

Packing and Covering Properties of CDCs and Subspace Codes

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

Abstract

Codes in the projective space over a finite field, referred to as subspace codes, and in particular codes in the Grassmannian, referred to as constant-dimension codes (CDCs), have been proposed for error control in random network coding. In this paper, we first study the covering properties of CDCs. We determine some fundamental geometric properties of the Grassmannian. Using these properties, 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 modified subspace metric. We investigate the properties of balls in the projective space. Using these results, we derive bounds on the cardinalities of packing and covering subspace codes, and we determine the asymptotic rate of optimal packing and optimal covering subspace codes for both metrics. We thus show that optimal packing CDCs are asymptotically optimal packing subspace codes for both metrics. However, optimal covering CDCs can be used to construct asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes only for the modified subspace metric.

I. INTRODUCTION

Sending data across a network using random network coding can be modeled as transmitting subspaces over an operator channel [1]. The errors that typically occur on the channel are described by the subspace metric [1], or, on adversarial channels, by the so-called modified subspace metric [2]. Error control for random network coding can hence be performed using codes in the projective space, referred to as subspace codes henceforth. Codes in the Grassmannian, referred to as constant-dimension codes (CDCs)

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).

henceforth, are a subclass of subspace codes for which all codewords have the same dimension. Using CDCs is advantageous for two main reasons. First, the decoding protocol is simplified, as the receiver only needs a given number of dimensions to perform the decoding. Also, CDCs are related to rank metric codes [3]–[5] through the lifting operation [6]. Using liftings of rank metric codes, a class of asymptotically optimal CDCs is designed [6], and an efficient decoding algorithm for these codes is given in [1]. Although CDCs seem more practical, they cannot offer the same rate as general subspace codes. Comparing the performance of CDCs to that of general subspace codes is hence crucial for code design.

There is a steady stream of works that focuses on CDCs. For example, Delsarte [7] proved that the Grassmannian endowed with the modified subspace distance forms an association scheme. The nonexistence of perfect codes in the Grassmannian was proved in [8], [9]. In [10], it was shown that Steiner structures yield diameter-perfect codes in the Grassmannian; properties and constructions of these structures were studied in [11]; in [12], it was shown that Steiner structures result in optimal CDCs. In [1], a Singleton bound for CDCs and a family of codes that are nearly Singleton-bound achieving were proposed, and a recursive construction of CDCs which outperform the codes in [1] was given in [13]. Further constructions have been given in [14]. 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 codes started only recently (see, for example, [15], [16]). Bounds on subspace codes with the subspace metric have been derived in [15].

Covering properties are significant for error control codes, and the covering radius is a basic geometric parameter of a code [17]. 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 [18]; if the code is used for data compression, then the covering radius is a measure of the maximum distortion [18]. The covering radius also characterizes the maximum weight of a decodable error by minimum distance decoding [?]. The Hamming covering radius of codes has been extensively studied (see, for example, [19]–[21]) and the rank covering radius was studied in [22], [23], whereas the covering radius of CDCs and subspace codes have not been studied yet.

In this paper, we investigate the general properties of CDCs and subspace codes. We first study the covering properties of CDCs. We determine some fundamental geometric properties of the Grassmannian. Using these properties, 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 investigate the properties of balls in the projective space.

Using these results, we derive bounds on the cardinalities of packing and covering subspace codes, and we determine the asymptotic rate of optimal packing and optimal covering subspace codes for both the subspace metric and the modified subspace metric. We thus show that optimal packing CDCs are asymptotically optimal packing subspace codes for both metrics; However, optimal covering CDCs can be used to construct asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes only for 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

The set of all subspaces of $\text{GF}(q)^n$ with dimension r , referred to as the Grassmannian, is denoted as $E_r(q, n)$ and $E(q, n) = \bigcup_{r=0}^n E_r(q, n)$ is referred to as the projective space. In order to simplify notations, we denote $\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. 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 [2]. 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 $E(q, n)$. 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 codewords.

B. CDCs and rank metric codes

The Grassmannian $E_r(q, n)$ endowed with the modified subspace metric forms an association scheme [1], [7]. 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 $q^{r(n-r)} \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} < K_q^{-1} q^{r(n-r)}$ for all $0 \leq r \leq n$, where $K_q = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^{-j})$. We denote the number of subspaces in $E_r(q, n)$ at distance d from a given subspace as $N_c(d) = q^{d^2} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d \end{bmatrix}$ [1]. The ball in $E_r(q, n)$ of radius t 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 codewords 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 [1], [12]–[14], [16]. In particular, $A_c(q, n, r, 1) = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix}$ and it is shown that for $r \leq \nu$ and $2 \leq d \leq r$,

$$\frac{q^{n(r-d+1)} - q^{(r+l)(r-d+1)}}{q^{r(r-d+1)} - 1} \leq A_c(q, n, r, d) \leq \frac{\begin{bmatrix} n \\ r-d+1 \end{bmatrix}}{\begin{bmatrix} r \\ r-d+1 \end{bmatrix}}, \quad (4)$$

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 [3]–[5] 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 $d_r(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{rk}(\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{D})$. The number of matrices in $\text{GF}(q)^{m \times n}$ with rank d is denoted as $N_R(q, m, n, d) = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ d \end{bmatrix} \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} (q^m - q^i)$, and the volume of a ball with rank radius t in $\text{GF}(q)^{m \times n}$ as $V_R(q, m, n, t)$. The minimum cardinality of a code in $\text{GF}(q)^{m \times n}$ with rank covering radius ρ is studied in [22] and is denoted as $K_R(q^m, n, \rho)$, where $K_R(q^m, n, \rho) = K_R(q^n, m, \rho)$ [22].

CDCs are related to rank metric codes through the concept of constant-rank codes [26] or through the lifting operation [6]. 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 $I(\mathbf{C}) = \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{I}_r | \mathbf{C}) \in E_r(q, n)$. For all $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$, we have $d_m(I(\mathbf{C}), I(\mathbf{D})) = d_r(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D})$ [6].

III. COVERING PROPERTIES OF CDCS

The packing properties of CDCs have been studied in [1], [12]–[14], [16] and the maximum asymptotic rate of CDCs has been determined in [1]. 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 $E_r(q, n)$. Since $E_r(q, n)$ is isomorphic to $E_{n-r}(q, n)$ [27], we assume $r \leq \nu$ without loss of generality.

Lemma 1: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, and $0 \leq t \leq r$, $q^{t(n-t)} \leq V_C(t) < K_q^{-2} q^{t(n-t)}$.

Proof: First, we have $V_C(t) \geq N_C(t) \geq q^{t(n-t)}$. Also, $N_C(d) < K_q^{-1} N_R(q, n-r, r, d)$, and hence $V_C(t) < K_q^{-1} V_R(q, n-r, r, t) < K_q^{-2} q^{t(n-t)}$ by [25, Lemma 9]. ■

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

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

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

where $\mu_i = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} n \\ i-1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $E_j(i)$ is a q -Eberlein polynomial [28]:

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

Proof: This directly follows Theorems 3.5 and 3.6 in [29, Chapter II]. ■

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 [27, 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 $c_j = J_C(1, j-1, j) = \begin{bmatrix} j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}^2$, $b_j = J_C(1, j+1, j) = q^{2j+1} \begin{bmatrix} r-j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r-j \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ [27, Theorem 9.3.3], and $a_j = J_C(1, j, j) = N_C(1) - b_j - c_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq r$ [27, 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 and 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 $u + s \leq r$. Using Lemma 3, it is easily shown that $J_C(u, s, u + s) = \left[\frac{u+s}{u}\right]^2$ for all u and s such that $u + s \leq r$.

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

Lemma 4: The volume of the union of any K balls in $E_r(q, n)$ with radius ρ is at most

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

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 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 $B_C(K, \rho)$.

B. Covering CDCs

In this section, we are interested in how CDCs cover the Grassmannian. The *covering radius* of a CDC $\mathcal{C} \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ is defined as $\rho = \max_{U \in E_r(q, n)} d_M(U, \mathcal{C})$. We denote the minimum cardinality of a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with 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 $r \leq \nu$. 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 5: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, and $0 < \rho < r$, $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \geq \min \{K : B_C(K, \rho) \geq \binom{n}{r}\} \geq \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{V_C(\rho)}$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a CDC with cardinality $K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$ and covering radius ρ . Then the balls around the codewords cover $\binom{n}{r}$ subspaces; however, by Lemma 4, they cannot cover more than $B_C(|\mathcal{C}|, \rho)$ subspaces. Therefore, $B_C(K_C(q, n, r, \rho), \rho) \geq \binom{n}{r}$ and we obtain the first inequality. Since $B_C(K, \rho) \leq KV_C(\rho)$ for all K , we obtain the second inequality. ■

The second lower bound in Lemma 5 is referred to as the sphere covering bound for CDCs. This bound can also be refined by considering the distance distribution of a covering code.

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 codewords at distance i from U . Then $\sum_{i=0}^r A_i(U) = |\mathcal{C}|$ and

$$0 \leq A_i(U) \leq N_C(i), \quad 0 \leq i \leq r \quad (6)$$

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

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

$$\sum_{i=0}^r A_i(U) \sum_{s=0}^{\rho} J_C(l, s, i) \geq N_C(l), \quad 0 \leq l \leq r. \quad (9)$$

Proof: (6)-(8) directly follow the hypothesis, and it suffices to prove (9). For $0 \leq l \leq r$, a codeword 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 $0 \leq i \leq r$ [30].

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

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } \sum_{i=0}^r a_i \\ & \text{subject to: } a_0 = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$0 \leq a_i \leq N_C(i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq r \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^r a_i \sum_{s=0}^{\rho} J_C(l, s, i) \geq N_C(l), \quad 0 \leq l \leq r \quad (12)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^r a_i \frac{E_i(l)}{N_C(i)} \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq l \leq r. \quad (13)$$

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 (11) and (12), respectively, while (10) follows the definition of a_0 . By the generalized MacWilliams identity [30, Theorem 3], $\sum_{i=0}^r a_i F_l(i) \geq 0$, where $F_l(i) = \frac{\mu}{N_C(i)} E_i(l)$ [29, Theorem 3.5] are the q -numbers of the association scheme, which yields (13). 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 [31], [32]. This concept being independent of the underlying metric, it was adapted to the rank metric in [22]. We adapt it to the modified subspace metric for CDCs below, thus obtaining the lower bound in Proposition 4.

Proposition 4: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, 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 6: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, 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 6 is given in Appendix C. The next upper bound is a straightforward adaptation of [22, Proposition 12].

Proposition 5: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, 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 5 is given in Appendix D. The next bound is a direct application of [21, Theorem 12.2.1].

Proposition 6: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, 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 6 can be refined by applying the greedy algorithm described in [23], [33] to CDCs.

Proposition 7: 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 $u_{k+1} = u_k - \left\lceil \frac{u_k V_C(\rho)}{\min\{\binom{n}{r} - k, B_C(u_k, \rho)\}} \right\rceil$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Thus $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq \min\{k : u_k = 0\}$.

