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## Problem 1.

(a) Since $C$ is non-empty, it contains some codeword $x$. By linearity $C$ must contain $x+x$. But, for any $x, x+x$ is the all-zero sequence since we are doing modulo- 2 sums. So, $C$ contains the all-zero sequence.
(b) The elements of $D^{\prime}$ are those sequences of the form $x+y$ where $y$ is in $D$. Since $x$ is in $C$ and $D$ is a subset of $C$, any $x$ and $y$ are both in $C$, and so is their sum.
(c) Suppose there was an element $z$ common to $D$ and $D^{\prime}$. Then $z=x+y$ where $y$ is in $D$. Since we assumed that $D$ is a linear subset, then $z+y$ is also in $D$. But $z+y$ equals $x$, and we arrive at the contradiction that $x$ is in $D$.
(d) Since the mapping $y \mapsto x+y$ is a bijection, $D$ and $D^{\prime}$ are in one-to-one correspondence, and hence have the same number of elements.
(e) Suppose $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ are in $D \cup D^{\prime}$. There are four possibilities: (1) both $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ are in $D$, (2) both $z_{1}$ and $z_{2}$ are in $D^{\prime}$, (3) $z_{1}$ is in $D, z_{2}$ is in $D^{\prime}$, (4) $z_{1}$ is in $D^{\prime}, z_{2}$ is in $D$. In case (1), the linearity of $D$ implies that $z_{1}+z_{2}$ is in $D$. In case (2), $z_{1}=x+y_{1}$ and $z_{2}=x+y_{2}$ for some $y_{1}$ and $y_{2}$ both in $D$, then $z_{1}+z_{2}=x+x+y_{1}+y_{2}=y_{1}+y_{2}$ is in $D$. In case (3) $z_{2}=x+y_{2}$ and $z_{1}+z_{2}=x+\left(z_{1}+y_{2}\right)$, which is in $D^{\prime}$, and similarly in case (4). Thus in all cases $z_{1}+z_{2}$ is in $D \cup D^{\prime}$ and we see that $D \cup D^{\prime}$ is a linear subset of $C$.
(f) We thus see that if at the beginning of step (ii) $D$ is a linear subset of $C$, at the end of step (iii) $D \cup D^{\prime}$ is linear, is a subset of $C$ because both $D$ and $D^{\prime}$ are, and has twice as many elements of $D$ since $D^{\prime}$ has the same number of elements of $D$ and is disjoint from it. Thus, when the algorithm terminates, $D$ contains all elements of $C$ and since it is a subset of $C$ it must equal $C$. Furthermore, its size, being equal to successive doublings of 1 , is a power of 2 .

## Problem 2.

(a) Any codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ is of the from $\langle\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{b}\rangle$ with $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{C}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}_{2}$. Given two codewords $\left\langle\mathbf{u}^{\prime}, \mathbf{u}^{\prime} \oplus \mathbf{v}^{\prime}\right\rangle$ and $\left\langle\mathbf{u}^{\prime \prime}, \mathbf{u}^{\prime \prime} \oplus \mathbf{v}^{\prime \prime}\right\rangle$ of $\mathcal{C}$, their sum is $\langle\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle$ with $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}^{\prime} \oplus \mathbf{u}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}^{\prime} \oplus \mathbf{v}^{\prime \prime}$. Since $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{2}$ are linear codes $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{C}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{C}_{2}$. Thus the sum of any two codewords of $\mathcal{C}$ is a codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ and we conclude that $\mathcal{C}$ is linear.
(b) If $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \neq\left(\mathbf{u}^{\prime}, \mathbf{v}^{\prime}\right)$, then either $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{u}^{\prime}$, or, $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}^{\prime}$ and $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{v}^{\prime}$. In either case $\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle \neq\left\langle\mathbf{u}^{\prime} \mid \mathbf{u}^{\prime} \oplus \mathbf{v}^{\prime}\right\rangle$ : in the first case the first halves differ, in the second case the second halves differ. Thus no two of the ( $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ ) pairs are mapped to the same element of $\mathcal{C}$, and the code has exactly $M_{1} M_{2}$ elements. Its rate is $\frac{1}{2 n} \log \left(M_{1} M_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{2} R_{1}+\frac{1}{2} R_{2}$.
(c) As $\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}$,

