

Bounds for the capacity error function for unidirectional channels with noiseless feedback

Christian Deppe*, Georg Maringer*

*Lehr- und Forschungseinheit für Nachrichtentechnik
Technische Universität München
Munich, Germany
christian.deppe@tum.de, georg.maringer@tum.de

Vladimir Lebedev

Kharkevich Institute for Information Transmission Problems
Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russia
lebedev37@mail.ru

Abstract—In digital systems such as fiber optical communications the ratio between probability of errors of type $1 \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow 1$ can be large. Practically, one can assume that only one type of errors can occur. These errors are called asymmetric. Unidirectional errors differ from asymmetric type of errors, here both $1 \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow 1$ type of errors are possible, but in any submitted codeword all the errors are of the same type.

We consider q -ary unidirectional channels with feedback and give bounds for the capacity error function. It turns out that the bounds depend on the parity of the alphabet q . Furthermore we show that for feedback the capacity error function for the binary asymmetric channel is different from the symmetric channel. This is in contrast to the behavior of that function without feedback.

Index Terms—Error-Correcting Codes, Unidirectional Errors, Feedback

I. INTRODUCTION

Shannon analyzed the capacity of a channel based on probabilistic notions. The arguably easiest example is a binary symmetric channel (BSC) with crossover probability ε . In a probabilistic model the number of errors in a block of symbols can be (having different probability) any number between 0 and the blocklength n . In this paper we analyze the situation when the fraction of erroneous symbols is upper bounded by $\tau = \frac{t}{n}$, where t denotes the maximal number of errors per block. Our focus in this work lies in the analysis of the capacity error function of unidirectional channels.

The analysis in this paper is purely combinatorial. That means that we are not distinguishing between likely and unlikely errors. We only consider whether a certain output may occur given that a certain symbol was chosen at the input of the channel.

The difference between symmetrical, asymmetrical and unidirectional errors is described in [11]. A unidirectional channel is composed of two special asymmetric channels. During the transmission of each codeword one of the two channels is randomly selected. Within the transmission of those codeword symbols the channel behaves like the selected channel and remains unchanged. After each transmitted codeword the channel is reselected. Precise definitions are given in Section II.

Asymmetrical channels are modelling photon communication systems better than symmetrical channels. Due to losses within the transmission medium photons may not reach the receiver. However the channel cannot generate photons on its own. Therefore the channel is of asymmetric nature [11, 1.3]. For a transmission without feedback the binary Z-channel (Figure 3) has the same capacity error function as the symmetric channel (Figure 2). This has already been shown by Bassalygo in [3]. In this paper we give lower and upper bounds on the capacity error function of asymmetric and unidirectional channels. We show that the capacity error function for the unidirectional channel composed out of Z-channel and inverse Z-channel is higher compared to the one of the symmetric channel for a wide range of τ .

II. Q-ARY CODES WITH FEEDBACK

In our transmission scheme a sender wants to transmit a finite number of messages over a channel with noiseless feedback (see Figure 1). The discrete channel has a q -ary alphabet $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Q} = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ at its input and at its output $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{Q}$. Each message m is encoded into a block of length n . For channels without feedback the codeword c to be transmitted over the channel only depends on the message m . In a feedback channel the situation is different.




Fig. 1. Channel with feedback

Christian Deppe was supported by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) through Grant 16KIS1005. Vladimir Lebedev was supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project no. 19-01-00364. Georg Maringer's work was supported by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) under Grant No.WA3907/4-1.

Definition 1:

- 1) Let the set of possible messages be denoted as $\mathcal{M} = \{1, \dots, M\}$. Then an encoding algorithm for a feedback channel with blocklength n is a set of functions

$$c_i : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{Q}^{i-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (1)$$

The respective coding algorithm is then constructed as

$$c(m, y^{n-1}) = ((c_1(m), c_2(m, y_1), \dots, c_n(m, y^{n-1}))) \quad (2)$$

where $y^k = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$.

- 2) An encoding algorithm is $(n, M, t)_f$ -successful if the corresponding decoder decodes correctly for any transmitted message m and any error pattern with less than or equal t errors caused by the channel.

Definition 1 shows that the encoder may adjust its algorithm for sending the k th symbol c_k according to the previously received symbols y^{k-1} . This extra flexibility can be used to increase the achievable rate of the system.