The proof of Proposition 7 is given in Appendix E. Using the bounds derived above, we finally determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$. The rate of a covering CDC $\mathcal{C} \in E_r(q, n)$ is defined as $\frac{\log_q |\mathcal{C}|}{\log_q |E_r(q, n)|}$. We use the following normalized parameters: $r' = \frac{r}{n}$, $\rho' = \frac{\rho}{n}$, and the asymptotic rate $k_C(r', \rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q K_C(q, n, r, \rho)}{\log_q \binom{n}{r}}$.

Proposition 8: For all $0 \leq \rho' \leq r' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_C(r', \rho') = 1 - \frac{\rho'(1-\rho')}{r'(1-r')}$.

Proof: The bounds on $V_C(\rho)$ in Lemma 1 together with the sphere covering bound yield $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) > N_q^{-1} K_q^2 q^{r(n-r) - \rho(n-\rho)}$. Using the bounds on the Gaussian polynomial in Section II-B, we obtain $k_C(r', \rho') \geq 1 - \frac{\rho'(1-\rho')}{r'(1-r')}$. Also, Proposition 6 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 $k_C(r', \rho') \leq 1 - \frac{\rho'(1-\rho')}{r'(1-r')}$. ■

We finish this section by studying the covering properties of liftings of rank metric codes. We first prove that they have maximum covering radius.

Lemma 7: Let $I(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq E_r(q, n)$ be the lifting of a rank metric code in $\text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$. Then $I(\mathcal{C})$ has covering radius r .

Proof: Let $D \in E_r(q, n)$ be generated by $\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{0}|\mathbf{D}_1)$, where $\mathbf{D}_1 \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$ has rank r . Then, for any codeword $I(\mathbf{C})$ generated by $(\mathbf{I}_r|\mathbf{C})$, it is easily seen that $d_s(D, I(\mathbf{C})) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{D}_1) = r$. ■

Although liftings of rank metric codes are poor covering codes, we construct below a class of covering CDCs from extended liftings of rank metric covering codes.

Proposition 9: For all $q, n, r \leq \nu$, 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 $I(J, \mathbf{C}) = \mathfrak{R}(\pi(\mathbf{I}_r|\mathbf{C})) \in E_r(q, n)$, 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 $d_M(I(J, \mathbf{C}), I(J, \mathbf{D})) = d_R(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D})$ for all $J \in S_n^r$ and all $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$.

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

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 , $q^{\nu(n-\nu)} \leq |E(q, n)| < 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{\nu(n-\nu)}$, where $N_q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

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

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 $N_s(r, s, d) = q^{u(d-u)} \binom{r}{u} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$, when $u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{r+d-s}{2}$ 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 [15, Theorem 5], 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 r, s , and $t \leq \min\{r + s, \nu\}$, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} P_q q^{f(t)}$, where $4f(d) = d(2n - d) - (r - s)(2n - r - 3s)$ and $P_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{3}{4}i^2}$.

Proof: We have $N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(d)}$, and hence $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(t)} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{-\frac{1}{4}(2n-2t+i)} \leq K_q^{-2} q^{f(t)} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{-\frac{3}{4}i^2} < K_q^{-2} P_q q^{f(t)}$. ■

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 $r \leq \nu$.

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

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} t(n - r - t) & \text{for } t \leq \frac{n-2r}{3}, \\ \frac{1}{12}(n - 2r)^2 + \frac{1}{4}t(2n - t) & \text{for } \frac{n-2r}{3} \leq t \leq \frac{n+4r}{3}, \\ (t - r)(n - t + r) & \text{for } \frac{n+4r}{3} \leq t \leq \frac{n}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The proof of Proposition 10 is given in Appendix F.

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.

We can relate $A_s(q, n, d)$ to $A_c(q, n, r, d)$. For all $J \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we denote the maximum cardinality of a code with minimum subspace distance d and codewords having dimensions in J as $A_s(q, n, d, J)$.

Proposition 11: For $2 \leq d \leq n$, denote $R_d = \{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil + 1, \dots, n - \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\}$, then $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2$. Also, we have $\max_{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil \leq r \leq \nu} A_c(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) \leq A_s(q, n, d) \leq 2 + \sum_{r \in R_d} A_c(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$.

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 codeword 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 codeword with dimension greater than $\frac{2n-d}{2}$. Thus $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2$.

A CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum modified subspace distance $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$ has minimum subspace distance $\geq d$, and hence $A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) \leq A_S(q, n, d)$ for all r . Also, the codewords with dimension r in a code with minimum subspace distance d form a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum distance at least $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$, and hence $A_S(q, n, d) \leq A_S(q, n, d, R_d) + 2 \leq 2 + \sum_{r \in R_d} A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$. ■

Several bounds on $A_S(q, n, d)$ have been derived in the literature, notably the Gilbert bound [15, Theorem 5]. This bound can be tightened by adapting the algorithm used in the proof of the Gilbert bound for the Hamming metric.

Proposition 12: For all $q, n, 2 \leq d \leq n$, and any permutation π of $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a code in $E(q, n)$ 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

$$A_{\pi(r)} = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \frac{\binom{n}{\pi(r)} - \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} A_{\pi(i)} \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_S(\pi(i), \pi(r), e)}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_S(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rceil \right\}. \quad (15)$$

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 subspace distance 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 $\left\lceil \frac{\binom{n}{\pi(r)} - N}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_S(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rceil$ codewords with dimension $\pi(r)$. ■

The bounds above help us determine the asymptotic behavior of $A_S(q, n, d)$. The rate of a subspace code $\mathcal{C} \in E(q, n)$ is defined as $\frac{\log_q |\mathcal{C}|}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$. We use the normalized parameter $d' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d}{n}$ and the normalized rate $a_s(d') = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_S(q, n, d)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$.

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

Proof: For $d = 2t$, we have $A_S(q, n, 2t) \geq A_C(q, n, \nu, t) \geq q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-t+1)}$, which asymptotically becomes $a_s(d') \geq 1 - d'$ by using the bounds on $|E(q, n)|$ in Lemma 8. Denoting $d = 2t - \epsilon$ where $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$, we have $A_S(q, n, 2t - \epsilon) \leq 2 + 2 \sum_{r=t}^{\nu} A_C(q, n, t)$ by Proposition 11. By (4), we obtain $A_S(q, n, 2t - \epsilon) < 2 + 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{r=t}^{\nu} q^{(n-r)(r-t+1)} < 2 + 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-t+1)}$, which asymptotically becomes $a_s(d') \leq 1 - d'$. ■

The asymptotic behavior of CDCs can be obtained from (4). Denoting $a_c(r', d') = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_C(q, n, r, d)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$, we obtain $a_c(r', d') = 2(1 - r')(2r' - d')$. 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. The subspace covering radius of a code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq E(q, n)$ is defined as $\rho_s = \max_{U \in E(q, n)} d_s(U, \mathcal{C})$. 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 $\rho \geq \nu$.

Proposition 14: For $\nu \leq \rho < n$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) = 2$.

Proof: For all $V \in E(q, n)$ 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 $\rho < n$, hence $K_s(q, n, \rho) > 1$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^n\}$, then for all $D \in E(q, n)$, $d_s(D, \mathcal{C}) = \min\{\dim(D), n - \dim(D)\} \leq \nu$. Thus \mathcal{C} has covering radius ν and $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2$ for all $\rho \geq \nu$. ■

We thus consider $0 < \rho < \nu$ henceforth. Proposition 15 below is the sphere covering bound for subspace codes with the subspace metric.

Proposition 15: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) \geq \min \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, 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 codeword 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 derive upper bounds on $K_s(q, n, \rho)$.

Proposition 16: For all q, n , $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2 + 2 \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} k_r$, where

$$k_r = \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{\binom{n-r+\rho}{\rho}} + \frac{\binom{n}{r-\rho}}{\binom{r}{\rho}} \ln \left[\binom{n-r+\rho}{\rho} \right].$$

Proof: We show that there exists a code with cardinality $2 + 2 \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} k_r$ 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 $\rho+1 \leq r \leq \nu$, 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 [21, Theorem 12.2.1], there exists an $\binom{n}{r} \times k_r$ submatrix of \mathbf{A} with no all-zero rows. Thus, all subspaces of dimension r can be covered using k_r codewords. Summing for all r , all subspaces with dimension $0 \leq r \leq \nu$ can be covered with $1 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} k_r$ subspaces. Similarly, it can be shown

that all subspaces with dimension $\nu + 1 \leq r \leq n$ can be covered with $1 + \sum_{r=\nu+1}^{\nu} k_r$ subspaces. \blacksquare

We remark that the upper bound in Proposition 16 can be further tightened by using the greedy algorithm described in [23], [33]. We now give an explicit construction of a subspace covering code.

Proposition 17: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \nu$, let $J_1 = \{0\} \cup \{\nu - \rho, \nu - 3\rho - 1, \dots, \nu - \rho - \lfloor \frac{\nu - \rho}{2\rho + 1} \rfloor (2\rho + 1)\}$ and $J_2 = \{n\} \cup \{\nu + 1 + \rho, \nu + 2 + 3\rho, \dots, \nu + \lfloor \frac{n - \nu}{2\rho + 1} \rfloor (2\rho + 1)\}$. 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 $\leq \nu$. First, all subspaces $D_0 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $0 \leq \dim(D_0) < \nu - 2\rho - \lfloor \frac{\nu - \rho}{2\rho + 1} \rfloor (2\rho + 1) \leq \rho$ are covered by the subspace with dimension 0. Second, for all $D_1 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $\nu - 2\rho - i(2\rho + 1) \leq \dim(D_1) \leq \nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1)$, there exists C_1 with dimension $\nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1)$ such that $D_1 \subseteq C_1$. 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 $\nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1) < \dim(D_2) \leq \nu - i(2\rho + 1)$, there exists C_2 with dimension $\nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1)$ 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 $\leq \nu$. Similarly, all the subspaces with dimension $\geq n - \nu$ are covered by $\bigcup_{r \in J_2} E_r(q, n)$. \blacksquare

Using the bounds derived above, we finally determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_s(q, n, \rho)$. We define $k_s(\rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q K_s(q, n, \rho)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$.

Proposition 18: For $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_s(\rho') = 1 - 2\rho'$. 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 $\rho < \nu$ and for $0 \leq l \leq n$, let A_l denote the number of codewords in \mathcal{C} with dimension l . All the subspaces in $E_\nu(q, n)$ are covered, hence $\binom{n}{\nu} \leq \sum_{l=0}^n A_l \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(l, \nu, d)$. Using Lemma 10, we obtain $\sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(l, \nu, d) < K_q^{-2} P_q q^{\rho(n-\nu)}$ for all l , and hence $\binom{n}{\nu} < K_q^{-2} P_q q^{\rho(n-\nu)} |\mathcal{C}|$. Therefore $K_s(q, n, \rho) > K_q^2 P_q^{-1} q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\rho)}$, which asymptotically becomes $k_s(\rho') \geq 1 - 2\rho'$.