$$
w_{H}(\mathbf{v})=w_{H}(\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}) \leq w_{H}(\mathbf{u})+w_{H}(\mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v})
$$

by the triangle inequality. Noting that the right hand side is $w_{H}(\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle)$ completes the proof.
(d) If $\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{0}$ we have $\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle=\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u}\rangle$ which has twice the Hamming weight of $\mathbf{u}$. Otherwise (c) gives $w_{H}(\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle) \geq w_{H}(\mathbf{v})$.
(e) Since $\mathcal{C}$ is linear its minimum distance equals the minimum weight of its non-zero codewords. If $\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle$ is non-zero either $\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}$, or, $\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$. By (d), in the first case $w_{H}(\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle) \geq w_{H}(\mathbf{v}) \geq d_{1}$, in the second case $w_{H}(\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \oplus \mathbf{v}\rangle) \geq$ $2 w_{H}(\mathbf{u}) \geq 2 d_{2}$. Thus $d \geq \min \left\{2 d_{1}, d_{2}\right\}$.
(f) Let $\mathbf{u}_{0}$ be the minimum weight non-zero codeword of $\mathcal{C}_{1}$ and let $\mathbf{v}_{0}$ be the minimum weight non-zero codeword of $\mathcal{C}_{2}$. Note that $\left\langle\mathbf{u}_{0} \mid \mathbf{u}_{0}\right\rangle$ is a non-zero codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ (corresponding to the choice $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{u}_{0}, \mathbf{v}=\mathbf{0}$ ). It has weight $2 d_{1}$. Similarly, $\left\langle\mathbf{0} \mid \mathbf{v}_{0}\right\rangle$ is also a non-zero codeword of $\mathcal{C}$ (corresponding to the choice $\mathbf{u}=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{v}=\mathbf{v}_{0}$ ). It has weight $d_{2}$. Consequently $d \leq \min \left\{2 d_{1}, d_{2}\right\}$. In light of (e) we find $d=\min \left\{2 d_{1}, d_{2}\right\}$.

This method of constructing a longer code from two shorter ones is known under several names: 'Plotkin construction', 'bar product', ' $(u \mid u+v)$ construction' appear regularly in the literature. Compare this method to the 'obvious' method of letting the codewords to be $\langle\mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{v}\rangle$. The simple method has the same block-length and rate as we have here, but its minimum distance is only $\min \left\{d_{1}, d_{2}\right\}$. The factor two gained in $d_{1}$ by the bar product is significant, and many practical code families can be built from very simple base codes by a recursive application of the bar product. Notable among them are the family of Reed-Muller codes.

## Problem 3.

(a) Suppose $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\prime}$ are two codewords in $\mathcal{C}$. Then for $\forall i=0,1, \ldots, m-1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{0}+x_{1} \alpha_{i}+\cdots+x_{n-1} \alpha_{i}^{n-1} & =0 \\
x_{0}^{\prime}+x_{1}^{\prime} \alpha_{i}+\cdots+x_{n-1}^{\prime} \alpha_{i}^{n-1} & =0
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\left(x_{0}+x_{0}^{\prime}\right)+\left(x_{1}+x_{1}^{\prime}\right) \alpha_{i}+\cdots+\left(x_{n-1}+x_{n-1}^{\prime}\right) \alpha_{i}^{n-1}=0 \quad \text { for } \forall i=0,1, \ldots, m-1
$$

