

Packing and Covering Properties of CDCs and Subspace Codes

Maximilien Gadouleau, *Student Member, IEEE*, and Zhiyuan Yan, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract

Constant-dimension codes (CDCs) and subspace codes have been proposed for error control in network coding. In this paper, we first study the covering properties of CDCs. We derive bounds on the minimum cardinality of a CDC with a given covering radius and determine the asymptotic rate of optimal covering CDCs. We then study the packing and covering properties of subspace codes, which can be used with the subspace metric or the so-called modified subspace metric. We derive bounds on the cardinalities of packing and covering subspace codes, and we determine the maximum asymptotic rate of both packing and covering subspace codes for both the subspace metric and the modified subspace metric.

I. INTRODUCTION

While random network coding [1]–[3] has proved to be a powerful tool for disseminating information in networks, it is highly susceptible to errors. Error control for random network coding hence is critical and has received growing attention recently. Error control for noncoherent random network coding was first considered in [4]. Motivated by the property that random network coding is vector-space preserving, an operator channel that captures the essence of the noncoherent transmission model was defined in [4]. Similar to codes defined in complex Grassmannians for noncoherent multiple-antenna channels, codes defined in Grassmannians over a finite field [5], [6] and used with the subspace distance (cf. [4, (3)]) play a significant role in error control for noncoherent random network coding; Under the subspace distance,

This work was supported in part by Thales Communications Inc. and in part by a grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Community and Economic Development, through the Pennsylvania Infrastructure Technology Alliance (PITA).

The authors are with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, 18015 USA (e-mail: magc@lehigh.edu; yan@lehigh.edu).

the weight of a subspace is simply its dimension; thus, we refer to these codes as constant-dimension codes (CDCs) henceforth.

There is a steady stream of works that focuses on codes in the Grassmannian. For example, Delsarte [5] proved that the Grassmannian endowed with the subspace distance forms an association scheme, and derived its parameters. The nonexistence of perfect codes in the Grassmannian was proved in [6], [10]. In [11], it was shown that Steiner structures yield diameter-perfect codes in the Grassmannian; properties and constructions of these structures were studied in [12]; in [13], it was shown that Steiner structures result in optimal CDCs. Related work on certain intersecting families and on byte-correcting codes can be found in [14] and [15], respectively. An application of codes in the Grassmannian to linear authentication schemes was considered in [16]. In [4], a Singleton bound for CDCs and a family of codes that are nearly Singleton-bound achieving are proposed, and a recursive construction of CDCs which outperform the codes in [4] was given in [17]. Further constructions have been given in [18]. However, despite all these results the maximum cardinality of a CDC with a given minimum distance remains unknown.

On the other hand, general studies of subspace metric codes (also referred to as codes in projective space or projective geometry) started only recently (see, for example, [7], [8]). Subspace codes have been introduced for network coding in [9], where it is shown that they can correct more errors than CDCs. Subspace codes can be used with either the subspace metric or with the modified subspace metric. Bounds on subspace codes with the subspace metric have been derived in [7].

Covering properties are significant for error control codes, and the covering radius is a basic geometric parameter of a code [19]. For instance, the covering radius can be viewed as a measure of performance: if the code is used for error correction, then the covering radius is the maximum weight of a correctable error vector [20]; if the code is used for data compression, then the covering radius is a measure of the maximum distortion [20]. The Hamming covering radius of ECCs has been extensively studied (see, for example, [21]–[23]) and the rank covering radius was studied in [29], [39], whereas the packing and covering radii of CDCs have received relatively little attention.

In this paper, we first study the covering properties of CDCs. We derive bounds on the minimum cardinality of a CDC with a given covering radius and determine the asymptotic rate of optimal covering CDCs. We then study the packing and covering properties of subspace codes. We derive bounds on the cardinalities of packing and covering subspace codes, and we determine the maximum asymptotic rate of packing and covering subspace codes for both the subspace metric and the modified subspace metric.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II gives necessary background on subspace codes, CDCs, and related concepts. In Section III, we study the covering properties of CDCs. In Section IV,

we study the packing and covering properties of subspace codes using the subspace metric. In Section V, we study the packing and covering properties of subspace codes using the modified subspace metric.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Subspace codes

We denote the set of all subspaces of $\text{GF}(q)^n$ with dimension r as $E_r(q, n)$ and $E(q, n) = \bigcup_{r=0}^n E_r(q, n)$. For $U, V \in E(q, n)$, it is easily shown that $d_s(U, V) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(U + V) - \dim(U \cap V)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(U, V) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2}d_s(U, V) + \frac{1}{2}|\dim(U) - \dim(V)| \\ &= \max\{\dim(U), \dim(V)\} - \dim(U \cap V) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

$$= \dim(U + V) - \min\{\dim(U), \dim(V)\} \quad (2)$$

are metrics over $E(q, n)$, referred to as the *subspace metric* and the *modified subspace metric*, respectively [9]. For all $U, V \in E(q, n)$,

$$\frac{1}{2}d_s(U, V) \leq d_M(U, V) \leq d_s(U, V), \quad (3)$$

$d_M(U, V) = \frac{1}{2}d_s(U, V)$ if and only if $\dim(U) = \dim(V)$, and $d_M(U, V) = d_s(U, V)$ if and only if $U \subseteq V$ or $V \subseteq U$.

A *subspace code* is a nonempty subset of $E(q, n)$, whose elements are called codesubspaces. The minimum subspace (respectively, modified subspace) distance of a subspace code, denoted as d_s (respectively, d_M) is the minimum distance over all pairs of distinct codesubspaces.

B. CDCs and rank metric codes

The Grassmannian $E_r(q, n)$ endowed with the modified subspace metric forms an association scheme [4], [5]. Since $d_s(U, V) = 2d_M(U, V)$ for all $U, V \in E_r(q, n)$, we only consider the modified subspace metric for the Grassmannian. We have $|E_r(q, n)| = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}$, where $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} = \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} \frac{q^n - q^i}{q^r - q^i}$ is the Gaussian polynomial [24]. It is shown in [25] that $q^{r(n-r)} \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} < K_q^{-1} q^{r(n-r)}$, where $K_q = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^{-j})$. We denote the number of subspaces of dimension r at distance d from a given subspace of dimension r as $N_C(d) = q^{d^2} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d \end{bmatrix}$ [4]. The ball of radius t in $E_r(q, n)$ around a subspace U is denoted as $B_t(U)$ and its volume as $V_C(t) = \sum_{d=0}^t N_C(d)$.

A subset of $E_r(q, n)$ is called a constant-dimension code (CDC). A CDC is thus a subspace code whose codesubspaces have the same dimension. We denote the maximum cardinality of a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum distance d as $A_C(q, n, r, d)$. Constructions of CDCs and bounds on $A_C(q, n, r, d)$ have been

given in [4], [8], [13], [17], [18]. In particular, $A_C(q, n, r, 1) = \binom{n}{r}$ and it is shown that for $2r \leq n$ and $2 \leq d \leq r$,

$$\frac{q^{n(r-d+1)} - q^{(r+l)(r-d+1)}}{q^{r(r-d+1)} - 1} \leq A_C(q, n, r, d) \leq \frac{\binom{n}{r-d+1}}{\binom{r}{r-d+1}}, \quad (4)$$

where $l = n \bmod r$. We denote the LHS of (4) as $L(q, n, r, d)$.

CDCs are closely related to rank metric codes. A rank metric code [26]–[28] can be viewed as a set of matrices in $\text{GF}(q)^{m \times n}$. The rank distance between two matrices $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \in \text{GF}(q)^{m \times n}$ is defined as $d_R(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{D})$. The minimum cardinality of a code in $\text{GF}(q)^{m \times n}$ with rank covering radius ρ is studied in [29] and is denoted as $K_R(q^m, n, \rho)$, where $K_R(q^m, n, \rho) = K_R(q^n, m, \rho)$ [29].

CDCs are related to rank metric codes through the concept of constant-rank codes [30] or through the lifting operation [31]. The row space and the column space of a matrix \mathbf{C} are denoted as $\mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{C})$ and $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{C})$, respectively. The lifting of $\mathbf{C} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$ is defined as $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{C}) = \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{I}_r | \mathbf{C}) \in E_r(q, n)$. For all $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$, we have $d_M(\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{C}), \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D})) = d_R(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D})$ [31].

III. COVERING PROPERTIES OF CDCS

The packing properties of CDCs have been studied in [4], [8], [13], [17], [18] and the asymptotic rate of CDCs has been determined in [4]. We hence focus on the covering properties of CDCs instead.

A. Properties of balls in the Grassmannian

In this section, we investigate the properties of balls in the Grassmannian $E_r(q, n)$, which will be instrumental in our study of covering properties of CDCs. First, we derive bounds on the volume of balls in $E_r(q, n)$.

Lemma 1: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 \leq t \leq r$, $q^{t(n-t)} \leq V_C(t) < K_q^{-2} N_q q^{t(n-t)}$, where $N_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

Proof: First, we have $q^{d(n-d)} \leq N_C(d) < K_q^{-2} q^{d(n-d)}$ for all $0 \leq d \leq r$. Therefore, $V_C(t) \geq N_C(t) \geq q^{t(n-t)}$ and $V_C(t) < K_q^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{t(n-t)-i(n-2t+i)} < N_q K_q^{-2} q^{t(n-t)}$. ■

We now determine the volume of the intersection of two spheres of radii u and s respectively with distance d between their centers, which is the intersection number $J_C(u, s, d)$ of the association scheme mentioned in Section II-B.