Definition 2: The capacity error function $C_q^f(\Gamma, \tau)$ of a channel Γ with noiseless feedback denotes the supremum on the rates for which a successful algorithm exists depending on $\tau = \frac{t}{n}$ as the blocklength n goes to infinity. t denotes the maximum number of errors inflicted by the channel noise and q specifies the alphabet size of the channel.

The capacity error function for $\tau = 1$ is denoted as $C_0^f(\Gamma)$ and was introduced by Shannon in [10] under the term zero error capacity of the channel.

If the sender and the receiver share a channel with noiseless passive feedback (Figure 1) the capacity error function of the symmetric channel is only known for some special channels like the binary case.

The most frequently analyzed communication channels are of symmetric nature. As an example we give the previously mentioned symmetric channel Γ^2 (Figure 2). In this case it is possible to receive a 1 when a 0 was transmitted and a 0 when a 1 was transmitted. Both events denote an error as correct reception of a symbol is considered to be the event that the sent symbol matches the received symbol. In the binary case the capacity error function of the symmetric channel was found by Berlekamp [4] and Zigangirov [12]

$$C_2^f(\Gamma^2, \tau) = \begin{cases} 1 - h(\tau) & \text{if } 0 \leq \tau \leq (3 + \sqrt{5})^{-1} \\ (1 - 3\tau) \log\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right) & \text{if } (3 + \sqrt{5})^{-1} \leq \tau \leq \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \text{if } \tau > \frac{1}{3}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

In general discrete channels can be specified by bipartite graphs.

Definition 3 (Discrete channel/bipartite graph): A discrete channel corresponds to a bipartite graph in the following way. Let \mathcal{V}_{in} denote the set of possible input symbols and let \mathcal{V}_{out} denote the set of possible output symbols. Then if it is possible that the channel maps input symbol $i \in \mathcal{V}_{in}$ to output symbol $j \in \mathcal{V}_{out}$ the pair (i, j) is part of the set of edges $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V}_{in} \times$




Fig. 2. Symmetric Channel Γ^2



Fig. 3. binary Z-channel and inverse Z-channel

\mathcal{V}_{out} . Conversely a bipartite graph between input symbols \mathcal{V}_{in} and \mathcal{V}_{out} defines a discrete channel.

Discrete channels with finite input and output alphabets correspond to their respective bipartite graphs by a one to one mapping. Therefore, in this paper we frequently speak about the graphs when we mean the respective channels and vice versa.

Definition 4 (Asymmetric channel): An asymmetric channel is a discrete channel whose specifying bipartite graph is not the full graph in the sense that the set of edges $\mathcal{E} \neq \mathcal{V}_{in} \times \mathcal{V}_{out}$.

As an example for an asymmetric channel we propose the Z-channel which is specified by the bipartite graph on the left hand side of Figure 3.

Definition 5 (Unidirectional channel): A unidirectional channel is specified by two asymmetric channels having the same set of input symbols \mathcal{V}_{in} and output symbols \mathcal{V}_{out} . One of the channels only allows positive error vectors ($e_i \geq 0 \forall i$), whereas the other one only allows negative error vectors ($e_i \leq 0 \forall i$). Within each the transmission of each codeword the channel is specified by one of the asymmetric channel. It is not known to sender or receiver at the beginning of the transmission to which asymmetric channel the unidirectional channel corresponds and this may also change for each codeword.

In Figure 3 the binary unidirectional channel is shown. It is denoted as Γ_U^2 and is composed of the binary Z-channel and its counterpart the inverse Z-channel.

Definition 6 (Generalized Z/inverse Z-channel): The generalized Z-channel Γ_Z^q is specified by the bipartite graph with input nodes $\mathcal{V}_{in} = \mathcal{V}_{out} = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ and the set of edges $\mathcal{E}_Z^q = \{(i, i-1) : i \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}\} \cup \{(i, i) : i \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}\}$.

The inverse Z-channel Γ_{Σ}^q is specified by the bipartite graph with input nodes $\mathcal{V}_{in} = \mathcal{V}_{out} = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ and the set of edges $\mathcal{E}_{\Sigma}^q = \{(i, i+1) : i \in \{0, \dots, q-2\}\} \cup \{(i, i) : i \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}\}$.

Both channels are depicted in Figure 4. Both combined together form a unidirectional channel which we denote as Γ_U^q .

