

Secure Frameproof Code Through Biclique Cover

Hossein Hajiabolhassan* and Farokhlagha Moazami†

**Department of Mathematical Sciences*

Shahid Beheshti University, G.C.

P.O. Box 1983963113, Tehran, Iran

School of Mathematics

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM)

P.O. Box 193955746, Tehran, Iran

hhaji@sbu.ac.ir

†*Department of Mathematics*

Alzahra University

P.O. Box 1993891176, Tehran, Iran

f.moazami@alzahra.ac.ir

Abstract

For a binary code Γ of length v , a v -word w produces by a set of codewords $\{w^1, \dots, w^r\} \subseteq \Gamma$ if for all $i = 1, \dots, v$, we have $w_i \in \{w_i^1, \dots, w_i^r\}$. We call a code r -secure frameproof of size t if $|\Gamma| = t$ and for any v -word that is produced by two sets C_1 and C_2 of size at most r then the intersection of these sets is nonempty. A d -biclique cover of size v of a graph G is a collection of v -complete bipartite subgraphs of G such that each edge of G belongs to at least d of these complete bipartite subgraphs. In this paper, we show that for $t \geq 2r$, an r -secure frameproof code of size t and length v exists if and only if there exists a 1-biclique cover of size v for the Kneser graph $\text{KG}(t, r)$ whose vertices are all r -subsets of a t -element set and two r -subsets are adjacent if their intersection is empty. Then we investigate some connection between the minimum size of d -biclique covers of Kneser graphs and cover-free families, where an $(r, w; d)$ cover-free family is a family of subsets of a finite set such that the intersection of any r members of the family contains at least d elements that are not in the union of any other w members. Also, we present an upper bound for 1-biclique covering number of Kneser graphs.

Key words: cover-free family, secure frameproof code, biclique cover, Hadamard matrix.

Subject classification: 05B40.

1 Introduction

Frameproof codes were first introduced by Boneh and Shaw [2]. Let $\Gamma \subseteq \{0, 1\}^v$ and $|\Gamma| = t$. Γ is called a (v, t) -code and every element of Γ is said to be a code word. We write w_i for the i th component of a word w . Also, the incidence matrix of Γ is a $t \times v$ matrix whose rows are the codewords in Γ . Suppose $C = \{w^{(u_1)}, w^{(u_2)}, \dots, w^{(u_d)}\} \subseteq \Gamma \subseteq \{0, 1\}^v$. For $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$, the i th component is said undetectable for C if

$$w_i^{(u_1)} = w_i^{(u_2)} = \dots = w_i^{(u_d)}.$$

¹*This research was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 90050114).

Let $U(C)$ be the set of undetectable components for C . The set

$$F(C) = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^v : x|_{U(C)} = w^{(u_i)}|_{U(C)} \text{ for all } w^{(u_i)} \in C\}$$

represents all possible v -tuples that could be produced by the coalition C by comparing the d codewords they jointly hold.

Definition 1. An r -frameproof code is a subset $\Gamma \subseteq \{0, 1\}^v$ such that for every $C \subseteq \Gamma$ where $|C| \leq r$, we have $F(C) \cap \Gamma = C$. ♠

See [1, 2, 6, 8, 9] for more details about frameproof codes. The following theorem was proved by Stinson and Wei [5].

Theorem A. [5] Suppose Γ is an $r - FPC(v, b)$ with $b > 2r - 1$. Suppose $D \subseteq \Gamma$, where $|D| = 2r - 1$. Then there exists an unregistered word, say $maj(D) \in \{0, 1\}^v$, such that $maj(D) \in F(C)$ for any $C \subseteq D$ with $|C| = r$.

In view of the aforementioned theorem, it is not possible to identify a pirate user in an $r - FPC(v, b)$. So they were considered a weaker condition and defined *secure frameproof codes* in which distributor is able to identify at least one pirate of the guilty coalitions.