Lemma 2: For all u, s , and d ,

$$J_C(u, s, d) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{r} N_C(d)} \sum_{i=0}^r \mu_i E_u(i) E_s(i) E_d(i),$$

where $\mu_i = \binom{n}{i} - \binom{n}{i-1}$ and $E_j(i)$ is a q -Eberlein polynomial [32]:

$$E_j(i) = \sum_{l=0}^j (-1)^{j-l} q^{li+(j-l)(j-l)/2} \begin{bmatrix} r-l \\ r-j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} r-l \\ i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r+l-i \\ l \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof: This directly follows Theorems 3.5 and 3.6 in [33, Chapter II]. \blacksquare

Although Lemma 2 is a direct application of the theory of association schemes, we present it formally since it is a fundamental geometric property of the Grassmannian which will be instrumental in our study of CDCs. By [34, Lemma 4.1.7], we also obtain a recursion formula for $J_C(u, s, d)$.

Lemma 3: $J_C(u, s, d)$ satisfies the following recursion: $J_C(0, s, d) = \delta_{s,d}$, $J_C(u, 0, d) = \delta_{u,d}$, and

$$c_{u+1} J_C(u+1, s, d) = b_{s-1} J_C(u, s-1, d) + (a_s - a_u) J_C(u, s, d) + c_{s+1} J_C(u, s+1, d) - b_{u-1} J_C(u-1, s, d),$$

where $c_j = J_C(1, j-1, j) = \begin{bmatrix} j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}^2$, $b_j = J_C(1, j+1, j) = q^{2j+1} \begin{bmatrix} r-j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r-j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ [34, Theorem 9.3.3], and $a_j = J_C(1, j, j) = N_C(1) - b_j - c_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq r$ [34, Chapter 4, (1a)].

Let $I_C(u, s, d)$ denote the intersection of two balls in $E_r(q, n)$ with radii u and s with distance d between their centers. Since $I_C(u, s, d) = \sum_{i=0}^u \sum_{j=0}^s J_C(i, j, d)$, Lemma 2 also leads to an analytical expression for $I_C(u, s, d)$. Proposition 1 below shows that the volume of the intersection of two balls decreases as the distance between their respective centers increases.

Proposition 1: For all u and s , $I_C(u, s, d)$ is a non-increasing function of d .

The proof of Proposition 1 is given in Appendix A. Therefore, the minimum nonzero intersection between two balls with radii u and s is given by $I_C(u, s, u+s) = J_C(u, s, u+s)$ for $u+s \leq r$. Lemma 4 below determines the value of this term.

Lemma 4: For all u, s , such that $u+s \leq r$, $J_C(u, s, u+s) = \begin{bmatrix} u+s \\ u \end{bmatrix}^2$.

Proof: The proof is by induction on u . For $u=0$, $J_C(0, s, s) = 1 = \begin{bmatrix} s \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}^2$. Assume $J_C(u, s, u+s) = \begin{bmatrix} u+s \\ u \end{bmatrix}^2$ for all $0 \leq s \leq r-u$. Then by Lemma 3, $J_C(u+1, s-1, u+s) = \frac{c_s}{c_{u+1}} J_C(u, s, u+s) = \begin{bmatrix} u+s \\ u+1 \end{bmatrix}^2$ for $1 \leq s \leq r-u$. \blacksquare

We derive below an upper bound on the union of balls in $E_r(q, n)$ with the same radius.

Lemma 5: The volume of the union of any K balls in $E_r(q, n)$ with radius ρ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} B_C(K) &= KV_C(\rho) - \sum_{a=1}^l [A_C(q, n, r, r-a+1) - A_C(q, n, r, r-a+2)] I_C(\rho, \rho, r-a+1) \\ &\quad - [K - A_C(q, n, r, r-l+1)] I_C(\rho, \rho, r-l), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $l = \max\{a : K \geq A_C(q, n, r, r-a+1)\}$.

Proof: Let $\{U_i\}_{i=0}^{K-1}$ denote the centers of K balls with modified subspace radius ρ and let $\mathcal{V}_j = \{U_i\}_{i=0}^{j-1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq K$. The centers are labeled such that $d_M(U_j, \mathcal{V}_j)$ is non-increasing for $j \geq 1$. For

$1 \leq a \leq l$ and $A_c(q, n, r, r - a + 2) \leq j < A_c(q, n, r, r - a + 1)$, we have $d_M(U_j, \mathcal{V}_j) = d_M(\mathcal{V}_{j+1}) \leq r - a + 1$. By Proposition 1, U_j hence covers at most $V_c(\rho) - I_c(\rho, \rho, r - a + 1)$ subspaces that are not previously covered by \mathcal{V}_j . ■

Note that although the value of $A_c(q, n, r, r - a + 1)$ is unknown in general, the upper bound in (4) can be used in (5) in order to obtain an upper bound on $B_c(K)$.

B. Covering CDCs

We denote the minimum cardinality of a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with modified subspace covering radius ρ as $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$. Since $K_c(q, n, n - r, \rho) = K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$, we assume $2r \leq n$. Also, $K_c(q, n, r, 0) = \binom{n}{r}$ and $K_c(q, n, r, r) = 1$, hence we assume $0 < \rho < r$ henceforth. We first derive lower bounds on $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Lemma 6: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_c(q, n, r, \rho) \geq \min \{K : B_c(K) \geq \binom{n}{r}\} \geq \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{V_c(\rho)}$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a CDC with cardinality $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$ and covering radius ρ . Then the balls around the codesubspaces cover $\binom{n}{r}$ subspaces; however, by Lemma 5, they cannot cover more than $B_c(|\mathcal{C}|)$ subspaces. Therefore, $B_c(K_c(q, n, r, \rho)) \geq \binom{n}{r}$ and we obtain the first inequality. Since $B_c(K) \leq KV_c(\rho)$ for all K , we obtain the second inequality. ■

The second lower bound in Lemma 6 is referred to as the sphere covering bound for CDCs. By considering the distance distribution of a covering code, we can refine the sphere covering bound for CDCs.

Proposition 2: Let \mathcal{C} be a CDC with covering radius ρ . For $U \in E_r(q, n)$ at distance δ from \mathcal{C} , let $A_i(U)$ denote the number of codesubspaces at distance i from U . Then $\sum_{i=0}^r A_i(U) = |\mathcal{C}|$ and

$$0 \leq A_i(U) \leq N_c(i), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, r \quad (6)$$

$$A_i(U) = 0, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, \delta - 1 \quad (7)$$

$$A_\delta(U) \geq 1, \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^r A_i(U) \sum_{s=0}^{\rho} J_c(l, s, i) \geq N_c(l), \quad l = 0, 1, \dots, r. \quad (9)$$

Proof: (6)-(8) directly follow the hypothesis, and it suffices to prove (9). For $0 \leq l \leq r$, a codesubspace at distance i from U covers exactly $\sum_{s=0}^{\rho} J_c(l, s, i)$ subspaces at distance l from U . All the subspaces at distance l from U are covered, hence $\sum_{i=0}^r A_i(U) \sum_{s=0}^{\rho} J_c(l, s, i) \geq N_c(l)$. ■

We remark that summing (9) for $0 \leq l \leq r$ yields the sphere covering bound. Proposition 2 also leads to a lower bound on $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Corollary 1: For $0 \leq \delta \leq \rho$, let $T_\delta = \min \sum_{i=0}^r A_i(U)$, where the minimum is taken over all sequences $\{A_i(U)\}$ which satisfy (6)-(9). Then $K_c(q, n, r, \rho) \geq \max_{0 \leq \delta \leq \rho} T_\delta$.

Another set of linear inequalities is obtained from the inner distribution $\{a_i\}$ of a covering code \mathcal{C} , defined as $a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} A_i(C)$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$ [35].

Proposition 3: Let t be the optimal solution to the following linear program:

$$\min \sum_{i=0}^r a_i \tag{10}$$

$$\text{st } a_0 = 1 \tag{11}$$

$$0 \leq a_i \leq N_C(i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, r \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^r a_i \sum_{s=0}^{\rho} J_C(l, s, i) \geq N_C(l), \quad l = 0, 1, \dots, r \tag{13}$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^r a_i \frac{E_i(l)}{N_C(i)} \geq 0, \quad l = 0, 1, \dots, r. \tag{14}$$

Then $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \geq t$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a CDC with covering radius ρ and inner distribution $\{a_i\}$. Summing (6) and (9) for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$ yields (12) and (13), respectively, while (11) follows the definition of a_0 . By the generalized MacWilliams identity [35, Theorem 3], $\sum_{i=0}^r a_i F_l(i) \geq 0$, where $F_l(i) = \frac{\mu}{N_C(i)} E_i(l)$ [33, Theorem 3.5] are the q -numbers of the association scheme, which yields (14). Since $\sum_{i=0}^r a_i = |\mathcal{C}|$ we obtain that $|\mathcal{C}| \geq t$. ■

Lower bounds on covering codes with the Hamming metric can be obtained through the concept of the excess of a code [36], [37]. This concept being independent of the underlying metric, it was adapted to the rank metric in [29]. We adapt it to the modified subspace metric for CDCs below, thus obtaining the lower bound in Proposition 4.