The symbols 0 and $q-1$ are of special interest for the




Fig. 4. Generalized Z-channel and generalized inverse Z-channel

generalized Z-channel and the inverse generalized Z-channel. For the generalized Z-channel the symbol 0 has the property that the sender knows that this symbol cannot be changed by the channel. If the symbol $q-1$ is received the receiver knows that the transmitter indeed sent this symbol. The properties of 0 and $q-1$ are swapped for the inverse generalized Z-channel compared to the generalized Z-channel. All other symbols do not have these special properties.

III. ZERO-ERROR CAPACITY OF THE GENERALIZED Z-CHANNEL

The method we use to obtain the zero error capacity of the generalized Z-channel was already introduced by Shannon in [10, Theorem 7].

The idea is to split the input symbols into sets according to their connected outputs.

Theorem 1 (Shannon [10]): Let the set \mathcal{S}_j denote the set of input symbols which are connected to the channel output $j \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ and let P_i denote the probability of symbol i at the input of the channel. Let P_o be defined as

$$P_o := \min_{P_i} \max_j \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_j} P_i \quad (4)$$

over all possible input distributions P_i .

The zero error capacity C_0^f is then obtained by

$$C_0^f = \log_q \left(\frac{1}{P_o} \right) \quad (5)$$

Theorem 1 suggests that in order to find the zero error capacity it is possible to find the input distribution which minimizes equation (4) and to take its logarithm.

Corollary 1: The zero error capacity of the generalized Z-channel and the inverse generalized Z-channel is

$$C_0^f(\Gamma_Z^q) = C_0^f(\Gamma_{\Sigma}^q) = \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right). \quad (6)$$

Proof: We apply Theorem 1 to the inverse generalized Z-channel Γ_{Σ}^q shown in Figure 4.

$$\mathcal{S}_0 = \{0\}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = \{0, 1\}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \{1, 2\}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{q-1} = \{q-2, q-1\}$$

Consider now an arbitrary distribution on the set of input letters $\{0, \dots, q-1\}$. It is obvious that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_0} P_i \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_1} P_i \quad (7)$$

with equality if and only if $P_1 = 0$. Assuming that $P_1 > 0$ we get an input probability which is at least as good as before according to equation (4) if we change the input probability to

$$P'_0 = P_0 + P_1$$

$$P'_1 = 0$$

$$P'_2 = P_2$$

$$\vdots$$

$$P'_{q-1} = P_{q-1}.$$

This is because $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_2} P_i = P_1 + P_2$ can only get smaller while for $j \in \{3, \dots, q-1\}$ $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}_j} P_i$ remains unchanged. Now we consider the distribution P' . As $P'_1 = 0$ the set \mathcal{S}_2 effectively only contains the element 2. As $\mathcal{S}_3 = \{2, 3\}$ we can use the same method as before to show that the zero error capacity cannot get smaller if we change the distribution such that $P'_2 = P'_2 + P'_3$ and $P'_3 = 0$ while all other input probabilities remain the same.

Using this procedure inductively gives us the result that it is optimal to only have non-zero probability for every second input symbol. Looking at equation (4) it is easy to see that the optimal distribution is the uniform one over all non-zero symbols. Therefore the zero error capacity of the inverse generalized Z-channel is

$$C_0^f(\Gamma_{\Sigma}^q) = \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right). \quad (8)$$

The zero error capacity of the generalized Z-channel is the same as for the inverse generalized Z-channel because it can be constructed by relabelling the nodes at the input and the output of the respective bipartite graph. ■

Furthermore, Corollary 1 can be used to show the following.

Lemma 1: It holds $C_0^f(\Gamma_U^q) = C_0^f(\Gamma_Z^q)$.

Proof: Because of Corollary 1 it holds that $C_0^f(\Gamma_Z^q) = C_0^f(\Gamma_{\Sigma}^q) = \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right)$. Therefore, $C_0^f(\Gamma_U^q) \leq \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right)$. It remains to show that $C_0^f(\Gamma_U^q) \geq \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right)$. In order to proof this we propose the following encoding and strategies.

For this we define the set $\mathcal{S} := \{k \in \{0, \dots, q-1\} : k \equiv 0 \pmod{2}\}$.

The encoding function

$$c : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{n-1} \quad (9)$$

can be any bijective function between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{S}^{n-1} . If the sender would like to send message $m \in \mathcal{M}$ he computes $x^{n-1} = c(m)$ and sends it over the channel. In order to send the last symbol the sender distinguishes two cases:

- 1) The channel caused an error within at least one of the previously transmitted symbols. In this case the sender knows the channel and sends $x_n = 0$ if the active channel is Γ_Z^q and $q - 1$ otherwise.
- 2) No error has occurred within the transmission. In this case the sender sends $x_n = 0$.