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

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 $N_M(r, s, d) = N_S(r, s, 2d - |r - s|)$. Hence, $N_M(r, s, d) = q^{d(d+s-r)} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d+s-r \end{bmatrix}$ for $r \geq s$ and $N_M(r, s, d) = q^{d(d+r-s)} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d+r-s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d \end{bmatrix}$ for $r \leq s$.

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 $d_S(U, V) = 2d - |r - s|$. Therefore, $N_M(r, s, d) = N_S(r, s, 2d - |r - s|)$, and the formula for $N_M(r, s, d)$ is easily obtained from Lemma 9. ■

We 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 $t \leq \nu$, $q^{t(n-t)} \leq V_M(r, t) < N_q(2N_q - 1)K_q^{-2}q^{t(n-t)}$, where $N_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

The proof of Proposition 19 is given in Appendix G.

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 $A_M(q, n, d)$. Since $A_M(q, n, 1) = |E(q, n)|$, we assume $d \geq 2$ henceforth. When $d > \nu$, 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 codewords having dimensions in J as $A_M(q, n, d, J)$.

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

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 $\max\{\dim(C), \dim(D)\} = d_M(C, D) + \dim(C \cap D) \geq d$, therefore there is at most one codeword 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 codeword with dimension greater than $n - d$. Thus $A_M(q, n, d) \leq 2$ for $d > \nu$ and $A_M(q, n, d) \leq A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$ for $d \leq \nu$. Also, adding $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\text{GF}(q)^n$ to a code with minimum distance $d \leq \nu$ and codewords 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 $d \leq \nu$. Similarly, the code $\{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^n\}$ has minimum distance n and hence $A_M(q, n, d) = 2$ for $d > \nu$. ■

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

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

$$\sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_C(q, n, r, d).$$

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 codewords have dimensions in Q_d . For all codewords U and V , $d_S(U, V) = 2d_M(U, V) - |\dim(U) - \dim(V)| \geq 2d - (n - 2d)$. Thus \mathcal{C} has 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 $A_M(q, n, d) = A_M(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2 \leq A_S(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d) + 2$.

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 codewords 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 $q, n, 2 \leq d \leq \nu$, 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

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

By extending the puncturing of subspaces introduced in [1], we derive a Singleton bound for modified subspace metric codes.

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

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 fixed $(r - 1)$ -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 $d \geq 2$, 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 rate $a_M(d') = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_M(q, n, d)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$.

Proposition 23: For $0 \leq d' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $a_M(d') = 1 - 2d'$. 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. By Lemma 12 we have $A_M(q, n, d) \leq 2 + \sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_C(q, n, r, d) < 2 + 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{r=d}^{\nu} q^{(n-r)(r-d+1)} < 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-d+1)}$, which asymptotically becomes $a_M(d') \leq 1 - 2d'$. Also, by Lemma 12 and (4) we obtain $A_M(q, n, d) \geq L(q, n, \nu, d) \geq q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-d+1)}$, which asymptotically becomes $a_M(d') \geq 1 - 2d'$. ■

Therefore, CDCs with constant dimension equal to half of n are asymptotically optimal subspace codes with the modified subspace metric.

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. The modified subspace covering radius of $\mathcal{C} \subseteq E(q, n)$ is defined as $\rho_M = \max_{U \in E(q, n)} d_M(U, \mathcal{C})$. 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 $\rho \geq \nu$, we determine the minimum cardinality of a code with modified subspace covering radius ρ .

Proposition 24: For $n - \nu \leq \rho < n$, $K_M(q, n, \rho) = 1$. If $n = 2\nu + 1$, then $K_M(q, 2\nu + 1, \nu) = 2$.

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

If $n = 2\nu + 1$, then it is easily shown that $\{C, C^\perp\}$ has covering radius ν , and hence $K_M(q, 2\nu + 1, \nu) \leq 2$. However, for any $D \in E(q, 2\nu + 1)$, then either $d_M(\{\mathbf{0}\}, D) > \nu$ or $d_M(\text{GF}(q)^n, D) > \nu$. Thus no subspace can cover the projective space with radius ν and $K_M(q, 2\nu + 1, \nu) \geq 2$. ■

We thus consider $0 < \rho < \nu$ 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 $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_S(q, n, 2\rho) \leq K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq K_S(q, n, \rho)$ and $K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq 2 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{n-\rho-1} K_C(q, n, r, \rho)$.

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 $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_M(q, n, \rho) \geq \min \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, 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 rate $k_M(\rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q K_M(q, n, \rho)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$.

Proposition 26: For $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_M(\rho') = (1 - 2\rho')^2$. 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 $K_M(q, n, \rho) \geq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_M(r, \rho)} > \frac{K_q^2}{N_q(2N_q - 1)} q^{\nu(n-\nu) - \rho(n-\rho)}$ by Proposition 19. This asymptotically becomes $k_M(\rho') \geq (1 - 2\rho')^2$ for $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, [21, Theorem 12.2.1], Lemma 8, and Proposition 19 yield

$$K_M(q, n, \rho) \leq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\min_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_M(r, \rho)} \left[1 + \ln \left(\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_M(r, \rho) \right) \right] \quad (17)$$

$$< 2K_q^{-1} N_q \left[1 + \ln(N_q(2N_q - 1)K_q^{-2}) + \rho(n - \rho) \ln q \right] q^{\nu(n-\nu) - \rho(n-\rho)}, \quad (18)$$

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

Proposition 26 shows that asymptotically optimal covering codes in the modified subspace metric can be constructed from covering CDCs.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Proposition 1

Before proving 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 $\mathbf{P}_d = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_d & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times (n-r)}$, 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 $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{B}) \in \text{GF}(q)^{r \times n}$, 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 $\text{rk}(\mathbf{X}) = r$. Also, it is easily shown that $d_M(V, U_0) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B})$ and $d_M(V, U_d) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_d) = \text{rk}(\mathbf{B}_1 - \mathbf{A}_1 | \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a} | \mathbf{B}_2)$. 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 [31], [32] 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 codewords 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 [32, 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 codeword $C_1 \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying $d_M(U, C_1) = \rho + 1$, by Lemma 3 we have $|B_\rho(C_1) \cap B_1(U)| = J_C(\rho, 1, \rho + 1) = c_{\rho+1}$. Finally, for all other codewords $C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ 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

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

The proof is completed by realizing that $-b_{\rho} < 0$, while $E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(U))$ is a non-negative integer. \blacksquare

We now establish a key lemma.

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

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 codeword does not belong to \mathcal{A} . Therefore, $B_1(Z) \cap B_{\rho-1}(C) \subseteq B_1(Z) \setminus \mathcal{A}$, and hence $|\mathcal{A} \cap B_1(Z)| = |B_1(Z)| - |B_1(Z) \setminus \mathcal{A}| \leq V_{\mathcal{C}}(1) - |B_1(Z) \cap B_{\rho-1}(C)|$. \blacksquare

We now give a proof of Proposition 4.

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

$$\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \left\{ \binom{n}{r} - |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho - 1) \right\} - (\epsilon - 1) \left\{ |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho) - \binom{n}{r} \right\} \quad (19)$$

$$\leq \epsilon|\mathcal{A}| - (\epsilon - 1)|\mathcal{Z}| \quad (20)$$

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

where (20) follows from $|\mathcal{Z}| \leq |\mathcal{C}|V_{\mathcal{C}}(\rho) - \binom{n}{r}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{Z}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(A)) + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(A)) \\ &= \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(B_1(A)), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where (21) follows from Lemma 15 and $|\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z}| \leq E_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{Z})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &\leq \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{U \in B_1(A) \cap \mathcal{Z}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}) \\ &= \sum_{U \in \mathcal{Z}} \sum_{A \in B_1(U) \cap \mathcal{A}} E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}) = \sum_{U \in \mathcal{Z}} |\mathcal{A} \cap B_1(U)| E_{\mathcal{C}}(\{U\}), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where (22) follows the fact that the second summation is over disjoint sets $\{U\}$. By Lemma 16, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma &\leq \sum_{U \in \mathcal{Z}} (V_C(1) - c_\rho) E_C(\{U\}) \\
&= (V_C(1) - c_\rho) E_C(\mathcal{Z}) \\
&= (V_C(1) - c_\rho) \left\{ |\mathcal{C}| V_C(\rho) - \binom{n}{r} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Combining (23) and (19), we obtain the bound in Proposition 4. \blacksquare

C. Proof of Lemma 6

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E_r(q, n-1)$ with covering radius $\rho-1$ and cardinality $K_C(q, n-1, r, \rho-1)$. 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 $d_M(C_1, U_1) \leq \rho$. 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 $d_M(C_1, U_1) \leq \rho$. 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 \mathcal{C}_1 has covering radius ρ and hence $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n-1, r, \rho-1)$, 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 $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{\mathfrak{R}((\mathbf{C}^T|\mathbf{c}^T)^T) : \mathfrak{R}(\mathbf{C}) \in \mathcal{C}\} \subseteq E_r(q, n)$, 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 $\text{rk}(\mathbf{C}_2^T|\mathbf{U}_2^T) \leq r + \rho - 2$. 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 $K_C(q, n, r, \rho) \leq K_C(q, n, r-\rho, 0) = \binom{n}{r-\rho}$. \blacksquare

D. Proof of Proposition 5

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

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in S_K} P(\mathcal{C}) &= \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in S_K} \sum_{\substack{U \in E_r(q,n) \\ d_M(U, \mathcal{C}) > \rho}} 1 \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{U \in E_r(q,n)} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \in S_K \\ d_M(U, \mathcal{C}) > \rho}} 1 \\
&= \frac{1}{|S_K|} \sum_{U \in E_r(q,n)} \binom{Q - V_c(\rho)}{K} \\
&= \frac{Q}{|S_K|} \binom{Q - V_c(\rho)}{K}.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Eq. (24) 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 7

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 codeword covers $V_c(\rho)$ subspaces. Second, suppose there exists a code with cardinality k which leaves u_k subspaces uncovered, 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 codeword, hence $|N(U_k)| \leq \binom{n}{r} - k$. Also, by Lemma 4, $|N(U_k)| \leq B_c(u_k, \rho)$. Thus $|N(U_k)| \leq \min \left\{ \binom{n}{r} - k, B_c(u_k, \rho) \right\}$ and there exists a row with at least $\left\lceil \frac{u_k V_c(\rho)}{\min \left\{ \binom{n}{r} - k, B_c(u_k, \rho) \right\}} \right\rceil$ 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 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 $u = u_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2r+3d-n}{6} \leq d$, we need to consider three 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 $\sum_{u=0}^r q^{f(u)} = q^{g(d)} \sum_{i=0}^r q^{-i(3d-4r-n+3i)} < M_q q^{g(d)}$.