Definition 2. Suppose that Γ is a (v, t) -code. Γ is said to be an r -secure frameproof code if for any $C_1, C_2 \subseteq \Gamma$ with $|C_1| \leq r$, $|C_2| \leq r$, and $C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset$, we have $F(C_1) \cap F(C_2) = \emptyset$. Also, Γ is termed an $r - SFPC(v, t)$, for short. ♠

Stinson and Wei in [5] studied the relationship between binary secure frameproof codes and combinatorial aspects. In this paper, we establish the relationship between this concept and biclique cover. By a *biclique* we mean a bipartite graph with vertex set (X, Y) such that every vertex in X is adjacent to every vertex in Y . Note that every empty graph is a biclique. A d -*biclique cover* of a graph G of size s is a collection of s bicliques of G such that each edge of G is in at least d of the bicliques. The d -*biclique covering number* of G , denoted by $bc_d(G)$, is defined to be the minimum number of s such that there exists a d -biclique cover of size s for the graph G .

Definition 3. Let X be an n -set and $\mathcal{F} = \{B_1, \dots, B_t\}$ be a family of subsets of X . \mathcal{F} is called an $(r, w; d)$ -cover-free family if for any two subsets $I, J \in [t]$ such that $|I| = r$, $|J| = w$, and $I \cap J = \emptyset$ the following condition holds

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} B_i \not\subseteq \bigcup_{j \in J} B_j.$$

We denote it briefly by $(r, w) - CFF(n, t)$. ♠

The minimum number of elements for which there exists an $(r, w; d) - CFF$ with t blocks is denoted by $N((r, w; d), t)$. The incidence matrix of an $(r, w; d) - CFF$ is a $t \times n$ binary matrix A such that $a_{ij} = 1$ whenever $j \in B_i$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. As usual, we denote by $[t]$ the set $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$, and denote by $\binom{[t]}{r}$ the collection of all r -subsets of $[t]$. The graph $I_t(r, w)$ is a bipartite graph with the vertex set $(\binom{[t]}{r}, \binom{[t]}{w})$ which a w -subset is adjacent to an r -subset whenever their intersection is empty.

Theorem B. [4] For any positive integers r, w, d , and t , where $t \geq r + w$, we have

$$N((r, w; d), t) = bc_d(I_t(r, w)).$$

For abbreviation, let $bc(G)$ stand for $bc_1(G)$. The *Kneser graph* $KG(t, r)$ is the graph with vertex set $\binom{[t]}{r}$, and A is adjacent to B if $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Throughout this paper, we only consider finite simple graphs. For a graph G , let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote its vertex and edge sets, respectively. A *homomorphism* from G to H is a map $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ such that adjacent vertices in G are mapped into adjacent vertices in H , i.e., $uv \in E(G)$ implies $\phi(u)\phi(v) \in E(H)$. In addition, if any edge in H is the image of some edge in G , then ϕ is termed an onto-edge homomorphism. In this paper, by A^c we mean the complement of the set A . In the next section, we show that for $t \geq 2r$, an r -secure frameproof code of size t and length v exists if and only if there exists a 1-biclique cover of size v for the Kneser graph $KG(t, r)$. Also, we wish to investigate some connection between the d -biclique covering number of Kneser graphs and cover-free families. Finally, we present an upper bound for the biclique covering number of Kneser graphs.

2 Secure Frameproof Codes

For a subset A_i of $[t]$, the *indicator vector* of A_i is the vector $v_{A_i} = (v_1, \dots, v_t)$, where $v_j = 1$ if $j \in A_i$ and $v_j = 0$ otherwise.

Theorem 1. Let r, t , and v be positive integers, where $t \geq 2r$. An r -SFPC(v, t) exists if and only if there exists a biclique cover of size v for the Kneser graph $KG(t, r)$.

Proof. Assume that A is the incidence matrix of an r -SFPC(v, t). Assign to the j th column of A , the set A_j as follows