Proposition 4: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \geq \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{V_C(\rho) - \frac{\epsilon}{\delta} N_C(\rho)}$, where $\epsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\lceil \frac{b_\rho}{c_{\rho+1}} \right\rceil c_{\rho+1} - b_\rho$ and $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N_C(1) - c_\rho + 2\epsilon$.

The proof of Proposition 4 is given in Appendix B. We now derive upper bounds on $K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$. First, we investigate how to expand covering CDCs.

Lemma 7: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n-1, r, \rho-1) \leq \binom{n-\rho}{r}$, and $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n, r-1, \rho-1) \leq \binom{n}{r-\rho}$.

The proof of Lemma 7 is given in Appendix C. We construct below a class of covering CDCs from liftings of rank metric covering codes.

Proposition 5: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq \binom{n}{r} K_R(q^{n-r}, r, \rho)$.

Proof: For all n and r , we denote the set of subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ with cardinality r as S_n^r . For all $J \in S_n^r$ and all $\mathbf{C} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$, let $\mathcal{I}(J, \mathbf{C}) = \mathfrak{R}(\pi(\mathbf{I}_r | \mathbf{C})) \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times n}$, where π is the

permutation of $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ satisfying $J = \{\pi(0), \pi(1), \dots, \pi(r-1)\}$, $\pi(0) < \pi(1) < \dots < \pi(r-1)$, and $\pi(r) < \pi(r+1) < \dots < \pi(n-1)$. It is easily shown that $d_M(\mathcal{I}(J, \mathbf{C}), \mathcal{I}(J, \mathbf{D})) = d_R(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D})$ for all $J \in S_n^r$, $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$.

Let $C \subseteq \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$ have rank covering radius ρ and cardinality $K_R(q^{n-r}, r, \rho)$. We show below that $\mathcal{I}(C) = \{\mathcal{I}(J, \mathbf{C}) : J \in S_n^r, \mathbf{C} \in C\}$ is a CDC with covering radius ρ . Any $U \in E_r(q, n)$ can be expressed as $\mathcal{I}(J, \mathbf{V})$ for some $J \in S_n^r$ and some $\mathbf{V} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$. Also, by definition, there exists $\mathbf{C} \in C$ such that $d_R(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{V}) \leq \rho$ and hence $d_M(U, \mathcal{I}(J, \mathbf{C})) = d_R(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{V}) \leq \rho$. Thus $\mathcal{I}(C)$ has covering radius ρ and cardinality $\leq \binom{n}{\rho} K_R(q^{n-r}, r, \rho)$. ■

The next upper bound is a straightforward adaptation of [29, Proposition 12].

Proposition 6: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq \left\{1 - \log_{\binom{n}{r}} \left(\binom{n}{r} - V_C(\rho)\right)\right\}^{-1} + 1$.

The proof of Proposition 6 is given in Appendix D. The next bound is a direct application of [23, Theorem 12.2.1].

Proposition 7: For all $q, n, 2r \leq n$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{V_C(\rho)} (1 + \ln V_C(\rho))$.

The bound in Proposition 7 can be refined by applying the greedy algorithm described in [38], [39] to CDCs.

Proposition 8: Let $k_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(q, n, r, 2\rho + 1)$ for $2\rho < r$ and $k_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$ for $2\rho \geq r$. Then for all $k \geq k_0$, there exists a CDC with cardinality k which covers at least $\binom{n}{r} - u_k$ subspaces, where $u_{k_0} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{n}{r} - k_0 V_C(\rho)$ and $u_{k+1} = u_k - \left\lceil \frac{u_k V_C(\rho)}{\min\{\binom{n}{r} - k, B_C(u_k)\}} \right\rceil$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Thus $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq \min\{k : u_k = 0\}$.

The proof of Proposition 8 is given in Appendix E.

Using the bounds derived above, we finally determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$. We use the following normalized parameters: $r' = \frac{r}{n}$, $\rho' = \frac{\rho}{n}$, and $k_C(r', \rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_{q^{n^2}} K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Proposition 9: For all $0 \leq \rho' \leq r' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_C(r', \rho') = (r' - \rho')(1 - r' - \rho')$.

Proof: Using the bounds on $V_C(\rho)$ in Lemma 1, the sphere covering bound yields $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) > N_q^{-1} K_q^2 q^{r(n-r) - \rho(n-\rho)}$, which asymptotically becomes $k_C(r', \rho') \geq r'(1-r') - \rho'(1-\rho')$. Also, Proposition 7 leads to $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) < K_q^{-1} q^{r(n-r) - \rho(n-\rho)} [1 + \ln(K_q^{-2} N_q) + \rho(n-\rho) \ln q]$, which asymptotically becomes $k_C(r', \rho') \leq r'(1-r') - \rho'(1-\rho')$. ■

IV. PACKING AND COVERING PROPERTIES OF SUBSPACE CODES WITH THE SUBSPACE METRIC

A. Properties of balls with subspace radii

In this section, we investigate the properties of balls with subspace radii in $E(q, n)$, which will be instrumental in our study of packing and covering properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric. We first derive bounds on $|E(q, n)|$ below.

Lemma 8: For all n , $q^{j(n-j)} \leq |E(q, n)| < 2K_q^{-1}N_q q^{j(n-j)}$, where $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and $N_q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

Proof: We have $|E(q, n)| = \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n}{r} \geq \binom{n}{j} \geq q^{j(n-j)}$, which proves the lower bound. In order to prove the upper bound, we distinguish two cases. First, if $n = 2j + 1$, then $\sum_{r=0}^{2j+1} \binom{2j+1}{r} = 2 \sum_{i=0}^j \binom{2j+1}{j-i} < 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^j q^{j(j+1)-i(i+1)} < 2K_q^{-1}N_q q^{j(n-j)}$. Second, if $n = 2j$, then $\sum_{r=0}^{2j} \binom{2j}{r} = \binom{2j}{j} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^j \binom{2j}{j-i} < 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^j q^{j^2-i^2} < 2K_q^{-1}N_q q^{j(n-j)}$. ■

We now determine the number of subspaces at a given distance from a fixed subspace.

Lemma 9: The number of subspaces with dimension s at subspace distance d from a subspace with dimension r is given by $N_s(r, s, d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} q^{u(d-u)} \binom{r}{u} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$, when $u = \frac{r+d-s}{2}$ is an integer, and $N_s(r, s, d) = 0$ otherwise.

Proof: For $U \in E_r(q, n)$ and $V \in E_s(q, n)$, $d_s(U, V) = d$ if and only if $\dim(U \cap V) = r - u$. Thus there are $\binom{r}{u}$ choices for $U \cap V$. The subspace V can then be completed in $q^{u(d-u)} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$ ways. ■

We remark that this result is implicitly contained in [7], where no proof is given. We also denote the volume of a ball with subspace radius d around a subspace with dimension r as $V_s(r, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{d=0}^t \sum_{s=0}^n N_s(r, s, d)$.

The following technical lemma will be instrumental in Section IV-C.

Lemma 10: For all q , n , $\frac{1}{2} - 4\log_q K_q + 2\log_q \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}} < t \leq r \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and $0 \leq l \leq n$, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(l, r, d) \leq N_s(r-t, r, t) = \binom{n-r+t}{t}$.

The proof of Lemma 10 is given in Appendix F.

We now give bounds on the volume of a ball with subspace radius. Since $V_s(r, t) = V_s(n-r, t)$ for all r and t , we only consider $2r \leq n$.

Proposition 10: For all q , n , $2r \leq n$, and $2t \leq n$, $q^{-\frac{3}{4}} q^{g(t)} \leq V_s(r, t) \leq (2M_q - 1)K_q^{-2}L_q q^{g(t)}$, where $M_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-3i^2}$, $L_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}}$, and

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} t(n-r-t) & \text{for } t \leq \frac{n-2r}{3}, \\ \frac{1}{12}(n-2r)^2 + \frac{1}{4}t(2n-t) & \text{for } \frac{n-2r}{3} \leq t \leq \frac{n+4r}{3}, \\ (t-r)(n-t+r) & \text{for } \frac{n+4r}{3} \leq t \leq \frac{n}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

The proof of Proposition 10 is given in Appendix G.

B. Packing properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric

In this section, we are interested in packing subspace codes used with the subspace metric. The maximum cardinality of a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum subspace distance d is denoted as $A_s(q, n, d)$. Since $A_s(q, n, 1) = |E(q, n)|$, we assume $d \geq 2$ henceforth. For all $J \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we denote the

maximum cardinality of a code with minimum subspace distance d and codesubspaces having dimensions in J as $A_s(q, n, d, J)$.

Proposition 11: For $2 \leq d \leq n$, let $R_d = \{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil + 1, \dots, n - \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\}$, then $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum subspace distance d and let $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$. We have $\dim(C) + \dim(D) \geq d_s(C, D) \geq d$, therefore there is at most one codesubspace with dimension less than $\frac{d}{2}$. Similarly, $\dim(C) + \dim(D) \leq 2n - d_s(C, D) \leq 2n - d$, therefore there is at most one codesubspace with dimension greater than $\frac{2n-d}{2}$. Thus $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2$. ■

Several bounds on $A_s(q, n, d)$ have been derived in the literature, notably the Gilbert bound [7, Theorem 5]. This bound could be tightened by adapting the algorithm used in the proof of the Gilbert bound for the Hamming metric.