From the discussion above, we obtain the lower bound on $V_s(r, t)$. Also, $\sum_{s=0}^{r+d} N_s(r, s, d) < (2M_q - 1)K_q^{-2}q^{g(d)}$, and hence $V_s(r, t) < (2M_q - 1)K_q^{-2} \sum_{d=0}^t q^{g(d)} < (2M_q - 1)L_q K_q^{-2} q^{g(t)}$. ■

G. 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 $r \leq \nu$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 11, we have $N_M(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{s(n-d+r-s)-(r-d)(n-d)}$ for $s \leq r$ and $N_M(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{s(r-s+d)+d(n-r-d)}$ for $s \geq r$. 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] 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.
- [2] D. Silva and F. R. Kschischang, "On metrics for error correction in network coding," 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.3824v1>.
- [3] P. Delsarte, "Bilinear forms over a finite field, with applications to coding theory," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, vol. 25, pp. 226–241, 1978.
- [4] E. M. Gabidulin, "Theory of codes with maximum rank distance," *Problems on Information Transmission*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Jan. 1985.
- [5] 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.
- [6] 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.
- [7] P. Delsarte, "Association schemes and t -designs in regular semilattices," *Journal of Combinatorial Theory A*, vol. 20, pp. 230–243, 1976.
- [8] 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.
- [9] 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.
- [10] 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.
- [11] M. Schwartz and T. Etzion, "Codes and anticodes in the Grassmann graph," *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, vol. 97, pp. 27–42, 2002.
- [12] 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>.
- [13] V. Skachek, "Recursive code construction for random networks," 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0806.3650v1>.
- [14] 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>.
- [15] 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.
- [16] E. M. Gabidulin and M. Bossert, "Codes for network coding," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Info. Theory*, Toronto, ON, July 2008, pp. 867–870.
- [17] P. Delsarte, "Four fundamental parameters of a code and their combinatorial significance," *Information and Control*, vol. 23, pp. 407–438, 1973.
- [18] 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.
- [19] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977.
- [20] R. Blahut, *Theory and Practice of Error Control Codes*. Addison-Wesley, 1983.
- [21] G. D. Cohen, I. Honkala, S. Litsyn, and A. C. Lobstein, *Covering Codes*. Elsevier, 1997.

- [22] 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.
- [23] —, "Bounds on covering codes with the rank metric," *submitted to Communications Letters*, September 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0809.2968>.
- [24] G. E. Andrews, *The Theory of Partitions*, ser. Encyclopedia 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] —, "Constant-rank codes and their connection to constant-dimension codes," *submitted to IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, July 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.2262>.
- [27] 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.
- [28] P. Delsarte, "Properties and applications of the recurrence $F(i + 1, k + 1, n + 1) = q^{k+1}F(i, k + 1, n) - q^kF(i, k, n)$," *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 262–270, September 1976.
- [29] E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic Combinatorics I. Association Schemes*. The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, 1983.
- [30] P. Delsarte and V. I. Levenshtein, "Association schemes and coding theory," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2477–2504, 1998.
- [31] G. van Wee, "Improved sphere bounds on the covering radius of codes," *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 34, pp. 237–245, 1988.
- [32] —, "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.
- [33] 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.

Packing and Covering Properties of Subspace Codes

Maximilien Gadouleau and Zhiyuan Yan

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Lehigh University, PA 18015, USA

E-mails: {magc, yan}@lehigh.edu

Abstract

Codes in the projective space and codes in the Grassmannian over a finite field have been proposed for error control in random network coding; the two types of codes are referred to as subspace codes and constant-dimension codes (CDCs), respectively. For subspace codes and CDCs, a subspace metric was introduced to correct both errors and erasures, and an injection metric was proposed to correct pessimistic adversarial errors. In this paper, we investigate the packing and covering properties of subspace codes with both metrics. We first determine some fundamental geometric properties of the projective space with both metrics; Using these properties, we then derive bounds on the cardinalities of packing and covering subspace codes, and determine the asymptotic rate of optimal packing and optimal covering subspace codes with both metrics. Our results not only illustrate the difference between the two metrics from a geometric perspective, but also provide guiding principles for the code design for error control in random network coding. In particular, our results show that optimal packing CDCs are optimal packing subspace codes up to a scalar for both metrics if and only if their dimension is half of their length (up to rounding). In this case, CDCs suffer from only limited rate loss as opposed to subspace codes with the same minimum distance. On the other hand, optimal covering CDCs can be used to construct asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes with the injection metric only.

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to its vector-space preserving property, random network coding [1], [2] can be interpreted as transmitting subspaces over an operator channel [3]. Error control for random network coding can hence be modeled as a coding theory problem, where codewords are subspaces and the distance is either the subspace distance [3] or, on adversarial channels, the injection metric [4]. Codes in the projective

space, referred to as subspace codes henceforth, and codes in the Grassmannian, referred to as constant-dimension codes (CDCs) henceforth, have been investigated for error control in random network coding. Using CDCs is sometimes advantageous since, as pointed out in [3], the fixed dimension of CDCs simplifies the network protocol somewhat.

The construction and properties of CDCs thus have attracted a lot of attention. Different constructions of CDCs have been proposed [3], [5]–[7]. Bounds on CDCs based on packing properties are investigated (see, for example, [3], [6], [8], [9]), and the covering properties of CDCs are investigated in [7]. The construction and properties of subspace codes have received less attention, and these previous works have focused on the packing properties of subspace codes. In [10], bounds on the maximum cardinality of a subspace code with the subspace metric, notably the counterpart of the Gilbert bound, are derived. Bounds and constructions of subspace codes are also investigated in [11]. Despite the previous works, two open problems remain. First, despite the aforementioned advantage of CDCs, what is the rate loss of CDCs as opposed to subspace codes of the same minimum distance and hence error correction capability? The second problem involves the two metrics that have been introduced for subspace codes: what is the difference between the two metrics proposed for subspace codes and CDCs beyond those discussed in [4]? Note that the two questions are somewhat related, since the first question is applicable for both metrics. The answers to these questions are significant to the code design for error control in random network coding.

Aiming to answer these two questions, our work in this paper focuses on the packing and covering properties of subspace codes. Packing and covering properties not only are fundamental geometric properties for error control codes, but also are significant to code design. For example, the covering radius is a crucial parameter of a code with applications to decoding with erasures and minimum distance decoding [12]. Our main contributions of this paper are, for both metrics, that we first determine some fundamental geometric properties of the projective space, and then use these properties to derive bounds and to determine the asymptotic rates of subspace codes based on packing and covering.

Our results provide some answers to both questions above from a geometric perspective. First, our results show that for both metrics optimal packing CDCs are optimal packing subspace codes up to a scalar if and only if their dimension is half of their length (up to rounding), which implies that in this case CDCs suffer from a limited rate loss as opposed to subspace codes with the same minimum distance. Furthermore, when the asymptotic rate of subspace codes is fixed, the relative subspace distance of optimal subspace codes is twice as much as the relative injection distance. Second, our results illustrate the difference between the two metrics from a geometric perspective. Above all, the projective space has

different geometric properties under the two metrics. The different geometric properties further result in different asymptotic rates of covering codes with the two metrics. With the injection metric, optimal covering CDCs can be used to construct asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes. However, with the subspace metric, this does not hold.

Our results presented in this paper are different from those in the literature. Our results on the geometric properties of the projective space are novel to the best of our knowledge. Our bounds based on packing properties are tighter than the Gilbert bound in [10]. Our investigation of the covering properties of subspace codes differs from that in [7]: while in [7] how CDCs cover the Grassmannian was investigated, we consider how subspace codes cover the whole projective space in this paper.

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

II. PRELIMINARIES

We refer to the set of all subspaces of $\text{GF}(q)^n$ with dimension r as the Grassmannian of dimension r and denote it as $E_r(q, n)$; we refer to $E(q, n) = \bigcup_{r=0}^n E_r(q, n)$ as the projective space. 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 [13]. A very instrumental result [14] about the Gaussian polynomial is that for all $0 \leq r \leq n$:

$$q^{r(n-r)} \leq \begin{bmatrix} n \\ r \end{bmatrix} < K_q^{-1} q^{r(n-r)}, \quad (1)$$

where $K_q = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^{-j})$. For $U, V \in E(q, n)$, both the *subspace metric* [3, (3)] $d_s(U, V) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim(U + V) - \dim(U \cap V)$ and *injection metric* [4, Def. 1]

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

$$= \dim(U + V) - \min\{\dim(U), \dim(V)\} \quad (3)$$

$$\geq |\dim(U) - \dim(V)| \quad (4)$$

are metrics over $E(q, n)$. For all $U, V \in E(q, n)$,

$$\frac{1}{2} d_s(U, V) \leq d_i(U, V) \leq d_s(U, V), \quad (5)$$

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

A *subspace code* is a nonempty subset of $E(q, n)$. The minimum subspace (respectively, injection) distance of a subspace code is the minimum subspace (respectively, injection) distance over all pairs of distinct codewords. A subset of $E_r(q, n)$ is called a constant-dimension code (CDC). A CDC is thus a subspace code whose codewords have the same dimension. Since for CDCs $d_t(U, V) = \frac{1}{2}d_s(U, V)$, we focus on the injection metric when considering CDCs. We denote the **maximum** cardinality of a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with **minimum injection distance** d as $A_c(q, n, r, d)$. We have $A_c(q, n, r, d) = A_c(q, n, n-r, d)$, $A_c(q, n, r, 1) = \binom{n}{r}$ and it is shown [7], [9] for $r \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and $2 \leq d \leq r$,

$$q^{(n-r)(r-d+1)} + 1 \leq A_c(q, n, r, d) \leq \frac{\binom{n}{r-d+1}}{\binom{r}{r-d+1}} < K_q^{-1} q^{(n-r)(r-d+1)}. \quad (6)$$

The lower bound on $A_c(q, n, r, d)$ in (6) is implicit from the code construction in [7], and the upper bounds on $A_c(q, n, r, d)$ in (6) are from [3]. Thus, CDCs in $E_r(q, n)$ ($r \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$) with minimum injection distance d and cardinality $q^{(n-r)(r-d+1)}$ proposed in [3] are optimal up to a scalar; we refer to these CDCs as **KK codes** henceforth. The covering radius in $E_r(q, n)$ of a CDC \mathcal{C} is defined as $\max_{U \in E_r(q, n)} d_t(U, \mathcal{C})$. We also denote the **minimum** cardinality of a CDC with covering radius ρ in $E_r(q, n)$ as $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$ [7]. It was shown in [7] that $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$ is on the order of $q^{r(n-r)-\rho(n-\rho)}$.

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

A. Properties of balls with subspace radii

We first 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. In order to simplify notations, we shall denote $\nu = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ henceforth.

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

Proof: We have $|E(q, n)| = \sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n}{r} \geq \binom{n}{\nu} \geq q^{\nu(n-\nu)}$ by (1), which proves the lower bound. Also, $\binom{n}{n-r} = \binom{n}{r}$ and hence $\sum_{r=0}^n \binom{n}{r} \leq 2 \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \binom{n}{r} < 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} q^{r(n-r)}$ by (1). Therefore, $|E(q, n)| < 2K_q^{-1} q^{\nu(n-\nu)} \sum_{i=0}^{\nu} q^{-i(n-2\nu+i)} < 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{\nu(n-\nu)}$. ■

We observe that by (1) and Lemma 1, $|E_r(q, n)|$ is the same as $|E(q, n)|$ up to a scalar when $r = \nu$ or $r = n - \nu$. That is, the volume of $E_\nu(q, n)$, which is equal to that of $E_{n-\nu}(q, n)$ when $\nu \neq n - \nu$, dominates the volumes of other Grassmannians. This geometric property has significant implication to the packing properties of subspace codes.