$$A_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq t, a_{ij} = 1\}.$$

Now, for $1 \leq j \leq v$, construct the bicliques G_j with vertex set (X_j, Y_j) , where the vertices of X_j are all r -subsets of A_j and the vertices of Y_j are all r -subsets of A_j^c i.e., $[t] \setminus A_j$. It is easily seen that G_j , for $1 \leq j \leq v$, is a complete bipartite graph of $KG(t, r)$. Let $C_1 C_2$ be an arbitrary edge of $KG(t, r)$. So $C_1, C_2 \subseteq [t]$, and $C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset$. Since A is the incidence matrix of an r -SFPC(v, t), we have $F(C_1) \cap F(C_2) = \emptyset$. This means that there exists a bit position i such that the i th bit of all code words of C_1 is c_i , for some $c_i \in \{0, 1\}$, and also the i th bit of all codewords of C_2 is $c_i + 1 \pmod{2}$. So there exists a column of A such that all entries corresponding to the rows of C_1 are equal to 1 and all entries corresponding to the rows of C_2 are equal to 0, or vice versa. Hence, $C_1 C_2 \in E(G_i)$. Conversely, assume that we have a biclique cover of size v for the graph $KG(t, r)$. Our objective is to construct an r -SFPC. Label graphs in this biclique cover with G_1, \dots, G_v , where G_i has as its vertex set (X_i, Y_i) . Let A_i be the union of sets that lie in X_i . Consider the indicator vectors of A_i , for $1 \leq i \leq v$, and construct the matrix A whose columns are these vectors. Assume that C_1 and C_2 are two disjoint subsets of $[t]$ of size r , i.e.,

$C_1C_2 \in E(\text{KG}(t, r))$. Let G_i be the complete bipartite graph that covers the edge C_1C_2 . Then in the i th column of the matrix A all entries corresponding to the rows of C_1 are equal to 1 and all entries corresponding to the rows of C_2 are equal to 0, or vice versa. Consequently, $F(C_1) \cap F(C_2) = \emptyset$. ■

A *covering* of a graph G is a subset K of $V(G)$ such that every edge of G has at least one end in K . The number of vertices in a minimum covering of G is called the *covering number* of G and denoted by $\beta(G)$. In [5], Stinson, Trung, and Wei construct an $r - \text{SFPC}(2\binom{2r-1}{r-1}, 2r + 1)$.

Corollary 1. [5] *For any integer $r \geq 0$, there exists an $r - \text{SFPC}(2\binom{2r-1}{r-1}, 2r + 1)$.*

Proof. Easily, one can check that the biclique covering number of a graph G without C_4 as a subgraph is equal to the covering number of G . On the other hand $\text{KG}(2r + 1, r)$ does not contain C_4 as a subgraph. So $bc(\text{KG}(2r + 1, r)) = \beta(\text{KG}(2r + 1, r))$. Also, it is a well-known fact that $\beta(\text{KG}(t, r)) = \frac{t-r}{r} \binom{t-1}{r-1}$. An easy computation confirms the assertion. ■

In the next theorem, we show the relationship between the d -biclique cover of Kneser graphs and cover-free families.

Theorem 2. *For any positive integers r, d , and t , where $t \geq 2r$, it holds that*

$$bc_{2d}(\text{KG}(t, r)) \leq N((r, r; d), t) \leq 2bc_d(\text{KG}(t, r)).$$

Proof. First, assume that we have an optimal $(r, r; d) - \text{CFF}(n, t)$, i.e., $n = N((r, r; d), t)$ with incidence matrix A . Assign to the j th column of A the set A_j as follows

$$A_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq t, a_{ij} = 1\}.$$

Consider the biclique G_j with vertex set (X_j, Y_j) , where the vertices of X_j are all r -subsets of A_j and the vertices of Y_j are all r -subsets of A_j^c . Also, two vertices are adjacent if the subsets corresponding to these vertices are disjoint. It is not difficult to see that G_j 's, for $1 \leq j \leq t$, form a $2d$ -biclique cover of $\text{KG}(t, r)$. So $bc_{2d}(\text{KG}(t, r)) \leq N((r, r; d), t)$.

Conversely, assume that we have a d -biclique cover of $\text{KG}(t, r)$. Label graphs in this biclique cover with G_1, \dots, G_l , where G_i has as its vertex set (X_i, Y_i) . Let A_i be the union of sets that lie in X_i and B_i be the union of sets that lie in Y_i . Obviously, A_i and B_i are disjoint. Consider the indicator vectors of A_i 's and B_i 's, for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Construct the matrix A whose columns are these vectors. Then A is the incidence matrix of an $(r, r; d) - \text{CFF}(2l, t)$. So $N((r, r; d), t) \leq 2bc_d(\text{KG}(t, r))$. ■

By the aforementioned results, it may be of interest to find some bounds for the biclique covering number of Kneser graphs.

