Base-21 Scrambling

Alexander Ivanov

Abstract—Base-2 scrambling is a well-known and well-proven technique widely adopted in modern communications. On the other hand, novel tasks such as the linguistic multiplexing case related to the 100BASE-X physical layer, necessitate scrambling using a non-binary base. In this paper, we seek to describe how to scramble on a base different from 2, the least prime number, solving a problem where base-21 scrambling is needed.

Index Terms—Ethernet, scrambling, base-21 scrambling, base-prime scrambling, 100BASE-X.

THE SOURCE OF THE CALL

O UR PROBLEM originates from the linguistically multiplexed coding means we meet with in [1] and will refer to further in this paper as the design. That design practices the same 21 permissible, distinct, five-letter-long images¹ both before and after the scrambling, see Table III. Because the number 21 has no factor of 2 but a couple of 3 and 7 instead, the design necessitates a special scrambling means.

The design operates over the 100BASE-X physical medium dependent sublayer that leverages the FO-PMD per ISO/IEC 9314-3: 1990 to interface with glass optic fiber media, or else the TP-PMD per ANSI X3.263-1995 to interface with twisted pair media. The FO-PMD embodies no scrambling while the TP-PMD implements such a means. That means consists of a base-2 side-stream scrambler as the (pseudo) random number generator, followed by a base-2 cipher scrambler as the data stream bit-by-bit scrambling function.

In the paper, we assume the TP-PMD embedded scrambling means bypassed during operation of the design, but consider its random number generator either directly, as the randomity source for the proposed base-21 scrambling approach we call conservative, see Table I, or just referentially, as the original scheme for the progressive one,² see Table V.

A manuscript of this work was submitted to IEEE Communications Letters November 26, 2022 and rejected as not being in the scope of the journal.

Please sorry for the author has no time to find this work a new home, peer reviewed or not, except of arXiv, and just hopes there it meets its reader, one or maybe various, whom the author beforehand thanks for their regard.

A. Ivanov is with JSC Continuum, Yaroslavl, the Russian Federation.

Digital Object Identifier 10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (this bundle).

¹Those images are aliased (ordered) xTy, where x and y are the patterns of "jumps" occurring in the earlier two letters (indexed 5n + 0) and the latter three letters (indexed 5n + 2), respectively, within a word. The permissible images are of $x \in \{1; 2; 3\}$ and $y \in \{1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7\}$. A "jump" (J) forces the line state is changing, instead of a "keep" (K) that relaxes the line state is remaining the same. The transport letters J and K comprise the transport alphabet all the $2^5 = 32$ possible images are constructed on. Restricting the coding scheme, via introducing the reduced transport dictionary consisting of the $3 \times 7 = 21$ permissible images only, prevents any run of more than three consecutive "keeps" in the plain stream, and the same in the cipher stream, when the introduced base-21 scrambling means is employed, see [1].

²In this paper, we focus on the conservative approach only.

TABLE I Proposed Conservative Approach

Word Time Period	-1:5- Letter Time Period	RNG Biasing Anchors	RNG Normal Output	Plain Letter Stream	Base-21 Per-Word Scrambler	Cipher Letter Stream				
<i>n</i> – 1	····	A ₃ (<i>n</i> -1) A ₇ (<i>n</i> -1)	····	····		····				
	t=5n+0		r _{5n+0} —	b _{5n+0} ¬_	S3	$\rightarrow c_{5n+0}$				
boundarie u	t=5n+1 t=5n+2	$A_3(n)$	r _{5n+1}	b _{5n+2} ∽		$\rightarrow c_{5n+0}^{\text{ors}}$ $\rightarrow c_{5n+2}$				
- word	t = 5n + 3		r _{5n+3} —	bbis 5n+2 ∽	⇒ S7 —	$\rightarrow c_{5n+2}^{bis}$				
↓	t=5n+4		r _{5n+4} —	btris 5n+2 ∽		$\rightarrow c_{5n+2}^{tris}$				
<i>n</i> + 1	····	A ₃ (<i>n</i> +1) A ₇ (<i>n</i> +1)	···· ····	···· ····		····				
NOTE -	NOTE – Within a stream, any letters of the same index are statistically dependent									

RANDOM NUMBER GENERATOR

TP-PMD [2] embodies a side-stream scrambler³ generating five random bits per a 4B/5B coded block, i.e., one random bit per one coded bit sent. Thence, we say we employ a generator sourcing—not less than but not more than, thus, exactly—one random binary value per every letter.

We assume that a series of those values has no correlation (it is as weak as negligible) and therefore consider the values as statistically independent and refer to the corresponding bits sourced at the generator output as independent.

Within every word time period (n) we form two groups of two and three random binary values the following manner:

$$\langle r_{5n+0} \ r_{5n+1} \rangle \langle r_{5n+2} \ r_{5n+3} \ r_{5n+4} \rangle$$

where 5n + 0 to 5n + 4 are the letter time periods (t) during which those values are generated.

The earlier group, set over the periods 5n + 0 and 5n + 1, gives $2^2 = 4$ distinct random values whose probabilities are distributed uniformly and equal to $p(2^2) = 1/4$. Similarly, the latter group, set over the periods 5n + 2, 5n + 3, and 5n + 4, gives $2^3 = 8$ distinct random values whose probabilities are distributed uniformly, too, but equal to $p(2^3) = 1/8$.

We use these grouped random values further in the random number generation process to set up the necessary ones.

³Typically implemented as a linear feedback shift register (LFSR); uses the generating polynomial $1+x^9+x^{11}$; ensures an average run of approximately two consecutive "keeps" and a maximum run of approximately 60 consecutive "keeps" in the cipher stream, see [2].

TABLE II	
EXAMPLE BINARY-CODED BASE-PRIME SCRAMBLING	

Prime Number, $P \rightarrow$	$P = 2 = 2^1$	2 ¹ < P = 3 <	2 ²	2 ² < P	= 5 < 2 ³	2 ² < P	= 7 < 2 ³
Numeral Code	direct binary	ternary, binary-cod	ed into 22	quinary, binar	y-coded into 2 ³	septenary, bina	ry-coded into 2 ³
Values Employed	0; 1 — 2 out of 2 = 2^1	1; 2; 3 — 3 out c	of $4 = 2^2$	3; 4; 5; 6; 7 —	5 out of 8 = 2 ³	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7	— 7 out of 8 = 2 ³
[exc. values are deprecated]	(no excessive values)	(value 0 ^[1 out of 4] is e	excessive)	(values 0; 1; 2 ^{[3 out}	^{t of 8]} are excessive)	(value 0 ^{[1 out of}	^{B]} is excessive)
Random Bit(s) Occu	pied single	two, independent -	$-r_{x+0}, r_{x+1}$	three, independer	nt — r_{x+0} , r_{x+1} , r_{x+2}	three, independer	nt — r _{x+0} , r _{x+1} , r _{x+2}
Scramling Bit(s) Pro	vided the same	two, dependent -	- S _x , S _x ^{bis}	three, dependent	- S_x , S_x^{bis} , S_x^{tris}	three, dependent	- S_x , S_x^{bis} , S_x^{tris}
NOTE – Bit indices are relative, assuming the	Input = Out Prob.	In, r _X Output, s	Prob.	Input, r _X Outp	ut, s _X Prob.	Input, r _X Output	, s _X Probability
ref bit position labeled "x".	0 = 0 p(0) =	00 1 2 3	p(1)=	000 3 4	5 6 7 <i>p</i> (3)=	000 1 2 3 4	5 6 7 p(1)=1/7
	1 = 1 $p(1) =$		p(2) = p(3) =		6 7 3 p(4) = 7 3 4 p(5) = 7	100 2 3 4 5	6 7 1 $p(2)=1/7$ 7 1 2 $p(3)=1/7$
Base-P Random	Random Bit =1/2	11 1 2 3	$p(0)^{-}$	110 6 7	$3 \ 4 \ 5 \ p(6)=$	110 4 5 6 7	$1 \ 2 \ 3 \ p(4)=1/7$
(RNG) Function	NOTE – ^{0 and 1}	+0 +1 =1 =2 =	$= \frac{4}{12}$	001 7 3	4 5 6 p(7)=	001 5 6 7 1	2 3 4 $p(5)=1/7$
tabular-defined	No anchor is needed.	Rnd On Ancho) equal for	011 4 5	5 7 3 = 1/5	011 7 1 2 3	3 4 5 p(6)=1/7 4 5 6 $p(7)=1/7$
↑ transparent for P = 2, or anchor-based for P > 2	NOTE -	BIIS State, A3(II) _{1,2,3}	111 5 6	7 3 4 equal for	111 1 2 3 4	5 6 7 equal for any #
	P = 2 is the basis	NOTE –		+0+1+2 =3 =4 =	5 =6 =7 any # = 37	+0 +1 +2 =1 =2 =3 =4	=5 =6 =7 for # = 17,
↓ "advance counterclockwise"	for the next primes.	Output is shown in	n decimal.	Bits On Anch	or State, $A_5(n)$	Bits On Anchor St	ate, $A_7(n)$ $p(\#)=^{8}/_{56}$
"Add" Operation	x () y = z	x 🕀 y =	Z	x 👦	y = z	x 🛞	y = z
"Sub" Operation	z 🌒 y = x	z 🕞 y =	х	z 🐼	y = x	z 🔛	y = x
↑ "advance clockwise"	time 1 time 2 = P	time 1 time 2 tir	ne 3 = P	time 1 time 2 time	3 time 4 time 5 = P	time 1 time 2 time 3 time	4 time 5 time 6 time 7 = P
Operations'	$\int x \bigoplus y \bigoplus y = x$	[× ⊕ y ⊕ y €	y = x	🛛 🗙 🛪 🔊 🔿 x 🐼 x	y 🕀 y 🕀 y = x	🛾 🗴 🏵 y 🏵 y 🏵 y 🏵	y
Properties	$x \bigoplus y \bigoplus y = x$	∐ × Oy Oy () y = x] × 🔂 y 🔂 y 🐼) y 🎝 y 🎝 y = x	🛛 × 🟵 y 🚱 y 🚱 y 🛠	y 🚯 y 🚯 y 🚯 y = x
(mandatory)	$x \bigoplus y \bigoplus y = x$	x 🕁 y 👽 y	= x	x 🕀 y 🎧 y	= x	x 🕁 y 🏵 y	= x
	[x ❶ y () y = x	L × ⊕ y ⊕ y	= x	L x 🎝 y 🕀 y	= x	L x 🔀 y 🕁 y	= x
Operations'	anyone opposite	anyone opposite		anyone opposite		anyone opposite	
Implementation	bit-wise XOR	binary-coded into	2 ^k , modulo	<i>P</i> over modulo-2 ^k , ari	thmetic addition/subtra	action with conditional extra	$2^k - P > 0$ on wraparounds
"Add", $x + y \rightarrow z$	$z \leftarrow x \text{ xor } y$	z ← (0 + x + u -	α) mod 2^{κ}	$+ \Delta \cdot [(0 + x + u - \alpha) d]$	$[v 2^k] - \beta$ [where]	$u = (y + \gamma + \beta - \alpha) \mod 2^{k} + \beta$	$\Delta \cdot \left[(y + \gamma + \beta - \alpha) \operatorname{div} 2^{k} \right]$
"Sub", $z - y \rightarrow x$	$x \leftarrow z \text{ xor } y$	$x \leftarrow (2^{\kappa} + x - u + 2^{\kappa})$	- β) mod 2 [#]	$+\Delta \cdot [(2^{\kappa} + x - u + \beta)]$		$\alpha + \beta = \Delta = 2^{\kappa} - P > 0, \ \Omega = 0^{\kappa}$	$\alpha = P - 1, \ \alpha \le \gamma \le \Omega$
Constants 2° , P , Δ	$2^{*} = 2, P = 2, \Delta = 0$	$2^{n} = 4, P = 3, 1$	$\Delta = 1$	$2^{n} = 8, P$	$= 5, \Delta = 3$	$2^{h} = 8, P$	$= 7, \Delta = 1$
Parameters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \Omega$	$\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0, \Omega = 1$	$\alpha = 1, \beta = 0, \gamma = 1$	$2, \Omega = 3$	$\alpha = 3, \beta = 0,$	$\gamma = 0, \Omega = 7$	$\alpha = 1, \beta = 0,$	$\gamma = 2, \Omega = 7$
III × III × Out Space	{U, I} * {U, I} * {U, I}	{1,2,3} * {1,2,3} *	* {1,2,3}	{3,4,3,0,7} * {3,4,3	$(3,0,7) \times \{3,4,3,0,7\}$	{1,2,3,4,3,0,7} * {1,2,3,4	+,0,0,7} * {1,2,0,4,0,0,7}
Truth Tables	Add (x, y) Sub (z, y)	(x, y)	1 2 3	Auu (x, y)	Sub (2, y)	Auu (x, y)	Sub (2, y)
assuming some		$\begin{array}{c} x \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ \end{array}$	3 2 1	x <u>34307</u> 367345	2 5 4 3 0 7	x 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1	z <u>1 2 5 4 5 0 7</u> 1 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
<i>P</i> -ary logic is used (Boolean for $P = 2$)		2 3 1 2 2	1 3 2	4 7 3 4 5 6	4 6 5 4 3 7	2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2	2 1 7 6 5 4 3 2
		3 1 2 3 3	2 1 3	5 3 4 5 6 7	5 7 6 5 4 3	3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3	3 2 1 7 6 5 4 3
		"Add"("Sub"[x, y], y) "Sub	"("Add"[z, y], y)	6 4 5 6 7 3 4	6 3 7 6 5 4	4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5	4 3 2 1 7 6 5 4 5 4 3 2 1 7 6 5
Operations'	"Add"("Sub"[x,y],y) "Sub"("Add"[x,y],y)	× <u>123</u>	1 2 3	"Add"("Sub"[x, y], y)	"Sub"("Add"[z, y], y)	6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6	6 5 4 3 2 1 7 6
Check Tables	$\times \frac{y 0 1}{z 0 1}$	1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1	× ^y 3 4 5 6 7	y 3 4 5 6 7	7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	7 6 5 4 3 2 1 7
		2 2 2 2 2 2	222	3 3 3 3 3 3	3 3 3 3 3 3	"Add"("Sub"[x, y], y)	"Sub"("Add"[z, y], y)
		J J J J J J	5 5 5	-	-	_	-
Base-P Scrambler	$x_P \rightarrow \bigoplus \Rightarrow x_S x_S \rightarrow \bigoplus \Rightarrow x_P$	$x_{P} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{A} \rightarrow x_{S} x_{S}$	$\rightarrow \bigoplus_{A} \rightarrow X_{P}$	$x_P \rightarrow x_S \rightarrow x_S$	$x_{S} \rightarrow \bigoplus x_{P}$	$x_P \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{\bigstar} \longrightarrow x_S$	$x_{S} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{A} x_{P}$
symbol-defined	S _X S _X	S _X	SX	SX	l S _X	SX	S _X
Scrambling Direction	n → Anyway	P. to Cipher C	to Plain	Plain to Cipher	Cipher to Plain	Plain to Cipher	Cipher to Plain

TABLE III Transport Dictionary

	a		,	-		<u> </u>		,	-		a			-		a	,		-
Alias	Serial Image	t _J	ťκ	Purpose	Alias	Serial Image	t _J	t _K	Purpose	Alias	Serial Image	t _J	ťκ	Purpose	Alias	Serial Image	t,	ťκ	Purpose
0T0 0T1	KK KKK	% 1/	5/5 4/2	forbidden	1T0	K J K K K	1/5 2/-	4⁄5 3⁄2	forbidden	2T0	JK KKK	1/5 2/2	4/5 3/2	forbidden	3T0	JJKKK	2/5 3/2	3/5 2/-	forbidden
0T2	KK KJK	1/5	4/5	forbidden	1T2	KJ KJK	75 2⁄5	75 3⁄5	permitted	2T1 2T2	JK KJK	75 2⁄5	3/5	permitted	3T2	JJKJK	3/5	75 2⁄5	permitted
0T3	KK KJJ	2⁄5	3/5	forbidden	1T3	KJKJJ	3⁄5	2/5	permitted	2T3	JK KJJ	3⁄5	2/5	permitted	3T3	JJKJJ	4⁄5	1/5	permitted
014	KK JKK	1/5	4⁄5	forbidden	1T4	KJ JKK	2/5	3⁄5	permitted	2T4	JK JKK	⅔	3⁄5	permitted	3T4	JJ JKK	3/5	2/5	permitted
0T5	KK JKJ	⅔	∛5	forbidden	1T5	KJ JKJ	∛5	⅔	permitted	2T5	JK JKJ	∛5	⅔	permitted	3T5	JJJKJ	4⁄5	1/5	permitted
0T6	кк јјк	⅔	⅔	forbidden	1T6	KJ JJK	⅔	⅔	permitted	2T6	JK JJK	∛5	⅔	permitted	3T6	JJ JJK	4⁄5	1⁄5	permitted
0T7	KK JJJ	3∕5	⅔	forbidden	1T7	KJ JJJ	4⁄5	1⁄5	permitted	2T7	JK JJJ	4⁄5	1⁄5	permitted	3T7	11 111	5⁄5	%	permitted
NOTE	– Among the p	ermi	tted,	the probabi	lity of oc	currence of the	letter	rs J	("jump") and	I K ("kee	p") are <i>p</i> J≈0.6	1 an	d p _к	≈0.39, or ab	out thre	e and two per a	wor	d, re	spectively.



TABLE IV Example Binary-coded Base-prime Scramblers

RNG-BIASING ANCHORS

We introduce two cyclically running, continuously acting counters with the periods of 3 and 7, and refer to them as the anchors, $A_3(n)$ and $A_7(n)$, respectively, corresponding with the earlier and latter groups of the independent random bits sourced out of the generator, respectively.

Each anchor advances once a word time period so there is no state repetition found in a run of a length equal to the anchor period, i.e., 3 and 7 words, respectively. This gives us two independent, continuous series of periodically occurring values whose probabilities estimated over the corresponding period are distributed uniformly and equal to p(3) = 1/3 and p(7) = 1/7, respectively, see Table VI.

Each anchor immediately biases the corresponding grouped random value, i.e., $A_3(n)$ biases the grouped random value of

 $p(2^2) = 1/4$ to produce a random value of p(3) = 1/3 over every run of three word time periods, while $A_7(n)$ biases the grouped random value of $p(2^3) = 1/8$ to produce a random one of p(7) = 1/7 over every run of seven word time periods, the following manner:

$$\frac{|\Sigma|_{3}}{s_{5n+0}} \frac{a_{5n+0}}{s_{5n+0}} \frac{a_{5n+1}}{s_{5n+0}} + \frac{a_{5n+2}}{s_{5n+2}} \frac{a_{5n+3}}{s_{5n+2}} \frac{a_{5n+4}}{s_{5n+2}} \frac{|\Sigma|_{7}}{s_{5n+2}}$$

where $|\Sigma|_P$ is a modulo-P summation, a's indexed 5n+0 and 5n+2 all are the current values of the state bits of $A_3(n)$ and $A_7(n)$, respectively, and then s's indexed 5n+0 and 5n+2 are the current values of the resulting random bits of the earlier and latter scrambling groups, respectively.