We denote the vector of symbols at the channel output as y^n . In order to determine which channel was active during the transmission the decoder checks the value of y_n . There are three cases to be distinguished:

- 1) $y_n = 0$: Either no transmission error occurred at all or the active channel was Γ_Z^q .
- 2) $y_n = q - 1$: The active channel was Γ_Σ^q .
- 3) $y_n = 1$: No error occurred within the first $n - 1$ symbols and the active channel was Γ_Σ^q .

Let \mathcal{K}_i denote the set of possible outputs for the channel if the symbol i is transmitted. The sets \mathcal{K}_i for different inputs are disjoint for Γ_Z^q and Γ_Σ^q respectively. From the last symbol y_n the decoder knows which channel has been active. Therefore our coding strategy is successful for a message set \mathcal{M} of size

$$|\mathcal{M}| = \left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil^{n-1}$$

achieving asymptotically the rate

$$R := \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right).$$

IV. AN UPPER BOUND ON CAPACITY ERROR FUNCTIONS

The analysis in the previous section deals with the zero error capacity assuming that the number of errors in a block of length n can be from 0 to n . This section deals with the problem of allowing the channel only to change a fraction of symbols during the transmission. Let this fraction be denoted as $\tau = \frac{t}{n}$ where t denotes the number of possible errors.

An upper bound on the capacity error function of the Z-channel can be obtained by using an upper bound on the capacity error function of the channel Γ^{q*} depicted in Figure 5.

Definition 7: The channel Γ^{q*} is specified by the graph with nodes $\mathcal{V}_{in} = \mathcal{V}_{out} = \{*\} \cup \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ and the set of edges $\mathcal{E} = \{(*, *), (i, i) : i \in \{0, \dots, q-1\}\} \cup \{(i, i+1) : i \in \{0, \dots, q-2\}\} \cup \{(*, q-1), (0, *)\}$.

Theorem 2: Let $\mathcal{M}_q^Z(n, t)$ denote a maximal set of messages which can successfully be transmitted over Γ_Z^q , let $\mathcal{M}_q^U(n, t)$ denote the maximal set of messages which can successfully be transmitted over Γ_U^q and let $\mathcal{M}_{q*}(n, t)$ denote a maximal set of messages which can successfully be transmitted over the channel Γ^{q*} .




Fig. 5. Bipartite graph Γ^{q*}

Then

$$\mathcal{M}_q^U(n, t) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathcal{M}_q^Z(n, t) \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathcal{M}_{q*}(n, t) \quad (10)$$

and

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q, \tau) \leq C_q^f(\Gamma_Z^q, \tau) \leq \frac{\log_q(\mathcal{M}_{q*}(n, t))}{n} \quad (11)$$

Proof: (a) follows because every successful algorithm for Γ_U^q is also a successful algorithm for Γ_Z^q . (b) follows from the fact that every successful strategy on Γ_Z^q is also successful on Γ_{q*} if the input $*$ is never used and every $*$ symbol at the receiver is interpreted as 0. The inequalities in (11) follow from (a), (b) and the monotonicity of the logarithm. ■

Remark 1: For $q = 2$ only an upper bound on $\mathcal{M}_{2*}(n, t)$ is known to the best of our knowledge. A proof for the upper bound on $\mathcal{M}_{q*}(n, t)$ which is given in [8] is applicable for $q = 2$. For $q > 2$ in the same paper there is also a successful encoding algorithm given to achieve this upper bound on $\mathcal{M}_{q*}(n, t)$, showing that the bound is tight. However, this encoding algorithm cannot be used for $q = 2$. So it is not clear whether the upper bound on $\mathcal{M}_{2*}(n, t)$ is tight.

Remark 2: The capacity error function of the generalized Z-channel Γ_Z^q is equal to the capacity error function of the inverse generalized Z-channel Γ_Σ^q .

Proof: The inverse Z-channel Γ_Σ^q can be obtained from the Z-channel Γ_Z^q a bijective mapping. The labelling of the nodes at the input and the output is just in reversed order. ■

V. LOWER BOUND ON THE CAPACITY ERROR FUNCTION

In this section a method introduced in [8, Lemma 2] is recapitulated. It is then used to construct a lower bound on the capacity error function of Γ_Z^q and Γ_Σ^q . The set of graphs with vertices $\mathcal{V}_{in} = \mathcal{V}_{out} = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ all having at most degree 2 is in the following denoted as $\tilde{\Gamma}_2(q)$.