We now determine the number of subspaces at a given subspace distance from a fixed subspace. Let us denote the number of subspaces with dimension s at subspace distance d from a subspace with dimension r as $N_s(r, s, d)$.

Lemma 2: $N_s(r, s, d)$ is given by $q^{u(d-u)} \binom{r}{u} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$ when $u = \frac{r+d-s}{2}$ is an integer, and 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 is then completed in $q^{u(d-u)} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$ ways. ■

We remark that this result in Lemma 2 is implicitly contained in [10, Theorem 5] without an explicit proof. It is formally stated here because it is important to the results in this paper. We also denote the volume of a ball with subspace radius t 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 III-C.

Lemma 3: For all r, s , and $t \leq \min\{r + s, \nu\}$, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} L_q q^{f(t)}$, where $4f(d) = d(2n - d) - (r - s)(2n - r - 3s)$ and $L_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-\frac{3}{4}i^2}$. Therefore, $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} L_q q^{t(n-s)}$ for $s \leq \nu$.

Proof: By Lemma 2 and (1), we have $N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(d)}$, and hence $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(t)} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{-\frac{i}{4}(2n-2t+i)} \leq K_q^{-2} q^{f(t)} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{-\frac{3}{4}i^2} < K_q^{-2} L_q q^{f(t)}$. Maximizing f for $s \leq \nu$ and $s - t \leq r \leq s + t$, we easily obtain $\sum_{d=0}^t N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} L_q q^{t(n-s)}$. ■

We now derive 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 $r \leq \nu$. Also, we assume $t \leq \nu$, for only this case will be needed in this paper.

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

$$g(r, t) = \begin{cases} t(n - r - t) & \text{for } t \leq \frac{n-2r}{3}, \\ \frac{1}{12}(n - 2r)^2 + \frac{1}{4}t(2n - t) & \text{for } \frac{n-2r}{3} < t \leq \frac{n+4r}{3}, \\ (t - r)(n - t + r) & \text{for } \frac{n+4r}{3} < t \leq \frac{n}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The proof of Proposition 1 is given in Appendix A. We remark that the lower and upper bounds on $V_s(r, t)$ in Proposition 1 are tight up to a scalar, and that $g(r, t)$ depends on both r and t . We also observe that $g(r, t)$ decreases with r for $r \leq \nu$. That is, the volume of a ball around a subspace of dimension r ($r \leq \nu$) decreases with r . This observation is significant to the covering properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric.

B. Packing properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric

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.

We can relate $A_s(q, n, d)$ to $A_c(q, n, r, d)$. For all $J \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, we denote the maximum cardinality of a code with minimum subspace distance d and codewords having dimensions in J as $A_s(q, n, d, J)$. For $2 \leq d \leq 2\nu$, $R_d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil + 1, \dots, n - \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\}$.

Proposition 2: For $n = d = 2\nu + 1$, $A_s(q, 2\nu + 1, 2\nu + 1) = 2$ and for $2 \leq d \leq 2\nu$, $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2$. Also, we have $\max_{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil \leq r \leq \nu} A_c(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) \leq A_s(q, n, d) \leq 2 + \sum_{r \in R_d} A_c(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum subspace distance d . For $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\dim(C) + \dim(D) \geq d_s(C, D) \geq d$; therefore there is at most one codeword 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 codeword with dimension greater than $\frac{2n-d}{2}$. Thus $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2$ for $d \leq 2\nu$ and $A_s(q, 2\nu + 1, 2\nu + 1) \leq 2$. Since the code $\{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^{2\nu+1}\}$ has minimum subspace distance $2\nu + 1$, we obtain $A_s(q, 2\nu + 1, 2\nu + 1) = 2$.

A CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$ has minimum subspace distance $\geq d$, and hence $A_c(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) \leq A_s(q, n, d)$ for all r . Also, the codewords with dimension r in a code with minimum subspace distance d form a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance at least $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$, and hence $A_s(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d, R_d) + 2 \leq 2 + \sum_{r \in R_d} A_c(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$. ■

We compare our lower bound on $A_s(q, n, d)$ in Proposition 2 to the Gilbert bound in [10, Theorem 5]. The latter shows that $A_s(q, n, d) \geq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\text{avg}\{V_s(r, d-1)\}}$, where the average volume $\text{avg}\{V_s(r, d-1)\}$ is taken over all subspaces in $E(q, n)$. Using the bounds on $V_s(r, d-1)$ in Proposition 1, it can be shown that this lower bound is at most $2K_q^{-1}N_qq^{\frac{3}{4}}q^{\nu(n-\nu)-\frac{1}{4}(d-1)(2n-d+1)}$. On the other hand, Proposition 2 and (6) yield $A_s(q, n, d) \geq q^{\nu(n-\nu)-\frac{1}{4}(d-1)(n+1)}$. The ratio between our bound and the Gilbert bound is hence at least $\frac{1}{2}K_qN_q^{-1}q^{\frac{1}{4}(d-1)(n-d)}$. Therefore, our lower bound in Proposition 2 is tighter than the Gilbert bound for nontrivial cases.

The lower bound in Proposition 2 is further tightened below.

Proposition 3: For all q, n , $2 \leq d \leq n$, and any permutation π of $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum subspace distance d and $A_{\pi(r)}$ codewords with dimension $\pi(r)$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$, where $A_{\pi(0)} = A_c(q, n, \pi(0), \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$ and

$$A_{\pi(r)} = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lceil \frac{\binom{n}{\pi(r)} - \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} A_{\pi(i)} \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_s(\pi(i), \pi(r), e)}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_s(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rceil \right\}. \quad (8)$$

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 subspace distance 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 $N \leq \binom{n}{r}$, then we can select at least $\left\lceil \frac{\binom{n}{r} - N}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_S(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rceil$ codewords with dimension $\pi(r)$. ■

Although the bound in Proposition 3 holds for any permutation π , we remark that not all choices for π lead to tight bounds. However, if we choose $\pi(0)$ to maximize $A_{\pi(0)}$, then $A_{\pi(0)} = A_C(q, n, \pi(0), \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) = \max_{\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil \leq r \leq \nu} A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$; thus, this approach leads to a tighter lower bound than that in Proposition 2.

We can now compare the cardinalities of optimal subspace codes and optimal CDCs with the same minimum subspace distance d . Note that the bounds on the cardinalities of optimal CDCs in (6) assume the injection metric for CDC. When d is even, a CDC with a minimum subspace distance d has a minimum injection distance $\frac{d}{2}$. When d is odd, a CDC with a minimum subspace distance $d+1$ has a minimum injection distance $\frac{d+1}{2} = \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$. Thus, a CDC has a minimum subspace distance at least d if and only if it has minimum injection distance at least $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil$. Hence, we compare $A_S(q, n, d)$ and $A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$ in Proposition 4 below.

Proposition 4: For $2 \leq d \leq 2\nu$ and $\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil \leq r \leq \nu$,

$$K_q q^{(\nu-r)(\nu-r+\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil-1)} A_C\left(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\right) < A_S(q, n, d) < 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(\nu-r)(\nu-r+\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil-1)} A_C\left(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\right), \quad (9)$$

where $N_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

Proof: By (1), Proposition 2, and (6), we have $A_S(q, n, d) \geq A_C(q, n, \nu, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) \geq q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil+1)} > K_q q^{(\nu-r)(\nu-r+\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil-1)} A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$. Proposition 2, (6), and (1) also lead to

$$\begin{aligned} A_S(q, n, d) &< 2 + 2K_q^{-1} \sum_{r=\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil}^{\nu} q^{(n-r)(r-\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil+1)} \\ &= 2 + 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil+1)} \sum_{i=0}^{\nu-\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil} q^{-i(n-2\nu+\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil-1+i)} \\ &< 2 + 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil+1)} \\ &\leq 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(\nu-r)(\nu-r+\lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil-1)} A_C\left(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil\right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where (10) follows (6). ■

The bounds in Proposition 4 help us determine the asymptotic behavior of $A_S(q, n, d)$. We first define the rate of a subspace code $\mathcal{C} \subseteq E(q, n)$ as $\frac{\log_q |\mathcal{C}|}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$. We note that this definition is combinatorial, and

differs from the rate introduced in [3] for CDCs. The rate defined in [3] also accounts for the channel usage, but it seems appropriate for CDCs only. On the other hand, our rate depends on only the cardinality of the code, and hence is more appropriate to compare general subspace codes, since all the subspaces are treated equally regardless of their dimension. Finally, the rate defined in [3] can be derived from our rate defined here. Using the normalized parameters $r' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{r}{n}$ and $d'_s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d_s}{n}$ where d_s is the minimum subspace distance of a code, the asymptotic rate of a subspace code $a_s(d'_s) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_S(q, n, d_s)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$ and of a CDC of given dimension $a_s(r', d'_s) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d_s}{2} \rceil)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$ can be easily determined.

Proposition 5: For $0 \leq d'_s \leq 1$, $a_s(d'_s) = 1 - d'_s$. For $0 \leq r' \leq \frac{d'_s}{2}$ or $1 - \frac{d'_s}{2} \leq r' \leq 1$, $a_s(r', d'_s) = 0$; for $\frac{d'_s}{2} \leq r' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $a_s(r', d'_s) = 2(1 - r')(2r' - d'_s)$; for $\frac{1}{2} \leq r' \leq 1 - \frac{d'_s}{2}$, $a_s(r', d'_s) = 2r'(2 - 2r' - d'_s)$.

Proof: First, (6) and Lemma 1 yield $a_s(r', d'_s) = 2(1 - r')(2r' - d'_s)$ for $0 \leq r' \leq \frac{d'_s}{2}$. Since $A_C(q, n, r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil) = A_C(q, n, n - r, \lceil \frac{d}{2} \rceil)$, we also obtain $a_s(r', d'_s) = 2(1 - r')(2r' - d'_s)$ for $\frac{d'_s}{2} \leq r' \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Second, (9) for $r = \nu$ and (6) yield $a_s(d'_s) = a_s(\frac{1}{2}, d'_s) = 1 - d'_s$. ■

Propositions 4 and 5 provide several important insights. First, Proposition 4 indicates that optimal CDCs with dimension being half of the block length up to rounding ($r = \nu$ and $r = n - \nu$) are optimal subspace codes up to a scalar. In this case, the optimal CDCs have a limited rate loss as opposed to optimal subspace codes with the same error correction capability. When $r < \nu$, the rate loss suffered by optimal CDCs increases with $\nu - r$. Proposition 5 indicates that using CDCs with dimension $\lceil \frac{d_s}{2} \rceil \leq r < \nu$ leads to a decrease in rate on the order of $(1 - 2r')(d'_s + 1 - 2r')$, where $r' = \frac{r}{n}$. Since the rate loss increases with $1 - 2r'$, using a CDC with a dimension further from ν leads to a larger rate loss.

