

Concave Programming Upper Bounds on the Capacity of 2-D Constraints*

Ido Tal Ron M. Roth
Computer Science Department,
Technion, Haifa 32000, Israel.

Email: {idotal, ronny}@cs.technion.ac.il

Abstract—The capacity of 1-D constraints is given by the entropy of a corresponding stationary maxentropic Markov chain. Namely, we maximize the entropy over a finite set of probabilities that must satisfy some requirements. We try to extend certain aspects of this characterization to 2-D constraints. The result is a method for calculating an upper bound on the capacity of 2-D constraints.

The key steps are: We look at a maxentropic probability distribution on square configurations, which is stationary. A set of linear equalities and inequalities is derived from this stationarity. The result is a concave program, which can be easily solved numerically.

I. INTRODUCTION

Let Σ be a finite alphabet. A two dimensional (2-D) constraint is a set \mathbb{S} of rectangular arrays over Σ . To be called a constraint, \mathbb{S} must satisfy some requirements, formally defined in [7, §1]. Examples of 2-D constraints include the square constraint [10], 2-D RLL constraints [8], 2-D SRLC constraints [4], and the “no isolated bits” constraint [6].

Let \mathbb{S} be a given 2-D constraint over a finite alphabet Σ . Denote by $\Sigma^{M \times N}$ the set of $M \times N$ arrays over Σ , and let

$$\mathbb{S}_M = \mathbb{S} \cap \Sigma^{M \times M} .$$

The capacity of \mathbb{S} is equal to

$$\text{cap}(\mathbb{S}) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \cdot \log_2 |\mathbb{S}_M| . \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we show a method for calculating an upper bound on $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$. Other methods of calculating an upper bound on a 2-D constraint include the stripe method (defined in Section IX), and [5].

2-D constraints are a generalization of one-dimensional (1-D) constraints (see [9]). The capacity of a given 1-D constraint is equal to the value of an optimization program, where the optimization is on the entropy of a certain stationary Markov chain, and is carried out over the conditional probabilities of that chain (see [9, §3.2.3]). We try to extend certain aspects of this characterization of capacity to 2-D constraints. What results is a (generally non-tight) upper bound on $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$.

II. NOTATION

We first set up some notation. Let $a = (a_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in U}$ be a 2-D configuration over Σ . Namely, the index set satisfies $U \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$, and for all $(i,j) \in U$ we have that $a_{i,j} \in \Sigma$. For integers α, β we denote the shifted index set as

$$\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(U) = \{(i + \alpha, j + \beta) : (i, j) \in U\} .$$

Also, by abuse of notation, let $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a)$ be the shifted configuration (with index set $\sigma(U)$):

$$\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a)_{i+\alpha, j+\beta} = a_{i,j} .$$

For an index set $V \subseteq U$, denote the restriction of a to V by $a[V] = (a[V]_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in V}$; namely,

$$a[V]_{i,j} = a_{i,j} , \quad \text{where } (i, j) \in V .$$

We denote the restriction of \mathbb{S} to U by $\mathbb{S}[U]$,

$$\mathbb{S}[U] = \{a : \text{there exists } a' \in \mathbb{S} \text{ such that } a'[U] = a\} .$$

III. STATIONARITY

The following is a simple corollary¹ of [2, Theorem 1.4].

Theorem 1: There exists a series of random variables $(W^{(M)})_{M=1}^{\infty}$ with the following properties: (i) Each $W^{(M)}$ takes values on \mathbb{S}_M . (ii) The probability distribution of $W^{(M)}$ is *stationary*. Namely, denote the index set of $W^{(M)}$ by

$$B_M = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i, j < M\} .$$

Then, for all $U \subseteq B_M$, all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(U) \subseteq B_M$, and all $a \in \mathbb{S}[U]$, we have that

$$\text{Prob}(W^{(M)}[U] = a) = \text{Prob}(W^{(M)}[\sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(U)] = \sigma_{\alpha,\beta}(a)) .$$

(iii) For large M , the normalized entropy of $W^{(M)}$ is close to $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$. Namely,

$$\text{cap}(\mathbb{S}) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \cdot H(W^{(M)}) . \quad (2)$$

From here onward, we fix M , and write W instead of $W^{(M)}$. Also, denote the index set of W as

$$U_W = B_M = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i, j < M\} .$$

Fix r, s , and t , such that

$$0 < r, s \leq M \text{ and } 0 \leq t < s .$$

* This work was supported by grant No. 2002197 from the United-States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem, Israel.