Proposition 12: For all q, n, d , and any permutation π of $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a code with minimum subspace distance d and A_r codewords with dimension r for $0 \leq r \leq n$, where $A_{\pi(0)} = A_c(q, n, \pi(0), \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$ and

$$A_{\pi(r)} = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \frac{\binom{n}{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil} - \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} A_{\pi(i)} \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_s(\pi(i), \pi(r), e)}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_s(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rceil \right\}. \quad (16)$$

Proof: We show that there exists such a code by recursion on r . First, for $r = 0$, this follows from the definition of $A_c(q, n, \pi(0), \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$. Second, suppose there exists a code with minimum modified subspace d and $A_{\pi(l)}$ codewords with dimension $\pi(l)$ for $0 \leq l \leq r-1$. These codewords cover at most $N = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} A_{\pi(i)} \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_s(\pi(i), \pi(r), e)$ subspaces of dimension $\pi(r)$. If $N \leq \binom{n}{\pi(r)}$, then we can select at least $\left\lceil \frac{\binom{n}{\pi(r)} - N}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_s(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rceil$ codesubspaces with dimension $\pi(r)$. ■

The bounds above help us determine the asymptotic behavior of $A_s(q, n, d)$. We use the normalized parameters $d' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d}{n}$ and $a_s(d') = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_{q^{n^2}} A_s(q, n, d)$.

Proposition 13: For $0 \leq d' \leq 1$, $a_s(d') = \frac{1-d'}{4}$.

Proof: For $d = 2t$, we have $A_s(q, n, 2t) \geq A_c(q, n, j, t) \geq q^{(n-j)(j-t+1)}$ where $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, which asymptotically becomes $a_s(d') \geq \frac{1-d'}{4}$. Denoting $d = 2t - \epsilon$ where $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$, we have $A_s(q, n, 2t - \epsilon) \leq \sum_{r=0}^n A_c(q, n, t)$, which asymptotically becomes $a_s(d') \leq \frac{1-d'}{4}$. ■

The asymptotic behavior of CDCs can be obtained from (4). Denoting $a_c(r', d') = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_{q^{n^2}} A_c(q, n, r, d)$, we obtain $a_c(r', d') = (1 - r')(r' - d')$. Therefore, the asymptotic behavior of the maximum cardinality of a subspace code is given by that of a CDC with dimension equal to half of n . However, for finite parameter values, using subspace codes is still beneficial over using CDCs.

C. Covering properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric

In this section, we consider the covering properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric. We denote the minimum cardinality of a subspace code in $E(q, n)$ with subspace covering radius ρ as $K_s(q, n, \rho)$. Since $K_s(q, n, 0) = |E(q, n)|$ and $K_s(q, n, n) = 1$, we assume $0 < \rho < n$ henceforth. We determine below the minimum cardinality of a code with subspace covering radius $\rho \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$.

Proposition 14: For $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \leq \rho < n$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) = 2$.

Proof: For all $V \in E_r(q, n)$ there exists \bar{V} such that $V \oplus \bar{V} = \text{GF}(q)^n$ and hence $d_s(V, \bar{V}) = n$. Therefore, one subspace cannot cover the whole $E(q, n)$ with radius $\rho < n$ and $K_s(q, n, \rho) > 1$. We prove below that the code $\{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^n\}$ has covering radius $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. For all $D_1 \in E(q, n)$ with $\dim(D_1) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, we have $d_s(\{\mathbf{0}\}, D_1) = \dim(D_1) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$; similarly, for all $D_2 \in E(q, n)$ with $\dim(D_2) \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1$, we have $d_s(\text{GF}(q)^n, D_2) = n - \dim(D_2) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Thus \mathcal{C} has covering radius 2 and $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2$ for all $\rho \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. ■

We thus consider $0 < \rho < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ henceforth. Here is the sphere covering bound for subspace codes with the subspace metric.

Proposition 15: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) \geq \min \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, where the minimum is taken over all integer sequences $\{A_i\}$ satisfying $0 \leq A_i \leq \binom{n}{i}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\sum_{i=0}^n A_i \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(i, r, d) \geq \binom{n}{r}$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a subspace code with covering radius ρ and let A_i denote the number of subspaces with dimension i in \mathcal{C} . Then $0 \leq A_i \leq \binom{n}{i}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. All subspaces with dimension r are covered; however, a codesubspace with dimension i covers exactly $\sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(i, r, d)$ subspaces with dimension r , hence $\sum_{i=0}^n A_i \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(i, r, d) \geq \binom{n}{r}$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$. ■

We now give upper bounds on $K_s(q, n, \rho)$.

Proposition 16: For all q, n , $0 < \rho < j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$,

$$K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2 + 2 \sum_{r=\rho+1}^j \frac{\binom{n}{r-\rho}}{\binom{n}{r}} \left(1 + \ln \binom{n-r+\rho}{\rho} \right). \quad (17)$$

Proof: We show that there exists a code with cardinality given by the RHS of (17) and covering radius ρ . We choose $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ to be in the code, hence all subspaces with dimension $0 \leq r \leq \rho$ are covered. For $\rho+1 \leq r \leq j$, let \mathbf{A} be the $\binom{n}{r} \times \binom{n}{r-\rho}$ 0–1 matrix whose rows represent the subspaces $U_i \in E_r(q, n)$ and whose columns represent the subspaces $V_j \in E_{r-\rho}(q, n)$, and where $a_{i,j} = 1$ if and only if $d_s(U_i, V_j) = \rho$. Then there are exactly $N_s(r, r-\rho, \rho) = \binom{r}{\rho}$ ones on each row and $N_s(r-\rho, r, \rho) = \binom{n-r+\rho}{\rho}$ ones on each column. By [23, Theorem 12.2.1], there exists an $\binom{n}{r} \times K_r$ submatrix of \mathbf{A} with no all-zero rows, where $K_r = \frac{\binom{n}{r-\rho}}{\binom{n}{r}} \left(1 + \ln \binom{n-r+\rho}{\rho} \right)$. Thus, all subspaces of dimension r can be covered using K_r codesubspaces.

Summing for all r , we all subspaces with dimension $0 \leq r \leq j$ can be covered with $1 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^j K_r$ subspaces. Similarly, it can be shown that all subspaces with dimension $j+1 \leq r \leq n$ can be covered with $1 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^j K_r$ subspaces. ■

We now give an explicit construction of a subspace covering code.

Proposition 17: For all q, n , and $\rho < j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, let $J_1 = \{0\} \cup \{j-\rho, j-3\rho-1, \dots, j-\rho - \lfloor \frac{j-\rho}{2\rho+1} \rfloor (2\rho+1)\}$ and $J_2 = \{n\} \cup \{j+1+\rho, j+2+2\rho, \dots, j + \lfloor \frac{n-j}{2\rho+1} \rfloor (2\rho+1)\}$. Then the code $\bigcup_{r \in J_1 \cup J_2} E_r(q, n)$ has subspace covering radius ρ , and hence $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq \sum_{r \in J_1 \cup J_2} \binom{n}{r}$.

Proof: We prove that $\bigcup_{r \in J_1} E_r(q, n)$ covers all subspaces with dimension $\leq j$. First, all subspaces $D_0 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $0 \leq \dim(D) < j - 2\rho - \lfloor \frac{j-\rho}{2\rho+1} \rfloor (2\rho+1) \leq \rho$ are covered by the subspace with dimension 0. Second, for all $D_1 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $j - 2\rho - i(2\rho+1) \leq \dim(D) < j - \rho - i(2\rho+1)$, there exists C_1 with dimension $j - \rho - i(2\rho+1)$ such that $D_1 \subset C_1$. Thus $d_s(C_1, D_1) = \dim(C_1) - \dim(D_1) \leq \rho$. Similarly, for all $D_2 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $j - \rho - i(2\rho+1) < \dim(D_2) \leq j - i(2\rho+1)$, there exists C_2 with dimension $j - \rho - i(2\rho+1)$ such that $C_2 \subset D_2$. Thus $d_s(C_2, D_2) = \dim(D_2) - \dim(C_2) \leq \rho$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{r \in J_1} E_r(q, n)$ covers all subspaces with dimension $\leq j$. Similarly, all the subspaces with dimension $\geq n - j$ are covered by $\bigcup_{r \in J_2} E_r(q, n)$. ■

We finally determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_s(q, n, \rho)$. We define $k_s(\rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_{q^{n^2}} K_s(q, n, \rho)$.

Proposition 18: For $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_s(\rho') = \frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{2} - \rho')$. For $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$, $k_s(\rho') = 0$.

Proof: By Proposition 14, $k_s(\rho') = 0$ for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$. Let \mathcal{C} be a code with subspace covering radius $10 \leq \rho < j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and for $0 \leq l \leq n$, let A_l denote the number of codesubspaces in \mathcal{C} with dimension l . Note that $10 > \frac{1}{2} - 4 \log_q K_q + 2 \log_q \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}}$ for all $q \geq 2$. All the subspaces in $E_j(q, n)$ are covered, hence $\binom{n}{j} \leq \sum_{l=0}^n A_l \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(l, j, d) \leq \binom{n-j+\rho}{\rho} |\mathcal{C}|$ by Lemma 9. Therefore, $K_s(q, n, \rho) \geq \frac{\binom{n}{j}}{\binom{n-j+\rho}{\rho}} > K_q q^{(n-j)(j-\rho)}$ for $\rho \geq 10$, which asymptotically becomes $k_s(\rho') \geq \frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{2} - \rho')$.