The conclusion above can be explained from a combinatorial perspective as well. When $r = \nu$ or $r = n - \nu$, by Lemma 1, $|E(q, n)|$ is the same as $|E_r(q, n)| = \binom{n}{r}$ up to scalar. Thus it is not surprising that the optimal packings in $E(q, n)$ are the same as those in $E_r(q, n)$ up to scalar.

We also comment that the asymptotic rates in Proposition 5 for subspace codes come from Singleton bounds. The asymptotic rate $a_s(r', d'_s)$ is achieved by KK codes. The asymptotic rate $a_s(d'_s)$ is similar to that for rank metric codes [15]. This can be explained by the fact that the asymptotic rate $a_s(d'_s)$ is also achieved by KK codes when $r = \nu$, whose cardinalities are equal to those of optimal rank metric codes.

C. Covering properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric

We now consider the covering properties of subspace codes with the subspace metric. The subspace covering radius in $E(q, n)$ of a code \mathcal{C} is defined as $\max_{U \in E(q, n)} d_s(U, \mathcal{C})$. 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 $\rho \geq \nu$.

Proposition 6: For $\nu \leq \rho < n$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) = 2$.

Proof: For all $V \in E(q, n)$ there exists \bar{V} such that $V \cap \bar{V} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $V + \bar{V} = \text{GF}(q)^n$, and hence $d_s(V, \bar{V}) = n$. Therefore, one subspace cannot cover the whole $E(q, n)$ with radius $\rho < n$, hence $K_s(q, n, \rho) > 1$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^n\}$, then for all $D \in E(q, n)$, $d_s(D, \mathcal{C}) = \min\{\dim(D), n - \dim(D)\} \leq \nu$. Thus \mathcal{C} has covering radius ν and $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2$ for all $\rho \geq \nu$. ■

We thus consider $0 < \rho < \nu$ henceforth. Proposition 7 below is the sphere covering bound for subspace codes with the subspace metric.

Proposition 7: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) \geq \min \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, 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 codeword 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 remark that the lower bound in Proposition 7 is based on the optimal solution to an integer linear program and hence determining this lower bound is computationally infeasible for large parameter values.

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

Proposition 8: For all q, n , $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2 + 2 \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} \lfloor k_r \rfloor$, where

$$k_r = \frac{\binom{n}{r}}{\binom{n-r+\rho}{\rho}} + \frac{\binom{n}{r-\rho}}{\binom{n}{r}} \ln \left[\frac{n-r+\rho}{\rho} \right].$$

Proof: We show that there exists a code with cardinality $2 + 2 \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} \lfloor k_r \rfloor$ 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 $\rho+1 \leq r \leq \nu$, let \mathbf{A} be the $\binom{n}{r} \times \binom{n}{r-\rho}$ binary 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 [12, Theorem 12.2.1], there exists an $\binom{n}{r} \times \lfloor k_r \rfloor$ submatrix of \mathbf{A} with no all-zero rows. Thus, all subspaces of dimension r can be covered using $\lfloor k_r \rfloor$ codewords. Summing for all r , all subspaces with dimension $0 \leq r \leq \nu$ can be covered with $1 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} \lfloor k_r \rfloor$ subspaces. Similarly, it can be shown that all subspaces with dimension $\nu+1 \leq r \leq n$ can be covered with $1 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{\nu} \lfloor k_r \rfloor$ subspaces. ■

We remark that the upper bound in Proposition 8 can be further tightened by using the greedy algorithm described in [16], [17]. We now give an explicit construction of a subspace covering code.

Proposition 9: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \nu$, let $J_1 = \{0\} \cup \{\nu - \rho - \lfloor \frac{\nu - \rho}{2\rho + 1} \rfloor (2\rho + 1), \dots, \nu - 3\rho - 1, \nu - \rho\}$ and $J_2 = \{n\} \cup \{n - \nu + \rho + \lfloor \frac{\nu - \rho}{2\rho + 1} \rfloor (2\rho + 1), \dots, n - \nu + 3\rho + 1, n - \nu + \rho\}$. 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 $\leq \nu$. First, all subspaces $D_0 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $0 \leq \dim(D_0) < \nu - 2\rho - \lfloor \frac{\nu - \rho}{2\rho + 1} \rfloor (2\rho + 1) \leq \rho$ are covered by the subspace with dimension 0. Second, for all $D_1 \in E(q, n)$ with dimension $\nu - 2\rho - i(2\rho + 1) \leq \dim(D_1) \leq \nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1)$, there exists C_1 with dimension $\nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1)$ such that $D_1 \subseteq C_1$. 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 $\nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1) < \dim(D_2) < \nu - 2\rho - (i - 1)(2\rho + 1)$, there exists C_2 with dimension $\nu - \rho - i(2\rho + 1)$ 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 $\leq \nu$. Similarly, all the subspaces with dimension $\geq n - \nu$ are covered by $\bigcup_{r \in J_2} E_r(q, n)$. ■

Using the bounds derived above, we now determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_s(q, n, \rho)$. We define $k_s(\rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q K_s(q, n, \rho)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$, where $\rho' = \frac{\rho}{n}$. We note that this definition of asymptotic rate is from a combinatorial perspective again.

Proposition 10: For $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_s(\rho') = 1 - 2\rho'$. For $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$, $k_s(\rho') = 0$.

Proof: By Proposition 6, $k_s(\rho') = 0$ for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$. Let \mathcal{C} be a code with subspace covering radius $\rho < \nu$ and for $0 \leq l \leq n$, let A_l denote the number of codewords in \mathcal{C} with dimension l . All the subspaces in $E_\nu(q, n)$ are covered, hence $\binom{n}{\nu} \leq \sum_{l=0}^n A_l \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(l, \nu, d)$. Using Lemma 3, we obtain $\sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_s(l, \nu, d) < K_q^{-2} L_q q^{\rho(n-\nu)}$ for all l , and hence $\binom{n}{\nu} < K_q^{-2} L_q q^{\rho(n-\nu)} |\mathcal{C}|$. Therefore $K_s(q, n, \rho) > K_q^2 L_q^{-1} q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\rho)}$, which asymptotically becomes $k_s(\rho') \geq 1 - 2\rho'$.

Also, by Proposition 8, it can be easily shown that $K_s(q, n, \rho) \leq 2 + (n + 1)[1 - \ln K_q + \rho(n - \rho - 1) \ln q] K_q^{-1} q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\rho)}$, which asymptotically becomes $k_s(\rho') \leq 1 - 2\rho'$. ■

The proof of Proposition 10 indicates that the minimum cardinality $K_s(q, n, \rho)$ of a covering subspace code is on the order of $q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\rho)}$. However, a covering subspace code is easily obtained by taking the union of optimal covering CDCs (in their respective Grassmannians) for all dimensions, leading to a code with cardinality $2 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{n-\rho-1} K_c(q, n, r, \lfloor \frac{\rho}{2} \rfloor)$. By [7, Proposition 11], $K_c(q, n, r, \lfloor \frac{\rho}{2} \rfloor)$ is on the order of $q^{r(n-r) - \lfloor \frac{\rho}{2} \rfloor (n - \lfloor \frac{\rho}{2} \rfloor)}$. Hence the code has a cardinality on the order of $q^{\nu(n-\nu) - \frac{\rho}{2}(n - \frac{\rho}{2})}$, which is greater than $q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-\rho)}$. Thus, a union of optimal covering CDCs (in their respective Grassmannians) does not result in asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes with the subspace metric.

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

A. Properties of balls with injection radii

We first investigate the properties of balls with injection radii in $E(q, n)$, which will be instrumental in our study of packing and covering properties of subspace codes with the injection distance. We denote the number of subspaces with dimension s at injection distance d from a subspace with dimension r as $N_1(r, s, d)$.

Lemma 4: $N_1(r, s, d) = N_s(r, s, 2d - |r - s|)$. Hence, $N_1(r, s, d) = q^{d(d+s-r)} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d+s-r \end{bmatrix}$ for $r \geq s$ and $N_1(r, s, d) = q^{d(d+r-s)} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ d+r-s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n-r \\ d \end{bmatrix}$ for $r \leq s$.

Proof: If $U \in E_r(q, n)$ and $V \in E_s(q, n)$, then $d_1(U, V) = d$ if and only if $d_s(U, V) = 2d - |r - s|$. Therefore, $N_1(r, s, d) = N_s(r, s, 2d - |r - s|)$, and the formula for $N_1(r, s, d)$ is easily obtained from Lemma 2. ■

We denote the volume of a ball with injection radius t around a subspace with dimension r as $V_1(r, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{d=0}^t \sum_{s=0}^n N_1(r, s, d)$. We derive bounds on $V_1(r, t)$ below.

Proposition 11: For all q, n, r , and $t \leq \nu$, $q^{t(n-t)} \leq V_1(r, t) < N_q(2N_q - 1)K_q^{-2}q^{t(n-t)}$, where $N_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

The proof of Proposition 11 is given in Appendix B. We remark that the bounds in Proposition 11 are tight up to a scalar, which will greatly facilitate our asymptotic study of subspace codes with the injection metric. Unlike the bounds on the volume of a ball with subspace radius in Proposition 1, the lower and upper bounds in Proposition 11 do not depend on r . This illustrates a clear geometric distinction between the subspace and injection metrics.

B. Packing properties of subspace codes with the injection metric

We are interested in packing subspace codes used with the injection metric. The maximum cardinality of a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance d is denoted as $A_1(q, n, d)$. Since $A_1(q, n, 1) = |E(q, n)|$, we assume $d \geq 2$ henceforth. When $d > \nu$, the maximum cardinality of a code with minimum injection 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 injection distance d and codewords having dimensions in J as $A_1(q, n, d, J)$. For $2 \leq d \leq \nu$, we denote $Q_d = \{d, d+1, \dots, n-d\}$.

Proposition 12: For $d > \nu$, $A_1(q, n, d) = 2$ and for $2 \leq d \leq \nu$, $A_1(q, n, d) = A_1(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$.

Proof: Let \mathcal{C} be a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance d and let $C, D \in \mathcal{C}$. We have $\max\{\dim(C), \dim(D)\} = d_1(C, D) + \dim(C \cap D) \geq d$, therefore there is at most one codeword with

dimension less than d . Also, $\min\{\dim(C), \dim(D)\} = \dim(C + D) - d_1(C, D) \leq n - d$, therefore there is at most one codeword with dimension greater than $n - d$. Thus $A_1(q, n, d) \leq 2$ for $d > \nu$ and $A_1(q, n, d) \leq A_1(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$ for $d \leq \nu$. Also, adding $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\text{GF}(q)^n$ to a code with minimum injection distance $d \leq \nu$ and codewords of dimensions in Q_d does not decrease the minimum distance. Thus $A_1(q, n, d) = A_1(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2$ for $d \leq \nu$. When $d > \nu$, $n - d \leq d$, and thus $A_M(q, n, d) = 2$. ■

Lemma 5 below relates $A_1(q, n, d)$ to $A_s(q, n, d)$ and $A_c(q, n, r, d)$.