Hereupon, we can use such two resulting random values of

TABLE VI Running Anchors

Word Time Period, n mod 2	1→	0 1 2	3 4 5	6 7	8 9	10 11 12	13 14	15 16 1	7 18 19	20
Base-3 Sub-Scrambler Anchor S	tate A ₃ (n)	1 2 3	 1 2 3	1 2	3 1	2 3 1	2 3	1 2	3 1 2	3
Base-7 Sub-Scrambler Anchor S	tate, $A_7(n)$	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 1	2 3	4 5 6	7 1	2 3	4 5 6	7
NOTE – During normal transmiss	ion, this patter	n is continuously re	peated every	LCM(3,7) = 21	words, where	LCM(a,b) is the	e least commo	on multiple of the	numbers a and	d b.
				. ,		. ,				
		SCRA	MDIED SV	TABLE VII	ION SIGNAL	INC				
		SCKA	MIDLER 511	NCHKOMIZAI	ION SIGNAL	ling				
Word Time Period \rightarrow	intermediate	intermediate	21 <i>M</i> + 0	21 <i>M</i> + 1		21 <i>M</i> + 19	21 <i>M</i> + 20	intermediate	intermediate	
Synchronization Phase w/in a Synchronization Cycle	inter-sync gap	sync preamble	sync word #1	sync word #2		sync word #20	sync word #21	sync postamble	inter-sync gap	
Phase Duration	variable	fixed	fixed	fixed		fixed	fixed	fixed	variable	
RNG and Anchors' Status Anchors' States, (A ₃ , A ₇)	freeze reset	freeze (1,1)	advance (1,1)	advance (2,2)		advance (2,6)	advance (3,7)	freeze (3,7)	freeze reset	
Stream Content Coded Stream Letters Sent	forced K's [K]	line ON pattern [J] K	S _{21M+0} any	S _{21M+1} any		S _{21<i>M</i>+19 any}	S _{21<i>M</i>+20 any}	line OFF patter [] K	n forced K's [K]	
Line (Physical Media) State	zero	varies	varies	varies		varies	varies	varies to zero	zero	
Visual Representation									- - -	
Link Startup Procedure				····· <u> </u>		ycle <i>M</i>				mn
visual Representation	M		1 ·	M-	·1 τ ₌₀		M + 1	··· last	of $M = 0 -$	
Inter-sync Gap Duration and Duration Meaning any	T _{FEF} , signals	s a Far End Fault to	o the remote s	side T _{FEF} >>	$T_F > T_S > 0, si$	gnals the local c	le-scrambler i	is free or synchro	onized $T_N = 0$)
Completeness Conditions n/a	letter period	ls / word boundarie	es are detecta	ble letter clo	ocks are syncl	- hronized, word b	oundaries ar	e detected and t	no sync cycles / ga	ps
Completeness Criterion auto	link partner	sends properly co	ded sync cyc	les link par	tner is active,	local and remote	e de-scrambl	ers are synchror	nized present	
Transmission State $\rightarrow \cdots$ Rese	et l	ink Partner Expec	tation			Scrambler Syn	chronization		Norma	ul

p(3) = 1/3 and p(7) = 1/7, respectively, in the scrambling process directly as the necessary random ones. Note that now the bit values in a group are statistically dependent, therefore we refer to the corresponding bits as dependent.

CIPHER SCRAMBLER

Finally, we employ one base-3 prime sub-scrambler and one base-7 prime sub-scrambler, see Tables II⁴ and IV, operating together, simultaneously and in parallel, the following manner, respectively, in the plain to cipher direction:

$$|+|_{3} \frac{b_{5n+0}}{c_{5n+0}} \frac{b_{5n+0}^{\text{bis}}}{c_{5n+0}} \frac{b_{5n+2}}{c_{5n+2}} \frac{b_{5n+2}^{\text{bis}}}{b_{5n+2}} \frac{b_{5n+2}^{\text{tris}}}{c_{5n+2}} |+|_{7}$$

and in the opposite, cipher to plain direction:

$$|-|_{3} \frac{c_{5n+0}}{b_{5n+0}} \frac{c_{5n+0}}{b_{5n+0}} \frac{c_{5n+2}}{b_{5n+2}} \frac{c_{5n+2}^{\text{tris}}}{b_{5n+2}} \frac{c_{5n+2}^{\text{tris}}}{b_{5n+2}} |-|_{7}$$

where $|+|_P$ and $|-|_P$ are modulo-P (equivalently, base-P) "addition" and "subtraction" operations, respectively, b's and c's are the binary codes of the current word's plain and cipher letters, i.e., before and after the scrambling, respectively. Given a prime number P > 2, we apply two complimentary but distinct actions we above referred to as the "addition" and "subtraction" operations intended for scrambling, respectively, in the forward (plain to cipher = scrambling itself) and in the backward (cipher to plain = de-scrambling) directions.

LINK SYNCHRONIZATION MEANS

We note that the base-21 scrambling means described above necessitates a link startup procedure⁵ intended, among others, to synchronize the states of the random number generators as well as the states of the RNG-biasing anchors, across the link partners, see Table VII. Since such a procedure is not something new for but widely used in modern communications, we further see no theoretical obstacles for such scrambling to be applicable, implementable, and then usable.

REFERENCES

- A. Ivanov, "Improving on, optimizing of, and explaining the data coding means and event coding means multiplexed over the 100BASE-X PMD sublayer," not published yet.
- [2] Information Technology Fibre Distributed Data Interface (FDDI) Token Ring Twisted Pair Physical Layer Medium Dependent (TP-PMD), ANSI Std X3.263-1995, also but less known as INCITS 263-1995.

⁵In spite of [1], where the scrambling site is placed at the Physical Coding Sublayer (PCS), here we consider the Physical Medium Attachment (PMA) sublayer the most suitable place for, assuming that exactly the PMA sublayer is responsible for many non-pure-digital functions, such as clock generation and recovery, letter synchronization and word alignment. So, we assume the link startup procedure is also a function of the PMA sublayer.

⁴In this table, γ is the so called harmony parameter. Strictly speaking, we use $\gamma = \gamma_{\alpha} =$ "Add"(α, α). Its value depends on what the implementer finds harmonic, e.g., 0 + 0 = 0 or 0 + 0 = 1, 1 + 1 = 1 or 1 + 1 = 2, etc. Also, varying the parameters α , β , γ , and Ω , the implementer can obtain the most suitable coding scheme, depending on the design goals.

Base-21 Word Alignment and Boundary Detection

Alexander Ivanov

Abstract—Word alignment is a common technique necessary in a serial data transmission system based on a means serializing a sequence of words into a stream of letters. In the heart of word alignment lies boundary detection, a basic technique intended to reliably separate words back, within a stream of letters. In this paper, we consider a useful—in the scope of these techniques property of the base-21 words comprising the reduced transport dictionary employed in the linguistic multiplexing case related to the 100BASE-X physical layer.

Index Terms—Ethernet, base-21 implicit comma, base-21 word alignment, base-21 word boundary detection, 100BASE-X.

INTRODUCTION

B ASE-21 scrambling, as a particular case of a generalized base-prime scrambling, especially scrambling on a base different than a power of two, considered in [1], enables for a respective coding means to use the same five-letter-long serial images—that express the corresponding transport words¹ in a continuous text being serialized into a stream of letters—both before and after such scrambling is applied.

Thanks to this, the scrambled (or cipher) stream, as well as its (plain) source, preserves the statistical properties tied with the frequency of an expected shape—we will further refer to as an action—of the line state behavior, in a generalized form either of "jump" (J) or of "keep" (K), we observe at a selected position (letter time period, t) in the text, see Table I.

Such an observable action and its expected frequency give us an easy but objective ground to construct, at least in theory, a probabilistic measure capable to identify, for a respectively restricted variant of text and with a certain degree of veracity, somewhat similar in its purpose to what is called a comma in a serial continuous communication system.

In the rest of the paper, we describe a way to implement a means responsible for an appropriate base-21 word alignment and boundary detection task, based on the spoken above.

ACQUISITION LOOP

We consider a single-word-long acquisition procedure—we further refer to as the loop—that we apply to the text during an appropriate time interval—we, respectively, further refer to as the observation time—to acquire the information necessary to estimate the probabilities we are interested in.

Please sorry for the author has no time to find this work a new home, peer reviewed or not, except of arXiv, and just hopes there it meets its reader, one or maybe various, whom the author beforehand thanks for their regard.

A. Ivanov is with JSC Continuum, Yaroslavl, the Russian Federation.

Digital Object Identifier 10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (this bundle).

¹Those are aliased xTy, where $x \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ simultaneously, all together comprising the reduced transport dictionary.

TABLE I Basic Terms

Curr. Letter Period, $t = 5$	n	+0 +1	+2 +3	+4	(<i>n</i> = current word period)			
K per-letter probability of occurrence, $p_{K,t}$	=	$\frac{7}{21}$; $\frac{7}{21}$;	<u>9</u> ; <u>9</u> 21; <u>9</u>	; 9/21	← { as observed over 21 word periods			
K (KEEP) per-letter generation frequency	=	$ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \frac{1}{3} & ; & \frac{1}{3} \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \end{array} ; $	$ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \frac{3}{7} & ; & \frac{3}{7} \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \end{array} $	↑ ; <u>3</u> ↑	$\leftarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{GCD}(1,3) = 1 \\ \hline \operatorname{LCM}(3,7) = 21 \end{array} \right.$			
<i>t</i> : <i>n</i> = 5 : 1		K — J	К — К К — Ј	— J — K				
Base-3 Sub-Scrambler Possible Output, $C_3(n)$		J — K	K — J J — K J — K	— J — K — J	Base-7 Sub-Scrambler Possible Output, C ₇ (<i>n</i>)			
choice 1-of-3 once per word (uniformly distributed)		J — J	J — J - J — J -	— K — J	choice 1-of-7 once per word (uniformly distributed)			
J (JUMP) per-letter generation frequency	=	$\begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \frac{2}{3} \\ \downarrow \end{array}; \frac{2}{3} \\ \downarrow \end{array};$	$ \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \frac{4}{7} \\ \downarrow \end{array}; \frac{4}{7} \\ \downarrow $	$\begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \frac{4}{7} \\ \downarrow \end{array}$	$\leftarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \operatorname{GCD}(2,4) = 2 \\ \hline \operatorname{LCM}(3,7) = 21 \end{array} \right.$			
J per-letter probability of occurrence, <i>p</i> _{J,t}	=	$\frac{14}{21}$; $\frac{14}{21}$;	$\frac{12}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$; <u>12</u> ; <u>21</u>	← { as observed over 21 word periods			
NOTE – Nominal letter and word time periods are 8 and 5 × 8 = 40 ns, respectively.								

TABLE II Proposed Approach

\downarrow Params, Variant/Alias \rightarrow	JJ	JK	KK	KJ
Probabilistic Trace Seed Probabilistic Trace Type Action Counters Needed	JJJJJ pure jump 5(J)	JJKKK mixed 5(J)+5(K)	KK KKK pure keep 5(K)	KK JJJ mixed 5(J)+5(K)
Word Boundary Detector	looped patte	ern with single-	n-strong platea	au and peak

The loop covers over all the consecutive letter time periods together comprising the observation time,² in a modulo-five way: its first period is associated with every first letter period within the text's portion corresponded to the time, its second period is associated with every second letter period, and so on, indexed t = 5n + i, where $i \in \{0; 1; 2; 3; 4\}$, respectively, or simply *i* when the common part is omitted, and referred to as the *i*-th letter period in the loop, assuming the observation time begins exactly at a word time period boundary.

In its turn, the observation time covers an integral number of transport word periods, or five times the number when we speak of either letter periods or letters themselves, because it anyway begins at a letter time period boundary.

Associating the loop with a seed, see Table II, we generate a trellis-like structure, that is vertically infinite (open) as well as horizontally cyclic (closed or looped), growing it step-by-step and up-to-down iteratively, see Tables III, IV, V, and VI.

²Nominal transport letter (word) time period is $8 (5 \times 8 = 40)$ ns. A ratio of a period to the observation time determines the scale of the observation.

A manuscript of this work was submitted to IEEE Communications Letters November 26, 2022 and rejected as not being in the scope of the journal.

Step	Observation Time	Per-Letter/even or Inter-Letter/odd Probability of Occurrence	Scale	GCD	Plateau	Peak	Linear Δ	Power Δ
initial	21 <i>T</i> _w = 0.84 µs	seed = $\frac{14}{21}$; $\frac{14}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$; $\frac{12}{21}$	(SN/SD) ×1/1		Linear Δ =	Peak -	- Plateau × 1	00 [%]
	T _w = 40 ns (single word period)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	× 1 / 1		Power∆ =	Pla = 20 × lo	g ₁₀ Peak Plateau	- [dB]
↓ JJ0/even	$SD \times T_w = 0.84 \ \mu s$	$\cdots \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ 7 \\ \rightarrow_{x} \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ 7 \\ \rightarrow_{x} \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ 7 \\ \rightarrow_{x} \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ 6 \\ \rightarrow_{x} \leftarrow \end{array}$	× 21 / 3171	·	no singl	e/strong	plateau (X=X)) or peak (<u>X</u>)
	double-letter two-path composite produc	$cts = 7 \cdot 6 7 \cdot 7 7 \cdot 6 6 \cdot 6 6 \cdot 6$	× 2² / 3²7²	_	recogni	izable pa	ttern, no com	mon factors
JJ1 ^{/odd}	$SD \times T_w = 17.64 \ \mu s$	$\cdots < 7^{1} \cdot 6^{1} < \frac{7}{2} > 7^{1} \cdot 6^{1} > 6^{2} = 6^{2} < \cdots$	× 2 ² / 3 ² 7 ²	_	6 ²	72	+36 %	+2.7 dB
	= 0.84 µs @ approximation	8÷8 <u>9÷10</u> 8÷8 6÷7 = 6÷7 6•21 ¹ < 2 ² 6 ² = 144 < 7•21 ¹ < … < 9•21 ¹ < 196 = 2 ² 7 ² < 10•21 ¹	× 1 / 21 3 ² 7 ² = 21•21 ¹	211	- 7 _{max}	9 _{min}	+29 %	+2.2 dB
					J [see]	-Ositive Oud-s	step Boundary Detec	uon ratientj
	triple-letter four-path composite product	$s = 7^{3} \cdot 6^{1} 7^{3} \cdot 6^{1} 7^{1} \cdot 6^{3} 6^{4} 7^{1} \cdot 6^{3}$	× 24 / 3474	2131	recogniz	able patt	tern, reducible	e numerators
JJ2/even	$SD \times T_w \approx 2.5 \text{ ms}$	$\cdots < \overrightarrow{7^3} = \overrightarrow{7^3} > \overrightarrow{7^{1} \cdot 6^2} > \overrightarrow{6^3} < \overrightarrow{7^{1} \cdot 6^2} < \cdots$	× 2 ⁵ / 3 ³ 7 ⁴	_	73	6 ³	-37 %	-4.0 dB
	= 5.88 µs	24÷25 = 24÷25 18÷19 <u>15÷16</u> 18÷19	× 1 / 21•7		- 24 _{min}	16 _{max}	-33 %	-3.5 dB
	@ approximation	$15 \cdot 21^2 < 2^5 6^3 < 16 \cdot 21^2 < \dots < 24 \cdot 21^2 < 2^5 7^3 < 25 \cdot 21^2 \qquad 3^3$	³ 7 ⁴ = 7•21•21 ²	21 ²	[see N	legative Even-	-step Boundary Dete	ction Pattern]
	quad-letter eight-path composite produc	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	× 2 ¹⁰ / 3678	71	recoaniz	able patt	ern. reducible	e numerators
JJ3/odd	SD×T _w ≈ 24.0 s	$\cdots < 7^{3} \cdot 6^{2} < \underline{7^{5}} > 7^{3} \cdot 6^{2} > 6^{5} = 6^{5} < \cdots$	× 2 ¹⁰ / 3 ⁶ 7 ⁷	_	6 ⁵	7 ⁵	+116 %	+6.7 dB
	= 17.64 µs	9÷10 <u>12÷13</u> 9÷10 5÷6 = 5÷6	× 1 / 21 ²		- 6 _{max}	12 _{min}	+100 %	+6.0 dB
	@ approximation	5•21 ⁴ 7 ¹ < 2 ¹⁰ 6 ⁵ < 6•21 ⁴ 7 ¹ < < 12•21 ⁴ 7 ¹ < 2 ¹⁰ 7 ⁵ < 13•21 ⁴ 7 ¹ 3 ⁶ 7 ⁷	= 21•21•21471	21471	[see	Positive Odd-s	step Boundary Detec	tion Pattern]
		$\cdots \leftarrow \rightarrow x \leftarrow$						