Also, by Proposition 16, it can be easily shown that $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq (n+1)[1 - \ln K_q + \rho(n-j) \ln q] K_q^{-1} q^{(n-j)(j-\rho)}$, which asymptotically becomes $k_s(\rho') \leq \frac{1}{2} (\frac{1}{2} - \rho')$. ■

V. PACKING AND COVERING PROPERTIES OF SUBSPACE CODES WITH THE MODIFIED SUBSPACE METRIC

A. Properties of balls with modified subspace radii

In this section, we investigate the properties of balls with modified subspace radii in $E(q, n)$, which will be instrumental in our study of packing and covering properties of subspace codes with the modified subspace distance.

Lemma 11: The number of subspaces with dimension s at modified subspace distance d from a subspace with dimension r is given by $N_M(r, s, d) = N_S(r, s, 2d - |r - s|)$.

Proof: If $U \in E_r(q, n)$ and $V \in E_s(q, n)$, then $d_M(U, V) = d$ if and only if $d_S(U, V) = 2d - |r - s|$. ■

We finally denote the volume of a ball with modified subspace radius t around a subspace with dimension r as $V_M(r, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{d=0}^t \sum_{s=0}^n N_M(r, s, d)$. We derive bounds on $V_M(r, t)$ below.

Proposition 19: For all q, n, r , and $2t \leq n$, $q^{t(n-t)} \leq V_M(r, t) < N_q(2N_q - 1)K_q^{-2}q^{t(n-t)}$, where $N_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

The proof of Proposition 19 is given in Appendix H.

B. Packing properties of subspace codes with the modified subspace metric

In this section, we are interested in packing subspace codes used with the modified subspace metric. The maximum cardinality of a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum modified subspace distance d is denoted as $A_M(q, n, d)$. When $2d > n$, the maximum cardinality of a code with minimum modified subspace distance d is determined and a code with maximum cardinality is given. For all $J \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we denote the maximum cardinality of a code with minimum modified subspace distance d and codesubspaces having dimensions in J as $A_M(q, n, d, J)$.

Proposition 20: For $d > \frac{n}{2}$, $A_M(q, n, d) = 2$. For $d \leq \frac{n}{2}$, let $Q_d = \{d, d+1, \dots, n-d\}$, then $A_M(q, n, d) = A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum modified subspace distance d and let $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$. We have $\max\{\dim(C), \dim(D)\} = d_M(C, D) + \dim(U \cap V) \geq d$, therefore there is at most one codesubspace with dimension less than d . Also, $\min\{\dim(C), \dim(D)\} = \dim(C + D) - d_M(C, D) \leq n - d$, therefore there is at most one codesubspace with dimension greater than $n - d$. Thus $A_M(q, n, d) \leq 2$ for $d > \frac{n}{2}$ and $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$ for $d \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Also, adding $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\text{GF}(q)^n$ to a code with minimum distance d and codesubspaces of dimensions in Q_d does not decrease the minimum distance. Thus $A_M(q, n, d) = A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$ for $d \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Similarly, the code $\{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^n\}$ has minimum distance n and hence $A_M(q, n, d) = 2$ for $d > \frac{n}{2}$. ■

Lemma 12 below relates $A_M(q, n, d)$ with $A_S(q, n, d)$ and $A_C(q, n, r, d)$.

Lemma 12: For all q, n , and d , $A_S(q, n, 2d - 1) \leq A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_S(q, n, d)$ and for $d \geq \frac{n}{3}$, $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_S(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d) + 2$. Also, $\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} A_C(q, n, r, d) \leq A_M(q, n, d) \leq 2 + \sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_C(q, n, r, d)$.

Proof: A code with minimum subspace distance $2d - 1$ has minimum modified subspace distance $\geq d$ by (3) and hence $A_S(q, n, 2d - 1) \leq A_M(q, n, d)$. Similarly, a code with minimum modified subspace

distance d has minimum subspace distance $\geq d$ and hence $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_S(q, n, d)$.

Let \mathcal{C} be a code with minimum modified subspace distance d whose codesubspaces have dimensions in Q_d . For all codesubspaces U and V , $d_s(U, V) = 2d_M(U, V) - |\dim(U) - \dim(V)| \geq 2d - (n - 2d)$. Thus \mathcal{C} has modified subspace distance $4d - n \geq d$ for $d \geq \frac{n}{3}$, and hence $A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) \leq A_S(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d)$. Proposition 20 finally yields $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2 \leq A_S(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d) + 2$.

Any CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum distance d is a subspace code with minimum modified subspace distance d , hence $A_C(q, n, r, d) \leq A_M(q, n, d)$ for all r . Also, the codesubspaces with dimension r in a subspace code with minimum distance d form a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum distance at least d , hence $A_M(q, n, d) = A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2 \leq 2 + \sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_C(q, n, r, d)$. ■

Proposition 21 below is the analogue of Proposition 12 for the modified subspace metric and its proof is hence omitted.

Proposition 21: For all q, n , $1 \leq d \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and any permutation π of $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a code with minimum modified subspace distance d and A_r codewords with dimension r for $0 \leq r \leq n$, where $A_{\pi(0)} = A_C(q, n, \pi(0), d)$ and

$$A_{\pi(r)} = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lfloor \frac{\binom{n}{\pi(r)} - \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} A_{\pi(i)} \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_M(\pi(i), \pi(r), e)}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_M(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rfloor \right\}. \quad (18)$$

We now derive a Singleton bound for modified subspace codes.

Proposition 22: For all q, n , and $2 \leq d \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_M(q, n-1, d-1) \leq \sum_{r=0}^{n-d+1} \binom{n-d+1}{r}$.

Proof: We define the puncturing $H(V)$ from $E(q, n)$ to $E(q, n-1)$ as follows. If $\dim(V) = 0$, then $\dim(H(V)) = 0$. Otherwise, if $\dim(V) = r > 0$, then $H(V)$ is a random $(r-1)$ -subspace of $V \cap \text{GF}(q)^{n-1}$. For all $U, V \in E(q, n)$, it is easily shown that $d_M(H(U), H(V)) \geq d_M(U, V) - 1$, and hence $H(U) \neq H(V)$ if $d_M(U, V) \geq 2$.

Therefore, if \mathcal{C} is a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum modified subspace distance d , then $\{H(V) : V \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is a code in $E(q, n-1)$ with minimum modified subspace distance $\geq d-1$ and cardinality $|\mathcal{C}|$. The first inequality follows. Applying it $d-1$ times yields $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_M(q, n-d+1, 1) = \sum_{r=0}^{n-d+1} \binom{n-d+1}{r}$. ■

We now determine the asymptotic behavior of $A_M(q, n, d)$ by using the normalized parameter $a_M(d') = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_{q^{n^2}} A_M(q, n, d)$.

Proposition 23: For $0 \leq d' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $a_M(d') = \frac{1-2d'}{4}$. For $\frac{1}{2} \leq d' \leq 1$, $a_M(d') = 0$.

Proof: First, Proposition 20 yields $a_M(d') = 0$ for $d' > \frac{1}{2}$. We hence suppose $d' \leq \frac{1}{2}$ henceforth. Denoting $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, by Lemma 12 we have $A_M(q, n, d) \leq 2 + \sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_C(q, n, r, d) < 2 + 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{r=d}^j q^{(n-r)(r-d+1)} < 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(n-j)(j-d+1)}$, which asymptotically becomes $a_M(d') \leq \frac{1-2d'}{4}$.

Also, by Lemma 12 and (4) we obtain $A_M(q, n, d) \geq L(q, n, j, d) \geq q^{(n-j)(j-d+1)}$, which asymptotically becomes $a_M(d') \geq \frac{1-2d'}{4}$. ■

C. Covering properties of subspace codes with the modified subspace metric

In this section, we consider the covering properties of subspace codes with the modified subspace metric. We denote the minimum cardinality of a subspace code in $E(q, n)$ with modified subspace covering radius ρ as $K_M(q, n, \rho)$. Since $K_M(q, n, 0) = |E(q, n)|$ and $K_M(q, n, n) = 1$, we assume $0 < \rho < n$ henceforth. When $\rho \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, we determine the minimum cardinality of a code with modified subspace covering radius ρ .

Proposition 24: For $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \leq \rho < n$, $K_M(q, n, \rho) = 1$.

Proof: Let C be a subspace with dimension $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Then for all D_1 with $\dim(D_1) \leq \dim(C)$, we have $d_M(C, D_1) \leq \dim(C) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ by (1); similarly, for all D_2 with $\dim(D_2) \geq \dim(C) + 1$, we have $d_M(C, D_2) \leq n - \dim(D_2) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ by (2). Thus C covers $E(q, n)$ with radius $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and $K_M(q, n, \rho) = 1$. ■

We thus consider $0 < \rho < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ henceforth. Lemma 13 relates $K_M(q, n, \rho)$ to $K_S(q, n, \rho)$ and $K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Lemma 13: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, $K_S(q, n, 2\rho) \leq K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq K_S(q, n, \rho)$ and $K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq \sum_{r=0}^n K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Proof: A code with modified subspace covering radius ρ has subspace covering radius $\leq 2\rho$, hence $K_S(q, n, 2\rho) \leq K_M(q, n, \rho)$. Also, a code with subspace covering radius ρ has modified subspace covering radius $\leq \rho$, hence $K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq K_S(q, n, \rho)$. The last inequality is trivial. ■

Proposition 25 below is the analogue of Proposition 15 and its proof is hence omitted.