Lemma 2 (DL A[8]): Let $R > 0$ be the rate of a successful algorithm for a channel $\Delta \in \tilde{\Gamma}_2(q)$ and $\tau = 1$. Then there exists a successful algorithm with rate $1 - \log_q(2)$ for all τ .

Lemma 3 (DL B[8]): If there exists a successful algorithm for a channel $\Delta \in \tilde{\Gamma}_2(q)$ with rate $R > 0$ for all τ , then there exists a successful algorithm with rate $1 - h(\tau) \log_q(2)$

for Δ and $0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{1}{2}$ where $h(\cdot)$ denotes the binary entropy function.

We omit the proof of Lemma 2 and give only the idea of the construction achieving the rate proposed in Lemma 3. A full proof is given in [8].

Proof sketch: The strategy of the proof of [8] is to give an algorithm which can transmit $\frac{q^n}{\binom{n}{t}}$ messages. This algorithm then achieves the rate claimed in the Lemma. The algorithm uses the first $k_1 = n - \log_q \binom{n}{t}$ symbols to transmit the information symbols and to use the rest of the block to correct potential errors caused by the channel. It is sufficient for the receiver to know the error positions because the nodes at the receiving side of the graph only have degree at most 2. Let t_1 denote the number of errors within the information symbols and $n_1 := n - k_1 = \log_q \binom{n}{t}$.

If $\binom{k_1}{t_1} \leq q^{Rn_1}$ then the algorithm Δ can be used to transmit the error positions and since this works for any number of errors the receiver can decode the message correctly. Otherwise let $k_2 = \log_q \binom{k_1}{t_1}$ and use the interval $[k_1 + 1, k_1 + k_2]$ to send the error positions of the t_1 errors within the first interval. This process continues by defining $k_{i+1} = \log_q \binom{k_i}{t_i}$ and $n_{i+1} = n_i - k_{i+1}$ and is stopped when $\binom{k_i}{t_i} \leq q^{Rn_i}$. Then algorithm Δ can be used to transmit the error positions with certainty. In the last block the k_i s have to be transmitted as well. The amount of symbols that need to be reserved in order to do this is of order $\mathcal{O}(\log(n) \log(t))$. This does not change the asymptotically achievable rate of the algorithm. ■

The capacity error function for the Z-channel Γ_Z^q with an additional edge $(0, q-1)$ was analyzed by Deppe and Lebedev in [8] for $q > 3$. We denote this channel as Γ_{DL}^q and its error capacity function as $C_q^f(\Gamma_{DL}^q, \tau)$. Since the additional edge can only make the channel worse,

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_Z^q, \tau) \geq C_q^f(\Gamma_{DL}^q, \tau). \quad (12)$$

We denote the asymptotic rate of the algorithm achieving $C_q^f(\Gamma_{DL}^q, \tau)$ as

$$R_{DL}^q := \begin{cases} 1 - h(\tau) \log_q 2 & \text{if } 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 - \log_q 2 & \text{if } \tau > \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

The algorithm achieving R_{DL}^q uses the methods of the proofs of Lemma 2 and Lemma 3. The algorithm in the proof of Lemma 3 requires the possibility of error-free transmission at a positive rate for $\tau = 1$. For the channel Γ_{DL}^3 this is not possible. However for Γ_U^3 the proposed method works as it is possible to transmit data with a positive rate for $\tau = 1$ by Lemma 1.

Corollary 2: Let $q \geq 3$. Then the capacity error functions of $\Gamma_Z^q, \Gamma_{DL}^q$ and the unidirectional channel $C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q, \tau)$ are lower bounded by R_{DL}^q .

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_Z^q, \tau) \geq C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q, \tau) \geq R_{DL}^q \quad (14)$$

We note that Corollary 2 does not give information on the capacity error functions for the binary channels.




