \rfloor \log(n+1)$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $d = \dim \text{BCH}(n, \delta, 2, 0)$. Then, $d \geq \delta$.

From Hamming ball packing $\text{Vol}_2(\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor, n)$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n}{i} \dots \dots \dots \textcircled{3}$$

$$\geq \binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor} \geq \left(\frac{n}{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}$$

From Hamming Ball Bound,

$$\dim \text{BCH}(n, \delta, 2, 0) \leq n - \log_2(\text{Vol}_2(\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor, n))$$

$$\leq n - \log_2 \left[\frac{2n}{\frac{d-1}{2}} \right]^{\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor}$$

$$= n - \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor \cdot \log n + \lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \rfloor \log \frac{d-1}{2} \dots \dots \textcircled{1}$$

On the other hand, $d \geq \delta$ so,

$$\dim \text{BCH}(n, \delta, 2, 0) \geq n - \lfloor \frac{\delta-1}{2} \rfloor \log(n+1) - 1$$

Also, we know, $d \leq m\delta$ [Exercise: $d \leq 2\delta$. BCH($2^m-1, \delta, 2, 1$)]

From (1),

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \text{BCH}(n, \delta, 2, 0) &\leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \right\rfloor \log n + \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \right\rfloor \log(m\delta) \dots \textcircled{2} \\ &= n - \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \right\rfloor (\log n - \log \log(n+1) - o(\log n)) \\ &= n - \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{2} \right\rfloor [\log n - o(\log n)] \quad \text{for } \delta = n^{o(1)} \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow$ for $\delta = n^{o(1)}$, Bound in Claim 3 is optimal.

Therefore, unlike Hamming Code, BCH code gives a family of optimal codes with unbounded distance.

Distance vs. Distance tradeoff:

1. An interesting regime is $\delta = \frac{n}{\omega(\log n)}$, e.g., $\delta = \frac{n}{\log^2 n}$,
then dimension $\gg (1 - o(1))n$

i.e. distance $\rightarrow 0$

But, dimension $\rightarrow 1$.

2. But, $\delta = \frac{n}{o(\log n)}$, e.g., $\delta = \frac{n}{\sqrt{\log n}}$

then Claim 3 is not giving anything interesting.

However, in general, primitive BCH codes are

asymptotically bad, i.e., if C_v is a $[n_v, k_v, d_v]$

primitive BCH code for $v = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ & $n_v \rightarrow \infty$.

then either $\frac{k_v}{n_v} \rightarrow 0$ or $\frac{d_v}{n_v} \rightarrow 0$

["Long BCH codes are Bad" by
SHU LIN & E. J. WELDON JR.]

Exercise: Let $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}$ be an n^{th} -primitive roots of unity.

& $E = \{1, \beta, \beta^2, \dots, \beta^{n-1}\}$. Then

1. $\text{BCH}(n, \delta, q, 0) = \text{RS}(E, \delta-1, q^m)^\perp \cap \mathbb{F}_q^n$
2. $\text{BCH}(n, \delta, q, 1) = \text{RS}(E, n-\delta+1, q^m) \cap \mathbb{F}_q^n$
3. $\text{BCH}(n, \delta, q, e) = \{ (p(1), p(\beta), p(\beta^2), \dots, p(\beta^{n-1})) \mid p(x) \in \mathbb{F}_{q^m}[x] \text{ s.t. } p(x) = x^{n-\ell+1} \cdot c(x) \text{ with } \deg(c(x)) \leq n-\delta \} \cap \mathbb{F}_q^n$