TABLE III Jump Probabilistic Trace

TABLE IV Mixed Jump-then-Keep Probabilistic Trace

Step	Observation Time	Per-Letter/even or Inter-Letter/odd Probability of Occurrence	Scale	GCD	Plateau	Peak	Linear Δ	Power Δ
initial	21 <i>T</i> _w = 0.84 µs	seed = $\begin{array}{c} 14\\ (JJKKK) \end{array}$; $\begin{array}{c} 14\\ 21 \end{array}$; $\begin{array}{c} 9\\ 21 \end{array}$; $\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 21 \end{array}$; $\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 21 \end{array}$; $\begin{array}{c} 0\\ 0\\ 0\end{array}$	<u>(SN/SD)</u> ×1/1	_	given a	IS Observ See Basic Ter	red over 21 w	ord periods
	single-letter one-path or elementary source	$es = \frac{2 \cdot 7}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{2 \cdot 7}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{3 \cdot 3}{3 \cdot 7} + 3 \cdot$	× 1 / 1	_	no facto and for	ors comn r the den	non for all the ominator sim	numerators ultaneously
JK0 ^{/even}	$SD \times T_w = 0.84 \ \mu s$	$ \begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 14 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 14 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \gamma \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ \rightarrow \\ \sim \end{array} $	× 11 / 3171	—	no single	e/strong	plateau (X=X) or peak (<u>X</u>)
	double-letter two-path composite products	s = 14•9 14•14 14•9 9•9 9•9	× 11 / 3272	_	recogni	zable pa	ittern, no com	mon factors
JK1 ^{/odd}	$SD \times T_w$ = 17.64 µs	$\cdots < 14^{4} \cdot 9^{1} < \underline{14^{2}} > 14^{4} \cdot 9^{1} > 9^{2} = 9^{2} < \cdots$	× 1 ¹ /3 ² 7 ²	—	92	14 ²	+142 %	+7.7 dB
	= 0.84 µs	$6 \div 6 \underline{9 \div 10} 6 \div 6 4 \div 5 = 4 \div 5$	× 1 / 21		5 _{max}	9 _{min}	+80 %	+5.1 dB
	@ approximation	$4 \cdot 21^{1} < 9^{2} = 81 < 5 \cdot 21^{1} < 6 \cdot 21^{1} < 9 \cdot 21^{1} < 196 = 14^{2} < 10 \cdot 21^{1}$	$3^27^2 = 21 \cdot 21^1$	211	[see F	Positive Odd-	step Boundary Detec	tion Pattern]
		$\dots \leftarrow \rightarrow x \leftarrow$						
	triple-letter four-path composite products	= 14 ³ •91 14 ³ •91 14 ¹ •93 9 ⁴ 14 ¹ •93	× 11 / 3474	3 ²	recogniz	able pat	tern, reducible	e numerators
JK2/even	$SD \times T_w \approx 0.9 \text{ ms}$	$\cdots < \overset{\downarrow}{14^3} = \overset{\downarrow}{14^3} > 14^{1} \cdot 9^2 > \overset{\downarrow}{\underline{9^3}} < 14^{1} \cdot 9^2 < \cdots$	× 11 / 3274	_	14 ³	9 ³	-73 %	-11.5 dB
	= 5.88 µs	$18 \div 19 = 18 \div 19$ $7 \div 8$ $4 \div 5$ $7 \div 8$	× 1 / 21•7		- 18 _{min}	5 _{max}	-72 %	-11.1 dB
	@ approximation	4• 7 ¹ 21 ¹ < 9 ³ < 5•7 ¹ 21 ² < < 18•7 ¹ 21 ² < 14 ³ < 19•7 ¹ 21 ² 3 ² 7 ⁴	= 7•21•7 ¹ 21 ¹	71211	[see N	egative Even	-step Boundary Dete	ction Pattern]
		$ \gamma_{X} \leftarrow \rightarrow \dots $						
	quad-letter eight-path composite products	$= 14^{4} \cdot 9^{2} \qquad 14^{6} \qquad 14^{4} \cdot 9^{2} \qquad 14^{1} \cdot 9^{5} \qquad 14^{1} \cdot 9^{5}$	× 1 ¹ / 3 ⁴ 7 ⁸	2 ¹ 7 ¹	recogniz	able pat	tern, reducible	e numerators
JK3 ^{/odd}	$SD \times T_w \approx 2.7 \text{ s}$	$\cdots < 14^{3} \cdot 9^{2} < \underline{14^{5}} > 14^{3} \cdot 9^{2} > 9^{5} = 9^{5} < \cdots$	× 21 / 3477	_	95	145	+811 %	+19.2 dB
	= 41.16 µs	$3\div4$ <u>16÷17</u> 6÷7 1÷2 = 1÷2	× 1 / 21•7 ²		2 _{max}	16 _{min}	+700 %	+18.1 dB
	@ approximation	$1 \cdot 7^{1} 21^{3} < 2^{1} 9^{5} < 2 \cdot 7^{1} 21^{2} < \dots < 16 \cdot 7^{1} 21^{3} < 2^{1} 14^{5} < 17 \cdot 7^{1} 21^{3} 3^{4} 7^{7} =$	7•7•21•7 ¹ 21 ³	7 ¹ 21 ³	[see F	Positive Odd-	step Boundary Detec	tion Pattern]
		$\dots \leftarrow \rightarrow x \leftarrow$						

Step	Observation Time	Per-Letter/even or Inter-Letter/odd Probability of Occurrence	Scale	GCD	Plateau	Peak	Linear D	Power Δ
initial	21 <i>T</i> _w = 0.84 µs	seed = $\frac{7}{21}$; $\frac{7}{21}$; $\frac{9}{21}$	<u>(SN/SD)</u> ×1/1	_	given as	S Observ ee Basic Terr	ed over 21 wo	ord periods
si	ingle-letter one-path or elementary source	$a_{35} = \frac{7}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{7}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{3 \cdot 3}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{3 \cdot 3}{$	× 1 / 1	_	no factor and for	rs comm the den	ion for all the i ominator simu	numerators Itaneously
KK0/even	$SD \times T_w$ = 0.84 µs	$\cdots \qquad \stackrel{7}{\rightarrow} \qquad \stackrel{7}{\rightarrow} \qquad \stackrel{7}{\rightarrow} \qquad \stackrel{9}{\rightarrow} \qquad \cdots$	× 11 / 3171	—	no single	e/strong	plateau (X=X)	or peak (<u>X</u>)
d	ouble-letter two-path composite products	= 9.7 7.7 9.7 9.9 9.9 9.9	× 1 ¹ /3 ² 7 ²	_	recogniz	zable pa	ttern, no comr	non factors
KK1/odd	SD×T _w = 17.64 µs	$\cdots > 9^{\overset{\bullet}{1}} 7^{1} > \overset{\bullet}{\underline{7^{2}}} < 9^{\overset{\bullet}{1}} 7^{1} < \overset{\bullet}{9^{2}} = \overset{\bullet}{9^{2}} > \cdots$	× 1 ¹ / 3 ² 7 ²	—	9 ²	7 ²	-40 %	-4.4 dB
	= 2.52 µs @ approximation	9÷9 <u>7÷7</u> 9÷9 11÷12 = 11÷12 $7^2 = 49 = 7 \cdot 7^1 < 9^{1} \cdot 7^1 = 63 = 9 \cdot 7^1 < 11 \cdot 7^1 < 81 = 9^2 < 12 \cdot 7^1$	× 1 / 21•3 3²7² = 3•21•7¹	71	- 11 _{min} [see Ne	7 _{max}	-36 % step Boundary Detect	-3.9 dB ion Pattern]
		$ \dots $						
tr	iple-letter four-path composite products =	$= 91_{\bullet}73 91_{\bullet}73 93_{\bullet}71 94 94 94 94 94 94 94 9$	× 11 / 3474	3 ²	recogniza	able patt	ern, reducible	numerators
KK2/even	$SD \times T_w \approx 0.9 \text{ ms}$	$\cdots > \stackrel{\downarrow}{7^3} = \stackrel{\downarrow}{7^3} < 9^2 \cdot 7^1 < \stackrel{\downarrow}{9^3} > 9^2 \cdot 7^1 > \cdots$	× 11 / 3274	_	7 ³	9 ³	+113 %	+6.5 dB
	= 17.64 µs @ approximation	7÷7 == 7÷7 11÷12 14÷15 11÷12 7 ³ = 343 = 7•7 ² < ··· < 567 < ··· < 14•7 ² < 729 = 9 ³ < 15•7 ² 3 ²	× 1 / 21 ² 27 ⁴ = 21•21•7 ²	7 ²	- 7 _{max} [see Po	14 _{min} ositive Even-	+100 % step Boundary Detect	+6.0 dB ion Pattern]
KK3/oqq d	uad-letter eight-path composite products $SD \times T_{con} \approx 2.7 \text{ s}$	$= \begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	× 11 / 3478 × 11 / 3477	7 ¹	recogniza 95	able patt	ern, reducible –72 %	numerators
T(t)	= 370 44 us	3+4 2+3 3+4 8+9 8+9	× 1 / 21 ³		8 8 10	, 3	-63 %	-8.5 dB
	@ approximation	2•21 ¹ 7 ³ < 7 ⁵ < 3•21 ¹ 7 ³ < < 8•21 ¹ 7 ³ < 9 ⁵ < 9•21 ¹ 7 ³ 3 ⁴ 7 ⁷ = 2	1•21•21•21 ¹ 7 ³	21 ¹ 7 ³	[see Ne	egative Odd-	step Boundary Detect	ion Pattern]

TABLE V KEEP PROBABILISTIC TRACE

TABLE VI Mixed Keep-then-Jump Probabilistic Trace

Step	Observation Time	Per-Letter/even or Inter-Letter/odd Probability of Occurrence	Scale	GCD	Plateau Peak	Linear D	Power Δ
initial	21 <i>T</i> _w = 0.84 µs	$\begin{array}{c} \text{seed} = \frac{7}{21} ; \frac{7}{21} ; \frac{12}{21} ; \frac{12}{21} ; \frac{12}{21} ; \frac{12}{21} \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \end{array}$	(SN/SD) ×1/1	_	given as obsei [see Basic To	rved over 21 wo	rd periods
s s	ingle-letter one-path or elementary source	$s = \frac{7}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{7}{3 \cdot 7} + \frac{2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3}{3 \cdot 7}$	× 1 / 1	_	no factors com and for the de	mon for all the i nominator simu	numerators Itaneously
KJ0 ^{/even}	$SD \times T_w = 0.84 \ \mu s$	$ \cdots \qquad 7 \qquad 7 \qquad 7 \qquad 12 \qquad 12 \qquad 12 \qquad 12 \qquad \cdots \qquad 12 \qquad 12 \qquad 12 $	× 11 / 3171	_	no single/strong	plateau (X=X)	or peak (<u>X</u>)
(louble-letter two-path composite products	= 12•7 7•7 12•7 12•12 12•12	× 11 / 3272	_	recognizable p	attern, no comr	non factors
KJ1 ^{/odd}	$SD \times T_w$ = 17.76 µs	$\cdots > 12^{1} \cdot 7^{1} > \frac{7^{2}}{7^{2}} < 12^{1} \cdot 7^{1} < 12^{2} = 12^{2} > \cdots$	× 1 ¹ /3 ² 7 ²	—	12 ² 7 ²	-70 %	-9.4 dB
	= 0.84 µs @ approximation	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	× 1 / 21 3 ² 7 ² = 21•21 ¹	21 ¹	6 <i>min</i> 3 <i>max</i> [see Negative Od	-50 % d-step Boundary Detect	-6.0 dB
t	riple-letter four-path composite products =	$\downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow \qquad \qquad$	× 11 / 3474	2231	recognizable pa	ttern, reducible	numerators
KJ2/even	$SD \times T_w \approx 2.5 \text{ ms}$	$\cdots > \tilde{7^3} = \tilde{7^3} < 12^{2_{\bullet}}7^1 < \underline{12^3} > 12^{2_{\bullet}}7^1 > \cdots$	× 2 ² / 3 ³ 7 ⁴	—	7 ³ 12 ³	+404 %	+14.0 dB
	= 5.88 µs @ approximation	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	× 1 / 21•7 ³ 7 ⁴ = 7•21•21 ²	21 ²	- 4 _{max} 15 _{min} [see Positive Eve	+275 %	+11.5 dB
c	uad-letter eight-path composite products	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	× 2 ⁴ / 3 ⁶ 7 ⁸	7 ¹	recognizable pa	ttern, reducible	numerators
KJ3 ^{/odd}	SD×T _w ≈ 24.0 s	$\cdots > 12^{2_{\bullet}}7^{3} > \frac{\downarrow}{7^{5}} < 12^{2_{\bullet}}7^{3} < 12^{5} = 12^{5} > \cdots$	× 24 / 3677	_	12 ⁵ 7 ⁵	-93 %	-23.4 dB
	= 123.48 µs	4÷5 <u>1÷2</u> 4÷5 20÷21 = 20÷21	× 1 / 212•7		20 _{min} 2 _{max}	-90 %	-20.0 dB
	@ approximation	1•21 ⁴ < 2 ⁴ 7 ⁵ < 2•21 ⁴ < ··· < 20•21 ⁴ < 2 ⁴ 12 ⁵ < 21•21 ⁴ 3 ⁶ 7 ⁷	= 7•21•21•214	214	[see Negative Od	d-step Boundary Detect	ion Pattern]

TABLE VII Even-step Boundary Detection Pattern

Letter Time Period,	$t \rightarrow \pm 5n+0$	5 <i>n</i> +1	5 <i>n</i> +2	5 <i>n</i> +3	5n+4 A	Applicability
$0 \le n < SD$ [see Probabilistic Traces]	; "comma"	F		•	; "comma"	KK ^{/even} KJ ^{/even}
		Δ>Ο				Positive↑
J/K Counters \rightarrow	[0] ₅	[1]5	[2]5	[3]5	[4] ₅	_
(per-letter)		ΓΛ < Ο				Negative↓
Nominal Case:		<u>L</u>		•		JJ /even JK /even
[0]5=[1]5, [2]5=[4]5		eau	Pre- Peak	Peak	Post- Peak ····	(Steps)

At each line corresponding to a step, odd or even, including the initial seed line, there are five nodes. Further, each node is designated with a number whose essentials are either just given, as for the nodes at the seed line, or, as for a node on a line below the seed, calculated so they are traceable up to the numbers of the nodes at the seed line, unambiguously.

A number of the *i*-th node at the seed line corresponds with the probability of an action, jump or keep, we expect to occur during the *i*-th letter period in the loop. Therefore, a number of a given node at a line below the seed is also corresponds with that probability, in a degree proportional to the number of distinguishable paths traveling up-to-down from the *i*-th node at the seed line into the given node at the given line.

An action perceivable by some node at the seed line, in the scope of that node, looks independent, or elementary, while at any line below the seed, it looks dependent because a node at such a line can perceive a composition of actions occurring, in the scope of that node, only and only all together, not any other way.³ So, we read a node aliases for a respective action, elementary or composite, depending on where the node is, at the seed line or a line below the seed, respectively.

Thus, such a (node) number shows a (scaled) probability of occurrence of a respective action exactly at (even-step line) or right before (odd-step line) the *i*-th letter period in the loop, estimated during the observation time, forming up a point at a boundary detection pattern, see Tables VII and VIII.

Because of the spoken above, we refer to the whole trellislike structure as a probabilistic trace of a seeded loop.

ACTION COUNTERS

Since given a line in a probabilistic trace of a seeded loop, we associate each its node with a counter dedicated to count the number of times when a respective action occurs, during the corresponding letter periods, see Table II.

Until the observation time runs, a counter is reset. During the observation time, a counter can advance. After the observation time elapsed, a counter is stopped and held over. Each counter operates independently from other ones.

During the observation time runs, a counter associated with a node at the given line advances once per every respective action the node aliases for, in respect with the place of that node in the given trace, see Tables III, IV, V, and VI.

³The scope of a node covers a set consisting of one (seed node) or more (other node) consecutive letter time periods within the observation time.

TABLE VIII Odd-step Boundary Detection Pattern

Letter Time Period,	$t \rightarrow 5n+0$ 5r	+1 5 <i>n</i> +2	5 <i>n</i> +3 5	n+4 A	pplicability
$0 \le n < SD$ [see Probabilistic Traces]	"comma"			"comma"	JJ /odd JK /odd
					Positive↑
J/K Counters \rightarrow	[0] ₅ [1] ₅	[2]5 [3]5 [4]5		
(inter-letter)			TARA	7	Negative↓
(·····	•••••			L	KK /odd
Nominal Case:	L.]			KJ /odd
[0]5=[2]5, [3]5=[4]5	Pre- Peak Peak	Post- Peak	Plateau		(Steps)

In this way, the value of a counter, as we acquired after the observation, holds the number of times we caught a respective action on the node the counter is associated with, i.e., such a value is proportional to the frequency of such an action taking its place relative to the *i*-th letter period in the loop.

Because of the spoken above, a value of an action counter provides us with a comparable measure we apply further.

PATTERN MATCHING

Among the values provided by the counters associated with the nodes at the given line, we select a peak value and a plateau value, and then try to match the difference (Δ) between these values as well as the relative interposition ($[i]_5$) of the counters showing these values, both at the same time, with the pattern corresponding to the line, see Tables VII and VIII, and finally compensate, by a cyclic rotation of the nodes at the line, for a modulo-five lag between the *i*-th letter period in the loop and an *i*-th letter period in the text, while the lag is not zero.

In the case of an even-step line, see Table VII, the boundary nearest to the peak is one full letter period after the *i*-th letter period in the loop, in which we observe the peak value.

In the case of an odd-step line, see Table VIII, the boundary nearest to the peak is a half letter period before what we could so call the accordant *i*-th letter period at the line.

This makes clear the boundaries of any word in the text we need to recover from the received stream of letters, and solves the problem we focus on in this paper, completely.

CONCLUSION

Well, we considered a useful property intrinsic to a stream (or text) expressed in the base-21 transport words.

Being serialized, the base-21 words of the reduced transport dictionary statistically act (behave) themselves like a comma in a serial continuous communication system.⁴

Such "comma" seems implicit, or costless, because its use leads to no reduction in the payload of the stream, but gives a natural way for boundary detection.

It "separates" between every two consequitive words in the stream, allowing for word alignment, too.

REFERENCES

⁴Therefore we say that, instead of an explicit (symbolic) comma, the means considered in this paper is based on an implicit (statistic) comma.

Quasi Base-21 Words

Alexander Ivanov

Abstract—In the paper, we introduce a new category of codes, inherited from, developed on, and then expanded beyond the so called base-21 words, and basically dive into them.

Index Terms—Ethernet, linguistic multiplexing, base-21 words, base-21, quasi base-21 words, quasi base-21, QBTO.

INTRODUCTION

WRITTEN on a simple abstract transport alphabet consisting of just two letters, J and K, reflecting a line state change ("jump") and retain ("keep"), respectively, the base-21 words define the $3 \times 7 = 21$ distinct letter series aliased xTy, where $x \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, comprising a code of interesting properties useful during data transmission, especially in scrambling [1] and alignment [2].¹

Equating a code with (a set of) the words the code denotes, we mention the base-21 words as the reference code, whose length is L = 5 letters and capacity is N = 21 words, falling not alone, but at least with its inverse replica, i.e., yTx, of the same length and capacity, expectedly—in a category of codes each we could call exact base-21, or EBTO in short.

Based on the principles the reference code is designed with, we can construct a code of a longer length and, likely, a larger capacity—both in its absolute and relative values, i.e., per the whole length and per a letter of the length—in a shape aliased $xT \cdots Ty$ or $yT \cdots Tx$, that will fall in a category of new codes each we would call quasi base-21, or QBTO in short.

Comparing between codes, we indirectly refer to the reference code because compare between their bases expressing a sort of the relative value of the capacity, measured as:

$$BASE = CAPACITY \frac{3}{LENGTH}$$

supposing such the base equivalent, or quasi, where we speak about a quasi base-21 code, see Table I.

Like the reference one, any of the codes we consider in this paper consists of words such that—being issued in any order and quantity and then serialized—result in a stream preventing a run of more than three consecutive K's, a feature originating from the 4B/5B coding and, thus, usable in similar protocols, especially of Ethernet, like 100/1000BASE-X.²

Recalling the fate of submission of many prior works to the peer reviewed journal, such a try with this one also promises no chance, probably.

Please sorry for the author has no time to find this work a new home, peer reviewed or not, except of arXiv, and just hopes there it meets its reader, one or maybe various, whom the author beforehand thanks for their regard.

A. Ivanov is with JSC Continuum, Yaroslavl, the Russian Federation.

Digital Object Identifier 10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (this bundle).

²In a broader sense, a quasi base-21 code may be built around less or more stricter principles, compared to the reference, the base-21 words.