Lemma 5: For all q, n , and $2 \leq d \leq \nu$, $A_s(q, n, 2d - 1) \leq A_1(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d)$; furthermore, when $d \geq \frac{n}{3}$, $A_1(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d) + 2$. Also, $\max_{d \leq r \leq \nu} A_c(q, n, r, d) \leq A_1(q, n, d) \leq 2 + \sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_c(q, n, r, d)$.

Proof: A code with minimum subspace distance $2d - 1$ has minimum injection distance $\geq d$ by (5) and hence $A_s(q, n, 2d - 1) \leq A_1(q, n, d)$. Similarly, a code with minimum injection distance d has minimum subspace distance $\geq d$ and hence $A_1(q, n, d) \leq A_s(q, n, d)$.

Let \mathcal{C} be a code with minimum injection distance d whose codewords have dimensions in Q_d . For all codewords U and V , $d_s(U, V) = 2d_1(U, V) - |\dim(U) - \dim(V)| \geq 2d - (n - 2d)$. Thus \mathcal{C} has minimum subspace distance $4d - n \geq d$ for $d \geq \frac{n}{3}$, and hence $A_1(q, n, d, Q_d) \leq A_s(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d)$. Proposition 12 finally yields $A_1(q, n, d) = A_1(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2 \leq A_s(q, n, 4d - n, Q_d) + 2$.

Any CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance d is a subspace code with minimum injection distance d , hence $A_c(q, n, r, d) \leq A_1(q, n, d)$ for all r . Also, the codewords with dimension r in a subspace code with minimum injection distance d form a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance at least d , hence $A_1(q, n, d) = A_1(q, n, d, Q_d) + 2 \leq 2 + \sum_{r=d}^{n-d} A_c(q, n, r, d)$. ■

We now derive more bounds on $A_1(q, n, d)$. Proposition 13 below is the analogue of Proposition 3 for the injection metric and its proof is hence omitted.

Proposition 13: For all q, n , $2 \leq d \leq \nu$, and any permutation π of $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there exists a code with minimum injection distance d and $A_{\pi(r)}$ codewords with dimension $\pi(r)$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$, where $A_{\pi(0)} = A_c(q, n, \pi(0), d)$ and

$$A_{\pi(r)} = \max \left\{ 0, \left\lfloor \frac{\binom{n}{\pi(r)} - \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} A_{\pi(i)} \sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_1(\pi(i), \pi(r), e)}{\sum_{e=0}^{d-1} N_1(\pi(r), \pi(r), e)} \right\rfloor \right\}. \quad (11)$$

By extending the puncturing of subspaces introduced in [3], we finally derive below a Singleton bound for injection metric codes.

Proposition 14: For all q, n , and $2 \leq d \leq \nu$, $A_1(q, n, d) \leq A_1(q, n - 1, d - 1) \leq \sum_{r=0}^{n-d+1} \binom{n-d+1}{r}$.

Proof: Let $W \in E_{n-1}(q, n)$. We define the puncturing $H_W(V)$ from $E(q, n)$ to $E(q, n - 1)$ as follows. If $\dim(V) = 0$, then $\dim(H_W(V)) = 0$; otherwise, if $\dim(V) = r > 0$, then $H_W(V)$ is a

fixed $(r-1)$ -subspace of $V \cap W$. For all $U, V \in E(q, n)$, it is easily shown that $d_1(H_W(U), H_W(V)) \geq d_1(U, V) - 1$, and hence $H_W(U) \neq H_W(V)$ if $d_1(U, V) \geq 2$.

Therefore, if \mathcal{C} is a code in $E(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance $d \geq 2$, then $\{H_W(V) : V \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is a code in $E(q, n-1)$ with minimum injection distance $\geq d-1$ and cardinality $|\mathcal{C}|$. The first inequality follows. Applying it $d-1$ times yields $A_1(q, n, d) \leq A_1(q, n-d+1, 1) = \sum_{r=0}^{n-d+1} \binom{n-d+1}{r}$. ■

We remark that although the puncturing defined in the proof of Proposition 14 depends on W , the bounds in Proposition 14 do not.

We now compare the cardinalities of optimal subspace codes and optimal CDCs with the same minimum injection distance d . We first establish the relation between $A_1(q, n, d)$ and $A_C(q, n, d)$ in Proposition 15 below.

Proposition 15: For $2 \leq d \leq r \leq \nu$,

$$q^{(\nu-r)(r-d+1)} A_C(q, n, r, d) \leq A_1(q, n, d) < 2K_q^{-1} N_q q^{(\nu-r)(r-d+1)} A_C(q, n, r, d), \quad (12)$$

where $N_q = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

The proof of Proposition 15 is similar to that of Proposition 4 and is hence omitted. We also obtain another relation between $A_1(q, n, d)$ and $A_s(q, n, d)$.

Corollary 1: For $2 \leq d \leq \nu$, $A_s(q, n, 2d) \leq A_s(q, n, 2d-1) \leq A_1(q, n, d) < 2K_q^{-1} N_q A_s(q, n, 2d)$. Also, $A_1(q, n, d) < 2K_q^{-2} N_q q^{(n-\nu)(\nu-d+1)}$.

Proof: The lower bounds on $A_1(q, n, d)$ follow Lemma 5. Furthermore, $A_1(q, n, d) < 2K_q^{-1} N_q A_C(q, n, \nu, d)$ by choosing $r = \nu$ in Proposition 15. Since $A_C(q, n, \nu, d) \leq A_s(q, n, 2d)$, we obtain $A_1(q, n, d) < 2K_q^{-1} N_q A_s(q, n, 2d)$. The last inequality follows from (6). ■

Corollary 1 provides several interesting insights. First, the upper and lower bounds are all tight up to a scalar. Second, for any optimal subspace code with minimum injection distance d and cardinality $A_1(q, n, d)$, the optimal (or nearly optimal) subspace codes with minimum subspace distance $2d$ have the same cardinality up to a scalar. Third, the last inequality in Corollary 1 implies that such nearly optimal subspace codes with minimum subspace distance $2d$ exist: KK codes in $E_\nu(q, n)$ are such codes.

Based on Proposition 15, we now determine the asymptotic rates of subspace codes and CDCs with the injection metric. Let us use the normalized parameters $r' = \frac{r}{n}$ defined earlier and $d'_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d_1}{n}$, where d_1 is the minimum injection distance of a code, and define the asymptotic maximum rate $a_1(d'_1) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_1(q, n, r, d_1)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$ for a subspace code with the injection metric and the asymptotic rate $a_1(r', d'_1) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q A_C(q, n, r, d_1)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$ for a CDC.

Proposition 16: For $\frac{1}{2} \leq d'_1 \leq 1$, $a_1(d'_1) = 0$; or $0 \leq d'_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(d'_1) = 1 - 2d'_1$. For $0 \leq r' \leq d'_1$ or $1 - d'_1 \leq r' \leq 1$, $a_1(r', d'_1) = 0$; for $d'_1 \leq r' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(r', d'_1) = 4(1 - r')(r' - d'_1)$; for $\frac{1}{2} \leq r' \leq 1 - d'_1$, $a_1(r', d'_1) = 4r'(1 - r' - d'_1)$.

The proof of Proposition 16 is similar to that of Proposition 5 and hence omitted.

Propositions 15 and 16 provide several important insights on the design of subspace codes with the injection metric. First, Proposition 15 indicates that optimal CDCs with dimension being half of the block length up to rounding ($r = \nu$ and $r = n - \nu$) are optimal subspace codes with the injection metric up to a scalar. In this case, the optimal CDCs have a limited rate loss as opposed to optimal subspace codes with the same error correction capability. When $r < \nu$, the rate loss suffered by optimal CDCs increases with $\nu - r$. Proposition 16 indicates that using CDCs with dimension $d_1 \leq r < \nu$ leads to a decrease in rate on the order of $(1 - 2r')(2d'_1 + 1 - 2r')$. Similarly to the subspace metric, the rate loss for CDCs using the injection metric increases with $1 - 2r'$. Hence using a CDC with a dimension further from ν leads to a high rate loss. The combinatorial explanation in Section III-B also applies in this case.

We also comment that the asymptotic rates in Proposition 16 for subspace codes come from Singleton bounds. The asymptotic rate $a_1(r', d'_1)$ is achieved by KK codes, and the asymptotic rate $a_1(d'_1)$ is achievable also by KK codes when $r = \nu$.

Proposition 16 also compares the difference between asymptotic rates of subspace codes with the subspace and injection metrics. Although $a_s(d'_s)$ and $a_1(d'_1)$ are different, the optimal subspace codes with the two metrics have similar asymptotic behavior. We note that a CDC with minimum injection distance d_1 has minimum subspace distance $d_s = 2d_1$, which implies that $a_s(r', d'_s) = a_1(r', d'_1)$ as long as $d'_s = 2d'_1$. Also, as shown above, CDCs in $E_\nu(q, n)$ with minimum injection distance d_1 are both asymptotically optimal subspace codes with minimum subspace distance $d_s = 2d_1$ and asymptotically optimal subspace codes with minimum injection distance d_1 . Finally, when the asymptotic rate is fixed, the relative subspace distance d'_s of optimal subspace codes is twice as much as the relative injection distance d'_1 . The implication of this on the error correction capability also depends on the decoding method.

C. Covering properties of subspace codes with the injection metric

We now consider the covering properties of subspace codes with the injection metric. The injection covering radius in $E(q, n)$ of \mathcal{C} is defined as $\max_{U \in E(q, n)} d_1(U, \mathcal{C})$. We denote the minimum cardinality of a subspace code with injection covering radius ρ in $E(q, n)$ as $K_1(q, n, \rho)$. Since $K_1(q, n, 0) = |E(q, n)|$ and $K_1(q, n, n) = 1$, we assume $0 < \rho < n$ henceforth. We first determine the minimum cardinality of a

code with injection covering radius ρ when $\rho \geq \nu$.

Proposition 17: For $n - \nu \leq \rho < n$, $K_1(q, n, \rho) = 1$. If $n = 2\nu + 1$, then $K_1(q, 2\nu + 1, \nu) = 2$.

Proof: Let C be a subspace with dimension ν . Then for all D_1 with $\dim(D_1) \leq \dim(C)$, we have $d_1(C, D_1) \leq \dim(C) = \nu$ by (2); similarly, for all D_2 with $\dim(D_2) \geq \dim(C) + 1$, we have $d_1(C, D_2) \leq n - \dim(C) = n - \nu$ by (3). Thus C covers $E(q, n)$ with radius $n - \nu$ and $K_1(q, n, \rho) = 1$ for $n - \nu \leq \rho < n$.

If $n = 2\nu + 1$, then it is easily shown that $\{C, C^\perp\}$ has covering radius ν , and hence $K_1(q, 2\nu + 1, \nu) \leq 2$. However, for any $D \in E(q, 2\nu + 1)$, then either $d_1(\{\mathbf{0}\}, D) = \dim(D) > \nu$ or $d_1(\text{GF}(q)^n, D) = n - \dim(D) > \nu$. Thus no **single** subspace can cover the projective space with radius ν and $K_1(q, 2\nu + 1, \nu) \geq 2$. ■

We thus consider $0 < \rho < \nu$ henceforth. Lemma 6 relates $K_1(q, n, \rho)$ to $K_s(q, n, \rho)$ and $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Lemma 6: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_s(q, n, 2\rho) \leq K_1(q, n, \rho) \leq K_s(q, n, \rho)$ and $K_1(q, n, \rho) \leq 2 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{n-\rho-1} K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$.