¹Note that [2, Theorem 1.4] is stated for constraints of finite type, but Theorem 1 is valid for all 2-D constraints, as defined in [7, §1]

Define random variables X , Y , and Z , with index sets

$$\begin{aligned} U_X &= \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i < r ; 0 \leq j < s\} \\ U_Y &= U_X \setminus \{(r-1, j) : s-t \leq j < s\} \\ U_Z &= U_X \setminus \{(r-1, j) : s-t-1 \leq j < s\} , \end{aligned}$$

as (see Figure 1)

$$X = W[U_X] , \quad Y = W[U_Y] , \quad Z = W[U_Z] .$$




Fig. 1. The index set U_W is represented by the $M \times M$ square, U_X is represented by the $r \times s$ rectangle, U_Y is represented by the shaded part (both black and gray), and U_Z is represented by the gray part. Note that $U_W \supseteq U_X \supseteq U_Y \supseteq U_Z$.

Lemma 2: For fixed r , s , and t ,

$$\text{cap}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} H(Y|Z) .$$

Proof: We show that

$$\frac{1}{M^2} H(W) \leq H(Y|Z) + O(1/M) .$$

Once this is proved, the claim follows from (2).

Define a lexicographic ordering \prec over indexes in U_W ,

$$(i', j') \prec (i, j) \iff (i' < i) \text{ or } (i' = i \text{ and } j' < j) ,$$

and let

$$T_{i,j} = \{(i', j') : (i', j') \prec (i, j)\} .$$

We have

$$H(W) = \sum_{(i,j) \in U_W} H(W_{i,j} | W[T_{i,j} \cap U_W]) .$$

Recall that $(r-1, s-t-1)$ is the rightmost index in the last row of U_Y . We partition U_W into two subsets,

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= \{(i, j) \in U_W : \sigma_{i-(r-1), j-(s-t-1)}(U_Y) \subseteq U_W\} \\ U_2 &= U_W \setminus U_1 . \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, by the definition of U_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} H(W_{i,j} | W[T_{i,j} \cap U_W]) &\leq \\ H(W_{i,j} | W[\sigma_{i-(r-1), j-(s-t-1)}(U_Z)]) &= H(Y|Z) , \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from stationarity (to see this, take for example, $i = r-1$ and $j = s-t-1$).

On the other hand, since $|U_2| < r \cdot M + s \cdot M$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{(i,j) \in U_2} H(W_{i,j} | W[T_{i,j} \cap U_W]) &< \\ \log_2 |\Sigma| ((r/M) + (s/M)) . & \end{aligned}$$

■

IV. LINEAR REQUIREMENTS FROM STATIONARITY

Recall that $X = W[U_X]$ is an $r \times s$ sub-configuration of W , and thus stationary as well. In this section, we formulate a set of linear requirements (equalities and inequalities) that follow from the stationarity of X .

Let $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$ be a realization of X . Denote

$$p_x = \text{Prob}(X = x) .$$

We start with the trivial requirements. Obviously, we must have for all $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$ that

$$p_x \geq 0 .$$

Also,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]} p_x = 1 .$$

Next, we show how we can use stationarity to get more linear equations on p_x . Let

$$U' = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i < r-1 , 0 \leq j < s\} .$$

For $x' \in \mathbb{S}[U']$ we must have by stationarity that

$$\text{Prob}(X[U'] = x') = \text{Prob}(X[\sigma_{1,0}(U')]) = \sigma_{1,0}(x') . \quad (3)$$

As a concrete example, suppose that $r = s = 3$. We claim that

$$\text{Prob} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ * & * & * \end{pmatrix} = \text{Prob} \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} ,$$

where $*$ denotes “don’t care”.