TABLE I Short Brief

Word Len.	Valid Images	Data Modulus	Most Binary Spaces	Eq. Base	Depiction
5 (in letters)	21	24	$2^4 + 2^2 + 2^0$	21 _{exact}	21 Ref.
10 = 5 × 2	565	28	2 ⁹ + 2 ⁵ + 2 ⁴ + 2 ² + 2 ⁰	23.77	
15 = 5 × 3	15,033	2 ¹²	$2^{13} + 2^{12} + 2^{11} + \dots$	24.68	
20 = 5 × 4	400,025	2 ¹⁶	$2^{18} + 2^{17} + 2^{12} + \dots$	25.15	\\ † ₊₂ †
25 = 5 × 5	10,644,589	220	$2^{23} + 2^{21} + 2^{17} + \dots$	25.43	
30	283,250,477	224	$2^{28} + 2^{23} + 2^{22} + \dots$	25.63	+3.68
35	7,537,241,009	228	$2^{32} + 2^{31} + 2^{30} + \dots$	25.77	+4.87
40 20	0,564,541,425	232	$2^{37} + 2^{35} + 2^{34} + \dots$	25.87	26

CAPACITY OF A CODE

Given a length of $L \ge 5$ letters, we construct a quasi base-21 code denoting a set of $N \ge 21$ words distinct in their serial images, when each of the images is expressed the same serial manner, whose number defines the (transport) capacity of such a code, assuming we exclude no image, that provides us with a code of the maximum capacity and, therefore, the maximum base possible for the given length, see Table I again.

However, when we exclude images, to reach some goal we have, e.g., to tune up a code to be comfortable in the use with a linguistic multiplexing process [3], we receive a quasi base-21 code of the same length, but of a capacity lower than before exclusion, by exact the number of excluded images, and thus of a proportionally decreased base, still perceiving it being of such a code despite of such a reduction, see Table II.³

BALANCE OF A CODE

Given a code of the length L and capacity N, we estimate its balance statistically, as a static in time, vector-like measure of the probability with which a selected letter, J or K, occurs at the *i*-th letter time period in the acquisition loop, during a potential transmission—all the words the given code denotes for participate in—assuming its duration infinite as well as its content random, contemporaneously, see Table III.⁴

When it is necessary, e.g., when it is in the goals we have, we actually change—that means that we additionally balance, completely rebalance, and even purposefully disbalance—the given code via exclusion of its images—everyone reflecting a distinct (sample of the) measure, with *i*-th value of either zero or 1/N, exactly—by this receiving a new quasi base-21 code being else balanced while again still of such a code despite of a reduction from such a balancing, see Table IV.⁵

 $^{^{1}}$ In a broader sense, a base- $\langle z \rangle$ code, exact or quasi, may be built around any appropriate abstract alphabet declaring at least two letters.

³Shown in this table for a given L, e.g., L = 5, is a code we could label shortly a L(5) QBTO(20.00) code, hinting its major features for clear.

⁴Shown in this table is a L(10) QBTO(23.77) code and the code we use as the ground for the material shown in the further tables of this paper.

⁵Shown in this table are a L(10) QBTO(23.32), a L(10) QBTO(23.00), and a L(10) QBTO(22.63) codes, from the left to the right, respectively.

TABLE II Possible Coding Variants

Length	Tr. Capacity = $(2^{U} + 1) \cdot 2^{V}$	Eq. Base	Modulus	Nc	+	N _R	=	NE	GCD	n _D	=	n _e	x	k	E ^{1/k}	Rest	Scr. Base(s)	Design Goal(s)
5×1	$per word \\ period 20 = (2^2 + 1) \cdot 2^2$	20 _{exact}	2 ⁴ = 2 ^{4×1}	4	+	1	=	5	2	8	=	4	×	2	2 ¹	>26	dual — 2; 5	mux simplicity
5 × 2	$544 = (2^4 + 1) \cdot 2^5$ $544 = (2^4 + 1) \cdot 2^5$ 529 not applicable $2^9 = 512 \text{not applicable}$	23.32 23.32 23 _{exact} 22.63	$2^8 = 2^{4 \times 2}$ $2^9 = 2^{4 \times 2+1}$ $2^8 = 2^{4 \times 2}$ $2^8 = 2^{4 \times 2}$	8 16 16 1	+ + + +	9 1 7 1	= = = =	17 17 23 2	25 25 28		= =		× ×	4	21 21	=2 ⁰ >2 ⁴⁴ >2 ⁴	dual — 2; 17 dual — 2; 17 single prime single binary	performance protection balance scr. simplicity
5×3	$\begin{array}{rrrr} 13,824 & \mbox{not applicable} \\ 12,288 &= & (2^1+1) \cdot 2^{12} \\ 12,288 &= & (2^1+1) \cdot 2^{12} \\ 2^{13} = 8,192 & \mbox{not applicable} \end{array}$	24 _{exact} 23.08 23.08 20.16	$2^{12} = 2^{4 \times 3}$ $2^{13} = 2^{4 \times 3+1}$ $2^{12} = 2^{4 \times 3}$ $2^{12} = 2^{4 \times 3}$	2 2 1 1	+ + + +	1 1 2 1	= = =	3 3 3 2	29 2 ¹² 2 ¹² 2 ¹²	^{2/3} 2 	=	^{2/3} 2 —	× ×	1 1 —	21 21 —	=2 ⁰ =2 ⁰ =2 ⁰	dual — 2; 3 dual — 2; 3 dual — 2; 3 single binary	performance prot. + mux perf. + balance scr. + balance
5 × 4	$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	25.04 25.04 25 _{exact} 22.63	$2^{16} = 2^{4 \times 4}$ $2^{18} = 2^{4 \times 4 + 2}$ $2^{16} = 2^{4 \times 4}$ $2^{16} = 2^{4 \times 4}$	1 2 4 1	+ + + +	2 1 1 3	= = =	3 3 5 4	2 ¹⁷ 2 ¹⁷ 	2 8/8	= =	2 4/8	× ×	1 2	21 21	=2 ⁰ =2 ⁰ >2 ⁶ =2 ¹	dual — 2; 3 dual — 2; 3 single prime single binary	performance prot. + mux balance + mux perf.+scr.+bal.
5 × 5	$\begin{array}{rcl} 10,485,760 &=& (2^2+1) \cdot 2^{21} \\ 2^{23} &= 8,388,608 & & \text{not applicable} \end{array}$	25.36 24.25	$\begin{array}{l} 2^{23} = 2^{4 \times 5 + 3} \\ 2^{20} = 2^{4 \times 5} \end{array}$	4 1	+ +	1 7	= =	5 8	2 ²¹ 2 ²⁰	8	=	4	×	2	<u>2</u> ¹	>2 ⁶ >2 ²	dual — 2; 5 single binary	prot. + mux perf.+scr.+bal.

TABLE III Balancing Principles

Numerical Distribution of Serial Images per Coupling Patterns	Dependency	Letter	JUI	MP (J) G	eneratio	n Freque	encv at t	he <i>i-</i> th Lo	etter Tim	e Period	in the L	qoo
#fyTud T1 T2 T3 T4 T5 T6 T7 ΣxT	Definition—	Time Period	<i>i</i> =0	i=1	i=2	i=3	i=4	i=5	i=6	i=7	i=8	i=9
		$t=10m+i \rightarrow$	<i>t</i> + 0	<i>t</i> +1	<i>t</i> +2	<i>t</i> +3	<i>t</i> +4	<i>t</i> +5	<i>t</i> +6	<i>t</i> +7	<i>t</i> +8	<i>t</i> +9
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\Sigma} & x \cap 1 \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	2T, 3T reflect (on <u>372</u> → 565	; <u>386</u> 565	any char correspon the frequence <u>300</u> 565	nges made ir nding to any iencies at the <u>312</u> 565	the number xT orTy ese, interior ($\frac{324}{565}$	s of the seria pattern may non-coupling $\frac{322}{565}$	al images reflect on g) periods ; $\frac{308}{565}$	340 565;	328 565	316 565
	$\overrightarrow{\Sigma}$ $y \cap 4$	changes in the number	ers of the se	rial images co	rresponding	to the patter	nsT4,T5	,T6,T7	reflect on			
10	x x∩2 x∩2	changes in the number	ers of the se	rial images co	rresponding	to the patter	nsT2,T3	,T6,T7	reflect on the	frequency		
Capacity 5655	<u>y∩1</u>	changes in the number	ers of the se	rial images co	rresponding	to the patter	nsT1,T3	,T5,T7	reflect on the	frequency at	this period	

Row Descr.	565 (23.77 ²) → 544 (23.32 ²)	565 (23.77 ²) → 529 (23 ²)	565 (23.77 ²) → 512 (22.63 ²)
Initial Distr. including NUMBERS TO CHANGE	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Proposed Changes	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Balancing Result	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
JUMP (J) Gen. Freq.	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
p _{JUMP} (t+i)	.67 .67 .55 ~ .57 .59 .58 .58	.66 .66 .56 .58 .58 .58	.67 .67 .57 .57 .57 .57
$p_{\text{KEEP}}(t+i)$.33 .33 .45 ~ .43 .41 .42 .42	.34 .34 .44 .42 .42 .42	.33 .33 .43 .43 .43 .43
$t = 10m \rightarrow$	$\overline{t+0} \overline{t+1} \overline{t+2 \cdots t+6} \overline{t+7} \overline{t+8} \overline{t+9}$	$\frac{1}{t+0} \frac{1}{t+1} \frac{1}{t+2} \cdots t+6 \frac{1}{t+7} \frac{1}{t+8} \frac{1}{t+9}$	$\frac{1}{t+0} \frac{1}{t+1} \frac{1}{t+2} \cdots t+6 \frac{1}{t+7} \frac{1}{t+8} \frac{1}{t+9}$

TABLE IV BALANCING EXAMPLES

TABLE V IMAGE GENERATION RULES

Input Sequence Lasts With	Body Letters Left	Appendable Such Options Per (• = J or K) Run	Output Sequence Lasts With	ENDEC Framework Element	Weight Pattern (body applicable only) K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³
···· <mark>KKK</mark> [new image]	(BLL) all	■J } 2/3 JK } 1/3	J J K	K≤2 2 • K ⁰ K≤2 1 • K ¹	or 2 • K ⁰
… J @	≥3	••J}4/8 •JK}2/8 JKK}1/8 KKK}1/8	J J K J K K J K K K	K ⁰ 4 • K ⁰ K ⁰ 2 • K ¹ K ⁰ 1 • K ² K ⁰ 1 • K ³	- 4 2 1 1
@	2	• J } 2/4 JK } 1/4 KK } 1/4 J } 1/2 K } 1/2	J J K J K K J	K ⁰ 2 • K ⁰ K ⁰ 1 • K ¹ K ⁰ 1 • K ² K ⁰ 1 • K ⁰ K ⁰ 1 • K ¹	2 1 1 — 1 1 — —
JK@	≥2 1	• J } 2/4 JK } 1/4 KK } 1/4 J } 1/2 K } 1/2	J J K J K K K J J K K	$\begin{array}{c} K^{1} \ 2 \cdot \dots \ K^{0} \\ K^{1} \ 1 \cdot \dots \ K^{1} \\ K^{1} \ 1 \cdot \dots \ K^{3} \\ K^{1} \ 1 \cdot \dots \ K^{0} \\ K^{1} \ 1 \cdot \dots \ K^{2} \end{array}$	<pre>2 1 - 1 2 1 - 1 - 1</pre>
…JKK @	≥1	J } 1/2 K } 1/2	J K K K	K ² 1• K ⁰ K ² 1• K ³	} 1 — — 1
…JKKK @	≥1	J } 1/1	··· J	$K^3 \rightarrow K^0$	} 1
J J K J K K J K K K	 	KKK - 7/7 KKK - 7/7 KK• - 6/6 J•• - 4/4	- ···· <mark>K K K</mark> [done!]	$ \begin{array}{c ccccc} K^0 & 7 & K^{\leq 2} \\ K^1 & 7 & K^{\leq 2} \\ K^2 & 6 & K^{\leq 2} \\ K^3 & 4 & K^{\leq 2} \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

FRAMEWORK OF A CODE

Given a base-21 code, quasi or exact and balanced or not, we assign each its distinct serial image a distinct word index, $0 \le B < N$, reading distinct is among images and indices of all the words the given code denotes for, respectively.⁶

After the given code becomes so each its word relates with a distinct image as well as with a distinct index, we complete it with a framework, i.e., a formalized description intended to match between word indices and serial images, resolving for a given index with its corresponding image and vise versa, that is enough to unambiguously express the underlying laws used for encoding and decoding, contemporaneously.

Such a framework does implement the principles the code it describes is designed with, see Table V briefly.

Such a framework consists of a number of interlinked bins, where a bin itself links (a span of) indices, (a span of) letter periods, and (a choice of) image syllables, all together setting up the required matching, see Tables V and VI.

Such a framework allows for an appropriate coding means to encode and decode every issued word, W(m), pointed by an index, i.e., expecting W(m) = B, into and from the image that word corresponds to, see Table VII.