Theorem 3. *For any positive integers d, r, s , and t , where $t > 2r$ and $r > s$, we have*

$$bc_d(\text{KG}(t, r)) \geq bc_m(\text{KG}(t, s)),$$

where $m = N((r - s, r - s; d), t - 2s)$.

Proof. Let $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_l\}$ be an optimal d -biclique cover of $\text{KG}(t, r)$. Also, assume that G_i has as its vertex set (X_i, Y_i) . Let A_i and B_i be the union of sets that lie in X_i and Y_i , respectively. For any $1 \leq i \leq l$, consider the biclique G'_i , as a subgraph of $\text{KG}(t, s)$, with vertex set (X'_i, Y'_i) , where X'_i is the set of all s -subsets of A_i and Y'_i is the set of all s -subsets of B_i . One can check that G'_i 's cover all edges of $\text{KG}(t, s)$. Moreover, any edge $UV \in E(\text{KG}(t, s))$ is contained in at least m -bicliques, where $m = N((r-s, r-s; d), t-2s)$. To see this, consider the bipartite graph $I_{\{U, V\}}$ (as an induced subgraph of $\text{KG}(t, r)$) with vertex set (X_U, Y_V) , where

$$X_U = \{W \mid U \subseteq W \subseteq [t], W \cap V = \emptyset, |W| = r\}$$

$$Y_V = \{W \mid V \subseteq W \subseteq [t], W \cap U = \emptyset, |W| = r\}.$$

It is a simple matter to check that $I_{\{U, V\}}$ and $I_{t-2s}(r-s, r-s)$ are isomorphic. Also, if G_j covers any edge of $I_{\{U, V\}}$, then UV is contained in G'_j . Consequently, by Theorem B the assertion follows. ■

In view of the proof of Theorem 3, similarly, one can extend any biclique of $I_t(r, w)$ to a biclique of $I_t(r-i, w-j)$. Consequently, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Let d, r, w , and t be positive integers, where $t \geq r + w$. For any $1 \leq i < r$ and $1 \leq j < w$, we have $N((r, w; d), t) \geq N((r-i, w-j; m), t)$, where $m = N((i, j; d), t-r-w+i+j)$.*

We know that the image of a biclique under a graph homomorphism is a biclique. This leads us to the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let G and H be two graphs and $\phi : G \rightarrow H$ be an onto-edge homomorphism. Also, assume that d and t are positive integers and for any edge $e \in E(H)$, $bc_d(\phi^{-1}(e)) \geq t$. Then $bc_d(G) \geq bc_t(H)$.*

Proof. Let $\{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_l\}$ be an optimal d -biclique cover of G . One can check that for any $0 \leq i \leq l$, $\phi(K_i)$ is a biclique and the family $\{\phi(K_1), \phi(K_2), \dots, \phi(K_l)\}$ is a t -biclique cover of H . ■

Theorem 4. *For any positive integers t and r , where $t > 2r$, we have*

$$bc_d(\text{KG}(t, r)) \geq bc_{3d}(\text{KG}(t-2, r-1)).$$

Proof. First, we present an onto-edge homomorphism ϕ from $\text{KG}(t, r)$ to $\text{KG}(t-2, r-1)$. To see this, for every vertex A of $\text{KG}(t, r)$, define $\phi(A) := A'$ as follows. If A does not contain both t and $t-1$, then define $A' := A \setminus \{\max A\}$. Otherwise, set $A' := \{x\} \cup A \setminus \{t, t-1\}$, where x is the maximum element absent from A . It is simple to check that the subgraph induced by the inverse image of any edge of $\text{KG}(t-2, r-1)$ contains an induced cycle of size six or an induced matching of size three. Hence, in view of Lemma 1, if $\{K_1, \dots, K_l\}$ is a d -biclique cover of $\text{KG}(t, r)$, then $\{\phi(K_1), \dots, \phi(K_l)\}$ is a $3d$ -biclique cover of $\text{KG}(t-2, r-1)$. ■

The aforementioned results motivate us to consider the following question.