Fig. 6. Lower and upper bound on the capacity error function of the unidirectional channels Γ_U^5 and Γ_U^6

Corollary 3: For odd q the following equations hold for $\tau \geq \frac{1}{2}$:

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_Z^q, \tau) = C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q, \tau) = C_0^f(\Gamma_Z^q) = C_0^f(\Gamma_U^q) \quad (15)$$

Proof: It holds that an upper bound on $C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q)$ (see equation 11) is equal to $R_{DL}^{q+1} \log_q(q+1)$. The result then follows from Corollary 1, Lemma 1, equation (13) and the fact that

$$\log_{q+1} \left(\frac{q+1}{2} \right) \log_q(q+1) = \log_q \left(\left\lceil \frac{q}{2} \right\rceil \right) = C_0^f(\Gamma_U^q)$$

if q is odd. ■

Figure 6 illustrates the results obtained in Theorem 2 and Corollaries 1, 2 and 3. Corollary 1 shows that the methodology proposed in [8] (Lemma 2 in this work) only achieves the zero error capacity of Γ_Z^q if q is even. However the strategy proposed in the proof of Lemma 1 is able to achieve the zero error capacity for Γ_U^q and Γ_Z^q for any q . The results in Figure 6 are in accordance with Corollary 3 for $q = 5$. For even q we only know the zero error capacity which is achieved by the lower bound. For $\tau \neq 1$ our results do not show whether upper and lower bound on $C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q, \tau)$ are tight. $q = 6$ was chosen as an example for even q .

VI. CONSTRUCTING LOWER BOUNDS USING RUBBER METHODS

The rubber method was developed in [2]. It is used to determine a lower bound on the capacity error function of a channel. Basically it reserves a sequence of symbols to notify the receiver that its previously received symbol has been an erroneous one. Therefore, after receiving the rubber sequence the receiver deletes the rubber plus the previous symbol. In [2] a rubber sequence consists of r equal rubber symbols $b \in \mathcal{Q}$. The sender then retransmits the previously erroneous symbol again. Because the number of errors t is fixed and smaller than the blocklength n he will succeed after at most

t trials. In [2] it is shown that that the rubber method is a successful algorithm. That means the decoder is able to decode each message correctly. In the error analysis in [2] the authors consider two kinds of errors: a **standard error** (that means a symbol is changed to another symbol and the sender sends the rubber sequence) and a **towards rubber error** (that means a symbol is changed to a rubber symbol such that the receiver obtains a rubber sequence). If a **towards rubber error** occurs a correctly received symbol is deleted and has to be sent again. For the generalized Z-channel Γ_Z^q a **towards rubber error** is not possible, if we use r times $q - 1$ as the rubber sequence. Also, for the inverse generalized Z-channel Γ_{Σ}^q a **towards rubber error** is not possible, if we use r times 0 as the rubber sequence. Therefore, the sender does not have to retransmit the previously erroneous symbol again, because for those channels there is only the possibility of a **standard error**. We denote this modified Algorithm (without retransmissions) by $A(r, b)$ if we use $b^r = (b, \dots, b)$ as the rubber and we get:

Lemma 4: The modified rubber strategy $A(r, q-1) [A(r, 0)]$ is a successful algorithm for the the generalized [inverse] Z-channel Γ_Z^q [Γ_{Σ}^q].

In the following we denote this rubber method without retransmission as the modified rubber method.

To calculate the rate of this algorithm we need as in [2] the following definitions. Let $z_r^{r+1} = qz_r^r - q + 1$. It is well known that for $n \rightarrow \infty$ the number of sequences of length n not containing a block $b^r = (b, \dots, b)$ is asymptotically equal to z_r^n (see [2], [5], how to choose the initial value for the iteration).

Theorem 3: Let z_r be defined as above. Then for the generalized [inverse] Z-channel Γ_Z^q [Γ_{Σ}^q] for $q \geq 2$ we get

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_Z^q, \tau) \geq R_{ml} := \begin{cases} \max_{2 \leq r \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - r\tau) \log_q z_r & \text{if } 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{if } \tau > \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Proof: The modified r -rubber method can be used to transmit information vectors not containing the rubber sequence. The blocklength is n and the number of erroneous symbols is at most t . For each error we require r symbols for correction. Therefore the length of the information vectors can be at most $n - rt$. The number of these sequences is asymptotically equal to z_r^{n-rt} . Therefore the asymptotic rate achieved by the modified rubber r -rubber method is

$$(1 - r\tau) \log_q z_r.$$

This gives the following lower bound on the capacity error function

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_Z^q, \tau) \geq (1 - r\tau) \log_q z_r.$$

We use the modified rubber method with the rubber length r that achieves the highest asymptotic for the respective value of τ and obtain the lower bound R_{ml} . ■