Proposition 25: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, $K_M(q, n, \rho) \geq \min \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, where the minimum is taken over all integer sequences $\{A_i\}$ satisfying $0 \leq A_i \leq \binom{n}{i}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\sum_{i=0}^n A_i \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_M(i, r, d) \geq \binom{n}{r}$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$.

We finally determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_M(q, n, \rho)$ by using the normalized parameter $k_M(\rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log_{q^{n^2}} K_M(q, n, \rho)$.

Proposition 26: For $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_M(\rho') = (\frac{1}{2} - \rho')^2$. For $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$, $k_M(\rho') = 0$.

Proof: By Proposition 24, $k_M(\rho') = 0$ for $\frac{1}{2} < \rho' \leq 1$. We have $K_M(q, n, \rho) \geq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_M(r, \rho)} > \frac{K_q^2}{N_q(2N_q-1)} q^{j(n-j)-\rho(n-\rho)}$ by Proposition 19, where $j = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. This asymptotically becomes $k_M(\rho') \geq \frac{1}{4} - \rho'(1 - \rho')$ for $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, [23, Theorem 12.2.1], Lemma 8, and Proposition 19 yield

$$K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\min_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_M(r, \rho)} \left[1 + \ln \left(\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_M(r, \rho) \right) \right] \quad (19)$$

$$< 2K_q^{-1} N_q \left[1 + \ln(N_q(2N_q - 1)K_q^{-2}) + \rho(n - \rho) \ln q \right] q^{j(n-j)-\rho(n-\rho)}, \quad (20)$$

which asymptotically becomes $k_M(\rho') \leq \frac{1}{4} - \rho'(1 - \rho')$ for $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$. \blacksquare

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Proposition 1

Before we prove Proposition 1, we introduce some useful notations. For $0 \leq d \leq r$, we denote $U_d = \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{I}_r | \mathbf{P}_d) \in E_r(q, n)$, where $\mathbf{P}_d = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right) \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$, hence $d_M(U_0, U_d) = d$ for all $0 \leq d \leq r$. We also denote the set of all generator matrices of all subspaces in $B_u(U_0) \cap B_s(U_d)$ as $F(u, s, d)$, hence $|F(u, s, d)| = I_C(u, s, d) \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (q^r - q^i)$.

Lemma 14: Let $\mathbf{X} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times n}$, $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{B})$, where \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} have r and $n - r$ columns, respectively. Furthermore, we denote $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{A}_2)$ and $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{B}_2)$, where \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} are the d -th columns of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , respectively. Then $\mathbf{X} \in F(u, s, d)$ if and only if $\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}) = r$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}) \leq u$, and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq s$.

Proof: First, \mathbf{X} is the generator matrix of some $V \in E_r(q, n)$ if and only if $\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}) = r$. Second,

$$d_M(V, U_0) = \text{rk} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \end{array} \right) - r = \text{rk} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} \end{array} \right) - r = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}).$$

Third,

$$d_M(V, U_d) = \text{rk} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{P}_d \\ \hline \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \end{array} \right) - r = \text{rk} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{I}_r & \mathbf{P}_d \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_d \end{array} \right) - r = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_d) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{b} | \mathbf{B}_2).$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{X} \in F(u, s, d)$ if and only if $\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}) = r$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}) \leq u$, and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq s$. \blacksquare

We now give the proof of Proposition 1.

Proof: It suffices to show that $I_C(u, s, d) \leq I_C(u, s, d - 1)$ for any $d \geq 1$. We do so by determining an injective mapping ϕ from $F(u, s, d)$ to $F(u, s, d - 1)$. Let $\mathbf{X} \in F(u, s, d)$, then by Lemma 14, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}) = r$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}) \leq u$, and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq s$. Since the mapping ϕ only modifies \mathbf{b} , we shall denote $\phi(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{c} | \mathbf{B}_2)$. We hence have to show that $\text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}) = r$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{c} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq u$, and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{c} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq s$. We need to distinguish three cases.

- Case I: $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq s - 1$. In this case, $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b}$. Note that $\text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}) = r$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}) \leq u$, and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{c} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) + 1 \leq s$.
- Case II: $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) = s$ and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq u - 1$. In this case, $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}$. Note that $\text{rk}(\mathbf{Y}) = r$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{c} | \mathbf{B}_2) \leq \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}) + 1 \leq u$, and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{c} | \mathbf{B}_2) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{B}_2) = s$.
- Case III: $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) = s$ and $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) = u$. We have $\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2)$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2)$. Hence $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2 | \mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1)$. Denoting $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2 | \mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1) = \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 | \mathbf{B}_2) \oplus \mathfrak{S}$, where \mathfrak{S}

is a fixed subspace of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1)$, \mathbf{a} can be uniquely expressed as $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{s}$, where $\mathbf{r} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1|\mathbf{B}_2)$ and $\mathbf{s} \in \mathfrak{S}$. In this case, $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{r}$. Since $\mathbf{b} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1|\mathbf{B}_2)$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{B}_1|\mathbf{B}_2) = r = \text{rk}(\mathbf{Y})$. Also, since $\mathbf{c} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1|\mathbf{B}_2)$, $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1|\mathbf{c}|\mathbf{B}_2) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1|\mathbf{B}_2) = u$. Finally, $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} - \mathbf{s} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1|\mathbf{B}_2)$, therefore $\text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1|\mathbf{c}|\mathbf{B}_2) = s$.

It is easy to show that ϕ is injective. Therefore, $|F(u, s, d)| \leq |F(u, s, d - 1)|$ and $I_C(u, s, d) \leq I_C(u, s, d - 1)$. ■

B. Proof of Proposition 4

We adapt below the notations in [36], [37] to the modified subspace metric for CDCs. For all $V \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ and a CDC $\mathcal{C} \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ with covering radius ρ , the excess on V by \mathcal{C} is defined to be $E_C(V) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |B_\rho(C) \cap V| - |V|$. Hence if $\{W_i\}$ is a family of disjoint subsets of $E_r(q, n)$, then $E_C(\bigcup_i W_i) = \sum_i E_C(W_i)$. We define $\mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{Z \in E_r(q, n) : E_C(\{Z\}) \geq 1\}$, i.e., \mathcal{Z} is the set of subspaces covered by at least two codesubspaces in \mathcal{C} . It follows that $|\mathcal{Z}| \leq E_C(\mathcal{Z}) = E_C(E_r(q, n)) = |\mathcal{C}|V_C(\rho) - \binom{n}{r}$.

Before proving Proposition 4, we need the following adaptation of [37, Lemma 8]. Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E_r(q, n)$ with covering radius ρ . We define $\mathcal{A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{U \in E_r(q, n) : d_M(U, \mathcal{C}) = \rho\}$.

Lemma 15: For $U \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Z}$ and $0 < \rho < n$, we have $E_C(B_1(U)) \geq \epsilon$.

Proof: Since $U \notin \mathcal{Z}$, there is a unique $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $d_M(U, C_0) = \rho$. We have $|B_\rho(C_0) \cap B_1(U)| = I_C(\rho, 1, \rho) = J_C(\rho, 0, \rho) + J_C(\rho, 1, \rho) + J_C(\rho - 1, 1, \rho) = 1 + a_\rho + c_\rho$. For any codesubspace $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying $d_M(U, C_1) = \rho + 1$, by Lemma 4 we have $|B_\rho(C_1) \cap B_1(U)| = J_C(\rho, 1, \rho + 1) = c_{\rho+1}$. Finally, for all other codesubspaces $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ at distance $> \rho + 1$ from U , we have $|B_\rho(C_2) \cap B_1(U)| = 0$. Denoting $N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\{C_1 \in \mathcal{C} : d_M(U, C_1) = \rho + 1\}|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_C(B_1(U)) &= \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |B_\rho(C) \cap B_1(U)| - |B_1(U)| \\ &= 1 + a_\rho + c_\rho + Nc_{\rho+1} - N_C(1) - 1 \\ &\equiv -b_\rho \pmod{c_{\rho+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by realizing that $-b_\rho < 0$, while $E_C(B_1(U))$ is a non-negative integer. ■

We now establish a key lemma.

Lemma 16: If $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $0 < \rho < n$, then $|\mathcal{A} \cap B_1(Z)| \leq V_C(1) - c_\rho$.

Proof: By definition of ρ , there exists $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $d_M(Z, C) \leq \rho$. By Proposition 1, $|B_1(Z) \cap B_{\rho-1}(C)|$ gets its minimal value for $d_M(Z, C) = \rho$, which is c_ρ . A subspace at distance $\leq \rho - 1$ from any codesubspace does not belong to \mathcal{A} . Therefore, $B_1(Z) \cap B_{\rho-1}(C) \subseteq B_1(Z) \setminus \mathcal{A}$, and hence $|\mathcal{A} \cap B_1(Z)| = |B_1(Z)| - |B_1(Z) \setminus \mathcal{A}| \leq V_C(1) - |B_1(Z) \cap B_{\rho-1}(C)|$. ■

We now give a proof of Proposition 4.