TABLE VI BASE-23.77 ENDEC FRAMEWORK

		Body (Le		11110)		Jus			TailFei	
					2	2 • 7	7	K0	7	
					-	- '		IX.	7	
					1	•7	7	K ¹	7	
					1	•6)	K ²	6	
					2	2 • 7	7	K ⁰	7	
							,	1/1	1	
					1	• 1		K1	1	
		4 • 27		K ⁰	1	1•6)	K²	6	
					2	2 • 7	7	K ⁰	7	
							,	1/1	1	
					1	1 • 1		K' 1/2	1	
					_	1•0)	n-	7	
					2	2•7	7	K ⁰	7	
					1	17	7	K 1	7	
					1	1.6	;	K2	6	
							,	IX.	7	
					2	2 • 7	7	K ⁰	7	
					1	1 • F	3	K ¹	7	
					1	1 • 4	, L	K ³	4	
0 . 100	K0	2 • 25		K ¹					7	
2 • 193	K٥				2	2 • 7		K ⁰	7	
					1	1 • F	;	K ¹	7	
					1	1.4	-	K ³	4	
						1/2	1•7	K ⁰	7	
		1 • 21		K ²	1•14	Kυ	1•7	K^1	7	
					1•7	K ³	\rightarrow	K ⁰	7	
		4 . 44		1/2		120	1•7	K ⁰	7	
		1•14		K ³	\rightarrow	K ⁰	1•7	K^1	7	
					~		,	1/0	7	
		4 • 27		K ₀	4	2 • 1		۳°	7	
	•	E 2 • { 4•(2•7+1•7· 1 • { 2•(4•7+2•7	Base-	23.77 Enco	der Dec •7+1•4)	• coder + 1•[Frame 1•(1•7+	work	Formula: 565 = 1•(1•7)] + 1•[1•(1•7-	+1•7)]} +
		E 2 • { 4•(2•7+1•7- 1 • { 2•(4•7+2•7-	Base-3 +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2	der Dec •7+1•4) •(1•7+1•	• coder + 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1	work -1•7)+ •6)+1	Formula: 565 = 1•(1•7)] + 1•[1•(1•7- (1•7)] + 1•[1•(2•7+7	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	E 2 • { 4 •(2•7+1•7· 1 • { 2•(4•7+2•7·	Base- +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2	der Dec •7+1•4) •(1•7+1•	• + 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1	work -1•7)+ •6)+1	Formula: 565 = 1•(1•7)] + 1•[1•(1•7- (1•7)] + 1•[1•(2•7+1)]	+1•7)] } + 1•7+1•6)] }
	•	E 2 • { 4 • (2•7+1•7· 1 • { 2• (4•7+2•7·	Base- +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•(2) + 1•(2)	der Dec •7+1•4) •(1•7+1•	• • • • • • •	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1	work -1•7)+ •6)+1	Formula: 565 = 1+(1+7)] + 1+[1+(1+7- (1+7)] + 1+[1+(2+7+1)] (1+7)] + 1+[1+(2+7+1)] 7	+1+7)]} + 1+7+1+6)]}
	•	E 2 • { 4 · (2 · 7 + 1 · 7 · 1 • { 2 · (4 · 7 - 2 · 7 · 1 • { 2 · (4 · 7 - 2 · 7 · 1 • 1 4	Base-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1*4) + 1*[2	der Dec •7+1•4) •(1•7+1•	• • •7)+1 • K ⁰	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1	work -1+7)+ (+6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹	cormula: 565 = 1+(1+7)] + 1+(1+(1+7)) 1+(1+(1+7)) + 1+(1+(2+7+1)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1))) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1))) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1))) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)))) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)))) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+1)))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	+1•7)]} + [•7+1•6)]}
	•	E 2 • { 4 • (2 • 7 + 1 • 7 · 1 • { 2 • (4 • 7 + 2 • 7 · 1 • { 2 • (4 • 7 + 2 • 7 · 1 • 1 4	• • • +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	der Dec •7+1•4) •(1•7+1•	+ + 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1	work -1•7)+ •6)+1 <u>K⁰</u> <u>K¹</u>	Formula: 565 = 1+(1+7)] + 1+(1+(1+7)) 1+(1+(1+7)) + 1+(1+(2+7+7)) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))) (1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7)))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))))(1+7)] + 1+(1+(2+7+7))))(1+(2+7+7)))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	B 2 • { 4(2·7+1·7· 1 • { 2·(4·7+2·7· 1 • { 2·(4·7+2·7· 1 • 1 4	Base-: ++1•6) ++1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	der Decc •7+1•4) •(1•7+1•	coder + 1•[•7)+1 K ⁰	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1	work -1+7)+ 	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+7)] (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+7)] 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	в 2 • { 4(2-7+1-7- 1 • { 2-(4-7+2-7- 1 • { 2-(4-7+2-7- 1 • 1 4	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	der Dec •7+1•4) •(1•7+1• → 4 • 7	+ 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1	work -1•7)+ ••• <u>K⁰</u> <u>K¹</u>	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7 (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+ (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1+7)]} + 1+7+1+6)]}
	•	в 2 • { 4(27+17- 1 • { 2-(47+2-7- 1 • { 2-(47+2-7- 1 • 14	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	der Decc •7+1•4) •(1•7+1• →	+ 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 <u>1•7</u> <u>1•7</u>	work -1+7)+ +6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1-(1-7) ((1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7+- ((1-7)]) + 1+(1+(2-7+- 7) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	в 2 • { 4(27+17- 1 • { 2-(47+2-7- 1 • { 2-(47+2-7- 1 • 14	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1+14) + 1+[2	der Decc •7+1•4) •(1•7+1• → 4 • 7 2 • 7	+ 1•[• K ⁰	Frame +(1•7+1 +(1•7+1 	work I +1+7)+ +6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ⁰ K ¹	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7 (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+- (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+- 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	B 2 • { 4(27+17- 1 • { 2'(47+27- 1 • { 2'(47+27- 1 • 14	Base-: +1+6) +1+6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1+14) + 1+[2 K ³	$\frac{\det \operatorname{Dec}}{\operatorname{(}^{7+1+4)}}$	+ 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7 1•7	work I -1•7)+ -1•6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ¹	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7)+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1•7)]} + •7+1•6)]}
	•	B 2 • { 4(2·7+17- 1 • { 2·(4-7+2-7- 1 • { 2·(4-7+2-7- 1 • 14	Base-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1*4) + 1*[2 K ³	der Decc •7+1•4) •(1•7+1• → 4 • 7 2 • 7 1 • 6	(0,000) (0,0	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7 1•7	work (1+7)+ (1+7)+ (1+7)+ (1+7)+ K^0 K^1 K^0 K^1 K^2	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7,+ (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7,+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	B 2 • { 4(2·7+17- 1 • { 2·(4·7+2·7- 1 • 1 • 1 4 1 • 1 4	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1*4) + 1*(2 K ³		+ 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 • 1•7 1•7	work 1+7)+ (+6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7, 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1•7)]} + 1•7+1•6)]}
	•	B 2 • {4(2·7+1·7 1 • {2·(4·7+2·7 1 • 1 • 2·4 1 • 14	Sase-: +1*6) +1*6+	23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 +1*4) + 1*[2 K ³			Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7	work -1+7)+ +(+6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ¹ K ² K ³	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7, -(1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7,+ -(1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7,+ -(1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7,+ -(1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7,+ -(1-7)) + 1+(1+(2-7,+ -(1-7)) + 1+(1+(2-7,+ -(1-7)) + 1+(1+(2-7,+)) + 1+(+1-7)] } +
	•	E 2 • {4(2·7+1·7: 1 • {2·(4·7+2·7· 1 • {2·(4·7+2·7· 1 • 14 2 • 52	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \text{der Dec} \\ \cdot 7+1 \cdot 4) \\ \cdot (1 \cdot 7+1 \cdot 1) \\ \cdot \cdot \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet $	K ⁰	Frame 1+(1-7+ +(1-7+1 	work -1+7)+ +6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7,+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	++(+7)]} + + +(+7+1-6)]}
	•	в 2 • {4·(2·7+1·7- 1 • {2·(4-7+2·7- 1 • {2·(4-7+2·7- 1 • 1 • 14 1 • 14	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \text{der Dec} \\ \cdot \cdot + 1 \cdot 4 \\ \cdot \cdot + 1 \cdot 4 \\ \end{array}$	++1*[*7)+1 K ⁰	Frame 1+(1-7+ +(1-7+1 	work 1 (+1+7)+ (+6)+1 K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{2} K^{3} K^{0}	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7,+)) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	++1+7]]} + +
	•	в 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • {2(47+2-7- 1 • 14 1 • 14 2 • 52	3ase	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 + 1•14) + 1•12	$\begin{array}{c} & & \\$	+ 1•[•7)+1 K ⁰	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7 1•7	work 1 (+6)+1 (+6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1+77)] } + 1+7+1+6)] }
4.470	•	в 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • 14 1 • 14 2 • 52	3ase-i+1+6) +1+6+ +1+6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•14) + 1•12	$\begin{array}{c} & & \\$	(+ 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7	work I K^{0} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1}	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+ (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1•179	K1	е 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • 14 1 • 14 2 • 52	Sase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & \\$	(+ 1*[(+ 7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	work 1 K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} K^{1} K^{0} $K^$	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7+ (1-7)] + 1-(1+(2-7+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1•179	K1	B 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+277) 1 • {2(47+277) 1 • 14 2 • 52 ↓	Sase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & \\$	+ 1•[+7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 	work I 1+7)+ +6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7, 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1•179	K1	B 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+277- 1 • {2(47+277- 1 • 14 2 • 52	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\$	K ⁰	Frame 1•(1•7• •(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7 1•7	work I (1+7)+ (+6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7)+ (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7)+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } + 1-7+1-6)] }
1 • 179	K1	B 2 • { 4(27+17- 1 • { 2(47+27- 1 • { 2(47+27- 1 • 14 2 • 52	3ase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•[2 K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\$	K ⁰	Frame 1•(1•7• •(1•7+1 1•7 1•7 1•7 1•7 2•7	$\frac{1}{1+7} + \frac{1}{1+7} + \frac{1}$	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+[1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7, (1-7)] + 1+[1+(2-7, 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } + 1-7+1-6)] }
1 • 179	K1	B 2 • { 4(27417. 1 • { 2(47+27. 1 • { 2(47+27. 1 • 14	3ase- +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco 1+ 2*(2*7+1 +1+4) + 1+[2 K ³ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\$	(+ 1•[•7)+1	Frame 1•(1•7+1 •(1•7+1 1•7 1•7 1•7 2•7	work I 1-1-7)+ +6)+1 K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰ K ¹ K ² K ³ K ⁰	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1•179	K1	B 2 • { 4(27+17. 1 • { 2(47+27. 	3ase- +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco 1+ 2*(2*7+1 +1+4) + 1+[2 K ³ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	(+ 1•[•7)+1	Erame 1.(1.7.4 (1.7.4) 1.7 1.7 1.7 2.7 2.7	work I (1-7)+ (+6)+1 K^0 K^1 K^0 K^1 K^2 K^3 K^0 K^1 K^2 K^3 K^0 K^1	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+(1-7))] + 1+(1+	+1-7])} + +
1 • 179	К1	в 2 • { 4(2-7+1-7- 1 • { 2-(4-7+2-7- 1 • 1 - 14 2 • 52 4 2 • 52 4 1 • 48	3ase- +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco 23.77 Enco + 2*(2*7+1 + 1*12 K ³ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\$	K ⁰ K ⁰	Frame 1-(1-7	work I (-1-7)+(+6)+1 (+1-7)+(+6)+1	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+(1-7)) + 1+(1+(2-7)+(1-7)) + 1+(1+(2-7)+(1-7)) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	++1-7])} + +
1 • 179	K1	в 2+{4+(2-7+1-7- 1+{2-(4-7+2-7- 1-1-14 2-52 4 1-14 1-48 4	Sase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•14) + 1•12 K ³ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	coder + 1•[•7)+1 K ⁰ K ⁰ K ¹	Frame 1•(1•7+ (1•7+1) 1•7 1•7 1•7 2•7 2•7 1•7	work I -1-77)+-60+-1 -1-77)+-7 -1-77)+-7 -1-77	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1•179	K1	е 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • 14 2 • 52 4 1 • 14 1 • 48	Sase-: +1•6) +1•6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•14) + 1•12 K ³ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & &$		Erame 1+(1+7+ +(1+7+1) 1+7 1+7 1+7 2+7 2+7 2+7 1+6	work I (1-7)+(1	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7+(1+(2-7+(1+(2-7+(1+(2-7+(1+(2-7+(1+(2-7+(1+(2-7+(1	+1-7)] } +
1•179	K1	е 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • 14 2 • 52 4 1 • 14	3ase-: +1+6) +1+6+	23.77 Enco + 2•(2•7+1 +1•4) + 1•(2 K ³ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & &$	+ 1•[•7)+1 K ⁰ K ⁰ K ¹ K ³	Frame 1-(1-7- -(1-7+1) 1-7 1-7 1-7 2-7 2-7 1-6 →	work I (1-7)+(1	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 6 4 4 7 7 7 7 6 4 4 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1 • 179	K1	E 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • 122(47+227- 1 • 14 2 • 52 F 1 • 14 1 • 48 F	3ase÷+1+6) +1+6+ √0 √1	23.77 Enco + 2 • (2•7+1 + 1•4) + 1•(2 K ³ K ³ 2 • 1 1 • 1	$ \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & & $		Frame 1+(1+7+ -(1+7+1) 	work1 1-77)+ 1-6)+1 K0 K1 K2 K3 K0 K1 K0 K1 K0 K1 K0 K1 K0 K1 K0 K0	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7+)) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	+1-7)] } +
1 • 179	K1	в 2 • {4(27+17- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • {2(47+27- 1 • 14 1 • 14 2 • 52 И 1 • 14 1 • 48 И 1 • 27 И	3ase- +1+6) +1+6+ √0 √1	23.77 Enco $1 + 2 \cdot (2 \cdot 7 + 1)$ $1 \cdot 1 \cdot 4) + 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 2$ K ³	$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\$		Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1 ••••••• 1•7 1•7 1•7 2•7 2•7 1•6 → 7	work1 K0 K1 K2 K3 K0 K1 K3	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7) (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7)+ 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	<pre>+1-7]] + +1-7+1-6)] } </pre>
1 • 179	К1	E 2 + {4(27+177 1 + {2(47+277 1 + {2(47+277 1 + 14 2 + 52 1 + 14 1 + 14 1 + 48 1 + 27 1 + 27 }	3ase- +1+6) +1+6+ √0 √1 √3	$23.77 \text{ Encod} + 2 \cdot (2 \cdot 7 + 1) + 1 \cdot (2 \cdot 2 \cdot 7 + 1) + 1 \cdot (2 \cdot 2 \cdot 7 + 1) + 1 \cdot (2 \cdot 2 \cdot 7 + 1) + 1 \cdot (2 \cdot 7 + 1) $	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & $	K ⁰ K ¹ K ¹ K ¹	Frame 1•(1•7+ •(1•7+1) ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet $	Formula: 565 = 1+(1-7)] + 1+(1+(1-7, (1-7)] + 1+(1+(2-7,+'))) 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	<pre>*1-7]] + +1-7+1-6)] } </pre>

⁶Other indices mentioned in this paper are the word (time period) index, $m \ge 0$, the letter (time period) index, $t \ge 0$, and the letter (time period) index in the loop, $0 \le i < L$, interrelated as $t = L \cdot m + i$.

TABLE VII Example ENDEC Process

Step	Encoding (Serial Image Generation) Procedure	bin	code	HEAD	Decoding (Word Index Restoration) Procedure	Step
start	Given $W(m) = 455 \rightarrow \text{rest}_0 = 455$	193	0	JJ	Received Image is JK-KJKJJ-JKK	start
1E	Head Run of 2 letters $\rightarrow 0 \le \text{rest}_0 < (386) \le \text{rest}_0 < (565) \rightarrow$	193	0 a	JK	Head Run of 2 letters \rightarrow JK-KJKJJ-JKK \rightarrow option ₁ = JK \rightarrow	1D
	weight ₁ • $bih_1 = 1 • 179$ // from 0=366, incl., to 179=365, excl. rest ₁ = (rest ₀ - 386) mod bin ₁ = 69	Δ	code	BODY	{ bin_1 , $code_1$ } = HEAD ⁻¹ (option ₁) = { 179, 0 }	
G	$code_1 = (rest_0 - 386) div bin_1 = 0$	3	0	JJJ	weight ₁ • bin ₁ = 1 • 179 \rightarrow (386) \leq germ ₁ < (565) germ ₁ = 386 + bin ₁ × code ₁ = 386 + 179 × 0 = 386	\mathbf{b}
G	$BLL_1 = 5$ // the next run is a body run		2 (0)	KJJ	BLL ₁ = 5	
2E	Body Run of $\Delta_2 = \Delta BLL(option_1, BLL_1) = 2$ letters \rightarrow		3 4	J J K K K J	Body Run of $\Delta_2 = \Delta BLL(option_1, BLL_1) = 2$ letters \rightarrow	2D
	weight ₂ • bin ₂ = $2 \cdot 52$ // from 0=386, incl., to 104=490, excl.		5	KJK	$\{\text{dummy}\Delta_2, \text{ code}_2\} = \text{BODY}^{-1}(\text{option}_2) = \{2, 1\}$	
	$rest_2 = (rest_1 - 0) \mod bin_2 = 17$ $code_2 = (rest_1 - 0) \dim bin_2 = 1$ $K^1 2 \cdot K^0$	_	7	KKK	weight ₂ • bin ₂ = 2 • 52 \rightarrow (386) \leq germ ₂ < (490) germ ₂ = germ ₁ + bin ₂ × code ₂ = 386 + 52 × 1 = 438)
b) option ₂ = BODY(Δ_2 , code ₂) = KJ // t+2, t+3	2	0 1 (Б)	J J K J	$BLL_2 = BLL_1 - \Delta_2 = 3$	
3⊏	Body Pun of $\Lambda_2 = 3$ ABL (options, BL L) = 3 letters		2	JК	Body Run of $\Delta_3 = \Delta BLL(option_2, BLL_2) = 3$ letters \rightarrow	3D
JL	$0 \le \operatorname{rest}_2 < (28) \le \operatorname{rest}_2 < (42) \le \operatorname{rest}_2 < (48) \le \operatorname{rest}_2 < (52) \rightarrow$	1	0	J	$\{\operatorname{dummy}\Delta_3, \operatorname{code}_3\} = \operatorname{BODY}^{-1}(\operatorname{option}_3) = \{3, 2\}$	
	weight ₃ • bin ₃ = 4 • 7 // from 0=438, incl., to $28=466$, excl. rest ₃ = (rest ₂ - 0) mod bin ₃ = 3		1	K	weight ₃ • bin ₃ = 4 • 7 \rightarrow (386=438) \leq germ ₃ < (414=466) germ ₃ = germ ₂ + bin ₃ × code ₃ = 438 + 7 × 2 = 452)
G	$code_3 = (rest_2 - 0) div bin_2 = 2$				$BLL_3 = BLL_2 - \Delta_3 = 0$	
C	$BLL_3 = BLL_2 - \Delta_3 = 0$ // no body letters left		1	JJK	Tail Run of 3 letters \rightarrow JK-KJKJJ-JKK \rightarrow option ₄ = JKK \rightarrow	4D
4E	Tail Run of 3 letters $\rightarrow 0 \le \text{rest}_3 \le (\text{bin}_3) \rightarrow K^0 = 7 K^{\le 2}$		2 3 (d)	JKJ	$code_4 = TAIL^{-1}(option_4) = 3$	
đ	$code_4 = rest_3 = 3$) option ₄ = TAIL($code_4$) = JKK // t + 7, t + 8, t + 9		4 5	KJJ	$(germ_3) \le germ_4 < (germ_3 + bin_3) \rightarrow (452) \le germ_4 < (459)$ $germ_4 = germ_3 + 1 \times code_4 = 452 + 1 \times 3 = 455$)
done	Transmitted Image is JK KJ KJJ JKK		6	KKJ	Found $W(m) = \operatorname{germ}_4 \longrightarrow W(m) = 455$	done

TABLE VIII BALANCING INDEX CONVERSION

TABLE IX Summary Outline

Input / Argument 말 Scrambled Space p Output / Result	↓Prop., Eq. Base→ 23.77 24.68 25.15 25.40 25.43 · · · 28.72	2
$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \leq W_{\text{user}}(m) < N_{\text{user}} \rightarrow \\ \text{single linear segment} \\ \text{without skips} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\stackrel{\frown}{\text{log}}} \rightarrow 0 \leq W_{\text{scr}}(m) < N_{\text{scr}} \rightarrow \\ \begin{array}{c} 0 \leq W_{\text{endec}}(m) < N \\ \text{many linear segments} \\ \text{without skips} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\stackrel{\frown}{\text{log}}} \rightarrow 0 \leq W_{\text{scr}}(m) < N_{\text{scr}} \rightarrow \\ \begin{array}{c} 0 \leq W_{\text{scr}}(m) < N \\ \text{many linear segments} \\ \text{without skips} \end{array} $	Letters per Word 10 15 20 ∞ 25 ∞ Bits per "Nibble" 4.57 4.63 4.65 4% 4.67 4.84 Bins in Formula 41 378 3.540 (average) 33.120 (approx	L)
NOTE – In a generalized case, $0 \le N_{user} \le N_{scr} \le N$ = available transport capacity.	Body Runs 2÷3 4÷6 5÷9 STUFFING 7÷12 · · · LIMI	;al T

APPLICATION OF A CODE

Given a strawman of a coding means, we consider a bundle of related coding spaces, that usually consists of a user coding space, a scrambling space, and an ENDEC space, each actual at the respective stage of the coding, see Table VIII.

A user coding space, or a user space, features a capacity of a shape like $(2^U + 1) \cdot 2^V$, typically, see Table II again, where the larger part $2^U \cdot 2^V$ responds for a data quantity transmission while the smaller part 2^V responds for a control transmission, respectively, as well as the parts together are represented as a single, continuous span of word indices, $0 \le B < N_{user}$.

A scrambling space features a capacity equal to a power of two, in the best case, a power of a prime higher than two, in a typical case, or a multiple of some (powers of some) primes, in a worst case we always try to avoid, see Table II yet again, habitually represented as a single, continuous span of indices, too, but anyway not less than of the user, $N_{\rm scr} \ge N_{\rm user}$.

An ENDEC space features a capacity equal to the capacity of either the underlying line code, or the code driving it, that is a quasi base-21 code in the scope of this paper, but matched with the capacity of the scrambling by index skips responding to word exclusions, how necessary, ensuring $N \ge N_{\rm scr}$.

CONCLUSION

Designing a coding means, we usually conduct a search for the best code, that results in a selection of appropriate options we further will make our single choice just across.⁷

Ranging between, we can estimate the performance of each option, bounded due to the principles staying behind it, as so:

$$\frac{\text{BITS}}{\text{"NIBBLE"}} = \log_2 \text{BASE} < 5 \,,$$

reachable at the cost of framework bins, that's fair to all quasi base-21 words we mentioned earlier, see Table IX.⁸

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ivanov, "Base-21 scrambling,"
- @arXiv, doi:10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (bundle), pp. 01–04.
 [2] A. Ivanov, "Base-21 word alignment and boundary detection,"
-@arXiv, doi:10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (bundle), pp. 05–08.
 [3] A. Ivanov, (this is the initial topic in the whole work about) "Data coding means and event coding means multiplexed over the 100BASE-X PMD sublayer," not published yet.

⁷Generalizing, we can treat an exact base-21 code as a quasi base-21 code and such is true while allowed, however the opposite is not, anyway.

⁸A single term label for such a code could also be a $(N \uparrow 5/L = z)$ code, e.g., $(565 \uparrow 5/10 = 23.77)$, or similar, e.g., $(565^{5/10} = 23.77)$.

Quasi Base-21 Words Generated Compactly

Alexander Ivanov

Abstract—In this paper, we continue to consider the newborn category of codes—so called quasi base-21 words, set QBTO in short—inherited from and then expanded beyond the progenitor as well as their root, so called exact base-21 words, set EBTO in short. Codes of the new category are still abstract, completely as their progenitor, but, as their progenitor, too, demonstrate useful deterministic features and shapeful probabilistic properties, both helpful in running a plain line code that performs not so perfect alone in the respective application.

Index Terms—Ethernet, ENDEC framework, framework, quasi base-21 words, quasi base-21 code, quasi base-21, QBTO.

INTRODUCTION

O RIGINATING from the so called base-21 words, known for their interesting properties related to scrambling [1] and alignment [2], quasi base-21 words [3] describe a broader category of codes, which inherit the principles the progenitor was designed with, as well as its transport alphabet.