Remark 3: For the generalized Z-channel Γ_Z^q the modified rubber method with a single 0 as the rubber symbol achieves the rate

$$R = (1 - \tau) \log_q(q - 1). \quad (16)$$

Proof: Using Lemma 4 it is easy to see that for every erroneous symbol one extra symbol has to be transmitted in order to achieve error free transmission. Therefore it is possible to achieve a message set \mathcal{M} of cardinality

$$M = (q - 1)^{n-t}, \quad (17)$$

leading to a rate

$$R = (1 - \tau) \log_q(q - 1). \quad (18)$$

By an adjustment of the modified rubber method for the channels Γ_Z^q and Γ_{Σ}^q we obtain the following result:

Theorem 4: Let Γ_U^q be a unidirectional channel consisting of the generalized Z-channel Γ_Z^q and the inverse generalized Z-channel Γ_{Σ}^q ($q \geq 2$). Then we have

$$C_q^f(\Gamma_U^q, \tau) \geq R_{ml}.$$

Proof: We adapt the modified rubber method to make it usable for Γ_U^q . Furthermore, we show that this method is successful and achieves the same asymptotic rate as the modified rubber method. The sender starts by using the encoding strategy for the generalized Z-channel Γ_Z^q and then adapts if he discovers that the active channel is Γ_{Σ}^q . After all the data symbols are transmitted an extra symbol (either 0 or $q - 1$ according to the channel) is added to tell the receiver which channel was present. The receiver can thus adjust its decoding algorithm accordingly. The previously described steps are now elaborated in more detail.

The only additional difficulty compared to the situation in Theorem 4 is that it is unknown to the sender and the receiver whether Γ_Z^q or Γ_{Σ}^q is used for the transmission of each codeword but once the first error occurs the sender knows which channel is in action.

At the start of the transmission the sender assumes that Γ_Z^q is the active channel of Γ_U^q . He therefore uses the modified rubber method of length r as its encoding strategy.

When the channel inflicts the first error to the transmission the sender knows which channel is active. We denote the transmitted symbol corresponding to the first error with x_{fe} . According to the actual channel the sender adjusts its encoding strategy from now on. We distinguish two cases:

- 1) The active channel is Γ_Z^q . In this case the channel keeps its encoding strategy as it is. After the sender knows that the all information symbols can be retrieved correctly by the decoder he fills the remaining block with 0 symbols. Notice that this last step involves knowledge about the decoding algorithm at sender.
- 2) The active channel is Γ_{Σ}^q . In this case there are two cases to be distinguished
 - a) A **standard error** occurred: In this case the transmitter sends r times the symbol $q - 1$. If there are not enough symbols left in the block the sender sends $q - 1$ for the remaining symbols.
 - b) a **towards rubber error** occurred: In this case the transmitter sends $r - 1$ times the symbol $q - 1$. If

there are not enough symbols left in the block the sender sends $q - 1$ for the remaining symbols.

The modified rubber method for Γ_{Σ}^q is used from now on to retransmit x_{fe} and to send the remaining information symbols but before sending them channel they are adapted to the channel Γ_{Σ}^q by using the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} f : \mathcal{Q} &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \\ k &\mapsto k + 1 \pmod{q}. \end{aligned}$$

Possibly remaining symbols within the block are filled by sending $q - 1$ symbols.

Let the received sequence be denoted as $y^n = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. The decoding strategy depends on the symbol y_n :

- 1) $y_n = 0$: The decoder uses the decoding procedure for the modified rubber method for Γ_Z^q until he retrieves the message m . Potentially remaining symbols within the block are ignored by the decoder.
- 2) $y_n = 1$: The decoder checks for the first occurrence of the sequence r times $q - 1$. All previously sent symbols with exception of the symbol that was sent right before this sequence have been received correctly. If those information symbols are sufficient to obtain the message with certainty the decoder outputs the message m . Otherwise, the receiver continues its decoding procedure by using the decoding algorithm of the modified rubber method for Γ_{Σ}^q on the remaining symbols. The function

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1} : \mathcal{Q} &\rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \\ k &\mapsto k - 1 \pmod{q} \end{aligned}$$

is then to be applied on all information symbols which were sent after the first occurrence of the sequence r times $q - 1$ to obtain the information vector. This vector uniquely determines the message m . ■

The following result follows directly from Remark 3 and Theorem 4.

Corollary 4: The rate achieved by using the modified rubber method on the unidirectional channel Γ_U^q using a single symbol rubber is

$$R = (1 - \tau) \log_2(q - 1). \quad (19)$$

Remark 4: The values for z_r in Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 can be computed. An important case is $q = 2$. It was proved that

$$C_2^f(\Gamma^2, \tau) = (1 - 3\tau) \log_2 \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$$

for $(3 + \sqrt{5})^{-1} \leq \tau \leq 1/3$ (see equation (3)). It was shown in [2] that this capacity can be achieved with the rubber method.

