

Minimal Polynomial Algorithms for Finite Sequences

Graham H. Norton

Dept. Mathematics, University of Queensland
Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia*

15 March, 2010

Abstract

We show that a straightforward rewrite of a known minimal polynomial algorithm yields a simpler version of a recent algorithm of A. Salagean.

Keywords: Berlekamp-Massey algorithm, characteristic polynomial, finite sequence, minimal polynomial.

1 Introduction

Let K be a field, $n \geq 1$ and $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ be a finite sequence over K . The Berlekamp-Massey (BM) algorithm computes an LFSR of shortest length L and a feedback polynomial $F \in K[x]$ generating s , vacuously if $L = n$ [1].

We begin with the approach and basics of [2]. Multiplication makes Laurent series in x^{-1} into a $K[x]$ -module and power series with non-zero annihilator ideal correspond to *linear recurring sequences*: they have a non-zero 'characteristic polynomial' (c.p.) [2, Section 2]. For finite sequences, we work with Laurent polynomials and $C \in K[x]$ is a *c.p. of s* if

$$C_0 \cdot s_{j-d} + \dots + C_d \cdot s_j = 0 \tag{1}$$

for $d+1 \leq j \leq n$, where $d = \deg(C) \geq 0$ [2, Definition 2.7, Proposition 2.8]. Any C with $d \geq n$ is vacuously a c.p. of s .

A c.p. C of s is a *minimal polynomial of s* if $\deg(C) = \min\{\deg(D) : D \text{ is a c.p. of } s\}$ and the *linear complexity* of s is the degree of any minimal polynomial of s [2, Definition 3.1], [3, Definition 2.2]. For example, $D = x^{L-\deg(F)}F^*$ is a c.p. of s — as usual, F^* is the reciprocal of F — and D is a minimal polynomial of s since $D^* = F$ and $\deg(D) = L$.

*e-mail: ghn@maths.uq.edu.au

As far as we know, Algorithm 4.2 of [2] (Algorithm 3.1 below) was the first algorithm to compute a minimal polynomial of s iteratively. In fact, it is valid for finite sequences over a commutative unital integral domain.

Algorithm 2.2 of [4] also computes a minimal polynomial of s . We show that these two algorithms are closely related: a straightforward rewrite of the former using the notation of [4] yields the latter, except that we initialise a polynomial to 0 instead of 1. Further, the rewrite uses fewer variables and is simpler. See also Remark 3.2 (iv).

We note that [2] and [3] (an expository version of [2]) were referred to in [5, Introduction].

2 The Inductive Construction

The whole process of Algorithm 3.1 is best explained in terms of the inductive construction of a minimal polynomial of s which was derived from first principles in [2].

2.1 The Naive Version

A natural choice for $C^{(1)}$ is 1 if $s_1 = 0$ and x otherwise; $C^{(1)}$ is certainly a c.p. of minimal degree. Now assume inductively that $2 \leq i \leq n$ and we have c.p.'s $C^{(j)}$ for (s_1, \dots, s_j) where $1 \leq j \leq i-1$. From Equation (1), $C^{(i-1)}$ is a c.p. of (s_1, \dots, s_i) if and only if the *discrepancy*

$$c_{i-1} = d(C^{(i-1)}) = \sum_{j=0}^{d_{i-1}} C_j^{(i-1)} \cdot s_{j+i-d_{i-1}} \in K$$

is zero, where $d_{i-1} = \deg(C^{(i-1)})$ [2, Definition 2.10], *cf.* [1, Equation (10)]. If $c_{i-1} = 0$ then clearly d_{i-1} is minimal. But if $c_{i-1} \neq 0$, a new c.p. is needed. We use an *index* a_{i-1} suggested by [1, Equation (11)]

$$a = a_{i-1} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq i-2} \{j : d_j < d_{i-1}\} \quad (2)$$

to index a previous c.p. [2, Definition 3.12]. The *exponent* $e_{i-1} = 2d_{i-1} - i$ and $C^{(i)}$ are from [2, Proposition 4.1]:

$$C^{(i)} = \begin{cases} c_a \cdot C^{(i-1)} - c_{i-1} \cdot x^{+e} C^{(a)} & \text{if } e = e_{i-1} \geq 0 \\ c_a \cdot x^{-e} C^{(i-1)} - c_{i-1} \cdot C^{(a)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Now $a = a_{i-1}$ and Equation (3) require $i \geq 3$ and $d_{i-1} > d_1$. For $i \geq 2$ and $d_{i-1} = d_1$, we complete our construction by

$$C^{(i)} = \begin{cases} x^i & \text{if } s_1 = 0 \\ s_1 \cdot x^{i-2} C^{(i-1)} - c_{i-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The case $s_1 = 0$ occurs when s has $i - 1 \geq 1$ leading zeroes.