Both the left-hand and right-hand sides of (3) are marginalizations of p_x . Thus, we get a set of linear equations on p_x . Namely, for all $x' \in \mathbb{S}[U']$,

$$\sum_{x: X[U'] = x'} p_x = \sum_{x: X[\sigma_{1,0}(U')] = \sigma_{1,0}(x')} p_x .$$

To get more equations, we now apply the same rational horizontally, instead of vertically. Let

$$U'' = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i < r , 0 \leq j < s-1\} .$$

for all $x'' \in \mathbb{S}[U'']$,

$$\sum_{x: X[U''] = x''} p_x = \sum_{x: X[\sigma_{0,1}(U'')] = \sigma_{0,1}(x'')} p_x .$$

V. LINEAR EQUATIONS FROM REFLECTION, TRANSPOSITION, AND COMPLEMENTATION

We now show that if \mathbb{S} is reflection, transposition, or complementation invariant (defined below), then we can derive yet more linear equations.

Define $v_M(\cdot)$ ($h_M(\cdot)$) as the vertical (horizontal) reflection of a rectangular configuration with M rows (columns). Namely,

$$(v_M(x))_{i,j} = x_{M-1-i,j}, \quad \text{and} \quad (h_M(x))_{i,j} = x_{i,M-1-j}.$$

Define τ as the transposition of a configuration. Namely,

$$\tau(w)_{i,j} = w_{j,i}.$$

For $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$, denote by $\text{comp}(w)$ the bitwise complement of a configuration w . Namely,

$$\text{comp}(w)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w_{i,j} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We state three similar lemmas, and prove the first. The proof of the other two is similar.

Lemma 3: Suppose that \mathbb{S} is such that for all $M > 0$ and $x \in \Sigma^{M \times M}$,

$$x \in \mathbb{S} \iff h_M(x) \in \mathbb{S} \iff v_M(x) \in \mathbb{S}.$$

Then, w.l.o.g., W is such that for all $w \in \mathbb{S}[U_M]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(W = w) &= \\ \text{Prob}(W = h_M(w)) &= \text{Prob}(W = v_M(w)). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Lemma 4: Suppose that \mathbb{S} is such that for all $M > 0$ and $x \in \Sigma^{M \times M}$,

$$x \in \mathbb{S} \iff \tau(x) \in \mathbb{S}.$$

Then, w.l.o.g., W is such that for all $w \in \mathbb{S}[U_M]$,

$$\text{Prob}(W = w) = \text{Prob}(W = \tau(w)). \quad (5)$$

Lemma 5: Suppose that $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ and \mathbb{S} is such that for all $M > 0$ and $x \in \Sigma^{M \times M}$,

$$x \in \mathbb{S} \iff \text{comp}(x) \in \mathbb{S}.$$

Then, w.l.o.g., W is such that for all $w \in \mathbb{S}[U_M]$,

$$\text{Prob}(W = w) = \text{Prob}(W = \text{comp}(w)). \quad (6)$$

Proof: [Proof of Lemma 4] Let h and v be shorthand for h_M and v_M , respectively. We define a new random variable W^{new} . For all $w \in \mathbb{S}[U_M]$,

$$\text{Prob}(W^{\text{new}}=w) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{w' \in \\ \{w, h(w), v(w), h(v(w))\}}} \text{Prob}(W=w').$$

Since $h(h(w)) = v(v(w)) = w$ and $h(v(w)) = v(h(w))$ we get that (4) holds for W^{new} . Moreover, by the concavity of the entropy function,

$$H(W) \leq H(W^{\text{new}}).$$

Thus, the properties defined in Theorem 1 hold for W^{new} . ■

If the condition of Lemma 3 holds, then we get the following equations by stationarity. For all $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$,

$$p_x = p_{v_r(x)} = p_{h_s(x)}.$$

If the condition of Lemma 4 holds, then the following holds by stationarity. Assume w.l.o.g. that $r \leq s$, and let

$$\tilde{U} = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i, j < r\}.$$

For all $\chi \in \mathbb{S}[\tilde{U}]$,

$$\sum_{x: x[\tilde{U}]=\chi} p_x = \sum_{x: x[\tilde{U}]=\tau(\chi)} p_x.$$

If the condition of Lemma 5 holds, then we get the following equations by stationarity. For all $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$,

$$p_x = p_{\text{comp}(x)}.$$

VI. AN UPPER BOUND ON $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$

Recall from Lemma 2 that we are interested in $H(Y|Z)$, in order to bound $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$ from above. As a first step, we express $H(Y|Z)$ in terms of the probabilities p_x of the random variable X .

