

Some constructions of maximal witness codes

Bertrand MEYER

Télécom ParisTech

Aachen, August 25th 2011

Progression

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Some constructions
- 3 Semidefinite programming bounds.

Witness codes

Definition

- A **code** \mathcal{C} is a subset of \mathbb{F}_2^n .
- A **witness** of a codeword c is a set of coordinates $W \subseteq [n]$ such that on the restriction

$$\forall c' \neq c \in \mathcal{C}, \quad c|_W \neq c'|_W.$$

- A **w-witness code** \mathcal{C} is a code with witnesses of length $\leq w$.

Example : A 2-witness code of length 6 with 4 codewords

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \boxed{1} \boxed{0} 0 1 0 1, \\ \boxed{0} \boxed{0} 0 1 0 \boxed{0}, \\ 1 1 0 \boxed{1} \boxed{1} 0, \\ 0 \boxed{0} 1 0 \boxed{1} 1 \end{array} \right\}.$$

State of the art

Our question

What is $f(n, w) = \max |\mathcal{C}|$?

where \mathcal{C} is a w -witness code of length n .

Example : The Hamming sphere $\mathcal{S}_n(w)$ of radius w is a w -witness code. So

$$\binom{n}{w} \leq f(n, w).$$

Theorem (Cohen, Randriam, Zémor, 08)

For any fixed w , the sequence $n \mapsto f(n, w) / \binom{n}{w}$ is decreasing,

Progression

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Some constructions**
- 3 Semidefinite programming bounds.

The double sphere

For $n = 2w - 1$, take $\mathcal{C}_0 = \mathcal{S}_n(w - 1) \cup \mathcal{S}_n(w)$. Witnesses : support or co-support.

Proposition

$$\binom{2w}{w} \leq f(2w - 1, w)$$

By extension : take $\mathcal{C} = \{cx; c \in \mathcal{C}_0, x \in \mathbb{F}_2^\ell\}$

Proposition

$$\forall w > n/2, \quad \binom{2(n - w + 1)}{n - w + 1} \leq f(n, w)$$

A construction for $n = 2w$

Codewords of \mathcal{C} are

Type	Codeword	Witness
A	$111x$, with $x \in \mathcal{S}_{n-3}(w-2)$	$\{1, 2\} \cup \text{Supp}(x)$
B	$011x$, with $x \in \mathcal{S}_{n-3}(w-2)$	$\{1, 3\} \cup \text{Supp}(x)$
C	$010x$, with $x \in \mathcal{S}_{n-3}(w-1)$	$\{2\} \cup \text{Supp}(x)$
D	$101x$, with $x \in \mathcal{S}_{n-3}(w-1)$	$\{3\} \cup \text{Supp}(x)$
E	$100x$, with $x \in \mathcal{S}_{n-3}(w)$	$\text{Supp}(x)$

Proposition

$$\forall w \geq 2, \quad \binom{2w}{w} + \binom{2w-2}{w-1} \leq f(2w, w)$$

Translates of classical codes

Let $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ a code with Hamming minimal distance $d \geq 2(n - w) + 1$ and

$$\mathcal{C} = \{c_0 + x; c_0 \in \mathcal{C}_0, x \in \mathcal{S}_n(n - w)\}.$$

Witness of $c_0 + x \in \mathcal{C}$: complement of $\text{Supp}x$.

Proposition

$$\forall w > (n + 1)/2, \quad \binom{n}{w} A_2(n, 2(n - w) + 1) \leq f(n, w),$$

where $A_2(n, d)$ is the largest size of a length n code with minimal distance d .

Example : Let $r \geq 3$. With \mathcal{C}_0 the $[2^r - 1, 2^r - r - 1, 3]_2$ Hamming code, we get $(2^r - 1)2^{2^r - r - 1} \leq f(2^r - 1, 2^r - 2)$.

With $\mathcal{C}_0 =$ extended Golay code, we get $8290304 \leq f(24, 21)$.

Progression

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Some constructions
- 3 Semidefinite programming bounds.**

$f(n, w)$ as an independance number

Let $\Gamma = (V, E)$ be the **proximity graph** with edges $V = \mathbb{F}_2^n \times \binom{[n]}{w}$ and vertices (x, W) et (x', W') if $x|_W = x'|_W$ or $x|_{W'} = x'|_{W'}$.

$$f(n, w) = \alpha(\Gamma) \quad (\text{independance number})$$

A semidefinite program through Lovász ϑ number

$$\vartheta'(\Gamma) = \max_{X \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V}} \langle J, X \rangle$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} \langle I, X \rangle & = & 1 \\ X(v, v') & = & 0 \quad \text{if } (v, v') \in E \\ X & \succeq & 0 \\ X & \succcurlyeq & 0 \end{cases}$$

where \mathbb{R} is the real field, I the identity matrix, J the all-one matrix, $X \succeq 0$ means X is positive semidefinite.