which shows $\mathbf{x}+\mathrm{x}^{\prime}$ is also a codeword.
(b) $x(D)=x_{0}+x_{1} D+\cdots+x_{n-1} D^{n-1}$ is a polynomial of degree (at most) $n-1$ and $\left(x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n-1}\right)$ is a codeword if $\alpha_{0}, \alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m-1}$ are $m$ of its roots. This means

$$
x(D)=\left(D-\alpha_{0}\right)\left(D-\alpha_{1}\right) \ldots\left(D-\alpha_{m-1}\right) h(D)=g(D) h(D)
$$

for some $h(D)$. Note that $h(D)$ can have degree (at most) $n-m-1$. On the other side, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the codewords of $\mathcal{C}$ and degree $n-1$ polynomials. Since $g(D)$ is fixed for all codewords, a polynomial $x(D)$ corresponding to a codeword $\mathbf{x}$ is determined by choosing the coefficients of $h(D)=$ $h_{0}+h_{1} D+\cdots+h_{n-m-1} D^{n-m-1}$. Since $h_{j} \in \mathcal{X}$ for $j=0,1, \ldots, n-m-1$ we have $q^{n-m}$ different $h(D)$ s and, thus, $q^{n-m}$ codewords.
(c) For every column vector $\mathbf{u}=\left[u_{0}, u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m-1}\right]^{T}, A \mathbf{u}=\left[u(1), u(\beta), \ldots, u\left(\beta^{n-1}\right)\right]^{T}$. Consequently, $A \mathbf{u}=\mathbf{0}$ means $u(D)$ has $n$ roots which is impossible (since it is a polynomial of degree $m-1<n$ ).
(d) Using the same reasoning as in (c) one can verify that $\mathbf{x}=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ is a codeword iff $\mathbf{x} A=\mathbf{0}$. This means $A$ is the parity-check matrix of the code $\mathcal{C}$. Since the code is linear, using Problem 4 of Homework 11 we know that has minimum distance $d$ iff every $d-1$ rows of $H$ are linearly independent and some $d$ rows are linearly dependent. That $A$ has rank $m$ implies there are no $m$ linearly dependent rows thus $d \geq m+1$. On the other side, we know from the Singleton bound that a code with $q^{n-m}$ codewords and block-length $n$ has minimum distance $d \leq m+1$. Thus we conclude that $d=m+1$.

## Problem 4.

(a) As $H$ had four columns the blocklength $n=4$. Observe that we can rearrange $H \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{0}$ to solve for $x_{1}, x_{2}$ in terms of $x_{3}, x_{4}$. As there are $3^{2}$ possibilities for $\left(x_{3}, x_{4}\right)$ the code has $M=9$ codewords. The code rate is thus $\frac{1}{2} \log 3$.
(b) The receiver receives $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{z}$ where $\mathbf{z}$ is either the zero vector, or it has only a single nonzero component $z_{i}$ which can take the value 1 or 2 . With $h_{i}$ denoting the $i$ th column of $H, H \mathbf{y}=H \mathbf{z}$ is either zero, or takes on the value $h_{i}$ (if $z_{i}=1$ ) or $2 h_{i}$ $\left(z_{i}=2\right)$. Since the collection of eight vectors $h_{1}, 2 h_{1}, h_{2}, 2 h_{2}, h_{3}, 2 h_{3}, h_{4}, 2 h_{4}$ are all distinct and different from zero, the receiver can identify if $z$ is the zero vector or the $i$ and the value of $z_{i}$ from $H \mathbf{y}$
(c) This will increase the block length to 5 and the number of codewords to $3^{3}$ yielding a new rate of $\frac{3}{5} \log 3$ which is larger than the rate found in (a).
(d) We need to ensure that the new column and its multiple by 2 is different from the zero and the collection of 8 vectors above. We see that this is not the case for any of the vectors listed.
(e) Now $z_{i}$ can take on only the value 1 (but not 2). Thus to ensure detection and correction we only need $h_{i}$ 's to be distinct and different from zero. Now, all columns except the zero column in (d) can be added.