Let $y \in \mathbb{S}[U_Y]$ and $z \in \mathbb{S}[U_Z]$ be realizations of Y and Z , respectively. Let

$$p_y = \text{Prob}(Y = y), \quad \text{and} \quad p_z = \text{Prob}(Z = z).$$

Both p_y and p_z are marginalizations of p_x . Namely,

$$p_y = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]: x[U_Y]=y} p_x, \quad p_z = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]: x[U_Z]=z} p_x.$$

Thus,

$$H(Y|Z) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}[U_Y]} -p_y \log_2 p_y + \sum_{z \in \mathbb{S}[U_Z]} p_z \log_2 p_z$$

is a function of the probabilities p_x of X .

Our next step will be to reason as follows: We have found linear requirements that the p_x 's satisfy and expressed $H(Y|Z)$ as a function of p_x . However, *we do not know of a way to actually calculate p_x* . So, instead of the probabilities p_x , consider the *variables* \bar{p}_x . From this line of thought we get our main theorem.

Theorem 6: The value of the optimization program given in Figure 2 is an upper bound on $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$.

Proof: First, notice that if we take $\bar{p}_x = p_x$, then (by Sections IV and V) all the requirements which the \bar{p}_x 's are subject to indeed hold, and the objective function is equal to $H(Y|Z)$. So, the maximum is an upper bound on $H(Y|Z)$. Next, notice that by compactness, a maximum indeed exists. Since the maximum is not a function of M , the claim now follows from Lemma 2. ■

$$\text{maximize} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}[U_Y]} -\bar{p}_y \log_2 \bar{p}_y + \sum_{z \in \mathbb{S}[U_Z]} \bar{p}_z \log_2 \bar{p}_z \right)$$

over the variables \bar{p}_x , $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$, where we define

$$\bar{p}_y \triangleq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]: x[U_Y]=y} \bar{p}_x, \quad \bar{p}_z \triangleq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]: x[U_Z]=z} \bar{p}_x,$$

and the variables \bar{p}_x are subject to the following:

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]} \bar{p}_x = 1.$$

For all $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$,

$$\bar{p}_x \geq 0$$

For all $x' \in \mathbb{S}[U']$,

$$\sum_{x: x[U'] = x'} \bar{p}_x = \sum_{x: x[\sigma_{1,0}(U')] = \sigma_{1,0}(x')} \bar{p}_x.$$

For all $x'' \in \mathbb{S}[U'']$,

$$\sum_{x: x[U''] = x''} \bar{p}_x = \sum_{x: x[\sigma_{0,1}(U'')] = \sigma_{0,1}(x'')} \bar{p}_x.$$

If the constraint is reflection (complementation) invariant: For all $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$,

$$\bar{p}_x = \bar{p}_{v_r(x)} = \bar{p}_{h_s(x)} \quad (\bar{p}_x = \bar{p}_{\text{comp}(x)}).$$

If the constraint is transposition invariant: For all $\chi \in \mathbb{S}[\tilde{U}]$,

$$\sum_{x: x[\tilde{U}] = \chi} \bar{p}_x = \sum_{x: x[\tilde{U}] = \tau(\chi)} \bar{p}_x.$$

VII. CONCAVITY

We now show that the optimization problem in Figure 2 is concave [1, p. 137]. Since the requirements that the variables \bar{p}_x are subject to are linear, this reduces to showing that the objective function is concave in \bar{p}_x .

As a first step, we prove the following.