Proposition

$$f(n, w) = \alpha(\Gamma) \leq \vartheta'(\Gamma)$$

Symmetry of the program

The graph Γ is **invariant** under the hyperoctahedral group $\mathfrak{H} = \mathbb{F}_2^n \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$ (translations and permutations). So we can consider only \mathfrak{H} -invariant matrices X in the semidefinite program.

Entries in the matrix X depend only on

$$\underline{d} = (\iota, d_i, d_l, d_r, d_t) = \left(|W \cap W'|, d_{W \cap W'}(x, x'), \right.$$

$$\left. d_{W \setminus W \cap W'}(x, x'), d_{W' \setminus W \cap W'}(x, x'), d_{[n] \setminus W \cup W'}(x, x') \right)$$

where d_A the Hamming distance on $A \subseteq [n]$.

Characterisation of positive semidefinite matrix

Theorem (Bochner)

There exists a basis of matrix valued functions $\underline{d} \mapsto Z_k(\underline{d})$ called *zonal functions* such that $X \succcurlyeq 0$ is equivalent to

$$\forall \underline{d} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad X(\underline{d}) = \sum_k \langle \Phi_k, Z_k(\underline{d}) \rangle,$$

where the $(\Phi_k)_k$ are $\succcurlyeq 0$ matrix.

“A semidefinite positive kernel has $\succcurlyeq 0$ Fourier coefficients and vice versa.”

Theoretic expression of the zonal functions

Let \mathbf{H}_k be a family of **representatives** of the **irreducible** representations of \mathfrak{H} and d_k their dimensions.

Let $\mathbb{C}^V = \bigoplus_k \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m_k} \mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ be a **decomposition** of \mathbb{C}^V into irreducible subrepresentations with multiplicity denoted m_k .

Let $e_{k,j,\ell}$ be the copy of an orthonormal basis of \mathbf{H}_k dans $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$.

Then the **zonal function** Z_k is the $m_k \times m_k$ -matrix-valued function defined over $V \times V$ by

$$(Z_k(v, v'))_{j_1, j_2} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{d_k} e_{k, j_1, \ell}(v) \overline{e_{k, j_2, \ell}(v')}.$$

Decomposition into irreducible's of \mathbb{C}^V under $\mathfrak{H} = \mathbb{F}_2^n \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_n$

For $I \subseteq [n]$, we denote

$$\chi_I := x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \mapsto (-1)^{\text{wgt}(x_I)} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

We denote $\mathbf{S}_{[l]}^s$ the **irreducible representation** (Specht module) of $\mathfrak{S}_{[l]}$ associated with the partition $i = (i-s) + s$. We recall that

$\mathbb{C}^{\binom{[l]}{j}} = \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \mathbf{S}_{[l],j}^s$. Then we get the irreducible representation

$$\mathbf{T}_{i,s,t}^j = \left(\chi_{[l]} \otimes \mathbf{S}_{[l],j}^s \otimes \mathbf{S}_{[i+1,n],w-j}^t \right) \Big|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \rtimes (\mathfrak{S}_{[l]} \times \mathfrak{S}_{[i+1,n]})}^{\mathfrak{H}}.$$

and the **decomposition** can be written as

$$\mathbb{C}^V = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \bigoplus_{j=\max(0, w+i-n)}^{\min(w,i)} \bigoplus_{\substack{0 \leq s \leq \min(j, i-j), \\ 0 \leq t \leq \min(j, n-i-j)}} \mathbf{T}_{i,s,t}^j.$$

Computation of the zonal functions

We deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
 & Z_{j_1, j_2}^{\mathbf{k}}((x, W), (x', W')) \\
 = & \sum_{\substack{I \in \binom{[n]}{w} \\ |W \cap I| = j_1, \\ |W' \cap I| = j_2}} (-1)^{\text{wgt}(x|_I - x'|_I)} \text{Hahn}_{i, j_1, j_2}^s(|W \cap W' \cap I|) \text{Hahn}_{\check{i}, \check{j}_1, \check{j}_2}^t(|W \cap W' \cap I^c|)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\check{i} = n - i$, $\check{j}_1 = w - j_1$, $\check{j}_2 = w - j_2$.

Computation of the zonal functions

- Zonal functions are naturally **orthogonal** as the subrepresentations are.
- We just need to focus on their dominant term. We expand the previous expression and compare with the expansion of the suggested monomials in the basis of the functions χ_i

$$\chi_k(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_k = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } x_k = 0 \end{cases}$$

and their product.