Part (i) of the following proposition is an analogue of [1, Equation (15)]. For Part (ii), see [3, Propositions 4.3, 4.5].

Proposition 2.1 For $2 \leq i \leq n$, if $c_{i-1} \neq 0$ then (i) $d_i = \max\{d_{i-1}, i - d_{i-1}\}$ and (ii) $C^{(i)}$ is a c.p. of (s_1, \dots, s_i) .

An analogue of [1, Lemma 1] establishes minimality.

Lemma 2.2 ([2, Theorems 3.8, 3.13] or [3, Lemma 5.2]) Let $2 \leq i \leq n$, f be a c.p. of (s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}) and $d(f) \neq 0$. If g is a c.p. of (s_1, \dots, s_i) , then $\deg(g) \geq i - \deg(f)$.

We now have a naive inductive construction for a minimal polynomial of s and illustrate it with two binary examples.

Example 2.3 Consider the subsequence $s = (0, 1, 1, 0)$ of [4, Table I]. We have $C^{(1)} = 1$ as $s_1 = 0$ and $c_1 = s_2 \neq 0$. As $i < 3$, we apply Equation (4): $C^{(2)} = x^2$ (there is one leading zero). Now $i = 3$, $c_2 = s_3 \neq 0$ and $d_2 = 2 > d_1 = 0$, so that $a_2 = 1$. Equation (3) applies with exponent $e_2 = 2 \cdot 2 - 3 = 1$ giving $C^{(3)} = C^{(2)} + x^1 C^{(1)} = x^2 + x$. Finally, $c_3 = s_4 + s_3 \neq 0$ and $d_3 = 2 > d_1 = 0$, so that $a_3 = a_2 = 1$. Equation (3) applies again with exponent $e_3 = 2 \cdot 2 - 4 = 0$ and $C^{(4)} = C^{(3)} + x^0 C^{(1)} = x^2 + x + 1$.

Example 2.4 Let $s = (1, 1, 0, 0)$. Clearly $C^{(1)} = x$ and $c_1 = s_2 \neq 0$, so $C^{(2)} = x^0 C^{(1)} + 1 = x + 1$ from Equation (4). Next, $c_2 = s_3 + s_2 \neq 0$ and Equation (4) obtains as $d_2 = d_1 = 1$, giving $C^{(3)} = x^1 C^{(2)} + c_2 = x^2 + x + 1$. For $i = 4$, $c_3 = s_4 + s_3 + s_2 \neq 0$, $d_3 = 2 > d_1 = 1$ and $a_3 = 2$. Equation (3) with exponent $e_3 = 2 \cdot 2 - 4 = 0$ gives $C^{(4)} = C^{(3)} + x^0 C^{(2)} = x^2$.

2.2 The Refined Version

The naive construction can be refined in three ways. Firstly, by noting that if $e_{i-1} \geq 0$ then $a_i = a_{i-1}$ since $d_{i-1} \geq i - d_{i-1}$ i.e. $d_i = d_{i-1}$ by Proposition 2.1. But if $e_{i-1} < 0$, $d_i = i - d_{i-1} > d_{i-1}$ and $a_i = i - 1$.

Secondly, we update $e_{i-1} = 2d_{i-1} - i$ (and so avoid using d_{i-1}) as follows: it is trivial that $e_i = e_{i-1} - 1$ if $c_{i-1} = 0$ and easy to check that $e_i = |e_{i-1}| - 1$ if $c_{i-1} \neq 0$.

Thirdly, we change the inductive basis by introducing artificial values $C^{(0)} = 1$ (which is only a c.p. if $s_1 = 0$), $C^{(a_0)} = 0$ (which is not a c.p. by definition) and $c_{a_0} = 1$ (which is not a discrepancy). For definiteness, we take $a_0 = -1$. Then remarkably (i) $e_0 = -1$ (ii) Equation (3) accomodates all three cases and (iii) the updating of a_{i-1} and e_{i-1} remains valid. We state this formally.

Theorem 2.5 ([2]) Put $a_0 = e_0 = -1$, $C^{(-1)} = 0$, $c_{-1} = 1$ and $C^{(0)} = 1$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, define $C^{(i)}$, a_i , e_i by

(i) if $c_{i-1} = 0$, $C^{(i)} = C^{(i-1)}$, $a_i = a_{i-1}$ and $e_i = e_{i-1} - 1$

(ii) if $c_{i-1} \neq 0$ let $C^{(i)}$ be as in Equation (3), $a_i = a_{i-1}$ if $e_{i-1} \geq 0$, $a_i = i - 1$ if $e_{i-1} < 0$ and $e_i = |e_{i-1}| - 1$.

Then for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $C^{(i)}$ is a minimal polynomial of (s_1, \dots, s_i) and $\deg(C^{(i)}) = \frac{e_i + i + 1}{2}$.