Lemma 7: The objective function is concave in the variables \bar{p}_y , $y \in \mathbb{S}[U_Y]$, where we naturally define for all $z \in \mathbb{S}[U_Z]$,

$$\bar{p}_z = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}[U_Y]: y[U_Z]=z} \bar{p}_y.$$

Proof: We rewrite the objective function as

$$\sum_{z \in \mathbb{S}[U_Z]} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{S}[U_Y]: y[U_Z]=z} \bar{p}_y \log_2 \frac{\bar{p}_z}{\bar{p}_y}.$$

Recall [3, Theorem 2.7.2] that the divergence $D(q_1||q_2)$ is convex in the pair (q_1, q_2) . The proof follows from defining

the probability functions $q_1, q_2 : \mathbb{S}[U_Y] \times \mathbb{S}[U_Z] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as

$$q_1(y, z) = \begin{cases} \bar{p}_y & y[U_Z] = z \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad q_2(y, z) = \frac{\bar{p}_z}{|\mathbb{S}[U_Y]|}.$$

Since \bar{p}_y is in fact a linear combination of \bar{p}_x , the following is a simple corollary of Lemma 7. ■

Corollary 8: The objective function is concave in \bar{p}_x .

VIII. SOME NOTES ON IMPLEMENTATION

At this point, we have formulated a concave optimization problem, and wish to solve it. An excellent reference on how to do this is [1]. Here, we will limit ourselves to writing about the main points that were important in our specific case.

The standard method for solving our concave optimization problem is to start with some initial vector of probabilities

$$\mathbf{p}^{(0)} = (\bar{p}_x^{(0)})_x, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X],$$

which satisfy our linear requirements, and use some form of an ascent method, such as the Newton method (see [1, Chapter 9]). Since we had a barrier function (see [1, Chapter 11]), a further requirement was that

$$\bar{p}_x^{(0)} > 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X].$$

Here is how we found such initial probabilities. For each $x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]$, we replaced the objective function in Figure 2 with

$$\text{maximize } \bar{p}_x.$$

The result was a *linear program*, and thus easily solvable. Upon solving it we got a probability distribution that satisfied our linear requirements, and had a positive probability for x . Our initial $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$ was the average of these probability distributions.

After finding $\mathbf{p}^{(0)}$, we iteratively use our ascent method, and eventually stop at some $\mathbf{p}^{(k)}$. Hopefully, $\mathbf{p}^{(k)}$ will be close to the maximizing probability. Let $f^{(k)}$ and

$$\mathbf{g}^{(k)} = (g_x^{(k)})_x, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X],$$

be the value of the objective function and the gradient at $\mathbf{p}^{(k)}$, respectively. Of course, f_k is a lower bound on the value of our optimization problem. For an upper bound, we replace the objective function in Figure 2 by

$$\text{maximize} \left(f^{(k)} + \sum_{x \in \mathbb{S}[U_X]} g_x^{(k)} (\bar{p}_x - \bar{p}_x^{(k)}) \right),$$

and again get a *linear program*. By concavity, the value of this linear program is indeed an upper bound.

IX. ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS

For given r , s , and t , denote by $\mu(r, s, t)$ the value of the optimization program in Figure 2 for a given constraint \mathbb{S} . In this section, we show that $\mu(r, s, t)$ is asymptotically tight, in the following sense.

Theorem 9: For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exist

$$r_0 > 0, \quad s_0 > 0, \quad 0 \leq t_0 < s_0$$

such that for all

$$r \geq r_0, \quad s \geq s_0, \quad t_0 \leq t < s,$$

we have that

$$\mu(r, s, t) - \text{cap}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \epsilon.$$

In order to prove Theorem 9, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 10: For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exist

$$r_0 > 0, \quad s_0 > 0, \quad 0 \leq t_0 < s_0$$

such that

$$\mu(r_0, s_0, t_0) - \text{cap}(\mathbb{S}) < \epsilon.$$

Proof: Another well known method for bounding $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$ from above is the so called ‘‘stripe method’’. Namely, for some given ℓ , consider the 1-D constraint $S = S(\ell)$ defined as follows. The alphabet of the constraint is Σ^ℓ . A word of length r' satisfies S if and only if when we write its entries as rows of length ℓ , one below the other, we get an $r' \times \ell$ configuration which satisfies the 2-D constraint \mathbb{S} .