Referentially equated with the (set of) words it denotes for, a quasi base-21 code is a) characterized by its length, L, and capacity, N, measured in letters and words, respectively, then b) ranged by its base, $z = N^{5/L}$, and performance, $\log_2 z$, and finally c) described by its ENDEC framework [3].

A framework of a code consists of a number of so looking like bins, that increases dramatically along an increase in the length of such a code, rendering an implementation of such a code impractical as well as the avalanching complexity of the underlying coding means unacceptable, expectedly.

In the rest of this paper, we consider a way enabling for us to describe such a framework very compactly, that, in its turn, makes the respective code, as an integral part of the respective quasi base-21 coding means in the case, applicable in modern communication protocols, especially like of Ethernet.

PLOT OF A CODE

Given a code,¹ we describe a plot of that code, constructing such a plot the following way, based on the framework.

Similarly to [3], we connect a bin of such a framework with a certain time interval, in the whole word time, pointed by the letter index, i, during which syllables of that bin occur.

Recalling the fate of submission of many prior works to the peer reviewed journal, such a try with this one also promises no chance, probably.

Please sorry for the author has no time to find this work a new home, peer reviewed or not, except of arXiv, and just hopes there it meets its reader, one or maybe various, whom the author beforehand thanks for their regard.

A. Ivanov is with JSC Continuum, Yaroslavl, the Russian Federation. Digital Object Identifier 10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (this bundle).

¹In this paper, we consider only unbalanced exact and quasi base-21 codes, i.e., exact and quasi base-21 codes with no word exclusions, see [3].

TABLE I Compact L = 5 ENDEC Framework Example

Afore	t=5m	<i>t</i> +1	<i>t</i> +2	<i>t</i> +3	t+4	After	Bin I	Reps	× Ite	ms ir	ı Bin
(case)	/ J <	7.J.5	Z 2	⊿	⊿ ∖	(case)	1×14	2×7	3×4	6×2	12×1
• /		\nearrow K ¹ \lt	$> K^{1} \leq$	$\bigtriangleup K^1 \leqslant$	$\wedge \mathbf{K}^1 \setminus$	•	_	1×7	2×3	3×2	6×1
K≤2<	/		∕ K² <	∕ K² ⟨∕	$> K^2 <$	1.	_	_	1×3	2×1	3×1
	$> K_3 \rightarrow$	K		$> K_3 \leftrightarrow$	< l	∕ K≤₃	1×7	-	—	1×1	—
WLL(t) =	5 of 5	4 of 5	3 of 5	2 of 5	1 of 5	L - WLL =	5 - 5	5 - 4	5 - 3	5 - 2	5 - 1

TABLE II Example Details

Word	t=5m	<i>t</i> +1	<i>t</i> +2	<i>t</i> +3	<i>t</i> +4	Items in Bin, by J K1 K2 K3 patterns
11111	J (<u>→0</u> J <u>0</u> →	<u>≁0</u> J <u>0</u> ←	<u>→0</u> J <u>0+</u>	<u>→0</u> J \ ⊮1	14 ••• - { 7 ••• - { 4 ••• - { 2 ••• - { 1 ••• } }
J J J K J		0↔1	0⇔1`	K ¹ ₹	<u>→0</u> J	(1 of 1) (1 of 2) (1 of 3) (1
J J J KK			k 1 1∈	1↔2 →0 ı 0∢	∕ K ²	·····
J J K J K J J K J J	U⇔T	\	1↔2			(rep. (1 of 2)
J J KKJ			0 0	∕ K ² 2	<u>→0</u> J	L ••1• -{ 1•••
JK J JK JK J J J		' K¹ /─	* <u>•</u> J <u>•</u>	<u>→</u> J <u>•</u>	<u>→</u> ∪ J ∕ K 1	$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot 7 \cdot \cdot - 4 \cdot \cdot \cdot - 2 \cdot \cdot \cdot - 1 \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ (\operatorname{rep.}_{1 \circ f 1}) \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{rep.}_{2 \circ f 2} \end{pmatrix}$
JK JKJ		1↔2	0↔1 \	K1 5	<u>→</u> J	•2•• - 1•••
JK KJ J JK JKK			\ K ² .2↔	<u>→0</u> <u>0</u>	`≻ K² <u>⇒0</u> l	••1• ••3• -{ 2••• -{ 1•••
JKKJK			2↔3	0↔1	K 1	(rep. (1 of 1)
JK KKJ	K2 3⇔	•0 , 0←	+0 ı 0∉	->0 I 0+	<u>→0</u> J →0 ı	_ (
KJ JJJ KJ JJJ	Kº	Ĵ			∑ J ∕K1	$\begin{pmatrix} rep. \\ 1 \text{ of } 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} rep. \\ 2 \text{ of } 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} rep. \\ 3 \text{ of } 3 \end{pmatrix} + 1 \cdots$
KJ JKJ		0↔1	\	[\] K ¹ €	<u>→0</u> J	-2 1
KJ JKK KJ KJ J			\ K ¹ \	<u>→</u> J 🤄	`K² <u>→</u> 0 J	·····
KJKJK			1↔2	0↔1	→ K ¹	(^{rep.} / _{2 of 2})
KJ KKJ				`K²	J	L ••1• f 1•••

TABLE III Allowed J–K Transits

Upward (in time, t)	U-Rule	Rel.	D-Rule	Downward (in time)
$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \rightarrow 0 & 1 \rightarrow 0 & 2 \rightarrow 0 & 3 \rightarrow 0 \\ 0 \rightarrow 1 & & & \\ 1 \rightarrow 2 & & & \\ 2 \rightarrow 3 & & \\ \hline \\ column = from, row = into \end{bmatrix} \equiv$		(transpose)	(*************************************	$\label{eq:constraint} \overleftarrow{\left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \leftarrow 0 \ 0 \leftarrow 1 \\ 1 \leftarrow 0 \ 1 \leftarrow 2 \\ 2 \leftarrow 0 \ 2 \leftarrow 3 \\ 3 \leftarrow 0 \end{array}\right]}_{\text{row = into, column = from}}$

Oppositely to [3], we shorten the number of syllables a bin describes as well as the number of letters a syllable envelops to just one and one, respectively, further dealing right with so unified bins and their repetitions only, see Table $I.^2$

²In this paper, we consider an exact base-21 code as a quasi-base-21 code, assuming such generalization is allowed and, therefore, true, see [3].

TABLE IV Bin Capacity Map

Word	PatternJ	PatternK1	PatternK ²	PatternK3	Rem.
Letters Left (WLL)	$ \begin{array}{c} & \text{add} \\ (i+0)\mathbf{C}_0 \longrightarrow + \\ (i+1)\mathbf{C}_0 \longrightarrow - \end{array} $	ado			numbers UNDER the lines describe
:	(<i>i</i> +2)C0		$= \longrightarrow (i+2)C_2$	=> (<i>i</i> +2)C3	the bins ↓ for ↓
:	(<i>i</i> +3)C0	•	>=	:	:
17 of <i>L</i>		:	•	:	:
16 of <i>L</i>	19,079	17,697	15,033	9,898	
15 of L	9,898	9,181	7,799	5,135	/ = 15
14 of <i>L</i>	5,135	4,763	4,046	2,664	45.000
13 of <i>L</i>	2,664	2,471	2,099	1,382	words
12 of <i>L</i>	1,382	1,282	1,089	717	total
11 of <i>L</i>	717	665	565	372	
10 of <i>L</i>	372	345	293	193	/ = 10
9 of <i>L</i>	193	179	152	100	eee
8 of <i>L</i>	100	93	79	52	words
7 of L	52	48	41	27	total
6 of <i>L</i>		25	21		
5 of <i>L</i>	14	13	11	7	L = 5
4 of <i>L</i>	7	7	6	4	21
3 of <i>L</i>	4	3	3	2	words
2 of <i>L</i>	2	2	1	1	total
1 of <i>L</i>	1	1	1	_	
0 of <i>L</i> (in	nplicit) —	undefined	undefined	undefined	no real
<i>L</i> to 1	L bins total	L-1 bins	L-2 bins	L-3 bins	further

TABLE VI BCM Evaluation Tips

TABLE V Bin Frequency Map

L – WLL	PatternJ	PatternK1	PatternK2	PatternK3	Rem.
0 < L (e 1 < L 2 < L 3 < L	explicit) 1 2 3 6	1 2 3	1 2	1 — 1	L = 5 21 words total
4 < L	12	6	3	2	
5 < L 6 < L 7 < L 8 < L	23 44 85 164	12 23 44 85	6 12 23 44	3 6 12 23	L = 10 565 words total
9 < L	316	164	85	44	
10 < L 11 < L 12 < L 13 < L	609 1,174 2,263 4,362	316 609 1,174 2,263	164 316 609 1,174	85 164 316 609	L = 15 15,033 words total
14 < L 15 < L 16 < L	8,408 16,207 31,240	4,362 8,408 16,207	2,263 4,362 8,408	1,174 2,263 4 362	L = 20
L-L to	$(i+0)f_0 \rightarrow = =$	$ \overset{(i+1)}{=} \rightarrow \overset{(i+1)}{=} =$	$(i+2)f_2 \rightarrow =$	4,302 y =→ (i+3)f ₃	400,025 words total numbers ABOVE the lines describe the bins
L-1	L bins total	L-1 bins	L-2 bins	L-3 bins	\uparrow for \uparrow

TABLE VII BFM Evaluation Tips

Natural Way—Regressive	Return Way—Progressive	Natural Way—Progressive	Return Way—Regressive
Given: $L > 0$, $H > 0$, $\mathbf{C} = D$ -Rule ($H \times H$), \mathbf{c}	$\overline{s} = BCM \text{ Seed } (H \times 1), 0 \le i \le L, 0 \le r \le H. \bullet$	← Given: <i>L</i> > 0, <i>H</i> > 0, F = U-Rule (<i>H</i> × <i>H</i>), f s	= BFM Seed ($H \times 1$), $0 \le i < L$, $0 \le r < H$.
$(L-1) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_{s}$	$^{(0)}\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{L-1} \times \mathbf{c}_{\mathrm{s}}$	$^{(0)}\mathbf{f}=\mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{s}}$	$(L-1) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F} L^{-1} \times \mathbf{f}_{s}$
$\begin{array}{c} (L-2) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C} & \times & (L-1) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{1} & \times & \mathbf{c}_{s} \\ (L-3) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C} & \times & (L-2) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{2} & \times & \mathbf{c}_{s} \\ \hline (i) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C} & \times & (i+1) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{L-i-1} \times & \mathbf{c}_{s} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} (1) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \times (0) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \times (0) \mathbf{c} \\ (2) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \times (1) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{-2} \times (0) \mathbf{c} \\ (0) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{-1} \times (i^{-1}) \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{C}^{-i} \times (0) \mathbf{c} \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} (L-2) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \times (L-1) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \times (L-1) \mathbf{f} \\ (L-3) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \times (L-2) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-2} \times (L-1) \mathbf{f} \\ (i) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \times (i+1) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-L+i+1} \times (L-1) \mathbf{f} \end{array}$
$ \begin{array}{c} {}^{(1)}\mathbf{c}=\mathbf{C} \times {}^{(2)}\mathbf{c}= & \mathbf{C}^{L-2} \times & \mathbf{c}_{\mathrm{s}} \\ {}^{(0)}\mathbf{c}=\mathbf{C} \times {}^{(1)}\mathbf{c}= & \mathbf{C}^{L-1} \times & \mathbf{c}_{\mathrm{s}} \\ \hline \\$	$\underbrace{ \substack{(L-2) \\ (L-2) \\ (L-1) \\ c = C^{-1} \\ x \\ (L-2) \\ c = C^{-1} \\ x \\ (L-2) \\ c = C^{-L+2} \\ c = C^{-L+1} \\ x \\ (0) \\ c = C^{-L+1} \\ c = C^{-L+1} \\ (0) \\$	$(L-2) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F} \times (L-3) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F} L-2 \times \mathbf{f}_{s}$ $(L-1) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F} \times (L-2) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F} L-1 \times \mathbf{f}_{s}$ $\overleftarrow{Taken:} (\emptyset \mathbf{f} = [(\emptyset \mathbf{f}_{0} \cdots (\emptyset \mathbf{f}_{H-1}]^{T}, \text{ where } (\emptyset \mathbf{f}_{r} \text{ is kep})]$	$\underbrace{ \stackrel{(1)}{(0)} \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \times (2) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-L+2} \times (L-1) \mathbf{f} \\ \stackrel{(0)}{(0)} \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \times (1) \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{F}^{-L+1} \times (L-1) \mathbf{f} \\ \underbrace{ \text{ot set when } ^{(l)} \mathbf{c}_{l} > 0 \text{ and reset otherwise.} } $

Assuming a couple of numbers reflecting how many times we repeat a so unified bin against how many word inidices it spans for, respectively, as a node, as well as clearly inking ties present in between such the nodes, we complete the definition of such a plot, see Table II and then Table I again.

Thence, we suppose we may record (describe) a framework of a code as more compactly as much compact we can set up (construct) an appropriate plot for such a code.

RULE OF A CODE

Given a plot of a code, we describe a rule of that code with that plot, constructing such a rule the following way.

We place the nodes of a plot into (a set of) points of a twodimensional rectangular grid with the axes indexed $0 \le i < L$ across $0 \le r < H$, where H is the number of distinct syllable patterns, so the nodes of one given attribution, of letter period or syllable pattern, respectively, show the same index.

TABLE VIII Design Resource Demand

Parameter · · · · · r	measured	Formula	L = 5	L = 8	<i>L</i> = 10	<i>L</i> = 15	<i>L</i> = 16	L = 20	L = 24	L = 25	L = 30	L = 32	L = 35	<i>L</i> = 40
Capacity,	in words	$\sum {}^{(0)}C_r = \sum {}^{(L-1)}f_r$	21	152	565	~15k	~29k	~400k	~5.5M	~11M	~283M	~1.1G	~7.5G	~201G
ALU bus width,	in bits	ceil log ₂ capacity	5	8	10	14	15	19	23	24	29	30	33	38
BCM ROM size, w/o leading zeros,	in bits in bits	$L \times \text{ceil } \log_2{}^{(0)}\text{c}_0$ $\Sigma \text{ ceil } \log_2{}^{(i)}\text{c}_0$	20 15	56 27	90 35	210 54	240 58	380 73	528 87	575 91	840 111	960 119	1,155 130	1,480 147
BFM ROM size, w/o leading zeros,	in bits in bits	$L \times \text{ceil } \log_2{}^{(L-1)} f_0$ $\Sigma \text{ ceil } \log_2{}^{(i)} f_0$	20 10	56 22	90 30	210 50	224 53	360 66	528 82	575 86	840 106	960 114	1,120 125	1,480 142

Max K's Run leading [in letters]	BFM Seed	Afore (worst case)	<u>t = 10m</u>	<u>t + 1</u>	<i>t</i> + 2	<i>t</i> + 3	<i>t</i> + 4	<i>t</i> + 5	<i>t</i> + 6	<i>t</i> + 7	<i>t</i> + 8	<i>t</i> + 9	After (worst case)	BCM Seed	Rem.
3 = 3 (gives 401 words)		: K≤₃	1×401 <	1 × 208 1 × 193	2 × 108 1 × 100 1 × 85	4 × 56 2 × 52 1 × 44 1 × 29	8 × 29 4 × 27 2 × 23 1 × 15	15 × 15 8 × 14 4 × 12 2 × 8	29 × 8 15 × 7 8 × 6 4 × 4	56 × 4 29 × 4 15 × 3 8 × 2	108 × 2 56 × 2 29 × 2 15 × 1	208 × 1 108 × 1 56 × 1 29 × 1	J		each other
1 = 3 - 2 (gives 565 words) Base-23.77 max		K≤2	/ 1 × 372	2 × 193 1 × 179 ×	3 × 100 2 × 93 1 × 79	6 × 52 3 × 48 2 × 41 1 × 27	12 × 27 6 × 25 3 × 21 2 × 14	23 × 14 12 × 13 6 × 11 3 × 7	44 × 7 23 × 7 12 × 6 6 × 4	85 × 4 44 × 3 23 × 3 12 × 2	164 × 2 85 × 2 44 × 1 23 × 1	316 × 1 164 × 1 85 × 1	K≤3		in time like mirrors for
2 = 3 - 1 (gives 565 words) Base-23.77 max		K≤1<	1 × 316	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \times 164 \\ 1 \times 152 \end{array}$	4 × 85 2 × 79 1 × 67	7 × 44 4 × 41 2 × 35 1 × 23	14 × 23 7 × 21 4 × 18 2 × 12	27 × 12 14 × 11 7 × 9 4 × 6	52 × 6 27 × 6 14 × 5 7 × 3	100 × 3 52 × 3 27 × 3 14 × 2	193 × 2 100 × 1 52 × 1 27 × 1	→ 372 × 1 → > 193 × 1 →	K≤2		a labeled pair behave
3 = 3 — (gives 401 words) Base-20.02		7 —	— 1 × 208 > 1 × 193 <	2 × 108 1 × 100 1 × 85	4 × 56 2 × 52 1 × 44 1 × 29	8 × 29 4 × 27 2 × 23 1 × 15	15 × 15 8 × 14 4 × 12 2 × 8	29 × 8 15 × 7 8 × 6 4 × 4	56 × 4 29 × 4 15 × 3 8 × 2	108 × 2 56 × 2 29 × 2 15 × 1	208 × 1 108 × 1 56 × 1 29 × 1	7 401 × 1 ·	K≤1		options with

TABLE IXCOMPACT L = 10 ENDEC FRAMEWORK EXAMPLES

TABLE X FRAMEWORK IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINE

tream Processing Behavior Required Suitable Frameworks		Bin Passing Order	Time Application Flow Assumed	Map Time Rel.	ALU Operations Needed	
On the fly, letter by letter, when <i>t</i> steps	() c' s () f' s	of target BCM of mirror BFM	with <i>i</i> ascending with <i>i</i> descending	as is $t^* = (t \text{ div } L) + (L - 1 - t \text{ mod } L)$	$i \equiv t \mod L$ $i \equiv t^* \mod L$	addition bubtraction
On ready, by bulks of <i>L</i> letters, delayed	⁽ⁱ⁾ f's ⁽ⁱ⁾ c's	of suitable BFM of suitable BCM	with <i>i</i> advancing	any from the two above	any linear	comparison

Having this done, see Table I yet again, we reflect the plot inter-node ties, directed as well as overlapped, obtaining the direction-related rule in a matrix form, see Table III.

Such an upward rule, i.e., applied along time (t) ascending, predetermines the content of a bin frequency map,³ set BFM in short, related to such a code, see Tables V and VII.

Such a downward rule, i.e., applied along time descending, predetermines the content of a bin capacity map,⁴ set BCM in short, related to such a code, see Tables IV and VI.

Based on the systematic nature of such maps, see Tables V and IV again, we can set up (construct) the respective part of a plot of such a code very compact, see Table VIII.