The BM algorithm decodes Reed-Solomon, Goppa and negacyclic codes [6], [7] and has been extended to multiple sequences [8]. For similar applications and extensions of Theorem 2.5, see [3, Section 8], [9].

3 The Algorithm

We deduce Algorithm 3.1 from Theorem 2.5. Firstly, we can dispense with the indices a_i if we define $B^{(i)} = C^{(a_i)}$ and scalars $b_i = d(C^{(a_i)})$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ provided we update $B^{(i-1)}$ and b_{i-1} when $e_{i-1} < 0$. Secondly, we replace d_{i-1} by $\frac{e_{i-1} + i}{2}$ in c_{i-1} . Finally, since only current values are used we can suppress all indices — provided we keep a copy T of $C^{(i-1)}$ to update $B^{(i-1)}$ when $e_{i-1} < 0$.

Algorithm 3.1 ([2, Algorithm 4.2] rewritten)

Input: $n \geq 1$ and a sequence $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ over a field K .

Output: C , a monic minimal polynomial for s .

begin $B \leftarrow 0$; $b \leftarrow 1$; $C \leftarrow 1$; $e \leftarrow -1$;

for $i = 1$ **to** n **do**

$c \leftarrow \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{e+i}{2}} C_j \cdot s_{j+\frac{i-e}{2}}$;

if $c \neq 0$ **then if** $e \geq 0$ **then** $C \leftarrow b \cdot C - c \cdot x^e B$;

else $T \leftarrow C$; $e \leftarrow -e$;

$C \leftarrow b \cdot x^e C - c \cdot B$;

$B \leftarrow T$; $b \leftarrow c$; **endif**

endif

$e \leftarrow e - 1$;

endfor

return (C/b) **end**.

Remark 3.2 We obtain [4, Algorithm 2.2] except that

(i) we could (but do not) make each C monic

(ii) in the notation of [4, p. 4696], we do not keep track of 'm' or $\deg(B)$ to recompute $v = N - m - (\deg(C) - \deg(B))$ at each iteration (where $0 \leq N \leq n - 1$)

(iii) in fact, (a) N corresponds to $i - 1$ (b) if there are N leading zeroes $v = N + 1$ (c) if $\deg(C) > \deg(B)$ then $\deg(C) = m + 1 - \deg(B)$ and $v = N - m - (\deg(C) - \deg(B)) = N + 1 - 2\deg(C)$; thus v corresponds to $-e$

(iv) $B^{(0)} = 0$ and some initial minimal polynomials will differ; with $B^{(0)} = C^{(-1)} = 1$, $C^{(i)} = x^i - c_{i-1}$ when there are $i - 1 \geq 0$ leading zeroes, Theorem 2.5 remains valid, the

algorithms are equivalent and their outputs are identical.

Remarks 3.3 (added in proof)

(i) Theorem 2.4 of [4] on the set of minimal polynomials of s is an immediate consequence of [2, Theorem 4.16]: simply replace d in Theorem 4.16, *loc. cit.* by $-v = \deg(C) - \deg(B) - (n - m)$ and take first components.

(ii) In [10], we calculate the monic reciprocals of the minimal polynomials of Theorem 2.5. This readily yields an algorithm similar to the BM algorithm, except that we do not calculate the 'lengths' L_i ; we update the exponents as above and obtain L_n as $\frac{en+n+1}{2}$. This article also contains proofs for the results of Section 2 using similar notation.

The author thanks the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] J. L. Massey. Shift-register synthesis and BCH decoding. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 15:122–127, 1969.
- [2] Graham H. Norton. On the minimal realizations of a finite sequence. *J. Symbolic Computation*, 20:93–115, 1995.
- [3] Graham H. Norton. On shortest linear recurrences. *J. Symbolic Computation*, 27:323–347, 1999.
- [4] A. Salagean. An Algorithm for Computing Minimal Bidirectional Linear Recurrence Relations. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 55:4695–4700, 2009.
- [5] Graham H. Norton and A. Salagean. On the key equation over a commutative ring. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 20:125–141, 2000.
- [6] E.R. Berlekamp, *Algebraic Coding Theory*, McGraw-Hill Series in Systems Science, New York-Toronto, 1968.
- [7] N.J. Patterson. The algebraic decoding of Goppa codes *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 21:203–207, 1975.
- [8] G.L. Feng and K.K. Tzeng. A generalization of the Berlekamp-Massey algorithm for multisequence shift register sequence synthesis with applications to decoding cyclic codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 37:1274–1287, 1991.
- [9] Graham H. Norton. Some decoding applications of minimal realization, In (C. Boyd Ed.) *Cryptography and Coding*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 1025:53–62, 1995.

- [10] Graham H. Norton. The Berlekamp-Massey Algorithm via Minimal Polynomials.
<http://arXiv.org>, 1001.1597.