Proof: For a code \mathcal{C} with covering radius ρ and $\epsilon \geq 1$,

$$\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \left\{ \binom{n}{r} - |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho-1) \right\} - (\epsilon-1) \left\{ |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho) - \binom{n}{r} \right\} \quad (21)$$

$$\leq \epsilon|\mathcal{A}| - (\epsilon-1)|\mathcal{Z}| \quad (22)$$

$$\leq \epsilon|\mathcal{A}| - (\epsilon-1)|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z}| = \epsilon|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Z}| + |\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z}|,$$

where (22) follows from $|\mathcal{Z}| \leq |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho) - \binom{n}{r}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Z}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(A)) + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(A)) \\ &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(A)), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where (23) follows from Lemma 15 and $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z}| \leq E_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{U \in B_1(A) \cap \mathcal{Z}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}) \\ &= \sum_{U \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{A \in B_1(U) \cap \mathcal{A}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}) = \sum_{U \in \mathcal{Z}} |\mathcal{A} \cap B_1(U)| E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where (24) follows the fact that the second summation is over disjoint sets $\{U\}$. By Lemma 16, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\leq \sum_{U \in \mathcal{Z}} (V_{\mathcal{C}}(1) - c_{\rho}) E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}) \\ &= (V_{\mathcal{C}}(1) - c_{\rho}) E_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{Z}) \\ &= (V_{\mathcal{C}}(1) - c_{\rho}) \left\{ |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho) - \binom{n}{r} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Combining (25) and (21), we obtain the bound in Proposition 4. \blacksquare

C. Proof of Lemma 7

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E_r(q, n-1)$ with covering radius $\rho-1$ and cardinality $K_{\mathcal{C}}(q, n-1, r, \rho-1)$. Define the code $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ as $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{\mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{C}|\mathbf{0}) : \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{C}) \in \mathcal{C}\}$. For any $U_1 \in E_r(q, n)$ with generator matrix $\mathbf{U}_1 = (\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{u})$, where $\mathbf{U} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times n-1}$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times 1}$, we prove that there exists $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ generated by $\mathbf{C}_1 = (\mathbf{C}|\mathbf{0})$ such that $d_{\text{M}}(C_1, U_1) \leq \rho$. First, if $\text{rk}(\mathbf{U}) = r$, then there exists $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}^T|\mathbf{U}^T) \leq r + \rho - 1$ and hence $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}_1^T|\mathbf{U}_1^T) \leq r + \rho$ and $d_{\text{M}}(C_1, U_1) \leq \rho$. Second,

if $\text{rk}(\mathbf{U}) = r - 1$, then let \mathbf{U}_0 be $r - 1$ linearly independent rows of \mathbf{U} . For any $\mathbf{v} \in \text{GF}(q)^{n-1}$, $\mathbf{v} \notin \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{U}_0)$, there exists $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $r + \rho - 1 \geq \text{rk}(\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{U}_0^T | \mathbf{v}^T) \geq \text{rk}(\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{U}_0^T) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{U}^T)$. Hence $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}_1^T | \mathbf{U}_1^T) \leq r + \rho$ and $d_M(C_1, U_1) \leq \rho$. Thus $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n - 1, r, \rho - 1)$ which applied ρ times yields $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n - \rho, r, 0) = \binom{n - \rho}{r}$.

Similarly, let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E_{r-1}(q, n)$ with covering radius $\rho - 1$ and cardinality $K_C(q, n, r - 1, \rho - 1)$. Define the code $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{\mathfrak{R}((\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{c}^T)^T) : \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}\} \in E_r(q, n)$, where $\mathbf{c} \in \text{GF}(q)^n$ is chosen at random such that $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{c}^T) = r$. We remark that $|\mathcal{C}_2| \leq |\mathcal{C}|$. For any $U_2 \in E_r(q, n)$ with generator matrix $\mathbf{U}_2 = (\mathbf{U}^T | \mathbf{u}^T)^T$, there exists $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$ with generator matrix $\mathbf{C}_2 = (\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{c}^T)^T$ with $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}^T | \mathbf{U}^T) \leq r + \rho - 2$. Thus $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}_2^T | \mathbf{U}_2^T) \leq r + \rho$ and \mathcal{C}_2 has covering radius at most ρ . Thus $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq |\mathcal{C}_2| \leq K_C(q, n, r - 1, \rho - 1)$ which applied ρ times yields $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n, r - \rho, 0) = \binom{n}{r - \rho}$. ■

D. Proof of Proposition 6

Proof: For any code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ we denote the number of subspaces in $E_r(q, n)$ at distance $> \rho$ from \mathcal{C} as $P(\mathcal{C})$. Denoting the set of all codes in $E_r(q, n)$ and cardinality K as S_K , we have $|S_K| = \binom{Q}{K}$, where $Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \binom{n}{r}$. The average value of $P(\mathcal{C})$ for all codes $\mathcal{C} \in S_K$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in S_K} P(\mathcal{C}) &= \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in S_K} \sum_{\substack{U \in E_r(q, n) \\ d_M(U, \mathcal{C}) > \rho}} 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{U \in E_r(q, n)} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in S_K \\ d_M(U, \mathcal{C}) > \rho}} 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{U \in E_r(q, n)} \binom{Q - V_C(\rho)}{K} \\ &= \frac{Q}{|S_K|} \binom{Q - V_C(\rho)}{K}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Eq. (26) comes from the fact that there are $\binom{Q - V_C(\rho)}{K}$ codes with cardinality K that do not cover U . For all K , there exists a code $\mathcal{C}' \in S_K$ for which $P(\mathcal{C}')$ is no more than the average, i.e., $P(\mathcal{C}') \leq Q \binom{Q}{K}^{-1} \binom{Q - V_C(\rho)}{K} \leq Q (1 - Q^{-1} V_C(\rho))^K$. For $K = \left\lfloor -\frac{1}{\log_Q(1 - Q^{-1} V_C(\rho))} \right\rfloor + 1$, $P(\mathcal{C}') \leq Q (1 - Q^{-1} V_C(\rho))^K < 1$ and \mathcal{C}' has covering radius at most ρ . ■

E. Proof of Proposition 8

Proof: The proof is by induction on k . First, by (4) there exists a code with cardinality k_0 and minimum distance $2\rho + 1$ for $2\rho < r$ which leaves u_{k_0} subspaces uncovered; for $2\rho \geq r$, a single codesubspace covers $V_C(\rho)$ subspaces. Second, suppose there exists a code with cardinality k which leaves

u_k uncovered subspaces, and denote the set of uncovered subspaces as U_k . Let G be the graph where the vertex set is $E_r(q, n)$ and two vertices are adjacent if and only if their distance is at most ρ . Let \mathbf{A} be the adjacency matrix of G and \mathbf{A}_k be the u_k columns of \mathbf{A} corresponding to U_k . There are $u_k V_C(\rho)$ ones in \mathbf{A}_k , distributed across $|N(U_k)|$ rows, where $N(U_k)$ is the neighborhood of U_k . By construction, $N(U_k)$ does not contain any codesubspace, hence $|N(U_k)| \leq \binom{n}{r} - k$. Also, by Lemma 5, $|N(U_k)| \leq B_C(u_k)$. Thus $|N(U_k)| \leq \min\{\binom{n}{r} - k, B_C(u_k)\}$ and there exists a row with at least $\left\lceil \frac{u_k V_C(\rho)}{\min\{\binom{n}{r} - k, B_C(u_k)\}} \right\rceil$ ones in \mathbf{A}_k . Adding the subspace corresponding to this row to the code, we obtain a code with cardinality $k + 1$ which leaves at most u_{k+1} subspaces uncovered. ■

F. Proof of Lemma 10

Proof: For $l \leq r - t - 1$ or $l \geq r + t + 1$, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(l, r, d) = 0$. Also, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r - t, r, d) = N_s(r - t, r, t)$ and $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r + t, r, d) = N_s(r + t, r, t) = \binom{r+t}{t} \leq \binom{n-r+t}{t}$. We hence assume $r - t + 1 \leq l \leq r + t - 1$ henceforth. We have $N_s(l, r, d) = q^{u(d-u)} \binom{l}{u} \binom{n-l}{d-u}$, where $u = \frac{l+d-r}{2}$, hence $N_s(l, r, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(l,d)}$, where $4f(l, d) = l(l - 2n + 2r) + 2d(n - d) + r(2n - 3r)$. Since $f(l, t - i) = f(l, t) - \frac{i}{2}(n - 2t + i)$, we obtain $\sum_{d=0}^t q^{f(l,d)} < q^{f(l,t)} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}}$. When $r - t + 1 \leq l \leq r + t - 1$, it is easily shown that $f(l, t) \leq f(r - t + 1, t) = t(n - r) - \frac{1}{4}(2n - 4r + 2t - 1)$. Therefore, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(l, r, d) < q^{t(n-r)} q^{-\frac{1}{4}(2t-1)} K_q^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}}$. Since $t > \frac{1}{2} - 4 \log_q K_q + 2 \log_q \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}}$, we have $q^{-\frac{1}{4}(2t-1)} K_q^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{i^2}{2}} < 1$ and $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(l, r, d) < q^{f(r-t,t)} \leq \binom{n-r+t}{t}$. ■

G. Proof of Proposition 10

Proof: First, by Lemma 9 $N_s(r, s, d) = q^{u(d-u)} \binom{r}{u} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$, where $u = \frac{r+d-s}{2}$ satisfies $0 \leq u \leq \min\{r, d\}$. Thus $q^{f(u)} \leq N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(u)}$, where $f(u) = u(2r + 3d - n - 3u) + d(n - r - d)$. Since f is maximized for $u = u_0 = \frac{2r+3d-n}{6} \leq d$, we need to consider several cases.