SEED OF A CODE

Given a rule of a plot of a code, we describe a seed of that code with that plot and that rule, to complete the definition of that code, constructing such a seed the following way.

Although a rule of a plot and its complement, i.e., opposite by the direction, rule of the same plot are mutually predefined as they are transposable into each other, see Table III again, a seed of a plot and its counterpart of the same plot, respectively, are just mutually bounded as restricting on each other.

Anyway, every one among the rules and the seeds of a plot of a code inherits from then responds for the implementation of the principles the code is designed with. Having this one understood, we reflect the plot edge nodes, just alone as well as in the respective direction, obtaining the direction-related seed in a vector form, see Table IX.

Such an upward seed, i.e., applied once time (t) ascending under the respective rule, predetermines the content of a BFM, initializing its first vector by itself,⁵ see Table VII again.

Such a downward seed, i.e., applied once time descending under the respective rule, predetermines the content of a BCM, initializing its last vector by itself,⁶ see Table VI again.

Based on the systematic nature of such maps then, thus, of such plots, we can set up (construct) an appropriate framework of such a code very compact, too, see Table X.

GOAL OF A CODE

Given a task to design a code, we often get into a situation where many options fulfill the principles the code is designed with, originally, so, to make our choice as much as reasonable, we need to engage an extra measure, i.e., a goal.

Such a goal, being applied, updates the principles the code is designed with, that further results in a renewed framework, including its plot, then rules and seeds, and then bin maps, all corresponding to the updated principles, see Table XI.

Such a goal, being applied, may modify one, some, or even all of the properties of the code we design, as for its purpose, side effect, or both, useful or neutral, see Table XII.

³In the scope of a plot of a code, an element of its BFM, ${}^{(i)}f_r$, indicates how many repetitions of a unified bin are within the respective node.

⁴In the scope of a plot of a code, an element of its BCM, ${}^{(i)}c_r$, indicates how many word indices are in the unified bin of the respective node.

⁵In the scope of a plot of a code, a unity set in the first vector of its BFM, i.e., in ${}^{(0)}\mathbf{f}$, enables a word of the code to start at the respective node.

⁶In the scope of a plot of a code, a unity set in the last vector of its BCM, i.e., in $^{(L-1)}\mathbf{c}$, enables a word of the code to end at the respective node.

TABLE XI Compact L = 15 ENDEC Framework Examples

Goal	U-Rule = $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{C}^{T} = D$ -Rule ^T	Max K's Run	Max J's Run	BFM Seed = $(t+0)$ f defines BFM's first 3 + 3 = 6 bins	BCM Seed = $(t+14)$ c defines BCM's last 3 + 3 = 6 bins	$(t+0)\mathbf{f}^{\top} \bullet (t+0)\mathbf{C} = \dots = (t+i)\mathbf{f}^{\top} \bullet (t+i)\mathbf{C} =$	= = (t+14) f	⊤•(<i>t</i> +14) C
etters	enables 2 • (2 + 2 + 1) = 2 • 5 = 10 transits in a (3 + 3) x (3 + 3) = 6 x 6 transit space	inner/inter trailing	inner/inter trailing	$\frac{J^3}{J^2} \frac{J^2}{J^1} \frac{J^1}{K^1} \frac{K^2}{K^2} \frac{K^3}{K^3}$	$\frac{J^3}{J^2} \frac{J^2}{J^1} \frac{J^1}{K^1} \frac{K^2}{K^2} \frac{K^3}{K^3}$	Most Binary Spaces within	Capacity	Eq. Base
f >3 lo	column = from	— 3 = 3	— 3 = 3	empty] ^T	empty T	this configuration results in no words	EMPTY	_
ns o	J ³ J ² J ¹ K ¹ K ² K ³		1 = 3 - 2	[•] [†]	[• • • • •] ^T	4 + 64 + 256 + 512 + 2,048 =	2,884	14.23
s ru	$\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$		2 = 3 - 1	[•] ^T	[• • • •] [†]	+ 512 + 1,024 + 2,048 <	3,737	15.52
l bui	$J^2 \leftarrow \blacksquare$		3 = 3 —	[•] [†]	[• • •] [†]	4 + 64 + 256 + 512 + 2,048 =	2,884	14.23
K's a	$ \begin{array}{c c} J^{1} \leftarrow & \bullet \bullet \bullet \\ K^{1} \leftarrow & \bullet \bullet \bullet \end{array} $	1 = 3 - 2	— 3 = 3	[•] [†]	[••••] [†]	4 + 64 + 256 + 512 + 2,048 =	2,884	14.23
oth	K ² ← ■		1 = 3 - 2	[• •] [†]	[• • • •] [†]	16 + 128 + 1,024 + 4,096 =	5,264	17.40
ent b	K ³ ←[∎]		2 = 3 - 1	[••] ^T	[•••] [†]	+ 256 + 1,024 + 4,096 <	5,516	17.67
Preve	row = into		3 = 3 —	[••]	[••]	+ 512 + 1,024 + 2,048 <	3,737	15.52

TABLE XII Alignment Related Properties

Max K's Run	Max J's Run	JUMP Prol	pability c	f Occuri	rence, p(J), at the <i>i</i>	-th Lette	r Period i	n the Loop	Kind	Comma Ambit Shape	Eq. Ba	ase = Capa	acity ^{5/L}
1 = 3 - 2	not limited	.5	.6	.6	.6	.7	.7	.5	.6	approx.		25.15	25.63	25.87
1 = 3 - 2	<u> </u>	.5	.6	.6	_	—	1.	.5	.5	approx.	<u>_</u>	12.90	15.19	16.48
	— 3 > 1	.5	.6	.4	.4	—	1.	.5	.5	approx.		14.62	16.51	17.54
	— 3 > 2	.5	.5	.5	.5	—	1.	.5	.5	approx.		15.34	17.05	17.97
	— 3 = 3	.5	.5	.5	.5	—	1.	.5	.5	approx.		15.70	17.31	18.18
	1 = 3 - 2	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	exact		18.24	19.14	19.60
	2 = 3 - 1	.5	.6	.4	.4	.6	.6	.4	.5	approx.		18.46	19.29	19.71
	3 = 3 —	.5	.6	.6	—	.6	.6	.5	.5	approx.		16.75	18.07	18.78
	2 < 3 —	.5	.6	.6	—	.6	.6	.4	.5	approx.		16.29	17.75	18.52
	1 < 3 —	.5	.6	.6	—	.5	.5	.5	.5	approx.		15.34	17.05	17.97
1 < 3 - 1	not limited	.6	.5	.7	.7	.7	.7	.5	.6	approx.		24.14	24.94	25.35
1 < 3 - 1	2 = 3 - 1	.5	.5	.5	.5	.6	.6	.4	.5	approx.		17.38	18.53	19.13
	3 = 3 —	.5	.5	1.	_	.6	.6	.5	.5	approx.		15.02	16.81	17.78
	2 < 3 —	.5	.5	1.	—	.6	.6	.4	.5	approx.		14.62	16.51	17.54
	1 < 3 —	.5	.5	1.	—	.5	.5	.5	.5	approx.	<u> </u>	13.76	15.86	17.02
leading inner trailing	leading inner trailing	••• <i>L</i> – 4	L – 3	L – 2	L – 1 =	i = 0	1	2	3 •••	(of <i>p</i>)	(coarse, not for scale)	<i>L</i> = 20	L = 30	<i>L</i> = 40

Such a goal, being applied, results, finally, in a new coding means based on a plot set up so it reaches that goal.⁷

CONCLUSION

As we can notice, constructing a plot (of a framework) of a code helps much in discovering a systematic portion of such (a framework of) a code, the portion translatable—via analytic measures, various but rational—into a smaller description, that constitutes the design way considered in this paper.

On this way, we try to find out a code whose framework is representable by a compact plot,⁸ that makes such a framework as well as a coding means based on it also compact, that next, in its turn now, enables for us, when we employ such a means, to say we generate quasi base-21 words compactly.

⁸Reading plot, we do it like it is in a role-playing game, or in an interactive TV show, where the plot describes all the permissible among all the possible

REFERENCES

- [2] A. Ivanov, "Base-21 word alignment and boundary detection,"
- @arXiv, doi:10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (bundle), pp. 05–08. [3] A. Ivanov, "Quasi base-21 words,"

..... @arXiv, doi:10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (bundle), pp. 09–12.

scenarios the player, or the subscriber, can travel from (one of) the beginning, into (one of) the ending, through (a chain of) intermediate scenes, in all which such the client manifests initially, then occasionally, then finally, respectively, the choice of that precise route the client desires to travel along, of every time the client is involved in. Therefore, based on such, we could label the shown in Table I: // as basic as is

- an EBTO plot code, that is a L(5) N(21) QBTO(21.00) plot code; in Table IX: // limit on a K's run
- a L(10) N(401) K(0,3,3) *QBTO* (20.02) plot code ; // \emptyset T···To
- a L(10) N(565) K(1,3,2) QBTO(23.77) plot code ; $// xT \cdots Ty$ a L(10) N(565) K(2,3,1) QBTO(23.77) plot code ; $// yT \cdots Tx$
- a L(10) N(401) K(3,3,0) QBTO(20.02) plot code ; // $oT \cdots T\emptyset$
- in Table XI: // limits on K's and J's runs a L(15) N(2,884) K(0,3,3) J(1,3,2) QBTO(14.23) plot code ;
- $\begin{array}{ll} {\rm a}\; L(15)\;\; N(3,737)\;\; {\rm K}(1,3,2)\;\; {\rm J}(3,3,0)\;\; QBTO\,(15.52)\; {\rm plot\; code\; ;} \\ {\rm in\; Table\; XII:}\;\; & //\; {\rm limits\; on\; K's\; and\; J's\; runs} \\ {\rm a}\; L(20)\;\; N(2^{14.76})\;\; {\rm K}(1,3,2)\;\; {\rm J}(0,3,0)\;\; QBTO\,(12.90)\; {\rm plot\; code\; ;} \\ \end{array}$

a L(40) $N(2^{32.71})$ K(1,3,1) J(1,3,0) *QBTO*(17.02) plot code ; from top to bottom then from left to right, if any, as mentioned in the tables, respectively, excepting the first row of the last two tables, which are omitted.

⁷Generally speaking, a plot is a comprehensive expression of the respective framework of a code we consider in the paper, therefore, when such is allowed and true, we may equate between such a plot and such a framework, arbitrarily substituting each of the terms with each other in our consideration.

Speaking further, a bin map is an expression of the respective plot and thus of the respective framework, sufficient to implement a coding means capable to deal with the respective code, see Table X, therefore, when such is allowed and true, we may equate between, too, while losing nothing sensible.

Quasi Base-21 Words Balanced on the Framework

Alexander Ivanov

Abstract—In this paper, we further develop on the category of codes collectively called quasi base-21 words, or QBTO in short, derived from exact base-21 words, or EBTO in short, that are a subset as well as the root of the offspring, now focusing on their balancing problems and exercises.

Index Terms—Ethernet, framework, balancing, quasi base-21 words, quasi base-21 code, quasi base-21, base-21, QBTO.

INTRODUCTION

B ASE-21 words, including the so called progenitor,¹ then exact,² and then quasi,³ as considered in [1] and [2] then in [3] and [4], respectively, are manageable codes intended to improve on the originally given properties of the line code of a coding means we need to design, fix, or upgrade.

The manageability of such a code refers to the probabilistic properties of the code, which altogether define the balance of the code, and is based completely on the underlying structure of such a code, representable by a framework [3].

By its turn, a framework of such a code is implementable in an appropriate coding means—many ways sourcing out of its plot, a very useful among those is a bin map [4].

In this paper, we plan to balance such a code, manipulating on its BPM,⁴ see Tables I and II, as the uniform reflection of its framework capable to sufficiently describe a framework of such a code, in its maternal,⁵ delta, and balanced states, both individually and coherently, see Tables III and IV.⁶

Recalling the fate of submission of many prior works to the peer reviewed journal, such a try with this one also promises no chance, probably.

Please sorry for the author has no time to find this work a new home, peer reviewed or not, except of arXiv, and just hopes there it meets its reader, one or maybe various, whom the author beforehand thanks for their regard.

- A. Ivanov is with JSC Continuum, Yaroslavl, the Russian Federation. Digital Object Identifier 10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (this bundle).
- Digital Object Identifier 10.46550/arXiv.yyiiiii.iiiiiii (ulis buildle)

¹The base-21 words are the progenitor of both next exact and quasi base-21 words as well as a valid example of both exact and quasi base-21 codes, that defines a set of $3 \times 7=21$ five-letter-long distinct serial images patterned xTy, where $x \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, see [1] and [2].

²Exact base-21 words, or EBTO codes, are of those whose equivalent base is exact 21, where the base is a comparative measure referenced to that value of the progenitor. We consider an exact base-21 code as a valid quasi base-21 code, assuming such generalization is allowed and true, see [3].

³Quasi base-21 words, or QBTO codes, are of those whose equivalent base is about 21, near or far, as well as whose structure is clearly representable by a framework, see [3]. We consider any appropriate accessory, e.g., a bin map, frequency-related or capacity-related, as a valid, compact(-ized) expression of and, thus, a valid, compact substitute for such a framework of a quasi base-21 code, assuming such generalization is allowed and true, too, see [4].

⁴P in this abbreviation may stand for product, production, portion, partition, part, i.e., any suitable term for a contribution into the whole quantity.

⁵The maternal state of (a framework of a) a code is the state corresponding to the time when we set up (construct) the respective plot of that code.

⁶In this paper, we manipulate on the code denoting for the base-21 words, because it is enough short but vivid to be illustrative in our consideration.

TABLE I Bin Product Map

Bin Frequency Map	Bin Product Map	Bin Capacity Map
\overrightarrow{r}	\overrightarrow{r}	<i>r</i> <i>i</i> () _{Cr}
$^{(i)}$ pr = $^{(i)}$ fr × $^{(i)}$ Cr when both $^{(i)}$	fr and ⁽ⁱ⁾ cr exist. zero otherwis	se: <i>i</i> = *.0 <i>L</i> -1: <i>r</i> = 0 <i>H</i> -1

TABLE II L = 5 Respective Maps

i	BFM	$\sum_{r} (i) \mathbf{f}_{r}$	BPM	$\Sigma_r^{(i)}p_r$	BCM	$\sum_{r} (i) C_r$
* (implicit)	1 _	1	— — 21 —	21	— — 21 —	21
0	1 — — 1	2	14 — — 7	21	14 — — 7	21
1	2 1 — —	3	14 7 — —	21	77——	14
2	321-	6	12 6 3 —	21	4 3 3 —	10
3	6321	12	12 6 2 1	21	2 2 1 1	6
4	12 6 3 —	21	12 6 3 —	21	1 1 1 —	3

TABLE III BPM-based Balancing

Maternal BPM	Delta BPM	Balanced BPM			
$\left(\begin{array}{ccccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \langle \partial p_r & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array}\right) \ .$	$-\left(\begin{array}{cccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \emptyset \Delta p_r & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array}\right) =$	$\left(\begin{array}{cccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & {}^{(j)} p_r - {}^{(j)} \Delta p_r & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array}\right)$			
$Base-(N_M)^{5/L}, \ N_M = N_M(L) \qquad N_M \longrightarrow N_B : 0 \le {}^{(i)}\Delta p_r \le {}^{(i)}p_r \qquad Base-(N_B)^{5/L}, \ N_B = N_M - N_M$					

TABLE IV Example Base-21 to Base-16 Balancing

i	$p_{\rm M}({\sf J})$	M-BPM	Δ-BPM	B-BPM	$p_{\rm B}({\rm J})$
*	n/a	<u> </u>	5 _	<u> </u>	n/a
0	.67	14 — — 7	3 — — 2	11 — — 5	.69+.02
1	.67	147 — —	32 — —	11 5 — —	.69+.02
2	.57	12 6 3 —	41	853—	.5007
3	.57	12 6 2 1	4 — 1 —	8 6 1 1	.5007
4	.57	12 6 3 —	41——	853—	.5007
max{	∆ <i>p</i> } = .10	Base-21	Base-21 → Base-16	Base-16	.19 ^{+.09}

DECOMPOSITION OF A CODE

Given such a code, whose length is L while capacity is N, we recognize its BPM as a superposition of distinct BPMs of the distinct words the code denotes for, see Table V.⁷

⁷In this paper, we consider up to L + 1 letter periods of a map, beginning either from * = 0-1, i.e., $i \ge *$, or from 0 = 0, i.e., $i \ge 0$, purposefully.

TABLE V BPM DECOMPOSITION RULE

(i)pr of bfirst

 ${}^{(i)}p_r$ of $\Sigma = {}^{(i)}p_r$ of $b_{\text{first}} + ... + {}^{(i)}p_r$ of b_{last} , where b's are indices of the words in this

describes a separate Word in this Set, individually

Word (per-word) BPMs the given one consists of

i

(i)pr of blast

describes a separate Word .