Zonal functions

In our case :

Proposition

The zonal functions $Z_{(i,s,t),j_1,j_2}$ can be computed by a Gram-Schmidt process on the monomials

$$\sum_{\substack{\alpha+\beta+\gamma+\delta=i, \\ \beta+\delta=j_1, \gamma+\delta=j_2}} \binom{\delta}{\mathbf{s}} \frac{\iota^t d_t^\alpha d_l^\beta d_r^\gamma d_j^\delta}{\alpha! \beta! \gamma! \delta!}.$$

ordered by lex order on $(i, t, \mathbf{s}, j_1, j_2)$.

A new equivalent program

$$\begin{aligned}
 \vartheta'(\Gamma) &= \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{D}|}} \sum_{\underline{d} \in \mathcal{D}} y_{\underline{d}} \\
 \text{such that } \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
 y_{(w,0,0,0,0)} & = 1 \\
 y_{\underline{d}} & = 0 \quad \text{if } \underline{d} \in \mathcal{D}_o \\
 y_{\underline{d}} & \geq 0 \quad \text{for any } \underline{d} \in \mathcal{D} \\
 \sum_{\underline{d}} y_{\underline{d}} Z_{i,s,t}(\underline{d}) & \preceq 0 \quad \text{for any } (i, s, t)
 \end{array} \right.
 \end{aligned}$$

Linear number of variables in n .

Numerical results (1)

n	$w = 2$	$w = 3$	$w = 4$	$w = 5$	$w = 6$	$w = 7$
3	6.00 6^b	8.00 8^b				
4	8.00 8^c	12.56 12^b	16.00 16^b			
5	10.56 10^a	20.00 20^b	26.15 25^e	32.00 32^b		
6	15.00 15^a	28.03 26^c	42.66 40^b	54.35 52^e	64.00 64^b	
7	21.00 21^a	39.31 35^a	70.00 70^b	90.30 80^b	112.00 112^d	128.00 128^b
8	28.00 28^a	56.65 56^a	102.15 90^c	150.61 140^b	189.27 160^b	226.86 224^b
9	36.00 36^a	84.00 84^a	149.05 126^a	252.00 252^b	321.31 280^b	393.34 320^b

Numerical results (2)

10	45.00 <i>45^a</i>	120.00 <i>120^a</i>	219.30 <i>210^a</i>	380.05 <i>322^c</i>	544.45 <i>504^b</i>	677.81 <i>560^b</i>
11	55.00 <i>55^a</i>	165.00 <i>165^a</i>	330.41 <i>330^a</i>	569.31 <i>462^a</i>	924.00 <i>924^b</i>	1166.08 <i>1004^b</i>
12	66.00 <i>66^a</i>	220.00 <i>220^a</i>	495.00 <i>495^a</i>	856.16 <i>792^a</i>	1422.87 <i>1176^c</i>	2000.21 <i>1848^b</i>
13	78.00 <i>78^a</i>	286.00 <i>286^a</i>	715.00 <i>715^a</i>	1304.65 <i>1287^a</i>	2184.91 <i>1716^a</i>	3432.00 <i>3432^b</i>
14	91.00 <i>91^a</i>	364.00 <i>364^a</i>	1001.00 <i>1001^a</i>	2002.00 <i>2002^a</i>	3349.38 <i>3003^a</i>	
15	105.00 <i>105^a</i>	455.00 <i>455^a</i>	1365.00 <i>1365^a</i>	3003.00 <i>3003^a</i>	5168.18 <i>5005^a</i>	
16	120 <i>120^a</i>	560.00 <i>560^a</i>	1820.00 <i>1820^a</i>	4368.00 <i>4368^a</i>	8024.58 <i>8008^a</i>	
17	136 <i>136^a</i>	680.00 <i>680^a</i>	2380.00 <i>2380^a</i>	6188.00 <i>6188^a</i>	12376 <i>12376^a</i>	

Results

- 1 For $w = 2$ and $n \geq 5$, $w = 3$ and $n \geq 8$, $w = 4$ and $n \geq 11$, $w = 5$ and $n \geq 14$, $w = 6$ and $n \geq 17$, we have

$$f(n, w) = \binom{n}{w}.$$

- 2 When $w = 2$, we have

$$f(2w, w) = \binom{2w}{w} + \binom{2w-2}{w-1}.$$

- 3 For $w \in \{2, \dots, 7\}$, we have

$$f(2w-1, w) = \binom{2w}{w}.$$

- 4 We have

$$f(4, 3) = 12, \quad f(7, 6) = 112.$$

Summary and future work

We have

- constructed first examples of large witness code for small parameters n and w ,
- disproved some previous guess about the maximal size,
- shown the maximality of our constructions in some cases.

We are still working on

- pushing the semidefinite programming technique to more general cases and understand where it works.

We need ideas

- where semidefinite programming doesn't work.

Thank you for your attention.
Questions.