- Case I: $0 \leq d \leq \frac{n-2r}{3} \leq \frac{n}{3}$. We have $u_0 \leq 0$ and hence f is maximized for $u = 0$: $f(0) = g(d) = d(n-r-d)$. Thus $V_s(r, t) \geq q^{g(d)}$, and it is easy to show that $\sum_{u=0}^r q^{f(u)} = q^{g(d)} \sum_{u=0}^r q^{-u(n-2r-3d+3u)} < M_q q^{g(d)}$.
- Case II: $0 \leq \frac{n-2r}{3} \leq d \leq \min\{\frac{n+4r}{3}, \frac{n}{2}\}$. We have $0 \leq u_0 \leq r$ and hence f is maximized for $u = u_0$: $f(u_0) = g(d) = \frac{1}{12}(n - 2r)^2 + \frac{1}{4}d(2n - d)$. Thus $V_s(r, t) \geq \max\{q^{f(\lfloor u_0 \rfloor)}, q^{f(\lceil u_0 \rceil)}\} \geq q^{g(d) - \frac{3}{4}}$, and it is easy to show that $\sum_{u=0}^r q^{f(u)} = q^{g(d)} \sum_{u=0}^r q^{-3(u-u_0)^2} < (2M_q - 1)q^{g(d)}$.
- Case III: $\frac{n}{3} \leq \frac{n+4r}{3} \leq d \leq \frac{n}{2}$. We have $u_0 \geq r$ and hence f is maximized for $u = r$: $f(r) = g(d) = (d - r)(n - d + r)$. Thus $V_s(r, t) \geq q^{g(d)}$, and it is easy to show that $\sum_{u=0}^r q^{f(u)} = q^{g(d)} \sum_{i=0}^r q^{-i(3d-4r-n+3i)} < M_q q^{g(d)}$.

It is easily shown that $g(d-i) \leq g(d) - \frac{i^2}{2}$ for all d and i . Therefore,

$$V_s(r, t) = \sum_{d=0}^t \sum_{s=0}^{r+d} N_s(r, s, d) \quad (27)$$

$$< (2M_q - 1)K_q^{-2} \sum_{d=0}^t q^{g(d)} \quad (28)$$

$$< (2M_q - 1)L_q K_q^{-2} q^{g(t)}. \quad (29)$$

■

H. Proof of Proposition 19

Proof: First, $V_M(r, t) \geq N_M(r, r, t) \geq q^{t(n-t)}$. We now prove the upper bound. Since $V_M(r, t) = V_M(n-r, t)$, we assume $r \leq \frac{n}{2}$ without loss of generality. For $s \leq r$, we have $N_M(r, s, d) = q^{d(d+s-r)} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d+s-r \end{bmatrix} < K_q^{-2} q^{s(n-d+r-s)-(r-d)(n-d)}$. Similarly, for $s \geq r$, we have $N_M(r, s, d) = q^{d(d+r-s)} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d+r-s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d \end{bmatrix} < K_q^{-2} q^{s(r-s+d)+d(n-r-d)}$. We have $V_M(r, t) = \sum_{d=0}^t \sum_{s=0}^n N_M(r, s, d)$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} K_q^2 V_M(r, t) &< \sum_{d=0}^r \left\{ \sum_{s=r-d}^r q^{s(n-d+r-s)-(r-d)(n-d)} + \sum_{s=r+1}^{r+d} q^{s(r-s+d)+d(n-r-d)} \right\} \\ &+ \sum_{d=r+1}^t \sum_{s=d}^{d+r} q^{s(r-s+d)+d(n-r-d)} \\ &= \sum_{d=0}^r q^{d(n-d)} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^d q^{-i(n-d-r+i)} + \sum_{j=1}^d q^{-j(r-d+j)} \right\} + \sum_{d=r+1}^t q^{d(n-d)} \sum_{k=0}^r q^{-k(d-r+k)} \\ &< (2N_q - 1) \sum_{d=0}^t q^{d(n-d)} + N_q \sum_{d=0}^t q^{d(n-d)} \\ &< (2N_q - 1) q^{t(n-t)} \sum_{l=0}^t q^{-l(n-2t-l)} \\ &< (2N_q - 1) N_q q^{t(n-t)}. \end{aligned}$$

■

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ho, R. Koetter, M. Médard, D. R. Karger, and M. Effros, "The benefits of coding over routing in a randomized setting," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, Yokohama, June-July 2003, p. 442.
- [2] P. A. Chou, Y. Wu, and K. Jain, "Practical network coding," in *Allerton Conf. on Comm., Control, and Computing*, Monticello, IL, October 2003.

- [3] T. Ho, M. Médard, R. Koetter, D. R. Karger, M. Effros, J. Shi, and B. Leong, “A random linear network coding approach to multicast,” vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4413–4430, October 2006.
- [4] R. Koetter and F. R. Kschischang, “Coding for errors and erasures in random network coding,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3579–3591, August 2008.
- [5] P. Delsarte, “Association schemes and t -designs in regular semilattices,” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, vol. 20, pp. 230–243, 1976.
- [6] L. Chihara, “On the zeros of the Askey-Wilson polynomials with applications to coding theory,” *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 191–207, January 1987.
- [7] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, “Error-correcting codes in projective space,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Info. Theory*, Toronto, ON, July 2008, pp. 871–875.
- [8] E. M. Gabidulin and M. Bossert, “Codes for network coding,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Info. Theory*, Toronto, ON, July 2008, pp. 867–870.
- [9] D. Silva and F. R. Kschischang, “On metrics for error correction in network coding,” 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.3824v1>.
- [10] W. J. Martin and X. J. Zhu, “Anticodes for the Grassmann and bilinear forms graphs,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 6, pp. 73–79, 1995.
- [11] R. Ahlswede, H. K. Aydinian, and L. H. Khachatrian, “On perfect codes and related concepts,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 22, pp. 221–237, 2001.
- [12] M. Schwartz and T. Etzion, “Codes and anticodes in the Grassmann graph,” *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, vol. 97, pp. 27–42, 2002.
- [13] S.-T. Xia and F.-W. Fu, “Johnson type bounds on constant dimension codes,” *submitted to Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, Sept. 2007, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.1074>.
- [14] P. Frankl and R. M. Wilson, “The Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for vector spaces,” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, vol. 43, pp. 228–236, 1986.
- [15] T. Etzion, “Perfect byte-correcting codes,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 44, pp. 3140–3146, 1998.
- [16] H. Wang, C. Xing, and R. Safani-Naini, “Linear authentication codes: Bounds and constructions,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 866–872, April 2003.
- [17] V. Skachek, “Recursive code construction for random networks,” 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0806.3650v1>.
- [18] A. Kohnert and S. Kurz, “Construction of large constant dimension codes with a prescribed minimum distance,” July 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.3212>.
- [19] P. Delsarte, “Four fundamental parameters of a code and their combinatorial significance,” *Information and Control*, vol. 23, pp. 407–438, 1973.
- [20] T. Berger, *Rate Distortion Theory: A Mathematical Basis for Data Compression*, ser. Information and System Sciences Series, T. Kailath, Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- [21] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977.
- [22] R. Blahut, *Theory and Practice of Error Control Codes*. Addison-Wesley, 1983.
- [23] G. D. Cohen, I. Honkala, S. Litsyn, and A. C. Lobstein, *Covering Codes*. Elsevier, 1997.
- [24] G. E. Andrews, *The Theory of Partitions*, ser. Encyclopædia of Mathematics and its Applications, G.-C. Rota, Ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1976, vol. 2.

- [25] M. Gadouneau and Z. Yan, “On the decoder error probability of bounded rank-distance decoders for maximum rank distance codes,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 3202–3206, July 2008.
- [26] P. Delsarte, “Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory,” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, vol. 25, pp. 226–241, 1978.
- [27] E. M. Gabidulin, “Theory of codes with maximum rank distance,” *Problems on Information Transmission*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Jan. 1985.
- [28] R. M. Roth, “Maximum-rank array codes and their application to crisscross error correction,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 328–336, March 1991.
- [29] M. Gadouneau and Z. Yan, “Packing and covering properties of rank metric codes,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3873–3883, September 2008.
- [30] —, “Constant-rank codes and their connection to constant-dimension codes,” *submitted to IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 2008.
- [31] D. Silva, F. R. Kschischang, and R. Koetter, “A rank-metric approach to error control in random network coding,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3951–3967, 2008.
- [32] P. Delsarte, “Properties and applications of the recurrence $F(i + 1, k + 1, n + 1) = q^{k+1}F(i, k + 1, n) - q^k F(i, k, n)$,” *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 262–270, September 1976.
- [33] E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic Combinatorics I. Association Schemes*. The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, 1983.
- [34] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, and A. Neumaier, *Distance-Regular Graphs*, ser. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1989, vol. 18, no. 3.
- [35] P. Delsarte and V. I. Levenshtein, “Association schemes and coding theory,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2477–2504, 1998.
- [36] G. van Wee, “Improved sphere bounds on the covering radius of codes,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 34, pp. 237–245, 1988.
- [37] —, “Bounds on packings and coverings by spheres in q -ary and mixed Hamming spaces,” *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, vol. 57, pp. 116–129, 1991.
- [38] W. E. Clark and L. A. Dunning, “Tight upper bounds for the domination numbers of graphs with given order and minimum degree,” *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, vol. 4, 1997.
- [39] M. Gadouneau and Z. Yan, “Bounds on covering codes with the rank metric,” *submitted to Communications Letters*, September 2008.