Proof: A code with injection covering radius ρ has subspace covering radius $\leq 2\rho$, hence $K_s(q, n, 2\rho) \leq K_1(q, n, \rho)$. Also, a code with subspace covering radius ρ has injection covering radius $\leq \rho$, hence $K_1(q, n, \rho) \leq K_s(q, n, \rho)$.

For $\rho + 1 \leq r \leq n - \rho - 1$, let \mathcal{C}_r be a CDC in $E_r(q, n)$ with covering radius ρ and cardinality $K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$ and let $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{r=\rho+1}^{n-\rho-1} \mathcal{C}_r \cup \{\{\mathbf{0}\}, \text{GF}(q)^n\}$. Then \mathcal{C} is a subspace code with injection covering radius ρ and cardinality $2 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{n-\rho-1} K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$. ■

Proposition 18 below is the analogue of Proposition 7 for the injection metric.

Proposition 18: For all q, n , and $0 < \rho < \nu$, $K_1(q, n, \rho) \geq \min \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, 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 $\sum_{i=0}^n A_i \sum_{d=0}^{\rho} N_1(i, r, d) \geq \binom{n}{r}$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$.

The lower bound in Proposition 18 is again based on the optimal solution to an integer linear program, and hence determining the lower bound is computationally infeasible for large parameter values.

Proposition 19: $K_1(q, n, \rho) \leq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\min_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_1(r, \rho)} [1 + \ln(\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_1(r, \rho))]$.

The proof of Proposition 19 is a direct application of [12, Theorem 12.2.1], and is hence omitted.

We finally determine the asymptotic behavior of $K_1(q, n, \rho)$ by using the asymptotic rate $k_1(\rho') = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q K_1(q, n, \rho)}{\log_q |E(q, n)|}$.

Proposition 20: For $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $k_1(\rho') = (1 - 2\rho')^2$. For $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$, $k_1(\rho') = 0$.

Proof: By Proposition 17, $k_1(\rho') = 0$ for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \rho' \leq 1$. We have $K_1(q, n, \rho) \geq \frac{|E(q, n)|}{\max_{0 \leq r \leq n} V_1(r, \rho)} > \frac{K_q^2}{N_q(2N_q - 1)} q^{\nu(n-\nu) - \rho(n-\rho)}$ by Lemma 1 and Proposition 11. This asymptotically becomes $k_1(\rho') \geq (1 -$

$2\rho')^2$ for $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, Proposition 19, Lemma 1, and Proposition 11 yield

$$K_1(q, n, \rho) < 2K_q^{-1}N_q q^{\nu(n-\nu)-\rho(n-\rho)} [1 + \ln(N_q(2N_q - 1)K_q^{-2}) + \rho(n - \rho) \ln q]$$

which asymptotically becomes $k_1(\rho') \leq (1 - 2\rho')^2$ for $0 \leq \rho' \leq \frac{1}{2}$. ■

The proof of Proposition 20 indicates that the minimum cardinality $K_1(q, n, \rho)$ of a covering subspace code with the injection metric is on the order of $q^{\nu(n-\nu)-\rho(n-\rho)}$. A covering subspace code is easily obtained by taking the union of optimal covering CDCs for all constant dimensions, leading to a code with cardinality $2 + \sum_{r=\rho+1}^{n-\rho-1} K_c(q, n, r, \rho)$. By [7], the cardinality of the union is on the order of $q^{\nu(n-\nu)-\rho(n-\rho)}$. Thus, a union of optimal covering CDCs (in their respective Grassmannians) results in asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes with the injection metric. Unfortunately, an explicit construction for either optimal covering CDCs (for their respective Grassmannians) or asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes is unavailable.

Propositions 10 and 20 as well as their implications illustrate the differences between the subspace and injection metrics. First, the asymptotic rates of optimal covering subspace codes with the two metrics are different. Second, a union of optimal covering CDCs (in their respective Grassmannians) results in asymptotically optimal covering subspace codes with the injection metric only, not with the subspace metric. These differences can be attributed to the different behaviors of the volume of a ball with subspace and injection radius. Although $V_s(0, t) = V_1(0, t)$, Proposition 1 indicates that $V_s(r, t)$ decreases with r ($r \leq \nu$), while according to Proposition 11, $V_1(r, t)$ remains asymptotically constant. Hence, for $\nu - \rho \leq r \leq \nu$, the balls with subspace radius ρ centered at a subspace with dimension r have significantly smaller volumes than their counterparts with an injection radius. Therefore, covering the subspaces with dimension ν requires more balls with subspace radius ρ than balls with injection radius ρ , which explains the different rates for $k_s(\rho')$ and $k_1(\rho')$. Also, since the volume of a ball with subspace radius reaches its minimum for $r = \nu$ and $E_\nu(q, n)$ has the largest cardinality among all Grassmannians, using covering CDCs of dimension ν to cover $E_\nu(q, n)$ is not advantageous. Thus, a union of covering CDCs does not lead to an asymptotically optimal covering subspace code in the subspace metric.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof: When $r = 0$, $V_s(0, t) = \sum_{i=0}^t \binom{n}{i}$. Hence $V_s(0, t) \geq \binom{n}{t} \geq q^{t(n-t)}$ by (1), which proves the lower bound. Also, $V_s(0, t) < K_q^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{i(n-i)} < K_q^{-1} q^{t(n-t)} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} q^{-j^2}$ by (1), which proves the upper bound.

We now prove the bounds on $V_s(r, t)$ for $r \geq 1$. First, by Lemma 2, $N_s(r, s, d) = q^{u(d-u)} \binom{r}{u} \binom{n-r}{d-u}$, where $u = \frac{r+d-s}{2}$ satisfies $0 \leq u \leq \min\{r, d\}$. Thus $q^{f(u)} \leq N_s(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{f(u)}$ by (1), where $f(u) = u(2r + 3d - n - 3u) + d(n - r - d)$. Hence, $\sum_{d=0}^t S(d) \leq V_s(r, t) < K_q^{-2} \sum_{d=0}^t S(d)$, where $S(d) = \sum_{u=0}^{\min\{r, d\}} q^{f(u)}$. Since $f(u)$ is maximized for $u = u_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2r+3d-n}{6} \leq d$, we need to consider the following three cases.

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

From the discussion above, we obtain $V_s(r, t) \geq S(t) \geq q^{-\frac{3}{4} + g(r, t)}$ which proves the lower bound, and $V_s(r, t) < K_q^{-2} \sum_{d=0}^t S(d) < 2M_q K_q^{-2} \sum_{d=0}^t q^{g(r, d)}$. We now show that $R(t) = \sum_{d=0}^t q^{g(r, d)} < (1 + q^{-1})L_q q^{g(r, t)}$ by distinguishing the following three cases.

First, if $t \leq \frac{n-2r}{3}$, $R(t) = \sum_{d=0}^t q^{d(n-r-d)} = q^{t(n-r-t)} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{-i(n-r-2t+i)} < q^{g(r, t)} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q^{-i^2}$.

Second, if $\frac{n-2r}{3} < t \leq \frac{n+4r}{3}$, we have $\frac{1}{12}(n-2r)^2 + \frac{1}{4}d(2n-d) \geq d(n-r-d)$ for all d and hence $R(t) \leq \sum_{d=0}^t q^{\frac{1}{12}(n-2r)^2 + \frac{1}{4}d(2n-d)} = q^{g(r, t)} \sum_{i=0}^t q^{-\frac{1}{4}i(2n-2t+i)} < L_q q^{g(r, t)}$.

Third, if $\frac{n+4r}{3} < t \leq \frac{n}{2}$, which implies $1 \leq r < \frac{n}{8}$, it can be shown that $g(r, \lfloor \frac{n+4r}{3} \rfloor) \leq g(r, \lfloor \frac{n+4r}{3} \rfloor + 1) - \frac{n-2r}{3} + 1 \leq g(r, t) - 1$. Hence $R(t) = R(\lfloor \frac{n+4r}{3} \rfloor) + q^{g(r, t)} \sum_{j=0}^{t - \lfloor \frac{n+4r}{3} \rfloor - 1} q^{-j(n-2t+2r+j)} < q^{g(r, t) - 1} L_q + q^{g(r, t)} L_q$.

Thus, $V_s(r, t) < 2M_q(1 + q^{-1})L_q K_q^{-2} q^{g(r, t)}$. ■

B. Proof of Proposition 11

Proof: First, $V_1(r, t) \geq N_1(r, r, t) \geq q^{t(n-t)}$. We now prove the upper bound. Since $V_1(r, t) = V_1(n-r, t)$, we assume $r \leq \nu$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 4, we have $N_1(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{s(n-d+r-s) - (r-d)(n-d)}$

for $s \leq r$ and $N_I(r, s, d) < K_q^{-2} q^{s(r-s+d)+d(n-r-d)}$ for $s \geq r$. Hence

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

■

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ho, M. Médard, R. Koetter, D. R. Karger, M. Effros, J. Shi, and B. Leong, “A random linear network coding approach to multicast,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 4413–4430, October 2006.
- [2] T. Ho and D. S. Lun, *Network coding: an introduction*. New York NY: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [3] 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.
- [4] D. Silva and F. R. Kschischang, “On metrics for error correction in network coding,” 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.3824v1>.
- [5] 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, September 2008.
- [6] V. Skachek, “Recursive code construction for random networks,” 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0806.3650v1>.
- [7] M. Gadouleau and Z. Yan, “Construction and covering properties of constant-dimension codes,” *submitted to IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 2009, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0903.2675>.
- [8] A. Kohnert and S. Kurz, “Construction of large constant dimension codes with a prescribed minimum distance,” *Mathematical Methods in Computer Science, LNCS*, vol. 5393, pp. 31–42, December 2008.
- [9] S.-T. Xia and F.-W. Fu, “Johnson type bounds on constant dimension codes,” *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 163–172, February 2009.
- [10] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, “Error-correcting codes in projective space,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, Toronto, ON, July 2008, pp. 871–875.
- [11] E. M. Gabidulin and M. Bossert, “Codes for network coding,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. on Information Theory*, Toronto, ON, July 2008, pp. 867–870.

- [12] G. D. Cohen, I. Honkala, S. Litsyn, and A. C. Lobstein, *Covering Codes*. Elsevier, 1997.
- [13] G. E. Andrews, *The Theory of Partitions*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, G.-C. Rota, Ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1976, vol. 2.
- [14] 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.
- [15] —, “Packing and covering properties of rank metric codes,” *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3873–3883, September 2008.
- [16] 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.
- [17] M. Gadouneau and Z. Yan, “Bounds on covering codes with the rank metric,” *submitted to IEEE Communications Letters*, September 2008, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0809.2968>.