If we apply the modified rubber method to the binary case we get the following result. The capacity error function of the unidirectional channel is lower bounded by

$$C_2^f(\Gamma_U^2, \tau) \geq \begin{cases} \max_{2 \leq r \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - r\tau) \log_2 z_r & \text{if } 0 \leq \tau \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{if } \tau > \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Comparison: Unidirectional channel, symmetric channel




Fig. 7. Comparison of the lower bound on $C_2^f(\Gamma_U^2, \tau)$ obtained by the modified rubber method using and the capacity error function of the symmetric channel $C_2^f(\Gamma^2, \tau)$

The result for $r = 2$ is

$$(1 - 2\tau) \log_2 \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right).$$

The major change compared to the result given in equation (3) is the change of the factor $(1 - 3\tau)$ to $(1 - 2\tau)$. It occurs because retransmissions after erroneous symbols are unnecessary. Figure 7 shows the lower bound on $C_2^f(\Gamma_U^2, \tau)$ obtained by using the modified rubber method and $C_2^f(\Gamma^2, \tau)$ for comparison. This result is different without feedback, since the capacity error functions of symmetrical and unidirectional channel are the same in that case.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Frans Willems for making them aware that the methods proposed in [8] may possibly be adapted to be used on unidirectional channels as well.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work we have analyzed channels with feedback with a fixed maximal fraction of erroneous symbols. A major focus of this work are asymmetric and unidirectional channels. Notably we have shown that the capacity error function with feedback for the unidirectional channel composed of Z-channel and inverse Z-channel is larger than the capacity error function of the symmetric channel for a significant proportion of the possible values of τ . This is not the case for the same channels without feedback. The channels analyzed in this work have at most two input symbols connected to each output. As the knowledge of an erroneous position at the receiver implies knowing the value of the respective symbol retransmissions are not necessary if the encoding strategy is chosen in a way such that the receiver is able to obtain the error positions. This can be used to create encoding strategies achieving a higher rate for many channels using the modified rubber method. Furthermore

it was shown how to change the modified rubber method for unidirectional channels. The method proposed shows that it is possible to achieve the same rate for the unidirectional channel consisting of generalized Z-channel and inverse generalized Z-channel as for its components. Obtaining tighter bounds on the capacity error functions for several of the channels analyzed in this paper is an interesting topic for further research.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Ahlswede, H. Aydinian, and L.H. Khachatrian, Unidirectional Error Control Codes and Related Combinatorial Problems, Proceedings of Eight International Workshop on Algebraic and Combinatorial Coding Theory, Russia, 2002.
- [2] R. Ahlswede, D. Deppe, and V. Lebedev, Non-binary error correcting codes with noiseless feedback, localized errors, or both, Annals of the European Academy of Sciences 1, 285-309, 2005.
- [3] L.A. Bassalygo, New upper bounds for error correcting codes, Problems Information Transmission, 1:4, 32-35, 1965.
- [4] C.R. Berlekamp, Block coding for the binary symmetric channel with noiseless delayless feedback, Proc. Symposium on Error Correcting Codes, Univ. Wisconsin, 1968.
- [5] R.A. Brualdi, Introductory Combinatorics, Elsevier North-Holland, 1977.
- [6] F. Cicalese, Fault-Tolerant Search Algorithms, Springer, EATCS Series, 2013.
- [7] C. Deppe, Searching with lies and coding with feedback, Entropy, Search, Complexity, Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies, Katona (Ed.), Vol. 16, 27-70, 2007.
- [8] C. Deppe, and V. Lebedev, Algorithms for Q-ary Error-Correcting Codes with Partial Feedback and Limited Magnitude, ISIT 2019.
- [9] V. Lebedev, Coding with noiseless feedback, Problems of Information Transmission, Vol. 52, No. 2, 103-113, 2016.
- [10] C.E. Shannon, The zero error capacity of a noisy channel, IRE Trans. Inform. Theory, IT-2, 3, 8-19, 1956.
- [11] Weber J. H., Bounds and Constructions for Binary Block Codes Correcting Asymmetric or Unidirectional Errors, TU Delft, Dissertation 1989.
- [12] K.Sh. Zigangirov, Number of correctable errors for transmission over a binary symmetrical channel with feedback, Problems Inform. Transmission 12, No. 2, 85-97, 1976.