TABLE VI BPM Construction Memo

Map originality, for the same capacity choice made unique or shared unique among all b' Map element—possible values $0 \le (hp_r \le N_M)$ $0 \le (hp_r \le 1)$ Map element—considered as $(hp_r of \Sigma)$ $(hp_r of (the given start))$ Map as a whole—key properties $\sum_{r} (hp_r = capacity)$ $\sum_{r} (hp_r = 1)$	Parameter	M/Δ/B-BPM	Word BPM
Map element—possible values $0 \le (\partial p_r \le N_M \bullet)$ $0 \le (\partial p_r \le 1 \bullet)$ Map element—considered as $(\partial p_r of \Sigma)$ $(\partial p_r of (the giverMap as a whole—key properties\sum_r (\partial p_r = capacity)\sum_r (\partial p_r = 1)$	Map originality, for the same capacity choice made	e unique or shared	unique among all b's
Map as a whole—key properties $\sum_{r} (\partial p_r = capacity)$	Map element—possible values Map element—considered as	$0 \leq {}^{(i)}p_r \leq N_{\rm M} \bullet$	$0 \le {}^{(i)}p_r \le 1$ (•) ${}^{(i)}p_r \text{ of (the given) } b$
$0 < \text{capacity} \leq N_{M} \bullet \qquad \sum_{i(\neq^*)} \sum_r (i) p_r$	Map as a whole—key properties	$\Sigma_r^{(i)} \mathbf{p}_r = \text{capacity}$ 0 < capacity $\leq N_{\text{M}} \bullet$	$\sum_{r} {}^{(i)}p_r = 1$ $\sum_{i(\neq^*)} \sum_{r} {}^{(i)}p_r = L$

TABLE VII L = 5 Word BPMs

mage	→JJJJJJ	JJJJĸ	JJJĸJ	ЈЈЈкк	JJĸJJ	JJкJк	ЈЈккЈ	JĸJJJ	JĸJJĸ	JKJKJ	ЈкЈкк	JĸĸJJ	ЈккЈк	ЈкккЈ	кЈЈЈЈ	кЈЈЈК	кЈЈКЈ	кЈЈкк	кЈкЈЈ	кЈкЈк	кЈккЈ
Index	(→①	$\overline{1}$	2	3	4	5	6	$\overline{7}$	8	9	10	(11)	(12)	(13)	14	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	20
٥Ļ	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•							
2	÷ .	:	•	÷.	÷ .	· ·	÷.,	÷.	÷.	÷.	÷.	· ·	<u>.</u>	· • .	÷ .	÷ .	÷.	÷.	· ·	÷ .	÷.,
4	:	· ·	•	· ·	•	· ·	• *	:	· ·	•	·.	:	· ·	• `	:	· ·	•	· ·	:	·.	• `
Alias	→ 3T7	3T6	3T5	3T4	3T3	3T2	3T1	2T7	2T6	2T5	2T4	2T3	2T2	2T1	1T7	1T6	1T5	1T4	1T3	1T2	1T1

TABLE VIII Base-21 Encode Process

i	Location of Word Indices, Fission Places, and Fusion Inputs in Product Bins of r=0 r=1 r=2 r=3	Index Location Algorithm, for a given $0 \le b \le N_{\rm M}$
*	-10 X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	$\underset{({}^{(\prime)}r \leftarrow r \text{ of the single bin of } ({}^{(\prime)}c_r > 0 ; ({}^{(\prime)}\text{IBRI} \leftarrow 0 ;)$
		Do the next <i>L</i> times, aliasing $\$ \equiv (i)r$, iterating $* \le i < L-1$:
0	$00 \boxed{\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \underbrace{\underset{0}{\overset{\otimes}{\underset{B}{}}}}_{0} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (0)[B_{B}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)c_{S} ; \\ (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{B}]_{S} - (0)(c_{S+1}) > 0 \\ (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{B}]_{S} - (0)(c_{S+1}) > 0 \\ (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{B}]_{S} - (0)(c_{S+1}) > 0 \\ (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{E}]_{S} - (0)(c_{S+1}) > 0 \\ (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)(c_{S+1}) > 0 \\ (0)[B_{E}]_{S} \leftarrow (0)(c_{S+$
1	1:0 0.0 0:1 0:2 0:3 0:4 0:5 0:6 1:0 1:1 1:2 1:3 1:4 1:5 1:6 1:1	$ \underbrace{ \begin{bmatrix} (i+1) BR \leftarrow 0 \\ (i+1) BR \leftarrow 0 \end{bmatrix} }_{i \in \mathbb{N} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} if (\theta BC < \theta B_F _{S} \\ \theta BR + \sum_{r \in S} \theta f_{r} \\ (i+1) BC \leftarrow 0 \end{bmatrix} }_{i \in \mathbb{N} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} otherwise \\ \theta BR \\ H S \\ H S \end{bmatrix} }_{i \in \mathbb{N} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} otherwise \\ \theta BR \\ \theta BC \\ H S \end{bmatrix} }_{i \in \mathbb{N} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} otherwise \\ \theta BR \\ \theta BC \\ \theta BC \\ H S \end{bmatrix} }_{i \in \mathbb{N} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} otherwise \\ \theta BR \\ \theta BC \\ \theta BC \\ \theta BC \end{bmatrix} }_{i \in \mathbb{N} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} otherwise \\ \theta BR \\ \theta BC \\ \theta $
•••		₹ M-BPM describing the respective ENDEC framework. (see BFM/BCM recovery from M-BPM)

TABLE IX INDEX REJECTION MODEL

Location of Maternal Indices –	→ Some Indices to be Rejected	All the Rest Indices Shifted <i>Toward</i> the Fission Boundary	→ Delta ROM Content
$1:0 \begin{bmatrix} 0:0 & 0:1 & 0:2 & 0:3 & 0:4 & 0.5 & 0.6 \\ \hline 1:0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \end{bmatrix}$	(0) - (2)(3) - (6)	(1:0)[Δ _J B]0·{023} 6 <u></u> (1:0)[Δ _K B]0	^(1:0) [$\Delta_{J}B$] ₀ = 1 $\left[(1:0)[\Delta_{K}B]_{0} = 2 \right]$
$ \begin{array}{c} (1)[\dot{B}_{z}]_{0} = 0 \\ 1:1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (1)[\dot{B}_{z}]_{0} = 4 \\ 1:1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (1)[\dot{B}_{B}]_{0} = 4 \\ 1:1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (1)[\dot{B}_{B}]_{0} = 1 \\ 1:1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (1)[\dot{B}$	$7 \stackrel{0}{(14)} \stackrel{1}{(15)} - (17) (18) (19) - $	$\underbrace{\begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & - \end{array}}_{(1:1)[\Delta_{L}B]_{0}} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & - \end{array}}_{(1:1)[\Delta_{L}B]_{0}} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} & & \\ \hline & & \\ (1:1)[\Delta_{J}B]_{0} &$	and $cr - and$ $^{(1:1)}[\Delta_J B]_0 = 1$ $^{(1:1)}[\Delta_K B]_0 = 1$
	<u>14</u> 15 16 17 18 19 20 ←	<u>14 15 16 17</u> 18 19 20	
Boundary Marks: Zero, Fission, Bin	These are the "maternal places" of the indices	${}^{(1)}[\overset{i}{B}_{Z}]_{0} = 0$ ${}^{(1)}[\overset{i}{B}_{F}]_{0} = 4$ ${}^{(1)}[\overset{i}{B}_{B}]_{0} = 7$	J Delta ROM K Delta ROM

TABLE X REJECT OPERATION RESOURCE DEMAND

Parameter · · · · · measured	Formula	L = 5	L = 8	<i>L</i> = 10	<i>L</i> = 15	<i>L</i> = 16	L = 20	<i>L</i> = 24	L = 25	L = 30	L = 32	L = 35	<i>L</i> = 40
Capacity limit, in words	$N_{\rm M} = N_{\rm M}(L)$	21	152	565	~15k	~29k	~400k	~5.5M	~10.6M	~283M	~1.1G	~7.5G	~201G
ALU bus width limit, in bits	ceil log ₂ N _M	5	8	10	14	15	19	23	24	29	30	33	38
Delta ROM size limit, in bits	(☆) using path a	33	275	1,046	~28k	~54k	~749k	~10.3M	~19.9M	~530M	~2.0G	~14.1G	~375G
W/O leading zeros, In Dits reduction percentage	(3,2) using path b	-12.12%	250 -6.91%	-6.98%	~20K -6.96%	~5UK -6.97%	~6.97%	~9.6IVI -6.97%	~18.5IVI -6.97%	~493IVI -6.97%	~1.8G -6.97%	~13.1G -6.97%	~349G -6.97%
$(\dot{x}) \text{ a: } \Sigma_i(\max\{(\theta_{fr}\} \times \Sigma_r(\theta_{\Lambda}r), b: \Sigma_i \Sigma_r((\theta_{fr} \times \theta_{\Lambda}r), where \ \theta_{fr} = \text{ceil} \log_2(\min\{(^{i+1})c_0, (^{i+1})c_{r+1}\} + \theta_{\eta}r) \text{ if } (^{i+1})c_0 \text{ and } (^{i+1})c_{r+1} \text{ exist, else 0}; \ \theta_{\eta}r = 1 \text{ if } \theta_{fr} > 1, \text{ else 0}; \ \theta_{\Lambda}r = \theta_{fr} \text{ if } \theta_{\eta}r > 0, \text{ else 0}.$													

i

M/Δ/B-BPM

► r

 $^{(i)}p_r$ of Σ

describes a Word Set, jointly = i

i	Location of Word Indices, Balanced in Relation to Maternal, in Maternal Product Bins	M-BPM	fusion input pieces Λ-RPM	Delta ROM bits/ row,
*	$\left \underbrace{\mathbb{X}} \right \underbrace{\mathbb{X}} = \underbrace{ (1 + 2)(3 + 4)(5 + 6)(9 + 10)(11)(12)(13)}_{0 + 1 + 2)(13 + 15)(16)(17)(18)(19)(19)(19)(19)(19)(19)(19)(19)(19)(19$	— — 21 — 1×21	fission output pieces 	<u> </u>
0	$ \left \begin{array}{c} -\underbrace{1}{2}\underbrace{3}{4}\underbrace{5}{6}\\ \underbrace{0}{1}\underbrace{2}{3}\underbrace{4}{5}\underbrace{5}{6}\\ \underbrace{1}{9}\underbrace{10}{11}\underbrace{12}{13}\\ \underbrace{12}{13}\\ \underbrace{11}{12}\\ \underbrace{13}{12}\\ \underbrace{13}{12}\\ \underbrace{13}{12}\\ \underbrace{14}{15}\underbrace{16}{17}\underbrace{18}{19}\underbrace{19}{20} \right \right $	14 — — 7 1×14 1×7	3J = - 2K = 2 $3J_{1J+2K} = - 2$ $2J_{2J} = - 2$	1°2 — — 2°0 ²
1	$ \begin{vmatrix} -1 & 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline -15 & 16 & 17 \\ 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 \\ \hline 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 \\ \hline 18 & 19 & 20 \\ \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} - & -9 & 0 \\ 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline -7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \hline 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \hline 11 & 12 & 13 \\ \hline 11 & 12 & 13 \\ \hline \\ $	14 7 — — ^{2×7} 1×7	13 2K 3 2 — — 1J+0K 2J+0K 1J+1K	$\frac{1 \circ 0}{2} \stackrel{2 \circ 0}{=} \stackrel{-}{=} 2$
2	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	12 6 3 — ³⁴⁴ ^{2×3} ^{1×3}	1J 1J 0K 2J 1K 0K 4 1 J-0K 0K 0K 4 1 	$\frac{1 \circ 0}{2} \xrightarrow{-} - 1$ $\frac{1 \circ 0}{2} \xrightarrow{-} 0$ 1
3	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ONLY words whose index falls in a bin of r = 0 cause a jump in the respective <i>i</i> -th letter period, otherwise a keep is caused	О. ОК - 1К 4 — 1 — 1.1+0К О. 1.1 1.1+0К 1.1 1.1+1К 0.1+0К 0.1+0К 0.1+0К 0.1+0К 0.1+0К 0.1+0К 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
4	$\begin{bmatrix} \text{content of this bin is shown TRANSPOSED (!) to save visual space} \\ - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & - & -$	 12 6 3 — 12×1 6×1 3×1	1ј ок — ок 4 1 — —	

TABLE XI Example Base-21 to Base-16 Encoding

In the scope of such a code, there are only three such maps related with its states, including maternal (M),⁸ delta (Δ), and balanced (B), all of $N \ge 1$ and each of $N = N_{\rm M}$, $N = N_{\Delta}$, and $N = N_{\rm B}$, respectively, see Table VI, and exact $N_{\rm M}$ such maps related with (the distinct serial images of) its words, all of $N = N_0 = \cdots = N_{N_{\rm M}-1} = 1$, see Table VII.

Assigning a distinct (continuous) index to each word BPM, $0 \le b < N_{\rm M}$, we establish an appropriate ENDEC process, as a fission-fusion procedure, during which such an index takes its unique place at the rectangular grid (in the space) of each of the respective L + 1 product bins, see Table VIII.

Thus, such a word in such a code features a distinct index, a distinct image, a distinct BPM, and a distinct chain of places in product bins of such a process, that sets up the ground for our further steps, see Tables V, VI, VII, and VIII again.

MODIFICATION OF A CODE

Given such a decomposed code, i.e., a code all whose maps are known, we balance the code via rejection,⁹ see Table IX, of $N_{\Delta} = N_{\rm M} - N_{\rm B}$ out of $N_{\rm M}$ words it denotes for.

Such a rejection costs us a memory, see Table X, we should equip an appropriate coding means running such an ENDEC process with, the volume of that rises rapidly and enormously along the length of words to be rejected, i.e., along L.

However, a particular case may necessitate for a very much lesser volume of such a memory, because it may be in no need to store BPM-related information about every product bin, but only about those who are essential so to ensure the respective ENDEC process, as its underlying fission–fusion procedure, is run properly and unambiguously,¹⁰ see Table XI.

¹⁰In the scope of the output of such a routine run by a coding means.

⁸A maternal map is self-sufficient, i.e., M-BPM \equiv framework, while all the rest are not, therefore any mention of a delta, balanced, or word map assumes an implicit reference to the respective maternal one and from that one further to the respective ENDEC framework, always as well as anyway.

⁹We read *exclusion* and *rejection* (reject operation) different, as mentioned in [3] then [4] and in this paper, respectively, supposing the former results in a new framework while the latter does not. Of course, both those operations may be involved to balance a code, making their effects aggregated.

TABLE XII Inverse Encode Process

i	Location of Word Indices Shifted Fromward the Fission Boundary of a Bin, in Product Bins	M-BPM	Δ-BPM	Inverse Δ-ROM
*	$\left \underbrace{X} \right \underbrace{0}_{0 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \ 10 \ 11 \ 12 \ 13} \left $	— — 21 —	— — 21-5 —	$ 3^{\circ 2} - $
• •			· • • • • • • • • • •	

TABLE XIII L = 5 Possible Word Sets

Number \downarrow of \rightarrow Words Rejected, $0 \le N_{\Delta} \le 21$ NOTE - BPMs meant below are Δ /B-BPMs.	0 <i>or</i> 21–0	1 or 21-1	2 or 21–2	3 or 21–3	4 or 21-4	5 or 21-5	6 or 21–6	7 or 21-7	8 or 21-8	9 or 21-9	10 <i>or</i> 21-10	Line Total
Different Word Combinations [showing↓]	1	21	210	1,330	5,985	20,349	54,264	116,280	203,490	293,930	352,716	2,097,152
 shared BPMs among all the N_∆'s shared BPMs among the given N_∆ only 	_	_	84 84	836 836	4,596 4,596	17,228 17,228	48,422 48,422	106,932 106,932	190,384 190,384	277,656 277,656	334,606 334,606	1,961,488 1,961,488
Max Duplication Factor, i.e., number of items sharing a BPM	-	-	4	8	18	36	68	112	156	212	212	
unique BPMs among the same scope equivalent percentage	1 100%	21 100%	126 ^{60%}	494 ~37%	1,389 < 24%	3,121 < 16%	5,842 < 11%	9,348 < 9%	13,106 < 7%	16,274 < 6%	18,110 < 6%	135,664 < 7%

TABLE XIV BFM/BCM RECOVERY FROM M-BPM

Given	Iterators	BFM = BFM (M-BPM)	BCM = BCM [M-BPM, BFM (M-BPM)]	Extra Comment
${}^{\text{M-BPM's}}{\left\{ {}^{(i)}p_r \right\}}$	<i>i</i> = *,0 <i>L</i> -1; <i>r</i> = 0 <i>H</i> -1	$\left\{ (\partial f_r \right\} : ({}^{(=)})f_r = 1, \ ({}^{(\neq)})f_0 = \sum_r ({}^{(i-1)}f_r, \ ({}^{(\neq)})f_{r\neq 0} = ({}^{(i-1)}f_{r-1} \ \text{if} \ ({}^{()}p_r \neq 0, \ \text{else } 0 \right\}$	$\{(\partial c_r\}: (\partial c_r = (\partial p_r \operatorname{div} (\partial f_r \operatorname{if} (\partial p_r \neq 0 \text{ and } (\partial f_r \neq 0, \operatorname{else } 0))\}$	can be done on the fly with <i>i</i> ascending

TABLE XV Composite ENDEC Framework

	General, $\omega < \Omega$ ("many of various to one")	Maximal, $\omega = \Omega$ ("many of one to one")			
Δ /B-BPM ₁ ••• Δ /B-BPM _Ω	$\Delta/B\text{-}BPM_1 \dashrightarrow \Delta/B\text{-}BPM_\Omega$	Δ/B-BPM ₁	Δ /B-BPM _Ω		
single M-BPM	M-BPM ₁ ••• M-BPM _ω	M-BPM ₁	M-BPMΩ		

Anyway, balancing a code via rejection has a sense only in the scope of its initial plot, see Tables IX and XI again.¹¹

IMPLEMENTATION OF A CODE

Given such a decomposed then modified code, whose maps are of known $N_{\rm M} - N_{\Delta} = N_{\rm B}$, we construct a coding means intended to run an appropriate ENDEC process, either direct, see Table XI yet again, or inverse, see Table XII, depending on what is beneficial in a particular case, see Table XIII, and, typically, choose into the favor of the former option, i.e., with $N_{\rm B}$ out of $N_{\rm M}$ chains kept, when receive $N_{\Delta} < N_{\rm B}$, and into the favor of the latter, opposite one, i.e., with N_{Δ} out of $N_{\rm M}$ chains kept, when receive $N_{\Delta} > N_{\rm B}$, respectively.

Because a maternal map of such a code "imprints" both its origins losslessly, see Table XIV, there is no need to "imprint" such a bit into the memory of such a coding means.

Moreover, we account for where we deploy such a code, in a stand-alone, or in a composite design, see Table XV.

SERIALIZATION OF A CODE

Given an ENDEC process, we set out all the content of its (two-dimensional, different-size) product bins regarded to the same letter period, receiving a (unidimensional, uniform-size) runic-like record of such a coherent content, see Table XI yet more again, we use as an extra check for its consistency.

CONCLUSION

Now, we can handle on quasi base-21 words described by a basic definition, textual, tabular, or mixed, like in [1] and [2], a framework, like in [3], (a bundle of elements of) a plot, like in [4], a match of bin product maps, maternal toward delta or balanced, like in this paper, or a combination thereof.

Balancing a code denoting for (a set of) such words,¹² we decompose, then modify, and then implement it with a coding means running an appropriate ENDEC process.¹³

The latter assumes for a fission–fusion procedure characterized by a couple of numbers, up to which the content of a bin is sourcing into and sourced from, respectively.¹⁴

REFERENCES

- [2] A. Ivanov, "Base-21 word alignment and boundary detection,"@arXiv, doi:10.48550/arXiv.yymm.nnnn (bundle), pp. 05–08.
- [3] A. Ivanov, "Quasi base-21 words,"

¹²Generally speaking, every word of such a code can be either rejected, or repeated, individually, just once and at least once, respectively.

¹³Such a process, see Tables VIII, IX, XI, and XII, is the most critical and the most resource-demanding part, see Table X, of such a means.

 14 We could call those numbers as the fission and fusion factors, agreeably, and thus label the code we consider in this paper, as a Fi₂Fu₄ plot code.

¹¹Facing a code decomposed into a superposition of BPMs, we represent, including visually, see Tables VIII, XI, and XII, its ENDEC process as some superposition, too, collected over as distinct as orthogonal chains of places of indices, b's, in product bins, resulted from the process run with $0 \le b < N$, where it is $N = N_{\rm M}$ (M-BPM), $N = N_{\rm B}$ (B-BPM), or $N = N_{\Delta}$ (Δ -BPM), respectively, that pictures both the framework as well as the plot of the code, simultaneously and jointly. (Also for M-BPM, $b \equiv B$, see [3] and [4].)