Question 1. Let d , r , and t be positive integers, where $t > 2r$. What is the exact value of $bc_d(\text{KG}(t, r))$?

An $n \times n$ matrix H with entries $+1$ and -1 is called a *Hadamard matrix* of order n whenever $HH^t = nI$. It is not difficult to see that any two columns of H are also orthogonal. If we permute rows or columns or if we multiply some rows or columns by -1 then this property does not change. Two such Hadamard matrices are called *equivalent*. For a given Hadamard matrix, we can find an equivalent one for which the first row and the first column consist entirely of $+1$ s. Such a Hadamard matrix is called *normalized*. We will denote by $K_{m,m}^-$ the complete bipartite graph with a perfect matching removed. Obviously, $K_{m,m}^-$ is isomorphic to $I_m(1, 1)$.

Theorem 5. Let d be a positive integer such that there exists a Hadamard matrix of order $4d$, then

1. $bc_{2d}(K_{8d}) = 4d$,
2. $N((1, 1; d), 8d - 2) = bc_d(K_{8d-2, 8d-2}^-) = 4d$.

Proof. Let $H = [h_{ij}]$ be a Hadamard matrix of order $4d$. Suppose that K_{8d} has $\{u_1, \dots, u_{4d}, v_1, \dots, v_{4d}\}$ as its vertex set. For the j th column of H , two sets X_j and Y_j are defined as follows

$$X_j := \{u_i | h_{ij} = +1\} \cup \{v_i | h_{ij} = -1\} \quad \& \quad Y_j := \{u_i | h_{ij} = -1\} \cup \{v_i | h_{ij} = +1\}.$$

By constructing a bipartite graph G_j with vertex set (X_j, Y_j) indeed we assign a biclique to each column. It is well-known that for any two rows of a Hadamard matrix, the number of columns for which corresponding entries in these rows are different in sign, are equal to $2d$. So, for $i \neq j$ the edges $u_i u_j$, $v_i v_j$ and $u_i v_j$ of the graph K_{8d} are covered by $2d$ bicliques. Finally, consider the edge $u_i v_i$, then there exist $4d$ bicliques that cover it. According to the above argument every edge is covered at least $2d$ times, so $bc_{2d}(K_{8d}) \leq 4d$. On the other hand, for every graph G we have $\frac{|E(G)|}{B(G)} \leq \frac{bc_d(G)}{d}$, therefore

$$4d - \frac{1}{2} \leq bc_{2d}(K_{8d}).$$

Since $bc_{2d}(K_{8d})$ is an integer, we have $4d \leq bc_{2d}(K_{8d})$ which completes the proof. For the proof of the second part, assume that H is a normalized Hadamard matrix of order $4d$. Delete the first row of H and denote it by $H' = [h'_{ij}]$. Also, assume that $K_{8d-2, 8d-2}^-$ has (X, Y) as its vertex set where $X = \{u_1, \dots, u_{4d-1}, v_1, \dots, v_{4d-1}\}$, $Y = \{u'_1, \dots, u'_{4d-1}, v'_1, \dots, v'_{4d-1}\}$ and $u_i u'_i, v_i v'_i \notin E(K_{8d-2, 8d-2}^-)$. Assign to the j th column of H' , two sets X_j and Y_j as follows

$$X_j := \{u_i | h'_{ij} = +1\} \cup \{v_i | h'_{ij} = -1\} \quad \& \quad Y_j := \{u'_i | h'_{ij} = -1\} \cup \{v'_i | h'_{ij} = +1\}.$$

By the same argument in the first part of the proof and using the well-known fact that in H' every two distinct rows i, j have exactly d columns that the corresponding entries are $+1$ and -1 in the rows i and j , respectively, one can see that every edge is covered at least d times. So $bc_d(K_{8d-2, 8d-2}^-) \leq 4d$. On the other hand $4d - \frac{2d}{4d-1} \leq bc_d(K_{8d-2, 8d-2}^-)$, and $\frac{2d}{4d-1} < 1$. Therefore $4d \leq bc_d(K_{8d-2, 8d-2}^-)$ which establishes the second part. \blacksquare

Stinson *et al* [5], using the probabilistic method, obtain an upper bound for *SFPC*. In the next theorem, we present a slight improvement of this upper bound.