Define the normalized capacity of S as

$$\widehat{\text{cap}}(S) = \frac{1}{\ell} \text{cap}(S).$$

By the definition of $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$, the normalized capacity approaches $\text{cap}(\mathbb{S})$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, fix an ℓ such that

$$\widehat{\text{cap}}(S) - \text{cap}(\mathbb{S}) \leq \epsilon/2.$$

By [9, Theorem 3.17] and its proof, there exists a series of 1-D constraints $\{S_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ such that $S \subseteq S_m$, the memory of S_m is m , and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{cap}(S_m) = \text{cap}(S)$. Thus, fix m such that

$$\widehat{\text{cap}}(S_m) - \widehat{\text{cap}}(S) \leq \epsilon/2.$$

To finish the proof, we now show that

$$\mu(r_0, s_0, t_0) \leq \widehat{\text{cap}}(S_m),$$

where

$$r_0 = m + 1, \quad s_0 = 2 \cdot \ell, \quad t_0 = \ell.$$

Denote

$$B_{M,N} = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i < M, 0 \leq j < N\}.$$

Note that $\mu(r_0, s_0, t_0)$ is the maximum of

$$H(\bar{X}_{m, \ell-1} | \{\bar{X}_{i,j} : (i, j) \in T_{m, \ell-1} \cap B_{m+1, 2 \cdot \ell}\}), \quad (7)$$

over all random variables $\bar{X} \in \mathbb{S}[B_{m+1, 2 \cdot \ell}]$ with a probability distribution satisfying our linear requirements.

For all $0 \leq \gamma < \ell$ we get by the (imposed) stationarity of \bar{X} that (7) is bounded from above by

$$H_\gamma = H(\bar{X}_{m, \gamma} | \bar{X}[U_\gamma]),$$

where

$$U_\gamma = \{(i, j) : i = m, j < \gamma \text{ or } 0 \leq i < m, 0 \leq j < \ell\}.$$

So, (7) is also bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{\gamma=0}^{\ell-1} H_\gamma. \quad (8)$$

The first ℓ columns of \bar{X} form an $(m+1) \times \ell$ configuration. By our linear requirements, stationarity (specifically, vertical stationarity) holds for this configuration as well. So, we may define a stationary 1-D Markov chain on S_m , with entropy given by (8). That entropy, in turn, is at most $\widehat{\text{cap}}(S_m)$. ■

Proof: [Proof of Theorem 9] The following inequalities are easily verified:

$$\mu(r, s, t) \geq \mu(r+1, s, t).$$

$$\mu(r, s, t) \geq \mu(r, s+1, t).$$

$$\mu(r, s, t) \geq \mu(r, s+1, t+1).$$

The proof follows from them and Lemma 10. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [2] R. Burton and J. E. Steif, ‘‘Non-uniqueness of measures of maximal entropy for subshifts of finite type,’’ *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 14 (1994), 213–235.
- [3] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley, 1991.
- [4] T. Etzion, ‘‘Cascading methods for runlength-limited arrays,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 43 (1997), 319–324.
- [5] S. Forchhammer and J. Justesen, ‘‘Bounds on the capacity of constrained two-dimensional codes,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 46 (2000), 2659–2666.
- [6] S. Halevy, J. Chen, R. M. Roth, P. H. Siegel, and J. K. Wolf, ‘‘Improved Bit-Stuffing Bounds on Two-Dimensional Constraints,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 50 (2004), 824–838.
- [7] S. Halevy and R. M. Roth, ‘‘Parallel constrained coding with application to two-dimensional constraints,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 48 (2002), 1009–1020.
- [8] A. Kato and K. Zeger, ‘‘On the capacity of two-dimensional run-length constrained code,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 45 (1999), 1527–1540.
- [9] B. H. Marcus, R. M. Roth, and P. H. Siegel, ‘‘Constrained systems and coding for recording channels,’’ in *Handbook of Coding Theory*, V. Pless and W. Huffman, Eds. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1998, pp. 1635–1764.
- [10] W. Weeks and R. E. Blahut, ‘‘The capacity and coding gain of certain checkerboard codes,’’ *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 44 (1998), 1193–1203.