Theorem 6. *Let r and t be positive integers. If t is sufficiently large respect to r then there exists an $r - SFPC(v, t)$ where*

$$v \leq \frac{\binom{t}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}}{2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}}} (1 + \ln(\binom{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}{r} \binom{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{r})).$$

Proof. We show that if $v \geq \lfloor \frac{\binom{t}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}}{2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}}} (1 + \ln(\binom{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}{r} \binom{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{r})) \rfloor$ then there exists a biclique cover of size v for the Kneser graph $KG(t, r)$. Let \mathcal{A} be $\binom{[t]}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}$. For every member of \mathcal{A} , say A_i , we can construct the biclique G_i with vertex set (X_i, Y_i) , where the vertices of X_i are all r -subsets of A_i and the vertices of Y_i are all r -subsets of A_i^c . We define \mathcal{B} to be the collection contains all of these bicliques. Let $p \in [0, 1]$ be arbitrary, later, we specify an optimized value for p . Let us pick, randomly and independently, each biclique of \mathcal{B} with probability p and \mathcal{F} be the random set of all bicliques picked and let $Y_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the set of all edges AB of the graph $KG(t, r)$ which are not covered by the set \mathcal{F} . The expected value of $|\mathcal{F}|$ is clearly $\binom{t}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil} p$. For every edge AB , $pr(AB \in Y_{\mathcal{F}}) = (1 - p)^l$ where $l = 2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}}$. So the expected value of the $|\mathcal{F}| + |Y_{\mathcal{F}}|$ is at most

$$\binom{t}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil} p + \frac{1}{2} \binom{t}{r} \binom{t-r}{r} (1 - p)^{2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}}}.$$

If we set $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} \cup Y_{\mathcal{F}}$, then clearly all edges of the graph $KG(t, r)$ are covered by \mathcal{F}' . So we want to estimate p such that $|\mathcal{F}'|$ is minimum. For convenient, we bound $1 - p \leq e^{-p}$ to obtain

$$E(|\mathcal{F}| + |Y_{\mathcal{F}}|) \leq \binom{t}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil} p + \frac{1}{2} \binom{t}{r} \binom{t-r}{r} e^{-2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}} p}.$$

The right hand side is minimized at $p = \frac{\ln \alpha}{\beta}$, which $\alpha = \binom{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}{r} \binom{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{r}$ and $\beta = 2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}}$ where $p \in [0, 1]$ if t is sufficiently large respect to r . So we have an $r - SFPC(v, t)$ that

$$v \leq \frac{\binom{t}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}}{2^{\binom{t-2r}{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil - r}}} (1 + \ln(\binom{\lceil \frac{t}{2} \rceil}{r} \binom{\lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor}{r})).$$

■

References

- [1] Simon R. Blackburn. Frameproof codes. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 16(3):499–510 (electronic), 2003.
- [2] Dan Boneh and James Shaw. Collusion-secure fingerprinting for digital data. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 44(5):1897–1905, 1998.

- [3] D. Deng, D. R. Stinson, and R. Wei. The Lovász local lemma and its applications to some combinatorial arrays. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 32(1-3):121–134, 2004.
- [4] H. Hajiabolhassan and F. Moazami. Some new bounds for cover-free families through biclique cover. Manuscript 2011.
- [5] D. R. Stinson, Tran van Trung, and R. Wei. Secure frameproof codes, key distribution patterns, group testing algorithms and related structures. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 86(2):595–617, 2000. Special issue in honor of Professor Ralph Stanton.
- [6] D. R. Stinson and R. Wei. Combinatorial properties and constructions of traceability schemes and frameproof codes. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 11(1):41–53 (electronic), 1998.
- [7] D. R. Stinson and R. Wei. Generalized cover-free families. *Discrete Math.*, 279(1-3):463–477, 2004. In honour of Zhu Lie.
- [8] Gábor Tardos. Optimal probabilistic fingerprint codes. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 116–125 (electronic), New York, 2003. ACM.
- [9] Gábor Tardos. Optimal probabilistic fingerprint codes. *J. ACM*, 55(2):Art. 10, 24, 2008.